
USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# INDONESIA: DECENTRALIZED BASIC EDUCATION PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION

## VOLUME I: MAIN REPORT

**Final Report**

**November 2012**

This report was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under Task Order 46 of the Global Evaluation and Monitoring (GEM) II BPA, Number EDH-E-00-08-00003-00. It was prepared by the Aguirre Division of JBS International, Inc.

# INDONESIA: DECENTRALIZED BASIC EDUCATION PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION

## Volume I: Main Report

November 2012

Photographic credits: Sean Tate and Lynn Losert, DBE Evaluation Team.

"Even if the DBE project is gone from this district, it is the soul of our education system and its spirit must live on."

Head of one of the DINAS in South Sulawesi

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation was undertaken in July, August, September and October by a team of nine people: Agung Purwadi, Education Analyst; Annisa Setiadi, Research Assistant and Translator; David P. Evans, Team Leader and Education Analyst; Lynn Losert, Education Analyst; M. Basri Wello, Education Analyst; Norman Ario Bimo, Research Assistant and Translator; Nurdin Noni, Education Analyst; Sean A. Tate, Education Analyst; and Tari Savitri, Chief Translator and Logistics Coordinator.

Over the course of the evaluation, the evaluation team met and worked with many people who provided enthusiastic support to our efforts and we wish to thank them all, even if we cannot name them here. We wish to give special thanks, however, to the following people:

Mark R. Doyle, Science and Technology Advisor, USAID/Indonesia

Lawrence W. Dolan, Education Officer, USAID/Indonesia

Margaret K. Sancho, Director, Education Office, USAID/Indonesia

Mimy M. Santika, Education Specialist, USAID/Indonesia

Jalu Noor Cahyanto, Education Specialist, USAID/Indonesia

Ester R. Manurung, Project Management Specialist, USAID/Indonesia

Stuart Weston, Director, PRIORITAS Project

Lorna Power, Deputy Director, PRIORITAS Project

Mark Heyward, Education Management and Governance Advisor, PRIORITAS Project,

Nurkolis, Central Java Provincial Coordinator, PRIORITAS Project,

Ajar Budi Kuncoro, Central Java TT Development Specialist, PRIORITAS Project

Jamaruddin, South Sulawesi Provincial Coordinator, PRIORITAS Project, Indonesia

Parapat Gultom, North Sumatera TT Development Specialist, PRIORITAS Project, Indonesia

Agus Marwan, North Sumatera Provincial Coordinator, PRIORITAS Project, Indonesia

Erix Hutasoit, North Sumatera Communications Specialist, PRIORITAS Project, Indonesia

Hariyadi, North Sumatera Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, PRIORITAS Project, Indonesia

Nur Jannah, Agus Danar, Lutfi Rahman, Husni Tamrin, Ramin, Syamsul Agus, Adi Sinaga, Gisler Simanulang, Gokman Pakpahan, local guides

All project partners and education personnel (teachers, principals, school committee members, supervisors, district and provincial education staff) who graciously provided their time, informed opinions, and assistance.

Any errors in the report are, of course, the sole responsibility of the evaluation team.

David P. Evans
Washington, D.C.
October 2012

# Table of Contents

# ACRONYMS

| | |
|---|---|
| AED | Academy for Educational Development |
| AL | Active Learning |
| ALFHE | Active Learning for Higher Education (DBE2 program) |
| AusAID | Australian Agency for International Development |
| BAPPEDA | Regional Government Planning Board |
| BAPPENAS | National Development Planning Board |
| BEC-TF | Basic Education Capacity Trust Fund |
| BERMUTU | Better Education Through Reform Management and Universal Teacher Upgrading Project, World Bank |
| BOS | Schools Operational Assistance Program (*Biaya Operasi Sekolah*, funded by the Central Government) |
| BTL | Better Teaching and Learning |
| Bupati | Principal Responsible Officer for District or City |
| CRC | Cluster Resource Center |
| CAR | Classroom Action Research |
| DBE | Decentralized Basic Education |
| DBE1 | Improving the Quality of Management and Governance |
| DBE2 | Improving the Quality of Primary Teaching and Learning |
| DBE3 | Improving the Quality and Relevance of Junior Secondary Education |
| DC | District Coordinator |
| DE | Distance Education |
| Dewan Pendidikan | Education Board |
| DIKTI | Directorate of Higher Education |
| DINAS Pendidikan | Education Office of Local Government (District and Provincial Levels) |
| EGR | Early Grade Reading |
| EGRA | Early Grade Reading Assessment |
| GOI | Government of Indonesia |
| HELM | Higher Education Leadership and Management Project |
| ICT | Information Communication Technology |
| IR | Intermediate Result |
| IRD | International Relief and Development |

| | |
|---|---|
| JICA | Japanese International Cooperation Agency |
| JSS | Junior Secondary School |
| Kepala Sekolah | Principal/Headmaster |
| Kesra | Menko Kesra-Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare |
| KKG | Teachers' Working Group (Primary Schools) |
| KKKS | Principals' Working Group |
| LPMP | Provincial Quality Assurance Institute |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| Madrasah | Islamic School |
| MAPENDA | Madrasah and Religious Education; a section of the Ministry of Religious Affairs. |
| MBE | Managing Basic Education |
| Menko Kesra | Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare |
| MGMP | Subject Teacher Working Group |
| MI | Islamic Primary School-Madrasah Ibtidaiyah |
| MOA | Memorandum of Agreement |
| MOEC | Ministry of Education and Culture |
| MORA | Ministry of Religious Affairs |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MSS | Minimum Service Standards |
| MTE | Mid-Term Evaluation |
| MTs | Islamic Junior Secondary School-Madrasah Tsanawiyah |
| MTT | Master Teacher Trainers |
| NFE | Nonformal Education |
| PAKEM | Active, Creative, Effective and Joyful Learning |
| PISA | Program for International Student Assessment |
| PLPG | In-service Teacher Education and Training Program |
| PPA | Public Private Alliance |
| PPG | Teacher Professional Education Program |
| PNS | Civil Servant (*Pegawai Negeri Sipil*) |
| PRIORITAS | Prioritizing Reform, Innovation, and Opportunities for Reaching Indonesia's Teachers, Administrators and Students Project |

| | |
|---|---|
| P4TK | Subject Matter Training Centers |
| *RENSTRA* | Education Strategic Plan |
| RKS | School Work Plans |
| S1 | Degree Equivalent to Bachelor's Degree-Sarjana 1 |
| SBM | School-based Management |
| SD | Primary School |
| SEAMOLEC | South East Asian Ministries of Education Organization Regional Open Learning Center |
| SMA/SMK | Senior High School/Vocational High School |
| SMP | Junior Secondary School |
| TIMSS | Trends in Mathematics and Science Study |
| TTI | Teacher Training Institutes |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| UT | *Universitas Terbuka* (Open University) |
| *Walikota* | City Council Head |
| WB | World Bank |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Background

This report is the final evaluation of USAID/Indonesia's Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) Program. The DBE program was the cornerstone of the United States' assistance to education in Indonesia and was designed to directly respond to the Government of Indonesia's priorities to decentralize and revitalize the education sector. The DBE program focused on improving school management and governance and the quality and relevance of education in primary and junior secondary schools. The project was divided into three components: 1) assistance to local governments and communities to manage education services more effectively; 2) enhancement of teaching and learning to improve student performance, especially in key subjects such as math, science and reading; and 3) assurance that Indonesia's youth gain more relevant life and work skills to better compete for jobs in the modern economy

## Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to assist USAID/Indonesia in the assessment of the impact of the three DBE programs on the quality and relevance of primary and junior secondary education in Indonesia. More specifically, the evaluation assessed how successful the three DBE programs were in achieving the primary goals, the degree to which these goals have been met, and the contributing factors that were responsible for or detracted from the achievement of these goals. In addition, USAID/Indonesia asked the evaluation team to highlight any lessons learned or best practices from the implementation of the DBE program that could be applied to a recently-awarded new basic education program, Prioritizing Reform, Innovation, Opportunities for Reaching Indonesia's Teachers, Administrators, and Students (PRIORITAS).

## Methodology

The evaluation team used six basic methods to obtain findings including: review of DBE project documents, research, evaluation studies, and findings in basic education; observation and interviews with DBE-assisted and non-DBE-assisted schools, principals, and teachers; targeted questions and interviews with stakeholders; targeted questions in focus group discussions with single groups of stakeholders (principals and supervisors); anonymous questionnaires administered to key stakeholders such as teachers and principals; and school profile checklists and facilities observations aimed at determining how well the school met the National Standards for schools. The evaluation team interviewed more than 750 stakeholders and visited a total of 107 schools in four provinces (Banten, Central Java, South Sulawesi, and North Sumatra) in ten districts: Tangerang, Purworejo, Boyolali, Kudus, Demak, Pangkep, Sidrap, Soppeng, Makassar, Binjai, and North Tapanuli.

## Findings

DBE1 Overall, DBE1 made a strong contribution to the improved management and governance of the Indonesian education system. Many of the techniques, tools and training programs that DBE1 pioneered were eventually adopted by the Government of Indonesia (GOI) and the program made a significant contribution to decentralization reform. In total, DBE1 trained

school administrators in the use of financial management tools and school planning to more than 16,106 schools in 15 provinces, 148 districts, and over 40,000 teachers, government officials and stakeholders. By any measure these outputs are huge, even for an education system as large as that operated by the GOI.

Unfortunately, for reasons largely beyond the control of DBE1, some of the early gains in the program were lost. Principals and school committee members, the main focus of many of DBE1 training activities, were replaced due to political considerations or normal retirements. Their replacements were not trained, resulting in a great loss of momentum in school governance reform as school principals were transferred and school committee member moved on. Less than a year after the end of the project, many schools have lost their enthusiasm for school planning and many communities are only barely involved in the management of the schools.

At the district level, it appears that DBE1 was a huge boon to those units that were directly involved with the DBE program. DBE1 was able to address problems and solve issues that no other organization focused on and they were able to do it in a very collaborative manner that ingratiated their effort within the district. Moreover, it appears that the DBE1 program served a very useful function as a demand-driven think tank that solved district education planning, budgeting, and cost analysis problems that districts themselves could not solve on their own.

DBE2 DBE2 made a significant contribution to the teaching-learning process, presenting innovative approaches that improved student learning and moreover brought joy to the learning process. DBE2 made strong in-roads to teacher training through the use of active learning of which a foundation remains in a place today to support a continued emphasis on teacher development. Teachers were highly appreciative of student-centered learning, mentioning development of materials and classroom management activities as most effective. They constantly expressed the need for more training in active learning with a deeper emphasis on assessment and combined content and pedagogy. DBE2 trained more than 16,000 teachers and was active in more than 1,203 schools.

Progress towards institutionalization of in-service teacher preparation had more limited success, due to some reasons beyond control of the project but also due to some difficulties in project implementation and oversight. Capacity was not grown in key places and important individuals in an envisioned in-service teacher development process may have been by-passed in training efforts. Training issues of timing, length, frequency, and follow-on mentoring point to the need to re-organize and re-plan training provision. Identification of a center for institutionalizing in-service teacher professional development remains questionable yet due to the limitations of various actors in the system; however DBE2 assisted to narrow down identification of important actors and processes which will serve PRIORITAS well in the next steps of teacher professional development.

DBE3 DBE3 focused on improving the quality and relevance of junior secondary education in its second phase and made the strongest contributions in terms of development of creative materials and methods, including active learning. The evaluation found that the teachers and principals were very appreciative of them. In general, project monitoring and reporting and the sharing of materials, documents and reports were regarded as strengths of the program. During the first three years of the program focused on non-formal education, DBE3 worked in six provinces, covering 98 subdistricts in 44 districts and 196 schools. A comprehensive

teacher training program trained and mentored 15,810 teachers. During the second phase of DBE3 (2009-2011), 330 schools, also in six provinces, were covered at first in 25 extension districts (extended from the districts covered in the first phase), and then expanded to19 other districts in 2009. In total, 13,466 teachers, 633 principals and 380 supervisors were trained using three Better Teaching and Learning (BTL) modules. Of the four project provinces evaluated in the current assessment, South Suluwesi appeared to have made the most of what DBE3 had to offer. The project produced a number of best practices that will assist future projects.

The challenges faced by DBE3 during its split project life were many and overall it was a case of trying to do too many things in too little time. This was the case in the efforts to improve in-service training through work with universities, the LPMP (Quality Assurance Institutes) and P4TKs (Indonesian in-service training institutions. It was also the case for the centerpiece of DBE3, the 'whole school approach' to educational development at the district level. The approach was regarded in this evaluation as both a strength and a weakness. Basically the approach was never fully implemented in project schools but the concept is very good and should be applied and strengthened in future projects. The evaluation also noted a dilution or fading of project effects from the time of the project's conclusion in 2011 to this final evaluation, an important sustainability issue.

**Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

Coordination with the GOI Many observers noted that the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) and the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) officials at all levels were often not partners in the program. Most suggested a new way of doing business was needed with better communication and coordination between USAID and MOEC/MORA at the heart of a new paradigm. Suggestions for better communication included: 1) establishing Memoranda of Agreement between the various entities (USAID, MOEC, MORA, PRIORITAS and local DINAS) to establish clear roles and responsibilities of participating parties; 2) sharing work plans before implementation of programs and annual reviews of progress; 3) arranging site visits and workshops for central and provincial government officers to review district level exemplary programs; and 4) submitting written proposals to MOEC and MORA at all levels on program problems and solutions concerning how individual government levels could assist with reforms.

Value of a well sequenced and coordinated approach For the DBE approach to work well, the inputs to the school have to be coordinated and well sequenced. When the inputs are properly sequenced, the results are spectacular and moribund schools can be turned into thriving schools that are the pride of the community and where children cannot wait to go to school to learn. Unfortunately, the three contractors implementing the three DBE components operated for the most part as separate programs with little coordination between components and often poor coordination with DINAS or the schools.

Limit objectives, components and complexity In the aftermath of DBE, it appears that each component had too many activities going on at the same time often resulting in resources and information being spread too thinly among uncoordinated programs. Although it is remarkable that so much was accomplished, many indications are evident that training programs did not achieve the depth needed to allow full assimilation of the methods or result in the level of

institutionalization anticipated despite a general feeling that training as a whole was well-liked and much-needed.

Active learning plateau and continuous training The DBE2 active learning training program was universally well-liked and appreciated by those who participated in the program. Despite the apparent success of the training, within the schools visited for the evaluation, the application of active learning methods varied widely from enthusiastic adoption in every class most of the time to hardly any vestiges of the program appearing anywhere. The majority of schools were using active learning methods partially in some classes with some teachers and application was often lack-luster and fading. Even when active learning methods were strongly evident in schools, the best teachers showed limited mastery of the array of active learning methods possible. Given these findings, it appears that the institutionalization of active learning methods requires several levels of follow-on training in sequence. A suggested progression could look like this: phase one: introduction to active learning methods; phase two: additional tools for active learning methods; and phase three: advanced active learning methods.

Sustainability requires GOI commitment, communication, and a quid quo pro Some districts the evaluation team visited had replicated the DBE program to all schools in all sub-districts while other districts had hardly moved the program beyond the original DBE set of schools and sub-districts. Still others had apparently largely abandoned the program (Of the ten districts visited, one district had replicated the program to all 236 schools; eight districts had replicated the program to some schools, while one district appeared to be totally disinterested in the program!). The reasons for the varied replication and/or sustainability of the program are complex but some of the more important factors appear to be the leadership in the district and DINAS and the degree to which trained principals and school committee members remained in place in the system. As part of the renewed communication and coordination between the program and the districts, clear-cut targets and commitments for funding should be established. Changes in key personnel (e.g. principals) should only be made in consultation with the project or if a suitable replacement[1] is at hand. District governments must become full partners with USAID and PRIORITAS, communicating their needs, monitoring the progress of the program, taking action to ensure success of the program, and committing funds to supplement and sustain programs that show good promise.

No ideal place: institutionalizing the locus of change An assumption of the DBE program was that if it demonstrated the effectiveness of school-based management and leadership training along with active learning methods, ICT, and development of teaching and learning materials in selected schools in a district, local governments would see the value of these approaches and replicate them in their areas. This strategy worked in a few cases but by and large, most districts failed to bring the DBE program to scale. In fact, in some districts it appears that the program has been allowed to languish, even if a decent foundation was in place to build on. Nevertheless, most observers of the education system argue that the district must be the locus of change within the education system.

1. Selection and replacement of principals is a political issue in Indonesia and somewhat beyond the purview of USAID and its implementing partners. Nevertheless, the responsibility of program implementation is somewhat comparable to series on concentric circles (i.e. a dartboard) where the bull's eye is the district government as the unit responsible for implementation and the outer circles are implementing partners and USAID, respectively. In this view, the district government should at least resist changing principals without consultation.

The PRIORITAS program proposes to make universities the center for change within the education system. While everyone agrees that universities can address many of the problems in the long-term through pre-service teacher training, in the short- to medium- term large numbers of teachers need professional upgrading opportunities. Most people interviewed think that university personnel know little about the realities of classroom teaching and are far too theoretical in approach. The two government institutions involved in in-service teacher training, P4TKs and LPMP, are limited in their ability to address the problem. Within this milieu, an ideal location to establish a sorely needed center for teacher professional development is not apparent. The task of converting universities into centers for servicing district and school in-service training or other educational needs or as a locus for institutionalizing this expertise may be a very difficult task for PRIORITAS. The role of universities in in-service teacher training and the best location to institutionalize that expertise should be carefully studied and different approaches should be experimented with before major investments are made in one direction.

Certification and professional development An assumption at the core of in-service teacher training is that 'teacher certification' is the pinnacle and end of professional development. The importance of graduated professional development programs with incentives for mastery deserves emphasis. If studies have been done on this, they need to be reviewed and action steps taken on the recommendations. If such studies do not exist, or more of them are needed, this is an opportunity for coming projects to address (perhaps PRIORITAS and Higher Education Leadership and Management Project (HELM) or inter-donor collaboration) and finance these studies and is recommended.

Policy dialogue Going forward, there are a series of policy issues within the education system that need to be explored and addressed. Some are very practical issues such as how any reforms can achieve sustainability within a system where constant turnover of trained personnel results in a loss of momentum and critical expertise and dampens the achievements of the program. Other policy issues may be more complex and political such as how to use BOS or other funds to ensure greater equity in the system. USAID and PRIORITAS should work closely with the GOI to minimally address those issues that directly impact the success of the PRIORITAS program.

Focus on what works and limit the 'ornaments of the tree' The application of DBE1 school management and governance and DBE2 and DBE3 active learning components together in the proper sequence can truly transform a conventional school into an outstanding learning environment. Nonetheless, DBE was too complex and had too many moving parts to be managed and coordinated effectively and the myriad of small, marginally-related tasks diverted project effort and resources away from core tasks. Although many in the government see the merits of the program, little real institutionalization has occurred and the sustainability of the effort is a real concern. Given the experience of DBE, USAID and PRIORITAS should focus on the core program to improve school management and governance and the quality of teaching especially in math, science, and reading. Despite the panoply of GOI needs and the penchant for including 'hot topics' of the day under the flagship program, USAID and the GOI should limit the expectations for PRIORITAS to what it can be reasonably expected to achieve.

Strategy for the next two years: experiment or push out the frontier? For whatever cultural, political or practical reasons, many districts[2] simply fail to accept that once demonstrated and developed, districts can replicate the DBE program with their own resources. There seems to be a lack of confidence within education personnel that they can sustain the program without donor expertise. Although many in the GOI see the merits of the program, little real institutionalization has occurred and sustainability is a real issue. Moreover, problems were caused by the lack of integration between DBE1, 2, and 3 and the separation of the management component from the teaching and learning components limited the gains from the program. USAID and PRIORITAS should consider experimenting with ways to ensure sustainability and institutionalization within districts. In this light, USAID and PRIORITAS might consider working in fewer districts in the future and focusing on 'getting it right' in a limited number of districts.

## Conclusion

All three of the DBE projects were aimed at addressing systematic weaknesses in the Indonesian education system. In each case, the DBE projects introduced important concepts and made significant in-roads toward improving school and district management and governance and teaching and learning outcomes in primary and secondary schools in Indonesia. Moreover, bringing education reforms to scale is incredibly difficult under the best of circumstances. Nevertheless, in the case of DBE, the 'glass is half-full' and rapidly shrinking. When compared to the standard conventional Indonesian school, DBE schools are significantly better and the schools are better managed with greater community involvement, better teaching methods evident, and more enthusiastic teachers and students apparent. When compared to outstanding schools using active learning pedagogy, most of the DBE-partner schools were lack-luster with weak, inconsistent active learning methods being applied. In some schools, the program appears to be fading quickly.

By any measure the DBE outputs are huge. Despite the 'half-full' assessment, overall the DBE program made a strong contribution to the improvement of the management and quality of education in the Indonesian education system. Many of the techniques, tools and teacher training programs that DBE 1, 2, and 3 pioneered have been adopted by the GOI and the programs made a significant contribution to the educational reforms initiated by the GOI.

The DBE program has developed a strong foundation, albeit with some areas that need attention, that the new follow-on program, PRIORITAS, can build on. Since the DBE foundation may be weaker than USAID has been led to believe, care should be taken to ensure that PRIORITAS can focus on the core program and not spread its resources too thinly.

2. In the sample of ten districts, all districts had carried out some replication of the DBE program using their own resources but only three districts demonstrated a strong commitment to replicating the DBE program without DBE technical leadership and resources.

# Education at a Glance: Indonesia

| | Primary | Junior secondary | MORA | MOEC |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population under 14 years old[1)] | 27.3% | | | |
| Economic growth rate 2011[1)] | 6.4% | | | |
| Unemployment rate[2)] | 7.1% | | | |
| Education expenditure [% of GNP] [1)] | 2.8% | | | |
| % of total education budget spent on sub-sector[3)] | 44.4% | 14.2% | 26.5% | 63.0% |
| Literacy rate 15 year old and older, 2009[2)] | 90.4% | | | |
| Total Number of enrollment[4)] | 30.6 mil | 12.8 mil | 13.7% | 86.3% |
| Total Number of school[4)] | 146,804 | 30,290 | 17.4% | 82.6% |
| Gross enrollment rate (GER)[4)] | 115.3% | 98.2% | NA | |
| Net enrollment rate (NER)[4)] | 95.4% | 75.6% | NA | |
| NER for highest income quintile[5)] | 94.8% | 70.5% | NA | |
| NER for lowest income quintile[5)] | 94.0% | 58.9% | NA | |
| Gender Parity Index GER[4)] | 1.0 | 1.0 | NA | |
| Transition rate[4)] | 98.5% | 89.8% | NA | |
| Drop-out rate[4)] | 1.6% | 1.8% | 0.3% | 1.8% |
| Repetition rate[4)] | 3.1% | 0.3% | 0.8% | 2.8% |
| Out of school children[6)] | 0.2 million | 1.8 million | NA | |
| Total number of teachers[4)] | 1.6 million | 0.6 million | 19.2% | 80.8% |
| % teachers with BA degree[4)] | 35.5% | 80.5% | 52.2% | 40.7% |
| Pupil/teacher ratio (all teacher)[4)] | 17 | 17 | 11 | 16 |
| Pupil/teacher ratio (S1 or higher)[4)] | 47 | 21 | 21 | 40 |

Notes:

- 2010 data unless otherwise noted
- % of total education budget spend by sub-sector, in addition, 10% spent on secondary, 16% on tertiary and 15% is not allocated by level
- Net Enrollment Rate primary education = number of 7-12 years old students/number of population under 7-12 years old cohort

- Net Enrollment Rate by income quintile shows that the lowest 20 % of the population by income have relatively equal access to primary education but much lower access to junior secondary education.
- Gross Enrollment Rate primary education = number of all primary school students / number of population under 7-12 years old cohort
- Gender Parity Index GER = GER female / GER male
- Transition rate: proportion of graduates who pursue their education into the next level to the total number of graduate.
- NA: not applicable

Sources:
[1)] CIA Fact Book https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/ This places Indonesia as the 137th when compared to the countries of the world. By comparison Malaysia invests 4.1 % of GNP in Education
[2)] Central Office of Statistics
[3)] Ministry of Finance
[4)] Ministry of Education and Culture (These data are for the total numbers within the education system)
[5)] National Development Planning Agency calculation based on Central Office of Statistics data
[6)] UNESCO Institute of Statistics http://www.uis.unesco.org/Pages/default.aspx

# SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

## Evaluation Objectives

This Report is the final evaluation of USAID/Indonesia's Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) Program. The DBE program was the cornerstone of the United States' assistance to basic education in Indonesia and was designed to directly respond to the Government of Indonesia's priorities to decentralize and revitalize the education sector. The DBE program focused on the improving school management and governance and the quality and relevance of education in primary and junior secondary schools and was divided into three components, each with its own contractor, to address three main goals. The primary goals were: 1) to assist local governments and communities to manage education services more effectively; 2) to enhance teaching and learning to improve student performance, especially in key subjects such as math, science and reading; and 3) to ensure that Indonesia's youth gain more relevant life and work skills to better compete for jobs in the modern economy.[3]

The purpose of this evaluation is to assist USAID/Indonesia in the assessment of the impact of the three DBE programs on the quality and relevance of primary and junior secondary education in Indonesia. More specifically, the evaluation will assess how successful the three DBE programs were in achieving the primary goals, the degree to which these goals have been met, and the contributing factors that have been responsible for, or detracted from, the achievement of these goals.[4] In addition, USAID/Indonesia asked the evaluation team to highlight any lessons learned or best practices from the implementation of the DBE program that could be applied to the new basic education program, Prioritizing Reform, Innovation, Opportunities for Reaching Indonesia's Teachers, Administrators, and Students (PRIORITAS), which has been recently awarded and is just starting to develop its strategy. In that regard, this final evaluation will assist by providing an assessment of the sustainability of the DBE program and any suggestions for improving the implementation and sustainability of PRIORITAS. To guide the evaluation team, USAID/Indonesia provided a set of 25 specific questions (Please see Annex 7.) that were to be addressed in the evaluation.

## Methodology

The evaluation was conducted over the four months of July, August, September, and October 2012 by a team of national and international consultants and the field work was guided by former staff members of the DBE program. To ensure that no conflict of interest was in affect, all decisions about site visits were ultimately made by the international consultants after consultation with the national consultants and former DBE staff.

The evaluation team used six basic methods to obtain findings including:

- Review of DBE project documents, research and evaluation studies, and findings in basic education (Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed);
- Observation and interviews of DBE-assisted and non-DBE-assisted schools, principals, and teachers (Annex 3: List of Schools Visited);

3. This last goal was changed as a result of the mid-term evaluation and refocused the program on improving the quality and providing relevant education for junior secondary youth.
4. Please see Annex 1 in Volume II of this report for the full Scope of Work guiding this evaluation task.

- Targeted questions and interviews with stakeholders (individuals, educators and officials) knowledgeable about the DBE programs (Annex 5: Interview Guides);
- Targeted questions in focus group discussions with single groups (teachers and principals) of stakeholders (Annex 5: Interview Guides);
- Questionnaires aimed at ensuring anonymity administered to key stakeholders such as teachers and principals (Annex 5: Interview Guides):
- School profile checklists and facilities observations aimed at determining how well the school met the National Standards for schools (Annex 11: School Profiles).

The evaluation team interviewed more than 750 stakeholders including: the Coordination Ministry for People's Welfare (*MENKO KESRA*), the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC), and Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA); officials of those Ministries at the provincial and district levels; District Education Board members; university staff at both the U.S. and in Indonesia; former DBE project facilitators and officials; school supervisors, principals, and teachers; and school committee members.[5]

The evaluation team visited a total of 107 schools in four provinces (Banten, Central Java, South Sulawesi, and North Sumatra) in ten districts (Tangerang, Purworejo, Boyolali, Kudus, Demak, Pangkep, Sidrap, Soppeng, Makassar, Binjai, North Tapanuli). Of the schools visited, 70 were under MOEC and 37 were under MORA administration, 61 had been directly assisted by DBE, 20 schools were DBE-replicated by the district governments, and 23 were non-DBE or untreated, conventional schools. Furthermore, 52 of the schools visited were urban and 52 were rural, while 73 were of modest income and 31 were considered poor.

### Constraints in Undertaking the Evaluation

There were a number of constraints to undertaking the evaluation. First, Indonesia is a huge country, geographically dispersed over more than 3,000 miles with the fourth largest education system in the world and a very poor transportation infrastructure. Given the scale and geographic spread of the DBE project and long transportation times between project sites, the evaluation team had insufficient time to undertake a detailed in-depth analysis of teacher classroom behavior and the time spent at each school (one and a half to two hours) was sufficient to only form impressions. Moreover, the presence of the evaluation team frequently interfered with documentation of ordinary behavior in the schools and classrooms.

Second, the sample of DBE partner schools in the evaluation was small (about 5 percent of the schools directly serviced) and could not be random owing to the logistics of visiting schools within school hours in far-flung locations. Moreover, the evaluation team aimed to see some of the best of the DBE partner schools so that the questions on sustainability could be addressed; therefore the sample may be skewed. Within these parameters, an attempt was made to draw a random sample by the former DBE staff working in cooperation with the evaluation team.

Third, part of the evaluation took place during Ramadan when schools in most provinces were closed and those that were open were on reduced hours, owing to the fasting of staff and students. Most schools closed early, often before noon, requiring the evaluation team to move quickly from school to school. The fasting also may have dampened the enthusiasm of both

5. Please see Annex 2 in Volume II of this report to see a list of people interviewed.

teachers and students and active learning may have suffered as a result. In addition, the end of Ramadan, *Idul Fitri*, is a traditional Indonesian family holiday where much of the country shuts down and visit relatives. As a result, the evaluation team had a sizeable interruption in the investigation which disrupted the process of interviewing stakeholders.

### Structure of the Report

The report is organized into six main sections. Following this introduction, the second section provides background information about the USAID/Indonesia education strategy, a brief description of the DBE project, and a review of the GOI education strategy. Section three presents the evaluation findings for each of the three DBE components, including the accomplishments and performance toward targets, findings from the interviews with stakeholders, as well as the overall conclusions for each component including strengths and weaknesses and individual intervention conclusions and recommendations. The fourth section summarizes the lessons learned from the findings and the fifth section draws some recommendations for the USAID/Indonesia and the new PRIORITAS program. The report finishes with some conclusions about the DBE program and its impact in Indonesia. The annexes to this main report are included in an accompanying volume, *Volume II: Annexes*.

# SECTION II. BACKGROUND

## Overview of USAID Education Strategy

Since independence 57 years ago, Indonesia has made remarkable successes. At independence, Indonesia was one of Asia's poorest countries, while today it is a middle-income country (per capita income of $4,700)[6] and the number of families below the poverty line has steadily declined. Indonesia is the world's third largest democracy and the nation is unified despite being home to hundreds of local languages and thousands of islands. Infant mortality has been drastically reduced. Primary school enrollment for both boys and girls is almost universal and 90.4 percent of the population is reported to be literate.[7]

Looking more closely at Indonesian development, however, presents a picture of many people not able to benefit from the growth of the economy. Nearly half of Indonesia's population (115 million people) hovers around the poverty line (15 percent officially living below the poverty line[8] and the 33 percent of 'near poor'[9]). With an economic growth led by domestic consumption and exports of petroleum products and minerals, the growth may not be sustainable over the medium-term and the growth provides few jobs. Over the past decade the country has experienced 'jobless growth,' with only about 3 million slots of the total jobs created (20 million) in the formal sector.[10] Unemployment hovers around 22.2 percent[11] for youth 15 to 24 years old. Efforts to reduce poverty face huge challenges, including Indonesia's size and diversity, widespread bureaucratic inefficiency and political corruption, and a political system dominated by elite and middle-class interests.

Within this setting, USAID programs in Indonesia are directed at addressing the root causes of poverty: inadequate basic education; lack of quality health care; low productivity, especially in agriculture; lack of infrastructure, especially in rural areas essential for marketing; and the loss of natural resources that rural communities depend on to sustain their families. USAID also supports the development of GOI policy that encourages more effective, responsive governance.

Education is one of the key solutions to breaking the cycle of poverty but the problems are daunting. Indonesia has the world's fourth largest basic education system with over 46 million students, 2.8 million teachers, and 227,000 schools.[12] Although significant progress has been made in primary school participation rates, access, equity and quality remain significant problems, especially for families from the lowest two income quintiles. Many children fail in the transitions from primary to junior secondary to senior secondary school. Only about 30 percent of the children from the lowest income quintile survive to high school and less than five percent achieve higher education. In international tests in math and science, Indonesia ranked 36th out of 49 countries in math, and 35th out of 49 countries in science on one test[13] and

6. Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) CIA (2012) World Factbook, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/
7. UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2010
8. The official poverty line is an earned wage of less than $US 1.55.
9. The percent of the population that earns between $US 2.00 and $US1.55.
10. USAID (2009) A Partnership for Prosperity
11. Ibid CIA 2012
12. These numbers are for basic education (primary and junior secondary) only.
13. Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) 2007

lower on other tests.[14] In reading, Indonesian students display low levels of retrieving, reflecting, and evaluating information and almost 34 percent do not attain minimum literacy levels.[15] Other major challenges include a strong need for higher quality pre-service and in-service teacher training, continuing professional development for teachers, and more transparent and accountable school and district management and governance.

Within higher education, positive trends and significant challenges are apparent. Over the last decade, many more high school graduates are continuing their education but challenges such as the quality and relevance of teaching, access and participation of Indonesia's poorest, and transparency and accountability of university management constrain the ability of institutions to contribute to the economic development of the country. Indonesian higher education lags behind neighboring countries such as Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines and no Indonesian higher education institution is ranked in the top 100 institutions in Asia. [16]

Within this milieu, USAID's education objective is to 'improve the capacity of Indonesian institutions to prepare students for learning, work, and community.' Under this overall objective, USAID has two intermediate objectives (IR): IR1: expand access to quality basic education; and IR2: improve the quality and relevance of higher education. Beneath the first intermediate objective, USAID has three sub-intermediate results: IR1.1 strengthened instruction in targeted schools and districts; IR1.2 improved education management and governance in targeted schools and districts; and IR 1.3 strengthened coordination between all levels of GOI and key education institutions. Beneath the second intermediate objective, USAID has three more sub- intermediate results: IR2.1 strengthened Directorate General for Higher Education (DGHE) capacity to implement policy reform, IR2.2 strengthened management of targeted higher education institutions; and IR2.3 improved teaching research and service at targeted university departments. Although USAID has a number of projects that support these objectives, the Higher Education and Leadership Management (HELM) program primarily supports IR2 and its sub-objectives and the DBE program and its successor, PRIORITAS, support IR1.

## Overview of the DBE and the PRIORITAS Projects

Decentralized Basic Education project The Decentralized Basic Education program of Indonesia was a partnership between the Government of Indonesia and the Government of the United States, focused on improving the quality of education provided in primary and junior secondary schools. Operating with an agreement between the Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare and USAID, the program supported national decentralization efforts to increase governance, financial, and managerial responsibility of district and school-level actors for strengthened and improved education provision across different stakeholders. Additionally, university partnerships between 15 Indonesian universities and three U.S. universities, the University of Pittsburg, Florida State University, and the University of Massachusetts, added support to the GOI's teacher certification program while several public-private alliances leveraged addition resources in support of DBE programs.

14. Program for International Assessment (PISA), 2007

15. USAID (2009) Partnership for Prosperity, p 15

16. Ibid, USAID (2009) p 16

An ambitious program, the DBE was implemented in three components, each under the management of a different contractor. Decentralized education management and governance was the focus of DBE1 with attention throughout on increasing the capacity of local actors to be involved in education provision in transparent and participative ways. DBE2 worked specifically to improve the quality of teaching and learning and employed an array of strategies designed to strengthen in-service teacher training and improve the school learning environment. Of the three components, DBE3 was the only component that worked at the junior secondary level and focused on assisting youth to gain valuable life skills. All three components were designed to complement and collaborate closely with each other to build a strong system of schools which provided quality education.

From 2005 to 2011, the DBE partnered with primary and junior secondary schools in more than 50 districts in seven target provinces: Aceh, North Sumatra, Banten, West Java, Central Java, East Java and South Sulawesi. Originally designed to be implemented in three cohorts, the complexity of the DBE program was amplified by the dynamic environment of the Indonesian political and reform arena, the vastness of the education sector, and the large number of sub-components and objectives each component attempted to achieve.

A Mid-term Review of the DBE, in 2008-2009, had far-reaching and critical implications for the program. Especially for the DBE2 and 3 components, recommendations as a result of the review refocused and adjusted program activities to ensure a better attainment of defined goals and objectives. As a result, attempts to implement cohort three were dropped altogether while a redirection of the program emphasized a transition of cohorts one and two to sustainability. Several new activities are added to DBE2 giving more direction to in-service teacher professional development. These included addition of the Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE) to build capacity of university lecturers, Distance Education as a possible approach to up-grade qualifications of primary teachers, and a classroom reading program. The DBE3 underwent the most change with a complete re-direction of program emphasis from non-formal education activities for out-of-school youth to improved teaching-learning processes in formal junior secondary education, under the heading of a 'whole school approach.'[17] These changes would ultimately have consequences on achievements of the component.

The PRIORITAS Project With the end of the DBE in December, 2011, the U.S. government sought to consolidate gains made in the sector and build on the foundation left by the DBE of improved capacity of local actors by starting a new education project, Prioritizing Reform, Innovation, Opportunities for Reaching Indonesia's Teachers, Administrators, and Students (PRIORITAS). Recognizing the need for continued emphasis to improve teachers' capacity, the new project focuses heavily on teacher professional development, both of pre-service training and in-service training provision through support to universities and Teacher Training Institutes as service providers, including a more specific content focus in math, science, and reading. Additionally, PRIORITAS will continue to support improvements in education management and governance at the school level. Initiated just in May, 2012, PRIORITAS is expected to continue until 2017.

17. DBE1 applied school planning activities in the initial group of junior secondary districts before the DBE3 revision but not after the re-direction of the DBE3 program.

## Overview of Government of Indonesia's Educational Strategy

Indonesia operates a very large and decentralized education system. About 560 district governments play a strong role in managing the system which consists of 61 million students, 340 thousand schools and about four million teachers in 2010.[18] By law, education has received 20 percent of the national budget annually since 2009.

The strategic plan of the Ministry of Education and Culture commits the education system to supporting the long-term goal of improving Indonesian human resources to a level where they are competitive with those of other nations so that Indonesia can benefit from the opportunities offered by globalization. Shorter-term goals are focused on increasing the availability and affordability of education services, improving educational quality and relevance, and ensuring equality and universality of access to quality education services.

The education system that is responsible for achieving this goal is a complex network of interlocking subsystems but in essence two central ministries have responsibility for supervising education provision: Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) and the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA). MOEC is the implementing ministry for the national system, but administrative authority and funding channels between the two ministries remain separate. In both MOEC and MORA, the formal education system consists of three levels: 1) basic education (elementary level of six grades and students aged seven to twelve and junior secondary of three grades, seven to nine, and ages of 13-15); 2) secondary (three grades ten to twelve and ages 16-18); and 3) tertiary (one, three- and four- year programs at the undergraduate level, plus post-graduate programs at the masters and doctorate levels).

Following more than five decades of centralized government administration in which most state functions, including education, were managed from the national capital, Indonesia embarked in 1999 on a major change in government management into a decentralized system. Most power was decentralized directly into district and municipal governments and the role left at the central government included the development of standards, norms and quality assurance.

Decentralization in education has been conducted through a two-pronged administration scheme. The first is decentralization of management from the Ministry of Education and Culture that now mostly rests in the district/municipal governments. To support this decentralization, the ministry empowers schools through the establishment of school committees that consist of parents and local informal leaders. Schools and their respective school committees are expected to be able to make decisions in several areas including budgeting and a small assurance element related to the teaching and learning process.

Education in Indonesia involves many authorities and actors. At the national level the main authorized agencies are MOEC and the MORA. MOEC supervises 86 percent of primary and junior secondary education in terms of student numbers and MORA supervised the remaining 14 percent (as of 2010). Other supporting central government institutions that play more indirect roles in education governance are the Ministry of Finance (for the education budget), the Ministry of Home Affairs (for implementation of regional autonomy and local government performance), and the National Parliament (for sanctioning programs and budgets for national

18. These figures represent the totals for early childhood education, primary, junior secondary, and secondary schools, and tertiary education. MOEC 2010.

education). At the district/municipality level, the district/municipality Office of Education (DINAS) is the institution responsible for provision of MOEC-supervised educational provision while the district offices of MORA are responsible for madrasahs (Islamic schools). The DINAS reports to the regent or mayor and in turn that person reports to the local parliament.

From the perspective of access to education services, in 1994 Indonesia initiated a universal nine-year basic education structure that made education compulsory in grades one to nine. By 2010, the primary school Net Enrollment Ratio (NER) had reached 95.4 percent and the Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) 115.3 percent, while at the junior secondary level the NER was 75.6 percent and the GER 98.2 percent. The efforts to improve access also came through provision of new school buildings and government subsidies through School Operational Grants (BOS). Recently, efforts have been made to extend universal education to 12 years. It is expected that the country will be able to achieve 12-year universal education between 2015 to 2020 in anticipation of the national senior secondary education GER rising to about 85 percent. Many districts and municipalities have already achieved this goal in 2012.

Despite these efforts to improve access, the quality and relevance of education remains a serious challenge. One of the basic efforts being made to deal with educational quality is through the introduction of the National Standards of Education (NSE) and Minimum Service Standards (MSS). NSE consists of eight standards including standards for teachers and the teaching-learning processes. MSS consists of standards that are applicable to districts or municipalities as well as standards for schools. To meet the standards for teachers, a major effort has been conducted to certify teachers and lecturers so that they minimally achieve a specific standard. This has been followed by a teacher competency test, conducted in 2012. This test will be used as a basis for continuous professional development efforts. To achieve the teaching-learning process standards, various approaches to improve students' achievement have also been developed and the search for the best and most appropriate teaching-learning approach is in progress.

# SECTION III. FINDINGS FROM THE FIELD

### *Decentralized Basic Education 1 (DBE1)*

### Background

Component one of the DBE program, more effective decentralized education, management and governance, was implemented by a consortium of firms with The Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International as the lead organization and World Education and Macom designated as sub-contractors. After two years, Macom dropped out of the contract. The term of the service was between April 12, 2005 and December 31, 2011.

The objective of DBE1 was to assist the GOI to improve the quality of basic education (grades one through nine) in Indonesia through more effective decentralized education management and governance. DBE1 was expected to work in close collaboration with DBE2, Teaching and Learning, which aimed at improving teacher methods and skills in the classroom, and DBE3, improving work and life skills, which aimed at improving the quality and relevance of junior secondary schooling.

In 1999, the GOI embarked on a widespread effort to transfer power, management authority, and funds for the delivery of basic services to districts and municipalities.[19] Subsequently in 2003, the Education Law of 2003[20] saw the transfer of responsibility for the delivery of education to lower levels of government, especially to the districts and schools through school committees. An important exception is that religion was not handed over to the districts and MORA, which administers the madrasah, has not decentralized its delivery of education services.

By law, Indonesia invests 20 percent of the national budget in education but that amount represents only about 2.8 per cent of Gross National Product (GNP) and translates into only about US$ 60 per child per year. Improving educational quality with limited central government financial support was daunting. The GOI initiated decentralization in the hopes of spreading the financial burden for improving education across different stakeholders. Given that Indonesia has the fourth largest education system in the world with over 50 million students and 2.6 million teachers in more than 250,000 schools[21] and that education is the largest public service provided by the GOI, addressing these complex challenges required the comprehensive approach embodied in the three DBE component programs. Therefore, within the DBE program and complex and changing environment, the goal of DBE1 was to strengthen the capacity of local governments and communities to manage educational services.

19. GOI Decentralization Law. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 22, Tahun 1999 Tentang Permerintah Daerah. Penerbit Usaha, Jakarta, 1999.

20. GOI Education Law, number 20, 2003: Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.

21. This number includes Islamic madrasah which teach the national curriculum in addition to religious studies. About 20 percent of Indonesia's children are educated in madrasah.

## Program elements and performance against targets

DBE1's strategy for strengthening the capacity of local governments was to develop tools and exemplars of good practice in management and governance, both at the school and district level, and build the capacity of local government to use these tools for planning, budgeting, and policy development. Wherever possible, DBE1 used existing tools but in many cases, the necessary tools were not available or were not adequate to address the new issues faced by local government. To improve the capacity of school and local government counterparts, DBE1 used a mixture of 'classroom-based' skills training, followed by on-the-job mentoring until products in the form of plans, budgets, and policies were drafted, stakeholder consultations were held, and tools were integrated into the standard operating procedures of local government and schools. At the same time, the DBE1 focused on creating forums where the data and tools could be presented and discussed by all stakeholders (executive, legislative, and civil society) in a collaborative environment to encourage good working relationships and good policy informed by good data and information. Although there were many tools developed by DBE1, they can be broadly characterized within four main areas: 1) School-based management and Governance (SBM), 2) District Management and Governance; 3) Information and Data management, and 4) Public-Private Alliances (PPA).

### 1. School-based Management and Governance.

Following the logic that school planning should inform district level planning, a kind of bottom-up approach, DBE1 focused at first on school-based planning. Together with DBE2, DBE3, and district partners, DBE1 jointly selected clusters of public (MOEC) primary schools, Islamic public (MORA) primary schools along with the public (MOEC) junior secondary schools and Islamic public (MORA) junior secondary schools in two cohorts in each province. Each cluster included approximately ten primary schools and two junior secondary schools along with a Cluster Resource Center (CRC), which was to act as a center where cluster teachers and principals could receive training, use computers to produce materials and gain access to the Internet, and borrow from a stock of training materials and teaching aids. While DBE2 focused on improving teaching in the cluster and DBE3 focused on improving teaching and curriculum relevance at junior secondary schools, DBE1 focused on school-based planning and strengthening school leadership.

Over the life of the DBE program, a variety of different school-based planning and leadership tools were developed, often simultaneously. First, school development plans and then school work plans were developed based on government regulation and subsequently modified using the newly developed National Education Standards as a benchmark. At the same time, a set of training modules to strengthen the leadership of schools through principals and supervisors along with training modules on the governance of schools through school committees were developed in an integrated program to assist in the implementation of the school plans. Over the first three years, DBE1 provided an average of 23 training days and 23 mentoring days to each of the 24 selected schools in each district to encourage a more open, transparent, and participatory approach to school leadership.

Over the life of the program, DBE1 operated under a dynamic regulatory and political climate resulting in a variety of challenges. To support the planning process, DBE1 developed software applications known as School Database Systems (SDS) based on the national educational

standards. Later, Minimum Service Standards (SPM) were developed by MOEC in cooperation with other donors and they became the basis for school planning, although the regulations did not change. In a separate but related development, MOEC asked DBE1 to assist them in the development of a manual and approach for reporting financial information, particularly on spending of the national school operation grants (*Bantuan Operasional Skolah* (BOS)). The introduction of the BOS grants changed the landscape of education sector funding, resulting in many challenges for districts. The DBE1 materials, however, were piloted and adopted by MOEC nationally. On the basis of that success and as a result of working closely with other MOEC partners: the World Bank, the Australian Aid Agency (AusAid), and the Asian Development Bank (ADB), DBE1 was asked to join the National BOS Development Team, which prepared and piloted a set of training materials for the country. DBE1 methodologies became the basis for two of the three modules, including the School Planning and Budgeting and School Financial Module.

Both the Mid-Term evaluation of DBE1 and project monitoring data showed that the DBE1 interventions had a significant impact on schools and communities. Management and governance in target schools were better after DBE interventions and many principals were more open, transparent and participative. School committees were more active and 96 percent of target primary schools had prepared school development plans, working with the school committees and community. During the first three years of DBE1's implementation, monitoring data estimated that Rp. 25 million (US $2.6 million) or an average of $2,446 per school was contributed either as cash or as in-kind, non-cash support to schools to help implement the development plans. These voluntary contributions were made despite the adoption of 'free schooling' policies that prevented schools from levying school fees from parents.

## 2. District Management and Governance.

Although previous projects, including USAID's Managing Basic Education (MBE) and UNICEF's Creative Learning Community for Children (CLCC), had a strong focus at the school level, their impact at the district level was limited. With the new focus on regional autonomy, DBE1 developed and piloted tools to improve the management and governance at the district level. The tools developed can be grouped into four categories: 1) planning and budget tools; 2) school cost analysis tools; 3) asset and personnel information systems; and 4) integrated tools for calculating costs of achieving minimum service standards and universal access.

### Planning and Budgeting tools

In response to the decentralization requirement that all government departments at each level should have a strategic plan (*RENSTRA*), DBE1 piloted the development of short- and medium-term strategic planning in schools and districts. The movement toward strategic planning was an attempt to shift the education system to evidence- and information-based planning focused on outputs/outcomes rather than inputs, and identifying low-performing or underserved schools that might benefit from additional funding and affirmative action. DBE1 worked closely with schools and districts to pilot, refine, and revise the strategic planning tool and the final version, which is very comprehensive, was eventually taken-up by the national and provincial governments, perhaps confirming the utility of the tool.

DBE1 also developed a tool for financial analysis: the *Analisis Keuangan Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota* (District Education Financial Tool (AKPK)). In essence, the AKPK methodology

reworks information from budget documents so that it provides an easily understood, transparent picture of how and where money is spent. Among other things, the AKPK assists districts to: set priorities of district sectors within education (primary versus secondary); provide per-student expenditure allowing assessment of the fairness of funding; compare performance among districts; move toward results orientation of expenditures; and improve internal and external accountability. The AKPK requires the availability of district government budget documents, the accessing of which was not always an easy task, but in the end of the DBE program, 66 districts had competed AKPK.

### School Cost Analysis Tools

DBE1 developed a tool called the School Operations Costs Calculation (*Penghitungan Biaya Operasional Satuan Pendidikan*), the BOSP, which addresses the issue of how much money is required to fund schools adequately. The BOSP allows district governments to determine how much funding is available from central government and what level of funding is needed by the district to meet national standards at every level of education. In a separate but related activity, DBE1 developed a personal cost survey tool that estimates the cost borne by parents to send a child to school. When the personal cost analysis is combined with the BOSP and AKPK, it provides a complete picture of the total cost of education, including the cost that is borne by parents plus the cost borne by different levels of government. In the three years since these cost analysis tools have been introduced, (and after consultations with stakeholders and policy makers) government allocations to schools increased by over Rp. two trillion (U.S. $240 million).

### Asset and personnel management systems

In line with DBE1's scope of work which called for the development of capacity planning tools, DBE1 developed two tools: 1) an asset management information system known as *Sistem Informasi Manajement Aset* (SIMA) and; 2) a personnel management information system known as *Sistem Informasi Management Pendidik dan Tenga Kependidikan* (SIM-PTK). Originally conceived as a preventive maintenance program, it became apparent that district governments lacked basic data on the assets they controlled. As a result, DBE1 developed a computerized information system for inventorying assets (SIMA) and a training program on preventive maintenance for school and district administrators. These mutually supportive systems have been disseminated to 1,605 schools in 16 districts in three provinces. The SIM-PTK personnel management system calculates teacher requirements based on information about the surplus or shortage of teachers at different educational levels and links that information to a variety of other data like school size, student/teacher ratio, length of service experience, and exam scores to help identify whether a school meets Minimum Service Standards. Based on anecdotal evidence, many stakeholders and policy makers assumed there was a shortage of teachers, when in fact the application of the model frequently reveals an oversupply of teachers with uneven deployment and underserved rural areas plaguing the system. The system was implemented fully in six districts across the country.

### Integrated tools for Calculating Costs

Late in the DBE1 project, in response to a request from the Deputy Minister of Education, DBE1 developed a new tool called the Calculation of Costs to Meet Standards (*Penghitungan Biaya Pencapaian Standard dan Akses Pendidikan* (PBPSAP)) which enable districts to calculate

costs to meet standards and achieve access targets over a period of five years. In addition, the package provides guidance to local governments to determine policy alternatives to meet standards and targets efficiently. The program was implemented in 51 districts and the analysis of those districts was presented at a national-level forum. Among other things, the analysis showed that that Indonesia faces major challenges in terms of educational equity. In some cases, greater efficiency in the deployment of teachers and distribution of resources could better enable districts to achieve Minimum Service Standards. In many cases, schools are under-resourced and do not meet the standards, while in others, schools are over-resourced.

By the end of the project, DBE1 district level tools had been implemented in 117 districts in 13 provinces in Indonesia. Of these districts, 78 were supported directly by USAID funds, while the other 69 districts used non-project resources amounting to Rp. 600 million to implement the tools. Moreover, the tools have been used by governments at the national, provincial, and district levels to inform educational policy, planning and budgeting.

### 3. Information and Data Management.

As part of the DBE1 scope of work, DBE1 was mandated to: 1) conduct an assessment and pilot new approaches to managing educational data for MOEC's Education Management Information System (EMIS); 2) develop innovative solutions for data transfer and management; and 3) develop and maintain a project Website and Project Data Management System (PDMS). In regard to those tasks, DBE1 conducted an assessment of Indonesia's EMIS and concluded that data supply and validity were poor, that the suppliers of the data did not use it, and had little incentive to provide accurate, timely data. DBE1 developed an ICT grant program to improve education management and to provide Internet access to schools, education offices, and the community. The grants were all different but were generally awarded to consortia consisting of the private and public sectors. Perhaps the most significant finding was that awards to governments were often not sustainable, while in contrast the private sector profit motive drove maintenance and continuous operation. Under the contract terms, DBE1 was required to develop and manage the PDMS for all three DBE programs (DBE1, 2, 3) which it did successfully and handed over to the GOI at project end.

### 4. Public-Private Alliances.

With corporate social responsibility interest on the rise, DBE1 was required to set aside about $678,000 to support Public-Private Alliances (PPA). The DBE1 work order required a 1:1 ratio of private contribution to public contribution but was able to achieve a 3:1 ratio. Although the PPA program assisted in the focus of private contributions to needed education areas, the program also diverted project effort away from its core activities and the activities were more in-line with the agenda of the company than with DBE1's or the GOI agenda. Notwithstanding these concerns, DBE1 was able to build capacity within the GOI to carry out PPAs. For example, after the Yogyakarta-Central Java earthquake, DBE1 provided technical expertise and coordinated cooperation between the donors such as Chevron, BP Migas Alliance and ConocoPhillips and local government, NGOs, and community partners to respond to the crisis. As a result of this work a manual was produced, "*Manual for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation of Schools and Madrasah Buildings*" and approximately Rp 210,000,000 ($US 22,800) in cash and in-kind contributions were made by local communities.

## Findings from Interviews and Observations

### 1. School-based management and governance.

### Stakeholder views

Most stakeholders who had taken the school-based management training offered by DBE1, including principals, supervisors, and sub-district DINAS officers, thought the training to be excellent. Virtually every principal expressed appreciation for the training and gave very positive appraisals about how the training had made them a better school manager. They said the training taught them to work cooperatively with the community and to develop a plan for improving the school. As one principal said, "Before the DBE school management training, I was in the dark and did the best I could. After the DBE school management training, it was if a light was brought in the room and I could see everything clearly. The DBE training taught me how to plan, how to work with the other teachers, how to develop partnerships with the community, and how to be a good leader. I owe much of the success of this school to DBE training." Most of the principals who had taken the DBE school management training had a good vision for the school and could articulate their main problems and challenges. Many of these same principals could not, however, articulate the long, medium or short-run objectives in the school plan and many could not locate a copy of the plan, noting that it had been completed several years previously or had not been updated. Nonetheless, supervisors and sub-district officers noted that the principals who had received the school management training were better managers than their peers in the area and had become leaders in the school system and in the community.

> *The DBE school management training taught me how to plan, how to work with other teachers, how to develop partnerships with the community, and how to be a good leader.*
>
> School Principal, Central Java

Other stakeholders in a position to observe the behavior of the principals noted the changes in them after they received the DBE school management training. DINAS officers in the district offices were quick to point out the merits of the school management training and said that district planning had improved dramatically as result of the school management training. Teachers frequently reported dramatic improvement in principals' performance once they had completed the training. School Committee members who had taken the school management training, also waxed positively about the impact of the training on themselves as well as school principals.

Unfortunately, there were relatively few remaining school committee members who had ever been trained by DBE (or any other organization) and many of them had little idea about their roles and responsibilities. Many school committee members seemed to serve at the pleasure of the principal (many had taken the job because they were close friends of the principal) and did not seem to see their role in school management. Most did not see their role as overseer of the school budget or school plan and few saw themselves as helping the

> *Because of the DBE training the principal comes to school with a smile instead of a frown. He is much more approachable and friendly since he received DBE school management training.*
>
> Teacher, South Sulawesi

school improve educational quality through community involvement, fund raising or in-kind contributions. Some school committee members along with principals recited the notion that 'since the BOS, education is free,' therefore community involvement in the schools was illegal or highly discouraged by the GOI. Moreover, in some districts, there was no community involvement in schools and school committee members and principals took the 'education is free' slogan as official GOI policy, interpreting the slogan to mean that communities should not contribute financially or in-kind to schools. In those same districts, there was also widespread paranoia that 'muckraking' journalists would target efforts of greater community involvement and, rightly or wrongly, turn that into a cause célèbre for possible corruption. Indeed, the role most often mentioned by school committee members was that as mediator between the principal and parents, teachers and parents, and teachers and principal. No doubt the role of mediator is important but the turnover in school committee members, the failure to retrain the new committee members, and the confusion about what school committees could and could not do, seem to have severely hampered community involvement in schools and limited the effectiveness of school planning. As will be more fully explained below, there are a number of steps that can be taken to improve community involvement of schools and getting school committees more involved in school management but, clearly PRIORITAS faces major challenges ahead in terms of local culture and politics that must be overcome.

> *I have been a school committee member for 11 years because the principal is my friend. I took the DBE school management training, which was very good and still helps me today, but no one else on the school committee has received training and they do not know what they are doing.*
>
> School committee member, North Sumatra

Virtually everyone who was familiar with school plans and the planning efforts of DBE was supportive of the program and noted that initially it made a significant impact on schools. Those who could recall, noted that the planning organized and unified the community but that over time, the enthusiasm for the process had waned, especially once it became clear that no new additional funding was to be made available. Many noted that the development of school plans and the data requirements for the plans had become onerous and should be simplified. If the school plans could be found, spot checks of the plans in a variety schools showed nicely done, often dusty, thick documents containing long-, medium-, and short-term plans with strikingly similar goals and objectives from school-to-school (The evaluation team later learned that school plans thought to be exemplary were often passed between principals and copied.). Many of the objectives of the school plans, even the yearly plans, were mostly unattainable in anyone's life time and did not appear relevant to the particular circumstances of the school. For example, one school with a particularly dark and dirty environment had no objectives aimed at making the school environment more inviting but outlined objectives aimed at 'building character within the student body.'

With only a few exceptions, Education Board[22] members knew very little about DBE and seemed to be relatively ineffective. Most claimed to play multiple roles in the system, including mediating disputes, supporting programs in the district, and advising the Head of DINAS about policy but evaluation members often had difficulty getting concrete examples of their work.

22. Education Boards are required by law to oversee the operation on the District education office (DINAS). Usually they consist of about 17 members from the education and community who are knowledgeable about education such as former DINAS officers and businessmen.

Most said that they had not received any training from DBE and most knew very little about the DBE program. They were often older, retired men appointed, in theory, for five-year terms but in practice for open-ended terms and served without much energy, frequently until their death. Even when the Education Board members were energetic and knowledgeable about education, they seemingly played a marginal role in the school system. Few board members could offer many substantive comments about the impact or possible improvements of the DBE program and none appeared to be advocates for the program or its sustainability.

DINAS and MORA district officers were generally very supportive of the DBE1 program in their schools. Both were enthusiastic about the changes DBE1 had been able to achieve in schools through training principals, developing school plans, and working with school committees. Many of the district and sub-district officers were anxious for the DBE program or its successor to continue within their district and asked the evaluation team to advocate for additional resources from the provincial level for future funding. Several Heads of DINAS had developed extensive replication programs for the DBE program and one District (Sidrap) had replicated the program to all 236 schools in 11 sub-districts but, by and large, most efforts to replicate the DBE1 program were modest at best. The description of their efforts suggested that the replication efforts were somewhat ad hoc, piecemeal, and not very systematic. Much of the training apparently was offered through the Principals' Working Group (KKM) and was not a regularly scheduled program nor was there a standard set of topics or materials covered in any sequential manner. Moreover, it appeared that the DBE1 training program differed from district to district with the length and details of the training dependent upon the amount of funding available.

As described more fully below, apparently many factors are in play to limit the replication efforts of DBE. One major factor appears to be cultural; many district officials have a strong donor dependence and lack confidence to carry out activities on their own. A second major factor was that supervisors, whose job it is to oversee ten or more schools in a sub-district (and replicate best practices), were often not trained by DBE, resulting in them not knowing much about the program and taking little initiative to replication efforts. A third factor is that most districts have very poor management systems in place and do not seem to track progress made in many factors, let alone replication, and coupled with the ad hoc delivery of replication programs, the replication process is completely disorganized.

### Differences between MOEC and MORA

The MORA and MOEC district officers saw no significant differences in the application of the DBE1 training to their systems and both sets of officials thought that the program was well-designed for all of their schools. In fact, the district MORA officials recommended that the foundation officers of many madrasah would benefit from any DBE1-like school management training and recommended that they be included in any future training opportunities. Although the provincial MOEC and MORA officers were somewhat removed from the implementation of the DBE1 school management training, they requested that in the future they be more regularly informed about the program so that they could better assist the program achieve its goals. The provincial officers had heard good things about the DBE program from the districts and occasionally had seen the program first-hand so they had good impressions of the DBE program and they were anxious for the program to continue.

Although there did not appear to be any differences in the application or results of the DBE program between MORA and MOEC primary schools, differences in the application of the DBE1 school management program were apparent between primary and junior secondary schools. Despite claims that DBE3 had used a 'whole school' approach, implying that all stakeholders (School Committee and community leaders, principals, and teachers) in junior secondary schools had been trained, the evaluation team found no evidence that principals and school committees had been trained in school management in junior secondary schools.[23] The lack of DBE1 school management training was apparent in many junior secondary schools the evaluation team visited insofar as those schools frequently did not have school plans, principals were generally less articulate about discussing their challenges and vision for the school, and they often appeared to be more stressed (although in fairness they manage much larger facilities with more students and teachers.).

### Regional Differences

For the most part, the DBE1 school management program seems to have been evenly applied and accepted equally across the various districts and provinces. In general, it appeared that the DBE1 program was best applied in South Sulawesi, especially in the rural districts. Rural schools in South Sulawesi generally had more active School Committees and the enthusiasm and cooperation between the community, schools and principals appeared to be higher than the other provinces visited. The practice of school planning and the involvement of the School Committees in Central Java appeared to be a bit less enthusiastic and varied considerably from district to district with at least one district largely abandoning DBE1 practice. In North Sumatra, one district did not appear to ever really grasp the notions of community involvement in schools, while the other was practicing the DBE1program but it was at best mixed in some schools and poor in others.

Possible reasons to explain the different provincial acceptance of DBE1 school management concepts include possible poor management, the degree of coordination and training of DBE1 programs in some provinces/districts; the level of community wealth (some poor communities were less inclined to support schools financially or in-kind); and the attitude and direction provided by the DINAS. Ultimately, some principals and school committee members in some provinces strongly claimed that efforts to involve the community in the school were wasted. On the other hand, other provinces had completely different and more enlightened attitudes about community involvement is schools and were much more open to accepting school management techniques.

### School-based management program impact

Overall, the DBE1 school management training and related activities appear to have had a significant impact on Indonesian schools but that impact appears to be waning and the program needs an infusion of further inputs, possibly on a regular basis, to ensure continued success. The introduction of school plans and the training of primary school principals and school committee members seem to have made a huge impact in those schools. Everyone who remembers the initial training was very impressed with the results of the school and the principals. Even today, six years after the introduction of the DBE1 school management

23. Principals were trained in teaching- learning and instructional leadership by DBE3 but only a few schools received training in school management and none after the mid-term revision.

training, DBE1-assisted schools are dramatically better managed than the average, traditional Indonesian primary schools; school plans are in place, principals and school committee members are in accord and working to achieve the same objectives, and principals and teachers appear to be working in harmony to improve the quality of education through the use of active learning methods. Unfortunately, when a principal is replaced at a DBE-assisted or replicated school with a non-DBE-trained principal, the school often enters into a downward spiral and much of the success of the DBE program fades quickly. The evaluation team repeatedly noted the importance of a DBE-trained principal to the success of the whole DBE program; if the principal was trained by DBE, the school management and active learning was strong, while a non-DBE trained principal usually was leading a poorly managed school with weak active learning.

Since the decentralization of schools and the delegation of hiring and firing of school personnel to the district level, there appears to be an inordinate amount of shuffling of school principals from school to school. Sometimes the movement of principals is due to normal causes, retirement, or the desire of the principal to change schools. Other times it appears that the change of political parties and the resulting change of school administration, results in changes in school principals. Some people contend that many of the changes are made as political pay-offs or as a result of cash transfers from the principal to the officer in charge of the hiring decisions. In any case, the wanton changing of principals and other key personnel is a serious obstacle to the success and sustainability of the DBE program. One district where the whole DBE program was thought to be exemplary only a few years ago was seen as one of the worst districts, apparently owing to the change of the political party in charge and the wholesale changing of key personnel in the education system.

Another area where the promise of the initial program seems to have faded is that of the school planning and plans. Initially, the school plans brought community leaders, School Committee member, principals, teachers, and parents together to discuss how to improve the quality of education in the school. Often these groups were included in local school decisions for the first time ever and the effort was seen as a new era of democracy in Indonesia.

The school planning exercise promoted dialogue, community spirit and pride and the community responded with an outpouring of financial and in-kind contributions to the school. After a number of iterations, the school plan has become a large and cumbersome document requiring data that is not always easy to obtain and not well-understood by some of the less astute personnel. Moreover, the planning is perfunctory and often the plan has short-run objectives that are not easily obtained or do not reflect the real needs of the school. Once completed, the plan is not consulted again until the next time up-dating it is required. Once it became clear that there was little payoff to producing a good school plan, many communities soured on the concept and interest waned.

### Conclusions and recommendations about school-based management

One of the major problems with DBE was the separation of school management from the teaching and learning component. This structural weakness of DBE meant that many of the management activities often failed to address the instructional functions of the school. When applied well, the school management and governance activities of DBE1 have proven to be major enhancements of the way schools were managed. The program should be seen as a

major success, but the success of the school planning as a tool to manage schools and generate community involvement is fading. In addition, many of the key people trained in school management such as principals and school committee members have been replaced or moved on, crippling the progress of the school management and active learning reform.

To combat these trends, USAID and its follow-on program PRIORITAS should consider:

- Mounting a school management training program for principals that have replaced previously trained principals;
- Providing school management training to new School Committee members and other key DINAS personnel, including supervisors and sub-district officers;
- Delivering the training program to DINAS staffs and ensure that the program can be delivered locally with modest resources;
- Revamping the school plan to focus on incrementally obtainable and school-specific, short-run targets;
- Offering cash grants to schools that develop the best school plans as a way to generate renewed interest in their development and reward well-performing schools;
- Working with the MOEC and MORA to develop clear guidance to provinces, districts, and schools indicating that the GOI encourages community involvement in education and mount a social marketing campaign to that effect.

### 2. District Management and Governance.

Although the evaluation team made a strong effort to assess the impact of DBE1 on district management and government, there were a number of factors which mitigated a complete review of this element of the program. First, the four sub-elements of the district management and governance program (planning and budgeting tools, school cost analysis tools, facilities and personnel management tools, and integrated tools for planning and policy development) were not always applied in each one of the 10 districts visited. Second, when visiting the DINAS offices, the district planning and budgeting staff were often not available for interview. Third, USAID's 25 questions that were meant to guide the final evaluation focused primarily on the school management and governance element and did not ask any specific questions related to the development of the various tools aimed at the district. Nevertheless, the evaluation team was able to interview a small sample of district budgeting and planning personnel.

#### Stakeholder views

District planning and budgeting personnel who had used the tools developed by DBE1 were very appreciative of the DBE program and strongly encouraged the continued support of these types of activities. They noted the government regulations frequently changed over the course of the program and despite some set-backs DBE1 was a tremendous boon to beleaguered district staff. Often district staffs would not have a good idea how to even start analyzing a problem or developing tools to service the new government policy or regulation. They claimed that by working with the DBE1 team, they were always able to respond in a timely manner to the new demand. The various district planning and budgeting personnel doubted

that they would be able to respond as rapidly or a accurately to new GOI demands in the future and saw no other alternative available to them to solve these kind of issues.

Beyond the gushing praise for DBE1 as a service agent for the district, it was difficult to get into specific details about the tools, in part because the tools are statistical routines that are difficult to describe and the nuances of the tools are a bit obscure. They all said, however, the school cost analysis, facilities management and budgeting cost tools were particularly useful. One got the impression that few had used the personnel management tools and because personnel deployment was a difficult political issue, they were avoiding using it.

### Regional and Ministry difference

There were no apparent differences between provinces as the tools were largely oriented for use by the district MOEC. The MORA as a centralized Ministry apparently does not use data or consider issues of these types at the district level. DBE1 apparently had little involvement at the provincial level.

> *Without the methods and tools provided by DBE, we would never have been able to respond to the changing policy directives of the MOEC central office. The DBE staffs were terrific. They helped us determine our data needs and then taught us how to use the data to improve our planning and budgeting.*
>
> DINAS official, Central Java

### District Management Program impact

For those districts and government units that were directly involved in district planning, budgeting and analysis, it appears that DBE1 was a huge boon to their development. DBE1 was apparently able to address problems and solve issues that no other organization had done and they were able to do so in a very collaborative manner that ingratiated their effort within the district.

### Conclusions and recommendations about District management program

It appears that the DBE1 program served a very useful function as a demand-driven think tank that could solve district education planning, budgeting, and cost analysis problems. It is not clear if this expertise currently exists in private sector consulting firms, a branch of the central government, or in universities but it is likely that the expertise could be found in one of these sectors. In any case, it would seem that if the GOI or the change in government regulations is the reason why these new tools need to be developed, then the GOI should establish some unit within the GOI or hire private sector firms or universities to develop these tools. Some possible areas for involvement by PRIORITAS might include:

- Working with the central government to carefully plan policy changes such that educational planning, budgeting and cost analysis methods and tools are developed and tested prior to policy reform and districts are given these tools as the policy is announced;
- Working to develop the capacity and skills within selected universities such as the State University of Makassar's Center for Effective Schools to address the needs of districts in implementing internal planning, budgeting and cost analysis;
- Offer a biannual 'Chinese menu' of planning, budgeting, and cost analysis tools and methods that appear to be needed by districts in the PRIORITAS network and hold a 'skills needs'

fair to determine which of those tools and skills are needed. PRIORITAS could then focus on those tools and methods that are demand driven.

### 3. Other DBE1 components.

Much like the district management and governance component above, the evaluation team did not focus on the reviewing the work completed on the EMIS, ICT innovation or the Public-Private alliances. The reasons for this lack of focus on these activities are much the same as the district management component above, namely the sub-elements of the DBE1 program (information and data management and Public-Private alliances were not easily visible in any of the ten districts the evaluation visited. Additionally, USAID's 25 questions that were meant to guide the final evaluation focused primarily on the school management and governance element and did not ask any specific questions related to the information and data management and public-private alliances. Nevertheless, the evaluation team was able to interview a small sample of MOEC officers who recalled DBE1 involvement in EMIS. The team was also able to review the dissemination of project results activities.

#### Stakeholders' views

MOEC officers who had worked with DBE1 in the development of EMIS and other data related to planning and budgeting were very positive about the role DBE1 had played. They pointed out that DBE1 had been a good partner to develop, pilot, test, and validate data and methodologies and tools. These efforts supported the implementation of GOI policy and worked to improve the management of basic education. In addition, they noted that DBE1 slowly shifted its focus from developing tools to building the capacity of districts, provinces, and central government to use these tools.

DBE1 was required by contract to develop and manage a project data and information management system (PDMS) as well as a project Website for all three DBE components (DBE1, 2, and 3). Although the PDMS and Website were transferred to the GOI, a quick review of the PDMS and comments from stakeholders suggest that the PDMS captured data accurately and in a timely manner and that data queries were answered quickly and accurately. The website, although originally intended for all three DBE programs, primarily housed DBE1 data, manuals, materials GOI regulations, and success stories. In the end, each DBE maintained its own website.

#### Program impact: other DBE1 components

Although it is very difficult to assess the impact of DBE components that were not directly reviewed, interviews with people knowledgeable about the activities claim the work was useful and made a positive impact. The EMIS activities seems to have been dropped altogether but DBE1's continuing efforts to improve data at the school and district surely led to improved regional data. The public-private alliances activities were terminated mid-way through the program apparently because they added little to the agenda of DBE1 and consumed considerable effort. Similarly, the small ICT grants seem to be terminated for much the same reason. It would appear then that in most cases these other activities diverted project effort and expertise away from core, mandated activities and they were judged to have too little return to merit further investment of time and resources.

### Conclusions and recommendations about other DBE1 components

It appears that the lesson learned from these other smaller and peripheral activities was that when ambitious project goals are not commensurate with project resources, great care should be taken to ensure that the goals are realistic and do not detract from the core program activities. For example, it is well-known that developing a workable EMIS is a large and complex activity usually requiring substantial resources. Providing very modest resources to an EMIS reform is probably not worth the effort and may diverted scarce project resources away for the core program activities. In an era when USAID often looks to limit its' management units, perhaps the temptation should be resisted to dump marginally-related activities with limited funding into large projects.

## Overall Conclusions of DBE1

### Strengths

Program Design Based on the initial success in transforming moribund conventional Indonesian schools with little or no community involvement into hubs of community interest, the program design of school-based management and leadership training for teachers, principals, and school committee members appears to have been a major success.

Impact on Principals Almost every principal trained under the DBE1 program was deeply appreciative of the training and thought it had made them a better school administrator. Some principals said the training changed their life and how they looked at themselves and their role in society. Given the strong impact the training had on principals, it would be difficult to argue other than the DBE1 program had a significant impact on the capacity of key personnel in the target school systems.

Strategic planning The introduction of school planning and the development of annual and multi-year strategic plans for the schools in Indonesia had a dramatic impact on the way MOEC does business and the adoption of the methodology has introduced a more rational, accountable, and transparent system into educational management.

Service Provider The DBE1 program seems to have been almost the ideal provider of services to the districts. In a period when the GOI was feeling its way through decentralization and regulations were changing with regularity, the DBE1 project appears to have provided a vital service to district education offices.

Manuals for sustainability DBE1 appears to have left behind a substantial body of knowledge, procedures, tools and materials that should allow any user to replicate the DBE1 programs.

***District capacity***

Many of the tools and methods DBE1 developed were left with the districts and became part of the normal programs and routines. These tools and methods and the problem-solving approach DBE1 fostered should continue well into the future.

### Weaknesses

High short-run/low long-term impact Despite the initial high impact in terms of community involvement the DBE1 training provided, the impact faded over the life of the program for a variety of reasons but largely because the people trained were replaced or otherwise moved on. Without the trained personnel, the program quickly wanes.

Little follow-up Nearly everyone from former DBE1 officers to district education officers seems to know that the DBE1 program has been fading because principals and school committee members are no longer in place. Despite this wide-spread knowledge, inexplicably few attempts were made by DBE1 in the districts to follow up the initial training with refresher or new participant courses. It would seem, therefore, that if PRIORITAS is to be successful, the project needs to use the program monitoring system to identify weaknesses, successes, outputs, and institutional mechanisms within the district to encourage follow up.

Too many priorities Although project interventions may have been good ideas and marginally related to the core activities of DBE1, the scope of work for all DBE1 and the other two components contained too many small peripheral activities that diverted attention and resources away from the main task. For example, experimenting with grants to stimulate ICT use in schools may have been interesting and valuable but probably was not closely related to improvement of the management and governance in schools.

Poor coordination District and provincial offices complained about poor coordination with DBE and noted that they seldom saw DBE1 representatives except when activities were planned. Some provincial officers claim not to have seen DBE representatives in several years. In addition, most noted that DBE1 did not coordinate well with the other DBE components or vice versa. Districts and provincial officers requested greater communication, planning, and determination of programs and targets for the future.

## Conclusions

Overall, DBE1 made a strong contribution to the improved management and governance of the Indonesian education system. Many of the techniques, tools and training programs that DBE1 pioneered were eventually adopted by the GOI and the program made a significant contribution to the decentralization reform initiated by the GOI. In total, DBE1 provided school planning training and financial management tools to more than 16,106 schools in 15 provinces, 148 districts, and over 40,000 teachers, government officials and stakeholders. By any measure these outputs are huge, even in so large an education systems as that operated by the GOI.

Unfortunately, for reasons largely beyond the control of DBE1, some of the early gains in the program were lost. Principals and school committee members, the main focus of many of DBE1 training activities, were replaced due to political considerations or normal retirements and their replacements were not retrained, resulting is a great loss of momentum. As noted earlier, there is evidence that some of the training provided has been lost as school principals are transferred and school committee members move on.

### *Decentralized Basic Education 2 (DBE2)*

## Background

The second component of the Decentralized Basic Education (DBE2) program undertook an ambitious effort to improve the quality of teaching and learning in Indonesia's primary schools. Implemented by the Education Development Center (EDC) and partners, the Academy for Education Development (AED), the Research Triangle Institute (RTI), Florida State University, University of Massachusetts, and the University of Pittsburgh, this component was expected to collaborate closely with the other two components of the DBE2 to build a strong system of school improvement. The combined efforts of the three DBE components would support Indonesia's efforts to decentralize governance, financial and managerial responsibilities to district and municipalities for service delivery.

Two realities confront the Indonesia education system: 1) the relatively poor quality and academic preparation of teachers and 2) the generally poor education in reading, math and science that students receive while in school.[24] In light of these issues, the Government of Indonesia has been taking steps to improve the quality and efficiency of basic education. One such step was the establishment in 2004 of the Board of National Educational Standards to guide the school accreditation process followed closely by the passing of the 2005 Teacher and Lecturer Law. These initiatives have been the foundation of the Central Government education reform initiative to up-grade the qualifications and certification of the country's 3.27 million teachers[25] by 2014.[26] A key challenge, however, continues to be strengthening provincial, district, and local capacity to implement a system which provides on-going opportunities for improved teacher professional development.[27] By aligning the goal of DBE2 with the strategic plans of Indonesia's education reform efforts, the program assisted government efforts to improve teachers' capacity through strengthening the delivery system of in-service teacher training. Results of the DBE2 will now serve as the foundation for the follow-on project, PRIORITAS, in continuing efforts to improve teachers.

DBE 2 worked with government, universities, and private sector partners to improve the teacher professional development system and strengthen the capacity of educators and administrations at the district and school level to facilitate and promote school improvement. The project was implemented in seven provinces and would directly partner with 1,203 primary school serving more than 263,000 students. [28] A project Mid-term Review in 2009 resulted in the DBE dropping implementation of a planned third cohort of schools and focusing more closely on transitioning the first cohort schools to sustainability. New activities were added or expanded in this component of the DBE project. A Distance Education and the Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE) initiatives worked with university partners while literacy efforts were aided by the addition of a Classroom Reading Program. An earlier focus on pre-primary school training lessened.

---

24. Jalal, F., M. Samani, M.C. Chand, R. Stevenson, A. Ragatz, and S. Negara. (2009) Teacher Certification in Indonesia: A strategy for teacher quality improvement. World Bank: Jakarta.

25. UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2010.

26. This law stipulates that teachers must have a minimum of a four-year university degree (Bachelor's). Indonesia Ministry of Education and Culture (2009) Ministry of National Education Strategic Plan (RENSTRA) 2010-2014. Jakarta.

27. EFA Secretariat and Ministry of National Education (2007) 2007 Mid-Decade Assessment Report, Jakarta.

28. Education Development Center (2012) Final Report (Vol. 1) DBE 2 Project 2005-2011. USAID

In the course of the evaluation, the team visited 58 primary schools (16 madrasah) and six Cluster Resource Centers (CRCs), interviewed a large number of teachers and principals, and sought the opinions of supervisors, Education Board and School Committee members, MORA and MOEC district and provincial education officials, and university faculty. The information collected from these interviews and site observations, as well as from almost 100 teacher survey questionnaires, serves as the basis for evaluation of this complex project component. Under the strategic objective of improving the quality of teaching and learning, DBE2 implementation efforts fall into the following intermediate goals: 1) in-service education professional development, 2) school learning environments, 3) public-private alliances, 4) student skills assessment, and 5) shared best practices. These goals are the framework for the organization of the report; however, because of the complexity of the project and the number of indicators the project reported against, the activities mentioned here in the following 'performance against targets' section (taken from the 2010 Monitoring and Evaluation Report[29]) are not necessarily in the same order as they are listed in the next section 'findings from the field' which activities and their placement are taken from the 2012 Final Report.[30] The reader should be aware of this difference in organization of the report.

### Program elements and performance towards targets

Training for improved teaching and learning was at the heart of DBE2. Using the platform of active learning pedagogy[31] as the foundation for training of teachers, principals, and other school-level actors in the system, DBE2 provided a comprehensive training package to enhance capacity in classroom instruction, classroom management, organization of learning environments, and instructional leadership. Ultimately, DBE2 would directly support professional development of over 16,000 teachers. In the assessment of project progress, four areas were measured: student performance, teacher performance, principal performance, and school performance; the ultimate expected outcome was improved student achievement.

As a result of implementation, DBE2 monitoring efforts reported gains in learning of math (in grades three and six), Indonesian language (in grades three and six), and science (grade six) in targeted schools over several years. Teachers in DBE schools also exhibited higher competencies when compared to teachers in control schools, especially in the use of interactive learning methods, creation of learning materials, and in preparation and use of lesson plans. Principals in DBE2 schools were reported to have improved their competence, being more likely to hold staff meetings and meet individually with teachers to discuss learning issues. DBE2 classrooms consistently met 12 of 15 learning-conducive criteria over several years observed.[32]

29. Education Development Center (2010) Impact, Results, and Programs: DBE 2 Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report, 2010. Jakarta: USAID.

30. Ibid, Education Development Center (2012).

31. 'Active Learning' is the latest permutation of the strategy, PIKEM which has been around Indonesia since about 1984. The current addition is called PAKEM; Indonesian educators refer to the methodology by both names. Participating DBE teachers actually were trained in DBE active learning under the name of PIKEM.

32. Education Development Center (2012) Final Report (Vol. 1) DBE 2 Project 2005-2011.

## 1. In-service education professional development.

Decentralizing authority and funding to district and school leaders to provide professional development training was severely constrained by low capacity; DBE2 developed multiple initiatives that would assist to build capacity of local education personnel.

University certified in-service training Partnering university faculty, local government education stakeholders, and DBE2 field staff on Module Development Teams, 24 training packages were written. The modules provided foundational information in active learning (AL) strategies, facilitation methodologies, subject-specific training in language, math, science, and civics, student assessment, and classroom and personnel management. The modules continue to be used today by DINAS offices in replication efforts of active learning practices and by other stakeholders involved in capacity development in the education sector including the World Bank, several universities, and government agencies (for example, LPMPs). The in-service training packets were university certified by participating DBE university partners, designed to assist teachers and principals to earn credits towards a four-year academic degree while they continued working. These training packages were highly appreciated by teachers and principals and were indeed more popular for the content they contained than for the fact that they were university accredited courses. The university accreditation aspect on the other hand was more useful as a pilot for a possible on-line professional development initiative.

Master Teacher Trainers DBE2 trained a cadre of Master Teacher Trainers, 212 in total, who played critical roles in managing, delivering, following up, and mentoring active learning training at the cluster level. Additionally they facilitated other DBE activities, such as Cluster Resource Centers and transition activities and provided necessary leadership to school-level activities. The position of MTT did not exist within the MOEC organizational and funding structures at the district level; however, at the end of the project, many of these individuals were subsumed into the education sector as teachers, principals, and supervisors where their extensive DBE2 knowledge and training continue to benefit the sector.

Additional Activities The Classroom Reading Program, added in 2009, provided professional development to teachers for integration of reading into daily classroom programs and pleasure books to grades one-three. A training-of-trainers approach, provided by twelve universities at the national and provincial levels, resulted in 5,265 teachers, mentors, and enrichment staffs being trained in reading activities. A Distance Education (DE) component trained one hundred university lecturers, school teachers, and principals to become on-line coaches to teachers, assisting them to integrate ICT tools into daily instructional practices. A second DE pilot trained university lecturers in development of professional courses for on-line presentation. Participants in both programs were overwhelmingly satisfied with the training they received, indicating that the training had been influential in their roles as educators.

Cluster Resource Centers These centers were often established at an existing Teachers' Activity Center (PKG) and offered a site for professional development activities for teachers and a centrally-located meeting place for other members of the school cluster. The project established 113 centers in seven provinces, one in each of the school clusters where DBE2 worked. At these centers, teachers could access facilities equipped with learning resources that were relevant to their needs and expand their abilities and knowledge as teachers. Before the project ended in 2011, teachers' and principals' responses to satisfaction surveys on CRCs was

high. CRCs continue to be used as training and meeting spaces for others groups in the education circle, principals, Teachers' Working Groups, School Committees, etc.

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Since 2009, the ICT-focus of DBE2 seems to have responded to a recommendation of the Mid-term Evaluation for more comprehensively designed ICT technology-based activities that address the needs of quality improvements to the teaching and learning process. ICT activities were used extensively in the project to improve teachers' instructional practices and extend usage of ICT into active learning in the classroom. All ICT-based activities in the DBE2 project, including Intel Teach, Developing Active Learning with ICT (DALI), the instruction of internet skills to teachers, distance education, and training of Master Teacher Trainers, were based at the CRCs, the main location for teachers to practice using technology. At a minimum, 12,000 educators received some kind of ICT training through the various interventions.

Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE) DBE2 responded to requests from partner universities to initiate training of active learning methodologies to university lecturers as a professional development service. The Active Learning for Higher Education was initiated and developed in partnership with higher education institutions in Aceh and then expanded to the fourteen other DBE2 university partners in the six remaining target provinces. ALFHE expanded rapidly thereafter through provincial university consortia with the result that by the end of DBE in 2011, the activity had expanded to 117 universities both within and outside of DBE target provinces and assisted 2,500 lecturers. ALFHE continues to have an impact at the higher education level; in Sulawesi alone the initiative has been spread to 139 private universities.

Pre-primary school training and development DBE2 established 131 kindergartens which implemented Interactive Audio Instruction (IAI) to provide on-the-job training for 1,768 teachers. The Final Report notes how popular the use of the IAI training was, assisting to make the kindergartens successful in increasing pre-primary children readiness for grade one. The evaluation team only saw a few DBE2 kindergartens on their school visits and noted how actively the children were involved in learning. The IAI was not in use in any of the classrooms visited, having perhaps already been absorbed by participating teachers. The evaluation team did understand that the focus on pre-primary school training had not received much prolonged attention by DBE2 after the mid-term review.

## 2. School learning environments.

DBE2 recognized the vital role supportive school environments have in the teaching-learning process and worked to build capacity of school stakeholders, supervisors, principals, teachers, school committees, and parents, to evaluate and enrich school learning environments.

Local support to school quality DBE2 developed a 15-point observation checklist of criteria within 'reasonable' control of teachers and principals to achieve in classrooms that would influence student learning.[33] The program then used the checklist to monitor schools' improvement in developing supportive classroom environments. Schools in both Cohorts 1 and

33. Examples of the 15 criteria are: all students can see the writing on the blackboard, all students can hear the teacher, current student work is displayed on the walls, the classroom is well-lit and ventilated, learning materials are current, and the teacher can provide examples of their use. Education Development Center (2010) Impact, Results, and Progress: DBE 2 Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report, 2010. Jakarta.

2 appeared to make consistent gains on the development of learning-conducive classrooms (achieving a minimum 12 of the 15 criteria). In conjunction with supportive classrooms, schools were also rated on the appearance of teaching-learning items in school development plans and evidence of community/parental involvement in resourcing schools. The use of these indicators focused school stakeholders' attention on the need to be involved in resourcing their local schools to ensure maximum learning benefit to students.

Student Learning Needs This area focused on DBE2 school staffs' ability to demonstrate that they understood and were able to address two or more identified student needs in DBE-prescribed areas of Active Learning, Gender Equity, and Civics Education. While the number of Cohort 1 and 2 schools demonstrated lower percentages (between 74 and 82) of interventions in Civics Education, both cohorts rated extremely high (98 percent) in the use of suitable interventions in both Active Learning and Gender Equity, demonstrating the understanding of school stakeholders on the benefits of these kinds of interventions. It appears that the option of Civics Education never did achieve much traction among DBE2 target schools as an appropriate intervention whereas active learning interventions have continued to remain extremely popular as witnessed by the current evaluation.

School report cards This activity was used to provide reliable information to school stakeholders to support development of school improvement plans. DBE1 and DBE2 worked together to develop software that would present a data-based illustration of school issues to serve as the basis for school planning. As noted by the DBE2 Final Report, the initiative was popular with school administrators although the computer-based format consistently presented problems as a result of poor computer literacy of participants. The initiative trained about 4,000 university trainers and school practitioners. In all interviews conducted by the evaluation team, this activity was least likely to be mentioned by respondents and did not appear to be very well-known among education practitioners generally.

Better-resourced school learning environment Two initiatives started by DBE2 to resource classrooms proved to be extremely popular and have had continuing effects as observed by the current evaluation. The Classroom Reading Program, initiated in 2009, provided reading materials to classrooms and professional development to teachers in integrated reading activities. As a result, 640,000 reading materials were distributed to 1,067 project schools for grades one to three and more than 5,000 educators were trained in reading instructional programs. A second popular initiative was the development of low-cost instructional materials which was embedded under the larger umbrella of active learning. Materials development was presented through the university-certified training programs at the Cluster Resource Centers. Although support by DBE for materials development stopped in 2010, the activity continues to remain popular among teachers and principals driven by the need to have better-resourced classrooms and was often recommended to the evaluation team as a 'best practice' activity for replication.

### 3. Public-private alliances (PPA).

Public Private Alliances (PPA) were established to add resources to project activities and serve as a catalyst in replication of good practices and scale-up or expansion of project activities to new areas. DBE2 made three PPAs: 1) The Bird's Head Education Alliance to increase the capacity of the university teacher training faculty in Jayapura, Papua, 2) the Intel Teach: Getting

Started Alliance for a K-12 teacher professional development ICT training program, and 3) the ConocoPhillips Education Response Alliance for earthquake-damaged schools in Central Java. Partnerships leveraged more than a two to one ratio of funds.

### 4. Student basic skills assessment.

Drawing on expertise of local university partners, DBE2 prepared examinations which tested student content knowledge for grades three and six in language, mathematics, and science (only in grade six), as improved student learning achievement was the ultimate indicator of project success. As noted above, students achieved learning gains across the years of the project in all subjects. These tests were not inserted to the selection of assessment tools available in the project teacher training efforts for primary schools although a unit focusing on student learning assessment (in the form of authentic assessment) was included in the modules developed for the active learning training process.

### 5. Shared best practices, knowledge, and experiences.

As a way to institutionalize knowledge and good practices gained from project implementation, DBE2 formalized a transition strategy in 2008 to guide the project in its final years from being one of 'service delivery' to one supporting 'sustainable systemic reform.' This was necessary to ensure that a process was in place to enable local stakeholders (i.e. district education offices, madrasah, university partners, and other service providers) to carry on DBE2 best practices with local funds and limited project support after the end of the project. Original guidelines for transition required that DBE2 materials, approaches, and personnel (either as facilitators or monitors) were used, funds were locally provided, and local implementing agencies led replication efforts. DBE2 best practices were made available in several media forms including interactive CD ROM, hard-copy training materials, and university-hosted digital libraries. By project end, 8,193 additional primary schools, 2,060 kindergartens, and innumerable district education and university personnel were replicating DBE2 best practices, more than doubling the project footprint. At this date, the evaluation team found continued replication efforts by DINAS education staffs with varying degrees of quality and intensity underway in the field; a concern for the quality of replicated practices however remains a critical issue.

## Findings from Interviews and Observations

### 1. In-service professional development.

During this assessment exercise, the evaluation team looked for signs of impact and sustainability in the in-service professional development process as a result of DBE2 interventions over five years. A schema of the actual organization and structure of the national in-service professional development system was not to be found; therefore a determination of where DBE2 efforts contributed specifically to the organization and provision of the system was difficult to make. However, the evaluation team determined that the project was very successful in terms of the delivery mechanism and the content of training the project offered to teachers. Many interventions proved to be highly popular with local stakeholders and evidence of DBE2 effects continue to be seen in classrooms.

Interviews with education stakeholders brought up the following issues about training implementation: limited or conflicting training schedule issues, limited scope or depth of the

trainings, no systematic process to include necessary stakeholders and subjects at school-level training, and a limited mentoring process after initial training. In the opinion of the evaluation team, these issues have had an impact on the current apparent level of teacher capacity visible in DBE schools today and more importantly, have implications for a continued focus on strengthening an in-service professional development system, the objective of the PRIORITAS.

### Stakeholders' views

> *Teachers' classroom behavior has changed and students have become active, curious, and motivated to learn, and have achieved better scores.*
>
> Principal, Central Java

DBE2 attempted to follow an approach where all relevant education personnel at the school-to-district level were involved in training so that all knew and understood the process and would be able to play their part to improve in-service provision. Teachers overwhelmingly expressed appreciation for the training they received in the active learning methods and were professionally rewarded to see happy, engaged, and learning students as a result of their increased capacities. Subject matter training in math and science was consistently highly-rated in interviews and surveys as effective to improve individual instructional abilities by teachers.[34] Despite this testimonial, however, evaluators saw relatively few teachers who were really 'actively' teaching. More commonly, teachers seem to be using 'hybrid' conventional styles of directed learning from the front of the classroom to students seated in groups while using some student-centered discussion techniques. Their limited understanding of the active learning philosophy was apparent by their responses to interviews questions. They feel they are neither able to expand their own personal teaching repertoires with new AL strategies nor are they able to expand active learning strategies to other subjects.

Principals were also appreciative of the training they and their teachers received and thought that active learning, ICT/media, classroom management activities, and mentoring were the most effective DBE2 activities. Trained, visionary principals were identified by the evaluation team as a key ingredient in successful schools. Principals who had received a complete package of training from DBE 1 and 2 (including school-based management, leadership, active learning, ICT strategies, and development of school work plans, lesson plans, and low-cost teaching materials) had a greater understanding of their roles as management and academic leaders. Their understanding of active learning was necessary to their role as a teacher mentor and the force which guided advancement of good education practices at school-level; many however voiced their limitations to serve as instructional leaders, noting that teachers knew more than they about the teaching process.

More than one individual interviewed mentioned how lucky the school was to have a Master Teacher Trainer in place at the District Education Office to support teacher development. Respondents did say however that MTTs should come from within the cluster so they were readily available and knowledgeable of local issues and that they should only be chosen from the teaching pool if they could get release time from their classroom responsibilities to assist in other schools. The number of MTTs trained by DBE was actually too few to provide consistent support to all the schools in the clusters. Development of strong mentors to support in-service

34. See Appendix 6, Results of Teacher Surveys.

training was a valuable practice to be continued although the identification of which individuals and what their role should be in the district education system are crucial.

> *The MTT seems to be the champion of DBE because he is well-trained in active learning and can support our teachers.*
>
> Principal, Central Java

Supervisors are a critical link in the in-service training process because of their role in monitoring of national minimum standard attainment by schools, training of Teachers' Working Group (KKG) members, and the fact that they are the link from the schools to the district office. They were involved throughout most DBE2 trainings, but apparently in minimum numbers. DBE2 chose to bypass working extensively with supervisors from the outset of the project because of their limited capacity and instead opted to develop project-supported Master Teacher Trainers to be based at the district office. DBE2 was the only one of the three DBE components which did not engage local district coordinators, instead placing much responsibility with MTTs, who were disbanded at project end. These issues affected monitoring efforts, sustainability, and strengthening capacity at the district education offices to take up DBE2 initiatives.

The evaluation team could not ascertain if supervisors' poor attendance at trainings (if they were invited) was because of their initial weak capacity, their own low motivation to be involved, or their heavy workloads. Many school interviewees responded that supervisors were of limited or no use to support teacher improvement during school visits although in all fairness, many of them, particularly in the MORA system, seem to be responsible for more schools than they can humanly manage. Their once-a-month school visits[35] hardly seemed adequate to support sustained improvement. When interviewed, supervisors consistently said that they felt they needed more training so they would be better qualified to help teachers. Many other respondents said that supervisors should know more than the individuals they were supposed to guide and suggested that they should have advanced degrees and be held to competency standards as teachers now are.

DBE invited other participants (for example, school committee members) to active learning training sessions. Evaluators could not assess the level or scale of participation in training by these individuals and only heard occasional references that some had and some had not attended trainings. Key individuals at the DINAS office, for example, district education officers and Subject Matter Specialists, seem to have been largely overlooked by training efforts.

### Training Delivery

Active learning as the foundation for training was very much appreciated by multiple stakeholders, especially teachers and principals. Increased attention on methods to get children actively involved and learning were very welcome. Increases in student learning and other indicators were given as evidence of success of the process.[36] Some principals mentioned increases in student scores on the National Exam while others mentioned increased participation and success in special academic Olympiads. For other respondents, success was

35. The Minimum Standards requires that the supervisors visit each school in their cluster once a month although many who the team spoke with managed to visit their schools more often.

36. Teachers and administrators were hard-pressed or unwilling however to show actual student scores as evidence of increased learning achievement.

evidenced in increased attendance of children, low or no student drop-out rates, increased rates of grade six graduation (95 percent or above was often quoted), and all graduating students being able to get into the junior secondary schools of their choice. The active engagement of students in their learning, increased motivation, creativity, and willingness to express themselves, participation in groups, and asking questions of the teachers were all cited as evidence of active learning.

> *DBE training is different from other trainings because after the training all trained teachers could immediately apply almost everything they got.*
>
> Teacher, South Sulawesi

Teachers most commonly cited the following DBE2 activities as most effective: classroom management (group seating, teacher presence in the classroom, and wall displays), lesson plan development, contextual learning, ICT/media, and making low-cost teaching aids. Classroom management activities tend to be the most obvious (and sometimes easiest to achieve) indicators of active learning. In the evaluation team's cursory observation of classrooms,[37] changes in classroom appearance were immediately apparent. In many of these AL classrooms, however, teachers still stood in front of their classes lecturing to children who worked individually in their books. Evaluators felt this indicated that teachers had not yet attained a deep enough understanding or confidence with student-centered methods and they easily reverted (continued?) with the conventional teaching styles they were comfortable with. One teacher in a good school in Sumatra estimated that only about 40 percent of DBE2 training is still in practice, verifying again the necessity for on-going and high quality support to change behaviors of teachers in classrooms.

Teachers noted that the conversion to active learning is complicated, makes more work, and needs adequate time and financial support to prepare teaching aids, media, etc. Additionally, special strategies are needed for slow learners and to insert the use of ICT into teaching practices. Big class sizes seem to impede active learning classroom activities. Others noted that inactive learners, most generally boys, may not function well in groups and do not participate. When questioned if alternative activities were used to encourage their participation, some teachers said that lower performing students just needed more repetition to learn so teachers continued to use traditional styles of teaching, not 'seeing the need to use active learning all the time.'[38] These issues could be as a result of several factors: the limited depth and length of training teachers received in AL methods, a lack or limited mentoring/support to teachers after training, or lack of appropriate monitoring and feedback mechanisms which would continue to identify and address classroom problems.

On the other hand, as a result of the training, some teachers noted that teaching was more enjoyable and interesting than before. Conceding that changing teaching behavior with active learning methodology was challenging, they also noted that classroom teaching had become fun after DBE training.

37. 'Cursory' is emphasized here. In most cases, evaluators saw individual classes in action for maybe five minutes and relied heavily on watching engagement of children, teachers' movements in the classroom, types of verbal interaction with students, and other cues that experienced educators pick up on to assess learning situations.

38. On a related note, evaluators saw no special needs children in schools although by Indonesian law, they should be attending regular schools to the extent that they can. Evaluators in fact saw few children who even wore glasses (evidence of visual limitations). Most certainly children with visual and hearing limitations attend the schools now without knowledge of school staffs although just as certainly, teachers probably recognize them as 'slow learners.' Active learning methods should accommodate all children, including those with special learning styles if teachers are knowledgeable of children's limitations and how to tailor activities to suit their needs.

A major fault of training delivery mentioned often by respondents was its lack of synchrony with either individual schools' required activities or the District Education Office (DINAS) agenda, forcing school staff to choose between participation in project or government-required activities. Some principals (especially in Central Java area) mentioned that DBE2 trainings took teachers out of their classrooms for long periods of time, 'leaving their students unattended and not studying'[39] and several principals even went so far as to say that student scores were lower as a result of teachers being out of classes too much for training.

The short length and infrequency of the training sessions were often cited as leading to only limited amounts of knowledge gained. Some teachers noted that they had received training for five days (all topics) followed by a couple of mentoring visits in one year and no more. Other participants responded that DBE2 should have given training to all school staffs in all subjects to ensure building a critical mass of trained individuals at individual schools. Evaluators feel that this limited and sometime conflicted training schedule has affected the depth of knowledge and skills acquired by teachers and the institutionalization of the process in key areas of the system. The result is that the DBE impact sometimes feels tenuous and appears to be fading in many schools. In any case, a closer inspection and design of a training delivery schedule will be critical if in-service teacher professional development is a priority issue of the government in the near future.

A last critical issue of training delivery was the provision of mentoring after training, a topic mentioned often by principals, supervisors, and LPMPs as a best practice from DBE2. The evaluation team found that mentoring of teachers continues to be done by MTTs (now in the guise of principals and supervisors) and is highly appreciated. The importance of continued support after training cannot be overlooked. The provision of on-going teacher support and training, 'a continuum of professional development,'[40] is an international best practice of teacher training and needs to be closely attended to and provided for in any focus on teacher professional development.

> *All DBE activities were beneficial and contributed to teacher professional development, but what distinguished the DBE project was the provision of mentoring after training.*
>
> Supervisor/MTT, Central Java

Cluster Resource Centers in each school cluster seem to be steadily used on weekends as training delivery sites, most often for weekly KKG meetings/trainings and by individual teachers who use the computers on-site. Despite responses that they should continue to be used, their popularity seems to be waning as noted by one principal in North Sumatra who said the CRC has not been used since DBE ended as 'the passion of the coordinator went down' and another noted that activities have been falling off since DBE2 ended. One of the CRCs, handed over by DBE2 to the sub-district MOEC office as a move toward sustainability, has been locked since the beginning of the year and has seen no use, not even by the host school. Visits to six CRCs by the evaluation teams confirmed a feeling of decreasing use, finding large rooms with well-

39. However, no mention was made of efforts being made for example, of off-duty teachers covering classes for other teachers who were out being trained, combining classes so teachers could take turns going out to be trained, or of even canceling classes for several days ('in-service days') so all teachers could attend trainings at once. This would appear to be a lack of motivation, knowledge, or flexibility on the administration's part to make accommodations for in-service training.

40. USAID (n/d) First Principles: Designing Effective Educational Programs for In-service Teacher Professional Development: A Compendium. EQUIP 1: USAID

stocked and displayed materials and resources (including banks of computers) but often static and uninviting learning spaces and mounting management problems. Interviews with CRC managers (often the principal of the host school) revealed steadily growing problems of declining engagement of cluster schools, aging computers that were becoming obsolete, growing issues of funding and management responsibility, a narrow strategic plan for future action, and a growing unwillingness of teachers from partner schools to travel to the CRCs. Some KKGs now want to rotate training sessions among cluster schools rather than holding them in the CRCs to encourage more sharing of materials and processes among a wider group of teachers. More than once, evaluators heard that non-DBE2 school teachers in the cluster did not use the local CRC as they didn't feel 'invited' by the host school to do so.

Evaluators felt that the life-span of the CRCs as a training space may be coming to an end because of their waning popularity and mounting financial problems although their location and resources should make them ideal locations to continue cluster-based activities. The CRCs have been handed over by the DBE2 project to DINAS offices and PRIORITAS will need to work closely with the district offices to identify strategies, funding, and willingness for continued use. PRIORITAS can also work with CRC host schools to plan the use of the space during the week (when teachers are not using the room for training) for special classes, remedial classes, special reading initiatives, etc. to ensure an effective use of the space for the entire week.

MORA and MOEC The focus on improved quality of the teaching and learning program was well received and both MOEC and MORA officers were equally positive about DBE2 activities, especially the use of active learning as a foundation of change. At the central level, the MOU with the Coordinating Ministry for the People's Welfare limited involvement of MOEC and MORA with the result of minimum engagement and commitment to DBE2 although both ministries appear equally open to cooperation with PRIORITAS. The provincial MOEC officials have limited but generally positive knowledge of DBE activities as they have had the least engagement with the project. Provincial officials want more and earlier involvement with the new project so they know how to contribute their financial support through the district to teacher competency efforts at the school level.

Support to DBE programs varied among districts. The team found, for example, strong enthusiasm for DBE active learning initiatives in South Sulawesi, evidenced in the high rate of DINAS-supported replication in many sub-districts. In other districts, support was dependent on the district commitment and willingness to take up and institutionalize good practices. Donor dependency was obvious. One district DINAS in North Sumatra, for example, wanted PRIORITAS to work in the district for the next twenty years to make sure all teachers were trained! Because of its centralized administration, district MORA representatives have their hands tied where funding for continued teacher development is concerned. They are eager to continue cooperation with PRIORITAS as the need is great in madrasah schools for in-service teacher development; some teachers mentioned that they go a whole year with no access to training opportunities.

In the attempt to institutionalize a professional development system at the district level, DBE2 made limited progress towards its objective. The Master Teacher Trainers put into place by the project were not part of the MOEC system, making institutionalization of these positions impossible after the project ended. Their value as a foundation for a strong training/mentoring unit at the DINAS level therefore was lost. Moreover, sub-district officials and supervisors of

primary schools who are in the MOEC/MORA system were not strengthened; thereby DBE2 lost another opportunity to build a strong nucleus for professional development at the district level. Low motivation of DINAS officials to take advantage of DBE2 efforts however could have also played a large factor in sustainability of project initiatives.

The evaluation team consistently heard of the poor coordination and communication by DBE2 with government staffs at all levels, leading to uneven degrees of government support, sometimes low replication rates, and poor institutionalization at all levels.

District and Provincial Collaboration The undefined relationship between the provincial and district offices further restrained DBE2 efforts to strengthen a logical system of professional development at the lower levels of the government. The provincial government does not have direct access to schools and is responsible only for coordination and facilitation of program funds while the district is directly responsible for implementation. The province feels that the district level does not respond well to policy changes but still has the power to directly affect teacher professional development. Meanwhile the provincial MOEC has a large funding allocation for education but often cannot optimally use it as they do not know how to get it down through the district level to school training programs. Some suggested that PRIORITAS could have a role to play in this scenario, facilitating a provincial-district coordination effort that develops a funding/implementation process to support a locally-based professional development system.

A different scenario exists between provincial and district MORA offices due to the centralized system they operate under. Most madrasah are privately run by foundations and have limited financial resources. Many private madrasah education staffs receive very limited or no professional training on a yearly basis but are still required to meet the certification standards of the government, leading to a dispirited and poor quality teacher corps. State-supported madrasah are on a completely different financial footing, benefitting from state resources and contributions from the community. Some of the best performing active learning junior secondary schools the evaluation team saw were state-run madrasah. District MORA offices however have little authority to initiate efforts to overcome education problems at the school level, leaving them in the difficult position of having to wait for centralized decisions to solve sometimes easy problems. Coordination and communication between the MORA and MOEC at provincial and district levels are limited but the evaluation team found many instances of shared trainings and supervisory visits at school level.

University Partnerships DBE2 worked with fifteen Indonesian universities to explore and improve the possibility of institutionalizing the process of in-service teacher training. With the help of three U.S. universities in the partnership, various interventions were piloted, assisting to build capacity of Indonesian universities. These activities were relatively small in scale and appeared to succeed more in building internal university capacity rather than directly supporting university provision and institutionalization of in-service training.

The few activities designed to directly benefit in-service training met with success on a limited scale. The accredited training modules granted only four university credits towards certification from specific universities and were not expanded enough to provide a full course of credits needed for a degree; therefore teachers did not appear to often request the credits for taking the courses. The Distance Learning initiative was popular among the university faculty

involved with it but a full-blown effort to offer on-line course-work remains inhibited by universities' own current capacities and by school practitioners limited technology capacity; this initiative does have the potential however to contribute to the growing movement in Indonesia towards provision of professional on-line learning opportunities.

Working in conjunction with primary school teachers, some university lecturers participated in the development and training of the Active Learning Modules which were very successful and enabled lecturers to gain valuable experience in schools (to pilot the modules). Feedback suggests they really enjoyed and benefitted from these experiences and were able to gain an understanding of the needs and situations of primary school teachers. University lecturers were often called on to provide the theoretical expertise for other DBE2 interventions (such as the reading program, ICT modules, and student assessment tools) but these appear to have built internal capacity more than support in-service provision.

The Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE) initiative, to train university lecturers in active learning methodologies, appears to be one of the most successful of the DBE activities with universities. Some universities have already institutionalized and/or integrated this intervention into their own lecturer professional development programs and it has been widely replicated among higher education institutes. This intervention should directly benefit pre-service training of teachers while indirectly assisting in-service training by building capacity of trainers and facilitators.

The Consortium of Indonesian Universities-Pittsburgh was initiated with great enthusiasm by university rectors and the University of Pittsburgh as a vehicle to promote coordination and communication among Indonesian and U.S. university members and facilitate the sharing of knowledge, experience, and expertise of DBE2 activities.[41] From the point of sharing information about good practices of in-service training and active learning strategies, the consortium may be contributing to the dialogue among university practitioners about professional development; how the information gets shared and put into action by the lecturers responsible for teacher preparation may be difficult to ascertain. The Consortium continues to meet once a year although concerns about leadership, funding, and a strategic plan may impact its continued effective functioning.

School personnel generally seemed to think that university lecturers are too theoretical and do not have the practical experience and understanding of issues in schools to really serve as in-service providers. Some did suggest however, that using the district as the meeting point, lecturers could be partnered with strong teachers to present combined theory and practical application courses to up-grade teachers' subject matter knowledge. The National University of Makassar in Sulawesi offers in-service training at the district level through their pay-for-service Center for Effective Schools. This could be a model for demand-driven university service provision to meet the professional development needs of districts.[42]

41. See Annex 8: Response from U.S. Universities

42. More information and interview responses from Indonesia university partnerships are included in Annex 9: Responses from Indonesian Universities.

### Program impact

DBE 2 was a very ambitious program with many interventions. Although actual teacher training in active learning was highly appreciated and effective, the scope and variety of activities was difficult to coordinate and was spread too thinly to build a critical mass. School-level affects are still apparent but fading as the strengthened system of support teachers need to refresh and expand their knowledge and skills is only thinly in place. The school-to-district level connection is not strong, system connections are confused, and skills of key players are not developed. DBE2 missed several key opportunities to enhance capacity and lay a solid foundation for a training unit at the district level to lead in-service professional development.

One large issue beyond the control of the project is that no national master plan of in-service professional development exists (that the evaluators could find) that identifies the schedule, provision, and requirements of the in-service professional development system. This presents difficulties for implementers in identifying needs of the system and how their efforts can contribute to strengthening the process. The absence of a schema of the in-service system will continue to be an issue for PRIORITAS but likewise offers a golden opportunity for the project to play a key role with the government in the development of such a prescribed system.

The project has been successful in 'spreading the word' about active learning and many individuals across seven target provinces know and like the process. PRIORITAS has a foundation, albeit a thin one, in place on which to build and institutionalize a strong teaching-learning process.

### Conclusions and recommendations for In-service Professional Development

It is imperative that PRIORITAS identify and address key training needs in the system to institutionalize active learning at the school and district level. The project should make a point of working only with those schools and districts which are truly motivated to work side-by-side with them. With only a limited amount of funds, the PRIORITAS' goal to institutionalize a stronger system will force the program to be very certain of engagement with partners who are motivated to participate; some DINAS have not shown good faith in replication of activities using the capacity gained from DBE2. The program needs to ensure good communication with stakeholders across administrative levels, from the central MOEC on down, to contribute to building a system of professional development rather than focusing purely on offering training assistance to isolated levels and individuals. Recommendations for PRIORITAS include the following:

- MOUs and letters of commitment should be put into place with all partners and at all levels to ensure everyone is aware of their own responsibility in the effort to make better schools.
- Work with willing district offices to examine and identify individuals and structures present in the system which will form the nucleus for in-service provision at the DINAS level, leading to institutionalization of the process.
- Assist the government to define graduated courses of training that lead to prescribed levels or degrees of professional development of teachers rather than continue to deliver an on-going cycle of 'teacher training.' An example of graduated levels of training could be Active

Learning I, II and III leading to a certificate of Master Teacher of Active Learning. This reinforces the best practice of a continuum of professional development for teachers.

- Support universities to explore ways to make them more attractive and experienced to district education offices as in-service providers. Initial strategies will need to focus on 'advertising' university services (via 'traveling university road shows,' and establishing branch offices with local universities) to inform district offices of the kinds of services available for in-service training. The university will need to identify a cadre of lecturers dedicated to development and delivery of in-service training services and PRIORITAS can assist those individuals to gain more experience and knowledge of school-level issues through project-sponsored activities.
- In the school-to-district level, identify those individuals (especially teachers, principals, and supervisors) who will be necessary to strengthen a local in-service professional development system and include them in training of active learning so everyone understands the process and their role in it. Identify strong individuals in each category who can serve as master teacher trainers in individual and neighboring schools.
- Include a combination of content and pedegogy and include more focused work on student assessment in continued training in active learning.
- Assist district education offices to develop and institute a system of teacher classroom observation and assessment as an addition to the teacher competency exam in gauging teacher competency. The teacher competency assessment tool used in DBE2 could serve as the basis for development of such a tool for PRIORITAS use.

## 2. School Learning Environments

DBE recognized the importance of resourcing learning environments to compliment increased teacher competency. Construction of learning materials by students and teachers was a sustainable, low-cost alternative to keeping classrooms supplied with resources. Teachers were very proud of their innovative ability to use every day cast-off materials to produce useful learning resources although several noted the time involved in making home-made aids.

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) ICT activities were used extensively in the DBE2 and stakeholders, especially teachers, were absolutely enamored of them. Active learning with ICT consistently rates high in interviews and surveys with teachers and principals as an effective practice and a recommendation for replication. Given its popularity, the evaluation team closely examined this intervention.

Evaluators' observations in schools revealed extremely few instances of technology use either in classrooms or in teacher rooms, administration, or district government education offices.[43] The most complete provision and usage of, for example, LCD projectors or power-point presentations were in urban classrooms where teachers most generally used them for technology-assisted 'lecturing.' CRCs are all stocked with banks of computers and according to reports, teachers come in on weekends to use them, although now some of the DBE computers are broken or mal-functioning. Further reports from CRC managers seem to

43. ICT is understood to include all forms of technology: computers, LCD projectors, laptops, TVs, etc.

indicate that now more teachers are able to purchase their own laptops, so usage of technology in some CRCs is declining. Only two of the six CRCs that the evaluation team visited in three provinces had an on-site ICT instructor who provided guidance for usage and training and provided equipment maintenance. Some CRCs cannot afford the connection charge so have no internet access now. Some schools that were visited do not have any ICT equipment (even though teachers received training), cannot afford the electricity charges to run computers or provide secure, clean locations for storage or usage of ICT equipment. Lastly, many school staffs often seem to be relatively illiterate in technology usage.[44]

The team understands that technology is an attractive, innovative way to present learning materials to students. Additionally, teachers new to active learning methods may misunderstand that its use does not increase student learning, rather it is only a tool to assist in presentation of materials which must be properly facilitated by a well-trained teacher. In any case, the evaluation team was hard-put to understand the continued obsession with ICT by educators in schools. Evaluators did notice that a moderate number of teachers now have their own laptops.

Reading Program The reading program was enormously popular with teachers and placing pleasure books in classrooms was well-appreciated. Evaluators saw many reading spaces in classrooms and heard about daily or weekly reading schedules in which children eagerly participated (e.g. a ten-minute reading period every morning when children come into the classroom). The pleasure books in classrooms were ragged from use and children had sometimes read every book many times over. Children in some schools were also able to take books home to read which may have positively influenced parents' attitudes about reading. According to teachers, the reading program apparently did not make an extreme impact on improving reading ability of students; rather improved their enjoyment of reading. Evaluators found that the same books (for grades one to three) were often made available to children of all grades (one through six) which certainly did not challenge or assist older children to improve their reading ability of more difficult books. New books were needed but school funds cannot be used to buy pleasure books. Many schools have libraries but they often seem to be underused and sometimes not welcoming. Books appropriate for grades four to six were recommended by several educators to continue the progress made in building a reading culture in the lower grades.

### Program Impact

Learning materials were highly regarded by teachers. Both principals and teachers recommended materials production as a valuable replication activity and topic for continued training. Evaluators however saw few learning resources actually in use by children although they were prominently on display in classrooms. A decreasing use of learning materials may be a manifestation of fading motivation and willingness to use active learning strategies. ICT was highly popular but the required hardware seems to be an expensive and variable issue that schools have to deal with first. Many individuals now have personal laptops and natural attrition rates in ownership should assist to build interest and use in ICT. Provision of pleasure books and reading activities were valuable activities to focus attention on improved literacy.

44. This was amplified to evaluators many times over by teachers' apparent trepidation as they told about trying to take – and failing – their competency exam as it is in a computer-based format.

### Conclusions and Recommendations for school learning environments

The increased level of learning materials in classrooms will continue to grow in importance, especially in poor schools. In the longer run, it is unrealistic for administrators to think that teachers and students will continue to make their own materials as it takes valuable time away from instruction. A huge selection of more sophisticated, durable, and grade-appropriate materials is available on the market. The focus on ICT should be minimal until and if school staffs acquire their own equipment and motivation to effectively use ICT. Then school administrations can discuss ways to support teachers to use ICT for instructional purposes. A focus on literacy programs will always be appropriate. Inclusion of instructional units in reading for the early grades might have increased impacts, aiding children to actually read better. The following recommendations are made to improve school learning environments:

- Learning resources for classrooms are necessary and can be expensive. All stakeholders need to be involved in identification of prioritized needs on a graduated scale and then work together to procure them.
- Dedicate a small part of the school budget (BOS) every year to acquire appropriate learning materials and books, including pleasure books.
- To continue growing an interest in reading, assist schools to present activities which focus on literacy. These could include such things as reading contests, parent-student reading activities at the school library, classroom story-time reading by parents, prominent citizens, etc., and story-writing competitions where winning stories are turned into classroom reading activities.
- Provide hotspots in CRCs or schools so teachers can access the internet on their own computers. Many resources and ideas are available on the web which they can access freely. Collect and distribute a list of good websites.

### 3. Public-private alliances.

The public-private partnerships were small and outputs were relatively few in total. The evaluation team was not able to gain any first-hand knowledge of their functioning. Because the numbers of participants was few, evaluators do wonder however if administration of these alliances was worth the value added to the project in additional funding.

### 4. Student Basic Skills Assessment.

Over the course of the project, DBE2 used valid assessment tools that proved increased academic achievement as a result of students' involvement in active learning programs; however these tools were not inserted to the school system to be used by teachers. Authentic assessment was included in the active learning training modules so participant teachers and principals did receive some information on the process but several interviewees noted that training was too limited and too infrequent for principals and teachers to acquire a deep understanding of the evaluation process.[45] The evaluation team was concerned therefore, that teachers in classrooms apparently do not understand and use authentic assessment procedures to effectively assess learning gains made from active learning programs. While school staffs

45. Information gained from North Sumatra provincial MORA education division interviews.

were happy with the apparent increased motivation and interest in learning of students, they seemed puzzled as to why test and achievement scores may not have drastically improved. Many teachers continue to equate the use of paper-and-pencil tests (knowledge-memorization tests) with knowledge assessment without understanding the under-laying principles of active learning (*creativity and critical thinking skills = learning how to learn*) which requires different assessment methods. This suggests that PRIORITAS will need to include a stronger focus on assessment in continued implementation of active learning.

### Program Impact

Teachers and principals need to be able to prove that students are learning as a result of using student-centered methods. While increased student motivation and interest in learning are very rewarding to educators, the fact is that the business of education is learning. Advancement of the whole education system – planning, budgeting, building capacity, etc. – should be based on the premise that the system is producing better-educated students. Therefore teachers must be able to prove that students are learning as a result of their efforts in classrooms. Increased student learning is also a measure of improved teacher capacity, one of the objectives of PRIORITAS and a major reform goal of the government. Continued success and longevity of the PRIORITAS focus on active learning may rest on the proof from classrooms that students have learned as a result.

### Conclusions and Recommendations for student basic skills assessment

School staffs need more training in active learning strategies so they have a deeper understanding of how they work and how to prove students are learning as a result. Teachers have not gained an in-depth knowledge of the active learning philosophy and they do not understand the need and how to conduct authentic or continuous assessment of students in class. Recommendations for PRIORITAS to consider for a continued focus on student basic skills assessment include:

- Present a stand-alone unit on student assessment so teachers gain a better understanding of appropriate tools to use to assess different instructional methods.
- Combine appropriate assessment measures with every subject matter unit.

## 5. Best Practices, knowledge, and experiences.

As a result of the success of DBE2 interventions, many schools wanted to have project activities copied at their school using their own resources, but with the use of DBE2 methods and materials. Therefore, in the transition phase of DBE2 (2008 until project end in 2011), the program developed a replication strategy to share best practices and knowledge with those who requested it. Stakeholders recommended that ICT, school planning, active learning, science, math, language, and early grade reading packages, and leadership programs for principals/supervisors were the most effective activities from the DBE2 program to be replicated.

Replication efforts are very dependent on the motivation, political will, and funding of DINAS offices to recognize the value of a program and then care enough about education in the district to support duplication of best practices. Rates of replication varied widely; for example, one

district (Sidrap, Sulawesi) has replicated DBE2 practices to 236 schools in 11 sub-districts, while in Taput, North Sumatra, the DINAS has doubled the number of replicated schools from the number of original DBE2 schools (40 DBE schools and 80 replicated). For the most part however replication efforts seem to be modest. Evaluators came across various replication schemes without being able to determine the success rate of any of them but certainly some of them could have merit for continued replication efforts:

- Transferal of strong DBE-trained principals to non-DBE schools to infuse DBE practices into new schools and to combat the decline in quality after project ends;
- Clustering treated schools and non-DBE schools together with one strong host school to facilitate DBE2 activities throughout cluster;
- Requested sub-districts to involve five schools and two teachers from each invited school to attend DBE2 training and then teachers were expected to train their peers on return to their own school;
- Rotate KKG trainings around the member cluster schools so all can share training information;
- Give supervisors major responsibility for dissemination of good practices by-way of their circulation to other schools in their sub-district.

Evaluators found generally that replicated schools are of poorer quality than DBE2 project schools. Project monitoring reports noted that replication trainings were sometimes not used according to DBE2 guidelines (for example, three days of training instead of the recommended five days). One respondent mentioned that the replication process was too haphazard and not well-planned; therefore not enough time was allowed for knowledge and skills to deepen.

The process of 'socialization,'[46] another common method of information-sharing, does not seem to have been a very effective as a method of dissemination of DBE2 practices. As noted by one respondent, this process did not have any impact on teachers as they were not able to practice and implement what they learned from the sessions (offering another support for the practice of being actively involved in learning, a best practice in adult learning as well.).

### Program Impact

Replication has 'spread the word' about good DBE2 practices in target provinces but replicated schools seem to be somewhat weaker than project schools in application of active learning methods. DBE2 practices seem to have been absorbed at a surface level and are almost certainly not institutionalized. Evaluators sometimes felt that replication was done rather repetitively just to achieve a targeted output without concern for the quality of the duplicated activities and without the necessary follow-up and support that quality programs need.

### Conclusions and Recommendations for best practices, knowledge, and experiences

Mechanisms to replicate activities need to be of high quality and the process well-planned. Delivery needs to be done initially by the same trained individuals who were involved with

46. 'Socialization' was group-sharing of information, a coming together and hearing about a program without the opportunity of being actively involved in practicing what was heard.

DBE2 until a higher quality of training can be achieved by District mechanisms (for example, by KKGs, KKM, and Subject Matter Specialists). Replication is highly dependent on the will of the DINAS. PRIORITAS should consider the following recommendations for successful replication efforts:

- Establish a replication unit at the DINAS to focus on budgeting, planning, and scheduling of activities to ensure a controlled and sequenced replication effort. Identification and provision of on-going mentoring should be a required part of replication planning and implementation.
- Replicate activities to schools which are motivated and sincere about supporting new activities to improve student achievement.
- Partner willing schools with strong 'buddy' schools which can serve as models for replication. High performing and willing teachers from the strong school can serve as trainers and mentors in the replicated school and school visits can be arranged.

## Overall Conclusions: DBE2

### Strengths

Three provinces: a comparison Producing good schools involves several factors: supportive principals who are knowledgeable and motivated to achieve improvement, involved local governments and communities, materials and resources to use as learning aids, and a system of training which continues to reinforce knowledge and skills of teachers. Evaluators became aware of the importance of each of these factors over the course of the assessment, but at the end of field visits, were no closer to predicting how each of these factors interfaced to produce the schools they did! The extent to which these factors interact to produce good schools will be an important area for PRIORITAS to engage in deeper research. Understanding these interactions will lead to more efficient investment of resources and a strengthened education system in Indonesia.

In making a comparison of provinces, the evaluation team based their decisions on school observations, interviews with stakeholders, and collection of school indicator data, but ultimately on their intuitive recognition of a place where learning was taking place. Sulawesi was considered the strongest in terms of DBE 2 application. Evaluators estimated that 53 percent of the total number of schools visited was considered mostly applying active learning[47] and evaluators saw many good-to-excellent schools with student-centered activities underway. In the same schools, a large number of principals had received combined school-based management and active learning training and the largest number of them has Master's degrees (65 percent[48]) of the provinces visited. A greater percentage of supervisors regularly visited schools in their area and their visits were considered helpful to teachers by principals. Replication rates in one of the districts were very high due to a very motivated DINAS. The National University of Makassar is very active and well-known in the arena of teacher preparation (pre-service); its presence is strongly felt in the region and the university seems to

47. 'Mostly' is defined as 65 percent or more of classrooms display three or more factors of active learning: wall displays, student seating arrangements, teacher classroom behavior, student behavior, and presence of learning materials. See Appendix 10: *Matrix of Schools: Primary*
48. See Appendix 11: School Profiles

garner much respect. The university is making progress in offering in-service training courses to district education offices on a fee-for-service basis.

Central Java and North Sumatra are lower in performance than Sulawesi, with Sumatra the weaker performer of these two. Both provinces have some good urban schools while some good schools are present in the districts; however in at least a large number of schools visited by the evaluation team, active learning appears to be thinly applied and in several districts in both provinces, hardly apparent. Central Java has one district, led by a dis-interested and unmotivated DINAS where the program seems to have failed. A relatively moderate number of schools have principals who received combined active learning and school-based management training. Twenty-three percent of them in Central Java have Master's degrees while 18 percent of them in Sumatra have. School committees appear to be relatively active at schools in Java but in Sumatra, both schools and communities are poor and schools really suffer from limited or no support from the community. About 60 percent of supervisors in both provinces have been rated by principals as not very helpful to teachers.[49]

Effective approaches to learning Participatory student-centered learning was widely appreciated and rated as one of the most effective activities of DBE2. Additionally, many of the component activities, including ICT, classroom management, and development of learning materials, were very well-liked and continue to be used. The 24 training packages were very effective as a foundation of training and also continue to be used for training and replication by donors, universities, and government organizations. Student-centered learning at university level is equally effective, as noted by reactions of university lecturers about the ALFHE initiative. The process has been institutionalized into policy for lecturer professional development at some universities and will assist in pre-service preparation of future teachers. The reading activity was highly appreciated and encouraged children to read more. This activity shared knowledge among a wide variety of educators to support future replication efforts. At the district level, supervisors, MTTs, and Subject Matter Specialists were trained to mentor teachers, provincial education offices were informed, and the reading program was shared among 12 partner universities. As a result, behavioral changes among teachers and facilitators were observed, leading to requests for replication assistance.

With the focus on active learning, DBE 2 has provided the education system with a culturally-appropriate and tried methodology[50] that has been proven internationally to work and will eventually lead to the production of the type of educated students the country needs. Teachers are rewarded to see their students involved and learning, a real motivation which stimulates educators to continue improving their skills and using pedagogy that works.

### Weaknesses

Coordination and communication DBE2 had a poor record of coordination and communication with many partners, including its own partner components, DBE1 and 3. Coordination with DBE1 (school-based management) was especially critical for principals and did not happen consistently. Collaboration at the central and provincial levels was almost non-existent as the whole project was aimed at the district level and at this level, partnership efforts were mixed.

49. See Appendix 10: Matrix of Schools, Primary

50. Active learning is a permutation of PIKEM and other student-centered methods which have had a presence in Indonesia since 1984.

This inhibited not only sequence and flow of implementation but also absorption and sustainability of interventions.

Training Delivery Serious issues of timing, frequency, and length all played roles in the ultimate absorption and continuing presence of active learning interventions. Timing of training that did not mesh with school and DINAS calendars was a well-noted problem and the length of time teachers were out of classrooms was an issue. Many of the timing issues could be as a result of coordination/communication issues mentioned above or just the fact that the project was extremely ambitious and spread too thinly over too large an area to provide an adequate level of concentrated training.

In-service training Some of the individuals important to the institutionalization and monitoring of the in-service training system were not brought into the cycle of training. For example, supervisors were minimally touched as were district education officers and Subject Matter Specialists, also at the DINAS level. On the other hand, Master Teacher Trainers, despite being very valuable additions to the teacher training roll-out, were not part of the education structure at the district level (i.e. not in the personnel budget); therefore when the project was over, district governments were not able to continue to employ these individuals as master trainers. Therefore the opportunity to develop a strong nucleus for in-service provision at the district level was by-passed.

Provincial quality assurance groups (LPMPs) were largely excluded from the DBE2 attentions except on an individual basis for subject matter expertise. Earlier uncertainty of the role they were to play in the organization of the education system at the province and district levels perhaps limited DBE2's early willingness to work with them. Not until the passing of the National Standards in 2008 did they get assigned the responsibility for quality assurance in achievement of the standards and monitoring of teacher competency issues. The evolution of the policy environment has now put them into a better position to play a role in the development of a professional teacher preparation process.

Some university lecturers appeared to have been effectively involved at school level to develop and train some of the initial training modules, although for the most part, university lecturers have little experience or knowledge about the realities of education provision in schools. Therefore, universities may not be the only choice as the seat of in-service provision but collaboration with well-performing school practitioners might be considered.

ICT DBE2 put in much time and resources to implement ICT as the platform for active learning. Despite best intentions to move Indonesia students and teachers into the 'modern world of technology,' the implementation of ICT was done without consideration of the ramifications of computer maintenance and up-keep, obsolescence, school electric capacity, high computer-to-student ratios, and ultimately, the best use of technology for education purposes. Few education personnel were seen to be using computers for either personal or professional use; at the same time, requests for more ICT training and technology were constant.

## Challenges

Rationalization of in-service professional development The national in-service professional development system begs for re-organization and rationalization. A defined and organized professional development structure is absent. Training provision for teachers is inconsistent, un-defined, and not standardized. The district level has poor capacity to become the institutionalized center of change in the system of professional development although would seem to be the correct location to do so. The necessary individuals who should form the nucleus for training (supervisors, Subject Matter Specialists, KKGs, and LPMPs from the provincial level) are poorly trained and their efforts uncoordinated to develop teachers. The provincial and district education offices do not communicate with the result that funding from the upper level cannot reach the schools where it is critically needed. Universities often have neither the interest nor capacity to be in-service providers.

The main provision for teacher training at the school level is the KKG.[51] The evaluation team however heard variously that principals, supervisors, LPMPs, university lecturers, peers or 'guest' teachers all provide training to teachers. As one principal said, 'whoever at the DINAS office is best qualified' comes to the school to train the teachers. Meanwhile, who trains all these 'trainers' to a high and consistent standard? This seems to be another serious challenge to the issue of providing high-quality teacher professional development! The schedule of trainings and priorities for participation are confusing as emphasized by participation scenarios from the field. Meanwhile, do principals accurately record the participation of individual teachers throughout the year so they know who has and who hasn't received training? Do some teachers get more training than others in the same school? Is there a point in time when all teachers at one school have received the same amount and type of training? When is training enough? These are all issues which are in need of serious clarification and attention to.

> *Projects need to build the capacity and activate the system to develop, motivate, and support teachers, and not just transmit knowledge and skills to teachers.*
>
> M. Ginsberg, 'Active-learning pedagogies as a reform initiative,' 2009.

Ultimately, a system of 'teacher professional development,' does not exist, only a constant cycle of poorly-planned, low quality trainings which contribute very little to teachers' overall competency. In the case of Indonesia, development of a professional development system that involves logical, graduated steps tied to incentives that culminate in a defined level of certification or professionalism is critical. Teachers themselves and the rest of the education system need to be thought of as professionals who are experts in what they do and not pawns of the system which can be acted upon without their input.

GOI commitment and coordination Both MOEC and MORA need to be on-board and fully committed to achieve a strong professional development system of teacher training. Budgets and processes need to be identified and organized down through all levels from the central to the schools, with identified roles and responsibilities so everyone knows what part of this process they are responsible for. If the GoI is serious about improving the education Indonesian

51. The KKG is a teachers' forum which supposedly all teachers belong to. In reality, training is provided by a few teachers with subject specialties or interest. KKGs regularly provide training, sometimes as often as every Saturday but most generally, once a month.

students receive, they have to make policies which institute active learning so it is pervasive throughout the system and all players conform to it (for example, defined in the National Standards, institutionalized into professional development requirements for principals and supervisors, required as a refresher training for district education officers, included in new textbooks, etc.). Donors need to maintain close communication with the GoI to ensure agreement on targets, processes, and implementation.

Universities as service providers While lecturers have abundant technical knowledge, their limited practical expertise about how education is provided in schools is a real constraint. Stakeholders will need to explore means to address this deficiency before universities can effectively serve as in-service providers. Using the district as the meeting/delivery point seems to be the logical location for the technical knowledge of lecturers and practical expertise of teachers to meet.

Personnel: Roles and Responsibilities The roles and responsibilities of district level education personnel (KKGs, supervisors, MTTs, Subject Matter Specialists) for in-service professional training provision are muddy and confusing. Identifying who does what and how they fit into the teacher development system, with a follow-on requirement that they get advanced training and academic qualifications as defined, would assist to establish an institutionalized training unit and process at the district level to facilitate teacher training.

Sustainability, institutionalization and donor dependency All stakeholders need to know from the beginning what the end goal of participation is and how everyone will get there. Increasing capacity and a continuous supply of resources into the system will need to be highlights of any dialogue among partners along with specific objectives and defined indicators. Donor dependency was an obvious issue; therefore an exit strategy should be prepared and shared in advance.

**Conclusions:**

DBE2 was very successful in bringing the teaching-learning process to the front of educators' cognizance, sharpening the focus on a sound strategy that improved student learning and was enthusiastically embraced by teachers and students alike. The program was complex and perhaps tried to achieve too much in five years; despite this, DBE2 made strong in-roads into teacher training. Active learning was at the heart of teacher training efforts and a foundation, albeit thin, remains in a reasonable number of schools visited. Teachers were highly appreciative of student-centered learning, mentioning development of materials, ICT strategies, and classroom management activities as most effective. They constantly expressed the need for more training in active learning but want a deeper emphasis on assessment and combined content and pedagogy. Based on collection of information through interviews, surveys, and observations in the field, evaluators judged Sulawesi to have the strongest remaining effects of DBE2. Central Java was judged to be slightly ahead of Sumatra but neither showing strong signs of DBE2 interventions at this time.

Progress towards institutionalization of in-service teacher presentation is much more limited. Capacity has not grown significantly in key places and important individuals may have been by-passed in training efforts. Other weaknesses concern training practices of timing, length,

frequency, and follow-on mentoring which conspired to limit the amount of knowledge and capacity teachers were able to attain. An exaggerated focus on ICT usage without proper consideration for the limits of its use in education has resulted in a false sense of reliance on technology. The determination of universities as the center for institutionalization of in-service training provision remains contentious until universities can move out into the field and increase their practical knowledge of education at the school-level. An entrepreneurial relationship in the form of a fee-for-service with district offices may be what is needed to put clients and service providers of in-service training together. Coordination and communication with partners and possible partners was a major weakness of DBE 2.

Some really good schools, dedicated principals, and enthusiastic teachers were seen during this evaluation. These will continue to serve as the foundation for PRIORITAS to build on. Unfortunately, a greater number of DBE2 schools had only remnants of active learning in place and project efforts often seemed to be fading. The DBE2 was just too big, had too many moving parts, and failed to bring some important players up to speed in capacity. The lessons learned from DBE2 should be the guide for PRIORITAS as they move forward and will serve as a sound foundation for the on-going attention to teacher development. USAID and PRIORITAS should focus on assisting the government to develop and contribute to a system of professional development that will serve as the legacy of the good work of DBE2 to improve teachers' abilities.

### *Decentralized Basic Education 3 (DBE3)*

## Background

Decentralized Basic Education Three (DBE3) began in June 7, 2005. In its original time frame, the project was scheduled to end in June 2010 but was extended until December 31, 2011 as Improving Work and Life Skills targeting improvement of the quality and relevance of junior secondary education. This component was expected to work closely with DBE1 and DBE2. Save the Children was the prime grantee while the International Relief and Development (for the length of the project) the Asia Foundation (until July 2008), and the Academy for Education Development (until December 2010) were included as sub-contractors.

Working in the context of the government decentralization efforts begun in 1999 and the Education Law of 2003, the principal objectives of the original project were to:

- Improve the basic education received by students in Junior Secondary School so that it is directly related to the skills needed upon entering the work force (life skills))
- Assist youth who had dropped out of school before receiving their Junior Secondary School certificate to build the skills needed better to participate in the community and workforce.[52]

In the first three years, DBE3 worked in six provinces,[53] covering in two cohorts 98 sub-districts in 44 districts. The project's main areas of intervention were 1) build support and capacity at the district level for relevant quality youth education programs and promote the dissemination (scaling up) of project innovations; 2) partner with 196 formal junior schools to implement a model of school improvement and student retention; and 3) select and work with 191 non-formal education providers to implement a model of education improvement for programs for out-of-school youth. The results of these efforts were according to the project's own final report, mixed.[54]

## The Mid-Term Evaluation and the Revised Project Focus

The mid-term evaluation of all three DBE projects, in 2008, had a particularly profound effect on DBE3. The evaluation report[55] concluded that DBE3 was trying to do too much, was spread too thin and therefore was having little impact. Based on recommendations in the Mid-term Review and under instructions from USAID, DBE3 underwent a major revision in 2008 with a key provision to eliminate the non-formal education activities and to refocus the project on formal junior secondary education. Therefore, the current evaluation focuses primarily on the work of DBE3 with formal junior secondary schools, both madrasah and public.

A more in-depth school training program was instituted upon USAID's approval of a revised project proposal in January 2009 (there was a time lag between this approval and the published evaluation results in mid-2008). The revised project emphasized a 'whole school integrated approach' to quality improvement in schools, training teachers of all core subjects, school principals and senior management staff of partner schools. The project focused initially on

52. Save the Children (n/d) Final Project Report : DBE3 Volume 1. June 7, 2005-December 31, 2011.

53. North Sumatra, Banten, West Java, Central Java, East Java, South Sulawesi

54. Ibid. 1

55. The Mitchell Group (2008) The Midterm Evaluation of USAID/Indonesia's Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) Project. Final Report, Volume 1. USAID,

junior secondary schools (SMPs) and madrasah junior secondary schools (MTs) in 25 extension districts, chosen from targeted schools in the earlier school cohorts of the project, to give greater presence and critical mass. The 'tag line' for the project was changed from 'Life Skills for Youth' to 'Relevant Education for Youth.' The three principal objectives (Intermediate Results: IRs), reviewed with two sub-objectives, of the revised project were:

1. Quality of junior secondary education providers in target districts increased. (IR1)
2. Support to the National GOI In-Service Teacher Training System provided.(IR2)
3. GOI better positioned to respond to the needs of the Junior Secondary Education sector.(IR3)

## Program elements and performance toward targets

The revised project, operating within the new objectives, focused on a more succinct set of design elements specifically for formal junior secondary education. After a difficult transition period involving management changes and one sub-contractor dropping out, the project began to address the new performance objectives and targets. The progress of each program element/objective is described below.

### 1. Quality of junior secondary education providers increased (IR1).

The post-midterm DBE3 took steps to support the sustainability and impact of a whole school program 'by developing local ownership of the program and its innovation and building capacity to support and disseminate the program.' These steps included:

- selecting and training a team of district facilitators to train teachers in core subjects;
- involving local government in the development and management of the program and working with school principals and supervisors to increase their role in supporting development and change;
- involving the provincial quality assurance institutes (LPMPs) and teacher training universities at the province, district and school levels in order to build up their understanding of the program and their capacity to support sustainability and wider dimensions;
- implementing strategies to identify and disseminate innovations between schools and districts and encourage their adoption at the national level by the use of a dedicated newsletter, website and district, provincial and central showcase meetings involving relevant GOI institutions; and implement (in late 2009) the whole school approach in the remaining 19 so-called 'core' districts.[56]

The primary strategy of the revised DBE3 was on the whole school approach and development of districts' own capacity to improve the quality and relevance of junior secondary education. The elements of the whole school strategy were to create training capacity, provide creative examples of good practice, involve key personnel from the school and district levels, and offer varied and practical training programs.

During the first three years, DBE3 created 38 general teacher training modules covering English, Citizenship and Mathematics. The decision was made to create a series of new modules

56. Save the Children/IRD (n/d) DBE3 Final Project Report, Volume 1. p. 30.

for the whole school training program to deepen the knowledge and implantation of the life skills program, The three new training modules developed for the whole school training program became volumes two, three, and four of the Better Teaching and Learning (BTL) series.[57]

DBE3 decided to concentrate initially in just 25 of the original 44 project districts. Fifteen district facilitators were selected from among suitable teachers, principals and supervisors (three district facilitators for each of the core curriculum subjects).[58] In 2009, 19 more districts, called core districts, were phased into the project and because there were fewer partner schools (usually about four, compared to ten in extension districts) in each of these core districts, only ten district facilitators (two per subject) were trained.

The performance of the whole school approach towards targets in the revised project sought to overcome the obstacles encountered in the original project; chief among these was the practice of putting DBE3-trained teachers back into unsupportive environments. The revised project managed to substantially increase the number of teachers trained; principals and supervisors were involved in the training as well and received special training. The project's own final evaluation reported increased impact in school practices and student performance and noted that "changes and improvements in teaching subject areas will only be successful if they are part of a wider program to improve the management and ethos of the school and the teaching methodologies used across the curriculum."[59]

To address strengthened capacity of the districts to support quality improvement of teaching and learning, school principals and supervisors were given special training in order that they should also understand the BTL program. Efforts were also made to involve representatives of the district education offices and religious affairs offices as well as members of local parliaments, education councils and local development agencies in showcasing program achievements and in planning and implementing dissemination.

An important mandate of the original pre-midterm project was to improve the quality and relevance of education for youth with a focus on life and work skills. By the end of 2008, it was reported that 85 percent of the teachers in partner schools were successfully using activity-based learning approaches to build students' life skills during lessons and 93.3 percent of students were consistently demonstrating key life skills competencies. By 2009, in the revised project, this had reached 98 percent. Project monitoring reported that 90.4 percent of classrooms could 'demonstrate improved learning behaviors.'

In terms of performance towards targets, DBE3 employed extensive monitoring and evaluation efforts to collect information based on the indicators for the 2009-2011 period. For the schools, three sets of indicators, agreed upon with USAID, were monitored: Teaching and learning, student performance (including DBE3's own student assessment) and school management and professional development.

57. BTL1 was developed and used during the first 3 years of the DBE3 project.

58. Bahasa Indonesia, mathematics, science, English, social studies.

59. Save the Children/IRD (n/d) DBE3 Final Project Report, Volume 1. USAID/Indonesia.

The project's own results indicators for this specific objective show that the project largely met or came close to most of the project targets. [60] To illustrate an example: school principal leadership: Target (2011): *principals provided professional and instructional leadership in 70 percent of schools*, Actual: *Extension Districts: 72.8 percent; core districts 69.3 percent.*

**2. Support to the national in-service teacher training system provided (IR2).**

In order to fulfill this objective, DBE3 collaborated with a small number of staff from teacher training universities (LPTK) and Quality Assurance Institutes (LPMP) in each of the project provinces. Sixty-three staff members of these institutions, including facilitators and teachers, participated in Better Teaching and Learning training programs (for facilitators and teachers).

Selected lecturers also participated in a Classroom Action Research (CAR) program (25) and in a pilot training program with two teacher training universities (State University of Semarang and State University of Makassar): 60.[61] Each university participant in the CAR program was partnered with a district facilitator and a classroom teacher, forming three-person teams (for a total of 75 persons) to design and implement the classroom action research. Research papers by the participants were reviewed by a DBE3 technical team and then submitted for publication in a CAR journal. Participants reportedly stated that the process was as important as the outcome and that they were very satisfied with the program. It was also reported that the CAR program had the effect of building cooperation among teachers and lecturers from the LPMP and universities.

It is important to note that a pilot program at the universities was implemented only in the final year of DBE3 (2011) with the idea that it might help to improve the quality of in-service and pre-service training programs at these institutions. Part of the strategy was also to target key staff members who could influence their colleagues and the institution to change and improve practices in the training programs. Sixty university and LPMP staff participated in the pilot programs; university lecturers were from the two universities.

Overall, in a final review and evaluation meeting in 2011 on the university pilot program, the lecturers were enthusiastic about the content and approach of the DBE3 materials. It was reported, however, that the university staff said it would be a challenge for them to conduct these activities by themselves and that continuing DBE3 support was needed.

Two other important issues on the pilot programs were noted in the Final Report. "DBE3 overestimated the capacity of the university staff' given that the training was relatively short and there was a lack of time for the universities to fully implement the activities." [62] The DBE3 activities had not been integrated into the initial training programs at the university and were perceived as an 'add on.' It was reported that the lecturers had to reduce the BTL material they used to train their students and that insufficient funds were available to replicate the training program as implemented by DBE3. Despite this, both universities were said to have plans for continued use of DBE3 materials.

60. Ibid, Volume 3. (2011) Monitoring and Evaluation Plan 2009-2011. P 87-90.

61. Both universities participating in this pilot program were in two of the provinces included in the Final Evaluation: Central Java and South Sulawesi.

62. Ibid Final Project Report, DBE3. p46.

Performance towards targets related to the university pilot programs, as reported by DBE3's own monitoring and evaluation efforts, is principally in the realm of 'activity indicators' rather than specific results. This is understandable given that the activities were of short duration as well as implemented late in the life of the project. Feedback from the final evaluation workshop was generally positive, but with the several important caveats noted above lending a cautionary note for future activities. Feedback from the Classroom Action Research program was positive.

Public-Private Alliance Programs Another aspect of the support to GOI in-service training was the formation and management of Public-Private Alliances (PPA) to help address project objectives, reach new geographic areas and address 'issues that complement, but are outside of the project scope.' Three such alliances were formed during the period 2005 and 2011, with (i) Exxon Mobil Indonesia, (2) Intel, and (3) Conoco Phillips. These alliances were terminated in 2010 and the evaluation team did not focus on them.

### 3. GOI better positioned to respond to the needs of the Junior Secondary Education Sector (IR3).

DBE3 made extensive efforts to collect and share information and knowledge on the approaches and progress of DBE3. These efforts encompassed Sharing and Advocacy Workshops, Newsletters for Good Practice, and a Website of Good Practice. The principal results indicator for these efforts was 'increased government access to information about good practices in Junior Secondary Education.'

Based on DBE3 Monitoring Reports and the Final Project Report, all targets for this objective were 'achieved.' This basically meant that specified numbers of workshops were held and met prescribed targets (e.g. 51 workshops were held in 2011; 44 at the district level, six at the provincial level, and one at the national level). It also meant that four national and 19 provincial newsletters were produced and distributed. Similarly, the Website of Good Practices was set up and updated regularly throughout the life of the project.

In terms of progress towards targets, it would appear, at least on the surface, that all targets were met. These efforts were intimately entwined with the total DBE3 project. Under the surface, however, the effectiveness of DBE3 in this area was questioned in the Midterm Evaluation, "A number of MONE and MORA officials made the point that they were not very well-informed about the project" and that "…while they may have received project newsletters and reports periodically, these generally did not provide sufficient insights into the challenges and lessons learned that could inform GOI policy and strategic planning."63 The outputs were significantly increased during the revised portion of DBE3 but many of the same questions remained. In addition, since they were largely outputs of the project, it would be difficult to say much about the reported progress towards longer-term outcomes and impacts of these specific efforts.

63. Ibid The Midterm Evaluation. p43

### The Cross Cutting Issues

There were six cross cutting issues in the original DBE3 but three of these were eliminated during technical revisions in 2009. The cross cutting issues considered here were part of DBE3 for the entire six years of implementation:

Promote the use and integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) to enhance teaching and learning The ICT program was modified in 2010 in order to rectify problems encountered in the first phase of the project involving synchronization of the ICT efforts with those of the teaching-learning program. One such change was that the Intel Teach program, one of the project's public private alliances was ended and was replaced by a project-designed ICT program that was integrated into the whole school approach. Laptops were purchased to augment equipment in the partner schools, a short training program was initiated on the use of ICT across subject matter teaching-learning processes, and a toolkit was distributed on how to manage and maintain ICT. The provision of computers was 'met with mixed success;' maintenance and repair were recurring problems.[64] Reaction to the training programs was reported to be positive.

Ensure success in the Islamic education subsector The purpose of this activity was to help improve the quality of Islamic schools and the mindset of staff and teachers in those schools. The project initiated a variety of sub-activities including a situation analysis of the Islamic education institutions, reviewed training modules for their appropriateness in the Islamic education sector, created opportunities for cooperation in the Subject Teacher Working Groups (MGMPs) and among Islamic and general schools, strengthened links between MORA and MOEC district education offices, and engaged with Islamic and general universities to build their capacities as teacher training service providers. The project reported that "DBE3 was equally as successful in Islamic schools as in the general school system and, in some cases, results in Islamic schools were better than in conventional schools." [65]

Promote gender equity DBE3 undertook a variety of program activities to ensure and improve relevant education for males and females. The activities included a study on potential gender-related issues including youths' access to education, recruitment of gender specialists to review and give input to the design of modules and other training materials, and incorporation of gender sensitive tools into project training materials for teachers.

## Findings from Interviews and Observations

The evaluation team conducted interviews with 197 teachers as well as the principals of 49 Junior Secondary Schools in four provinces (from a total number of 330 Junior Secondary partner schools). The 49 junior secondary schools included:

- 28 state schools
- 1 private school
- 14 state madrasahs
- 6 private madrasahs

64. Ibid DBE3 Final Report. p60
65. Ibid DBE3 Final Report. p61

Based on these interviews, as well as those with supervisors, Education Board and School Committee members, MORA and MOEC district and provincial education office officials, university faculty, and from information garnered from survey questionnaires, the team made a determined effort to analyze the complex jigsaw puzzle that was DBE3. The overwhelming number of the puzzle pieces in the project led to the determination by the Midterm Review, correctly, that the project was simply too much and spread too thin, and that the non-formal education portion of the project had to be eliminated. The project then struggled with management and contractor changes and revised objectives to regain its traction. The staff who continued with the project deserves full credit for their hard work, persistence, and dedication in the face of continuing challenges, not the least of which was time and timing.

Before beginning the review of the qualitative findings for this evaluation, it is important to mention the major efforts by DBE3 to monitor, evaluate, document, and share project information and lessons learned. The project consistently prepared and distributed monitoring reports, newsletters and other reports, including a final report that was candid about the project's weaknesses and the lessons learned. The project was awash in data on project activities and much of it was helpful. Having said that, the quality of indicators for the project and the effectiveness of coordination and communication (critiqued elsewhere in the report), leave much to be desired and improved and will be addressed in the following review of the project.

The findings, based on the final evaluation team's research, basically follow the same project objectives as outlined previously and that were put forth as a result of the Midterm review. Within that framework, key issues are highlighted leading to the conclusions and recommendations that follow.

### 1. Quality of Junior Secondary Education providers in target districts increased.

The findings of the evaluation team encompass a series of interrelated issues around this objective.

Approaching the Whole School The whole school approach was a central concept of the revised DBE3 and with all good intentions and much hard work, it was attempted. In contrast to the previous piecemeal approaches, the idea was to basically get a 'critical mass' of the key actors/stakeholders all moving in the same direction through upgraded training, materials and support, in other words, a 'full-court press.' Based on the evaluation interviews conducted with teachers, principals and others, as well as survey and observation information, it can be said that while DBE3 *approached* whole school development in terms of its many activities, especially training, it did not really happen. Despite the reports that the various elements of the whole school approach were taking place and that indicator targets were being met, the pieces never seemed to constitute a whole. It was the heart of DBE3 and it was not implemented. Why? Based on information gathered in the final evaluation, the reasons appear to be multiple and were reflective of DBE3 as a whole:

- Lack of time: too little time to implement the concept between the end of the mid-term evaluation and the end of the project. The training of trainers, for example, took place just *15 months* before the scheduled end of the project. Two project extensions, of six and twelve months respectively were reportedly of such an ad hoc nature that project planning

and continuity were affected.[66] Modules and trainings were added on as time and funds became available.

- Amount of work: too much to do, with too many actors and pieces to cover in that time frame. The project was overly complex. This complexity was reflected, for example, in the inconsistency of the kinds of training given from school to school (schools had a voice in the types and quantity of training provided). Variations in who was trained in each location added to the complexity. Training was sometimes given for some teachers but not for principals. As noted, in dissemination/replication schools, provinces were able to apply their own tactics and approaches to this process leading to variations in quality and the number of training modules applied.
- Management, contractor and other changes: after the mid-term, the project never seemed to achieve the necessary 'traction' to catch up. The changes included:
    - Personnel movements and changes within the educational system itself. DBE3 had little control over these and other factors (such as policies and politics).
    - Shallow training programs (another issue entirely).
    - Varying degrees of collaboration and communication, between DBE3 and stakeholders at different levels.
    - The Fade Factor; dilution of DBE3 effects at different rates in different areas.

In the end, and for the beginning, the whole school approach was not implemented, but it did validate the 'power of piloting' (ideas, concepts), confirmed that the approach was of value, and reaffirmed the importance of implementation in the pantheon of project elements.

Teaching-Learning and Performance In interview feedback from teachers and principals, the most frequent comment in terms of the most effective activity of DBE3 was that the methods used e.g. active learning and similar approaches, were much appreciated. In general, the Better Teaching and Learning modules and the other associated DBE3 training programs were deemed of high quality and helped to bring more student-centered activity, more joy of learning, and a better learning environment into the classroom.

This evaluation revealed mixed findings in terms of teacher and principal performance as a result of DBE3. There were patterns among the observations and interviews but they were not always consistent. The variance was more pronounced between regions and between partner and replication schools than between state junior secondary schools and MTs or between public and private institutions.

> *Before DBE, in the old system, the teachers were getting smarter and smarter. Now, with the influence of DBE, it is the students who are getting smarter.*
>
> Principal, North Sumatra MTs

Analysis of the interview, survey, and observation results did highlight other related issues. Teacher age did seem to be a factor; younger teachers were observed, and reported to be more flexible and open to implementing new methods. Teachers and principals in DBE3 partner state and madrasah schools seemed to perform better than in replicated state and madrasah schools. The differences in performance would appear to come from the depth of treatment (including training) in the partner schools and the dilution of effects in replication schools,

66. This affected DBE1 and DBE2 as well.

although this was not always true (note the previously-mentioned effective replication efforts in Sidrap, South Sulawesi).

Life Skills Life skills, including cooperative learning and problem solving, was one of the more important themes in the BTL modules, a theme carried over from the first half of DBE3. As noted, the sub-title of DBE3's first phase was 'Life Skills for Youth' but in the revised program this became 'Relevant Education for Youth.' The project monitored both student behavior and student performance on life skills competencies. By 2011, 90.4 percent of project extension schools were rated as having demonstrated life skills in the classroom in the areas of personal, social and academic development; however by the last year of the project, the indicator for student performance on life skills was discontinued.

The extent to which the Life Skills approach was successful in terms of quality and relevance is difficult to estimate for many reasons. Because of the scope and focus of the current evaluation, the evaluation team did not interview students and teachers had little to say about life skills. Much more time would have been needed to carry out the type of concentrated observation in classrooms and communities where necessary to verify the extent to which this quality/relevance approach was successful. The extent that Life Skills was embedded in the whole school approach is reflected in the degree of success of that approach; it was never really implemented. The degree to which this lack of success affected the quality and relevance of education provided for youth (i.e. through Life Skills provision) can only be surmised. This would be a very good topic for an impact study.

Regional Variations In terms of performance of teachers in the classrooms using active learning and other activities, the results varied in accordance with what was found in the analysis of results for the final evaluation of DBE1 and 2. Geographically, the best teacher performance generally was seen in South Sulawesi, somewhat less so in Central Java, with the least effective implementation in North Sumatra.

In terms of general teacher and school performance, some outstanding examples were seen in both South Sulawesi and Central Java. The outstanding schools in which these examples were seen, whether state or madrasah schools literally hummed with a certain 'magic' and dynamism that was recognizable even as an observer first set foot in these institutions. These were happy schools and contained happy teachers and students who were learning. It could be felt. There were other DBE3 partner schools, however, where the impact was relatively low and DBE3, through the general star ranking system (one to three stars) used in the monitoring reports, was generally accurate in identifying such schools. The evaluation team did, on the other hand, see non-DBE schools which were excellent. As noted, sometimes replication schools were very good and many times they were not.

The Fade Factor Again Given that DBE3 had ended for more than a year, in terms of teacher and principal performance, it was found that, among all the DBE3 schools, the effects of the project were fading, being diluted by time, personnel transfers, training programs that were too short and lacking depth, and lack of continuing support. This is a serious sustainability concern.

Signs of Life: Learning Actively Associated with the overall teaching-learning issue in DBE3 is the active learning approach and similar methods,[67] key interventions used by DBE3 and the other

67. Indonesia has been using such methods similar to' active learning' under different names prior to DBE.

project components. The active learning classroom contained teachers who had planned for and worked hard to implement participatory activities. The students, depending on the type of class, would be sitting at grouped desks and the classroom was supposed to be an exciting learning environment with student products and even individual portfolios on the walls. That is what it should be but this was not always true and what looked to be true often was not.

The evaluation team felt that the effects of DBE3 one year after the close of the project in terms of teaching-learning, were not as clear-cut as the project would have hoped or reported. This was particularly true of active learning and echoes what has been found in the DBE1 and DBE2. Indicators such as students sitting in groups, while interesting and full of potential, were not, as observed by the team, always signs that active learning or anything like it were taking place. Frequently, the students worked in groups (and not just while working on workbook materials) with the teacher stolidly standing or sitting behind a desk in front of the room just as if she/he were commanding a traditional class. The signs of 'activeness' were often false cues as to the kinds of learning taking place. It was felt that DBE3 over-estimated the effects or 'impact' (a word used loosely here) of the training programs once it came to implementation. Why? There is no one simple answer to this. In the case of DBE3, it would again appear to be a combination of the project's own late start; the reorganization after the Midterm review; the varied quality of trainers; the quality, length and frequency of its own training programs, and the quality and extent of support by government stakeholders.

Language learning actively An important subject-matter aspect of teaching-learning is learning languages. In the case of DBE3, this involved principally English and *bahasa* Indonesia. Classroom observation in junior secondary classrooms, no matter what the language or where they were, whether in the context of active learning or 'inactive' classrooms, generally found the quality of language teaching and learning to be in serious need of improvement. This finding is particularly important given the emphasis in the global USAID education strategy on reading. Teachers seemed to be overly dependent on workbooks while the spoken word was not given priority. Teachers of English, for example, were often (though not always) plowing rigidly through standard language books and the students were seldom capable of responding beyond simple greetings and phrases.

It is clear that language teachers in (and out of) the DBE3 program needed to be trained, at least more thoroughly, in modern approaches to language learning to first get their students talking actively .and then moving slowly into grammar/structure and writing. This also applies to *bahasa* Indonesia, where classes also seemed mind-numbingly dull. A young teacher (trained by DBE3 and not yet certified) in South Sulawesi was therefore a breath of fresh air with his active and lively English-language class. Two adjacent classrooms in the same school had teachers, who were certified, but who seemed to be unaware of the possibilities of language learning. Part of this challenge may be the prevalence of "teaching to the test" (re: national exams). It's a lot of hard work but lively language learning can be done.

The Leadership Performance Factor While the presence of talented trained teachers is crucial, good leadership at the school level by the principal was identified as a key to a 'successful school' and for good school performance. There were principals who may have had DBE management training (or management training elsewhere), had been in place for at least a few years so they achieved traction in school reform, and who truly had an educational vision of what their school would be like in three to five years. This could have been framed not only in

terms of improved infrastructure but also in the improved quality of students and teachers and community relations.

These were principals who seemed to have the respect of their teaching staffs, were able to mobilize them as an educational team and who worked hard to build relationships with other educational stakeholders at various levels (such as the DINAS or KANDEP in the districts and the community). Some good principals were not necessarily dynamic personalities but were able to nevertheless inspire their staff into action through quiet management practices and good communication. Then there were cases of mediocre principals who were fortunate to have a superb and enthusiastic teaching staff and that critical mass of teachers was able to carry along the whole school as it tried to improve.

Classroom Assessment This topic addressed the objectives regarding performance of key school personnel as well as those concerning the increased quality of and relevance of in-service training. Key personnel (teachers, principals, supervisors) but particularly teachers expressed the need for good methods and techniques to conduct regular in-class assessment of student progress. Examples of classroom assessment methods include oral questioning and feedback, homework assignments, student portfolios and presentations, peer teaching, diagnostic tests, and end-of-unit quizzes. The main purpose of these assessments is to provide 'real time' information to support teaching and learning. From the interviews, it became clear that many teachers do not know how to plan or implement such assessments. This is an important skill gap.

> *What I got from DBE was a model of learning (but) we don't know how to analyze; we don't know how to give feedback in the classroom.*
>
> Principal, South Sulawesi

The Supervisors and the Supervised If DBE3 was a traditional play or a television drama, the supervisor would be the character who was feared and very seldom loved. In the scenario of real life, several teachers and principals in the evaluation expressed the opinion that they feared their supervisors. One principal, when asked about the role of the supervisor said it was 'control.' In many ways, current supervisors continue to be viewed as inspectors, not a surprise to those who work in schools.

> *Sometimes it would be better to have pengawas as partners; the supervisors must be partners to the teachers.*
>
> University Lecturer

The modern day supervisor, however, is expected to, or at least should, do more and know more, monitor progress, control as necessary, be a subject/knowledge specialist, and be a trusted counselor, advisor and even somewhat of a mentor to teachers and principals. The evaluation team met three supervisors *(pengawas*) in South Sulawesi who managed to embody most of those roles, including counseling/advising/mentoring. That was unusual.

For DBE3 and the educational system, the place of supervisors and their performance was and remains a challenge. For one thing, the supervisors need the substantive knowledge, the experience, and the wisdom, to support and 'backstop' teachers with up-to-date subject matter and principals with subject and administrative/managerial expertise. Just as important, especially for DBE3, the supervisors needed to know active learning pedagogy, the use of low-cost media,

classroom assessment methods, and the myriad techniques that a modern teacher and principal must know. That meant that the supervisors had to thoroughly know about DBE3 and its philosophy and methods. The impressions from the evaluation team were that they often did not have this understanding. Supervisors were part of DBE3 training programs but its effects on them seem to have been limited.

When asked to describe what supervisors did when they came to a school, the responses from principals were varied. Many supervisors simply came and filled out forms and went away and were seen only once a month or semester. When they did provide advice on teaching, they did observe in classrooms and then gathered the teachers together to discuss specific teaching challenges experienced by a teacher or teachers in the school. In fairness to the supervisors, there do not appear to be enough of them, especially in MORA, and they often have very full school visit schedules.

They also, however, need the knowledge of content and modern pedagogical methods, to not only advise and counsel but also, importantly, to inspire teachers and principals. From this evaluation, the supervisory role is seen as muddled while merit does not seem to be among the criteria for their selection. The supervisors are a key link in the system and DBE3 needed to do much more than it did to make them full partners in the district educational capacity development efforts.

Looking at Libraries The evaluation team observed and surveyed the libraries in the sample schools. Many were well organized, with tables at which children could sit and read. Only one library in the sample was not operational at all. On the whole, however, this evaluation is not as positive as reports from DBE3 on the state of the school libraries. Many of the books are old and uninviting. Some schools were merely using the facilities as stockrooms for student textbooks, which made them look better-stocked than they actually were. Requests by students for newer and more interesting books are frequent; fiction was a popular request. Schools that actually had programs integrating library use with the class instruction were well-done but there were few of them.

Better Training and Learning DBE3 implemented many training programs in the junior secondary schools and the scope of that training has been enumerated in the project reports. These programs were critical to the performance of teachers, principals and others. While the comments here may be repetitive of what was heard by the DBE2 evaluators, it is important to review them because the target audience (junior secondary personnel), the project foci, and the management/contractors were different. Much of this effort was appreciated but the evaluation interviewees also were vocal in their criticism of the programs. These criticisms focused on the following issues: training programs were too short for the content, shorter time gaps between trainings, the timing of the trainings (better in the afternoons), the cost of transport, facilitators who were unsure of their material, the lack of depth in the training content, and the need for a graduated 'growth path' of knowledge and skills over a series of trainings.

In terms of the objectives for the revised DBE3 program, the quality and relevance of the in-service training programs increased, particularly at the district level, and has been substantiated in the monitoring and evaluation reports of the project itself. The programs can certainly be said to have helped the educational system in terms of increased access. The findings of the evaluation team, based particularly on the interviews, are that the quality of in-service training

improved through the use of the well-regarded training modules and other materials as well as the training methods themselves.

District capacities, principal performance and school leadership stability When DBE3 was revised, the project increased the number of partner schools from four to ten. The additional schools were selected in a needs assessment process that involved the districts with guidance from DBE3 staff. The factors that the districts were asked to take into account included previous involvement of schools in DBE1 school planning activities and/or DBE3 MGMP activities which might make schools more disposed to change, and strategic factors that supported the aim of the project to develop models of good practice and disseminate these widely within the district. The assessment process also included the willingness of school management to learn and commit to change, an important capacity measurement focusing on school principals.

Principal performance was a key factor in determining the degree of success of the DBE3 programs at the school level. Principal performance is an amalgam of leadership skills, good training, good support from government education authorities, knowledge of education skills and trends, good future vision, and good management and human relations skills, including community relations. The performance of principals and their schools depended on the ability of well-trained principals to work in stable environments and not subject to frequent transfers. Such transfers are often a matter of politics and governmental decisions, in themselves signs of the degree of capacity and maturity of thinking and planning. The transferability of principals continued as a challenge in some DBE3 schools (one DBE3 school in a Central Java district had four principals in five years). This is a contextual and sensitive issue since it does involve local politics but it also made an apparent difference in DBE3 performance.

The evaluation team observed instances where a strong, creative, DBE3-trained principal had been transferred into a school with a morass of problems and that otherwise-talented person was truly struggling for traction because there was little or no extra support provided for capacity development i.e. 'affirmative action' support through additional human and financial resources. (It should also be noted that while principals were trained in teaching-learning and instructional leadership by DBE3, only a few schools were trained in School-based Management and none of this occurred after the project revision). All districts are not the same. Future programs must propose and if possible, provide supportive options in this regard.

There is no *one* recommended solution to the challenge of transferability of principals but projects in the future should play a role in ameliorating what is a national, systemic problem. The elements of this process include:

- Districts could and should track forthcoming changes in school principals.
- There should be close coordination between the project and the DINAS on principal transfer.
- Coordination should include an agreement on transfer policies, as for example, location of suitable replacements and training requirements on the focus and implementation of the project, including School-based Management, for all new transfer into project schools.

**Conclusions and recommendations for quality of junior secondary school providers:**

This evaluation has only highlighted some key factors in the progress and problems of DBE3. The project monitoring and evaluation reports, including an assessment of student performance, are commendable in their attention to details. The pieces (activities and results), however, did not add up to whole school success or whole district success.[68] The whole school approach was basically not implemented in DBE3 for reasons of time, thinly-spread resources, and attempting to do too much even beyond the reorientation after the mid-term evaluation.

The quality of junior secondary providers in target districts was improved but the progress was limited. The project Final Report provided candid lessons learned to which this evaluation adds its own perspectives on training, technology, supervisors, language learning, and sustainability (including the apparent dilution of DBE3 effects). The whole school approach is definitely a recommendation for future projects, as is the need for better coordination and collaboration among all stakeholders at all levels to sustain the progress that is made and limit the problems. Key factors for sustainability in future projects can also include:

- Avoid doing too much. Do less, in fewer places and get it right so whatever is implemented 'sticks.' Do not be overworked and under-resourced. Use more staff, more resources, and collaboration from top to bottom. Focus. Give a project room to grow and breathe.
- Plan for sustainability more thoroughly from the beginning: Prepare exit strategies that help the project to work itself 'out of a job' in every district. A midterm evaluation (and monitoring during the project) should be evaluating the progress of these exit strategies. Have a long-term perspective that sees beyond 'projects' and has an extended timeline into the future. While it is best to 'transition out' (the exit strategy), plan as necessary for a follow-on project/activity that makes a much more seamless transition between activities.
- Give a whole school approach the time it needs to really make a difference. Also try a true whole district approach in which all schools of one district become the target of a program intervention."[69]
- Build a Monitoring and Evaluation plan that from the beginning has adequate staff who can not only do valuable analysis but also get beyond the usual emphasis on inputs and outputs, giving more emphasis to gathering information towards long-term *outcomes*. Have more and better quality outcome indicators. *Monitor progress towards sustainabilty during the life of the project*. Sustainability must be a much more integral part of project 'success.' Prepare fundamental 'sustainability questions' that have to be answered during and at the end of the project. Prepare and use these questions from the beginning of the project, not just for a final evaluation.
- Provide much more mentoring and build in follow-on. Mentoring is a key factor in sustainability. The world is littered with training programs that have had little or no effect.
- Institutionalize systems. Develop capacity (not build) with a view towards having the engine for development operate on it own, through whatever institutions seem most promising

68. The Whole District Approach, leading to 'Whole District Success,' was originally described in a USAID document (August 2009) Teacher Education and Professional Development in Indonesia; A Gap Analysis. It was explained as a "kind of district-level capacity-building in cooperation with a Teacher Training College, LPMP and district government/DINAS. The approach is basically to choose one district and having all schools within the district be the target of the program intervention. This means that relevant institutions and personnel within a district should get involved to various degrees and share the responsibilities of making the program successful with particular attention to the responsibility of keeping the program sustainable once the project is over." pp. 49-50.

69. Ibid USAID 2009

(such as universities). Have a long-term view that thriving institutions need the time to ripen and mature and be self-sustaining.

- Build and think 'learning organizations' at all levels. The 'systems thinking' work of Peter Senge (*The Fifth Discipline*)[70] has many useful models to put into practice including ideas that lead to sustainable processes and organizations, including schools.
- Initiate or commission a 'Drivers of Change' study or studies that could help identify the drivers of change that lead to greater sustainability in educational development.[71] This could be one of the project studies.

## 2. Support to the national GOI in-service teacher training system provided (IR2).

This is second of the three major revised objectives for DBE3 and as with the previous objectives, the current evaluation highlights project progress, problems, and prospects based on findings from interviews, surveys and observation. Detailed quantitative information can be found both in the Annexes to this report and in the DBE3 reports.

There was a vast effort by DBE3 to train district facilitators, supervisors and principals to organize and run professional development programs through the junior secondary school teacher associations (MGMPs). For example, training in professional development, by national facilitators, was provided for 1349 of these personnel in 2011, a number beyond the project target. The project support of these activities was viewed by DBE3 as essential and included not only training but study visits to schools to see good practices, mentoring by district facilitators in the classroom, and other efforts. Access through the efforts of the program and dissemination certainly increased. From the perspective of one year after the project ended, the quality and relevance of these training programs can only be surmised from the interviews and observations. It did increase but the overall impact has been mixed and the results are fading, in part because of gaps in continuity and support.

As noted, DBE3 collaborated with a small number (65) of staffs from teacher training universities and Quality Assurance Institutes to train teachers and facilitators. These staff members took part in provincial-level BTL and other training programs. The trained personnel reportedly liked the content and approach presented in these programs but university staffs felt it would be a challenge for them to independently implement these programs. The project reports provide detailed descriptions of these programs and the feedback from them. A pilot program implemented at two universities, the State University of Semarang in Central Java and the State University of Makassar in South Sulawesi, was also limited in time and scope. It occurred in the final year of the project (2011).

Interviews with relevant university faculty and LPMP staff provided the following impressions about the roles of these institutions in DBE3 in-service training:

- For whom? The university personnel, at least those interviewed, seemed to have a skewed perspective on who should be benefiting from programs such as this. The view seemed to

70. Peter Senge. The Fifth Discipline (1990) New York: Doubleday/Currency. Also Peter Senge et al (2000). Schools that Learn: A Fifth Discipline Fieldbook for Educators, Parents, and Everyone Who Cares about Education. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
71. See DFID and ODI websites and publications for examples.

be that it was they and their university, who were the chief beneficiaries of the DBE3 training programs. Communities and schools came in a distant second.[72]

- Scheduling: The university personnel said their schedules were already full and that it was difficult for them to fit in programs such as this. Several faculty said they did not participate in all the training days because they had other obligations.
- Funding: While the innovative methods were much appreciated, funding was a concern for training programs and work in communities.
- Two Kinds of Distance: The perception (by the evaluators) was that university lecturers were not only constrained by time, but also reluctant 'to get their feet dirty' with the follow-up activities necessary, limiting university participation in communities and schools that were even relatively remote. Another aspect of 'distance' to be considered is the 'mindful distance' between the academic lives of many (though not all) lecturers and the realities of schools and communities, whether urban or rural, state or madrasah.

> *I see the conditions (in the schools), but because of lack of understanding of content it is difficult for teachers to develop methods...because a lot of teachers were introduced to only one method...the same old methods. Many conditions like this are difficult to change. We should help with content.*
>
> University Lecturer

DBE3, in its Final Report, has acknowledged that the management capacity of the universities to run extended programs is weak, universities should not work outside their own 'catchment areas' and MOUs with universities could help to mobilize resources.

**Conclusions and recommendations for Support for in-service training:**

DBE3 provided a large amount of assistance to the GOI in terms of training and materials for increasing the quality and relevance of in-service training programs at the various levels. Access to quality training was increased and the contributions of innovative methods and materials were shown to improve quality and relevance of in-service training. The evaluation team also concurs with the project's own lessons learned, noted above.

An assumption at the core of in-service teacher training that needs renewed attention is 'certification.' An assumption, by many teachers and perhaps others, is that teacher 'certification' is the pinnacle of professional development and is a flaw in the system (this assumption has been noted in the final evaluation of DBE2 as well). The importance of graduated professional development programs that include incentives for mastery deserves repeated emphasis. If studies have been done on this, they need to be reviewed and action steps recommended. If such studies do not exist, or more of them are needed, this is an opportunity for coming projects (perhaps cooperation among basic education PRIORITAS and higher education projects, for example HELM, or even inter-donor collaboration) to finance such studies, and is recommended.

72. The concept of tri-dharma for higher education institutions in Indonesia advocates three roles: education, research and community support and development.

DBE3 did attempt to involve teacher training institutions, the LPMP, and universities as providers of such training but resources were limited and time was short. The LPMPs remain confused in their roles and limited in their effects, unless there is a profound turnaround that kick-starts LPMPs out of their respective malaise. The plunge into a pilot program for and through two universities was late in the project (in its last year) and there were many challenges. Lessons were learned about what to do and not to do in the future - a future that is now.

The alternatives for proceeding with upgrading and increased access to quality, relevant in-service training are limited. There are, however, a number of different in-service provider options. These include NGOs, more empowered LPMPs, P4TKs, specialized university centers (such as at the University of Makassar) or a collaborative combination of some of these options. Basically, there is no ideal place for in-service training, as has been noted elsewhere in this report.

Based on the DBE3 experience with higher education teacher training institutions, working through universities is tempting and is moving forward in PRIORITAS as this evaluation is concluding. DBE3 identified their own challenges and lessons with the process and this evaluation has pointed out others. Those lessons indicate that it is wise to proceed with caution with the universities and make sure that efforts are thoroughly planned and well-resourced with a capacity development timeline that is realistic and sustainable. Several recommendations for PRIORITAS or similar projects would be to:

- Bring or build the model of the Center for Effective Schools at the University of Makassar to fruition. Strengthen it and carefully multiply it at other institutions. Make sure there are adequate numbers of 'dedicated' staff at these centers (that is, staff who only focus on implementing the work of the centers).
- Make sure that such centers or the universities themselves have more focal points at the district level.
- Help to develop the graduated professional teacher in-service system described above.
- Provide 'incentives' (financial or otherwise) for university lecturers to work outside of their usual 'catchment areas' in order to provide in-service training programs in more remote locations that might otherwise be ignored.

It is also clear that future efforts for in-service training improvement require a'champion' or champions at the national level, donor harmony, and good communication and collaboration among all national and international stakeholders. Without this, 'lessons learned' will be rapidly unlearned.

### 3. GOI better positioned to respond to the needs of Junior Secondary Education sector.

DBE3 held 'sharing and advocacy workshops' in districts and provinces to disseminate good practices in junior secondary education from project schools (As noted, 51 such workshops were held in the last year of the project alone in 2011.). *Mitra Pendidik*, the DBE newsletter, was published by DBE3 and appeared every six months during the project; 181,508 copies, according to project calculations, were produced in ten editions in Indonesian and English and distributed to all project provinces and partner institutions. The DBE3 Good Practices

newsletter, *Innovasi Pendidikan*, was published from early 2009 in eleven quarterly editions (5,500 in Indonesian and 1500 in English) and authored by local project staff to document effective teaching-learning practices. The DBE3 website allowed web visitors to download the newsletters, all the BTL training materials, Good Practices books and DBE3 research studies.

DBE3 supported a number of very good research studies and the findings from some of them can be helpful to the policy-making of the GOI. One example is the study by Cannon and Arlianti (2009) on *Transition to and Participation in Junior Secondary School.* The authors conclude that there is much evidence to show how participation and and transition can operate more effectively. Their findings were and are very relevant to the work of DBE3 and include:

- The necessity for Districts to collect accurate data about education to inform better standards of planning;
- The 'whole of schooling' approach that recognizes the many transitions that occur throughout school life; the importance of enrolling children in school at the correct age; supporting progress through the grades; reducing or eliminating grade repetition; and addressing barriers to participation, including poverty;
- Empowering communities and parents so that they are aware of their rights and obligations and so that they can participate in the democratic management of schools and appropriately support and encourage their own children's education;
- Identifying and addressing the neglect and abuse of young people;
- Empowering children to give them the life skills to manage their school participation transitions and the risks they will inevitably encounter in life.[73]

A study by the same authors, also published in 2009, explored the Ujian Nasional (UN) or National Examination administered at the end of nine years of basic education. The study noted that there were four factors that erode the credibility of the Examination: a weak foundation of professional knowledge about student assessment, poor professional and ethical standards, educational and technical weaknesses in the assessment design, and unacceptable educational risk from high stakes testing. Among the recommendations for reform proposed are:

- Increase and sustain all effforts to improve the quality of the teaching workforce specifically and to improve basic education generally;
- Increase the supply of high-quality assessment leadership;
- Increase the demand in society for high quality assessment;
- Align curriculum, learning and teaching, and assessment;
- Increase efforts through research and management to better understand the mechanisms of malpractice and cheating and implement coordinated policies and practices to eliminate it from the education sector;
- Create and develop a professional and ethical environment in which corruption and cheating is denied the opportunity to exist;
- Develop a high quality and credible credential at the end of Year 9 through undertaking a systematic and professional review of the National Examination, with international best practice input.[74]

73. Robert Cannon and Rina Arlianti (2009). Transition to and Participation in Junior Secondary School. Abstract.

74. Robert Cannon and Rina Arlianti (2009). An Exploratory Study of the Ujian Nasional. pp 2-3.

These and other studies have supplied important inputs for policy makers on a variety of other important educational topics.

It is clear that there was intensive and extensive effort by DBE3 to advocate and share the research studies, Good Practice materials, and BTL materials; they have been praised and are excellent contributions.

### Conclusions and Recommendations for GOI better positioned to respond:

The numbers of materials and the efforts made at spreading knowledge, good practices and lessons learned by DBE3 are impressive and certainly such efforts should not be curtailed in future projects. It remains unclear how effective these materials were and are. The comment made as part of the mid-term evaluation would seem to still apply "while they (MORA and MOEC personnel) may have received project newsletters and reports periodically, these generally did not provide sufficient insights into the challenges and lessons learned that could inform GOI policy and strategic planning." [75] Dust-covered BTL materials and toolkits seen in a few school libraries are not conclusive evidence on impact but they are not a hopeful sign either. Nevertheless, it is recommended that these efforts should be continued in the future.

'Continuous continuity' is a factor in such knowledge sharing and advocacy efforts. It is unfortunate that there is now a one year and growing gap in these efforts. In that gap, good practices and knowledge begin to fade away, just as skills in the classroom become diluted with time and lack of support. This is one of the debits of time-bound project initiatives, a short-term vision when long-term insights are required. 'Impact studies' may be able to determine the effectiveness of these specific efforts. Knowledge sharing and advocacy need support and continuity.

### Cross-Cutting Issues

There were three cross-cutting issues from among the original six from the beginning of the project.

### Promote the use and integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) to enhance teaching and learning.

The Perils of ICT: Observation in the schools confirmed some of what had already been reported in DBE3 reports. Technology is important for today's educational systems but technology as provided in this project (and others) neglected some important essentials. The principal technological inputs were computers and LCD projectors. Even though the Intel Teach ICT program, as one of the Public-Private Alliances, was terminated and the ICT program including training programs for teachers on the use of ICT in the classroom, moved in-house, the problems were multiple. DBE3 is not alone in sharing these problems.

In terms of the computers and LCD projectors, the problems observed by the evaluation team included lack of maintenance (and planning and budgeting for it), unplanned obsolesence, poor planning for adequate electrical capacity and costs, and the need to understand the educational consequences of linear thinking inspired by computers as well as the educational purposes for

75. The Midterm Evaluation Report (2008) p. 43.

which they are used. LCD projectors come with similar baggage. While they can be useful, they are most often used as a way to deliver hi-tech lectures and therefore are at odds with participatory techniques such as active learning.

Technology is helpful in education; it won't go away to state the obvious. In DBE3 a set of issues were encountered involving not only the technology itself but also donor dependence. Projects like DBE3 need to absorb the lessons learned and proceed with caution. If computers and projectors are involved, these projects need a vision that involves continuing support and maintenance and how the technology can be used in education beyond rote learning.

**Ensure success in the Islamic education sector.**

The project reported that DBE3 was equally as successful in Islamic schools as in the general school system, and in some cases, results in Islamic schools were better than in conventional schools. Observations and interviews by the evaluation team seemed to confirm this. There were two or three very good madrasah schools in the sample and also some that were not so good. MOEC and MORA officials did seem to communicate at the district level but MORA supervisors were in short supply and some of them felt they needed to know more about subject matter outside of religious studies. In terms of training programs, the question remains as to why private Islamic school foundation members and principals were not included. The activities of DBE3, previously outlined, appear to have laid a good foundation for future work with Islamic education institutions.

**Promote gender equity.**

DBE3 implemented a series of activities to ensure that youth of both sexes were being provided with relevant education by integrating gender sensitivity tools into project training materials for teachers and recruiting gender specialists to review and provide input into training modules. These activities are seen as positive evidence that the project made appropriate efforts to achieve this cross-cutting issue.

**Distance Learning**

This activity of DBE3 was not a focus of the final evaluation and is not formally a cross-cutting issue but it should be noted that DBE3 did work, during the last three years of the project, with the Southeast East Asian Minister of Education Organization Regional Open Learning Center (SEAMOLEC) to convert the BTL materials into an E-Module or online distance education teacher training program. This program was seen as successful and 600 copies of the DBE3 learning module were distributed on CD-ROM. The effect or short-term impact of this distribution cannot be verified. An e-learning website was established in May 2010 to host the e-module (in February 2011 this was redesigned to accommodate a wider range of information than just the e-module).

DBE3 also reported that it attempted to work with the Open University (UT) to change the face-to-face BTL materials into self-study materials for use in UT's distance learning program. The project's final report states that "unfortunately the submission of DBE3 training materials did not coincide with the cycle of revision of the UT training materials." UT staff apparently decided that the materials were better suited for use in tutorial activities. The project did not have any knowledge as to whether these materials were actually used.

## Overall Conclusions and Recommendations: DBE3

This review of DBE3 has identified strengths and weaknesses of the project as well as the challenges it faced in each of the key objective/result areas. It has also provided conclusions and recommendations in the process and these are summarized, and in some cases amplified, here.

### Strengths

Methods and Materials DBE3 was widely appreciated by teachers and principals for many of the same reasons as DBE2; its methods and materials were regarded as excellent. Creative and participatory approaches to student-centered learning were the most frequently identified activities which should be implemented in similar future programs. Active learning, not really a new concept in Indonesia, is widely recognized.

In Comparative Contexts From among the three provinces receiving the most evaluative attention, South Sulawesi whether partner or replicated schools, were perceived as much better than similar programs in Central Java, with North Sumatra lagging considerably behind.

Monitoring, Documentation and Distribution DBE3 appeared to do a very good job in monitoring its progress and problems, and in publishing and distributing documentation and publications, including some very good studies. The Final Report is candid and lessons learned are articulate and realistic. 'Showcases' were seen as effective. This is all to its credit. There is a weakness in this as well.

The Whole School Approach This approach as a project strategy was and is regarded as effective and valuable. The central concept was to get a 'critical mass' of stakeholders and key actors involved with a school in a district all moving in the same direction towards progress through upgraded training, materials and other support. It is recommended to continue for future project efforts.

### Weaknesses

The Whole School Approach The application was a weakness. The overall result in DBE3 was that while the project may have approached the whole school in terms of its many activities, it really did not happen in this project. Despite all good intentions and much hard work by all concerned, the 'critical mass' needed to call the whole school approach a success was not there. Why? Reasons included lack of time, too much to do, too late in the project, management and contractor changes after the mid-term, and the 'Fade Factor' in which the effects of the initiative began to fade after the project ended (a sustainability issue). The pieces of the approach looked successful but the whole did not happen.

Over-Active Learning Active learning has been identified as a strength and in many ways it is but too many assumptions seem to have been piled onto the technique. Sitting in groups or U-shaped seating arrangements are not necessarily signs that active learning is taking place. Training programs needed to move beyond repetition of the basics of AL into a graduated series of sequentially advanced uses for active learning and other approaches.

Due to Technical Difficulties: Computers, Projectors and Education Despite good efforts to retrench following the cancellation of the Intel Teach Public Private Alliance (re: computers) including the ICT Toolkit and training programs, the perils of computer maintenance and

obsolescence, school electrical capacity and costs, and most importantly the use of computers for educational purposes, were and are challenging factors. It was clear that the project had even more to do than it thought or for which it had time and resources. LCD projectors were requested by principals and teachers as 'must-have' technology for their schools without thinking as to how they might be used educationally (frequently as stand-ins for high-tech lectures by the teacher).

Classroom Assessment Cited in the interviews with teachers and principals, it was clear that this was a topic about which practitioners felt they needed more help and had not gotten it. The need for more classroom assessment tools (often referred to as continuous or formative assessment) for teachers and principals was also noted in the final evaluation of DBE2. While some formative evaluation processes were included in DBE3 teaching and learning materials, there was no stand-alone unit on this topic nor was there any specific project indicator about it. This was a definite weakness. Training and mentoring and other steps are recommended for future projects (see recommendations section).

Language Learning Actively The quality of language teaching/learning observed in classrooms was uneven and for the most part poorly done.

Monitoring, Documentation and Distribution Lauded as a project strength, this also seemed to be a weakness. The impact or more accurately the effect of all the DBE3 efforts (newsletters, books, studies, websites, e-modules) appears muted and now diluted by time. This is not to say these efforts were bad, but even more face-to-face collaboration and communication at and among all levels might have enhanced what all the workshops and newsletters were trying to do.

Support to In-Service Training This could be considered a strength if DBE3 was considered a pilot project since much was learned. Nevertheless, the roles of the universities and the LPMPs in DBE3 were and are still questionable. The work of the LPMPs is still confused and confusing. With the universities it was a matter of too little and then too late (re: a pilot project with two universities). Some universities saw themselves as the principal beneficiaries of the DBE3 program with school and community efforts far behind. Two kinds of distance have been noted concerning the university lecturers: the physical distance of going out to the field to work with remote schools and communities (a factor recognized by DBE3 in its 'lessons learned') and the 'mindful distance' between the academic lives of lecturers and the realities of education provision in the classroom in junior secondary schools.

Collaboration and Cooperation Acknowledged as an overall weakness in the Mid-Term Review and elsewhere, collaboration among the DBE components was quite clearly a constraining factor for DBE3. Collaboration at the national level among the relevant ministries was limited, while MOEC/MORA collaboration at the district level was mixed.

Post-Mid-Term Traction For DBE3, the mid-project reorganization was clearly needed, but also clearly hampered the project in trying to regain what traction it had in project implementation. The shortened time frame to accomplish a still-imposing number of tasks weakened the project; that the project accomplished so much is a credit to the staff.

## Challenges

Weaknesses are in many ways also challenges and so the weaknesses described above and in this review are challenges for the future. The challenges that follow from DBE3 are organized for several different levels.

### District Level Challenges

The Supervisors and the Supervised Upgrading the supervisors is a true challenge. While their role still falls mainly in the area of inspection and control, moving them towards a more modern and professional advisory/counseling/mentoring role within the system will not be simple, in part because they are part of the entire educational system.

Mentoring to success Certainly training programs by themselves are not the answer to improving teachers. Mentoring is essential to improve the quality of educational delivery systems. The challenge is to identify more clearly who can be a mentor (supervisors, principals, head teachers) and then train and support them effectively and continuously.

Using MOUs These agreements, signed with districts or schools to annually delineate educational commitments like Annual Plans, present an interesting challenge, made so because it is unclear whether signing a piece of paper really would inspire the required commitment.

### School-Level Challenges

Eyes and Ears. Observations in sample schools found that very few junior secondary school children wore glasses or had hearing aids (or had any impairments). This is a key issue related to Inclusive Education in Indonesia. In a press release (June 26, 2012) noting the importance of reading in the organization's strategy, USAID announced in partnership with Lions Clubs International the signing of an MOU promoting world literacy. One objective of this partnership is to "promote reading among young children with disabilities, particularly the visually impaired." [76] This issue present both a challenge and an opportunity.

Classroom Maps Observations in sample schools also found that very few classrooms had wall maps, either of Indonesia or the world. Maps are not 'ornaments.' They are educational tools (as are globes) and they do need to be used and more frequently incorporated into classroom learning activities. The challenge is to put wall maps on educational and project agendas and then do something about the issue.

### In-Service Training Challenges

Working *effectively* with universities or other institutions to develop a quality in-service training program is and will be a challenge. If this is the path to be followed, there will be a need to tread cautiously in moving institutions and staff members to understanding the depth of commitment and resources required to implement an effective program.

Graduated Training Programs Continuing to offer the spin-cycle of training programs as was done in DBE3 would truly create a challenge because such a process would likely suffer a slow demise. As in the review by DBE2, the true challenge now will be to create in-service training system that *is* logical and advances teacher knowledge and ability in graduated steps with

76. USAID Press Release (June 26, 2012) USAID and Lions Clubs International sign MOU Promoting Literacy Around the World.

rewards in the form of incentives for professional credits or remuneration. 'Certification' should not be the end-all pinnacle of teacher professional development; this may be no surprise to some and a complete surprise to others.

### Overall Project Challenges

Political Realities and Project Voices There is an uneasy tension between what a project like DBE3 would like to do and what it actually can do. For example, political realities present one of the biggest challenges (example: principal transfers) to project success. Nevertheless, projects have 'voices' and can express concerns and as necessary take actions that firmly make a point.

The Dimensions of Capacity: Closing the Gaps For DBE3 and the other components, the heart of the program was (or should have been) capacity development for the long-term. The challenge was and is closing the capacity gaps and addressing the different aspects of capacity in a holistic view as presented by Brown (2002).[77] The challenge is to design projects that are better able to address the different aspects of capacity development at all levels and then implement and evaluate them with care. This may seem obvious but it often is not. In abbreviated form, a list of capacities to help meet this challenge is presented here (See box).

Collaboration and Communication This was identified as one of the key DBE weaknesses. It is a challenge to go beyond the superficial in information-sharing to the personal and patient face-to-face work that is essential to effective collaboration. This applies from USAID down to the district.

Sustaining Quality This is a challenge that DBE3 tried to address but with which it didn't truly succeed. The challenge is that of preventing the Fade Factor and dilution of effectiveness whether by over-replication or simply too long lapses of time and support and sustaining what is good but dropping what is weak.

Donor Dependency Choose and implement carefully an 'exit strategy' that copes with the challenge of donor dependency. This is not easy and requires the involvement of all stakeholders.

***Closing the Capacity Gap***

- *Capacity to set objectives.*
- *Capacity to develop strategies.*
- *Capacity to draw up action plans.*
- *Capacity to develop and implement appropriate policies.*
- *Capacity to develop regulatory and legal frameworks.*
- *Capacity to build and manage partnerships.*
- *Capacity to foster an enabling environment in civil society (or in a school).*
- *Capacity to mobilize and manage resources.*
- *Capacity to implement a plan.*
- *Capacity to monitor progress and analyze effects.*

Adapted from: S. Browne, 2002

Build on Project Monitoring and Evaluation Efforts Future monitoring and evaluation requires even more than was done in DBE3, especially increased and stronger analysis, and seeing beyond the success of pieces to a 'whole project approach' to the monitoring process. This includes an evaluation of the project indicators, no matter if they have been handed down from on high or handed up in a hurry. Quality indicators do have something to do with a quality project.

77. S. Browne. (2002) Developing Capacity Through Technical Cooperation:Country Experiences. UNDP/Earthscan Publications. p4

Best Practices and Lessons Learned This challenge is one of absorption and sustainability. DBE3 has produced best practices and they have identified some candid lessons learned. The challenge is not to lose them in a file cabinet or in a fading organizational memory that flows out with the departure of its key actors. The challenge is to share them widely with those who will take action.

## Recommendations

### The Whole School Approach

The whole school approach is a good strategy should be continued in similar future educational projects. From the findings and the challenges, recommendations for successful implementation of the approach include:

- Adequate time to implement the approach so that it is inclusive and covering all relevant personnel;
- Teachers/trainers/facilitators who are well-qualified in subject matter and teaching/training methods;
- Multiple training programs that are carefully sequenced and delivered at convenient and agreed-upon times;
- The need for a greater emphasis on classroom assessment tools and techniques. Future projects such as PRIORITAS can highlight this emphasis by: 1) developing a separate stand-alone unit/module (collaborating with MOEC and MORA on what exists and what is needed) which focuses on 'real time' assessment through the use of various procedures (oral, written and other forms of evidence of student learning and achievement), 2) inserting a specific results indicator and criteria in project work plans and M&E processes on classroom assessment (particularly for Year Two in PRIORITAS), 3) measuring progress against the indicator and criteria, and 4) supporting a research and development study on the state of classroom assessment in Indonesia and the possibilities for innovation (begin with the 2012 framework paper on student assessment systems by Marguerite Clarke).[78]
- Follow-on and follow-up activities that includes timely, high-quality mentoring of training participants;
- Monitoring/assessment that is also timely and provides empathetic feedback supportive of participants' needs and project's goals. The monitoring process should lead to analysis of trends and patterns, and to reporting that leads to continuous improvement of the teaching-learning process as well as to information that places greater emphasis on outcomes.

### Professional Development for Teachers

Recommendations include:

- Prepare, plan and advocate for in-service teacher training programs that are graduated in nature. Certification should not be seen as the pinnacle of teachers' professional

78. Marguerite Clarke (2012) What matters most for student assessment systems: A framework paper. World Bank: Washington, DC. See pp 3, 7, and 20. Of particular value is the rubric on classroom assessment in judging the development level of different assessment types (p. 20). The author categorizes the development t levels as 'Latent." Emerging,' 'Established,' and 'Advanced.'

development and 'spin cycles' of training programs that do not truly advance teachers' skills need to be re-thought and re-designed.

- Public-Private Alliances are of value and should be used but only after thorough planning and adequate time and resources to make an impact. Proceed cautiously with PPAs.
- For developing in-service training, think carefully, build relationships, focus small at first, proceed cautiously, and involve those who have the insight, passion, endurance, and willingness to build a high-quality in-service program.
- Have a Plan B: think about other organizational candidates (Centers/ NGOs) to implement the in-service process. Work with what is and if that doesn't work, move on.
- Impact and research studies can be valuable as was learned in DBE3 and the recommendation is made that future projects fund even *more* such studies to balance the usual inputs of quantitative data. Some topics for these studies may develop from the challenges and issues identified in this report. A list of possible topics for these studies appears in the overall DBE conclusions and recommendations for this report.

### Project Monitoring, Reporting and Documentation

In a multi-part project such as the DBEs (which, if the lesson is truly learned will not happen again) there has to be close (better) coordination on what data must be reported and the styles and format in which it is presented. There must be clear, easily accessible, and comparable, information. Styles and substance must be better coordinated.

### Implementing MOUs

To focus district and school education leaders on commitments and timelines for completion of educational development activities, such as education or school development plans, it is recommended that MOUs (or MOAs) be signed among collaborating parties and that there be periodic check-ins to determine progress and problems. Without appropriate planning and attention to implementation steps and follow-up, such plans may only be regarded as pieces of paper, but an MOU in place (with a checklist of activities) is the basis of understanding between implementing partners.

### Classroom Maps

Put wall maps of Indonesia and the world on educational and project agendas and make these valuable educational tools part of educational planning, the educational process, and budgets. They should be in every junior secondary classroom, not just pulled out a closet or library for specific lessons and can become much more active parts of active learning.

### Libraries

Much greater emphasis should be placed on library improvement including provision of more books that are attractive to students and more school programs that integrate library usage with classroom activities. With reading capabilities central to every educational system as well as to the global education strategy of USAID, library improvement is fundamental to systemic improvement. While many school libraries are at least of good quality, there is a long way to go before they are excellent facilities (with good quality books, other media, and an attractive setting).

### Seeing for Reading

Make use of the USAID/Lion's Club opportunity already noted and others like it to assist junior secondary (and other) students in receiving eye checkups and eyeglasses. Programs like this must also become part of the total Indonesian educational system. If students cannot adequately see, the chances to learn are severely constrained in contemporary Indonesia.

### Create a Recipe for Success.

What are the ingredients for project success in projects like DBE3? Making and baking bread is one metaphor. Making a loaf of bread that is attractive and well-risen requires just the right amount of specific ingredients and a thorough mixing. It requires time for the yeast to 'work' and rise. It needs an appreciation for the temperature and humidity of the environment plus kneading and hard work to finally produce a finished loaf. Students, teachers, principals and supervisors are certainly more complex than a loaf of bread, but there are certain factors that constitute a challenge and lead to recommendations. They include the obvious and not so obvious and apply to educational systems as well:

- Adequate resources, efficiently used.
- 'Working with the willing.
- Do not try to do too much, especially if time and resources are limited.
- Cut out the ornaments. Focus on what works. Identify best chances.
- Good management and commitment of leadership.
- Communication and collaboration are the keys to project success. A project can spend all its money, be done on time, meet all technical specifications, and still be a failure.

### Recommendation:

Create an even better recipe for success. Add to this list. Share and use it. This is not a one-project issue.

Lessons Learned, Lessons Implemented The final recommendation is not just to learn a lesson (lessons can be easily forgotten or lost). Recommendation: use it, or lose it.

# SECTION IV. LESSONS LEARNED

## 1. Coordination with the GOI

While the DBE program was focused at the district level, in keeping with the aim of assisting the GOI to decentralize the education system and build capacity at the local level, many observers stated that MOEC and MORA officials at all levels were not really partners in the program. They themselves noted that they were not well informed about the program, despite a plethora of newsletters and periodic reports. Most DBE program newsletters and reports tended to focus on the positive outcomes and were a bit on the self-promoting style. Without closer collaboration and insights into the implementation problems, MOEC and MORA could not provide financial or human resource support to assist the achievement of program objectives. Most suggested a new way of doing business with better communication and coordination between USAID and MOEC/MORA at the heart of a new paradigm. Suggestions for better communication include: Memorandum of Agreement between the various entities (USAID and MORA, PRIORITAS and local DINAS) to establish clear roles and responsibilities of the parties; sharing work plans before implementation of program and annual reviews of progress; site visits and workshops for central and provincial government officers to review district level exemplary programs; and written proposals to MOEC and MORA at all levels on program problems and solutions about how that government level could assist the reforms. Even if these proposed solutions were implemented, it is worth noting that the main beneficiaries of the PRIORITAS program will be the districts and, going forward, getting ownership from the central ministries will be difficult.

## 2. Value of a well sequenced and coordinated approach

For the DBE approach to work well, the inputs to the school have to be coordinated and well sequenced, preferably in a 'whole school' approach. School committee members, principals and teachers must be trained in school management, planning, and leadership, closely followed by training for principals, teachers and school committee members in active learning and classroom management methods, and materials development. When these inputs are properly sequenced, the results are spectacular and moribund schools can be turned into thriving schools that are the pride of the community and where children cannot wait to go to school to learn. Unfortunately, the three contractors implementing the three DBE mostly operated as separate programs with little coordination between components and often poor coordination with DINAS or the schools. Last-minute training, unclear road maps, poor sequencing of inputs, and incomplete application of training modules, plagued the program. The poor orchestration of DBE 1 and 2 resulted in many school implementing the program half-heartedly and much of the "magic" of transforming schools was lost. Project technical officers and facilitator were placed in the district offices only under DBE1 and that approach provided generally good coordination and communication. The PRIORITAS program should consider placing a district coordinator in each of its partner districts and that facilitator should be responsible for institutionalizing the program in that district.

## 3. Limit objectives, components and complexity

In the aftermath of DBE, it appears that each DBE component had too many activities ongoing at the same time often resulting in resources and information being spread too thinly and

uncoordinated programs. DBE1, for example, had as many as 499 training activities in a province in a year or an average of 42 training programs a month (and some months clearly would get even more training sessions). Although it is remarkable that so much was accomplished the training was well-liked and well-needed, there are many indications that the training programs did not achieve the depth needed to allow full assimilation or result in the institutionalization anticipated.

### 4. Active learning Plateau and continuous training

In one form or another, active learning has been in Indonesia since 1984 and has become an approved teaching methodology of the MOEC. In addition, the DBE2 active learning training program was universally well-liked and appreciated by those who took the program. Despite the apparent success of the training, within the schools visited for the evaluation, the application of active learning methods varied widely from enthusiastic adoption in every class all the time to hardly any vestiges of the program apparent anywhere. The majority of schools were using active learning methods partially in some classes with some teachers and the application was often lack-luster and fading. Even when active learning methods were apparent, the best teachers showed limited mastery of the panoply of active learning methods. Under the best of circumstances, it is difficult to change human behavior and teachers are no different. Efforts to change teachers from a conventional model of chalk 'n talk and drill, drill, drill, may not be successful with one training program. Given these findings, it appears that the institutionalization of active learning methods requires several follow-on training programs.

### 5. Sustainability requires equal GOI commitment, communication, and resources.

Some districts the evaluation team visited had replicated the DBE program to all schools and all sub-districts while other districts had hardly moved the program beyond the original DBE set of schools and sub-districts, and still others had apparently largely abandoned the program. The reasons for the varied replication or sustainability of the program are complex but some of the more important factors appear to be the leadership in the district and DINAS and the degree to which trained principals and school committee members remained in place in the system. The commitment of the *Bupati* and the Head of the DINAS in education was paramount to the success of the program. In the district that had completed the replication to all the schools, both the *Bupati* and the Head of DINAS were tireless promoters and cheerleaders of the DBE program and most of the trained principals remained in place in the schools. In the districts where DBE had failed or was nearly extinct, the *Bupati* knew little about the DBE program and had changed many of the DBE trained principals for 'political' reasons. School committee members who had replaced members due to natural causes or retirement had not been trained.

Without the enabling environment created by committed public officials and principals, any education reform will wither and die. As part of the renewed communication and coordination between the program and the districts, clear-cut targets and commitments for funding should be put into place, and changes in key personnel such as principals should only be made in consultation with the project or if a suitable replacement is located and agreed on. Moreover, district governments must become full partners with USAID and PRIORITAS, communicating their needs, monitoring the progress of the program, taking action to ensure success of the program, and committing funds to supplement and sustain programs that show good promise.

## 6. No ideal place: Institutionalizing the locus of change

An assumption of the DBE program was that if it demonstrated in selected schools in a district the utility of school-based management and leadership training along with active learning methods, ICT usage, and materials development, district and provincial governments would see the value of these approaches and replicate them in their area. The strategy worked in a few cases but, by and large, most districts failed to bring the DBE program to scale. In fact, in some districts it appears that the program has been allowed to languish, even if a decent foundation was left in place to build on.

Nevertheless, most observers of the education system argue that the district must be the locus for change within the education system. Perhaps in recognition of the failure of most districts to bring the program to scale, the PRIORITAS program proposes to make universities the center for change within the education system. While everyone agrees that universities can address many of the problems in the long-term through pre-service teacher training, in the short- to medium- term large numbers of teachers need professional upgrading opportunities.

The GOI's efforts to ensure that all teachers are certified and have achieved at least a Bachelor's degree (S1) will assist in the efforts to upgrade the teaching corps but system of professional training opportunities beyond certification needs to be put into place. In-country studies by the World Bank have shown that certification does not seem to impact teacher performance. Moreover, while universities do pre-service teacher training well, most observers think that university personnel know little about the realities of classroom teaching and are far too theoretical. Even supporters of the university as change agents in in-service teacher training would be hard-pressed to cite examples of successful programs of this type, world-wide. The two other GOI institutions involved in in-service teacher training, P4TKs and LPMP, are limited in their ability to address the problem. P4TKs, all of which are based in Java, are charged with in-service teacher training but are subject-matter-based with one P4TK per subject matter area so the programs offered are mostly residential, costly and limited in scope. The LPMP, which have branches in most large provinces, are not strictly speaking in-service teacher training institutions but instead are charged with quality assurance and ensuring that schools meet the minimum education standards. In that capacity, the LPMP train teachers in schools which do not meet the minimum standards. Within this milieu, there does not appear to be an ideal location to establish a sorely needed system for teacher professional development. Attempting to convert universities into centers for servicing district and school training, other educational needs, and as a locus for institutionalizing this expertise may be a very difficult task for PRIORITAS.

## 7. Policy dialogue

Like the issue above concerning the location to establish and institutionalize a professional development in-service system, a series of policy issues exist within the education system that need to be explored and addressed. Some are very practical issues such as how to achieve sustainability of reforms within a system where constant turnover of trained personnel results in a loss of momentum and critical expertise, and dampens the achievements of the program. Other policy issues may be more complex and political, including questions about the usage of BOS or other funds to ensure greater equity in the system. USAID and PRIORITAS should

work closely with the GOI to at least address those issues that directly impact the success of the PRIORITAS program.

### 8. Focus on what works and limit the 'ornaments of the tree'

The application of DBE1 school management and governance and DBE2 active learning components together in the proper sequence can truly transform a conventional school into an outstanding learning environment. Nonetheless, DBE was too complex and had too many moving parts to be managed and coordinated effectively and the myriad of small, marginally-related tasks diverted project effort away from core tasks. Although many in the GOI see the merits of the program, little real institutionalization has occurred and the sustainability of the effort is a real concern. Given the experience of DBE, USAID and PRIORITAS should focus on the core program to improve school management and governance and the quality of the teaching-learning process, especially in math, science, and reading. Despite the panoply of GOI needs and the penchant for including' hot topics' of the day under the flagship program, USAID and the GOI should limit the expectations for PRIORITAS to what it can be reasonably expected to achieve.

### 9. Strategy for the next two years: experiment or push out the frontier?

For whatever cultural, political or practical reasons, many districts simply fail to accept that once demonstrated and developed, districts can replicate the DBE program with their own resources. There seems to be a lack of confidence within education personnel that they can sustain the program without donor expertise. Although many in the GOI see the merits of the program, little real institutionalization has occurred and sustainability is a real issue. USAID and PRIORITAS should consider experimenting with ways to ensure sustainability and institutionalization within districts. In this light, USAID and PRIORITAS might consider adding fewer districts in the future and focusing on 'getting it right' in a limited number of other districts.

# SECTION V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The design of PRIORITAS began several years before the conclusion of the DBE program. Once the contract was awarded a detailed first year workplan for the project was prepared in May 2012 and a revised version was issued on August 10, 2012. Although the work-plan was developed before the completion of this DBE final evaluation, the work-plan will be adjusted within the context of the design to accommodate the findings of this evaluation. Moreover, the final reports of the DBEs already offered many 'lessons learned,' which have been incorporated into the work-plan. The official launch of the project occurred in early October, with objectives (Intermediate Results) in place to address the following components. These components are:

- Strengthen the capacity of selected pre-service teacher training institutes to produce skilled primary and secondary teachers, competent and practiced in active learning methodologies with enhanced capability to teach reading, math and science.
- Strengthen the capacity of selected in-service teacher training organizations to deliver quality, active learning, EGR, math and science teaching methodologies; ensure that these these organizations have the capacity to deliver training in an organized and systematic fashion, with published class schedules, trainer rosters and fee schedules.
- Strenthen and expand provincial and district capacity to improve education management and governance from the school level up particularly as it realtes to improving revenue streams to directly support teacher development and improved learning.
- Strengthen coordination and feedback systems across all levels of the GOI decentralized education system and key educational institutions.

The focus of PRIORITAS is clearly on teachers, capacity building, quality improvements for teacher training institutions (TTI), and for non-academic, pre-service teacher training providers as well as building the capacities of MONE and MORA to coordinate, plan and train.

Given these components and related objectives, the following recommendations to PRIORITAS are made based on the findings from interviews, observations and surveys of the final evaluation team, the analysis of them, and on the lessons learned in this process. It is understood that some aspects of these recommendations have already been incorporated into PRIORITAS.

### Build on DBE Strengths

Focus on what works The application of DBE1 school management and governance and DBE2 active learning components together, in the proper sequence, can truly transform a conventional school into an outstanding learning environment. PRIORITAS has already begun that process.

Build on the Whole School Approach The concept of training the whole school, everyone from the supervisors to the school committee to the principal, teachers and parents is basically very sound.

Build on Active Learning Continue to offer active learning training in graduated successive levels which culminate in attainment of a 'Certificate of Active Learning', a 'Master Teacher of Active Learning' and other similar earned acknowledgement of competency recognition. Further, the next cycle of active learning training should include greater emphasis on assessment, and combined pedagogy and subject matter.

Strengthen or reinvigorate the school management activities begun in DBE1 The final evaluation shows that while that program should be deemed a major success, some of the efforts, such as those in school planning, are fading. In addition, personnel trained in school management, such as principals and school committee members, have either been replaced or transferred, crippling not only the progress of school management but also innovations in learning styles. To combat these trends, PRIORITAS should consider:

- Mounting a school management training program for principals who have replaced previously trained principals;
- Providing school management training to new School Committee members and other key DINAS personnel, including supervisors and sub-district officers;
- Delivering the training program with DINAS staff and ensure that the program can be delivered locally with modest resources;
- Revamping the school plan to focus on incrementally obtainable and school-specific, short-run targets.
- Offering cash grants[79] to schools that develop the best school plans as a way to generate renewed interest in their development and recognize well-performing schools;
- Working with MOEC and MORA to develop clear guidance to provinces, districts and schools indicating government encouragement of community involvement in education and mount a social marketing campaign to that effect.

Re-direct as possible district management and governance efforts Formerly done very successfully by DBE1, this activity assisted to solve district education planning, budgeting and cost analysis problems. If this task cannot be done by universities or private consulting firms, assist the GOI to establish its own internal think-tank able to respond to district needs. PRIORITAS should avoid providing these types of services unless the expertise cannot be found in Indonesia.

Re-examine and revitalize school planning and budgeting tools Simplify data requirements development of for school plans and turn what has become a perfunctory requirement into a useful living document.

Building monitoring and evaluation Develop tools for monitoring students' learning achievement in the classroom under active learning methods, conduct impact studies comparing different interventions, and develop a PRIORITAS program monitoring system that goes beyond outputs.

Expand the number and quality of impact and research studies DBE did support some very good studies (e.g. those by Cannon and Arlianti[80]). PRIORITAS must do even more in this regard. These studies not only balance the flood of quantitative project data on activities but can provide valuable information and insights not only to current project work but to the larger education context. Possible topics of needed studies include:

- The Whole School Approach: Analyzing a work in progress.

79. These grants should come from the Government of Indonesia.

80. Cannon, Robert and R. Arlianti. (August 21, 2009). Transition to and participation in junior secondary school. DBE3 Research Report. Jakarta: USAID/Indonesia. And Cannon, Robert and R. Arlianti. (November 27, 2009). An exploratory study of the ujian nasional. DBE3 Research Report. Jakarta: USAID/Indonesia.

- Beyond Certification: Visiting and revisiting the challenges of professional teacher development in Indonesia. From Policies to Action.
- Social Inclusion and Education in Indonesia: Steps towards realistic reform.
- Improving the quality of indicators used by educational projects in Indonesia.
- Data Analysis for Educational Policy Change.
- Exit Strategies for donor-assisted education projects: How to leave sustainably. What works and what does not.
- A Whole District Approach to Educational Development.
- Comparative approaches to educational development in Indonesia: The government of Indonesia and the donor agencies.
- Improving Language Teaching and Learning in Indonesia: Avenues for Reform and Implementation.
- The Fade Factor: Educational Innovation and how to keep it alive.
- Making the Best of it: Bringing together the best of donor agency approaches to educational development.
- From Best Practices to Best Action.
- Beyond Information: How to improve the impact of educational project reporting and publications in educational development efforts.
- The Drivers of Change: Educational Reform for Action in Indonesia.
- Overhauling the In-service teacher training system of Indonesia.

Develop and model an improved, graduated program in teacher professional development A lesson learned from the final evaluation was that there seems to be no ideal place to institutionalize change in terms of a teacher professional development system and that trying to do so will be a very difficult task for PRIORITAS. There is, however, a need for a *rationalized structure of graduated teacher development that moves beyond certification and rewards attainment of advanced knowledge and skills.*

Having said this, one possible 'avenue of action' for PRIORITAS would be to develop and model a set of professional teacher training programs that guide teachers through a series of successively more advanced professional training and development programs. These should be required beyond certification and should be sequential in levels of knowledge and skills, leading to an acknowledgement of profession (e.g. Certificate of Teacher/Principal Development, Master of Teacher Development.). If this could be institutionalized within the educational system, eventually attainment should also lead to sequential rewards in terms of promotion as well as increased status and remuneration.

Revise and build on the DBE experiences with training, including active learning methodologies. The locus of such training will be difficult, as noted, but if that locus universities, then work with them to develop the programs. Most importantly, in terms of collaboration, work with relevant MOEC and MORA staffs from the beginning, involving them in the process and do not reinvent the wheel. Thoroughly build on what exists.

**Avoid the DBE Weaknesses**

Do not put too many ornaments on the tree This is a major danger for PRIORITAS in its present form. The DBEs suffered from an excess of complexity even after the mid-term and the reorganization that occurred. Even though, or perhaps because, it is only one project (as opposed to three components), PRIORITAS needs to reassess as soon as possible its own 'ornaments' and realistically prune them, preferably before the project becomes more emeshed in implementation. To not do this endangers the whole tree.

Improve the quality of coordination and communication with the GOI at all levels This is a two-way street but it does mean that:

- There needs to be a new role for USAID, developing a true partnership through coordination at all levels. USAID needs to work with MOEC and MORA at all levels to share work plans, sign yearly MOAs, and set common performance targets.

- Project representatives should not be used as surrogates for USAID officials, especially at the national level where USAID involvement would be not only be appropriate but valuable. Project and USAID collaboration with government officials needs to be in the form of much more personal, face-to-face relationships. This is a long-term process.

- Collaboration, communication and coordination between the project and all relevant ministries, (MOEC, MORA and including KESRA if the project takes this route again) must be much more personal, open and supportive at all levels.

- While producing project documents and publications are very useful, maximizing the impact of these 'products' involves much more than handing out or distributing newsletters or even online services. Building personal relationships is a two-way street and is to the advantage of all that the two lanes of the street are open and free-flowing.

Fight the 'Fade Factor.' Prepare an exit strategy with sustainability in mind, from the start One of the surprising findings of the DBE final evaluation is that the project seemed to have achieved less than it claimed. The reasons for this are mixed but one of them seems to be time and lack of support over the year-long gap between the end of the project and this evaluation. There was a 'fade factor' and this was and is a serious sustainability problem. Several recommendations flow from this challenge:

- Maximize prospects for sustainability. PRIORITAS could develop annual Memorandum of Agreement or work plans with districts.

- The role of supervisors should be rexamined and revitalized and training should be provided in active learning, school management and mentoring.

- Insist that turnover among key personnel (principals, supervisors and DINAS heads) be made only after a suitable replacement is identified and trained.

- Prepare an exit strategy that encompasses, from the beginning, every possible approach to perpetuating and sustaining the effects of PRIORITAS before it reaches its own finale.

Making a silk purse from a sow's ear: re-examine the role of universities as service providers or hubs for effective practices. Most observers see potential in universities as trainers of pre-service teachers and repositories of research and good practice but few see universities as service providers to districts without a complete revision of university personnel away from theory and more toward school-level practice.

Mastering Mentoring: Re-analyze who does mentoring and then offer training in this valuable role Principals would be apparent choices but do they have enough time? Supervisors may be appropriate if their current inspectorial role is modified to include modern counseling, advising, and mentoring skills. Teacher should also be considered through the use of peer groups.

### Opening to Opportunities

Work with the Willing; Make Strategic Choices This is already a mantra from the lessons learned in DBE. Moving from mantra to action, however, will require tough decisions when the easy way would be to do nothing. (This also applies to universities and training institutions). Strategic choices have to made and one such choice that needs immediate consideration is the aim of PRIORITAS in the next two years. Should the project: 1) build on whatever success has been achieved in the best districts from DBE and end the relationship in the fading districts or 2) try to repair the holes in all the districts and reinforce or redo the program? There is obviously no easy answer to this question, especially now that PRIORITAS is already underway, but if 'working with the willing' is to be put into practice, then the recommended choice is apparent.

Be very selective in entering into Public-Private Alliances Enter into such alliances only when there is a strong similarity of agendas and potential alliances are carefully reviewed (DBE3 compiled a useful list of lessons learned regarding PPAs after analyzing its own set of disappointing experiences). There are opportunities but they must be chosen with care.

Reading Between the Lions: explore a potiential PPA with Lion's Club International for its eyeglass program. USAID and Lion's Club International signed an MOU on June 26, 2012 to promote literacy around the world. One objective of this program is to promote reading among young children with disabilities, particularly the visually impaired. One lesson learned which the evaluation team observed in schools is that there are almost no children wearing eyeglasses (this is not 'new news' but is a continuing problem). It is a relevant opportunity for PRIORITAS to address needs of all children in classrooms.

### Apply the Lessons Learned

Move beyond the Lessons Learned Take all lessons learned from DBE reports, the Mid-term evaluation and this evaluation and do a 'Progress, Problems and Prospects' report on those lessons every month or two. Lessons may or not be truly learned. Lessons learned need to become lessons used.

# SECTION VI. CONCLUSION

Overall, the DBE program was a remarkably successful project. Addressing change in the huge education sector presented many challenges and DBE successfully evolved to meet the needs of this dynamic sector. It achieved well – often in excess – of agreed performance indicators, introduced a large number of new concepts tools, methods and procedures that will make a positive impact on the Indonesian education system for years beyond the life of the program. Despite being a large, complex program, much of the program implementation went smoothly and by any measure the outputs achieved under the program are huge.

When compared to the standard conventional Indonesian school, DBE schools are significantly better and the schools are better managed with greater community involvement, better teaching methods, and more enthusiastic teachers and students. When compared to high-performing active learning schools, many of the observed DBE-partner schools were lack-luster with weak, inconsistent, active learning methods being applied. In some schools, where principals and school committee members have been replaced or have moved on for other reasons, the program appears to be fading quickly. Only in a few districts has the program truly been adopted by the district and brought to scale, challenging the assumption that once demonstrated to districts the value of the program would be manifest and districts would rapidly replicate the program. Seen in this light, the glass is half-full and may be shrinking.

Despite the need to repair some cracks, the DBE program has developed a strong foundation that the new follow on program, PRIORITAS, can build on. The DBE foundation may be weaker than USAID has been led to believe however, and care should be taken to learn the lessons of the DBE program. The PRIORITAS should focus on the core program and not spread its resources too thinly.

> *Because … it is easy to explain things looking backward, we think that we can then predict them forward. It doesn't work, as many economists know to their cost. The world keeps changing. It is one of the paradoxes of success that the things and the ways that got you where you are, are seldom those that keep you there."*
>
> Charles Handy, *The Age of Paradox*
> Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1994