USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

INDONESIA: DECENTRALIZED BASIC EDUCATION PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION

VOLUME II: ANNEXES

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Information in this document has been collected, complied, and authored by the DBE Evaluation Team: Agung Purwadi, Annisa Setiadi, David P. Evans, Lynn Losert, M. Basri Wello, Norman Ario Bimo, Nurdin Noni, Sean A. Tate, and Tari Savitri.

Annex 1: Evaluation Scope of Work

SCOPE OF WORK

PURPOSE

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of the three DBE programs on the quality and relevance of basic education in primary and secondary schools in Indonesia. More specifically, the evaluation should assess how successful the three DBE programs were in terms of achieving their primary goals of: 1) assisting local governments and communities to manage education services more effectively; 2) enhancing teaching and learning to improve student performance in key subjects such as reading, math and science; and 3) ensuring that Indonesia's youth gain relevant life and work skills to better compete for jobs in the modern economy. This evaluation should measure 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. In addition, this evaluation should provide an initial assessment of the sustainability of program achievements and the factors that have contributed to or detracted from the sustainability of program achievements.

SERVICES REQUIRED

The contractor shall provide professional and thorough evaluation services sufficient to achieve the objectives set forth above. Specifically, the evaluation should address the series of questions that follow.

General Questions

1. What progress was made in terms of performance indicators, targets and program deliverables? What aspects of the DBE programs proved most and least effective?
2. Were DBE program interventions equally effective in poor and better off schools, in urban and rural schools, and in madrasahs and public schools? Similarly, were there provincial or district differences in program outcomes?
3. Were there noticeable gender differences in program outcomes at the student level, at the school professional level or at the district and provincial administrative staff level?
4. To what extent are DBE interventions showing signs that they are sustainable? What are the factors influencing sustainability?
5. Were the central offices of MOEC and MORA sufficiently aware and supportive of the DBE interventions - thereby helping to ensure that approaches pioneered by the DBE project were sustained and replicated? Conversely, how effectively did DBE engage MOEC and MORA in its interventions?
6. How effective were DBE interventions in improving student learning in reading, math and science? What DBE activities have been most responsible for increases in learning achievement?
7. To what extent have DBE best practices at the local, district and provincial levels fed into national education policy dialogue and reform?
8. Were there any major areas not supported by DBE that should have been in order to achieve the intended program results?
9. How did the DBE districts and provinces engage with their local universities on education issues? How about with P4TK and with LPMP? What have been some effective strategies for strengthening these linkages? What could be other effective strategies?
10. Which of the DBE modules are the most replicated and disseminated? Who does the replication and dissemination and why? Are replication practices at the same standard of quality as the original? Which modules are replicated in whole and which are replicated in part? Are there steps that could be taken for further distribution and use of the modules?

11. Has DBE's approach to Islamic education been effective? Are there any special needs/issues that should be considered for the future in order to engage effectively with MORA?
12. What lessons were learned about large project management in Indonesia's complex basic education sector?
13. How have the DBE interventions contributed to the fulfillment of minimum service standards as well as national standards of education in the DBE target districts?
14. How have the DBE projects complemented, overlapped, and/or filled in a void with respect to other major international donor efforts such as AusAid, the World Bank, and JICA.

DBE1 Questions
1. The DBE1 project had a mandate to support planning and strengthen management at the local and district levels. To what extent were approaches undertaken in support of this mandate successful?
2. How did DBE1 respond to the needs of schools, districts and provincial governments? How effective were they in ensuring good practices were institutionalized?
3. What were the most influential factors in increasing the participation of school committee members and parents? What are the biggest challenges?
4. How effective was the project in increasing the capacity of personnel at school and district level?

DBE2 Questions
1. The DBE2 project had a mandate to improve the quality of teaching and learning in Indonesia's primary schools. To what extent were approaches undertaken in support of this mandate successful?
2. Are there DBE2 activities or best practices that could or should serve as the basis to reform national policy?
3. How effective were the contributions made by Indonesian and U.S. universities to DBE2's in-service teacher training initiatives? What do the Indonesian partner universities see as DBE strengths in terms of improving their methods of teacher training?
4. Were new approaches (classroom reading program and distance education pilots) under DBE2 initiated post mid-term evaluation effective?

DBE3 Questions
1. The DBE3 project originally had a mandate to improve the quality and relevance of education for youth with a focus on life and work skills. Following the midterm, DBE3 withdrew from non-formal education and focused on a whole-school approach to improving the quality and relevancy of education for youth. To what extent was quality/relevance approach successful?
2. How successful was DBE 3 in achieving its three mail goals as set forth in the midterm: 1) quality of junior secondary education providers in target districts improved; (2) support to the national in-service training system provided; and (3) GOI better positioned to respond to the needs of the junior secondary education sector?
3. Are there DBE3 activities or best practices that could or should serve as the basis to reform national policy?

These questions are particularly relevant to the Education Office because a major new USAID education program, PRIORITAS, again seeks to strengthen teaching and learning in reading, math and science and to improve school management at the school and district level. Thus, any lessons that can be gleaned from the existing program could be applied to the future program in order to enhance its chances for success. The results of this evaluation will inform USAID, MOEC, MORA, the implementing partners, the DBE beneficiaries and the broader community concerned about primary education in Indonesia about lessons learned under the DBE program. It is envisioned that two separate reports will need to be

prepared for these different constituencies. The first report will be a "traditional" evaluation for USAID, MOEC, MORA, and the implementing partners.

The second report, written in Indonesian, will be aimed at the DBE recipients and the broader education community in Indonesia. It should: a) accurately summarize the findings in the main DBE evaluation report; b) provide very practical advice, based on the DBE program results, that will further the new basic education program approaches; and c) be both easy to read and lend itself to discussion in the general media and central ministries in Indonesia.

APPROACH

The contractor shall propose an evaluation methodology or mix of methodologies for answering the questions above that is effective and cost efficient. The methodology is likely to combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches that include document reviews, directive observations, mini-surveys, interviews and the use of focus groups. It is anticipated that one or more field surveys will be needed to address some of the questions above. The contractor shall include in its proposal the drafts of surveys intended to be used in the evaluation.

In developing its methodology, the contractor must follow the guidance published in the January 2011 document entitled, "USAID Evaluation Policy." In particular, the contactor should carefully review Section 5 entitled, "Evaluation Requirements." One example of the many points highlighted in this section is that, where available, the evaluation should use sex-disaggregated data and incorporate attention to gender relations in all relevant areas. (See Appendix II for more details.). Below is an illustrative approach to the evaluation. It may be modified in the proposal submitted by the candidate contractor.

1. Conduct interviews with USAID/Indonesia Education Team Members, Menko Kesra, MOEC and MORA staffs and relevant implementing partners. (Most of the Indonesian staff remains accessible in Indonesia. Some of the expatriate staff may have to be reached through the offices of the U.S. partners.)
2. Conduct at least three and as many as five field visits to speak with and observe DBE implementers (e.g. teachers) and beneficiaries.
3. Identify possible explanations for the observed findings and trends.
4. Develop an evaluation approach to assess whether any of the explanations are valid and explore unidentified explanations.
5. Prepare a draft of the main evaluation report.
6. Present the draft report findings to USAID, Menko Kesra, MOEC, MORA and the DBE implementing partners for feedback.
7. After receipt of initial feedback from the parties above on the main evaluation report, draft the "lessons learned" report for the primary education community in Indonesia.
8. Present the final evaluation report to USAID for final comment.
9. Present Lessons Learned Report to USAID, Menko Kesra, MOEC and MORA for comment.
10. After receipt of feedback from USAID, Menko Kesra, MOEC and MORA on the lessons learned report, prepare and circulate news releases on the report. Also, take other appropriate steps, including a dissemination workshop, to publicize the reports.
11. Print copies of the Lessons Learned Report and distribute multiple copies to Menko Kesra, MOEC and MORA headquarters staff, all provincial and district education offices and all head teachers participating in the DBE program.
12. The contractor is welcome to submit additional approaches, beyond the draft press release referenced below, to publicize the findings of the Lesson Learned Report.

DELIVERABLES

The contractor shall produce the following materials:

- A final main evaluation report written in English. The main report should include an executive summary that provides a description of methods, key findings and recommendations. The executive summary should be presented in both English and Indonesian.
- A final Lessons Learned Report, written in Bahasa Indonesia, on DBE activities;
- Presentation of a workshop, open to USAID, Menko Kesra, MOEC and MORA staff to discuss the evaluation findings; and presentation of a smaller, more targeted workshop open to USAID and newly hired staff from the PRIORITAS program. (Representatives from Menko Kesra, MOEC and MORA will also be invited but the focus will be on the transfer of lessons learned to new PRIORITAS staff.)
- A draft press release, to be provided to USAID, outlining key findings from the Lessons Learned Report.

Electronic copies of the main evaluation report and Lessons Learned Report should be submitted within three months of completion to the Development Experience Clearinghouse at http://dec.usaid.gov.
In addition, all performance data used in the evaluation should be presented, in an organized manner, to the USAID/Indonesia Education Office where it will be warehoused for future use.

COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team could be comprised of a home office coordinator, three international consultants and one or more Indonesian firms. (An alternative to one of the firms might be faculty and staff from an Indonesian university that was not involved in the implementation of the DBE programs.) The three international consultants should have seven or more years of international experience in one or more of the three main goal areas of the DBE programs: 1) assisting local governments and communities manage education services more effectively; 2) enhancing teaching and learning to improve student performance; and 3) ensuring that youth acquire a high quality and relevant education. In the final weeks of the study, it would also be useful to have a fourth international consultant with expertise in making research findings accessible to general public.
The local consulting firms used should be independent in the sense that they did not actively participate in the implementation of DBE activities. They should, however, have the capacity to assess DBE program results and possess the editorial capacity to prepare the Lesson Learned Report. (This effectively means having bilingual editorial capacity within one of the Indonesian firms.)

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The Starting date of this project is the signing date of this BPA call by the Contracting Officer. Completion date is November 15, 2012. The Contractor must submit to USAID/Indonesia/Education Office copies of the final report in English within eighteen weeks from the starting date.

INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE OF WORK PERFORMED TO CONDUCT THE AGREEDUPON PROCEDURES AND THE REPORT

The work program (including detailed steps) and the draft report will be subject to approval and acceptance by USAID/Indonesia Education Office.

RELATIONSHIPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The client for this award is USAID/Indonesia/Education Office. The Contractor shall work in coordination with USAID/Indonesia. The liaison for concerns arising throughout the engagement will be the USAID/Indonesia/Education Office.

LOGISTICS

The Contractor shall be responsible for providing all logistical support, including transportation for personnel and equipment required for the completion of the assignment.

WORK PLAN/DELIVERABLES

The following time frame for the evaluation is presented for illustrative purposes only, as it is recognized that the contractor will develop the actual time frame in consultation with USAID/Indonesia as part of the implementation of the evaluation. It is estimated that the evaluation and the production of the requested reports will require approximately 18 weeks.

ACTIVITY TIME FRAME

In the U.S. the Evaluation Team reviews documents forwarded by USAID and then travels to Indonesia.
Week 1: The Evaluation Team meets with USAID, MOEC and MORA, and reviews DBE data and results. It may be useful to conduct these meetings in a workshop format.
Week 2: Review of data and results continues. Evaluation Team finalizes its research instruments and approach. This review might be supplemented by preliminary interviews in Indonesia.
Week 3: Field work gets underway.
Week 4: Field work continues.
Week 5-7: Evaluation Team analyzes field work data, develops initial conclusions and recommendations, and begins drafting the main evaluation report.
Week 8-9: Evaluation Team presents a summary of key findings to USAID, MOEC and MORA, and continues drafting the main evaluation report.
Week 10: Evaluation Team submits first complete draft of the main evaluation report and presents findings orally to USAID, MOEC and MORA.
Beginning of Week 11: Two days after submitting the complete draft of the main evaluation report, the Evaluation Team makes an oral presentation on the findings to USAID, MONEC and MORA.
Week 11: Evaluation Team begins work on Lessons Learned Report.
Beginning of Week 12: USAID, MOEC, MORA and Menko Kesra provide feedback on the draft evaluation report.
End of Week 12: Evaluation Team submits final draft of the main evaluation report.
End of Week 13: Evaluation Team submits draft Lessons Learned Report, sample press releases and other publicity materials.
End of Week 13: Evaluation Team makes administrative arrangements to print and distribute the Lessons Learned Report.
Week 10-14: USAID, MOEC and MORA provide feedback on lessons learned report, sample press releases and other publicity materials.
End of Week 14: Evaluation Team finalizes the Lessons Learned Report and publicity materials and international members of the team depart Indonesia.
By the end of Week 15: Conduct evaluation results workshops
Weeks 16-18: Lesson Learned Report and publicity materials distributed to interested parties throughout Indonesia.

Annex 2: List of People Interviewed

NAME	POSITION	INSTITUTION
Mark R. Doyle	Science and Technology Advisor	USAID
Lawrence W. Dolan	Education Officer	USAID
Mimy M. Santika	Education Specialist	USAID
Esther R. Manurung	Project Management Specialist	USAID
Jalu Noor Cahyanto	Education Specialist	USAID
Dan Moulton	Former Director: DBE 1	USAID
Stuart Weston	Chief of Party: PRIORITAS	USAID
Lorna Power	Deputy Chief of Party: PRIORITAS	USAID
Mark Heyward	D&G: PRIORITAS	USAID
Pudji Agustine	Deputy Nat'l Coordinator, Bridging Team	USAID
Lira Herlina	Administrative Manager, Bridging Team	USAID
Khatib Latief	Provincial Liaison Aceh, Bridging Team	USAID
Parapat Gultom	Prov. Liaison N. Sumatra, Bridging Team	USAID
Syihabuddin	Provincial Liaison Banten, Bridging Team	USAID
Ajar Budi Kuncoro	Prov. Liaison Central Java Bridging Team	USAID
Supriono Subakir	Provincial Liaison East Java, Bridging Team	USAID
Nur Jannah	Ex-district DBE Coordinator, Purwarejo	USAID
Agus Danar	Ex-district DBE Coordinator, Karanganyar	USAID
Lutfi Rahman	Ex-district DBE Coordinator, Kudus	USAID
Mae Chu Chang	Head of Human Development	WORLD BANK
T. Erita Nurhalim	Senior Operations Officer	WORLD BANK
Santoso	BERMUTU	WORLD BANK
Petra	BERMUTU	WORLD BANK
Brian Spicer	Education Quality Team Leader	AUSAID
Karen Taylor	International Education Advisor	AUSAID
Nandang Amanda	Education Management Advisor	AUSAID
Agus Sartono	Deputy IV	MENKO KESRA
Femmy Kartika	Assistant Deputy for Basic Education	MENKO KESRA
Fuad Abdul Hamid	Ex - Deputy IV	MENKO KESRA
Suyanto	Directorate General for Basic Education	DIKNAS/MOEC
Palogo Balianto	Directorate for Primary Schooling	DIKNAS/MOEC
Didik Suhardi	Directorate for Jr. Secondary Schooling	DIKNAS/MOEC
Fasli Jalal	Ex – Vice Minister	DIKNAS/MOEC
Nur Hadi Amiyanto	Secretary: Central Java	Provincial MOEC
Edi Cahyono	Head of Program: Central Java	Provincial MOEC
Alfrida Kriswati	Head of Teacher Service: Central Java	Provincial MOEC
Jhonny Lorang	Head of Basic Education: Central Java	Provincial MOEC

Hari Wulyanto	Head of Curriculum: Central Java	Provincial MOEC
Ernest Septyanti	Head of Planning: Central Java	Provincial MOEC
Panca Astuti	Head of BECTF: Central Java	Provincial MOEC
Syaiful Safri	Head of Office: North Sumatera	Provincial MOEC
Baharuddin	Secretary: North Sumatera	Provincial MOEC
Henri Siregar	Head of Primary Education: N. Sumatera	Provincial MOEC
L. Hanum Daulay	Head of Secondary Education: N. Sumatera	Provincial MOEC
Edward Sinaga	Head of Personnel: North Sumatera	Provincial MOEC
Rosmawaty	General Affairs Staff :North Sumatera	Provincial MOEC
Syafrida	General Affairs Staff :North Sumatera	Provincial MOEC
Jamun Effendi	Head of Madrasah & BE :Central Java	Provincial MORA
H. Ahmad Hanafi	Head of Administration: North Sumatera	Provincial MORA
Yulizar	Head of Madrasah & BE: North Sumatera	Provincial MORA
Khairul Syam	Head of Social Order: North Sumatera	Provincial MORA
Totoh Santoso	Director: West Java	LPMP
Paulus Mujino	Instructor: Central Java	LPMP
Tri Mulyani	Instructor: Central Java	LPMP
Frans	Head of Information System: West Java	LPMP
Ignun	Head of General Affairs: West Java	LPMP
A. Qashas Rahman	Director: South Sulawesi	LPMP
H. Bambang Minarji	Director: North Sumatera	LPMP
Dame A. Sitanggang	Director Assistant: North Sumatera	LPMP
T. Ginting	Head of FPMP: North Sumatera	LPMP
Syahdian	Head of PMS: North Sumatera	LPMP
Indra Sakti	Head of General Affairs: North Sumatera	LPMP
Surya Dermawan	Secretary of G.A.: North Sumatera	LPMP
Akhmad Hadi	Head Secretary: North Sumatera	LPMP
Miswuryanti	Head of S1 Secretary: North Sumatera	LPMP
Ely Kesumawati	Head of FPMP Secretary: North Sumatera	LPMP
Neni Juli Astuti	Head of PMS Secretary: North Sumatera	LPMP
M. Faisal S.	Public Relations: North Sumatera	LPMP
M. Yakub	Instructor, North Sumatera	LPMP
Dermalince Sitinjak	Instructor, North Sumatera	LPMP
Siti Nawardi	Instructor, North Sumatera	LPMP
Siti Syamsiani	Instructor, North Sumatera	LPMP
Nurhaiti Purba	Instructor, North Sumatera	LPMP
Ezra	Instructor, North Sumatera	LPMP
Miftah	Secretary, Purworejo	LPMP
Farid Sholichin	Head of Education, Purworejo	LPMP
Choirudin	Supervisor, Purworejo	LPMP
Sutarja	Supervisor of Junior Secondary, Purworejo	LPMP
Zarkasi	Head of Madrasah & BE, Boyolali	LPMP
H. Ni'am Ansori	Head of Office, Demak	LPMP

Farikhin	Head of Madrasah & BE, Demak	LPMP
Suyadi	Supervisor	LPMP
H. Mangendre	Head of Madrasah & BE, Pangkep	LPMP
Syarifuddin	Head of Office, Makassar	LPMP
Al Ahyu	Head of Office, Binjai	LPMP
Ponu Siregar	Head of Madrasah & BE, Binjai	LPMP
A. Munir Aritonang	Head of Administration, North Tapanuli	LPMP
Widodo	Director, P4TK Math	P4TK
Fajar Sadik	Head of General Affairs, P4TK Math	P4TK
Ganung Anggraini	Instructor,P4TK Math	P4TK
Pujianti	Instructor, P4TK Math	P4TK
H. Mahzun Zain	Regent of Purworejo, Central Java	City/District Government
H. S. A. Hamid	Regent of Pangkep, South Sulawesi	City/District Government
Idaham	Mayor of Binjai, North Sumatera	City/District Government
Torang Tobing	Regent of North Tapanuli, North Sumatera	City/District Government
Herry	Head of Basic Education, Tangerang	City/District MOEC
Hamidi	Staff of Basic Education, Purworejo	City/District MOEC
Sunaryo	Member of Education Board, Purworejo	City/District MOEC
Drajatno	Head of Office, Boyolali	City/District MOEC
Jono Trimanto	Head of Curriculum, Boyolali	City/District MOEC
Suroto	Head of Junior Secondary, Boyolali	City/District MOEC
Retno Palupi	Head of DBE Replication, Boyolali	City/District MOEC
Sumarno	Supervisor, Boyolali	City/District MOEC
Marsono	Supervisor, Boyolali	City/District MOEC
Hartono	Head of Secondary School Division, Kudus	City/District MOEC
Sugiarto	Secretary, Demak	City/District MOEC
Khomeid	Head of Kindergarten & Primary, Demak	City/District MOEC
Umi Furyani	Head of Program Planning, Demak	City/District MOEC
Mas'udah	Supervisor	City/District MOEC
H. M. Ridwan	Head of Office, Pangkep	City/District MOEC
Muhammad Nasir	Head of Basic Education, Pangkep	City/District MOEC
Sitaurusdin	Head of Office, Sidrap	City/District MOEC
H. Abbas Laude	Head of Education Board, Sidrap	City/District MOEC
Buhari	Head of Education Board, Soppeng	City/District MOEC
H. Mahmudin	Head of Subdistrict Wattang, Soppeng	City/District MOEC
Idham	Supervisor, Soppeng	City/District MOEC
Sandang	Supervisor, Soppeng	City/District MOEC
Nur Alim	Supervisor, Soppeng	City/District MOEC
Mahmud	Head of Office, Makassar	City/District MOEC
Bahrum	Head of Curriculum, Makassar	City/District MOEC
Bahnan Abubakar	Supervisor of Junior Secondary, Makassar	City/District MOEC
Wahid	Supervisor, Makassar	City/District MOEC
Dasril Suar	Member of Education Board, Binjai	City/District MOEC

Haryoto	Member of Education Board, Binjai	City/District MOEC
A. M. Situmeang	Secretary of EB, North Tapanuli	City/District MOEC
Gisler Manulang	Supervisor, North Tapanuli	City/District MOEC
Ruhaya Hutabarat	Supervisor, North Tapanuli	City/District MOEC
Adi Sinaga	Ex District Facilitator, North Tapanuli	City/District MOEC
H. Nurudin	Head of Office, Purworejo	City/District MORA
Miftah	Secretary, Purworejo	City/ District MORA
Farid Sholichin	Head of Education, Purworejo	City/ District MORA
Choirudin	Supervisor of Prim. Ed., Purworejo	City/ District MORA
Sutarja	Supervisor of Junior Secondary, Purworejo	City/ District MORA
Zarkasi	Head of Madrasah & BE, Boyolali	City/ District MORA
H. Ni'am Ansori	Head of Office, Demak	City/ District MORA
Farikhin	Head of Madrasah & BE, Demak	City/ District MORA
Suyadi	Supervisor	City/ District MORA
H. Mangendre	Head of Madrasah & BE, Pangkep	City/ District MORA
Syarifuddin	Head of Office, Makassar	City/ District MORA
Al Ahyu	Head of Office, Binjai	City/ District MORA
Ponu Siregar	Head of Madrasah & Basic Education, Binjai	City/ District MORA
A. Munir Aritonang	Head of Administration, North Tapanuli	City/ District MORA
Hasan Asari	Vice Rector I, IAIN Medan	University
Ramli Abdul Wahid	Vice Rector IV, IAIN Medan	University
Zainul Fuad	Head of Culture & Language, IAIN Medan	University
Muhammad Nuh	PMM Staff, IAIN Medan	University
Nirwana Anas	Lecturer, IAIN Medan	University
Fibri Rakhmawati	Lecturer, IAIN Medan	University
Solihah T. Sumanti	Lecturer, IAIN Medan	University
Irwan Nasution	Lecturer, IAIN Medan	University
Ibnu Hajar	Rector, UNIMED	University
Khairil Ansari	Vice Rector I, UNIMED	University
Berlin Sibarani	Vice Rector IV, UNIMED	University
Ramli Sitorus	FIP Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Chairil Anwar	FIP Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Mastiana	FIP Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Daitin Tarigan,	FIP Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Badiran	FBS Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Wisman	FBS Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Inayah Hanum	FBS Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Suprakisno	FBS Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Elly Djulia	FMIPA Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Izwita Dewi Lubis	FMIPA Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Lis Siti Zahro	FMIPA Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Tri Harsono	FMIPA Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Betty Marisi Turnip	FMIPA Lecturer, UNIMED	University

Ali N. Hutabarat	FIS Lecturer ,UNIMED	University
Tumiar Sidauruk	FIS Lecturer ,UNIMED	University
Hafnita S. D. Lubis	FIS Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Abdul Hamid	FT Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Arif Rahman	FT Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Rahmat Mulyana,	FT Lecturer, UNIMED	University
Abil Mansyur	Vice Rector IV Staff, UNIMED	University
Johannes J. Gultom	Vice Rector IV Staff ,UNIMED	University
Winsyahputra	Vice Rector IV Staff, UNIMED	University

Annex 3: List of Schools Visited

1. Primary Schools

PROVINCE			
CENTRAL JAVA	**SOUTH SULAWESI**	**NORTH KALIMANTAN**	**BANTEN**
PURWOREJO	**PANGKEP**	**BINJAI**	**TANGERANG**
SDN Kaliurip	SDN 28 Kemampuan	MIN 1 Binjai	SDN Sukasari 4
MIN Bener		MIS Al Muqorobbin	
MI Glagah Malang		MIS Ikwanul Mukminin	
SDN Loano		SDN 020255	
SDN Maron 1		SDN 020256	
		SDN 020260	
		SDN 020263	
		SDN 023894	
		SDN 023901	
		SDN 028288	
BOYOLALI	**SIDRAP**	**TAPANULI UTARA**	
MI Gunung Wijil	SDB 10 Pangkajenne	MIN Peanornor	
MI Ringin	SDN 11Pangkejenne	SDN 173100	
SD Sukabumi	SDN 4 Otting	SDN 173102	
SD Paras 1	SDN 3 Otting	SDN 173104	
SD Randusari		SDN 173119	
MI Kopen		SDN 173133	
		SDN 178492	
KUDUS	**SOPPENG**		
MI Manafiul Ulum	MI Assaddiyah Cabbenge		
SD N 1 Kaliwungu	SD 34 Tokabbeng		
MI Sidorekso	SD 161 Karya		
SDN 1 Gondosari	SD 166 Lapurawung		
SDN 3 Prambatan Kidul	SDN 1 Lamappapoleware		
MI Tsamratul Wathon	SDN 23 Tanete		
	SDN 28 Malaka		
DEMAK	**MAKASSAR**		
MI Wonosalm	SD 202 Walennae		
SDN 13 Bintoro	SD Islam Al Bayan		
SDN Sidomulyo 2	SDN 3 Bertingkat		
MI Sultan Fatah	SDN IKEKP 1		
MI Tanwirudholam	SDN IKEP 2		
SDN Cabean 2			

2. Junior Secondary Schools

PROVINCE			
CENTRAL JAVA	**SOUTH SULAWESI**	**NORTH SUMATRA**	**BANTEN**
PURWOREJO	**PANGKEP**	**BINJAI**	**TANGERANG**
MTsN Bener	MtsN Ma'rang	MTs Al Washliyah	MTsN 1 Tangerang
SMPN 19 Purworejo	SMPN Pangkajenne	MTsN Binjai	SMP Nusa Putra
SMPN 6 Purworejo		SMP N 9	MTS Dua Putra
MTsN Loano		SMPN 10	
SMPN 31 Purworejo		SMPN 11	
		SMPN 2	
		SMPN 7	
BOYOLALI	**SIDRAP**	**TAPANULI UTARA**	
MTsN Cepogo	MI DDI Pangsid	MTsN Peanornor	
SMPN 1 Cepogo	SMPN 4 Duapitue	SMPN 1 Siborong	
SMPN 2 Ngemplak		SMPN 1 Sipoholon	
SMPN 1 Klego		SMPN 1Tarutung	
MTsN Ngandong		SMPN 4 Tarutung	
MTsN Sambi			
KUDUS	**SOPPENG**		
MTsN 2 Mejobo Kudos	MTs Takalalla		
SMPN 2 Jekulo	SMPN 3 Watang Soppeng		
MTs Nurul Ulum	SMPN Lili Rilau		
SMPN 3 Jekulo			
SMP 1 Bae			
MTs Banat			
Demak	**Makassar**		
MTs Gajah Demak	MTsN Biring Kanayya		
MTs NU Demak	MTsN Gunungsari		
MTs Raudlatul Mu'alimin	SMP PGRI		
SMPN 1 Mijen Demak	SMPN 3 Makassar		
SMPN 1 Mranggen	SMPN 33		
SMPN 5 Demak			

Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed

Ali, Mohammad, J. Kos, P. Lietz, D. Nugroho, Furquon, A. Zainul, and E. Emilia. (2011) *Quality of education in madrasah: Main study.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Ministry of Religious Affairs, Australian Council for Educational Research, and Indonesian University of Education.

Basic Education Capacity-Trust Fund (BEC-TF) Secretariat. (2010-2011) *Governance matters to education outcomes.* Jakarta: Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education.

Cannon, Robert and R. Arlianti. (August 21, 2009). *Transition to and participation in junior secondary school.* DBE3 Research Report. Jakarta: USAID/Indonesia.

Cannon, Robert and R. Arlianti. (November 27, 2009). *An exploratory study of the* ujian nasional. DBE3 Research Report. Jakarta: USAID/Indonesia.

Center for Faculty Excellence (2009) *Classroom activities for active learning.* For Your Consideration … Suggestions and Reflections on Teaching and Learning. Chapel Hill, North Carolina. http://cfe.unc.edu/pdfs/fyc3_Web.pdf

Clarke, Marguerite. (2012) *What matters most for student assessment systems: A framework paper.* Working Paper 1. Washington: DC: The World Bank.

Education Development Center. (2006). *Annual report: decentralized basic education, Indonesia component 2: teaching and learning*. Boston, MA: Education Development Center and USAID Indonesia.

Education Development Center. (2009). *Impact, Results & Progress: DBE2 Annual Report Summary.* Boston, MA: Education Development Center (EDC).

Education Development Center. (2008). *Executive summary: impact, results & progress DBE2 monitoring and evaluation report FY 2008*. Boston, MA: Education Development Center (EDC) and USAID Indonesia.

Education Development Center. (2010). *Impact, results and progress: DBE2 annual monitoring and evaluation report FY 2010*. Boston, MA: Education Development Center (EDC) and USAID Indonesia.

Education Development Center. (2011a). *Final report (vol. 1): DBE 2 project 2005-2011*. Boston, MA: Education Development Center (EDC).

Education Development Center. (2011b). *Final report (vol. 2): DBE 2 project 2005-2011*. Boston, MA: Education Development Center (EDC).

Education Development Center. (2011c). *Final report (vol. 3): DBE 2 project 2005-2011*. Boston, MA: Education Development Center (EDC).

Fast Track Initiative (FTI). (2008). *Guidelines for capacity development in the education sector.* Washington, DC.

Fearnley-Sander, M., Nainggolan, P., Ratcliffe, M., Riddell, A., Serper, S., & Taylor, G. (2008). *Pre-feasibility study mission: support to basic education in Indonesia.* European Commission and AusAid.

Ginsberg, M. (2009) *Pedagogies as a reform initiative: Synthesis of case studies.* American Institutes for Research, USAID: EQUIP 1http://www.equip123.net/docs/e1-ActiveLearningSynthesis_PrintReady.pdf

Gorgens, Marelize.and J. Kusek. (2009). *Making monitoring and evaluation systems work.* Washington DC: The World Bank.

Handy, Charles. (1994). *The age of paradox.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Ho, J., Mitchell, J., Mardjohan, M., & Surahman, I. (2009). *Impact, results and progress: DBE 2 monitoring and evaluation report FY 2009*. Boston, MA: Education Development Center (EDC).

Jalal, F., Samani, M., Chang, M.C., Stevenson, R., Ragatz, A.B., & Negara, S.D. (2009). *Teacher certification in Indonesia: a strategy for teacher quality improvement*. Jakarta, Indonesia: The World Bank.

Kusek, J. and R. Rist. (2004) *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system.* Washington DC: The World Bank.

Ministry of National Education Indonesia, & Japan International Cooperation Agency. (2008). *End-line survey report for program for strengthening in-service teacher training of mathematics and science education at junior secondary level (SISTTEMS)*. International Development Center of Japan.

Ministry of National Education (2010) *Ministry of National Education Strategic Plan 2010-2014* (*RENSTRA*), Jakarta, Indonesia.

Mitchell Group, Inc. (2008a).*The midterm evaluation of USAID/Indonesia's decentralized basic education (DBE) project.* Washington, D.C.: USAID.

Power, L. and Bachri, W. (n.d.). *Project dissemination report.* Arlington, VA: Save the Children, IRD and USAID.

RTI International.(2006a). *More effective decentralized education management and governance annual report April 2005 to 30 September 2006.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2006b). *More effective decentralized education management and governance baseline report edition 1*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2006c). *More effective decentralized education management and governance monitoring progress report 1. September 30, 2006.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2007a). *More effective decentralized education management and governance annual report October 2006 to September 2007.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2007b). *More effective decentralized education management and governance baseline report edition 2.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2007c). *More effective decentralized education management and governance monitoring progress report 2.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2008). *More effective decentralized education management and governance annual report October 2007 to September 2008.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2009a). *More effective decentralized education management and governance annual report October 2008 to September 2009.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2009b). *More effective decentralized education management and governance monitoring progress report 6.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2009c). *Study of the legal framework for the Indonesian basic education sector.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID

RTI International. (2009d). *Decentralized basic education 1: Management and governance. Good practice, dissemination and sustainability: Implications for policy.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2009e). *Decentralized basic education 1: Public private alliance.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2010a). *More effective decentralized education management and governance annual report October 2009 to September 2010.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2010b). *More effective decentralized education management and governance monitoring progress report 7.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2010c). *Decentralized basic education 1: Management and governance*: *Good practice in implementing Indonesian decentralized basic education policies.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2010d). *Decentralized basic education 1: Management and governance*: *Implementing school-based management in Indonesia: The DBE1 experience: 2005-2010.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2011a). *More effective decentralized education management and governance annual report October 2010 to September 2011.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International.(2011b). *More effective decentralized education management and governance (DBE1) final report.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2011c). *More effective decentralized education management and governance DBE1 project completion report, volume 1 appendix A: consolidated project implementation data.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2011d). *More effective decentralized education management and governance DBE1 project completion report – volume 1 appendix B: data by province.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2011e). *Assessment of dissemination of DBE1 ICT innovations: MONE's EMIS reporting technology.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2011f). *Decentralized basic education 1: Management and governance: Provincial plans and polices facilitated by DBE1in Aceh and East Java.* Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

RTI International. (2011g). *Replication of school based management activities and adoption/adaptation of DBE1school-based management materials by MONE BOS training team (Decentralized basic education 1: Management and governance*). Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and USAID.

Royer, J.M. (2010). *Final report 2009-2010 student learning evaluation DBE2 project.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts.

Save the Children. (2009). *Decentralized basic education (DBE3) supplementary monitoring report – monitoring a sample of schools in the 25 extension districts which have not received project assistance*. Westport, CT: Save the Children, Academy for Educational Development, and International Relief & Development.

Save the Children (2010a). *Decentralized basic education (DBE3) assessing the impact of the DBE3 program on student performance – second round assessment of a sample of students in junior secondary schools (SMPs and MTs) in the 25 DBE3 extension districts*. Westport, CT: Save the Children, Academy for Educational Development, and International Relief & Development.

Save the Children. (2010b). *Decentralized basic education (DBE3) monitoring of a group of comparison schools – monitoring a sample of schools in the 25 extension districts which have not received project assistance*. Westport, CT: Save the Children, Academy for Educational Development, and International Relief & Development.

Save the Children. (2010c). *Decentralized basic education three (DBE3) monitoring report 2010 - activities conducted, impact on partner schools, and impact on student performance.* Westport, CT: Save the Children and International Relief & Development.

Save the Children. (2011a). *Decentralized basic education three (DBE3) monitoring report 2011 – activities conducted, impact on partner schools, and impact on student performance.* Westport, CT: Save the Children and International Relief & Development.

Save the Children. (2011b). *Decentralized basic education three (DBE3) relevant education for youth – Volume 1: main project report*. Washington, DC: Save the Children. Westport, CT: Save the Children and International Relief & Development.

Save the Children. (2011c). *Decentralized basic education three (DBE3) relevant education for youth – Volume 2: provincial reports*. Westport, CT: Save the Children.

Save the Children. (2011d). *Decentralized basic education three (DBE3) relevant education for youth – Volume 3: annexes*. Westport, CT: Save the Children.

Senge, Peter. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline.* New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Senge, Peter et al. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline field-book for educators, parents and everyone who cares about education.* New York: Doubleday/Currency.

USAID. (2009). *A partnership for prosperity: USAID strategy Indonesia 2009-2014.* Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID (n/d) *First Principles: Designing Effective Education Programs for In-service Teacher Professional Development.* Washington D.C.: USAID, EQUIP 1.

USAID. (2011a). *Evaluation learning from experience: USAID evaluation policy. Washington, D.C.: USAID.*

USAID.(2011b). *2011 USAID education strategy implementation guidance- Volume II, Annexes.* Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID.(2011c). *2011 USAID education strategy implementation guidance- Volume III- Recent evidence on primary grade reading.* Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID.(2011d). *2011 USAID education strategy implementation guidance- Volume III- Recent evidence on primary grade reading.* Washington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID.(2011e). *2011 USAID education strategy implementation guidance.* Washington, D.C.: USAID.

World Bank (2010) *Transforming Indonesia's teaching force*. Volume II: From pre-service training to retirement. World Bank: Jakarta.

Annex 5: Interview Guides and Survey Instruments

1. DINAS Director and Staff and MORA District staff

The objectives of the interview are to: a) gain an understanding of the District's involvement in DBE and what impacts DBE interventions have had student learning, school governance, and school planning, b) gather opinions and facts about the most and least effective elements of DBE; and c) gather information about best practices and lessons learned that can be applied to any future program, especially PRIORITAS.

1. Can you briefly tell us a little about your district, e. g. number of primary and junior secondary schools, number of teachers and employees, responsibilities and mandates, etc.?

2. What was the type and level of involvement of DBE program elements and number of schools (what did they do in cooperation with you)?

3. From your perspective in DINAS (MORA), what activities within the DBE project proved to be the most effective? Why? (Please try to examine all three components of DBE.)

4. From your perspective in DINAS (MORA), what activities within the DBE appear to have been the least effective? Why?(Please try to examine all three components of DBE.)

5. How effective was the effort expended by DBE to increase the capacity of personnel at the school level? Please explain how capacity was improved.

6. How effective were the resources and effort expended by DBE to increase the capacity of personnel at the district level? Please explain how capacity was improved.

7. What activities should have been included in DBE or should be in any future program(such as PRIORITAS) that would improve the performance of the program?

8. Has the District made any effort to replicate the DBE program within the District in other sub-districts and school? How have you done that and how successful has that been?

9. DBE appears to have influenced education reform at the district and school level but, at the same time, the Central MOEC (MORA) does not seem to understand or appreciate the contributions the DBE program made. How could the DBE or any future programs better communicate with the Central Ministry and/or Provincial Governments?

10. What are the best practices (activities that worked very well) from the implementation of DBE?What are the lessons learned (both positive and negative) from the implementation of DBE?

11. What lessons learned or best practices would you highlight for incorporation into USAID's follow-on program?

12. Are there any additional points or comments that you would like to make to inform USAID, DBE, and the development of future programs in basic education?

2. Donors

The objective of this interview is to obtain information on the perspectives and opinions from donor agencies on a) the performance of the DBE projects (1, 2, and 3) and b) how the experience and lessons learned from the DBE projects can effectively contribute to education reform.

1. To begin, what your does organization do in education in Indonesia. Please explain briefly.

2. We would like to know your general, overall impressions of the DBE projects. Please tell us what you know of these projects (DBE1, 2, and 3); their objectives and performance. Tell us what you can about the focus of each of these projects.

INTERVIEWER NOTES/GUIDE:

Use as necessary.

DBE1 focused on governance and management of education, principally at the District level.

DBE2 focused on student learning and teaching.

DBE3 focused, at least in its second phase, on Junior Secondary schools).

The Decentralized Basic Education Program (DBE), begun in 2005, focused on improving the quality and relevance of basic education in primary and junior secondary schools (JSS). Through technical assistance and training, the program had three goals:

- to assist local governments and communities to manage education services more effectively;
- to enhance teaching and learning to improve student performance in key subjects such as math, science and reading; and
- to ensure Indonesia's youth gain more relevant life and work skills to better compete for jobs in the modern economy.

3. How effectively did USAID coordinate with the donor community in the initial planning stages of the DBE project? Was an initial sector analysis done to identify gaps in the education sector that could be met by the DBE?

4. From what you know, was the work of DBE in education complementary to that of donor organizations, especially yours?

5. From your perspective, what activities within the DBE projects proved to be the most effective in advancing education reform in the country? Why? Please explain.

6. From your perspective, in which of the three content subjects which DBE focused on, (reading, math, and science) did the DBE most impact student learning(was most effective)?

7. Based on your knowledge and/or experience, to what extent have DBE best practices at the local, district and provincial levels become part of national education policy dialogue and reform? Please explain. [Interviewer Notes: Use visual aid rating scale as appropriate.]'Best Practices' are learning/teaching techniques and methods that are best in improving the quality and effectiveness of education.

8. What other activities could DBE have supported that would have added value to the sector?

9. How can donors improve cooperation to avoid over-laps in programming?

10. What interventions (type) do you think are still needed in this sector (Basic Education)? Please explain.

11. What is your perception of donors' communication and collaboration with MOEC and MORA? What steps would you recommend to improve that communication and collaboration? Please explain.

12. Could donor communication and collaboration between the DBE projects and your donor agency have been improved? How? Please explain.

13. Please give any other thoughts on the DBE projects including their performance and effectivenessthat you think would be useful to know.

3. Education Boards (EB)

The objectives of the interview are to obtain information of the perspective and opinion of Education Board members on a) the interaction between universities and provinces/district on education issues, b) the experiences and lessons learned from DBE projects and c) more effective engagement of education stakeholders in future programs.

1. What is your role as a member of an Education Board? What activities are you engaged in?

2. In your opinion, how was the interaction/engagement between Districts/Provinces and local universities on education issues (before and after the DBE)?

3. How effective was this interaction and how could be it improved? Please explain.

4. What lessons were learned from the implementation of DBE to improve involvement of the school committees to strengthen education at the school level?

5. Based on your knowledge and experience, to what extent have DBE best practices and lesson learned contributed to education policy (of the MOEC and MORA) at the local, district and national levels?

6. What lessons learned or best practices would you highlight for incorporation into any follow-up education programs?

7. Are there any additional points or comments that you would like to share with USAID about the development of future programs in basic education (in public schools and Madrasah)?

4. LPMP and P4TK

The objective of this interview is to obtain information on the perspectives and opinions of LPMPs and P4TKs on a) the performance of the DBE project and b) the identification and use of best practices and lessons learned from DBE to assist similar future projects to be more effective.

1. To begin, it would be helpful to know about the work of this LPMP /P4TK. Please tell us briefly about the amount and kinds of work that are being done. Briefly explain your own role and work in the LPMP/P4TK.

2. What challenges are currently facing your LPMP/P4TK?

3. From your perspective, what are your overall impressions of DBE projects? Please tell us what you know from your experience and knowledge, about the DBE components (DBE1, 2 and 3), their objectives and performance.

INTERVIEWER NOTES/GUIDE:

Use as necessary.

DBE1 focused on governance and management of education, principally at the District level.

DBE2 focused on student learning and teaching.

DBE3 focused, at least in its second phase, on Junior Secondary schools).

The Decentralized Basic Education Program (DBE), begun in 2005, focused on improving the quality and relevance of basic education in primary and junior secondary schools (JSS). Through technical assistance and training, the program had three goals:

- to assist local governments and communities to manage education services more effectively;
- to enhance teaching and learning to improve student performance in key subjects such as math, science and reading; and
- to ensure Indonesia's youth gain more relevant life and work skills to better compete for jobs in the modern economy.

General Questions on DBE and LPMPs/P4TKs

4. From your knowledge and experience, we would like to know if andhow the DBE districts engaged or interacted with your LPMP/P4TK. In what ways did this happen and how useful was this interaction? Please explain.

For LPMPs

5. As an institution responsible for quality assurance of education in the region, has this LPMP been involved in the quality assurance of DBE programs? If yes, please explain how?

6. As an institution responsible for quality assurance, from your perspective were DBE programs/activities equally effective in Madrasahs and public schools? In rural and urban schools? In rich and poor schools? Please explain.

7. What should the LPMP be doing to assure the quality of education provided by the schools?

For P4TKs

8. How has your P4TK been involved in in-service teacher training for schools? Please explain.

9. As an institution responsible for in-service teacher training in this region, what has this P4TK done to improve that training?

For LPMPs and P4TKs

10. Have the DBE projects had an impact on the work of your LPMP/P4TK, and if so, how (in what ways) have they affected that work? To your knowledge, has the LPMP/P4TK adopted any specific DBE ideas, methods and techniques in its own programs and if so which ones?

11. From your knowledge and experience, what activities within the DBE projects proved to be most effective? Why? Explain.

Concluding Questions

12. What recommendations would you make toimprove the working relationships (quality of interaction) with your LPMP/P4TK and future education programs?

13. What recommendations would you make to improve the materials and practices of the LPMP/P4TK? Explain.

14. Is there any other topic related to DBE and the work of LPMP/P4TK that has not been discussed here that you would like to add?

5. MOEC, MORA and KESRA

The objective of this interview is to obtain information on the perspectives and opinions from government officials on a)their sense of ownership in the DBE program, b) the usefulness/effectiveness of DBE activities on education provision, and c) inputs to policy dialogue or reform.

1. To begin, please tell us what you know about the DBE projects.

2. From your perspective, were the central offices of MORA, MOEC and KESRA sufficiently aware and encouraging of the DBE interventions, adding support to sustainability and replication of good practices? How effectively did DBE engage MOEC, MORA and KESRA in its interventions?

3. Was MOEC/MORA/KESRA involved in the planning of the DBE project from the beginning? What kinds of input did central government bodies give to the planning of DBE?

4. Please explain the approaches used by DBE to inform MOEC/MORA/KESRA of DBE interventions, progress and performance.

5. Did DBE have any 'champions' within your Ministry?

6. What could have been done more effectively by DBE to build better relationships?

For MORA

7. Has DBE's approach to Islamic education been effective? Are there any special needs/issues that should be considered for the future in order to engage effectively with MORA? Please explain.

8. What changes does MORA contemplate undertaking at the provincial and district levels to effectively participate in future programming activities? How do Madrasahs need to be supported to have an equal opportunity to perform as well as public schools?

9. What would MORA like to gain from involvement in future education programming (as they did with DBE)? How can future programming effectively engage with MORA to improve Madrasah education?

10. What are the challenges of working with Madrasahs to improve education provision (given the generally poor resources, under-qualified teachers, and centralized management of the schools)?

For All

11. Were there noticeable gender differences in program outcomes at the student level, at the school professional level, or at the district and provincial administrative staff levels? What efforts do you make to address gender differences in education at all levels?

12. To what extent are DBE interventions showing signs that they are sustainable? What are the factors influencing sustainability of good practices?

13. From your own knowledge or experience, which among the DBE activities or best practices could have the most impact on the reform of national policy? Please give you top three choices of activities that could impact education policy. Please explain why you picked these.

14. To what extent have DBE best practices at the local, district and provincial levels been fed into national education policy dialogue and reform? [Interviewer Note: "Best Practices" are learning/teaching techniques and methods that are "best" in improving the quality and effectiveness of education.]

15. Are there any elements of DBE that are to become MOEC/MORA/KESRA policy in the next year or two?

16. From the perspective of donor coordination at the central level, how have the DBE projects complemented, overlapped, and/or filled in a void in the education sector with respect to other major international donor efforts such as AusAid, the World Bank, and JICA? Which interventions have other donors adapted to complement their own programs?

17. What remaining gaps in the education sector can future programming fill?

18. What other issues about DBE do you think are important that haven't been discussed?

6. Master Teacher Trainers/Primary School Supervisors

The objectives of the interview are to collect opinions from master teacher trainers/school supervisorsabout the DBE programon: 1)the contribution of the DBE interventions to the fulfillment of minimum service standards and national standards of education in target districts; 2) the extent to which the DBE approaches have successfully improved of quality of teaching and learning in target schools; 3) the effectiveness of the partnership of Indonesian and US universities on in-service teacher training initiatives; and 4) the effectiveness of the new activities (classroom reading programs and distance education pilots) initiated post mid-term evaluation.

1. How long have you been a school supervisor or MTT in this subdistrict? When were you involved as an MTT? Please tell us briefly about your own role and work as a school supervisor/MTT?

2. What do you know about the DBE projects?

Minimum Service Standards and National Standards of Education

3. What has DBE done to contribute most to the fulfillment of Minimum Service Standards?

The Minimum Service Standards include: 1) a maximum of 32 students per class, 2)two teachers with S1 or D4 qualifications and two certified teachers in each school, 3) a principal with certification and S1 degree, 4) textbooks (Bahasa, Math, IPA, IPS) for all students, 5) one set of IPA teaching aids in each school, 6) 100 titiles of enrichment books and 10 reference book in each school, 7)teaching hours per week for each teacher: 37.5, 8) each teacher does a daily lesson plan and an evaluation program, 9) principal supervises classroom and provides feedback once a semester to every teacher, and 10) every school implements school-based management.

4. What has DBE done to contribute to the fulfillment of National Standards of Education?

The eight National Standards of Education include: 1) graduate competence, 2) content, 3) process, 4) teachers and administrative staff, 5) facilities and infrastructure, 6) education management, 7) educational financing, and 8) educational evaluation.

5. What areas of the standards has DBE made the most contribution?

6. What areas should future programming focus on to continue strengthening achievement of the standards and/or institutionalize them?

DBE approaches

7. Which interventions were most effective to improve the quality of teaching and learning in target schools?

8. What evidence is available which illustrates improved teaching and learning processes? How has this evidence been gathered?

9. How has DBE affected the roles of principals to support teaching and learning in schools?

10. Did your school receive the classroom reading program? What activities of the program were most useful and appreciated by teachers in classrooms? What were the challenges to this program?

11. Did your teachers participate in the distance education program? How was the program useful to teachers to improve their skills? What were the challenges of this program?

12. How effective is the use of the CRC to improve the quality of the teaching and learning process for the teachers in your area? What activities are available at the Centers which improve the quality of teachers? Would the addition of activities such as a reading program [including provision of books, training teachers how to teach reading activities, etc.] or a distance education program [to up-grade professional competencies or academic degrees through access to university programs] add value to the services provided by the CRCs?

13. Are you aware of any activities offered by Indonesian universities partnered with US universities through DBE2 which focused on improving teacher capacities? Which activities? [Interviewer refers to chart below for activities.] Which were most effective?

14. What do you think about the use of university partnerships to improve teacher training and improved capacity?

15. What activities would you recommend for future education programming to continue the improvement of the teaching-learning process?

7. Primary Teachers

The objective of the interview is to: obtain information from primary teachers on how DBE interventions have strengthened their ability to provide quality instruction in the classroom which results in improved student learning outcomes.

1. Please tell us what you know about the DBE project and its objectives. How long have you been involved with the DBE at your school?

2. Which DBE activities were most effective to improve your teaching ability? Explain why.

3. Which DBE activities had the least effect on your teaching ability? Explain why.

4. Which activities were most effective to improve student learning in your classroom in math, science, and language? Which activities had the least effect on improving learning in target schools? Explain why.

5. How useful was the classroom reading program to improve student abilities to read? What were the challenges to this program?

6. Was the distance education program useful for teachers to improve their teaching skills? Please explain how it helped you. What were the challenges of this program?

7. Are there noticeable gender differences in program outcomes of students at your school, at the district, and province levels? As a result of DBE, what efforts do you make to encourage equal opportunities and equal outcomes for male and female students in your classroom and school?

8. How has DBE assisted the school principal to support teaching and learning in your school?

9. How has the DBE strengthened planning and management at your school? Do you feel your school is a better provider of education because of DBE efforts to improve education planning and management? Have you personally been involved in the school planning and management process?

10. What activities of the DBE program should be replicated in other schools because they are effective and improve the education the students receive? Do you know of any DBE activities that have become official education policy by the MOEC or MORA?

11. What would you say are best practices of the DBE project? What would you say are lessons learned of the DBE project?

12. In your opinion, what new activities in future programming would continue to improve teacher capacity and student learning?

13. Do you have any other comments you would like to add about the DBE program?

8. School Committees (SC)

The objectives of the interview are togather information: a) about the impact of the DBE program on schools, especially on school governance, b) about the most and least effective elements of the DBE, c) about best practices and lessons learned about project implementation, and d) gain any suggestions for implementation of future projects (PRIORITAS).

1. As a member of a school committee, what activities have you been involved in at the school?

2. Did you receive any training to carry out your responsibilities? What was the nature of the training and who provided it? How was the training useful? Were there any elements of the training that you think should be improved?

3. From your perspective as a SC member, what activities within the DBE project proved to be the most effective? Why?

4. What activities within the DBE appear to have been the least effective? Why?

5. What were the main elements of the DBE approach to support planning and strengthen management? How successful was this component of DBE? Please explain.

6. How effective was the effort expended by the DBE to increase the capacity of personnel at the school level? Please explain how capacity was improved.

7. Which DBE program elements were most successful and why?

8. Which DBE program elements were less successful and why?

9. What are the best practices (activities that worked well) from the implementation of DBE?

10. What are the lessons learned from the implementation of DBE?

11. What elements of the DBE program should be incorporated into any follow-on program?

12. What recommendations would you make to improve interventions for any future projects? Could you suggest new activities that might make future programs more effective?

13. What factors influence the prospects for a program element to become sustainable?

14. What could have been done more effectively by DBE to build better engagement with local government, DINAS and Community stakeholders?

9. School Principals (MOEC and MORA)

The objectives of the interview are to: a) gain an understanding of the principal's involvement in DBE and what impact DBE interventions have had, both positive and negative, on student learning, school governance, and school planning, b) gather opinions and facts about the most and least effective elements of DBE; and c) gather information about best practices and lessons learned that can be applied to any future program, especially PRIORITAS.

1. Please tell us about you and your school (number of students, teachers, the school committee, number of years as a principal at school, etc.).

2. Please explain what type of DBE activities you and your school have participated.

3. From your perspective, what activities within the DBE project proved to be the most effective in your school? Why? (Please try to examine all three components of DBE.)

4. What activities within the DBE appear to have had little or no effect? Why?(Please try to examine all three components of DBE.)

5. Please explain how capacity of teachers was improved through DBE interventions.

6. How useful is the CRC to improve the teaching-learning process? What suggestions can you make to improve the role of the CRC to be a service provider for teacher training for the schools in the area?

7. How effective was the DBE to improve community participation and school governance? Please explain how capacity was improved.

8. How could a partnership with a university assist to improve teachers' capacity?

9. Has the District made any effort to replicate the DBE program within the District in other sub-districts and schools? What has been your role in the replication of DBE best practices and how successful has that been? What activities should be replicated?

10. How can DBE or any follow-up program improve communication and coordination with the District (and/or Provincial and Central Governments)?

11. What lessons learned or best practices would you highlight for incorporation into USAID's next program?

12. Are there any additional points or comments that you would like to make to inform USAID, DBE, and the development of future programs in basic education?

10. Junior Secondary Teachers

The objective of the interview is to obtain information from junior secondary teachers on how DBE interventions have improved the quality and relevancy of education for youth through the 'whole school approach.'

1. Please tell us what you know about the DBE project and its objectives. How long have you been involved with the DBE at your school?

2. As you understand it, how effective was the whole school approach to improve education for the students of your junior secondary school(s)? Do you feel quality and relevance of the education the student's received as a result of the whole school approach has improved? [Check for teacher's understanding of quality and relevance.]

3. How effective were DBE in-service training activities to improve your teaching ability? Explain why.

4. Which DBE activities had the least effect on your teaching ability? Explain why.[Refer to the accompanying chart of activities.]

5. Which activities were most effective to improve student learning in your classroom in math, science, and language?

6. Which activities had the least effect on improving learning in target schools? Explain why.

7. Did principals in your schools receive training on school management? Has their training strengthened their support to teaching and learning in your school? What examples can you give that illustrate their increased capacity and motivation to provide instructional leadership to the school?

8. Has your school received gender training from the DBE project? As a result of participation in DBE, what efforts do you make to encourage equal opportunities and equal outcomes for male and female students in your classroom and school?

9. Have you been able to participate in the in-service training provided for teachers for professional development? Which activities did you find most useful personally?

10. What best practices from the DBE whole school model would you recommend to the Government of Indonesia as a way to respond to the needs of the junior secondary education sector?

11. In your opinion, what new activities in future programming would continue to improve teacher capacity and student learning at the junior secondary level?

12. Do you have additional comments you would like to add about the DBE whole school approach and teaching and learning?

11. Universities (Module Development Teams, Service Providers, and University Point-of-Contacts)

The objective of this interview is to obtain information on the perspectives and opinions of university personnel who worked with DBE about a) teachers' development through in-service training activities, b) pre-service teacher preparation, and c) university cooperation with U.S universities, provinces and districts, and donors.

1. Please tell us about the involvement of your university with DBE projects/activities. When was the university involved in DBE activities? What were your university's roles in the DBE activities? [Interviewer: please reference the List of University Activities below.] Within those activities what were your roles?

List of University Activities (DBE2)			
	University-accredited teacher training		Indonesia/US university partnerships
	Curriculum and instructional program development		Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE)
	Distance education pilot		Digital library provision
	Study tours/fellowships		On-line course development
	Education research		Educational ICT

Teacher Development

2. What best practices from in-service teacher professional development activities were gained from DBE? What lessons were learned? [Interviewer note: 'Best Practices' are learning/teaching techniques and methods that are 'best' in improving the quality and effectiveness of education.]

3. How can progress made in in-service teacher professional development be institutionalized by schools? Who are the most important/best parties (persons) to enhance the institutionalization of these practices? What would be their roles?

4. What additional resources (financial and human) and technical assistance would the university need in order to strengthen their own capacity to provide teacher professional development services?

5. What kinds of activities can the university do with their own resources to improve their teacher professional development services?

6. What best practices from the Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE) initiative can strengthen teacher preparation at the university? What were the lessons learned from participation with DBE in this initiative?

7. How can efforts made in training of active learning methodology at the school level be institutionalized by universities? Please explain.

Pre-service Teacher Preparation

8. What best practices from in-service teacher professional development activities, a major focus of the DBE, can strengthen pre-service teacher preparation? What lessons were learned?

Indonesian and U.S. Universities partnerships

9. Which interventions, if any, from the partnership between Indonesian and U.S. universities, contributed most effectively to DBE teacher training initiatives?

10. How does or can the University Consortium (the KTIPT Working Group) contribute to the improvement and continuation of teacher professional development in Indonesia?

Coordination and Sustainability

11. How effective was the working relationship between your university (including the work you did) and the DBE?

12. What role do the universities have in the sustainability of the DBE interventions both to teachers and to pre-service teacher preparation?

13. What needs to be done to strengthen the relationship between universities and the district education offices to enable a continuous process of teacher professional development?

14. How could the professional development relationship between the university and similar future projects be improved? Please give suggestions.

15. Are there any additional comments you would like to make, that have not been discussed, on these subjects?

12. Junior Secondary School Principals

The objective of the interview is to obtain information from junior secondary school principals on how DBE interventions have strengthened their ability to manage schools and improve student learning outcomes.

1. Please tell us briefly about your work as principal of this junior secondary school. What work takes up most of your time in your role as principal? When did you begin here? Were you a principal at another junior secondary school or primary school before you came to this school?

2. Please tell us what you know about the DBE project and its objectives. How were you and your school involved in the project? When did this begin?

3. What type of training did you receive through DBE? What skills and knowledge of your own were improved as a result of involvement with DBE? What activities helped you most to improve?

4. The second half of the DBE3 project focused on a 'whole school approach' to improve the quality and relevancy of education for youth. From your perspective, to what extent was this approach to quality and relevance successful? Why?

5. How has the DBE strengthened education planning and management at your school? How have DBE efforts made your school a better provider of education by improving the planning and management capacity of the people involved in your school (supervisors, school committee, teachers, and parents)? Has the financial management of the school improved as a result of these efforts? If yes, please explain.

6. How effective were the DBE interventions in improving your own teaching ability and those of the teachers in your school?

7. What DBE activities had the most effect on improving student learning and which were the least effective? How was student learning measured?

8. Please explain about your school's relationship or liaison with the community and parents. Did DBE interventions improve this relationship in any way? If yes, how?

9. In your opinion, did the DBE program adequately contribute to the education of junior secondary students to obtain employment in the future? Please explain. How do you know this? [Evidence?] Share any cases/specific stories.

10. What do you think about the teacher certification requirement of the MOEC and how do most teachers at your school plan to meet those requirements?

11. From your perspective, should local universities assist schools by offering in-service professional development and teaching qualifications? Has your school been assisted? If yes, how? Please explain.

12. How can the relationship between junior secondary schools and universities be facilitated to improve the services they offer to educators?

13. What activities of the DBE program should be replicated in other junior secondary schools? What new activities in future programming would continue to improve teacher capacity and student learning?

14. Is there any other information that you think it is important that we should know that we have not yet discussed.

13. DINAS and MORA Officials (Focus Group Discussion)

The objective of this group interview is to obtain information from district education officers in MOEC and MORA on how DBE interventions have strengthened their ability to manage schools and improve student learning outcomes.

1. Please tell us what you know about the DBE project and its objectives. How were you and your schools involved in the project?

2. What significant changes have you seen in schools as a result of the DBE program? How have DBE efforts made your district a better provider of education by improving planning and management capacity of people involved in your district or schools (planners, inspectors, supervisors, school committee, teachers, and parents)? What skills or knowledge were improved as a result of involvement in DBE? What activities helped the district to improve most?

3. How effective were the DBE interventions to improve teaching ability in the schools? What skills or knowledge were improved as a result of involvement in DBE? What activities helped the district to improve most?

4. Did student learning in math, science, and language improve in the district as a result of involvement in the DBE activities? Which activities had the most effect on improving student learning and which were least effective? How did you measure student learning gains?

5. What do you think about the teacher certification requirement of the MOEC and how do most teachers at your school plan to meet these requirements? In your opinion, should local universities assist schools by offering in-service professional development and teaching qualifications? How can the relationship between districts, schools and universities be facilitated to improve the services they offer to educators?

6. What activities of the DBE program should be replicated in other schools because they are effective and improve the planning and management of schools and the education the students receive? What replication of the DBE program has occurred in your district and/or what plans do you have to replicate the DBE program? How have you been able to assure quality in the replication of programs in the district?

7. From your perspective, what was the 'whole school approach' and how effective was it in improving junior secondary education? What good practices can be gained from the whole school approach that will assist the GOI to meet the needs of early secondary education throughout the country?

14. Primary Principals (Focus Group Discussion)

The objective of this group interview is to obtain information from primary principals on how DBE interventions have strengthened their ability to manage schools and improve student learning outcomes.

1. Please tell us what you know about the DBE project and its objectives. How were you and your school involved in the project?

2. What significant changes have you had in your school as a result of the DBE program? How have DBE efforts made your school a better provider of education by improving planning and management capacity of people involved in your school (supervisors, school committee, teachers, and parents)?

3. How has the DBE program affected your work as a principal? How has the DBE strengthened education planning and management at your school? How effective were the DBE interventions to improve your own teaching ability or those of the teachers in your school? What skills or knowledge did you improve as a result of involvement in DBE? What activities helped you the most to improve? What challenges have you faced in implementing DBE components?

4. Did student learning in math, science, and language improve as a result of involvement in the DBE activities? Which activities had the most effect on improving student learning and which were least effective? How did you measure student learning gains?

5. What do you think about the teacher certification requirement of the MOEC and how do most teachers at your school plan to meet these requirements? In your opinion, should local universities assist schools by offering in-service professional development and teaching qualifications? How can the relationship between schools and universities be facilitated to improve the services they offer to educators?

6. What activities of the DBE program should be replicated in other schools because they are effective and improve the education the students receive? What new activities in future programming would continue to improve teacher capacity and student learning?

15. Primary Teachers (Focus Group Discussion)

The objective of the group interview is to obtain information from primary teachers on how DBE interventions have strengthened their ability to provide quality instruction in the classroom which results in improved student learning outcomes.

1. Please tell us what you know about the DBE project and its objectives. How were you and your school involved in the project?

2. How effective were the DBE interventions to improve your own teaching ability? What skills or knowledge did you improve as a result of involvement in DBE? What activities helped you the most to improve?

3. Did student learning in math, science, and language improve as a result of involvement in the DBE activities? Which activities had the most effect on improving student learning and which were least effective? How did you measure student learning gains?

4. How has the DBE strengthened education planning and management at your school? How haveDBE efforts made your school a better provider of education by improving planning and management capacity of people involved in your school [for example, the principal, supervisors, school committee, education boards, and parents] ? Have you personally been involved in the school planning and management process?

5. What do you think about the teacher certification requirement of the MOEC and how do you plan to meet these requirements? In your opinion, should local universities assist schools by offering in-service professional development? How can the relationship between schools and universities be facilitated to improve the services they offer to educators?

6. What activities of the DBE program should be replicated in other schools because they are effective and improve the education the students receive? What new activities in future programming would continue to improve teacher capacity and student learning?

16. Junior Secondary School Principals (Focus Group Discussion)

The objectives of the interview are to obtain information from junior secondary school principals on how DBE interventions have strengthened their ability to manage schools and improve student learning outcomes.

1. Please tell us briefly about your work as principal of this junior secondary school. What work takes up most of your time in your role as principal? When did you begin here? Were you a principal at another junior secondary school or primary school before you came to this school?

2. Please tell us what you know about the DBE project and its objectives. How were you and your school involved in the project? When did this begin?

3. What type of training did you receive through DBE? What skills and knowledge of your own were improved as a result of involvement with DBE? What activities helped you most to improve?

4. The second half of the DBE3 project focused on a 'whole school approach' to improve the quality and relevancy of education for youth. From your perspective, to what extent was this approach to quality and relevance successful? Why? [Interviewer Note: Please use rating scale as a visual aid if appropriate].

5. How has the DBE strengthened education planning and management at your school? How have DBE efforts made your school a better provider of education by improving the planning and management capacity of the people involved in your school (supervisors, school committee, teachers, and parents)? Has the financial management of the school improved as a result of these efforts? If yes, please explain.

6. How effective were the DBE interventions in improving your own teaching ability and those of the teachers in your school?

7. What DBE activities had the most effect on improving student learning and which were the least effective? How was student learning measured?

8. Please explain about your school's relationship or liaison with the community and parents. Did DBE interventions improve this relationship in any way? If yes, how?

9. In your opinion, did the DBE program adequately contribute to the education of junior secondary students' to obtain employment in the future? Please explain. How do you know this? [What evidence?] Share any cases/specific stories.

10. What do you think about the teacher certification requirement of the MOEC and how do most teachers at your school plan to meet those requirements?

11. From your perspective, should local universities assist schools by offering in-service professional development and teaching qualifications? Has your school been assisted? If yes, how? Please explain.

12. How can the relationship between junior secondary schools and universities be facilitated to improve the services they offer to educators?

13. What activities of the DBE program should be replicated in other junior secondary schools? What new activities in future programming would continue to improve teacher capacity and student learning?

14. Is there any other information that you think it is important that we should know that we have not yet discussed.

17. Universities (Module Development Team, Service Provider, and University Point-of-Contact) (Focus Group Discussion)

The objective of this interview is to obtain information on the perspectives and opinions of university personnel who worked with DBE, about a) teachers' development through in-service training activities, b) pre-service teacher preparation, and c) university cooperation with U.S universities, provinces and districts, and donors.

1. Please tell us about the involvement of your university with DBE projects/activities. When was the university involved in DBE activities? What were your university's roles in the DBE activities? [Interviewer: please note the List of University Activities below.] Within those activities what were your roles?

List of University Activities (DBE2)			
	University-accredited teacher training		Indonesia/US university partnerships
	Curriculum and instructional program development		Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE)
	Distance education pilot		Digital library provision
	Study tours/fellowships		On-line course development
	Education research		Educational ICT

Teacher Development

2. What best practices from in-service teacher professional development activities were gained from DBE? What lessons were learned? [Interviewer Note: "Best Practices" are learning/teaching techniques and methods that are "best" in improving the quality and effectiveness of education.]

3. What kinds of activities can the university do with their own resources to improve their teacher professional development services?

Pre-service Teacher Preparation

4. What best practices from in-service teacher professional development activities gained from university participation with DBE can strengthen pre-service teacher preparation? What lessons were learned?

Indonesian and U.S. Universities Partnerships

5. Which interventions, if any, from Indonesian universities twinned with U.S. universities contributed most effectively to DBE teacher training initiatives?

6. How does or can the University Consortium (the KTIPT Working Group) contribute to the improvement and continuation of teacher professional development in Indonesia?

Coordination and Sustainability

7. What role do the universities have in the sustainability of the DBE interventions both to teachers and to pre-service teacher preparation?

8. How effective was the working relationship between your university (including the work you did) and the DBE? What needs to be done to strengthen the relationship between universities and the district education offices to enable an on-going process of teacher professional development?

9. Are there any additional comments you would like to make, that have not been discussed, on these subjects?

Annex 6: Result of Teacher Surveys

ALL PROVINCES PRIMARY TEACHER SURVEY TALLY

General Information

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
Grades	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
1	1	4.16%	5	6	14.28%	4	6	18.18%	1	13	13.13%	4
2	4	16.66%	2	2	4.76%	6	6	18.18%	1	12	12.12%	6
3	4	16.66%	2	3	7.14%	5	6	18.18%	1	13	13.13%	4
4	9	37.50%	1	9	21.43%	2	5	15.15%	4	23	23.23%	1
5	4	16.66%	2	8	19.05%	3	5	15.15%	4	17	17.17%	2
6	1	4.16%	5	10	23.81%	1	4	12.12%	5	15	15.15%	3
Tenure												
1 - 2 Years	3	12.50%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3.03%	4
3 - 4 Years	1	4.16&	4	6	14.28%	3	1	3.03%	3	8	8.08%	3
5 - 10 Years	7	29.16%	2	11	26.19%	2	10	30.30%	2	28	28.28%	2
> 10 Years	9	37.50%	1	17	40.48%	1	17	51.51%	1	43	43.43%	1
Highest Degree												
SMA	2	8.33%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.02%	4
Diploma	5	20.83%	2	5	11.90%	2	8	24.24%	2	18	18.18%	2
S1	17	70.83%	1	29	69.05%	1	20	60.60%	1	66	66.67%	1
S2	0	0%	0	2	4.76%	3	1	3.03%	3	3	3.03%	3
Certification												
Yes	12	50%	1	17	40.48%	2	19	57.57%	1	48	48.48%	1
No	9	37.50%	2	24	57.14%	1	14	42.42%	2	47	47.47%	2
Subject Matter												
Islam / Arabic	2	8.33%	2	1	2.38%	2	1	3.03%	2	4	4.04%	2
Maths	1	4.16%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.01%	3
Science	1	4.16%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.01%	3
Classroom	13	54.16%	1	14	33.33%	1	8	24.24%	1	35	35.35%	1
Art	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	2	0	0	0	1	1.01%	3
Thematic	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	2	0	0	0	1	1.01%	3
Civics	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	2	0	0	0	1	1.01%	3
ICT	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	1	3.03%	2	1	1.01%	3

Q1: HOW MANY YEARS DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE DBE PROGRAMS?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
1. # of Years DBE	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
1 - 3 Years	9	37.50%	2	13	30.95%	2	10	30.30%	2	32	32.32%	2
4 - 6 Years	15	62.50%	1	26	61.90%	1	23	69.69%	1	64	64.64%	1

Q2: WHICH DBE ACTIVITIES DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
2. Participation	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Teacher Training in ICT	21	87.50%	2	36	85.71%	2	26	78.78%	3	83	83.83%	3
Active Learning with ICT	19	79.16%	4	35	83.33%	3	23	69.69%	4	77	77.78%	4
Active Learning Training	22	91.66%	1	41	97.62%	1	29	87.87%	1	92	92.92%	1
Subject Training	20	80.33%	3	35	83.33%	3	29	87.87%	1	84	84.84%	2
ICT Master Teacher Training	13	54.16%	8	9	21.43%	10	7	21.21%	9	29	29.29%	10
Mentoring / Coaching	17	70.83%	5	35	83.33%	3	7	21.21%	9	59	59.59%	5
Training & Resources @ CRCs	8	33.33%	9	17	40.48%	7	10	30.30%	7	35	35.35%	8
Professional Development T.	6	25%	10	12	28.57%	9	14	42.42%	6	32	32.32%	9
Accredited University T.	0	0	0	6	14.28%	11	2	6.06%	11	8	8.08	11
Reading Program: Books	15	62.50%	6	21	50.00%	6	19	57.57%	5	55	55.55%	6
Teacher Training: Reading	14	58.33%	7	15	35.71%	8	8	24.24%	8	37	37.37%	7
Leadership Training	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
School Committee Training	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	12	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
School Management Training	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	12	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12

Q3: WHICH DBE ACTIVITIES WERE MOST EFFECTIVE TO IMPROVE YOUR INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS IN THE CLASSROOM?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
3. Teaching Effectiveness	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Teacher Training in ICT	15	62.50%	4	27	64.28%	4	20	60.60%	4	62	62.62%	4
Active Learning with ICT	19	79.16%	3	32	76.19%	2	24	72.72%	3	75	75.75%	3
Active Learning Training	21	87.50%	2	37	88.09%	1	26	78.79%	2	84	84.84%	1
Subject Training	22	91.66%	1	32	76.19%	2	27	81.81%	1	81	81.81%	2
ICT Master Teacher Training	9	37.50%	6	9	21.43%	7	9	27.27%	7	27	27.27%	7
Mentoring / Coaching	14	58.33%	5	22	52.38%	5	1	3.03%	11	37	37.37%	6
Training & Resources @ CRCs	1	4.16%	10	6	14.28%	10	9	27.27%	7	16	16.16%	10
Professional Development T.	2	8.33%	9	8	19.05%	8	11	33.33%	6	21	21.21%	9
Accredited University T.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.06%	10	2	2.02%	11
Reading Program: Books	7	29.16%	7	20	47.62%	6	13	39.39%	5	40	40.40%	5
Teacher Training: Reading	6	25%	8	8	19.05%	8	9	27.27%	7	23	23.23%	8
Leadership Training	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
School Committee Training	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	11	0	0	0	1	1.01%	12
School Management Training	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	11	0	0	0	1	1.01%	12
Child psychology	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	1	3.03%	11	1	1.01%	12

Q4: WHICH OF YOUR TEACHING SKILLS IMPROVED THE MOST?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
4. Teaching Improvement	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Providing guidance feedback	7	29.16%	5	12	28.57%	7	15	45.45%	4	34	34.34%	5
Classroom management	13	54.16%	2	26	61.90%	1	17	51.51%	3	56	56.56%	1
Promoting student reflection	8	33.33%	4	20	47.62%	2	20	60.60%	1	48	48.48%	3
Question/Discussion/Voice	17	70.83%	1	16	38.09%	4	19	57.57%	2	52	52.52%	2
Collaborative Learning	12	50%	3	17	40.48%	3	9	27.27%	5	38	38.38%	4
Material use & development	6	25%	6	16	38.09%	4	7	21.21%	6	29	29.29%	6
Lesson Planning	6	25%	6	16	38.09%	4	3	9.09%	7	25	25.25%	7
Multiple forms of assessment	2	8.33%	8	3	7.14%	8	3	9.09%	7	8	8.08%	8
Instructional resources use	2	8.33%	8	0	0	0	2	6.06%	10	4	4.04%	9
Learner-centered instruction	1	4.16%	10	0	0	0	3	9.09%	7	4	4.04%	9
Multiple technology use	0	0	0	2	4.76%	9	2	6.06%	10	4	4.04%	9
Cooperating with community	0	0	0	1	2.38%	10	0	0	0	1	1.01%	12

Q5: HOW EFFECTIVE WERE THE DBE INTERVENTIONS IN IMPROVING STUDENT LEARNING IN MATH, SCIENCE AND LANGUAGE?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
5. Improved Student Learning	Ave.	%	Rank	Ave.	%	Rank	Ave.	%	Rank	Ave	%	Rank
Maths Improvement	7.41	74.11%	3	6.05	60.50%	3	7.15	71.51%	3	6.87	68.70%	3
Science Improvement	8.11	81.11%	1	7.21	72.10%	2	7.63	76.36%	1	7.65	76.50%	2
Language Improvement	8	80.00%	2	7.38	73.80%	1	7.61	76.13%	2	7.66	76.63%	1

Q6: WHAT DBE ACTIVITIES WERE THE MOST EFFECTIVE TO IMPROVE STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN ANY SUBJECT?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
6. Learning Effectiveness	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Teacher Training in ICT	2	8.33%	4	1	2.38%	12	1	3.03%	9	4	4.04%	10
Active Learning with ICT	4	16.66%	2	10	23.81%	1	4	12.12%	5	18	18.18%	2
Active Learning Training	12	50%	1	6	14.28%	5	11	33.33%	1	29	29.29%	1
Subject Training	4	16.66%	2	4	9.52%	9	2	6.06%	7	10	10.10%	7
ICT Master Teacher Training	0	0	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	14
Mentoring / Coaching	0	0	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	14
Training & Resources @ CRCs	0	0	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	14
Professional Development T.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.06%	7	2	2.02%	12
Accredited University T.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Reading Program: Books	0	0	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	14
Teacher Training: Reading	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Providing guidance feedback	1	4.16%	7	6	14.28%	5	5	15.15%	3	12	12.12%	5
Classroom management	0	0	0	2	4.76%	10	3	9.09%	6	5	5.05%	10
Promoting student reflection	0	0	0	8	19.05%	3	5	15.15%	3	13	13.13%	4
Question/Discussion/Voice	1	4.16%	7	8	19.05%	3	8	24.24%	2	17	17.17%	3
Collaborative Learning	2	8.33%	4	9	21.43%	2	1	3.03%	9	12	12.12%	5
Material use & development	0	0	0	5	11.90%	8	1	3.03%	9	6	6.06%	9
Lesson Planning	2	8.33%	4	6	14.28%	5	0	0	0	8	8.08%	8
Multiple forms of assessment	0	0	0	2	4.76%	10	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
Instructional resources use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Learner-centered instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Multiple technology use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
School management	0	0	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	14

Q7: WHAT ACTIVITIES OF THE DBE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE REPLICATED IN OTHER SCHOOLS?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
7. Best to Replicate	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Teacher Training in ICT	2	8.33%	5	5	11.90%	5	5	15.15%	2	12	12.12%	5
Active Learning with ICT	5	20.83%	3	5	11.90%	5	5	15.15%	2	15	15.15%	2
Active Learning Training	7	29.16%	2	12	28.57%	1	5	15.15%	2	24	24.24%	1
Subject Training	8	33.33%	1	2	4.76%	15	3	9.09%	9	13	13.13%	3
ICT Master Teacher Training	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.03%	14	1	1.01%	17
Mentoring / Coaching	0	0	0	3	7.14%	11	1	3.03%	14	4	4.04%	14
Training & Resources @ CRCs	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12.12%	6	4	4.04%	14
Professional Development T.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.03%	14	1	1.01%	17
Accredited University T.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Reading Program: Books	0	0	0	4	9.52%	9	2	6.06%	11	6	6.06%	11
Teacher Training: Reading	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Providing guidance feedback	0	0	0	3	7.14%	11	2	6.06%	11	5	5.05%	12
Classroom management	3	12.50%	4	4	9.52%	9	6	18.18%	1	13	13.13%	3
Promoting student reflection	1	4.16%	7	5	11.90%	5	3	9.09%	9	9	9.09%	9
Question/Discussion/Voice	2	8.33%	5	6	14.28%	2	2	6.06%	11	10	10.10%	6
Collaborative Learning	0	0	0	6	14.28%	2	4	12.12%	6	10	10.10%	6
Material use & development	0	0	0	3	7.14%	11	5	15.15%	2	8	8.08%	10
Lesson Planning	0	0	0	5	11.90%	5	0	0	0	5	5.05%	12
Multiple forms of assessment	0	0	0	3	7.14%	11	0	0	0	3	3.03%	16
Instructional resources use	1	4.16%	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.01%	17
Learner-centered instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Multiple technology use	0	0	0	6	14.28%	2	4	12.12%	6	10	10.10%	6

Q8: WHAT NEW ACTIVITIES IN FUTURE PROGRAMMING WOULD IMPROVE TEACHER CAPACITY & STUDENT LEARNING?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 33)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 99)		
8. Future Activities	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
TT w/ ICT	12	50.00%	1	6	14.28%	3	7	21.21%	1	25	25.25%	1
ICT MTT training	1	4.16%	4	0	0	0	2	6.06%	7	3	3.03%	9
Add school facilities as needed	1	4.16%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
Integrated & continuous trainings with room for teacher sharing	1	4.16%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
Continuous AL training	1	4.16%	4	0	0	0	1	3.03%	10	2	2.02%	12
Cheap teaching aids	1	4.16%	4	3	7.14%	5	1	3.03%	10	5	5.05%	6
AL & TT w/ ICT	1	4.16%	4	1	2.38%	12	5	15.15%	2	7	7.07%	4
TT as motivator	1	4.16%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
AL w/ ICT for all subjects	2	8.33%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
Use cooperative learning (Jigsaw & Investigative)	1	4.16%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
Mentoring training	2	8.33%	2	0	0	0	1	3.03%	10	3	3.03%	9
AL w/ ICT	1	4.16%	4	1	2.38%	12	4	12.12%	3	6	6.06%	5
Professional Development Training	0	0.00%	0	10	23.81%	1	1	3.03%		11	11.11%	2
Accredited University Training	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	6	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
Classroom management	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
School-based management	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	6	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
Finance management	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
Integrate civics w/ AL	0	0.00%	0	7	16.67%	2	3	9.09%	5	10	10.10%	3
Learning through environment	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
Question/Discussion/Voice	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	12	1	3.03%	10	2	2.02%	12
Provide more books for children	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	12	0	0	0	1	1.01%	21
Subject matter strengthening	0	0.00%	0	4	9.52%	4	1	3.03%	10	5	5.05%	6
Transfer good teachers to other schools	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	6	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
Organise quality teacher working group	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	6	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
Student's work from used materials	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	6	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
Effective trainings as needed by teachers	0	0.00%	0	2	4.76%	6	0	0	0	2	2.02%	12
DBE should facilitate research for teacher	0	0.00%	0	1	2.38%	12	2	6.06%	7	1	1.01%	21
Leadership training	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	1	3.03%	10	1	1.01%	21
Multiple technology use	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	4	12.12%	3	4	4.04%	8
Classroom Action Research	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	3	9.09%	5	3	3.03%	9
Math & science kit training	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	2	6.06%	7	2	2.02%	12
Child psychology training	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	1	3.03%	10	1	1.01%	21

Q9: ANY OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT DBE AND TEACHING & LEARNING?

	CENTRAL JAVA (n = 24)			SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 42)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 66)		
9. Remarks	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
DBE assignments are time & energy consuming	1	4.16%	2	0	0	0	1	1.51%	5
Expand AL w/ ICT	1	4.16%	2	0	0	0	1	1.51%	5
Teachers need to apply DBE in class	1	4.16%	2	0	0	0	1	1.51%	5
TT w/ ICT to make AL w/ ICT	1	4.16%	2	0	0	0	1	1.51%	5
Modern learning media	1	4.16%	2	5	11.90%	1	6	9.09%	2
DBE is good	4	33.33%	1	4	9.52%	2	8	12.12%	1
Non-civil teachers should improve performance	1	4.16%	2	0	0	0	1	1.51%	5
Spread teaching aids to other DBE schools besides main schl	0	0	0	2	4.76%	3	2	3.03%	3
DBE funds programs proposed by schools	0	0	0	1	2.38%	5	1	1.51%	5
DBE should increase professional teacher trainings	0	0	0	1	2.38%	5	1	1.51%	5
Classroom management	0	0	0	2	4.76%	3	2	3.03%	3
School-based management	0	0	0	1	2.38%	5	1	1.51%	5
Maintain & improve education	0	0	0	1	2.38%	5	1	1.51%	5

LEGEND:

AL = Active Learning

ICT = Information & Communication Technology

MTT = Master Teacher Trainer

CRC = Cluster Resource Center

TT = Teacher Training

Explanation of Primary Teacher Survey

General Information

- Of 99 state primary & madrasah teacher respondents in Central Java, South Sulawesi and North Sumatera, 23 people (23.23%) were 4th grade teachers, 17 people (17.17%) were 5th grade teachers and 15 people (15.15%) were 6th grade teachers. Six teachers (6.06%) did not answer the question.

- 43 people (43.43%) had tenure of more than 10 years and 28 people (28.28%) had tenure of 5 to 10 years. Four teachers (16.66%) did not answer the question.

- 66 people (66.67%) had Bachelors degree and 18 people (18.18%) had Diplomas. Ten people (10.10%) did not answer the question.

- 48 people (48.48%) were certified and 47 people (47.47%) people were not certified. Four teachers (4.04%) did not answer.

- 35 people (35.35%) were classroom teachers and 4 people (4.04%) were religion teachers. Fifty-four teachers (54.54%) did not answer the question.

Q1: How many years did you participate in the DBE programs?

Of the 99 teacher respondents, 64 people (64.64%) were involved in DBE for 4 to 6 years and 32 people (32.32%) were involved for 1 to 3 years. Three teachers (3.03%) did not answer the question.

Q2: Which DBE activities did you participate in?

Of the 99 teacher respondents, 92 people (92.92%) participated in AL Training, 84 people (84.84%) participated in Subject Matter Training, 83 people (83.83%) participated in TT with ICT, 77 people (77.78%) participated in AL with ICT, 59 people (59.59%) participated in Mentoring / Coaching Training and 55 people (55.55%) participated in Reading Program with Books in Classroom. No teachers participated in Leadership Training.

Q3: Which DBE activities were most effective to improve your instructional skills in the classroom?

Of the 99 teacher respondents, 84 people (84.84%) said AL Training, 81 people (81.81%) said Subject Training, 75 people (75.75%) said AL with ICT and 62 people (62.62%) said TT with ICT. No teachers said Leadership Training was effective for teaching.

Q4: Which of your teaching skills improved the most?

Of the 99 teacher respondents, 56 people (56.56%) said Classroom Management and 52 people (52.52%) said the Question, Discussion and Student Voice.

Q5: How effective were the DBE interventions in improving student learning in Math, Science and Language?

From an average scale of 1 to 10, 94 teachers feel Math Learning improved 68.70%, 96 teachers feel Science Learning improved 76.50%, and 92 teachers feel Language Learning improved 76.63%.
Four (4) teachers did not answer for Math, 3 teachers did not answer for Science and 6 teachers did not answer for Language questions.

Q6: What DBE activities were most effective to improve student performance in any subject?

Of the 99 teacher respondents, 29 people (29.29%) said AL Training, 18 people (18.18%) said AL with ICT, 17 people (17.17%) said Question, Discussion & Student Voice and 13 people (13.13%) said Promoting Student Reflection. No teacher said Accredited University Training, TT for Reading, Use of Instructional Resources, Learner-centered Instruction and Use of Multiple Technology were effective for student learning.

Q7: What activities of the DBE programs should be replicated in other schools?

Of the 99 teacher respondents, 24 people (24.24%) said AL Training, 15 people (15.15%) said AL with ICT, 13 people (13.13%) said Subject Training, 13 people (13.13%) said Classroom Management and 12 people (12.12%) said TT in ICT. No teacher said Accredited University Training, TT for Reading and Learner-centered Instruction should be replicated.

Q8: What new activities in future programming would improve teacher capacity and student learning?

Of the 99 teacher respondents, 25 people (25.25%) said "TT with ICT", 11 people (11.11%) said "Professional Development Training", 10 people (10.10%) said "Integrate civics with AL", 7 people (7.07%) said "AL & TT with ICT" and 6 people (6.06%) said "AL with ICT".

Q9: Any other comments about DBE and teaching & learning?

Of the 66 teacher respondents (Central Java & South Sulawesi), 8 people (12.12%) said "DBE is good" and 6 people (9.09%) said "(provide) modern learning media [parentheses added]". Thirty-nine (59.09%) teachers did not leave any remarks.

ALL PROVINCES JUNIOR SECONDARY TEACHER SURVEY TALLY

General Information

	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
Grades	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
VII	11	30.55%	2	13	30.23%	3	24	30.38%	3
VIII	11	30.55%	2	15	34.88%	1	26	32.91%	2
IX	14	38.89%	1	14	32.56%	2	28	35.44%	1
Tenure									
1 - 2 Years	0	0	0	2	4.65%	3	2	2.53%	4
3 - 4 Years	2	5.56%	3	1	2.32%	4	3	3.79%	3
5 - 10 Years	8	22.22%	2	12	27.91%	2	20	25.32%	2
> 10 Years	16	44.44%	1	23	53.48%	1	39	49.37%	1
Highest Degree									
SMA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Diploma	0	0.00%	0	2	4.65%	2	2	2.53%	3
S1	28	77.78%	1	37	86.05%	1	65	82.28%	1
S2	4	11.11%	2	2	4.65%	2	6	7.59%	2
Certification									
Yes	32	88.89%	1	32	74.42%	1	64	81.01%	1
No	3	8.33%	2	10	23.26%	2	13	16.46%	2
Subject Matter									
Islam / Arabic	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	5	1	1.27%	6
Maths	7	19.44%	2	8	18.60%	2	15	18.99%	3
Science	8	22.22%	1	10	23.26%	1	18	22.78%	1
Social Science	6	16.67%	5	6	13.95%	4	12	15.19%	5
English	7	19.44%	2	10	23.26%	1	17	21.52%	2
Indonesian	7	19.44%	2	7	16.28%	3	14	17.72%	4
Local language	1	2.78%	6	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	6
Civics	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	5	1	1.27%	6

Q1: HOW MANY YEARS DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE DBE PROGRAMS?

	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
1. # of Years DBE	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
1 - 3 Years	24	66.67%	1	29	67.44%	1	53	67.09%	1
4 - 6 Years	12	33.33%	2	13	30.23%	2	25	31.65%	2

Q2: WHICH DBE ACTIVITIES DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN?

2. Participation	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
Life Skills Program (05-09)	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Better Teaching & Learning 1	20	55.56%	5	18	41.86%	3	38	48.10%	4
Integrate Life Skills Edu. To Classroom	20	55.56%	5	14	32.56%	5	34	43.04%	5
Civics Modules	2	5.56%	12	4	9.30%	11	6	7.59%	12
English Modules	6	16.67%	8	4	9.30%	11	10	12.66%	10
Mathematics Modules	5	13.89%	10	5	11.63%	10	10	12.66%	10
ICT for Life Skills Education	18	50.00%	7	10	23.26%	6	28	35.44%	7
Non-Curricular Toolkit	6	16.67%	8	9	20.93%	8	15	18.99%	8
School Retention Toolkit	1	2.78%	0	2	4.65%	13	3	3.79%	13
Whole School Appr. (09 - 11)									
Better Teaching & Learning 2	25	69.44%	2	35	81.39%	1	60	75.95%	1
Better Teaching & Learning 3	27	75.00%	1	31	72.09%	2	58	73.42%	2
Better Teaching & Learning 4	22	61.11%	3	10	23.26%	6	32	40.51%	6
ICT in Better Teaching & Learning	22	61.11%	3	17	39.53%	4	39	49.37%	3
Capacity of School Principal & Supervisor	5	13.89%	10	7	16.28%	9	12	15.19%	9
Social Science Modules	2	5.56%	12	0	0	0	2	2.53%	15
Science Modules	2	5.56%	12	0	0	0	2	2.53%	15
Indonesian Modules	2	5.56%	12	1	2.32%	14	3	3.79%	13
Peer mediation	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	14	1	1.27%	17

Q3: WHICH DBE ACTIVITIES WERE MOST EFFECTIVE TO IMPROVE YOUR INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS IN THE CLASSROOM?

3. Teaching Effectiveness	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
Life Skills Program (05 - 09)	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Better Teaching & Learning 1	18	50.00%	3	10	23.26%	6	28	35.44%	4
Integrate Life Skills Edu. To Classroom	13	36.11%	6	13	30.23%	3	26	32.91%	5
Civics Modules	1	2.78%	13	1	2.32%	11	2	2.53%	13
English Modules	6	16.67%	8	3	6.98%	8	9	11.39%	8
Mathematics Modules	4	11.11%	11	3	6.98%	8	7	8.86%	9
ICT for Life Skills Education	14	38.89%	5	11	25.58%	5	25	31.65%	6
Non-Curricular Toolkit	5	13.89%	9	2	4.65%	10	7	8.86%	9
School Retention Toolkit	2	5.56%	12	1	2.32%	11	3	3.78%	12
Whole School Appr. (09 - 11)									
Better Teaching & Learning 2	17	47.22%	4	24	55.81%	1	41	51.89%	1
Better Teaching & Learning 3	19	52.78%	2	20	46.51%	2	39	49.37%	2
Better Teaching & Learning 4	12	33.33%	7	6	13.95%	7	18	22.78%	7
ICT in Better Teaching & Learning	21	58.33%	1	12	27.91%	4	33	41.77%	3
Capacity of School Principal & Supervisor	5	13.89%	9	0	0.00%	0	5	6.33%	11
Science Modules	1	2.78%	13	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14

Q4: WHICH OF YOUR TEACHING SKILLS IMPROVED THE MOST?

	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
4. Teaching Improvement	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Providing guidance feedback	19	52.78%	2	14	32.56%	5	33	41.77%	4
Classroom management	11	30.55%	5	15	34.88%	4	26	32.91%	5
Collaborative Learning	13	36.11%	4	23	53.48%	1	36	45.57%	3
Material use & development	19	52.78%	2	22	51.16%	2	41	51.90%	1
Lesson Planning	20	55.56%	1	21	48.84%	3	41	51.90%	1
Multiple forms of assessment	6	16.67%	7	8	18.60%	7	14	17.72%	7
Instructional resources use	5	13.89%	8	3	6.98%	9	8	10.13%	9
Learner-centered instruction	5	13.89%	8	11	25.58%	6	16	20.25%	6
Using instructional technology	8	22.22%	6	5	11.63%	8	13	16.46%	8
Showcasing	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	10

Q5: HOW EFFECTIVE WERE THE DBE INTERVENTIONS IN IMPROVING STUDENT LEARNING IN MATH, SCIENCE AND LANGUAGE?

	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
5. Improved Student Learning	Ave.	%	Rank	Ave.	%	Rank	Ave	%	Rank
Maths Improvement	6.36	63.63%	3	5.75	57.50%	2	6.05	60.55%	3
Science Improvement	7.2	72.00%	1	6.7	67.00%	1	6.95	69.50%	1
Language Improvement	7	70.00%	2	5.7	57.00%	3	6.35	63.50%	2

Q6: WHAT DBE ACTIVITIES WERE THE MOST EFFECTIVE TO IMPROVE STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN ANY SUBJECT?

	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
6. Learning Effectiveness	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Better Teaching & Learning 1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0
Integrate Life Skills Edu. To Classroom	4	11.11%	5	0	0.00%	0	4	5.06%	10
Civics Modules	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0
English Modules	1	2.78%	11	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	13
Mathematics Modules	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
ICT for Life Skills Education	1	2.78%	11	0	0	0	1	1.27%	13
Non-Curricular Toolkit	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
School Retention Toolkit	1	2.78%	11	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	13
Better Teaching & Learning 2	6	16.67%	4	5	11.63%	3	11	13.92%	5
Better Teaching & Learning 3	8	22.22%	1	5	11.63%	3	13	16.46%	2
Better Teaching & Learning 4	4	11.11%	5	1	2.32%	10	5	6.33%	7
ICT in Better Teaching & Learning	3	8.33%	8	2	4.65%	7	5	6.33%	7
Capacity of School Principal & Supervisor	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0
Providing guidance & feedback	8	22.22%	1	4	9.30%	5	12	15.19%	3
Classroom management	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0
Collaborative Learning	7	19.44%	3	17	39.53%	1	24	30.38%	1
Material use & development	2	5.56%	10	3	6.98%	6	5	6.33%	7
Lesson Planning	4	11.11%	5	2	4.65%	7	6	7.59%	6
Multiple forms of assessment	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
Instructional resources use	0	0	0	2	4.65%	7	2	2.53%	12
Learner-centered instruction	0	0	0	12	27.91%	2	12	15.19%	3
Using instructional technology	3	8.33%	8	0	0	0	3	3.78%	11

Q7: WHAT ACTIVITIES OF THE DBE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE REPLICATED IN OTHER SCHOOLS?

	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
7. Best to Replicate	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Better Teaching & Learning 1	2	5.56%	15	0	0.00%	0	2	2.53%	16
Integrate Life Skills Edu. To Classroom	2	5.56%	15	0	0.00%	0	2	2.53%	16
Civics Modules	2	5.56%	15	0	0.00%	0	2	2.53%	16
English Modules	2	5.56%	15	0	0.00%	0	2	2.53%	16
Mathematics Modules	3	8.33%	12	0	0.00%	0	3	3.78%	13
ICT for Life Skills Education	2	5.56%	15	0	0.00%	0	2	2.53%	16
Non-Curricular Toolkit	2	5.56%	15	1	2.32%	12	3	3.78%	13
School Retention Toolkit	2	5.56%	15	0	0.00%	0	2	2.53%	16
Better Teaching & Learning 2	4	11.11%	10	9	20.93%	3	13	16.46%	6
Better Teaching & Learning 3	5	13.89%	6	10	23.26%	2	15	18.99%	4
Better Teaching & Learning 4	3	8.33%	12	2	4.65%	10	6	7.59%	11
ICT in Better Teaching & Learning	6	16.67%	4	2	4.65%	10	8	10.13%	9
Capacity of School Principal & Supervisor	2	5.56%	15	0	0.00%	0	2	2.53%	16
Providing guidance & feedback	6	16.67%	4	3	6.98%	8	9	11.39%	8
Classroom management	8	22.22%	1	7	16.28%	7	15	18.99%	4
Collaborative Learning	4	11.11%	10	15	34.88%	1	19	24.05%	1
Material use & development	7	19.44%	3	9	20.93%	3	16	20.25%	3
Lesson Planning	8	22.22%	1	9	20.93	3	17	21.52%	2
Multiple forms of assessment	3	8.33%	12	0	0	0	3	3.78%	13
Instructional resources use	5	13.89%	6	3	6.98%	8	8	10.13%	9
Learner-centered instruction	5	13.89%	6	8	18.60%	6	13	16.46%	6
Using instructional technology	5	13.89%	6	1	2.32%	12	6	7.59%	11
Contextual Teaching & Learning	1	2.78%	23	0	0	0	1	1.27%	23

Q8: WHAT NEW ACTIVITIES IN FUTURE PROGRAMMING WOULD IMPROVE TEACHER CAPACITY & STUDENT LEARNING?

	SOUTH SULAWESI (n = 36)			NORTH SUMATERA (n = 43)			ALL PROVINCES (n = 79)		
8. Future Activities	Raw	%	Rank	Raw	%	Rank	Total	%	Rank
Quality instructor/tutor training	0	0	0	3	6.98%	4	3	3.78%	7
Continuous AL training	0	0	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	14
Cheap teaching aids	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	14
AL & TT w/ ICT	3	8.33%	4	3	6.98%	4	6	7.59%	4
Material use & development	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Multiple forms of assessment	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Collaborative Learning	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Mentoring training	0	0	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	14
AL w/ ICT	2	5.56%	7	1	2.32%	10	3	3.78%	7
Professional Development Training	1	2.78%	8	1	2.32%	10	2	2.53%	11
Teacher Performance Assessment	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Classroom management	1	2.78%	8	0	0	0	1	1.27%	14
Outdoor/Environment Learning	1	2.78%	8	0	0	0	1	1.27%	14
Subject matter strengthening	5	13.89%	1	8	18.60%	1	13	16.46%	1
Guest native speaker for English class	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Exploration/Elaboration/Confirmation	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Effective trainings as needed by teachers	0	0.00%	0	2	4.65%	7	2	2.53%	11
Using instructional technology	5	13.89%	1	2	4.65%	7	7	8.86%	2
Instructional resources use	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Classroom Action Research	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	14
Powerpoint training	3	8.33%	4	0	0.00%	0	3	3.78%	7
Local content / language training	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Module development	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Organized & advanced trainings	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Provide language lab with ICT	1	2.78%	8	1	2.32%	10	2	2.53%	11
Simple & realistic learning media	3	8.33%	4	4	9.30%	2	7	8.86%	2
Contextual learning	1	2.78%	8	0	0.00%	0	1	1.27%	14
Lesson planning with character	4	11.11%	3	2	4.65%	7	6	7.59%	4
Subject matter laboratory	0	0.00%	0	3	6.98%	4	3	3.78%	7
Forum for local & international teachers	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	14
Comparative study / Study visits	0	0.00%	0	4	9.30%	2	4	5.06%	6
Provide every classroom with ICT	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	14
Extra curriculums / classes	0	0.00%	0	1	2.32%	10	1	1.27%	14

LEGEND:
AL = Active Learning
ICT = Information & Communication Technology
MTT = Master Teacher Trainer
CRC = Cluster Resource Center
TT = Teacher Training
BTL = Better Teaching & Learning

NOTES:
1. There were no Junior Secondary Surveys for Central Java.
2. Three teachers did not know the difference between BTL 2, 3 and 4.

Explanation of Junior Secondary Teacher Survey

General Information

- Of 79 state junior secondary & madrasah teacher respondents in South Sulawesi and North Sumatera, 28 people (35.44%) were 9th grade teachers, 26 people (32.91%) were 8th grade teachers and 24 people (30.38%) were 7th grade teachers. One teacher (1.27%) did not answer the question.

- 39 people (49.37%) had tenure of more than 10 years and 20 people (25.32%) had tenure of 5 to 10 years. Fifteen teachers (18.99%) did not answer the question.

- 65 people (82.28%) had Bachelors degree, 6 people (7.59%) had Masters and 2 people (2.53%) had Diplomas. Six people (7.59%) did not answer the question.

- 64 people (81.01%) were certified and 13 people (16.46%) people were not certified. Two teachers (2.53%) did not answer.

- 18 people (22.78%) were Science teachers, 17 people (21.52%) were English teachers, 15 people (18.99%) were Math teachers, 14 people (17.72%) were Indonesian language teachers and 12 people (15.19%) were Social Science teachers.

Q1: How many years did you participate in the DBE programs?

Of the 79 teacher respondents, 53 people (67.09%) were involved in DBE for 1 to 3 years and 25 people (31.65%) were involved for 4 to 6 years. One teacher (1.27%) did not answer the question.

Q2: Which DBE programs did you participate in?

Of the 79 teacher respondents, 60 people (75.95%) participated in BTL 2, 58 people (73.42%) participated in BTL 3, 39 people (49.37%) participated in ICT in BTL, 38 people (48.10%) participated in BTL 1 and 34 people (43.04%) participated in Integrating Life Skills into Classrooms.

Q3: Which DBE activities were most effective to improve your instructional skills in the classroom?

Of the 79 teacher respondents, 41 people (51.89%) said BTL 2, 39 people (49.37%) said BTL 3, 33 people (41.77%) said ICT in BTL, 28 people (35.44%) said BTL 1, 26 people (32.91%) said Integrating Life Skills into Classrooms and 25 people (31.65%) said ICT for Life Skills.

Q4: Which of your teaching skills improved the most?

Of the 79 teacher respondents, 41 people (51.90%) said Material Use & Development, 41 people (51.90%) said Lesson Planning, 36 people (45.57%) said Collaborative Learning, 33 people (41.77%) said Providing Guidance & Feedback, 26 people (32.91%) said Classroom Management and 16 people (20.25%) said Learner-centered Instruction.

Q5: How effective were the DBE interventions in improving student learning in Math, Science and Language?

From an average scale of 1 to 10, 20 teachers felt Science Learning improved 69.50%, 35 teachers felt Language Learning improved 63.50% and 19 teachers felt Math Learning improved 60.55%.
60 teachers (75.95%) did not answer for Math, 59 teachers (74.68%) did not answer for Science and 35 (46.83%) teachers did not answer for Language.

Q6: What DBE activities were most effective to improve student performance in any subject?

Of the 79 teacher respondents, 24 people (30.38%) said Collaborative Learning, 13 people (16.46%) said BTL 3, 12 people (15.19%) said Providing Guidance & Feedback, 12 people (15.19%) said Learner-centered Instruction and 11 people (13.92%) said BTL 2. No teacher said BTL 1, Civics Modules, Mathematics Modules, Non-Curricular Toolkit, Increase Capacity of Principal & SPVs, Classroom Management and Multiple Forms of Assessment were effective for student learning.

Q7: What activities of the DBE programs should be replicated in other schools?

Of the 79 teacher respondents, 19 people (24.05%) said Collaborative Learning, 17 people (21.52%) said Lesson Planning, 16 people (20.25%) said Material Use & Development, 15 people (18.99%) said Classroom Management, 15 people (18.99%) said BTL 3, 13 people (16.46%) said BTL 2, 13 people (16.46%) said Learner-centered Instruction and 9 people (11.39%) said Providing Guidance & Feedback.

Q8: What new activities in future programming would improve teacher capacity and student learning?

Of the 79 teacher respondents, 13 people (16.46%) said "subject matter strengthening", 7 people (8.86%) said "using instructional technology", 7 people (8.86%) said "(simple & realistic) learning media", 6 people (7.59%) said "AL & TT with ICT", 6 people (7.59%) said "lesson planning (with character)" and 4 people (5.06%) said "comparative study / study visits

Annex 7: USAID Twenty-five Questions

General Questions

1. What progress was made in terms of performance indicators, targets and program deliverables? What aspects of the DBE programs proved most and least effective?

Overall, the DBE program was remarkably successful. Over the six years of the program, USAID directly partnered with 74 districts, and more than 1,476 schools, 57,400 educators, and 400,000 students have benefited from enhanced teaching and learning methods and improved school management and governance. When measured against the mutually agreed upon performance indicators and targets, the DBE program outputs went well beyond the contractual standards and achieved even more outstanding impact through replication. For example, 84 districts and cities and more than 30,000 schools have used their own budgets and resources to replicate the DBE best practices. Although it is not possible to review all program 'deliverables' in this space (please see full text of the final report), the DBE program must be judged as a very successful program. The DBE program introduced and demonstrated methods, tools and materials for improving the management and governance of schools and for improving teaching and learning and these methods, tools and materials should serve the GOI well into the future.

In regard to the issue of which aspects of the DBE program proved to be most and least effective, it is a complex question again best answered in the full final report. Nevertheless, as seen by the clients of DBE (teachers and principals), the following responses are noted from surveys:

- DBE1: the most effective components were the 1) school leadership training for principals, 2) followed by the training in the development of school plans, and the 3) school committee training, the 4) BOS budgeting and 5) asset management tools. The least effective DBE1 component was the school personnel management tools insofar as they seem to be seldom used by the districts.
- DBE2: According to the teachers, the most effective components to improve their instructional skills were the 1) active learning training; 2) the subject matter training; and 3) active learning with ICT. The least effective were: 1) teacher resource centers (CRCs) and 2) accredited university training.
- DBE3: Using teachers' responses as our standard, the most effective components were: 1) better teaching and learning: BTL2, BTL3, and the use of ICT in BTL. The least effective was BTL 4 (Please see Annex 6).

2. Were DBE program interventions equally effective in poor and better off schools, in urban and rural schools, in madrasahs and public schools? Similarly, were there provincial or district differences in program outcomes?

It an attempt to answer these questions, the evaluation team carefully recorded through interview and observation a series of data that could serve as proxies for the effectiveness of program interventions. Each school was classified and then these proxies were tracked against income levels of schools, the urban and rural nature of the schools, and whether they were public or madrasah. These data were further aggregated by district and by province (please see annex 10).

Despite the analysis, it is very difficult to determine any definitive patterns of effectiveness of interventions across different types of schools. The evaluation team observed from the data, for example, that schools in a rural, poor district in North Sumatra were less advanced in the application of active learning methods and had fewer good schools than other districts. At the same time, many of the rural, relatively poor districts in South Sulawesi had very good schools and some were the best schools the evaluation team saw anywhere. After seeing the very good rural schools in South Sulawesi, the team speculated that rural schools may have had fewer problems than urban schools because issues like overcrowding in urban schools (especially noted in the city of Makassar) may have a severe impact on the quality and application of active learning methods. Urban schools in other provinces however were quite good even with heavily used, over-crowded facilities. Across all provinces, however, it seems that interventions were equally effective in poor and better off schools and in urban and rural schools. Moreover, the evaluation team concluded that DBE interventions were equally effective in madrasah and public schools. The evaluation team found that schools in South Sulawesi were a level above schools in Central Java, while, in turn, the schools in Central Java were nearly a level above the schools in North Sumatra.

3. Were there noticeable gender differences in program outcomes at the student level, at the school professional level or at the district and provincial administrative level?

There were noticeable gender differences in program outputs at all levels but it is not clear that these differences are significant or if there were gender differences in program 'outcomes' at different levels for a variety of reasons. One reason for the difficulty in answering this question is that the evaluation team could not find any information about the gender distribution by occupation within the districts or provinces. It was therefore, difficult to compare the outputs of the DBE program with the gender distribution of the district. Second, measuring outcomes at the student or school professional level requires closer observation or some other kind of baseline and outcome data in more detail than available to the evaluation team.

To illustrate the difference in program outputs, DBE1 trained 40,839 people, of which 27,105 were male and 13,734 were female. That means that only 33.6 percent of the people trained under DBE1 were female. The percent of females trained under DBE1 by occupational category were 33.1 percent of school principals, 29.3 percent of school committees, 54.9 percent of teachers, 20.4 percent of MOEC district education staff, and 16.0 percent of MORA district staff. On the face of it, females appear to have had fewer training opportunities than men but, the evaluation team investigation found that there were decidedly less females than men in each of the above occupational categories, except for the position of primary school teacher. Without information about the gender distribution by occupational group nationwide and by district, which we could not find, it is impossible to draw any conclusions.

From limited school observation, there did not seem to be any gender difference at the student level. Boys and girls seem to work well in groups and girls seemed to be as active in active learning schools as boys. Within the teacher ranks, both female and male teachers appear to adopt active learning methods equally well. We met articulate spokespeople and very good active learning teachers from both sexes.

Age may play a stronger role in program outcomes than gender. We found, but cannot prove, that younger teachers seem more willing to accept and use active learning methods than older teachers. Moreover, older male teachers seem to be the most resistant to adopting active learning methods.

4. To what extent are DBE interventions showing signs that they are sustainable? What are the factors influencing sustainability?

Perhaps one of the major findings of the final evaluation is that the DBE interventions are not as sustainable as the final reports of the DBE1, 2, and 3 contracts would have led one to believe nor were as sustainable as USAID appeared to believe when it designed the follow-on PRIORITAS project. Much of what one concludes about the sustainability of the DBE interventions has to do about the definition of 'sustainability' and the factors that one focuses on to make a determination.

Typically, sustainability refers to the capacity to endure. If reference is made to the financial sustainability of an investment, one might look for evidence that the investment will endure beyond the initial period to some expected typical life of the investment. If referring to the sustainability of an education reform, the expectation would be that the positive impact of the reform continues beyond the life of the program for some undetermined length of time.

Assuming that the second definition is referred to, the DBE programs are clearly having a positive impact on the Indonesian school system and there are a number of bright spots in the Indonesian education system owing to the DBE-assisted schools. Nevertheless, in general, it appears that the impact of the program is rapidly dissipating. In DBE1, the initial enthusiasm generated by school planning and training of school principals and school committee members appears to be waning. In DBE2, the training of teachers in active learning methods seems to have reached a plateau and is rapidly fading in many schools. In DBE 3, the program had limited impact due to a late start and its impact on the schools is declining.

Some of the main factors which could have influenced sustainability include:

- Too rapid turnover of key personnel, like principals and school committee members;
- Superficial treatment and training of active learning methods;
- No program of professional development for teachers and insufficient professional development opportunities;
- Trying to do too much, with too little, too late;
- District field staff that our donor dependent and apparently indifferent to solving problems within their manageable interest; and
- Insufficient per capita funds to carry out real reform.

5. Were the central offices of MOEC and MORA sufficiently aware and supportive of the DBE interventions thereby helping to ensure that approaches pioneered by the DBE project were sustained and replicated? Conversely how effectively did DBE engage MOEC and MORA in its interventions?

While central MOEC and MORA offices were aware of the DBE program on a general level, according to most feedback received, they were not really partners in the project and would be more appropriately termed 'observers' of the program. They were regularly invited to big events: openings, sharing and advocacy workshops, etc. and seemed to approve of what they heard of DBE.

Provincial level offices seemed to be in a similar situation, knowledgeable and approving, but to their seeming dismay, not engaged. The provincial government officials interviewed by evaluators indicated their desire to be involved. As noted by one official, the DBE should not have skipped over the provincial level. His advice was that any new project needs to start work at the central level and work its way down to the school level, 'not start in the middle at the district level.' Key provincial-level actors who were not extensively involved in DBE were Provincial Quality Assurance Institute (LPMP) and Subject Matter Training Center (P4TK) representatives; both of these organizations are responsible for improving teacher competency so need to be actively engaged and committed in any focus on teacher professional development.

As the DBE's stated intention was to support the country's decentralization movement, project efforts were focused largely at the district and school levels. District education offices were regularly involved in knowledge-sharing loops and officials were invited to trainings and workshops and enthusiastic about the changes in schools as a result of DBE. DBE district representatives, the Master Teacher Trainers (MTTs), were very successful and had a large responsibility for training and mentoring teachers and supporting CRCs. Other district-level individuals who were not well-engaged in DBE but could have added to the sustainability of a locally-provided teacher in-service system were supervisors and Subject Matter Specialists.

A recommendation for PRIORITAS is to actively engage and ensure that all levels of the education sector are appropriately and adequately informed of the project. On a deeper level, getting buy-in from the government means working closely with identified individuals to ensure PRIORITAS' goals closely align and contribute to government reforms efforts.

6. How effective were DBE interventions in improving student learning in reading, math, and science? What DBE activities have been most responsible for increases in learning achievement?

DBE interventions were shown to positively affect student learning achievement in math, science, and language as a result of project focus on improving teacher skills and knowledge. DBE 2 measured learning gains in math and language of Grade 3 students and math, language, and science of Grade 6 students across several years of project implementation. The results showed that DBE students consistently learned as a result of their teachers' participation in active learning training, receiving higher scores than control students and consistent gains in learning in all subjects over the course of the program

While the tests were not designed to isolate which variables were most influential in increasing student learning, this evaluation sought information from teachers through surveys (N = 97) on which DBE interventions were considered most effective to improve student learning in any subject. Teachers responded that active learning training was most effective to improve student learning. Other interventions in descending order of effectiveness as ranked by teachers in three provinces who responded to surveys are: active learning with ICT, questions/discussions/voice [of students], student reflection, and collaborative learning.

DBE 3 also conducted student learning assessments in project junior secondary schools to determine learning gains as a result of teacher involvement in training programs. Student assessment tests were conducted in partner schools after the DBE 3 was revised in 2009. Students were tested in Bahasa Indonesia reading and writing skills, mathematics, and English listening, reading, and writing. Results showed that all groups of students tested (girls, boys, public and madrasah [public and private] schools) achieved consistent gains on all tests over a period of two years (2009-2011) and rises in average test scores were evident except in English skills over the last year of testing (2010). During interviews, teachers consistently noted that the Better Teaching and Learning units were most effective in influencing students learning achievement.

Institutionalization of proven methods of instruction should be a main goal of PRIORITAS. This will involve determining the current level of active learning present in project schools and the level of support needed through continued training to move it to a sustainable level.

7. To what extent have DBE best practices at the local, district, and provincial level fed into education policy dialogue and reform?

The work of DBE in strategic planning and management was very effective at the school and district level. After much refinement and revision, these tools and processes were eventually adopted by at the provincial and national levels. The school-based management process has become national policy, a great success of the DBE program.

From DBE 2, the use of active learning as the platform for teacher training has the potential to strongly influence national education reform efforts in in-service professional development. The method has proven to be highly-appreciated, shows learning results, and is popular with students and teachers. Additionally, the methodology strongly supports Standard Two of the National Standards of Education requiring the learning process to be interactive, inspirational, joyful, and motivating. Successful replication of DBE activities by some districts has resulted in some very good schools, showing the potential this approach has to improve education.

Acceptance of the active learning pedagogy on a national level will depend on the combined efforts of key players to continue to show its effectiveness. PRIORITAS needs to show that well-trained teachers produce better-educated students, universities need to firmly implant the process to internal professional development policies in order to produce better-prepared pre-service teacher candidates, and education officials at every level need to plan and fund the use of the pedagogy into systems that support teaching and learning. The move to official recognition and adoption of the approach by name[1] in government documents and policies (such as the National Standards) would assist to get the pedagogy accepted and used nationally.

From a system point of view, the whole school approach of DBE 3 is really what education at the district-school level should look like - everyone who is involved and responsible for sound education provision is trained, knowledgeable of their roles and responsibilities, and in place to add their contribution. Although the revised DBE 3 operated over a limited time, the approach was beginning to show results. Continued efforts in the education sector by stakeholders should be addressed as a 'whole' package of reform rather than through piecemeal and independent interventions.

[1] In Indonesia, the term for active learning could show up as PAKEM as that term already has a history of use and understanding in the country. In DBE 2 training literature, the term PAKEM was used in place of 'active learning.'

8. Were there any major areas not supported by DBE that should have been in order to achieve intended program results?

As successful as many of the DBE interventions were on a local basis, the evaluation team would have liked to see a more thorough assessment and presentation of the larger system of teacher professional development with identification of how the DBE efforts specifically fit into the scheme of in-service teacher preparation at the lower levels. As noted in the evaluation report, a schema of the national in-service professional development system does not exist. Given the complexity of the system, identification of the links between the districts and schools that represent the current system as practitioners seem to understand it, is vital to ensure that DBE efforts worked with and strengthened the appropriate individuals, leaving a stronger process of a locally-provided in-service teacher development system in place. Early identification of these individuals and the links they have in the system would have guided DBE to spend more efforts on training these key individuals and 'connecting' levels. DBE made great contributions to the training of teachers and principals but important individuals who are the next links in the system (at the district and provincial level) may not have received the attention they could have used; therefore the system remains weak at these junctures. Supervisors, Subject Matter Teachers, KKGs, and LPMPs (at the provincial level) would all seem to be important individuals to include in training efforts. PRIORITAS may consider working with the national government to identify and distribute a diagram of the in-service professional development system so that all stakeholders understand how it works and know their part in it. This should assist to identify logical paths of training provision.

9. How did the DBE districts and provinces engage with their local universities on education issues? How about the P4TK and with LPMP? What have been some effective strategies for strengthening these linkages? What could be other effective strategies?

In the investigation of university involvement in the education system and a possible role in the provision and institutionalization of in-service teacher training, the evaluation team found a few instances of engagement between institutes of higher education and district education offices. While connections currently seem to be at a more surface level and not a deeper engagement on education issues, these beginnings could form the basis for future, closer ties as each side understands how it could benefit from cooperation with the other partner.

Universities send out teacher candidates and other students to do practicum teaching and community service at schools. Whether these placements involve the district offices or not evaluators could not determine but certainly a basis for a relationship is there. In several cases, universities provided training to teachers, principals, district education officers, etc. and to LPMP staff at the provincial level at the request and funding of the respective education offices. The evaluation team also heard of lecturers fulfilling their community service requirements through provision of various services to district offices. One university, UPI in West Java, for example, sent lecturers to the district offices to disseminate DBE 1 best practices.

One effective strategy for making stronger linkages was the hosting of a 'shopping mall' for district officers by the State University of Makassar to showcase services the university provides for professional development of education staffs. District education officers can look over the various services the university offers to identify suitable ones that support individual district needs. As a result, the University has trained teachers in several districts through their fee-for-service 'effective schools' center. The evaluation team found this business model of training provision effective as the process matches need with provision and benefits both partners. As it is, school-level practitioners do not always have a high opinion of the ability of university lecturers to understand the realities of education provision in schools; therefor such a business model, to be successful, would force universities to become more effective at offering targeted services.

School practitioners seem to have a poor awareness of just what role universities could play in in-service professional training; therefore strategies will need to focus on 'advertising' of university services. These could involve for example, 'traveling university road shows' where a team of university representatives sets up in districts and displays various services available. Larger centrally-located universities might also identify local universities with which to partner to provide information-sharing opportunities and delivery sites for district-level activities.

Universities themselves should improve the types of services they can offer, providing for example, flexible certification programs or adult education classes in active learning, leadership for principals and supervisors, special education and inclusion, subject-area intensive training (useful for Subject Matter Specialists), and student assessment and evaluation courses. University programs need to provide flexible and specific provision to education staffs who continue to work. These short programs however should be linked to the larger system of professional development.

10. Which of the DBE modules are the most replicated and disseminated? Who does the replication and dissemination and why? Are replication practices at the same standard of quality as the original? Which modules are replicated in whole and which are replicated in part? Are there steps that could be taken for further distribution and use of the modules?

This is a set of six questions is very difficult to answer succinctly 'after-the-fact' as there seems to be no combined set of information for the three DBE projects. This is a reflection of the state of collaboration and communication among the projects (not good), their complexity, (too much) and the state of oversight (too little). While there was qualitative and quantative reporting for *each* project, putting together a combined analysis of information for all three projects that would answer these questions in overview form during the implementation of all three projects did not appear to occur.

Which of the DBE modules are the most replicated and disseminated?[2]

- DBE1, the most replicated module was RKS/RKT (Annual School Plans and School Annual Medium-Term Plans): in 10,343 schools.[3]
- In DBE2, the most replicated module cannot be determined from project reports despite an extensive review. There were 26 modules and from interviews they were apparently all liked, especially math and science. A Deliverables Tracker Final Report in the DBE2 Final Report[4] lists 'transition activities' on project best practices by numbers of schools covered per quarter for 2010 and 2011 (7500 schools) but there appears to be no information on which module was most replicated.
- In DBE3, the most disseminated/replicated module was BTL2 (basic concepts of Active Learning, life skills, and the role of the facilitator and basic school leadership skills). Dissemination took place in 6,440 junior secondary schools and the BTL2 module was disseminated in 34 percent of them (or about 2,189 schools).

Who does the replication and dissemination and why?

In terms of who directly did the replication, in many cases it was the DBE facilitators and Master Trainers, working through the DINAS. The courses/programs were custom-tailored to what the DINAS wanted in terms of time and money. The DBE3 Project Dissemination Report provided the most complete answer to this question, including 'why'. "The most common type of dissemination (58 percent in DBE3) was the direct provision of support for training on one or more of the teacher modules to individual schools or group of schools.....The main reason for supporting this type of dissemination activity was to affect change within the schools involved." Another type of direct dissemination activity occurred when direct support was provided to a District or Provincial Department to assist them to implement their own plans

[2] In the DBE3 dissemination report, 'dissemination'was defined as "*the process where the programs or innovations developed under the DBE3 project is implemented independently by others beyond the original project areas using their own resources*. 'Transition' was defined as *the process where project-led management, financing, leadership and management are gradually transferred to local stakeholders*.'Replication' is defined as "*the action of copying or duplicating something exactly."* Lorna Power and Wasmiyati Zainul Bachri. (undated but probably 2011) *Project Dissemination Report* (DBE3).

[3] RTI International (2011). *More Effective Decentralized Education Management and Governance*.(DBE1). P. 43.

[4] Final Report DBE2 Project 2005-2011-Volume 3. pp. 22-23.

for dissemination. In these cases, support was provided to train key persons, 'Indirect' support occurred when people and institutions trained directly through the (DBE3) program went on to formally or informally train others independently and without any DBE3 support." These definitions would seem to apply to all DBEs.

Are replication practices at the same standard of quality as the original?
Basically, no, but with important exceptions (such as in Sidrap in South Suluwesi, where the program had been replicated to all 236 schools in all 11 sub-districts, and even there it is difficult to judge the possible quality differences). Why? One reason stems from the lack of consistent quality guidelines in and from the projects and among provinces, and compromises on quality in implementation of replications even when there were guidelines. Provinces were often allowed to develop their own approaches and tactics to disseminate/replicate with one result that quality standards slipped in the process. Dissemination therefore seemed to be open to interpretation and segments of the dissemination could be deleted in different locations. A second reason seems to be that *quantity* of replications was valued more highly than quality in the projects; one attitude expressed was that the main goal of dissemination was to achieve high outputs to report to USAID.

The most candid and complete explanation of quality standards for replication came from the DBE3 dissemination report submitted to USAID; it is difficult to substantiate replication practices for DBE1 and 2. DBE3 did set quality standards for the dissemination of project innovations. The standards included the order in which the modules were presented, a minimum of one complete project unit (module) being used in its intended lifetime, training implemented by qualified DBE3 facilitators, and at least 10 participants from a single institution must be involved in training. "In terms of of participants per school and complete training programs used, these standards were more frequently not met"[5] *The overall quality standards "were not adhered to 50 percent of the time".*[6] A footnote in the DBE3 dissemination report states that "it should be noted that DBE3 does not include or report the numbers of institutions, participants funding and so on in the official project data as it is not possible to collect and verify it." This would particularly seem to apply to indirect replication. The DBE3 dissemination report concludes with this telling statement which says much about why the quality of replication/dissemination was not the same as the original: "*There was no real depth of understanding of the real significance of dissemination. For DBE3 the main goal of dissemination seemed to be to achieve numbers to report to USAID. The higher the numbers the more successful the project was perceived to be. USAID did nothing to dispel this.* "[7]

Recommendations to ensure replication quality in future projects. The findings on quality of replication noted above are instructive on what *not* to do in future attempts at replication and lead naturally to recommendations for improving the quality of this practice. Aside from not trying to do too much at once (and having a three-part project that takes different approaches to, and even different names for, 'replication') the DBE3 Project Dissemination Report (2011) has already given USAID and future projects a set of excellent recommendations that can serve

[5] Ibid. Power and Bachri (2011) p 41.
[6] Ibid. 72.
[7] Ibid.

as guidelines for ensuring or at least improving, replication quality. The most important of these recommendations include, in abbreviated and annotated form:

- *Re-think dissemination* (*replication*). Dissemination activities (must be) given equal status with other project activities and are implemented with as much attention.
- *Focus on quality not quantity*. Related to this point, all project monitoring and evaluation plans should assess the quality and impact of the replication, and not just the quantity, and this should be done annually. Objective monitors should conduct these assessments.
- *Maintain standards*. Standards should be set for conducting dissemination/replication and should be strictly adhered to. Data collected should be reviewed regularly to make sure that standards are being followed, and the standards themselves should also be regularly reviewed.
- *Don't be in a hurry*. Projects should not be pressured to disseminate too quickly and too early.
- *Plan for dissemination*. Projects need an overall approach to replication, including strategies and promoting and supporting it, but also policies and priorities. "Dissemination should start from project schools and spread outwards, like dominos…" "Replicate to new schools within partner districts, before spreading out to new districts and provinces."
- *Build capacity in new districts*. Approach the district first and build local capacity first before spreading to individual schools.
- *Use national and district planning and review meetings*. (the provincial level should now be involved as well). Such meetings were found to be one of the most effective ways to build commitment and funding for dissemination/replication efforts in DBE, and should be continued in the future. A key point in this recommendation is that there should be *consequences* for lack of commitment including withdrawal of financial support and even replacement of districts that do not perform over the long term.
- *Plan for a shift in responsibility*. "Funding should increasingly be provided by local sources and by the end of the project, districts should be covering all dissemination costs." "Projects need to plan in a cutoff point when the project no longer provides financial support for dissemination."[8]

<u>Which modules are replicated in whole and which are replicated in part?</u>
This is very difficult to know for all three DBEs. In DBE3, if the training was less than the minimum number of days, and this occurred in about 10 percent of that project's dissemination activities, then it indicated that content had been reduced or cannibalized.

<u>Are there steps that could be taken for further distribution and use of the modules?</u>
Yes. The modules could be updated and improved for use in PRIORITAS. Working more closely with the education offices at all levels could lead to wider and more effective distribution. Most importantly, however, *before* anyone contemplates further distribution and use of these modules, better planning/preparation must take place. Steps should include (as noted in the DBE3 report):

- Re-think dissemination. Give it equal status and attention as other project activities.

[8] For the complete set of recommendations, see pages 73-75 of the Project Dissemination Report (2011) by Lorna Power and Wasmiyati Zainul Bachri

- Focus on quality, not quantity. Indicators should also assess quality and impact.
- Develop comprehensive standards; maintain them.

11. Has DBE's approach to Islamic education been effective? Are there any special needs/issues that should be considered for the future in order to engage effectively with MORA?

The project reported that DBE 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 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. There remains the question as to why private Islamic school foundation members and principals were not included in DBE training. In Central Java it is noted that there were large numbers of private schools that were not equally serviced, not receiving necessary support, even though they are asked to follow government policies.

For future activities, DBE appears to have laid a good foundation for future work with Islamic education institutions. In terms of training programs, supervisors need to receive much greater attention and, if possible, private Islamic school foundation members and principals need to be included in any program as they too should be members of a Whole School Approach. There seems to be the need for more 'outreach' activities to these private Islamic schools and more cooperation from MOEC/MORA in focusing on them. As part of improvements in communication and collaboration, MORA needs much greater attention at all levels.

12. What lessons were learned about large project management in Indonesia's complex education sector?

Large project management can be difficult in any circumstances and that was certainly true in the three DBEs in Indonesia. Indonesia is complex and so is the education sector; it is dynamic, and ever changing, even if not as quickly as anyone would like. Because of the system's size, it is also difficult to make an impact. Given the complexity and size of the educational system, splitting DBE into three projects made it even *more* complex. 'Large project management' sometimes just means unmanageable. USAID should consider not implementing such large and complex projects in the future. The lessons are:

- *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. A corallary to this lesson is the need to focus on what works and limit the 'ornaments on the tree.'
- *Coordination with the GOI*. Many observers noted that MOEC and MORA officials at all levels were not really partners in the program. Most suggested a new way of doing business with better communication and coordination between USAID and MOEC/MORA should be at the heart of the new paradigm. Suggestions for better communication include: 1)Memorandum of Agreement between the various entities (USAID and MORA, PRIORITAS and local DINAS) to establish clear roles and responsibilities of the parties; 2) sharing work plans before implementation of program and annual reviews of progress; 3) site visits and workshops for central and provincial government officers to review district level exemplary programs; and 4)written proposals to MOEC and MORA at all levels on program problems and solutions about how that government level could assist the 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 can't wait to go to school to learn.
- *Sustainability requires GOI commitment, communication, and a quid quo pro*. As part of the renewed communication and coordination between the program and districts, there should be clear-cut targets and commitments for funding. Changes in key personnel such as principals should only be made in consultation with the project or if there is a suitable replacement. District governments must become full partners with USAID and PRIORITAS, communicating their needs, monitoring the progress of the program and taking action to ensure success of the program, and committing funds to supplement and sustain programs that show good promise.

13. How have DBE interventions contributed to the fulfillment of minimum service standards as well as national standards of education in the DBE target districts?

The Education Minimum Service Standards (MSS), formally were established in 2010 (Law No. 15) and consist of 27 specific standards, all of which are supposed to be attained by 2013. While DBE interventions did not basically affect the standards relating to facilities and infrastructure in the target districts, they did contribute to standards on the learning process, improving the qualifications of teachers, and implementation of the principle of school-based management (the latter largely being a direct influence of DBE1). Future efforts should also focus on the standard for teachers to provide learning assessment for students to help them improve their learning.

DBE made important contributions to the following National Standards:

- The National Standard is: "*The school management in basic and secondary level implements school-based management which is demonstrated by autonomy, partnership, participation, openness, and accountability*" DBE1 was very influential with its school-based management (SBM) program.

- The National Standard for the teaching-learning process is:
  - *The learning process at school is interactive, inspirative, joyful, motivating learners to actively participate, and providing ample opportunities for initiative, creativity, and independency based on the learners' aptitude, interest, and physical and psychological development.*The efforts of all the DBEs in active learning and other participatory methods, as well as the accompanying creative materials, are well-respected, influential and appreciated.
  - *Every school carries out lesson planning, learning process, assessment on learning result, and learning process supervision for the sake of the implementation of effective and efficient learning process.* The DBEs contributed much to lesson planning and the implementation of effective and efficient learning processes.

Through its training programs for teachers, the DBE programs also contributed to the National Standard on Educators and Education Personnel for improving pedagogic and professional competence.

14. How have the DBE projects complemented, overlapped, and/or filled in a void with respect to other major international donor efforts such as AusAID, the World Bank, and JICA?

DBE projects have sometimes inadvertently and sometimes purposefully complemented, overlapped and/or filled in a void with respect to other international donor efforts. The DBE focus on the district and school level, working from the ground up, has definitely complemented (or filled in a void) the work of AusAid and their 'work from the center approach,' the World Bank and others. There is much mutual learning to be had from both these efforts. The DBE1 initiatives on School-based Management (SBM) have been very influential and complemented the efforts of the other donors. The Active Learning Modules developed by DBE2 have been used by the World Bank in their continued focus on improving teacher competency. DBE3 has used the 'lesson study' approach (BTL4) that has been at the center of JICA initiatives and while this might be construed as overlapping, it is important to overlap when a method from one donor proves successful. The work of the DBEs in terms of teacher professional development can and should provide an important area for cooperation in the future, especially in the development of a graduated series/sequence of high-quality in-service training after certification.

DBE1 Questions

1. The DBE1 project had a mandate to support planning and strengthen management at the local and district levels. To what extent were approaches undertaken in support of this mandate successful.

By all accounts the approaches undertaken by DBE1 (training, tools and methods) to strengthen management and planning at the local and district levels were very successful. All of the stakeholders interviewed who took the training programs developed and delivered by DBE1 (district education office staff, principals, teachers, school committee members) touted the training as very useful for their jobs and strengthening the management of schools. Some even went so far as to claim that it was the most useful, most practical training they had received in their career and that the training had made a huge difference in their performance. All of the stakeholders interviewed (district planning, budgeting and analytical staff) who used the tools and methods (including the planning and budgeting tools, the school cost analysis tools, and the facilities and personnel management tools) all maintained that they were excellent, had made their work easier, and had seriously strengthened the ability of the district to make good decisions and policy.

In the absence of any evidence about the quality of management in the districts and schools, either before or after the DBE1 interventions, it is difficult to offer any proof of strengthened management other than the testimony of those partners who were in the program. When one compares how schools are managed where the principal was not DBE1 trained, generally one can see a marked improvement in the management practices at DBE1-trained school. Since the evaluation did not travel to non-DBE districts, there is no basis for comparison between districts.

Given the available evidence, it seems fair to conclude that the DBE1 program successfully fulfilled its mandate to support and improve planning and management at schools and districts. Nevertheless, self-governance is embryonic in Indonesia and despite the gains made by DBE1, much strengthening must occur.

2. How did DBE1 respond to the needs of schools, districts and provincial governments? How effective were they in ensuring good practices were institutionalized?

Perhaps one of the greatest strengths of the DBE1 program was its ability to respond to the needs of schools, and districts. Although they moved toward responding to the needs of provincial government in the later stages of the program, the main focus of DBE1 was on schools and districts. In many respects, DBE1 was a service-oriented, demand-driven organization that worked collaboratively with its partners to train personnel and develop, pilot, finalize, and attempt to institutionalize financial and management tools and methodologies that responded to GOI policy and would improve the management and governance of schools. Stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team repeatedly stressed that DBE1 was excellent in its ability to respond to schools and district needs.

As the program progressed, the focus of DBE1 shifted from building tools to building the capacity of the GOI and service providers to use the tools by, among other things, jointly planning and implementing programs with schools and districts, basing interventions on GOI policy, ensuring that programs were affordable for partners, and developing manuals to institutionalize the best practices. The fact that schools, districts and other partners committed substantial local funding (over US$ 2 million by DBE1 estimates) to replicated DBE1 programs in 15 provinces, 148 districts and over 16,000 schools appears to confirm that DBE1 provided good products and services to fill the needs of its counterparts.

Despite these apparent successes at servicing the needs of schools, districts, and provinces, the final evaluation found that turnover in key personnel such as principals and school committee members and other factors have severely hampered the program. The initial gains from the school-based and district management programs appear to be fading. For some inexplicable reason, the district education officers are not offering training programs to new school committee members and DBE-trained principals are being replaced by principals who have had no DBE training and do not understand the program. It appears that DBE1 did all the right things to institutionalize the program within districts but districts apparently do not see the need to follow up the program with refresher courses. In this light, it is not clear how effective the DBE1 program was to institutionalize the program.

3. What were the most influential factors in increasing the participation of school committee members and parents? What are the biggest challenges?

Although the evaluation team asked questions about the most influential factors increasing the participation of school committee members from a variety of stakeholders (principals, teachers, supervisors, district education officers, and school committee members), the results of the inquiry were indeterminate. Apparently there is a host of countervailing factors influencing the participation of school committee members.

Many stakeholders noted that the initial DBE1 training of school committee members, principals, and teachers, along with the new focus on the school, generated a great deal of community enthusiasm and involvement in the school. Once the training and attention on the school had ended and it became clear that there were no additional resources forthcoming from DBE1, interest from the community and the school committee members began to fade. Over time both principals and school committee members who had been trained by DBE1 were transferred or completed their term in office and the replacements for these key people were not trained.

Over the life of the DBE program, the GOI instituted the BOS payments to schools and there apparently was a good deal of fanfare touting the notion that education was now free. For many, this meant that no fees would be charged for any child to enter school and parents could not be solicited for additional financial or in-kind contributions. Finally, journalists, looking to uncover evidence of corruption in schools, often focused on the management of BOS funds by principals and school committee members and community contributions in schools.

As a result of these factors, community involvement in schools appears to have waned and in some districts, especially in very poor areas, most school committee members and principals claim that efforts to involve parents and school committees in the schools have a low payoff or they are simply a waste of time. Some principals even go so far as to claim that parents in their community are too poor, too ignorant, and too unconcerned about their children to care about their education.

4. How effective was the project in increasing the capacity of personnel at the school and district?

At first glance, the DBE1 program was exceptionally effective in increasing the capacity of personnel at the school and district. Over the life of the program, DBE1 carried out 5,893 training activities. Almost 69 percent of those training activities took place in four provinces (Central Java, East Java, South Sulawesi, and North Sumatra). Most of those training activities (80 per cent) took place in the three years 2007- 2009. DBE1 trained a total of 40,839 people (66.3 percent were male) of which 11,504 (28.1 percent) were school committee members, 8,109 (19.9 percent) were teachers, 5,044 (12.4 percent) were principals, 4,524 (11.1 percent) were district education staff and another 3,225 (7.9 percent were district facilitators, supervisors and MORA staff. Over 79 percent of the people trained by DBE were from districts and schools.

In addition to the 1,272 original DBE1 target schools, an additional 16,106 schools had implemented some aspect of the DBE1 school-based management package, including training in the development of school plans, strengthening school committees, improving school leadership, asset and financial management, and BOS reporting or school database systems using counterpart funds equal to US $ 2 million. Over 64 percent of the additional schools used their funds to implement training in medium-term or annual school plans. DBE1 estimated that for every one project-funded school another 12 schools used DBE1 developed tools and training programs. In the end, DBE1 claims to have reached 15 provinces, 148 districts, over 16,000 schools and over 40,000 government officials, teachers, principals and local stakeholders.

Despite these very impressive numbers, the final evaluation team found that much of the initial enthusiasm generated by the training programs and tools has faded. School plans and planning have often become an onerous task driven by gathering hard-to-find data and many school objectives have crept up into the 'unrealistically unattainable' category rather than based on the realities of the school. An inordinate number of trained principals had been transferred and replaced with principals who had not received DBE1 training. Most of the school committee members had not had any school management training and did not always understand their role. In some poor schools and districts the DBE1 school-based management training appears to have been poorly administered and did not 'catch," or the notion that "education is free" and community participation in education is to be discouraged after BOS, has crippled the impact of the DBE1 training.

It appears, therefore that DBE1 was very effective in increasing the capacity of a variety of stakeholders but factors outside the project's control such as principal turnover crippled the sustainability of capacity development.

DBE 2 Questions

1. The DBE 2 project had a mandate to improve the quality of teaching and learning in Indonesia's primary schools. To what extent were approaches undertaken in support of this mandate successful?

As reviewed extensively in the evaluation report, the active learning approach was highly successful and appreciated. Teachers and principals consistently noted how much teacher and student behavior had positively changed as a result of active learning. Local educators did not have evidence in the form of test scores and learning achievements available as proof of success of active learning approaches,[9] although many noted for example that scores on the National Exam had improved. Many practitioners had developed their own indicators of effectiveness of active learning including the following: participation and success in special academic Olympiads, increased school attendance, decreased student drop-out, increased grade six graduation, and entrance to junior secondary schools of choice. The active engagement of students in their learning, increased motivation, creativity, willingness to express themselves, participation in groups, and asking questions of the teachers were all cited as evidence of active learning.

DBE2 also fulfilled its mandate to improve instructional abilities of teachers involved in the program. According to project monitoring efforts, DBE teachers consistently out-scored non-DBE teachers in control groups in classroom management, the use of teaching-learning activities, instructional planning, and student assessment. This was determined through the use of a standardized instrument covering fourteen observable teacher actions in classrooms and through teacher interviews. The greatest areas of difference between DBE2 and control teachers were the use of lesson planning and the amount of interaction between students and teachers, indicating that DBE2 had been effective in changing teachers' instructional behavior. Based on observations, the evaluation team also determined that teachers who had been trained by DBE2 were more actively involving their students in classroom learning than teachers in non-DBE schools.

[9] Teachers either didn't have them or were at least hesitant to show them to the evaluation team.

2. Are there DBE 2 activities or best practices that could or should serve as the basis to reform national policy?

As noted in General Question # 7 above, the active learning approach has the potential to serve as the basis to infuse national policy. It closely aligns with the government's National Standards of Education, offering an effective, culturally-trialed and acceptable system of student learning that both students and teachers enjoy. The approach offers a proven method to address different learning needs and styles of children, is adaptable to all subjects, and results in academic and behavioral gains. It needs to be continually reinforced and focused on however so the success and use of the approach continues to expand.

The efforts of DBE 2 in the in-service preparation of teachers generated several practices that were often noted as effective and valuable to assist teachers to learn. These should be considered in any future focus on teacher competency and reforms to the system of professional development:

- Training composed of classroom presentations of theory coupled with opportunities for immediate practical application in classrooms was very successful;
- Mentoring after training was considered by many as one of the best DBE practices for teacher training;
- Training packages and modules that were developed through the combined efforts of experts in the field (for example, university lecturers and school practitioners) were very successful and continue to be used;
- Many noted that individuals responsible for the training and monitoring of professional development (teachers, principals, and supervisors) should all have similar foundational training.

3. How effective were the contributions made by Indonesian and U.S universities to DBE 2's in-service teacher training initiatives? What do the Indonesian partner universities see as DBE strengths in terms of improving their methods of teacher training?

Several activities undertaken by the Indonesian and U.S university partnerships may have directly contributed to DBE in-service teacher training initiatives although taken as a whole, the partnership activities might be said to have more directly built internal university capacity and only indirectly supported in-service training capacity. This opinion was supported by both Indonesian and U.S university participants, who noted that partnership activities more directly addressed pre-service teacher preparation.

The development of the training modules by combined teams of university staffs and education practitioners was probably one of the most effective activities of the university partnerships as the modules continue to be used by various actors in the education sector. Moreover, lecturers who were involved in the development of these modules worked directly with teachers and schools to pilot the modules, the first time many lecturers had actually worked at the classroom level. The experience they gained of the realities of education in schools most likely continues to influence their work in the teacher training institutes in their universities.

Two activities that were related through technology, the distance education pilots and accredited training courses seemed to individually have limited impact on in-service training. The one distance education pilot supported the on-line training of coaches for teachers in integration of ICT in the classroom. An assessment of the initiative indicated that teachers still preferred to have large amounts of face-to-face contact during training rather than large amounts of on-line training, which seems to indicate a current limited preference for on-line formats for in-service training provision.

The evaluation team met few teachers during school interviews who had actually participated in the accredited training which may lead to the conclusion that the activity was rather small in scale and had limited impact. Practitioners who knew of the activity seemed to indicate that it was not particularly effective as participating teachers only received four university credits towards certification and the program was not expanded enough to provide a full course of credits needed for a degree.

The classroom action research intervention was well-received by university lecturers but only minimally noted or understood by school practitioners. This activity seems to have great utility for the future to assist university and eventually school-level instructors to rigorously research issues in the education system that could directly impact the way education is presented in the classroom.

The Active Learning for Higher Education (ALFHE) initiative was by far the most successful university activity of DBE and continues to be replicated. The evaluation team heard much positive feedback on the influence the approach has had on the way instruction is presented at the university level. It has the most potential to affect pre-service preparation of teachers as they will graduate and go into schools with a knowledge and experience of a sound teaching approach.

4. Were new approaches (classroom reading program and distance education pilots) under DBE 2, initiated post-mid-term evaluation effective?

Feedback from educators indicated that the classroom reading program was highly appreciated by teachers and well-liked by the children. The pleasure books donated by the DBE 2 to partner schools were often located in 'reading corners' in classrooms and teachers had established regular reading times (for example, ten minutes at the beginning of every day, twenty minutes every Friday, etc.) in which children appeared to eagerly participate. Conversations with teachers indicated that despite the concentrated focus on reading, children's reading abilities did not appear to significantly increase nor did they necessarily exhibit increased reading ability in other subjects; rather the reading program had drastically increased their interest in reading.

In the distance education initiative, DBE 2 piloted two activities on a small scale which from a larger perspective seem to have limited impact. In the first pilot, the focus was on the use of on-line learning to cultivate the skills of school-based coaches to assist teachers to use ICT in student-centered classroom activities. Results of an assessment of this activity proved that on-line instructional delivery was useful to train teacher coaches but also that the most successful forms of on-line delivery were those that included a relatively large amount of face-to-face instruction. The second pilot involved training 100 faculty members from DBE 2 partner universities to become certified on-line professional development providers and who ultimately were able to produce nearly one hundred on-line courses. Lecturers were enthusiastic about the training they had received and extolled the extreme benefits of on-line information dissemination, but did note however that their university currently does not have plans to continue use of on-line coursework nor the technical capacity (bandwidth) to do so.

In conclusion, the reading program was popular and has built a good foundation on which to base future efforts in literacy. More attention perhaps should be spent on training teachers how to teach reading so improved reading skills will impact all subjects. Also, more age-appropriate pleasure books are needed for grades four to six so the momentum for pleasure reading gained in the earlier grades does not diminish. The DBE distance education effort was deemed by evaluators as having potential. The pilots proved popular but the numbers of participants involved were small, making definitive conclusions as to its immediate utility difficult. Both technology pilots also reinforced what evaluators found often about ICT usage in the field: on-line access and the level of computer literacy of participants are limited. The evaluation team feels that the idea of distance education is be a good one for future consideration, but the approach has many logistical and practical issues that need to be confronted before it can be fully and successfully implemented.

DBE3 Questions

1. The DBE3 project originally had a mandate to improve the quality and relevance of education for youth with a focus on life and work skills. Following the midterm, DBE3 withdrew from nonformal education and focused on a whole-school approach to improving the quality and relevancy of education for youth. To what extent was the quality/relevance approach successful?

The response to this question on the extent of success is in three parts, focusing on; (1) the scope of the final evaluation. (2) determining what DBE3 had already monitored and reported to USAID related to the extent of quality/relevance success, and (3) reviewing the extent of success of the Whole School Approach in which, as noted in the question, quality/relevance was embedded.

The extent to which the quality/relevance approach was successful requires research beyond the scope of this evaluation. Why? First, because of time contraints, the evaluation team did not interview students; the main beneficiaries/targets of the quality/relevance approach. Second, the teachers who were interviewed had little to say about life skills and quality/relevance. Third, much more time would have been needed than was available to implement the type of concentrated observation in classrooms and/or tracer studies of relevant youth *outside* the classroom to verify the extent of success. The extent of success of the quality/relevance approach is a very good question for an impact study; a study that should be done.

A second response to the question is to review what DBE3 already did to monitor and report on the project indicators encompassing life skills in the context of quality and relevance (a theme in the Better Teaching and Learning modules of the revised project; life skills continued as a theme both before and after the midterm evaluation).

In 2009, USAID and DBE3 agreed upon a revised set of project indicators. One of those indicators was that 'students demonstrate new learning behaviors in class' and one of the five learning behaviors monitored included "*students demonstrate life skills in the areas of personal, social and academic development (according to MONE guidelines), including working in a group and problem solving."* The project monitored, principally by classroom observation, both student behavior and student performance on life skills competencies. By 2011, 90.4 percent in project extension schools were rated as having demonstrated student behavior that met at least three of the pre-determined criteria; a possible proxy for estimating the extent of educational quality/relevance success. It should be noted that in the last year of the project, 2011, another indicator for student performance on life skills was discontinued. Nevertheless, DBE3 did supply some information to USAID on the extent of quality/relevance.

Third, to the extent that quality/relevance was a part of the Whole School approach, as noted in the question, its overall success must also be reflected in the extent of success of that Approach itself. The Whole School Approach was central to DBE3, and the evaluation team found that while it was an excellent concept, it was never really implemented during the relatively short life of DBE3. The degree to which this lack of success affected the quality and relevance of education provided for youth can only be surmised at this point without the types of research already noted.

2. How successful was DBE3 in achieving its three main goals as set forth in the midterm:

Goal 1: Quality of junior secondary education providers in target districts increased.
Based on the interviews, surveys and observations by the evaluation team, in the short-term the quality of junior secondary providers in target districts did increase as a result of the inputs and outputs of DBE3. Teachers and principals expressed their opinions that they appreciated the active methods and the materials. Performance scores of students, at least those tested by DBE3, did increase as a result of the project. All quantitative targets for this objective were 'achieved' and the project can be said to have achieved moderate success towards this goal. In the sense whether project efforts seem to be 'sticking,' and that these efforts were being institutionalized, the outcome appears to be much less successful; the evaluation team noted that effects have been fading since the end of the project. Sustainability is, and must be, an integral part of 'success.'

Goal 2: Support to the national inservice training system provided;
The degree of success in achieving this goal is mixed. Support to the national inservice training system was 'provided'; DBE3 did give a large amount of assistance to the GOI in terms of training and modules 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. Did all this effort fundamentally affect the system? The answer is largely no. The teacher training system, no matter how many trainings and materials are provided, needs total reform and that requires close collaboration among major stakeholders. Future efforts must expand on the meaning of 'support.' A graduated professional development in-service program for teachers is needed but the locus for that effort is unclear: universities, university 'centers,' NGOs, and LPMPs are all candidates.

Goal 3: GOI is better positioned to respond to the needs of the junior secondary education sector.
To what extent is the GOI in a better position to respond to the needs of junior secondary education as a result of the efforts of DBE3? The answer lies in the responsiveness of the project to the two sub-objectives of this goal: 'knowledge and information collected and shared' and' advocacy and policy dialogue conducted.' The answer, as with the previous two goals, must be qualified. The outputs were largely accomplished; the outcomes (short-term effects on society) are at best unclear.

Yes, knowledge and information was collected and shared. In the sense that modules were developed, trainings were designed and implemented, information on school and student performance was shared, newsletters and reports distributed, and that there was a somewhat greater awareness of school and district challenges and needs, then this aspect of DBE3 can be considered moderately successful. For 'advocacy and policy dialogue conducted,' the result was similar; in the sense that numerous workshops and showcases were held at various levels the project could also be deemed successful.

Having said that, however, it remains unclear how effective the plethora of newsletters, reports, workshops and other outputs were and are. Based on the interviews and

observation, the evaluation team felt that they have had far less impact than the project hoped and reported. Is the GOI now better able to respond to the needs of the junior secondary sector (because of the project)? The answer is not quantifiable at this point but qualitatively it can be said that there is much to be done to improve that responsiveness. The DBE3 efforts needed to be coupled with a much greater degree of personal collaboration and communication at all levels to be truly effective and successful. It is also unfortunate that the one year gap since DBE3's conclusion is leading to the dilution and fading of these project outputs as well.

3. Are there DBE3 activities or best practices that could or should serve as the basis to reform national policy?

Yes. The Whole School Approach is one such example. It offers an important strategy for quality improvement although not having been fully implemented in DBE3 has limited its utility in that project. Integration of life skills processes, active learning and other participatory methods all can contribute to GOI educational reform efforts and could influence future policy and national standards. The efforts by DBE3 to improve in-service training, including a pilot program with two universities, while limited by time and timing, offer best practices in terms of methods, and valuable 'lessons learned' in terms of the process of professionalizing teachers beyond certification. With the future improvements in collaboration and communication, the activities noted above all have the potential to influence policy reform.

Annex 8: Response from U.S Universities

DBE- US University Partnership Interview Matrix*
Interview Question 1: Name and role in university partnership
Florida State University: Jeffrey Ayala Milligan, Principal Investigator for FSU on DBE II, overseeing budget, activities, ensuring responsiveness to EDC, proposing further activities the 4 FSU team members deemed useful, supportive.
University of Massachusetts: James Royer, Principal Investigator for UMAass on DEB II, from September 2005 – end of project in 2011. UMass's 2 primary roles: impact evaluation of learning outcomes and train trainers.
University of Pittsburgh: PIs for Pitt- Clementina Acedo, 2005-2007, Maureen W. McClure 2007-2010, John C. Weidman, 2010-2011.Those Interviewed: Maureen W. McClure, Principal Investigator; John C. Weidman, PI; and W. James Jacob, Co-PI. Primary Roles: develop a sustainable university partnership, the Consortium of Indonesian Universities – Pittsburgh, that could outlive the end of DBE2, to help university leaders institutionalize project reforms in line with reform planning.
Interview Question 2: Involvement of your university with DBE? When? Indonesia partners? Role of your university?
Florida State University: Work began in 2006 and continued to the end of 2011. Worked with the universities in Aceh, North Sumatra, Banten, and the Open University in Jakarta. In 2010-11 also worked with other universities in Central Java, East Java and South Sulawesi. Worked with expanded number of university partners, but most extensively with those in the first 4 provinces mentioned. Principal activities: 1) trained lecturers associated with teacher education in participatory action research methods. 2) With the Open University, helped develop online delivery mechanisms for distance education primarily involved in course design and development, not the technology. 3) Provided input to the distance education pilot in Aceh. 4) Hosted a study tour at project beginning and had 2 Indonesian graduate students from Ache on fellowships.
University of Massachusetts: UMass attempted to upgrade the quality and expertise of the Indonesian education community in psychometrics. Worked with a UMass graduate at Padjajaran University in Bandung to develop a test to measure student learning impact. That test was administered in various forms over the life of the project. In any given year about 8,000 kids tested and in the first year a pre-test and post-test done, so 16,000 kids tested. A high-level standard-setting workshop held in Bandung for representatives from 3 of the major federal agencies in the summer of 2007 to set standards of competency in three subjects. Included study tours for 20 high-level Indonesian educators and attendance of summer courses in psychometrics. Three Indonesian graduate students attended UMass and successfully completed a master's degree. Workshops held every summer for Indonesian professors at a variety of universities. Little direct involvement with teacher training, but a lot of involvement in training trainers of teachers, and development of instructional materials to increase the psychometric expertise in the Indonesian community.
University of Pittsburgh: Work began in 2006 and continued through the no-cost extension to the end of 2011. Originally worked with universities in Central Java, East Java and South Sulawesi. This scope was extended with the formation the consortium (KPTIP) of DBE2 rectors in the fall of 2007, based on recommendations of USAID, Jakarta. Opinion of rectors: one of the best ways to preserves the gains from DBE2 was to institutionalize reforms through a revitalization of the lab school movement to showcase best practices for pre-service teachers and make available for the development of better in-service professional preparation programs centered in the university. Kept the Ministry of National Education informed of efforts and several groups of them visited Pittsburgh at ministry expense. KPTIP assignments given to the University of Pittsburgh included:

(1) the establishment of the journal, *Excellence in Higher Education* in partnership with IAIN North Sumatra; (2) the establishment and maintenance of the KPTIP website with Sebelas Maret University in Surakarta; (3) the establishment of the Indonesian National Association of Laboratory Schools (INALS) with the State University of Malang; and (4) ongoing Higher Education Administration Training (HEAT) Programs with partner universities throughout the KPTIP.
Interview Question 3: Which activities most successful to strengthen capacity of Indonesian university?
Florida State University: The most effective: training in classroom action research, emphasized the utility of action research in a variety of settings. Not sure what UT has been able to do with the training. Additionally helping them try to transfer part of what they were doing in distance education to online delivery. Develop research capacity in the partner universities. Did a series of trainings embedded in a much larger collaborative action research project. Teams in each of the partner universities worked on an action research projects culminating in a national conference where research was presented. Ultimately published as scholarly articles last December, as the project ended. Included in *Journal of Excellence in Higher Education.*
University of Massachusetts: The student learning evaluation with the DBE II was best effort. Several things made it work well: 1) development of a test designed to measure outcomes relevant to the project, rather than taking an off-the-shelf test that doesn't fit with what project goals, 2) involvement from the beginning, not just brought in to analyze data already gathered. Critical details: sampling plans, test administration procedures, get the data into a usable form.
University of Pittsburgh: The most important activities: activities that built and supported the rectors' consortium, including regular meetings and KPTIP website construction, its spinoffs in terms of interests in lab schools and the development of related networks for cooperation, and the development of an international journal for higher education management, the *Journal of Excellence in Higher Education*. *EHE* is a noted sustained activity now in its third volume and features reform efforts not only in Indonesia and the US, but globally as well, with a particular interest in East Asia. It includes interests in the growing education reform roles of universities in the face of rapid decentralization.
Interview Question 4: How did your university work with an Indonesian university contribute to teacher development? What not effective?
Florida State University: Emphasized the utility of action research in a variety of setting. Was the most extensive and effective activity FSU engaged in. Intensive and extensive contact with a lot of lecturers over the entire period of the project through that activity so was sustained from day one all the way through the end of the project.
University of Massachusetts: No answer to this because had quite an impact on trainers of teachers, though some of the impact was fairly ephemeral. Difficult to know if attendance at workshop will translate into changes when someone is teaching classes to teachers or potential teachers. The modules were directed at people directly involved in test development, not so much in teaching. Goal – enhancement of education system but not one that teachers are necessarily going to be the recipients of. Don't know the extent to which that is going to have an impact on educators.
University of Pittsburgh: Reform has to be approved at top. Engaged senior managers essential for the success of a project, and institutionalization. Important to have rectors who are aware of the successful efforts of their faculty members and who see the importance of continuing to provide these efforts after the life of the project. The KPTIP gave rectors a place to share ideas with each other and develop advocacy strategies for resource acquisition at the ministry level in light of increasing responsibilities for K-12 education reform in a rapidly decentralizing sector. Disagreements between DBE and members as to purpose and membership led to degraded version of consortium.
Interview Question 5: Best practices to inform in-service teacher professional development? Lessons learned?
Florida State University: A sustained engagement with a group of people was really important. Getting people involved in actually doing something – getting them out of the workshop or the university and into the field doing something together was important. If done over again, would probably do it a lot better. Activity didn't work out as planned. FSU not directly involved in the in-service teacher training that was actually teaching teachers in schools.
University of Massachusetts: No response.

University of Pittsburgh: The most important best practice was the absolute necessity to think system wide and institution grounded. Need to understand how institutionalization works, i.e. who will fund it after project ends? And how will these programs compete with the myriad of competitive programs exported by Australia, Japan, Germany, France and others. In the future, necessary to have a stronger, highly experienced USAID education team in place who can adequately supervise large projects in complex environments.
Interview Question 6: Institutionalization of in-service teacher professional development - how? Most important parties to enhance these practices?
Florida State University: Regarding institutionalization: Ministry of Education and District Offices, etc. important players for providing ongoing in-service training for teachers, but also for providing pre-service training. University a critical place for institutionalizing improvements. That's where prospective teachers are trained, where they are educated, where they are shaped as they go out into the field. If the universities are not producing decently trained teachers, if they aren't doing their part along with the various agencies in the Ministry of National Education, then they are really working at cross-purposes and undercutting one another. Do these [DBE II] activities get brought into and institutionalized within the? They have the capacity to do so, so they are one important place for institutionalizing these kinds of innovations.
University of Massachusetts: No direct evidence but I think so. Pretty obvious from looking at the sampled syllabuses that the universities weren't doing things in a way that was consistent with modern psychometric practice. To extent that UMass assisted to modernize the curriculum, impacted quite a few universities. Workshops in Banda Aceh, Semarang, and Central Java and participants in each workshop from multiple universities that surrounded the university.
University of Pittsburgh: Part of the problem was that the education program people didn't have much experience in the problems of institutionalization in rapidly decentralizing conditions. USAID's model of program-based planning outdated and wasn't suited to current realities. The management of institutions becomes central to institutionalization. The program created great opportunity for universities to start building alternative sources of funding through pre-service programs. Requests for DBE2 staff to visit UPitt School of Education to compare similarities of overall professional development structures to Indonesian universities not taken into consideration. Failure on whose part? Future work must better account for the rapid changes in institutional systems within the country.
Interview Question 7: Best practices for ALFHE? Lessons learned from DBE participation in this effort?
Florida State University: Not directly engaged in that. Current evaluation effort is important because many wonderful things that were done that people liked and appreciated. Critical question: what kind of lasting improvement or changes did this make? With ALFHE, now a year later, is it making a difference in those universities where they received that training? Hopefully it is, and the same thing with the action research training that we did.
University of Massachusetts: No knowledge.
University of Pittsburgh: Best practices alone cannot institutionalize programs in highly competitive environments with scarce resources.
Interview Question 8: What best practices from in-service prof. dev. to strengthen pre-service teacher preparation?
Florida State University: The common theme is active learning/action research is engagement. One of the most striking aspects of teacher education in Indonesia is how remote it seems to be from education and schools. The lecturers have an S1 degree and they are training people to be teachers, but they have never been teachers themselves. Had academic training in the subject matter, not in pedagogy, not in education. Rarely go out into schools or collaborate with teachers so one wonders how useful they can actually be in preparing people to teach. They stand in front of a class and talk at them. Trying to break out of this and teach people other approaches to teaching is one of the most important achievements of DBE II because [project implementers] were doing a lot with the modules and training and the active learning in schools to get away from that. If not changing the culture of the institution that's providing that training to teachers, it's less likely to take hold. How to go about creating that active research culture in schools and getting people teaching the content knowledge, so that they can figure out what a teacher's life is like in the classroom? Due to hierarchical [framework] lecturers at the university are supposedly more knowledgeable and superior to someone who's teaching in the elementary school, even though may have essentially the same degree.

Ministry's expectations and universities' expectations were unrealistic. Want to produce international quality research, but all have same expectations of these institutions, no matter what the institution or the level of training of the lecturers. A significant percentage of lecturers just have bachelor's degrees. A significant number have master's degrees. A tiny minority have PhDs. Lecturers don't have the training to do research. The action research training of FSU is a more practical and realistic form of research that people at various levels can do, but the differentiation of roles is something that they're going to have to work out if they really want to produce, if they really want to develop research capacity.
University of Massachusetts: Offered a series of workshops in two very important topics related to that: performance-based assessments on standard setting to begin with and data analysis. Those workshops were offered to university-level educators in a number of different settings in Indonesia but no knowledge of continued usage of information.
University of Pittsburgh: Again, note the chronic focus on programs with no mentions of the importance of institutions and systems.
Interview Question 9: What future resources needed at Indonesian universities to strengthen own capacity as pre-service provider?
Florida State University: Universities need schedules that allow them to be more reflective about their practice or to conduct their own inquiries into their practice. Relationships with FSU were assets of which attempts to continue to cultivate them are being made, even after the project ended. Indonesian universities are incredibly in-bred, typically the faculty are graduates of that institution. The kinds of relationships that they were able to develop with FSU, with Pitt, and probably less so with UMass, were helpful and introduced new ideas. They were all always very interested and very enthusiastic about these relationships and about what they could learn.
University of Massachusetts: No response.
University of Pittsburgh: No response.
Interview Question: How did the Indonesian university partnership benefit your university?
Florida State University: FSU benefitted enormously and learned a lot by being involved in this project. Developed relationships with institutions, signed student exchange agreements with a couple of university partners, signed cooperative agreements with a number of the other partners, have had at least 2 visitors from 2 of the universities who have come to visit FSU on their own. Received graduate students, two directly from the project with USAID money but all the others indirectly. Open University has sent several students here, by word of mouth of students have had directly or indirectly from the project a dozen graduate students come to FSU for degrees. Some have finished and gone home, others are still here, and from them, others come, so has been a steady stream of graduate students. FSU has sent a couple of students to partner universities in Aceh through student exchange programs and one graduate student taught there for a year. Enormously beneficial for FSU. DBE 2 first project in probably 10 years. So an enormous [boost] leading to development of other projects, and work with other projects.
University of Massachusetts: No response.
University of Pittsburgh: No response.
Interview Question 11: How effective was the working relationship with Indonesian universities?
Florida State University: It varies. Some better than others. Much depends on the initiative and leadership in the universities. A lot depends on expanding awareness. Good relationships with many of the university partners developed and continued cultivation, but absent some specific activity, it may not be as active as probably both parties would like. Issue: what's the capacity of institutions to really make use of the student exchange agreements? Three issues: an interest in cooperating, something specific to cooperate on, and then finding the right funding to support that. Which is best: to put a lot of money into a handful of individuals who return and become critical figure in home university or to go off to do trainings that are relatively brief. Time and sustained engagement needed to change habits and practices and institutional cultures.
University of Massachusetts: Hoped for development of some joint programs with Indonesian universities, create a situation where there would be exchange of faculty and students both ways. Now funding joint programs is major issue. Also eager to get Indonesian students over here for a funded PhD program but couldn't be worked out on their end [family visa issues].

Were partnerships developed and sustained or just doing workshops and then leaving? All of the planning had been done through one of the DBE II regional officers. No idea [how] universities were selected to host. UMass no partnering with those universities. Participated in a sort of formal dog and pony show - see the Rector, talk to some deans, maybe visit a department or two and then do our workshop. In terms of the fellows that came to U Mass to study, were you in partnership with their universities at all or were they identified through a different process? In Banda Aceh, had money for more participants than came over. One, it was shortly after the tsunami and every university in the world was there looking for students to bring to their own country so people had been culled over. The other issue is language. UMass requires passing the TOEFL which was difficult particularly in Banda Aceh. Only one person could meet the requirements. The others came from the Jakarta area, where much easier to find people. Had money to fund 2 but neither one of them worked through or were part of the university. Both were university graduates who had master's degrees from an Indonesia university.
University of Pittsburgh: No response.
Interview Question 12: Role of Indonesian universities in sustainability of DBE initiatives for professional development?
Florida State University: From limited perspective of FSU involvement, universities are a critical component in institutionalizing and sustaining changes in practice. Example: lecturers of university were participants in the in-service teacher training and the module development, and that's one place where it really seemed to take. Is where teachers are trained before they go out into the field and bring change to the culture of schools. Past practices in universities and lecturing and that sort of thing have really institutionalized that culture [of being told what to do, centralized control, etc.]. Will be difficult to change the culture of schools of a country of 250 million people, but maybe starting in places like universities would be one place try it.
University of Massachusetts: Some lasting impact probably in curriculum changes at the university level as a consequence of the training and development of the instructional. Fellows at U Mass received some psychometric expertise that simply wasn't available anyplace else in Indonesia, received information that no one else there knew which could have a lasting impact. At the federal level things really in a state of flux. Some people who UMass worked with badly needed direction. Two issues Indonesia is struggling with: 1) development of a national test and 2) common standards for that test. Wanted to have a clear standard of student competency and non-competent but extremely controversial decision in Indonesia to have same standard for all students (urban, rural, poor, etc.). During study tours to UMass, participants received a view of same process in MA to pass standards. A political process but very controversial. These decision-makers from Indonesia took away from a real sense of what need to be done politically to make some changes that would impact Indonesia as a whole.
University of Pittsburgh: No response.
Interview Question 13: How to improve profession development relationship between Indonesian university and similar future projects?
Florida State University: Make sure that universities are part of and partners with projects [like DBE]. Millions of teachers not qualified with S1, so it's a huge in-service training challenge. How do you provide the courses, the training, and upgrade teachers in the field so they meet that requirement? Working with the universities, or at least UT anyway, so they could award credit for training that the teachers received was pretty innovative and a new experience for the Indonesian universities, was something that was good and useful.
University of Massachusetts: Sense was that [DBE] was really good at it - quite impressed with the extent to which they knew the critical people in the universities.Anything in particular come to mind that they did very well? Vague sense that DBE really knew what they were doing with respect to the political aspects of Indonesia universities. Knew how to maintain important relationships in the environment of Islamic/non-Islamic universities and seemingly conflicting educational goals. Had a really impressive staff, almost uniformly Indonesian speakers. Some sense they had some problems in the central office with some of the staff, but in regional offices things worked out pretty well.
University of Pittsburgh No response.
Interview Question 14: Contribution of Indonesian University Consortium to improvement and continuation of teacher professional development?
Florida State University: Has potential. The huge question is what happens to it once USAID funding dries up. Not clear how much of what was discussed

and planned at those meetings actually happened in the institutions. A good idea and there's potential there. What kind of continued activities if funding available to help improve and continue teachers' professional development? Serve as a supportive community for continuing to build on some of the things that they were engaged in with the DBE II project. They've got the beginnings of a scholarly organization[through the Journal of EHE], a scholarly society where they can continue to do research together, come together and share their work in conferences, publish it in the journal or publish it in other journals. That's something that they could do and they could support. It will be interesting to see what becomes of the consortium.
University of Massachusetts: No response.
University of Pittsburgh: No response.
Interview Question 15: Did your university evaluate the partnership program with Indonesian universities? Can you share what you learned from evaluation? What changes being considered as a result?
Florida State University: No formal evaluation of the whole project. Have articles and drafts as data, interview notes with some of the participants so have material for evaluation. Basic structure of implementation makes sense. Opportunity to replicate [action research] one more time in the last year of the project with the other universities in the other provinces. Had a core of people to work with the entire thing but a many people come and go. The gaps between activities were often too long, at least in the initial part. Doubt that the majority of the people who received the training will continue to do research to a significant extent because of the conditions that they are working in; however some people have continued.
University of Massachusetts: No response.
University of Pittsburgh: No response.
Interview Question 16: Last comments?
Florida State University: One interesting and important thing found is engagement with the state Islamic Studies institutes. Is critical and is a significant component of education in Indonesia because caters to the core two quintiles of the population and the rural population. They have an enormous amount of creditability in villages in rural areas. They all want to develop into universities; they all want to develop secular programs. They all want to develop math programs and biology programs and psychology programs, etc. Going forward, that's going to be a really important area for collaboration with the Indonesian universities. If USAID really wants to target the rural areas and the poor, those are the institutions to work with.
University of Massachusetts: No response.
University of Pittsburgh: No response.

* Information for Florida State University and the University of Massachusetts has been condensed from telephone interviews. Information from the University of Pittsburgh is a direct response to this matrix in an on-line format.

Annex 9: Responses from Indonesian Universities

Highlights of Interviews with Indonesian Universities

Overview of DBE involvement

DBE1 established partnerships with four universities: UNM Makassar, UM Malang, UPI Bandung, and Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, in order to develop the capacity of a small number of university staff as service providers for distict level and school level programs. In the role of service providers, the universities provided assistance to district and school officials in the use of the planning and budgeting tools of district financial analysis (AKPK), finance management (SIMP-K), calculation of costs for Minimum Service Standards and access (PBPSAP), strategic planning (*RENSTRA*), accountability statements (LAKIP), annual work plans *(renja),* and school unit cost analysis (BOSP).[10]

DBE2 established close working partnerships with 15 Indonesian universities and the Open University (Universitas Terbuka/UT) to improve their capacity as in-service training providers and increase the professional capacity of teachers. University faculty were involved in the following DBE2 activities in varying degrees: Training Package Development and Adaptation, accredited teacher training through on-line courses, Instructional Video Development, University Working Group (UWG), Consortium of Indonesian Universities-Pittsburgh (Konsorsium Perguruan Tinggi Indonesia- Pittsburgh/KPTIP), Active Learning for Higher Education Program (ALFHE), Distance Education Pilot, and Digital Library. The following is the explanation of each question which is extracted from the highlights of university interviews. As a result of the partnership with these universities, 26 active learning–based training packages were developed, providing some 18,000 primary school teachers and principals with university-accredited, on-the-job professional development across 113 school clusters in seven provinces.[11]

DBE3 partnered with universities through engagement of a small group of individuals in the provincial BTL program for training of facilitators and teachers and in the Classroom Action Research program. In the final year of the project, DBE3 implemented a more intensive pilot program with UNNES Semarang and UNM Makassar to encourage lecturers to adopt and make use of some of the key project programs and approaches in order to improve the quality of both their pre- and in-service teacher training courses. In year four of the program, DBE 3 also involved a number of lecturers in a classroom action research program.[12]

<u>Description of DBE2 projects/activities</u>
Indonesian universities paired with U.S. universities to participate in the following activities. The university faculty members were variously involved as trainees, facilitators, and/or service

[10]RTI International (2011). *More Effective Decentralized Wducation Management and Governance (DBE 1) Final Report.*

[11] Education Development Center (2012) *Final Report (Vol. 1) DBE 2 Project 2005-2011*.

[12] Save the Children and IRD (2012) *Decentralized Basic Education Three (DBE3) Relevant Education for Youth June 7, 2005 – December 31, 2011.*

providers. Some of the materials produced by DBE continue to be used by lecturers in their classes or used by universities in provision of services to clients.

Training Package Development and Adaptation: Lecturers were involved on Module Development Teams (MDT) along with school practitioners to design, develop, and implement training packages in active learning. An unintended result of this teamwork was that lecturers gained valuable experience and insight into the realities of education at school-level.
Accredited teacher training: The training modules were accredited by partner universities, allowing teachers and other educators who participated and completed all of the course requirements to earn credits for certain relevant subjects. This intervention was intended to assist teachers to pursue their Bachelor degree qualifications while they continued teaching. The credits assigned by universities per package ranged from two to eight SKS.

Instructional Video Development: Intended to improve capacity in educational media development, this activity was led by the instructional video development team of the Open University and resulted in production of 33 scripts. Seven universities were involved in this activity: Universitas Negeri Malang (UM), Universitas Negeri Makassar (UNM), Universitas Negeri Surabaya (UNESA), Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) North Sumatra, Universitas Negeri Medan (UNIMED), Syiah Kuala University (UNSYIAH), Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES).

University Working Group (UWG): The establishment of this forum was intended to promote universities' communication and information-sharing about the DBE activities. The forum members consisted of university contact persons of each partner university, university advisor of DBE2, representatives from MOEC, MORA, KEMKOKESRA, and USAID. They conducted meeting or workshop at least once a year.

Consortium of Indonesian Universities-Pittsburgh (Konsorsium Perguruan Tinggi Indonesia-Pittsburgh/KPTIP): The development of this consortium aimed to establish a vehicle to promote coordination and communication among Indonesian and U.S. university members; encourage partnership and collaboration among consortium members in Indonesia and the United States; and facilitate the sharing of knowledge, experience, and expertise of DBE activities specifically and education reform initiatives generally.

Journal of Excellence in Higher Education: In partnership with the University of Pittsburgh, the start-up of this professional journal was the result of considerable initiative demonstrated by IAIN North Sumatra. The journal is a peer-reviewed professional publication which provides a forum to present university research as well as current education reforms efforts in Indonesia and globally.

Classroom Action Research: With support from Florida State University, this activity built capacity of participating universities to understand the utility of action research to investigate identified issues in education. Resulting research efforts were reviewed and published in the *Journal of Excellence in Higher Education*.

Active Learning for Higher Education Program (ALFHE): ALFHE was designed to familiarize university lecturers with active learning strategies. The intervention had four main components, namely (1) the Active Learning in School (ALIS) workshop and accompanying school visit, (2) the Active Learning in Higher Education (ALIHE) workshop, (3) implementation and supervision

of Active Learning in the Class, and (4) portfolio assessment and student feedback. Exposing university lecturers to active learning methods was intended to build internal capacity of those lecturers who were responsible for pre-service teacher preparation.

Distance Education Pilot: Two pilot activities were implemented in this intervention, namely pilot 1 which used online learning as the forum to develop skills of school-based coaches to help teachers integrate technology-based instruction into classrooms, and pilot 2 which focused on participation of university faculty in online course design and professional development for university lecturers.

Digital Library: The Digital Library was developed by DBE 2 and managed with the assistance of UT. The library housed DBE 2 products and best practices intended as learning resources for teachers, school principals, and other education personnel. The web address of the Digital Library is www.pustakapendidik.org. and is now hosted by eight university partners.

FINDINGS

The following information is based on interviews (face-to-face and by telephone) with these universities:

- UPI Bandung
- UNNES Semarang
- UNIMED Medan
- UNM Makassar
- IAIN Walisongo
- IAIN Medan
- UNISMUH
- UNESA Surabaya

The following are highlights of interviews/FGDs with university faculty members:

- All universities that participated in ALFHE claimed that it was the most effective of the DBE university activities. The active learning methodologies appear to be successful with university students also. ALFHE continues to be rolled-out to other universities, and in several universities, has been inserted to the Educator Professional Development Institute (LP3) as a requirement for all newly-hired young lecturers.

  The ALFHE opened the lecturers' mind about how to effectively prepare student teachers. As they noted, the university can only support change in teachers' behavior if they know the issues at schools. They use active learning in their own classes and find the use of environment, contextual learning, different seating arrangements, mentoring, and peer teaching effective to increase student learning. Students appreciate the 'freedom to learn,' make more use of the library for research, and employ higher order thinking to learn. Lecturers themselves have had to do more learning so that they can 'stay ahead' of their students in classrooms where active learning methods are employed. They find the authentic assessment techniques of active learning pedagogy fair and accurate ways to evaluate student progress. ALFHE is integrated to the training on PEKERTI (teaching and

learning pedagogy) and applied approach for university lecturers. ALFHE is sometimes required by the Rectors to be used in the Instructional Skill Enhancement Program for instructors using the DBE modules.

- From the DBE as a whole, the other most effective activities were trainings of university service providers on planning and budgeting tools (DBE1), module development (DBE2), and BTL and Classroom Action Research (DBE3).

1. DBE Partnership Problems/Challenges:

- DBE programs were not synchronized with the university programs, curricular plans, and budgeting process causing difficulty for universities to participate fully in the DBE.
- Funding must come more quickly for some universities to efficiently implement training programs. Budgets must be prepared a year in advance to implement such programs.
- The accredited teacher training was not a strong activity as the participating teachers only received four university credits towards certification, not a degree and the program was not expanded enough to provide a full course of credits needed for a degree.
- The distance learning initiative to enable teachers in the field to participate on-line towards certification had limited success as the program did not mesh with the university plans for expansion of on-line programs; therefore the activity was not sustained. Participating university lecturers however were very happy with their increased capacity to develop on-line courses.
- The *Journal for Excellence in Higher Education* which is the location for publishing action research results is not accredited by the Directorate of Higher Education due to the lack of international editors.
- The university consortium founded in partnership with 15 universities and Pittsburgh University may not be as strong as the U.S partner perceives. From Indonesian lecturers, evaluators heard concerns about leadership, funding, and a weak strategic plan which seem to influence its effective functioning.
- Lecturers voiced their opinion that study tours just for senior university staff may not be as useful in building capacity and strengthening programs. They opined that lecturers who teach should also benefit from study tours as they could learn and then input practical skills and knowledge to their own instructional methods that they had learned while overseas.

2. Sustainability and Replication Models

- UNM: The Center for Effective Schools is a university-based service provider in education which could be used as a replication model for in-service teacher preparation. The model provides on-demand services for in-service training to districts to improve teacher capacity. The Center has also worked with LPMP and P4TKs staffs but not on a regular basis. Although the Center has made a strong start, the Center operates with three, part-time directors. This staffing scheme may work well in the short run when the Center is just starting but in the medium-term the Center should consider putting into place a full-time director to actively generate and manage business, and develop programs for the Center.

- UPI: The program trained 26 lecturers in the DBE1 methods and program who in turn then taught those methods and procedures to 500 undergraduate students. The students are then sent out in groups of 10 to neighboring schools to assist school principals in developing school work plans. They also assist in developing the data as the basis for school planning and provide leadership guidance for the principal. The university lectures provide mentoring to the students and the schools.

3. Recommendations:

- Formal relationships, in the form of MOUs, between universities and projects are necessary to identify roles and responsibilities of each partner, especially commitment and mobilization of financial resources to support participation.
- For future partnerships, the universities request to have planning meetings a year in advance to ensure that future programs are aligned with university plans.
- It is important to identify university programs which can usefully be strengthened using the materials and technical assistance available.
- Future programs needs to focus at the district level and work only with committed partners. District and provincial partnerships need to involve local governments in every stage of the planning and implementation and ensure that the initial orientation of the program is very clear. MOUs should be revisited yearly. Local governments need to build in budgets a year in advance and provincial and district governments need to be in agreement on program goals and outcomes.
- The university should make efforts to improve their own capacity by:
    - Periodical revision of their curriculum,
    - Capacity building of the lecturers both in pedagogy and content of subject matters,
    - Periodical meetings or workshops for lecturers from the same field of study for sharing knowledge and best practices,
    - Dissemination of ALFHE to all faculty members,
- PRIORITAS should build and share extensively a portal for 'best practices' in teaching and learning at all levels of education institutions.
- PRIORITAS should carefully consider times/dates for training programs (maybe in closer consultation with the university) to align with academic calendars and other agendas of the universities.
- Research grants for university teachers to participate in Action Research would be helpful.
- To make partnerships with the government education system to support teacher professional development, universities suggests the ideal connection would be cooperation between the LP3 and the DINAS to work with the schools.
- Universities suggest that DBE activities be continued in future programming as they are appropriate and useful to increase teachers' competency. The recommendation from universities strongly suggests that new programs need to discuss with Rectors a year in advance to ensure the best match between plans, budgets, and curricula.
- The Principals Working Groups can be a bridge to universities to provide professional development services to schools.

- Training should be based on training needs assessment of individual teachers. The need for training is the gap between expected competencies and actual competencies acquired by individual teachers. Therefore (i) the standards for teacher competence (from National Standard of Education, NSE) that consists of four competencies (namely pedagogy, cognitive, social, and personal) needs to be operationalized up to a 'measurable measure,' and (ii) individual teachers' capacity in the four competencies needs to be measured. The results of the Ujian Kompetensi Guru (UKG) for pedagogy and cognitive competence have been used as the measurement, however due to claims of inaccuracy of the UKG to measure pedagogy competence, effective measurement tools for the competencies of pedagogy, social, and personal are still needed.

4. Lessons learned

- Universities should be more open to innovation and new approaches in teaching and learning. They should sometimes look out of the box and challenge themselves.
- Development of a service provider facility at a university takes time.
- Partnership programs needed to be reviewed and renewed each year.
- University service providers really need long periods of training and mentoring to become fully effective in their roles.

Annex 10: Matrix of schools

Legend for School Matrix

1. **School classification**: Public or madrasah (private or state)
2. **Type of School** by geographic and socioeconomic classification: urban, rural, or poor.
3. **DBE status**: partner, replicated, or non-DBE school.
4. **Are active learning methods present in school** based on following observable factors at time of visit: wall displays, student seating arrangement, teacher classroom behavior, student behavior, and presence of learning materials. Rating of **mostly**: 65% or more of classrooms display 3 or more factors. **Partial**: 40-65% of classrooms display 2 or more factors. **No**: few or no observable active learning factors apparent.
5. **Characteristics of school principals**: sex and number of years in current post.
6. **Information about supervisors**: **regularly / irregularly** - frequency of visits to schools based on the requirement of National Standard of once a semester. **Helpful / so-so**: interviewee's judgment on usefulness of supervisor's visits to the school.
7. **Identification of principal's knowledge or use of DBE activities currently in school**: From **DBE1**: **SBM**: use of school-based management to develop school plans. **SC**: the school committee is actively involved at school through financial, in-kind or other support. **Vision?** principal has a vision to develop the school which addresses students/ learning issues and appears to be actively committed to achieve it. **DBE2: AL**: Active learning: includes activities such as subject content knowledge, lesson planning, assessment measures and specific teacher/student behaviors (such as questioning, problem-solving, guidance & feedback, student voice, student reflection, collaborative activities), etc. **DALI**: Development of Active Learning with ICT: includes improved staff use of technology, media, development of teaching aids, research, and student ICT use. **CRC**: Cluster Resource Centers: knowledge and use of locations for training, accessing resources, sharing with peers, developing learning materials, etc. **DBE3**: BTL: Better Teaching and Learning, modules 1-4. **ICT:** how to Use ICT in BTL. **KS cap:** increasing capacity of school principals (*Kepala Sekolah)*.
8. Do DINAS education staffs continue to use DBE tools and processes to develop the schools and train teachers? Y / N
9. Who provides teacher training (TT) /continuous professional development (CFD) to teachers? **KKM**: Principals' Working Group, **KKG**: Teachers' Working Group, **Supervisors, Other:** training received occasionally from university lecturers, subject matter specialists from DINAS, LPMP, principals. **Independently:** teachers expected to work on their own (through books, internet or share with their friends/peers) to learn and keep themselves up-dated.
10. **University partnerships**: In the opinion of the interviewee, do partnerships with universities offer an opportunity to provide professional development/ teacher training for school staffs? Y / N

Banten Primary and Junior Secondary School Information

	1. School Classificat			2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				7. Know/use DBE activities									8. DINAS use DBE		9. Who provides TT/CPD?					10. Universit	
		Madrasah																		DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3										
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpfu	So-so	SBM	Active	SC?	/ision?	AL	ICT	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	KS cap	tools?		KKM	KKG	Super	Other	pend ently	ossibl	No
Banten																					Yes	No								Yes	No							
Primary School																																					
SDS Sukasari 4	x			x			x				x		x		2yrs					x	x			x		x				x			x				x	
	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Jr. Secondary																																					
MTsN 1 Tangerang			x	x			x				x		x		6mon					x	x						x	x		x							x	
SMP Nusa Putra	x			x			x				x			x				x									x	x				x						x
MTS Duarl Putra			x	x			x				x		x															x		x					x		x	
Total	1	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	1		0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1

- Data are from one day field test of interview guides and process so may not be complete. Date of visit: July 30, 2012

Central Java Junior Secondary School Information

		Madrasah					3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3			8. DINAS		9. Who provides TT				10. Universit	
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpfu	So-so	SBM	Active	SC?	Vision	AL	DALI	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	KS cap	use DBE		KKM	KKG	supers	pend	ossibl	No
Jr. Secondary																					Yes	No								Yes	No						
Purworego																																				
MTsN Bener			x		x	x	x				x		x		1.5yrs							x				x	x	x								
SMPN 19 Purworejo	x				x		x			x			x	x	4yrs					x	x		x				x	x	x							x	
SMPN 6 Purworejo	x				x	x		x				x		x													x	x	x								
MTsN Loano			x		x			x			x		x		5 yrs		x		x	x	x		x				x							x		x	
SMPN 31 Purworejo	x			x					x			x	x		6 mon					x	x																
Purwarego N = 5 Total	**3**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**2**		**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**1**	**2**				**4**	**3**	**3**			**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**
Boyolali																																				
MTsN Cepogo			x		x	x	x				x		x		6yrs							x	x			x	x	x								
SMPN 1 Cepogo	x			x					x			x		x	1 mon					x	x		x												x	
SMPN 2 Ngemplak	x				x	x	x					x	x		1 mon						x		x				x	x	x								
SMPN 1 Klego	x				x			x				x	x		1 yr		x		x	x							x					x		x			
MTsN Ngandong			x	x					x			x	x		4 yrs		x				x		x											x			
MTsN Sambi			x		x			x				x	x		3.5yrs						x		x				x	x	x								
Boyolali N = 6 Total	**3**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**5**	**5**	**1**		**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**1**	**5**				**4**	**3**	**3**			**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**
Kudus																																				
MTsN 2 Mejobo Kudos			x		x	x	x			x			x		6 yrs		x		x				x				x	x	x				x		x		x
SMPN 2 Jekulo	x				x	x	x			x			x		2yrs							x	x				x	x	x								
MTs Nurul Ulum		x		x		x			x			x	x				x						x											x		x	
SMPN 3 Jekulo	x				x				x			x	x		5yrs						x						x	x	x								
SMP 1 Bae	x				x			x			x		x										x				x		x							x	
MTs Banat		x		x				x				x		x	1yr						x								x							x	
Kudus N = 6 Total	**3**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**5**	**1**		**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**4**				**4**	**3**	**5**			**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**3**
Demak																																				
MTs Gajah Demak		x			x	x		x		x			x		6 mon		x		x			x	x											x		x	
MTs NU Demak		x			x	x	x				x		x		2yrs							x				x	x	x								x	
MTs Raudlatul Mu'alimin		x			x	x			x			x	x		10yrs				x	x	x						x	x									
SMPN 1 Mijen Demak	x				x				x			x	x		8 yrs		x		x			x	x				x				x	x					
SMPN 1 Mranggen	x				x			x		x				x	5yrs						x		x				x	x	x					x		x	
SMPN 5 Demak	x			x			x					x	x		8rys						x		x				x	x	x								x
Demak N = 6 Total	3	3	0	1	5	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	5	1		0	2	0	3	1	3	3	4				5	4	3			1	1	0	2	1	3
N = 23 Grand Total	**12**	**5**	**6**	**6**	**17**	**10**	**8**	**8**	**7**	**5**	**5**	**13**	**19**	**5**		**0**	**7**	**0**	**6**	**6**	**12**	**6**	**15**				**17**	**12**	**14**			**1**	**3**	**0**	**7**	**4**	**7**

- Interview guides and process were modified after Central Java visit to include Question #8; therefore data for this question are missing. Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visit: Central Java: August 1-12, 2012.

Central Java Primary Schools Information

	1. School Classifica			2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				7. Know/use DBE activities: DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3			8. DINAS use DBE		9. Who provides TT/CPD?					10. Universit	
		Madrasah																																				
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpfu	So-so	SBM	Active SC? Yes	Active SC? No	Vision	AL	ICT	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	KS cap	use DBE Yes	use DBE No	KKM	KKG	Supersother?	pend	Inde	ossibl	No
Primary Schools																																					
Purworego																																					
SDN Kaliurip	x				x		x			x			x		2 mon	x		x			x			x	x	x									x	x	
MIN Bener			x		x	x	x				x		x		4 yrs		x		x		x		x	x	x	x						x					x
MI Glagah Malang		x			x	x			x			x		x	1 yr		x		x		x					x									x		
SDN Loano	x				x				x			x		x	9 yrs		x		x	x	x										x						
SDN Maron 1	x				x	x		x			x			x	8 yrs	x		x			x		x	x							x	x					
N = 5 Total	**3**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**3**		**2**	**3**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**5**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**3**						**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**1**
Boyolali																																					
MI Gunung Wijil		x			x	x			x			x		x	1 yr		x		x			x													x		
MI Ringin		x			x	x	x				x		x		1 mon		x		x	x	x			x	x	x									x		
SD Sukabumi	x				x		x					x	x		2 mon							x		x	x	x											
SD Paras 1	x				x				x			x	x		1 yr	x			x	x	x		x									x	x				x
SD Randusari	x				x	x		x			x		x		4 yrs	x		x		x				x	x								x		x	x	
MI Kopen		x			x	x			x			x	x		3yrs							x											x				
N = 6 Total	**3**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**4**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**5**	**1**		**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**2**						**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**1**
Kudus																																					
MI Manafiul Ulum		x			x				x			x	x		N/A								x									x				x		
SD N 1 Kaliwungu	x				x				x			x	x		12 yrs				x				x			x											x
MI Sidorekso		x			x	x			x			x	x		N/A		x		x			x													x	x	
SDN 1 Gondosari	x			x			x					x	x		6 yrs	x			x		x			x	x	x						x	x				x
SDN 3 Prambatan Ki	x			x		x		x				x		x	3 mon		x					x															
MI Tsamratul Wathon		x			x		x				x		x		7 yrs	x			x	x	x			x		x									x		
N = 6 Total	**3**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**5**	**5**	**1**		**2**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**						**2**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**1**	**2**
Demak																																					
MI Wonosalm		x			x	x	x			x			x		7 yrs		x		x		x		x	x	x	x						x	x			x		x
SDN 13 Bintoro	x			x			x			x			x		3.5 yrs	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x						x		x				
SDN Sidomulyo 2	x				x			x				x	x		2.5 yrs				x					x	x	x							x		x			
MI Sultan Fatah		x		x				x				x		x	N/A		x		x							x									x			
MI Tanwirudholam		x			x	x			x			x	x		12 yrs							x											x		x			
SDN Cabean 2	x			x					x		x		x		2 yrs	x			x		x		x									x	x		x			x
N = 6 Total	**3**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**5**	**1**		**2**	**2**	**1**	**4**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**4**						**3**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**2**
N = 23 Grand Total	**12**	**10**	**1**	**5**	**18**	**11**	**8**	**4**	**11**	**3**	**6**	**14**	**17**	**5**		**8**	**9**	**4**	**14**	**6**	**12**	**6**	**8**	**11**	**10**	**12**						**8**	**9**	**2**	**0**	**15**	**3**	**6**

- Interview guides and process were modified after Central Java visit to include Question #8; therefore data for this question are missing. Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visit: Central Java: August 1-12, 2012.

North Sumatra Junior Secondary School Information

	1. School Classificat			2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3			8. DINAS		9. Who provides TT/CPD?					10. Universit	
		Madrasah																												use DBE								
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpful	So-so	SBM	Active SC?		Vision?	AL	DALI	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	IKS cap	Yes	No	KKM	KKG	Supers	Other?	Inde pend	ossibl	No
Jr. Secondary																					Yes	No								Yes	No							
Binjai																																					
MTs Al Washliyah		x		x			x					x	x							x							x	x	x					x			x
MTsN Binjai	x			x			x				x		x			x			x				x				x	x	x	x				x		x	
SMP 9	x			x				x				x	x			x			x								x			x				x			
SMPN 10	x			x		x		x			x		x		1yr	x			x								x			x		x					x
SMPN 11	x				x		x			x				x	1yr	x			x								x	x	x	x				x			
SMPN 2	x			x			x					x	x		3yr	x			x								x	x	x					x		x	
SMPN 7	x			x			x					x		x	6mo	x		x					x				x	x	x	x				x			
Binjai N = 7 Total	6	1	0	6	1	1	5	2	0	1	2	4	5	2		6	0	1	5	1	0	0	2				7	5	5	5	0	0	1	6	5	1	4	2
Taput																																					
MTsN Peanornor			x		x	x	x			x			x		6yrs		x	x				x	x				x	x		x		x	x				x	
SMPN 1 Siborong	x			x			x				x		x		2yrs	x			x				x				x	x	x	x				x			x	
SMPN 1 Sipoholon	x			x			x				x			x	3yrs	x			x								x	x	x	x				x			x	
SMPN 1Taratung	x			x			x				x		x			x											x	x	x	x				x			x	
SMPN 4 Taratung	x			x			x			x				x	10yrs	x											x	x	x					x			x	
Taput N =5 Total	4	0	1	4	1	1	5	0	0	2	3	0	3	2		4	1	1	2	0	0	1	2				5	5	4	4	0	1	1	4	3	0	5	0
N = 12 Grand Total	10	1	1	10	2	2	10	2	0	3	5	4	8	4		10	1	2	7	1	0	1	4				12	10	9	9		1	2	10	8	1	9	2

- Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visits: North Sumatra: September 6-16, 2012.

North Sumatra Primary School Information

	1. School Classificat	Madrasah		2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				7. Know/use DBE activities DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3			use DBE tools?		9. Who provides TT/CPD?				pend	10. Universit	
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In post?	Reg	Irreg	Helpful	So-so	SBM	Active SC?		Vision	AL	ICT	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	KKS cap			KKM	KKG	Supers	Other	ently	ossibl	No
Primary Schools																					Yes	No								Yes	No							
Binjai																																						
MIN 1 Binjai	x			x			x			x				x	7yrs	x			x	x	x		x	x	x					x			x				x	
MIS Al Muqorobbin		x		x			x			x			x		6yr	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x				x			x			x	N/A	N/A
MIS Ikwanul Mukminin			x	x			x				x			x	3yr	x			x	x	x		x	x	x					x			x				x	
SDN 020255	x			x			x				x		x		1yr	x			x					x		x				x			x				x	
SDN 020256	x			x			x				x			x	12yr	x			x	x		x		x	x					x			x					x
SDN 020260	x			x					x		x		x		6yrs	x			x			x								x			x					
SDN 020263	x			x			x			x				x	7yr	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x				x			x	x	x		N/A	N/A
SDN 023894	x			x		x	x				x			x	3yrs	x			x			x	x	x	x					x			x					
SDN 023901	x			x			x				x		x		12yrs	x			x	x	x			x	x					x			x				NA	
SDN 028288	x				x	x			x			x	x		N/A	x			x					x						N/A	N/A		x		x			
Binjai N = 10 Total	**8**	**1**	**1**	**9**	**1**	**2**	**8**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**6**	**1**	**5**	**5**		**10**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**6**	**5**	**3**	**5**	**9**	**7**	**3**				**9**	**0**		**10**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**1**
Taput																																						
MIN Peanornor			x		x	x	x				x			x	4yrs		x		x	x		x		x	x					N/A			x					
SDN 173100	x			x			x				x		x		6yr	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	x		x		x						N/A	N/A		x		x	x	x	
SDN 173102	x				x			x				x	x		1yr	x			x	x	N/A	N/A		x						N/A	N/A		x	x		x	N/A	N/A
SDN 173104	x				x	x	x				x		x		8mon	x		x				x	x										x		x	x	x	
SDN 173119	x				x	x	x			x			x		6yr	x			x	x		x	x	x	x					N/A			x			x		x
SDN 173133	x			x			x				x			x	6yrs	x			x	x		x		x	x					x			x				x	
SDN 178492	x			x				x			x			x	3yr	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		x		x	x						N/A	N/A		x			x	N/A	N/A
Taput N = 7 Total	**6**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**5**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**5**	**1**	**4**	**3**		**4**	**1**	**1**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**5**	**3**	**6**	**3**	**0**				**1**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**1**	**2**	**5**	**3**	**1**
N = 17 Grand Total	**14**	**1**	**2**	**12**	**5**	**5**	**13**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**11**	**2**	**9**	**8**		**14**	**1**	**1**	**14**	**11**	**6**	**8**	**8**	**15**	**10**	**3**				**10**	**0**	**0**	**17**	**1**	**4**	**6**	**6**	**2**

- Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visits: North Sumatra: September 6-16, 2012.

South Sulawesi Junior Secondary School Information

	1. School Classifica			2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				7. Know/use DBE activities: DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3			use DBE		9. Who provides TT/CPD?					10. Universit	
	Madrasah																																					
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpfu	So-so	SBM	Active	SC?	/ision?	AL	DALI	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	KS cap	tools?		KKM	KKG	Supers	Other?	pend ently	ossibl	No
Jr. Secondary																					Yes	No									Yes	No							
Pangkep																																						
MtsN Ma'rang			x		x		x			x			x		2yr	x			x	x	x						x	x			x				x	x	
SMPN Pangkajenne	x			x			x				x		x		6												x	x	x	x				x		x	
Pangkep N = 2 Total	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0		1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0				2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
Sidrap																																						
MI DDI Pangsid		x		x			x					x		x													x	x	x	x			x				x
SMPN 4 Duapitue	x				x		x			x			x			x			x								x	x	x	x			x			x	
Sidrap N = 2 Total	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1				2	2	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1
Soppeng																																						
MTs Takalalla			x		x		x			x			x		4yr		x		x	x	x		x				x	x		x							x
SMPN 3 Watang	x			x			x				x		x		9	x			x				x				x	x	x	x			x			x	
SMPN Lili Rilau	x				x		x			x			x		8	x					x						x	x	x	x			x			x	
Soppeng N = 3 Total	2	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	3	0		2	1	0	2	1	2	0	2				3	3	2	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1
Makassar																																						
MTsN Biring Kanayya		x		x					x			x	x		3yr	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			x	N/A				x				x			x	x	N/A	N/A
MTsN Gunungsari		x		x					x			x	x		9mo	x			N/A				x									x			x	x	
SMP PGRI		x*		x			x			x				x	12	x			x	x				x			x	x	x	x			x			x	
SMPN 3 Makassar	x			x				x				x	x		1yr		x		x								x			x				x			x
SMPN 33	x			x			x			x			x		14mo	x			N/A				x				x	x	x	x							
Makassar N = 5 Total	2	3	0	5	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	3	4	1		3	1	0	2	1	0	1	2	1			4	2	2	3	1	0	0	2	2	3	2	1
N= 12 Grand Total	6	4	2	8	4	0	9	1	2	6	2	4	10	2		7	2	0	6	3	3	1	5	1			11	9	7	9	2	0	1	6	3	4	7	3

- Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visits: South Sulawesi: August 28-September 6, 2012.

South Sulawesi Primary Schools Information

	1. School Classifica			2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3			use DBE	9. Who provides TT/CPD?				pend	10. Universit	
	State	Madrasah private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpfu	So-so	SBM	Active	SC?	/ision	AL	ICT	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	IKS cap	tools?	KKM	KKG	Supers	Other	ently	ossibl	No
Primary Schools																					Yes	No								Yes	No							
Pangkep																																						
SDN 28 Kemampuan	x			x			x			x				x	2mo	x			x				x		x	x	x			x			x				x	
Pangkep N = 1 Total	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1				1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Sidrap																																						
SDB 10 Pangkajenne	x			x		x	x					x	x		3yr	x			x	x	x			x								x	x				x	
SDN 11Pangkejenne	x			x			x				x		x		4 mon	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x			x	x	x		x	
SDN 4 Otting	x				x		x			x			x		11 yr	x			x	x	x		x	x						x			x	x			x	
SDN 3 Otting	x				x		x			x				x	17 yrs	x			x	x	x			x		x				x			x	x			x	
Sidrap N = 4 Total	4	0	0	2	2	1	4	0	0	2	1	1	3	1		4	0	4	0	4	4	1	2	4	3	2				3	0	0	4	4	1	0	4	0
Soppeng																																						
MI Assaddiyah Cabbenge		x		x		x	x				x			x	1yr	x			x		x		x			x					x			x	x	x	x	x	
SD 34 Tokabbeng	x				x			x		x				x	4yr	x				x			x							x			x		x	x	x	
SD 161 Karya	x			x			x			x			x		5yr	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x		x	x	x	x		x	
SD 166 Lapurawung	x				x			x				x	x		8yr	x			x												x				x	x		x
SDN 1 Lamappapolewar	x			x			x			x			x		7yr		x		x	x	x			x	x	x				x							x	
SDN 23 Tanete	x			x			x			x				x			x			x	x			x		x				x							x	
SDN 28 Malaka	x				x		x			x			x		3yr	x			x	x	x		x	x						x			x	x	x		x	
Soppeng N = 7 Total	6	1	0	4	3	1	5	2	0	5	1	1	4	3		5	2	4	2	4	6	0	4	5	2	4				5	2	1	5	4	5	3	6	1
Makassar																																						
SD 202 Walennae	x				x		x				x			x	6 mo.	x								x	x					x				x			x	
SD Islam Al Bayan	x			x		x	x				x		x		6yr	x			x	x	x		x							x		x						x
SDN 3 Bertingkat	x			x			x			x				x	12yr	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x				x			x	x		x	x	
SDN IKEKP 1	x			x					x		x			x	4yr	x			x	x	x		x	x						x			x	x		x	x	
SDN IKEP 2	x			x					x		x		x		1yr	x			x			x	x							x			x					x
Makassar N = 5 Total	5	0	0	4	1	1	3	0	2	1	4	0	2	3		5	0	1	3	3	3	1	4	3	2	1				4	0	1	4	3	0	2	3	2
N = 17 Grand Total	16	1	0	11	6	3	13	2	2	9	6	2	9	8		15	2	10	5	11	13	3	10	13	8	8				13	2	1	14	11	6	5	14	3

- Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visits: South Sulawesi: August 28-September 6, 2012.

DBE Evaluation: Junior Secondary School Totals: Four Provinces

	1. School Classifica			2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				7. Know/use DBE activities											8. DINAS use DBE tools?		9. Who provides TT/CPD?					10. University Prntshps	
	Madrasah																			DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3											
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpfu	So-so	SBM	Active	SC?	Vision?	AL	ICT	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	KS cap			KKM	KKG	Supers	Other	Indepe ndently	Possibl	No
Secondary Schools																																						
Central Java																																						
Purwarego N = 5 Total	3	0	2	1	4	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	2		0	1	0	1	3	3	1	2				4	3	3			0	0	0		1	1	1
Boyolali N = 6 Total	3	0	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	0	1	5	5	1		0	2	0	1	2	4	1	5				4	3	3			0	1	0		2	1	0
Kudus N = 6 Total	3	2	1	2	4	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	5	1		0	2	0	1	0	2	1	4				4	3	5			0	1	0		2	1	3
Demak N = 6 Total	3	3	0	1	5	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	5	1		0	2	0	3	1	3	3	4				5	4	3			1	1	0		2	1	3
N = 23 Total	12	5	6	6	17	10	8	8	7	5	5	13	19	5		0	7	0	6	6	12	6	15				17	13	14			1	3	0		7	4	7
South Sulawesi																																						
Pangkep N = 2 total	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0		1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0				2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
Sidrap N = 2 Total	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1		1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1				2	2	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1
Soppeng N = 3 Total	2	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	3	0		2	1	0	2	1	2	0	2				3	3	2	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1
Makassar N = 5 Total	2	3	0	5	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	3	4	1		3	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	1			4	2	2	3	1	0	0	2	2	3	2	1
N= 12 Grand Total	6	4	2	8	4	0	9	1	2	6	2	4	10	2		7	2	0	6	3	3	1	5	1			11	9	7	9	2	0	1	6	3	4	7	3
North Sumatra																																						
Binjai N = 7 Total	6	1	0	6	1	1	5	2	0	1	2	4	5	2		6	0	1	5	1	0	0	2				7	5	5	5	0	0	1	6	5	1	4	2
Taput N =5 Total	4	0	1	4	1	1	5	0	0	2	3	0	3	2		4	1	1	2	0	0	1	2				5	5	4	4	0	1	1	4	3	0	5	0
N = 12 Grand Total	10	1	1	10	2	2	10	2	0	3	5	4	8	4		10	1	2	7	1	0	1	4				12	10	9	9	0	1	2	10	8	1	9	2
Banten																																						
Banten N= 3 Total	1	0	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	1		0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1
N = 3 Total	1	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	1		0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1
N = 47 Grand Total	29	10	11	27	23	12	30	11	9	14	15	21	39	12		17	10	3	19	11	16	8	24				42	35	30	20	2	2	7	16	11	13	22	13

- Information is data from schools visited by evaluation team in four provinces. Interview guides were field tested in Banten, West Java for one day so data are not complete. Interview guides and process were modified after Central Java visit to include Question #8. Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visits: West Java: July 30, 2012, Central Java: August 1-12, 2012, South Sulawesi: August 28 – September 5, 2012, North Sumatra: September 6-16, 2012.

DBE Evaluation: Primary School Totals: Four Provinces

	1. School Classifica			2. Type			3. DBE Status			4. Active Learning?			5. Principals			6. Supervisors visit?				7. Know/use DBE activities										8. DINAS use DBE tools?		9. Who provides TT/CPD?					10. University Prntshps	
	Madrasah																			DBE 1				DBE 2			DBE 3									
	State	Private	State	Urban	Rural	Poor	Prtnr	Replic	Non	Mostly	Partial	No	M	F	In pos	Reg	Irreg	Helpful	So-so	SBM	Active SC?		Vision?	AL	ICT	CRC	BTL 1-4	ICT	KS cap	Yes	No	KKM	KKG	Supers	Other	Indepe ndently	ossibl	No
Primary Schools																					Yes	No								Yes	No							
Central Java																																					
Purwarego N = 5 Total	3	1	1	0	5	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3		2	3	2	3	1	5	0	2	3	3	3						2	2	0	0	2	1	1
Boyolali N = 6 Total	3	3	0	0	6	4	2	1	3	0	2	4	5	1		2	2	1	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	2						1	2	1	0	3	1	1
Kudus N = 6 Total	3	3	0	2	4	2	2	1	3	0	1	5	5	1		2	2	0	4	1	2	2	2	2	1	3						2	1	0	0	5	1	2
Demak N = 6 Total	3	3	0	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	5	1		2	2	1	4	1	3	1	3	3	3	4						3	4	1	0	5	0	2
N = 23 Total	12	10	1	5	18	11	8	5	10	3	6	14	17	6		8	9	4	14	6	12	6	8	11	10	12						8	9	2	0	15	3	6
South Sulawesi																																					
Pangkep N = 1 Total	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1				1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Sidrap N = 4 Total	4	0	0	2	2	1	4	0	0	2	1	1	3	1		4	0	4	0	4	4	1	2	4	3	2				3	0	0	4	4	1	0	4	0
Soppeng N = 7 Total	6	1	0	4	3	1	5	2	1	5	1	1	4	3		5	2	4	2	4	6	0	4	5	2	4				5	2	1	5	4	5	3	6	1
Makassar N = 5 Total	5	0	0	4	1	1	3	0	2	1	4	0	2	3		5	0	1	3	3	3	1	4	3	2	1				4	0	1	4	3	0	2	3	2
N = 17 Total	16	1	0	11	6	3	13	2	2	9	6	2	9	8		15	2	9	5	11	13	3	10	13	8	8				13	2	2	14	11	6	5	14	3
North Sumatra																																					
Binjai N = 10 Total	8	1	1	9	1	2	8	0	2	3	6	1	5	5		10	0	0	10	6	5	3	5	9	7	3				9	0	0	10	1	2	1	3	1
Taput N = 7 Total	6	0	1	3	4	3	5	2	0	1	5	1	4	3		4	1	1	4	5	1	5	3	6	3	0				1	0	0	7	1	2	5	3	1
N = 17 Total	14	1	2	12	5	5	13	2	2	4	11	2	9	8		14	1	1	14	11	6	8	8	15	10	3				10	0	0	17	1	4	6	6	2
Baten																																					
Banten N= 1 Total	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1				1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
N = 1 Total	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1				1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
N = 58 Grand Total	43	12	3	29	29	19	35	9	14	16	24	18	36	22		37	12	14	33	29	32	17	26	40	28	24				24	4	10	41	14	10	26	24	11

- Information is data from selected schools visited by evaluation team in four provinces. Interview guides were field tested in Banten, West Java for one day so data are not complete. Interview guides and process were modified again after Central Java visit to include Question #8. Data in Questions 6-10 may be incomplete due to non-responses. Dates of field visits: West Java: July 30, 2012, Central Java: August 1-12, 2012, South Sulawesi: August 28 – September 5, 2012, North Sumatra: September 6-16, 2012.

Annex 11: School Profile

PART 1: PRINCIPAL and TEACHER INFORMATION*

A. CENTRAL JAVA

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1 /DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
1.	Boyolali	MI Gunung Wijil	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	9	77.8%	11.1%	77.8%	22.2%
2.	Boyolali	SD N Sukabumi	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	9	66.7%	N/A	77.8%	66.7%
3.	Boyolali	SMP N 1 Cepogo	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	40	42.5%	12.5%	80.0%	60.0%
4.	Boyolali	MTs N Cepogo	Cohort 1	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	38	50.0%	81.6%	68.4%	68.4%
5.	Boyolali	MTs N Wonotoro, Sambi	Replicated	Madrasah	State owned	Master Degree	Y	21	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%	71.4%
6.	Boyolali	SMP N 2 Ngemplak	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	42	52.4%	2.4%	97.6%	78.6%
7.	Boyolali	MI Ringin	Cohort 2	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	N	7	57.1%	100.0 %	42.9%	14.3%
8.	Boyolali	SN N 1 Panas	Non DBE	General Public School	Private owned	Master Degree	Y	10	70.0%	10.0%	70.0%	40.0%
9.	Boyolali	SMP 1 Klego	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	41	53.7%	19.5%	92.7%	56.1%
10.	Boyolali	MTs N Andong	Non DBE	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	63	42.9%	23.8%	93.7%	61.9%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1 /DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
11.	Boyolali	SDN Randusari	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	8	50.0%	37.5%	100.0%	100.0%
12.	Boyolali	MI Kopen	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	N	10	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%	10.0%
	Average							**N = 298**	**57.2%**	**36.1%**	**83.4%**	**54.1%**
13.	Demak	MTs N Gajah	Replicated	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	49	44.9%	10.2%	100.0%	59.2%
14.	Demak	SMP Negeri 1 Mijen	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	46	50.0%	30.4%	97.8%	56.5%
15.	Demak	SDN Cabean 2	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	15	80.0%	46.7%	80.0%	26.7%
16.	Demak	MI Miftahussalam	Cohort 1 & 2	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	20	65.0%	35.0%	90.0%	30.0%
17.	Demak	MTs NU Raudhatul Mu'alimin	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	23	47.8%	87.0%	47.8%	47.8%
18.	Demak	MTs NU Demak	Cohort 1	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	24	41.7%	79.2%	75.0%	50.0%
19.	Demak	SMP 1 Mranggen	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	doctorate degree	Y	53	62.3%	11.3%	71.7%	64.2%
20.	Demak	SMP 5 Demak	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	46	65.2%	21.7%	93.5%	58.7%
21.	Demak	SD N Sidomulyo 2	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	15	73.3%	33.3%	40.0%	33.3%
22.	Demak	SD N Bintoro 13	cohort 1	General Public	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	12	50.0%	50.0%	83.3%	33.3%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1 /DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
				School								
23.	Demak	MI Sultan Fatah Bintoro	Replicated	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	N	25	60.0%	64.0%	96.0%	36.0%
24.	Demak	MI Tanwirudh Dholam	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	high school , Islamic university (not finished)	N	10	60.0%	80.0%	70.0%	N/A
	Average							**N=338**	**58.4%**	**45.7%**	**78.8%**	**45.1%**
25.	Kudus	MTs N 2 Kudus	Cohort 1 & 2	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	54	70.4%	38.9%	92.6%	50.0%
26.	Kudus	SD N Gondosari 1	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	13	46.2%	23.1%	92.3%	38.5%
27.	Kudus	SD N Prambatan Kidul	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	10	80.0%	40.0%	60.0%	30.0%
28.	Kudus	MTs NU Nurul Ulum	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	N	49	63.3%	98.0%	81.6%	26.5%
29.	Kudus	SMP 2 Jekulo	Cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	40	55.0%	2.5%	97.5%	55.0%
30.	Kudus	SMP N 3 Jekulo	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	44	59.1%	9.1%	90.9%	43.2%
31.	Kudus	MTs Banat	Replicated	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	52	84.6%	90.4%	86.5%	46.2%
32.	Kudus	SMP N 1 Bae	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	44	61.4%	9.1%	81.8%	61.4%
33.	Kudus	SD N Kaliwungu	Non DBE	General Public	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	11	72.7%	27.3%	72.7%	27.3%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1 /DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
				School								
34.	Kudus	MI Nurul Huda	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	14	21.4%	71.4%	78.6%	7.1%
35.	Kudus	MI NU Manafiul Ulum 1 and 2	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	24	50.0%	95.8%	75.0%	33.3%
36.	Kudus	MI Tsanratul Wathon	Partner	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	11	54.5%	90.9%	54.5%	36.4%
Average								**N=366**	**59.8%**	**49.7%**	**80.3%**	**37.9%**
37.	Purworejo	SD N Kaliurip	Cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	15	60.0%	20.0%	46.7%	53.3%
38.	Purworejo	MIN Bener	Cohort 2	Madrasah	State owned	Diploma	Y	14	57.1%	21.4%	21.4%	14.3%
39.	Purworejo	MI Al-Ikhwan Glagah Malang	Non DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	9	66.7%	66.7%	55.6%	11.1%
40.	Purworejo	MTs N Loano	Replicated	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	33	45.5%	12.1%	100.0%	75.8%
41.	Purworejo	SMP N 6 Purworejo	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	30	63.3%	26.7%	80.0%	93.3%
42.	Purworejo	SMP 31 Purworejo	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	36	50.0%	19.4%	80.6%	72.2%
43.	Purworejo	MTs N Bener	cohort 2	Madrasah	State owned	Master Degree	Y	45	51.1%	11.1%	93.3%	86.7%
44.	Purworejo	SMP N 19 Bener	cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	33	48.5%	9.1%	87.9%	63.6%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1 /DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
45.	Purwore jo	SD N Loano	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	10	70.0%	30.0%	90.0%	50.0%
46.	Purwore jo	SD N Maron I	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	10	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%	60.0%
Average								**N=235**	**58.2%**	**24.7%**	**75.6%**	**58%**
GRAND TOTAL		**Non DBE = 18 Replicated =12 Partner = 16**		**General Public = 24 Madrasah = 22**	**Private owned = 31 State owned = 15**	**Diploma =2 Bachelor = 33 Master = 10 Doctorate = 1**	**Yes = 41 No = 5**	**1237**	**52.3%**	**39%**	**79.5%**	**48.8%**

* School data has been gathered directly from conversations with school administrators and staffs.

B. NORTH SUMATRA

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teacher with S1 /DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
1	Binjai City	MTs Negeri Binjai	cohort 1	Madrasah	State owned	Master Degree	Y	63	66.7%	23.8%	96.8%	74.6%
2	Binjai City	SMP Negeri 2 Binjai	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	69	81.2%	7.2%	78.3%	53.6%
3	Binjai City	SMP N 10	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	46	73.9%	8.7%	100.0%	54.3%
4	Binjai City	SMP N 11 Binjai	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	50	48.0%	2.0%	96.0%	64.0%
5	Binjai City	SMP N 7 Binjai	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	45	77.8%	22.2%	97.8%	57.8%
6	Binjai City	MTs Swasta al washliyah	cohort 1	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	33	57.6%	93.9%	87.9%	36.4%
7	Binjai City	SMP Negeri 9 Binjai	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	46	78.3%	10.9%	93.5%	60.9%
8	Binjai City	MIS Ikhwanul Mukminin	cohort 1	Madrasah	Private owned	Master Degree	Y	11	72.7%	63.6%	100.0%	18.2%
9	Binjai City	MIN 1	cohort 1	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	N	22	86.4%	22.7%	100.0%	27.3%
10	Binjai City	SD N 020255	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	13	84.6%	23.1%	46.2%	23.1%
11	Binjai City	SD N 020263	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	14	78.6%	7.1%	14.3%	50.0%
12	Binjai City	SD N 028288	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	16	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	93.8%
13	Binjai City	SD N 020260	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	14	85.7%	42.9%	28.6%	35.7%
14	Binjai City	SD N 023901	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Diploma	Y	14	78.6%	21.4%	28.6%	28.6%
15	Binjai City	MIS AL Muqoirubin	Cohort 1	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	10	30.0%	80.0%	100.0%	10.0%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teacher with S1 /DIV Qualific ation	% Certified Teacher
16	Binjai City	SDN 023894	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	13	92.3%	15.4%	53.8%	38.5%
17	Binjai City	SDN 020256	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	14	78.6%	21.4%	35.7%	28.6%
	Average							**N=493**	**73.2%**	**28.9%**	**73.8%**	**44.4%**
18	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N1 Sipoholon	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	32	68.8%	25.0%	90.6%	56.3%
19	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N 4 Tarutung	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	31	64.5%	9.7%	83.9%	67.7%
20	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N 1 Tarutung	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	42	76.2%	11.9%	61.9%	52.4%
21	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N 1 Siborongbor ong	Cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	51	72.5%	19.6%	84.3%	60.8%
22	Tapanuli Utara	Mts N Peanornor	Cohort 1	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	13	76.9%	30.8%	100.0%	30.8%
23	Tapanuli Utara	SD 173102	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	17	76.5%	23.5%	11.8%	29.4%
24	Tapanuli Utara	SD 178492	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	14	85.7%	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%
25	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173133	Cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Diploma	Y	12	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	58.3%
26	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173 119	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	9	66.7%	11.1%	22.2%	55.6%
27	Tapanuli Utara	MI N Peanornor	Cohort 1	Madrasah	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	9	77.8%	33.3%	88.9%	44.4%
28	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173100	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	17	82.4%	11.8%	35.3%	52.9%
29	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173104	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	15	73.3%	13.3%	26.7%	46.7%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Principal Qualification	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teacher with S1 /DIV Qualific ation	% Certified Teacher
	Average							N=262	76.8%	18.4%	55.6%	48.7%
GRAND TOTAL		Non DBE = 1 Replicated =3 Partner = 25		General Public = 22 Madrasah = 7	Private owned = 3 State owned = 26	Diploma =2 Bachelor = 22 Master = 5	Yes = 28 No = 1	755	75%	23.7%	64.7%	46.6%

C. SOUTH SULAWESI

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Qualification of the Principal	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1/DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
1	Makassar City	MTs Negeri Model Gunung Sari	Non-DBE	Madrasah	State owned	Doctorate	Y	82	N/A	18.3%	N/A	80.5%
2	Makassar City	SMPN 33 Makassar	cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	57	68.4%	8.8%	89.5%	71.9%
3	Makassar City	SDIT Al Bayan	cohort 2	Madrasah	State owned	Master Degree	Y	30	56.7%	93.3%	93.3%	13.3%
4	Makassar City	SMPN 3 Makassar	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	62	79.0%	9.7%	82.3%	83.9%
5	Makassar City	MTs Negeri Biringkanay	DBE	Madrasah	State owned	Master Degree	Y	78	61.5%	34.6%	92.3%	62.8%
6	Makassar City	SDI BTK - Mamajang III	cohort 2	Madrasah	State owned	Master Degree	Y	17	100.0%	35.3%	94.1%	35.3%
7	Makassar City	SMP YP PGRI (Disamakan)	DBE	General Public School	Private owned	Master Degree	Y	24	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	41.7%
8	Makassar City	SDN Komplek IKIP	Non-DBE	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	24	66.7%	66.7%	100.0%	25.0%
	Average							**N= 374**	**72.5%**	**42.7%**	**89.5%**	**51.8%**
9	Pangkep	MTs N Ma'rang	cohort 1	Madrasah	State owned	Master Degree	Y	53	58.5%	34.0%	94.3%	54.7%
10	Pangkep	SD 28 Tumampua II	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	32	78.1%	15.6%	87.5%	40.6%
11	Pangkep	SMP 2 Pangkajene	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	67	67.2%	17.9%	98.5%	59.7%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Qualification of the Principal	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1/DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
	Average							**N= 155**	**67.9%**	**22.3%**	**93.4%**	**51.7%**
12	Sidrap	SD Negeri 3 Otting	cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	8	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%	37.5%
13	Sidrap	SD Negeri 4 Otting	cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	9	55.6%	55.6%	88.9%	33.3%
14	Sidrap	SD Negeri 10 Pangsid	cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	30	70.0%	43.3%	36.7%	40.0%
15	Sidrap	SD Negeri 11 Pangkajene	cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	25	88.0%	56.0%	56.0%	40.0%
16	Sidrap	MIS DDI Pangkajene	cohort 2	Madrasah	Private owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	11	54.5%	72.7%	90.9%	9.1%
17	Sidrap	SMPN 4 DUA PITUE	cohort 2	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	25	52.0%	8.0%	96.0%	72.0%
	Average							**N=108**	**54.7%**	**45.5%**	**78.1%**	**38.7%**
18	soppeng	SDN 28 Malaka	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	10	70.0%	20.0%	100.0%	80.0%
19	soppeng	SDN 166 Laburawung	Non DBE	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	9	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%
20	soppeng	SDN 23 Tanete	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	17	76.5%	41.2%	70.6%	47.1%
21	soppeng	SDN 1 Lamappolowware	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Bachelor Degree	Y	20	85.0%	10.0%	95.0%	90.0%
22	soppeng	SMP N 3 Watansoppeng	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	44	75.0%	2.3%	86.4%	61.4%

No	District	Name of school	Cohort	Type of School	Owner ship	Qualification of the Principal	Certified Principal (Y / N)	Total Teacher	% Female Teacher	% Non PNS	% Teachers with S1/DIV Qualification	% Certified Teacher
23	soppeng	SDN 161 Karya	Cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	16	62.5%	81.3%	81.3%	56.3%
24	soppeng	MI As'adiyah cabenge	Cohort 1	Madrasah	Private owned	Master Degree	Y	9	66.7%	88.9%	33.3%	22.2%
25	soppeng	MTS N Takalala	DBE	Madrasah	Private owned	Master Degree	Y	28	64.3%	42.9%	100.0%	28.6%
26	soppeng	SDN 139 Tokebbeng	Replicated	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	10	90.0%	20.0%	60.0%	30.0%
27	soppeng	SDN 202 Walnae	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	N	11	81.8%	36.4%	54.5%	18.2%
28	soppeng	SMPN 1 Lilirilau	cohort 1	General Public School	State owned	Master Degree	Y	55	63.6%	12.7%	89.1%	70.9%
	Average							**N=229**	**72.9%**	**41.4%**	**79%**	**51.9%**
GRAND TOTAL		**Non DBE = 3 Replicated =2 Partner = 23**		**General Public = 20 Madrasah = 8**	**Private owned = 4 State owned = 24**	**Bachelor = 9 Master = 18 Doctorate : 1**	**Yes = 27 No = 1**	**863**	**68.3%**	**38%**	**85%**	**57.8%**

D. RECAPITULATION BY PROVINCE, GENDER, AND SCHOOL TYPE

No	Province	Female Teacher				Male Teacher			
		Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI)	Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs)	Primary School (SD)	Jr. Secondary School (SMP)	Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI)	Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs)	Primary School (SD)	Jr. Secondary School (SMP)
1	Central Java	58%	55%	66%	56%	42%	45%	34%	44%
2	South Sulawesi	69%	60%	75%	70%	31%	40%	25%	30%
3	North Sumatra	71%	65%	81%	72%	29%	35%	19%	28%

E. RECAPITULATION BY TOTAL ON PNS , NON-PNS AND CERTIFIED TEACHERS

No	Province	PNS	Non PNS	Certified Teachers
1	Central Java	65%	35%	54%
2	South Sulawesi	69%	31%	57%
3	North Sumatra	79%	21%	52%

PART 2: STUDENT INFORMATION*

A. CENTRAL JAVA

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of Students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of classes
1.	Boyolali	MI Gunung Wijil	Madrasah	121	70	57.9%	26	21.5%	20	6
2.	Boyolali	SD N Sukabumi	General Public School	121	98	81.0%	108	89.3%	34	6
3.	Boyolali	SMP N 1 Cepogo	General Public School	740	400	54.1%	340	45.9%	36	18
4.	Boyolali	MTs N Cepogo	Madrasah	540	253	46.9%	287	53.1%	36	15
5.	Boyolali	MTs N Wonotoro, Sambi	Madrasah	211	103	48.8%	108	51.2%	24	9
6.	Boyolali	SMP N 2 Ngemplak	General Public School	661	357	54.0%	304	46.0%	32	21
7.	Boyolali	MI Ringin	Madrasah	76	35	46.1%	41	53.9%	12	6
8.	Boyolali	SN N 1 Panas	General Public School	145	70	48.3%	75	51.7%	24	6
9.	Boyolali	SMP 1 Klego	General Public School	565	282	49.9%	283	50.1%	32	19
10.	Boyolali	MTs N Andong	Madrasah	1018	518	50.9%	500	49.1%	36	29
11.	Boyolali	SDN Randusari	General Public School	160	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26	6
12.	Boyolali	MI Kopen	Madrasah	104	51	49.0%	53	51.0%	17	6
	Average			**N= 4,472**	**N= 2,237**	**53.4%**	**N=2,235**	**46.6%**	**27**	**12**

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of Students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of classes
13.	Demak	MTs N Gajah	Madrasah	579	289	49.9%	290	50.1%	36	16
14.	Demak	SMP Negeri 1 Mijen	General Public School	732	341	46.6%	391	53.4%	31	24
15.	Demak	SDN Cabean 2	General Public School	258	126	48.8%	132	51.2%	N/A	6
16.	Demak	MI Miftahussalam	Madrasah	431	204	47.3%	227	52.7%	36	12
17.	Demak	MTs NU Raudhatul Mu'alimin	Madrasah	665	334	50.2%	331	49.8%	40	18
18.	Demak	MTs NU Demak	Madrasah	511	251	49.1%	260	50.9%	37	12
19.	Demak	SMP 1 Mranggen	General Public School	995	547	55.0%	448	45.0%	36	27
20.	Demak	SMP 5 Demak	General Public School	729	331	45.4%	398	54.6%	30	21
21.	Demak	SD N Sidomulyo 2	General Public School	270	138	51.1%	132	48.9%	30	9
22.	Demak	SD N Bintoro 13	General Public School	169	82	48.5%	87	51.5%	28	6
23.	Demak	MI Sultan Fatah Bintoro	Madrasah	471	214	45.4%	257	54.6%	28	17
24.	Demak	MI Tanwirudh Dholam	Madrasah	85	42	49.4%	43	50.6%	6	1
	Average			**N=5,895**	**N= 2,899**	**49.1%**	**N=2,996**	**50.9%**	**30**	**14**
25.	Kudus	MTs N 2 Kudus	Madrasah	759	401	52.8%	358	47.2%	36	21
26.	Kudus	SD N Gondosari 1	General Public	266	146	54.9%	120	45.1%	45	6

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of Students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of classes
			School							
27.	Kudus	SD N Prambatan Kidul	General Public School	69	36	52.2%	33	47.8%	12	6
28.	Kudus	MTs NU Nurul Ulum	Madrasah	789	409	51.8%	380	48.2%	37	21
29.	Kudus	SMP 2 Jekulo	General Public School	799	378	47.3%	421	52.7%	32	18
30.	Kudus	SMP N 3 Jekulo	General Public School	672	286	42.6%	386	57.4%	30	22
31.	Kudus	MTs Banat	Madrasah	936	936	100.0%	N/A	0.0%	45	21
32.	Kudus	SMP N 1 Bae	General Public School	768	438	57.0%	330	43.0%	32	24
33.	Kudus	SD N Kaliwungu	General Public School	135	72	53.3%	63	46.7%	23	6
34.	Kudus	MI Nurul Huda	Madrasah	221	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	36	6
35.	Kudus	MI NU Manafiul Ulum 1 and 2	Madrasah	366	180	49.2%	186	50.8%	30	12
36.	Kudus	MI Tsanratul Wathon	Madrasah	102	45	44.1%	57	55.9%	17	6
	Average			**N=5,882**	**N=3,327**	**56.6%**	**N=2,555**	**43.4%**	**31**	**14**
37.	Purworejo	SD N Kaliurip	General Public School	289	132	45.7%	157	54.3%	23	12
38.	Purworejo	MIN Bener	Madrasah	146	75	51.4%	71	48.6%	24	6
39.	Purworejo	MI Al- Ikhwan Glagah Malang	Madrasah	69	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	6

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of Students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of classes
40.	Purworejo	MTs N Loano	Madrasah	634	308	48.6%	326	51.4%	35	18
41.	Purworejo	SMP N 6 Purworejo	General Public School	569	262	46.0%	307	54.0%	32	18
42.	Purworejo	SMP 31 Purworejo	General Public School	536	274	51.1%	262	48.9%	32	15
43.	Purworejo	MTs N Bener	Madrasah	790	389	49.2%	401	50.8%	34	24
44.	Purworejo	SMP N 19 Bener	General Public School	563	314	55.8%	249	44.2%	32	18
45.	Purworejo	SD N Loano	General Public School	195	90	46.2%	105	53.8%	32	6
46.	Purworejo	SD N Maron I	General Public School	141	61	43.3%	80	56.7%	23	6
Average				**3,932**	**1,905**	**48.4%**	**2,027**	**51.6%**	**28**	**13**
Grand Total				**20,171**	**10368**	**51.4%**	**9413**	**46.7%**	**29**	**13**

* Information has been gathered from conversations with school administrators and staffs or collected from information posted in school offices.

B. NORTH SUMATRA

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of Students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of class
1	Binjai City	MTs Negeri Binjai	Madrasah	710	436	61.4%	274	38.6%	32	22
2	Binjai City	SMP Negeri 2 Binjai	General Public School	1091	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	44	25
3	Binjai City	SMP N 10	General Public School	600	294	49.0%	306	51.0%	32	18
4	Binjai City	SMP N 11 Binjai	General Public School	760	379	49.9%	381	50.1%	38	20
5	Binjai City	SMP N 7 Binjai	General Public School	859	455	53.0%	404	47.0%	39	22
6	Binjai City	MTs Swasta al washliyah	Madrasah	310	160	51.6%	150	48.4%	38	8
7	Binjai City	SMP Negeri 9 Binjai	General Public School	684	322	47.1%	362	52.9%	38	18
8	Binjai City	MIS Ikhwanul Mukminin	Madrasah	136	58	42.6%	78	57.4%	23	6
9	Binjai City	MIN 1	Madrasah	319	157	49.2%	162	50.8%	35	9
10	Binjai City	SD N 020255	General Public School	222	102	45.9%	120	54.1%	37	6
11	Binjai City	SD N 020263	General Public School	325	163	50.2%	162	49.8%	41	8
12	Binjai City	SD N 028288	General Public School	284	151	53.2%	133	46.8%	47	8
13	Binjai City	SD N 020260	General Public School	236	120	50.8%	116	49.2%	27	9
14	Binjai City	SD N 023901	General Public School	190	79	41.6%	111	58.4%	31	6
15	Binjai City	MIS AL Muqoirubin	Madrasah	104	58	55.8%	46	44.2%	17	6
16	Binjai City	SDN 023894	General Public	147	72	49.0%	75	51.0%	24	6

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of Students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of class
			School							
17	Binjai City	SDN 020256	General Public School	206	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25	8
	Average			**N=7,183**	**N=3,006**	**50%**	**N=2,880**	**50%**	**33**	**12**
18	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N1 Sipoholon	General Public School	515	255	49.5%	260	50.5%	32	15
19	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N 4 Tarutung	General Public School	386	177	45.9%	209	54.1%	32	14
20	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N 1 Tarutung	General Public School	615	292	47.5%	323	52.5%	32	21
21	Tapanuli Utara	SMP N 1 Siborongborong	General Public School	791	408	51.6%	383	48.4%	34	23
22	Tapanuli Utara	Mts N Peanornor	Madrasah	130	69	53.1%	61	46.9%	18	6
23	Tapanuli Utara	SD 173102	General Public School	352	184	52.3%	166	47.2%	29	12
24	Tapanuli Utara	SD 178492	General Public School	225	112	49.8%	113	50.2%	28	8
25	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173133	General Public School	144	64	44.4%	80	55.6%	24	6
26	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173 119	General Public School	152	76	50.0%	76	50.0%	23	6
27	Tapanuli Utara	MI N Peanornor	Madrasah	51	23	45.1%	28	54.9%	6	1
28	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173100	General Public School	259	137	52.9%	122	47.1%	24	11
29	Tapanuli Utara	SD N 173104	General Public School	246	111	45.1%	135	54.9%	8	7
	Average			**N=4,136**	**N=1,908**	**46.1%**	**N=2,228**	**53.9%**	**24**	**11**
	Grand Total			**N=11,319**	**N=4,914**	**48%**	**N= 5108**	**52%**	**29**	**12**

C. SOUTH SULAWESI

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of classes
1	Makassar City	MTs Negeri Model Gunung Sari	Madrasah	1116	591	53.0%	515	46.1%	36 - 40	29
2	Makassar City	SMPN 33 Makassar	General Public School	962	485	50.4%	477	49.6%	36	27
3	Makassar City	SDIT Al Bayan	Madrasah	286	149	52.1%	137	47.9%	20 - 25	14
4	Makassar City	SMPN 3 Makassar	General Public School	1118	620	55.5%	498	44.5%	40	38
5	Makassar City	MTs Negeri Biringkanay	Madrasah	1162	612	52.7%	550	47.3%	40	30
6	Makassar City	SDI BTK - Mamajang III	Madrasah	348	154	44.3%	194	55.7%	29	12
7	Makassar City	SMP YP PGRI (Disamakan)	General Public School	570	275	48.2%	295	51.8%	45	12
8	Makassar City	SDN Komplek IKIP	General Public School	549	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	45	12
	Average			**N=6,111**	**N=2,886**	**51%**	**N=2,666**	**49%**	**36**	**22**
9	Pangkep	MTs N Ma'rang	Madrasah	606	312	51.5%	294	48.5%	28	22
10	Pangkep	SD 28 Tumampua II	General Public School	698	366	52.4%	332	47.6%	37	6
11	Pangkep	SMP 2 Pangkajene	General Public School	982	453	46.1%	528	53.8%	32	34
	Average			**N=2,286**	**N=1,132**	**50%**	**N=1,154**	**50%**	**32**	**21**
12	Sidrap	SD Negeri 3 Otting	General Public School	152	80	52.6%	72	47.4%	25	6
13	Sidrap	SD Negeri 4 Otting	General Public School	241	113	46.9%	128	53.1%	40	6
14	Sidrap	SD Negeri 10 Pangsid	General Public School	430	220	51.2%	210	48.8%	32	13

No	District	Name of school	Type of School	Number of students	Female Students	% Female Students	Male Students	% Male Students	Average Students per class	Number of classes
15	Sidrap	SD Negeri 11 Pangkajene	General Public School	463	202	43.6%	261	56.4%	32	16
16	Sidrap	MIS DDI Pangkajene	Madrasah	124	65	52.4%	59	47.6%	21	6
17	Sidrap	SMPN 4 DUA PITUE	General Public School	501	266	53.1%	235	46.9%	30	17
	Average			**N=1,911**	**N=946**	**49.5%**	**N=965**	**50.5%**	**30**	**10**
18	Sopeng	SDN 202 Walnae	General Public School	56	24	42.9%	32	57.1%	9	1
19	Sopeng	SMPN 1 Lilirilau	General Public School	795	422	53.1%	373	46.9%	32	25
20	soppeng	SDN 28 Malaka	General Public School	184	100	54.3%	84	45.7%	30	8
21	soppeng	SDN 166 Laburawung	General Public School	161	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28	6
22	soppeng	SDN 23 Tanete	General Public School	179	73	40.8%	106	59.2%	27	7
23	soppeng	SDN 1 Lamappoloware	General Public School	307	163	53.1%	144	46.9%	23	14
24	soppeng	SMP N 3 Watansoppeng	General Public School	420	189	45.0%	231	55.0%	20	21
25	soppeng	SDN 161 Karya	General Public School	239	110	46.0%	129	54.0%	27	9
26	soppeng	MI As'adiyah cabenge	Madrasah	78	38	48.7%	40	51.3%	13	6
27	soppeng	MTS N Takalala	Madrasah	413	215	52.1%	198	47.9%	27	15
28	soppeng	SDN 139 Tokebbeng	General Public School	142	66	46.5%	76	53.5%	20	6
	Average			**N=2,974**	**N=1,362**	**45.8%**	**N=1,413**	**54.2%**	**23**	**11**
Grand Total				**13282**	**6363**	**47.9%**	**6198**	**46.7%**	**30**	**16**