

**COMPARISON OF EDUCATION POLICY USA & INDONESIA****Ulul Albab**University Dr Soetomo Surabaya, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia  
Email: dr.ululalbab@gmail.com**Abstract**

In public policy, both from Feldman's and Heidenheimer's definitions of CPP (Comparative Public Policy), we can conclude that there are 3 elements (elements) that are keywords that are the center of attention of CPP. In Feldman's terms, the 3 keywords are "process," "output," and "outcomes," while the keywords used by Heidenheimer are "how," "why," and "to what effect." There are at least 3 reasons and objectives for comparing existing public policies between certain countries and other countries, or between existing policies in our country and policies in other countries. Namely: To get an overview and lessons on how to design a good policy. To gain a more profound and better understanding of how the role of government institutions and political processes (as they should be) is primarily related to the formulation and resolution of concrete problems that develop in society. To review various existing policies across the national level. Qualitative analysis method using SWOT. This is based on a qualitative study, not a quantitative one. This analysis refers to the results of studies and references on the existing Decentralization of education, including relevant books and publications. The comparison of public policies results includes Choices of Scope, Choices of Policy Instruments, Choices of Distribution, Choices of Restraints, and Innovation. In the United States, the education decentralization policy has proven to be an option to make it easier for the Government to deal with problems in detail and create alternative options for further improvement of education policy with innovations that vary from district to district. In Indonesia, the education decentralization policy has been able to help the central Government more quickly and in detail solve problems that arise in the education sector.

**Keywords:** Education policy; United States of America; Indonesia

Received 01 March 2022, Revised 04 March 2022, Accepted 10 April 2022

**Introduction****A. Understanding Comparative Public Policy**

As noted by (Feldman, 1978), Public policy comparison is a method of studying public policy (covering the policy process, policy outcomes, and policy impacts), which is carried out by adopting a "comparative" approach. Comparing certain policies with other policies in specific countries with those in other countries. (Heidenheimer, Hecl, & Adams, 1990) gives a more specific affirmation, by the comparison of public

policy is the study of how, why, and what impacts are caused by government actions and government inaction.

From both Feldman's and Heidenheimer's definitions of CPP (Comparative Public Policy), we can conclude that there are 3 elements (elements) that are keywords that are the center of attention of CPP. In Feldman's terms, the 3 keywords are "process," "output," and "outcomes," while the keywords used by Heidenheimer are "how," "why," and "to what effect." Although there are differences in using

keywords, the concepts of Feldman and Heidenheimer are not contradictory, and even Heidenheimer (who developed the concept later than Feldman) seems to have clarified our understanding of CPP.

### **B. Objectives of Comparative Public Policy**

There are at least 3 reasons and objectives why we need to conduct a comparative study of existing public policies between certain countries and other countries or between existing policies in our country and policies in other countries. That is:

- 1) To get an overview and lessons on designing a good policy.
- 2) To gain a more profound and better understanding of how the role of government institutions and political processes (as they should be) is primarily related to the formulation and resolution of concrete problems that develop in society.
- 3) To review various existing policies across the national level.

### **C. CPP Framework**

With the definition and objectives of CPP as stated above, it can be said that the CPP study includes theoretical analysis and practical analysis aimed at solving problems (as formulated in the policy) in more detail and detail. Thus, the scope of the study becomes very broad. Therefore, it is possible to have many choices to compare public policies, including "economic choice" and "politics choice." If in the economic framework (economical choice) there are known 2 types, namely allocation (allocational) and distribution (distributive), then in the framework of politics (politics choice), we will know more. Heidenheimer helps us concentrate only on 4 types of choices from the many choices in Politics as Choice. That is:

- 1) Choices of coverage areas (Choices of Scope). This type of Choice of Scope analyzes how public (Government) roles and responsibilities are compared

to private (private) roles and responsibilities in dealing with policy issues. In other words, the extent to which the scope of government involvement in dealing with public problems is compared to the scope of public (private) involvement. This choice of Scope type is also used to analyze whether a policy is set to solve single problems or complex (interrelated) problems. For example, policies on education; Is the policy only specifically to solve education problems, or is it also intended to solve poverty problems and others related to increasing citizens' access to a more harmonious life?

- 2) Choices of Policy Instruments (Choices of Policy Instruments). This type of choice analyzes what instrument or policy tool is used. The policy was taken for the purpose (as a tool to achieve the goal) to maintain decision-making power at the national level or for the purpose (as a tool to achieve the goal) of delegation of authority at a lower level?. Using the government structure as a policy instrument or other tools? Moreover, there are many more choices of policy instruments used, which are generally related to specific instruments in public intervention.
- 3) Choices of Distribution (Choices of Distribution). This option analyzes the impact of that policy anywhere. Does the policy have a multiplier impact or not?
- 4) Choices of Detailed Problem Solving and Innovation (Choices of Restraints and Innovation). This type of choice analyzes various possible alternatives that can be selected and used to solve problems in detail. The questions asked ranged from; how to continue, end or adjust policies that have been implemented so far. These questions are used to find creations and

innovations for solving problems that may not be solved with alternatives that have been chosen so far.

#### **D. CPP approach**

Comparative Public Policy (CPP) studies recognize several approaches. W. Parsons (1997: 40) suggests that 5 approaches are generally used in CPP studies, namely:

- 1) Socio-Economic Approaches; This approach analyzes how far the impact of the policy affects economic and social factors.
- 2) Party Government Approaches; This approach examines how the competition (competition) between political parties and partisans controls the Government, especially in controlling public policy.
- 3) Class Struggle Approaches; This approach explains the struggles of each group in society regarding the political format of public policy, which differs between capitalist countries.
- 4) Neo-Corporatist Approaches; This approach focuses more on analyzing the influence of interest organizations (interest groups) in determining public policy. In other words, focusing on competing interest organizations.
- 5) Institutionalist Approaches; This approach examines the role of the State and social institutions in defining and formulating public policy.

As a complement, (Clasen & Clegg, 2006) are also presented on various approaches to Comparative Public Policy. According to Doling, 3 focus studies are always compared. Each has significant questions and significant goals. The three focuses of the study are:

- 1) Context to Content; In the focus of this study, the study aims to test and build new theories. The main questions asked are; why and how did the policy emerge (held)?.
- 2) Content; In the focus of this study, the main objective to be achieved is to

describe the content of the policy and make its classification (classify the policy). The questions asked are; what is the content of the policy?

- 3) Context to Conclusion; In this focus study, the main objective is to evaluate and learn policy lessons. The critical question is; what is the result of that policy?

#### **Method**

Data analysis is a method in a research process carried out after all the data obtained will be used to solve a problem. The discussion uses a descriptive method, where the descriptive analysis method is "a statistical method used to collect, analyze and classify the data that has been collected according to what it is without intending to conclude. This study uses data analysis techniques in the form of the SWOT method. This research study method uses SWOT analysis. The authors' data comes from primary and secondary observations and documentation, namely from many sources such as journals, articles, literature, and field observations. This process begins with identifying and formulating a policy, a plan, and a large or small-scale project by assessing and explaining internal and external factors that can influence policies to achieve results.

The SWOT analysis guideline is to compare certain areas' conditions with other conditions that are the same or different. The swot method consists of:

- 1) Strength: the policy is in the form of strengths and advantages.
- 2) Weakness: the policy is in the form of weaknesses and shortcomings.
- 3) Opportunity: the policy is in the form of opportunities.
- 4) Threats: the policy is a threat.

Then analyze the various data that have been obtained and set goals.

## Results and Discussion

### A. Description of United States Education Policy

#### 1. US Education Politics

In general, educational policies taken in a country tend to be used for state intervention in its citizens. The form of intervention can be in the form of justification (abash or acknowledgment or not) of specific knowledge, school institutional arrangements, length of education and degrees, and educational qualifications associated with job positions (positions). Among the existing levels of school education (starting from Elementary to Higher Education levels), the State generally prefers to concentrate its power on intervening in school education intended for children, youth, and youth. Hardly any country pays sufficient attention to adult education.

The question is; Why does the State prefer to focus its attention on the education of children (youth) compared to adult education?. (Heidenheimer et al., 1990) illustrates the answer as follows: Some countries choose to concentrate their intervention on education for children and youth is due to the reason that the State has the responsibility to create national cadres. Some other countries have reasons that schools are pretty interesting to master, in which there is a generation that is very easy to influence. Some countries argue that voting rights for future political elections need a socialization process, and it is suitable for children through their schools.

Meanwhile, education is a basic need that must be met. State intervention and intervention in formal school education seem to be often ignored by parents. Because of this, parents flocked to enroll their children

in various educational institutions, mainly formal educational institutions organized or accredited by the State.

Therefore, it is necessary to have a supervisory mechanism carried out by local adults (community) on the implementation of formal school education so that state intervention (policy) in the education sector has a positive meaning for the next generation who is more reliable, as well as to reduce the chances of deviations that may occur. Carried out by the State in its intervention activities.

The United States is one of the pioneers of democracy. In democratic countries, the awareness to monitor and limit government intervention in the education sector is marked by choice of the principle of Decentralization in policymaking (regulation) in the education sector. Education policy in the United States has long been the responsibility of the State and Local Governments. Previously, the Central Government did intervene in educational policy, as had happened since 1872, when the US Central Government intervened in education policy by giving state land to the State for the construction of agricultural and engineering faculties; assisting schools with lunch programs, providing education for Indians; providing education funds for veterans who return to campus for further education.

Provide loans for students; provide budgets for research purposes, foreign student exchanges, and assistance for various other student needs; and provide indirect assistance (because under United States law, the Government is prohibited from providing direct assistance) to religious schools in the form of textbooks and laboratories.

However, since the administration of President Ronald Reagan, the US Central Government's intervention in education has begun to be reduced. Furthermore, responsibilities and initiatives for education policies are handed over to the State (Provincial level) and Local/District Governments (Regency/City level). In the United States, there are 50 States and 15,358 Districts, so many institutions are given the authority and autonomy to manage education.

## 2. US Educational Goals

As described above, the main characteristic of the political education system in the United States is the prominence of DECENTRALIZATION (Inglehart, 1988). The Central Government gives the broadest possible autonomy to the Government, namely the State and Regional Governments (Districts). Although the United States does not have a centralized or national education system, this does not mean that there is no formulation of educational goals that apply nationally. The goals of the American education system are generally formulated in 5 points as follows:

- a) To achieve unity in diversity;
- b) To develop democratic ideals and practices;
- c) To assist individual development;
- d) To improve the social conditions of the community; and
- e) To accelerate national progress.

Beyond these 5 goals, the United States developed a vision and mission of free education for school-age children for 12 years of early education. The cost of education is relatively cheap for higher education levels.

## 3. US Education Mangement

By developing the pattern of Decentralization, education management in the United States is managed based on the aspirations and needs of the State community and local Government. One department was formed at the national (federal/central) level, namely the FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (Data & Pendidikan, n.d.). A Cabinet Secretary equivalent heads this department. The task of this department is to implement all federal government policies in the education sector at all levels of Government and for all levels of education (Hakam, 2011) (Kurniawan, 2011).

However, since most educational authority and responsibility have been delegated to the State and Local Governments, the Federal Department of Education only monitors and supervises. At the state level, a body called the BOARD of EDUCATION was formed. This Agency has the task and function of making policies and determining the education budget for each region (State), especially Basic Education and Secondary Education. Furthermore, to deal with problems related to more technical matters (namely, regarding the school curriculum, determination of certification requirements, teachers, and school financing), an education section called the COMMISSIONER, often also referred to as the SUPERINTENDENT, was formed. This section is headed by a person appointed by the Board of Education or the Governor.

Principals have broad freedom and autonomy to carry out educational and operational management. Many are carried out directly by the respective schools. For some States, the leadership of the Education Section is elected by the community.

Meanwhile, at the operational level, the implementation of education management is carried out by lower units.

To deal with Higher Education policy, the United States education management developed by the States separates the Agency that permits the establishment of Higher Education (State and Private) from the Agency that formulates academic and financial policies. The governing body for academic and financial policy for Higher Education is the BOARD of TRUSTEES. For State Universities, the body members are appointed by the Governor of the State. Some are selected from and by the group to be represented. As for Private Universities, the members of the Agency are selected from their respective universities.

#### **4. US Education Funding**

Sources of funding for education in America, mainly primary and secondary education, better known as PUBLIC SCHOOLS, come from the Central Government Budget (Federal), State Government Budgets, and Local Government Budgets.

#### **5. US Education Issues**

According to the results of a comparative study conducted by (Nur, 2001), there are several educational issues and problems experienced by the United States government and society, including:

a) The number of school-age children who are not directly cared for by their parents is due to the dynamics of social change in US society, in which generally, both the mother and the father are very busy outside the home. This will be a severe problem for children's social development seen from the psychological and emotional aspects.

b) The high divorce rate resulted in many school-age children whom the mother only raises as a single parent in the household. Not a few divorcee widows in the US are forced to have a lowly and rude profession. This also affects the social development of their children.

c) The high level of immigration generally comes from the poor and uneducated, because of which many of them do not get a decent job. This causes the educational problems of children from immigrant families cannot be resolved. In addition, the language factor of immigrants makes it difficult for immigrant children themselves if they have access to education.

d) From various monitoring and evaluations of education carried out by various US official agencies themselves, it turns out that the quality of education and school graduates in the US is still inferior to other countries in international standards. Many children drop-outs and have high levels of violence by children.

#### **6. US Education Reform**

Because of these problems, the US government in 1990 has launched educational reforms. In that year, US President George H. B. Bush and all the Governors of the State (at that time, Bill Clinton was one of the Governors of the State) agreed to education reform by declaring 6 new US national education goals (Herawati, Suryadi, Warlizasusi, & Aliyyah, 2020). That is:

a) By 2000, all children in the US when they started primary school were ready to learn.

b) In 2000, high school graduations rose by at least 90%.

- c) In 2000, US students who completed "grades 4, 8, and 12" demonstrated proficiency in challenging subjects, namely English, maths, science, history, and geography. Every school in the US must demonstrate that children can use their minds well so that they are ready to become good citizens, ready for higher education, and ready for productive work in the modern economy.
- d) In 2000, US students were among the best in the world in science and mathematics.
- e) By 2000, every US adult can read and write, has the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in the global economy, and can exercise his rights and responsibilities as a citizen.
- f) By 2000, every school in the US must be free of drugs and violence and be able to create a stable and safe environment conducive to learning.

The main points of these reforms are intended as a guide in making education policies that must be implemented immediately, and the results should be seen in 2000. Moreover, indeed that is what happened in the US. (Inkeles & Larry, n.d.) The points of education reform were finally followed up with various educational policy creations at the state and local government levels. The education reform movement among Governors was spearheaded by Governors Bill Clinton and Lamar Alexander in their respective states. The breakthroughs were:

- a) Increasing the requirements for completing a level of education,
- b) Carry out standardized tests to measure student success,
- c) Carrying out a strict assessment system for teachers in line with reforming the career path,

- d) Increase additional state funding for schools. This new additional fund was generally used to increase teacher salaries, which were still at a superficial level.

Finally, the United States made progress in the field of education. When Bill Clinton became President of the United States, the success of the United States in developing education policy received special attention.

## **B. Description of Indonesian Education Policy**

### **1. Indonesian Education Politics**

Educational politics in Indonesia seems to have shifted from being centralized to decentralized. The act of state intervention in the education sector is vast, very thick, and very vulgar. The situation reached its peak when Daoed Joesop held the ministry of education. At that time, there was no freedom in schools and colleges. Even different opinions are not possible. Schools and campuses are like big classes to indoctrinate government ideology (not state ideology) who do not want open criticism. The curriculum is designed so that political subjects become very important. The subjects of Pancasila, History, Entrepreneurship and even religion are designed to thicken state intervention in its citizens' minds, thoughts, and attitudes.

Along with the fall of the intervening 'new order' regime, which was brought down by a total societal reform movement led by students and educated people, came an era full of enthusiasm for reducing the role and intervention of the central government in dealing with various policy issues, including education policy. . The first inspiration came from the promulgation of reformist regional autonomy, namely Law No.22 of 1999. It is said to be reformist because there had been a

regional autonomy law before this, but it did not have the spirit of reform and was only a formality, namely Law No.5 of 1975. The autonomy law The new area inspired the formulation of a decentralized education policy.

In his book entitled 'Fixing National Education,' (Tilaar, 2005) states that the Decentralization of education in Indonesia is not just a desire and a will but has become a necessity. After the political reform movement was launched in 1998, in the future, the Indonesian nation must rise to become a solid and dignified nation, which means the education sector must be placed in an important and urgent position. In connection with the urgency of the education sector, reforms in education must be carried out from centralization to Decentralization. 3 things can explain the urgency of the Decentralization of education in Indonesia, namely:

- a) For the development of a democratic society.
- b) For the development of social capital.
- c) To increase the competitiveness of the nation.

Furthermore, a description of the politics of education in Indonesia can be followed by the quote 'proponents dikes which are systematized as follows:

At the beginning of the XXI century, the world of education in Indonesia faced three significant challenges. The first challenge, as a result of the economic crisis, the world of education is required to maintain the results of educational development that have been achieved. Second, to anticipate the global era, education is required to prepare competent human resources to compete in the global job market. Third, in line with the implementation of regional autonomy,

it is necessary to make changes and adjustments to the national education system so that it can realize a more democratic education process, pay attention to the diversity of needs/conditions of the region and students, and encourage increased community participation.

Currently, national education is still faced with several significant problems:

- 1) There is still low equity in obtaining an education.
- 2) The quality and relevance of education are still low.
- 3) Education management is still weak and does not realize the independence and excellence of science and technology among academics. Inequality in education distribution also occurs between geographical areas, namely between urban and rural areas, between eastern Indonesia (KTI) and western Indonesia (KBI), and between income levels of the population or between genders.

The quality of education in Indonesia is still very concerning. This is reflected, among other things, in the results of a reading ability study for elementary school (SD) conducted by the International Educational Achievement (IEA) organization which shows that elementary school students in Indonesia are in 38th place out of 39 study participants countries. Meanwhile, for the Junior High School (SLTP) level, the study for the mathematics ability of junior high school students in Indonesia is only 39th out of 42 countries, and the Natural Sciences (IPA) is only 40th out of 42 participating countries. (Klingemann, Hofferbert, Budge, & Jatmika, 2000) The management of national education as a whole is still centralized so that it does not



encourage democratization and Decentralization of education administration (Peters & Van Nispen, 1998). The centralized management of education has led to uniform policies that cannot accommodate differences in diversity/interests of regions/schools/students, shutting down community participation in the education process, and encouraging waste and leakage of education budget allocations.

Meanwhile, the distribution of human research resources of various kinds and levels has not followed the needs and challenges faced. In addition, there is still a lack of a culture of critical thinking, inadequate awards for copyrighted works (HAKI), the ineffectiveness of the institutional system and legal instruments, and professional scientific certification. These problems will be overcome by implementing various development programs that refer to the direction of education policies that the 1999-2004 GBHN has mandated.

**National Education Vision.** The vision of national education is the realization of an Indonesian society that is peaceful, democratic, moral, skilled, competitive, advanced, and prosperous within the unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, supported by Indonesian people who are healthy, independent, faithful, devoted, have a noble character, love the homeland, based on law and environment, mastering science and technology, have a high work ethic and discipline.

**National Education Mission.** In order to realize the vision of national education, youth, and sports, missions that are the targets of national education, youth, and sports development are set, which are as follows:

- 1) Realizing a democratic and quality national education system and climate to create a nation with a noble character, is creative, innovative, has a national perspective, is intelligent, healthy, disciplined, responsible, skilled, and masters science and technology.
- 2) Realizing a social and cultural life that is personal, dynamic, creative, and resilient to the effects of globalization.
- 3) Improving the practice of religious teachings in daily life to realize the quality of faith and piety to God Almighty in life, and the stability of brotherhood among religious people who have a noble character, tolerance, harmony, and peace
- 4) Improving the quality of human resources that are productive, independent, advanced, competitive, environmentally friendly, and sustainable in empowering the community and all national economic forces, tiny, medium, and cooperative entrepreneurs.

## **2. Direction of Indonesian Education Policy**

Education development policies in Indonesia are directed at achieving the following:

- 1) Strive for the expansion and equal distribution of opportunities to obtain high-quality education for all Indonesian people towards creating high-quality Indonesian people with a significant increase in the education budget
- 2) Improving academic and professional abilities as well as improving the welfare of educational staff so that educators can function optimally, especially in improving character and character education so that they can restore

the authority of institutions and educational staff;

- 3) Reforming the education system, including curriculum renewal, in the form of curriculum diversification to serve the diversity of students, preparation of national and local applicable curricula following local interests, and diversification of types of education in a professional manner.
- 4) Empowering educational institutions, both school and out of school, as centers for cultivating values, attitudes, and abilities and increasing family and community participation supported by adequate facilities and infrastructure.
- 5) To reform and strengthen the national education system based on the principles of Decentralization, scientific autonomy, and management.
- 6) Improving the quality of educational institutions organized by both the community and the Government to establish an effective and efficient education system in the face of developments in science, technology, and the arts.
- 7) Develop the quality of human resources as early as possible in a directed, integrated, and comprehensive manner through various proactive and reactive efforts by all components of the nation so that the younger generation can develop optimally accompanied by the right to support and protection according to their potential.
- 8) Increase the mastery, development, and utilization of science and technology, including the nation's technology in the business world, minimal, medium, and cooperative enterprises to increase the

competitiveness of products based on local resources.

### **3. Indonesian Education Development Program**

#### **a. Primary and Preschool Education Program**

The primary and preschool education development program aims to:

- 1) Expand the reach and capacity of SD and Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI), SLTP and Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs), and preschool educational institutions to reach children from all communities.
- 2) Increasing equal opportunity to obtain education for disadvantaged groups, including those living in remote areas and urban slums, problem areas, the poor, and children with disabilities.
- 3) Improve the quality of primary and preschool education with adequate quality.
- 4) School/community-based management of primary education and preschools implementation.

The targets to be achieved by the primary and preschool education development program until the end of 2004 are:

- 1) Increasing the Gross Enrollment Rate (APK) for SD, MI, and SLTP-MTs.
- 2) The realization of school organizations in each district/city that are more democratic, transparent, efficient, accountable, and encourage community participation.
- 3) Realization of school/community-based education management by introducing the concept and pioneering the formation of School Councils in each

district/city and empowerment or formation of School Committees in all SD and MI, and SLTP MTs.

The main activities in seeking an equal distribution of primary education are:

- 1) Improve educational facilities and infrastructure in SD and MI and develop and improve facilities and infrastructure in SLTP and MTs, including sports facilities.
- 2) Provide education subsidies for private schools to provide quality education and provide educational services that are accessible to the broader community.
- 3) Implementing alternative education services, especially for disadvantaged communities (poor, nomadic, isolated, isolated, minority, and in problem areas, including street children), such as one teacher primary and small MI, visiting teacher/tutorial system, SD Pamong, SD-MI integrated, remote classes, as well as SLTP-MTs open.
- 4) Carry out revitalization and regrouping of schools, especially elementary schools, to achieve school efficiency and effectiveness supported by adequate facilities.
- 5) Provide scholarships for outstanding students from low-income families, considering female students proportionally.
- 6) Equalize the reach of preschool education through increasing community participation in providing quality child care institutions, playgroups, and kindergartens, as well as providing facilities, assistance, and awards by the Government.

The main activities to improve the quality of primary and preschool education are:

- 1) Improve teachers' professional ability and welfare and other education personnel to improve the quality, image, prestige, dignity, and worth.
- 2) Formulating a curriculum based on essential competencies, following the needs and potential of regional development, able to increase teacher creativity, inclusive and not gender biased, following the capacities and abilities of students, supporting the improvement of mastery of basic sciences as well as faith, piety, and personality noble character.
- 3) Improve the provision, use, and maintenance of educational facilities and infrastructure: introductory textbooks, reading books, Social Sciences (IPS) educational tools, science and mathematics, libraries, laboratories, and other necessary spaces.
- 4) Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the teaching and learning process through school quality mapping, gradual and continuous assessment of learning processes and outcomes, as well as the development of more effective educational assessment systems and measurement tools to improve education control and quality.
- 5) Improve supervision and accountability of institutional performance so that the roles and responsibilities of schools, local governments, including legislative institutions, and the

community in efforts to improve the quality of education are increasingly fundamental.

The main activities to improve the management of primary and preschool education are:

- 1) Implement gradual, wise, and professional Decentralization of the education sector, including increasing the role of the School Committee by encouraging the regions to implement pilot implementation of the concept of establishing a School Council.
- 2) Develop a pattern of education implementation based on school-based management to improve the efficiency of utilization of educational resources by taking into account the conditions and needs of the local community.
- 3) Increasing public participation in the provision of education, such as diversifying the use of resources and funds.
- 4) Developing an incentive system that encourages healthy competition between institutions and school personnel to achieve educational goals.
- 5) Empowering personnel and institutions, among others, through training conducted by professional institutions. This empowerment program needs to be followed by gradual and intensive monitoring and evaluation so that school performance can survive following the established quality standards of education.
- 6) Reviewing all legal products in education that are no longer following the direction and demands of educational development.
- 7) Pioneering the establishment of teaching accreditation and

certification bodies in the regions to improve the quality of education personnel independently.

#### **b. Secondary Education Program**

The secondary education development program, which includes General High School (SMU), Vocational High School (SMK), and Madrasah Aliyah (MA), is aimed at:

- 5) Expand the reach and capacity of SMU, SMK, and MA for the entire community.
- 6) Increasing equal opportunity to obtain education for disadvantaged groups, including those living in remote areas and urban slums, problem areas and the poor, and children with disabilities.
- 7) Improve the quality of secondary education as a basis for students to continue their education to a higher level of education and meet the needs of the world of work.
- 8) Improve the efficiency of utilization of available educational resources.
- 9) Improve equity in financing with public funds.
- 10) Increase the effectiveness of education following local needs and conditions
- 11) Improve the performance of personnel and educational institutions.
- 12) Increase community participation to support education programs.
- 13) Improve the transparency and accountability of education implementation.

The targets to be achieved by the secondary education development program until the end of 2004 are:

- 1) Increase in Gross Enrollment Rate (APK) for SMU, SMK, and MA.
- 2) The increase in capacity, including for SLTP and MTs graduates, resulted from completing the Nine

Years Basic Education Compulsory Education of 5.6 million students.

- 3) Realizing school organizations in each district/city are more democratic, transparent, efficient, accountable, and encourage community participation.
- 4) The realization of school/community-based education management (school/community-based management) by introducing the concept and pioneering the formation of School Councils in each district/city and empowerment or the formation of School Committees in each school.

The main activities to improve the quality and relevance of secondary education are:

- 1) Improve the professional ability and welfare of teachers and other education personnel, among others, through the provision of accreditation and teaching certification in specific fields that are reviewed and evaluated periodically, and improvement of the credit score system for teacher career advancement.
- 2) Compiling a curriculum based on essential competencies following the needs and potential of regional development, able to increase teacher creativity, inclusive and not gender biased according to the capacity of students, and emphasizing the need to increase faith and piety, national insight, physical health, moral personality noble, work ethic, understand rights and obligations, and improve mastery of basic sciences (mathematics, science and technology, language and literature, social sciences, and English).
- 3) Gradually increasing national quality standards so that secondary education graduates can compete with secondary education graduates in other countries.
- 4) Implementing competency-based curriculum in vocational high schools to meet workforce requirements.
- 5) Develop scientific work competitions and the like that are adapted to the standards used in international education.
- 6) Approach the business world and industry to collaborate with secondary schools, primarily vocational secondary education, to develop, develop subject matter, implement activities, and assess teaching programs.
- 7) Develop skills/vocational programs in high school and MA following the local environment or the demands of the local world of work. High school and MA graduates who do not have the opportunity to continue university can compete in entering the workforce.
- 8) Gradually increase the procurement, use, and maintenance of educational facilities and infrastructure, including books and teaching aids, libraries, and laboratories for public and private schools.
- 9) Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the teaching and learning process through school quality mapping, gradual and continuous assessment of learning processes and outcomes, as well as the development of more effective educational assessment systems and measurement tools to improve education control and quality.
- 10) Improve supervision and accountability of institutional performance and management of funding sources so that the roles and responsibilities of schools, local governments, including legislative

institutions, and the community in efforts to improve the quality of education are more accurate.

#### **c. Higher Education Program**

The higher education national development program aims to:

- 7) Organize the higher education system.
- 8) Improve the quality and relevance of higher education to the world of work.
- 9) Increase equal opportunity to obtain higher education, especially for outstanding students who come from underprivileged families.

#### **d. Out of School Education Development Program**

This out-of-school education development program (PLS) aims to provide services to people who do not or have not had the opportunity to obtain formal education to develop themselves, attitudes, knowledge and skills, personal potential, and can develop productive businesses to improve their welfare. In addition, the PLS program is directed at providing basic knowledge and professional business skills so that learning citizens can create employment opportunities for themselves and their family members.

The target of the PLS program is residents or learning residents who do not or have not had time to obtain formal education, which includes:

- 1) Residents who are still illiterate in Latin, numbers, and Indonesian.
- 2) Learning residents who have not completed 9 years of compulsory primary education.
- 3) Empowerment of places/studios for community learning activity centers.

#### **e. Program Sinkronisasi dan Koordinasi**

This program aims to improve the synchronization and coordination of planning, implementation, control, and supervision of educational programs both between levels, pathways, types, and regions. The goal is to realize the synchronization and coordination of planning, implementation, control, and supervision of educational development programs between levels, pathways, types, and regions.

The main activities are:

- 1) Conduct academic studies, formulate, and realize laws and regulations and national education policies that support the synchronization and coordination of planning and implementation of educational development between levels, pathways, and types, and between regions.
- 2) Develop and implement an institutional system that supports the synchronization and coordination of planning, implementation, control, and supervision of educational development between levels, pathways and types, and regions.
- 3) Assessing or measuring the success of national education development.
- 4) Standardize educational facilities and infrastructure to support quality teaching and learning processes.
- 5) Develop and implement information systems and data collection for all lines, types, levels, and regions.

- 6) Conduct advocacy and socialization of national education policies.
- 7) Cooperate in education with various institutions both at home and abroad.

#### **f. Research and Development Program**

This program aims to:

- 10) Improve the quality of research results.
- 11) Improve the quality of research.
- 12) Improve the competence of public research and development (R&D) institutions in line with the needs of the business world and society and the accelerated development of science and technology.
- 13) Establish a conducive climate for the formation of R&D resources.

The target to be achieved is to utilize science and technology following the nation's religious values and noble culture to solve various development problems.

#### **g. Program for Increasing Independence and Excellence in Science and Technology**

This program aims to improve the technical service capabilities of R&D institutions, Metrology, Standardization, Testing, and Quality (MSTQ), which is emphasized to support the competitiveness of the business world and encourage the implementation of R&D in and by the business world.

The target is to increase the independence of technology services and the superiority of the nation's technological innovations to increase the competitiveness of the business world and society.

#### **4. Education Management in Indonesia**

The administration and management (bureaucracy) of education in Indonesia is no different from the administration and management of other sectors in the form of departments. Nationally, problems in the education sector are handled by an agency in the form of a department, which has changed its name several times. The last change was named DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

For now, the organizational structure is as follows. At the regional (provincial) level, the coordination of educational affairs is handled by a body called the PROVINCIAL DINAS EDUCATION, headed by ahead. The Head of the Provincial Education Office is appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Provincial DPRD. This department is headed by whom the president directly appoints a president.

Meanwhile, at the Regency/City level, the coordination of educational affairs is handled by the DISTRICT/CITY EDUCATION DINAS. Similar to the Provincial Service, this Service is headed ahead. The difference is that the head of the Service at the district/city level is appointed by the Regent/Mayor with the approval of the relevant Regency/City DPRD.

The formation of the Board of Education and the School Committee must be carried out in a transparent, accountable, and democratic manner. What is done transparently is that the School Committee must be formed openly and widely known by the public starting from the stage of forming the preparatory committee, the socialization process by the preparatory committee, the criteria for prospective members, the selection process for

prospective members, announcement of prospective members, the selection process, and submission of election results. Carried out in an accountable manner is that the preparatory committee should submit an accountability report on its performance and the use of committee funds. It is carried out democratically. The selection process for members and management is carried out by deliberation and consensus. If deemed necessary, members and management can be elected through voting.

### **5. Education Funding in Indonesia**

Compared to the US, education funding sources in Indonesia come from several budget sources. That comes from the APBN, Provincial APBD, and Regency/City APBD. Funding sources from the APBN are generally allocated for all educational activities, from elementary and secondary to tertiary levels.

The source of funds from the provincial budget is allocated to implement education in the province. Sources from the APBN are also earmarked for the implementation of national education. Meanwhile, funding sources from the Provincial APBN are generally allocated for primary and secondary education. Only a tiny part is allocated to support activities at the higher education level. The funding sources from the Regency/City APBD are entire to support the implementation of education in the region. This follows the spirit of Decentralization.

Since implementing the education decentralization policy, the education budget allocation, both in the APBN and Provincial and Regency/City APBD, has increased quite significantly. According to the law's mandate, the education budget must continue to be increased until it

reaches at least 20% of the total state budget or APBD expenditures.

### **Conclusion**

From the description and elaboration of educational decentralization policies in two countries: the United States and Indonesia, and by using the Comparative Public Policy Framework as conceptualized by Heidenheimer, it can be concluded that the results of the comparison as intended by Heidenheimer are that the comparison of policies using this framework analyzes the extent to which public (Government) roles and responsibilities compared to private (private) roles and responsibilities in dealing with policy issues. The extent to which government involvement in dealing with public problems is compared to the scope of public (private) involvement.

Also, analyze whether a policy is set to solve single problems or complex (interrelated) problems. For example, policies on education, whether the policy is only specifically to solve the problem of education or is also intended to solve the problem of poverty and others related to increasing citizens' access to a more harmonious life.

The decentralization policy of education in Indonesia also seems to broadly favor this Choice of Scope framework. Education decentralization in Indonesia is intended to achieve many goals: to regulate education itself, increase access to the broadest possible service to the community, for bureaucratic reform, the function of Decentralization and regional autonomy politically, and to solve population problems and population poverty.

It can be concluded that there are similarities in this framework for matters relating to the scope beyond funding between the US and Indonesia. This is possible because Indonesia has been leaning towards the US in terms of developing a decentralized system of Government and in developing its education sector. the difference is only in the time factor. The US came first and lasted



longer, while Indonesia is still just being proclaimed and implemented. The choice of "Choice of Scope" from a review outside of funding factors in education policies in various countries is almost the same, focusing on the breadth of coverage and the breadth or complexity of the problems that a particular policy must solve.

However, if viewed from the size of the coverage area of the State that has a monopoly on education (The Scope of the State Education Monopoly), then what happens and is applied in Indonesia is slightly different. Under certain conditions, the State/Government of Indonesia provides assistance (such as grants) for private schools and private universities. This is usually associated with a coaching program. Recently, there has been a quite favorable political decision: all private schools (SD-SMP) receive automatic assistance, which is called BOS (School Operational Assistance). For the latter, we do not find it in the United States.

Both the United States and Indonesia have chosen education policy as a state intervention for their people (citizens). Heidenheimer even stated that education policy in many countries is used as a government tool to show hegemony or government intervention over its citizens. However, the reasons for each country are different from one another.

In the United States, the impact of the Decentralization policy on education is especially felt in the development of politics, economics, and technology development. In Indonesia, the impact of the education decentralization policy extends to the following areas; politics, economy, culture, religion, technology, defense, and even tourism. So it can be concluded that the US and Indonesia have similarities in terms of distribution choices (Choices of Distribution).

That in many ways, Indonesia is the same as the US. Perhaps this is because Indonesia is more inclined to reform education policies based on experiential studies in the US. (Huntington, 1993) The

political direction of the policy is thus to create conditions conducive to the development of democratization from the lowest level to a more mid-level, from the sector with the narrowest impact to the sector with a very complex impact.

The involvement of the wider community is therefore very much needed. Likewise, environmental factors, such as economic growth, must be designed so that the political mission of decentralized education can be achieved optimally.

The BOS (School Operational Assistance) subsidy mechanism concept does not reflect a sense of justice and a passion for education. Why not? BOS is given to all students in all elementary schools without exception. Elementary students whose parents are wealthy and who study at favorite elementary schools that are super expensive must also receive the same BOS allowance as elementary school students whose parents are impoverished and schools in suburban elementary schools that are not taken into account. Therefore, the author proposes that the education decentralization policy is more focused on Service with the spirit of creating distributive justice, not cumulative justice.

There needs to be a new law that regulates the education of school-age children from low-income families located in local government areas that do not have excess budgetary capacity. It is also necessary to improve (reform) the government (regional) bureaucracy that explicitly handles the education sector. The target is to create a harmonious and solutive relationship between the Bureaucracy-School-Community.

Local Government in the area and when and how the provincial government is involved in education planning and policy (Chan & Sam, 2005). Furthermore, the provincial Government prepares a plan and identifies environmental factors that should be able to intervene to be conducive to the planned policy. Finally, it is also necessary to think about making regulations that require

all regional governments, which have the authority and autonomy, to prepare a master plan for education in their respective regions and present it at the respective provincial level so that the provincial Government can know at an early stage where the education policy is headed. This is also beneficial for the local Government concerned because by knowing each other's presentations, it is hoped that they will complete each other's master plans.

### References

- Chan, Sam M., & Sam, Tuti T. (2005). Analisis swot kebijakan pendidikan era otonomi daerah. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo. [Google Scholar](#)
- Clasen, Jochen, & Clegg, Daniel. (2006). Beyond activation reforming European unemployment protection systems in post-industrial labour markets. *European Societies*, 8(4), 527–553. [Google Scholar](#)
- Data, Pusat, & Pendidikan, Informasi. (n.d.). Balitbang-Depdiknas.(2004). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 Tentang Guru Dan Dosen. [Google Scholar](#)
- Feldman, Kenneth A. (1978). Course characteristics and college students' ratings of their teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Research in Higher Education*, 9(3), 199–242. [Google Scholar](#)
- Hakam, Kama Abdul. (2011). Pengembangan Model Pembudayaan Nilai-Moral dalam Pendidikan Dasar di Indonesia: Studi Kasus di Sekolah Dasar Negeri Bandungrejosari 1 Kota Malang, Jawa Timur. *Sosiohumanika*, 4(2). [Google Scholar](#)
- Heidenheimer, Arnold J., Hecl, Hugh, & Adams, Carolyn Teich. (1990). *Comparative public policy: The politics of social choice in America, Europe, and Japan*. St. Martin's Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Herawati, Endang Sri Budi, Suryadi, Suryadi, Warlizasusi, Jumira, & Aliyyah, Rusi Rusmiati. (2020). Kinerja Dewan Pendidikan Dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pendidikan. *Tadbir: Jurnal Studi Manajemen Pendidikan*, 4(1), 87–100. [Google Scholar](#)
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1993). *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century* (Vol. 4). University of Oklahoma press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Inglehart, Ronald. (1988). The renaissance of political culture. *American Political Science Review*, 82(4), 1203–1230. [Google Scholar](#)
- Inkeles, Alex, & Larry, J. (n.d.). Diamond, 1980, "Personal Development and National Development: A Cross-National Perspective," dalam *The Quality of Life: Comparative Studies*, ed. Alexander Szalai dan Frank M. Andrews. London: Sage Publications. [Google Scholar](#)
- Klingemann, Hans Dieter, Hofferbert, Richard I., Budge, Ian, & Jatmika, Sigit. (2000). *Partai, kebijakan dan demokrasi*. Jentera bekerjasama dengan Pustaka Pelajar. [Google Scholar](#)
- Kurniawan, Bodi. (2011). Peran komite sekolah dalam meningkatkan mutu pendidikan di Madrasah Pembangunan UIN Jakarta. [Google Scholar](#)
- Nur, Agustiar Syah. (2001). *Perbandingan Sistem Pendidikan 15 Negara*. Lubuk Agung. [Google Scholar](#)
- Peters, B. Guy, & Van Nispen, Frans K. M. (1998). *Public policy instruments: Evaluating the tools of public administration*. Edward Elgar. [Google Scholar](#)
- Tilaar, H. A. R. (2005). *Adaptasi dan adopsi masyarakat terhadap pendidikan modern*. [Google Scholar](#)



© 2022 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).