



Decentralized Basic Education 1: Management and Governance

Replication of DBE1 School Development Planning by District Governments and Non-Government Agencies



DBE 1

Special Monitoring Report

October 2008

This report is one of a series of special reports produced by RTI International, Implementing Partner for the USAID-funded Improved Quality of Decentralized Basic Education (IQDBE) program in Indonesia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. METHODOLOGY	3
A. Aim.....	3
B. Scope and Timing.....	3
C. Approach and Standard of Measurement.....	3
D. Data Collection.....	4
E. Validity and Reliability.....	5
III. FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS	6
A. Overall Findings.....	6
B. Quantitative Results in Sample Schools and Districts	6
1. RPS development prior to the DBE1 replication program	7
2. Correlation between implementing DBE1 training phases and RPS completion.....	8
3. Analysis of implementation of specific aspects of the DBE1 methodology in sample schools	15
4. Trainers and facilitators.....	18
5. School mentoring.....	19
6. Other stakeholders involvement	23
7. Financial and in-kind contributions.....	25
C. Case Study by District	25
1. Kabupaten Boyolali	25
2. Kabupaten Klaten	26
3. Kabupaten Karanganyar	27
4. Kota Mojokerto.....	27
5. Kabupaten Tuban.....	28
6. Kabupaten Sidoarjo.....	29
7. Kota Surabaya	29
8. Kabupaten Pangkajene Kepulauan (Pangkep)	30
9. Kabupaten Enrekang	31
10. Kabupaten Soppeng	31
11. Kota Palopo	32
12. Kabupaten Indramayu	32
13. Kabupaten Karawang.....	33
14. Kabupaten Lebak	33
15. Kota Tebing Tinggi.....	34
16. Kabupaten Tapanuli Utara.....	34
17. Kabupaten Deli Serdang.....	35
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	37
A. Conclusions.....	37
1. Factors contribute to the success of replication efforts?.....	37
2. Factors contribute to the failure of replication efforts:	38
B. Recommendations	38
C. Follow Up	39
Appendix 1: Replication efforts carried out in districts	40
Appendix 2: Survey Instruments	45
Appendix 3: Case Study Locations & Key Persons Met.....	51

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A key strategy of DBE1 is to provide intensive support to a limited number of districts, and schools and madrasah within those districts, in the hope that the program will meet their needs and that districts and stakeholders will replicate and expand the program using their own resources, creating a far greater impact. This is what is meant by the term “replication.”

As of December 2007, a total of 27 districts were replicating DBE1 programs at school level—all of them focusing on school development planning (RPS or RKS). A number of districts were also replicating DBE1 programs for leadership and strengthening school committees. This effort covered a total of 1,686 schools and madrasah—and counterpart funding in the amount of Rp 2,903,100,000 (approximately \$325,000).

A range of management styles and approaches to funding and implementation were being taken. Field reports suggested a diverse experience in terms of perceived success of these replication efforts. In order to better understand the factors associated with success, and conversely with failure, a field study was planned. The study aimed to inform DBE1 planning and practice for the remainder of the project implementation period in order to maximize the effort to replicate the RPS program and to enable DBE1 to better advise and guide counterpart governments and non-government institutions on replication.

The study was conducted during the period March–May 2008 at program and school levels. A mix of quantitative and qualitative methodologies was employed. A nationwide survey of replication collected data at the program level—including numbers of schools, levels of funding, and funding sources. This was followed up with quantitative and qualitative mini-case studies conducted in a sample of 92 schools in 17 districts in six provinces.

Among others, the study found that the following factors are associated with success:

1. Ensuring that the program is conducted in its entirety.
2. Ensuring that community members are involved in the process of developing RPS. The data show that no contributions were forthcoming from the community in contrast to the great community support achieved in the DBE target schools where community were more actively involved.
3. Limiting the target number of schools to ensure that the capacity/funds are there for the complete program.
4. *Studi-banding* / school visits are *very* effective if followed up with training.
5. The role of District Coordinator (DC), District Facilitators (DF), the Education Office (Dinas), Sub-District Office (KCD) and school principals are all important.

Since it was conducted, the study has already informed DBE1 practice. In particular, initial findings were discussed with stakeholders and counterparts in a series of province- and district-level workshops to plan replication programs conducted in July 2008. It is recommended that this report be widely disseminated to further inform the process of planning for replication in 2009.

Further monitoring and follow-up study is recommended to support schools, particularly in cases where the program has stalled and is less than half complete, and to determine causes for the lack of community participation in the replication programs studied.

I. INTRODUCTION

A major outcome for the DBE project is the take up and replication of programs and interventions by local governments and other institutions.¹ The extent to which DBE interventions are replicated by others is a measure of sustainability.

The term “replication” means that programs, approaches, and good practices from DBE are implemented by stakeholders using their own resources.²

The DBE project began in mid 2005 with the selection of 29 districts, followed in early 2007 with the addition of 21 new districts. These are referred to as Cohort 1 and 2. DBE activities will continue in these districts until the end of the project in early 2010.

DBE1 interventions at the school/community level began in January 2006, with training in school development planning and budgeting. By the end of 2006, several district governments and private foundations had allocated funds for replicating DBE1 programs. In many cases, schools also contributed their own funds for the RPS program. For the most part, the funds prepared in 2006 became available in mid 2007, and the first round of replication took place in the period from mid-2007–early 2008. As of March 2008, 1,686 schools had completed or were in the process of completing school development plans. In the period March–May 2008, DBE1 monitored the implementation program. The results are presented in this report.

In the period June–July 2008, DBE1 organized workshops in each DBE district to explain the replication program and to assist districts in preparing well-targeted and realistic budgets. To enable districts and other organizations to better manage replication, DBE1 produced a manual that explains how DBE programs should be replicated; the manual also includes user-friendly software to assist in preparing budgets for replication.³ The initial findings from the first monitoring were incorporated in replication workshop materials. DBE1 expects improvements in the quality of replication in the next cycle of schools that will begin toward the later part of 2008 and into 2009. DBE1 will monitor replication again in March–May 2009 and produce a second report on the findings.

The next section of this report describes the methodology and timing of the study. Part III presents the major findings and data analysis; this part contains both quantitative data and qualitative data in the form of district level case studies. Part IV presents lessons learned, conclusions, and recommendations.

¹ The Contractor will ensure that best practices under this Contract are replicated and that results are thoroughly documented. Contract No. 497-M-00-05-00029-00.

² DBE1, 2, and 3: *Towards Cohort Three: Thoughts on Sustainability & Replication* (September 4th, 2007)

³ DBE1, *Panduan Diseminasi: Program Manajemen dan Tata Layanan Pendidikan Bberbasis Sekolah* (Mei 2008)

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Aim

The study set out to answer the following questions that determine the methodology of the survey and case study:

1. What factors contribute to the success of replication efforts?
2. What factors contribute to the failure of replication efforts?

Answering these two questions enables us to better design our approach to promoting and supporting replication. It also helps address the concerns that have been frequently raised and are currently under discussion: What are the lessons? What is good practice in replication? How can we assure quality? How can we address problems?

B. Scope and Timing

DBE1 school/community level programs include training for school development planning (RPS), training for school committees and principals, and school database systems. This survey only assessed the RPS/M replication program. When DBE1 began the school development planning program in early 2006, we followed MONE/MORA guidelines based on government regulation PP 19/2005 which called for schools to develop *Rencana Pengembangan Sekolah/Madrasah (RPS/M)*. Toward the beginning of 2007, MONE modified the guidelines and regulations on school planning calling for schools to produce *Rencana Kegiatan Sekolah/Madrasah (RKS/M)* (*Permendiknas 19/2007*). DBE1 modified its methodology and applied the new RKS/M methodology for new Cohort 2 schools while continuing to assist Cohort 1 schools in implementing RPS that were produced the previous year. At the time of the current study, both RPS/M and RKS/M were being replicated, depending on whether the districts were in Cohort 1 or 2. The differences between RPS/M and RKS/M are not great, especially in terms of lessons learned for replication. Throughout this report, the term RPS/M is used to refer to both types of plans.

The report draws on a nation-wide survey of replication programs together with field work conducted in the provinces of North Sumatra, Banten, West Java, Central Java, East Java, and South Sulawesi. The study used a mix of quantitative and qualitative approaches. This study was conducted in the period of March–May 2008. The data was updated in September 2008. At the time of the updating, we found that some schools that had not completed RPS at the time of the field survey had completed them by September 2008.

C. Approach and Standard of Measurement

The approach taken in the study was to leave the research questions somewhat open in order to see what emerged from the field. What stakeholders regard as success may be slightly different to project expectations. For example, in the first round of RPS implementation, many school communities responded to the process with spontaneous financial or in-kind contributions to support implementation of school development plans. This was an unanticipated outcome, and thus a new measure of success became the amount of community contribution to the program.

Nonetheless, in order to categorize replication efforts as successful or unsuccessful, we need to agree on DBE1 standards for replication—both process and outcome. Success means meeting the standards. Failure means not meeting the standards. For the purposes of this

study, standards based on MONE regulations for school development planning were adopted as follows.

Successful RPS/M or RKS/M replication programs produce an RPS/M or RKS/M which:

1. includes: (1) a school profile, (2) school objectives, (3) analysis of challenges and strategies, (4) program (including schedule), and (5) budget and RKAS/M (*Rencana Kegiatan dan Anggaran Sekolah/Madrasah*); and
2. includes multi-source funding and multi-year planning.

For the purposes of this study, which focused only on replication of RPS,⁴ success is defined as the completion of an RPS document which meets DBE1 standards. Progress in completing RPS is indicated in the analysis as follows:

- 0% means the school has not yet produced anything
- 25% means that the school profile has been prepared
- 50% means that the profile and the section on challenges and alternative solutions have been prepared
- 75% means that the profile, challenges and alternative solutions and four-year program have been prepared
- 100% means that the profile, challenges and alternative solutions, and four-year program including a budget for every activity have been prepared.

Since it is too soon to determine the degree to which RPS have been implemented by schools this is not considered in the study. However, this should become the focus for a follow-up study (see footnote 4).

D. Data Collection

The methodology includes two parallel approaches—quantitative and qualitative. There are two sets of quantitative data: (i) data on the number and type of schools that had replicated or have been replicating the RPS, along with the budget amount planned in all project districts; and (ii) in-depth data on the program implementation in sample schools and districts visited. In order to add depth and meaning, a qualitative mini-case study approach was employed in selected districts and schools. Based on the two surveys, some simple correlations between process and outcomes were possible.

At the time of the survey, replication of RPS/M had been completed or was underway in 1,686 schools in 27 districts. In-depth data on the process of replication was obtained through a survey which was conducted in a sample of 92 schools in 17 districts in North Sumatera, Banten, West Java, Central Java, East Java, and South Sulawesi. The survey sampling was purposive in that the 17 sample districts were chosen on the basis of preliminary information; districts that were thought to have good models of replication and poor models were purposefully chosen for the sample.

In each sample location, staff collected quantitative data using the instrument in Appendix 2, and interviewed key persons. Sample locations and persons interviewed can be found in Appendix 3. These instruments were piloted in Central Java and East Java for three weeks in March 2008.

⁴ The next monitoring report will assess the degree to which planned programs are implemented and provide more in-depth assessment of community contributions.

E. Validity and Reliability

A number of strategies were employed to increase validity and reliability. In addition to adding depth, the school-level survey enabled validation of the program level survey data. By visiting a number of schools (at least four) in each sample district, we were able to triangulate the data collection to increase validity. Collecting data from six provinces further enhanced validity. Finally, use of both qualitative and quantitative approaches increases validity.

The analysis and completion of this report also coincided with a series of workshops conducted at the national and provincial level that provided opportunity to validate information and conclusions with key actors from within the Project and from district key counterparts.

Reliability was increased by (1) trialing the instruments in the field and (2) cross-checking of data collection and coordination by the DBE1 M&E Specialist.

III. FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

A. Overall Findings

Based on a December 2007 report from DBE-assisted provinces, a total of 27 districts were currently replicating DBE1 programs at the school level—all of them focusing on RPS or RKS. A number of districts were also replicating DBE1 programs for leadership and strengthening school committees.

This involved a total of 1,686 schools and madrasah—and counterpart funding in the amount of Rp 2,903,100,000 (US\$350,000) (see Appendix 1). A range of approaches to funding and management was being taken. The majority of replication programs were funded from district budgets (APBD) and managed by Education Offices (Dinas Pendidikan). A number of programs used alternative models including: (1) funding by the schools themselves (using BOS funds) and management at the sub-district level, (2) funding from Departemen Agama (MORA) for replication in madrasah, and (3) private sector funding and management (Muhammadiyah).

Table 1: Replication Program as of December 2007

Province	District	Number of schools replicating RPS	Source and amount of funding (RUPIAH) as of December 2007		
			District Funding	Private Funding	Total
7	27	1,686	2,785,600,012	17,500,000	2,903,100,012

The experience is varied. At one end of the scale, some programs were limited to “socialization” or a study tour, with no follow up. At the other end, some programs had faithfully implemented the full DBE1 model with staged training programs for school stakeholders (KK-RKS) and on-site mentoring (*pendampingan*) by trained district facilitators.

The following sections of this report describe the various ways in which the RPS program was being implemented under the replication program and the results achieved under each model of replication.

B. Quantitative Results in Sample Schools and Districts

This section of the report presents the quantitative results of a sample survey carried out in 92 schools in 17 districts. The results are presented in four sets of analysis. The first set of findings examines the status of RPS in 92 schools before the replication program. This is followed by a correlation between the extent to which the sample schools followed the DBE1 methodology for developing RPS and the schools’ success in completing RPS. The third set of data analyzes the extent to which sample schools implemented some specific aspects of the DBE1 methodology. Finally the results of community contributions to the sample schools for implementing the development plans are presented in the fourth set of findings. One of the significant unanticipated achievements of the DBE1 methodology in the original DBE support schools was the tremendous support from the community as a result of being involved in the RPS process.

1. RPS development prior to the DBE1 replication program

Based on government regulation PP 19/2005 each school must develop RPS.⁵ However, before the replication of the DBE program started, from the 92 sample schools only 10 (11%) had ever developed RPS. The majority of the schools had only produced an annual budget (RAPBS).

Table 2 shows that from 17 districts replicating DBE RPS programs, only three districts (Tuban, Sidoarjo, and Kota Tebingtinggi) have previously developed RPS. **We can conclude that most schools had not produced RPS in accordance with government regulations.**

Table 2. RPS Development before the DBE1 Replication Program

District	No	Yes	Total
Klaten	5	0	5
Karanganyar	4	0	4
Boyolali	11	0	11
Mojokerto	6	0	6
Tuban	3	5	8
Sidoarjo	3	1	4
Surabaya	3	0	3
Lebak	6	0	6
Karawang	5	0	5
Indramayu	2	0	2
Pangkep	6	0	6
Enrekang	7	0	7
Soppeng	6	0	6
Palopo	4	0	4
Deli Serdang	5	0	5
Tapanuli Utara	5	0	5
Tebingtinggi	1	4	5
Total	82 (89%)	10 (11%)	92 (100%)

Total sample: 92 schools

1. a. Stakeholders involved in RPS development

The following table shows how RPS were developed in the 10 schools prior to the DBE1 replication program.

Most schools developed RPS without involving school stakeholders such as the School Committee. Table 3 clearly shows that the RPS development process was dominated by the school principal and teachers. Only four schools in Tuban district involved School

⁵ As explained above, this regulation has been revised with Permendiknas No. 19/2007, which requires each school to produce RKS.

Committee members. **We can conclude that before the replication program, in the schools surveyed, RPS were generally prepared by school management without involving other community stakeholders.**

Table 3. Stakeholders Involved in Producing RPS

District	Principal	Teacher	Committee Member 1	Committee Member 2	Others
1. Tuban	5	5	4	0	0
2. Sidoarjo	1	1	0	0	0
3. Tebingtinggi	4	4	0	0	0
Total	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	4 (40%)	0	0

Total Sample: 10 schools

1.b. RPS quality

In accordance with government regulations, RPS should have a school profile; school objectives; challenges and strategies; a program schedule; and a multi-source, multi-year budget for each program or activity. Before the replication program started, the RPS developed in survey schools were not complete. Table 4 shows that most RPS only had a program schedule (90%). In Sidoarjo district, RPS were developed with only a strategy and program schedule. The most complete RPS found were in Tebingtinggi district, where the only missing aspect was school challenges. **We can conclude that RPS developed prior to the replication program did not meet the requirements for a complete RPS.**

Table 4. RPS Quality

District	Profile	Challenge	Strategy	Program Schedule	Budget
1. Tuban	1	4	4	4	2
2. Sidoarjo	0	1	0	1	0
3. Tebingtinggi	4	0	4	4	0
Total	5	5	8	9	2

Total Sample: 10 schools

2. Correlation between implementing DBE1 training phases and RPS completion

2. a. Training phases

If following the full DBE1 approach with staged training activities, a replication program should start with a socialization activity and continue with the first training followed by in-school mentoring. Then it continues with the second training activity, again followed by mentoring. However; schools had implemented a range of different training models (see Table 5). For instance, some schools only implemented the socialization phase, whilst other schools implemented two training phases also followed by mentoring. Still other schools conducted training which combined the two phases in one activity. **We can conclude that no school surveyed fully implemented the DBE1 replication staged training program.**

Table 5: Schools that Follow DBE1 Training Phases

District	School Name	Training Phases				
		Socialization RPS	First Training	Second Training	Combine Training	Mentoring
Boyolali	1. MIN Boyolali		√	√		√
	2. SDN 9 Boyolali		√	√		√
	3. SDN Kebonbimo 3		√	√		√
	4. SDN Kiringan 1		√	√		√
	5. SDN Siswoduran I		√	√		√
	6. SDN Boyolali 1		√	√		√
	7. SDN Bandung		√	√		√
	8. MI Ngasinan		√	√		√
	9. SDN 1 Repaking		√	√		√
	10. MI Darul Ulum		√	√		√
	11. SDN Banyuasri		√	√		√
Klaten	1. SDN Gatak II	√				
	2. SDN VI	√				
	3. SDN Tonggalan I	√				
	4. SDN Karangdukuh	√				
	5. SDN Prawatan	√				
Karanganyar	1. SDN 04 Bejen		√	√		√
	2. SDN 01 Mojogedang		√	√		√
	3. SDN 01 Papahan		√	√		√
	4. SDN 03 Jaten		√	√		√
Mojokerto	1. SDN Gedongan 3	√	√			√
	2. SDN Gedongan 1	√	√			√
	3. SDN Balongsari 1	√	√			√
	4. MI Nurul Huda	√	√			√
	5. SDN Kranggan 1	√	√			√
	6. SDN Kranggan 5	√	√			√
Tuban	1. SDN Panyuran	√			√	
	2. SDN Sumurgung	√			√	
	3. SDN Tegalbank	√			√	
	4. SDN Cendoro 02	√			√	
	5. SDN Lerankulon	√			√	
	6. SDN Sumberrejo 2	√			√	
	7. SDN Rengel 01	√			√	

District	School Name	Training Phases				
		Socialization RPS	First Training	Second Training	Combine Training	Mentoring
	8. SDN Banjarum II	√			√	
Sidoarjo	1. MI Miftahul Ulum	√	√	√		√
	2. SDN Klantingsari	√	√	√		√
	3. MI Al Ibrohimi	√	√	√		√
	4. SDN Kendal Sewu	√	√	√		√
Surabaya	1. MI Muh. 5	√	√			-
	2. SD Muh. 16	√	√			-
	3. SD Muh. 4	√	√			-
Lebak	1. SDN Rangkasbitung 4		√	√		√
	2. SDN Rangkasbitung 1		√	√		√
	3. SDN Rangkasbitung 5		√	√		√
	4. SDN Kaduagung 01		√	√		√
	5. SDN Kaduagung B 1		√	√		√
	6. SDN Kaduagung B 2		√	√		√
Indramayu	1. SDN Tugu 1		√	√		√
	2. SDN Tulungagung 1	√				
Karawang	1. SDN Karyasari IV	√				-
	2. SDN Kalangsari IV	√				-
	3. SD Karyasari V	√				-
	4. SD Dukuh Karya 1	√				-
	5. SD Dukuh Karya 2	√				-
Pangkep	1. SDN 5 Padanglampe		√	√		√
	2. SDN 13 P.lampe		√	√		√
	3. SDN 19 Gelengan		√	√		√
	4. SDN 45 Pacceleng		√	√		√
	5. SDN 8 Pacelleng		√	√		√
	6. SDN 37 Bulu-bulu		√	√		√
Enrekang	1. SDN 15 Kotu				√	√
	2. SDN 175 Cendana D				√	√
	3. SDN 17 Singkih				√	√
	4. SDN 76 Kasambi				√	√
	5. SDN 110 Laura				√	√
	6. SDN 57 Sangeran				√	
	7. SDN 54 Kolosi				√	

District	School Name	Training Phases				
		Socialization RPS	First Training	Second Training	Combine Training	Mentoring
Soppeng	1. SDN 26 Matajang		√	√		√
	2. MIS DDI Jampu2		√	√		√
	3. SDN 193 Rarae		√	√		√
	4. SDN 135 MRRW		√	√		√
	5. SDN 147 Lamarung		√	√		√
	6. SDN 50 Tarawang		√	√		√
Palopo	1. SDI Pesantren		√	√		√
	2. SDN 79 T.Palopo		√	√		√
	3. SDN Pajalesang		√	√		√
	4. SDN Pinceputte		√	√		√
Deli Serdang	1. SDN 105855 II		√	√		√
	2. SDN 101879		√	√		√
	3. SDN 101878		√	√		√
	4. SDN 101786		√	√		√
	5. SDN 107415		√	√		√
Taput	1. SDN 173276		√	√		√
	2. SDN 173148		√	√		√
	3. SDN 174568		√	√		√
	4. SDN 175766		√	√		√
	5. SDS Santa Lusia		√	√		√
Tebingtinggi	1. MIN Rambutan		√	√		√
	2. SD.Negeri 164523		√	√		√
	3. SD.Negeri.165729		√	√		√
	4. SD.Negeri 167644		√	√		√
	5. SD.Negeri 168294		√	√		√

Total Sample: 92 schools

2. b. RPS completion

Compared with 11% of sample schools that had previously produced RPS (although not in accordance with government regulation) 39% of sample schools had completed RPS in accordance with government regulations while another 25% had plans that were 75% complete. Only 23% of sample schools had made no or only 25% progress in producing RPS in accordance with regulations. **We can conclude that the replication programs have had**

an impact on increasing the number of schools that produce RPS that meet government standards.

Table 6: Extent of RPS completion⁶

RPS Completion	Number of School
0%	14 (15%)
25%	7 (8%)
50%	9 (10%)
75%	23 (25%)
100%	39 (42%)

Total Sample: 92 schools

2. c. Correlation between RPS completion and DBE1 model

In this section, we make a correlation between the extent to which the DBE1 model was followed and the schools' success in completing their RPS in accordance with MONE/MORA standards (based on Permendiknas 19/2007). The results (Table 7) show a strong correlation between the number of DBE1 phases and the degree to which the plans were completed. For example all schools in Boyolali applied most of the DBE1 phases and demonstrated a 100% success rate in completing RPS. On the other hand the schools in Klaten only conducted one phase, socialization, and the success rate was 0. **We can conclude that, based on the survey, the greater extent to which schools follow the phases of the DBE1 model, the greater the likelihood that they will complete RPS in accordance with MONE/MORA standards. Another important conclusion is that the follow-up mentoring is an essential component of the program.**

Table 7. Correlation between DBE1 Training Phases and RPS Completion

District	School Name	Training Phases					RPS Progress ⁷
		Socialization RPS	First Training	Second Training	Combine Training	Mentoring	
Boyolali	1. MIN Boyolali		√	√		√	100%
	2. SDN 9 Boyolali		√	√		√	100%
	3. SDN Kebonbimo 3		√	√		√	100%
	4. SDN Kiringan 1		√	√		√	100%
	5. SDN Siswoduran I		√	√		√	100%

⁶ Data as of September 2008.

⁷ The data in this column show extent to which RPS were completed as of September 2008. All districts in North Sumatera and Mojokerto City stated that they would continue not-completed program in 2008 with funding from the 2008 district budget (APBD). Muhammadiyah Kota Surabaya would continue in 2008; Lebak and Sidoarjo district would finish it before school year 2008/09; other districts have not yet decided whether they would finish the replication program or not.

District	School Name	Training Phases					RPS Progress ⁷
		Socialization RPS	First Training	Second Training	Combine Training	Mentoring	
	6. SDN Boyolali 1		√	√		√	100%
	7. SDN Bandung		√	√		√	100%
	8. MI Ngasinan		√	√		√	100%
	9. SDN 1 Repaking		√	√		√	100%
	10. MI Darul Ulum		√	√		√	100%
	11. SDN Banyuasri		√	√		√	100%
Klaten	1. SDN Gatak II	√					0
	2. SDN VI	√					0
	3. SDN Tonggalan I	√					0
	4. SDN Karangdukuh	√					0
	5. SDN Prawatan	√					0
Karanganyar	1. SDN 04 Bejen		√	√		√	25%
	2. SDN 01 Mojogedang		√	√		√	100%
	3. SDN 01 Papahan		√	√		√	25%
	4. SDN 03 Jaten		√	√		√	75%
Mojokerto	1. SDN Gedongan 3	√	√			√	50%
	2. SDN Gedongan 1	√	√			√	50%
	3. SDN Balongsari 1	√	√			√	50%
	4. MI Nurul Huda	√	√			√	50%
	5. SDN Kranggan 1	√	√			√	50%
	6. SDN Kranggan 5	√	√			√	50%
Tuban	1. SDN Panyuran	√			√		75%
	2. SDN Sumurgung	√			√		100%
	3. SDN Tegalbank	√			√		0
	4. SDN Cendoro 02	√			√		75%
	5. SDN Lerankulon	√			√		75%
	6. SDN Sumberrejo 2	√			√		75%
	7. SDN Rengel 01	√			√		75%
	8. SDN Banjarum II	√			√		75%
Sidoarjo	1. MI Miftahul Ulum	√	√	√		√	75%
	2. SDN Klantingsari	√	√	√		√	75%
	3. MI Al Ibrohimi	√	√	√		√	75%
	4. SDN Kendal Sewu	√	√	√		√	75%
Surabaya	1. MI Muh. 5	√	√			-	0

District	School Name	Training Phases					RPS Progress ⁷
		Socialization RPS	First Training	Second Training	Combine Training	Mentoring	
	2. SD Muh. 16	√	√			-	0
	3. SD Muh. 4	√	√			-	0
Lebak	1. SDN Rangkasbitung 4		√	√		√	100%
	2. SDN Rangkasbitung 1		√	√		√	75%
	3. SDN Rangkasbitung 5		√	√		√	75%
	4. SDN Kaduagung 01		√	√		√	75%
	5. SDN Kaduagung B 1		√	√		√	75%
	6. SDN Kaduagung B 2		√	√		√	75%
Indramayu	1. SDN Tugu 1		√	√		√	100%
	2. SDN Tulungagung 1	√					100%
Karawang	6. SDN Karyasari IV	√				-	0
	7. SDN Kalangsari IV	√				-	0
	8. SD Karyasari V	√				-	0
	9. SD Dukuh Karya 1	√				-	50%
	10. SD Dukuh Karya 2	√				-	50%
Pangkep	7. SDN 5 Padanglampe		√	√		√	100%
	8. SDN 13 P.lampe		√	√		√	100%
	9. SDN 19 Gelengan		√	√		√	100%
	10. SDN 45 Pacceleng		√	√		√	100%
	11. SDN 8 Pacelleng		√	√		√	100%
	12. SDN 37 Bulu-bulu		√	√		√	100%
Enrekang	8. SDN 15 Kotu				√	√	25%
	9. SDN 175 Cendana D				√	√	25%
	10. SDN 17 Singkih				√	√	25%
	11. SDN 76 Kasambi				√	√	25%
	12. SDN 110 Laura				√	√	25%
	13. SDN 57 Sangeran				√		0
	14. SDN 54 Kolosi				√		0
Soppeng	7. SDN 26 Matajang		√	√		√	100%
	8. MIS DDI Jampu2		√	√		√	100%
	9. SDN 193 Rarae		√	√		√	100%
	10. SDN 135 MRRW		√	√		√	100%
	11. SDN 147 Lamarung		√	√		√	100%
	12. SDN 50 Tarawang		√	√		√	100%

District	School Name	Training Phases					RPS Progress ⁷
		Socialization RPS	First Training	Second Training	Combine Training	Mentoring	
4. Palopo	1. SDI Pesantren		√	√		√	100%
	2. SDN 79 T.Palopo		√	√		√	100%
	3. SDN Pajalesang		√	√		√	100%
	4. SDN Pinceputte		√	√		√	100%
Deli Serdang	6. SDN 105855 II		√	√		√	100%
	7. SDN 101879		√	√		√	100%
	8. SDN 101878		√	√		√	75%
	9. SDN 101786		√	√		√	75%
	10. SDN 107415		√	√		√	50%
Taput	1. SDN 173276		√	√		√	75%
	2. SDN 173148		√	√		√	75%
	3. SDN 174568		√	√		√	75%
	4. SDN 175766		√	√		√	75%
	5. SDS Santa Lusia		√	√		√	75%
Tebingtinggi	1. MIN Rambutan		√	√		√	100%
	2. SD.Negeri 164523		√	√		√	100%
	3. SD.Negeri.165729		√	√		√	100%
	4. SD.Negeri 167644		√	√		√	100%
	5. SD.Negeri 168294		√	√		√	100%

3. Analysis of implementation of specific aspects of the DBE1 methodology in sample schools

3. a. RPS working group (KKRPS)

As described in 1.a. above, RPS were usually prepared by the school management, usually only the principal, sometimes helped by some teachers. RPS were rarely prepared with school committee or other community stakeholder participation. In the DBE1 methodology, RPS development involves non-school management stakeholders such as the school committee.

The following table shows that most replication schools surveyed had formed a KK-RPS. No schools in Klaten or Karawang districts, nor two schools in Enrekang district, had yet formed a KK-RPS. One of the reasons cited as to why these schools had not yet formed a KK-RPS is that they did not receive any prior training or mentoring. **We can conclude that the majority of the sample schools have followed the DBE1 model by forming KK-RPS.**

Table 8. Schools that Formed a KK-RPS in the Replication Program

District	Had Formed	Not Yet	Total
	KKRPS		
Klaten	0	5	5
Karanganyar	4	0	4
Boyolali	11	0	11
Mojokerto	6	0	6
Tuban	8	0	8
Sidoarjo	4	0	4
Surabaya	3	0	3
Lebak	6	0	6
Karawang	0	5	5
Indramayu	2	0	2
Pangkep	6	0	6
Enrekang	5	2	7
Soppeng	6	0	6
Palopo	4	0	4
Deli Serdang	5	0	5
Tapanuli Utara	5	0	5
Tebingtinggi	5	0	5
TOTAL	80 (87%)	12 (13%)	92 (100%)

Total sample: 92 schools

3. b. KK-RPS membership

Members of KK-RPS should not only come from the school (principal and teachers) but also come from the community (school committee and parents). In all sample schools, KK-RPS membership included the principal and teacher, whilst 82% had at least one representative from the school committee and 45% had two representatives from the school committee. **We can conclude that the majority of replication schools surveyed had followed the DBE1 model and formed a KK-RPS, which consists of the principal and representatives of the teachers and school committee.**

Table 9. KK-RPS Membership

District	Have not yet formed	Involved in KK-RPS			
		Principal	Teacher	School Committee Member 1	School Committee Member 2
Klaten	5	-	-	-	-
Karanganyar	0	4	4	4	4
Boyolali	0	11	11	11	11
Mojokerto	0	6	6	6	5
Tuban	0	8	8	7	0
Sidoarjo	0	4	4	4	4

District	Have not yet formed	Involved in KK-RPS			
		Principal	Teacher	School Committee Member 1	School Committee Member 2
Surabaya	0	3	3	3	0
Lebak	0	6	6	6	0
Karawang	5	-	-	-	-
Indramayu	0	2	2	2	1
Pangkep	0	6	6	6	0
Enrekang	2	5	5	5	0
Soppeng	0	6	6	6	6
Palopo	0	4	4	3	0
Deli Serdang	0	5	5	2	0
Tapanuli Utara	0	5	5	5	5
Tebingtinggi	0	5	5	5	5
TOTAL	12 (13%)	80 (87%)	80 (87%)	75 (82%)	41 (45%)

Total sample: 92 schools

3. c. KK-RPS members involved in training

To strengthen management and governance at the school level, RPS development should involve the school community represented by the school committee, in this case joining the KK-RPS. All members of KK-RPS should be involved in the training. From all of the replication schools surveyed, only those in Karanganyar and Karawang districts did not involve the school committee. Meanwhile, schools in Boyolali, Sidoarjo, Soppeng, Tapanuli Utara, and Tebingtinggi involved two representatives from the school committee. **We can conclude that the majority of replication schools surveyed had followed the DBE1 training model which should include training for school committee members.**

Table 10. KK-RPS Members Involved in Training

District	Principal	Guru	School Committee Member 1	School Committee Member 2
Klaten	5	5	5	0
Karanganyar	4	0	0	0
Boyolali	11	11	11	11
Mojokerto	6	6	6	0
Tuban	8	7	7	0
Sidoarjo	4	4	4	4
Surabaya	3	3	3	0
Lebak	6	6	6	0
Karawang	5	5	0	0
Indramayu	2	2	2	0

District	Principal	Guru	School Committee Member 1	School Committee Member 2
Pangkep	6	6	6	0
Enrekang	7	7	7	0
Soppeng	6	6	6	6
Palopo	4	4	4	0
Deli Serdang	5	5	5	0
Tapanuli Utara	5	5	5	5
Tebingtinggi	5	5	5	5
TOTAL	92 (100%)	87 (95%)	82 (89%)	31 (34%)

Total sample: 92 schools

4. Trainers and facilitators

In the replication programs, district staff play an important role in conducting training and mentoring. Since the beginning of the project, DBE1 has developed the capacity of district staff, particularly school supervisors (pengawas), to act as facilitators (called District Facilitator or DF) to train schools in producing RPS. The majority of sample districts did have DBE1 trained facilitators (DF) conduct training and mentoring in the replication programs. Some districts also recruited additional school supervisors to facilitate training. The table below shows that DBE1 staff continued to provide some support to the district staff. **We can conclude that although the majority of sample replication districts relied on DBE1 trained staff to facilitate RPS, at the same time some DBE1 assistance was still required.**

There are some cases that need further explanation. First, the replication program in Surabaya City was implemented by Muhammadiyah Foundation. In this case the Foundation only provided funds for implementing the program while DBE1 fully provided the resource persons. Replication by a private foundation is a slightly different model than replication implemented by local government. Hence, an alternative model of dissemination was used for Muhammadiyah in the first step of enabling that institution to carry out dissemination on its own. An entirely different case was found in Karawang District where DBE1 staff conducted socialization; however, in this case there was no follow-up training by the district itself, resulting in a failed program (see Table 7).

Table 11. Resource Person in School Training

District	DBE1 Staff	DF	Other Supervisors
Klaten	5	5	0
Karanganyar	4	4	1
Boyolali	11	11	3
Mojokerto	6	6	3
Tuban	0	8	1
Sidoarjo	4	4	4
Surabaya	3	0	0
Lebak	6	6	6

District	DBE1 Staff	DF	Other Supervisors
Karawang	5	0	0
Indramayu	2	1	2
Pangkep	6	6	6
Enrekang	7	7	0
Soppeng	6	6	0
Palopo	4	4	0
Deli Serdang	5	2	0
Tapanuli Utara	5	5	5
Tebingtinggi	5	5	5
TOTAL	84 (91%)	80 (87%)	36 (39%)

Total sample: 92 schools

5. School mentoring

Follow-up mentoring on-site is a critical component of the DBE1 methodology; mentoring is essential for RPS completion. Only schools in Klaten, Surabaya, Karawang, Tuban, and part of Enrekang did not receive follow-up mentoring. Table 12 shows that **the majority of replication schools surveyed (77%) stated that they received both training and follow-up mentoring.**

Table 12. Schools That Received or Did Not Receive Mentoring

District	Yes	No	Total
Klaten	0	5	5
Karanganyar	4	0	4
Boyolali	11	0	11
Mojokerto	6	0	6
Tuban	3	5	8
Sidoarjo	4	0	4
Surabaya	0	3	3
Lebak	6	0	6
Karawang	0	5	5
Indramayu	1	1	2
Pangkep	6	0	6
Enrekang	5	2	7
Soppeng	6	0	6
Palopo	4	0	4
Deli Serdang	5	0	5
Tapanuli Utara	5	0	5
Tebingtinggi	5	0	5
TOTAL	71 (77%)	21 (23%)	92 (100%)

5. a. School Mentors for RPS development

The majority of follow-up mentoring was conducted by DFs (district staff trained by DBE1), except for schools in Tuban District. DBE1 district coordinators (DCs) were also actively mentoring schools in Lebak, Pangkep, Soppeng, and Tapanuli Utara districts.

Besides using DBE1 DCs or DFs, districts such as Tuban, Sidoarjo, Lebak, and Indramayu also used sub-district staff, who are mostly school supervisors that received some form of training for the replication programs. DC involvement in the follow-up mentoring should be reduced gradually, so that the program could continue when the DBE1 project is ended. **For the most part, mentoring is carried out by district staff with some continuing support from DBE1, which indicates that others are taking responsibility for the program.**

Table 13. School Mentors

District	No Mentoring	Mentors		
		DC	DF	Other Supervisors
Klaten	5	-	-	-
Karanganyar	0	0	4	0
Boyolali	0	6	11	2
Mojokerto	0	1	6	2
Tuban	5	0	0	3
Sidoarjo	0	0	1	4
Surabaya	3	-	-	-
Lebak	0	6	6	6
Karawang	5	-	-	-
Pangkep	0	6	6	6
Indramayu	1	0	1	0
Enrekang	2	0	5	0
Soppeng	0	6	6	0
Palopo	0	0	4	0
Deli Serdang	0	1	5	0
Taput	0	5	5	0
Tebingtinggi	0	1	5	0
Total	21 (23%)	32 (35%)	65 (71%)	23 (25%)

Total sample: 92 schools

5. b. Mentoring frequency

Each of the two training sessions in RPS development should be followed up by mentoring. The majority of sample schools received plenty of follow-up mentoring visits. Effective

follow-up mentoring was conducted in Lebak, Enrekang,⁸ Sopeng, Palopo, Tapanuli Utara, and Tebingtinggi districts. Schools in Karanganyar received follow-up mentoring three times or more, but it was not conducted in every school. Rather, the school representatives were brought together in one place. Group mentoring is better than no mentoring at all; however, combined mentoring is clearly less effective. **Based on the survey, the majority of sample districts demonstrate an understanding of the importance of mentoring, but still several do not fully appreciate the value.**

⁸ This occurred because the supervisor was DBE1 DF (Bp. Hasan Basri)

Table 14. Mentoring Frequency

District	No Mentoring	1–2 Times	3 Times or More
Klaten	5	0	0
Karanganyar	0	1	3
Boyolali	0	8	3
Mojokerto	0	3	3
Tuban	5	2	1
Sidoarjo	0	1	3
Surabaya	3	0	0
Lebak	0	0	6
Karawang	5	0	0
Indramayu	1	1	0
Pangkep	0	6	0
Enrekang	2	0	5
Soppeng	0	0	6
Palopo	0	0	4
Deli Serdang	0	2	3
Taput	0	0	5
Tebingtinggi	0	0	5
TOTAL	21 (23%)	24 (26%)	47 (51%)

Total sample: 92 schools

5. c. Topics of mentoring

A complete mentoring program should be conducted for the development of the school profile until the budget is completed. At the time of data collection, the majority of sample schools only received follow-up mentoring for the topics covered in the first training, which is school profile development and alternates for problem-solving. **The majority of sample schools did not receive mentoring for the most difficult and most meaningful aspects of the process: program development and budget.**

Table 15. Topics of Mentoring

District	No mentoring	Mentoring Topics			
		School profile development	Alternates for problem solving	Program development	Budget
Klaten	5	-	-	-	-
Karanganyar	-	4	4	0	0
Boyolali	-	11	11	11	11
Mojokerto	-	6	6	0	0
Tuban	5	3	3	0	0
Sidoarjo	-	4	4	0	0
Surabaya	3	-	-	-	-
Lebak	-	6	6	6	6
Karawang	5	-	-	-	-
Indramayu	1	1	1	1	1
Pangkep	-	6	6	6	6
Enrekang	2	5	5	0	0
Soppeng	-	6	6	6	6
Palopo	-	4	4	4	4
Deli Serdang	-	3	5	3	3
Taput	-	5	5	5	5
Tebbingtinggi	-	5	5	5	5
TOTAL	21 (23%)	69 (75%)	71 (77%)	52 (57%)	47 (51%)

Total sample: 92 schools

6. Other stakeholders involvement

In accordance with DBE1 methodology, community stakeholders, as well as school management (principal and school committee), should produce RPS. However, of the 78 sample schools that had already begun to produce RPS, only 37% or 40% had involved community stakeholders. The majority of schools in South Sulawesi, Lebak, and Deliserdang did not involve other stakeholders, reportedly due to the reason that the school committee already represented community leaders. In more than 1,000 that were directly assisted by DBE1, activities were held to inform or solicit inputs for the plans by the school community. As a result of this community participation in the planning process, the schools received significant contributions from the community.⁹ **In the replication schools surveyed, community involvement in the RPS development is small.**

⁹ Since 2006, DBE1 has been tracking contributions in the form of cash, goods, and services. As of 2008, the contributions to 855 schools totaled Rp. 7.089.906.300. This is reported in "Ketika Menyapa Masyarakat, Edisi September 2008." See also section 7 below.

Table 16. Other Stakeholder Involvement in RPS development

District	RPS have not yet developed	For schools that have developed RPS, has it involved other stakeholders?	
		No	Yes
Klaten	5	-	-
Karanganyar	-	2	2
Boyolali	-	0	11
Mojokerto	-	0	6
Tuban	1	3	4
Sidoarjo	-	1	3
Surabaya	3	-	-
Lebak		6	0
Karawang	3	2	0
Indramayu	0	1	1
Pangkep		6	0
Enrekang	2	5	0
Soppeng	-	6	0
Palopo	-	4	0
Deli Serdang	-	5	0
Taput	-	0	5
Tebingtinggi	-	0	5
TOTAL	14 (15%)	41 (45%)	37 (40%)

Total sample: 92 schools

6. a. Stakeholders involved in RPS development

Table 16 lists the types of non-school management stakeholders who had been involved in developing RPS. Members of the community who can bring about support for the schools, such as village heads and religious leaders, were involved at some point in the process; however, the numbers of schools that purposely involved them is small.

Table 17. Stakeholders Involved in RPS development

District	Village head	Community / religious leaders	Paguyuban / parents	Women local organization	Others
Karanganyar	0	1	1	0	1
Boyolali	8	8	9	2	2
Mojokerto	3	3	3	3	5
Tuban	1	1	2	0	2
Sidoarjo	1	1	0	0	2
Indramayu	0	1	0	0	0
Taput	1	4	0	0	0
Tebingtinggi	5	5	0	0	0
TOTAL	19 (51%)	24 (65%)	15 (41%)	5 (14%)	12 (32%)

Total sample: 92 schools

7. Financial and in-kind contributions

Unlike in DBE1-assisted schools where the majority of school communities gave contributions to the schools during the RPS development (see footnote 8), none of the replication schools surveyed stated the community had given contributions to the schools in the form of cash or in-kind. Some of those interviewed commented that this was due to the availability of BOS funds, and as a result, parents felt that they had no obligation to give contributions to the school. This finding is very disappointing. More investigation is required for a deeper understanding of the reasons.

C. Case Study by District

This section describes 17 cases of replication programs in the following districts:

- Boyolali, Klaten, and Karanganyer, located in Central Java;
- Mojokerto, Tuban, Sidoarjo, and Surabaya in East Java;
- Lebak in Banten Province;
- Indramayu and Karawang in West Java;
- Pangkep, Enrekang, Soppeng, and Palopo in South Sulawesi; and
- Deli Serdang, Tebing Tinggi, and Tapanuli Utara in North Sumatra.

1. Kabupaten Boyolali

Introduction

During the 2007 financial year the district government of Kabupaten Boyolali allocated funds of Rp. 250 million. These funds were used for DBE1 and DBE2 replication programs with a target of 43 SD and 7 MI, making a total of 50 schools. The DBE1 replication program is focused on RPS/M. In the current 2008 financial year, Boyolali District has already budgeted funds of Rp. 750 million for 75 schools in three sub-districts.

Site Visits

The RPS/M development process started in Boyolali district with two training sessions for KK-RPS/M—each session ran for three days. The first training was focused on discussing school profiles, challenges, and alternate solutions. The second training discussed school improvement programs and four-year school development budgets.

Aside from these two training events, each school received four “pendampingan” or mentoring visits from DF to support the preparation of RPS; specifically two visits to the schools to prepare the profile and two visits when the schools were preparing programs and budgets. To implement this pendampingan (mentoring), the DF were paid an incentive (transport money) from DBE1. Aside from payment of DF, DBE1 also provided trainers for the workshops, both from the provincial specialist team and the Boyolali DC.

Our review of eleven replication schools found that all schools have prepared RPS. The DBE1 replication program in this district is operating very well. All schools have completed an RPS and followed the manual developed and used by DBE1. One of the factors behind the success of the replication program is the strong support from DBE1, such as providing trainers and support for pendampingan (mentoring).

Recommendations

1. Monitoring from local government is required to ensure the follow up and results of RPS preparation; most importantly to see whether the programs planned are realized or not.
2. In implementing replication programs, the involvement of DBE1 is still important; for the coming period, support from DBE1 should diminish so that local governments implement the program independently, particularly to make use of the DF who have already worked for three years with DBE1.

2. Kabupaten Klaten

Introduction

In the 2007 financial year, the local government of Kabupaten Klaten allocated funds of Rp. 300 million for school-based management (MBS) activities in elementary schools (SD) (previously this district was supported by UNICEF), MBS for SMP, and DBE1. In summary, these significant funds were not all used for DBE1 replication program but were shared with other activities. A total of 120 schools were targeted for the DBE1 replication program. For the 2008 financial year, the local government has budgeted funds of Rp. 290 million which will be used for MBS activities in SD (Rp. 200 million), MBS for SMP (Rp. 40 million) and the balance for DBE replication (Rp. 50 million).

Site Visits

The visits and review of five sample schools found that no school has prepared an RPS. All the schools visited by the DBE1 team indicated that they are very enthusiastic about RPS, since, according to them, RPS is very important for their school. Moreover, as a result of the study visits to DBE1 target schools, they have seen first-hand how the schools supported by DBE have improved their performance. Their difficulty is that they do not yet know how to prepare an RPS because they have not been trained

The local government in Kabupaten Klaten appears to lack serious commitment to implementing replication. This is evidenced by the fact that only one activity has been conducted with no follow-up. Furthermore, funding of Rp. 50 million is not sufficient to fund replication activities for 120 schools. Notwithstanding this, based on discussions with Dinas Pendidikan, it seems there is interest in continuing with the DBE1 replication program, despite the limited funds.

Recommendations

1. If Kabupaten Klaten wishes to implement replication in a serious way, the district must follow the same steps taken by DBE1 and other districts where there is evidence of success—and provide the same level of training and mentoring for all schools.
2. Kabupaten Klaten is one of the expansion districts, meaning that two clusters were added in Cohort 2. In conclusion, there are a great many schools supported by DBE1 that can provide a good model or example and could be visited by replication schools which truly wish to adopt the DBE1 program. There is no need to take schools out of the district for study tours.

3. Kabupaten Karanganyar

Introduction

During the 2007 financial year, the government of Kabupaten Karanganyar allocated funds of Rp 50 million for a DBE1 replication program. In fact, in the budget proposal, this level of funding was not allocated for DBE1 replication but for cluster empowerment. However, Dinas Pendidikan channeled the funds to the DBE1 program. The number of target schools is 72 core schools (*sekolah inti*). In this district, there are 74 core schools or “*sekolah inti*”; however two core schools have already received DBE1 support. For the 2008 financial year, the local government budgeted funds of Rp 100 million for DBE1 replication. They aim to complete RPS in two clusters (*gugus*) or 18 schools.

Site Visits

The DBE1 team visited four schools and found that only one of the schools had completed an RPS (i.e. SDN 01 Mojogedang); two schools had only completed the profile and one school had nearly finished the process (only the budget for each activity was outstanding).

The process of preparing RPS in Kabupaten Karanganyar was somewhat different to that in other districts. In this district, training was provided only to the school principals, whilst the DBE1 model requires that the principal should be just one member of the team from each school. In the end, from several schools visited, it can be seen that the principal wishes to complete the RPS. From the school visits, we can conclude that school-level *pendampingan* is definitely needed in order to avoid problems in preparing a draft RPS. Clearly the process lacked participation from a wider range of stakeholders and relied too much on the principal in each school. As a result, it is likely that the RPS will not fully represent the aspirations of the school community and will certainly not be “owned” by the wider school community. It will be interesting to see what impact this has on implementation.

Recommendations

1. The training should not only be attended by school principals, but as a minimum should also include teachers and school committee representatives.
2. *Pendampingan* (mentoring) should not be provided “*en masse*,” but should be provided at school level—or at least, at *gugus* (cluster) level.

4. Kota Mojokerto

Introduction

Kota Mojokerto was the first local government to allocated funds for the replication program in East Java. In 2006, Kota Mojokerto allocated Rp. 50 million to replicate the DBE1 program in two sub-districts in 51 schools. However; the implementation was discontinued after they conducted the first training. Follow-up mentoring was conducted by DF three times. Discussion between DBE1 and Dinas Pendidikan indicated that they would like to continue the replication program using the 2008 budget (APBD).

Site Visits

The RPS development process followed DBE1 procedures, commencing with an initial three-day training activity. Three representatives from each school—the principal, a teacher, and a school committee member—were involved in the training. Besides training, follow-up mentoring was also conducted to all schools by the DF. Mentoring was conducted 2–3 times.

The DBE1 review team randomly visited six schools to see how far the RPS has been developed. From the visit, it was found that all schools have begun developing RPS, but only

school profiles (including school objectives and analysis of challenges). No schools have finished an RPS, because so far they only attended the first training.

Conclusions

Even though Kota Mojokerto was the first district that implemented a DBE1 replication program, the RPS development was not finished. It appears that the Rp. 50 million budget allocated is not sufficient to implement RPS development in 51 schools; each school received about Rp. 1 million. All schools visited have finished preparing a school profile. From this visit, we can conclude that schools were very enthusiastic about developing an RPS. In Magersari sub-district, replication schools have even planned to self-fund the second training.

Recommendations

If funding is available in 2008, it should be used to complete RPS in the schools that have already started the process. All replication schools have prepared a school profile, so they only need the second training to prepare programs and budget development. Trained DF are fully able to conduct follow-up mentoring in the schools.

5. Kabupaten Tuban

Introduction

The replication program in Tuban is different than that in other districts where funding is from the district budget (APBD). There are two types of funding in Tuban: replication in madrasah (MI, MTs, and MA), funded by the Tuban Office of Religious Affairs; and self-funded replication in elementary schools (SD), where each school self-funds all of the RPS development activities.

In 2007, the Tuban Office of Religious Affairs allocated Rp. 9 million to replicate DBE programs in 21 MI, 35 MTs, and 14 MA, a total of 70 madrasah. In 2008, the office has allocated Rp. 12 million to continue the replication program or to finish the 2007 program.¹⁰ Funding available for self-funded replication in Palang sub-district was Rp. 12 million (for 27 schools) and in Rengel sub-district was Rp. 12 million (for 33 schools).

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team did not visit the replication schools funded by the Tuban Office of Religious Affairs. However, the DBE1 monitoring team was informed that no schools have yet finished RPS. A four-day combined training was conducted, attended only by principals. Follow-up mentoring has not yet been conducted. In the 2008 budget, there is a plan to train supervisors from the Office of Religious Affairs who will subsequently conduct follow-up mentoring on RPS development.

In Palang and Rengel sub-districts, a four-day combined training activity was conducted. Three representatives from each school attended the training. Follow-up mentoring was not conducted intensively. Some schools visited by the DBE1 review team in Palang sub-district mentioned that they had never been visited by a supervisor. Follow-up mentoring was conducted on average two times in Rengel sub-district.

In Palang sub-district, of the five schools visited, one school had finished developing RPS, one school had finished preparing a school profile, and three schools had not yet prepared anything. In Rengel sub-district, the three schools visited had prepared a school profile.

Recommendations

¹⁰ Funds from Tuban Office of Religious Affairs are for replicating both the DBE1 and DBE2 programs.

The DBE1 replication program in Tuban is different from replication programs in other districts in that the funding is not coming from APBD but from the Office of Religious Affairs and self-funding. DBE1 should assist these organizations in planning a program and budget so that the work already started can be completed next year. DBE1 should offer to provide more training for supervisors.

6. Kabupaten Sidoarjo

Introduction

Kabupaten Sidoarjo allocated Rp. 357 million in 2007 and Rp. 200 million in 2008 to replicate DBE1 and DBE2 programs. At the time the DBE1 review team visited replication schools, only the DBE1 program had been implemented. In 2007, it was decided that 16 schools in two sub-districts, Candi and Jabon, would implement the replication program. However, the program was implemented using the 2008 budget in another sub-district, Tarik. In Tarik, the program involved eight schools plus an additional three schools that used their own funds. The replication program in Candi and Jabon sub-districts will be implemented in 2008 using the 2007 budget.

Site Visits

The replication program commenced with a five-day RPS training activity for school supervisors and PPAI (Islamic School Supervisor), conducted by DBE1. These supervisors were prepared to supervise RPS development and conduct follow-up mentoring. On January 12–14, 2008, the first training was conducted for members of KK-RPS. Newly DBE1-trained school supervisors and DF from Kabupaten Sidoarjo also conducted follow-up mentoring.

At the time the DBE1 review team visited Tarik sub-district, the second training was being conducted. The training was attended by KK-RPS members from 11 schools. Based on the plan made by school supervisors, each school would receive a follow-up mentoring five times.

The DBE1 review team also randomly interviewed four schools. It was found that the schools have a high level of enthusiasm for preparing RPS. They prepared a school profile and were planning to complete the RPS development after the training was finished.

Conclusions

Kabupaten Sidoarjo has managed the replication funds well. The district has followed the DBE1 methodology by training school supervisors who would supervise schools and by conducting two-staged trainings involving principals, teachers, and school committees. Follow-up mentoring was also regularly conducted by school supervisors.

Recommendations

The allocated replication funds for Tarik sub-district are quite large (Rp. 200 million). Even though it was planned to replicate the DBE1 and DBE2 program, only the DBE1 program was implemented. If the DBE2 program replication is not implemented, a number of replication schools should be added.

7. Kota Surabaya

Introduction

The DBE1 replication program in Kota Surabaya was implemented not by the government, but by a non-government institution, Majelis Dikdasmen Muhammadiyah Kota Surabaya.

The fund allocated for replication was about Rp. 35 million. It was targeted to be implemented in 24 SD/MI, 16 SMP, 6 SMA, and 1 SMK: a total of 47 schools.

Site Visits

The replication program in Muhammadiyah schools started with a DBE1 program socialization on February 4, 2008, which was attended by 47 schools. Each school sent three representatives: the principal, a teacher, and a member of the school committee. The following activity was a three-day training for principals (teacher and school committee members were not involved). This was the first RPS training that focused on the school profile, challenges, and alternative solutions. This training also involved six Muhammadiyah supervisors who would later supervise the RPS development. Majelis Dikdasmen Muhammadiyah together with DBE1 planned to conduct the second training before the 2008/2009 school year.

The DBE1 team visited three schools: two SD and one MI. Only one school had prepared an RPS document. Follow-up mentoring was also not conducted. Principals mentioned that they were very busy so that they had no time to start the RPS development.

Conclusions

Training that only involved the school principal was apparently not effective. The training should also involve teachers and school committee members. Likewise, no follow-up mentoring resulted in schools not preparing RPS.

Recommendations

1. Coordination between Majelis Dikdasmen Muhammadiyah Kota Surabaya and DBE1 should be improved so that the planned program continues to get full support from DBE1 East Java.
2. The second training should be conducted very soon to reduce the time gap between the first and the second training.
3. Muhammadiyah schools supervisors should be fully involved in the training. Likewise, they must supervise schools in developing RPS.

8. Kabupaten Pangkajene Kepulauan (Pangkep)

Introduction

In 2008, Kabupaten Pangkajene Kepulauan allocated Rp. 63 million to replicate DBE1 programs in 10 schools. The program was implemented properly and in accordance with DBE1 methodology. It commenced with the first training and was followed with the second training. Follow-up mentoring was also conducted in each school by DBE1 DF and other supervisors newly trained by DBE1.

In this district, DBE1 DF, KCD (head of sub-district education office), and school supervisors that were trained by DBE1 were very active. All of the KK-RPS consisted of the principal, a teacher, and two members of the school committee, and all attended the training.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited 6 out of 10 replication schools. All schools were able to complete RPS. They said that beside the training activities, they also received follow-up mentoring from DBE1 DF, and other supervisors and sub district heads (KCD) trained by DBE1. All schools stated that they could finish RPS development due to effective follow-up mentoring.

Recommendations

The DBE1 replication program in Kabupaten Pangkep is operating well. The District Education Office should monitor whether all programs prepared in the RPS can be implemented or not. DBE1 should devise follow-on programs such as school committee empowering or leadership training.

9. Kabupaten Enrekang

Introduction

In 2007 the local government in Kabupaten Enrekang allocated Rp. 83 million to replicate DBE1 programs in 40 schools. In 2008, a further Rp. 100 million was allocated for the DBE1 replication program in another 50 schools.

Compared to the replication program in Kabupaten Pangkep, the program implementation in Kabupaten Enrekang was unsuccessful. The unsuccessful program in Enrekang occurred because RPS development training was only conducted one time. After the training, there was no follow-up mentoring from supervisors, except in Anggareja sub-district, where one of the school supervisors is a DBE1 DF.

Based on the interview with Ibu Uni of the District Education Office (Kasi Ketenagaan, Dinas Pendidikan), the local government did not know how to manage replication funds properly. The local government requires support from DBE1 on how to manage the funds for the training and mentoring.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited seven schools in two different sub-districts. In Anggareja sub-district, where the school supervisor is a DBE1 District Facilitator, five schools completed a school profile, while RPS development in two schools that are not under the District Facilitator's supervision was not implemented as intended.

Recommendations

DBE1 recommends that the 2008 replication funds should be managed effectively. The replication program in Enrekang should be implemented in accordance with DBE1 methodology by conducting the first training, following with the second training and follow-up mentoring. The local government in Enrekang should make use of the DF who are already trained by DBE1. Likewise, DBE1 should give more assistance to Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten Enrekang on the program planning and implementation.

10. Kabupaten Soppeng

Introduction

In 2006, the local government in Kabupaten Soppeng allocated Rp. 129 million for replicating the DBE1 program in 12 schools. In 2008, local government allocated a further Rp. 63 million for implementing the program but the number of replication schools had not yet been decided at the time of the survey. Dinas Pendidikan is very supportive of the DBE1 replication program.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited six replication schools. All of the schools visited had completed an RPS and followed the DBE1 model. All schools attended the first and the second training. DF and newly trained supervisors conducted follow-up mentoring.

Recommendations

The DBE1 replication program in Kabupaten Soppeng is running very well. Follow on programs like school committee empowering or leadership training should be planned in replication schools.

11. Kota Palopo

Introduction

In 2007 Kabupaten Palopo allocated Rp. 150 million for DBE1 program replication, of which Rp. 100 million was allocated for RPS development and Rp. 50 million allocated for school committee empowering. A total of 16 schools were targeted for the replication program.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited four replication schools. Based on the interviews, we can conclude that the replication program in Kabupaten Soppeng was implemented well; training and follow-up mentoring was conducted in accordance with the DBE1 model. DF and newly trained supervisors were very active in supporting schools in RPS development. All schools visited have completed RPS development.

Recommendations

The DBE1 replication program in Kota Palopo is implemented effectively, so follow-on programs like school committee empowering or leadership training should be planned in replication schools.

12. Kabupaten Indramayu

Introduction

There are two types of replication programs in Kabupaten Indramayu: (1) a replication program funded by local government, with a total funding of Rp. 100 million for 28 schools in 28 sub-districts (one school per sub-district); and (2) a self-funded replication program in Sliyeg sub-district.

In 2008 Kabupaten Indramayu has allocated Rp. 80 million to continue the 2007 program.

Site Visits

Due to time limitation, the DBE1 review team visited only two schools; one self-funded replication school and one school that was funded by local government. The self-funded school, SDN Tugu, has completed an RPS and followed the DBE1 model in the process. The school took part in two training activities and received on-site mentoring from DBE1 DF and replication DF.

The replication school that was funded by the local government only included socialization by DBE1 staff. There was no further training or follow-up mentoring. There were no follow-on activities from Dinas Pendidikan to continue the replication program. So, we can say that the replication program funded by the local government was not successful. From the two cases above, we can conclude that the DBE1 replication program will be successful if it follows DBE1 methodology.

Recommendations

If local government plans to allocate additional funding, it should be used to continue the previous program and follow DBE1 methodology. This can be seen from the success of the replication program in Sliyeg sub-district that followed DBE1-staged training, as well as follow-up mentoring. Likewise, Dinas Pendidikan should make use of DF or newly trained supervisors to support schools in RPS development.

13. Kabupaten Karawang

Introduction

As in Kabupaten Indramayu, there are also two types of replication program in Kabupaten Karawang: (1) a replication program funded by the district budget (APBD) in 10 schools, and (2) a self-funded replication program in 74 schools.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited five self-funded replication schools. All schools mentioned that the replication program was not implemented seriously. Socialization was only conducted for a few hours. Likewise, two-staged training was not conducted. There was no follow-up mentoring by DF or other supervisors. Of the five schools, three did not prepare anything and two schools had prepared a school profile, challenges, and alternate solutions.¹¹

Recommendations

DBE1 needs to assist local governments and schools in planning replication with funds provided by the schools themselves. If local government Karawang wishes to implement a replication program in a serious way, they should follow the DBE1 methodology. Local government in Karawang should also make better use of DF and newly trained supervisors in implementing the program.

14. Kabupaten Lebak

Introduction

In 2007, the local government in Lebak District allocated Rp. 50 million from APBD to replicate the DBE1 program in 10 schools. The DBE1 replication program was implemented in two sub-districts, Rangkasbitung and Cibadak, with five schools from each sub-district participating. The District Education Office intends that the replication schools can be used as a model for other schools.

¹¹ Based on information received from DC Karawang, in 2007 there was no replication budget from APBD. Local government Karawang just made the allocation in 2008. The replication program will start in October 2008.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited three replication schools in Rangkasbitung sub-district and three schools in Cibadak sub-district. All schools mentioned that they have attended two phases of training and have also received mentoring during the training. Follow-up mentoring was conducted along with the training. DF and newly trained supervisors were very active in supporting schools developing RPS. Draft RPS are almost completed, and the schools hope that before the school year 2008/2009, RPS development in each school will be complete.

Recommendations

Even though the RPS development has not been 100% completed, the DBE1 replication program in Kabupaten Lebak is relatively successful. All schools have draft RPS, followed the staged training activities, and received follow-up mentoring. If they finish the RPS development, follow-on programs like school committee empowering or leadership training should be devised.

15. Kota Tebing Tinggi

Introduction

Kota Tebing Tinggi allocated Rp. 42 million in 2007 to replicate DBE1 programs in nine SD and one MI. The replication program enables schools to develop school programs and to improve cooperation between the school committee and school. In 2008, the government of Kota Tebing Tinggi has allocated Rp. 100 million through the district budget (APBD) for DBE1 replication program in 9 SD, 1 MI, 4 SMP, and 1 MT. Training and follow-up mentoring have been implemented properly. DBE1 DF played a big part in the training and follow-up mentoring. The first training was conducted on July 19–21, 2007, and the second training was conducted on September 5–7, 2007.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited five schools, of which four had completed RPS and one had nearly completed the process (75%). Based on the information received, 6 of 10 replication schools had completed RPS. The DBE1 replication program started with a socialization of the RPS program and followed with the formation of KK-RPS working groups. Two phases of training were conducted, and then followed by workshops in each school, attended by school stakeholders (school committee, community leaders, and local officials). After the training, follow-up mentoring was conducted three times by a DF. The completed RPS documents are kept in the school and district office; however, there is no updating process. In fact, schools have not yet begun implementing the RPS programs.

Recommendations

1. DF should continue supporting schools that have not yet completed RPS.
2. The district government should independently monitor and evaluate the RPS implementation in each school to assess the result in each school before and after having the RPS.
3. DF or DC should encourage the district government to follow up the RPS process, including updating and developing annual plans.

16. Kabupaten Tapanuli Utara

Introduction

During the 2007 financial year, the local government of Kabupaten Tapanuli Utara allocated funds of Rp 190 million for replicating the DBE1 program in 16 schools. The RPS

development commenced with phased training with follow-up mentoring. A DBE1 DF, a Provincial Specialist and District Coordinator were actively involved in the replication process. The DBE1 replication program was initiated by Dinas Pendidikan, which then funded the program from APBD. The replication program enables schools to develop school programs and to improve the roles of the school committee and principal. In the 2008 financial year, the local government has already budgeted funds of Rp 75 million for the DBE1 replication program in 53 SMP and 1 MT.

Site Visits

The DBE1 review team visited five schools. No schools have finished preparing the RPS. Most have completed about 75% of the plan. The replication program commenced with a socialization of the RPS program, and was followed with RPS development training by the DF. Two phases of training were conducted and then, after the training, follow-up mentoring was conducted three times by the District Facilitators. RPS documents have not yet been completed, so there was not yet any program implementation in each school. All the schools visited by the DBE1 team indicated that according to them, RPS is very important for their school, so they hope that they can complete RPS.

Recommendations

1. The budget provided by local government in Kabupaten Taput is quiet large, so the DC or DF should encourage the local government to complete the replication program.
2. DF should continue supporting schools that have not yet completed RPS.
3. Monitoring and evaluation from local government of RPS implementation in each school is required to see whether the programs planned are realized or not.
4. Dinas Pendidikan should issue a decree requiring schools to develop RPS as a school work plan.

17. Kabupaten Deli Serdang

Introduction

There are two types of replication programs in Kabupaten Deli Serdang: (1) a self-funded replication program and (2) a replication program funded by APBD. The number of self-funded replication schools is seven, with funding of Rp. 8.2 million, and the number of replication schools funded by APBD is 32, with funding of Rp. 230.2 million. The local government in Deli Serdang did not allocate funds from the 2008 budget to replicate the DBE1 program further; APBD 2008 funds will be used to replicate DBE2 and DBE3 program. Dinas Pendidikan intends that the further implementation of the DBE1 replication program will be self-funded by schools.

Site Visits

Self-funded replication schools, and replication schools funded by APBD, have followed training and received follow-up mentoring from DC. However; no school had completed RPS. The progress of RPS development in five schools in Deli Serdang is approximately 75%. The DBE1 replication program started with socialization of RPS program and followed with RPS training. Two phases-trainings were conducted. After the training, follow-up mentoring was conducted two times by the District Facilitator.

Recommendations

1. DF or DC should coordinate with the local education office to ensure completion of RPS development in the replication schools, both self-funded schools and schools that are funded by APBD. The budget provided by local government in Kabupaten Deli Serdang is quite big, so DC or DF should encourage local government to complete the replication program very soon.
2. DF should continue supporting schools that have not yet completed RPS.
3. Monitoring and evaluation from the education office (Dinas Pendidikan) is required to assess the extent of the RPS replication program on school development.
4. It will be helpful if Dinas Pendidikan issues a decree requiring schools to develop RPS as a school work plan.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Based on the analysis of program-level data, school visits, and case studies outlined above, a number of conclusions can be made. In this final section of the report, answers to the questions posed in the study are given:

1. What factors contribute to the success of replication efforts?
2. What factors contribute to the failure of replication efforts?

A. Conclusions

1. Factors contribute to the success of replication efforts?

1. Ensuring that the entire DBE1 program model is implemented completely (training steps 1–2, 3–4, and mentoring for each step).
2. Ensuring more community members are involved in the process for developing RPS. The data show that no contributions were forthcoming from the community in contrast to the great community support achieved in the DBE target schools. Dissemination managers, including Education Office (Dinas Pendidikan) officials and other funders and school principals, must understand the long-term benefits of community participation in the RPS development process.
3. Limiting the target number of schools to ensure that the capacity/funds are there for the complete program. For example, Kabupaten Boyolali, Lebak, and Soppeng are relatively successful because they only targeted a few schools; on the contrary, Kabupaten Klaten and Indramayu are unsuccessful because they tend to replicate many schools in a wide area (e.g., one kecamatan one school).
4. Enhancing the role of the current District Facilitators (DF) is also critical, especially in mentoring the replication schools. Over 300 DF in 50 project districts have been trained and supported by DBE1 for 2–3 years, so they have the capacity to implement replication programs.
5. Recruiting new district facilitators from the pool of district school inspectors (pengawas) to be trained and supported by experienced DF and DBE1.
6. Continuing the role of District Coordinator (DC) is critical in assisting with lobbying, planning, budget proposal, intervention, M&E, and so on. The DC must assist the local government in how to use the replication budget for training, mentoring, and writing the RPS.
7. Improving coordination between the District Education Office (Dinas Pendidikan) and DBE1 to prepare realistic budgets and targets and increasing their efforts in monitoring program implementation.
8. Increasing the role of sub-district education officials (KCD) is critical. For example, in several places where schools used their own funds, such as in Indramayu and Tuban, the KCD was instrumental in organizing the programs
9. Ensuring school principals understand the value of producing RPS and the value of wide participation by community stakeholders in the development process.
10. Selecting sub-districts for replication that are geographically close to schools where the program has already been successfully implemented supports replication.

2. Factors contribute to the failure of replication efforts:

1. Districts and other agencies that provide budgets for replication but without specifying how the budget should be used. For example, the replication budget should be detailed enough to ensure the correct number of persons are trained and that the training and follow-up mentoring follows the DBE1 model.
2. DBE1 staff that do not sufficiently assist local governments in preparing budgets and program implementation.
3. Local governments that do not make full use of District Facilitators who have been trained by DBE1. Some district education offices are not prepared to have trained inspectors conduct training outside the sub-districts to which they are posted.
4. Going too wide too soon, i.e., focusing on quantity not quality. It is politically appealing to target large numbers of schools, but if the resources are inadequate, the result is usually failure and wasted resources.
5. Selecting schools on the basis of one per cluster, usually core school (sekolah inti), and expecting these schools to disseminate (“mengimbaskan”) the program to other schools in the cluster is not an effective strategy.

B. Recommendations

1. Promote better linkage between school development planning and district planning and budgeting. DBE1 district planning and governance programs should ensure school development plans become inputs for district planning, budgeting and policy development.
2. The findings from the study must be shared widely with government decision-makers at the district, provincial, and national levels. The information should also be shared with potential funders such as MORA, Muhammadiyah, and other donors. PowerPoint presentations, along with updated fliers and manuals, should be distributed.
3. Dissemination of the findings of this study should highlight the need for wider community participation in the plan development process. Funding agencies may be reluctant to promote wide participation because they believe it will be too expensive because most people who would participate would require payments to do so. However, we have found that payment of participant costs is not always a critical factor. There are many cases where schools, teachers, and community members are happy to participate without any or very minimum payment.
4. Muhammadiyah seems to be a very good partner for replication—and possibly MORA in some places, such as Tuban. There are other funding sources other than APBD. Districts should plan to collaborate with MORA, Muhammadiyah, Christian school networks, etc. They should also consider collaborating with schools that are interested in contributing funds from BOS for the program.
5. Districts and other partners should be encouraged to plan and implement replication programs in whole clusters that are located near successful project sites. A good strategy may be to increase engagement at the sub-district level with KCD who are motivated and capable and encourage districts to support replication in these areas—using commitment from KCD as one selection criteria.
6. DBE1 should encourage District Education Offices to use terms for replication that meet local budgeting standards. For example, the terms “replikasi DBE” or

“diseminasi DBE,” may not be acceptable to district finance and auditing authorities. Instead they may need to use terms such as “menerapkan MBS.” At the same time, the budget should be sufficiently detailed to ensure that the DBE1 methodology can be fully implemented; i.e., ensure wide community representation in plan development and ensure the all the training steps are followed.

C. Follow Up

1. Share results of this study as soon as possible with district stakeholders during the process in which they plan budgets for 2009, or revise plans for implementing dissemination of RPS in 2008 that have not yet begun.
2. Share results of this study with provincial and national stakeholders as potential inputs for program planning and policy formulation for the 2009 fiscal year and beyond.
3. Conduct follow-up monitoring with the schools that have begun or completed RPS under the dissemination program in 2008, to determine if assistance can be found to complete the process that has stalled at over 50%.
4. Conduct a limited, focused follow-up study to explore in-depth the reasons why no contributions were made by the community in the 92 sample schools. This should be completed by mid-November 2008. The results of the study should be incorporated in presentations on the dissemination study as described above.

Appendix 1: Replication efforts carried out in districts¹²

Province	District	Number of schools/madrasah replicating RPS/M	Funding source and total amount			Form of DBE1 assistance
			District Budget	Self Funded	Total	
Aceh	Banda Aceh	8	42,000,000		42,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitated RPS/M development process Provided input to Education Office on budget for training
		8	42,000,000		42,000,000	
North Sumatra	Tebing Tinggi	10	67,000,000		67,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisted Replication budget preparation process Specialist provided input for RPS/M training DC and DF facilitated RPS/M development process
	Tapanuli Utara	16	190,000,000		190,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above Additional activity for Tapanuli Utara: DC and DF assisted Education Council in carrying out a training of School Committee members
	Deli Serdang	30				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above
		56	257,000,000		257,000,000	
Banten	Cilegon	5		17,500,000	17,500,000	
	Lebak	10	50,000,000		50,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Coordinator provided assistance to related Head of Sub-District Education Office. District Facilitator monitored RPS development process

¹² The information in this Appendix is based on reports from the provinces as of December 2007.

Province	District	Number of schools/madrasah replicating RPS/M	Funding source and total amount			Form of DBE1 assistance
			District Budget	Self Funded	Total	
	Tangerang	30	147,600,000		147,600,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So far, District Coordinator provided input on steps involved in the replication process
		45	197,600,000	17,500,000	215,100,000	
West Java	Karawang	10	50,000,000		50,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Information Specialist provided input during training • DC and ADC coordinated workshops • DF facilitated the process until completion
	Indramayu	28	100,000,012		100,000,012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC and ADC coordinated workshops • DF facilitated the process after completion • Note: Possibility for School Committee capacity building process to be replicated as well.
	Sukabumi	65	325,000,000		325,000,000	
		103	475,000,012	-	475,000,012	
Central Java	Boyolali	50	250,000,000		250,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated with related stakeholders (MONE, MORA, Development Agency, District Parliament, Education Council) prior to replication • Reimbursed transportation charges for District Facilitator from the beginning (program introduction) to the end of process (RPS/M workshop at District level.) • DBE1 Central Java team and District Coordinator facilitated process of including RPS into RASK SKPD of Education Office. <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving School/Madrasah Committee, RPS/M development process completed in 50 SD/MI • Selection of 3 supervisors from Kindergarten/Elementary School/Madrasah as facilitators • Commitment of district stakeholders to

Province	District	Number of schools/madrasah replicating RPS/M	Funding source and total amount			Form of DBE1 assistance
			District Budget	Self Funded	Total	
						allocate Rp. 750 million in 2008 to support replication in 3 other sub-districts.
	Klaten	173	48,000,000		48,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisted schools for study visit to Boyolali and Karanganyar District. Prepared budget, training materials Provided assistance to 1 Principal, 1 Teacher, and 1 School Committee member from each participating school
	Kudus	76	100,000,000		100,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinated with related district-level stakeholders (MONE, MORA, Development Agency, District Parliament, Education Council) for replication efforts District Facilitators assisted Teacher Working Groups (KKG) every Saturday
	Karanganyar	71	200,000,000		200,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinated with related district-level stakeholders (MONE, MORA, Development Agency, District Parliament, Education Council) for replication efforts DBE1 Provincial team and Coordinator introduced replication to schools and provided information in meeting attended by 71 schools and several stakeholders

Province	District	Number of schools/madrasah replicating RPS/M	Funding source and total amount			Form of DBE1 assistance
			District Budget	Self Funded	Total	
	Jepara	758		100,000,000	100,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Facilitator coordinated with district and sub-district level MONE during preparation stage District Facilitator provided information in 1 day workshop attended by Head of sub-district education office, teachers, and principals. Arranged for schools under DBE1 program to be source of information for schools participating in replication program. <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75% RPS from Tahunan sub-district already completed School in 16 sub-districts are involved in the replication program Self-funded replication carried out in 14 sub-districts
		1,128	598,000,000	-	698,000,000	
East Java	Kota Mojokerto	51	51,000,000		51,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisted in planning, carrying out workshop and mentoring.
	Bangkalan	6			-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replication effort is carried out by District Facilitator using funds from schools. Total amount of money allocated for replication is not available.
	Sidoarjo	16	357,000,000		357,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DBE1 facilitated Training of Trainers for Sidoarjo's own District Facilitators used in the replication efforts Provided assistance in budgeting, training materials preparation, school profile completion. District Coordinator took part in facilitating parts of RPS development process
	Majelis Dikdasmen Muhammadiyah Kota Surabaya	47	150,000,000		150,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisted in planning, facilitation, RPS development workshops phases 1-4, and mentoring until completion. Assisted in Leadership training

Province	District	Number of schools/madrasah replicating RPS/M	Funding source and total amount			Form of DBE1 assistance
			District Budget	Self Funded	Total	
	Tuban	130	24,000,000		24,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on request of Head of sub-district education office, DBE1 District Facilitator: Facilitated RPS development process for 3 days Monitored the process, evaluated and updated RPS for 1 day in all 5 clusters For MONE, provided RPS training for Madrasah Principals for 3 days
		250	582,000,000	-	582,000,000	
South Sulawesi	Soppeng	40	63,000,000		63,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities have not taken place yet. Planned activities would include monitoring of RPS development process by districts' own District Facilitators.
	Palopo	6	75,000,000		75,000,000	
	Enrekang	30	100,000,000		100,000,000	
	Pangkep	20	176,000,000		176,000,000	
	Jeneponto		85,000,000		85,000,000	
	Sidrap		75,000,000		75,000,000	
	Makassar		60,000,000		60,000,000	
		96	634,000,000	-	634,000,000	
National		1,686	2,785,600,012	17,500,000	2,903,100,012	

Appendix 2: Survey Instruments

Instrumen Diseminasi RPS/RKS Untuk Sekolah

Nama Sekolah-Madrasah :

Alamat :

Kecamatan :

Kabupaten/kota :

Nama Responden* :

Jenis Kelamin :

Jabatan :

Pengumpul data :

Tanggal pengumpulan data :

Tanda Tangan :

A. Baseline data

1. Apakah sekolah sebelumnya sudah mempunyai RPS atau RKS?

- a. Ya
- b. Tidak (*Lanjutkan ke pertanyaan No. 4*)

2. Jika “ya”, siapa saja yang terlibat dalam penyusunan RPS/RKS tersebut?

No	Unsur	Ya	Tidak
1	Kepala Sekolah		
2	Guru		
3	Komite Sekolah 1 (mis. ketua)		
4	Komite Sekolah 2 (mis. Sekretaris)		
5	Lainnya (sebutkan).....		

3. Berdasarkan kajian dokumen RPS/RKS (jika ada) , apakah terdapat unsur-unsur berikut ini:

No	Criteria	Ya	Tidak
1	Mempunyai profile		
2	Terdapat analisis tentang tantangan yang dihadapi sekolah		
3	Terdapat strategi dan program untuk mengatasinya dan memperbaiki kualitas sekolah		
4	Memuat Jadwal program		
5	Terdapat budget utk setiap kegiatan		

B. Proses penyusunan RPS / RKS :

1. Apakah sekolah sudah membentuk KK-RPS atau KK-RKS?

- a. Ya
- b. Tidak

2. Jika “ya”, siapa sajakah yang duduk dalam KK-RPS / RKS?

No	Unsur	Ya	Tidak
1	Kepala Sekolah		
2	Guru		
3	Komite Sekolah 1 (mis. ketua)		
4	Komite Sekolah 2 (mis. Sekretaris)		
5	Lainnya (sebutkan).....		

3. Selama menyusun RPS/RKS apakah sekolah pernah diikut sertakan dalam sosialisasi ataupun pelatihan?
- a. Ya
 - b. Tidak (**LANGSUNG KE PERTANYAAN No. 8**)

4. Jika “ya”, sosialisasi atau pelatihan apa saja yang pernah diikuti, siapa yang menjadi narasumber dan siapa saja yang hadir?

No	Jenis Kegiatan	Nara sumber *						Yang hadir**			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4
7.1	Sosialisasi DBE1-RPS										
7.2	Pelatihan Tahap 1 dan 2										
7.3	Pelatihan Tahap 3 dan 4										
7.4	Pelatihan Tahap 1-4										

* Mohon dichecklist pada kolom yang sesuai (boleh lebih dari 1): Narasumber: 1. Specialist provinsi; 2. DC; 3. DF; 4. Pengawas/staf Dinas yang telah mengikuti pelatihan; 5. KCD; 6 lainnya;

**Yang hadir: 1. Kepala Sekolah; 2. Guru; 3. Anggota Komsek 1; 4. Anggota Komsek 2.

5. Selain pelatihan, apakah sekolah juga memperoleh pendampingan?

- Ya
- Tidak (**LANJUTKAN KE PERTANYAAN NO. 11**)

6. Jika “ya” pada materi apa, berapa kali dan siapa yang mendampingi?

No	Materi Pendampingan	Berapa kali?	Pendamping*			
			1	2	3	4
1	Penyusunan profile					
2	Perumusan harapan dan alternatif pemecahan					
3	Perumusan program					
4	Penyusunan RAPBS / RAKS					

* Berilah checklist pada kolom yang sesuai: 1. DC; 2. DF; 3. Pengawas yang pernah mengikuti pelatihan DBE1; 4. Lainnya (sebutkan.....)

7. Dimanakah pendampingan tersebut dilakukan?

- Di sekolah
- Di Gugus
- Dikumpulkan dalam satu tempat dan diikuti oleh semua sekolah diseminasi
- Lainnya (sebutkan)

8. Apakah dalam penyusunan RPS/RKS juga melibatkan stakeholders lainnya?

- Ya

b. Tidak (**LANJUTKAN KE PERTANYAAN No. 13**)

9. Jika ”ya” siapa dan dalam tahap apa mereka terlibat?

No	Materi Pendampingan	siapa saja yang terlibat?*				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Penyusunan profile					
2	Analisa pemecahan tantangan					
3	Perumusan Program					
4	Perumusan Rencana Biaya dan Pendanaan					

* berikan checklist pada kolom yang sesuai: 1. Kepala Desa; 2. Tokoh Masyarakat/Agama; 3. Paguyuban kelas (termasuk orangtua murid); 4. PKK; 5. Lainnya (mohon disebutkan)

10. Pada saat penyusunan RPS, apakah ada masyarakat yang secara spontan ingin memberikan bantuan?

a. Tidak (**LANJUTKAN KE PERTANYAAN NO. 15**)

b. Ada

i. Jika ada, dalam bentuk apakah sumbangan tersebut?

(3) Rp. (jika dalam bentuk uang)

(4) Barang atau jasa seharga: Rp..... (mohon diperkirakan nilai sumbangannya)

C. Kualitas RPS/RKS (Review dokumen RPS)

15. Berdasarkan kajian terhadap dokumen RPS, berapa persen RPS tersebut telah selesai dibuat?

a. Nol persen (sekolah tidak dapat menunjukkan draft RPS)

b. 25% (apabila hanya profile saja)

c. 50% (apabila sekolah telah menyelesaikan profile, harapan, dan tantangan sekolah)

d. 75% (apabila program 4 tahun sudah dibuat tetapi belum ada anggarannya)

e. 100% (dokumen RPS selesai dibuat, termasuk program dan budget)

16. Berdasarkan kajian dokumen RPS/RKS (bagi sekolah yang telah selesai membuat RPS), apakah terdapat unsur-unsur berikut ini:

No	Criteria	Ya	Tidak
1	Mempunyai profile		
2	Terdapat Analisis tentang tantangan yang dihadapi sekolah		
3	Memuat Strategi dan program untuk mengatasinya dan memperbaiki kualitas sekolah		
4	Memuat Jadwal program		
5	Terdapat budget untuk setiap kegiatan		

D. Pelaksanaan RPS

17. Dari semua program/kegiatan pada tahun pertama (2007/2008), berapa yang dilaksanakan, ditunda, atau dibatalkan?

No		Jumlah	%
19.1	Total kegiatan tahun 2007/2008		
19.2	Total kegiatan sedang/sudah dilaksanakan		
19.3	Total kegiatan yang ditunda		
19.4	Total kegiatan yang dibatalkan		

18. Jika kegiatan tersebut ditunda/dibatalkan, apa penyebabnya?

.....

Appendix 3: Case Study Locations and Key Persons Met

Sites / Persons Met	Position
Boyolali, Jawa Tengah	March 10th
<i>Dinas Pendidikan Boyolali</i>	
Ibu Dasih Wiryastuti	Kasubdin TK-SD
<i>1. SDN1, Boyolali</i>	
(1). Bpk Pardjono	Kepala Sekolah
(2). Ibu Darmisi	Guru Kelas 6 (anggota KKRKS)
(3). Ibu Drs. Ngatmi,	Guru pemandu, Anggota Komite Sekolah, MTT
<i>2. SDN Siswodipuran 1</i>	
(1). Ibu Asri Aryani	Kepala Sekolah
(2). Bok Tri Joko Listianto	Guru Kelas 4
(3). Ibu Sri Lestari SDp	Pengawas TK/SD
<i>3. SDN Kiringan 1, Boyolali</i>	
(1) Ibu Titik Sri Andyani	Kepala Sekolah
(2) Bpk Rohadi	Pengawas
<i>4. MIN Boyolali Boyolali</i>	
(1). Bp. Suharto	Guru Kl. IV
(2). Bp. A. Sardi	Guru Kl V
(3). Ibu Anik M.	Guru IPS
<i>5. SDN 9 Boyolali</i>	
1. Sri Saparindah	Kepala Sekolah
2. Joko Legowo	Pengawas Sekolah Kec. Boyolali
<i>6. SDN Kebonbimo III</i>	
Ibu Sudini	Kepala Sekolah
<i>7. SDN Bandung, Kec. Wonosegoro</i>	
Benny Supadmono	Kepala Sekolah
<i>8. MI Ngasinan</i>	
Bp. Muslih	Kepala Sekolah
<i>9. SD Repaking I</i>	
	Kepala Sekolah
<i>10. MI Darum Ulum</i>	
Bp. Imron	Kepala Sekolah
<i>11. SDN Banyusri</i>	

Sites / Persons Met	Position
Bp. Supardiono	Kepala Sekolah
Kabupaten Klaten, Jawa Tengah	March 11th
<i>Dinas Pendidikan, Klaten</i>	
Ibu Tulus,	Staff TK-SD (Subdin DBE!)
Bpk Pantoro,	Kasubdin TK-SD
1. SDN2 Gatak	
(1) Ibu Sri Mardasih,	Kepala Sekolah
(2) Ibu Dri Rahyu,	Pengawas
2. SDN Tonggolan 1, Klaten	
Ibu Sarti	Kepala Sekolah
3. SDN 02 Karangdukuh	
Ibu Istinah	Kepala Sekolah
4. SDN 1 Prawatan,	Kec. Jogonalan,
Bpk Sumali,	Ketua Komite Sekolah and 4 teachers
5. SDN Klaten 6	
Ibu Rukmini	Kepala Sekolah
Kabupaten Karanganyar, Jawa Tengah	March 14th
Drs Tarsa M.Pd,	Kasie Pengembangan Profesi Guru TK/SD
1. SDN 04 karanganyar	
Sutardi	Kepala Sekolah
2. SDN 01 Mojogedang	
Ibu Sudarmi	Kepala Sekolah
3. SDN 01 Papahan	
4. SDN 03 Jaten	
Ibu Endang Widowati	Kepala Sekolah
Kota Yogyakarta, DIY	March 11th
Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta	
Bpk Muqowim	Majelis Pendidikan Muhammadiyah, DIY
Save the Children UK	
Bpk Agus Budiarto	Programme Manager
???	Programme Officer
Kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur	March 24th
Majalis Pendidikan Muhammadiyah,	

Sites / Persons Met	Position
<i>Kota Surabaya,</i>	
Drs H.M. Wahyudi Indrajaya	Pimpin Daerah
Bpk Sukron	
<i>SD Muhammadiyah 25 Surabaya</i>	(non diseminasi)
Bpk Feri Ismawan,	Kepala Sekolah
Bpk Yahya,	Wakil Kepala Sekolah (former Kepsek)
<i>(1) SD Muhammadiyah 5</i>	
Bp. Wahid Arifin	
<i>(2) SDN Muhammadiyah 16</i>	
Abdul Kodir	Kepala Sekolah
<i>(3) SDN Muhamadiyah 4</i>	
Bp. Solihin	Kepala Sekolah
Kota Mojokerto, Jawa Timur	March 25th
<i>Dinas Pendidikan</i>	
Bpk Pudjiono,	Wakil Kadis (Kabag TU)
<i>(1) SDN Kranggan 1</i>	
Ibu Ending Sulistyoyo	Kepsek; Teachers
Ibu Sunariah	Pengawas TK-SD & DF
Ibu Lili Hartini	Pengawas TK-SD
Bpk M. Ruslan	Pengawas TK-SD
Ibu Ruhainah	Pengawas Depag (PAI)
<i>(2) MIS Nurul Huda 2</i>	
Bpk M A. Rudianto (K M)	Kepsek.; Teachers
Bpk Samian Hasan	Pengawas (PAI)
<i>(3) SDN Kranggan 5</i>	
Bpk Sunarno	Kepsek.; Teachers
<i>(4) SDN Gedongan 3</i>	
Bp. Sudarmaji	Kepala Sekolah
<i>(5) SDN Gedongan</i>	
Ibu Markonah	Kepala Sekolah
<i>(6) SDN Balangsari I</i>	
Ibu Halim + Ibu Riani	Kepala Sekolah+Komite Sekolah
Kabupaten Tuban, Jawa Timur	March 26th

Sites / Persons Met	Position
KCD Kecamatan Rengal	
Drs H Achmad Suyitno, MD	(KCD) Kecamatan Rengel
<i>(1) SDN Sumberejo 2,</i>	<i>Kec Rengal, Tuban</i>
Bpk Whinoto,	Kepsek.
<i>(2) SDN Rengel 01,</i>	<i>Kec Rengal, Tuban</i>
Bpk M. Darum,	Kepsek
<i>(3) SDN Banjarum II,</i>	<i>Kec Rengal, Tuban</i>
Bpk Sudiro	Kepsek
<i>Departemen Agama, Tuban</i>	
Bpk Sutrisno Rachmat,	Kepala Depag, Tuban
<i>(4) SDN Panyuran I</i>	
Ibu Sukasri	Kepala Sekolah
<i>(5) SDN Sumurgung 6</i>	
Bapak Sutego	Kepala Sekolah
<i>(6) SDN Tegalbank</i>	
Bp. Citro	Kepala Sekolah
<i>(7) SDN Cendoro 02</i>	
Bp. Mid Minarto	Kepala Sekolah
<i>(8) SDN Lerankulon</i>	
Bapak Wadri Djurianto	Kepala Sekolah
Kabupaten Sidoarjo, Jawa Timur	March 27th
KCD Kecamatan Tarik	
Bpk Andi Sudianto,	KCD
Bpk Suprpto,	Pengawas
<i>(1) SDN Kendalasewu</i>	<i>Tarik</i>
Bpk Sidoarto	Kepsek
Plus 4 teachers/komite	
<i>(2) MI Alibrohim</i>	<i>Kelanting Sari, Tarik</i>
Bpk Edi Aluyo	
Plus 4 teachers/komite	
<i>(3) MI Miftahuk Ulum</i>	
Bapak Yasjurdzan + A. Zaini	Kepala Sekolah+Komite
<i>(4) SDN klantingsari</i>	

Sites / Persons Met	Position
Bp. Tumino	Kepala Sekolah
Kabupaten Indramayu	April 30th, 2008
Drs Masdik MM	1. Kasie Kurrikulum Dikdas
Dety Kusmiati	2. Pengawas TK-SD Kec Kec. Sliyeg
(1) SDN Tugu	
Bp. Sutadi	Kepala Sekolah
(2) SDN Tulungagung I	
Bp. Muh. Maksum	Kepala Sekolah
Kabupaten Karawang	May 2nd, 2008
H/ Muhrodi Suruzi	KCD Kec. Rengasdengklok
(1) SDN Karyasari IV	Guru SDN Karyasari IV
(2) SDN Kalangsari IV	Kepala SDN Kalangsari IV
(3) SD Karyasari V	Kepala SDN karyasari V
(4) SD Dukuh Karya 1	Kepala SDN Dukuh Karya 1
(5) SD Dukuh Karya 2	Kepala SDN DUkuh Karya 2
Kabupaten Lebak	
Bp. Zulkifili	1. Kepala SDN Rangkasbitung 4
Bp. H. Rosid	2. Kepala SDN Rangkasbitung 1
Ibu Hj. Babay R.	3. kepala SDN Rangkasbittung 5
Ibu Hj. Bay Rosikah	4. Kepala SDN Kaduagung Barat 02
Ibu Warniawari	5. Kepala SDN Kaduagung Barat 01
Nurhidayati	6. Kepala SDN Kaduagung 01
Kabupaten Pangkep	May 5th, 2008
Burhan Karim	DF DBE1
H. Zubari	DF Diseminasi
1. SDN 5 padanglampe	
Siti F. + Marhaini	Kepala Sekolah + teacher
2. SDN 13 Padanglampe	
Jaenuddin	Teacher
3. SDN 19	
Siti Aminah	Kepala Sekolah
4. SDN 37 Bulu-bulu	
Siti Aizah+ibu Ratna	Teachers

Sites / Persons Met	Position
5. SDN Negeri 45 Pacelleng	
Ibu Nurhaya	Kepala Sekolah
6. SDN 8 Pacelleng	
Ibu Rahmawati	Kepala Sekolah
Kabupaten Enrekang	
1.SDN 15 Kotu	Sumarni
2.SDN 175 Cendana D	Siti Mariam
3.SDN 17 Singkih	Abdul Azis
4.SDN 76 Kasambi	Zaenal
5.SDN 110 Laura	Junaeda
6.SDN 57 Sangeran	Kepala Sekolah
7.SDN 54 Kolosi	Murniwati
Kabupaten Soppeng	
1.SDN 26 Matajang	Kepala Sekolah
2.MIS DDI Jampu2	Haerawati
3.SDN 193 Rarae	Aminu
4.SDN 135 MRRW	Syafii
5.SDN 147 Lamarung	Justan
6.SDN 50 Tarawang	Ruwaenah
Kabupaten Palopo	
1. SDI Pesantren	Dra. Hj. Ombong M
2. SDN 79 T.Palopo	Drs. H. Muklim Saleh
3. SDN Pajalesang	Drs. H. Muklim Saleh
4. SDN Pinceputte	Hj. St. Janawang
Kabupaten Deliserdang	
1.SDN 105855 II	Zuraida
2.SDN 101879	Syarifah H.
3.SDN 101878	Suryati
4.SDN 101786	Drs. Sudarno (Kepsek)
5.SDN 107415	Sulistiono Sp.D (Kepsek)
Kabupaten Taput	
1.SDN 173276	Mery Sihombing (Kepsek)
2.SDN 173148	Edisma Manalu (Kepsek)

Sites / Persons Met	Position
3.SDN 174568	Muliana Samosir (Kepsek)
4.SDN 175766	Luhut Manalu (Kepsek)
5.SDS Santa Lusia	SR. Sagala (Kepsek)
Kabupaten Tebingtinggi	
1.MIN Rambutan	Bahtiar (Komite Sekolah)
2.SD.Negeri 164523	Mahmuddin (Komsek)
3.SD.Negeri.165729	Suryani (guru)
4.SD.Negeri 167644	Hamdan (Ketua Komsek)
5.SD.Negeri 168294	Jailani Lubis (Ketua Komsek)