Indonesia: Using open school data to improve transparency and accountability

Nisa Felicia
Indonesia: Using open school data to improve transparency and accountability

Nisa Felicia
Presentation of the series:
Ethics and Corruption in Education

Several studies conducted over the last two decades have emphasized the negative impact of corruption on the economic, social, and political development of countries. Corruption increases transaction costs, reduces the efficiency of public services, distorts the decision-making process, and undermines social values. Studies have also shown a strong correlation between corruption and poverty: statistical regressions suggest that an improvement in the ‘control of corruption’ indicator by one standard deviation (two points) is associated with an increase of some $11,000 in gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (Sturm, 2013, in OECD, 2015). Moreover, corruption tends to contribute to the reinforcement of inequities by placing a disproportionate economic burden on the poor and limiting their access to public services.

As a consequence, fighting corruption has become a major concern for policy-makers and actors involved in development. In view of the decrease in international aid flows and the increasingly stringent conditions for the provision of aid – due to growing pressure on public resources within donor countries and the pressure exerted by taxpayers on governments to increase transparency and accountability in resource management – fighting corruption is now regarded as a major priority on the agendas of countries and international agencies of development cooperation. The Drafting Committee of the World Education Forum expressed this concern in the following terms: ‘Corruption is a major drain on the effective use of resources for education and should be drastically curbed’ (UNESCO, 2000). In other words, to ‘ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning’ – the fourth of the 2015 Sustainable Development Goals – the issue of corruption must be properly addressed.

A brief review of the literature highlights a number of global and sectoral attempts to tackle the issue of corruption. In the social sector, for example, several studies have been conducted on corruption in relation to the provision of healthcare services. However, it appears that the education sector has not received adequate attention from national education authorities and donors, despite numerous grounds for prioritizing the challenge of combating corruption in education:

- Public sector reforms aimed at improving governance and limiting corruption-related phenomena cannot produce significant results unless adequate attention is paid to the education sector, as in most countries this constitutes the largest or second-largest public sector in both human and financial terms.
- Any attempt to improve the functioning of the education sector to increase access to quality education for all will be undermined if problems related to corruption, which have severe implications for the efficient use of resources and the quality of education and school performance, are not being properly addressed.
- Lack of integrity and unethical behaviour within the education sector are inconsistent with one of the primary aims of education: to produce ‘good citizens’ who are respectful of the law, human rights, and equity. They are also incompatible with any strategy that considers education as a principal means of fighting corruption.

In this context, the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) launched a research project entitled ‘Ethics and Corruption in Education’. Corruption is defined as the systematic use of public office for private benefit that results in a reduction in the quality or availability of public goods and services. The main objective of this project is to improve decision-making and the management of educational systems by integrating
governance and corruption concerns into methodologies of planning and administration of education. More specifically, it seeks to develop methodological approaches for studying and addressing the issue of corruption in education and to collect and share information on the best approaches for promoting transparency, accountability, and integrity in the management of educational systems in both developing and industrialized countries.

The project includes publications on topics such as school financing, pro-poor education incentives, teacher codes of conduct, textbook production and distribution, and academic fraud. It also features monographs on success stories in improving management and governance, as well as case studies that facilitate the development of methodologies for analysing transparency and integrity in education management.*

Within this framework, IIEP conducted research to explore the recent development of school report cards and to examine cases in which report cards prove especially successful in helping to improve transparency and accountability in education systems. This research included the preparation of case studies on the use of open school data in six countries from Asia and the Pacific – namely Australia, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Pakistan (Punjab), and the Philippines – as well as two state-of-the-art papers on Africa and Latin America.

This publication presents the case of Indonesia. It is based on interviews with key informants and a survey of 250 school-level actors. It compares the design and implementation of two major initiatives: Sekolah Kita, which is government-led, and Cek Sekolahku, which is citizen-led. It investigates and compares the type of information published, those who publish it, and how it is accessed. It highlights critical data for improving transparency and accountability, and explores how different categories of stakeholders access and utilize the information. It also identifies the conditions required to improve transparency and accountability in the education system, and the limits of such processes.

It concludes by highlighting that greater information through school report cards does not necessarily increase parental and community participation in school monitoring. Achieving this goal requires proper capacity building. The publication ends with a series of recommendations including: displaying and communicating the underlying objective and approach when designing school report cards, giving priority to data ‘that matter’ for parents, and integrating transparency efforts into strategies for school improvement efforts.

IIEP is very grateful to Nisa Felicia for her valuable insights and would like to thank her accordingly. It would also like to thank all the people interviewed as part of this research and those who gave their time to participate and collaborate in the fieldwork.

Jacques Hallak** and Muriel Poisson***

* An information platform entitled ETICO has been created within the framework of the project and can be accessed at: http://etico.iiep.unesco.org
** Former IIEP Director
*** Programme Specialist, Research and Development, IIEP
Foreword

The number of countries providing the general public with access to school data has grown rapidly over the past decade, encouraged by the development of information technologies and under the pressure of social movements demanding the right to information and greater accountability in service delivery. A wide variety of initiatives have been developed to share school-level information in the form of school report cards. These provide key information about a school, including student enrolment, funding, number of teachers, teacher qualifications, pupil/teacher ratios, conditions of school facilities, textbooks, and student achievement. In some countries, governments have taken the lead in disseminating such data, relying on existing educational management information systems. Elsewhere, civil society organizations have taken the initiative to produce school report cards for selected schools, placing the emphasis on community engagement in data collection and use.

In recent years, the Asia-Pacific region in particular has become a hub for increased initiatives for access to information and has called for more transparent and accountable government. Australia, New Zealand, and Singapore have pioneered innovative and comprehensive uses of new technologies with the launching of My School, Education Sector Indicators, and the School Information Service respectively. Grassroots movements in India have stimulated the passing of Right to Information Acts in many states during the last decades; furthermore, initiatives aimed at displaying information through district report cards and school boards have spread throughout the country. Bangladesh now has more than a decade of experience in developing school report cards with the support of civil society, and the Check My School initiative has spread from the Philippines to Cambodia and Indonesia. These are but a few examples which highlight the opening up of school data to the general public throughout the region.

It is widely acknowledged in the literature that public access to information is one of the most efficient means of achieving better transparency and accountability in the education sector. It enables education authorities not only to better monitor educational progress and outcomes, but also to detect bottlenecks in the system and take adequate measures to address them. It also enables school communities to check whether they have received all the resources they were entitled to, in terms of funding, teachers, textbooks, and so on. Finally, it enables parents to exert pressure on school authorities and public officials to improve service delivery. Nevertheless, experience shows that the link between data, transparency, and accountability is not straightforward in practice, and needs to be unpacked carefully.

Indeed, while open school data are important, the information published is not always the kind most urgently needed to improve accountability in the management of education systems. In addition, when data are available to the public, they are not necessarily in easily accessible formats, and people are often unaware of how to access and utilize those data. Moreover, sharing best practices in this area has not yet been carried out in a useful and systematic manner. Essential to addressing these issues is an increased dialogue between key stakeholders, that is to say government education officers and planners responsible for data collection and dissemination, civil society organizations (CSOs) involved in the empowerment of citizens through information, and parent representatives.

This raises a number of questions:

- What data are most relevant to improving transparency and accountability in the system?
- What format is most likely to encourage school communities to make better use of data?
- What can be done to ensure that the data provided benefit more than a small proportion of the population, allowing all the community to make informed decisions?
• What mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure that parents and communities can make proper use of data?
• What incentives are needed to help stakeholders improve their practice?

Such questions can be seen as all the more relevant as the amount of school data – and the number of countries adopting school report cards – continue to grow. They are also timely, as there is still a lack of robust assessment of the actual efficacy of such initiatives: the ‘lessons learned’ so far rely predominantly on desk reviews and anecdotal evidence. They are also critical for ascertaining whether the conditions for the usefulness of open school data are properly taken into account, together with other factors critical for improving transparency and accountability in a sustainable way.

In this context, the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) initiated a research project in 2014 on ‘Using open school data to improve transparency and accountability in education’, so as to compare the motivations, purposes, audiences, data sources, contents, uses, and impacts of school report cards developed in different regions of the world.

The overall goals of this programme are to: develop an evidence base for the most critical data needed and the most effective open education policies for improving government transparency and accountability in education; help decision-makers and educational managers make informed decisions about the design and implementation of open education data policies, so as to promote transparency and empower citizens to fight against corruption; build the commitment and capacity of civil society organizations, media representatives, in addition to education officials in charge of access to information, to work together to develop access to more practical, effective, and usable educational data.

The research addresses the necessary conditions for enabling open education data to promote transparency and accountability in education. It pays particular attention to data published at school level through school report cards, in the belief that the school level is particularly critical for encouraging citizens to make the best use of the information provided and to act upon it. It analyses the chain of action needed for developing school report cards successfully at each of the steps involved in their design and implementation.

The main assumptions underlying the research are as follows: First, open data initiatives are powerful tools to improve transparency, hold schools accountable, and reduce corruption risks in education. Second, government-led initiatives are less likely than citizen-led initiatives to respond to users’ needs, engage them, and generate real impact, since they are often more supply- than demand-driven. And third, all users do not benefit equally from open data initiatives. In the absence of adequate safeguards, such initiatives can enhance inequalities and result in ‘elite capture of information’. Within this framework, the research attempts to address and document the following questions:

• What is an enabling legal framework for access to information initiatives in the countries under analysis?
• What are the most critical data for revealing corruption in different areas such as school funding, infrastructure procurement, or school and teacher management?
• Which information model has proved to be more effective: supply-driven (for top-down management) or demand-driven (for bottom-up control)?
• How can we ensure that the information is actually being used by the target audiences in the desired manner?
• What is an effective set-up that will facilitate participation by the general public?
• How can demand for information be created among a desired range of audiences?
• What successful actions following the publication of school-level data have a real impact in improving transparency and accountability in the education sector?
• What are the potential adverse effects of access to information on the existing education systems?
The research focuses on countries from Asia and the Pacific which have developed innovative projects during recent years in the area of open data in education, including Australia, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Pakistan (Punjab province), and the Philippines.* In each participating country, national researchers have analysed in detail these initiatives’ aim to share access to school data with the general public in order to improve transparency and accountability and fight corruption in education systems. They have compared, as far as possible, two types of initiative, one that is government-led (the collection and distribution of school-level information is initiated by the central authority of the country or of a jurisdiction), and one that is citizen-led (the collection and distribution of school-level information is initiated at the community level). The following activities were accordingly undertaken at country level:

- The analysis and collection of relevant documentation and laws related to the right to access information, including legislation specific to the education sector, if any;
- A review of the list of education data shared with the public at all levels of the system, but particularly at the school level, produced and disseminated by government authorities and also through large-scale civil society initiatives;
- A series of semi-structured interviews with key informants (people in charge of the implementation of the right to information legislation, education sector managers, actors from civil society organizations involved in the empowerment of citizens though public access to data, members of parent associations, and representatives from the media);
- A survey of 250 school-level actors, using a multi-stage stratified sample method to illustrate the diversity of perspectives and perceptions about the usefulness of open education data, considering socio-economic, educational, and geographical factors. Informants included head teachers, teachers, parent–teacher associations, parents, and community leaders.

At the school level, field surveys helped to identify the type of information published, those publishing it, and how it is accessed; the most critical data for improving transparency; how different categories of stakeholder access and use the information; the conditions required to impact the level of transparency and accountability in the education system; and the limits of such processes, particularly from a legal perspective. Their main findings are analysed in detail in a set of case studies published by IIEP in its series, ‘Ethics and corruption in education’. This report presents the results of the case study conducted in Indonesia.

It is hoped that the results of this work will help build the capacities of education officials, as well as civil society representatives in charge of the management of school data, to develop access to practical, effective, and usable open data in education; to encourage further dialogue and cooperation between stakeholders within individual countries and in the wider region with respect to the conditions in which such initiatives can improve accountability in education; and beyond this, to enable promoters of public access to information based in different regions of the world to learn from the success and limits of the experiences of other regions.

IIEP would like to thank Nisa Felicia for her valuable contribution and the interviewees for sharing their knowledge and experience. It would also like to express its gratitude to the high-level decision-makers from the six countries under review, who agreed to discuss the main findings of the research during a policy forum organized by IIEP in Manila, Philippines, from 24 to 26 January 2018.

*Muriel Poisson, Programme Specialist, IIEP

* The six case studies have been published as part of the IIEP Series on Ethics and Corruption in Education, and are available on the Institute’s publication website: www.iiep.unesco.org
This study was prepared under the supervision of Muriel Poisson, Programme Specialist at the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP-UNESCO).
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAN</td>
<td>Badan Akreditasi Nasional, National Accreditation Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOS</td>
<td>Bantuan Operasional Sekolah, School Operational Assistance Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapodik</td>
<td>Data Pokok Pendidikan, Main Education Data (Indonesian EMIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikdasmen</td>
<td>Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Primary and Secondary Education Unit in MoEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIP</td>
<td>Komisi Informasi Pusat, Central Information Commission of the Republic of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPK</td>
<td>Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, Corruption Eradication Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoEC</td>
<td>Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan (Kemendikbud), Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGP</td>
<td>Open Government and Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDSPK</td>
<td>Pusat Data Statistik Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Centre for Statistical Data of Education and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puspendik</td>
<td>Pusat Penilaian Pendidikan, Centre for Educational Assessment, a unit in MoEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKAS</td>
<td>Rencana Kegiatan dan Anggaran Sekolah, School Activity and Budget Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Sekolah Dasar, Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Sekolah Menengah Atas, Higher secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMK</td>
<td>Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan, Vocational secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Sekolah Menengah Pertama, Lower secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII</td>
<td>Transparency International Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULT</td>
<td>Unit Layanan Teknis, Technical Service Unit, a unit in MoEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive summary

The Right to Information Law, introduced in 2008, secures the right of Indonesian citizens to public information. As stated in Law Number 14 Year 2008, the main purposes of public information disclosure include the desire to promote transparency and accountability in public institutions and increase public engagement in decision-making processes. Following the enactment of the law, in 2009 the government passed Law Number 25 Year 2009 on Public Service, requiring all public service institutions including the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) to provide accessible information to the public regarding their organizations (i.e. vision and mission statements, programmes, etc.) and to develop mechanisms that would enable the public to provide feedback quickly.

To promote transparency and accountability in education, MoEC and a civil society organization in Indonesia developed school report cards, defined by Cheng and Moses (2016) as the ‘aggregation of education information at the school level’. Information and communication technology development in the country enables school information to be made publicly available online. The technology also allows stakeholders to give direct feedback to schools via computers and mobile phones, both of which are widely used in Indonesia.

The purpose of this case study is to compare and contrast two recent initiatives, Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, both of which were developed within the last five years. Sekolah Kita is a government-led school report card developed and administered by MoEC and initiated in 2015. Cek Sekolahku was developed in 2014 by Transparency International Indonesia (TII), a civil society organization. The Sekolah Kita website stores the data of all schools in Indonesia including private and public schools, from kindergarten to upper secondary schools, as well as learning centres for non-formal education institutions across the country. Cek Sekolahku is implemented in 182 schools in five districts including cities and Kabupaten, out of over 400 districts in Indonesia. Although not a nation-wide programme, the school data including school profiles and complaints published on the Cek Sekolahku website can be viewed by anyone.

This study involved two groups of participants: key informants and school-level actors. About 12 key informants were interviewed for this study including legislators and regulators, persons in charge of Education Management Information System (EMIS) (or Dapodik, in Indonesia), individuals in charge of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, civil society representatives, school directors and parent leaders, and media representatives. School-level actors consisted of principals, teachers, School Committee representatives, students, and parents. In total, 548 people participated in this case study.

School-level data were collected from 17 lower secondary schools in three districts where both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku were operational. The three districts were Semarang, Makassar, and Bojonegoro. All three are urban areas with different levels of social and economic development. Semarang is categorized as the most developed district (category A), Makassar is considered a category B district, and Bojonegoro is the least developed district (category C).

The aim of comparing and contrasting Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku is to draw lessons from the two initiatives that could help decision-makers and educational managers make informed decisions about the design and implementation of open education data policies, with a view to promoting transparency and accountability in the education

1. The indicators used for categorizing the districts are: GDP per capita (IDR), national ranking on the Human Development Index, national ranking for adult literacy rates, and means years of schooling.
sector. The key findings and recommendations are presented below and were generated based on data collected at national, district, and school levels.

Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are ground-breaking initiatives in the education sector in Indonesia. Prior to the initiatives, there were no national-level school report cards available online that allowed stakeholders and the public to provide feedback and complaints directly to schools. The initiatives were developed as a strategy to increase the quality of school-based management through participation. Both students and parents appreciated the initiatives because of their own reluctance to communicate their concerns and complaints about school facilities and programmes to teachers and administrators in person. Once the online system was in place, they felt more comfortable giving feedback to schools.

The initiatives should be presented to schools and stakeholders more frequently. The release of education information can improve school accountability if several assumptions are met. First and foremost, the information should be accessible to parents, students, and other stakeholders. This study, however, finds that many participants are still unfamiliar with the initiatives. Some of them only know about one initiative, and only about 35% of parent respondents knew both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. Teachers and students may have limited knowledge about the initiatives because both are relatively new. Effective approaches should therefore be used to present the initiatives to the public. Otherwise, open school data are unlikely to lead to any improvement in schools.

The quality (accuracy and frequency) of information published by the initiatives is influenced by formal reinforcement and government sanctions. Sekolah Kita is updated at least once per semester, in accordance with education data (Dapodik)\(^2\) and BOS\(^3\) regulations. Non-submission of Dapodik (which are subsequently published on Sekolah Kita) to the central government results in school budget funds being withheld. This consequence has proved effective in ensuring schools provide updated data and has increased the accuracy of the information on Sekolah Kita. Such policies do not apply to Cek Sekolahku. Consequently, some information on Cek Sekolahku is not quite up to date. Thus, although school information is publicly available, the quality of the data may undermine efforts to improve school transparency and accountability.

More information on school report cards does not necessarily increase participation. Sekolah Kita displays more information about schools than Cek Sekolahku. The information includes not only educational data, but also geospatial data that tell users about cultural heritage sites located near the school. However, Sekolah Kita does not provide information about school financial matters. Cek Sekolahku, on the other hand, tends to focus on basic information such as number of teachers, school facilities, learning equipment, and school budget plans (RKAS or Rencana Kegiatan dan Anggaran Sekolah). More importantly, Cek Sekolahku’s main component is a complaint-handling system. The website publicly displays complaints submitted by students and parents to schools and the status of each complaint. Hence, the public is able to see whether schools respond to stakeholders’ feedback and resolve their issues. Such a system or mechanism is not available on Sekolah Kita.

School report cards are seen as a means to publicize or market schools, rather than to improve accountability. Influenced by the longstanding tradition of school choice in

---

\(^2\) *Data Pokok Pendidikan* (Dapodik) is the Indonesian EMIS. Schools are required to submit educational information directly to MoEC through the online system at least once per semester.

\(^3\) *Bantuan Operasional Sekolah* or School Operational Assistance Fund is a programme that enables the abolition of tuition fees for primary and lower secondary schools, or 9-year compulsory education. The fund is allocated based on an amount for each student on a quarterly basis to all public and private schools. Because BOS is granted by the central government to schools on a per-student basis, the central government obtains information about the number of students in every school from Dapodik.
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Indonesia, publishing information about schools is viewed by school-level actors as a way to promote school programmes and achievements. In general, the participants agreed that only information that could promote a school’s brand or image should be published, rather than information that could damage its reputation.

There is a lack of formal consequences or sanctions for misconduct or malpractice revealed by data or reported by stakeholders. The absence of clear consequences decreases stakeholders’ motivation to participate in school accountability efforts. Teachers and stakeholders feel frustrated when there are no visible results of their efforts to improve school accountability and highlight malpractice. Hence, it can be argued that unless the impact of stakeholders’ participation is apparent to them, transparency will not lead to accountability in the management of the education system.

Ček Sekolahku, as a citizen-led initiative, has more flexibility to respond to schools’ and stakeholders’ needs and adjust to local contexts. Such flexibility is more difficult for Sekolah Kita owing to its strict bureaucratic framework. MoEC personnel who participated as key informants in this research admit that they cannot reach out to schools and the public, because this authority and responsibility falls under other units in MoEC. Although individuals in the MoEC statistical data centre, PDSPK, have a strong commitment to improving data-driven decision-making processes in education, they must depend on District Officers to promote the use of data among school principals and teachers. Nonetheless, it should be noted that government support is critical to improving implementation of the initiative. Without the endorsement and reinforcement of district leaders, it would be very difficult for Transparency International Indonesia and its local facilitators to encourage schools to publish their data and to welcome community participation in school management.

Parent and community participation in monitoring schools requires capacity building. Transparency does not necessarily lead to school accountability. To increase school accountability, stakeholders need the competency or capacity to use data and provide feedback to schools. Through surveys and interviews, participants in this research constantly mentioned the need for capacity building. While it is important to help stakeholders understand and become skilled in using data, capacity is more than cognitive ability; it also concerns the power dynamic between students and teachers or school administrators.
Major recommendations are as follows:

- Transparency efforts should be integrated into strategies or blueprints for school improvement efforts, rather than being viewed as a separate programme. Although knowledge is important, capacity building for education actors and stakeholders should not be reduced to knowledge and skills transfers from experts to individual actors. Instead, positive relationships among actors should be developed, in order to build the relational trust necessary for productive school improvement efforts.

- School report cards should be the main reference point for schools and the public to evaluate school performance and plan for improvements. Policy-makers and education managers and planners should also be able to display and communicate a clear theory of change, in which school report card initiatives are included and interlinked with other initiatives and reform efforts. This would allow the public to see how school report cards and school accountability efforts can contribute to quality learning outcomes. Educators and stakeholders should also view school report cards as a catalyst for change, rather than as a policy competing with other education policies.

- One recommendation for MoEC, as the initiator of Sekolah Kita, is to reformulate school report cards to allow parents and the public to focus on important aspects of the schools. ‘The more, the better’ is not an effective principle in this context. Although this study shows that the majority of parents could understand the information displayed on the website, it is important to help them to focus on meaningful information that can hold schools accountable. In addition, the publication of school data should be accompanied by capacity building and public engagement efforts, such as those undertaken by the Cek Sekolahku initiative.
1. Introduction

Indonesia is a vast country consisting of thousands of islands stretching for over 3,000 miles. Statistics Indonesia (2016a) estimates that the total population of Indonesia was 260.58 million, or about 3.51% of the total world population. According to the Population Reference Bureau (2017), Indonesia is the world’s fourth most populous country after China, India, and the United States. There are five major islands: from east to west, Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan (Borneo), Sulawesi (Celebes), and Papua. These are accompanied by four archipelagos: Riau Islands, Bangka Belitung (these two areas surround Sumatra island), Nusa Tenggara, and Maluku (Moluccas).

Figure 1. Map of Indonesia and the three research site districts

Source: https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berkas:Indonesia_provinces_blank_map.svg

There are three time zones in Indonesia: Indonesia Western Time Zone (UCT+7:00), Central Time Zone (UCT+8:00), and Eastern Time Zone (UCT+9:00). It is important, however, to emphasize that the term ‘Eastern Region of Indonesia’ (Kawasan Indonesia Timur) has a distinctive feature. While these terms are widely used in social, political, and economic discourse, ‘Eastern Indonesia’ is not a formal geographical unit. Government and development agencies such as the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank use this term as an inclusive descriptor to cover all major islands outside Java, Sumatra, Bali, and Madura (Parkinson, 1993). The region is relatively less developed compared to development rates in western parts of the country, with higher poverty rates and a dispersed population. Based on data provided by Statistics Indonesia (2014), out of 34 provinces across the country, 17 provinces are located in Eastern Indonesia, ranging from West Nusa Tenggara to the easternmost province, Papua.

Every province in Indonesia consists of several districts. Today, there are 514 districts or municipalities in Indonesia, 416 of which are categorized as ‘regencies’ (Kabupaten), 4. Unless indicated otherwise, the figures and tables in this case study have been prepared by the author.

5. In general, the proportion of provinces with a high-income poverty headcount index is higher in eastern Indonesia compared to western Indonesia (OECD 2015; Statistics Indonesia, 2013). Most of the provinces in eastern Indonesia also have a lower urban density in percentage terms. Many of these villages are located in remote and isolated areas, known as the ‘3T areas’ – Daerah Terdepan, Terluar, Tertinggal – or frontier, outer, and disadvantaged areas (Statistics Indonesia, 2014). With a larger number of small islands and mountains, geographical conditions in eastern Indonesia are generally more challenging than those in western Indonesia. This complex geography is one of the main challenges facing local school management and resource distribution (Al-Samarrai, 2013).
while the other 98 are cities (kota). According to Government Regulation Number 38 Year 2007, in terms of area, regencies are greater than cities and tend to consist of rural villages. Some of the villages are isolated and thus the people have limited access to basic services such as education and health. In population terms, on average, regencies have a lower density than cities or urban areas. In general, people in regency areas work in the agricultural sector, and possess a lower level of education attainment than people in cities. The poverty rate is higher in regencies than in cities, with relatively limited basic facilities and infrastructure including health, education, and communication. Hence, in many studies, regencies are considered to be rural areas, while cities are considered urban areas.

The school report card published by the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) of the Republic of Indonesia, known as Sekolah Kita, is implemented across all private and public schools from kindergarten to upper secondary schools, as well as learning centres for non-formal education institutions across the country. Meanwhile, Cek Sekolahku, introduced by the civil society organization Transparency International Indonesia (TII), is implemented in five districts including cities and regencies.

This study selected three out of these five districts: Semarang, Makassar, and Bojonegoro. All are located on the major islands, which may imply better resources including information and communication infrastructure and education facilities, compared to the regencies on smaller islands (Statistics Indonesia, 2016a). Semarang and Makassar are categorized as cities. Semarang is the capital of the Central Java province, and Makassar is the capital of the South Sulawesi province. Bojonegoro is a regency in the East Java province. Makassar is located in the Eastern Indonesia region, while Semarang and Bojonegoro are both situated on Java Island in Western Indonesia.

1.1 A brief introduction to Sekolah Kita

Sekolah Kita (‘our school’) is a government-led school report card initiated in 2015. It was developed by the Centre for Data and Statistics of Education and Culture (Pusat Data dan Statistik Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan or PDSPK), a unit in MoEC. A designated Sekolah Kita officer in PDSPK manages the Sekolah Kita website, organizing data on students, teachers, and schools processed at PDSPK and aggregating them into school-level data, referred to as Dapodik (Data Pokok Pendidikan or main education data). The Sekolah Kita officer is not involved in data collection in schools.

According to the Sekolah Kita officer, the main goal of the initiative is twofold: information and participation. Sekolah Kita makes available the profiles and geo-locations of 215,697 schools consisting of early childhood education and kindergartens, primary schools, lower secondary schools, and upper secondary schools in 514 municipalities under the jurisdiction of MoEC.6 This information is accessible to all stakeholders across the country. Sekolah Kita is also designed to allow interaction and communication between schools and stakeholders or the general public. School stakeholders can participate in the education process (e.g. by providing feedback, asking questions, and submitting requests for information) via the website.7 According to PDSPK, the main target audience of Sekolah Kita is parents, although the community in general including civil society organizations and other government institutions, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi or KPK), also make use of information available on the website.

---

6. Islamic Madrasa and boarding schools (Pesantren) fall under the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA). Accordingly, data and information about these schools are not managed by MoEC. MoRA has its own EMIS. According to the Head of PDSPK, there is a possibility that these schools will be included in Sekolah Kita in the future.
7. http://sekolah.data.kemdikbud.go.id
The information posted on Sekolah Kita was accessed by KPK to develop an online application called Jaga Sekolah (‘protect schools’), the main purpose of which is similar to that of Cek Sekolahku. It allows users to increase stakeholder participation in monitoring school facilities, equipment, and teacher absenteeism. In August 2017, MoEC and KPK signed a Memorandum of Understanding to combine efforts on corruption eradication in the education sector (MoEC, 2017). The collaboration between the two institutions includes an anti-corruption education programme, data exchange between KPK and MoEC – which in this case is Sekolah Kita data, and implementation of the Jaga Sekolah platform.

1.2 A brief introduction to Cek Sekolahku

Cek Sekolahku (literally ‘Check My School’) was initiated and developed by Transparency International Indonesia (TII), a civil society organization. The model was adopted and adapted from the Check My School initiative implemented in the Philippines. Planned in 2013, Cek Sekolahku was first implemented in five upper secondary schools (grades 10 to 12) in three cities: Semarang, Makassar, and Palangka Raya. According to the TII officer in charge of Cek Sekolahku, they were selected because TII had already implemented another programme in all three cities related to open government and partnership (OGP) initiatives, which was relevant to Cek Sekolahku.

Cek Sekolahku is a network-based system that allows public to participate actively in monitoring school governance and programme. As a system, it encourages citizens, especially students, parents, and community members, to become aware of and engage in school governance and processes through both online and offline mechanisms. The Cek Sekolahku site8 is an integrated website that presents main school data and links to individual school websites that provide more detailed information about the schools. The content focuses on displaying public complaints and feedback to schools, with brief information about school profiles and budgets. The offline system of Cek Sekolahku, according to its Standard Operating Procedure,9 manages recruitment and training for school agents, consisting of students, teachers, and parent representatives, who verify complaints submitted by the public via email, text message, and online or offline forms, and then monitor follow-up actions taken by the school. In addition, offline monthly consultation or public meetings allow parents or communities and schools to learn and improve the social accountability process. Therefore, the target audience of this initiative comprises students, parents, community members, the media, and education officers including superintendents and District Officers.

Today, Cek Sekolahku is being implemented in 182 schools in five districts: Makassar, Semarang, Palangka Raya, Batang, and Bojonegoro. The programme targets mainly upper and lower secondary schools. To reiterate, Cek Sekolahku is not a nation-wide programme, although the school data, including school profiles and complaints published on the Cek Sekolahku website, can be viewed by anyone. The TII officer explained that the programme employs a ‘bottom-up organic approach’. TII partners with local civic society organizations (CSOs) in the five districts to help manage offline activities including training courses and discussion forums. These partnerships also prove invaluable in contextualizing approaches to Cek Sekolahku implementation. In Makassar, for example, TII has partnered with Skhola Tanpa Batas, a community-based organization specializing in the education sector. In Semarang, TII’s partner is Pattiro, however the organization has also partnered with the District Office, because the district has adopted Cek Sekolahku and demands that all schools under its jurisdiction implement this programme. Similarly, the local partner of TII in Bojonegoro is the District Education Office and IDFoS, a civil society organization. Lastly, TII partners with the KH2 Institute in Palangka Raya and with Laskar in Batang.

---
8. http://ceksekolahku.or.id
9. This document can be downloaded from the Cek Sekolahku website: http://ceksekolahku.or.id/media/3_SOP_English.pdf
1.3 Methodology

This study has been conducted to compare and contrast the two initiatives and to draw lessons from government-led (i.e. Sekolah Kita) and citizen-led (i.e. Cek Sekolahku) school report cards. These lessons will help decision-makers and educational managers make informed decisions about the design and implementation of open education data policies, with a view to promoting transparency and accountability and empowering citizens to fight corruption in education. Taking into account the theory of change for effective school report cards introduced by IIEP (Cheng and Moses, 2016), this study has involved actors able to provide various perspectives about transparency and accountability in education, including bureaucrats at national and local levels, and school actors.

Sampling. This study involves two groups of participants: key informants and school-level actors. The key informants (about 12) consisted of legislators and regulators, individuals in charge of EMIS (or Dapodik, in Indonesia), individuals in charge of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, civil society representatives, school directors and parent leaders, and media representatives. Information was collected through semi-structured interviews.

School-level actors consisted of principals, teachers, School Committee (Komite Sekolah) representatives, students, and parents. Data were collected using a sampling method recommended by IIEP-UNESCO. The first step was to select three districts where both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are implemented. As mentioned earlier, Sekolah Kita contains information for all schools in Indonesia, but Cek Sekolahku is implemented in only five out of over 500 districts (see Table 1). Three of these five districts were selected for the study based on the following indicators: GDP per capita, national ranking on the Human Development Index (HDI), national ranking for adult literacy rates, and mean years of schooling. The shaded rows in Table 1 indicate the districts selected for this study.

Table 1. Implementation of Cek Sekolahku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Primary school (SD)</th>
<th>Lower secondary school (SMP)</th>
<th>Upper secondary school (SMA/SMK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Sulawesi</td>
<td>Makassar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>Semarang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>Batang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kalimantan</td>
<td>Palangkaraya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Java</td>
<td>Bojonegoro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initially, the study targeted primary schools. However, as shown in Table 1, the number of primary schools that implement Cek Sekolahku is very small. In addition, according to the TIi officer, implementation of Cek Sekolahku in these two primary schools has stagnated. Therefore, the focus was shifted to lower secondary schools (Sekolah Menengah Pertama or SMPs) to enable comparisons between districts. In Indonesia, lower secondary schools form part of basic education with nine-year compulsory education consisting of primary and lower secondary (Sekolah Dasar or SD).

Primary schools implementing both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolah were selected in every district (see Annex A for details of the procedure for school and participant selection). The total number of schools included in the sample was 17 with 11 located in Semarang, four in

---

10. Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) no longer exist in most, if not all, public schools in Indonesia. With the decentralization of the education system, the PTA has been replaced by the School Committee. According to Decree No. 044 year 2002 (Ministry of Education, 2002), every Committee consists of teachers, school leaders, parents, and community members, and functions as the channel for the community to participate in and influence school governance and decision-making.
11. Human Development Index Year 2015 (Statistics Indonesia, 2016b).
Makassar, and two in Bojonegoro. In each school, parents of about 15 students participated as survey respondents, giving a total of 304 parents. In addition, 103 students and 98 teachers participated in focus group discussion (FGD) sessions. All principals of the 17 schools participated as survey respondents in this study, and 14 School Committee representatives completed and returned the questionnaires. In total, the case study had 548 participants.

Data analyses. A mixed-methods approach was used for qualitative (semi-structured interview and focus group discussion) and quantitative (survey for parents, principals, and School Committees) analysis. Qualitative analysis software (MAXQDA) was used to code qualitative interview and FGD data. The main aims of the school-level data analyses were to identify the extent to which the school communities were familiar with the Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku initiatives, and to examine their perceptions about transparency and accountability in schools. Survey data were analysed using quantitative analysis software (SPSS), and descriptive analyses were applied with additional between-group comparison analyses, where necessary.

A teacher focus group discussion session in a school in Bojonegoro

All in all, this case study attempted to assess the following three assumptions: (i) that open data initiatives are powerful tools to improve transparency in Indonesian lower secondary schools, hold schools accountable, and reduce corruption risks in education; (ii) that Sekolah Kita, a government-led initiative, is less likely than Cek Sekolahku, a civil society-led initiative, to respond to users’ needs, engage them, and generate real impact, as the former is often more supply- than demand-driven; and (iii) that all users do not benefit equally from open data initiatives. In the absence of adequate safeguards, such initiatives can enhance inequalities and result in ‘elite capture of information’.

This study is structured in the following way. Chapter 2 compares and contrasts the features of the two initiatives in terms of their content, data sources, types of comparisons allowed, format of the school report cards, and the means used to access data. Chapter 3 compares and analyses the accountability models used for both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku including targeted domains, the selection of models, lines of accountability, and established consequences of publishing and not publishing data. Chapter 4 analyses stakeholders’ perspectives on the usefulness of the two initiatives including the relevance, accessibility, and usability of the information, and short-term and long-term impacts on transparency and accountability in education. Chapter 5 discusses the necessary conditions for success, limits, and strategies for improvement, based on the perspectives of participants. Finally, the last chapter presents conclusions and recommendations.
2. Comparison of the main features of the initiatives

2.1 Content of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku

Sekolah Kita. The principal source of the main education data displayed on the Sekolah Kita website is Dapodik, the Indonesian Education Management Information System (EMIS). According to Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No. 79 Year 2015, Dapodik is a data collection and processing system managed by MoEC, which comprises data on individual schools, students, teachers, and administrative staff, as well as education data that inform the teaching and learning process. These data are collected from schools using survey instruments developed by MoEC, and are simultaneously updated online. Student and teacher/staff data constitute individual-level data; however Sekolah Kita also contains data aggregated to the school level. Table 2 presents the content of both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku.13

Table 2. Content of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sekolah Kita</th>
<th>Cek Sekolahku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School accreditation grades (grade A, B, or C)*</td>
<td>School address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum used in the school **</td>
<td>School website (if any)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers based on highest level of education attainment</td>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of certified teachers ***</td>
<td>Number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers based on their demographic data (age, gender)</td>
<td>List of facilities available in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of teacher's name and subjects they teach in a specific semester</td>
<td>School budget plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of classrooms (damaged, partially damaged, or good)</td>
<td>School news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of other facilities including library, laboratory, and sanitation facilities (damaged, partially damaged, or good)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and specification (provider, speed) of internet connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students based on their demographic data (age, gender, religion) and grade levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average National Exam scores achieved by 9th grade students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of academic and non-academic achievements****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School environment data such as the distances between school cultural sites (e.g. museum, art studio, and cultural park) and other educational sites, including the District Education Office, other schools, and learning communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * The National Accreditation Body of Schools and Madrasas (Badan Akreditasi Nasional Sekolah or BAN-SM) is an independent body responsible for evaluating whether or not primary and secondary schools meet national education standards. BAN-SM accredits schools and grades them with an A (which indicates high-quality schools), B, or C. ** MoEC allows schools to use either the school-based curriculum (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan or KTSP), also known as Kurikulum 2006 for it was released in 2006, or Kurikulum 2013, which is more centralized. *** In-service teachers in Indonesia take teaching competency tests to achieve certificates. Sekolah Kita displays the number of teachers who have been certified and the number who have not. **** Academic achievements include, but are not limited to, maths competitions, science Olympics, and so on. Non-academic achievements include school team or individual achievements in sports, art, and so on.

13. The information in Table 2 was used to contextualize research instruments. Hence, questions about data on Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku refer to categories presented in this table.
The Head of PDSPK, who was a key informant for this study, argued that Sekolah Kita is a groundbreaking initiative because it displays geospatial information, including school maps and important sites such as educational and cultural sites around schools. He also claimed that the President of the Republic of Indonesia is highly appreciative of MoEC’s efforts in opening school data to the public, in particular the availability of geospatial data. He added that Sekolah Kita is the first and only initiative to integrate educational and cultural data in one website.

The content of Sekolah Kita is influenced by education policies enacted by MoEC and its Directorates General, such as a new policy that requires schools to submit School Activity and Budget Plans (RKAS or Rencana Kegiatan dan Anggaran Sekolah) and share them publicly. According to the Dapodik Manager in the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education (Dikdasmen), ‘In the near future, Dapodik will contain RKAS data, and most likely Sekolah Kita will also publish the information’.

Sekolah Kita publishes a great variety of school data but not public information on school finance. The Head of PDSPK explained that the idea behind Sekolah Kita was to provide basic school data: ‘It is Dapodik, data pokok (main data) and not all data. So we are focused on the basic and main information about schools’. This implies that financial information does not constitute basic information. However, the Sekolah Kita officer asserts that school budget data will likely be included in the future owing to increasing public demand for financial information.

Cek Sekolahku. The Cek Sekolahku website contains substantially fewer school data variables than Sekolah Kita. The available data relate to teacher and student numbers, school facilities, school budgets, school websites, and school programme agendas. An operator14 in each individual school (usually the same person who transmits the Dapodik data) uploads the information to the Cek Sekolahku system. Transparency International Indonesia (TII) does not determine the level of detail shared by schools. Perhaps because of this mechanism, data completeness varies between schools. For example, some schools list all their facilities, while others mention only basic facilities such as ‘Laboratory, library, wifi, etc.’ When asked about the different level of detail on available facilities or data on teacher numbers, the TII officer stated that these were not the main concern of Cek Sekolahku. She suggested that parents could obtain this information elsewhere, including from Sekolah Kita. Subsequent research, however, showed that information about school facilities was viewed as very important by school-level actors.

According to TII, two aspects of Cek Sekolahku distinguish it from Sekolah Kita. The first is the availability of School Activity and Budget Plans (RKAS). However, while this is the case for some schools, not all schools publish their financial information on the Cek Sekolahku site. For example, the RKAS of a primary school in Semarang is available on Cek Sekolahku, but in May 2017 similar data were not available for other primary schools in the same city. Second, Cek Sekolahku makes available complaints submitted by school communities, especially students and parents. These are submitted to schools by text message, email, the school website, or complaint forms. The status of each complaint indicates whether the complaint is new, has been reviewed by agents and forwarded to the school administrators, or has been resolved. For example, there are four resolved complaints on school infrastructure and learning facilities on the Cek Sekolahku webpages for Semarang. According to TII, this function is the main feature of Cek Sekolahku. Sekolah Kita has a similar option on its website where visitors can submit feedback and questions, but PDSPK does not publicize this function, and instead focuses on making comprehensive information about schools across the nation publicly available.

---

14. School operators are usually teachers or part-time staff dedicated to collecting and uploading school data to the Dapodik system. In schools where Cek Sekolahku is implemented, operators also upload information to the Cek Sekolahku website. Teachers or staff who serve as operators receive an allowance.
User involvement is central to the Cek Sekolahku concept. The TII officer viewed complaints submitted by school community members as potentially valuable data on school conditions, facilities, and especially school management. This function is necessary to promote participation in the school-based management system, yet the sustainability of Cek Sekolahku depends largely on the awareness and motivation of students and parents to participate in providing feedback. Stakeholder perspectives regarding the usefulness of this approach are discussed further in Chapter 4.

To summarize, Sekolah Kita contains more information about schools than Cek Sekolahku. Sekolah Kita hosts school-level data on students, teachers, schools, and school environments. It also includes information on student academic performances and teacher qualification. Meanwhile, Cek Sekolahku focuses more on two main features: information on school budgets (not available on Sekolah Kita) and complaints reported by students and parents.

2.2 Data sources

Sekolah Kita. The main source of data for Sekolah Kita is education data, or Dapodik, collected from schools and managed by the central government or MoEC\(^1\) (see Figure 2). In addition to Dapodik, data are obtained from a variety of sources. Information on average National Examination school scores\(^2\) are obtained from the MoEC Centre for Educational Assessment (Puspendik). Meanwhile, school accreditation data are obtained from the National Accreditation Board (BAN). Sekolah Kita, according to a PDSPK staff member who manages the website, is the only school report card to integrate educational and cultural data. The main resource for cultural data on Sekolah Kita, including data about cultural heritage sites around schools, is Dapobud. According to PDSPK, there are two reasons for integrating educational and cultural data. First, Sekolah Kita was developed by MoEC to publish cultural as well as educational data. Second, MoEC expects cultural data to be integrated into educational programmes in schools. However, based on the information collected for this study, schools have yet to use the cultural data in the ways MoEC expected.\(^3\)

Figure 2. Flowchart of the Dapodik process

![Flowchart of the Dapodik process](http://dapodik.data.kemdikbud.go.id).

Figure 2 shows the data and information collection process from each school. The process involves three key parties: the individual who inputs the school data (school operator), Directorates General, and PDSPK. According to Regulation No. 79 Year 2015, the Directorates General are responsible for data collection in schools, and must confirm

---

15. As stipulated under MoEC Regulation No. 79 Year 2015.
16. The National Examination or Ujian Nasional is a national standardized test designed as an exit requirement for 6th grade primary school students, 9th grade lower secondary school students, and 12th grade upper secondary school students. The test is compulsory, but passing is not the only requirement for graduation. To date, Indonesia does not have another national standardized assessment that can measure academic performance and be used to make between-school or between-district comparisons on student learning outcomes.
17. Cultural data are not included in this study to facilitate comparisons between Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. In FGD with teachers, however, cultural data were discussed and teachers admitted they never used the information.
that all schools submit complete and correct data as per the requirement in the Dapodik system.

*Figure 2* also suggests that local District Offices (or Dinas) at municipal and province levels are not directly involved in the school data collection process. A staff member of the Directorate of Primary and Secondary Education (known as Dikdasmen), who is responsible for managing Dapodik, stated that, ‘District Offices do not take part in data collection. But they do an important job to encourage schools to submit their data on time.’ According to the above-mentioned regulation, in relation to Dapodik District Offices are responsible for uploading data only on school superintendents. However, they are also responsible for monitoring the data submission process in schools, introducing new school policies, and providing guidance and technical support to schools when needed. In the event of feedback from the central government, District Officers also need to ensure that schools review and revise their data. A leader of a District Office at the provincial level confirmed that they did not play a significant role in the Dapodik submission process.

Schools must submit and update their data throughout the academic year, at least once per semester. Dapodik is the one and only basis for various policies, including but not limited to the distribution and disbursement of the School Operational Assistance Fund (*Bantuan Operasional Sekolah* or *BOS*), the certified teacher allowance, and other school grants and forms of student financial aid. Schools must meet the deadlines for submitting Dapodik to MoEC in order to receive BOS funds on time. In other words, because the deadline for BOS funds is April, schools must update their data beforehand or they will not receive the funds.

Uploading and updating school data onto the Dapodik online system is commonly known as ‘data synchronization’. Instead of one-way data submission, synchronization is a data renewal process where the most recent data are matched with school data available on the system. This enables the detection of irrelevant and questionable data. Perhaps because of internet connection problems in schools, the data submitted are sometimes incomplete or need verification. As one staff member recalled, ‘it was written that a 9-year old student was in the sixth grade; and we thought maybe the school operator who uploaded the data made a typo. Therefore, the system will notify them to review it again.’

Sekolah Kita is developed and managed by the Centre for Data and Statistics of Education and Culture (PDSPK). Data published on Sekolah Kita are verified by PDSPK and other units in MoEC. As shown in *Figure 2*, during data collection and publication the role of PDSPK is to integrate, verify and validate, analyse, and publish Dapodik collected by the three Directorates General in MoEC. In PDSPK, Dapodik are verified and then distributed.

---

18. To implement its free basic education policy, the Government of Indonesia implements several policies including the School Operational Assistance Fund (BOS), which was introduced in 2005. This programme enables the abolition of tuition fees for primary and lower secondary schools, or nine-year compulsory education. The fund is allocated quarterly based on a fixed amount for each student (Rp 580,000 for a primary school student per month and Rp 710,000 for a lower secondary school student per month) to all public and private schools under MoEC, as well as madrasas under MoRA. The fund is administered and financed by the central government and is distributed directly to schools. School autonomy under the decentralized education system requires schools to manage their own programmes and finances, including BOS funds (MoEC, 2013). Because BOS funds are granted by the central government to schools on a per student basis, the central government obtains information about the number of students in every school from Dapodik. Prior to Dapodik, schools needed to report student numbers to the central government via district offices.

19. In 2005, Indonesia passed Law No. 14/2005 on Teachers and Lecturers. The largest component of this law in fiscal terms is the teacher certification programme. Teachers must have a Bachelor's degree in order to be certified. They also have to be permanent teachers registered on the MoEC database and must pass the Teacher Competency Test (*Uji Kompetensi Guru* or *UKG*). Teachers who complete the certification process are eligible for a certification allowance equal to their base salary in the civil service. Hence, certification in many cases doubles a teacher’s take-home pay (World Bank, 2015).

20. School operators are part-time or full-time school staff members assigned to collect data from individual teachers, staff, and students in a school, and upload/synchronize them to the Dapodik system. Operators may be hired non-permanently to undertake the specific tasks involved or permanent teachers/staff members given additional responsibilities.
to other units for use as the basis for planning, programme development, programme monitoring and evaluation, and so on. Once they have been processed and analysed by the units, the data are returned to PDSPK.

For PDSPK, verification and validation are very important, and are conducted in several stages involving different actors. The first stage of data verification is synchronization. When a school fails to synchronize its data, the school operator needs to revise it. Successful synchronization does not ensure accurate school data, however. PDSPK must apply verification methods as part of a follow-up process intended to detect irregular data and biases. The Sekolah Kita officer provided an example: ‘According to the formula, the number of classrooms should be correlated with the number of students. Therefore it will not make sense if the number of classrooms in the school building is so few and the number of students is so high.’ He also pointed out that the system notifies them when suspicious data appear. He highlighted a case in which ‘all classrooms are broken. All of them, it is hard to believe and we will inform this to the District Office and they can verify it.’ Hence, when PDSPK detects data with validity and reliability issues, they notify the Directorates General and district leaders.

Although actors at the national level (MoEC) posited several issues related to the quality of Dapodik, leaders at municipal and provincial District Offices have very high confidence in the accuracy of the data. The Head of the Provincial District said, ‘I believe the data are accurate, BOS distribution and teacher allowance disbursement control the accuracy of the data. If schools do not submit accurate data on time, it may affect the funds they get.’ Because Dapodik is used to determine the amount of BOS a school receives, the district leaders believe that the information schools report to MoEC is accurate. However, a MoEC staff who worked with Dapodik said that there were cases where the number of students listed in Dapodik were greater than the actual student figures.

Regarding the new online Dapodik system, which allows schools to submit data directly to the central government, a staff member commented, ‘Unlike in the past, today schools do not need to submit their data to the district in order to avoid having the data going through so many “doors”.’ PDSPK staff also shared similar comments: ‘In the past when a school reported to the District Office that there are, let’s say, 10 students enrolled, the number reported to the central government might be changed into 15 students. You know, because the amount of the BOS is per student.’ He did not elaborate further, but agreed when the interviewer suggested that the figures were inflated to increase the amount of BOS obtained by the school.

The following statement made by a staff member also indicates that the current system for data collection helps to mitigate corruption in BOS funds distribution: ‘This is an interesting fact, the number of primary school students keeps decreasing.’ He then explained that with the Dapodik system in place, it is much more difficult for schools to inflate their student numbers. For each student, schools have to submit many variables including their demographic background, family background, academic progress, and even the distance between the student’s home and her/his school. This approach is perceived to be effective in reducing corruption risks. ‘It is much more difficult to manipulate students’ data now’, the staff member added.

Out of four sets of Dapodik data (students, teachers and staff, teaching and learning, and school facilities), the Head of PDSPK stated that the quality of data on teachers and students was markedly better than the other two categories. A staff member also posited that because these two datasets were linked to financial aid (BOS funds and the certified teacher allowance), data on individual students, teachers, and staff were more accurate, updated, and complete. He stated that the quality of data on school facilities was less accurate, but still more accurate than data produced prior to implementation of the online Dapodik system. In the past, schools had to state whether the condition of the library, for
example, was good or damaged, based on their own subjective evaluation. Today, the conditions of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and so on, are determined by a system based on school responses to approximately 20 questions about each of the facilities. This approach also helps to mitigate corruption. In the past, according to the staff member, some schools would state that their facilities were severely damaged on the expectation of obtaining grants, but would sometimes claim that the conditions of classrooms were very good in order to obtain good grades in school accreditation assessments.

To summarize, there are multiple sources of data published on the Sekolah Kita website. The main data are drawn from the Dapodik dataset collected from individual schools using the online system and sent directly to the central government. While key informants at district levels, as well as participants in the sample schools, are confident that the data are accurate, key informants at the MoEC stated that the quality of data should be improved, because self-reported data may be biased by individual schools’ needs and interests (e.g. the desire to obtain school grants).

Cek Sekolahku. Schools implementing Cek Sekolahku upload data directly to the online system, a process that is relatively straightforward compared to that of Sekolah Kita. As a result, all the data published on Cek Sekolahku are sourced directly from schools, including School Activity and Budget Plans (RKAS). Information on individual school webpages are developed on the basis of complaints and feedback from stakeholders. Accordingly, Cek Sekolahku maintains webpages for each individual school. Figure 3 illustrates the complaint procedure which involves individuals or groups of stakeholders who make complaints, intermediaries or school agents who verify the complaints, and school principals and district leaders.

School agents consist of students, parents, and teachers who voluntarily review and verify complaints. Because of their roles in the community, stakeholders’ complaints are highly reliable and can shed light on conditions and issues in schools. TII and local District Officers (or local CSOs) trained students, parents, and teachers who were willing to serve as school agents. The training and mentoring help the school agents to increase parent and student participation, to manage complaints, and to conduct complaint verification. The majority of student representatives are actively engaged in the student body or other school extracurricular programmes. Similarly, parents willing to participate as agents are usually consistently involved in the School Committee or actively attend meetings.

As indicated in Figure 3, not all complaints are published on the website. Only data that have been verified are displayed for public consumption, while others are returned to the senders. School agents select the complaints on the basis of two main criteria: the issues are real/true, and the senders are real persons. Once the complaints are received, school agents verify the information. For example, if a complaint is received about broken school toilets, they verify that the toilets are actually damaged. They also check that the senders are students or parents of students, rather than anonymous individuals. Cek Sekolahku officers explain that verification is crucial to avoid false reports. Although school agents receive the name and/or phone number of the sender (if the complaint is submitted via text message), their names are not displayed on the website and their phone numbers are replaced with an ‘x’ to protect their identity.

A comparison of the features of Cek Sekolahku and Sekolah Kita found some common information on both sites (Table 3). However, Cek Sekolahku does not use Dapodik as a source of data. According to the TII officer interviewed, although there is a possibility that school information published on Cek Sekolahku will be sourced from Dapodik in the future, this is not their main goal. Instead, Cek Sekolahku will remain focused on complaint handling. The Sekolah Kita officer shares a similar view, explaining that rather than using Dapodik data, it would be more useful for Cek Sekolahku to use Dapodik for verification purposes. He also recommends that the public employ the two school report card initiatives as reference points and use them to validate information obtained elsewhere.
To conclude, the data sources in both cases are mainly individual schools. Administered by the central government, the data collection and verification process for Sekolah Kita is more complicated than that of Cek Sekolahku, and is supported as well as delimited by its bureaucratic framework. Meanwhile, Cek Sekolahku places greater emphasis on stakeholder participation. In terms of user involvement in data collection, both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku allow students, parents, and other stakeholders to send feedback to schools. However, based on the features of the websites and discussion with key informants, it is evident that Sekolah Kita does not promote the feedback/comment function to the same extent as Cek Sekolahku. PDSPK, the unit in MoEC that manages Sekolah Kita, operates the online school report card process. In the case of Cek Sekolahku, however, TII provides offline programmes for schools and stakeholders, in order to increase participation in school monitoring and development.
Table 3. Comparison of the features of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sekolah Kita</td>
<td>School profiles, spatial data, academic performance, etc. Detailed data No information about school budget</td>
<td>Dapodik and other units in MoEC</td>
<td>School-to-school comparison</td>
<td>School profile</td>
<td>Online (website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(government-initiated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cek Sekolahku</td>
<td>School profile (in brief), school agenda (programmes), school budget Students’ and other stakeholders’ complaints</td>
<td>Individual school</td>
<td>No comparison</td>
<td>School profile and status of complaints</td>
<td>Online (website) and offline approaches for building school and stakeholder’s capacity in using data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(civil society organization-initiated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 School comparisons

The data hosted on Sekolah Kita are updated and renewed on a regular basis. While PDSPK produces time series data, Sekolah Kita only publishes the latest or current information about schools. Year-to-year comparisons of individual schools are therefore not possible. Similarly, Cek Sekolahku does not enable year-to-year comparisons, although some teachers and parents confirmed that they would find the ability to compare school budget plans across years useful when monitoring schools.

Comparison between schools is possible on Sekolah Kita, but the function is not available on Cek Sekolahku. On Sekolah Kita, users can select up to three schools for comparison using the menu option *bandingkan* (compare), as shown in Figure 4. Seven main school profile indicators are used as the basis for comparison: accreditation grade, number of students, number of teachers, number of certified teachers, number of usable classrooms, number of groups of students according to their grade levels, and number of usable sanitation facilities. Users can also compare and contrast the school average of national exam scores for four subjects: Indonesian language, English language, mathematics, and science. Users can even compare primary schools to upper secondary schools, although the website does not explain how or for what purpose.

According to PDSPK, the ability to compare schools against national standards21 is one of the main justifications for Sekolah Kita. The staff member who manages Sekolah Kita states that, ‘The goal of Dapodik should not be about grants and aids. Instead, schools need to understand that we publish the data on Sekolah Kita so that they can assess themselves, comparing their current conditions with the national standards. They should use the data to identify their needs, how to reach the standards.’ This said, Sekolah Kita does not provide menus or applications that allow users to compare schools with national standards, and does not provide information on the standards.

To summarize, Sekolah Kita enables school-to-school comparisons, but does not explain to users how and why comparing and contrasting schools may be useful for them. In the

---

21. National Education Standards (Standar Nasional Pendidikan or SNP) are stipulated under Government Regulation Number 19 Year 2005. There are eight standards: Graduate Competency Standards (Standar Kompetensi Lulusan or SKL, regulated by MoEC Regulation Number 23 Year 2006); Content Standards (MoEC Regulation Number 22 Year 2006); Standard Process (MoEC Regulation Number 41 Year 2007); Personnel Standards and Education (MoEC Regulation Number 16 Year 2007 on Teacher Qualification, MoEC Regulation Number 12 Year 2007 on School Superintendent Qualification, MoEC Regulation Number 13 Year 2007 on Principal Qualification); Infrastructure Standards (MoEC Regulation Number 24 Year 2007); Management Standards (MoEC Regulation Number 19 Year 2007); Standards for Education Funding; and Educational Assessment Standards (MoEC Regulation Number 20 Year 2007).
future, PDSPK will improve the design of the website to allow users to compare schools against national standards. In the case of Cek Sekolahku, the website design focuses on individual schools, and there is no option to compare schools on the website.

2.4 Format of the school report cards

Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are publicly accessible, web-based school report cards. Both display school profiles without the use of ranking or education indices (such systems are unavailable in Indonesia). The main page of the Sekolah Kita website functions as a search engine for schools (Figure 5). This enables the public to search for information about a specific school or to locate schools within a province, a municipality, or a sub-district. Other filters that can be applied include level, type, and status (public or private) of the schools.

Information on Sekolah Kita consists of school profiles and geospatial data (Figure 6). The geospatial data were developed in accordance with Government Regulation Number 9 Year 2016, based on a one-map policy that aims to digitize spatial data and information. On each school webpage, users can find spatial information such as the nearest museums, cultural parks, and so on. According to the Sekolah Kita officer, this information can help schools design their programmes.
The main page of the Cek Sekolahku website displays a list of schools implementing the programme, with a map showing the districts where the schools are located (Figure 7). Since the principal purpose of this website is to publish complaints submitted by school stakeholders, the main page provides links to information about how to submit complaints through the website or via mobile applications, text message, and email. It also shows the number of complaints for all schools grouped according to issues (facilities and infrastructure, finance and budget issues, and teaching and learning processes) and their status (resolved, verified by school agents and forwarded to the schools, or new complaints).

Neither Sekolah Kita nor Cek Sekolahku have involved users in the design of their systems. During the FGD sessions, students and teachers in Makassar and Semarang agreed that data should be presented in more interesting ways to provoke interest among students. Students and teachers also highlighted the need for a guide to reading and interpreting the data, so as to enable stakeholders to understand the information published in school budgets and know how to respond.

Both school report cards can be accessed via their respective websites year round. Data on Sekolah Kita are updated at least once every semester, in accordance with MoEC Regulation Number 79 Year 2015. Schools can update their information on the Cek Sekolahku website at any time, although displaying school profiles is not the main purpose of Cek Sekolahku. Perhaps owing to lack of regulation, some data are missing from Cek Sekolahku. For example, some schools post Activity and Budget Plans for the previous year or do not upload them at all. The local Cek Sekolahku officer expected stakeholders to request this information, however no such demands have been received from the public. Based on interviews, FGD, and survey data, public demand for school financial information is apparently low compared with public attention to school facilities (see Chapter 4).
To conclude, the formats used for Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku resemble lists of information on school profiles. Although National Standards of Education have been enacted, they are not used as indicators in the school report cards. The Sekolah Kita officer stated, ‘It is not new variables that should be added into Sekolah Kita. Instead, there has to be a function or an application that allows users to measure the quality of the schools using National Standards as the main indicators’. In the case of Cek Sekolahku, the format of each school profile is very brief and the website focuses largely on complaint management. Sekolah Kita data are regularly updated, mainly because Dapodik data are renewed at least once per semester. However, this is not the case for Cek Sekolahku, with some schools yet to publish Activity and Budget Plans on their webpages.

2.5 Means used to access data

Schools, especially public schools funded by the government under national and provincial or district budgets, must comply with Republic of Indonesia Law Number 25 Year 2009 on Public Services, which requires them to openly display information for students, parents,
teachers, and all other stakeholders. Accordingly, information is presented on banners, boards, and posters displayed in the school environment, as well as on the Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku websites. Most students interviewed for this study knew about the school announcement boards and understood themselves to be the target audience for the information displayed on them. None of them viewed parents or other stakeholders as part of the target audience. In addition to the banners and boards, principals and teachers of the sample schools noted that information about school budgets and programmes is made available to parents during school gatherings, especially at the beginning of academic year. In Semarang, teachers also stated that students are informed about school data during a flag-raising ceremony usually conducted on Monday every other week.

Some schools have already developed school websites, which are used to post school profiles, programmes, and other information. According to students in Bojonegoro, however, some of the information on the websites is obsolete. Similarly, a group of teachers in Makassar posited that their school website had not been updated because none of the school staff there has taken responsibility for its maintainence. According to teachers and students in the three districts, the primary reason for the websites is promotion of the schools.

Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are internet-based school report cards that can be accessed from computers, smartphones, and other internet-enabled devices. Teachers in Makassar highlighted the convenience of this approach, noting that, ‘Today, people use their mobile phone more than they use a computer’. Some students in the three districts stated that such social media-style report cards, where stakeholders can post comments and complaints online, are a positive means to promote student participation, especially because they feel more comfortable sharing their comments through online media rather than face to face with administrators or teachers.

TII monitors implementation of Cek Sekolahku and has found that 240 complaints were reported to schools in 2014, almost 90% of which were submitted by text message. According to TII, parents and students submitted complaints via text message rather than via email or the website mainly owing to their low level of internet literacy and access to this technology.

Perhaps the main feature that distinguishes Cek Sekolahku from Sekolah Kita, in terms of means used to access data, is its offline approach. Sekolah Kita relies wholly on its online system, while Cek Sekolahku conducts seminars and workshops for schools and stakeholders, in order to develop their capacity to use school data to promote transparency and accountability. PDSPK does not provide similar training sessions for schools and stakeholders largely owing to bureaucratic constraints. As a part of the central government, PDSPK can only advise District Offices to encourage schools and build their capacity to use data.

When discussing issues related to school facilities, one parent leader in Semarang mentioned that information regarding facilities was obtained from their children or by visiting the schools, rather than from school websites or the two school report card initiatives. Her statement indicated that information published on Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku might or might not be used as a reference, but as a parent who actively promoted engagement with schools she encouraged other parents to use Cek Sekolahku to highlight problems with facilities. Thus, from her perspective, Cek Sekolahku served more as complaint mechanism than as a source of information. Chapter 4 provides more information regarding the ways that parents use both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku.

When asked how schools in Bojonegoro and Semarang publish school data for transparency and accountability purposes, district leaders emphasized mainly offline
modes of display in schools (e.g. banners or boards and posters), but did not mention Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku.

The first assumption of this study is that open data initiatives are powerful tools to improve transparency in Indonesian lower secondary schools, hold schools accountable, and reduce corruption risks in education. Based solely on the features of the two initiatives, Cek Sekolahku has greater potential to reduce corruption in schools, especially because its main purpose is to promote community participation in monitoring the school budget, facilities, and the teaching-learning process. Although more data variables are displayed on Sekolah Kita, information related to the school budget is not among them.

The second assumption focuses on stakeholder engagement and supposes that Sekolah Kita, a government-led initiative, is less likely than Cek Sekolahku, a citizen-led initiative, to respond to users’ needs, engage them, and generate real impact, because it is often more supply than demand driven. Arguably the design of Cek Sekolahku has greater potential to respond to user needs and engage them in action. Sekolah Kita also provides a menu for users to submit comments, feedback, or complaints to individual schools, which then receive a direct response from the school administrator. However, unlike Cek Sekolahku, the feedback feature on Sekolah Kita is not central to its main function.

As Cek Sekolahku is designed largely around its complaints handling mechanism, the data available are limited. For example, there is information on school facilities but not their condition, and information on teachers is limited to total numbers. Meanwhile, individuals using Sekolah Kita can search for information about teachers who have been certified, the number of teachers with certain educational degrees, and even their names.
3 Comparison and analysis of the accountability models

3.1 Targeted domains of accountability

From interviews with Cek Sekolahku officers and documents related to the initiative, it is clear that financial accountability is the main domain targeted by Cek Sekolahku, particularly regarding the use of the School Operational Assistance Fund (BOS) or public funds by schools. The Transparency International Indonesia (TII) officer also highlighted bribery as a key problem targeted by the organization. In 2013, Transparency International's *Global Corruption Barometer 2013* reported that 36% of Indonesians had paid bribes for public services including education. According to the TII officer, this was the main reason for initiating Cek Sekolahku. She stated:

> Our main target is in fact the financial issue, the school budget, as we want to eradicate corruption in schools. However, if keep pushing on budget, we are afraid that there will be resistance from the school to this (Cek Sekolahku) programme. Hence, we start from the peripheral issues that are highly related to students and that are tangible such as infrastructures, teaching, and [the] learning process. These issues are indirectly related to school budget expenditure anyway.

She then explained that the key question TII asked school stakeholders when commencing implementation of Cek Sekolahku was whether or not they had knowledge about or access to school budget plans and reports. This strongly indicates that the financial issue is the main focus of the initiative. However, according to the Cek Sekolahku website (*Figure 7*), about 67% of complaints submitted to Cek Sekolahku schools concern mainly facilities and infrastructure, while only about 10% relate directly to the school budget and financial issues, including but not limited to bribes and illegal levies.

Unlike Cek Sekolahku, Sekolah Kita has no formal document identifying targeted domains of accountability. The Head of PDSPK and the Sekolah Kita officer both confirmed the lack of a background paper or similar documents explaining the goals and mission of this initiative. The domains of accountability targeted by Sekolah Kita are therefore unclear.

Financial data (e.g. school budget plans or RKAS, budget reports) are not available on the website. However, the Sekolah Kita officer argued that stakeholders could use the information published on Sekolah Kita to hold schools accountable for student performance and resource allocations. The Head of PDSPK also mentioned that Sekolah Kita was initiated by MoEC to monitor school performance across the country. Sekolah Kita is also used to inform the public about the capacity of school management to provide quality educational services to its students. Among the indicators used for this purpose are teacher numbers (based on highest level of education and certification or non-certification), school facilities and equipment, and so on. The Bojonegoro district leader pointed out that the information on the Sekolah Kita website helped hold schools accountable for their policies including textbook purchasing, illegal levies, and other forms of malpractice. He cited one example: ‘From Sekolah Kita, I can read that the number of students in school A, for example, is 600. So when a school requests textbooks for 650 students, I know that I should hold that school accountable.’

The Sekolah Kita officer maintained that school budget plans and other financial data would be published on Sekolah Kita in the future. He was aware that this might result in resistance from schools, but argued that, ‘If the open data is supported by clear regulation about consequences, I believe publishing school budget plan will bring positive impact to education. It’s about time.’ Students in Semarang seconded the statement. They
demanded public access to financial data because they believe that this could increase trust between parents and school administrators.

For students, financial accountability matters particularly where it affects school facilities and infrastructure. Students in Semarang, for example, were aware that all public schools received BOS funds and said that they could compare and contrast the availability and condition of facilities and infrastructure in their schools with those of other schools. Some students in the three districts even argued that schools do not need to publish budget expenditure data. One student in Semarang with the agreement of her peers stated that, ‘What we need to know is the real objects: school facilities, books, labs, and so on. People may not understand budget so that schools do not need to publish the information, it can create misunderstanding’. However, while some students believed that the school budget was not their concern, others asserted that the school budget should be published. Another student in Semarang, insisted that, ‘Schools need to show the information to us, to our parents too. We need to know if there’s corruption or misconduct’.

To summarize, Cek Sekolahku is designed to focus mainly on accountability domains. Meanwhile, based on documents and interviews with Sekolah Kita personnel, the report card, to date, focuses mainly on sharing information with the public, rather than holding schools accountable. Nonetheless, key informants stated that the comprehensive information available on Sekolah Kita could enhance school accountability.

### 3.2 Accountability models

Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are designed to promote public participation in education accountability. The Sekolah Kita officer stated that the motive behind displaying comprehensive information about schools was to enable the public to monitor schools and provide feedback or comments on the website. He argued that even if users do not submit comments or feedback, the presence of publicly open data alone increases public participation in education. According to him, the Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi or KPK) uses information available on Sekolah Kita as resource to detect corruption or malpractice.

Cek Sekolahku is also designed to promote the public participation model of accountability – what TII refers to as the ‘social audit approach’. Based on the Cek Sekolahku Monitoring and Evaluation report (Transparency International Indonesia, 2014), Cek Sekolahku is initiated to address problems in budget transparency and accountability in school management, the low level of community participation in programme planning and implementation, and to resolve school problems through an online complaint mechanism. In addition, stakeholders including students, teachers, and community members are organized through public forums in order to solve educational problems.

Cek Sekolahku is initiated to address problems in budget transparency and accountability in school management, the low level of community participation in programme planning and implementation, and to resolve school problems through an online complaint mechanism. In addition, stakeholders including students, teachers, and community members are organized through public forums in order to solve educational problems.

To promote participation, students, parents, and community representatives are trained and empowered to take part in this accountability process through a series of workshops, discussions, and consultation forums. These are the offline approaches mentioned in Chapter 2. Cek Sekolahku views a school as an entity consisting of teachers and administrators, students, parents, and the community. Its mission is to empower schools to give them the ability to improve practices, starting by opening up school data to the public and creating an open space for parent and community participation where two-way communication can occur between the school and stakeholders.
The public participation model applied by Cek Sekolahku and Sekolah Kita also depends on the willingness of individual parents to participate. The TII officer noted that this is among the main issues in both rural and urban schools: ‘In rural areas, many parents have limited access to technology, feel that they do not have the capacity to participate in school…. Meanwhile, parents in urban areas tend to be busy, they don’t have time to visit their children schools and attend meetings. So participation problems occur not only in rural or in urban schools – it’s the problem in all schools.’

To address the low level of parent participation, the local officer of Cek Sekolahku in Semarang hired a parent leader and trained her in the concept and goals of Cek Sekolahku. She became a cultural broker linking Cek Sekolahku officers, schools, and local communities in the school neighbourhood. She attended meetings and gatherings including with district leaders. The parent leader encouraged other parents to participate and take action in monitoring the school budget and programme. She acknowledged that this was not easy for some parents, who were afraid to question school policies and were worried that their criticism would affect their children. But after she explained that the anonymity of informants who submitted complaints to schools would be protected, some parents decided to participate.

A district leader of Bojonegoro viewed parental participation and public complaints as necessary and noted that the District Office used them as a reference point when deciding whether to intervene. He also asserted that schools that actively engage with parents and communities and respond effectively to complaints should be rewarded. This sanction/reward model of accountability is used by both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku to enhance their public participation model. For example, in the case of Sekolah Kita, if schools do not submit their data (Dapodik) on time, they will not receive BOS funds (see Chapter 2). The PDSPK leader expects that schools will gradually become more willing to publish their data without coercion or ‘transactional’ procedures in which school data are traded for funds or grants.

The Cek Sekolahku officer admitted that the programme’s effectiveness increased when the degree of buy-in from the District Office was high, while similar narratives were absent in the case of Sekolah Kita. Endorsement by the District Office made it easier for officers to encourage schools to become more transparent by publishing data on the Cek Sekolahku website. The District Office also has access to complaints submitted by stakeholders to schools, and can therefore monitor how they resolve the problems. When a school in Semarang ignored complaints for several weeks, a District Officer visited the school and reprimanded the principal.

While it may not be the intention of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, their use has led inevitably to the application of a market model of accountability, especially at the school level. This is linked to the use of a market model (school choice approach) in Indonesia, whereby individual students are allowed to select the school they want to attend regardless of location, and public schools can select students based on various criteria including, but not limited to, student performance in standardized tests. Under this approach, the market model of accountability uses market incentives to establish and maintain school accountability.

Actors at school levels including teachers and students tend to correlate transparency and accountability with market incentives. For example, a group of teachers in Makassar voiced their collective view that, ‘Financial information is indeed important; but more importantly, we need to inform public about the school facilities and school programmes and extracurricular so that communities, especially parents, are willing to send their children here (to this school).’ Another teacher stated that, ‘The most important goal in transparency is to promote the school or to make public be aware of the school performance.’ These statements reflect the common perception that the main purpose of open data is school promotion.
Students also share similar perceptions about the need to present a good public image of the school. In the three districts, the majority of students shared a belief that the negative aspects of the schools should not be made public. In Semarang, a group of students argued that, ‘The number of students who had to repeat grade-level should not be published because it will make our school look bad. And if the school looks bad, no one will want to come here.’ Some students also agreed that open data are good, as long as the data make the schools look good. In another focus group discussion, a group of students in Semarang shared the view that financial data should only be seen by students and parents, but should not be made public. The reason given was the need to avoid misunderstanding and prevent public humiliation. Hence, open data are often linked to school reputation.

Following the market model, open data are also perceived as a way to win market competition. One group of students interviewed believed that schools should publish their students’ academic achievements, as this would reflect well on the institution, and thus make the students proud of attending a highly reputable school. A teacher in Makassar also stated, ‘Data related to students who progress to upper secondary schools; yes, we always publish the percentage of them and sometimes [we show] the names of students who got accepted in favourite schools. The reason why we do this is to inform parents that this school has good reputation with good output.’ Therefore, for most teachers and students, open data are perceived as a form of publicity.

To conclude, Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are both designed around a public participation model. However, the sanction/reward model is also applied, in particular to encourage schools to submit and publish their data and respond to stakeholders’ complaints. At the school level, actors link open data with school promotion or marketing. This perception comes naturally among teachers and students, perhaps because of the market mechanism applied in the Indonesian education system.

However, MoEC recently enacted a new regulation (Number 17 Year 2017) for a zone-based system of student admission to all levels of public school. This requires schools to allocate 45% of their quotas to students who live within their zones.\(^{22}\) Future research should be conducted to assess whether the market model of accountability is still relevant to the new system.

### 3.3 Accountability lines

Neither Sekolah Kita nor Cek Sekolahku have any authority to hold schools accountable. PDSPK, the unit that manages school data and publishes them on Sekolah Kita is situated within MoEC, but lacks any authority to hold schools accountable for their policies and practices. According to the Sekolah Kita officer, even if PDSPK uncovers suspicious information, they cannot ask schools for clarification. Instead, they need to inform the local District Office, so that District Officers can intervene and hold the school accountable.

Similarly, TII, which developed Cek Sekolahku, lacks the authority to hold schools accountable. As a civil society organization, TII is not a part of the MoEC structure. Hence, it has even less authority over the public school system in Indonesia. As stated earlier, TII engages with District Offices to support the implementation of Cek Sekolahku, and expects district leaders to hold schools accountable when they do not respond properly to stakeholders’ complaints. Therefore, both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku depend on a formal bureaucratic hierarchy whereby school administrators are held accountable to the District Office at the municipal level.

The effectiveness of both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku depends on the orientation of district leaders towards transparency and accountability. Bojonegoro is among several

\(^{22}\) The system divides the zones into three zones based on school levels. The zone for the primary school level is the village (kelurahan), the zone for the lower secondary school level is the sub-district (kecamatan), and the zone for the upper secondary school level is a group of sub-districts (rayon).
districts in Indonesia that have pioneered an open government partnership (OGP) programme to secure commitments to promote transparency, empower citizens, and fight against corruption. In Bojonegoro, every Friday the regent (Bupati) arranges an open town hall meeting where he listens to citizens’ questions, concerns, and complaints concerning public services including about education and health. He even provides a number for the public to submit complaints via text message. The District Officer acknowledged that the regent has made consistent demands for transparency and accountability in education, which in turn have reinforced the effectiveness of the Cek Sekolahku programme in schools.

Cek Sekolahku’s efforts to promote social accountability rely on the capacity of citizens to hold schools accountable, One TII officer stated that responding to stakeholders’ complaints is the most important thing a school must do to be perceived as reliable, adding that, ‘The point of Cek Sekolahku is not the number of complaints submitted to schools, but how many of them are actually resolved’. In 2014, only about 25% of complaints were resolved, indicating problems with the process. The officer also shared a case in Makassar where a principal was fired because he ignored parents’ complaints about illegal levies imposed by teachers. The principal and teachers did not respond to the complaints for weeks, so the parents organized a meeting with a state senator and the media. The District Office finally decided to fire the principal. The TII officer added, ‘This kind of issue is actually what we want to avoid. Through Cek Sekolahku, schools should be able to resolve the problem without too much fuss. But I also understand the frustration the parents felt, so when they didn’t get any response, that’s what happens.’

Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku expect communities to impose social sanctions on schools, yet this line of accountability is weak because parents have no collective power to hold schools accountable. The parent leader further explained that although it was true that parents and students could impose social sanctions by not selecting unreliable schools, in practice it was difficult for parents to take this course of action. Their children might not be accepted, or the other schools might be too expensive or located too far from home.

Once Cek Sekolahku was in place, teachers became aware that students could submit complaints at any time. They admitted that it affected their behaviour. One teacher said, ‘I know that students could complain about teaching and learning online. Well, I am trying my best, and I am glad the complaints are verified, so that they cannot say whatever they want.’ However, some teachers noted that student feedback had yet to target teaching and learning because of the power dynamic:

> Students are not afraid to file complaint about school facilities. However, they are still afraid to complain about their teacher’s performance, like when the teacher is absent or other issue, I don’t think I ever heard any complaint about teacher in this school…. I think they are afraid something will harm them if they report complaints about their teachers, or about other students…. It is the limitation, and that’s why teacher performance is not quite impacted by Cek Sekolahku, I think.

Another teacher added:

> It’s too bad, because if students can give feedback to teachers, it can improve our performance. I don’t see why teacher performance should not be published. If public know about our performance, even if the performance is not good, I think it is the opportunity for us to find out how to improve our teaching and to change.

It is also not realistic to expect students to hold their teachers accountable. Most of the students in all three districts were unsure about their role in holding their teachers and principals accountable. Many had received little or no information on this issue, although a few who served as school agents had attended workshops held by Cek Sekolahku. When a group of students was asked about bribery, one stated: ‘I believe in every school bribery happens. But how is it to report it, we don’t have any proof.’ Her peers shared this common concern – they did not know what evidence they needed or how to report bribery cases.
Many students were also unaware of line accountability, as indicated by the following conversation which took place during a FGD session:

Student A: With the clear and detail data in place, we will be able to take action whenever there’s misconduct and corruption. We will report that to the District Office.

Student B: District Office? Are you sure? Parents, maybe; but District Officers?

Student A: Yeah, but our parents can report it to the District Office.

Student B: Now I agree, it’s difficult if the students do that.

Student C: But I heard there were students who reported corruption case to the District Office, I read it somewhere. And the District Officer really responded to it.

Interviewer: And therefore it is possible for students to report corruption cases to the District Office, then?

Student D: Well, I don’t think we’re afraid of it. I mean, it’s not because that we’re afraid.

Student B: Yeah, but they won’t really take us seriously. They’d say, ‘you are just kids, what do you know!’

Everyone agreed.

The market model of accountability allows the market (in this case, students and parents) to impose sanctions on schools. However, students and parents have yet to understand their roles and their power to hold school administrators and teachers accountable. When the system lacks clear lines of accountability and stakeholders lack capacity, the link between transparency and accountability is likely to be weak.

3.4 Established consequences of not publishing school data

The right to information introduced in Law Number 14 Year 2008 secures the right of Indonesian citizens to public information. As stated in the law, among the main purposes of public information disclosure are promoting the transparency and accountability of
public institutions, and increasing public engagement in decision-making processes. The introduction of legislation is viewed as a major shift as, prior to the law, the public had limited rights to access information relating to public institution performance and outcomes. Shortly thereafter, the government enacted Law Number 25 Year 2009 on Public Services, requiring all public service institutions including MoEC to provide publicly accessible information on their institutions (i.e. vision and mission statements, programmes, etc.) and to develop efficient mechanisms for the public to provide feedback.

One of the key informants for this research is a head of the Central Information Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (known as KIP, Komisi Informasi Pusat). He drew attention to one major loophole of Law Number 14 Year 2008: the lack of consequences of publishing, or not publishing information. There is at present no regulated system of rewards or punishments for institutions who provide or do not provide public access to their data. He added that publishing information had yet to be included as an indicator to assess the feasibility and fitness of an institution. Consequently, many institutions were not encouraged to publish their data, especially education institutions, because publishing data does not form part of their key performance indicators.

To date, the School Operational Assistance Fund (BOS) may be the only educational policy with detailed and strict procedures relating to transparency and accountability, which are explicitly included in technical guidelines published by MoEC, based on MoEC Regulation Number 80 Year 2015 and the amendments stipulated in MoEC Regulation Number 16 Year 2016 (MoEC, 2016). As mentioned in Chapter 2, Sekolah Kita data are collected mostly through the Dapodik system from schools, who are obliged to submit the data. If they fail to do so, BOS funds and other central government grants are withheld. A MoEC officer responsible for organizing Dapodik asserts that withholding BOS and other funds disbursements is the most effective way to make schools publish their data. Each semester the central government informs District Offices of any schools within their jurisdiction that have not submitted data. When asked about concrete sanctions, a district leader stated that the school will be warned, but no official consequences were in place. He elaborated:

There are social sanctions, though, especially from the school’s stakeholders, because they may suffer from the lack of BOS funds. And when school operators who are supposed to submit and publish Dapodik data don’t update the data correctly, they will meet social sanctions from the teachers and principals too, because certified teacher allowance are held by the central government if the data are incorrect. And social sanction is effective, and sufficient.

The possibility of financial penalties displeased the Head of PDSPK and the Sekolah Kita officer. Both argued that more substantial reasons should be used to encourage schools to publish their data, rather than incentives such as grants or allowances. They maintain that linking data with funds will not lead to accountability, only formality, and would not result in the main goal of Sekolah Kita: public participation.

TII, as the initiator and developer of Cek Sekolahku, admitted that it lacked the authority to impose sanctions on schools when data are not published or updated. As stated earlier, however, TII can ask District Offices for support to encourage schools to publish their data. According to the TII officer, two factors influence schools to publish their data:

First is the reinforcement from the District Office. Some schools were not quite motivated to share their data and use Cek Sekolahku. But when the District Office demanded them to implement this, they had to follow the order. However, there’s a second factor, there are reformer principals who believe that their role is to make improvement in schools. At the beginning we met only few of them, but the more we work with schools the more we find principals and teachers who actually are reformers. And in schools led by reformers we find the programme (Cek Sekolahku) lasts longer, more sustainable.
Social sanctions from stakeholders could effectively encourage schools to publish their data. In one case in Bojonegoro, a school did not publish or update its data on Cek Sekolahku, leading students to question the school administrator’s integrity and commitment to eradicating misconduct. Unfortunately, the students did not know how to demand the data or impose sanctions. Parents and School Committees have also yet to impose significant sanctions on schools, including those who have not published their data.

To summarize, the consequences for not publishing data are detrimental to the school. The negative impact on the school budget and subsequently to the school programme has pushed schools to publish information through the Dapodik system. Meanwhile, as a non-governmental programme, Cek Sekolahku has limitations in terms of making schools accountable for their action or inaction. District Offices have therefore engaged with Cek Sekolahku to ensure schools implement the programme and publish their data. Social sanctions from school stakeholders are not effective, when they occur. Although students and parents agree that schools need to publish more information, they have not demanded more data from them.

3.5 Established consequences of publishing school data

Based on its design, the Sekolah Kita website is more likely to provide information to the public than explicitly encourage users to use the information for school accountability purposes. Users can participate by posting comments, complaints, or feedback, which should receive a direct response from the schools. However, unlike Cek Sekolahku, comments posted on Sekolah Kita are not filtered. In other words, no one checks the veracity of comments before they are published online.

Most of the comments on Sekolah Kita relate to data published on schools, including on facilities, environment, school activities, and student performance. However, some comments concern the school budget – information that is not published on Sekolah Kita. At the time of writing, there are 7,634 comments posted on the website, but only 150 (less than 2%) have received a response. While the comments can be interpreted as a public response to open data, the fact that many schools do not respond may indicate that Sekolah Kita does not affect school behaviour or decisions.

School response is the main difference between Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku in terms of the publication of stakeholder complaints. Although PDSPK and District Officers expect schools to respond to comments posted on Sekolah Kita, they are not required to do so. Cek Sekolahku, on the other hand, places great emphasis on complaint handling by schools. Effective and timely response to stakeholder complaints – rather than the number of complaints – is the main indicator of success for the programme. Although schools do not always respond directly to comments, their response is mostly indicated by the status of the complaint – whether it has been resolved or forwarded to the school.

Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku do not provide any descriptions about the data or the variables they publish. Likewise, they do not inform the public about how to use the data for school accountability purposes. Hence, based on the design alone, it is unclear how the public can monitor teacher performance using the information published on the websites. Meanwhile, to establish more concrete consequences from the publication of data about the school budget, Cek Sekolahku held offline sessions (i.e. workshops and seminars) with school staff and separately with school stakeholders, in order to educate them about how to use the data. Such an approach is absent in the Sekolah Kita initiative. However, neither Sekolah Kita nor Cek Sekolahku provide information about sanctions in cases of misuse of resources, teacher absenteeism, and so on. Interviews with key informants in the central government (MoEC) indicate that no clear sanctions
have been established, with decisions about sanctions for malpractice in schools usually left to the District Office.

Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are designed in accordance with the Law on Rights to Information and the Law on Electronic Information and Transaction (Law Number 19 Year 2016). No information regarding individual students is published on either system, and both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku officers assert that individual data will not be shared with the public. According to the PDSPK leader, anyone requesting individual-level data must submit a proposal to PDSPK, because although Dapodik contains information on every student in the country, the data are confidential.

To summarize, the consequences of publishing school data remain unclear. Neither initiative includes information or guidance to help the public participate in school accountability, and MoEC and the District Offices have yet to establish clear and formal consequences for schools, administrators, and teachers involved in malpractice. Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku have encountered limitations in modifying the behaviours of school institutions and personnel, because consequences have yet to effectively established.

Table 4. Summary of accountability models of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of accountability</th>
<th>Accountability models</th>
<th>Lines of accountability</th>
<th>Consequences of not publishing information</th>
<th>Consequences of publishing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sekolah Kita (MoEC)</td>
<td>Unclear. Maybe a mix of pedagogical and financial (i.e. resource management) domains of accountability</td>
<td>A mix of public participation and market models</td>
<td>Schools are held accountable to District Offices and MoEC, and to the general public</td>
<td>Financial sanction (the distribution of BOS funds, teacher allowances, and other grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cek Sekolahku (TII)</td>
<td>Financial accountability</td>
<td>A mix of public participation and market models</td>
<td>Schools are held accountable mostly to stakeholders, but also to the District Office</td>
<td>No clear consequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first assumption of this research is that open data initiatives are powerful instruments able to hold schools accountable and reduce corruption risks in education. As shown in Table 4, however, transparency does not necessarily lead to accountability. In the cases of both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, there are no clear lines of accountability or consequences imposed on schools for publishing or not publishing their data. Without clear consequences, whether positive or negative, behaviour modification (e.g. to eradicate corruption or minimize teacher absenteeism) becomes a futile effort.

The second assumption of this research is that Sekolah Kita, a government-led initiative, is less likely than Cek Sekolahku, a civil society-led initiative, to respond to user needs, engage them, and generate real impact. This chapter demonstrates that this assumption has merit. Cek Sekolahku has more potential to engage stakeholders in monitoring schools and to generate higher stakeholder participation by submitting complaints through the system. The schools then have to respond to the complaints in timely fashion, and the public can monitor the complaint resolution process through the website.

The market model of accountability demands market capacity to hold schools accountable. Sekolah Kita relies on its website, which lacks information about how to
use the data to hold schools accountable. While the Cek Sekolahku website lacks similar information, the initiative also implements offline approaches which aim to increase community participation and empower schools to use data for improvement. Hence, in terms of design, Cek Sekolahku has greater potential to generate real impact on school accountability.
4. Analysis of stakeholder perspectives on the usefulness of the initiatives

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first discusses school stakeholder perspectives on the accessibility of information shared with the public. The second and third sections present analyses of stakeholder perspectives on the relevance and usability of the information, respectively. Finally, the fourth and fifth sections present stakeholder perspectives on the short-term and long-term impacts of the information shared with the public. Each section categorizes findings by type of respondent: key informants, principals, teachers, parents, School Committee members, and students.

4.1 Analysis of stakeholder perspectives on the accessibility of publicly shared information

Key informants. A participant representing the Integrated Service Unit (Unit Layanan Terpadu or ULT) of the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) asserted that all citizens could submit complaints and access information through various media including but not limited to websites, emails, and text messages. They could also visit the ULT office to petition for information and file complaints. As the law protects the confidentiality of requesters’ identities, she believed that members of the public would not hesitate to request information or submit complaints through ULT. According to her, most reports received by ULT concern the School Operational Assistance Fund (BOS) or other funding-related issues.

This section describes the different ways that users can access Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. The Head of PDSPK asserts that the website is very simple, comprehensive, and easy to access. Updated every semester, Sekolah Kita can be viewed at any point during the year. However, one parent leader and local Cek Sekolahku officer in Semarang had no knowledge of Sekolah Kita. Likewise, the TII officer had never heard of this government-led initiative. However, PDSPK and other key informants in MoEC were aware of Cek Sekolahku. The Sekolah Kita officer even stated that Cek Sekolahku was used as a reference by the designers of Sekolah Kita.

Despite open and free access to the website, the Sekolah Kita officer admitted that the initiative should be introduced more effectively to schools across the nation. However, he pointed out that the major obstacle to promoting open school data among schools was bureaucracy. As a unit under MoEC, PDSPK lacks the authority to approach schools and promote initiatives, including encouraging schools to access and use Sekolah Kita. According to the Sekolah Kita officer, they expected that the media would promote Sekolah Kita. The PDSPK officer concurred, noting that the media ‘can reach out to public, to schools, to individual principals and even teachers, while our hands are tied’.

The media have a prominent role in raising awareness of educational policies in Indonesia. One of the key informants for this study was a journalist responsible for the education section of Kompas, an independent newspaper. Although the media have a commitment to reporting educational news, she mentioned that, to date, Kompas is the only national newspaper to dedicate two pages to educational news every day. She was familiar with Sekolah Kita and used their data often for the reports or articles she wrote. Prior to the interview session she had not heard about Cek Sekolahku. She reviewed the website and found it both interesting and useful for her work.

The role of the media in promoting open school data and raising awareness of the public’s right to school information is not straightforward. The media have yet to publish a dedicated article on the topic, but consistently emphasize the importance of parent and
community involvement and participation in education, ‘it’s like our tagline is “education problem is not only for the government to solve but parent and community need to take part in solving it”’. Meanwhile, as a journalist, she often encourages schools and parents to access Dapodik data through the Sekolah Kita website.

She explained that in many cases the problem is not access to data, but willingness among stakeholders to access the information. She doubted that open school data would focus the attention of the public, and especially parents, on education issues:

I did a small experiment; I posted unsettling educational data on social media. Yes, some people were interested in the issue, but they were the same people. If many people and parents did not bother to say anything after they read my post, then I doubt that they’d like to access more information about schools and education. I know communities and groups of people who work tirelessly to encourage parents to question about school funds and so on. But some parents don’t seem to have any curiosity…. And they are parents from the upper middle class. We can imagine [the response of] parents from the lower class.

A district leader also identified a similar problem in relation to demand for school data. He stated that parents were not very engaged in school development, let alone aware of school data. He criticized schools for not encouraging participation: ‘Some schools shared their data on announcement boards and banners, but only for a week. It’s only a formality. How can parents be engaged in using school data if they only publish them for a week?’

For the TII officer, raising awareness of school data meant increasing their own capacity to use the data to make schools more accountable. As the originator of Cek Sekolahku, TII worked with local District Officers not only to raise awareness about the initiative, but also to help parents and communities understand the data and learn how to use them to improve school accountability.

Offline approaches to increasing access to school data are also significant. The parent leader stated that, although the number might be small, some parents still lacked online access or were not technologically literate. Some of them lived in poverty and could not afford a smartphone or computer. As such, they were unable to make use of initiatives such as the internet-based school report cards, and depended on offline communication for information. In these cases, the School Committee plays a very important role in channelling information to and from schools.

One of the key informants was a member of the Indonesian House of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia or DPR-RI), as well as a member of Commission X on education and culture. She admitted that she had never accessed Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku. She had heard about the MoEC initiative to publish school data, but was not aware of the existence of any government regulations or other formal policies to manage the right to information in the education sector.

**Principals.** On average, the 17 schools that participated in this study have published data related to their schools over a period of almost six years, following the enactment of the Right to Information policies and implementation of Dapodik regulation. The exception is two schools in Semarang, who initiated open data for public policies over 10 years ago.

Sixteen out of 17 principals who participated in this study published most of the school data listed in Table 5. Schools collect data including student socio-economic profiles mainly through MoEC’s Dapodik instrument. However, only seven or about 41% of the schools collected school income data (see Table 5). Five principals or about 17% reported that they collected data related to community involvement. Only one out of 17 schools collected data on school safety.

In general, data were collected every semester. This may be a consequence of a Dapodik regulation that requires schools to update their data every semester. However, Table 5 indicates that schools have different timelines for data collection. While the majority
Table 5. Frequency of data collection and data publication in schools (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School data</th>
<th>How often are they collected?</th>
<th>How often are they published?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Every month</td>
<td>Every semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student socio-economic profiles</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attendance</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition, dropout, and promotion</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attendance</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher qualification</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding sources</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School income</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation from students</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School capital expenditure</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School facilities</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School equipment</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>64.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>76.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student test scores</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition rate to secondary school</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>64.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School inspection</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental satisfaction</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School safety</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of schools collected teacher qualification data every year, some schools updated their data every month and every semester. As predicted, the types of school data collected in schools related to the demands of Dapodik, including but not limited to data on students, teachers, teaching and learning, and school data.

Not all the collected data were made publicly available. For instance, about 77% of principals admitted that they collected student test scores annually. However, only about 58% of the schools published the data. Some data are also restricted to the school and the government. As schools must collect and submit school data (Dapodik) to the central government (MoEC), the main purpose of data collection is not necessarily providing information to the public.

Three different methods were available to schools to publish their data. Eleven schools used formal school administrative reports that were submitted to the District Office and shared with school stakeholders. Five schools depended on school report cards to briefly announce school programmes, activities, and school budgets. The data were shared with parents through various media including but not limited to school websites and printed reports. One school used visual media such as banners, posters, or an announcement board to briefly display their data. However, every school employed multiple approaches to disseminate school data (Figure 9), with school reports, meetings, and school board reports the preferred methods. Meanwhile, mass media such as newspapers and radio were not popular means for disseminating educational information.
All the principals stated that the forms of presentation should be easy to understand and efficient. In general, they agreed that data presentations should be designed carefully and in a simple manner, so that teachers, students, and parents could understand them easily. In addition, the information should be placed where stakeholders could easily access it, both online and offline. A principal also noted that schools need to allocate human resources and a budget for website development and improving internet connections, so that data shared online could be updated in a timely fashion and be easily accessed by all stakeholders.

The variations in methods used for data collection and dissemination may be indicative of a lack of specific regulation enacted by either central or district governments detailing how schools need to publish their data. When schools keep their own schedules for data collection, publication, and updating information, parents and communities may become confused or remain unaware of updates and changes. Web-based school report cards such as Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku display school data throughout the year, and may therefore help stakeholders access school data more efficiently.

Teachers. Focus group discussions (FGD) with teachers revealed that most teachers in the three districts had not heard of the Sekolah Kita initiative, although they were very familiar with Dapodik data. Some groups tried to access the website during the FGD sessions, and wondered why no one at the District Office or central government had ever mentioned it, particularly as some teachers found the information on the site both interesting and useful.

Implementation of Cek Sekolahku is at a different stage in each school. In Semarang and Makassar, many teachers were aware of Cek Sekolahku, although they rarely access the website anymore. A teacher even commented, ‘Is it still running? It’s been a while.’ Meanwhile, some teachers in lower secondary schools in Semarang and Bojonegoro were not familiar with the initiative, as it was implemented in their schools several months before the data were collected. After looking at the website, all teachers agreed that Cek Sekolah was easy to access, because they could use the application on their smartphones. In general, teachers also agreed that data on Cek Sekolahku were easy to understand.

Some teachers agreed that their schools had published data to inform the public about school facilities, teachers, and programmes. One teacher confirmed that information on student academic progress and behavioural problems was shared with parents. When they were asked if parents were interested in accessing the data, some teachers noted that while some parents were interested in the data, others seemed not to care.
Parents. Despite this perception among key informants, the survey (n=304) showed that a large proportion of parents considered the publication of school data to be very important (66.1%) or important (32.9%), with only one participant considering it to be of little importance.

Almost 65% of the parents interviewed had heard of Sekolah Kita, while about 40% were aware of Cek Sekolahku. Table 6 highlights the percentage of parents who knew of the two initiatives in the three districts. In each district, Sekolah Kita is more popular than Cek Sekolahku, perhaps because stakeholders already knew about Dapodik, and this in turn led to awareness of Sekolah Kita. The percentage of parents who were aware of Sekolah Kita seems higher in Bojonegoro, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 6. Awareness among parents (n=304) of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Sekolah Kita</th>
<th>Cek Sekolahku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semarang</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makassar</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bojonegoro</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents’ statements about their familiarity with Sekolah Kita do not accord with the assumptions of key stakeholders, however. Cek Sekolahku officers, the TII officer, and even the Sekolah Kita officer assumed that parents would be ignorant of Sekolah Kita because it has never been formally introduced in schools. On the other hand, Cek Sekolahku has been present for years in a significant number of lower secondary schools in Semarang, but a large proportion of parents remain unaware of the initiative.

Out of 304 parents who participated in this research, about 108 (35.5%) were aware of both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, 34.2% knew of either Cek Sekolahku or Sekolah Kita, and the remainder (30.3%) had not heard of either initiative. This finding reflects relatively low access to both initiatives.

Almost 90% of the parents who knew about Sekolah Kita (n=198) found the presentation of data easy to understand. About 90% of the parents who were aware of Cek Sekolahku (n=122) shared a similar perspective. Some parents suggested that Sekolah Kita should try to use language and terms more familiar to parents. Some also suggested that the data should be presented in interesting ways (e.g. infographics) to enable parents to more easily understand them. In addition, one parent suggested that data related to teaching and learning should be highlighted. Finally, some parents believed that face-to-face meetings with teachers are necessary to clarify the meaning of information available online.

Some parents who accessed Cek Sekolahku suggested that the information on the website should be more comprehensive. According to some parents, some data were not updated and others were not available, resulting in a less meaningful experience. As with Sekolah Kita, some parents who accessed Cek Sekolahku found that the terminology used on the website should be simpler and more accessible for parents. Other parents suggested that some terms should have explanations.

Figure 10 shows the means that parents used to access Sekolah Kita (n=198) and Cek Sekolahku (n=122) data. The websites of the two initiatives seem to be the main source of data for parents, although the majority of those who accessed them also learned about data from school meetings. Only a few parents who accessed both initiatives used radio

23. One possible explanation for this finding is an error in data collection. Owing to time constraints and efficiency, some parents asked to take the questionnaire home. School principals seconded the idea because of lack of time and space for parents to complete the questionnaires at school. As a result, parents might have accessed Sekolah Kita at home when completing the questionnaire and thus become more familiar with the initiative.
or newspapers to acquire school data. Almost 90% of parents who accessed Sekolah Kita agreed that the modes of dissemination of school data are appropriate and efficient. The same perspective was slightly higher (about 95%) among parents who accessed Cek Sekolahku.

Figure 10. Means used by parents (n=198) to access Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku data (%)

Parents who accessed Sekolah Kita and/or Cek Sekolahku argued that schools need to better promote the school report card initiatives and websites, by referencing their data in meetings on a regular basis. Others argued that such collaborations between schools and groups of parents can lead to sharing information with other parents, and eventually to greater public awareness of school report cards. It was unclear how parents learned about school data through radio and newspapers. However, some parents believed that the mass media should promote school report cards more often and use them as a reference.

School Committee. The majority of School Committee representatives (n=14) were aware of Sekolah Kita (n=11) and Cek Sekolahku (n=10). Five representatives said they were most likely to access school data on Sekolah Kita before the school year started and then at the beginning of the school year. One participant said that she accessed Sekolah Kita data at the end of the second semester. Similarly, four Committee representatives accessed Cek Sekolahku, and others accessed Cek Sekolahku before the school year started and then at the beginning of the school year.

All the representatives found the presentation of data easy to understand. To increase parents’ understanding of school data, most Committee representatives suggested that the school hold regular meetings with parents to discuss the information. This suggestion may be influenced by the manner in which they accessed school data, with seven of the representatives accessing data from school reports and school meetings (Figure 11).

Figure 11 shows that school reports and school meetings are the most popular means among Committee representatives to access both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku data. Because Sekolah Kita data contains Dapodik information, some Committee representatives may have been able to access the data via local newspapers and radio. The majority of Committee representatives asserted that the modes of dissemination used by both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are appropriate and efficient. When asked to provide suggestions to improve data dissemination, the main recommendation was more offline sessions to complement the website portals. Face-to-face meetings would help both parents and communities become more aware of the websites.
Students. The majority of the students in three districts were aware of open school data efforts in their schools. They cited various media used by their schools including offline media such as announcement boards, banners, and posters, and online media such as the school website and Cek Sekolahku. During the FGD session, one of the students in Semarang said, ‘Data especially about school facilities, equipment, and programmes – I mean extracurricular programmes – are informed in our schools. You can see large boards displaying the information.’ Another student in Makassar believed that all students in his school could see the data: ‘In my school the information is displayed in the area where students usually hang out. And as soon as we enter the gate, we will see large banner of school vision and mission statements. And if we keep walking through the hallway, we’ll find more information about school programmes and other data.’

Even though schools display most of their information in the school environment, financial data were less accessible in some schools for students. In Semarang, at least two groups of students noted that information on the school budget and expenditure was not shared in the same way as administrators shared data on facilities and equipment.

Many students, especially in Semarang and Makassar, were aware of Cek Sekolahku and could name data available on the website. The initiative was only implemented recently in Bojonegoro, so students from this district were less familiar with the data. Nevertheless, almost none of the students were aware of Sekolah Kita. Some students said that the website sounded familiar, but had never accessed it.

Some groups of students admitted that they did not really know how to use open school data:

Student A: Yes, they are published. But sometimes I can't understand what they mean, are they good or bad. I don't know the purpose and what is it for the students to know all the information. No one explains how to read it to us.

Student B: For example the school budget. There are numbers, but we don't know what to read about it.

Other students maintained that they could understand the data easily. However, they suggested that the presentation of the data could be more attractive to encourage students to learn more about the issues. Groups of students agreed that one problem with using posters to display data in schools was vandalism. According to one student, if the poster designs were better, students might appreciate them rather than vandalizing them.
4.2 Analysis of stakeholder perspectives on the relevance of publicly shared information

Key informants. Initiatives to make school data publicly available do not necessarily increase public demand for information. The Sekolah Kita officer raised this issue during the interview session: ‘As a matter of fact, school data [published on Sekolah Kita] are and will always be relevant to parents. As long as they are looking for good schools, they need data, don’t they? But today, they are still looking for information [about schools] through word-of-mouth and based on assumptions they make without solid foundation. So although they actually need data, the demand is still low.’

In relation to information demand, the journalist cited the lack of popularity of education news, especially in the absence of a connection with political issues. From her perspective, the public pay little attention to educational issues unless they directly affect their children. The issue is not one of access, she argued, but perceived relevancy of the data. However, she stated that she personally found Sekolah Kita to be professionally useful for writing articles and reports, and that she used the website to verify data obtained from the field and her newspaper company’s database.

The TII officer argued that not all schools and parents perceive the importance of open school data, including information on school funds and expenditures. Some even ignored the initiative preferring to judge a school on the basis of its reputation, in particular the success of its graduates (e.g. the upper secondary schools they attend). She also mentioned that some parents even refuse to report instances of bribery, arguing that such practices were common to many schools and formed part of the system. ‘So it’s not about socio-economic background’, she added, ‘they are well-educated parents with highly reputable professions. But perhaps they got the benefit from such a system, they don’t think Cek Sekolahku is important.’

In the case of parents with a lower socio-economic status, the main problem was lack of understanding about school data and their roles in school accountability, according to the TII officer. The PDSPK officer concurred, stating that many parents in Indonesia still struggled to send their children to schools, ‘and were not fully aware of why school is important for them, let alone to understand school data.’ In short, these key informants from the different initiatives both recognized a need to increase stakeholders’ interest in data.

School data were not perceived as particularly relevant by leaders at local District Offices. When asked if Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku were relevant to his needs, a provincial leader explained that his office did not manage lower secondary schools (SMP), only upper secondary schools. For him, lower secondary data were relevant only for District Offices at the municipal level, ‘Because if an SMP does not submit the data (Dapodik), we cannot do anything. The District Office at Kabupaten (municipalities) will handle that’. However, his explanation focused on the decision by schools to publish/submit data, rather than the relevance of the data themselves. When interviewed, the District Office Head at the municipal level confirmed that the office did not use school data: ‘We keep telling school administrators to use the school data, that’s our responsibility’, he said.

Principals. Head teachers/principals generally agreed that open school data were useful for all stakeholders. The majority believed that the main group to make use of open school data was the community, including but not limited to non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities/researchers, and community-based organizations (Figure 12). The majority (88.24%) agreed that the community made use of open school data. This response was similar to that of teachers who believed that the community was the group that benefitted most from open school data initiatives, as this would enable them to get to know the schools in more detail.
All principals interviewed shared a common belief that a major goal of open school data was parent and community engagement (Figure 13). Twelve out of 17 principals (70.59%) agreed that the data were useful for providing feedback to the schools. However, only four principals (23.53%) agreed that the purpose of open school data was to facilitate rewards and punishments – the central theme of accountability. Put another way, only four principals agreed that the school data should result in consequences.

**Teachers.** In general, teachers agreed that open school data were relevant to them. One teacher said, ‘Open data will allow not only the public, but also the school community like myself, to understand better about this school; because day-to-day activities sometimes do not allow me to know what is actually going on in this school…. If we want to improve our school, we need to understand what happens in this school.’ In another session, a teacher elaborated, ‘I believe that we need to understand school data, not only outsiders, but we, as insiders of this school, need to understand and use data more effectively.’

As reported earlier, the majority of teachers who participated in this study were not aware of Sekolah Kita. However, when shown the website during FGD sessions, they shared similar views, with some noting that it contained abundant information that might be useful for them, but would be more useful for parents. One group of teachers agreed that the most important information published on Sekolah Kita related to school facilities. A group of teachers in Makassar also agreed that while the financial information shared on Cek Sekolahku was important, it was more important to inform parents about school facilities, school programmes, and extracurricular activities, and to encourage communities, and
especially parents, to send their children to the school. A group of teachers also added that data related to school achievements (e.g. sports, arts, and other co-curricular or extracurricular activities) and school facilities such as computers, internet connections, and sport facilities, should be highlighted. Such responses indicate that the market model of accountability may influence teachers’ perspectives on the relevance of school data.

Meanwhile, some teachers highlighted the need for time series data because of the importance of tracking student progress. They agreed that school report cards would be more relevant for teachers if they displayed information about the socio-economic and academic background of students (i.e. their primary schools), as well as the upper secondary schools they subsequently attended.

In relation to transparency, most teachers tended to agree that individual teachers or school administrators’ wealth or assets should not be made public: ‘It has nothing to do with the school, and it won’t give any valuable information to the public. We should not share it.’ Other teachers also agreed that although open data could mitigate corruption, in reality no opportunities or loopholes would allow teachers and administrators to misuse funds. Put another way, they implied that open data might not be strongly relevant to eradicating corruption, because of the lack of opportunity to commit fraud. This statement, however, was not warranted. Both TII and Cek Sekolahku officers, as well as officers in MoEC, highlighted cases where school administrators and teachers had misused BOS funds, by increasing the number of students or collecting illegal levies from parents and students for various events not approved by District Offices.

Parents. Despite the perception among key informants, the survey (n=304) showed that a large proportion of parents considered the publication of school data to be very important (66.1%) or important (32.9%), with only one participant considering it to be of little importance. According to a parent leader at the district level, the main concern of parents is school facilities, not the school budget. As such, parents may not be interested in information on school financial activities. Instead, they generally seek information about facilities and infrastructure related to teaching and learning.

In the survey, parents were asked to rate the usefulness of school data (Figure 14). The majority of parents considered all the school data to be either ‘very useful’ or ‘quite useful’. None of the parents perceived data about school facilities and equipment to be less than ‘quite useful’. Meanwhile, about 10% of parents perceived data about school income to be ‘not very useful’ or ‘not useful at all’. Less than 90% of parents considered information about school income and donations received by the schools receive to be ‘not very useful’. This finding corresponds with the parent leader’s statement that parents tend to be more interested in data closely related to teaching and learning. Some parents wrote that information on teaching and learning processes should be highlighted by school report cards. Although they paid less attention to school financial data (i.e. income and donations), examining school facilities and textbooks could be a way to track school financial resources. The TII officer referred to this approach as an indirect strategy for mitigating corruption in schools. Instead of focusing on financial data, school stakeholders were expected to pay attention to data related to teaching and learning.

The majority of parents who accessed Sekolah Kita (n=198) and Cek Sekolahku (n=122) stated that they found the school report cards to be ‘quite useful’ to ‘very useful’. About 83% of parents who accessed Sekolah Kita agreed that the initiative was ‘very useful’. Almost 80% of parents who accessed Cek Sekolahku held the same opinion. Less than 1% of parents found the initiatives to be ‘not very useful’. In other words, the majority of parents found both initiatives to be useful.
Out of 198 parents who were aware of Sekolah Kita, all agreed that data directly related to teaching and learning, including school accreditation, national exam scores, and student achievements in various competitions such as academic and non-academic events, ‘somewhat’ to ‘fully’ responded to their needs (Figure 15). Teacher data on Sekolah Kita include percentages of teachers according to their academic background, age, gender, number and proportion of teachers who have been certified, and so on. Meanwhile, fewer parents found data on student demography (age, gender, and year of schooling) to be useful to them.

Cek Sekolahku presents five items of school data. As shown in Figure 16, more parents stated that information about school facilities fully responded to their needs. The school budget is the main feature that distinguishes Cek Sekolahku from Sekolah Kita, and based on the survey alone, almost 10% of participants did not think information on the school budget fully responded to their needs.

Parents who were aware of Sekolah Kita (n=198) generally agreed that the data were useful for improving transparency in the management of education resources, making school authorities more accountable, and fighting forms of malpractice such as fund leakage, teacher absenteeism, corruption in textbooks, and so on. Table 7 presents the perspectives of parents on the usefulness of Sekolah Kita data for accountability purposes. Fewer parents agreed that Sekolah Kita data were ‘very useful’ for fighting malpractice than agreed that the data were useful for improving the transparency of school resource management and making school authorities accountable. For example, 87.4% of parents considered school facilities data ‘very useful’ for improving transparency in the management of education resources, but 79.8% thought the same data were ‘very useful’ for fighting malpractice – almost 10 percentage points lower.

The majority of parents agreed that data about school facilities and school accreditation were most useful for improving the transparency of school resources, holding school authorities accountable, and fighting malpractice. The results correspond with parents’ views about the relevance of data and students’ responses concerning the usefulness of school data. Perhaps because school accreditation is indicative of the quality of teachers,
facilities, and school infrastructure, parents believed that these data could be used to hold school authorities more accountable.

**Figure 15. Parents’ perspectives on the usefulness of the information on Sekolah Kita (n=198) (%)**

To what extent do the school data published under Sekolah Kita respond to your needs?

**Figure 16. Parents’ perspectives on the usefulness of the information on Cek Sekolahku (n=122) (%)**

To what extent do the school data published by Cek Sekolahku respond to your needs?

Similarly, the majority of parents who were aware of Cek Sekolahku also believed that school data published on the website were ‘very useful’ for promoting school accountability (Table 8). The majority also thought that school facility data were useful for improving transparency in the management of education resources and mitigating malpractice.

When parents were asked if there were any additional school data they would like to see published, some requested year-to-year school time series data, in particular related
Table 7. Parents’ perspectives on the usefulness of Sekolah Kita data for accountability purposes (n=198) (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School data</th>
<th>How useful are Sekolah Kita data?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving transparency in the management of education resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School accreditation</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School environment</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National exams</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievements</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Parents’ perspectives on the usefulness of Cek Sekolahku data for accountability purposes (n=198) (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How useful are Cek Sekolahku data?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving transparency in the management of education resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School budget plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School programme agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to teaching and learning outcomes. Some other parents demanded more accurate and detailed school budget data. Some parents also highlighted a need for data about flagship academic and extracurricular programmes, perhaps because they use this information to select schools for their children. While 53.6% of parents agreed that all school data could be published, the remainder believed that there should be some limitations. For example, some parents believed that students’ socio-economic backgrounds should not be made public, because of the potential humiliation for the students and the schools. One parent also said that student retention dropout numbers should not be published, because it would cause more harm than good. Some parents also stated that school data that could provoke conflicts among school communities should not be published, but did not cite specific data.

School Committee. Eleven out of 14 School Committee representatives stated that the publication of school data was ‘very important’, and the remainder believed it was ‘quite

24. Although they did not mention the reason, demands for more accurate school budget data might be linked to the absence of school budget information in some schools that implemented Cek Sekolahku (see Chapter 2).
important’. As shown in Figure 17, Committee representatives believed most school data were useful. All Committee representatives agreed that information on school facilities was ‘quite useful’ to ‘very useful’. Data related to financial matters, such as school income and donations, were not considered as useful as information about school facilities. Information about school safety, on the other hand, was not popular among Committee representatives.

Figure 17. School Committee representatives’ perspectives on the usefulness of school data

Nine Committee representatives claimed that they found the Sekolah Kita initiative ‘very useful’, while two others found it ‘quite useful’. Five Committee representatives who were aware of Cek Sekolahku found this initiative to be ‘very useful’, while the other five perceived Cek Sekolahku to be ‘quite useful’. Figure 18 presents the perspectives of Committee representatives on the usefulness of school data published on Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. As predicted, the majority of representatives agreed that information about school facilities presented on Sekolah Kita ‘fully’ responded to their needs, while one participant thought that it only responded ‘somewhat’.

While about 71% of School Committee representatives agreed that facility data on Sekolah Kita fully responded to their needs, only 42% shared similar a view about facility data on Cek Sekolahku. This may be because only limited information about school facilities is available on Cek Sekolahku (i.e. a list of the facilities available in schools without quantities and specific conditions). Four Committee representatives considered that information on the school budget fully responded to their needs, while three participants answered ‘somewhat’. This finding may indicate that the School Committee did not generally perceive this information to be as important as data on school facilities.

The School Committee representatives did not make any major suggestions regarding the need to publish additional school data. However, one representative suggested publishing information about school partnerships with other institutions, such as community-based organizations and universities.

Students. Although not all students were aware of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, they found the school data they could access on the websites to be useful and, in some cases, relevant to themselves. For many students, the most important information concerned facilities and infrastructure, in particular the availability of textbooks and other resources. One student stated that, ‘Even before they enrol in the school, they will consider the facilities of this school.’ Another student added, ‘By knowing the facilities, we know how the school spends BOS funds’, thereby underlining the importance of data on facilities in eliminating
corruption in schools. These responses may also be influenced by the fact that some of the students found school budget data difficult to understand.

Students in some schools, however, valued the importance of school budget data. In Semarang, a student asserted that the school budget should be used as a reference point when assessing decisions and priorities made by school administrators:

For me, the most important information is school budget. If we know how our school allocates the BOS and other funds from the government, we will understand if they really spend the fund for the textbooks, chairs, desks, that are available in our classrooms. But if we found so many desks and chairs are broken and textbooks are not available, we can question the administrators how they spend the funds and why they don’t prioritize our needs.

Some of the school data were relevant to their learning. Among these was information about school and student achievements. The students believed that this information could motivate other students to learn. While some students linked the data to the quality of their learning, others drew a direct link with the school’s image. As one student in Semarang said, ‘If they [the public] know that there are many teachers with higher level of education such as postgraduate degree, they would probably see that this school has
good quality.’ When asked whether data that could harm the school’s reputation should be published, students responded in unison: ‘No.’ Some students justified this response: ‘Information on student retention and dropout should not be shared with the public. If there are many students who fail to continue their education, it may suggest that the school is not good, and people will not choose to school here.’ In relation to this point, some students agreed that the ‘Public should know the number of graduates from this school who continue [on] to favourite upper secondary schools. It can motivate us to follow their paths, and at the same time it will make us proud. People will know that this is a good school, with good quality of graduates.’ The students expressed great concern about the reputation of their school, asking: ‘Please just publish positive information and data for the sake of school reputation.’

To summarize, when students discussed whether school data published were relevant for them, they linked the data to learning processes, but also to the school image or school brand. This may be influenced by the longstanding tradition of school choice in Indonesia which fosters market mechanisms where between-school competition can be fierce.

4.3 Analysis of stakeholder perspectives on the usability of publicly shared information

Key informants. According to MoEC Regulation Number 79 Year 2015, schools and administrators must make use of Dapodik when implementing and analysing programmes and making decisions regarding schools (including on facilities, equipment, programmes, teachers, and students). Community-based organizations and NGOs make use of data published on Sekolah Kita to develop and monitor programmes in schools. For example, NGOs implementing programmes on children’s hygiene have accessed information on the number and condition of toilets in schools. The Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi or KPK) also used information on Sekolah Kita to develop a smartphone application to allow the public to monitor schools.

The Sekolah Kita officer believed that schools and their stakeholders had yet to make effective use of the published data. According to him, school administrators and teachers only submit data in order to receive BOS funds and other grants. They do not use the data to plan, implement, or monitor their programmes and activities. They also do not take advantage of the available information to compare their school performance against that of other schools or national standards.

The journalist found Sekolah Kita to be very useful as a reference on numerous aspects of schools. She noted that journalists usually verify their facts using the website after conducting field research or interview sessions for articles. They also sometimes draw on it for additional, detailed information about the topics of their reports: ‘When I had to make a report about honorary or non-permanent teachers in a district, I used Sekolah Kita to find descriptions about schools in that area, the schools where my interviewees worked, the number of classrooms that were in good condition, and so on. It helped me to provide contexts for my writing.’ However, when the journalist briefly reviewed the website, she noted that some information was out of date, and was thus concerned about its usability for her work.

In the case of Cek Sekolahku, both the TII officer and field officers emphasized the website’s complaint mechanism as its principal function. Instead of one-way data presentation, the website and the offline public engagement approaches were designed for interaction between schools and their stakeholders. The parent leader endorsed this view, noting that she herself used Cek Sekolahku mainly to lodge formal complaints and encouraged other parents to make similar use of the system.
The District Office leader acknowledged that his office did not use data on Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku to make comparisons between schools. Similarly, MoEC personnel at the central level and the House of Representatives member who worked closely on educational policies had not used the information to benchmark schools against national standards.

Principal. Fourteen out of 17 principals claimed that they used the data provided from their schools to perform comparisons with other schools. Eight used the data to conduct year-to-year comparisons, and two used the data to compare their school to a set standard or set of national standards. The other two principals reported that they used the data to compare their school with other schools from the same district, and one school head used the data to compare his/her school with other similar schools.

Five principals found year-to-year comparisons and comparisons with other schools from the same district to be useful. Four principals considered comparison with a set standard was necessary. Two principals believed that only comparisons with schools that shared similar characteristics would be useful. Although the study did not explore which data were being used for comparisons, it can be assumed from the market model approach that principals focus on competing schools in the same district, rather than comparing their school with other schools in districts further away.

Teachers. As mentioned earlier, teachers tended to view both initiatives as tools developed for the public or stakeholders, rather than for their own use. Hence, the usability of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku were associated with the need for parents to obtain school information. For example, a teacher in Bojonegoro said, ‘It is mainly used to control us. Teachers who intend to deviate from the rules must be aware of the public that monitors us through Cek Sekolahku.’ Another teacher stated that it was difficult for a school to spend BOS funds on items not allowed under regulations, because the public monitors their budget: ‘Today, students are very critical, they’d ask us about anything they found unusual’.

Some teachers found that information on the websites actually helped them to remain informed about school problems: ‘Open data will allow not only the public, but also the school community like myself to understand better about this school; because day-to-day activities sometimes do not allow me to know what actually going on in this school…. If we want to improve our school, we need to understand what happens in this school.’

According to groups of teachers and key informants (i.e. district leaders), data from both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku have been transmitted to researchers, as they are deemed ‘useful for university students who are conducting educational research.’ However, neither the teachers nor the district leaders have received feedback or suggestions from the researchers about ways to improve their practices.

Teachers and principals have also used school data, including information on the school budget, to communicate their needs to stakeholders. They argued that once the information was publicly available, it was easier for them to justify requests for additional funds to renovate school facilities, improve programmes, and so on.

One teacher highlighted the importance of tracking student progress from primary through to upper secondary. Such school records would track where a student comes from, how they progress in the school, and which upper secondary school they attend afterwards.

None of the teachers, however, had ever used data on Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku to make systematic comparisons between schools or across years. One teacher admitted, ‘I believe that we need to understand school data, not only outsiders [stakeholders] but we, as insiders of this school, need to understand and use data more effectively for the sake of our school improvement.’ In particular, the teachers cited capacity building as key to using data more effectively.

However, one teacher/vice principal argued that comparisons between schools could produce negative results as well as beneficial outcomes. He argued that teachers, students,
and parents might compare schools without considering student input factors, such as socio-economic background and home and school environments. Before making judgements about the quality of one school versus another, teachers needed to have a discussion about school data comparison: ‘We need to understand why they [other schools] have what they have. For example, a visitor came to our school and asked “why do you have a very good basketball court? Why is it different from the ones in other schools?” So we need to explain to them that we obtain donations from an oil company’s CSR programme.’

Parents. About 90% of parents who were aware of Sekolah Kita (n=198) claimed that they used the data available on the website to make comparisons. The majority (52.7%) compared schools with a set of standards – possibly national standards (see Chapter 2). Others used the data to make year-to-year comparisons (25.3%) and comparisons with schools that share similar characteristics (18.7%).

About 87% of parents who had heard of Cek Sekolahku (n=122) reported that they used the data to make comparisons. Similarly to Sekolah Kita, 59.6% of parents who used Cek Sekolahku made comparisons with certain standards, presumably national standards. About 35% of parents used the data to compare and contrast their children’s schools with other similar schools – a higher proportion than with parents accessing Sekolah Kita. Only a few parents used Cek Sekolahku data to make year-to-year comparisons of schools. This finding corresponds with the main objective of Transparency International Indonesia, the developer of Cek Sekolahku, which is not to make year-to-year comparisons, but to focus on the current performance of the school, particularly in relation to the school budget and resource management.

In the three districts, year-to-year comparisons are the most common type of comparison made by parents for Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku (see Figure 19). In Semarang, however, the majority of the parents used Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku data to compare schools with a set of standards. For example, they compared the school facility against national standards for school facilities and infrastructure (Standar Sarana dan Prasarana Sekolah).

Very few parents in the three districts used data to make comparisons between their children’s school and other schools in the same district.

When asked which additional school comparisons they would find useful, the parents gave various responses (n=304). The majority of them would find comparison with a set standard (31.9%) and year-to-year comparison (26.3%) useful. About 18% preferred to compare schools with other similar schools, and about 12% preferred to make comparisons with other schools from the same district. Such variation may indicate that parents are interested in comparing and contrasting their children’s schools with other schools and with the standards set by MoEC.
Figure 19. Types of school comparisons made by parents based on Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku data (%)

Sekolah Kita

Cek Sekolahku

As explained in Chapter 2, the designs of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku follow the market model of accountability to some extent. When asked if the publication of school data influenced their choice of school, the majority of parents responded affirmatively (about 88% and 85% for parents who accessed Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, respectively). However, the study did not explore which information was most influential for their choice of school.

When asked ‘How else have you made use of school data?’, parents shared similar responses for Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. Their answers focused mainly on teaching and learning processes and included: monitoring their children’s learning, knowing the approaches and methods used by teachers, and knowing how they could help provide better facilities for their children’s learning. Some parents, however, stated that they reviewed the data to help promote the school – ‘to share the information [with the] public, so that they know the good quality of the school’. While most of the responses were similar, some parents who accessed Cek Sekolahku stated that they also used the data to learn about complaints and to see how the schools resolved them.

School Committee. Out of 14 School Committee representatives, six had used Sekolah Kita data to make between-school comparisons, and nine had used Cek Sekolahku. The data were most commonly used to compare schools against a set of national standards. The School Committee also used the data to make year-to-year comparisons of the school. No
Committee had ever used Cek Sekolahku data to make comparisons with other schools from the same district. However, the TIi officer mentioned during the interview that between-school comparisons were not the main aim of Cek Sekolahku and that it was not designed with this purpose in mind.

Eleven Committee representatives agreed that Sekolah Kita data influenced parents in their choice of school for their children, while three participants stated otherwise. Similarly, the majority (nine participants) believed that parents used Cek Sekolahku as a reference when selecting a school for their children.

Only a few School Committee representatives used data from either initiative to make school comparisons. The types of comparison made based on Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku data differed (Figure 20). In Semarang, School Committee representatives made more comparisons using both sets of data, compared to the other two districts. In Bojonegoro, no comparisons were made based on Sekolah Kita data, while only one representative used Cek Sekolahku data to make year-to-year comparisons. Cek Sekolahku officers in Semarang explained that parents in the district were quite active in voicing their opinions and concerns in schools. Perhaps for this reason, the School Committee tends to be more active in Semarang than in the other two districts.

When asked how else the School Committee had made use of school data, some participants responded that data published by either Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku had been used to submit requests to the district and central government to provide or improve school facilities. The Committee had also used the data to advise school management about learning improvements. Some of the participants also stated that school data were sometimes used to inform the public about school successes and student achievements, and to establish a good image of the school.

Students. As stated earlier, the majority of students agreed that information on school facilities was most important to them. Some believed that making school facility data publicly available could increase parental involvement in resolving problems related to lack of good facilities. They stated that it was common for schools to request voluntary contributions from parents to renovate a classroom or to repair or replace learning equipment. Students believed that parents were willing to help when information about the condition of school facilities and equipment were made public. Some added that information about the school budget could also help to increase parental participation. Often, parents were reluctant to contribute because they felt that the school budget should be used to fix the problem. Thus, open school budget data, according to the students, could help parents better understand school needs.

Students also used the facility data to compare and contrast their schools with other schools mostly within the same district. Other between-school comparisons concerned school and student achievements. These comparisons were made for different purposes. Many of the students compared schools to decide where to apply for enrolment. However, some students did not make their selection based on data published formally by the schools, preferring to gather information from teachers, parents, or other family members.

Some students used the data as a motivation to reach achievements attained by their seniors or other schools. Other students conducted comparisons as a basis to request similar facilities from school administrators. Yet, in almost all the FGD sessions some students stated that the comparisons were useful for promoting their schools. Some students had shared positive information about their schools with friends and parents. For example, a student of one school mentioned that extracurricular programmes in her school were very popular. She would therefore share information about the programmes, but not information about the teachers, because data on teachers would have a lesser impact.
When students were introduced to Cek Sekolahku, they found the system very useful, because the complaint mechanism made them feel, to some extent, more comfortable about giving feedback to the school:

Student A: I think the data could become more useful because it [Cek Sekolahku] is like social media for channelling our complaints. Because you know, if we speak up directly, we feel nervous.

Student B: Yes, we’ll be scared when we see our teachers’ faces. It will be better if we can write them down.

Only a few students participating in the study had ever submitted complaint(s) using Cek Sekolahku. Major issues they had complained about related to facilities and equipment, such as lack of restrooms, broken projectors in classrooms, and internet access. Other students stated that they had no complaints and had therefore never used the system.
Some students also did not quite understand how to use Cek Sekolahku to submit complaints. Hence, use of Cek Sekolahku by students was relatively low in all three districts.

### 4.4 Analysis of stakeholder perspectives on the short-term impact of publicly shared information

**Key informants.** Key informants from MoEC and District Offices consistently associated school funding with the submission of Dapodik data to the central government, but did not explain how open data impacted school funding, or how Cek Sekolahku and Sekolah Kita influenced school policy and management. When questioned about the short-term impact of open school data, they stated that the school-based management system allows schools to be independent. They were not fully aware of the ways that open school data influence school programmes and budgets. However, they believed that open school data accompanied by student and parent complaints, submitted through various channels, helped to reduce malpractice in schools.

The journalist shared a similar perspective. She appreciated both the Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku initiatives, but doubted that the public would use them to hold schools accountable. Stakeholders, according to her, might not care about the detailed information shared on Sekolah Kita. Instead, there was a lack of attention and interest among the public in school data. Even those members of the public who expressed interest might have inadequate knowledge to interpret the information. For her, this was the major barrier to using data to influence school policy.

According to the Cek Sekolahku monitoring report, the system was used to monitor enrolment processes in public schools and its complaint system led to the uncovering of illegal levies. The report specified several cases including obligations imposed on parents to buy school uniforms directly from the school, rather from the supplier of their choice, and cases of bribery where children of high-ranking government officials were able to enrol in schools despite not meeting the set criteria. TII stated that these cases had been reported to the District Office, where district leaders would use them as examples to fix the broken system. However, it was unclear whether the District Office would sanction the schools following their misconduct.

The TII officer asserted that in schools where Cek Sekolahku had been implemented, students were more engaged in monitoring school policies and programmes:

> Of course in different schools the impacts are different, and school dynamics affect the implementation as well. But observing the whole process, I am confident to say that students become more aware of their school conditions and more critical in reading information shared by the schools. We also see that the school administrators’ performances become more optimal too, because they are also aware that stakeholders can give input and feedback directly. So we see schools that turn to be more transparent. And we see that the District Offices that have developed collaboration with us, they become more transparent too. So I can say that there’s acceleration in addressing school problems.

In Bojonegoro, the impacts of open school data may be interlinked with the impacts of the open government partnership (OGP) initiated by the Bupati (the regent or mayor). With the OGP in place, every Friday the Bupati holds a town hall meeting where anyone can raise questions, complaints, or requests related to public services, including about education policies. The district leader admitted that the Bupati approach influenced school practices and, in particular, reduced forms of malpractice such as illegal levies and lack of good quality school facilities.

**Principals.** The majority of the principals agreed that most of the school data played a useful role in improving school transparency and accountability (Figure 21). Data on funding resources, for example, were considered very useful by most principals, because
of the close link with corruption issues. Seven principals agreed that data on student repetition and dropout were important; however two principals stated that they were not useful.

Figure 21. Principals’ perspectives on the usefulness of school data for improving transparency and accountability

Teachers. FGD sessions with the teachers indicated that the short-term impact of data publication was unclear. The teachers did not explain how open school data influenced school policies. Some teachers were aware that absence of impact might be due to a power imbalance:

Students are not afraid to file complaints about school facilities through Cek Sekolahku. However, they are still afraid to complain about their teacher’s performance, like when the teacher is absent or other issue. I don’t think I ever heard any complaint about teachers in this school…. I think they are afraid something will harm them if they report a complaint about their teachers, or about other students…. It is the limitation [of this complaint mechanism], and that’s why teacher performance is not quite impacted by Cek Sekolahku.

Another teacher added:

It’s too bad, because if students can give feedback to teachers, it can improve our performance. I don’t see why teacher performance should not be published. If the public know about our performance, even if the performance is not good, I think it is the opportunity for us to find out how to improve our teaching and to change.

Even if open school data had an impact on pedagogy, the impact was not collective but specific to individual teachers. In different FGD sessions, some teachers admitted that Cek Sekolahku influenced their practices, as they felt that students and parents could monitor them and report their actions easily. Although to date no student had reported their practices, they believed that students were not only technology savvy, but were also critical of schools and teachers, and might use Cek Sekolah to criticize them.

Parents. A survey completed by 304 parents in the three districts included several questions relating to the role of school data in highlighting misconduct in schools. Questions covered areas including misuse of resources, teachers registered but not teaching in the school (ghost teachers), and other issues (see Table 9). Over 60% of parents (n=304) agreed that school data published on both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku helped to reveal misconduct. In general, the percentage of parents who believed that data could highlight misconduct was higher for Cek Sekolahku than for Sekolah Kita. This may be due to the format of Cek Sekolahku, which is largely designed for addressing reports and complaints made by parents and students.
Table 9. Parents’ perspectives on the short-term impact of information shared on Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication of school data helps to reveal</th>
<th>Sekolah Kita</th>
<th>Cek Sekolahku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of resources</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to ghost teachers</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to teacher absenteeism</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to misuse of school facilities</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to misuse of school equipment</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to misuse of textbooks</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to low quality of teaching/learning</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To check the parents’ responses about the use of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku for addressing one of the incidents of misconduct in Table 9, researchers observed the sample schools’ webpages on Cek Sekolahku, and found no evidence of complaints made regarding teacher absenteeism. It is therefore very important to validate responses made by parents regarding short-term (and long-term) impacts of the publication of school data. Parents’ responses may reflect their assumptions or espoused theories, rather than real experiences.

School Committee. In general, School Committee representatives agreed that the school data published on both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku were relatively useful (Figure 22). Committee representatives found that the publication of school data on both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku helped to uncover issues related to misconduct in schools that might compromise student performance. Committee representatives also agreed that Sekolah Kita data played a useful role in making schools more transparent and accountable. Perhaps because Sekolah Kita contains more detailed information about school facilities, teachers, and teaching-learning factors, the majority of Committee representatives (85.7%) found that this information could address issues related to misuse of resources, including textbooks (78.6%).

Students. As mentioned earlier, the majority of students prioritized data on facilities, in order to compare and contrast the facilities available in their schools with those of other schools. Some students also used the data to demand better facilities in their schools. One student in Semarang remarked, ‘We know that our school receives BOS funds too, but facilities in
our school [are] not as good as they are in another school. So we ask our teachers and the principal about it'. A similar statement was made by another student in Makassar.

Some of the students noted that after they submitted complaints via Cek Sekolahku, the schools made real efforts to fix the problems:

Student A: We also used text message to request for a digital classroom.
Interviewer: What is digital classroom?
Student B: The classroom with computers, internet connection, and other technology.
Student A: Usually you have such a classroom in upper secondary schools or vocational schools. But now we have it in our school.
Interviewer: After you requested for it?
Students all together: Yes.

Some students were comfortable using Cek Sekolahku or even speaking directly to the school administrators about facilities. As one student noted, when they discovered that a chair was broken, they reported it to the school staff, ‘and then we got it fixed without hassle’.

The majority of students saw little change in teachers’ behaviour and performance following the publication of school data. Some students who made complaints through Cek Sekolahku were certain that their actions would not change their relationships with teachers and the principal. Perhaps, as stated by some teachers, this was because the students’ complaints focused on school facilities and not teacher performance, and as such did not jeopardize teacher–student relations.

4.5 Analysis of stakeholder perspectives on the long-term impact of publicly shared information

Key informants. Based on interviews with key informants, it is apparent that Cek Sekolahku has greater long-term impact on school policies and practices than Sekolah Kita. This may be because Sekolah Kita, as a government initiative, is bound by formal regulations related to sanctions. However, the Central Information Commission (KIP) explained that one of the limitations of the formal policy on the Right to Information is the lack of clarity regarding educational/professional sanctions for schools involved in malpractice. While the study found only limited narratives about Sekolah Kita in this regard, the TII officer stated that Cek Sekolahku might exert a positive influence, thereby helping to decrease malpractice in schools, albeit not in a systematic manner.

According to the TII officer, open school budget data is the most prominent long-term impact of Cek Sekolahku in schools. When it was first implemented, TII and its local facilitators encountered difficulties in encouraging their school partners to publish budget data. However, local District Offices supported the initiative by obliging schools to publish their data, and schools eventually began to display their information both online and offline in schools. As mentioned at the beginning of this report, not all schools in the districts implemented Cek Sekolahku. However, because the District Office supports Cek Sekolahku, the policy on open school budget data is applied to all schools within the jurisdiction, regardless of their engagement in the Cek Sekolahku programme.

The TII officer and local facilitator in Makassar shared a case involving the dismissal of a principal of an upper secondary school (which is not the focus of this study) after Cek Sekolahku was implemented. Although Cek Sekolahku helped to reveal malpractice and corruption cases in schools, the imposition of sanctions on school administrators depended on formal policy. Unfortunately, the formal policy does not specify sanctions for such forms of malpractice. Hence, she found that the district leadership style and leaders’ orientation towards transparency and accountability, especially with regard to enacting policies related to malpractice, affected the impact of Cek Sekolahku.
Another impact shared by the TII officer related to offline approaches to building school and stakeholder capacity in publishing and using open school data. Through overarching approaches of online and offline community participation and capacity building, the TII officer was confident that Cek Sekolahku helped students to become more critical in monitoring school management. She also mentioned that implementation of Cek Sekolahku tended to empower schools with tools that allowed them to demonstrate to the public that they could manage schools in an effective way.

The media have attempted to amplify the impact of open school data and public participation on education and education policies in published reports and articles, as well as through various seminars and teacher workshops initiated by local CSOs and the District Office. The journalist explained that the aim of the newspaper company in publishing daily educational news (although it is not considered popular) is to increase public awareness and participation in education. She pointed out, ‘What we expect is the more people read and are exposed to educational news, the more they become interested in participating in addressing those problems.’

Principals. The survey asked principals to respond to several statements related to the impact of open school data on school management, in particular transparency and accountability. In general, principals tended to agree that the publication of school data improved school transparency and accountability. The majority of the principals agreed/strongly agreed that the publication of school data could change school management and relations between schools and stakeholders by enhancing parent/community participation. One suggestion the principals offered to increase the impact of open school data on transparency, accountability, and the fight against corruption, was to implement a clear policy to strengthen schools’ capacities to undertake follow-up actions. Some principals also posited that parents and local community-based organizations should participate in synergic efforts to ensure that different actors monitored the schools and raised issues that schools need to address.

Teachers. According to some groups of teachers, the real long-term impact of open school data might be the development of trust between the schools and stakeholders. For teachers, trust was very important, however it was not easy to establish when parents had little information about their children’s schools. Once parents were informed about school facilities and the school budget, communication between schools and parents could be established. ‘We want them [parents] to know that we welcome questions and suggestions’, said a teacher. Another teacher added that, to date, some parents were still reluctant to ask about school policies or to submit complaints, yet she was confident that parents would eventually be comfortable discussing them with teachers and principals, and that open data could lead to trust between schools and parents.

Other groups of teachers also discussed how comparing and contrasting their schools could lead to the formation of new programmes. One teacher stated that he learned about an interesting school event from another school webpage on Cek Sekolahku, and was then inspired to create a similar event at his school. In another group, a teacher said that a new extracurricular programme was developed after they found out that another school had run the programme.

The teacher FGD was unable to provide any information about sanctions imposed for unscrupulous activities uncovered by the initiatives. Instead, the teachers suggested that sanctions should be imposed on members of the public or stakeholders who submitted false reports on Cek Sekolahku. They argued that people who held a negative view of the school might humiliate the institution by posting false reports or fake information. The teachers therefore believed that efforts should be made to control public participation, so as to avoid harming the schools.
Parents. Out of 198 parents who accessed Sekolah Kita, 128 (64.6%) took action following the publication of school data on the website. Meanwhile, 80 parents who accessed Cek Sekolahku (about 66%) took action after data were published on Cek Sekolahku (Figure 23). Pressure on school principals, teachers, and District Officers to improve quality of education was the most popular action demanded by parents, followed by improving teacher quality. Less than 60% of parents used the data to pressure education authorities to make better use of funds, and an even smaller proportion demanded action to reduce fund leakage.

As shown in Figure 23, Cek Sekolahku data are more useful than Sekolah Kita data for holding schools accountable. Despite the large amount of information available on Sekolah Kita, not all parents used them to demand changes. Similarly, although it is designed mainly for reducing corruption in schools, some parents have yet to use the Cek Sekolahku website for that purpose.

**Figure 23. Parents' actions following the publication of school data (%)**
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Arguably, from the parents’ perspective, considerable use has been made of school data to demand changes in schools. This finding corresponds with principals’ perspectives regarding the use of open school data. However, this research study has not explored strategies employed by parents or the effectiveness of their actions. Cross-referencing with teachers’ and principals’ perspectives shows that parents’ actions were important and to some extent influenced teachers’ behaviour. For example, teachers admitted that they felt they had to be careful when teaching and awarding punishments in the classroom, because students could report their actions.

School Committee. Nine out of 12 School Committee representatives who were aware of Sekolah Kita reported taking action following the publication of school data. Meanwhile, eight Committee representatives claimed that they took action based on Cek Sekolahku data. Figure 24 shows the percentages of Committee representatives who took action following the publication of data on Sekolah Kita (n=11) or Cek Sekolahku (n=10).
Perhaps because Sekolah Kita contains more detailed information about teachers, including their official status (permanent teachers, civil service teachers, or unofficial/honorary teachers), the Committee representatives perceived it as useful for eradicating ghost teachers. Meanwhile, perhaps because Cek Sekolahku publishes school budget information, Committee representatives were able to use the information more easily to pressure authorities to increase funding or to ask school leaders to make better use of funds.

Students. The student FGD sessions did not provide much information about the long-term impact of open school data. For example, one group shared that some students in their schools were aware that an item in the school budget plan was not handled appropriately. Yet, when asked if anything was done, they admitted that they were afraid to question the matter. Hence, although school data were made publicly accessible through Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku, the impact of the initiative was not apparent, based on the student FGD. Perhaps this was due to lack of student capacity to hold schools accountable. In general, this study found that stakeholders, especially students, were limited in their understanding of how to interpret the data. There were also limitations in terms of perceptions of power. Interviews and FGD sessions with key informants and students revealed that many parents and students were still afraid to file complaints with schools.
4.6 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Information on Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Readability</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
<th>Usability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sekolah Kita</td>
<td>Key informants (of Cek Sekolahku) believe that financial information should be available in Sekolah Kita. Data on school facilities are considered to be very relevant.</td>
<td>Information is easy to read. Guidance on how to interpret and make evaluations about the school should be available for website users.</td>
<td>Key informants (of Cek Sekolahku) have never accessed Sekolah Kita. Media access and use the information. Majority of questionnaire respondents (principals, parents, and School Committee representatives) admitted that they had accessed Sekolah Kita. Most FGD participants (teachers and students) were not familiar with Sekolah Kita.</td>
<td>School facilities are most discussed item by key informants.</td>
<td>Media frequently used the information. Community-based organizations also used the information. Participants used the data to make non-systematic between-school comparisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cek Sekolahku</td>
<td>School budget data, while available, are not considered to be the most important data for most participants.</td>
<td>Information is easy to read. Stakeholders argued that there should be guidance on how to interpret and make evaluations about schools, especially for budget data.</td>
<td>Media had never used the information. Key informants of Sekolah Kita knew Cek Sekolahku, but had never accessed it. Teachers and students were more familiar with Cek Sekolahku than Sekolah Kita.</td>
<td>The school budget is the most discussed item by key informants.</td>
<td>Students used Cek Sekolahku to provide feedback or to submit complaints to schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School data are made publicly available through Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku websites and other offline media, especially through various displays in the schools. Apparently, the need for an internet connection did not prevent the majority of parents and students from accessing either Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku. Although there are many areas in Indonesia where public access and use of the internet is relatively low, internet access did not pose a major problem, perhaps because this study was conducted in three urban areas.25

---

25. According to Statistics Indonesia (2015), about 57% of households in urban areas had access to internet, compared to 26% in rural areas. The three districts included in this study were located in urban areas, increasing the chance that the households (parents and/or children) would have internet access. In 2013, the percentage of people with an internet connection was 32.12% in Makassar and 25% in Semarang (Data & Statistik KOMINFO, n.d.). These percentages were higher than the national average (21.98%) (Statistics Indonesia, 2015). Unfortunately the percentage in Bojonegoro was unknown. The internet connection gap between districts does not influence parents’ access to Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. Based on survey data, there is no significant difference in terms of parents’ access, with 64.6% of parents in Bojonegoro, 63.3% of parents in Makassar, and 71.9% of parents in Semarang aware of Sekolah Kita. The proportion of parents who were aware of Cek Sekolahku in the three districts were not statistically different either, at 38.2%, 45%, and 43.8% in Bojonegoro, Makassar, and Semarang, respectively.
Principals and teachers believed that open school data initiatives are mainly relevant for the public or stakeholders, rather than schools. While information on school financial data (i.e. the budget plan) should theoretically be made accessible to the public to improve transparency and accountability, parents and students (the stakeholders) did not rate this information as equally important as the data on school facilities or learning equipment. Therefore, although some schools did not share their budget data through Cek Sekolahku, parents and students expressed little concern over its absence.

The short-term impacts of open school data on funding, management, and pedagogy are not quite evident (Table 11). While research participants believed that the data could be useful for holding school accountable, it was unclear how they used the information to provide feedback on school policy and practice. Their view seemed to reflect a theory of change, rather than experience. Similarly, the long-term impacts of both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are not quite evident, especially for Sekolah Kita (Table 12). More narratives were forthcoming about the capacity of Cek Sekolahku to influence the decisions and practices of principals and teachers, largely because the main feature of the initiative is complaint management. The first assumption of this study is not quite supported by the findings in this chapter. Open school data initiatives indeed have great potential to improve transparency and accountability in Indonesian lower secondary schools, hold schools accountable, and reduce corruption risks in education. However, only a limited number of research participants could provide evidence for this assumption.

### Table 11. Perspectives on the short-term impact of the initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Impact on funding</th>
<th>Impact on management</th>
<th>Impact of pedagogy</th>
<th>Other short-term impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sekolah Kita</strong></td>
<td>No clear evidence of the impact of the initiative on funding</td>
<td>Students used school facility data to request school facility improvements</td>
<td>No clear evidence of the impact of the initiative on pedagogy</td>
<td>The website was used as a main reference for discussing school improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cek Sekolahku</strong></td>
<td>Some participants stated that open data improved the transparency of the school budget</td>
<td>Principals and teachers were aware that students and parents monitor their practices</td>
<td>Teachers were aware that students and parents monitor their practices</td>
<td>According to key informants, students became more critical in evaluating the school budget and other policies and practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. Perspectives on the long-term impacts of the initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responsibilities better established</th>
<th>Sanctions taken</th>
<th>Anti-corruption policies adopted</th>
<th>Communities better empowered</th>
<th>Other long-term impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sekolah Kita</strong></td>
<td>No clear evidence</td>
<td>No clear evidence</td>
<td>No clear evidence</td>
<td>No clear evidence</td>
<td>No clear evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cek Sekolahku</strong></td>
<td>School principals must respond to and address complaints</td>
<td>There was a case of principal dismissal due to a corruption case</td>
<td>No clear evidence of adoption of a new policy</td>
<td>Some students were confident that they became more empowered</td>
<td>The development of trust between school and parent Schools are empowered with tools that could help to improve transparency and accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This research study is also built on a second assumption that a government-led initiative is less likely than a citizen-led initiative to respond to users’ needs, engage them, and generate real impact. This chapter demonstrates that Cek Sekolahku, the citizen-led initiative, had a greater capacity than Sekolah Kita to empower students and parents to become more engaged in school management. The complaint mechanism, which is central to Cek Sekolahku, to some extent increased the impact of the initiative including by developing a culture of trust and accountability.

Findings related to the accessibility of the open school data somewhat refute the third assumption that all users do not benefit equally from open data initiatives when adequate safeguards are absent. This may be due to the urban setting of this research, as access to internet was not a major challenge, and the majority of parents could access both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. With regard to the Cek Sekolahku initiative, parents’ or students’ identities remain confidential, removing any concerns associated with potential negative consequences of submitting complaints.
5. Conditions of success, limits, and strategies for improvement of the two initiatives

5.1 Stakeholder perspectives on the conditions of success of the initiatives

Key informants. National policy related to the Right to Information (e.g. Law Number 14 Year 2008, Central Commission of Information Regulation Number 1 Year 2010) and open school data underpins the existence of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. In this context, the Central Commission of Information (KIP) was established to help ensure the right to information, including in the education sector. The leader of KIP provided the study with information about policies and regulations concerning open data or transparency, but less detail about accountability, in particular sanctions for schools or individuals involved in malpractice and corruption. Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku benefit from these regulations.

In the Indonesian education sector, schools must submit their data, known as Dapodik, to the central government (MoEC), which then publishes the data. As mentioned in previous chapters, non-submission of data incurs serious consequences, as MoEC withholds BOS funds from schools that do not submit their data. For the Head of PDSPK, such a ‘transactional’ approach has proved successful in making schools pay attention to data. However, unless other approaches are introduced, schools will continue to ‘transact’ data, rather than using them to develop evidence-based improvements and promote accountability in schools. Cek Sekolahku also applies this transactional approach. Reinforcement from the District Office helps local facilitators to push schools to publish their data. The TII officer elaborated further: ‘We need the letter with the District Office logo. With that letter, we know that schools will implement the programme.’

MoEC applies various methods to control the quality of data validity and reliability every semester. Because the data are continuously updated and verified, journalists and NGOs rely more on information published on Sekolah Kita than information from Cek Sekolahku. Because Cek Sekolahku relies greatly on social sanctions, and stakeholders do not demand that schools publish their data or renew them, the quality of information is perhaps compromised. This is the major caveat of Cek Sekolahku.

Key informants were asked to share their opinions regarding the sustainability of the open school data policy. In particular, they were asked whether they thought political dynamics would influence the policy moving forward, or whether a new MoEC leader might replace the open data policy with one that would hinder public access to school data. All key informants were confident that the policy would be sustainable. From their perspective, the alternative would be counterproductive to good governance and would represent a backwards move away from democracy. Another reason they were confident about the sustainability of the policy was the continuing demand for educational data among various actors, both inside and outside the education sector.

In relation to the capacity of schools to produce timely data, MoEC personnel and district leaders asserted that most schools today had access to an internet connection and could submit and renew data at their convenience. Schools that lacked an internet connection

26. This term was used by the Head of PDSPK to represent the deal between schools and the central government (MoEC). The schools exchange their data for BOS and other grant funds from MoEC. According to him, the value of school data is its currency to obtain funds.
should submit data through the District Office. As mentioned in the previous section, every school assigns an operator for this purpose, so there should be no technical issues with data publication.

In terms of non-technical factors, the macro-context can contribute to the success of the initiatives. Bojonegoro, as mentioned in the previous section, has implemented an Open Government Partnership (OGP) initiative that established a solid foundation for both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. District leaders and Cek Sekolahku field officers in Semarang asserted that the OGP engendered a culture of transparency in which the public, including parents, did not hesitate to make demands for information. One district leader also appreciated the approaches used by Cek Sekolahku because they matched the characteristics of Semarang communities:

"Communities in Semarang are very critical; they often shared their ideas, thoughts, and critiques about the school programmes. Thus, their motivation to participate in school management is quite high. We receive critiques many times from different groups of communities. We appreciate criticism, but in my view, they also need to improve their ways to submit their complaints, so that their points can be productive, I mean so that we can get ideas how to solve the problems."

The approach used by Cek Sekolahku is also an important factor in its success. For example, Cek Sekolahku involves students as ‘agents’ who verify complaints addressed to the school. The Cek Sekolahku Monitoring and Evaluation report stated that students were willing to take part in corruption eradication movements in their schools when their peers actively encouraged them to send feedback to the school administrators and teachers. Cek Sekolahku also empowered parents and raised awareness of the need for their participation. At the same time, parents learned the importance of working hand-in-hand with teachers, rather than aggressively criticizing without helping them to find solutions. Local facilitators also mediated and helped to bridge communication between schools and parents.

The effectiveness of the Cek Sekolahku programme, according to the Monitoring and Evaluation report, was also influenced by the schools’ adoption of other programmes. For example, some schools competed for the Adiwiyata Schools award, established by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Republic of Indonesia to encourage schools to raise awareness and undertake efforts to promote sustainable development. One of the criteria for an Adiwiyata school is school community participation and openness. Hence, Cek Sekolahku was used to encourage participation in the Adiwiyata Schools programme.

From the perspective of media outlets that use open school data, public interest in education information is a key factor in promoting school accountability. In general, news and articles about education are less popular than those about politics and economics. To increase public awareness and interest, the media should consistently inform the public about educational issues, rather than publishing occasional reports and following trends.

Key informants representing Cek Sekolahku as well as Sekolah Kita agreed that principals play a key role in the success of the initiative. ‘When the principals are reformist’, the TII officer said, ‘it will be very helpful for running the programme.’ Reform-oriented principals, according to her, are committed to making differences, and recognize that their authority and power provide them with an opportunity to improve the quality of their schools. Having worked closely with schools, the TII officer argued that the number of principals with such characteristics was increasing, although she could not provide definite data about numbers.

Principals. When asked the question, ‘In your experience, what factors affect the effectiveness of open school data?’ (n=17), principals highly valued the school’s capacity to produce accurate and timely data, and the capacity of stakeholders to access, understand, and act upon the information they received (see Figure 25). A smaller number, however,
stated that the capacities of parents and communities to act upon information were also important in using open school data to make schools more transparent and accountable.

**Figure 25.** Principals’ perspectives on factors affecting the effectiveness of open school data

According to the principals, initiatives to teach principals and teachers how to use open school data existed in 11 schools (about 65% of the schools), but such activities were absent in the other six schools. Out of the 11 schools, only six principals reported that such initiatives were available for parents, indicating that the majority of the schools lacked capacity-building programmes to teach them how to use data. Training sessions for principals, teachers, or parents, according to seven principals, were ‘very useful’. The other seven principals stated that they were ‘quite useful’, while the remaining three principals found the training ‘not very useful’.

In addition, school administrators need to generate awareness of open school data, in order to make them an effective means to increase transparency and accountability. Sixteen out of 17 principals claimed that they participated in activities to generate awareness of open school data. They also stated that the teachers and parents in their schools participated in activities to generate awareness of open school data. When the principals were asked if they found those awareness activities to be useful, however, only seven found them ‘very useful’, another seven said they were ‘quite useful’, and the rest admitted that they were ‘not very useful’.

The principals were asked if they had any suggestions to improve efforts to generate awareness of open school data (e.g. data displays, meetings with parents, seminars, etc.). The most common response related to the use of multiple media to promote information, such as promoting websites, producing brochures and letters, and undertaking other approaches to ensure the data would remain accessible to all parents and communities. One principal responded that introducing data to teachers and parents should begin with simple ideas on why and how data could be useful for them, and what would be the benefit to their children. In this way, stakeholders would be more motivated to learn more and to raise awareness of open school data.

When the principals were asked to suggest ways to teach school communities how to use open school data, the major theme of the responses related to training. One of them

---

27. The principals did not specify the kind of training sessions, the duration, or the providers. They mentioned that the training sessions related mainly to school-based management and leadership, and were provided by MoEC and also by TII in relation to the Cek Sekolahku initiative (there were no similar training sessions designed for Sekolah Kita). The training sessions were not a continuous series of workshops or seminars, and were conducted only once per semester or per year.
wrote that workshops or training sessions on how to effectively publish data, and how to
design school programmes that applied the principles of transparency and accountability,
were necessary for school administrators and teachers. Others suggested training
sessions that allowed teachers to interact with parents and communities. Some principals
also highlighted the need for continuous learning opportunities that would allow them
to understand the link between transparency, accountability, and school improvement.

All in all, the 17 principals tended to agree on the need to build capacities to improve
school transparency and accountability, and highlighted training sessions or workshops
as the most common strategy to achieve this end. They expected the government or civil
society organizations such as TII to provide the training and to help increase parent and
community awareness about open school data. They did not mention whether or not they
would develop and/or lead any school-based initiatives themselves to increase school
transparency and accountability.

Teachers. As mentioned earlier, some schools are competing for the Adiwiyata Award.
Among the criteria for the award are parent and community participation and open school
data or transparency. The teachers admitted that this goal fosters the initiative to publish
school data and implement Cek Sekolahku.

Other than the aspiration to win the Adiwiyata Award, some teachers also noted that their
school’s decision to publish data was conditioned by parents’ willingness to participate
in school programmes. A group of teachers in Semarang argued that when parents were
critical of school policies and programmes, sharing data with them helped to increase their
understanding and trust in the school. A teacher in Bojonegoro also stated that sharing
information with parents helped teachers to establish trust, although many parents
remained unaware of the importance of building trust through open data.

From the teachers’ perspective, national policies related to Dapodik, BOS, and the
teacher certification allowance are major factors influencing the accuracy of school data
published on Sekolah Kita. The teachers admitted that if the open school data policy was
not linked to funding policies, efforts to publish school data would not receive the same
level of response. Some teachers argued that the open school data initiatives were not
very effective, and that the main contributory factor was lack of clear consequence or
sanctions for individuals involved in malpractice. This statement corresponded with of the
opinion of the Head of PDSPK, who doubted that open school data would lead to school
accountability, because schools were concerned only with publishing the data required by
the central government, and did not really use the information to improve schools.

Parents. Over half of the parents who participated in this study (n=304) agreed that the
capacity to produce accurate and timely data would affect the effectiveness of open school
data. In addition, 53.6% of the parents also agreed that accessibility of data affected the
overall effectiveness of open school data (see Figure 26). Although the framework for this
research is based on the supposition that the capacity of schools and parents to act upon
information is vital to its effectiveness, less than 50% of the parents shared the same view.

Supports including, but not limited to, training and workshops are needed to increase
parents’ awareness of and capacity to use school data. About 52% of parents reported
that they had participated in activities to inform them about open school data. Out of this
proportion, 86 parents, or about 54%, were ‘greatly encouraged’ by the ability to access
school data, 37.1% were ‘somewhat encouraged’, and the others were ‘not encouraged’.

The above initiatives to raise awareness of school data are most likely not followed by
capacity-building efforts to use the data. Out of the 304 parents who participated in this
study, only 35.9% had participated in training activities to help them use open school data.
The training sessions, according to 88% of the parents who attended them, ‘somewhat’ to
‘greatly’ helped them to use school data. When parents were asked what type of support
would help them make better use of the data, their suggestions included improving parent-teacher communication through regular meetings and offline and online forums. They also suggested that the design of the websites and the terminology used on the report cards could be made more user friendly for parents. If designed carefully, the presentation of data on the report cards could also help build their understanding of the meaning of the information and how to use it to make informed decisions.

**Figure 26. Parents’ perspectives on factors affecting the effectiveness of open school data**

![Bar chart showing parents' perspectives on factors affecting the effectiveness of open school data: Capacity to produce accurate and timely data: 56%, Comprehensibility of data: 52%, Accessibility of data: 54%, Capacity of the school to act upon information: 36%, Capacity of parents and communities to act upon information: 43%.]

School Committee. The majority of School Committee representatives agreed that accessibility of data was a key factor affecting the effectiveness of open school data (Figure 27). School capacity to produce accurate and timely data and to act upon the information were also important factors. Even though the market model of accountability relies in this case on parents’ ability to choose or select schools, only five Committee representatives considered parents’ and communities’ capacity to act upon information to be an important factor.

**Figure 27. School Committee representatives’ perspectives on factors affecting the effectiveness of open school data**

![Bar chart showing School Committee representatives' perspectives on factors affecting the effectiveness of open school data: Capacity to produce accurate and timely data: 71.43%, Comprehensibility of data: 64.29%, Accessibility of data: 78.57%, Capacity of the school to act upon information: 50%, Capacity of parents and communities to act upon information: 35.71%.]

All 14 School Committee representatives had already participated in activities (such as training courses and seminars) to generate awareness of open school data, and 13 of them were ‘somewhat’ to ‘strongly’ agreed that in the training and seminars they were
encouraged to access school data. Ten of the Committee representatives also participated in training activities to help the Committee use open school data, and nine agreed that the training played a significant role in this regard. Some Committee representatives expected better quality training, while others suggested that instead of a single discontinuous training session, a series of learning sessions and opportunities to meet and discuss the use of open school data would provide a better introduction.

**Students.** Access to information through online platforms is the main factor cited by students as affecting the effectiveness of open school data. The students argued that technology had fostered the open school data initiative, and that although schools also published information in the school environment, the ability to access and share information through various social media was very important. Other students also mentioned that the publication of data online allowed more people to monitor schools, including alumni.

Another important factor cited by the students was openness to criticism. Such an environment made them feel more comfortable about using the data to ask school administrators and teachers about school facilities and learning equipment. As one student in Semarang said, ‘Perhaps the data on the website wouldn’t be useful at all, if we don’t believe that the principal and the teachers welcome our opinion’.

Some of the students who participated in the FGD sessions also played an active role in school student body organizations, and attended training sessions and seminars about open school data held by Cek Sekolahku.28 They believed the training helped them not only to learn how to use data to improve their school, but also to be more confident in giving feedback based on the data to school administrators. However, many other students had never attended a capacity-building session.

### 5.2 Stakeholder perspectives on the limits and risks of the initiatives

**Key informants.** A central theme that emerges in discussions about the limits of open school data to improve school accountability is the existence of power imbalances. The TII officer stated that many parents and students were still afraid to report complaints through Cek Sekolahku, even though they had been assured that their identities would remain confidential. The TII officer also emphasized that complaints by students or parents about teacher performance could harm teachers or schools if the public became aware of the identities of the individuals involved. Confidentiality and anonymity were therefore among the main principles explained to school communities during the workshops. The FGD with students revealed similar issues which are reported in the student section.

Cultural perceptions may also to some extent limit the effectiveness of the two initiatives. The district leader explained:

> We are Javanese. We do want to be open, but we don't want to cross the line and be impolite. Transparency and accountability should take into account the culture factor. Accountability in Western culture is different from that in Javanese culture.... For Javanese people, feeling is important and their feeling will be the basis for taking or not taking actions, and that is the main difference between Western culture and ours.

When asked if publicly sharing school budget data would violate the cultural code, he disagreed. Sharing the information was acceptable, but it was important to understand that the public might decide not to enquire further because they thought it would be impolite.

---

28. The majority of the students who participated in this study were selected by their teachers. According to the teachers, they were relatively high achievers and active students who could provide more accurate information about the schools, scholastic programmes, and so on.
There was a shared perspective among the key informants that none of the data currently published through either Sekolah Kita or Cek Sekolahku involved serious risks and should remain private. Equally, none of the information on the websites violated the law. Individual student and teacher data were not publicly displayed and student names were not available on the websites. The leader of the Central Commission of Information (KIP) said: ‘I believe there is very minimum risk, if any, for any institution including schools, to open their data. Sometimes they (the schools) say, “we are afraid the public will misuse the information”, but actually the risk is only in their imagination. They worry too much about open data, they worry it would harm them’.

When district leaders were asked if the websites should refrain from publishing any information, their responses echoed the ‘imagined risks’ mentioned by the KPI leader. Some information should remained unpublished, according to them, but when asked to specify which information, they could not answer or explain the potential risks of publication.

The TII officer elaborated on the dilemma of publishing school budget data in too much or too little detail. Some parents might not understand the information if it was presented in too much detail and used unfamiliar terminology; however, if the information was too brief, people might not be able to detect problems or unreasonable spending.

**Principals.** Eleven out of 17 principals believed that some school data should not be published, while six held the opposing view. For the principals, individual-level data (i.e. information on individual students and teachers), such as teacher/staff performance appraisals, should not be made publicly available. Other principals argued that information on the school budget should only be presented in general terms, because overly detailed information might lead to misunderstandings. One principal stated that information that highlighted the limitations of schools should be available internally (administrators and teachers), but should not be made public. The reasoning behind this position was not explained, but it is presumably related to market mechanisms in which data publication is linked to school promotion.

Twelve principals believed that the publication of school data involved risks for schools. Six principals believed that access to school data could provide parents with more criteria when choosing schools, and could lead them to enrol their children in another school. Five principals agreed that open school data could highlight inequalities between schools. Six principals also worried that open data could create tensions between school authorities and parents/communities. However, only one principal worried that open data would cause frustration for parents and the community if they lacked the capacity to act on the information.

**Teachers.** A numbers of teachers mentioned that open school data could be detrimental to their reputation, especially when published on Cek Sekolahku. Some teachers agreed that multiple complaints lodged against a school could reflect poorly on them as teachers and harm their reputation. Reputation is considered of great importance in the Indonesian school system, especially because of the market model. Hence, both teachers and students maintained that schools should only publish data that could not cause them harm. However, they could not specify which data should not be published. Instead, they admitted that the open school data initiatives had not, so far, provoked any negative impacts in their careers.

The theme of power imbalance also emerged in teacher FGD sessions. One teacher noticed that students rarely, if ever, complained about teaching staff. She knew that students lodged complaints about school facilities and learning equipment, but had never heard of a student complain against a teacher. She identified this as a limitation of the initiatives, stating that teachers would not receive the feedback from students necessary to improve teacher practice until the students believed that teachers welcomed their criticism.
Parents. About 126, or 42%, parents agreed that there were risks inherent in the publication of school data; the remainder (178 parents) did not perceive any risks. The types of risks mentioned are shown in Figure 28. Among the parents who perceived risks, the majority highlighted possible risks related to market competition including the risk of parents choosing to enrol their child in another school (35.7%) and the risk of highlighting inequalities between schools (25.4%). The 3.2% of parents who selected ‘other’ raised similar concerns – that the school’s image would be compromised by the data and that the ability to compare and contrast schools would lead to growing demands from parents. Hence, the majority of parents’ concerns about open school data relate to school choice.

The pattern of parents’ responses resembled that of the principals. The majority of those who perceived risks in publishing school data linked them to the possibility of parents choosing to enrol their children in other schools, as a result of having more information about different school options. The parent leader in Semarang, however, mentioned that while parents with more resources could enrol their children in other schools, others from lower socio-economic status (SES) had more limited choices in terms of selecting schools for their children. Hence, her statement indicates the elite capture of the school report cards in which the information may be more useful for parents with higher SES but not as useful for others.

School Committee. Eight of the School Committee representatives (n=14) agreed that some data should not be published. Some believed that schools should not publish individual information that is not aggregated at the school level; however, neither Cek Sekolahku nor Sekolah Kita publish individual student data. One representative stated that data that could harm the image of a school should not be published, implying that open school data should be limited to promoting schools in the market place. The risk of parents choosing to enrol their child in another school relates directly to the market model of accountability, and was the most popular identified risk among the nine representatives who believed that open data could cause risks.

None of the Committee representatives highlighted ‘frustration on behalf of parents/community who lack the capacity to act upon information’ as a possible risk of open school data (Figure 29). One possible explanation is that the Committee, which consists mainly of parents and school personnel, might assume that the statement was not relevant. Theoretically, parents and communities can channel their complaints or suggestions through the Committee to school management. However, the Committee might not be aware that ‘capacity’ requires not only a channel or access, but also the cognitive ability to understand how to interpret the data presented on school report cards.
Students. The responses of students regarding the risks of open school data matched those of teachers. When asked if data that could potentially have a negative impact on the school reputation should be published, students responded in unison: ‘No, they should not be publicly known’. However, they could not explain which data or what kind of information might harm the school’s image. It was apparent, though, that they were concerned for the school’s reputation.

Some students argued that information related to students’ socio-economic backgrounds should not be published, as they did not consider it relevant to learning. Others believed that the publication of such data would cause more harm than good, because highlighting their SES might harm self-confidence especially for students from lower SES families.

As mentioned earlier, some students shared a common narrative that power imbalances might hinder school accountability. Some doubted that teachers and principals would be interested in hearing their views because of their status as students and the fact that they were just teenagers. Others argued that it would be better if adults (parents and teachers) resolved problems in schools. They preferred to inform their parents of any issues and ask them to talk with the teachers. However, a small number of students were confident that they could discuss school problems with their teachers in order to address them.

5.3 Stakeholder perspectives on strategies to improve the impact of the initiatives

Key informants. The strategy most key informants mentioned as crucial to improving the impact of the initiatives was the need to enhance school administrators’ and teachers’ awareness of the core principles of open school data and the public right to information. The district leader of Bojonegoro found that schools published their budget information in the school environment for only about a week and then removed it. The reason for this approach, according to the district leader, was not because they were attempting to hide the information, but because they were following the rule without comprehending the underlying rationale. The TII officer also stated that school leaders working with the initiatives needed to see the bigger picture and be aware of their roles in reforming school policies and practices.

Along these lines, key informants also agreed on the need for a policy or regulation that not only pushes schools to submit their data, but imposes financial consequences if they fail to do so. Conversely, there is also a need for formal regulation or actions that promote positive reinforcement, such as an award for schools that consistently promote transparency and accountability. The informants also recommended putting in place sanctions for malpractice or misconduct by individuals or institutions that violate
the public right to information. The majority also suggested that educational leaders at national and local levels should set rules and regulations to hold schools accountable. Furthermore, the informants were aware that lack of substantial follow-up on parents’ and other stakeholders’ complaints could decrease interest and participation in school accountability efforts. In response to questions about the ambiguity of sanctions, one district leader explained that he needed to resort to religious values to reinforce clean and open governance in schools: ‘I found a principal came very late to his school, around 9 or 10. He didn’t violate any rule, he signed in. Because according to the law, he just needs to sign in and the rule didn’t say what time you should sign in. So I couldn’t do anything about it, but I could tell him that the Almighty saw his behaviour.’

In other words, while it is necessary to build school leaders’ awareness, the key informants agreed that formal regulation should be in place to reinforce and guide implementation of the initiatives.

Key informants from MoEC also highlighted a strategy that could improve the impact of open school data and increase data usability. They suggested integrating Dapodik data with other information, such as health and social welfare data, to provide people with an overview of children’s growth and development. In addition, they suggested that professional development programmes for school administrators include training on how to conduct simple statistical procedures and make evidence-based decisions in schools. The parent leader shared a similar point regarding capacity building. She believed that parents needed help to build their understanding of the use of data and how to properly monitor the school budget. Based on these responses, key informants believed that capacity building is the main strategy to increase the impact of open school data initiatives.

Some key informants also discussed the need to make Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku more accessible to a wider public. Key informants in MoEC admitted that Sekolah Kita had not been presented to the general public. Policies regarding the right to information had been introduced to district leaders at province and municipal levels, but not directly to parents, students, and the community in general. MoEC had used online social media to inform the public that they could access data and request information, but had not made specific mention of Sekolah Kita. The journalist suggested that school leaders and teachers should use the websites as reference points on a frequent basis, in order to develop public awareness of the initiatives. To attract a wider public, the website designs should also be improved and the language made simpler to facilitate public understanding of the information.

To improve the impact of the initiative, the Sekolah Kita officer argued that the main issue was not data quality or lack of data; instead, the website should encourage users to use the data interactively to evaluate school performances using national standards as a benchmark. Accordingly, users would read data about school facilities, then could compare them with national standards. He wanted Sekolah Kita to help schools and stakeholders understand how far their schools deviate from national standards.

Principals. Some of the principals who participated in this study stated that capacity-building training and seminars for school administrators, teachers, and staff, as well as parents and communities, were vital and should form the heart of strategies to improve the impact of open school data. According to one principal, without capacity building to help communities make use of the data, the initiatives could result in negative impacts, such as unnecessary tension between teachers and parents. In this regard, another principal underlined the strategic importance of building positive and collaborative relations between the school, parents, and the community, so as to ensure that data are used effectively to improve the quality of learning, rather than apportion blame.
Teachers. Groups of teachers also shared similar perspectives regarding the importance of capacity building. They argued that this was necessary for students, parents, community members, and themselves, in order to improve the skills needed to review data and report complaints. One teacher had attended a writing workshop held by a media corporation, but underlined the need for continuous improvement rather than single workshops without follow-up. Overall, the teachers agreed on the need for continuous capacity development in school communities to enable stakeholders to use data effectively.

The teachers also suggested that District Offices and TII increase the number of visitors to the Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku websites, by working with local radio or TV stations to promote the initiatives. They further suggested that publishing school programmes and other policies on the websites would increase usage by stakeholders. For example, if information about student enrolment was published on the websites, parents and other stakeholders would visit more often and for purposes other than monitoring the school budget and other policies.

Teachers also agreed with other stakeholders that feedback from communities should be responded to more effectively. Parents and students needed to know that their voices mattered and that schools welcomed their feedback. The teachers believed that such gestures could help build trust between schools and parents. They also agreed that improving school transparency and accountability requires non-technical solutions including building positive communication between schools and parents.

Both teachers and students raised the issue of the schools’ ability to maintain Cek Sekolahku. One teacher said: ‘In the beginning of CSK, it was very good; agents were very active in promoting school transparency and managing feedback to the school. But later it didn't run as active as before, because soon after the agents graduated from this school, the successors did not comprehend the goals the way their predecessors did, and they may not be as motivated as the first generation of CSK agents.’ They argued that strategies needed to be in place to ensure the sustainability of the Cek Sekolahku programme, and they expected civil society organizations to keep working with schools for this purpose.

Parents. Improving parent and community engagement in school activities and decision-making was the most popular theme among parents’ suggestions regarding strategies to enhance the impact of open school data on transparency, accountability, and the fight against corruption. One parent wrote that teachers and school leaders needed to be more open when explaining the school budget during meetings, so as to help parents understand the challenges the school faced. Another parent suggested that communication, coordination, and collaboration with parents should be improved, while other parents suggested scheduling more regular parent-teacher meetings, as parents had ideas and suggestions that might help the school.

While most parents provided suggestions to improve the impact of open data on school transparency and accountability, a few parents shared contrasting opinions. One parent said that she would like to focus on their children’s learning process, rather than other areas. Another parent wrote: ‘What parents need, and what school must do, is to fulfil our children’s needs so that they will be smart and [academically] successful. Fighting against corruption should be the task of others who have the responsibility in that area, not our task, and we should not meddle with it.’

School Committee. School Committee representatives offered several suggestions to improve the impact of open school data on transparency, accountability, and the fight against corruption. One focused on capacity building, including a series of training sessions and workshops for both school personnel and stakeholders. Two Committee representatives raised the theme of capacity building, in particular the ability of stakeholders to access/understand the data. The other two Committee representatives
suggested that school leaders and teachers should be more open to criticism, and that schools should respond to complaints and critics in a professional manner. Another participant highlighted the issue of data quality, and suggested that higher education institutions or NGOs should be involved in monitoring transparency and accountability in schools. Finally, a participant wrote that although openness or transparency is important, the most critical issue for schools to address is school facilities, because this is the primary factor cited by parents when selecting schools for their children.

**Students.** Students also suggested that school data should be presented in more interesting ways to attract students’ attention and to stimulate their critical thinking in reviewing school policies and programmes. They were also aware that their ability to evaluate the school budgets or other data was mainly influenced by their capacity to understanding the information. Therefore, they suggested that training sessions or seminars should be made available for all students, not just student leaders. They also recommended that the role of students in improving school transparency and accountability be introduced during the first week of school.
6. Conclusion

Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku were introduced less than five years ago. Prior to the initiatives, no national-level school report cards were available online. The initiatives were developed as a strategy to increase the quality of school-based management through participation. The Right to Information Law, which was introduced in 2008, is among the central policies underpinning the initiatives. Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku use online platforms to publish school report cards and to enable interaction between schools and stakeholders. The principal difference between them is the initiating body: Sekolah Kita was developed by a unit called PDSPK within the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC), and Cek Sekolahku was developed and is operated by a civil society organization, namely Transparency International Indonesia (TII).

This case study research was undertaken to compare and contrast the aforementioned initiatives and to draw lessons from government-led (i.e. Sekolah Kita) and citizen-led (i.e. Cek Sekolahku) school report cards. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected from 17 lower secondary schools (SMP) in the three districts of Semarang, Makassar, and Bojonegoro. The case study attempted to test three assumptions.

The first assumption is that open data initiatives are powerful tools able to improve transparency in Indonesian lower secondary schools, hold schools accountable and reduce corruption risks in education. Both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are designed in accordance with this assumption, and are available online to allow anyone with an internet connection to access the information they publish.

Transparency or the release of information about schools will not be effective unless stakeholders, especially students and parents, who are the main audience for school report cards, are aware of and able to access the information. This study shows that a large number of stakeholders are not aware of the initiatives. Some participants in the study know about one initiative, and only about 35% of parent respondents knew of both. Knowledge about them may be limited among teachers and students owing to the relative youth of the initiatives. Therefore, unless Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku are presented to the public on a more frequent basis, the open school data they publish are unlikely to lead to any improvements in schools.

Improving transparency requires good quality data. Sekolah Kita is updated at least once per semester in accordance with Dapodik and BOS regulations. Non-submission of Dapodik data to the central government (which are subsequently published on Sekolah Kita) can have a detrimental impact on the school budget. This form of negative reinforcement encourages schools to regularly provide updated data, and has increased the accuracy of the information on Sekolah Kita. Such policies do not apply to Cek Sekolahku and, as a result, some of the information on the website is not current. Hence, although the data are available to the public, the quality of the information may undermine efforts to improve school transparency and accountability.

By design, Cek Sekolahku focuses on corruption eradication in school institutions. The website contains school budget plan data (known as RKAS or School Activity and Budget Plans), which are not published on Sekolah Kita. Based on the availability of this information alone, Cek Sekolahku has a greater potential to reduce corruption risks in schools.29 Complaint handling is also a central feature of Cek Sekolahku. Students and parents, and even teachers, are encouraged to file complaints via emails, text messages,

---

29. However, the study found that parents and students do not consider school financial data to be the most important and useful information. Students are more interested in data on school facilities and learning equipment. Stakeholders’ perspectives about the relevancy and usability of school financial data therefore contrast with TII’s theory of action.
the website, or mobile applications. This function was designed to encourage the public to participate in holding schools accountable.

Transparency International Indonesia (TII), the civil society organization behind Cek Sekolahku, not only developed the platform for Cek Sekolahku, but also builds and reinforces teacher, student, and parent capacities to use the complaint-handling system through workshops and consultation sessions. Such offline approaches for capacity building are not available through the Sekolah Kita programme, although its design does also allow users to submit feedback or complaints to a school through a comment section on the website.

This feedback menu is not the main function of Sekolah Kita, however. Instead, the website seems designed to provide information to the public, rather than explicitly encourage users to use the information as a basis for providing feedback to schools. Moreover, unlike Cek Sekolahku schools are not required to respond to comments on Sekolah Kita. MoEC has never formally encouraged the public to use data on the site to improve school accountability. Based on the findings, it can therefore be concluded that although the quality of data on Sekolah Kita is better than on Cek Sekolahku, the design of the Cek Sekolahku initiative (online and offline) is more effective at increasing public participation and school accountability than Sekolah Kita.

The first assumption distinguishes transparency from accountability. This research confirms that transparency does not necessarily lead to school accountability. To increase school accountability, stakeholders need the competency or capacity to use data and to provide feedback to schools. Through surveys and interviews, participants in this research constantly mentioned the need for capacity building. While it is important to help stakeholders understand and become skilled in using data, capacity is more than cognitive ability; it also concerns the power dynamic between students and teachers or school administrators.

In addition to capacity, another major obstacle to improving school accountability is the lack of formal consequences or sanctions for instances of misconduct or malpractice revealed by data or reported by stakeholders. The absence of clear consequences can decrease stakeholders’ motivation to participate in school accountability efforts. One group of teachers even mentioned that the absence of follow-up and lack of sanctions for teachers or administrators involved in malpractice could cause frustration among teachers and stakeholders, owing to the lack of visible results from their participation in efforts to improve school accountability. It can therefore be argued that unless the impact of stakeholders’ participation is apparent, transparency will not lead to accountability in the management of the education system.

One important question in relation to formal consequences is: ‘Who should hold schools and any personnel involved in malpractice accountable?’ Put differently, which accountability model is most effective?

The market model of accountability apparently plays an active role in both Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku. This model is arguably influenced by the longstanding tradition of school choice in Indonesia. This research, however, shows that awareness of the significant role of data in market competition does not lead to improvement in accountability. Instead, it can lead to a decrease in transparency. Participants in this study firmly believed that information that could harm a school’s reputation should not be published, to avoid parents sending their children to other schools.

Cek Sekolahku, however, emphasizes the public participation model of accountability, especially in relation to its complaint-handling mechanism. This model has great potential to improve accountability in school-based management. Individual schools are empowered and have greater independence to manage their programmes. This research
demonstrates that the public participation model in schools is effective, on condition that stakeholders are aware of their role in holding schools accountable, that the school leadership shares common goals of transparency and accountability in education, that the District Office supports the implementation of Cek Sekolahku, and that the initiative is integrated into school policies and practices.

As the two initiatives were implemented relatively recently, it may be too early to confidently argue that one initiative is better than the other. However, from the designs and based on early adoption of the initiatives, Cek Sekolahku has more potential than Sekolah Kita to improve transparency and accountability in school management. Cek Sekolahku has a more comprehensive framework designed to develop participation for school accountability, whereas Sekolah Kita relies heavily on public willingness to access and use information without any outreach. One of the lessons learned from this study is that school transparency – or making information about schools publicly available – is only the first step towards effective school governance. Once the data are published, school personnel and stakeholders have to be able to use the information to improve school accountability. Effort is required to build the capacity to use the data effectively, and in the case of Sekolah Kita, this kind of effort is absent.

The second assumption is that Sekolah Kita, a government-led initiative, is less likely than Cek Sekolahku, a citizen-led initiative, to respond to users’ needs, engage them, and generate real impact, as the former is often more supply- than demand-driven. To some extent, the research confirms this assumption.

As mentioned earlier, Cek Sekolahku encourages, and in fact depends on, stakeholder participation in school monitoring and evaluation. Even though school communities, including parents, students, and teachers, need to improve their capacity to use data, Cek Sekolahku has more flexibility in terms of implementation. Such flexibility is more difficult for Sekolah Kita because of its strict bureaucratic framework. MoEC personnel who participated as key informants in this research admitted that they cannot reach out to schools and the public, because this authority and responsibility falls under other units in MoEC. Although individuals in PDSPK have a strong commitment to improving data-driven decision-making processes in education, they must depend on District Officers to promote the use of data among school principals and teachers.

Another consequence of this red tape is policy competition at the school level. Participants at school and national levels cannot see that the policy of open school data for accountability is interrelated with other policies. Instead, they see school transparency and accountability as another regulation competing with policies such as teacher quality and curriculum. Thus, the open school data initiative is not considered to be a priority.

Cek Sekolahku, as a citizen-led initiative, therefore has a greater capacity to respond to schools’ and stakeholders’ needs, and to engage them in school accountability efforts. Nonetheless, it should be noted that government support is critical to improving implementation of the initiative. Without the endorsement and reinforcement of district leaders, it would be very difficult for TII and its local facilitators to encourage schools to publish their data and to welcome community participation in school management.

The third assumption is that all users do not benefit equally from open data initiatives. In the absence of adequate safeguards, such initiatives can enhance inequalities and result in ‘elite capture of information’. This research, unfortunately, cannot establish a firm conclusion regarding this assumption. The main reason is that the initiatives have been implemented only recently and issues relating to inequality are not yet apparent.

It was hypothesized that inequality in accessing and subsequently using data would occur owing to the need for an internet connection to access both initiatives. However, the survey data did not support this hypothesis, because no significant gap in access to
school data was found to exist between districts and parents. This may be because the research focused on communities in relatively urban areas, where internet connections are easy to access. Teachers and students also confirmed that they and many parents had access to mobile phone technology. Cek Sekolahku had anticipated potential problems in this regard by allowing stakeholders to use multiple means to submit complaints to schools, including online and offline methods. Sekolah Kita, on the other hand, can only be accessed online.

There is, however, a potential unequal benefit of open school data when market mechanisms or school choice maintained. Middle- and upper-middle-class parents have more resources to send their children to better-performing schools, despite the potentially higher cost, and can use open school data to aid school selection. However, parents with a lower socio-economic status have more limited options, even though they may be aware of the quality of different schools from the information on school report cards.

Another problem related to inequality that was actually mentioned by student participants is the potential benefits of open school data for school marketing. Some students were concerned that open school data would only benefit better-performing schools, because they can share more achievements and therefore attract more student applicants. Meanwhile, publishing data could exacerbate poor performance and undermine public trust in underperforming schools. However, the research found no empirical evidence for these two potential issues.

**Main recommendations.** This report contains a number of suggestions proposed by participants to improve implementation of Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku (see Chapter 5). To reiterate, the central issue that education administrators, managers, and planners should prioritize is capacity building. Capacity-building efforts should target whole school communities including principals, teachers, parents, School Committee representatives, and students, in order to support their efforts to help improve school transparency and accountability.

Transparency efforts should be integrated into strategies or blueprints for school improvement efforts, rather than being viewed as a separate programme. A commitment to school transparency and accountability also requires paradigm and cultural shifts. While knowledge is important, capacity building for education actors in Indonesia should not be reduced to knowledge and skills transfers from experts to individual actors. Instead, positive relationships among actors should be developed in order to build the relational trust necessary for productive school improvement efforts (Bryk and Schneider, 2002). Continuous capacity-building programmes are also inevitable, which means that Sekolah Kita and Cek Sekolahku should not be seen as finite projects, but rather as longer-term initiatives to be continued by schools.

School report cards should be more than a formality required under national regulation. They should be the main point of reference for schools and the public to evaluate school performance and plan for improvements. Therefore, policy-makers and education managers and planners should be able to display and communicate a clear theory of change in which school report card initiatives are included and interlinked with other initiatives and reform efforts. Where available, the public should also be able to see how school report cards and school accountability efforts contribute to quality learning outcomes. Educators and stakeholders should also view school report cards as a catalyst for change, rather than as a policy competing with other education policies.

One recommendation for MoEC, as the initiator of Sekolah Kita, is to reformulate school report cards to allow parents and the public to focus on important aspects of schools. ‘The more, the better’ is not an effective principle in this context. Although this study shows that the majority of parents could understand the information displayed on the website, it is important to help them focus on meaningful information that can help hold
schools accountable. Such information includes, but is not limited to, the school budget, the conditions of school facilities, and student performance indicators (e.g. national exam scores, student retention and dropout). In addition, the publication of school data should be accompanied by capacity building and public engagement efforts such as those undertaken by the Cek Sekolahku initiative.

In their review of school report cards in the United States of America, Jacobsen, Saultz, and Snyder (2013) argue that, if not carefully designed, school report cards can damage public perceptions of school quality. This is because school report cards have the potential to enlighten or to embarrass. They can allow people to make better decisions and plans, and reward/sanction policies based on information; however, they can also reveal information that is embarrassing to schools and demoralizing to teachers. Having been implemented relatively recently in Indonesia, school report card initiatives still have significant potential to enlighten school administrators, teachers, and stakeholders. The main agenda for education leaders, policy-makers, and managers, as well as civil society organizations in education, is to design school report cards and their supporting efforts carefully, so as to ensure that the initiatives bring more benefit than damage to schools and, more importantly, to students.

Limitations. This case study does not attempt to provide a complete picture of school report cards across the whole country. The sampling areas were selected based on the availability of the Cek Sekolahku initiative, and the study was implemented in a relatively small number of lower secondary schools in Indonesia.

The initiatives are relatively new. During interview and focus group discussion sessions it was apparent that many participants had not heard of either Cek Sekolahku or Sekolah Kita. However, the survey data indicate otherwise. Only a small number of parents, principals, and School Committee representatives admitted that they had never heard of at least one of the initiatives. While this finding may be true, there is a possibility that the respondents browsed and searched the websites while completing the questionnaires, which might compromise the quality of the data collected during this research. The quality of survey data may also be compromised by the possibility that the respondents shared their opinions or espoused theories, rather than responding to questions based on their experience. For this reason, the researcher has endeavoured to interpret the survey data with care.

The survey data are presented with one caveat. The respondents – including parents, principals, and School Committee representatives – might not report current conditions or actual practices in schools. Instead, they might choose to give their opinion about what should or could happen in schools.

A similar study should be conducted in the future to assess the sustainability of the initiatives. This study could explore in more depth factors contributing to the effectiveness of the initiatives in terms of increasing school accountability. Evaluating the impact of school report cards at such an early stage in their implementation could be considered precipitate, but it is hoped that this research will be useful for educators, decision-makers, and civil society organizations in planning the next steps.
Annex

Sampling

Based on the suggestion of IIEP-UNESCO, lower secondary schools (SMPs) in the three districts were selected and categorized using those indicators: GDP per capita, national ranking on the Human Development Index (HDI), national ranking for adult literacy rates, and mean years of schooling. Table A1 presents the three districts and their characteristics.

Table A1. District samples and characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT A</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Semarang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>Rp 72 483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>80.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for HDI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy rate</td>
<td>97.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for adult literacy rate</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of schooling</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for MYS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT B</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Makassar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>South Sulawesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>Urban, Eastern Indonesia region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>Rp 69 986 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>79.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for HDI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy rate</td>
<td>97.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for adult literacy rate</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of schooling</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for MYS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT C</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Bojonegoro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>East Java</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>Rp 41 086 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for HDI</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy rate</td>
<td>85.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for adult literacy rate</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of schooling</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rank for MYS</td>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Human Development Index Year 2015 (Statistics Indonesia, 2016b).
31. Data from Statistics Indonesia (2016b). Compulsory education in Indonesia lasts nine years and consists of primary and lower secondary schools.
In total, 28 lower secondary schools in the three districts are implementing Cek Sekolahku. Table A2 shows the number of schools and students alongside the lower secondary schools selected for this case study. The selected schools were determined based on two considerations: first, that about 250 parents and students were expected to participate in the study; and second, that 15 parents should be randomly selected in each school. Accordingly, 17 schools were included in the study. With a total population of 23,828 students and 250 student samples (whose parents will participate in this study), the margin of error is 6.10% (with a confidence level of 95%) or 5.12% (with a confidence level of 90%).

Table A2. Number of lower secondary schools with Cek Sekolahku and Sekolah Kita and number of samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>SMP with Cek Sekolahku</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N school</td>
<td>N student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semarang (District A)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makassar (District B)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bojonegoro (District C)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23 828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools from each district were selected using random number tables. Student numbers in each school were compared in order to identify smaller schools among the samples. The number of students in most of the schools were found to be within the range of mean (867.06) ± 2 times the standard deviation (SD=157.16), indicating that the sizes were relatively similar (see the N students in Table A2). Therefore, 15 students were selected from each school using the random table, and their parents were asked to complete the questionnaires.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School name</th>
<th>N student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 01 SEMARANG</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 05 SEMARANG</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 39</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 09 SEMARANG</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 02 SEMARANG</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 16 SEMARANG</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 11</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 04 SEMARANG</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 22 SEMARANG</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 12 SEMARANG</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 27</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 20 SEMARANG</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 03 SEMARANG</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 08 SEMARANG</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 06</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 40 SEMARANG</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 28 SEMARANG</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 07 SEMARANG</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 37</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 41 SEMARANG</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 23 MAKASSAR</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 30 MAKASSAR</td>
<td>1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 18 MAKASSAR</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 27 MAKASSAR</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 2 MAKASSAR</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 1 BOJONEGORO</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 5 BOJONEGORO</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMP NEGERI 3 BOJONEGORO</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>23,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>157.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six types of data were collected in each school (see Table A4).
Table A4. Types of data and number of participants in each school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire (survey)</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>School Committee representative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>0(^{31})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Many schools did not submit the community leader surveys, so these were eliminated from the sample.
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The case study

The number of countries providing access to school data to the general public has grown rapidly over the past decade, encouraged by the development of information technologies and under the pressure of social movements demanding the right to information. A wide variety of initiatives have been developed by both governments and civil society, to share school-level information in the form of 'school report cards'. These provide key information about a school, e.g. on student enrolment, funding, number of teachers, teacher qualifications, pupil–teacher ratios, conditions of school facilities, textbooks, and student achievement. But now that such data are in the public domain, how can it be ensured that they are used to promote not only transparency but also accountability in the education sector?

This case study compares the design and implementation of two major open school data initiatives implemented in Indonesia – Sekolah Kita, which is government-led, and Cek Sekolahku, which is citizen-led. It covers the types of information published, who publishes it and how it is accessed; the critical data for improving transparency and accountability; how different categories of stakeholders access and use it; the requisite conditions for improving transparency and accountability; and the limitations of such processes.

The publication highlights that greater provision of information on school report cards does not necessarily increase participation, and that parent and community participation in monitoring schools requires proper capacity building. It concludes with a set of recommendations, including: displaying and communicating clear theories of change when designing school report cards, giving the priority to data that matter for parents, and integrating transparency efforts into the blueprint for school improvement efforts.
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