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CHAPTER 8

Access and Equity in Higher Education in Indonesia: A Review from the Periphery

Losina Purnastuti¹ and Rita Eka Izzaty²
¹Faculty of Economics, Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia ²Faculty of Education, Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

The education sector in Indonesia is experiencing rapid expansion and change. Governments have implemented new initiatives and increased spending to encourage greater enrollment and attendance at the school level as well as higher education. The Indonesian government has supported a variety of initiatives to improve access and equity in higher education, including: increasing “Bidik Misi” scholarship; mobilizing government and private scholarship funding sources; improving equity for communities and regions that are underrepresented; optimizing public and private higher education institutions (HEIs); increasing capacity of vocational education institutions and the number of vocational education students; increasing the role of communities and local governments to expand access and equality; and increasing the role of information and communication technology.

Indonesian higher education is in a transition phase from an elite to a mass system. Indonesia has a particularly impressive record of expansion of primary education, however, in the case of higher education, while there has been much improvement, Indonesia is still struggling with its objective of increasing the participation rate and the opportunity to learn. Although there is an enormous international literature devoted to examining widening participation and equity in higher education, there are few empirical studies from Indonesia. This study helps to fill this gap. This chapter is organized as follows: “Background: The Indonesian Education System”; “Trends of Access and Equity in Indonesia Higher Education”; “Government Policy: Affordability, Equity, and Access to Higher Education”; and “Conclusions.”
BACKGROUND: THE INDONESIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

Indonesia’s national education system is enormous and complex. With over 46 million students enrolled in all levels of education and 2.7 million teachers in more than 250,000 schools, it is the third largest education system in the Asian region and the fourth largest in the world (behind only China, India, and the United States) (National Development Planning Agency, 2010). Two ministries are responsible for managing the education system, with 84% of schools under the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and the remaining 16% under the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA).

Based on the 1999 decentralization legislation and the education Law 20/2003, the government has designed specific strategies and programmes to implement the education policy through three strategic pillars. These three strategic pillars consist of ensuring expanded access and equity, improving quality and relevance, and strengthening governance, accountability, and the public image (MoNE, 2007).

The Indonesian National Education System is organized into three different paths, namely formal, nonformal and informal education (Figure 8.1). Formal education is conducted in schools through teaching and learning activities that are gradual, hierarchical, and continuous. Nonformal or out-of-school education is a substitute programme designed to eradicate illiteracy in reading/writing and numerals and the Indonesian language. This programme also provides individuals with an opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills required to work and generate an income, to enable individuals to proceed to a higher level within the formal education system, and to fulfil the needs of persons, families, and communities that cannot be met by the formal education system. Education within the family or what is called informal education, is an essential part of out-of-school education and provides cultural, religious and moral values, and family skills.

According to the Act of The Republic of Indonesia Number 20, year 2003 on National Education System (MoNE, 2003), the national formal education system consists of three main levels of education: basic education, middle or secondary education and higher or tertiary education. Apart from the levels of education mentioned above, pre-school education is also provided to a small proportion of children. Preschool is the lowest level required to enter elementary school. However, the government encourages parents to send their children to preschool education before entering elementary school.

Basic education consists of six years of Primary/Elementary Schools (PS) and three years of Junior Secondary Schools (JSS), which was declared as nine years of compulsory education by the President of the Republic of Indonesia on May 2, 1994. Children start formal schooling at the age of seven.

The types of secondary education include General Senior Secondary School (GSSS) and Vocational Senior Secondary School (VSSS). General education gives priority to expanding knowledge and developing students' skills and preparing them to continue their studies to a higher level of education. Vocational secondary education focuses on expanding specific occupational skills and puts emphasis on the preparation of students to enter the world of work and on developing their professional attitude. Middle or secondary education consists of three years of schooling at GSSS or three to four years at VSSS.
Parallel to the formal system is a set of nonformal programs known as Packet A Learning Program (Kajur Paket A), a nonformal program equivalent to primary education; Packet B Learning Program (Kajur Paket B) for junior secondary education; and Packet C Learning Program (Kajur Paket C) for senior secondary education.

Similar to most countries, there are public and private schools in Indonesia. Both types of schools follow the national curriculum developed by the MoNE. There are also Islamic schools, called Madrasah. Madrasah Ibtiidaiyyah (MI) is equivalent to elementary school, Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs) is equivalent to junior secondary school, and Madrasah Aliyah (MA) is equivalent to senior secondary school. Different from regular schools, Madrasah follow the curriculum developed by the MoRA and, as the name suggests, use Islam as the curriculum’s foundation. Similar to regular schools, there are also public and private Madrasah.

Higher education is offered through diploma (D1, D2, D3, and D4) and bachelor degree courses (S1). Higher education also includes postgraduate programs (S2) and doctoral programs (S3). Open universities provide distance learning higher education programs (UT). Education Law No. 20 of 2003 and Higher Education Law No. 12 of 2012 stipulate that there are six types of HEIs in Indonesia (see Figure 8.2):

- Academies (Akademi) and Community Colleges (Akademi Komunitas), which offer only one or a limited number of fields of study;
- Polytechnics (Politeknik), which offer vocational education or practical skills development;
- Advanced Schools (Sekolah Tinggi), which provide academic and vocational education in one specific discipline;
- Institutes (Institut), consisting of several faculties or departments pertaining to one particular discipline; and
- Universities (Universitas), which offer academic study across multiple disciplines and professional education.

**TRENDS OF ACCESS AND EQUITY IN INDONESIA HIGHER EDUCATION**

Higher education in Indonesia has steadily expanded since the enactment of the Education Act in 1961. This expansion has been reasonably uniform across the past four decades. Thus, the number of students grew continuously from around 200,000 students in 1975 to more than 5 million students by 2011 (see Figure 8.3). Of the current enrollment, more than 1.7 million students attend the 82 public HEIs and 2.5 million students attend the 2892 private HEIs. According to Nizam (2006), the rapid growth in the enrollment rate was driven by economic growth and an increase in the international trend towards mass participation in higher education.

Similar to the trend in the higher education student numbers, the gross enrollment rates for higher education have gradually increased since 1975. During the period of 1975–1995, the gross enrollment rate rose from 2% to 11%. Then, during the 2000s, enrollment in higher education steadily increased from about 14% in 2000 to about 17.25% in 2007.
of Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand. These comparisons therefore show that Indonesia has had credible improvement in its higher education enrollment rate. They also show, however, particularly with reference to Thailand, that much more can be achieved in this area (Table 8.1).

Turning to the Higher Education Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) in 2013, from Figure 8.5 it can be seen that this is 28.57%. Among 33 provinces, 15 provinces, or 45.5%, have a higher GER compared to the national average, and 18 provinces, or 54.5%, have lower figures compared to the national average. DKI Jakarta is the province with the highest GER, with 99.56%. On the contrary, Bangka Belitung province has the lowest figure, with just 8.34%.

Figure 8.6 presents the information on gender parity for gross enrollment in higher education since 2010 to 2013. Generally, the gender parity for higher education are 107.6, 103.54, 104.6, and 103.2 in 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013, respectively, suggesting that rates of participation are slightly higher for women than for men. However, this global figure disguises differing participation rates for men and women in different provinces.

Figure 8.7 provides several important issues related to access and retention of higher education enrollment based on income grouping of students. It is clear that there is a very wide gap in enrollment rates between...
the richest 20% and the other four quintile groupings. The enrollment rates of the five quintile groupings reveals that the enrollment rate for the 20% poorest quintile decreases more compared to the other four quintile groupings. This figure implies that income has a positive correlation with the number of the people attending any level of education, including higher education. In other words, this suggests that financial capacity may make a difference for Higher Education entrance. Further, based on transition rates the figure tells us that a smaller percentage of students from the richest group stop their schooling at that point compared to the other four quintile groupings.

Figure 8.8 shows that higher education institutions (HEIs) are mostly privately owned, with 2744 institutions or 97.13% of the total, 2892 institutions or 97.21% of the total, and 3078 institutions or 97.10% of the total of all institutions in 2005/2006, 2008/2009, and 2011/2012, respectively. On the other hand, only 81 institutions or 2.87% in 2005/2006, 83 institutions or 2.79% in 2008/2009, and 92 institutions or 2.90% of all HEIs in 2011/2012 are public institutions.

GOVERNMENT POLICY: AFFORDABILITY, EQUITY, AND ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

As seen in Table 8.1, Indonesia still has a problem in access and equity in higher education. This is reflected by Indonesia higher education gross enrollment ratios, which are lower, compared to other developing countries such as Thailand, Malaysia, and the Philippines. There are still quite a high proportion of secondary education graduates who cannot continue their education to the higher education level, especially students from poor families. Several policies have been introduced by the government to achieve the goals of affordability, equity, and access to higher education.
Increasing Scholarship and Education Cost Assistance

To achieve educational equity, the Directorate General for Higher Education (DGHE) and the community have sought ways to reduce disparities in access to higher education for higher education-age student. This has been done through continuous expansion of scholarship schemes, especially for students from disadvantaged families. However, provision of scholarships for disadvantaged communities could be further developed to assist students’ transition into higher education from the secondary school level, because the biggest filter occurs in junior high school, with many students unable to continue their education beyond this level due to financial reasons.

The Directorate General for Higher Education provides four scholarship schemes for students. The four scholarship schemes are as follows:

- **Bidikmisi**: The Bidikmisi scholarship scheme was first introduced in 2010 to support students at public and private universities. Sixty thousand students were targeted to receive Bidikmisi scholarships in 2014 (see Figure 8.9). The scholarship is Rp 6 million (US$ 681.8) per student per semester, with some of that amount transferred to the university to cover tuition fees, and some going directly to the students to cover living expenses. Graduates from senior secondary schools are eligible to receive the scholarship, provided that they have academic potential and come from poor families. The process to get this scholarship involves national selection through the national university entrance examinations and a local selection process set up by the respective university. This government’s pro-poor policy has made a significant contribution to the GER in higher education. It can be seen in Figure 8.4, that when the Bidikmisi Scholarship scheme was launched for the first time in 2010, it significantly raised the Higher Education GER from 17.93% in 2009 to 26.34% in 2010.

- **Beasiswa Peningkatan Prestasi Akademik (Beasiswa-PPA)** and Bantuan Biaya Pendidikan Peningkatan Prestasi Akademik (BPP-PPA): These two scholarship schemes aim to raise access and equity in higher education, reduce the number of students dropping out from universities, and improve students’ achievement and motivation in terms of academic/curricular, cocurricular, and extracurricular activities. The schemes target two groups of students: (i) students with strong academic/curricular, cocurricular, and extra-curricular achievement, and (ii) students with minimum achievement from disadvantaged family backgrounds who are already enrolled in a public or private university. Students with a high grade point average (GPA), or achievement in sports and arts, will be awarded this scholarship. The difference to the Bidikmisi scheme is that the scholarship awardees receive their scholarship from the first semester, whereas BBM and PPA are available only for students already enrolled from the second to eighth semester.

- **Olimpiade Sains Internasional (OSI)**: OSI is a scholarship for students who win the international Science Olympics competition. The OSI scholarship scheme aims to: (i) motivate students to improve their achievement, (ii) motivate students to pursue their education to higher level of education (undergraduate and graduate levels), and (iii) enhance science and Indonesian competitiveness. This scholarship is targeted at students from senior secondary schools. A student winning an International Science Olympics gold medal is eligible to receive an OSI scholarship to attend higher education until doctoral level (S3); a student winning a silver medal can get a scholarship until masters level (S2); and a student winning bronze can get a scholarship to finish undergraduate study (S1). The scholarship covers registration, tuition, living expenses, books, and research.

![Figure 8.9 Number of Bidikmisi scholarship recipients. Dirjen DIKTI 2014 Evaluasi Kebijakan Pendidikan Tinggi, Rembug Nasional 2014.](attachment:bidikmisi_recipients.png)
Financial assistance in the form of scholarships, vouchers, or credit for students is developed through the cooperation of central government, local government, as well as business and industrial entities. To be effective and efficient, the tuition assistance management system must also be well developed. Learning from the experience of the high default rate on student loans in Indonesia (Kredit Mahasiswa Indonesia: KMI) and the unavailability of a graduate tracking system, the credit system for students relies on social and emotional ties through such mechanisms as alumni associations. Thus, an incentive system for HEIs that successfully organize loans may be an effective method for ensuring viability.

**Resources Mobilization**

DGHE synergizes and mobilizes sources of funding scholarships and tuition assistance from both government and private institutions. Furthermore, DGHE also strives to increase the participation of stakeholders to jointly develop a scholarship scheme to provide the right incentives system. Among others by encouraging the participation of social and philanthropic institutions to develop a system that leads to the availability of scholarships not only for higher education with high quality, but also for education in which its mission of equity is considered essential for the local area.

**Improving Equity in Left Behind Areas**

Areas that are considered to be disadvantaged in terms of socio-economics, geography, and culture, referred to as “left behind,” will be prioritized to receive the scholarship scheme and tuition assistance. The DGHI has developed a special scholarship system designed for certain areas, including the border areas, disadvantaged areas, and areas that are located away from higher education facilities. In addition, distance learning systems are being developed alongside the development of information technology and telecommunications.

**Optimizing Public HEIs**

There are two mechanisms taken by government in order to raise the capacity of HEIs, namely expanding the capacity of existing HEIs and establishing new HEIs. In 2013, all public HEIs were suggested to increase the number of new students as much as 10 percent (Figure 8.10).
However, some institutions face some obstacles as they do not have a sufficient number of lecturers and adequate facilities. In 2012, the government built three institutes of art and culture, two institutes of technology, and 20 community colleges. In addition, the government focused on strengthening and increasing the capacity of HEIs in border areas.

Another government policy regarding access to higher education is providing the Public HEI Operational Assistance Fund (Bantuan Operasional Perguruan Tinggi Negeri: BOPTN). The total amount of this Operational Assistance Fund disbursed in 2012 and 2013 was 2.7 trillion rupiah ($2.5 million). It is expected that the figure will reach 4 trillion rupiah.

**Optimizing Private HEIs (Rightsizing)**

Currently, there are many individual private HEIs that are held by the community. Typically these education institutions are characterized by low efficiency because of the small number of students at each institution. DGHE encourages optimization in terms of numbers and size of private HEIs, including attempts to facility and encourage the small HEIs to merge. Moreover, a rationalization of the number of private HEIs in terms of local needs and conditions is required. DGHI will continue to optimize and mobilize community participation and resources in developing and improving access to quality higher education.

**Increasing Vocational Institutions’ Capacity and the Number of Vocational Students**

Vocational student graduates who are going to improve their competence should be facilitated through a separate or different admission system from nonvocational (academic) students. Because the students graduating from Senior Secondary Vocational Education have had some basic vocational skills, the length of study period for diploma programs may be shortened, therefore the capacity of vocational education will be increased. To maintain the absorption of diploma program graduates, the development of diploma programs such as D1, D2, D3, and D4 must involve local government, business entities, and industrial entities.

**Increasing the Role of Business Entities and Local Government**

Communities, business entities, and local governments have significant potential in expanding access and equity in higher education. DGHE facilitates and encourages equity groups to participate in the following ways: (i) providing scholarships for local students; and (ii) establishing and expanding the capacity of HEIs whose graduates are more likely to be absorbed by business entities in that area or by the local government in accordance with the potential and direction of their own local/regional development.

**Enhancing the Role of Information Technology and Communication**

In order to improve quality of and access to Indonesia higher education through the provision of ICT, the Directorate of Higher Education established a national ICT backbone for Indonesian HEIs, namely the Indonesia Higher Education Network (INHERENT). It began on 2006 with 83 universities connected to the network. The membership of INHERENT became 200 universities in 2007. Although the number of INHERENT members is continuing to grow the utilization of information and communication technology (ICT), research networking, and higher education facilities such as INHERENT and the Global Development Learning Network (GDLN) still need to be optimized to improve equality of access to high-quality education. Utilization of ICT for research and distance learning are encouraged in order to improve resource efficiency. IT skilled lecturers and educational infrastructure such as integrated digital libraries, e-laboratories and e-learning are part of this. ICT is also employed to improve the governance and transparency of HEI management.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Indonesia has undergone a process of rapid change in the education sector. Governments have implemented new initiatives and increased spending to encourage greater enrollment and attendance at the school level as well as in higher education. However, Indonesian governments face some challenges regarding access to higher education, including: a very large population, social disparity, economic disparity, geographic disparity, and limited capacity and equity of education services. The government’s commitment toward education, including access and equity to higher education, can be seen in some policies initiated by the government through the DGHI providing scholarships, optimizing public as well as private HEIs and establishing new public HEIs. The significant increase in access is made possible through considerable government subsidies in the form of cheap student loans, scholarships, and the Public HEI Operational Assistance Fund. It is
impossible for government to solve all of the problems regarding access and equity to higher education without any help from other parties. Contribution from communities and the private sector would boost better access and equity to higher education.
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