

DEEL 1: VRAGEN EN OPMERKINGEN

Dear romo Adri,

According your report and proposal 'Education Scholarship' we've some questions.

The background of our questions are the changes in the Education system of the 'Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar' in the last 7 years and also according these developments there are also changes too in the school fees or school tuitions for the state/public-SD and the state/public-SMP.

General questions:

1. I (Anton) know from my colleagues from the PGSD (Sanata Dharma) that they were very busy with offering certificate programs for primary teachers (sure from 2012 till 2016), because a lot of these primary teachers are not qualified.
These SD-teachers needs a new certificate to proof that they are a competent/quality primary teacher and also to receive the salary with belongs to this position.
By the way: in Flores I've observed in January this year, that there are 2 different salaries for primary teachers.
One receive 3-4 milj. Rp. a month, the other only 400.000 Rp. , because the first one is certificated the other not. **Is this right or not?**
2. According these current improvements, the government provided also for the children who enter the state-SD and the state-SMP free charge of school fees/tuitions. **Is this right or not?**
3. **When** the government does start with this program of free charge of school fees/tuitions for the public/state schools??
4. Does the state-SMK has also a free charge of school fees/tuitions??
5. Do you make in your proposal a difference between a **private** SD-SMP-SMK and a **public/state** SD-SMP-SMK?? (Because in principle the public/state schools are free from school fees/tuitions, private not. Are there more differences between private and state??)

The main **formal** question is yet: why should the SKPI support the scholarship program from Realino when the children from the **state/public** SD – SMP – and maybe the SMK, are free of charge of school fees?? (See also the proposal 2020, page 5, second '•', sentence 2-3)

[I've split this formal question underneath in more detailed ones]

Specific questions:

1. See the proposal 2020, page 1, 2nd paragraph: "*.... has increasingly provided assistance in (for) poor children...*". See the 3 conditions (poor, student public school, KTP).
For the 25 children (see report 2019, page 1, and last sentence) it's absolute clear that they could apply for a Realino scholarship.
But what about the other 175 children, because they meet (!) the 3 conditions, so they had to pay anything to enter the state/public schools??
(See also point 3 underneath)
2. What do you mean with:
 - Report 2019, page 3, 2nd paragraph:
"However, to enter the state schools students should have enough skills. The poor children usually living with less facilities, they did not have any chances of getting

such facilities as other children normally. Its ability also did not develop optimally. Therefore, it is very difficult to enter the state schools."

See also Proposal 2020, page 5, 2nd '•':

"However, the poor children live with restricted condition. It means that they have less capabilities to develop their skill optimally because they have limited facilities and means. In addition, the environment in which they live is usually also not ideal for the children. It makes them unable to compete with other children to enter public schools."

Questions:

- What do you mean with these propositions?
What do you mean with: they does not have enough abilities and skills?
Could you give concrete examples?
- Should these (poor) children had to take **an entrance exam** to enter a state/public school?
- Are poor children, uneducated children not allowed to enter a state/public school?

3. In your report 2019, page 3, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: you mentioned that state schools *"..... received subsidies from the government."*

Same page 3, 2nd paragraph, 7th sentence: *"The government actually supported etc. "*

So, if state schools were subsidized by the government, why does these schools ask the (poor) children and children in general to pay educational/tuition fees??

See the proposal 2020, page 5, 1st '•'!!

See also proposal 2020, page 6, 1st '•', too.

And when children should pay these educational/tuition fees for a public/state school, where are these then intended?? (Please give us a specification?)

And if the government subsidies schools in relation to the poor children, what do the school receive for 1 child a year, differentiate to SD – SMP – SMK??

4. If you ask for a poor child a scholarship to enter a school (private or public) could you present the SKPI a specification of this scholarship??
(to understand what the scholarship is for)

Dear Romo Adri, why do I ask you these questions? Because I'm aware that there are people/donator's who know the recent developments of education in Indonesia. They could ask me critical questions about your reports and proposals.

To give them a reasonable answer, I should have your information.

Hope to hear soon from you.

Warm regards,
Anton.

DEEL 2: ANTWOORDEN

Dear Mr. Anton,

the education in Indonesia is very complex. I will try to explain about it. Since the reformation of 1998, the government is in search for better education management. Some aspects of the complexities on education are as follows:

General questions:

1. The teacher

- a. The overall quality of teachers in Indonesia is still low. To improve the quality, the government has decided that all teachers should have bachelor degree (S1), not only the associate degree (D3) as accepted before. Besides, all teachers should proceed with some programmes of improvement and test of competence to obtain certification. Sanata Dharma University provides these programmes. The teachers with certification will have a very significant additional benefit to their salary. Those who failed will not be granted such benefit.
- b. The status of teachers can be categorized into four, i.e. (1) teachers as civil servants (PNS) who teach at public schools, (2) honorary teachers at public schools, (3) permanent teachers at private schools, and (4) honorary teachers at private schools. There is significant difference on salary based on the categories. The causes of the difference are:
 - Certification benefit: there is huge gap of salary between those who are granted with the benefit and those without the benefit. The category of teacher number (1) and (3) have had good salary. By certification, their salary will be three times of those without the benefit. The idea of the programme is good enough but the implementation is not always good. The test of competence is often only kind of formality that is not really scrutinizing the teachers' quality. Finally, certification does not have substantial impact to the objective of increasing the quality of teachers.
 - Comparing to those in category (1) and (3), the honorary teachers still stay with low salary. The honorary teachers in private schools have their salary from the tuition fees paid by the students. They sometimes had a very low salary around IDR 400.000-500.000.
 - The very low salary of teachers in Flores might be because of the failings during the process of certification or because of their status as honorary teachers.

2. Subsidy for education

- a. By the Government Regulation No. 47/2008, the Governments at the national and regional levels are mandated to ensure the implementation of compulsory education programme, at least at the elementary level, which is free of charge. The government's 9-years compulsory education programme does not work as expected. The free education is in fact not totally free. The parents still have to pay for direct expenses (books, uniforms, and stationaries) and also indirect ones (transportation, course fee, pocket money).

- b. For the time being, the free education is for students at elementary school (SD) and junior high school (SMP). The students of vocational school (SMK) still pay for tuition fee.
- c. In our proposal, we acknowledge that we have not differentiate between children who go to public schools and private schools. The most practical way to see the difference is by identifying the names and numbers of the schools. The public school must have include the word “Negeri” and its number. For example: SD Negeri 1, SMP Negeri 5. “Negeri” means public. Because of that, the names of private schools never use the word “Negeri”.

Specific questions:

1. See the proposal 2020, page 1, 2nd paragraph: “... *has increasingly provided assistance in (for) poor children...*”. See the 3 conditions (poor, student public school, KTP). For the 25 children (see report 2019, page 1, and last sentence) it’s absolute clear that they could apply for a Realino scholarship. But what about the other 175 children, because they meet (!) the 3 conditions, so they had to pay anything to enter the state/public schools?? (See also point 3 underneath)

Response:

- People tend to send their children to public schools to have cheaper education fee. It is cheaper, not totally free as mandated by the Government Regulation, because the parents still pay for certain direct and indirect expenses.
- The prospective grantees for scholarship we propose to SKPI are all private school students. They failed in test and performance based selection to enter the public schools. Therefore, they have to pay for tuition fee.
- Not all public schools have quality education. Even, some are in bad quality. The dilemma came up when children were accepted at public schools with low quality. The parents usually will choose to send their children to better private schools with tuition fee than to a cheaper but bad public schools.

2. What do you mean with:

- Report 2019, page 3, 2nd paragraph:
“However, to enter the state schools students should have enough skills. The poor children usually living with less facilities, they did not have any chances of getting such facilities as other children normally. Its ability also did not develop optimally. Therefore, it is very difficult to enter the state schools.”

Response:

Many children will try to enter the free elementary and junior high schools whereas the quota of acceptance are limited. Because of that, the public schools impose the entrance test to those who apply. The free of charge here is applied only to the school operational cost. The parents still pay the expenses of books, uniform, pocket money, student worksheet, and activities.

Children of the poor families have difficulties to compete with those of better economic backgrounds. The poor children usually do not entitle to sufficient learning facilities and lack of attention from their parents.

See also Proposal 2020, page 5, 2nd ‘•’:

*“However, the poor children live with restricted condition. It means that they have less capabilities to develop their skill optimally because they have limited facilities and means. In addition, the environment in which they live is usually also not ideal for the children. It makes them unable to compete with other children **to enter public schools.**”*

Questions:

- What do you mean with these propositions?
What do you mean with: they does not have enough abilities and skills?
Could you give concrete examples?
- Should these (poor) children had to take **an entrance exam** to enter a state/public school?
- Are poor children, uneducated children not allowed to enter a state/public school?

Response:

1. Some children of poor families are smart. However, their potentials are not flourishing well because of lack of learning facilities and opportunities to develop. The poverty and uneducated parents become factors that hinder their growth. For example: smart children whose parents are beggars, lazy, undisciplined, and accustomed to dirty words finds difficulty to develop themselves. They lack of ideal figures in their family.
 2. All children, whether they are poor or not, have to pass entrance test to access public schools.
 3. Children from all economic backgrounds, including the poor, are eligible to enter public schools as long as they pass the entrance test.
3. In your report 2019, page 3, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: you mentioned that state schools *“..... received subsidies from the government.”*
Same page 3, 2nd paragraph, 7th sentence: *“The government actually supported etc. “*

So, if state schools were subsidized by the government, why does these schools ask the (poor) children and children in general to pay educational/tuition fees??

See the proposal 2020, page 5, 1st ‘•’!!

See also proposal 2020, page 6, 1st ‘•’, too.

And when children should pay these educational/tuition fees for a public/state school, where are these then intended?? (Please give us a specification?)

And if the government subsidies schools in relation to the poor children, what do the school receive for 1 child a year, differentiate to SD – SMP – SMK??

Response:

- The government subsidizes only the operational cost. There are still expenses that are charged to the parents, either direct or indirect expenses.
 - The Government Regulation for a free education at elementary and junior high school level does not bring benefits for the schools. Consequently, the schools take benefits from several items such as tuition fee, monthly extracurricular activities, contribution for annual building construction, uniform, books, and per semester student worksheet.
4. If you ask for a poor child a scholarship to enter a school (private or public) could you present the SKPI a specification of this scholarship??
(to understand what the scholarship is for)

Response:

All children we prospect for SKPI scholarships are private school students who still have to pay for their education. We will later complete the information you ask for.

DEEL 3: VERDERE SPECIFICATIES

Van: Anton Vandeursen [<mailto:antonvde@xs4all.nl>]

Verzonden: zondag 15 maart 2020 14:42

Aan: 'Maswan Sst' <thmaswan@gmail.com>

CC: 'StichtingKPI@gmail.com SKPI' <stichtingkpi@gmail.com>

Onderwerp: FW: FW: Document van Anton Vandeursen

So I have only 2 little questions A and B.

But: on page 6 of your proposal, I read in the paragraph 'The Family condition', the next sentence:

- *"During survey, we visited the applicants and met their parents to check their living condition in order to consider the amount of subsidies that **they need**."*
- and also: *"The family conditions of grantees are **diverse**. Some children **need full support** because their parents are not able to pay educational fees at all. Some parents could support half of school fees, so that their children **will have smaller amount of scholarships**".*

2nd But: when I go to page 12 and next, I only observe **no any diversity** between children concerning the school fees, only between schools.

4 different SD's charge different tuitions, but there are no differences between the children at all.

Question A:

- Please could you explain us, why we don't see any diversity between families/children (going to the same school) in your lists?

The 2nd question is also simple, but very important for the next application/proposal 2021.

In your revised proposal 2020 you write on page 6:

- “Thus, the parents still have to pay for direct expenses (books, uniforms, and stationaries) and also indirect ones (transportation, additional course, pocket money).”

Question B:

- Are these direct and indirect expenses included in the monthly Tuition or 6 month Payment, see page 10 and the next pages?
- The same question, but formulated different: Include the SKPI-scholarship not only the school fee but also the direct/indirect costs?

If no:

- Is this the reel school tuition/fee?

If yes:

- Looking to the SKPI-scholarship how much is intended for the school fee (a) and how much is intended for the direct/indirect expenses (b)?
- And how do you calculate the amounts for both (a) and (b)?

I will be very pleased if you could answer my questions.

it will provide us with much clarity, special for the next years.

Thanks so much for your attention, wait for your answers.

Answers A and B:

A. We found diversity in specific condition as we have written in the proposal, i.e. a single mother working as scavanger with her two daughters (pg. 6). We have found and have been supporting also twins of female children who were already orphaned.

We acknowledged another features of diversity in the context of average families' condition in each region where the private schools are located (pg. 12 onwards). After having recommendation from the schools about the students in need of support, we conducted surveys. In each region where the prospective grantees and their families live, we found averagely similar condition of poverty. The parents' occupations of SD Kanisius Baturetno scholarship grantees could serve as description:

No	Name of grantees	Order in the family	Σ children in family	Fathers' occupation	Mothers' occupation
1	Agnes Nurvita Anggitawati	2 nd	2	Deceased	Labour
2	Albert Yeremia Mendrofa	3 rd	3	Self employed	Housewife
3	Anastasia Dwi Kurnia Sari	1 st	1	Farmer	Labour
4	Aurora Oktavia Dwi Hastuti	1 st	1	Security	Housewife
5	Christian Kevin Cahyo Prabowo	2 nd	2	Self employed	Housewife
6	Elizabeth Afrianti Mega Kristi	1 st	2	Labour	Housewife
7	Felix Asdhitya J S	2 nd	4	Labour	Housewife
8	Felixius Abednego Derossi N	1 st	1	Deceased	Labour

No	Name of grantees	Order in the family	Σ children in family	Fathers' occupation	Mothers' occupation
9	Fransisca Cinta Dian Maharani	1 st	1	Deceased	Self employed
10	Gea Heri Irawan	2 nd	4	Labour	Housewife
11	Hironimus Yosiko Inori Simbawa	3 rd	3	Self employed	Housewife
12	Immanuel Darrel Setya Gunawan	1 st	1	Self employed	Housewife
13	Kevin Maulana Syah Putra	2 nd	2	Deceased	Labour
14	Khrisna Bagus Setiawan	1 st	2	Labour	Deceased
15	Margaretta Yanuari Maharani	2 nd	2	Labour	Housewife
16	Martinus Zavier Putra Ariasy	1 st	2	Labour	Housewife
17	Maulana Pamungkas	2 nd	2	Labour	Labour
18	Racheel Avrilianna Saputri	1 st	2	Labour	Labour
19	Raihan Setiawan	3 rd	4	Labour	Housewife
20	Rico Satrio Utomo	2 nd	2	Labour	Swasta
21	Valentina Kurnia Putri	2 nd	2	Labour	Housewife
22	Victor Suryo Dwi Prasajo	2 nd	2	Self employed	Housewife
23	Yohana Paschalista Giva Martarina	1 st	2	Labour	Housewife
24	Yunita Sari	1 st	2	Labour	Housewife
25	Wahyu Hariyanto	1 st	1	Deceased	Labour

The surveyors could recommend that some students could be supported fully for the tuition fees while others could be supported partially.

Our consideration on the surveys led us to the decision of which recommended students were appropriate for scholarship. Afterwards, we went back to the schools to inform them about the decision. The schools proposed that each selected grantee of SPM Realino scholarship is supported with the same amount of scholarship that covers the tuition fee. The consideration was the averagely similar condition of poverty among the grantees' families with slight difference in between. Considering the common feature of poverty we found during surveys and the schools' proposals on the amount of support, we apply the same amount of scholarship for grantees that go to the same school.

- B. We do not support either the direct or indirect expenses our scholarship scheme. In other words, SKPI scholarship supports the tuition fees. Based on discussion with the schools, the amount indicated in the list (pg. 12 onwards) varies between 50% - 80% of the total monthly tuition fee charged by the schools. The rest will be from family contribution or private donors' contribution. In this way, we share responsibility for children education.

