

Public Sector Innovation: Basic Service Innovation Practices In Nonformal Education In Baubau City

Syahril Ramadhan

Article Info	Abstract
<p>Article History</p> <p>Received: May 07, 2021</p> <p>Accepted: August 22, 2021</p> <hr/> <p>Keywords : Innovation, Public Sector, Non-Formal Education</p> <p>DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5233852</p>	<p><i>The problem of education is one of the actual problems currently being faced by the State of Indonesia, especially the City of Baubau, Southeast Sulawesi Province. This study aims to provide an overview of innovative initiatives developed in basic services and service coverage in the minimum service standards for basic education in Baubau City, Southeast Sulawesi Province during the period 2011-2013. The research approach used in this research is a qualitative approach. This research was conducted in Baubau City, Southeast Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. The results show that public sector innovation, especially in the non-formal education sector, provides mutually beneficial benefits to the government and society in a sustainable manner, with an emphasis on improving basic services in the field of education.</i></p>

Introduction

The problem of education in the State of Indonesia, especially in Baubau City, Southeast Sulawesi Province, among others, is that there are still many children who drop out of school and are illiterate. Dropping out of school means stopping school before being declared graduated or deciding not to continue school at a higher level after completing a certain level of education. Meanwhile, illiteracy is a term that refers to the lack of knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic.

Referring to UNICEF data, in Indonesia as many as 2.5 million children cannot enjoy education: 600,000 children of primary school age and 1.9 million children of junior high school age (UNICEF Indonesia, 2013). Children from the poorest households are 4 times more likely to drop out of school than those from affluent households. Nearly 3% of primary school (SD) age children in rural areas do not attend school, compared to just over 1% in urban areas (UNICEF Indonesia, 2013).

The number of students studying in primary school, nearly 1 in 5 cannot continue to junior secondary school, compared to 1 in 10 in urban areas. Nearly half of the children who come from poor families cannot afford to continue their education to junior secondary school. The likelihood of dropping out of school was 20 times higher for children whose mothers had no education than for those whose mothers had tertiary education (UNICEF Indonesia, 2013).

In 2011 in Baubau City, Southeast Sulawesi Province, it was found that 1,801 children had dropped out of school at the elementary school level or the equivalent, 42% or 768 of whom were women. In addition, it was also found that 818 children dropped out of school at the Junior High School level or equivalent, 41% were girls. (BASICS, 2013). **Meanwhile, the number of illiterates in Baubau City, according to data from the Baubau City Youth and Sports Education Office, reaches no less than 1500 people, spread over eight sub-districts in Baubau City.**

A number of causes for problems with dropping out of school and illiteracy are evident, namely economic factors (BASICS, 2013). Geographical environmental factors, as well as population migration, are also factors that cause the increase in dropout rates. In addition, the high dropout and illiteracy rates in Kota Baubau are related to demographic developments, socio-cultural constraints and community powerlessness.

Prior to 2011, the City Government of Baubau did not yet have accurate data on school dropouts and illiteracy. The data held is only government projection data or data that only comes from school reports. So that children who have never gone to school and are illiterate are not included in it. The absence of accurate data on school dropouts and illiteracy has resulted in the City Government of Baubau not having developed a special plan or strategy in dealing with school dropouts and illiteracy. Also, the map of the distribution of pockets of school dropouts and illiteracy is not yet known with certainty (BASICS, 2013). Thus it is clear that the cause of children dropping out of school and being illiterate is not just an economic problem.

The problems of school dropouts and illiteracy are the basis of the Baubau City Government-Baubau City Youth and Sports Education Office which is supported by the Basics Responsive Initiative (BRI) and the Community Learning Activity Center (PKBM) to create innovative initiatives developed to alleviate school dropouts and illiterate in Baubau City during the 2011-2013 period.

During the period 2011-2013, a number of educational innovations have been carried out by the Baubau City Government through the Basics Responsive Initiative (BRI) component as an effort to handle school dropouts and illiteracy in Baubau City through non-formal education, starting from managing non-formal education data, increasing the budget. Regional Budget (APBD) for non-formal education, increasing the capacity of PKBM, synergizing the roles of schools and PKBM, and strengthening regional policies that support the development of non-formal education.

The scope of non-formal education is very broad and complex. Therefore, this study limits non-formal education only to community-based education services that are organized outside the school system, carried out on purpose, regularly and in a planned manner aimed at dealing with dropouts and blind people. script in the City of Baubau during the 2011-2013 period.

The results of this collaborative initiative developed by Basics with local governments contain several criteria; innovative, participatory, sustainable, accountable pro-poor and gender responsive.

Literature Review

In fact, public sector organizations in Indonesia are still relatively new to innovation activities. In other words, innovation activity in the public sector is less agile in the private sector, which tends to have a dynamic character. Traditionally, public sector organizations in Indonesia have been less interested in innovation because according to tradition, the public sector is in a monopolistic, static, rigid, inflexible and status quo-inclined atmosphere. In a situation like this, it is natural that the practice of innovation receives less attention in public sector organizations.

In general, the term innovation is used in two different ways (Godin, 2008): first, as something new, original and unique. Every kind of new thing: art, science, technology, organization, social culture or individual culture. Second, as the adoption or dissemination of existing innovations. The term 'new' does not mean original but rather newness. The meaning of this newness, can mean creating and implementing something into a single combination (Adair & Thomas, 2004).

At a lower level, innovation can be seen as a change in the thought process of doing something. Innovation can be seen as a change in the thought process of doing something, or finding useful applications (Batalli, 2011). Change will lead to improvement for some people, while for others it may not be relevant, and for third parties it can lead to a worsening of the situation (Skogen, 2001).

Change can be accidental and unsystematic, but for change to be called innovation, it must contain a strong element of awareness and reflection (Skogen, 2001). In other words, innovation must contain planning. So that innovation is defined as a planned change. However, for change to have a purpose, it is important to tie it to something and it must be something better than before. In other words, innovation is about a planned change, which aims to improve (Skogen, 2001).

Innovation is not only a concept of a new idea, a new invention or also not a development of something new, but innovation is a combination of all these processes (Kotler, 2000). The general definition of innovation combines three main components (Dundon, 2002), namely: creativity, strategy, implementation. Innovation is a new mechanism or institutional arrangement that is successfully applied to solve governance problems or to obtain better governance outcomes. Innovation is new to public action and the art of doing things in a way that is better than ever in public administration (Anttiroiko et al., 2011).

Innovation in the context of the public sector has been defined as the creation and implementation of new processes, products, services and delivery methods that result in significant improvements in the efficiency, effectiveness or quality of results (Moor & Hartley, 2008). Public administration innovations include decentralizing public administration, simplifying procedures, informatizing service delivery and improving human resource development. Therefore, the innovation process includes mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability of the public sector (Batalli, 2011). Types of Innovations in the public sector include (Thenint, 2010): New service innovations or developments; process innovation (changes in the manufacture of a product or service); administrative innovation (use of new policy instruments, which may be the result of changing policies); system innovation (new systems or fundamental changes from existing systems, the formation of new organizations or new patterns of cooperation and interaction); conceptual innovation (changes in the views of actors, these changes are accompanied by the use of new concepts; radical changes in rationality).

Public sector innovation can also focus on several different aspects of the public sector value chain, although most public administrators today strongly equate innovation with technology. However, an innovation need not result in a change in technology. Rather, it may instead involve different combinations or processes using existing technology. From a public management point of view, however, behavioral innovation may be

much more important in the long run. Behavioral innovation can mean new strategies, new ways to learn and share, and new ways of reacting to environmental changes such as increasing diversity in the work environment (McNabb, 2007). This also means that strategic innovation can mean behavioral innovation as well as new ways of reacting or acting.

The innovation cycle starts from the stage of pooling ideas, selection, implementation and diffusion, from the initial stage to the next stage (Bommert, 2010). Collaborative innovation is based on the assumption of active participation from various actors through their innovation assets. These assets can be in the form of intangible assets, namely: knowledge, creativity and so on, as well as tangible assets, namely in the form of money and other physical assets, which are needed to increase the quantity and quality of innovation (Bommert, 2010).

Innovation is gradual and cumulative, and is more of a process than a stage. This process, however, is not linear "but involves continuous interactivity between various institutions (Lundvall, et al., 2006). This concept reflects a new paradigm, namely as an institution. As implied in the view of Thomson & Perry, (2006) that "Collaboration as a collective process based on mutually beneficial relationships (mutualism) and the common goals of organizations or individuals who have autonomous characteristics interact with each other through negotiations both formal and informal. in a mutually agreed upon rules and mutual trust."

According to Arundel & Hollanders (2011), collaboration-based innovation is an innovation approach that is driven by collaboration with external organizations, and obtaining important knowledge for innovative activities. Likewise, according to Agolla & Lill, (2013) that innovation no longer depends only on how the public sector, universities, research institutions or government regulators innovate individually, but on how various related institutions collaborate. As concluded by Bommert, (2010) that the government needs to adopt a form of collaborative innovation, which takes advantage of innovation assets from a variety of organizational and individual sources. Collaborative innovation in other words is a form of strategic development (Arundel & Hollanders, 2011; Agolla & Lill, 2013; Bommert, 2010; Hartley et al., 2013). Successful innovation contributes to the creation and implementation of new processes, products, services and service delivery methods resulting in a significant increase in yield efficiency, effectiveness or quality (Mulgan & Albury, 2003).

Method

The research approach used in this research is a qualitative approach. In this research, the researcher acts as the main research instrument. In other words, the researcher himself determines the entire research scenario starting from planning, implementing data collection, analyzing, and interpreting data. Researchers act as data collectors and as active instruments in an effort to collect data in the field.

This research was conducted in Baubau City, Southeast Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. The considerations for choosing the City of Baubau as the research location are first; The City Government of Baubau has made the issue of education a priority and strategic issue. Various new breakthroughs (innovations) have been made by the Baubau City Government in order to improve the level of public education, both through increasing public access at various levels of education ranging from early childhood education (PAUD) to secondary education as well as by increasing the quality and quantity of students. Second, the City of Baubau has been included in the nominees for the recipient of the 2010 Innovative Government Award (IGA) which was initiated by the Ministry of Home Affairs (Kemendagri). The Ministry of Home Affairs has given IGAs to district / city governments that have breakthroughs / innovative activities that have a national impact. In this regard, the City Government of Baubau is considered to have an innovative vision.

When the research was carried out intensively from 2014 to 2015. The data source in the study was informants who had competence and were in accordance with the data needs (purposive). Determination of research informants using criterion-based selection which is based on the assumption that the research informants are actors who are involved either directly or indirectly with non-formal education activities in Baubau City. The informants in this study were: the head of the Baubau City Youth and Sports Education Office, employees of the Youth and Sports Education Office, administrators of the Community Learning Activity Center (PKBM), Basics administrators, employees of the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda).

Data analysis in this study was carried out at the time the data collection took place, and after completing data collection within a certain period. In fulfilling the validity of this research data triangulation was carried out with the source. Triangulation with sources carried out in this study was to compare the results of the interviews with the contents of the related documents.

Result and Discussion

The regulation of education services in Indonesia is regulated through Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System. The Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2003, recognizes the Community Learning Activity Center (PKBM) as a Non-Formal Education Unit. Intensive government involvement in PKBM fostering is carried out by various agencies / agencies both at the

central and regional levels starting from the level of the directorate general to the Education Office in the province / district / city, sub-district in accordance with their respective duties and functions.

The existence of PKBM in Kota Baubau, in early 1999, had not fully received attention from the local government of Baubau City because only formal education was concerned. Non-formal education organized by PKBM has not received attention or received less attention from the government. PKBM managers have not received guidance from related agencies. PKBM in Baubau City has not played a role as a facilitator in providing guidance to the community as it should be because the government's attention is still lacking.

Since 2007, non-formal education in the City of Baubau has experienced an increase in the number of learning citizens (WB), namely 20 people in 2003, 80 in 2004, 80 in 2005 and 120 in 2007. In accordance with the recommendations and results of verification from the Baubau City Education, Youth and Sports Office on the PKBM managers at the Baubau City Education, Youth and Sports Office level, the number of PKBM in Baubau City is 33 institutions. Each PKBM varies in terms of; activity, program and management.

The development of PKBM in the City of Baubau in the period 2011-2013 not only shows an increase in quantity but also in terms of quality. On the quality side, although it has not been seen in all existing PKBM, the implementation of PKBM in Baubau City increasingly provides an illustration that the community is not only positioned as the target group (learning citizens) of programs designed from outside themselves, but also a description of the community's ability to manage non-formal education programs in accordance with his needs. PKBM in Baubau City is currently a joint forum by both the government and the community to mutually strengthen and optimize each other's roles in the management of non-formal education programs.

The Department of Youth Education and Sports of Baubau City in accordance with its duties and functions in the 2011-2013 period has carried out developments related to the implementation of PKBM. The development carried out is more focused on the management (management) of PKBM which is oriented towards the framework of, by and for the community.

PKBM, as a center for out-of-school education activities, PKBM grows and develops based on the interests and abilities of the community, so programs are developed for students who come from disadvantaged communities, never go to school, drop out of school and continue to drop out, as well as productive age. who want to increase their knowledge and life skills to meet their daily needs.

However, related to PKBM in Baubau City as a forum for community capacity building, there are several problems that require integrated handling and require the involvement and contribution of various parties. These problems are related to institutions, education personnel, and sources of funds.

In general, the PKBM institutions in the City of Baubau do not yet have a standardized management of program and activity services. Meanwhile, PKBM tutors have not met the competency standard qualifications. Likewise, the source of funds is still dependent on outside aid funds. Not many PKBMs have business units that can be used as a source of financing for implementing programs or activities, especially in the education sector.

Improving the quality of basic services in the field of basic education is closely related to the programs and efforts made by various parties to encourage public awareness of school or assistance for school dropouts from underprivileged families to return to school. This effort is highly dependent on other efforts outside the education unit, such as the role of PKBM, the role of the community and the role of the government.

One of the approaches taken by the Baubau City Government in dealing with school dropouts and illiteracy in Baubau City is by collaborating with various parties, including the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) of Baubau City, the Southeast Sulawesi Provincial Government, the Basics Team (Better Approaches to Service Provision Through Increased Capacities in Sulawesi), and Community Learning Activity Center (PKBM) in Baubau City.

The Education Office seeks various steps in cooperation with various parties to overcome school dropouts and illiteracy. The collaboration between the Baubau City Government, the Southeast Sulawesi Provincial Government, the Basics Project Team, and the PKBM in Baubau City is aimed at efforts to overcome school dropouts and illiteracy in Baubau City as well as to achieve Minimum Service Standards and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Cooperation in the program for overcoming school dropouts and illiteracy in the City of Baubau is directed at two major goals, namely the achievement of minimum service standards and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals or MDG's by 2015. To support the achievement of this program the roles and cooperation of various parties are needed. Formal and informal interactions the parties in the Basics project occur according to the sequence or stage of the BASICS Responsive Initiative (BRI) management. The six stages that the parties in the Basics project go through (BASICS, 2013); namely:

The first stage is the BRI SPP and RKT Preparation stage. BRI SPP and RKT are prepared based on data on achievement of the MDGs and Minimum Service Standards (SPM) for Education in Districts / Cities. The programs and activities proposed in the BRI Service Improvement Strategy (SPP) and Annual Work Plan (RKT) are aimed at efforts to address the gap between the MDGs and MSS targets and the current achievements. The second stage is the RKT Implementation stage. The implementation phase of the RKT is the stage of realizing the initiatives developed by the districts / cities in improving health and education services to accelerate the

achievement of the selected MDGs and MSS targets. The third stage is the monitoring and evaluation stage. This activity is carried out regularly every year by the Provincial BRI Sub-Committee together with the District / City BASICS Coordinating Committee. The fourth stage is a reflection of learning to share experiences and lessons learned. The fifth stage is the institutionalization of initiatives. BASICS encourages Provincial and District / City Governments to institutionalize various basic service innovations and service coverage in basic education MSS to become local government policies as outlined in planning and budgeting documents. BASICS also encourages the issuance of Regional Regulations to ensure the sustainability of these innovations. The sixth stage, dissemination and replication. BASICS encourages the dissemination of innovations developed by BASICS partner regions through the BRI mechanism in the education sector to be replicated in other areas that have the same problems or challenges. A model of stakeholder interaction based on adaptations of documents (BASICS, 2013).

BRI's focus is on efforts to improve the quality of basic education services in the communities where Basics works. This focus refers to efforts to accelerate MSS and MDG indicators in the basic education sector. The determination of the MSS and MDGs indicators is aimed at indicators that have quite high inequality. From these indicators, proposals for activities are compiled in the BRI Service Improvement Strategy (SPP).

In 2011-2013 BASICS provided grant funds through the BASICS Responsive Initiative (BRI) mechanism to support innovative planning, budgeting and community service processes, especially in the field of education. The focus of the BRI program for education is to increase net enrollment rates and reduce dropout rates through increasing the capacity of teachers and out-of-school education.

In addition, cooperation in institutional strengthening is one of the strategic development frameworks of the Baubau City Youth and Sports Education Office which aims to trigger PKBM to be able to provide comprehensive services in the context of providing quality, professional, and competitive non-formal education.

The form of institutional strengthening assistance provided by the Baubau City Youth and Sports Education Office consists of physical, non-physical, direct and / or indirect assistance, among others; assistance to increase the capacity of facilities and infrastructure, increase learning capacity, management / management training, facilitation or in other forms adapted to the development of PKBM needs. Institutional strengthening was carried out in 14 PKBMs spread across eight sub-districts through improving the quality of teaching tutors, PKBM management, training tutors in learning methods and curricula, training on how to manage data and strengthening collaboration between PKBM through the PKBM Forum.

The Basics Responsive Initiative (BRI) held a workshop to increase the capacity of the Baubau Community Learning Activity Center (PKBM) which was attended by 30 participants each consisting of 2 administrators from 14 PKBM plus a delegation from the Office of Youth Education and Sports. This workshop was for capacity building as a follow-up to the collaboration between the Baubau City Youth and Sports Education Agency and the BASICS project team. BASICS also collaborates with the Baubau City Youth and Sports Education Office to organize Competency Quality Training for PKBM Managers and Equality Tutors for Packages A, B and Illiteracy. PKBM is the alternative chosen to overcome school dropouts and illiteracy.

In fact, PKBM which was supported automatically began to actively carry out the learning process and was immediately recorded as absorbing school dropouts and illiteracy. The learning community for 14 PKBM has absorbed 100 school dropouts at the elementary school level, 15 dropouts at the secondary school level, and 200 illiterate children. This achievement is practically directed towards achieving the goals of the two MDGs and the Net Participation Rate (NER).

Conclusion

Public sector innovation, especially in the non-formal education sector, provides mutually beneficial benefits for the government and society in a sustainable manner, with an emphasis on improving basic services in the education sector in Baubau City, Southeast Sulawesi Province. Parties involved in innovation are willing to review priorities, especially education non-formal, namely; willingness and ability to align goals, strategies, systems, people and processes; commitment to the desired innovation process and results hierarchically (from top to bottom and bottom to top) and across functions; the ability to build trust and productive communication; willingness to openly share knowledge and information; the ability to plan and carry out continuous innovation; willingness to provide the resources needed to support the development of non-formal education innovations.

References

- Adair, J. & Thomas, N., 2004. *The Concise Adair on Creativity and Innovation*. London: Thorogood Publishing Ltd.
- Agolla, J.E. & Lill, J.B.V., 2013. Public Sector Innovation Drivers: A Process Model. *J. Soc. Sci*, 34 (2)(2013), pp.165-76.
- Anttiroiko, A.-V., Bailey, S.J. & Valkama, P., 2011. *Innovations in Public Governance*. USA: IOS Press, Inc.
- Arundel, A. & Hollanders, & H., 2011. A taxonomy of innovation: How do public sector agencies innovate? Results of the 2010 European Innobarometer survey of public agencies.

- http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/files/psi-studies/taxonomy-of-innovation-how_en.pdf: PRO INNOEURPE.
- BASICS, 2013. Mengatasi Anak Putus Sekolah dan Buta Aksar melalui Peran PKBM. Basics.
- BASICS, 2013. Praktik Cerdas Piloting Penganggaran Responsif Gender Bidang Pendidikan Di Kota BauBau, Sulawesi Tenggara: Pengalaman dan Hasil. Sesi Lembaran Informasi BASICS. BASICS.
- Batalli, M., 2011. Impact of Public Administration Innovations on Enhancing the Citizens' Expectations. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (June, 2011), pp.157-62.
- Bommert, B., 2010. Collaborative Innovation in The Public Sector. *International Public Management Review*, Volume 11, Issue 1, pp.15-33.
- Dundon, E., 2002. *The Seeds of Innovation Cultivating the Synergy That Fosters New Ideas*. New York: AMACOM.
- Godin, B., 2008. *Innovation: The History of a Category*. Montréal, Québec Canada: Project on the Intellectual History of Innovation Working Paper No. 1.
- Hartley, J., Sørensen, E. & Torfing, a.J., 2013. Collaborative innovation: A viable alternative to market-competition and organizational entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review* (In Press), pp. <http://oro.open.ac.uk/id/eprint/38011>.
- Kotler, P., 2000. *Marketing, Management, Millenium Edition*. Tenth Edition ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lundvall, B.-Å., Intarakumnerd, P. & Vang, J., 2006. *Asia's Innovation Systems in Transition*. Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- McNabb, D.E., 2007. *Knowledge Management in the Public Sector: A Blueprint for Innovation in Government*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Moor, M. & Hartley, J., 2008. Innovations in governance. *Public Management Review*, Vol.10 (No.1). (ISSN 1471-9037, pp. pp. 3-20..
- Mulgan, G. & Albury, D., 2003. *Innovation In The Public Sector*. London, 2003. Admiralty Arch, The Mall.
- Skogen, K., 2001. Education – Special Needs Education. Chapter II in DSSI-project. Socrates Programme 25234-CP-1-96-NO-ODL: http://www.idp-europe.org/docs/uio_upi_inclusion_book/.
- Thenint, H., 2010. *Mini Study 10 Innovation in the public sector*. Manchester: INNO--GRIIPS Global Review off Innovation Intelligence and Polliicy Studiies.
- Thomson, A.M. & Perry, J.L., 2006. Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box. *Public Administration Review* •, (December 2006, Special Issue), pp.20-32.
- UNICEF Indonesia, 2013. PENDIDIKAN. [Online] Available at: <http://www.unicef.org/indonesia/id/education.html> [Accessed 23 MEI 2014].

Author Information

Syahril Ramadhan

Department of Public Administration, Universitas
Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Baubau
