ANALYSIS OF CERTIFICATION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Ishak Kusnandar

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi YPPT Priatim Tasikmalaya,Tasikmalaya, Indonesia
E-mail:ishak_kusnandar@yahoo.com

Abstract. This study aims to find out and describe the implementation of Teacher Certification Policy in Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Sukamanah Tasikmalaya Regency. The approach used in this research is quantitative approach. The method used in this research is descriptive research method, that is research conducted to know the independent value, that is the variable of Implementation of Certification Policy at Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Sukamanah of Tasikmalaya Regency with analysis of implementation model of Edward III. The results showed that the Implementation of Certification Policy in Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Sukamanah Tasikmalaya Regency simultaneously is in the high category stage.

Keywords**:** Implementation of Certification Policy; Policy Implementation Model

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the mandates of the 1945 Constitution of the State of the Republic of Indonesia is further stipulated in Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System which has a vision of the realization of an educational system as a strong and authoritative social institution to empower all Indonesian citizens to grow into quality human beings capable of and proactively responding to the ever-changing challenges of the age. Human quality needed by the Indonesian nation in the future is able to face increasingly tight competition with other nations in the world.

The quality of Indonesian people is produced through the provision of quality education. Therefore, teachers and lecturers have a very strategic function, role, and position. Article 39 Paragraph (2) of Law Number 20 Year 2003 regarding National Education System states that educators are professionals. The position of teachers and lecturers as professionals has a vision of the realization of the implementation of learning in accordance with the principles of professionalism to fulfill equal rights for every citizen in obtaining quality education. In the consideration of Law Number 14 Year 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, it is explained that the national development in the field of education is an effort to improve the life of the nation and to improve the quality of Indonesian people who believe, pious and noble and master the science, technology and art in realizing society progressive, fair, prosperous and civilized based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the State of the Republic of Indonesia. To ensure the expansion and equitable access, enhancement of quality and relevance, as well as good governance and accountability of education capable of facing challenges according to changing demands local, national, and global life needs to be done empowerment and improvement of teacher quality in planned, directed, and sustainable. Furthermore, the teacher has a very strategic function, role, and position in national development in the field of education as referred to in letter a, so it needs to be developed as a dignified profession.

In the Act is a teacher is a professional educator with the main task of educating, teaching, guiding, directing, training, assessing, and evaluating learners in early childhood education formal education, basic education, and secondary education. Teachers have positions as professionals at elementary, secondary, and early childhood education levels in the formal education channels that are appointed in accordance with the laws and regulations. The acknowledgment of the position of the teacher as a professional as referred to is evidenced by the educator's certificate. Teachers are required to have academic qualifications, competencies, educator certificates, physical and mental health, and have the ability to realize national education objectives (Article 8).

Based on Article 62 paragraph (1) of Law Number 14 Year 2005 regarding Teachers and Lecturers, the Government shall begin to implement the longest educator certification program within 12 months from the enactment of the law.

The Minister of National Education issued the Regulation of the Minister of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 18 Year 2007 regarding Serfikasi for Master in Position. In the regulation mentioned that certification for teachers in the office is the process of providing teacher certification for teachers in the office. Certification can be attended by teachers in positions with already undergraduate academic qualifications (S-1) or Diploma Four (D-lV). Certification for teachers in positions held by universities that organize accredited educational procurement programs established by the Minister of Education. Certification for teachers in the position is conducted through competency test to obtain educator certificate.

The policies must, of course, be implemented so that the programs that have been designed can be implemented properly and achieve results as expected. Implementation of policies is the implementation of policies. Islamy (l988: 6.2) suggests the process of public policy implementation as a realization of government programs so as to show the results. Jones (1977: 138) suggests "Implementations we mean that activities directed toward putting a program into effect" (Implementation is an activity intended to operate a program). Winarno (l989: 65) suggests that policy implementation involves attempts at a time to convert decisions into operations.

Abdulwahab (1998: 50) says that policy implementation can be viewed as a process of implementing policy decisions (usually in the form of laws, government regulations, judicial decisions, executive orders, or presidential decrees).

Dwijowijoto (2003: 158) Implementation of policy in principle is a way for a policy to achieve its goals. There are two options to implement in the form of programs or through the formulation of a derivative policy of public policy. In public sector management. Implementation of the policy is described as follows: Mission, Vision, Plan, Strategy, Program, Project, Activity, Feedback.

Ekowati (2005: 24) suggests the definition of implementation explicitly includes actions by private individuals and private groups and the public directly on the achievement of a series of continuous objectives in pre-determined policy decisions. This includes inter-efforts to transform decisions into operational actions, striving to achieve major and minor changes as mandated by policy decisions.

Implementation of policies is one of the stages in the policy-making process lies between policy formulation and policy consequences. This is stated by Edward III (l980: 1). Policy implementation is the stage of policymaking between the establishment of a policy ... and the consequences of the policy for the people whom it effects.

Another opinion put forward by Putra (2001: 84) policy implementation is intended to understand what happens after a program is formulated, as well as what impacts arise from the policy program. In addition, policy implementation is not only related to administrative issues but also examines the environmental factors that affect the implementation process of the policy.

Also explained by Hogwood & Gun (l984: 196) Implementation as a key element in the study public policy. (Implementation is a key element in public policy studies).

Based on the opinion of experts mentioned above that the implementation of public policy as follows:

a. An activity intended to operate a program;
b. The realization of government programs so as to show the results;
c. Something important, perhaps even more important than policy-making;
d. Includes attempts at a time to change the decisions into operations;
e. The process of implementing policy decisions;
f. One of the stages in the policy-making process lies between policy formulation and policy consequences;
g. Understanding what happens after a program is formulated, as well as what impacts arise from the policy program (Kusnandar, 2017: 91).

The main implementers of policy implementation are government officials/agencies commonly called government bureaucracy including executive, legislative, judiciary, political party leaders, community organizations, and citizens.

To find out the effectiveness of policy implementation by the government, it is necessary to analyze the implementation of public policy itself. The analysis model of the implementation of the policy used in the research is the implementation model of Edward III. In other words, Edwards III model will serve as a model used as a measurement tool of certification policy implementation in Madrasah AliyahNegeri Sukamanah Kabupaten Tasikmalaya.

Edwards III (1980) explains that the assessment of policy implementation is crucial for the review of public administration and public policy. In reviewing the implementation of the policy begins by asking two questions, namely: what preconditions are needed so that a policy implementation works? and what are the major obstacles that lead to an implementation fail?

The attempt to answer these two important questions is to discuss four factors in the implementation of public policy. These factors are

communication, sources, dispositions or implementers, and bureaucratic structures.

a. Communication. Communication plays an important role, namely as a reference for policy implementers to know exactly what they will do. Thus, communication can also be expressed as a superior order against policy implementers so that the implementation of the policy does not come out of the desired target.

b. Resources. Implementation orders may be forwarded carefully, clearly and consistently, but if the executors lack the resources needed to implement the policies, implementation tends to be ineffective. Resources can be important factors in implementing public policy. Important resources include adequate staff and good skills to carry out their duties, information, powers, and facilities necessary to translate proposals on paper to carry out public services.

c. Disposition. The disposition of policy implementers is a factor that has important consequences for the effectiveness of policy implementation. The implementor must know what to do and have the ability to do this so that the policy is implemented effectively. If the executors are kind to a particular policy, and this means support, they are likely to implement policies as desired by early decision makers.

d. Bureaucratic Structure. Policy implementers may know what to do and have enough desire and resources to do so, but they may still be prevented in the implementation by the organizational structure in which they are served. Bureaucracy is one of the most frequent bodies even as a whole executing policy. The bureaucratic structure is a dimension that has an impact on policy implementation. In the sense that the implementation of the policy will not succeed if there is a weakness in the structure of the implementing agency.

II. METHODOLOGY

The research method used in this study is a research method that is directed to describe the critical factors in the implementation of public policy certification in Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Sukamanah Tasikmalaya Regency. Therefore, the research method used is descriptive research. As a problem-solving procedure that is investigated by describing the state of the current research object based on the fact as it is. According to Sugiono (2007: 115), Descriptive research is a study conducted to determine the value of independent, either one or more variables without making a comparison, or connect between variables one with other variables.

The population of this research is civil servant teacher in Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Sukamanah Tasikmalaya Regency as many as 60 people who have received certification. Samples of research as many as 30 teachers. This refers to the opinion of Kartono (1996: 120) who argues that in principle there are no strict rules to absolutely determine how many samples should be taken from the population.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive analysis of the implementation of the certification policy is conducted on 4 (four) dimensions, namely dimensions: communication, sources, dispositions, and bureaucratic structure.

The results of descriptive analysis of the implementation of the overall certification policy can be explained as follows:

A. Communication.

Dimensions create communication, operationally covering 6 (six) indicators, namely (a) Guidance on certification implementation, (b) Conformity of certification implementation guidelines with certification objectives, (c) Consistent implementation of certification technical guidelines, (d) Clarity of certification requirements, (e)) Strict certification enforcement requirements, (f) Implementation of duties in accordance with certification.

Respondents' answers related to the proposed statement can be seen in the following table:

Table I
Respondents Answer Recapitulation
Communication Dimensions

No.	Score Indicator	SS 5		S 4		R 3		KS 2		TS 1		Total Score (F x B)	Level
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Certification Implementation Instructions	7	17,5	33	82,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	
2	Compliance of Certification Implementation Instructions with Certification Objectives	10	25	30	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	
3	Consistency of Implementation of Certification Implementation Instructions	2	5	25	62,5	13	32,5	0	0	0	0	149	
4	Clarity of Certification requirements	1	2,5	2	5	37	92,5	2	5	0	0	159	
5	Strict implementation of certification requirements	2	5	35	87,5	1	2,5	2	5	0	0	148	
6	Conformity of tasks with the certification policy	1	2,5	38	95	1	2,5	0	0	0	0	160	
	Total											953	Very High

Information:
SS = Agree; S = Agree, R = Doubt, KS = Neither Agree nor Disagree; TS = Disagree

F = Frequency; B = Weight

Based on the above table, obtained the description that the responses of respondents regarding the 17.5% certification guard answered strongly agree and 82.5% of respondents answered agree. In terms of responses of respondents to the suitability of the certification guidelines with the purpose of certification as much as 25% of respondents answered strongly agree and as many as 75% of respondents answered agree. In terms of responses of respondents to the consistency of the implementation of the implementation of the certification guidelines by 5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 62.5% of respondents answered agree, and 32.5% respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the clarity of certification requirements as much as 2.5% answered strongly agree, as many as 92.5% answered agree, and as much as 2.5% of respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the strict implementation of certification requirements, as many as 5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 87.5% answered agree, as much as 2.5% of respondents answered hesitantly, and 5% of respondents answered less agree.

In terms of respondents' responses to the conformity of the implementation of the implementation of the implementation of the certification policy, 2.5% answered strongly agree, as many as 95% of respondents answered agree, as much as 2.5% of respondents answered hesitantly,

Recapitulation results of respondents' answers above, illustrates that the respondent gave approval of 953. This shows that the dimensions of communication are categorized very high. That is, the dimension of communication is implemented within the context of the implementation of the certification policy.

B. Resources

Dimensions of resources, operational includes 6 (six) indicators, namely (1) Quantity of certification policy implementers, (2) Quality of certified teachers, (3) means of certification, (4) Distribution of certification facilities, (5) certification, and (6) Source of certification policy information is adequate.

Respondents' answers related to the source information dimension can be seen in the following table.

Table II
Recapitulation of Respondents' Answer Results
Against Dimension of Resources

No.	Score Indicator	SS 5		S 4		R 3		KS 2		TS 1		Total Score (F x B)	Level
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Certification Implementor Quantity	0	0	19	47,5	21	52,5	0	0	0	0	139	
2	Certification Implementor Quality	1	2,5	15	37,5	21	52,5	3	7,5	0	0	133	
3	Certification Facilities	24	60	14	35	2	5	0	0	0	0	182	
4	Distribution of Certification Facilities	7	17,5	31	77,5	2	5	0	0	0	0	168	
5	Feasibility of Certification Facilities	1	2,5	30	75	8	20	1	2,5	0	0	152	
6	Certification Information	2	5	23	57,5	15	37,7	0	0	0	0	175	
	Total											949	Very High

Based on the above table, obtained the description that the responses of respondents to the quantity of certification implementor as much as 47.5% answered agree and 52.5% of respondents answered agree. In terms of responses of respondents to the quality of implementation in the implementation of certification as much as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 37.5% of respondents answered agree, 52.5% of respondents answered hesitantly, and 7.5% of respondents answered less agree. In terms of responses of respondents to certification facilities, as many as 60% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 35% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 5% of respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the distribution of certification facilities, as many as 17.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 77.5% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 5% of respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the feasibility of certification facilities as much as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 75% of respondents answered agree, and as much as 20% of respondents answered hesitantly, and as many as 2.5% of respondents answered disagree. In terms of responses of respondents to certification information, as much as 5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 57.5% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 37.5% of respondents answered hesitantly.

Recapitulation results of respondents' answers above, illustrates that the respondent gave approval of 953. This shows that the dimensions of sources in the category are very high. That is, the dimensions of resources have been implemented in the context of the implementation of the certification policy.

C. Disposition

Dimensions of disposition, operationally covering 8 (eight) indicators, namely: (1) Certification allowance is adequate, (2) Ease of Promotion Position, (3) Development of education, (4) Development of training, (5) the implementor, (7) the personality of the implementors, and (8) the compliance of the implementors.

Respondents' answers related to the proposed statement can be seen in the following table:

Table III
Recapitulation of Respondents' Answer Results
Dimension Disposition

No.	Indicator	SS (Score 5)		S (Score 4)		R (Score 3)		KS (Score 2)		TS (Score 1)		Total Score (F x B)	Level
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Certification allowances are adequate	1	2,5	12	30	27	67,5	0	0	0	0	146	
2	Ease of Promotion Position	3	7,5	7	17,5	18	45	12	30	0	0	121	
3	Educational Development	2	5	32	80	4	10	2	5	0	0	154	
4	Training Development	3	7,5	30	75	6	15	1	2,5	0	0	155	
5	Implementers Support	2	5	11	27,5	25	62,5	2	5	0	0	135	
6	Implementers Involvement	1	2,5	17	42,5	22	55	0	0	0	0	139	
7	Implementers Personality	1	2,5	20	50	19	47,5	0	0	0	0	176	
8	Implementers Obedience	12	30	24	60	4	10	0	0	0	0	168	
	Total											1194	Very High

Based on the above table, obtained the description that the response of respondents regarding certification allowance as much as 2.5% of respondents answered agree, 30% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 67.5% answered hesitantly. In terms of respondent responses to promotions, as many as 7.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 17% of respondents answered agree, as many as 45% of respondents answered hesitantly, and as many as 30% of respondents answered less agree. In terms of responses of respondents to the development of education, as many as 5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 80% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 10% of respondents answered hesitantly, and as many as 5% of respondents answered less agree. In terms of respondents' responses to training development, 7.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, 75% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 15% respondents answered hesitantly, as much as 2.5% of respondents answered less agree. In the case of respondents' responses to the support of the implementors as much as 5% response answered strongly agree, as many as 27.5% respondents answered agree, and as many as 62.5% respondents answered hesitantly, and as many as 5% of respondents answered disagree. In terms of responses of respondents to the involvement of the implementor as much as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly

agree, as many as 42.5% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 55% of respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the personality of the implementor as much as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 50% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 47.5% respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the compliance of the implementor as much as 30% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 60% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 10% of respondents answered hesitantly.

The result of the recapitulation of respondents' answers above illustrates that the respondent gave approval of 1194. This shows that the disposition dimension in the category is very high. That is, the dimension of communication is implemented within the context of the implementation of the certification policy.

D. Bureaucratic Structure

The dimensions of bureaucracy structure, operationally covering 9 (nine) indicators, namely: (1) Clarity of Organizational Structure of Certification Executor, (2) Clarity Division of task implementation of dissertation, (3) Distribution of duties in the implementation of certification equally, (4) Clarity Authority implementation of the certification , (5) Presence of supervision on certification implementation, (6) Coordination of certification implementation (7) Implementor responsible for certification implementation.

Respondents' answers related to the proposed statement can be seen in the following table:

Table IV
Recapitulation of Respondents' Answer Results
Dimensions of Bureaucracy Structure

No.	Indicator	SS (Score 5)		S (Score 4)		R (Score 3)		KS (Score 2)		TS (Score 1)		Total Score (F x B)	Level
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Clarity of organizational structure Certification Implementers	1	2,5	31	77,5	8	20	0	0	0	0	135	
2	Clarity of Tasks Division	2	5	33	82,5	5	12,5	0	0	0	0	157	
3	Clarity of Tasks	1	2,5	37	92,5	1	2,5	1	2,5	0	0	158	
4	Clarity of Authority	1	2,5	31	77,5	8	20	0	0	0	0	153	
5	Supervision of Certification Implementation	1	2,5	20	50	19	47,5	0	0	0	0	142	
6	Coordination of Implementation of Certification Policy	2	5	27	67,5	11	27,5	0	0	0	0	148	
7	Responsible in the implementation of certification	1	2,5	17	42,5	22	55	0	0	0	0	139	
	Total											1032	Very High

Based on the above table, obtained the description that the responses of respondents to the clarity of the organizational structure of implementing certification as much as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly

agree, as many as 77.5% of respondents answered agree, as much as 20% of respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the clarity of the division of tasks, as many as 2.5% of respondents strongly agree, as many as 92.5% answered agree, as much as 2.5% of respondents hesitant, and 2.5% of respondents answered less agree. In terms of responses of respondents to the clarity of the task, as much as 2.5% strongly agree, as many as 92.5% answered agree, as much as 2.5% of respondents answered hesitantly, and 2.5% respondents answered less agree. In terms of responses of respondents to the clarity of authority, as many as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 77.5% of respondents answered agree, and as much as 20% of respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the supervision of certification implementation as much as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 50% answered agree, and as many as 47.5% respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the coordination of the implementation of certification policy as much as 5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 67.5% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 27.5% respondents answered hesitantly. In terms of responses of respondents to the responsibility in implementing certification as much as 2.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, as many as 42.5% of respondents answered agree, and as many as 55% of respondents answered hesitantly.

The result of recapitulation of respondents' answers above, illustrates that the respondent gave approval of 1032. This shows that the dimension of bureaucratic structure in the category is very high. That is, the dimensions of bureaucratic structures are implemented in the context of the implementation of certification policies.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion that the implementation of the certification policy consisting of 4 dimensions, namely: 1) Communication, 2) Resources, 3) Disposition and 4) Bureaucratic Structure, categorized very high.

Due to all dimensions, ie the dimensions of communication, sources, dispositions, and bureaucratic structures are very high, the implementors of certification policies in Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Sukamanah must maintain such a high category so that they can actually maintain the effectiveness of certification policy implementation even more than the current implementation.

REFERENCES

Abdul Wahab, Solichin. 1991. Analisis Kebijaksanaan dari Formulasi ke Implementasi Kebijaksanaan Negara. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.

Dwijowijoto, N. Riyan. 2003. Kebijakan Publik Formulasi, Imlementasi dan Evaluasi. Jakarta. Gramedia.

Edwards. C. George III. 1980. Implementing Public Policy. Texas: Congressional Quarterly.

Ekowati, Mas Roro Lilik. 2005. Perencanaan, Implementasi & Evaluasi Kebijakan atau Program (Suatu Kajian Teoritis dan Parktis). Surakarta: Pustaka Cakra.

Hogwood, Brian W & Gunn, Lewis A. 1984. Policy Analysis for the Real World. New York: Oxford.

Islamy, M. Irvan. 1988. Kebijakan Publik. Jakarta: Karunika.

Jones, O. 1977. An Introduction To The Study Of Public Policy. Massachusetts: Duxbury Press.

Kartono, Kartini.1996. Pengantar Metodologi Riset Sosial.Bandung. Mandar Maju.

Kusnandar, Ishak. 2017. Analisis Kebijakan Publik. Bandung. Multazam.

Mustopadidjaja. 2002. Manajemen Proses Kebijakan Publik (Formulasi, Implementasi dan Evaluasi). Jakarta: LAN RI.

Putra, Fadillah. 2001. Paradigma Kritis Dalam Studi Kebijakan Publik. Surabaya : Pustaka Pelajar.

Winarno, Budi. 1989. Teori Kebijakan Publik. Yogyakarta: PAU Studi Sosial UGM.