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Abstract. Within the current framework of global development agenda, the importance of equality and quality of education for all become one main priority to be achieved. Youth as the future leaders are also expected to enhance their skills and competitiveness. University as the centre of knowledge transfer can contribute to the agenda by diverse means, including the community engagement programs. Through the programs, university can involve improving youth capacity building and to the achievement of global development goals. However, the impact of the programs can be difference depend on several factors, including the partner selection. By taking case study analysis, this paper discusses the assessment on partners’ institutional capacity on the implementation of community engagement program.

1. Introduction

The international society comes into consensus to set benchmark for international development by setting the Development Goals in the beginning of the Millennium known as Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). MDGs set the priorities to eradicate poverty, hunger, disease, and other goals aimed to be achieved by 2015. The global development takes a big leap with the launch of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 that replaced the outdated MDGs. The SDGs spread its focus more on the development of the human capacity in more advance level than the MDGs. The focuses are ranging from the issue of fully eradicating poverty, promoting equal chance for education, health access, economy, to environment, and global partnership [1].

SDGs, as the new global development framework, have been effective since 2016 and will be ended by the end of 2030 in the 85th Session of the General Assembly. SDGs, providing more inclusive framework for development, were formulated and targeted for all nations without exceptions [2]. As the obligation of each member of the United Nations, SDGs need to be carried on by each national interest of each member states. The implementation of the SDGs itself will be based upon the national policy of each states, in which each state need to put their best efforts in fulfilling the duty of global development. Indonesia, follows the current global development framework, currently integrates SDGs indicators into the 2020-2024 National Development Planning (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah—RPJM), as the sign of commitment to achieve the targets [3].

Education within the SDGs comes with the goal “Quality Education”. This goal is mainly focusing on providing inclusive and equitable quality of education by increasing efforts from multi-stakeholders. The United Nations by far, believe that the poor quality of teachers and facility of the
school are two main issues that jeopardized the achievement of this goals. The occurrence already
hamper the student to acquire basic skills and motivation to get better quality in higher education and
the occurrence already hamper the student to acquire basic skills and motivation to get better quality in higher education and
other exposure such as leadership and extra-academic skills [4]. In this context, university as a centre
of knowledge transfer can contribute to the agenda by diverse means, including community
engagement. For community engagement, university works together with the partner institutions, both
are in systematic relations that have mutual benefit, which bring enrichment to the learning, teaching,
and research while also giving solutions to the problems in the society [5], [6].

The success factor for the conduct of community engagement basically depends on various factors.
The first domain is the strong commitment from the stakeholders, namely the university as the main
organizer for the community engagement; the local government; as well as related office like Office of
Education in Municipality/ City Level. Second, the program activity’s comprehensive planning,
implementation and evaluation. In order to create reliable and accountable community engagement
with long-term and strong effect, it needs the commitment from the organizer to create comprehensive
plan in the long-term period. As the other factor that will be analyzed in this research, is the active
cooperation from the engaging parties, in other word, the institutional capacity of the partnering
institutions [7].

This paper discusses an analysis on how the institutional capacity becomes the one of the
preeminent factors in succession the implementation of the community engagement program from the
university itself. Besides the strong commitment from the university, it is really important to consider
each partnering institution capability and capacity to create the supporting environment for the
program itself.

2. Study Design and Method
This research uses a qualitative approach, based on case studies of community engagement programs,
entitled “Socialization and Workshop of Study Abroad for High School Student” which were held in
two schools near the area of Universitas Padjadjaran (UNPAD), an Indonesian public university
located in West Java. For the partner institutions, the first school is a public school, while the other
one is a private school. The main objective of the program is to see the impact of such programs in
increasing and enhancing youth capacity and competitiveness. In this research, the argument focuses
on seeing the factor from partner institution capacity is important. Therefore, the main comparison is
to analyse whether the successful main activity and program relates to the management status and
school capacity. The pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire were given to the students to see the
impression of the participant about the importance of the program.

3. Result and Discussion
3.1. Questionnaire Result and Assessment
The community engagement program (Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat-PKM) is compulsory activity
conducted by the scholars in Indonesia’s public university [8]. The engagement process in UNPAD is
currently conducted in the form of research-based community service and engagement, twice a year, in
the first and second term of each academic year with the theme changing depends on the research
period (single or multi-year).

In the process of community engagement program, in which taking the theme of Socialization and
Workshop of Study Abroad for High School Student. The research team was giving the compact and
reliable information about the chances and opportunities available for a high school student to gain the
experiences of study abroad in the form of exchange programs, summer school, and also higher
education in a various country with or without scholarships. The programs were conducted in late
2017 for High School A (Public School) and early 2018 for High School B (Private School).
Participant were selected student with high motivation to study abroad chosen by school’s teacher to
participate in the programs.

The programs were conducted with the support from university student with experiences of going
abroad for academic and cultural engagement purposes during their high school and/or university
times. The engagement from the experienced university student is preeminent to give the clear image and information about how and why the participant needs to go abroad for gaining more academic experiences. The programs were conducted with two forms of activities. First, socialization from the lectures team about the importance of study abroad to gain competitiveness as the form of improvement of the youth capacity in the era of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Second, the workshops were given by student engaged in the programs with mainly encouraging the student to study abroad by various activities, funded or not. Later, the counselling activity by the mentor is continuing after the programs, until the student can apply for any going abroad activities.

Comparing the result of the questionnaire from the participant from both school (School A and School B), there is a slightly different trend of the answer in each item of the questionnaire. In the case study taken in this research, as mentioned previously, a questionnaire was delivered to the students in both schools, to see and set the benchmark and understanding the difference in between participant of two schools and to understand more what material that will be given during the socialization and workshop activities. The results from 100 students in School A and 46 students in School B as respondents showed that:

**Table 1. The Comparison Result of Questionnaires in School A and School B**

| No | School A (Public School)                                                                 | School B (Private School)                                                                 |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Of the 100 respondents, there are still 4% of respondents who are still hesitant to have the intention to study abroad, while 96% of them expressed great interests; | Of the 50 respondents, 96% of respondents expressed their interest in studying abroad, 2% are not willing to study abroad, while the rest 2% are still hesitant to study abroad; |
| 2. | Of the 100 respondents, 60% of respondents did not know information about student exchanges, while 27% were still hesitant and 13% knew about the existing student exchange program; | Of the 46 respondents, 40% of the respondents have information about the student exchange, with 15% others answered not knowing, and 45% still answered hesitantly |
| 3. | Of the 100 respondents, 54% of the respondents having barriers in obtaining information about study abroad, with 30% still in doubt, with 16% of respondents having no anything barriers; | Of 46 respondents, 53% still have barriers, with 32% still respond hesitantly, with 13% having no obstacles in getting information about study abroad; |
| 4. | Of 100 respondents, only 42% often spoke their desire to study abroad, with 29% still respond hesitantly, and another 29% who never discussed intentions; | Of the 46 respondents, 30% often discussed their desire to study abroad, with 30% still in doubt, and 40% answered never discuss their intention to study abroad; |
| 5. | Of 100 respondents, 61% of respondents were unaware of the interest and talent development program provided by Ministry of Education and Culture, with 24% still in doubt, and another 15% answered already know it; | Of the 46 respondents, 68% said they already knew the interest and talent development program provided by Ministry of Education and Culture, with 23% still in doubt, and another 6% still did not know the information; |
| 6. | Of the 100 respondents, 82% of respondents said they had an interest in study abroad, with 15% still in doubt and 3% who said no; | Of the 46 respondents, 89% said they had an interest in study abroad, with 9% still respond hesitantly, and 2% have no interest; |
| 7. | Of the 100 respondents, 26% of the respondents knew the scholarship program given by foreign government, while 30% are still hesitant and 44% are unaware of the related information; | Of the 46 respondents, 32% of the respondents knew the scholarship program given by foreign government, while 38% are still hesitant and 30% are unaware of the related information |
| 8. | Of the 100 respondents, 18% of respondents said they are helped to study abroad by teachers, while 44% are still hesitant and 38% still do not feel the role of the school. | Of the 46 respondents, 25% of the respondents felt assistance to study abroad, 47% were undecided, and 28% still did not feel any role from the school. |

There is a slightly different from the result from each school that probably depends on the institutional capacity of each school itself. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) applies
the three-level conceptual approach to analyse the institutional capacity in a systemic manner. Even, the said approach is used to analyse the government public institutions in the study of UNDP in developing countries. The measurements are derived from the organizational theory of the institution and development itself. There is three level that could affect the institutional capacity of the certain institution to undergo their tasks and functions in the daily basis. To mention, the individual level, the entity level, and the system level [9].

3.2. Role of Institutional Awareness to Increase Student’s Capacity
In sustaining the basic components of involvement of university in the global development, it is important to understand that partner institutions need to have the same awareness to conduct the relations that aimed to the increase of institutional capacity in fulfilling its main task and functions. During the community engagement programs conducted by UNPAD itself, as the case study here, there are slightly different arrangements that done with consideration of the institutional capacity of the partner institutions.

During the program of community engagement in this research, the awareness of the school partners is significantly in the different part of the spectrum. School A, as the open public school, with student coming from various level of income, served and fully funded by the state budget, are facing barriers coming lack of information, small number of supporting facilities, language and economic barriers, as well as conservative teaching based on the curriculum set up by the government. These circumstances create less awareness about the importance of abroad experiences for the student itself, because the prerequisite requirements are not matched with the standard for abroad experiences. The awareness and the discourse about sending their student abroad are diminished.

It is shown by the data from the questionnaire filled by the participant in School A that only 18% out of 100 participants thinks that their school has a role to support their intentions or wish to study abroad. Later in the questionnaire, the role of the teacher is also still small, with only 1/3 participant are doing counselling with their teacher about their education. On the other side, School B, is known by its achievement domestically and abroad. School B has a lot of achievements abroad in science and robotics competition. The student in School B were more confident in perceiving the possibility of school’s support in helping them gaining study abroad experiences. The participants from School B were more active in term of planning their study and involving in various academic activity. Even though, currently, the school only focuses on the area of science and technology. School B was showing more significant awareness that coming from the school opinion about the importance of the student capacity development through various science fair and competition, both nationally and internationally.

3.3. The Structure of School as Well-Build Institutions
School as partner institutions are important to have the clear vision, mission, and programs to support the university mission to take a big role in the global development. Within the long-term programs, it is important to have the clear planned programs aimed to improve the capacity of the student in experiencing better exposure.

School A is a public school under the Ministry of Education, while School B is a private school under well-known private institution. The difference in term of the vision, mission, and programs are indeed relied on how the School B could explore more on the teaching methods, the information flow, as well as utilizing the financial capability of the students’ parent because of their independent character. A public school like School A could not freely set their missions and programs, due to the hierarchic process with the Ministry of Education in the highest level to the Office of Education in each municipality and provinces [10]. The process of School A to get approval for long-term school programs such as the increasing of the students’ capacity development through annual science fair, leadership camp, et cetera. School B, on the other way, could set every program independently with only need to report to the higher authorities about their programs. The reason is the financial capacity of the school that not relied on the state's budget.
Building the institutional capacity also comes from the individual level of the board of director in the school as well academic staffs. Private school often have more aware academic staff that encourage their student to not just excel in academic in-school but also out-school. As a private school, School B has better achievement and science and leadership exposure than School A that relied only on the governments' programs to improve the students’ capacity, such as limited scout programs and other extra-curriculum programs.

School facility is preeminent in supporting the academic process of the school, the existence of compact and massive sport and science centre in School B significantly increasing the possibility that School B has a higher chance to excel in academic and sport than School A. School facility itself, could raise the awareness of the students and academic staff. Because the facility is available, there will be no more barriers in conducting extensive learning to increase the student capacity in the SDGs era. Sufficient facilities are also the sign of decent institutional capacity as the partner of the university in the global development.

3.4. External Factor Affecting Institutional Capacity

Financial capability and language ability of both school, academic staff and student are the main external factor affecting the institutional capacity of the institution partner in this research. School A and School B have a wide gap in term of school financial ability as well as the student and academic staff ability in the foreign language. Private school is often professionally managed by its mother institutions in term of financial management of the school. Private school also possesses an ability to collect a certain amount of fund from the students’ parent enable school to conduct better programs based upon the character of their student with the consent of their parents that already willing to pay more tuition when they register their children into a private school.

Citing from the questionnaire, 67% respondent from School A is facing the financial difficulty, while only 25% of the respondent from School B is having the financial problem. Thus, the reception of the community engagement programs is also different. The students from School B were way more excited because they believed they do not have any barriers to go abroad if they could. While, the student from School A, need more motivation and encouragement to be able to build their confidence about study abroad. Institutional capacity is not entirely about the financial capability. It is more about the system from the individual level to the systemic level. However, in order to practically undergo the better institutional capacity, financial always comes in between of the process of institutional capacity development.

Financial ability, therefore, becomes a different problem in both schools taken as a sample in this research. School A has a difficulty in managing its own financial plan and annual budget due to the centrality of the budget regulation of the public school that is strictly managed by the higher education office and forbid school to collect additional fund from the parents without consent of the Office of Education in the municipal/city/province level itself.

Centralized authority in one way could increase the education institutions capacity in a way they could focus only on teaching the student, instead of thinking the sources of school income. However, it also could create decadence in term of school development other than teaching activity on the daily basis. A private school like School B, thus, have better institutional capacity when we saw them in term of individual capacity of the student, teacher, and academic staff; the school as an independent entity; as well as school as part of Indonesia’s education system. School A, served the main purposes of Indonesia to be able to give education inclusively to all the children in Indonesia, already done excellent job to educate the children inclusively.

4. Conclusion

University’s involvement in achieving equality and quality education for all plays an important role in global development. One form of university’s involvement that aimed to improve youth capacity building which will give positive impact with the achievement of global development goals is the university’s community engagement program. Based on Universitas Padjadjaran’s community
engagement programs on socialization and workshop of studying abroad for high school students that were run in two different institutions: public school (School A) and private school (School B), it is found that the success impact of program is dependent on at least two factors: (i) institutional capacity and awareness of partners on study abroad experiences for their students and (ii) external factors.

The level of capacity and awareness of institutional partners on study abroad experiences for students can be seen on the clarity of vision, mission and curriculum of school which show well-build institutions; supporting facilities; and competent teaching staff. The enhancement of study abroad experiences for students need to be supported by a clear school program, easy access for information through supporting facilities and teaching staffs who as competent consular to guide students in academic and non-academic achievements. On the other side, external factors include financial capacity and foreign language ability for both school academic staff and student are something that cannot be underestimated.
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