e-ISSN: 3025-8189 ; p-ISSN: 3025-8197

doi.org/10.35870/ljit.v4i2.9177

Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026

PP. 1872-1884

Homepage http://www.journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Minimum Education Service Standards in Archipelagic Maluku: Institutional Readiness and Policy Implementation

Ta'lum Latuconsina[1], Wahab Tuanaya[2], Josef Antonius Ufi[3]

Department of Public Administration, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia[1,2,3]

Corresponding Author's Email: latuconsinata88@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted *11 13, 2026*

Accepted *11 16, 2026*

Published *11 24, 2026*

ABSTRACT

This article examines how Minimum Service Standards (MSS) for education can be analyzed in the Maluku Provincial Education and Culture Office through a bounded qualitative document review. The identifiable substantive set comprises 20 sources: four national regulations and 16 published studies dated 2018–2026. Regulatory duties and comparator findings are classified under four dimensions: planning, resources and organization, coordination, and direction and control. Five candidate risks emerge from published comparisons geographic logistics, financing, data reliability, personnel distribution, and facilities but their prevalence in Maluku has not been measured. A seven-stage data-to-correction cycle, with evidence gates and feedback, is proposed as an analytical framework for subsequent field verification. The reference-based selection is purposive and non-exhaustive; no original database-screening log is available. Accordingly, this article does not evaluate provincial compliance or report interviews, observations, or school-level performance data. Its contribution is a traceable distinction between legal obligations, comparative evidence, and propositions requiring local testing.

Keywords: *Minimum Service Standards; Education Policy; Archipelagic Governance; Public Administration; Maluku*

How to Cite:

Latuconsina, T., Tuanaya, W., & Ufi, J. A. (2026). Minimum Education Service Standards in Archipelagic Maluku: Institutional Readiness and Policy Implementation. LANCAH: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Tren, 4(2), 1872-1884. https://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit/article/view/9177

Copyright @ 2026. Published by Lembaga Komunitas Informasi Teknologi Aceh (KITA), Indonesia. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). Based on a work at http://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Abstract & Indexing

CC BY-NC 4.0

INTRODUCTION

Public service is a central responsibility of government because it translates legal rights into services that citizens can actually access. In public administration, service performance is not limited to the delivery of administrative documents; it also includes the provision of basic goods and social services that determine the quality of life. Education is one of the most strategic basic services because it supports human development, social mobility, regional competitiveness, and the constitutional objective of educating the nation. Consequently, the quality and equity of education services cannot depend solely on local discretion. They require minimum standards that define the services every citizen is entitled to receive.

The policy rationale is strongest where administrative averages hide unequal access. A regional MSS achievement rate may rise even while some island schools remain unable to obtain qualified personnel, learning resources, accessible facilities, or regular supervision. For that reason, this study treats minimum standards as both a legal entitlement and a test of the capacity of regional institutions to allocate public resources according to demonstrated needs. Compliance is a necessary administrative condition, but it is analytically distinct from service availability, accessibility, continuity, and quality in each locality.

Indonesia assigns education-service responsibilities across levels of government. Law Number 23 of 2014 establishes the broader decentralization framework; Government Regulation Number 2 of 2018 defines MSS as the minimum basic services owed to every eligible citizen; the Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation Number 59 of 2021 governs implementation procedures; and the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology Regulation Number 32 of 2022 specifies the technical education standards. Together, these instruments make education MSS relevant to data collection, target setting, planning, budgeting, implementation, and performance reporting. They do not, however, provide evidence that a particular province has fulfilled the standards.

The distinction between MSS and general education-quality targets matters. Damanik (2018) explains their relationship to National Education Standards: a minimum obligation creates a baseline for services, whereas higher quality ambitions require additional institutional effort. The experience of secondary education in Banten described by Subki et al. (2022) shows that formal integration into planning documents can coexist with limitations in personnel distribution and the achievement of service indicators. Evidence from Sumbawa also links incomplete implementation to communication, staffing, infrastructure, working procedures, and financing arrangements (Kusuma et al., 2024).

Studies of educational institutions point to different combinations of bottlenecks. Vitri et al. (2019) report that school-related standards may be uneven across classroom facilities, teacher qualifications, and supervision indicators. Setiawati et al. (2025) emphasizes the role of teaching processes and instructional facilities in meeting minimum educational requirements, while Ardianto et al. (2024) identify budgetary and social constraints affecting the effectiveness of education MSS. These findings are from different institutional and geographic settings; they inform the analytical questions posed here rather than establish the actual situation in Maluku.

These issues are particularly relevant to archipelagic governance, but this review does not use unspecified local background documents as proof of Maluku conditions. Instead, five potential risk domains are derived from identifiable published studies: geographic access and logistics (Madubun, 2024; Nurlatu et al., 2025), financing and policy implementation (Ardianto et al., 2024; Kusuma et al., 2024), accuracy of service planning data (Kempa & Lisapaly, 2026), human-resource distribution (Subki et al., 2022; Kempa

et al., 2026), and facilities and learning conditions (Metarum, 2021; Setiawati et al., 2025). These are candidate mechanisms for examination in Maluku, not verified failures of the provincial education office.

Island geography deserves particular attention because equal national targets do not imply equal delivery costs. In Maluku, research on public service organization has connected access constraints with institutional arrangements that insufficiently reflect island conditions (Madubun, 2024). More recent education studies discuss personnel distribution, transport logistics, and the vulnerability of remote schools to delayed support (Kempa et al., 2026; Nurlatu et al., 2025). Such literature suggests that geographic difficulty should be recorded in needs assessments and budget assumptions, rather than treated as a peripheral implementation detail. An additional Maluku study on educational zoning distinguishes widened administrative access from unresolved quality differences across schools (Tahapary et al., 2026).

Policy-implementation research provides a conceptual basis for the four dimensions. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) link implementation performance to policy standards, resources, communication, organizational characteristics, and the surrounding environment; these concerns inform the planning and resource/organization dimensions. Matland (1995) shows why ambiguity and conflict condition how policies move from formal decisions to practice, sharpening the assessment of target clarity, task division, and local discretion. O'Toole (2000) emphasizes that implementation takes place across organizational and institutional relationships, supporting attention to inter-unit coordination and supervision. In this article, planning refers to the translation of service obligations into timed, data-based targets; resources and organization refer to staffing, financing, facilities, and assigned authority; coordination refers to alignment across actors; and direction and control refer to monitoring and corrective feedback. These four dimensions are analytical categories, not validated indicators of provincial institutional performance.

Existing studies document implementation constraints in other Indonesian education settings, while Maluku-oriented research addresses island accessibility and policy design (Madubun, 2024; Pattiasina et al., 2026). Yet the sources reviewed do not trace, indicator by indicator, how the provincial office converts MSS obligations into verified recipient data, operational responsibilities, funded interventions, and corrective decisions. This is the specific analytical gap: the connection between regulatory duties and the institutional decision chain for provincial secondary and special education in a geographically fragmented territory remains under-specified. The research question is therefore: what institutional requirements and evidence checkpoints can be established from regulations and comparative studies to examine education MSS implementation in Maluku?

The article contributes an explicit, bounded documentary synthesis: a traceable source inventory, a distinction between legal obligations and comparative evidence, five hypotheses about implementation risks, and a seven-stage framework for future testing. It does not report a completed field study, calculate provincial MSS compliance, or attribute shortcomings to officials without local administrative and school-level evidence.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

This article reports a bounded qualitative document analysis (Bowen, 2009), not the results of interviews or observation. The unit of analysis is the proposed institutional process for provincial education MSS. The review addresses services within the province's legal responsibilities, especially secondary and special education. It examines four national legal instruments and the published scholarly works actually

cited in the submitted manuscript; unpublished research proposals and unspecified background documents are excluded as evidentiary sources.

The analytical framework comprises four categories drawn from implementation scholarship and the research focus: (1) planning—target definitions, timing, service gaps and preparedness; (2) resources and organization—staffing, budgets, facilities, task assignment and workload; (3) coordination—alignment among units and levels of government; and (4) direction and control—reporting, oversight and corrective decisions. These categories are used to classify written obligations and comparator findings, not to infer that the Maluku office already meets or fails any criterion (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975; Matland, 1995; O'Toole, 2000).

The auditable, reference-based source set contains 20 substantive documents: four national normative instruments (Law No. 23/2014; Government Regulation No. 2/2018; Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 59/2021; and Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology Regulation No. 32/2022) and 16 published studies dated 2018–2026. The 16 studies are Ardianto et al. (2024), Damanik (2018), Iryani (2023), Kempa and Lisapaly (2026), Kempa et al. (2026), Kilmas et al. (2026), Kusuma et al. (2024), Madubun (2024), Metarum (2021), Nurlatu et al. (2025), Pattiasina et al. (2026), Setiawati et al. (2025), Subki et al. (2022), Tahapary et al. (2026), Vitri et al. (2019), and Yugo (2025). Separate theory and methods works serve as analytical guidance rather than as evidence of education-service conditions.

Source identification and selection are presented transparently as a purposive, citation-based reconstruction, not a systematic literature search. The 20 records are enumerated in REFERENCES and were retained if they concerned (a) binding MSS/education authority or (b) implementation, education access, equity, personnel, budgeting, data, or island-service delivery. Legal sources were checked against public regulatory repositories; journal records are traceable through the publisher or DOI links in REFERENCES. Searches across databases, screening totals, excluded full texts, and original search strings were not logged in the earlier manuscript and therefore cannot be reported retrospectively as completed procedures. Consequently, this set is bounded and non-exhaustive. Readers can replicate the source-level comparison from the explicit inventory, but not an unrecorded search history.

The 20 documents were read against a three-column evidence matrix: (i) a regulatory requirement explicitly stated in a legal instrument, (ii) a comparator finding reported in published research, and (iii) an author-developed proposition requiring Maluku verification. The third column is not treated as a result observed in Maluku. Primary-school and institution-specific studies are used only as context when their jurisdiction differs from provincial secondary or special education. This prevents findings from unrelated sites from being transferred into local performance claims.

Following the logic of qualitative data condensation, display, and conclusion verification in Miles et al. (2014), relevant passages were categorized by the four institutional dimensions, displayed in a responsibility/evidence matrix, checked against their source type, and synthesized into a candidate risk map and decision cycle. Bowen (2009) provides the methodological rationale for critically assessing documentary evidence and its limits. No statistical tests, interviews, field observations, original performance records, or Maluku-specific school measurements were conducted for this article.

The analytical output is an account of what the cited documents require or report, followed by clearly marked interpretations and practical proposals. Legal provisions establish formal duties; comparative studies indicate plausible implementation mechanisms; neither establishes local prevalence, causal effects,

or the actual effectiveness of the Maluku Provincial Education and Culture Office. No prospective database-screening count or Maluku implementation score is claimed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Regulatory Obligations and the Provincial Institutional Mandate

The four normative instruments establish complementary but distinguishable requirements. Law No. 23/2014 allocates regional responsibilities for education; Government Regulation No. 2/2018 defines the basic-service obligation; Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 59/2021 governs the implementation process; and Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology Regulation No. 32/2022 specifies education-service technical standards. The documented result is therefore regulatory specification of duties and steps—not empirical evidence that any particular school or office has fulfilled them.

Read together, the regulations require identifying eligible service recipients and needs and translating them into service fulfillment planning, implementation, and reporting. This is an observable documentary chain of obligations. The sources do not provide a validated denominator, a school-by-school compliance inventory, or an audited provincial decision trail. Consequently, they do not permit a numerical assessment of coverage, accessibility, or service quality in Maluku.

The allocation of education responsibilities under the regional-government framework places provincial analysis primarily in secondary and special education. Several published comparators concern primary schools or different institutions (Ardianto et al., 2024; Vitri et al., 2019; Yugo, 2025); their findings illustrate possible administrative problems but cannot be presented as compliance measurements for provincial schools. This jurisdictional distinction is maintained in the evidence matrix.

The documentary sources contain requirements concerning educational service standards, planning, fulfillment, and reporting, but they do not identify the current lead unit, data custodian, budget owner, or follow-up decision-maker for each indicator within the Maluku office. An indicator-responsibility matrix is consequently presented below as an analytical instrument requiring confirmation, not as a description of current staffing.

The documentary finding is limited to the existence and scope of regulatory responsibilities. Operational questions—whether a common indicator dictionary exists, who validates records, how priorities align with appropriations, and who authorizes exceptions—remain unanswered by the available material. These are proposed field-verification questions rather than observed institutional weaknesses.

Planning Quality, Target Accuracy, and Timeliness

The implementation regulations connect minimum-service fulfillment with needs identification, planning, and reporting. The sources establish a sequence of administrative obligations; they do not provide the Maluku office's dated planning files, procurement timetable, student-level denominator, or verified school accessibility records. Accordingly, actual timeliness and accuracy cannot be established in this review.

Comparative studies identify why those missing records matter. Subki et al. (2022) report a Banten setting in which formal planning and realization are not equivalent, while Kempa and Lisapaly (2026) discuss needs assessment, educational data, and risks in island-service planning. These findings justify

investigating data timeliness, geographic breakdown, and the connection between needs and funded activities; they do not prove misallocation in Maluku.

For each applicable indicator, documentary verification would require a recorded denominator, reference year, geographic unit, service threshold, and validation source. Such records were not supplied as part of the bounded corpus. The absence of these primary records from this article means the provincial baseline is unknown, not that provincial records necessarily are absent.

The combined normative and comparator evidence therefore supports a checklist linking an identified eligible group to the applicable standard, a verified service gap, a planned intervention, and a budgeted responsibility. Table 1 makes this distinction explicit by separating the analytical dimension from the local evidence that would be required to assess implementation.

A potential difference between islands is analytically relevant because geographical distribution can affect the cost and time required to deliver the same service (Madubun, 2024; Nurlatu et al., 2025). This is a source-supported rationale for disaggregation, but the reviewed documents cannot show which Maluku schools face the largest current deficits.

Table 1. Documentary analytical dimensions and Maluku evidence still required

Dimension	Documentary Basis / Focus	Maluku Evidence Required	Decision to Test
Planning	MSS rules: needs, targets, plans; Subki et al. (2022)	Indicator denominators; verified school/student records; dated plans	Target and priority alignment
Resources and organization	MSS service duties; Nurlatu et al. (2025); Kempa et al. (2026)	Staff maps, budgets, facilities, workload and signed responsibilities	Allocation and accountability
Coordination	Implementation regulation; O'Toole (2000)	Joint decisions; data reconciliation; meeting/action records	Unresolved inter-unit gaps
Direction and control	Implementation and reporting obligations; Setiawati et al. (2025)	Inspection reports; complaints; documented corrections	Verification and follow-up

Source: Authors' analytical matrix based on Law No. 23/2014, Government Regulation No. 2/2018, the two implementation/technical regulations, and comparative studies; no Maluku field measurements were available.

Resources, Personnel Distribution, and Facilities

Published studies associate service quality with the distribution, suitability, and continuity of personnel and facilities. For example, Subki et al. (2022) discuss MSS performance in Banten; Kempa et al. (2026) synthesize accessibility, staffing, and educational logistics in archipelagic regions; and Nurlatu et al. (2025) examine education constraints in an island district of Maluku. These are comparator-level observations. The present corpus does not contain a validated provincial map of teacher vacancies, school conditions, staffing workloads, or budget allocations.

The source evidence suggests at least four distinguishable resource questions: staffing counts, qualifications, geographic placement, and the timing of deployment. Regulations specify service obligations, while published comparators illustrate why resource availability cannot be inferred from province-wide totals (Subki et al., 2022; Nurlatu et al., 2025). A local assessment would need human-resource records and school-level service gaps to determine whether these mechanisms arise in Maluku.

Archipelagic-oriented studies discuss higher delivery complexity, transport risk, school access, and uneven staffing (Kempa et al., 2026; Pattiasina et al., 2026). Kilmas et al. (2026) likewise address learning management in an isolated school setting. Together they establish relevant comparison questions about transport costs, lead times, and continuity; they do not quantify costs or interruptions at the Maluku Provincial Education and Culture Office.

The document review indicates a necessary evidentiary distinction between financial commitments and actual resource delivery. Studies of education MSS implementation discuss financing and program constraints in their respective locations (Ardianto et al., 2024; Kusuma et al., 2024; Iryani, 2023). Without the Maluku office's indicator-linked budget lines, procurement records, and expenditure realization, this article cannot determine whether financial provision is sufficient, synchronized, or effective in the province.

Published material on remote-school service quality and instructional conditions links facilities to safe and functional educational provision (Metarum, 2021; Setiawati et al., 2025). Such literature motivates distinguishing the existence of an asset from its current usability. However, no school-by-school facility inspection, maintenance history, accessibility audit, or learning-resource stocktake for Maluku was examined here.

The evidence matrix consequently separates provincial management capacity from school-level service resources. Personnel administration, education data, and procurement are distinct from subject-teacher availability, facilities, and materials at schools. They require different records and potentially different remedies. This separation is a framework output rather than a verified assessment of current organizational performance.

Division of Labor, Workload, and Organizational Accountability

The legal instruments allocate broad service duties but do not, by themselves, specify how the Maluku office currently distributes every indicator across planning, finance, personnel, procurement, and supervision. This leaves an empirical question about whether designated lead officers and reporting routes exist for each service target. The document review cannot answer that question without organizational decrees or internal workflow records.

Comparative implementation research gives a reason to examine workload and task allocation. Subki et al. (2022) and Vitri et al. (2019) describe indicator-dependent implementation conditions in other jurisdictions, while O'Toole (2000) treats organizational linkages as a core concern of implementation research. No evidence in the present corpus permits a finding that the province's job descriptions or workload distributions are inadequate.

One output of the synthesis is a proposed verification record containing the responsible unit, supporting units, the data source, the decision deadline, the funding route, and evidence of follow-up. Such an instrument would reveal whether responsibilities are traceable, but it cannot be presented as an existing document used by the Maluku office.

The comparator studies also show why a single aggregate performance score can obscure differences between staff, facilities, and supervision (Vitri et al., 2019; Subki et al., 2022). The application of this observation to provincial education MSS is a plausible analytical extension; verification still requires indicator-specific Maluku administrative evidence.

Coordination, Guidance, and Monitoring

Normative guidance requires service planning, implementation and reporting, while policy-implementation scholarship directs attention to relationships among responsible actors (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975; O'Toole, 2000). These sources justify distinguishing vertical coordination across government levels from horizontal coordination among planning, finance, personnel, procurement, schools, and oversight units. They do not describe the frequency or effectiveness of coordination meetings in Maluku.

The source comparison indicates that monitoring and reporting must be distinguished from direct proof of service use and quality. Studies from other educational settings discuss the relevance of facilities and teaching conditions to learning quality (Setiawati et al., 2025; Yugo, 2025). The article lacks a primary Maluku record linking office reports to school inspections and beneficiary experiences; any claim that the provincial monitoring system is successful or ineffective would therefore be premature.

The matrix identifies specific records that could establish coordination effects: agreed indicator definitions, reconciled datasets, joint decision minutes, dated budget corrections, and evidence of action on identified gaps. None of these internal documents is represented as having been inspected in this study. This is an evidence requirement derived from the theory and regulatory process, not a field result.

Public transparency and service feedback are normatively relevant to a rights-based view of MSS. Nevertheless, the cited corpus does not record actual citizen complaints, school feedback channels, or provincial responses. Their accessibility and effectiveness remain questions for subsequent empirical investigation.

Monitoring quality also requires separating an administrative entry from a functioning service: a registered asset need not be currently usable, and staffing records alone cannot establish teaching continuity. External studies provide reasons to check both coverage and quality (Setiawati et al., 2025; Yugo, 2025), but this is not a finding of poor service performance in Maluku.

Source-Supported Candidate Risks and Evidence Status

The five risk domains in Table 2 are analytical categories derived from published comparator studies, not reported frequencies or rankings for Maluku. The documentary basis for each is made explicit: geographic and logistics issues (Madubun, 2024; Nurlatu et al., 2025), financing and implementation limits (Ardianto et al., 2024; Kusuma et al., 2024), data and planning uncertainty (Kempa & Lisapaly, 2026), human-resource distribution (Subki et al., 2022; Kempa et al., 2026), and facility quality (Metarum, 2021; Setiawati et al., 2025). As a conceptual interaction, inconsistent records could distort priority setting, which could alter allocations, delay delivery, and then undermine subsequent monitoring. The feedback chain remains a proposition until traced through Maluku-specific records.

Table 2. Candidate Risks, Cited Source Types, and Evidence Needed for Verification

Candidate Risk + Comparator Basis	What Must be Verified in Maluku	Possible Response (Not Observed)
Geographic logistics: Madubun (2024); Nurlatu et al. (2025)	Transport times/costs, interruptions, island school locations	Island-cluster schedules; cost weighting
Financing: Ardianto et al. (2024); Kusuma et al. (2024)	Costed MSS plans, spending records, procurement dates	Budget synchronization and gap-based priorities

Candidate Risk + Comparator Basis	What Must be Verified in Maluku	Possible Response (Not Observed)
Data: Kempa & Lisapaly (2026)	Denominators, refresh dates, discrepancies and validation logs	Agreed definitions and source reconciliation
Human resources: Subki et al. (2022); Kempa et al. (2026)	Teacher placement, qualifications, vacancy and workload records	Targeted redeployment and competence support
Facilities: Metarum (2021); Setiawati et al. (2025)	Safe and usable classrooms, sanitation, electricity and materials	Evidence-based repairs and maintenance

Source: The published comparator studies cited in column 1 and author-developed test questions. Categories are not measured Maluku implementation failures.

Documentary Synthesis of a Seven-Stage Implementation Cycle

Four regulations together describe a route from identifying service needs and standards toward planning, execution, and reporting. This review organizes those requirements and comparative lessons into seven proposed stages: (1) verify data; (2) assess service gaps; (3) prioritize eligible needs; (4) cost and align the plan with the budget; (5) execute through assigned units; (6) monitor coverage, quality, and outstanding gaps; and (7) record corrective decisions. Figure 1 visualizes this proposed management cycle and its feedback to verification. It is a conceptual synthesis, not an observed procedure or evaluated model in Maluku.



Figure 1. Proposed seven-stage MSS implementation cycle and verification gates.
Source: *Authors' conceptual synthesis of the cited regulations and comparative literature; the process has not been tested in Maluku.*

The seven stages are joined by proposed evidence gates. A data gate checks unresolved discrepancies; an assessment gate records recipients and thresholds; a priority gate documents equity criteria; a budget gate connects activities to funds; an execution gate records accountable delivery; a monitoring gate shows remaining gaps; and a correction gate authorizes follow-up. These gates specify questions for later fieldwork, not achievements already established by this documentary review.

The synthesis also distinguishes formal compliance records from evidence of services received. A reported activity or submitted form does not by itself establish that eligible learners received a functioning minimum service. Checking that distinction requires school records, budget realization, site-level observation, and beneficiary accounts that were not available for this article.

The proposed cycle cannot be validated or compared with existing provincial practices from the cited records alone. The present findings comprise requirements extracted from regulations, thematic patterns appearing in comparable published studies, and questions generated for local verification. The design implications are discussed separately below.

The documentary conclusion is restricted to identifiable rules, comparator patterns, and proposed tests. The scope and relevance of those tests require independent validation with Maluku administrative and school-level evidence.

Discussion

The principal contribution of the evidence matrix is to make the inferential steps visible. Regulation establishes a duty; comparator research identifies a possible source of implementation difficulty; an institutional diagnosis requires current, local evidence. Earlier work on implementation stresses the movement from standards and resources to actual delivery (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975), uncertainty in policy execution (Matland, 1995), and relations among implementing organizations (O'Toole, 2000). The four dimensions bring these concerns together as questions for documentary verification. A future interview or administrative audit can then challenge each proposed explanation rather than assume that it applies to Maluku.

Geographic equity provides a substantive reason to move beyond aggregate MSS reporting. Maluku-oriented comparative studies point to spatial access, logistics, and variation in local service conditions (Madubun, 2024; Nurlatu et al., 2025; Pattiasina et al., 2026). For provincial secondary and special education, a plausible response would be to compare indicator denominators, funding, staff deployment, travel times, and effective service access by island group. This would test whether apparently uniform targets mask unequal costs or interrupted delivery. Such a design is an analytical recommendation and must not be interpreted as evidence that the provincial office currently neglects remote schools.

The proposed seven-stage cycle is intended to connect routine management decisions with an accountability trail. Planning would specify the service gap and beneficiary; the resource stage would identify a responsible unit and budget; monitoring would test outputs against usable services; corrective action would document who changed what and when. The interaction among risks matters: inaccurate data could alter funding priorities, a delayed intervention could affect service continuity, and interrupted supervision could worsen subsequent data quality. This is a mechanism to investigate rather than an empirical causal finding. Testing requires a time-ordered sample of actual MSS decisions and the records at each gate.

The evidence base limits the strength of these implications. The 20-source set is explicit but purposive and non-exhaustive; no original database selection log survives, and most research findings are drawn from different jurisdictions or education levels. Although the regulatory obligations are identifiable, provincial performance and risk severity remain unknown without administrative records, school observations, and stakeholder accounts. Further work should first secure a complete indicator inventory and dated service records, then compare island conditions and trace selected planning-to-correction decisions. Positive and negative cases should both be examined to avoid selecting only examples consistent with the proposed framework.

CONCLUSION

The documents reviewed establish the legal duties and procedural elements of education Minimum Service Standards and identify implementation concerns reported in comparable education settings. They do not establish that institutional capacity is the principal problem at the Maluku Provincial Education and Culture Office. A specific, testable question is how the office currently translates these obligations into reliable needs data, assigned responsibilities, funded services, coordination, monitoring, and corrective action across islands.

Five source-supported candidate risks geographic logistics, financing, data quality, personnel distribution, and facilities offer a structured agenda for investigation. The proposed seven-stage cycle provides evidence checkpoints for examining whether minimum educational entitlements lead to functioning services, but its usefulness and feasibility have not yet been tested locally. No risk ranking, local compliance percentage, or causal diagnosis is warranted from this documentary corpus.

The article's contribution is therefore a reproducible inventory of cited substantive sources and a transparent separation among regulation, comparator findings, and analytical proposals. The strongest limitation is the absence of original source-screening logs and local operational evidence. Next-stage research needs interviews, school and administrative records, geographically disaggregated MSS data, budget records, and targeted observations to assess actual implementation.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Ta'lum Latuconsina developed the original research focus and the initial manuscript. Wahab Tuanaya and Josef Antonius Ufi are listed as co-authors in the source manuscript and contributed to its scholarly development.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors are responsible for confirming and disclosing any actual or potential conflicts of interest to the journal before publication.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USE STATEMENT

Artificial intelligence was used to assist in restructuring, English-language editing, and preparation of this revised manuscript. Additional scholarly sources were checked against publicly accessible journal information. AI was not used to fabricate interviews, administrative data, or field observations.

REFERENCES

Ardianto, A. D. S., Syafingi, H. M., Noviasari, D. T., & Dewi, D. A. S. (2024). Efektivitas Standar Pelayanan Minimal bidang pendidikan untuk mewujudkan hak dan mutu di sekolah dasar. *Borobudur Law and Society Journal*, *3*(5), 177–189. https://doi.org/10.31603/12117

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Damanik, J. (2018). Keterkaitan Standar Pelayanan Minimal (SPM) dengan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (SNP). *Jurnal Dinamika Pendidikan, 10*(2), 180–203. https://doi.org/10.51212/jdp.v10i2.613

Government of the Republic of Indonesia. (2014). Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government. https://jdih.kemenkeu.go.id/api/download/fulltext/2014/23TAHUN2014UU.htm

Government of the Republic of Indonesia. (2018). Government Regulation Number 2 of 2018 on Minimum Service Standards. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/67029/pp-no-2-tahun-2018

Iryani, E. (2023). Achievement of minimum education service standards for Indonesia during the COVID-19 transition period. *Research and Development Journal of Education, 9*(1), 465–473. https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v9i1.16608

Kempa, R., & Lisapaly, G. (2026). Perencanaan strategis layanan pendidikan kepulauan berbasis analisis kebutuhan, data, dan risiko untuk peningkatan mutu sekolah pulau. *Journal of Education Research, 7*(3), 1521–1528. https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v7i3.3712

Kempa, R., Pattiasina, J., & Arjanto, P. (2026). School service resilience in Indonesia's archipelagic regions: A systematic review of spatial accessibility, distribution of educational personnel, and educational logistics. *International Journal of Social Science, Educational, Economics, Agriculture Research and Technology, 5*(8). https://ijset.org/index.php/ijset/article/view/2020

Kilmas, M., Kempa, R., & Arjanto, P. (2026). Manajemen pembelajaran di tengah keterisolasian: Potret nyata tantangan geografis, konflik sosial, dan pengembangan kompetensi guru di SD Negeri 13 Tual. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisipliner Research, 4*(3). https://doi.org/10.69693/ijim.v4i3.1220

Kusuma, A., Yamin, A., & Dewi, G. (2024). Implementasi kebijakan dan capaian kinerja pelayanan publik (Studi kasus pada Standar Pelayanan Minimal bidang pendidikan di Kabupaten Sumbawa). *JIIP: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan, 7*(2), 1208–1218. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i2.3857

Madubun, J. (2024). Public services in island sub-districts: Towards geography-based governance. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 83*(3), 308–327. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12586

Matland, R. E. (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: The ambiguity-conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 5*(2), 145–174. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a037242

Metarum, M. F. H. (2021). Tantangan SPM: Menilik mutu pendidikan sekolah pedalaman di Ules Nusa Tenggara Timur. *Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 3*(3). https://www.edukatif.org/edukatif/article/view/483

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED565763

Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia. (2022). Regulation Number 32 of 2022 on Technical Standards for Minimum Education Services. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/224734/permendikbudriset-no-32-tahun-2022

Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. (2021). Regulation Number 59 of 2021 on Implementation of Minimum Service Standards. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/196234/permendagri-no-59-tahun-2021

Nurlatu, J., Laurens, S., Ohoiwutum, S. K., & Tuanaya, W. (2025). Pendidikan di daerah kepulauan: Pembelajaran dari Kecamatan Lolong Guba Kabupaten Buru. *JIIP: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan, 8*(9), 11307–11317. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v8i9.9592

O'Toole, L. J., Jr. (2000). Research on policy implementation: Assessment and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 10*(2), 263–288. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024270

Pattiasina, J., Ratumanan, T. G., & Laurens, T. (2026). Desain kebijakan pendidikan kepulauan berbasis keadilan geografis di Maluku: Analisis alternatif, instrumen, dan dampak regulasi terhadap pemerataan mutu pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Geografi Unpatti, 5*(1), 212–234. https://ojs3.unpatti.ac.id/index.php/jpgu/article/view/26785

Setiawati, F., Ismail, I., Niswanto, N., Kamaluddin, K., & Warni, A. (2025). Implementing minimum education service standards to enhance learning quality in Indonesian junior high schools. *Journal of General Education and Humanities, 4*(4), 2035–2044. https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v4i4.784

Subki, S., Sjafari, A., & Arenawati, A. (2022). Evaluation of the implementation of minimum service standards (MSS) in middle education in Banten Province. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pembangunan Daerah, 6*(1), 49–66. https://doi.org/10.56945/jkpd.v6i1.167

Tahapary, M., Rahawarin, M. A., & Rahanra, I. Y. (2026). Evaluasi kebijakan zonasi di Kantor Dinas Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Provinsi Maluku: Studi kasus pada SMA Negeri 1 Ambon. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi, 16*(1). https://doi.org/10.33592/jiia.v16i1.8343

Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society, 6*(4), 445–488. https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404

Vitri, O., Kusumawiranti, R., & Suwarjo, S. (2019). Implementasi kebijakan Standar Pelayanan Minimal pendidikan dasar di Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten Sleman. *Populika, 7*(1), 22–33. https://doi.org/10.37631/populika.v7i1.25

Yugo, T. (2025). Implementation of minimum service standards and their contribution to learning quality in Madrasah Diniyah Takmiliyah. *Al-Qalam, 31*(1), 107–119. https://doi.org/10.31969/alq.v31i1.1576