

PROJECT REPORT

MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY

IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Project sponsored by United Board for Christian Higher
Education in Asia

Theodorus Sudimin,
Bernadeta Irmawati, Eny Trimeiningrum, Yusni Warastuti,
Thomas Budi Santoso, Antonius Suratno



2014-2015

SOEGIJAPRANATA CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
Jl. Pawiyatan Luhur IV/1 Bendan Duwur, Semarang 50234 Indonesia
<http://www.unika.ac.id>

PROJECT REPORT

MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1. **Name of Institution:** SOEGIJAPRANATA CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
2. **Academic Year:** 2014/2015
3. **Title of the project:** MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION
4. **Abstract of the report:**

In its very nature, Indonesia has been a pluralistic country in terms of religion, ethnicity, skin colour, regional social system, culture, language, archipelagic domicile, etc. Such pluralistic characteristics mark its diversity and that the slogan of Unity in Diversity should forever be relevant and fit to the lives of the Indonesian people. In addition, Pancasila, the State Ideology, onto which constitution of the nation was built and the National Coat of Arms “Garuda Pancasila” under which the above slogan is attached should be the bonding agent of the national unity and thereby provides the warrantee for the value of diversity to prosper and to triumph. The major concern, however is that there is a growing interest, by certain parties, to question the relevance and the validity of the value of diversity, which from time to time, sparks concern and restlessness as a result of the “designed” conflicts and violence threatening the existing harmonious diverse nation.

Diversity, once again, marks and epitomizes all types of communities everywhere in the country of Indonesia, not to mention smaller community such as education institutional establishment. Higher education is one of the communities where diversity is prevalent. In such a small community diversity is inevitable, as despite the size, it almost always accommodate various students, academic and non-academic staffs of different walk of life, creed, ethnic group, skin colour, social strata, interests, etc., or even in relatively more homogeneous religion-based Universities, to be one united member of academic community demands that each member be aware that diversity is an absolute precondition without which the institutional objectives may be achievable. The challenge, however, is it really that the pervasiveness of the diversity has been acknowledged and more importantly gained respect from the respectable members of the educational institution whose creeds happen to be the dominant ones in the community?; is it really that the persons in the

higher institutional management positions acknowledge and with all due respect accept the diversity? As a matter of fact, it is in this perspective that this research has particularly be built on and therefore relevant. This current project of study, initiated by a focus group discussion involving academic and non-academic staffs of several higher institutions as well as the open-ended survey questions administered to a few other university staff members, focuses itself in formulating training modules for three major target audiences, i.e.: 1). managers, staffs, and lecturers of universities, 2). Human Resource Management subject, 3). university student organizations.

Prior to module design activities, the United Board research team members conducted two separate activities, as part of the effort to keep this whole project into a reliable academic track and therefore, academically accountable, by previously conducting research on the implementation of the value of diversity in the selected higher institutions in three major cities and town in Central Java and Jogjakarta Special Provinces. The chosen research method was a qualitative method involving the adoption of two research instruments namely Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and open-ended questionnaire. The FGD was conducted twice for two different groups, one for Christian academic members working in the non-Christian Higher Institutions, and another for the Non-Christian academic members working in the Christian Higher Institutions. While, questionnaire was distributed to the academic members from three Christian Universities which managed to garner 5 returned questionnaires from both Catholic and Moslem academic staffs working in Satya Wacana Christian University (SWCU), Salatiga, and 9 other non-Catholic academic staffs working in two Catholic Universities, Sanata Dharma (SDU) and Atma Jaya, Yogyakarta (Atma Jaya).

Both types of data taken from FGD and questionnaire were analyzed and the results suggest that lecturers, non-academic staffs and students of non-Muslim minority in the State-owned universities were prone to fall victim of discrimination. Surprisingly, however, the non-state and the private non religion based universities show higher respect for diversity and the staffs of the aforementioned institutions accordingly behave themselves relevant to the values and principles of diversity. Acknowledgement of and respect for diversity of religion has well been practiced. As a result, those staffs, comprising of lecturers, non-academic staffs, and students belonging to the minority

religion were relatively equally well-served and enjoy higher respect from the members of the majority religion. In the latter case, religion is neither the evidence nor the justification for the acts of discrimination and indeed it should never be. When it comes to diversity practice, three religion-based Universities, Satya Wacana Christian University (Christian), Sanata Dharma University and Atma Jaya University Yogyakarta (both Catholic) epitomize the harmonious institutions which uphold the diversity principles. Unluckily, however, the team failed to collect the information from the Islamic-based universities, due to the fact this latest institutions tend to hire people from the same belief. After all, it is on the basis of the above research results that the modules were ultimately designed.

5. Contact person and contact information:

Theodorus Sudimin

Mobile phone: +62-819-0442-2889

Email: theo@unika.ac.id or sudimintheodorus@yahoo.co.id

Faculty of Economics and Business

Justinus Building 2nd floor, Soegijapranata Catholic University

Pawiyatan Luhur Street IV/1 Bendan Duwur

Telephone: +62-24-8441555

Fax: +62-24-8415429 and +62-24-8445265

Semarang, Indonesia.

6. Description of activities and participants, including problems encountered and solutions offered:

6.1. Description of activities

In April 2014:

the Team was notified that the research grant for our research proposal was granted by the United Board, which was then followed by an electronic mail detailing about rationales of each proposal. The mail clarified that in response to our research proposal entitled “Managing Religious Diversity in Selected Indonesian Universities”, United Board:

- a. did not recommend us to conduct a stand-alone research (stand-alone research is not normally recommended for funding) (objective 1).
- b. and instead recommended us to design training modules for management people, lecturers, and non-academic staffs of universities, learning module for Human Resource Management subject, and training module for university student bodies (objectives 2, 3, and 4)

May 8, 2014:

The team met up to determine the necessary steps in response to the recommendation of UB to modify our proposal. The team set the time frame to discuss our next stages.

September 4 and 11, 2014:

The team managed to take strategic stages responding to the suggestion for modification made by United Board:

1. Data collection procedure was still taken to be the basis for designing modules which were expected to be empirically based and for obtaining cases relevant to religious diversity.
2. Data were collected from diverse institutions, i.e. state-owned universities, private religious-based universities, private non religious-based universities
3. The universities selected for the data collection were those residing in Semarang, Salatiga, and Yogyakarta. The reason for the choice is the fact that in the above mentioned cities reside varied universities.
4. The method of data collection: focus group discussion (FGD) for universities in Semarang and questionnaire for universities in Salatiga and Yogyakarta.
5. The grouping of the FGD was made on the basis of the mapping of the spread of the respondents on majority and minority basis considerations in terms of their religions. Considering that Islam is the majority and non-Islam is the minority, so, priority was given to state universities and private non religious-based universities. For instance, in Catholic University, Catholic is the majority and non-Catholic is the minority; In Christian (protestant), Christian is the majority and non-Christian is the minority. Unluckily we

failed to trace the existence of non-Muslim working in the private Islam-based universities. On the basis of the mapping, FGD was divided into two distinct groups, i.e. FGD group I was for lecturers of non-Islam working in the state universities and private non religious-based universities, while FGD group II was for Moslem lecturers and non-academic staffs working in non- Islam universities, in this case Catholic higher education.

6. Respondents selected to fill in questionnaire were lecturers and staffs of non Christian working in Christian university of SWCU, Salatiga and lecturers and staff members of no Catholic working in Catholic University, SDU and AJU (both Catholic Universities) in Yogyakarta.

September 18 and 25, 2014:

Gathered relevant information and discussed materials, theories, references pertaining to the practices of religious diversity in general in order for us to be able to construct the basic concepts and to design FGD guidance and questionnaire.

October 23, 13, and November 20, 2014:

The team discussed and designed FGD guidance and questionnaire as well as the interview guidance. The questionnaire encompasses the following points:

- I. RESPONDENT IDENTITY.**
- II. REASONS FOR JOINING THE UNIVERSITY:** Reason for deciding to be part of the religion-based university staff despite the religion difference.
- III. VISION / MISSION AND CORE VALUES:** Respondents' knowledge about the core values, vision and mission of the university.
- IV. UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS:** Written regulations and policies of the university supporting or hindering respondent's career as a result of religion differences; as well as talks, gossip, machinations, informal talk about religion of the respondents.
- V. EXPERIENCES WORKING IN UNIVERSITIES:** psychological atmospheric comfort experiences in the job milieu for being minority in the university; freedom to express the beliefs inside campus (praying, proposing

ideas related to religious activities, congratulating others in line with religious day observance; collegial relation (warm, open, fair, or the opposite); discriminatory treatment as a result of religion differences.

VI. POSITIVE / NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF UNIVERSITIES: positive and negative sides of the diversity in universities.

The fundamental of FGD scope:

1. University regulations and policies pertaining to religion and beliefs.
2. Campus general atmosphere of whether people becoming more or less religious, tolerant about religion-related holidays.
3. The practice and the assurance of religious freedom.
4. Whether or not there exist individually informal, undercover practices, covert moves leading to the acts which are against religious freedom and are prone to be discriminatory to other believers.
5. Formal and informal religion-motivated motives and considerations for the appointment of university high rank officials.
6. The roles of the leaders in the level of study program/ faculty/university/ foundation in creating religiosity atmosphere.

December 2 – 9, 2014:

the team attempted to trace the contact person in each designated higher institution to be allotted to FGD groups, while at the same time informing the day, time for FGD, fixing the Hotel as the venue for FGD, coordinating students to assist the running of the FGD.

January 5 – 9, 2015:

preparation and distribution of invitation letters.

February 9, 2015:

finalization of FGD preparation

February 11, 2015:

the first day of FGD for Group I was held in Noormans Hotel. This group was comprising of the non-Moslem lecturers working in the state and private non-religious-based universities.

February 12, 2015:

the second day of FGD in Hotel Noormans for Group II. It was attended by lecturers and non-academic staffs, whose religion is non-Christian, working in Christian University.

February 13, 2015:

consolidating and formulating the FGD results

February 18, 2015:

preparing the dispatch of request letter and the sets of questionnaire to SWCU (Salatiga), SDU, and AJU (Yogyakarta)

March 6, 2015:

delivering the sets of questionnaire to SWCU, the results of which were received on 16 March 2015.

March 17, 2015

delivering the sets of questionnaire to SDU and AJU Yogyakarta.

April 13, April 2015:

the data from AJU were received. A problem was encountered with the questionnaire sent to SDU. While the data from SWCU and AJU were received far ahead of time, the ones from SDU were too far behind schedule making us decide to temporary drop them from analysis.

April 28 – 29, 2015:

data analysis of the questionnaire and presentation of findings.

May 1, 2015:

the data from SDU were received, analyzed and added to the existing analysis and table.

May 7, 2015:

research team met up to discuss both FGD and questionnaire to establish the results as the basis for drawing up the relevant cases for module design of religious diversity. As a matter of fact, it is the cases drawn from this meeting that made up of the most central elements of the training modules, expecting that, latter on, the cases discussed in the training come up from the empirical experiences.

May 8, 2015:

research team discussing framework and materials for diversity training module. From then on the team was grouped into three, subsequently: Theo and Anton were in charge of the module for the managerial level (top managers, staff, and lecturers of universities); Yusni and Enny were in charge of the module for students active in the student bodies; Thomas and Irma designed the module for MSDM. Each group worked on the project on a tight schedule of two week time and the results of which to be presented in the next plenary.

May 22 – 23, 2015:

Plenary meeting to present all the module design by groups of module designers (the UB research team), revision and finalization by each group was expected to be made.

June 11, 2015:

Making both final paper and financial report of the United Board Project.

June 20, 2015:

Wrapping up and finalizing the reports of the United Board Project.

7. The results of data collection

7.1. The result of Focus Group Discussion of Managing Religious Diversity in Higher Education

Focus Group Discussion Group I was attended by lecturers from Diponegoro Univeristy (UNDIP state university), Semarang State University (UNNES), Dian Nuswantoro University (UDINUS), Semarang University (USM), PGRI University, Stikubank

University, Semarang State Polytechnic, Maritime Politechnic, AMNI. Total participants were 29 people. FGD Group II was attended by lecturers and academic staffs working in Soegijapranata Catholic University, ASM Secretarial Academy Marsudirini Santa Maria, Akademy of Industrial Chemistry Santo Paulus. Total participants were 17 People. The results of which are as follows:

	INSTITUTION	STATUS
1	Diponegoro University (UNDIP)	State-owned
2	Semarang State University	State-owned
3	Dian Nuswantoro University (UDINUS)	Private non religious-based
4	Semarang University	Private non religious-based
5	PGRI University	Private non religious-based
6	Stikubank University	Private non religious-based
7	Semarang State Polytechnic	State-owned
8	Maritime Polytechnic	State-owned
9	AMNI Maritime Academy	Private non religious-based
10	Soegijapranata Catholic University	Private religious-based (Catholic)
11	Santo Paulus Industry Chemical Academy	Private religious-based (Catholic)
12	ASM Secretary Academy	Private religious based (Catholic)

1. None of the university above has explicit written regulations and policies on discrimination on the basis of religions and beliefs. Each of them normatively guarantees religious freedom and diversity of religions and beliefs.
2. Cases of discrimination took place in the forms of informal gossip, machinations, and surreptitious actions by minority groups of anti religious diversity. Discrimination manifests through prioritizing Islam and undermining the Non-Islam on the pretext of majority-minority logic. The last case has been prevalent in state university which should be surprising, while in the private non-religion based universities discrimination is non-existent, and fairness is maintained which makes the respondents feel comfortable.

3. Religion-motivated discrimination took place in the event of management people candidacy and selection as well as the staff recruitment (either lecturer or administration staffs) on the basis of 'Islam yes.....while non Islam no-principle'..... discriminatory practices are mainly prevalent in the state universities, which is in contrast to that in the private-non religious based universities where selection and recruitment are relatively more open to religious diversity. Regretfully, it is getting more and more noticeable that even to congratulate other believers for the reason of religion observance is getting more widespread practice in the state universities. Ironically, however, staffs who are notably Islam or non-Christian working in Christian universities admit themselves that they are very welcome and enjoy working in Christian institutions. They don't find trouble practicing their beliefs and can get along well with others without worrying of being discriminated or even in many cases they get themselves reminded by their non-Moslem colleagues for not forgetting to pray during prayer times for Moslem. There is another case when one of the lecturers decided to go for a Haj Pilgrim to Mecca, with all due respect the permit was easily granted. A place for worship has also been provided for them. In return, the said staffs fully understand the values which should be adhered to when it comes to institutional rights and obligation working in the Christian institutions. What a beautiful harmony it will be, should similar practice also happen in all the rest of university institutions. From the above cases, it is evident that the religious-based and the non religious-based universities are more capable of nurturing religion and belief diversity.
4. It was discovered in the FGD that the top management people (Head of foundation, Rector, and the Deans) in the state universities tremendously color and effect the practice of religious diversity in his/her respective unit or establishment, making it distinctively unique despite being in the same university. One affects positively while another does the other way around.
5. Segregation through 'Islamic hijab attire' for females has been growing rapidly. Women of non-hijabi attire have been subject to critique encouraging them to be in pursuance to the majority. In another extreme, Hijab attire has been merely deemed as a compulsory working uniform, as a result, once leaving the working compound it

tends to be stripped off. This latter trend has been rampant among staffs and students irrespective of the universities. “Hijabisasi”, however, is essentially a phenomenon highly conditioned by informal talks or mass media coverage.

6. Among the participating state universities in the FGD, UNNES, has been the least tolerant institution with regard to the religious diversity. Compared to the private and the non-religious-based counterparts, it has the most violations of the religious diversity principles.
7. In the non-religious-based universities, student activities are open to all creeds.

7.2. The results of questionnaire

1. Table of Respondents’ Identity

UNIVERSITY	SUM OF RESPONDENTS AND RELIGION	LECTURER/STAFF
Satya Wacana (Christian University)	4 respondents Catholic	Lecturer
	1 respondent Islam	Staff
Atma Jaya (Catholic University)	3 respondent Islam	Lecturer
	1 respondent Buddhism	
	1 respondent Hindu	
Sanata Dharma (Catholic University)	2 respondent Islam	Lecturer
	2 respondent Islam	Staff

2. The respondents’ reasons for becoming the staffs and lecturers of university

From the FGD it was discovered that there are various reasons for the staffs to work in the university. Despite the religion differences, they admit that they can accept them and a few are even happy working in the university differing in the religiosity principle and basis. Among the respondents explicitly stated that it does not matter what religion basis a university institution is built upon inasmuch as it allows him/her to conduct three basic university obligations (TDPT) and has a conducive atmosphere. Another respondent had a

distinct principle in that inclusiveness (relevant to the believed values of the university) is the prime reason for liking the university. In such a milieu he/she does not find any trouble getting along with anyone and is happy to know that the institution of his/her choice is non-discriminative to other staffs having different creeds. One Hindu respondent claims that one of the Hinduism teachings has what is so-called *Tatwan Asi*, meaning ‘*you are I and I am you*’, which obviously in line with the inclusiveness principle. Similarly one last respondent judges himself/herself as someone who is of self-nurturing principle person, and is capable of keeping his/her own religion teaching principle, thus, insofar as freedom of religion is maintained and guaranteed he/she has no problem working anywhere.

Other respondents said that a university should be built on the basic principle of diversity where differences should be accommodated and therefore there should be no reason for discrimination whatsoever. All the members of *civitas academica* should be equally fairly treated. Another respondent sees religion differences should not be considered a problem as each religion is for disseminating goodness. Next respondent’s reason for taking the job is his love and loyalty to *alma mater* to which he will dedicate his life. Despite the differences of religion, he has already known the values, culture and the working atmosphere since the moment he was the student. He has been used to enjoying religious freedom and freedom for worship.

There are some respondents who personally think that religion is not the primary consideration before deciding to apply for the job and start working in the current institution. Trust to the institution is first and foremost as they believe that belief is every individual person’s inherent right, and thus the higher education with the religion basis is simply making the religion an attribute attached to it. Inasmuch as their rights are guaranteed and respected, there should be no reason for not accepting the job especially when knowing that the hiring institution puts some respect for differences.

All Moslem respondents working in USD are happy working there due to knowing that it is a university which is open to different values, strong in professionalism and they believe that all other religions are good and that respect for others is an utmost importance.

3. University vision, mission, and core values

The majority of respondents are well aware of the visions, missions and the core values of the university in which they are working. They know how to distinguish their position as individual persons from institution as an organization. Such an understanding is an initial asset for them to develop the *alignment* between individual and organization which is the precondition to the success of an organization. The success of an institution, including in managing diversity, is determined not only by the institution and the leaders, but also by each individual person in the institution who are jointly coordinating, cooperating in a well orchestrated synergy.

4. The university regulations

Respondents think that from the perspective of three university obligations (TPDT), there should not even be a single relevant policy inhibiting the practice of religious diversity. There is not even one written policy concerning religion whatsoever that restricts people from being recruited or admitted to a university institution. Strangely, however, there is a university which demands that a candidate obtain a letter of recommendation from a certain religion body.

There is a case where the stipulated regulations of the university explicitly restrict that it is only a person of a certain religion who has entitlement of the top positions in the university, such as the Deans, the Vice Rectors up to the Rector. This is a common rulling in the private religious-based universities. Reacting to such a rulling, the participants who are notably lecturer of the minority religion think it is absolutely not a problem because their primary concern is on how to be a good teacher not on how to be a leader. Even in USD, some lecturers of the minority religion who happened to be in the positions of management found themselves comfortable with the managerial jobs and not even once underwent discriminatory experiences

Machinations concerning religious diversity are generally acknowledged by the participants despite the scale and frequency. In other words, if any at all, this is generally insignificant. Parties with radical views are generally acknowledged to be existent in each of the higher institutions however it does not necessarily hinder the freedom of belief. Apart from the well facilitated institutions which have provided what all staffs need, among the

minor grievance by the minority staffs is regarding the insufficiency or the non-existence of worshipping space and facilities in a few other institutions.

5. The respondent experiences for working in universities

With regard to working comfort, the respondents think that it is not interfered by religion differences. Non-discriminatory acts are highly appreciated and the comfort has generally been experienced through adaptation and cooperation. They admit that within the academic discourse, proposing religion-related arguments are considered irrelevant due to its academic nature. This is regarded as the ‘positive energy’ driving people to pursue academic success. Among the respondents who said that the motive for taking the job was not primarily for being successful in the management career, but rather simply for dedicating his life for becoming a lecturer or staff, so whether or not there is a restriction on the basis of religion for a career in management, it is not a big deal. He firmly asserted that: “I don’ care if I will never be promoted into a management career because the regulation does not allow me to get it and fortunately I have no interest of such a management job”.

There is a divided views as regards their beliefs in particular concerning whether or not they are allowed to congratulate other believers in the observance of their religious holidays. One group does not think it matters to do so, while another one strictly forbid it as it is against the religious law. In the case of the staffs working in Catholic institution, collegial relation among them is considered conducive and warm irrespective of their beliefs. There has never happened a social friction resulted from the differences of religion. In the context of organizational involvement, meetings of all sort are typically egalitarian where each participants contribution is appreciated and no religious-motivated stereotyping was noticeable, as a result a conducive collegial relationship apparent manifests.

6. Positive and negative aspect

Despite the needs for them to accept the consequences, the respondents found some positive and negative aspects of accepting diversity. Probably the only exception is in USD where no respondents found anything negative.

From the collected data about the practice of religious diversity management in higher education, there are four essential things to be highlighted:

1. State-owned universities, which are supposed to be the epitome of tolerance, turns out to be a place where religious harmony and tolerance among lecturers, staffs and students are hard to find. Minority groups are subject to discriminatory actions by the majority in the aspects of career promotion for lecturers and staffs and unfairness of academic marking for students despite the non-existence of rules and regulations. Disrespect and disharmony are prevalent in spite of the fact that they are against the diversity principles.
2. Lecturers, staffs, students in the private non religious-based higher institutions receive acknowledgement and respect with regard to diversity. They have all been treated equally well by other members of different creeds as generally reflected from the equal funding given to hold activities in conjunction with the religious holiday observances in which members enjoy freedom of worship and other staff members of different creeds congratulate one another.
3. When it comes to differences of religion, minority lecturers, staffs, and students in the private religious-based higher education institutions have been enjoying higher respect. They are happy working in their current higher institutions because of their beliefs that it is there where universal values, professionalism, and respect for other people of different creeds are found. They feel that they are equally well treated, apart from the fact they have less chance to be in the top posts. They also enjoy togetherness, friendship, and non-religion bias collaboration. They do not find any problem with religious diversity.
4. On the basis of the data collected from the investigations, the team is determined to design modules and formulate relevant cases established out of the empirical data.

All of the research result become as module formulation material. Based on this research result, the team can formulate some cases on religious diversity practicing in Semarang, Salatiga, and Yogyakarta higher education.

8. Overall impact of the project and future implications

8.1. The impact of project

This is not an exclusive research project, however the data collected from the investigation on which the modules were designed provides us with extremely interesting dimensions. We believe that the modules designed in this particular way may be of high relevance to promote an awareness about the importance of respect for religious diversity. Given the fact that religion is one of sensitive issues in the day-to-day lives of people in Indonesia, such an effort is not without handicaps and hindrances in particular realizing the fact that it is highly sensitive to openly discuss religious issues with the people or groups of different creeds. Open discussion involving people of different creeds is prone to be less open. There have always been likely undisclosed issues due to their sensitive nature. Nevertheless, along with time, the icy-frozen undisclosed issues may potentially be dismantled through the proper use of the training modules. The cases proposed and presented in the modules should generally be openly discussed especially through the perspectives of the urgency of the needs to put respect for basic human rights, religion differences, as well as rationality.

8.2. Future implications

Discussing religious diversity in the university level management needs to be frequently done in particular for the purpose of arousing and nurturing common awareness about the importance of respect when it comes to religion differences. Respects for such differences should not be a mere domain of cognition but should rather be that of affection and actions. Open discussions in the level of university management in the state-owned, private non religious-based, and religious-based higher institutions have to be made to refresh the knowledge about the dos or the don'ts, what is and what is not allowed in order to build the awareness of the rights and obligations that each individual lecturer non-academic staff, students has to be aware of with regard to religion practices.

8.3. The output of this project

The project objectives written at Proposal “Managing Religious Diversity in Indonesia Higher Education”, the output of this project are:

1. Training module for the management, lectures, and staffs of higher education institution
2. Learning module for the Human Resource Management subject
3. Training module for university student organization

9. Financial report

FINANCIAL REPORT MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

		Research Activities	Item	Subtotal
A	1	Preparation (the team discussed the guidance interview and questionnaire, copied research proposal, letters to respondents)	164	
	2	Observation and data collection	275	
	3	Data analysis	275	
	4	Report Writing	148	
		Sub Total		
Focus Group Discussion Activities				
B	1	Preparation (invitation, stationary, publications, backdrop, communication, OC and research team, etc)	250	
	2	Material and workshop kit	340	
	3	Accomodation, tenting a venue, snack and meals	728	
	4	Speakers	246	
	5	Transportation	398	
		Sub Total		
Formulation Modules				
C	1	Material preparation	236	
	2	Formulation modules	648	
	3	Tryout modules	150	
		Sub Total		
Final Activities				
D	1	Final report	186	
	2	Copied module	500	
	3	Sent the learning and training modules to the workshop participants	82	
	4	Seminar	374	
		Sub Total		
E		TOTAL		5,000

Report prepared by Theodorus Sudimin

Date, June 24th 2015

Submitted by Prof. Dr. Y. Budi Widianarko, M.Sc.

Date... 26/6/2015

Head of Institution

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Y. Budi Widianarko", is written over the seal and extends to the right.

**THE VENUE OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION
ON MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION
NOORMANS HOTEL SEMARANG
FEBRUARY 11 - 12, 2015**



**PROJECT TEAM LEADER (THEODORUS SUDIMIN-green shirt)
INTRODUCTION SPEAKING OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION**



THE FIRST GROUP OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION





THE SECOND GROUP OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION





UNITED BOARD PROJECT TEAM
MANAGING RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION



STUDENTS OF THE TEAM ASSISTANCE

