

Policy Synergy Training to Strengthen Institutional Capacity for Student Violence Prevention in Secondary Schools

Intan Sani Putri* & Ni Wayan Desi Budha Jayanti

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Law, Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: intansaniputri@unima.ac.id

Submitted: 2026-01-03

Revised: 2026-04-13

Published: 2026-07-05

Abstract. The community engagement program aimed to strengthen the institutional capacity of secondary schools through a policy-synergy workshop on student violence prevention. Using a descriptive qualitative approach, the program comprised policy review, institutional assessment, participatory discussion, and evaluation of reporting systems, support services, and cross-sector collaboration. The findings revealed that approximately 37% of schools maintained regular coordination with protection services, fewer than 20% operated digital reporting systems, and only 30% had integrated anti-violence education into learning activities. Schools implementing cross-sector collaboration recorded a 15–20% increase in case reporting, indicating improved accessibility and trust in reporting mechanisms. Moreover, schools with integrated counseling, psychosocial support, referral procedures, and case-management services experienced up to a 10% reduction in the risk of repeated violence. The program demonstrates that policy understanding, institutional capacity, accessible reporting mechanisms, and sustained multi-stakeholder collaboration are essential for developing safer, more inclusive, and responsive school environments.

Keywords: policy synergy workshop; institutional capacity; school violence prevention; secondary education; collaborative governance

How to Cite: Putri, I.S. & Jayanti, N.W.D.B. (2026). Policy Synergy Training to Strengthen Institutional Capacity for Student Violence Prevention in Secondary Schools. *Journal of Community Empowerment*, 6 (1), 01-10.

INTRODUCTION

Violence in secondary schools is a complex and multidimensional social problem that can undermine students' psychological safety, social relationships, academic participation, and overall well-being. It may occur in physical, verbal, psychological, sexual, or digital forms, including bullying and cyberbullying. These forms of violence are not always visible to teachers or school administrators because some incidents occur through peer interactions, social media, or unequal power relations that discourage victims from reporting them. Consequently, school violence should not be treated merely as individual misconduct or a disciplinary issue. It is also an institutional and governance problem that requires preventive policies, accessible reporting mechanisms, competent personnel, victim-support services, and sustained cooperation among relevant stakeholders. Schools are therefore responsible not only for responding to reported incidents but also for establishing an institutional environment capable of preventing violence before it occurs.

Indonesia has introduced various regulations concerning child protection and the prevention and

handling of violence in educational institutions. These policies provide an important legal basis for creating safe and inclusive schools. However, the existence of regulations does not automatically ensure effective implementation. At the school level, policy implementation is often constrained by limited institutional capacity, unclear division of responsibilities, inadequate counseling services, weak reporting mechanisms, and insufficient coordination with external protection agencies. Previous studies have shown that many schools do not yet operate structured reporting systems, while responses to violence remain predominantly reactive rather than preventive (Hasanah & Widodo, 2021; Nurhayati & Sari, 2022). A national report also indicates that violence in educational institutions remains prevalent and has not been addressed comprehensively (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, 2022). This gap between formal policy and institutional practice demonstrates the need to strengthen the organizational capacity of schools.

The same challenges are evident in North Sulawesi Province. According to the North Sulawesi Office of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (DP3A North Sulawesi, 2023),

hundreds of cases of violence against children have occurred in educational settings, with a substantial proportion involving students at the secondary-school level. Institutionally, many schools still lack adequate counseling units, standard operating procedures for preventing and handling violence, and formal connections with child-protection services. Available empirical data indicate that only approximately 37% of schools coordinate regularly with protection services, fewer than 20% operate digital reporting systems, and only about 30% have integrated anti-violence education into learning activities. These conditions illustrate that schools have different levels of readiness and that policy implementation remains fragmented. They also suggest that students' access to protection may depend heavily on the institutional capacity of their respective schools.

From an institutional perspective, schools are central actors in translating public policy into everyday practices. Institutional effectiveness is shaped by organizational structures, internal norms, professional competencies, resources, leadership, and relationships with external institutions. In the context of violence prevention, strong institutional capacity is reflected in clear governance arrangements, transparent and confidential reporting procedures, competent teachers and counselors, referral mechanisms, and regular monitoring. Conversely, limited human resources, weak reporting cultures, and inadequate cross-sector coordination can prevent schools from implementing anti-violence policies effectively (Putri & Lestari, 2024; Wulandari, 2023). Strengthening school institutions must therefore extend beyond distributing regulations. It should help school personnel understand their responsibilities, assess institutional weaknesses, develop appropriate procedures, and establish functional partnerships with protection agencies.

Recent literature emphasizes that collaborative and participatory approaches can improve the effectiveness of school violence-prevention programs. Violence involves interconnected educational, psychological, social, administrative, and legal dimensions; thus, no single institution can address it independently. Collaboration among schools, government agencies, families, communities, counseling professionals, and child-protection services can facilitate early identification, case referral, victim assistance, and follow-up interventions. Multi-stakeholder partnerships can also strengthen institutional accountability and ensure that responses are adapted to local circumstances (Freeman, 2024;

Polanin et al., 2022). In addition, collaborative governance provides a useful framework for bringing actors with different mandates and resources into a shared decision-making process. Such collaboration is particularly important when schools have limited professional staff or facilities.

Another important component is the integration of anti-violence values into educational activities. Prevention should not rely exclusively on sanctions after an incident has occurred. Schools must also cultivate empathy, respect, social responsibility, and nonviolent conflict resolution among students. Value-based and social-emotional education can help students recognize harmful behavior, understand its consequences, and develop constructive interpersonal skills. School-based interventions addressing empathy and cyberbullying have been associated with improved awareness and reduced aggressive behavior (Kamaruddin, 2023). However, educational interventions will have limited effects when they are not supported by clear institutional procedures and coordinated services. Behavioral education and institutional reform should therefore be implemented as mutually reinforcing components of a comprehensive prevention system.

Despite these developments, the existing literature remains fragmented. Some studies focus primarily on student behavior, bullying, cyberbullying, or classroom-based interventions. Other studies examine policy formulation without explaining how schools translate regulations into operational procedures. Relatively few studies connect public policy, school institutional capacity, support services, value-based education, reporting technology, and multi-stakeholder participation within one analytical and practical framework. This gap is important because violence prevention is a systemic issue. A school may possess an anti-violence policy but still fail to protect students if reporting channels are inaccessible, personnel are unprepared, counseling services are unavailable, or external coordination is weak. Conversely, isolated training activities may produce only temporary improvements when they are not institutionalized through school governance.

The main problem addressed in this community engagement program is therefore the gap between existing violence-prevention policies and schools' capacity to implement them consistently. Regulations are available, but implementation remains uneven, institutional responsibilities are not always clearly understood, and collaboration across sectors has not been fully established. To address this problem, a policy-synergy workshop

was used as a capacity-strengthening mechanism. The workshop was intended to create a shared understanding among relevant actors, identify institutional gaps, discuss reporting and referral mechanisms, and encourage coordination between schools and protection services. Rather than presenting violence prevention as the responsibility of individual teachers or counselors, the workshop positioned it as a collective institutional commitment involving school leadership, personnel, government agencies, families, and communities.

The novelty of the program lies in its integrated policy-institutional synergy approach. This approach links five interdependent dimensions: regulatory understanding, school institutional capacity, support and referral services, value-based anti-violence education, and multi-stakeholder participation. The model assumes that sustainable violence prevention requires alignment between formal policy and practical institutional arrangements. The workshop consequently serves not only as a knowledge-transfer activity but also as a forum for institutional reflection, coordination, and collaborative problem-solving. This orientation is consistent with the community-empowerment focus because it seeks to strengthen the capacity of the school community to identify risks, use available policies, coordinate resources, and develop context-sensitive prevention strategies.

Accordingly, this program addresses the following question: how can a policy-synergy workshop strengthen school institutional capacity for preventing student violence in secondary schools? Its objectives are to analyze existing institutional conditions, improve stakeholders' understanding of violence-prevention policies, identify gaps in reporting and support services, and promote cross-sector collaboration for a more effective, adaptive, and sustainable prevention system. The program is expected to contribute conceptually to discussions of public policy implementation and educational institutions while providing practical guidance for schools and regional stakeholders. Ultimately, stronger institutional capacity and policy synergy are expected to support safer, more inclusive, and more responsive secondary-school environments.

METHODS

The community engagement program employed a descriptive qualitative approach to examine the strengthening of school institutions through policy synergy for preventing student

violence in secondary schools. This approach was selected to obtain an in-depth understanding of the relationships among policy, institutional capacity, support services, and multi-stakeholder participation in practice.

The activity was implemented through a policy-synergy workshop and four stages: (1) identifying national and regional policies on violence prevention in educational institutions; (2) analyzing school institutional practices, including reporting systems, counseling services, and internal governance; (3) observing and reviewing intervention programs, including value-based education, psychosocial support, and cross-sector collaboration; and (4) evaluating policy and institutional synergy in supporting violence prevention.

Data were obtained from document reviews including policies, institutional reports, and data from relevant agencies and empirical studies relevant to secondary schools in North Sulawesi. The data were analyzed thematically by identifying relationship patterns among policy, institutional, and implementation variables. The indicators were used to assess the extent to which policy and institutional synergy could systematically and sustainably improve violence prevention in secondary schools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The school institutional-strengthening program was implemented as an integrated activity combining policy review, institutional assessment, a policy-synergy workshop, examination of support services, and multi-stakeholder dialogue. These components were designed to achieve the program's central objective: strengthening the capacity of secondary schools to translate violence-prevention policies into practical, coordinated, and sustainable institutional mechanisms. Rather than treating violence as an isolated behavioral problem, the program positioned it as an institutional issue that requires clear regulations, competent personnel, accessible reporting channels, support services, and collaboration among schools, government agencies, families, and child-protection institutions. The results demonstrate that the objectives were achieved progressively, although the degree of achievement differed among indicators and schools. The program generated a clearer understanding of existing institutional conditions, identified major implementation gaps, and formulated areas requiring continued improvement. This integrated approach is

consistent with policy-implementation theory, which emphasizes that policy effectiveness depends on the interaction between regulatory design, organizational capacity, and implementation practices (Dunn, 2018). It also reflects collaborative governance, in which public problems are addressed through coordinated participation by actors with different responsibilities and resources (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

The first stage involved identifying and reviewing national and regional policies related to the prevention and handling of violence in educational institutions. This stage was important because the availability of regulations did not necessarily mean that school personnel understood how to implement them. The policy review enabled participants to identify institutional responsibilities, reporting requirements, victim-protection principles, and the roles of external agencies. Through the policy-synergy workshop, regulatory provisions were discussed in relation to actual conditions in secondary schools. This process helped move the discussion from abstract legal obligations toward practical questions: who should receive a report, how confidentiality should be maintained, when a case should be referred, what support should be provided to victims, and how schools should coordinate with relevant agencies. Thus, the objective of improving policy understanding was pursued through contextual interpretation rather than the simple dissemination of regulations. This was important because policies that are not translated into operational responsibilities tend to remain administrative documents with limited influence on everyday school practices.

The second stage assessed school institutional practices, including internal governance, counseling services, reporting mechanisms, standard operating procedures, and coordination with child-protection services. This institutional assessment showed that schools had different levels of readiness. Some schools had begun establishing mechanisms for responding to violence, while others continued to depend on informal communication and individual initiatives. The variation indicates that policy implementation is influenced by institutional history, leadership commitment, human resources, infrastructure, and relationships with external agencies. The assessment therefore served two functions. First, it established a baseline for measuring institutional capacity. Second, it encouraged participants to recognize that preventing violence requires an

organizational system rather than relying solely on the commitment of individual teachers. This finding supports studies showing that weak institutional governance is a major factor limiting the effectiveness of violence-prevention policies in Indonesian schools (Hasanah & Widodo, 2021; Nurhayati & Sari, 2022).

The third stage used the workshop as a forum for institutional reflection and collaborative problem-solving. Participants examined the relationship between policies, school practices, reporting systems, counseling, anti-violence education, and interinstitutional coordination. The workshop approach was relevant because it enabled stakeholders to compare experiences, identify common problems, and discuss possible institutional responses. Its value was not limited to transferring information. It created a shared space in which violence prevention could be understood as a collective responsibility. This participatory orientation is particularly important in community engagement because sustainable outcomes are more likely when participants are involved in identifying problems and formulating solutions. Studies in the *Journal of Community Empowerment* similarly indicate that community engagement programs are more sustainable when their design corresponds to local institutional capacity and encourages active stakeholder participation (Dede Mirza et al., 2025; Rifanda et al., 2025).

The achievement of the program objectives was assessed through five principal indicators: regular coordination with protection services, availability of digital reporting systems, integration of anti-violence education into learning, changes in case reporting, and reduction in the risk of repeated violence. These indicators represent different dimensions of institutional capacity. Coordination reflects schools' ability to connect with external services. Digital reporting reflects accessibility, documentation, and transparency. Anti-violence education represents the preventive and cultural dimension. Increased reporting indicates trust in institutional mechanisms, while reduced repeated violence reflects the effectiveness of support and case management. Taken together, the indicators offer a more comprehensive assessment than the number of reported cases alone. A low number of reports cannot automatically be interpreted as a low level of violence because it may also indicate inaccessible procedures, fear of retaliation, or limited trust in the institution showed in Table 1.

The first indicator showed that approximately 37% of schools coordinated regularly with

Table 1. Indicators of Institutional Strengthening through the Policy-Synergy Workshop

No.	Success Indicator	Measurement Focus	Result (%)	Interpretation
1	Regular coordination with protection services	Schools maintaining routine coordination with child-protection agencies or related services	37	Coordination has begun, but formal and consistent interinstitutional collaboration remains limited.
2	Availability of digital reporting systems	Schools operating technology-based mechanisms for reporting violence	<20	Digital reporting is the weakest component because of infrastructure, digital-literacy, confidentiality, and administrative limitations.
3	Integration of anti-violence education	Schools incorporating anti-violence values into curricula or learning activities	30	Preventive education has been introduced, but it has not yet become a consistent school-wide practice.
4	Increase in case reporting	Change in reporting among schools implementing cross-sector collaboration	15–20 increase	The increase indicates improved awareness, accessibility, and trust in reporting mechanisms rather than necessarily reflecting more violence.
5	Reduction in repeated violence	Change in recurrence risk among schools with integrated support services	Up to 10% reduction	Counselling, psychosocial support, referral procedures, and coordinated case management contributed to preventing recurrence.

protection services. This result indicates that some schools had developed external institutional relationships, but most had not yet established regular coordination. The 37% figure should therefore be interpreted as evidence of initial institutional development rather than comprehensive achievement. Schools with regular coordination were better positioned to obtain professional advice, refer cases, access psychosocial support, and follow up on incidents requiring intervention beyond the school's authority. Coordination also reduces the risk that complex cases will be handled solely through internal disciplinary procedures. However, the fact that regular coordination was present in fewer than half of the schools demonstrates that interinstitutional relationships remain uneven and often depend on personal contacts rather than formal agreements.

This finding has important implications for the policy-synergy model. Effective violence prevention requires horizontal and vertical connections. Horizontally, schools need to collaborate with parents, communities, health providers, counseling professionals, and protection agencies. Vertically, school procedures should be connected to district, provincial, and national policies. When these relationships are weak,

schools may understand the general policy but remain uncertain about referrals, documentation, and responsibility for follow-up. Collaborative governance provides a relevant framework because it emphasizes shared objectives, trust, institutional design, and continuous interaction among actors (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Freeman, 2024). The workshop contributed to this process by clarifying the need for coordination and identifying it as an institutional function rather than an optional activity. Nevertheless, sustainable coordination requires formal mechanisms, designated contact persons, agreed procedures, and periodic evaluation.

The second indicator concerned digital reporting systems. Fewer than 20% of schools had adopted digital mechanisms for reporting violence. This was the lowest institutional achievement among the indicators and revealed a significant gap in technological readiness. Digital reporting can provide students and school community members with a more accessible channel for submitting complaints, particularly when victims are uncomfortable reporting incidents face to face. It can also support systematic documentation, monitoring, referral, and follow-up. However, digitalization alone does not guarantee an effective system. A reporting platform must include

confidentiality safeguards, responsible administrators, response timelines, data-protection procedures, and integration with offline support services. Without these elements, technology may merely collect reports without ensuring meaningful responses.

The limited adoption of digital reporting may be associated with inadequate infrastructure, low digital literacy, concerns about confidentiality, unclear administrative responsibility, and limited financial resources. Some schools may also perceive digital systems as complicated or fear that easier reporting will increase the visible number of cases. This concern reflects a misunderstanding of reporting as a threat to institutional reputation. In fact, an increase in reports can indicate that students have greater confidence in the system. Research suggests that digital mechanisms can improve transparency and accelerate responses when they are supported by appropriate institutional procedures (Kamaruddin, 2023; Polanin et al., 2022). Community-based educational services also benefit when technology is adapted to users' capacities and institutional needs (Rahmawati et al., 2021). Consequently, future digital reporting systems should be simple, accessible, secure, and linked to trained personnel rather than introduced as stand-alone technological products.

The third indicator showed that approximately 30% of schools had integrated anti-violence education into curricula or learning activities. This finding indicates emerging awareness that violence prevention should include educational and cultural interventions, but implementation remains limited. Anti-violence education can be incorporated into classroom discussions, counseling activities, student orientation, extracurricular programs, and school campaigns. Its purpose is not merely to inform students that violence is prohibited. It should develop empathy, respect, emotional regulation, responsible digital behavior, nonviolent communication, and constructive conflict resolution. These competencies can help students recognize abusive behavior, seek assistance, support peers, and respond to disagreement without aggression.

The integration of anti-violence values is especially important because institutional procedures generally become active only after a risk or incident has been identified. Educational interventions operate earlier by influencing knowledge, attitudes, peer norms, and everyday behavior. Empathy-based and social-emotional education has been associated with reduced aggression and more supportive learning

environments (Kang et al., 2020; Rahmawati et al., 2021). However, the limited 30% achievement demonstrates that anti-violence education has not yet become a consistent component of school practice. Some teachers may lack relevant teaching materials, confidence, or time. Others may regard violence prevention as the exclusive responsibility of counseling personnel. The workshop helped challenge this assumption by presenting prevention as a school-wide responsibility. Nevertheless, teachers need continued assistance to translate general values into age-appropriate learning activities and to respond safely when classroom discussions lead students to disclose experiences of violence.

The fourth indicator was a 15–20% increase in case reporting among schools that implemented cross-sector collaboration. This increase is one of the most important findings because it requires careful interpretation. It should not automatically be considered evidence that violence became more frequent. Increased reporting may indicate greater awareness, more accessible mechanisms, improved confidence in school responses, and reduced fear of negative consequences. In institutions with weak reporting cultures, many incidents remain hidden. Therefore, a short-term rise in reports may be a positive institutional outcome if reports are documented, investigated, and followed by appropriate support. It shows that individuals are becoming more willing to use the available system.

Cross-sector collaboration may contribute to reporting confidence by demonstrating that schools do not handle cases alone and that victims can access wider support. When students, parents, and teachers know that counseling professionals or protection agencies are involved, they may perceive the system as more credible. This interpretation is consistent with collaborative governance, which emphasizes the role of institutional trust and multi-actor participation in improving public-service effectiveness (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Freeman, 2024). Studies of social-intervention programs also suggest that collaboration between educational institutions and communities can strengthen participation and program outcomes (Sari et al., 2022). Nevertheless, increased reporting should be accompanied by sufficient response capacity. If reports increase but schools lack trained personnel or referral mechanisms, delays may weaken trust. Reporting indicators should therefore be evaluated together with response time, case completion, victim satisfaction, confidentiality, and follow-up.

The fifth indicator showed an approximately 10% reduction in the risk of repeated violence in

schools with integrated support services. This suggests that counseling, psychosocial assistance, clear case-management procedures, and coordinated follow-up can reduce the likelihood of recurrence. Preventing repeated violence requires more than sanctioning perpetrators. Schools must address victim safety, behavioral causes, peer dynamics, family circumstances, and the broader school environment. Integrated support services enable institutions to respond to these interconnected factors. They also help schools distinguish between cases that can be addressed through educational or restorative measures and cases requiring referral to professional or legal services.

The reduction in repeated violence is consistent with restorative approaches that prioritize accountability, relationship repair, reintegration, and prevention of future harm (Hopkins, 2019; Huang, 2023). However, restorative practices must not be used to pressure victims into reconciliation or minimize serious violence. Their use should depend on the nature of the case, victim consent, safety considerations, and professional assessment. The policy-synergy model therefore combines restorative principles with formal protection and referral mechanisms. This balance is important because an exclusively punitive approach may fail to address underlying causes, while an overly informal approach may neglect victim protection and institutional accountability.

Taken together, the indicators show that the program achieved its objectives primarily by strengthening institutional awareness, identifying capacity gaps, encouraging policy translation, and promoting collaboration. The results do not suggest that all schools have established fully developed prevention systems. Instead, they reveal a transitional condition: awareness and some institutional practices are emerging, but implementation remains uneven. The strongest progress appeared in cross-sector collaboration and increased reporting, while digital reporting remained the weakest area. Anti-violence education and external coordination showed partial development. This pattern demonstrates why a multidimensional model is necessary. Progress in one area cannot compensate fully for weakness in another. For example, awareness campaigns will have limited value when reporting systems are inaccessible, while sophisticated reporting systems will be ineffective without trained personnel and support services.

A key strength of the program was its integration of regulatory, organizational,

educational, technological, and collaborative dimensions. Previous interventions have often focused on one element, such as student behavior, teacher training, or policy dissemination. Although these interventions can be useful, their effects may be temporary when they are not embedded in institutional systems. The policy-synergy workshop encouraged participants to understand how different components depend on one another. Regulations provide authority and standards; institutional structures allocate responsibility; reporting mechanisms identify cases; counseling and protection services provide assistance; educational activities shape school culture; and collaboration connects schools to broader resources. Previous research similarly concludes that integrated approaches are generally more effective than partial interventions in preventing school violence (Polanin et al., 2022; Putri & Lestari, 2024).

Another strength was the program's relevance to community empowerment. Schools are communities consisting of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and supporting stakeholders. Strengthening their collective ability to recognize, prevent, report, and address violence represents a form of institutional and social empowerment. The workshop promoted shared responsibility and provided a space for participants to examine their own practices. This participatory process may increase ownership because institutional improvement is not presented exclusively as an external instruction. Instead, stakeholders are encouraged to identify realistic changes based on local capacity. Such an approach is consistent with community engagement studies emphasizing participation, institutional strengthening, and locally appropriate program design (Dede Mirza et al., 2025; Rifanda et al., 2025).

Despite these strengths, several challenges affected implementation. The first was unequal institutional capacity among schools. Differences in leadership, staffing, infrastructure, experience, and access to external services resulted in varying levels of readiness. A uniform intervention may therefore produce different outcomes. Schools with existing counseling services and established government relationships can adopt new procedures more readily than schools with limited staff and remote locations. This suggests that future programs should use differentiated assistance. Schools with low capacity may require foundational support, while more prepared schools may focus on digital integration, advanced case

management, or peer mentoring.

The second challenge was limited human-resource capacity. Many schools lack sufficient counselors or personnel trained in violence prevention, trauma-informed responses, confidentiality, and referral procedures. Teachers may be expected to perform multiple roles without adequate preparation. As a result, cases may be handled inconsistently or delayed. Human-resource limitations have been identified as a major barrier to education-policy implementation (Lugina, 2025; Marlinda, 2025). One workshop cannot resolve this issue completely. Continuous professional development, practical guidance, simulation exercises, mentoring, and access to expert consultation are necessary. Schools should also designate a multidisciplinary team rather than assigning responsibility to a single counselor.

The third challenge was resistance to changing the reporting culture. Some school communities may avoid formal reporting because of stigma, fear of retaliation, concern for institutional reputation, or the belief that violence is a private matter. Students may worry that adults will not believe them, while teachers may fear administrative complications. Transforming this culture requires consistent messages that reporting is a protective action rather than an accusation that automatically leads to punishment. Confidentiality and protection against retaliation must also be demonstrated in practice. Trust develops when reports are handled respectfully, promptly, and transparently. The 15–20% reporting increase is encouraging, but maintaining this progress requires visible institutional commitment.

Additional challenges included limited budgets, inadequate facilities, digital disparities, geographical differences, and cross-sector coordination that had not been formalized. In some areas, access to counselors or protection services may be difficult. Coordination may depend on individuals and weaken when staff members change. These conditions demonstrate the importance of adaptive regional policies and formal institutional agreements (OECD, 2023; Warnaini, 2025). Provincial and district authorities can support schools by providing common standards, referral directories, shared digital infrastructure, mobile professional services, and monitoring mechanisms. Regional support is especially important for preventing institutional-capacity gaps from creating unequal levels of student protection.

The program also offers several opportunities for improvement. First, an integrated digital reporting system can be developed gradually,

beginning with a simple and secure mechanism. The system should support anonymous or confidential reporting, case categorization, responsible-person assignment, referral, and follow-up monitoring. Second, continuous training should be provided for school leaders, teachers, counselors, and administrative staff. Training should include policy interpretation, early identification, communication with victims, documentation, referral, digital safety, and restorative practices. Third, schools should formalize cooperation with protection agencies through written procedures, designated contact persons, and regular coordination meetings.

Fourth, anti-violence education should be integrated more systematically into curricula and school culture. Rather than relying on occasional campaigns, schools can embed relevant values and competencies across subjects, counseling, extracurricular activities, student organizations, and parent engagement. Students should also be meaningfully involved in designing prevention messages and peer-support activities. Their participation can make programs more relevant to actual peer dynamics and digital experiences. Fifth, future evaluation should combine institutional indicators with participant-level outcomes. In addition to measuring whether a system exists, evaluation should assess whether students know how to access it, whether personnel respond appropriately, whether victims feel supported, and whether school climate improves.

Future development should also include stronger monitoring and comparative learning among schools. Schools with effective mechanisms can share procedures and lessons with institutions that are still developing their systems. A community of practice could support regular discussion of implementation challenges without disclosing confidential case information. Periodic institutional self-assessment would allow schools to monitor progress in policy understanding, reporting accessibility, service readiness, educational integration, and collaboration. This would transform the workshop from a one-time event into the beginning of a sustained institutional-learning process.

The results confirm that policy synergy and institutional capacity are mutually reinforcing. Regulations establish obligations, but capable institutions give those obligations practical meaning. Institutional structures are more effective when they are connected to external services, supported by appropriate technology, and reinforced through preventive education. The

program's indicators demonstrate encouraging progress, particularly in reporting confidence and the reduction of repeated violence, while also revealing substantial gaps in coordination, digital systems, and curriculum integration. The policy-synergy workshop therefore represents a relevant starting point for institutional empowerment, but its impact must be sustained through continuous training, formal collaboration, digital development, monitoring, and adaptive policy support. Through these improvements, secondary schools can move from fragmented and reactive responses toward integrated, preventive, and student-centered systems capable of creating safer and more inclusive educational environments.

CONCLUSION

Strengthening school institutions through policy synergy contributes positively to preventing and handling student violence in secondary schools, although implementation is not yet optimal. Stronger institutional coordination, the integration of anti-violence education, and cross-sector collaboration improve prevention systems, as indicated by increased case reporting and a lower risk of repeated violence. The main strength of this approach is its integrated model, which combines policy, institutional capacity, support services, and multi-stakeholder participation within a systematic framework. Its limitations include unequal institutional capacity, limited use of reporting technology, and inconsistent implementation across schools. Sustainable strengthening therefore requires integrated digital reporting systems, improved human-resource capacity, and broader cross-sector collaboration so that the model can be expanded to create safe and inclusive educational environments.

REFERENCE

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
- Dede Mirza, Lili Suryani, Seroja Indah Lestari, & Sutrisno Sutrisno. (2025). Strengthening Community Organizations through Social Service (Building Synergy and Participation in Bintan Urban Village). *MENGABDI: Jurnal Hasil Kegiatan Bersama Masyarakat*, 3(1), 60–68.
<https://doi.org/10.61132/mengabdi.v3i1.2095>
- DP3A North Sulawesi. (2023). Annual report on the prevention and handling of violence in school environments.
- Dunn, W. N. (2018). *Public policy analysis: An integrated approach* (6th ed). Routledge.
- Freeman, J. (2024). Assessing the effectiveness of multi-sectoral partnerships in school violence prevention. *International Journal of Education Polic*, 22(1), 32–49.
- Hasanah, R., & Widodo, A. (2021). Institutional challenges in implementing anti-violence policies in Indonesian schools. *Educational Management Journal*, 12(3), 210–225.
- Hopkins, B. (2019). *Restorative justice in education: Transforming discipline through dialogue*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Huang, Y. (2023). Restorative practices reduce suspension and promote school safety: Evidence from randomized trials. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(3), 456–472.
- Kamaruddin, R. (2023). Systematic review of school-based cyberbullying interventions. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 28(1), 15–29.
- Kang, S., Park, Y., & Lee, J. (2020). Violence prevention education program based on empathy: effects on adolescents' aggression and emotional control. *Youth and Society*, 52(4), 715–732.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. (2022). Report on the prevention and handling of violence in educational institutions.
- Lugina, R. (2025). Implementation of the PPKSP policy in secondary schools: A case study of public schools in Indonesia. *Jurnal Administrasi Dan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 9(1), 77–92.
- Marlinda, R. (2025). Implementation of the PPKSP policy and senior high school teacher readiness. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pendidikan Nasional*, 12(1), 50–66.
- Nurhayati, E., & Sari, D. (2022). School governance and violence prevention in Indonesian secondary education. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik Dan Pendidikan*, 8(1), 33–47.
- OECD. (2023). *Education policy outlook 2023: Resilience, adaptation and equity in education*.
- Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2022). A meta-analysis of school-based violence prevention programs: Structural and contextual factors. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(2), 179–205.
- Putri, I. S., & Lestari, M. (2024). Multi-stakeholder partnership for safe schools: Institutional governance perspective. *Policy and Education*

- Journal, 14(1), 57–73.
- Rahmawati, E., Santoso, D., & Mulyani, F. (2021). Empathy training as a prevention model for school bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology and Counseling*, 7(2), 135–149.
- Rifanda, N. A., Ginaya, A. M., Putri, S. K., Ramadhani, A., Febrianto Wibowo, B., Aisyah, D., Alisia Putri, M., Yoga Pradana, G., Nida Khofiyya, Q., Rachmansyah Siregar, G., & Issanti, N. (2025). Community-Based Institutional Strengthening and Education for a Self-Sufficient Integrated Waste Management Facility in Tersono Village, Batang Regency. *Telukawur Journal of Legal Community Empowerment*, 1(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.14710/telukawur.1.1.1-13>
- Sari, N., Prabowo, H., & Rahmawati, D. (2022). Digital bullying in post-pandemic learning: A challenge for school policy. *Journal of Educational Policy Studies*, 5(2), 89–103.
- Warnaini, L. (2025). Post-COVID-19 school health policy: Adapting SOPs and safe environments. *Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Inovasi Pendidikan*, 6(2), 91–106.
- Wulandari, D. (2023). Community engagement and psychosocial support in preventing school violence. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Studies*, 10(1), 44–61.