

Is Indonesia Ready? A Legal and Policy Interrogation of Outcome-Based Academic Services for Accelerated Students with Disabilities

Rodiyah Rodiyah¹  , Waspiah Waspiah¹ , Bayangsari Wedhatami¹ ,
Runjati Runjati² 

¹ Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

² Politkenik Kesehatan Kementerian Kesehatan Semarang, Indonesia

✉ Corresponding email: rodiyah@mail.unnes.ac.id

Abstract

This study critically examines Indonesia's readiness to implement outcome-based education (OBE) in academic services for accelerated students with disabilities, situating the analysis within national legal frameworks and the global commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 4 on inclusive and equitable quality education. Indonesia has formally recognized the right to inclusive education through key legal instruments, including Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities and Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education, which mandate accessibility and non-discrimination in educational provision. However, a persistent gap remains between these normative commitments and their practical implementation in

higher education institutions. Employing a normative juridical method combined with conceptual and policy analysis, this research evaluates the extent to which existing regulations support the operationalization of OBE in inclusive academic services. The findings reveal that although Indonesian legal frameworks provide a general mandate for disability inclusion, they lack specific and enforceable standards for integrating OBE principles—such as measurable learning outcomes, adaptive assessment systems, and institutional accountability mechanisms—particularly within acceleration programs. This regulatory ambiguity contributes to fragmented implementation and limits the achievement of equitable educational outcomes, thereby constraining Indonesia's progress toward SDG 4 targets. This article argues that Indonesia is not yet fully prepared to align its higher education system with both OBE principles and SDG commitments without substantial legal and policy reform. Strengthening regulatory coherence, embedding disability-sensitive outcome indicators, and enhancing institutional compliance mechanisms are essential to bridging the gap between rights and results. This study contributes to legal scholarship by linking national regulatory frameworks with global development agendas, offering pathways toward a more inclusive and globally competitive higher education system.

KEYWORDS *Outcome-Based Education (OBE), Disability Rights Law, Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4), Inclusive Higher Education, Indonesia Legal Framework*

Introduction

The paradigm shift toward Outcome-Based Education (OBE) represents a global movement in higher education that prioritizes demonstrable results over traditional input-driven curricula.¹ In the context of inclusive education, OBE offers a unique opportunity to tailor academic experiences to the diverse needs of students with disabilities, particularly those in accelerated programs who require both rigor and flexibility. However, the successful integration of OBE for this demographic necessitates more than pedagogical adjustments; it

¹ Spady, William G. *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*. (Arlington: American Association of School Administrators, 1994).

requires a robust legal foundation that mandates institutional accountability.² As Indonesia seeks to modernize its higher education sector, the intersection of disability rights and outcome-oriented frameworks becomes a critical point of inquiry. This interrogation is not merely academic but central to ensuring that the Indonesian education system moves beyond mere presence—allowing students with disabilities into classrooms—and toward actual performance, where learning outcomes are equitable, measurable, and supported by specialized legal protections.³

Central to this discussion is Indonesia's formal commitment to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically SDG 4, which aims to “*ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*”.⁴ The realization of SDG 4 in the Indonesian archipelago is contingent upon the state's ability to dismantle systemic barriers that hinder the progress of vulnerable groups.⁵ For accelerated students with disabilities, the stakes are particularly high; these individuals possess exceptional cognitive or artistic potential but are often thwarted by rigid instructional designs that do not account for their specific functional limitations.⁶ Aligning national policy with SDG 4 requires a transition from a charity-based model of disability to a rights-based model, where academic services are legally required to facilitate the achievement of predetermined learning outcomes.⁷ Without a synchronized legal and policy framework, the “leave no one behind” mantra remains an aspirational sentiment rather than a practical reality for Indonesia's most gifted but marginalized learners.

² See Harden, Ronald M. “Why Outcome-based education (OBE) is an important development in medical education.” *Routledge International Handbook of Medical Education*. (London: Routledge, 2015), pp. 27-42.

³ Rao, Kavita, and Margaret Meo. “Using Universal Design for Learning to Design Standards-Based Lessons of Outcome-Based Education.” *SAGE Open* 6, no. 4 (2016): 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016680688>

⁴ See United Nations. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. A/RES/70/1. (New York: UN Publishing, 2015).

⁵ See UNESCO. *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education: All Means All*. (Paris: UNESCO, 2020).

⁶ Ronksley-Pavia, Michelle. “A Model of Twice-Exceptionality: Explaining and Defining the Apparent Paradoxical Combination of Disability and Giftedness in Childhood.” *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* 38, no. 3 (2015): 318-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353215592499>

⁷ Degener, Theresia. “A Human Rights Model of Disability.” In Peter Blanck and Eilionóir Flynn (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Disability Law and Policy*. (London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 31-49.

The legal landscape in Indonesia provides a broad, albeit fragmented, mandate for the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the higher education sphere. The primary legislative pillars include Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education and Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities. Law No. 12 of 2012 explicitly prohibits discrimination in university admissions and mandates that institutions provide accessible facilities.⁸ Complementing this, Law No. 8 of 2016 serves as a comprehensive “charter of rights,” establishing the state’s obligation to provide “Reasonable Accommodation” (*Akomodasi yang Layak*) in educational settings.⁹ While these statutes are progressive in their recognition of human rights, they are often critiqued for being overly general.¹⁰ They establish the right to access but remain largely silent on the specificities of academic service delivery, such as how curricula should be modified or how outcomes should be assessed for students enrolled in accelerated tracks who may require unconventional assessment methods to demonstrate mastery.

Despite these normative commitments, a significant gap persists between the *de jure* rights enshrined in Indonesian law and the *de facto* experiences of students within higher education institutions (HEIs). This implementation gap is often characterized by a lack of technical guidelines that would allow administrators to translate broad legal mandates into classroom practices.¹¹ In the absence of specific regulations, many universities adopt a minimalist approach to inclusion, focusing on physical infrastructure like ramps while neglecting the instructional accessibility required by OBE.¹² For accelerated students with disabilities, this gap is exacerbated by the intensity of their programs. If the legal framework does not explicitly define how OBE should be adapted—such as through the use of assistive technology in high-stakes

⁸ See Republic of Indonesia. *Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education*. (Jakarta: State Secretariat, 2012).

⁹ See Republic of Indonesia. *Law Number 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities*. (Jakarta: State Secretariat, 2016).

¹⁰ See Azizah, Nur, Elga Andriana, and David Evans. “Conceptualising Inclusion within Indonesian Contexts.” *Global Directions in Inclusive Education*. (London: Routledge, 2021), pp. 81-98; Heryansyah, Despan, and Sahid Hadi. “On the hierarchy of human rights of persons with disabilities and higher education: Capturing the fulfilment of the right to accessibility in Indonesia.” *The Routledge International Handbook of Disability Human Rights Hierarchies*. (London: Routledge, 2023), pp. 255-282.

¹¹ Moriña, Anabel. “Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities.” *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 32, no. 1 (2017): 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1254964>

¹² Burgstahler, Sheryl E. *Universal Design in Higher Education: From Principles to Practice*. 2nd ed. (Boston: Harvard Education Press, 2015).

assessments—the student’s right to education is effectively curtailed by institutional inertia and regulatory ambiguity.¹³

The integration of OBE into inclusive academic services requires a sophisticated understanding of measurable learning outcomes that are sensitive to disability. Traditional OBE frameworks often assume a standard student profile, which can inadvertently create new barriers.¹⁴ For Indonesia to be truly ready, its policy must mandate that learning outcomes be defined not by the method of achievement, but by the competency acquired. For instance, an outcome requiring effective communication should be legally recognized as being met through sign language or augmentative communication devices.¹⁵ However, current Indonesian educational regulations lack the granularity to enforce such nuances. This research suggests that without embedding disability-sensitive indicators into the national quality assurance standards (*Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi*), the shift to OBE may unintentionally alienate accelerated students with disabilities by holding them to rigid standards.¹⁶

Institutional accountability mechanisms represent another critical deficiency in the current Indonesian legal framework. While Law No. 8 of 2016 mentions sanctions for non-compliance, the enforcement of these penalties within academia remains rare.¹⁷ For OBE to function effectively, there must be a feedback loop where institutions are held responsible for the outcomes of their students with disabilities. If a student in an accelerated program fails to meet a learning objective due to a lack of reasonable accommodation, the failure should be viewed as an institutional shortcoming.¹⁸ Yet, the current regulatory environment does not provide a clear pathway for students to seek redress for pedagogical negligence. Strengthening the legal framework means creating

¹³ Griful-Freixenet, Julia, Katrien Struyven, Wendelien Vantieghem, and Esther Gheysens. “Exploring the Interrelationship between Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction (DI): A Systematic Review.” *Educational Research Review* 29 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100306>

¹⁴ Biggs, John, and Catherine Tang. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 4th ed. (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education, 2011).

¹⁵ Meyer, Anne, David H. Rose, and David Gordon. *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and Practice*. (Wakefield, MA: CAST Professional Publishing, 2014).

¹⁶ Oliver, Michael. *The Politics of Disablement*. (London: Macmillan International Higher Education, 2013).

¹⁷ Simanjuntak, Jeremia Gom Gom Parulian. “Policy on Fulfilling the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia: Quo Vadis?.” *Indonesian Journal of Disability Studies* 8, no. 1 (2021): 211-277. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.ijds.2021.008.01.16>

¹⁸ Shakespeare, Tom. *Disability Rights and Wrongs Revisited*. 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2014).

enforceable standards of service that link institutional accreditation and funding to the successful attainment of learning outcomes for students with disabilities.¹⁹

Furthermore, the concept of acceleration in the Indonesian context often implies a one-size-fits-all fast track that leaves little room for iterative adjustments. Legal frameworks must bridge the gap between the need for speed in accelerated programs and the need for flexibility in disability support. Policy interrogation reveals that existing regulations regarding Special Intelligence and Talent (*Cerdas Istimewa dan Bakat Istimewa*) are often siloed from disability regulations.²⁰ This creates a paradox where a student can be recognized as gifted but denied the accommodations necessary to succeed because they are not viewed through a holistic legal lens. A unified policy approach is required—one that recognizes the twice-exceptional learner and mandates that OBE frameworks in accelerated tracks are inherently adaptive rather than merely additive.²¹

In addition, while Indonesia has made commendable strides in drafting inclusive legislation, the nation is not yet fully prepared to operationalize OBE for accelerated students with disabilities. The current legal and policy infrastructure provides a foundation of access but lacks the architecture of success required by an outcome-based philosophy.²² To bridge this gap, Indonesia must pursue substantial legal reforms that harmonize disability rights with educational quality standards. This includes the development of specific technical regulations for reasonable accommodation in high-stakes academic settings, the integration of inclusive indicators into national accreditation

¹⁹ Shaw, Anne. "Inclusion of disabled Higher Education students: why are we not there yet?." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 28, no. 6 (2024): 820-838. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1968514>; Rahajeng, Unita Werdi, Wiwin Hendriani, and Pramesti Pradna Paramita. "Navigating higher education challenges: A review of strategies among students with disabilities in Indonesia." *Disabilities* 4, no. 3 (2024): 678-695. <https://doi.org/10.3390/disabilities4030042>

²⁰ Sari, Indah Permata, et al. "Strategi Pembelajaran untuk Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus Kategori Cerdas dan Bakat Istimewa (CIBI): Tinjauan Literatur." *caXra: Jurnal Pendidikan Sekolah Dasar* 5, no. 1 (2025): 259-264. <https://doi.org/10.31980/caxra.v5i1.2282>

²¹ Townend, Geraldine, and Donna Pendergast. "Student voice: What can we learn from twice-exceptional students about the teacher's role in enhancing or inhibiting academic selfconcept." *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education* 24, no. 1 (2015): 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.21505/ajge.2015.0006>

²² Fullan, Michael. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. 4th ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

systems, and the establishment of clear accountability mechanisms.²³ Only by aligning its domestic laws with the global mandates of SDG 4 and the pedagogical rigor of OBE can Indonesia ensure that its higher education system is truly equitable and capable of fostering the potential of every student.²⁴

Theoretical & Legal Framework

A. The Conceptual Evolution of Outcome-Based Education (OBE)

The philosophy of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) marks a definitive departure from traditional “clock-hour” or input-centric models, focusing instead on the specific competencies students must demonstrate upon completion of their studies. At its core, OBE is a student-centered learning philosophy that organizes the entire educational system—including curriculum, instruction, and assessment—around the essential outcomes that students should achieve.²⁵ This framework is particularly pertinent for accelerated programs, where the pace of learning is heightened and the traditional focus on “seat time” becomes obsolete. In an OBE system, the “outcome” is not merely a grade or the completion of a module but a high-level performance that reflects the integration of knowledge, skills, and values in real-world contexts.²⁶

For students with disabilities, the OBE model shifts the focus from perceived functional limitations to actualized potential. It requires that educational standards be flexible enough to allow for diverse methods of achievement while maintaining the absolute integrity of academic rigor.²⁷ In this context, the outcome remains constant, but the pathway to that outcome is individualized. This is a critical distinction for accelerated tracks, as it allows

²³ Crespo, Raquel M., et al. “Aligning assessment with learning outcomes in outcome-based education.” *IEEE EDUCON 2010 Conference*. IEEE, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON.2010.5492385>. See also Premalatha, K. “Course and Program Outcomes Assessment Methods in Outcome-Based Education: A Review.” *Journal of Education* 199, no. 3 (2019): 111-127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057419854351>

²⁴ Lang, Raymond, et al. “Implementing the United Nations Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities: Principles, implications, practice and limitations.” *Alter. European Journal of Disability Research* 5-3 (2011): 206-220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alter.2011.02.004>

²⁵ See Spady, *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*.

²⁶ See Harden, “Why Outcome-based education (OBE) is an important development in medical education.” *Routledge International Handbook of Medical Education*.

²⁷ Biggs, and Tang. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 4th ed.

students with disabilities to bypass traditional pedagogical barriers that are often time-dependent rather than competency-dependent. By prioritizing what a student can do over how long it takes them to do it in a standard classroom setting, OBE provides the theoretical architecture necessary for true inclusion.²⁸

Furthermore, the implementation of OBE necessitates a backwards design approach, where learning objectives are defined first and the pedagogical path is adjusted accordingly. For accelerated students with disabilities, this means that the legal right to a modified curriculum is not a concession but a foundational requirement of the OBE system. When institutions focus on outcomes, they are compelled to dismantle rigid, standardized instructional paths that often exclude those who learn differently.²⁹ This systemic shift moves education away from a survival of the fittest mentality toward a mastery for all approach, which is essential for twice-exceptional learners who may excel in cognitive domains while requiring support in executive or physical functions.

The theoretical merit of OBE also lies in its emphasis on transparency and institutional accountability. Because outcomes must be clearly defined and measurable, there is less room for the “hidden curriculum” that often disadvantages students with disabilities.³⁰ In an inclusive OBE framework, the criteria for success are explicit, allowing students to advocate for the specific accommodations—such as assistive technology or alternative assessment formats—that will enable them to meet those criteria.³¹ (Burgstahler 2015). This transparency is vital in accelerated programs, where the margin for error is slim and the need for clear communication between the student and the institution is paramount.

However, without a formal legal mandate, the inherent flexibility of OBE often remains at the discretion of individual institutions, leading to fragmented implementation. Strengthening the regulatory framework in Indonesia would mean formalizing the requirement that OBE assessments must be inclusive by design (*Universal Design for Learning*). This ensures that students in accelerated tracks are evaluated based on their mastery of the subject matter rather than their ability to navigate a standard, non-accessible environment.³² Legal

²⁸ See Rao, and Meo. “Using Universal Design for Learning to Design Standards-Based Lessons of Outcome-Based Education.”

²⁹ See Moriña, “Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities.”

³⁰ Oliver, Michael. *The Politics of Disablement*. (London: Macmillan International Higher Education, 2013).

³¹ See Burgstahler, *Universal Design in Higher Education: From Principles to Practice*. 2nd ed.

³² See Griful-Freixenet, et.al. “Exploring the Interrelationship between Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction (DI): A Systematic Review.”

interrogation must therefore focus on how OBE principles are codified in national education standards to prevent them from becoming yet another barrier to equity.

Finally, the transition to OBE requires a cultural shift within the academic community. Faculty members must move from being deliverers of content to facilitators of outcomes, a change that requires significant professional development in inclusive pedagogy.³³ For accelerated programs, this means instructors must be trained to recognize that acceleration and accommodation are not mutually exclusive. The theoretical success of OBE is contingent upon the instructor's ability to design assessments that are both challenging and accessible. Without this human element, the legal and policy frameworks for OBE remain hollow shells, unable to deliver the promised benefits to students with disabilities.

B. The Right to Education and Disability Inclusion: A Rights-Based Paradigm

The right to education for persons with disabilities is deeply rooted in international human rights law, most notably the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which Indonesia ratified in 2011 via Law No. 19 of 2011. Article 24 of the CRPD mandates that states parties ensure an inclusive education system at all levels, aimed at the full development of human potential and the sense of dignity and self-worth.³⁴ This legal imperative shifts the paradigm from a “medical model,” where disability is viewed as a deficit to be cured, to a “human rights model,” where the barrier is identified as the environment and the state's failure to provide adequate support.³⁵

In Indonesia, Law No. 8 of 2016 reflects this shift by establishing the right of persons with disabilities to receive quality education on an equal basis with others through Reasonable Accommodation (*Akomodasi yang Layak*). However, the legal definition of reasonable remains a subject of intense debate. In higher education, particularly in accelerated tracks, what is considered reasonable must

³³ See Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. 4th ed.

³⁴ See United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. (New York: United Nations, 2006).

³⁵ See Degener, “A Human Rights Model of Disability.” In Peter Blanck and Eilionóir Flynn (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Disability Law and Policy*.

be balanced against academic standards.³⁶ The law requires institutions to provide support services, yet it lacks the specificity to mandate how these services should be integrated into high-intensity curricula. This ambiguity often results in a protectionist rather than an empowerment approach to disability in Indonesian universities.

The right to education in the modern era has evolved to mean the right to a quality, equitable education that leads to tangible outcomes. For accelerated students, inclusion does not merely mean being present in a high-speed academic track; it involves the legal entitlement to specific pedagogical supports that enable them to compete on an even playing field.³⁷ The intersection of disability rights and academic services for the gifted requires a nuanced legal approach that recognizes “twice-exceptionality.” Current Indonesian policy often treats these two identities—disability and high intelligence—as mutually exclusive, leaving a regulatory void for students who require both acceleration and accommodation.³⁸

Furthermore, the legal framework must address the pedagogical negligence that occurs when an institution fails to provide the necessary accommodations for a student to reach a mandated outcome. Under a rights-based paradigm, the failure of a student with a disability to achieve an outcome should first be interrogated as a failure of the institution to provide reasonable accommodation.³⁹ This places the burden of proof on the educational provider, a concept that is currently underdeveloped in Indonesian administrative law. Strengthening this area would involve creating clear grievance mechanisms and legal remedies for students whose academic progress is hindered by institutional barriers.

In addition to domestic law, the influence of regional frameworks like the ASEAN Enabling Masterplan 2025 cannot be overlooked. This regional

³⁶ See Azizah, and Evans. “Conceptualising Inclusion within Indonesian Contexts.” *Global Directions in Inclusive Education*; Heryansyah, and Hadi. “On the hierarchy of human rights of persons with disabilities and higher education: Capturing the fulfilment of the right to accessibility in Indonesia.” *The Routledge International Handbook of Disability Human Rights Hierarchies*.

³⁷ Shakespeare, *Disability Rights and Wrongs Revisited*. 2nd ed.

³⁸ Foley Nicpon, Megan, et al. “Empirical Investigation of Twice-Exceptionality: Where Have We Been and Where Are We Going?.” *Gifted Child Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (2011): 3-17. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0016986210382575>

³⁹ Liasidou, Anastasia. “Disabling discourses and human rights law: a case study based on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities.” *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 37, no. 1 (2016): 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2014.936928>

commitment emphasizes the importance of inclusive education as a driver of economic participation for persons with disabilities. By linking disability rights to national development goals, the legal discourse in Indonesia can move beyond mere compliance to a more strategic integration of disability inclusion in higher education.⁴⁰ This involves not only physical accessibility but the accessibility of information, communication, and digital learning platforms which are essential in accelerated OBE environments.

Ultimately, the rights-based paradigm demands a move toward “substantive equality” rather than just “formal equality.” Formal equality might dictate that all students are given the same test, but substantive equality recognizes that for a student with a visual impairment, a standard test is inherently unequal. The legal framework must therefore mandate Instructional Accessibility, where the delivery of knowledge is as accessible as the building itself.⁴¹ This requires a sophisticated alignment of Law No. 8 of 2016 with the technical regulations of the Ministry of Education to ensure that *Reasonable Accommodation* is interpreted through the lens of outcome achievement.

C. SDG 4: Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education as a Global Mandate

Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) serves as the global blueprint for educational reform, emphasizing the necessity of inclusive and equitable quality education and the promotion of lifelong learning opportunities for all.⁴² Target 4.5 of this goal specifically mandates the elimination of gender disparities and ensures equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities. In the Indonesian context, SDG 4 provides a critical normative benchmark for evaluating the effectiveness of national higher education policies. It forces a macro-level interrogation of whether the current system is truly equitable or merely available.

The ‘*equitable*’ component of SDG 4 is particularly relevant to the OBE framework, as it demands that educational systems provide varying levels of

⁴⁰ Simanjuntak, “Policy on Fulfilling the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia: Quo Vadis?”

⁴¹ See Konur, Ozcan. “Creating enforceable civil rights for disabled students in higher education: An institutional theory perspective.” *Disability & Society* 15, no. 7 (2000): 1041-1063. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713662018>

⁴² See United Nations. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. A/RES/70/1. New York: UN Publishing, 2015.

support to ensure that all students can reach the same high-level outcomes.⁴³ Equity in this sense is not about treating everyone the same, but about providing the specific resources—be they technological, financial, or pedagogical—required for each individual to succeed. For accelerated students with disabilities, this means that the state must invest in specialized academic services that are often more costly and complex than standard provisions.⁴⁴ Without this investment, the promise of SDG 4 remains unfulfilled for a significant portion of the population.

Integrating SDG 4 into Indonesia's legal and policy interrogation also highlights a fundamental requirement for institutional accountability through data. To align with global standards, Indonesia must move beyond access-based indicators—such as the number of students with disabilities enrolled—and adopt outcome-based indicators that specifically track completion rates, employment outcomes, and the quality of learning for these students.⁴⁵ This data-driven approach is essential for identifying where the system is failing and for directing policy interventions more effectively. The current lack of disaggregated data on students with disabilities in Indonesian higher education is a significant barrier to achieving SDG 4 targets.

Moreover, SDG 4 emphasizes the importance of quality education. In an OBE context, quality is defined by the relevance of the outcomes to the student's future participation in society and the workforce. For students in accelerated tracks, the quality of education must include the development of high-level analytical and professional skills. If these students are denied accommodations, the quality of their education is diminished, as they are unable to fully demonstrate or develop their potential.⁴⁶ Thus, the legal mandate for inclusion is also a mandate for quality assurance; an education system that excludes or disadvantages a segment of its learners cannot be considered a high-quality system.

The global mandate of SDG 4 also places Indonesia within a peer network of nations striving for educational reform. This provides opportunities for policy learning and the adoption of international best practices in inclusive OBE. For instance, the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is

⁴³ See UNESCO. *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education: All Means All*. (Paris: UNESCO, 2020).

⁴⁴ See Ronksley-Pavia, "A Model of Twice-Exceptionality: Explaining and Defining the Apparent Paradoxical Combination of Disability and Giftedness in Childhood."

⁴⁵ See Moriña, "Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities."

⁴⁶ See also Premalatha, "Course and Program Outcomes Assessment Methods in Outcome-Based Education: A Review."

increasingly recognized worldwide as a primary strategy for achieving SDG 4.⁴⁷ By embedding UDL principles into national law and policy, Indonesia can create a more resilient and flexible education system that naturally accommodates diversity without the need for constant, individualized “retrofitting” of curricula.

Therefore, the achievement of SDG 4 is inextricably linked to the broader agenda of social justice and economic development. By ensuring that accelerated students with disabilities can achieve high-level outcomes, Indonesia is not only fulfilling a human rights obligation but also maximizing its human capital. These students represent a pool of potential leaders, innovators, and professionals who can contribute significantly to the nation’s progress.⁴⁸ Therefore, the interrogation of legal and policy readiness for inclusive OBE is not just a technical exercise; it is a vital step toward creating an inclusive society where the leave no one behind promise of the SDGs is translated into tangible academic and professional success for all.

Method

The structural integrity of this research is grounded in a normative juridical approach, a method that prioritizes the analysis of legal rules, principles, and doctrines as they exist within the written ‘black letter’ law. This methodology treats law not merely as a social phenomenon but as a normative system of prescriptions that must be internally coherent and externally valid. By employing this approach, the study systematically interrogates the Indonesian legislative landscape to determine the legal force and clarity of mandates surrounding Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and disability inclusion. This involves a rigorous examination of secondary data sources, including primary legal materials such as national statutes and international conventions, and secondary materials such as academic journals and authoritative legal commentaries, to identify normative gaps in the current educational framework.

To ensure a comprehensive evaluation of Indonesia’s readiness, the research utilizes a statutory approach as its primary analytical lens. This involves a meticulous review of the hierarchy of Indonesian laws, beginning with the

⁴⁷ See Rao, and Meo. “Using Universal Design for Learning to Design Standards-Based Lessons of Outcome-Based Education.”

⁴⁸ See Foley-Nicpon, Megan, Susan G. Assouline, and Nicholas Colangelo. “Twice-Exceptional Learners: Who Needs to Know What?.” *Gifted Child Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2013): 169-180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986213490021>

1945 Constitution and extending to Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education and Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities. Through this approach, the study identifies specific legal provisions that govern the provision of academic services for accelerated students. The statutory analysis serves to map the existing regulatory “infrastructure,” highlighting where the law explicitly mandates inclusive practices and where it remains silent or ambiguous regarding the technical implementation of OBE principles in high-stakes, accelerated environments.

Complementing the statutory analysis is a conceptual approach, which provides the theoretical scaffolding necessary to critique the current legal state. This approach draws upon the foundational theories of Outcome-Based Education as proposed by Spady⁴⁹ and the human rights model of disability advocated by Degener⁵⁰. By moving beyond existing legislation, the conceptual approach allows the researchers to construct an ideal framework for inclusive academic services. This framework serves as a normative benchmark against which the current Indonesian system is measured. It facilitates a deeper understanding of how abstract concepts like “Reasonable Accommodation” and “Measurable Learning Outcomes” should be legally interpreted to benefit students who possess both high cognitive potential and functional disabilities.

Finally, the study incorporates a policy approach to evaluate the operationalization of legal norms within administrative and institutional settings. This involves an interrogation of lower-level regulations, such as Ministerial Decrees (*Peraturan Menteri*) and institutional guidelines, which serve as the bridge between broad legislative mandates and actual academic practice. The policy approach is critical for identifying ‘bottlenecks’ in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4) at the university level. By synthesizing these three approaches—statutory, conceptual, and policy—the methodology provides a multi-layered interrogation of Indonesia’s educational ecosystem, offering a robust basis for the subsequent legal and policy recommendations aimed at fostering a truly inclusive and outcome-oriented higher education system.

⁴⁹ See Spady, *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*.

⁵⁰ See Degener, “A Human Rights Model of Disability.” In Peter Blanck and Eilionóir Flynn (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Disability Law and Policy*.

Indonesian Legal and Policy Frameworks: A Critical Interrogation

The structural integrity of inclusive education in Indonesia is ostensibly anchored in Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities. This statute represents a significant normative shift, moving the national legal paradigm from a ‘charity-based’ welfare model to a ‘rights-based’ model of social citizenship.⁵¹ Specifically, Article 10, Paragraph (a) guarantees the right of persons with disabilities to obtain a quality education across all types, pathways, and levels. While this provision serves as a foundational ‘charter of rights,’ its application within the high-pressure environment of accelerated academic programs remains legally ambiguous. The law establishes the right to be present, yet it lacks the granular definitions required to ensure the right to perform—a distinction that is critical for the effective implementation of Outcome-Based Education (OBE).

A more focused critique must be directed at Article 42, Paragraph (3), which mandates that higher education institutions facilitate the formation of Disability Service Units (*Unit Layanan Disabilitas*). From a normative juridical perspective, the term facilitate is dangerously vague, often resulting in administrative entities that lack the executive power to influence faculty-level academic policies.⁵² In an OBE framework, where the curriculum is centered on demonstrable outcomes, these units must evolve beyond pastoral care. They should be legally empowered to act as technical auditors of Reasonable Accommodation, ensuring that learning outcomes are not just aspirational but are structurally accessible to students with diverse functional profiles.⁵³

The concept of Reasonable Accommodation, as enshrined in Article 10, Paragraph (b) of Law No. 8/2016, is perhaps the most contested legal battleground in Indonesian higher education. For accelerated students, who are expected to master complex competencies at a rapid pace, the “reasonableness” of an accommodation is often weighed against the preservation of academic rigor. However, international human rights jurisprudence suggests that a failure to provide accommodation constitutes discrimination unless it imposes an

⁵¹ See Degener, “A Human Rights Model of Disability.” In Peter Blanck and Eilionóir Flynn (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Disability Law and Policy*.

⁵² See Simanjuntak, “Policy on Fulfilling the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia: Quo Vadis?”

⁵³ See Rao, and Meo. “Using Universal Design for Learning to Design Standards-Based Lessons of Outcome-Based Education.”

“undue burden”.⁵⁴ In Indonesia, the lack of a clear legal threshold for what constitutes an ‘undue burden’ allows institutions to resist necessary instructional modifications, such as the use of assistive technology in high-stakes examinations, under the guise of maintaining institutional standards.

Furthermore, the legal discourse surrounding Article 42, Paragraph (1), which mandates accessible infrastructure, is traditionally limited to the physical realm (e.g., ramps and elevators). A contemporary interrogation must expand this interpretation to include digital and instructional infrastructure. As OBE increasingly relies on Learning Management Systems (LMS) and digital assessment tools, the legal definition of accessibility must encompass WCAG 2.1 standards.⁵⁵ Without a formal amendment or a binding ministerial regulation that defines digital accessibility as a component of the right to education, accelerated students with visual or motor impairments remain legally vulnerable to technological exclusion.

Shifting the analysis to Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education, we encounter a different set of systemic challenges. Article 6, Paragraph (b) dictates that higher education be organized in a democratic and equitable manner. However, the Indonesian legal system often conflates equality with uniformity. In a uniform system, every student is given the same test at the same speed; in an equitable system, the output is standardized while the input is differentiated. Law No. 12/2012 provides the academic autonomy for universities to create these differentiated pathways, yet it provides no legal incentive or mandate to ensure they are inclusive of the twice-exceptional learner—those with both high cognitive potential and significant disabilities.⁵⁶

Under Article 35, Paragraph (1) of Law No. 12/2012, the development of curriculum is tied to the National Standard of Higher Education (SN-Dikti). The current SN-Dikti is largely silent on the methodology of inclusive OBE. This silence creates a regulatory vacuum where academic departments can claim that modifying an accelerated program for a student with a disability would violate national standards of excellence.⁵⁷ A sophisticated legal reform would involve embedding Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles directly into the SN-Dikti. By doing so, the law would recognize that an accessible

⁵⁴ See Liasidou, “Disabling discourses and human rights law: a case study based on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities.”

⁵⁵ See Burgstahler, *Universal Design in Higher Education: From Principles to Practice*. 2nd ed.

⁵⁶ See Foley-Nicpon, Megan, and Susan G. Assouline. “High ability students with coexisting disabilities: Implications for school psychological practice.” *Psychology in the Schools* 57, no. 10 (2020): 1615-1626. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22342>

⁵⁷ See Moriña, “Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities.”

curriculum is not a deviation from quality, but rather a benchmark of a high-performing education system.⁵⁸

The role of Article 31 concerning Distance Education also warrants interrogation. While distance learning offers a potential sanctuary for students with mobility-related disabilities, it must not become a legal “dumping ground” that segregates disabled students from the face-to-face richness of accelerated honors programs. The law must ensure that the choice of delivery mode is pedagogical, not exclusionary. If an accelerated student with a disability prefers an on-campus experience, the institution cannot legally default to distance education as a reasonable accommodation simply because it is cheaper than making the physical or instructional environment accessible.⁵⁹

Moreover, the financial regulations stipulated in Law No. 12/2012 fail to address the disability premium inherent in inclusive academic services. Providing high-level, outcome-based education for a student requiring sign-language interpretation for quantum physics or advanced law requires substantial investment. While the law mandates financial aid for the economically disadvantaged, it does not provide a dedicated funding stream for the technologically or functionally disadvantaged.⁶⁰ This creates a situation where institutional readiness is hindered by fiscal fear, leading to a reluctant and minimal implementation of inclusive mandates.

The policy landscape at the ministerial level, specifically the ‘*Merdeka Belajar*’ (Freedom to Learn) initiative, has introduced a culture of flexibility that theoretically complements OBE. However, policy interrogation reveals that freedom in this context is often defined for the majority. For a student with a disability, freedom to learn is contingent upon the availability of specialized support.⁶¹ Ministerial Decree No. 3 of 2020 on SN-Dikti mentions the need for inclusive education, yet it fails to provide the Inclusive Performance Indicators necessary for university accreditation. Until inclusive outcomes are tied to a university’s prestige and funding via BAN-PT (National Accreditation Agency), inclusion will remain a peripheral concern.

Furthermore, the accelerated tracks mentioned in various institutional policies are often designed with a survivor mentality. The legal framework surrounding these tracks often ignores the iterative nature of disability

⁵⁸ See Griful-Freixenet, et.al. “Exploring the Interrelationship between Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction (DI): A Systematic Review.”

⁵⁹ Shakespeare, *Disability Rights and Wrongs Revisited*. 2nd ed.

⁶⁰ Azzahra, Maura Olivia, et al. “Legal Recognition of Hidden Disabilities in Higher Education.” *Disable* 2, no. 1 (2026): 33-64. <https://doi.org/10.26740/dlr.v2i1.52510>

⁶¹ See Oliver, Michael. *The Politics of Disablement*.

management. A student may excel for three months but require a two-week period of medical leave. Current policies regarding Time-to-Degree are often too rigid to accommodate such fluctuations. A truly outcome-based policy would allow for a “variable time, constant competency” model, where the student is evaluated on their final mastery of the outcome regardless of the specific week in which that mastery was demonstrated.⁶²

The professional development of faculty, governed by ministerial regulations on Lecturer Certification (*Sertifikasi Dosen*), is another area of policy failure. Most faculty members are experts in their disciplines but are “pedagogically illiterate” regarding disability accommodation. There is no legal requirement for faculty to demonstrate competency in inclusive design to maintain their certification. This creates a “competency gap” where the law mandates inclusion, but the human actors responsible for delivery are not equipped to perform it.⁶³ At the institutional level, the lack of standardized bylaws regarding inclusive OBE leads to ‘administrative ad-hocism.’ When a student with a disability enters an accelerated program, the accommodations are often negotiated on a case-by-case basis, which is inherently unstable and legally precarious.⁶⁴ A robust policy framework would require every university to publish an Inclusive Academic Handbook that legally binds the institution to specific service standards. This would provide the legal certainty that students need to pursue accelerated degrees without the fear of sudden withdrawal of support.

The interaction between Law No. 8/2016 and Law No. 12/2012 also reveals a lack of inter-sectoral synchronization. The Ministry of Social Affairs handles disability rights, while the Ministry of Education handles academic standards. This creates a situation where a student’s right to an assistive device is handled by one agency, but the right to use that device in a university lab is handled by another. For Indonesia to be ready, there must be a unified legal-policy ecosystem that views the student as a single entity with both rights and academic potential.⁶⁵

The interrogation of these frameworks also highlights the absence of a Pedagogical Grievance Mechanism. If a student is denied a ramp, they can complain to the Disability Service Unit. However, if a student is denied an alternative assessment format that would allow them to demonstrate a learning

⁶² See Spady, *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*.

⁶³ See Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. 4th ed.

⁶⁴ See Moriña, “Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities.”

⁶⁵ See Liasidou, “Disabling discourses and human rights law: a case study based on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities.”

outcome, they have no clear legal path for redress. This lack of a specialized appeals process for academic accommodations means that the academic autonomy of the lecturer often trumps the civil rights of the student.⁶⁶

Furthermore, the concept of Continuous Improvement within OBE is rarely applied to inclusive services. Policies should mandate that institutions conduct annual Inclusion Audits, where the success rates of students with disabilities in accelerated programs are analyzed against those of their non-disabled peers. This data-driven approach is essential for achieving the equity targets of SDG 4.⁶⁷ Without data, the implementation of inclusion remains anecdotal and disconnected from national developmental goals.

The legal status of assistive technology (AT) also requires clarification. In many Indonesian HEIs, AT is viewed as a personal belonging rather than an educational tool. If a university provides a lab for general students, it must provide the adaptive equivalent for disabled students. The current policy ambiguity regarding who is responsible for providing and maintaining high-level AT (e.g., eye-tracking hardware for paralyzed students) significantly delays academic progress in accelerated programs where every week counts.

In the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Indonesia's readiness is further hampered by the "siloeing" of SDG 4. Inclusive education is often treated as a standalone goal, rather than being integrated with SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) and SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth). A legal framework that promotes inclusive OBE in accelerated tracks directly contributes to creating a high-skilled workforce among persons with disabilities, yet the current policy links are weak.

Furthermore, the ASEAN Enabling Masterplan 2025 provides a regional legal backdrop that Indonesia must respect. This masterplan calls for the mainstreaming of persons with disabilities across all developmental pillars. In higher education, this means that inclusion must move from being a special project to being a standard operating procedure.⁶⁸ The interrogation of current

⁶⁶ Rismawati, Shinta Dewi, et al. "Legal Culture and Disability Rights in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education: A Review of Practices." *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3, no. 4 (2024): 1368-1377; Diny Sujannah, Wahyu, Sinta Swastikawara, and Zubaidah Ningsih. "Advancing inclusive practices in higher education: insights from Indonesia's approach to disability support." *Cogent Social Sciences* 11, no. 1 (2025): 2593559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2593559>

⁶⁷ UNESCO. *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education: All Means All*. (Paris: UNESCO, 2020).

⁶⁸ See Simanjuntak, "Policy on Fulfilling the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia: Quo Vadis?."

policies suggests that Indonesia is still in the special project phase, with inclusive academic services being the exception rather than the rule.

A critical missing link in the policy framework is the Transition Policy for students moving from inclusive secondary schools to accelerated higher education. Many students who were supported in high school find a support cliff upon entering university. The law must mandate bridging programs that prepare both the student and the university department for the unique demands of an accelerated OBE curriculum. Therefore, the interrogation of Indonesia's legal and policy frameworks reveals a nation in transition. The legislative "bones" are present—provided by Law No. 8/2016 and Law No. 12/2012—but the "connective tissue" of technical regulations, inclusive standards, and accountability mechanisms is missing. For Indonesia to be truly ready for inclusive OBE, it must move beyond the normative romanticism of human rights and engage in the technical realism of educational reform.⁶⁹ This requires a synchronized effort to amend the SN-Dikti, clarify the parameters of reasonable accommodation, and establish a culture of institutional accountability that values the outcomes of all students equally.

Critical Analysis: Readiness and Structural Gaps

A. Absence of Technical OBE Guidelines for Inclusive Services

The primary structural gap in the Indonesian education system is the profound disconnect between normative legislative intent and technical operationalization. While Spady's (1994) foundational theory of Outcome-Based Education (OBE)⁷⁰ posits that the "culminating demonstration of learning" is the ultimate goal, Indonesian regulations fail to provide the technical "bridging" required for students with disabilities to reach these demonstrations. Current ministerial guidelines for OBE focus almost exclusively on industrial alignment and general graduate competencies, leaving a void regarding how these outcomes should be modified—not lowered—for students with sensory or motor disabilities.⁷¹ This creates a "compliance trap" where universities believe they are being inclusive by simply enrolling students,

⁶⁹ See Degener, "A Human Rights Model of Disability." In Peter Blanck and Eilionóir Flynn (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Disability Law and Policy*.

⁷⁰ See Spady, *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*.

⁷¹ See Rao, and Meo. "Using Universal Design for Learning to Design Standards-Based Lessons of Outcome-Based Education."

without providing the specialized technical pathways required to achieve high-level academic outcomes.

Scholars argue that for OBE to be truly inclusive, it must move beyond traditional reasonable accommodation and embrace a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework, providing multiple means of representation and expression.⁷² However, in the Indonesian context, the lack of technical standards for alternative outcome demonstration means that students are held to typical physical or sensory performance standards. For example, a learning outcome requiring clinical precision in an accelerated medical lab may not have a documented legal pathway for a student using assistive robotics. Consequently, the lack of UDL integration into national policy ensures that standardization inadvertently becomes a tool for exclusion.⁷³

B. Weak Enforcement and Policy Fragmentation

A critical analysis of the Indonesian legal landscape reveals a state of normative romanticism where progressive laws, such as Law No. 8 of 2016, lack the enforcement teeth required to change institutional behavior. This policy fragmentation occurs because the mandate for disability rights (Ministry of Social Affairs) is functionally divorced from the mandate for academic quality and accreditation (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology). This disconnect results in what Degener (2017)⁷⁴ describes as a failure of the human rights model, where the state recognizes the right to education but fails to provide the specific administrative remedies to enforce it. The result is a rights-based facade that often collapses under the pressure of department-level academic autonomy.

Furthermore, the academic autonomy granted to universities under Law No. 12 of 2012 often acts as a double-edged sword. While it allows for curriculum innovation, it frequently serves as a shield for faculty members who resist modifying accelerated tracks for students with disabilities. Without a legal mechanism to compel pedagogical training as a prerequisite for teaching these high-intensity programs, the Right to Education remains an empty promise at the classroom level.⁷⁵ Institutional accountability is further weakened by the accreditation blind spot, as the National Accreditation Agency (BAN-PT) does

⁷² See Meyer, Rose, and Gordon. *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and Practice*.

⁷³ See Burgstahler, *Universal Design in Higher Education: From Principles to Practice*. 2nd ed.

⁷⁴ See Degener, "A Human Rights Model of Disability." In Peter Blanck and Eilionóir Flynn (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Disability Law and Policy*.

⁷⁵ Shakespeare, *Disability Rights and Wrongs Revisited*. 2nd ed.

not currently place significant weight on the success rates of students with disabilities when evaluating university performance.⁷⁶

C. Barriers in Acceleration Programs

The intersection of acceleration and disability creates a unique set of barriers for the twice-exceptional (2e) learner—those who possess superior cognitive abilities alongside functional disabilities. In Indonesia, acceleration programs are traditionally governed by a fast-track logic that prioritizes speed and volume. However, these regulations are siloed from disability law, creating a paradox: a student can be fast enough cognitively but denied the tools to keep up functionally. This reflects a medical model bias where disability is seen as a deficit that disqualifies a student from high-intensity tracks, rather than an environmental barrier requiring adjustment.⁷⁷

In practice, the rigidity of accelerated tracks—characterized by high credit loads and fast-paced assessment cycles—leaves no room for the iterative accommodation required by many students with disabilities. If an accelerated student with a neurodivergent condition requires extra time for high-stakes testing, institutional policies often view this as an unfair advantage rather than a leveling of the playing field.⁷⁸ This structural barrier is exacerbated by the absence of a variable time model in Indonesian higher education, which still prioritizes the time-to-degree metric over the pure competency-mastery metric essential to inclusive OBE. This lack of flexibility is often cited as a primary reason for the high attrition rates among high-achieving students with disabilities in elite academic programs.⁷⁹

D. Implications for SDG 4 Achievement

The failure to bridge these structural gaps has dire implications for Indonesia's commitment to Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4). While Indonesia may show progress in access indicators (Target 4.5), the qualitative aspect of equitable quality education (Target 4.1) remains compromised. True inclusion in higher education is not merely about “letting them in,” but about

⁷⁶ See Moriña, “Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities.”

⁷⁷ Oliver, Michael. *The Politics of Disablement*.

⁷⁸ See Steiner, Alecia. *Embracing the intersection of giftedness and disability: Examining a Standalone school model for twice-exceptional learners*. University of Southern California, 2024.

⁷⁹ Foley-Nicpon, Assouline, and Colangelo. “Twice-Exceptional Learners: Who Needs to Know What?.”

ensuring that the educational journey leads to equivalent professional outcomes.⁸⁰ If accelerated students with disabilities are forced to drop out because the system cannot accommodate their pace, Indonesia is effectively squandering its most promising human capital.

Ultimately, the goal of inclusive academic services for accelerated students is to prove that excellence and equity are not mutually exclusive. Strengthening the legal coherence between Law No. 8 of 2016 and Law No. 12 of 2012 is not just a domestic necessity; it is a global obligation. Indonesia has the opportunity to lead the ASEAN region in inclusive higher education, but this requires dismantling the rigid barriers of the past and building an adaptive, outcome-oriented future where the environment is finally as limitless as the student's potential.⁸¹

Reformulating an Inclusive OBE Model

A. Disability-Sensitive Learning Outcomes and Assessment

The reformulation of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) in Indonesia must begin with a radical reconceptualization of how outcomes are defined. Traditional OBE frameworks often fall into the trap of normative standardization, where a learning outcome is inadvertently tied to a specific physical or sensory method of demonstration. To be truly inclusive, the Indonesian higher education system must decouple the competency from the modality. This is rooted in the Theory of Substantive Equality, which argues that treating everyone identically (formal equality) can actually perpetuate discrimination against those with different starting points. By defining outcomes based on cognitive mastery rather than physical execution, we move toward a system where the end remains high-quality, but the means are democratized.

From a legal standpoint, this reformulation is a direct application of the Human Rights Model of Disability as espoused in Article 24 of the CRPD and Law No. 8 of 2016. These legal instruments mandate that the individual potential of the learner must be the focal point of the educational experience. In an accelerated program, this means that the legal and pedagogical definition of a learning outcome should focus on the professional essence of the task. For

⁸⁰ See Moriña, "Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities."

⁸¹ See Liasidou, "Disabling discourses and human rights law: a case study based on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities."

instance, an outcome requiring effective communication of complex data must be explicitly recognized in the syllabus as being met through diverse means, including augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) or sign language, without requiring the student to petition for a deviation from the standard.

Implementing disability-sensitive outcomes requires the adoption of Flexible Assessment Pathways. In an accelerated program, where time is a critical variable, the assessment must be designed to measure mastery efficiently without penalizing students for functional differences. This involves a transition from Accommodated Testing—which treats disability as an afterthought—to Universal Design for Assessment (UDA). Under UDA, assessments are born accessible, offering multiple formats for expression by default. This aligns with the legal principle of Proactive Duty, where institutions are obligated to remove barriers before they are encountered by a specific individual, rather than reacting to a request for a waiver.

The integration of UDL principles into OBE also demands a shift in how rigor is perceived. Institutional readiness is often hindered by the fallacious belief that modifying assessment formats waters down academic standards. On the contrary, disability-sensitive assessment enhances rigor by ensuring that the student is tested on the actual learning objective rather than their ability to overcome an inaccessible medium. A student who masters an outcome through an alternative format has demonstrated the same level of intellectual competency. Legal frameworks must therefore mandate that functional equivalence in assessment be recognized as a standard component of academic quality assurance under Law No. 12 of 2012.

Furthermore, the reformulation must address the acceleration-accommodation conflict. In fast-track programs, the density of assessments can be overwhelming. A disability-sensitive OBE model would allow for Spaced Assessment Cycles or Continuous Mastery Checks, where students can demonstrate outcomes incrementally. This avoids the all-or-nothing high-stakes testing environment that acts as a barrier. This reflects the Theory of Backwards Design, where we start with the outcome and build the most accessible path toward it. By breaking down complex outcomes into smaller, demonstrable competencies, the system allows accelerated students with disabilities to maintain the required pace in a sustainable manner.

The table below outlines the conceptual shift required to move from a standard OBE model to a Disability-Sensitive Inclusive OBE model.

TABLE 1. Disability-Sensitive Inclusive OBE model

Component	Standard OBE Model	Inclusive OBE Model (Reformulated)	Legal/ Theoretical Basis
Outcome Definition	Tied to standard physical performance.	Functional and modality-independent.	Human Rights Model (CRPD)
Assessment Format	Single, standardized format.	Multiple means of action/expression.	Substantive Equality
Accommodation	Reactive: Provided upon request.	Proactive: Built into curriculum.	Universal Design (UDL)
Time Variable	Fixed semesters/rigid deadlines.	Variable time within mastery.	Competency-Based Theory
Technology	Secondary: Supplemental tools.	Primary: Integrated adaptive platforms.	Right to Assistive Tech

Sources: Various sources, edited and analyzed by the authors

To operationalize these outcomes, the implementation of Inclusive Rubrics should be positioned not merely as a pedagogical strategy but as an institutional instrument for fulfilling the legal rights of students with disabilities. The normative foundation can be traced to Article 28H paragraph (2) and Article 28I of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which establish the constitutional basis for equal treatment and affirmative measures to achieve equality. This constitutional framework is reinforced by Law No. 19 of 2011 ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which places equality, non-discrimination, accessibility, and reasonable accommodation at the centre of the rights of persons with disabilities.⁸²

⁸² This constitutional framework is reinforced by Law No. 19 of 2011 ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which embeds equality, non-discrimination, accessibility, participation, and reasonable accommodation within Indonesia's disability-rights framework. Article 24 of the CRPD is particularly significant because it requires inclusive education at all levels, including higher education, together with reasonable accommodation and individualized support. This rights-based approach can be read alongside Indonesian socio-legal studies on gender-based violence, child marriage, women's rights, and domestic violence, which demonstrate a recurring gap between progressive legal norms and their implementation within institutions and communities. These studies show that formal legal recognition does not automatically produce substantive equality when social norms, institutional practices, and discretionary decision-making continue to reproduce exclusion. The same analytical problem arises in disability-inclusive higher education. Accordingly, CRPD ratification should be understood not merely as formal legal recognition, but as requiring institutional

At the statutory level, Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities represents the principal domestic legal framework. The law recognizes the rights of persons with disabilities to education and requires the fulfilment of accessibility and reasonable accommodation. In the context of higher education, the law is particularly significant because it requires the facilitation of disability services and provides for the establishment of a Unit Layanan Disabilitas (ULD). The law further establishes administrative consequences for higher education providers that fail to establish such a unit.

Within this framework, inclusive rubrics can be understood as a concrete form of reasonable accommodation in assessment. The legal issue is not whether every student must be assessed through an identical procedure, but whether the assessment measures the substantive learning outcomes without creating disability-based barriers.⁸³ Accordingly, rubrics should identify the essential competencies that must be achieved while permitting students to demonstrate those competencies through accessible and functionally equivalent modalities. This distinction is important from the perspective of substantive equality: identical assessment procedures may produce unequal outcomes when students encounter different functional barriers. Consequently, an assessment system that permits reasonable modification of the mode, format, or conditions of

transformation through accessible policies, reasonable accommodation, participatory governance, and effective implementation mechanisms. *See also* Baiquni, Muhammad Iqbal, and Septhian Eka Adiyatma. “‘Keep It Within the Family’: Legal Intervention in the Social Normalization of Domestic Violence in Indonesian Communities”. *The Indonesian Journal of Legal Intervention in Social Problems* 1, no. 1 (2026): 31-70; Latifiani, Dian, and Waspiah Waspiah. “Family Honor Versus Child Protection: Legal Intervention in the Persistence of Child Marriage in Indonesian Communities”. *The Indonesian Journal of Legal Intervention in Social Problems* 1, no. 1 (2026): 109-130; Prameswari, Mahira Aluna. “Islamic Legal Modernism and Women’s Rights in Indonesian Pesantren Communities”. *The Indonesian Journal of Islamic Legal Modernism* 1, no. 1 (2026): 21-42; Utari, Indah Sri, Ridwan Arifin, and Sergi Fernandez Alejandro. “Gender-Based Violence and the Implementation of the Sexual Violence Crime Law in Indonesia”. *The Indonesian Journal of Feminist Legal Studies* 1, no. 1 (2026): 1-32; Zubaedah, Zubaedah. “Sociolegal Analysis of Child Marriage Prevention Policies in Rural Indonesia”. *The Indonesian Journal of Sociolegal Development* 1, no. 1 (2026): 101-120.

⁸³ Holdheide, Lynn. “Same Debate, New Opportunity: Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems That Promote and Support Educators in Practices That Advance All Students’ Learning.” *Journal of Special Education Leadership* 28, no. 2 (2015): 74; Ashworth, Mary, Sue Bloxham, and Leonie Pearce. “Examining the tension between academic standards and inclusion for disabled students: The impact on marking of individual academics’ frameworks for assessment.” *Studies in Higher Education* 35, no. 2 (2010): 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903062864>

assessment may be legally justified without constituting a reduction of academic standards.

This interpretation is further supported by Government Regulation No. 13 of 2020 concerning Reasonable Accommodation for Students with Disabilities. The regulation requires educational institutions to modify and adjust educational provision according to the needs arising from different forms of disability and places the provision of reasonable accommodation within the responsibilities of educational institutions, with facilitation from the central and regional governments.⁸⁴ Therefore, the use of transparent and modality-neutral assessment criteria should be understood as part of the institutional duty to eliminate barriers to participation, rather than as a discretionary concession provided at the individual lecturer's initiative.

This legal interpretation has particular significance for accelerated and honors programs. Acceleration cannot be used as a justification for reducing the legal protection afforded to students with disabilities. On the contrary, compressed academic schedules may increase the risk that students are required to repeatedly negotiate individual accommodations with lecturers or administrators. Such a system potentially shifts the burden of implementing disability rights from the institution to the student. A rights-based OBE framework should instead institutionalize accommodation through curriculum regulations, assessment policies, and ULD procedures, thereby transforming individual negotiation into a predictable institutional mechanism.

The implementation of Adaptive Learning Technologies should similarly be incorporated into the institutional framework of reasonable accommodation. Law No. 8 of 2016 recognizes accessibility as a component of the fulfilment of disability rights, including access to information and communication technology. However, the legal obligation should not be interpreted to mean that every institution is automatically required to procure AI-based adaptive learning systems. Rather, the stronger legal proposition is that when an institution employs digital learning systems, those systems should be designed, selected, and implemented consistently with the principles of accessibility, equality, reasonable accommodation, and non-discrimination. The procurement of adaptive technologies may therefore constitute one means of discharging the institution's obligation where such technology is reasonably necessary to overcome barriers experienced by students with disabilities.

⁸⁴ See Iqbal, Asep Muhamad, and M. Pasqa. "Menuju Kampus Ramah Disabilitas di Perguruan Tinggi Keagamaan: Kajian dan Pengembangan Model Kebijakan Disabilitas di UIN Bandung." *Jurnal Altifani Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat* 5, no. 4 (2025): 594-609. <https://doi.org/10.59395/p3mw0h64>

Permendikbudristek No. 48 of 2023 provides an important regulatory bridge between these general legal principles and higher education practice. The regulation expressly applies to higher education and regulates the provision of reasonable accommodation through funding support, facilities and infrastructure, educators and educational personnel, and curriculum. It also regulates the establishment and functions of the *Unit Layanan Disabilitas*, together with monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and administrative sanctions.⁸⁵ Accordingly, adaptive learning technology should not be treated as a stand-alone technological project. Its implementation should form part of an integrated accessibility policy administered through the institution's disability-service structure and linked to curriculum and assessment design.

The legal analysis also requires a distinction between an *essential learning outcome* and the *method used to achieve or demonstrate that outcome*. Outcome-Based Education is particularly compatible with this distinction because its principal concern is the attainment of defined competencies. Where the competency itself remains unchanged, allowing an accessible method of demonstrating that competency does not necessarily constitute a lowering of academic standards. For example, permitting an alternative accessible format for demonstrating analytical competence may preserve the substantive outcome while removing a barrier associated with a particular mode of communication. The legality of such modification should therefore be assessed according to whether it preserves the essential academic competency and constitutes a reasonable response to an identified disability-related barrier.

The recognition of Metacognitive Outcomes can likewise be situated within the principle of substantive equality. Students with disabilities may develop competencies in self-advocacy, self-regulation, strategic problem-solving, and navigating complex institutional environments. These competencies should not automatically replace discipline-specific learning outcomes, but may legitimately be incorporated as transversal graduate attributes where they are relevant to the program's educational objectives. Such recognition is consistent with a rights-based approach because it avoids constructing disability exclusively through a deficit model. More importantly, it recognizes students with disabilities as active participants in the educational process rather than passive recipients of institutional assistance.

⁸⁵ Wijayanti, Nuniek Prahesti, et al. "The Role of the Disability Services Unit in Improving the Quality of Vocational Skills for Students with Special Needs." *IJOBBA: International Journal of Bunga Bangsa Cirebon* 4, no. 2 (2025): 339-344.

The institutionalization of these outcomes should also be accompanied by meaningful participation of students with disabilities. The principle of “Nothing About Us Without Us,” reflected in contemporary disability-rights governance and consistent with the participatory orientation of the CRPD, provides a normative basis for involving students with disabilities in decisions affecting their education. Law No. 8 of 2016 establishes a broader rights-based framework in which persons with disabilities are recognized as rights-holders rather than objects of welfare. In higher education, this principle can be operationalized through representation or consultation within curriculum-development processes, accessibility committees, ULD mechanisms, and evaluation of accommodation policies.

Student participation, however, should not be interpreted as transferring the institution’s legal responsibility to the students themselves. Participation is a mechanism for improving the adequacy and effectiveness of accommodation, whereas the primary obligation to provide an accessible educational environment remains with the educational institution. This distinction is important because a purely consultative model may become symbolic if students are asked to identify barriers but the institution does not establish corresponding institutional duties, procedures, resources, and accountability mechanisms. The cumulative effect of these legal requirements should be reflected in the graduation profile. An inclusive graduation profile should demonstrate that students with disabilities have attained the substantive competencies required by the relevant program, while recognizing that the pathway and modality through which those competencies are demonstrated may legitimately differ.⁸⁶ The legal objective is therefore not to produce a “modified” degree with diminished academic value, but to ensure that reasonable accommodation enables students to demonstrate equivalent academic achievement without discrimination.

From this perspective, the relationship between OBE and disability rights is complementary rather than contradictory. OBE establishes the substantive academic outcomes that graduates are expected to achieve, while the legal framework on disability establishes the institutional obligation to ensure that students have an equal and accessible opportunity to achieve and demonstrate those outcomes. Law No. 8 of 2016, Government Regulation No. 13 of 2020, and Permendikbudristek No. 48 of 2023 collectively provide a regulatory basis

⁸⁶ See Mulyadi, Asal Wahyuni Erlin. “Policy of inclusive education for education for all in Indonesia.” *Policy & Governance Review* 1, no. 3 (2017): 201-212.

for moving from individualized and discretionary accommodation toward an institutionalized system of accessibility and reasonable accommodation.

Accordingly, the reformulation of OBE for twice-exceptional students in accelerated higher education programs should not be framed as an exception to academic standards. It should instead be conceptualized as an application of substantive equality within the existing legal framework. The central legal question is not whether students with disabilities should receive a lower standard, but whether the institution has removed disability-related barriers while preserving the essential competencies required for graduation. By embedding accessible assessment, reasonable accommodation, accessible digital learning, student participation, and institutional accountability into OBE policies, Indonesian higher education can reconcile academic excellence with the legally protected rights of persons with disabilities. Inclusion, in this sense, is not an administrative burden or discretionary benefit; it is part of the institution's legal responsibility to guarantee equal educational opportunity.

B. Legal Harmonization and Policy Integration

The second pillar of reformulation is the urgent need for legal harmonization. Currently, Indonesia's legal framework is a patchwork of general mandates and specific academic standards that do not communicate. To resolve this, the state must pursue Horizontal Harmonization between Law No. 8 of 2016 and Law No. 12 of 2012. This involves creating a unified regulatory instrument—potentially a Government Regulation—that explicitly dictates how the general rights of persons with disabilities are applied within the specific academic structures of a university. This is consistent with the Legal Certainty Theory, ensuring that rights are not just theoretical but enforceable.

Policy integration must specifically target the National Standard of Higher Education (SN-Dikti). The SN-Dikti serves as the 'DNA' of the Indonesian university system; if it does not contain inclusive markers, the system will remain inherently exclusive. The reformulation should include an amendment to the SN-Dikti to mandate Universal Design as a core requirement for both physical and instructional environments. This would transform inclusion from a special project into a quality requirement. By making UDL a mandatory standard for institutional licensing and program accreditation, the state provides a clear legal incentive for universities to overhaul their academic services.

A critical aspect of this harmonization is the legal definition of Reasonable Accommodation in high-stakes academic settings. The current ambiguity allows for varied and often substandard interpretations. The law must provide a Technical Taxonomy of Accommodations that categorizes what is expected for

different functional profiles. This taxonomy should be legally binding, providing students with a Service Level Agreement (SLA). For accelerated programs, these accommodations must be pre-validated, meaning the infrastructure for support is ready before the student even applies, thus eliminating the wait time for support that often derails accelerated studies.

Furthermore, there must be a synchronization between *Special Talent* regulations and *Disability* regulations. Indonesia's policy for gifted education and its policy for disability inclusion currently operate on parallel tracks. A reformulated policy must recognize the Twice-Exceptional Learner as a specific demographic with unique legal entitlements. This involves creating Individualized Acceleration Plans (IAPs) that combine the speed of honors curricula with the support of disability services. By legally recognizing this dual identity, the state ensures that a student's disability does not disqualify them from their giftedness.

Legal harmonization also requires a revamp of the 'academic autonomy' clause in Law No. 12/2012. While autonomy is vital for academic freedom, it cannot be used as a shield for discriminatory practices. This is supported by the *lex specialis derogat legi generali* principle, where specific human rights protections should clarify the boundaries of general academic autonomy. The law must clarify that academic autonomy is subject to the constitutional right to non-discrimination. A lecturer's freedom to design a course does not include the freedom to design an inaccessible course. In addition, the policy integration should also extend to the *Merdeka Belajar* (Freedom to Learn) initiative. A reformulated *Merdeka Belajar* policy would include an Inclusive Mobility component, ensuring that students can participate in internships and industry placements with the same support they receive on campus. This requires the state to mandate that any industry partner collaborating with a university must also comply with national disability accessibility standards. This follows the Theory of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), extending the inclusive environment into the professional sphere.

Financial policy integration is equally critical. The Disability Premium—the extra cost of providing accessible OBE—must be formally integrated into the national higher education funding model. Instead of viewing inclusion as a cost center, the law should view it as an investment in human capital. Providing specific Inclusion Grants to universities that demonstrate high success rates for accelerated students with disabilities would provide the fiscal fuel necessary for structural change. This would shift the institutional mindset from compliance as a burden to inclusion as a competitive advantage.

The reformulation must also address the Legal Standing of Disability Service Units (DSUs). Currently, many DSUs in Indonesia are mere administrative offices. Policy integration should elevate the DSU to a Technical Quality Assurance Body. Legally, the DSU should have the authority to veto inaccessible course designs and mandate changes in assessment methods if found to be discriminatory. By placing the DSU within the university's quality assurance hierarchy, the state ensures that disability support is viewed as a prerequisite for academic excellence.

Another essential element is the Transition Law. There is currently a legal vacuum for students moving from the K-12 system to higher education. Harmonized policy should mandate a Data Transfer Protocol, where a student's high school accessibility profile is shared with the receiving university. This allows the university to prepare accommodations in advance, ensuring a seamless start to their accelerated program. Without this legal bridge, students often spend their first semester fighting for the same supports they already had, leading to unnecessary setbacks. In addition, legal harmonization must include an International Alignment clause. As a signatory to the CRPD, Indonesia's higher education laws should be periodically audited against international best practices. This ensures that the Indonesian Inclusive OBE Model" remains globally competitive and aligned with the 'leave no one behind' philosophy of SDG 4. By integrating these international norms into domestic law, Indonesia signals that its higher education system is a modern, equitable, and world-class environment for all learners.

C. Strengthening Accountability and Compliance

The final pillar of the inclusive OBE model is the establishment of a rigorous accountability framework. Without clear consequences for non-compliance and rewards for excellence, even the best-designed laws remain dormant. This follows the Theory of Legal Sanctions, where the effectiveness of a law is tied to its enforcement mechanism. The state must integrate Inclusive Performance Indicators into the national university ranking and accreditation system managed by BAN-PT and the Ministry's Key Performance Indicators (IKU).

Compliance should also be enforced through Inclusion Audits. Every five years, institutions should undergo a mandatory audit of their instructional and physical accessibility. This audit should not be a self-report but an external evaluation conducted by a body that includes disability rights experts. The results should be public, allowing prospective students to make informed decisions. A low audit score should lead to Pedagogical Probation, where the

institution is required to implement a corrective action plan to maintain its accreditation and funding, applying the principle of Administrative Accountability.

To strengthen accountability at the micro-level, there must be a Redress and Grievance Mechanism that is accessible and fast. In an accelerated program, a delay in resolving a dispute is a delay in education. The law should mandate the appointment of an Inclusive Education Ombudsman. This ombudsman would have the power to mediate disputes between students and academic departments and to issue binding rulings on Reasonable Accommodation. Having a clear, non-adversarial path to justice empowers students to advocate for their rights without fear of academic retaliation.

Furthermore, accountability must be linked to Professional Standards for Educators. The lecturer certification process should include a mandatory module on Inclusive Pedagogy and OBE Assessment. Faculty who fail to demonstrate these competencies should not be allowed to lead accelerated or honors tracks. By making inclusivity a professional competency, the system ensures that the front-line deliverers of education are both willing and able to support diverse learners. This professional accountability transforms inclusion from a policy goal into a daily practice.

The state must also implement Transparent Data Reporting. Currently, disaggregated data on the academic success of students with disabilities in Indonesia is largely unavailable. Accountability requires that universities publish annual reports on the retention, GPA, and graduation rates of their students with disabilities. This data serves as a Diagnostic Tool for the government to identify which institutions require intervention. Data transparency creates a Social Accountability loop that is essential for systemic change.

Rewards for compliance should be as prominent as sanctions. The government should establish Centres of Excellence in Inclusive Education awards. Universities that go beyond the legal minimum should receive additional research funding. These centers would serve as Policy Laboratories, testing new assistive technologies and pedagogical models. This incentivizes a race to the top, where institutions compete to be recognized as the most inclusive in the country.

Accountability also involves Stakeholder Monitoring. The law should empower local Disabled Persons' Organizations (DPOs) to participate in the monitoring of university compliance. By giving civil society a formal role, the state ensures that the lived experience of disability is always at the center of the evaluation. DPOs can provide independent User Reviews of university services, providing a layer of accountability that is grounded in real-world experiences.

Another critical layer of compliance is Technological Auditing. In an OBE system that relies on digital platforms, the Digital Accessibility of the LMS must be a non-negotiable requirement. If a university's digital platform does not meet WCAG 2.1 AA standards, it should be considered "technically non-compliant." This ensures that the digital divide does not become a new wall for students with disabilities, particularly in the post-pandemic era of hybrid learning.

Moreover, Institutional Leadership Accountability is paramount. The Rector and university board should be held personally accountable for the implementation of the university's Inclusion Strategic Plan. If an institution repeatedly fails to meet its inclusion targets, the leadership should face administrative consequences. This ensures that inclusion is not delegated to a low-level committee but remains a primary concern for the highest levels of university management. Finally, strengthening accountability requires a Global Benchmarking approach. Indonesia should participate in international studies and peer reviews of inclusive education systems. By comparing its progress against global leaders, the Indonesian government can maintain a high level of ambition. This global accountability ensures that the Indonesian Inclusive OBE Model is not just good for Indonesia, but meets the highest international standards of social justice and academic excellence. Ultimately, a strong accountability framework ensures that reforms translate into real, measurable successes for accelerated students with disabilities.

Conclusion

This legal and policy interrogation has demonstrated that while Indonesia has established a progressive normative foundation for disability rights, a significant readiness gap persists within the higher education sector. The research identifies that the current implementation of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) remains largely standardized and inaccessible to accelerated students with disabilities. A primary finding is the existence of a technical vacuum—a lack of granular, modality-neutral guidelines that allow for the achievement of high-level academic outcomes through alternative means. Furthermore, the study highlights that twice-exceptional learners are currently trapped in a regulatory paradox where their cognitive acceleration is structurally incompatible with their functional support needs. The data suggests that without intentional reform, the rigid time-to-degree metrics of honors programs will continue to act as a barrier to equity, regardless of a student's intellectual merit.

The legal implications of this study necessitate a shift from formal equality to substantive equality within the Indonesian statutory framework. Critically,

there is an urgent need for the horizontal harmonization of Law No. 8 of 2016 and Law No. 12 of 2012. Policy analysis suggests that the National Standard of Higher Education (SN-Dikti) must be amended to mandate Universal Design for Learning (UDL) as a core indicator of institutional quality. Legally, the definition of *Reasonable Accommodation* must be expanded from mere physical access to instructional and assessment equity, ensuring that functional equivalence is recognized as a valid path to academic mastery. Failure to synchronize these laws creates a state of pedagogical negligence, where institutions are compliant with the letter of the law but fail to uphold the spirit of constitutional non-discrimination.

This research contributes to the global discourse on Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) by providing a blueprint for moving beyond access to equitable quality. By reformulating an inclusive OBE model, this study offers a pathway for Indonesian universities to transition from passive inclusion to active empowerment. The proposed framework ensures that 'leaving no one behind' includes the most gifted and high-achieving persons with disabilities, who represent a vital pool of human capital for the nation's future. Ultimately, the development of inclusive university services is not merely a social obligation but a strategic necessity for creating a globally competitive, outcome-oriented educational ecosystem that values diverse ways of knowing and performing.

References

- Ashworth, Mary, Sue Bloxham, and Leonie Pearce. "Examining the tension between academic standards and inclusion for disabled students: The impact on marking of individual academics' frameworks for assessment." *Studies in Higher Education* 35, no. 2 (2010): 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903062864>
- Azizah, Nur, Elga Andriana, and David Evans. "Conceptualising Inclusion within Indonesian Contexts." *Global Directions in Inclusive Education*. (London: Routledge, 2021), pp. 81-98.
- Azzahra, Maura Olivia, et al. "Legal Recognition of Hidden Disabilities in Higher Education." *Disable* 2, no. 1 (2026): 33-64. <https://doi.org/10.26740/dlr.v2i1.52510>
- Baiquni, Muhammad Iqbal, and Septhian Eka Adiyatma. "'Keep It Within the Family': Legal Intervention in the Social Normalization of Domestic Violence in Indonesian Communities". *The Indonesian Journal of Legal Intervention in Social Problems* 1, no. 1 (2026): 31-70.

- Biggs, John, and Catherine Tang. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 4th ed. (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education, 2011).
- Burgstahler, Sheryl E. *Universal Design in Higher Education: From Principles to Practice*. 2nd ed. (Boston: Harvard Education Press, 2015).
- Crespo, Raquel M., et al. "Aligning assessment with learning outcomes in outcome-based education." *IEEE EDUCON 2010 Conference*. IEEE, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON.2010.5492385>
- Degener, Theresia. "A Human Rights Model of Disability." In Peter Blanck and Eilionóir Flynn (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Disability Law and Policy*. (London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 31-49.
- Diny Sujannah, Wahyu, Sinta Swastikawara, and Zubaidah Ningsih. "Advancing inclusive practices in higher education: insights from Indonesia's approach to disability support." *Cogent Social Sciences* 11, no. 1 (2025): 2593559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2593559>
- Foley Nicpon, Megan, et al. "Empirical Investigation of Twice-Exceptionality: Where Have We Been and Where Are We Going?." *Gifted Child Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (2011): 3-17. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0016986210382575>
- Foley-Nicpon, Megan, and Susan G. Assouline. "High ability students with coexisting disabilities: Implications for school psychological practice." *Psychology in the Schools* 57, no. 10 (2020): 1615-1626. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22342>
- Foley-Nicpon, Megan, Susan G. Assouline, and Nicholas Colangelo. "Twice-Exceptional Learners: Who Needs to Know What?." *Gifted Child Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2013): 169-180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986213490021>
- Fullan, Michael. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. 4th ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).
- Griful-Freixenet, Julia, Katrien Struyven, Wendelien Vantieghem, and Esther Gheysens. "Exploring the Interrelationship between Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction (DI): A Systematic Review." *Educational Research Review* 29 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100306>
- Harden, Ronald M. "Why Outcome-based education (OBE) is an important development in medical education." *Routledge International Handbook of Medical Education*. (London: Routledge, 2015), pp. 27-42.
- Heryansyah, Despan, and Sahid Hadi. "On the hierarchy of human rights of persons with disabilities and higher education: Capturing the fulfilment of the right to accessibility in Indonesia." *The Routledge International*

- Handbook of Disability Human Rights Hierarchies*. (London: Routledge, 2023), pp. 255-282.
- Holdheide, Lynn. "Same Debate, New Opportunity: Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems That Promote and Support Educators in Practices That Advance All Students' Learning." *Journal of Special Education Leadership* 28, no. 2 (2015): 74.
- Iqbal, Asep Muhamad, and M. Pasqa. "Menuju Kampus Ramah Disabilitas di Perguruan Tinggi Keagamaan: Kajian dan Pengembangan Model Kebijakan Disabilitas di UIN Bandung." *Jurnal Altifani Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat* 5, no. 4 (2025): 594-609. <https://doi.org/10.59395/p3mw0h64>
- Konur, Ozcan. "Creating enforceable civil rights for disabled students in higher education: An institutional theory perspective." *Disability & Society* 15, no. 7 (2000): 1041-1063. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713662018>
- Lang, Raymond, et al. "Implementing the United Nations Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities: Principles, implications, practice and limitations." *Alter. European Journal of Disability Research* 5-3 (2011): 206-220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alter.2011.02.004>
- Latifiani, Dian, and Waspiah Waspiah. "Family Honor Versus Child Protection: Legal Intervention in the Persistence of Child Marriage in Indonesian Communities". *The Indonesian Journal of Legal Intervention in Social Problems* 1, no. 1 (2026): 109-130.
- Liasidou, Anastasia. "Disabling discourses and human rights law: a case study based on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 37, no. 1 (2016): 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2014.936928>
- Meyer, Anne, David H. Rose, and David Gordon. *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and Practice*. (Wakefield, MA: CAST Professional Publishing, 2014).
- Moriña, Anabel. "Inclusive Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 32, no. 1 (2017): 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1254964>
- Mulyadi, Asal Wahyuni Erlin. "Policy of inclusive education for education for all in Indonesia." *Policy & Governance Review* 1, no. 3 (2017): 201-212.
- Oliver, Michael. *The Politics of Disablement*. (London: Macmillan International Higher Education, 2013).

- Prameswari, Mahira Aluna. "Islamic Legal Modernism and Women's Rights in Indonesian Pesantren Communities". *The Indonesian Journal of Islamic Legal Modernism* 1, no. 1 (2026): 21-42.
- Premalatha, K. "Course and Program Outcomes Assessment Methods in Outcome-Based Education: A Review." *Journal of Education* 199, no. 3 (2019): 111-127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057419854351>
- Rahajeng, Unita Werdi, Wiwin Hendriani, and Pramesti Pradna Paramita. "Navigating higher education challenges: A review of strategies among students with disabilities in Indonesia." *Disabilities* 4, no. 3 (2024): 678-695. <https://doi.org/10.3390/disabilities4030042>
- Rao, Kavita, and Margaret Meo. "Using Universal Design for Learning to Design Standards-Based Lessons of Outcome-Based Education." *SAGE Open* 6, no. 4 (2016): 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016680688>
- Republic of Indonesia. *Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education*. (Jakarta: State Secretariat, 2012).
- Republic of Indonesia. *Law Number 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities*. (Jakarta: State Secretariat, 2016).
- Rismawati, Shinta Dewi, et al. "Legal Culture and Disability Rights in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education: A Review of Practices." *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3, no. 4 (2024): 1368-1377
- Ronksley-Pavia, Michelle. "A Model of Twice-Exceptionality: Explaining and Defining the Apparent Paradoxical Combination of Disability and Giftedness in Childhood." *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* 38, no. 3 (2015): 318-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353215592499>
- Sari, Indah Permata, et al. "Strategi Pembelajaran untuk Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus Kategori Cerdas dan Bakat Istimewa (CIBI): Tinjauan Literatur." *caXra: Jurnal Pendidikan Sekolah Dasar* 5, no. 1 (2025): 259-264. <https://doi.org/10.31980/caxra.v5i1.2282>
- Shakespeare, Tom. *Disability Rights and Wrongs Revisited*. 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2014).
- Shaw, Anne. "Inclusion of disabled Higher Education students: why are we not there yet?." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 28, no. 6 (2024): 820-838. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1968514>
- Simanjuntak, Jeremia Gom Gom Parulian. "Policy on Fulfilling the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia: Quo Vadis?." *Indonesian Journal of Disability Studies* 8, no. 1 (2021): 211-277. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.ijds.2021.008.01.16>
- Spady, William G. *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*. (Arlington: American Association of School Administrators, 1994).

- Steiner, Alecia. *Embracing the intersection of giftedness and disability: Examining a Standalone school model for twice-exceptional learners*. University of Southern California, 2024.
- Townend, Geraldine, and Donna Pendergast. "Student voice: What can we learn from twice-exceptional students about the teacher's role in enhancing or inhibiting academic selfconcept." *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education* 24, no. 1 (2015): 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.21505/ajge.2015.0006>
- UNESCO. *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education: All Means All*. (Paris: UNESCO, 2020).
- United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. (New York: United Nations, 2006).
- United Nations. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. A/RES/70/1. New York: UN Publishing, 2015.
- Utari, Indah Sri, Ridwan Arifin, and Sergi Fernandez Alejandro. "Gender-Based Violence and the Implementation of the Sexual Violence Crime Law in Indonesia". *The Indonesian Journal of Feminist Legal Studies* 1, no. 1 (2026): 1-32.
- Wijayanti, Nuniek Prahesti, et al. "The Role of the Disability Services Unit in Improving the Quality of Vocational Skills for Students with Special Needs." *IJOBBA: International Journal of Bunga Bangsa Cirebon* 4, no. 2 (2025): 339-344.
- Zubaedah, Zubaedah. "Sociolegal Analysis of Child Marriage Prevention Policies in Rural Indonesia". *The Indonesian Journal of Sociolegal Development* 1, no. 1 (2026): 101-120.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES) for its institutional support and academic environment, which contributed significantly to the completion of this research. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the support and encouragement provided throughout the research and publication process.

Funding Information

This research funded by Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES)

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Generative AI Statement

None.

Notification

Starting from the 2024 issue, our journal has transitioned to a new platform for an enhanced reading experience. All new articles and content will now be available on this updated site. However, we would like to assure you that archived issues from 2016 to 2023 are still accessible via the previous site. You can view these editions by visiting the following link:

<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/jils/issue/archive>.

Cite this article as:

Rodiyah, Rodiyah, Waspiah Waspiah, Bayangsari Wedhatami, and Runjati Runjati. "Is Indonesia Ready? A Legal and Policy Interrogation of Outcome-Based Academic Services for Accelerated Students With Disabilities". *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies* 11, no. 1 (2026): 397-436. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v11i1.48626>