Sapientia Diversalis Journal of Human Interaction and Social Studies
Vol 1 No 2 May 2026, Hal 170-179
ISSN: 3125-1269 (Print) ISSN: 3125-0696 (Electronic)
Open Access: https://researchfrontiers.id/sapientiadiversalis

Budget Efficiency Policy and the Violation of the Right to Educational Priority: A Case Study of Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 (Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2025)

Wilma Silalahi[1*], Gesta Subysesa Maharwani Adeputri[2]
[1-2] Universitas Tarumanegara, Indonesia
email: wilmasilalahi@fh.untar.ac.id[1]

Article Info :
Received:
23-04-2026
Revised:
16-05-2026
Accepted:
20-05-2026

Abstract

The issuance of Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 concerning budget efficiency in the implementation of the 2025 State Budget and Regional Budget has generated significant constitutional and administrative law debates in Indonesia. The policy mandates substantial expenditure reductions across ministries and government agencies, including the education sector, despite the constitutional requirement under Article 31 paragraph (4) of the Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945 that education receive priority funding. Simultaneously, the government allocated substantial financial resources to the Free Nutritious Meals Program (Program Makan Bergizi Gratis), creating concerns regarding the consistency of fiscal priorities and the protection of constitutional rights. This study employs a normative legal research method using statute, conceptual, and case approaches. Primary legal materials consist of constitutional and statutory provisions, while secondary materials include scholarly literature and legal doctrines. The findings indicate that the implementation of budget efficiency measures through Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 potentially conflicts with constitutional guarantees of educational rights and exceeds the permissible limits of executive discretion under administrative law principles. The study further emphasizes the need for stronger constitutional oversight and accountability mechanisms to ensure that fiscal policies remain consistent with constitutionally protected educational priorities.

Keywords:*Administrative Law, Budget Efficiency Policy, Constitutional Right to Education, Executive Discretion, Presidential Instruction Number 1 Of 2025.*

INTRODUCTION

The recognition of education as a fundamental human right has become a central concern in contemporary discussions on governance, social justice, and sustainable development, particularly as governments across the world increasingly confront fiscal pressures that compel difficult budgetary choices between competing public priorities. International scholarship has consistently emphasized that educational expenditure should not be treated merely as a discretionary budget item because it constitutes a long-term investment in human capital formation, democratic participation, and social mobility (Lega, 2023). Within this global context, constitutional democracies have increasingly incorporated explicit guarantees regarding educational rights in order to protect access to education from fluctuations in political preferences and short-term economic considerations (Rahmani, 2022). Indonesia represents a notable example of this constitutional commitment through Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution, which not only guarantees the right to education but also mandates the prioritization of educational funding within state financial policy (Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945). The constitutionalization of educational expenditure reflects the broader understanding that public budgeting is not solely a technical economic process but also a mechanism through which states fulfill legally protected social rights. Such developments have intensified scholarly interest in examining the interaction between fiscal governance and constitutional rights protection, particularly when executive policies appear to alter established priorities in public expenditure.

Existing studies have generated important insights into the legal and administrative dimensions of fiscal policymaking, particularly concerning the balance between executive flexibility and constitutional limitations. Research on Indonesia's post-pandemic fiscal governance demonstrates that extraordinary budgetary adjustments may be justified under certain circumstances, yet such measures remain subject to constitutional scrutiny and legal accountability mechanisms (Giri et al., 2024). Studies examining presidential instructions as instruments of executive discretion have similarly argued that administrative flexibility must operate within the hierarchy of laws and cannot disregard superior legal norms governing state action (Kaharudin & Amalia, 2022). Theoretical foundations of Indonesian administrative law further emphasize that all governmental decisions derive legitimacy from conformity with legal principles, legality requirements, and public accountability standards (Hadjon et al., 2007). Similar arguments are reflected in broader administrative law scholarship, which conceptualizes governmental authority as inherently limited by constitutional obligations and the protection of citizens' rights (HR, 2006). Recent legal debates have also explored whether the expanding use of presidential instructions reflects a legitimate exercise of executive power or signals a broader trend toward the concentration of governmental authority beyond constitutionally prescribed boundaries (Salsabil et al., 2025). These studies collectively suggest that fiscal policy cannot be divorced from questions of constitutional legitimacy and administrative responsibility.

Despite these contributions, significant conceptual and empirical gaps remain within the existing literature concerning the relationship between budget efficiency policies and constitutionally protected educational rights. Much of the previous scholarship has concentrated on general questions of fiscal flexibility, administrative discretion, or executive authority without specifically investigating how budget-cutting measures affect constitutional guarantees of educational prioritization. Legal analyses of legislative hierarchy have established that executive instruments must remain consistent with superior regulations and constitutional mandates, yet few studies have examined how this principle operates in the context of large-scale expenditure reductions affecting the education sector (Indrati, 2007). Existing discussions regarding the formation and hierarchy of legislation have generally focused on procedural legality rather than substantive rights protection in budget allocation decisions (Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 jo. Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2022 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan). Research specifically addressing Inpres No. 1 of 2025 has begun to question the compatibility of expenditure efficiency measures with educational rights, although the analysis remains fragmented and largely descriptive (Satriadi et al., 2025). Similar concerns have been raised regarding the constitutional implications of educational budget reductions, yet a comprehensive framework linking constitutional law, administrative discretion, and social rights protection remains underdeveloped (Ihsan, 2025). The absence of an integrated analytical perspective has limited scholarly understanding of how executive budgetary interventions reshape the practical realization of educational rights in contemporary Indonesia.

The urgency of addressing this gap has become increasingly apparent following the issuance of Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2025 concerning budget efficiency in the implementation of national and regional budgets. The instruction introduced substantial expenditure reductions across ministries and governmental institutions, creating significant consequences for higher education funding, educational infrastructure development, research activities, and educational service delivery (Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 tentang Efisiensi Anggaran dalam Pelaksanaan Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara dan Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah Tahun Anggaran 2025). Empirical assessments indicate that budget reductions have generated concerns regarding the continuity of educational programs and the quality of educational outcomes across multiple levels of the education system (Hisyam & Siradjuddin, 2025). The policy has attracted further controversy because it emerged simultaneously with the expansion of the Free Nutritious Meals Program, a flagship governmental initiative supported through substantial public expenditure allocations (Peraturan Presiden Nomor 83 Tahun 2024 tentang Badan Gizi Nasional). Recent studies have highlighted important accountability and governance challenges associated with the implementation of this nutritional program, particularly regarding resource allocation and public service priorities (Khairiah et al., 2025). Scholarly evaluations have similarly noted that tensions between educational funding reductions and increased expenditure on nutritional programs raise broader questions concerning constitutional consistency and distributive justice in state budgeting (Carvallo et al., 2026). The issue therefore extends beyond administrative efficiency and enters the realm of constitutional rights protection, public accountability, and the prioritization of social welfare objectives.

Against this backdrop, the present study positions itself at the intersection of constitutional law, administrative law, and human interaction studies by examining how budget efficiency policies influence the realization of educational rights and state obligations toward citizens. Unlike previous studies that primarily focus on the legality of executive discretion or the technical dimensions of fiscal policy, this research investigates the normative consequences of executive budgetary decisions for constitutionally guaranteed educational priorities. The study also addresses the broader social implications of fiscal reallocation by exploring how governmental choices shape relationships between citizens, public institutions, and constitutional expectations. Such an approach is particularly important because educational rights are not only legal entitlements but also social mechanisms that influence equality, participation, and long-term human development. By integrating constitutional analysis with administrative accountability and social rights perspectives, this research seeks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the legal boundaries governing executive intervention in educational budgeting.

This study aims to analyze the constitutionality of Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2025 in relation to the constitutional guarantee of educational rights, to examine the limits of presidential discretion in determining budgetary priorities from the perspective of administrative law, and to identify the forms of legal accountability that arise when executive fiscal policies potentially undermine constitutionally protected rights. The research contributes theoretically by developing an integrated framework connecting constitutional rights protection, administrative discretion, and fiscal governance within the context of educational policy. Methodologically, it advances existing scholarship through a multidisciplinary legal analysis that combines constitutional interpretation, statutory analysis, and administrative law approaches to assess the legitimacy of executive budgetary interventions. The findings are expected to enrich contemporary debates concerning the relationship between state budgeting and social rights protection while offering a more nuanced understanding of how constitutional commitments to educational prioritization should operate within modern systems of public financial management.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a non-empirical normative legal research design, focusing on the examination of legal norms, doctrines, principles, and regulatory frameworks relevant to the research problem rather than the collection of field-based empirical data. The selection of this method is based on the objective of assessing the constitutional validity of budget efficiency policies and their implications for the constitutional guarantee of educational rights in Indonesia. The research adopts three complementary approaches. First, the statute approach is utilized to examine the hierarchy, coherence, and consistency of legal norms governing educational rights, executive authority, fiscal policy, and administrative accountability. Second, the conceptual approach is employed to analyze the doctrines of administrative discretion, constitutional rights protection, legal accountability, and the principles of good governance as developed within Indonesian administrative law scholarship (HR, 2006). Third, a case approach is applied to examine the implementation of budget efficiency policies introduced through presidential directives and their relationship to contemporary public welfare programs as a concrete illustration of the tension between fiscal efficiency and the protection of educational rights. The primary legal materials consist of constitutional provisions, statutory regulations, executive regulations, and relevant judicial decisions, while secondary legal materials include scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and academic commentaries on constitutional law, administrative law, and public policy (Hadjon et al., 2007).

Legal materials were collected through an extensive library research process using both printed and electronic sources. Secondary materials were identified through academic databases, including Google Scholar, SINTA-indexed journals, and other reputable scientific publication platforms, with selection criteria based on relevance, academic credibility, and direct connection to educational rights, executive discretion, and public financial governance. The analysis was conducted qualitatively using grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation methods to identify the meaning, purpose, and interrelationship of the legal norms under examination. The analytical framework was guided by the principles of normative hierarchy and constitutional supremacy to evaluate whether executive budgetary policies remain consistent with superior legal norms and constitutionally protected rights. To ensure analytical rigor, the study applied source triangulation across statutory materials, judicial decisions, legal doctrines, and contemporary scholarly literature. The findings are presented through a descriptive-analytical and prescriptive approach, enabling the identification of normative inconsistencies, the assessment of constitutional compliance, and the formulation of legal recommendations concerning the limits of presidential discretion in determining budgetary priorities that affect the fulfillment of educational rights.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Constitutional Protection of Educational Rights and the Limits of Budgetary Discretion

The normative analysis demonstrates that the right to education occupies a privileged position within Indonesia's constitutional framework because it is expressly guaranteed by Article 28C paragraph (1) and Article 31 paragraphs (1) and (2) of the Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945. These provisions establish education not merely as a social aspiration but as a constitutional entitlement that must be protected and fulfilled by the state. The constitutional framework becomes more substantive through Article 31 paragraph (4) of the Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945, which requires the state to prioritize educational expenditure by allocating at least twenty percent of the national and regional budgets. This constitutional arrangement reflects a deliberate choice to place education among the fundamental pillars of national development and human resource advancement. The constitutionalization of educational funding indicates that fiscal policy cannot be detached from the protection of fundamental rights because budgetary allocation serves as a principal instrument for realizing educational access and equality (Rahmani, 2022). Within this perspective, educational financing constitutes both a constitutional obligation and a mechanism for addressing persistent social disparities in educational opportunities across different socioeconomic groups (Lega, 2023).

The examination of constitutional norms further reveals that the requirement to allocate at least twenty percent of public expenditure to education represents a legally binding mandate rather than a policy preference subject to governmental discretion. The inclusion of this provision through constitutional amendment reflects the deliberate intention of the constitutional framers to shield educational funding from political fluctuations and short-term fiscal priorities. From the perspective of legislative hierarchy, constitutional provisions possess the highest normative authority and serve as binding parameters for all subordinate legal and administrative instruments (Indrati, 2007). Educational budgeting therefore cannot be interpreted merely as a matter of fiscal management because it simultaneously constitutes a mechanism for implementing constitutionally protected rights. Any governmental action that directly or indirectly diminishes the constitutional priority granted to education must be assessed against the broader objectives of constitutional governance and rights protection. The normative force of constitutional provisions creates legal obligations that remain applicable regardless of changes in governmental priorities or policy agendas.

The constitutional protection of educational rights is further reinforced through statutory regulations that operationalize constitutional commitments into legally enforceable obligations. A central provision can be found in Article 49 paragraph (1) of Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional, which stipulates that education funding, excluding educators' salaries and official education expenditures, shall be allocated at a minimum of twenty percent of both the national and regional budgets. This provision establishes a direct normative connection between constitutional guarantees and public budgeting practices, thereby strengthening legal certainty regarding the state's responsibility in financing education. The coexistence of constitutional and statutory safeguards creates a multilayered legal framework that restricts the possibility of reducing educational commitments through lower-level administrative policies. Educational funding consequently acquires a dual character as both a fiscal instrument and a constitutional mandate whose implementation can be assessed through legal accountability mechanisms. From a normative perspective, the legal framework demonstrates that the prioritization of education is embedded within Indonesia's legal order as a binding obligation rather than a matter of governmental preference or temporary policy orientation.

From the perspective of human rights theory, the state's obligation concerning education encompasses the duties to respect, protect, and fulfill educational rights. The obligation to fulfill is particularly relevant in the context of budgetary policy because it requires governments to actively mobilize and allocate resources necessary for the realization of educational access and quality (HR, 2006). Contemporary legal scholarship increasingly recognizes that reductions in public investment affecting the core content of social rights may constitute retrogressive measures requiring strong constitutional justification. The fulfillment of educational rights depends not only on the existence of schools and educational institutions but also on the continuity of funding that supports teachers, infrastructure, research activities, scholarships, and educational innovation. Budgetary decisions that weaken these components inevitably affect the substantive realization of educational rights. The legal significance of educational funding therefore lies in its function as a prerequisite for the effective enjoyment of constitutional guarantees.

The analysis of Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 2025 suggests that the policy raises important constitutional questions because the objective of budget efficiency intersects directly with sectors protected by explicit constitutional guarantees. Fiscal efficiency is undoubtedly a legitimate governmental objective, particularly in periods characterized by economic uncertainty and competing expenditure demands. Legal scholarship on post-pandemic fiscal governance acknowledges that governments possess a degree of flexibility in adjusting expenditure priorities to maintain fiscal sustainability (Giri et al., 2024). The existence of fiscal discretion, however, does not eliminate constitutional obligations that have been expressly formulated as mandatory commitments. Recent studies examining the impact of educational budget reductions argue that efficiency measures must be evaluated not only according to economic outcomes but also according to their compatibility with constitutional rights and public welfare objectives (Hisyam & Siradjuddin, 2025). The constitutional status of educational funding consequently limits the extent to which budgetary reductions can be justified solely on the basis of administrative efficiency.

A broader constitutional interpretation indicates that educational rights cannot be separated from the principle of constitutional supremacy that governs all state action. The legitimacy of governmental policy depends not only on procedural compliance but also on substantive consistency with constitutional values and objectives. Recent normative analyses of budget efficiency policies have questioned whether reductions affecting educational expenditure remain compatible with the constitutional obligation to prioritize education within public budgeting processes (Ihsan, 2025). Similar concerns are reflected in studies advocating the reconstruction of fiscal policies that potentially undermine educational rights protected by higher legal norms (Satriadi et al., 2025). The findings of this research suggest that constitutional protection of educational rights establishes a normative boundary that restricts governmental discretion in budgetary decision-making. The debate surrounding Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 2025 therefore extends beyond fiscal administration and enters the broader constitutional discourse concerning the relationship between executive power, social rights, and the rule of law.

Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 (Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2025) and the Constitutional Boundaries of Executive Authority

The normative examination of Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 tentang Efisiensi Anggaran dalam Pelaksanaan Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara dan Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah Tahun Anggaran 2025 reveals a fundamental legal issue concerning the relationship between executive authority and constitutional limitations. Within the Indonesian legal system, a Presidential Instruction functions primarily as an internal governmental instrument intended to direct administrative action among executive bodies rather than to establish generally binding legal norms. Its legal character differs from statutory regulations formally recognized within the hierarchy of legislation established under Article 7 paragraph (1) of Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 sebagaimana diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2022 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan. The absence of Presidential Instructions from this hierarchy does not imply immunity from constitutional scrutiny, particularly when their implementation affects the realization of constitutionally protected rights. Contemporary scholarship increasingly notes that executive policy instruments may generate significant normative consequences despite their formal status as internal administrative directives (Salsabil et al., 2025). Questions concerning constitutional compliance become more prominent when such instruments influence sectors explicitly protected by constitutional provisions, including education.

The legal basis for executive flexibility is commonly associated with the doctrine of administrative discretion, which enables public officials to respond to concrete governmental challenges that may not be fully regulated by existing legal norms. Indonesian administrative law defines discretion through Article 1 point 9 of Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan, which authorizes government officials to make decisions and undertake actions based on their own judgment under specific circumstances. The existence of discretion is intended to enhance governmental effectiveness rather than to create an autonomous sphere of authority detached from legal constraints. Administrative discretion therefore functions as an exception within the framework of legality rather than as a substitute for legality itself. Scholarly analyses of presidential instructions have emphasized that discretionary authority must remain consistent with the objectives and principles established by superior legal norms (Kaharudin & Amalia, 2022). Executive flexibility acquires legal legitimacy only when exercised within the boundaries established by constitutional and statutory provisions.

Further analysis indicates that the exercise of discretion is subject to substantive and procedural limitations established under administrative law. Article 24 of Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan requires that discretionary actions satisfy several cumulative conditions, including conformity with statutory regulations, consistency with the principles of good governance, objective justification, absence of conflicts of interest, and good faith. These requirements demonstrate that administrative discretion is conceived as a controlled legal mechanism rather than an unrestricted political instrument. The legality of a discretionary measure cannot be assessed solely on the basis of governmental objectives but must also be evaluated according to its compatibility with existing legal obligations. Where constitutional rights are involved, the threshold for justification becomes considerably higher because public authorities are expected to safeguard rather than diminish the protection afforded to those rights. This framework becomes particularly relevant when budgetary decisions influence constitutionally mandated educational priorities.

The doctrine of Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik (AAUPB) provides an additional normative framework for assessing the legitimacy of executive action. Article 10 of Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan incorporates principles such as legal certainty, proportionality, impartiality, accountability, and the prohibition of abuse of power as fundamental standards governing administrative conduct. From the perspective of legal certainty, governmental policies are expected to remain consistent with higher legal norms, including constitutional guarantees concerning educational funding. The principle of proportionality requires that administrative measures maintain a reasonable balance between governmental objectives and the rights potentially affected by those measures. Administrative law scholarship has long maintained that public authority cannot be exercised in a manner that undermines the legal interests the state is obligated to protect (Hadjon et al., 2007). The relevance of these principles becomes evident when evaluating whether budget efficiency measures disproportionately burden constitutionally protected sectors such as education.

The issue becomes more complex when examined through the lens of normative hierarchy. Legal validity within the Indonesian legal system is derived from the relationship between lower and higher norms, creating a hierarchical structure in which subordinate instruments must remain consistent with superior legal provisions. This understanding is reflected in Indonesian legislative theory, which views constitutional norms as the primary source of legal authority and legitimacy for all subsequent regulations and governmental actions (Indrati, 2007). A presidential instruction therefore cannot be interpreted in a manner that effectively diminishes constitutional guarantees that have been expressly formulated in the Constitution and reinforced through statutory legislation. Recent legal analyses have argued that budget efficiency policies affecting educational expenditure must be assessed not only according to administrative necessity but also according to their compatibility with constitutionally mandated funding obligations (Ihsan, 2025). The constitutional priority granted to education creates a normative benchmark against which executive fiscal decisions must be evaluated.

The findings suggest that the constitutional validity of Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 depends not merely on its formal legality as an executive directive but also on the substantive consequences arising from its implementation. Fiscal efficiency may constitute a legitimate governmental objective, particularly within changing economic circumstances, and previous studies have recognized the importance of adaptive fiscal governance in responding to national challenges (Giri et al., 2024). Constitutional governance nevertheless requires that policy adaptation remain compatible with fundamental rights and constitutional commitments. Normative evaluations of executive authority have increasingly highlighted the danger of allowing discretionary instruments to expand beyond their intended legal function and operate as mechanisms capable of indirectly modifying constitutional priorities (Salsabil et al., 2025). The present analysis indicates that executive discretion reaches its constitutional limit when the implementation of a policy creates conditions that potentially weaken the realization of rights expressly protected by the Constitution. Within this framework, the legality of budget efficiency measures cannot be separated from their implications for the constitutional obligation to prioritize education as a fundamental public responsibility.

Budgetary Priority Contradictions and Administrative Accountability for Educational Rights

The normative review identifies a significant tension between the implementation of Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 and the constitutional obligation to prioritize educational funding. Although the policy was introduced under the rationale of fiscal efficiency, its practical implications reveal a redistribution of public resources that affects sectors protected by explicit constitutional guarantees. At the same time that expenditure reductions were directed toward educational institutions and related programs, substantial state resources were allocated to the implementation of the Free Nutritious Meal Program under Peraturan Presiden Nomor 83 Tahun 2024 tentang Badan Gizi Nasional. This situation raises an important legal question concerning the criteria used by the government in determining fiscal priorities when constitutional rights are directly implicated. Public budgeting is not merely a technical exercise in financial management but also a reflection of constitutional commitments and policy values. Recent scholarship argues that the protection of educational rights requires the state to ensure that budgetary restructuring does not undermine the minimum guarantees already established within the constitutional framework (Satriadi et al., 2025).

From a constitutional perspective, the issue does not lie in the existence of social welfare programs themselves but in the possibility that their financing may indirectly weaken the fulfillment of educational obligations. Educational expenditure possesses a unique constitutional status because its prioritization is expressly mandated by Article 31 paragraph (4) of the Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945 and further reinforced by Article 49 paragraph (1) of Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Governmental discretion in allocating public resources therefore remains constrained by these normative commitments. Studies examining the constitutional implications of the MBG program suggest that public welfare initiatives may become legally problematic when their implementation contributes to declining educational access or quality (Carvallo et al., 2026). The constitutional principle of prioritization requires educational funding to be treated as a protected allocation rather than as an expendable component of fiscal adjustment. Such an interpretation reflects the broader principle that constitutionally guaranteed rights occupy a superior position in public policy formulation.

The findings further indicate that the contradiction between educational budget reductions and the expansion of other public spending programs may be evaluated through the principles of administrative accountability. Administrative law recognizes that governmental decisions affecting public rights must be supported by transparent, rational, and proportionate justifications. Accountability becomes particularly important when policy choices generate adverse consequences for sectors associated with constitutional rights. Analyses of the implementation of the MBG program have highlighted concerns regarding budget transparency, implementation challenges, and institutional accountability mechanisms (Zulaika et al., 2025). Similar concerns are raised in discussions of legal responsibility and public service accountability within large-scale welfare programs financed through public expenditure (Khairiah et al., 2025). These observations suggest that budgetary prioritization cannot be assessed solely according to policy objectives but must also be evaluated according to standards of constitutional accountability and administrative responsibility.

Administrative accountability also extends to the legality of governmental actions undertaken through discretionary authority. Under Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan, public officials remain responsible for the legal consequences of discretionary decisions that affect the rights and interests of citizens. This responsibility is not limited to procedural compliance but encompasses the substantive consequences arising from policy implementation. Indonesian administrative law scholarship has consistently emphasized that public authority carries an obligation to protect the legal interests of citizens and to prevent abuses of governmental power (HR, 2006). Where educational rights are concerned, accountability requires public authorities to demonstrate that any limitation affecting educational expenditure is justified by compelling legal and constitutional considerations. The absence of such justification may create a normative basis for questioning the legality of the policy and its consistency with constitutional governance principles (Hadjon et al., 2007).

The constitutional implications of educational budget reductions become more evident when examined through the lens of social rights protection. Education functions as a foundational right that influences access to employment, social mobility, political participation, and broader human development outcomes. Reductions in educational resources therefore generate effects extending beyond the education sector itself. Research on educational governance has demonstrated that insufficient public investment contributes to widening educational inequalities and diminishing opportunities for disadvantaged communities (Lega, 2023). Similar findings indicate that budget efficiency measures affecting educational institutions may reduce program effectiveness, institutional capacity, and the quality of educational outcomes (Hisyam & Siradjuddin, 2025). The constitutional significance of educational funding derives from its role in safeguarding long-term social development rather than merely financing administrative operations. Public policies that weaken this function inevitably raise concerns regarding the state's commitment to constitutional rights protection.

The analysis ultimately demonstrates that the controversy surrounding Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 extends beyond questions of fiscal management and enters the broader domain of constitutional accountability. Budget efficiency may constitute a legitimate governmental objective, yet constitutional governance requires that such objectives be pursued within the limits established by superior legal norms and protected rights. The coexistence of educational budget reductions and substantial allocations to alternative policy programs illustrates the complexity of balancing competing public interests within a constitutional state. Normative legal analysis suggests that executive budgetary decisions should remain subject to constitutional review whenever their implementation affects rights expressly protected by the Constitution. The protection of educational rights consequently requires stronger mechanisms of accountability, transparency, and constitutional oversight to ensure that future fiscal policies remain consistent with the legal obligation to prioritize education as a fundamental public responsibility.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the constitutional guarantee of educational rights in Indonesia extends beyond the formal recognition of access to education and encompasses a binding obligation upon the state to prioritize educational funding within the national budgeting framework. The normative analysis reveals that the implementation of Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 raises significant constitutional concerns because the budget efficiency measures introduced through the presidential directive have the potential to affect sectors protected by explicit constitutional mandates. Educational funding occupies a unique legal position under Article 31 paragraph (4) of the Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945 and Article 49 paragraph (1) of Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 about the National Education System, both of which require the state to maintain education as a priority in public expenditure. The findings indicate that executive discretion in fiscal management is not unlimited and must remain consistent with the principles of constitutional supremacy, legality, and good governance. Although budget efficiency may constitute a legitimate governmental objective, the exercise of discretionary authority cannot result in the weakening of constitutional obligations that have been expressly established by superior legal norms. The analysis further confirms that the legal validity of executive budgetary policies should be assessed not only through their formal administrative character but also through their substantive impact on the fulfillment of constitutionally protected rights.

The study also finds that the coexistence of educational budget reductions and substantial fiscal commitments to other government programs illustrates a broader challenge concerning constitutional accountability in public financial governance. Such a policy configuration raises questions regarding proportionality, legal certainty, and the consistency of governmental priorities with constitutional commitments to educational development. From the perspective of administrative law, public authorities remain accountable for discretionary decisions that affect fundamental rights, particularly when those decisions may reduce the level of protection previously afforded to constitutionally guaranteed interests. Strengthening constitutional oversight of executive fiscal policies therefore becomes essential for preventing the use of administrative instruments in ways that indirectly undermine protected rights. This study recommends a comprehensive review of budget efficiency policies affecting the education sector, greater parliamentary and institutional oversight of budgetary decision-making, and the development of stronger legal safeguards capable of protecting constitutionally mandated budget allocations from discretionary reductions. Future reforms should also explore mechanisms that enable more effective constitutional review of executive actions whose practical consequences extend beyond internal administrative governance and directly affect the realization of citizens' constitutional rights..

REFERENCES

Carvallo, G., Clarisya, N. P., Sinaga, E. S., & Benu, S. E. (2026). Konstitusionalitas Program Makan Bergizi Gratis Terhadap Hak Pendidikan Dasar. *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW*, *9*(2), 1351-1370. https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v9i2.14106

Giri, N. P. N. S., Yusa, I. G., Sumerthayasa, P. G. A., Kelly, D., & Ivory, J. (2024). The Dynamics of Government Fiscal Policy Post COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia (Legal Analysis of Government Regulation instead of Law Number 1 Year 2020). *Law Reform: Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum*, *20*(1), 135-152. https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v20i1.63339

Hadjon, P. M., Martosoewignjo, S., Basah, S., Manan, B., Marzuki, H. M. L., ten Berge, J. B. J. M., van Buuren, P. J. J., & Stroink, F. A. M. (2007). *Pengantar hukum administrasi Indonesia*. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Hisyam, M., & Siradjuddin, S. (2025). Dampak Efisiensi Anggaran Pendidikan: Tinjauan Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Program Pendidikan dan Kualitas Outputnya. *Islamic Management: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, *2*(1), 21-27. https://doi.org/10.63097/1kyadh15

HR, R. (2006). *Hukum administrasi negara*. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Ihsan, G. (2025). Efisiensi Anggaran Berdasarkan Inpres No. 1 Tahun 2025 Terhadap Hak Konstitusional Pendidikan Warga Negara. *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum*, *6*(2), 328-339. https://doi.org/10.22225/juinhum.6.2.2025.328-339

Indrati, M. F. (2007). *Ilmu perundang-undangan: Jenis, fungsi dan materi muatan*. Kanisius.

Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 tentang Efisiensi Anggaran dalam Pelaksanaan Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara dan Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah Tahun Anggaran 2025.

Kaharudin, K., & Amalia, R. A. (2022). Analisis Unsur Diskresi Dalam Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2022. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, *10*(1), 262-273. https://jurnalius.ac.id/ojs/index.php/jurnalIUS/article/view/1118

Khairiah, U., Saputra, J. H., & Sipahutar, A. (2025). Pengaturan Hukum dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana dalam Program Makan Bergizi Gratis (MBG) dalam Kajian Prinsip Pelayanan Publik dan Akuntabilitas Negara. *Jurnal Ilmiah Penegakan Hukum*, *12*(2), 196-206. https://doi.org/10.31289/jiph.v12i2.14087

Lega, D. (2023). Tanggungjawab pemerintah dan kesenjangan sosial dalam pendidikan. *ADIL Indonesia Journal*, *4*(2), 54-67. https://doi.org/10.35473/aij.v4i2.2404

Peraturan Presiden Nomor 83 Tahun 2024 tentang Badan Gizi Nasional. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2024 Nomor 173.

Rahmani, I. (2022). Pelaksanaan Hak Dan Kewajiban Warga Negara Indonesia Di Dalam Bidang Pendidikan Tinjauan Dari Pasal 31 Undang-Undang Dasar Tahun 1945. *Pamulang Law Review*, *5*(1), 77-84. https://doi.org/10.32493/palrev.v5i1.23611

Salsabil, H. H., Munazih, M., & Widadi, E. (2025). Intruksi Presiden dalam Negara Hukum: Kewenangan Eksekutif atau Pelebaran Kekuasaan?. *Law Jurnal*, *6*(1), 82-102. https://doi.org/10.46576/lj.v6i1.6741

Satriadi, S., Ansar, L., & Hasmiyati, H. (2025). Rekonstruksi kebijakan presiden terkait inpres no. 1 tahun 2025 tentang efisiensi belanja negara dalam pelaksanaan apbn dan apbd terhadap pemenuhan hak pendidikan. *Journal Ilmu Hukum Pengayoman*, *3*(2), 83-91. https://journal.uniasman.ac.id/index.php/JIHP/article/view/152

Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.

Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 jo. Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2022 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan.

Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2003 Nomor 78.

Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 292.

.

Zulaika, N., Lestari, D., & Istiqomah, H. (2025). Tantangan Implementasi dan Akuntabilitas Anggaran Program Makanan Bergizi Gratis (MBG) Berdasarkan Instruksi Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2025. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmiah Multidisipliner*, *1*(03), 426-435. https://ojs.ruangpublikasi.com/index.php/jpim/article/view/622