

OPTIMIZATION OF THE APPLICATION OF THE 2013 CURRICULUM

**Hidayati Puja Utami, Laurentia Angela Rosvita, Mentari Afrisca, Wilatikta Winda
Manilla Supardi, Mustiningsih**

Manajemen Pendidikan, Universitas Negeri Malang
Jl. Semarang No. 5 Malang 65145
Email: angelarosvita@gmail.com

Abstract: The implementation of the 2013 program is a strategic effort to improve the quality of education. The purpose of this research is to examine the problems and the steps taken to overcome them. This research method using literature study method. The results of this study are that there are three factors or inhibiting factors in the implementation of the 2013 program, namely: teacher readiness, academic support and teacher support, and strategic steps to overcome and overcome. These problems are teacher training, teacher socialization and student tutor coordination. both between governments.

Keywords: curriculum 2013, problems, strategic steps

A change in the world of education can cause anxiety because there are many differences of opinion in it. We can feel this in curriculum changes and development, especially at the implementation stage. Curriculum change and development is a dynamic and continuous process to improve the quality of education that reflects the needs and aspirations of students, provides the right proportion of goals to be achieved with the learning load, student potential, supporting facilities, and environmental conditions (Samsudi, 2009). Likewise with the changes and development of the 2013 curriculum. Suspicions often arise about changes and curriculum development because they are followed by changes or changes in national leadership. This suspicion is related directly or indirectly because the curriculum cannot be avoided from power. The curriculum determinants are the authorities, not only that this party will carry out the educational process in a country.

Not a few people, including the educational component, are wondering about the change in curriculum from the 2006 curriculum to the 2013 curriculum. The question is related to whether the curriculum changes have been carried out systematically, planned, and measured? This was then emphasized by Abong (2015) who said the constellation of power in the formulation of the educational curriculum was an indisputable reality. This is not a problem as long as the quality of education can be improved. Furthermore, Abong (2015) argues that curriculum changes should not be carried out because of the interests of power, certain groups, or business motives, but rather carried out systematically, planned, measured, and aimed at achieving national education goals.

Changes and curriculum development by the former Minister of Education and Culture, Nuh M. With the background of changing times, especially related to the education system, the curriculum must always adjust (Dikbud, 2013). This change and development is expected to increase the competence of human resources in facing globalization that occurs suddenly. Furthermore, emphasized that the change and development of the 2013 Curriculum has gone through a long process and has been carefully studied and all its consequences so that Indonesia's human resources are not left behind.

Curriculum development in 2013 is oriented towards achieving balanced competences between attitudes, skills and knowledge competencies. As stipulated in Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System that graduate competencies are qualifications of

graduate abilities that include attitudes, knowledge, and skills. This is in line with the development of the Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC) which was initiated in 2004, which includes attitudes, knowledge and skills (Yusuf, 2013).

According to Kastawi (2017), people's weak attitudes are a source of social, economic and legal problems. So that in practice, the 2013 curriculum makes attitude aspects a top priority. A good attitude can form a good relationship with anyone. The government says that the formation of aspects of attitude is the formation of community character in the form of honesty, responsibility, integrity, tolerance, and so on.

Curriculum changes have an impact on the education component. Every time a curriculum change occurs, teachers are the most affected (Kastawi, et al. 2017). curriculum change means that there is a change in teaching materials, even the learning model used. This means that the teacher must update the teaching materials, up to the previously applied learning model. This change is not only happening in Indonesia but also throughout the world. In New Zealand, for example, history teachers have to work hard to prepare new material when there is a change in policy related to history (Ormond, 2016, p. 599). Likewise in Indonesia, any curriculum changes will also have a direct impact on teachers. Therefore, it is important to know the readiness of teachers in implementing the 2013 Curriculum.

In the early stages of implementing the 2013 Curriculum, it is still called the trial phase where the results can be an important benchmark in improving the curriculum if there are mistakes in it. Trials can provide information on how far the expected educational outcomes can be achieved, supporting and inhibiting factors, and coping strategies to overcome obstacles in implementation. Therefore the authors conducted research to seek to provide justification for the significance of the 2013 Curriculum trial results that had been carried out in the field.

Based on research by Melati and Utanto (2016: 1) the implementation of the 2013 curriculum has not been effective because teachers do not have sufficient knowledge. The results of research by Siambaton, Erlinawati, and Haryanto (2016) also show that the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum has not been effective because teachers have not been able to prepare a lesson plan (RPP) properly. Ruja and Sukanto (2015) who examined the readiness of Social Science (IPS) subject teachers in the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum also showed that the implementation had not been effective. Kastawi, et al (2017) examined the constraints and implementation of the 2013 Curriculum also showed that there were still many problems in implementing the 2013 Curriculum. Similarly, research conducted by Suherman (2014) showed that the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum was not effective because it was not in accordance with school demands.

In fact, the new curriculum is relatively difficult for teachers. Subekti and friends (2016) who examined the understanding of Information Technology and Technology (ICT) teachers regarding the 2013 Curriculum concluded that ICT teachers who were research respondents lacked adequate understanding and implementation in schools. Research that focuses on the evaluation dimension also concludes that the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum has not been effective in planning, implementing, and reporting (Setiadi, 2016). Meanwhile, Mastur (2017) research concluded that implementation of the 2013 Curriculum at the Junior High School (SMP) level in Yogyakarta has been running.

This article aims to describe the data and facts regarding the readiness of teachers, the carrying capacity of schools, local governments as well as the various obstacles and solutions applied to the implementation of the 2013 program. Hopefully this research will be carried out. can enrich data and information and provide a broader overview of implementation. Curriculum 2013 and its barriers. And how to implement it so that it can function optimally if

human resources in schools, especially teachers and school principals, do not change their behavior.

Teachers must be enthusiastic and change the mindset in learning, that students must be active in learning, and learning must be fun for students. Principals must be innovative and responsive in creating opportunities for teachers to further develop professionalism in teaching. The absence of the supporting factors above will create obstacles in the implementation of the 2013 program. Next is the availability of learning facilities, although the existence of books is sufficient, further study is needed if the contents of this manual have a global dimension? If not, the 2013 program will lag behind other countries. Based on Taiwan's experience, it was found that only about 10% of textbook content contained global material. The concept of global education, which relates material to the context of international relations on a global scale, which has been included in the textbook is ecological sustainability and world peace, while human rights and social justice underrepresented (Chou & Ting, 2016).

METHOD

The research method is the method used by researchers to collect research data (Arikunto, 2010). Scientific articles should be prepared with systematic methods and measures to facilitate research. This research is a study of the literature using a content analysis approach. The literature review is carried out by collecting material both from journals or from other sources related to the optimization of program implementation.

RESULTS

Previous research has argued that the 2013 curriculum was not implemented properly in schools. Based on previous research by Niam, et al (2018), it shows that there are various issues in the curriculum development process, including limited stakeholder involvement, quality of human resources and limited curriculum assistance. Referring to previous research, Lucia (2016) also found that several problems were encountered, namely the local government does not provide a special budget to disseminate the 2013 program to teachers, school principals and to supervisors. Usually, this socialization is only inserted through official meetings, workshops, seminars, trainings and activities such as KKG, MGMP, KKS and principals forums. Then the role of local government in education and training in the 2013 program is considered limited as a coordinator. However, local governments play a very important role in overcoming delays in the purchase and distribution of books by facilitating the purchase of compact discs (CDs) to replace books and coordinating with schools to do so. reply. to reserve the requirements. In terms of funding, local governments begin to get involved in the second year by providing a budget via the APBD to train school heads and supervisors. On the other hand the government did not carry out monitoring and evaluation because the knowledge of monitoring and evaluation actors concerning the 2013 program in the regions is still limited.

Kastawi, et al (2017) also explained that in the implementation of the 2013 program, teacher readiness was still lacking, tutoring was still weak and the use of school budgets. local government is not optimal. According to Dwi et al (2018), this shows that there are several inhibiting factors in the implementation of the 2013 program, namely the absence of an understanding of program implementation. 2013 as a whole, it is necessary to understand the learning model, assessment, HOTS questions and the use of computing.

DISCUSSION

Based on several previous studies, this study will examine one by one the problems in the implementation of the 2013 program and the steps to overcome these problems.

1. Teacher preparation

The teacher's lack of understanding of the nature of the 2013 curriculum strengthens the research findings of Melati and Utanto (2016). In this study, most teachers did not have sufficient knowledge to understand the 2013 curriculum and were not ready to implement it. Teachers also experienced problems in the training they received was inadequate, so that teachers were not able to achieve learning as expected in the 2013 curriculum. Both studies were conducted in different locations. However, the results were the same, namely teachers who did not understand the essence of the 2013 program felt they did not understand because the training was not well organized. Some other obstacles raised by Melati and Utanto (2016, p. 6) are the lack of curriculum materials, 2013 curriculum books, and good training with sub-optimal quality and intensity.

In the practice of implementing the 2013 curriculum by preparing lessons, teachers do not make lesson plans. Most pre-apprentice teachers are armed with textbook content. Seeing this condition, what needs to be improved is the mentality of the teachers, not a change in curriculum. This is in line with the conclusions of research which show that the solutions implemented so far include participation in training, learning and retrieval of information from the internet or sources that know more about the 2013 Program.

According to Ruja and Sukamto (2015), previous findings also show that the implementation of the 2013 program was not actually implemented. There are at least three reasons that indicate that the implementation of the 2013 program was not effective, namely: (1) the teacher does not feel ready because the socialization and training is too short, (2) the training is too short so that the teacher is unable to make plans to implement the learning, and (3) the teacher is not prepared. also demonstrated in the assessment of student learning outcomes.

Regarding material that teachers did not understand, most of them focus on the following 3 (three) facts. Elementary level (DS) teachers mostly said they did not understand thematic learning, the result was that they could not implement it in school. Second, teachers in junior high (SMP) and senior high school (SMA) also mostly said they did not understand the science learning approach. Additionally, most elementary, junior high and high school teachers reported not understanding how to assess student performance using authentic assessment.

In fact, based on the interviews with the teachers, they really hoped that they would get help after the training was finished. Mentorship can be provided by principals, district supervisors, or instructors. Indeed, according to them, the key to a successful implementation of learning innovation is not in training, but in assistance. Therefore, according to them, school principals and principals should also be trained in the 2013 curriculum so that they can also assist teachers.

The changes and development of the programs in Indonesia through the implementation of the 2013 program are actually going in the right direction. Because in the 2013 curriculum, the main concern is that students and teachers are given the autonomy to develop lesson plans and implement them. In this case, there are at least 3 (three) general trends in curriculum reform. First, it combines top-down and bottom-up approaches to program planning. Second, position students as the center of curriculum activities. Third, ensure teacher autonomy and

professionalism, as has happened in North America, England and New Zealand (Priestley, 2011).

To support the change of the new curriculum, the government has also launched a new program called Sustainable Professional Development (PKB), which is a program designed to continue to increase the independence and professionalism of teachers in schools. The hope is that school students will benefit from high quality educational services provided by qualified teachers. The PKB program includes various means and strategies to improve the quality of teachers in schools through mentoring and training (Kemdiknas, 2010).

2. School Support in Implementing the 2013 Curriculum

Schools have made various efforts to prepare for the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum. However, school support related to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum, such as support from all school community parties, the use of BOS funds and improving school administration is still low. The implementation of the 2013 Curriculum has not received a positive response and full support from all parties in the school, starting from teachers, students, school principals, administrative staff, school supervisors and school committees (Kaswati, 2017). To achieve the goals and succeed in implementing the 2013 Curriculum, schools need to provide training and assistance to teachers, school principals, administrative staff, and school committees. Although teachers and school principals get socialization and training from the government. However, according to Siambaton (2016), it was revealed that in the 2015/2016 school year the teachers in the junior high schools studied had not been able to prepare RPP in accordance with the standard provisions of the 2013 Curriculum policy.

Furthermore, schools use BOS funds only for the procurement of curriculum books in accordance with the Ministry of Education and Culture Letter Number 36250 / WMP / KR / 2014. As for infrastructure, according to Seuherman (2014), it explains that the facilities and infrastructure are incomplete so that the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum is considered ineffective. Facilities and infrastructure are also very important because they can make Teaching and Learning activities more quality and get maximum results in accordance with the hopes and goals of implementing the 2013 Curriculum.

School administration also needs attention from schools. Based on the Ministry of Education and Culture Letter Number 36250 / WMP / KR / 2014, schools must improve their Basic Education Data (Dapodik) for the purpose of procuring books. The data that needs to be upgraded are the data on the number of students per class, the number of teachers per subject, and the number of students and teachers according to their religion.

3. Local Government Support in Implementing the 2013 Curriculum

Since the Ministry of Education and Culture decided that the 2013 Curriculum should be applied at all levels of education gradually, the Regional Government immediately followed up and strived to provide various kinds of support for the successful implementation of the 2013 Curriculum. This support includes providing outreach, training, procurement and distribution of Curriculum 2013 books, funding for the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum, and conducting monitoring and evaluation (Monev).

According to Hariana (2005) Curriculum socialization is the first step to introduce a new curriculum that will be applied to teachers, school principals and supervisors. Sulistya (2014) suggests that curriculum socialization has a positive and significant impact on the planning of the learning process. This is based on the findings by distributing questionnaires in 10 schools to 127 principals and 238 teachers. From the data obtained, 89% of school

principals and 84% of teachers have participated in the socialization and understanding of the 2013 Curriculum material. Furthermore, 76% of school principals and 64% of teachers stated that they had understood the introduction of the 2013 Curriculum which had been socialized by the local government.

Training for teachers, school principals and supervisors related to the 2013 Curriculum is also provided by local governments. According to Sulistya (2014) in a study conducted in September and October 2014 related to the training provided by the government, it was shown that 86% of school principals and 81% of teachers had attended the 2013 Curriculum training. 4% of school principals and 60% of teachers have understood the training material that has been given. Furthermore, in Permendikbud Number 34 of 2014 regarding the procurement or purchase of Curriculum 2013 books, schools can order and buy books through the Regency / City Education Office online via e-catalog according to the ordering procedure and schedule. District / City Education Offices continue to coordinate with schools regarding the need for book procurement. However, for funding, Sulistya (2014) revealed that schools can fulfill the procurement of books from BOS funds, central government and regional funds.

The role of the government in funding the implementation of the 2013 curriculum varies greatly (Winingsih, 2015). In the first year of implementing the 2013 curriculum, local governments did not participate in funding the implementation of the 2013 curriculum. This was due to the funding that came from the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBN). In 2014, local governments began to budget for the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum through the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD).

Monitoring and evaluation (Monev) is the government's authority to supervise and evaluate the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum in all schools. Monev can be carried out by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemdikbud), the Provincial Education Office, and District / City Education Offices.

4. Steps to Resolve Constraints on Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum

Based on the problems that exist in the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum, there are several steps to overcome the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum . The central government and regional governments must set maximum targets for the next 1, 2 and 3 years. According to Kastawi (2013), the implementation starts from budgeting, providing educational facilities, training, implementation, counseling, and evaluating of the strengths and the weaknesses .

This target requires implementation, namely the budget plan for student study books , teacher manuals, teacher training costs, training for headmaster, training forl leaders or supervisors , as well as socialization with the head of the school committee and the parents of students. The budget must also be comprehensive. Book procurement should not be done centrally, but rather decentralized both by region and province. This is done to avoid delays in the printing and delivery process to regencies and cities that have been happening so far.

The next one is necessary to hold the training step by step well coordinated between components in educational organizations is conducted by experienced teachers who follow the principles of good learning and apply the curriculum. Not only fulfilling the official requirements at the time of training , but also receiving benefits through this training .

Training of teachers should focus more on thematic approach to primary school teacher and scientific approach for junior and senior high school teachers, as complained of by the majority of teachers who reported the program . Evaluation guidelines for teachers to

evaluate student learning outcomes must be issued immediately by the Central Government and approved by the Local Government.

CONCLUSION

This article generally supports some of the findings of previous research that the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum was ineffective due to several reasons, as follows, first, not all of the teaching staff have received it, so that the teaching staff has not been able to carry out thematic and scientific or competitive training, and have not been able to do assessment authentically.

Second, the teachers do not understand of the nature and substance of this curriculum and cannot implement it properly. The main weakness of an educator and teacher in learning is their lack of understanding of science thematic approaches and evaluation of student learning outcomes. Third, school support is still low because there are few school members who do not receive training in this curriculum. The main reason for the lack of support for schools is a lack of awareness of new programs among the school community, particularly school principals and school supervisors.

Fourth, the regional government has provided support in the form of a training budget, a budget for assistance, a budget for purchasing books, and a teacher-principal-school leader through training provided by the Education Office and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, but the results are less than optimal. Fifth, the lack of planning for the implementation of the 2013 curriculum is a repressive factor. The lack of coherence between the various levels of government responsible for implementing the curriculum also checks for other weaknesses. Sixth, the management of the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum needs to be improved, starting from setting program budgeting goals, budgeting, providing educational facilities, training, implementing, consulting, and evaluating its success and failure. In the era of decentralization, curriculum implementation must also be decentralized. The key is good coordination between various levels of government, central, provincial, and district / city.

REFERENCES

- Abong, R. (2015). *Konstelasi Kurikulum Pendidikan di Indonesia*. At-Turats, Vol. 9 Nomor 2: 37-47.
- Bergqvist, E. & Bergqvist, T. (2017) The role of the formal written curriculum in standards-based re-form. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49(2): 149-168. doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2016.1202323.
- Chou, P.I. dan Ting, H.J. (2016). How closely related are the national curriculum and the global dimension? A content analysis of the global dimension in elementary school text-books in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(3): 533-543. doi.org/10.1007/s12564-016-9437-6.
- Dikbud. (2013). Nomor 5, Tahun IV, September 2013.
- Dina, A., Mawarsari, V.D., dan Suprpto, R. (2015). Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 pada Perangkat Pembelajaran Model Discovery Learning Pendekatan Scientific terhadap Kemampuan Komunikasi Matematis Materi Geometri SMK. *JKPM*, 2(1): 22-31.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional. (2010). *Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Profesi Guru Buku 1: Pedoman Pengelolaan Pengembangan Keprofesian Berkelanjutan (PKB)*. Jakarta: Kemdiknas, Direktorat Jenderal Peningkatan Mutu Pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan.

- Mastur. (2017). Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Dalam Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran di SMP. *Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi Pendidikan*, 4(1): 50-64.
- Melati, E.R., dan Utanto, Y. (2016). Kendala Guru Sekolah Dasar dalam Memahami Kurikulum 2013. *Indonesian Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology Studies*, 4(1): 1-9.
- Ormond, B.M. (2017). Curriculum decisions—the challenges of teacher autonomy over knowledge selection for history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49(5): 599-619. doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2016.1149225.
- Priestley, M. (2011). Whatever happened to curriculum theory? Critical realism and curriculum change. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 19(2): 221–237.
- Ruja, I.N. dan Sukanto. (2015). Survey Permasalahan Implementasi Kurikulum Nasional 2013 Mata Pelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial Sekolah Menengah Pertama di Jawa Timur. *Sejarah dan Budaya, Tahun Kesembilan*, 2(2): 193-199.
- Samsudi. (2009). *Desain Penelitian Pendidikan*. Semarang: Unnes Press.
- Setiadi, H. (2016). Pelaksanaan Penilaian Pada Kurikulum 2013. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 20(2): 166-178.
- Siambaton, H.R., Erlinawati, dan Haryanto. (2016). Problem Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Mata Pelajaran Ilmu Pendidikan Sosial di Jenjang Sekolah Menengah Pertama. *Indonesian Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology Studies*, 4(1): 10-16.
- Subekti, A., Yudha, S.S., dan Budisantoso, H.T. (2016). Pemahaman dan Peran Guru TIK dalam Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 di Sekolah Menengah Atas. *Indonesian Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology Studies*, 4(1): 25-31.
- Suherman, A. (20104). Implementasi Kurikulum Baru Tahun 2013 Mata Pelajaran Pendidikan Jasmani: Studi Deskriptif Kualitatif Pada SDN Cilengkrang. *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar*, 1(1): 71-76.
- World Bank. (2007). Investing in Indonesia’s Education: Allocation, Equity, and Efficiency of Public Expenditures. The World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4329. Diakses dari <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/7280>.
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2003). UndangUndang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Jakarta.
- Yusuf, M. (2013). Mengantisipasi Perubahan Kurikulum 2013. *Jurnal Ilmiah SPIRIT*, 13(1): 27-42.