



Development and Implementation Of Educational Curriculum in Indonesia

Prof. Dr. Ki Supriyoko, S.D.U., M.Pd.
Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa (Indonesia)

A. PREFACE

Many understandings about the educational curriculum; while in this paper, what is meant by the educational curriculum is a set of subjects and educational programs provided by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia containing the design of lessons for students in schools and madrasas in Indonesia.

The educational curriculum has a strategic position in the effort to develop education because the educational curriculum provides the direction of education itself. The educational curriculum also has a strategic position in an effort to improve the quality of education because the educational curriculum does not only contain the subject matter but also educational programs planned and (must) be carried out by the education providers.

In the development and implementation of the educational curriculum, Indonesia has an interesting experience; from the "makeshift" curriculum for example the Curriculum 1947 to the "intact" example of the Curriculum 2007 or the Education Unit Level Curriculum or Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP); from patchwork such as the Curriculum 1950 to the standard ones such as the Curriculum 1984 or the Active Student Learning or Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif (CBSA), even from non-political ones such as the Curriculum 1947 to the highly political ones such as the Curriculum 1968.

Other interesting experiences in the development and implementation of educational curriculum in Indonesia are, from those planned (by design), for example the Curriculum 2004 or Competency-Based Curriculum or Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi (KBK) to those that are not planned (nondesign), for example the Curriculum 2013 or Kurikulum 2013 or K-13.

B. HISTORY OF CURRICULUM

Historically, Indonesia has repeatedly developed and implemented curriculum in the post-independence era.

The first time Indonesia made an educational curriculum, or rather a lesson plan (leer plan) for schools in 1947. After this lesson plan was tried out for three years, an educational curriculum was born in 1950. Further-more, the educational curriculum is known as the 1950 Curriculum which became a milestone in the development of education in Indonesia.

Two years later, the lesson plan created in 1947 and developed into the Curriculum 1950, was finally refined to become a Unraveled Learning Plan or Rencana Pelajaran Terurai (RPT). This last lesson plan is indeed more unraveled, especially regarding teaching materials or what is now known as a syllabus. This RPT was then known as the Curriculum 1952 which was the development of the Curriculum 1950.

Then in 1964 a Education Plan 1964 or Rencana Pendidikan 1964 was developed which emphasized the development of creativity, feeling, intention, creation and moral education. One of the backgrounds of the development of this education plan is the emergence of public awareness about the importance of education that is not just teaching. Teaching is considered not to accommodate the “right brain” such as planting attitudes and morals. The Education Plan 1964 was finally known as the Curriculum 1964.

Four years later, in 1968 a new educational curriculum emerged, known as the Curriculum 1968. The birth of this educational curriculum was very political.

With the argument that the Curriculum 1964 was regarded as the work or legacy of the Old Order Regime, which was considered communist and unable to equip students to unite within the framework of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia or Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia (NKRI), a curriculum aimed at forming the True Pancasila Man (Manusia Pancasila Sejati) was developed. For this (political) reason, finally the Curriculum 1968 was first developed by the New Order Regime.

After the Curriculum 1968 was considered “out of dated”, the Curriculum 1975 was developed. This curriculum emphasized the importance of efficient and effective education. The basis for its development is the Management by Objective (MBO) theory. In this curriculum are the methods, materials, and objectives detailed in the Instructional System Development Procedure or Prosedur Pengembangan Sistem Instruksional (PPSI).

Nine years later the Curriculum 1984 was born. This new educational curriculum emphasized Student Active Learning (SAL) or Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif (CBSA). For this reason, many Indonesian people or many personalities are sent to several developed countries, especially Britain, which have practiced it

The emergence of this new curriculum was an attempt to integrate approaches to previous curriculums; in this case it wants to combine the Curriculum 1975 with the Curriculum 1984, between the goal approach and the process approach. The theory is; if the objectives to be achieved in the curriculum are clearly accompanied by a clear process then the results will be clear.

As with the previous curriculums which are still felt to have short-comings or deficiencies here and there, after several years of implementation the Curriculum 1994 also experienced it. The government then perfected this new curriculum by providing significant amounts of additional substances. This situation occurred five years after the introduction of the 1994 curriculum.

Because the time interval is considered relatively very short for curriculum development, the additional substance is considered insufficient to replace the previous curriculum; in the end it was decided to use a new educational curriculum called the

Improved of Curriculum 1994 or Kurikulum 1994 Yang Disempurnakan, or the Curriculum 1994 with Supplements or Kurikulum 1994 dengan Suplemen.

Then in 2004 the government launched a new educational curriculum known as the Curriculum 2004. This curriculum is relatively well known at the time of its implementation until now, due to learning objectives that directly lead to what types of competencies must be mastered by students. This curriculum is known to the public with the Competency Based Curriculum or Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi (KBK) 2004. In this curriculum all learning objectives are the formation of clear competencies.

When the KBK have not be run by the school, it is not even feasible to measure the results of its application in the field, because only three years have been implemented, the government has created a new educational curriculum called the Curriculum 2007 or Education Unit Level Curriculum or Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP).

Nowadays schools in Indonesia in various education units are still running KTSP with all the advantages and disadvantages. Schools located in urban areas and in the information center areas in general are already very familiar with the KTSP, of course, but in reality many schools in the “remote” areas like in mountains and middle of the sea are apparently not fully familiar with KTSP.

After KTSP have run for six years, a new educational curriculum emerged in 2013, known as the Curriculum 2013 (K-13). The Curriculum is an educational curriculum applied by the government to replace the 2006 curriculum or KTSP. The Curriculum 2013 entered the trial period in 2013 by making several schools, precisely 6,326 schools throughout Indonesia, become pilot schools.

In K-13 there are Core Competencies or Kompetensi Inti (KI) and Basic Competencies or Kompetensi Dasar (KD) which become the characteristics. KI is the level of ability to achieve the Graduates Competency Standards or Standar Kompetensi Lulusan (SKL) that must have by students; while KD is the level of ability to reach KI. KI consists of four aspects; namely Core Competencies of Spiritual Attitudes, Core Competencies of Social Attitudes, Core Competencies of Knowledges and Core Competencies of Skills. While KD consist of Basic Competencies of Spiritual Attitude, Basic Competencies of Social Attitudes, Basic Competencies of Knowledges and Basic Competencies of Skills.

After four years, in 2017 precisely; there was a revision of the 2013 curriculum which is now known as K-13 Revision or K-13 Revisi.

C. MANY PROBLEMS

The development and implementation of the educational curriculum in Indonesia raises many problems. The three of the many problems can be explained as follows.

1. Digital Problems

Marc Prensky in his paper ‘Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants’ published in the Journal ‘On the Horizon’ Volume 9 Number 5 October 2001 introduces the Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants terminology. Digital Native is someone, especially children and adolescents (current generation), which since its born has been facilitated by the incessant development of technology, especially information technology, such

as computers, lap top, internet, animation, etc. While Digital Immigrant is a person, especially those who are aged (older generation) who in childhood and adolescence do not experience technological development as it is today.

In his paper Marc Prensky refers more to children and adolescents (Digital Native) to preschool students to college students; while people who have aged (Digital Immigrant) to teachers in schools and lecturers in universities. Various educational programs planned by teachers and lecturers are not suitable with the needs of students in preschool, primary and secondary school and students in universities, due to differences in experience in technological development.

The problem of the issue with the development of educational curriculum is that the educational curriculum is used for today's children who are thirsty with technological developments, on the other hand educational curriculum are made by people "past" who are not familiar with technology. The result is a "different generation" education curriculum, between users and their maker is not connected.

The mindset of today's children (digital natives) is a technological mindset. They seek the science using technology, develop the science of using technology, apply the science of using technology and find new science using technology. They can do all that by sitting sweetly at home without or with other people. While the educational curriculum created by educational practitioner and educational decision makers is "elderly people" (digital immigrants). The result is an educational curriculum that does not allow children now as users to run optimally.

As the conclusions from the above description, these conditions cannot be productive because (in part) the curriculum cannot be implemented optimally in the real world by using technology.

2. Heterogeneity Problems

Departing from geographical conditions that are very heterogeneous, resulting in school conditions and demands of school graduate for very heterogeneous. This heterogeneous graduate of school demand leads to the complexity to development and implication of educational curriculum in school.

Schools in Indonesia are located in urban areas with complete learning facilities, but some are located in rural areas with limited learning facilities. Moreover, there are even schools located in "remote" areas such as in the middle of a forest, on top of mountain, on the beach, in the middle of the sea, and so on.

The availability of learning facilities certainly greatly affects the learning process; in a sense, the learning process in schools with complete learning facilities is very different with the learning process in schools where learning facilities are limited. In schools where learning facilities are complete, the learning process can be done by utilizing information technology; on the contrary, in schools with limited learning facilities, the learning process with a technology approach is very difficult and cannot even be run.

If we talk about the subject of Pancasila, for example, it is possible that this subject is applied equally and can be run well in schools in urban, schools in rural areas, even schools in "remote" areas. However, if we talk about the subject Natural Sciences or Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam (IPA), only schools with adequate learning

facilities can run these subjects optimally, while schools that do not have adequate learning facilities are difficult to run these subjects normally.

The (work) demands of graduate schools located in urban areas with adequate learning facilities with schools located in rural areas and “remote” areas with limited learning facilities, may not be different or even very different. The demands of graduate schools located in urban areas may tend to be great scientists, successful business people, successful politicians, established academics, and the like; whereas the demands of school graduates in rural areas and “remote” areas may be limited to being middle-skilled worker, loyal employees, successful workers in low or middle level, and the like.

In the context of the development and implementation of educational curriculum, this condition creates its own problems. Equalizing the demands of different graduates in the construction of the educational curriculum is not easy. This is very difficult. Distinguishing the educational curriculum according to the demands of graduates can lead to national disintegration; something that can actually divide Indonesian citizens; something that is very expensive.

3. Socialization Problems

This very heterogeneous geographical condition also resulted in a lack of smoothness of the educational curriculum socialization system in schools. Socializing the (new) educational curriculum to schools in urban areas with the availability of adequate information technology is much easier than socializing the (new) educational curriculum to schools in rural areas and “remote” areas that do not have adequate information technology.

The number of schools in Indonesia compared to other countries in general is very high. According to official data from the Ministry of Education and Culture or Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan (Kemdikbud) published by the Education and Culture Statistics Data Center or Pusat Data Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Secretary General of the Ministry of Education and Culture atau Sekretaris Jenderal Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan in 'Overview of Education and Culture Data 2017/18', the number of schools in Indonesia reached 307,655 institutions with as many students 50,034,518 people. This number does not include madrasah.

Statistically the number of Kindergarten (TK) is 91,089 schools with 4,606,102 students; consists of 3,363 State TK and 87,726 Private TK. The number of Extraordinary School (SLB) is 2,157 schools with 128,510 students; consists of 563 State SLB and 1,594 Private SLB. The number of Elementary Schools (SD) is 148,244 schools with 25,486,506 students; consisting of 131,974 public SD and 16,270 private SD. The number of Junior High Schools is 38,960 schools with 10,125,724 students; consists of 23,227 Public SMP and 15,733 Private SMP.

For secondary schools can be explained as follows. The number of High Schools (SMA) is 13,495 with 4,783,645 students; consists of 6,732 state SMA and 6,763 private SMA. The number of Vocational High Schools (SMK) is 13,710 schools with 4,904,031 students; consists of 3,519 State SMK and 10,191 Private SMK.

The very high number of schools has become a problem in terms of socializing the development and implementation of the (new) educational curriculum. If the socialization system is carried out conventionally, in the sense that it does not involve

information technology, and the socialization technique is in turn per group and per region, this system and technique require a long time.

Bureaucratic systems that are less flexible in socializing the develop-ing and constructing (new) curriculum are problems. The relatively small number of education officials at the central level who have to attend socialization on one side and too many schools that have to take part in socialization on the other side become problems that must be found a solution.

A concrete example of the problematic socialization of the implementation of the educational curriculum is the Kurikulum 2013 or K-13 socialization. As we know, K-13 has been implemented gradually starting in 2013, even in 2017 a revision was made which resulted in K-13 Revision, but until the end of 2018 there are still many schools that have not implemented K-13.

D. CLOSING

The three problems of the development and implementation of the educational curriculum in Indonesia must immediately find a solution that is “win-win solution” between academic interests and political, social and cultural interests.

Involving the young generation (digital natives) would be an alternative to overcome digital problems. Involving the younger generation in the old generation (digital immigrant) group will bring the distance between users and curriculum makers closer; in this case the technology approach can be more practiced in the new educational curriculum later. The provision of learning facilities and facilities to schools in “remote” areas so as to be able to access information technology adequately would be one alternative to overcome heterogeneity problems.

Improving the system and technical socialization of the educational curriculum as well as cutting the educational bureaucracy would be an alternative to overcome the problem of socialization.

REFERENCE:

- Ki Supriyoko. *Build Students' Character through Curriculum 2013*. Yogyakarta: Basic Education Dynamics, Discussion Paper, 2013
- Ki Supriyoko. *Anticipate the Failure of the Curriculum*. Semarang: Semarang State University, National Seminar Paper, 2013
- Ministry of Education and Culture. *Overview Of Education And Cultural Data 2017/18*. Jakarta: Center for Education and Culture Data and Statistics, 2018
- Ross, Alistair. *Curriculum: Construction and Critique*. London: Falmer Press, Second Published, 2015
- Squires, David A. *The Balanced Curriculum Model: Description and Results*. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/> Diunduh tanggal 22 Oktober 2018

Tyler, Ralph W. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*.
<https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/B/bo17239506>. Diunduh 22
Oktober 2018

Wahyuni, Sri. *Curriculum Development in Indonesian Context The Historical
Perspectives And The Implementation*. <http://www.academia.edu/34300977/>
Diunduh 22 Oktober 2018

Wyse, Dominic, Baumfield, Vivienne and Egan, David. *Creating The Curriculum*.
London and New York: Rautledge Taylor & Francis Group, First Published, 2013