

**IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM 2013
ON PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION LEVEL
IN THE YOGYAKARTA**

By:

Suyanta *), Anik G. *), Widarto *), Widyastuti P. *), Panggung S. *), Paidi *)

ABSTRACT

Curriculum 2013 has been set by the government be applicable curriculum in schools from elementary to secondary education. The implementation of this curriculum milestone start of the school year 2013/2014 (July 2013). On entry into this curriculum encountered various limitations, both in education and in subjects. In an effort to improve the implementation of the curriculum, it is necessary input to overcome various obstacles and problems that occur in the field. It is necessary for this study in order to determine: (1) the extent to which the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the SD / MI in Yogyakarta; (2) the extent to which the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the junior high school in Yogyakarta; and (3) the extent to which the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the level of SMA / SMK in Yogyakarta.

Subjects were Principals, Teachers, and Students in elementary school, junior high, and high school / vocational school that has implemented the curriculum of 2013. While the object of study is the curriculum of 2013. The study was conducted in Yogyakarta which includes one municipality and four districts, which includes public and private schools, good schools under Kemendikbud and MORA. Schools were chosen as the study site is a school which has run Curriculum 2013, in the category of good schools, medium, low according to the Education Department or the justification of the research team. Thus, the determination of sample schools by purposive sampling. Data were collected by using a questionnaire with a scale Linkert. Data were analyzed by descriptive statistics.

Based on these results we can conclude that, (1) implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the primary school level in Yogyakarta is not good, (2) the implementation of the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the junior high school in Yogyakarta is not good, (3) the implementation of the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the SMA / SMK in Yogyakarta is not good. Based on these results, the research team on this occasion to provide recommendations "should be reconsidered implementation of Curriculum 2013 at all levels of education".

Keywords: implementation, Curriculum 2013

*) Yogyakarta State University

A. Introduction

Education contributes greatly to the advancement of the nation because of the intelligent community will give the feel of intelligent life anyway, and will progressively establish independence. One of the educational problems faced by Indonesia is the low quality of education at every level and education units. Various attempts have been made to improve the quality of national education, through the development of national and local curricula, improving teacher competence through training, provision of books and learning tools, procurement and improvement of educational facilities, and improving the quality of school management. However, various indicators of the quality of education has not shown a significant increase (Benchmark, 2010).

The issue of quality of education according to Fasli Jalal and Dedi Supriadi (2001) related to (a) the quality of teachers and education personnel, including principals, supervisors, overseers, (b) teaching curriculum, (c) teaching methods, (d) materials, (e) teaching aids, and (f) manajemenen school. These six elements are interrelated in an effort to improve the quality of teaching and learning, which sprout on improving the quality of education.

In an effort to improve the quality and equity of education, the government has planned an educational innovation by implementing Curriculum 2013, which is expected to produce Indonesian people productive, creative, innovative and effective through strengthening the attitude (know why), skills (know how), and knowledge (know what) integrated (Moh. Noah, 2013). Furthermore, Moh. Noah (2013) as Minister of Education and Culture expects that the development of curriculum in 2013, in addition to provide answers to some of the problems inherent to the curriculum in 2006, aims also to encourage learners or students, better able to make observations, ask questions, reasoning, and communicating (present), what is obtained or known after students receive learning materials.

Curriculum change is intended as a form of education reform in order to improve the quality of education. The changes are a logical consequence of the change of political system, socio-cultural, economic, and science and technology in the community, state and nation. Therefore, the curriculum as a set of educational plan needs to be developed dynamically in accordance with the demands and changes in society. But, in the implementation of the new curriculum will lead to differences in perception between the policy holder with stakeholders. Assuming that the policy holder has a policy actors

(teacher) does not like change, while on the side of the teachers also believe that the policy holder does not understand the realities that occur during the execution of the learning (Puskur, in Loeloek EP., 2008).

Curriculum change is a natural process that happens and should happen as statements Oliva (2004) "Curriculum change is Inevitable and desireble". The development of science and technology, the needs of society, the progress of time, and the new government policy led to the curriculum should be changed. Life in the XXI century amendment will require higher education system is fundamental. Shape those changes are: (i) a change of view of local community life to the world community (global), (ii) a change of social cohesion into democratic participation, particularly in the education and practice of citizenship (Higher Education, the Zaenal Arifin, 2008).

The demands of the curriculum changes have been anticipated by the government with the policies issued by the RI Kemendikbud in 2013 have imposed a new curriculum called Curriculum 2013. The curriculum is intended for elementary and secondary education. This policy began in July 2013 by enacting the Curriculum 2013 is limited to a certain level and subject. This policy is in principle impose gradual implementation of Curriculum 2013, thus continuing hope this curriculum will apply in full for all subjects and levels of education (Mulyasa, E., 2013).

In line with the implementation of the curriculum throughout the country in 2013, the pact sufficient amount to the pros and cons. Although the implementation of Curriculum 2013 is still very limited, but the results, findings and obstacles to its implementation becomes very important to be revealed, in order to provide input for the implementation of the next time. For that we need research that can reveal how the implementation of Curriculum 2013, which has been put in place during the year, particularly in the instimewa Yogyakarta.

So the problem is how the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the elementary, middle and high school / vocational school in Yogyakarta. For that is the purpose of this study was to determine:

- a. The extent to which the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the primary school level in Yogyakarta.
- b. The extent to which the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the high school level in Yogyakarta.

- c. The extent to which the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the level of SMA / SMK in Yogyakarta

B. Methods

This 2013 study curriculum implementation is a qualitative descriptive study, to describe the level of adherence to the Curriculum 2013 in DIY. This study aimed to describe or depict phenomena that exist in the field of research data related to the implementation of Curriculum 2013. The subjects were school principals, teachers, and students in elementary school, junior high, and high school / vocational school that has implemented Curriculum 2013. Whereas the object of research is the Curriculum 2013 (Sugiyono, 2008).

This research was conducted in Yogyakarta which includes one municipality and four districts, which includes public and private schools, good schools under Kemendikbud and Kemenag. Schools were chosen as the study site is a school which has run Curriculum 2013, in the category of good schools, medium, low according to the Education Department or the justification of the research team. Thus, purposive sampling schools based on the quality of school clusters, with details such as the following table (Sudjana and Ibrahim, 2007).

Table 1. Location of Research

| No. | Location | School level | Category | Number |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|----------|--------|
| 1 | Kota Yogyakarta | SD, SMP, dan SMA | Good | 3 |
| 2 | Kab. Bantul | SMP dan SMK | Medium | 2 |
| 3 | Kab. Kulon Progo | SD dan SMA | Medium | 2 |
| 4 | Kab. Sleman | SD dan SMA | Low | 2 |
| 5 | Kab. Gunung Kidul | SMP | Low | 1 |
| Total | | | | 10 |

The timing of the study for approximately 6 months. Research began on the new school year 2014/2015, after one year of implementation of Curriculum 2013.

The steps of the research is as follows.

1. Preparation of the instrument. The research instrument was a questionnaire adapted from questionnaires curriculum implementation made by Kemendikbud, with some modifications and adjustment for the purposes of this study. Questionnaire includes questionnaires for teachers, principals and for students.

2. Determination of the sample schools. Determination of school for the study sample through the sampling system considerations representative model. Start representation strata and type of school (elementary middle), representative of the area (city and district) and school-level representation (good and less good) (see Table 1).
3. Data collection. The instrument is ready to be delivered to the school by representatives of the research team to the principal. School head teacher determines the respondents, which is subject teachers who run the curriculum 13. The principal, teachers and students fill questionnaire according keperuntukannya respectively. Data were collected by using a questionnaire with a scale Linkert.
4. Analysis of the data. Data were analyzed by descriptive statistics.

C. Results and Discussion

Data were taken from the 10 schools that have been determined as sampling, representing the SD / MI, junior high, and high school / vocational school spread over five cities / counties in DIY. Location of the study are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2. List of School Location Research

| No | Name of School | District / City |
|----|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | SDN Ungaran 1 | Yogyakarta |
| 2 | SDN Percobaan 4 | Kulon Progo |
| 3 | SDN Gamping | Sleman |
| 4 | SMPN 8 Yogyakarta | Yogyakarta |
| 5 | SMPN 1 Patuk | Gunung Kidul |
| 6 | SMPN 1 Sewon | Bantul |
| 7 | SMAN 3 Yogyakarta | Yogyakarta |
| 8 | SMAN 1 Sentolo | Kulon Progo |
| 9 | SMAN 1 Godean | Sleman |
| 10 | SMKN 1 Bantul | Bantul |

The results of the research data after being processed by descriptive statistics obtained and stated in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Summary of Research Data

| No. | ASPECTS | SCHOOL LEVEL | | | Average per aspect |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|------|---------|--------------------|
| | | SD | SMP | SMA/SMK | |
| 1 | Opinion of students about ability of teachers in the implementation of K-13 *) | | 3.20 | 3.10 | 3.15 |
| 2 | Opinion of students about impact on students K-13 *) | | 3.09 | 2.73 | 2.91 |
| 3 | Opinion about teachers K-13 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.95 | 2.85 |
| 4 | Opinions teacher textbooks about book | 2.84 | 2.83 | 2.80 | 2.82 |
| 5 | Opinion about teacher teacher manual | 2.95 | 2.84 | 2.63 | 2.76 |
| 6 | Opinion about teacher training K-13, on the aspect of training experience | 2.73 | 2.60 | 2,93 | 2.81 |
| 7 | Opinion about teacher training K-13, sarpras aspects and institutional support | 2.80 | 2.85 | 2.70 | 2.88 |
| 8 | Opinion about teacher learning process, the planning aspect | 2.00 | 1.94 | 2.93 | 2.78 |
| 9 | Opinion about teacher learning process, in the aspect of implementation | 2.86 | 2.81 | 2.88 | 2.85 |
| 10 | Opinion about teacher impact on students K-13 | 2.71 | 2.89 | 2.95 | 2.85 |
| 11 | Opinion teachers about impact on teachers K-13 | 2.79 | 2.90 | 2.95 | 2.88 |
| 12 | Opinion KS about learning process, the planning aspect | 3.03 | 3.57 | 3.89 | 3.27 |
| 13 | Opinion KS about learning process, the implementation aspects of | 2.65 | 3.12 | 3.36 | 3.04 |
| 14 | Opinion KS about impact on teachers K-13 | 2.80 | 3.03 | 3.43 | 3.09 |
| The mean per school level | | 2.74 | 2.89 | 2.97 | 2.87 |

Description: Score: 1 to 4 (a score of 1 means no good, a score of 2 is less good, 3 good score and a score of 4 meaning excellent)

Based on data in Table 3 above, can be explained in two points of view. The first, based on the viewpoint of education (elementary, middle and high school / vocational school). While the second viewpoint is based on the viewpoint of the assessor aspect (teachers, principals and students).

From the standpoint of education, there are only three classifications, namely elementary, junior high, high school / vocational. Data consecutive scores implementation of curriculum implementation: the elementary with a score of 2.74; SMP with a score of 2.89; and the level of SMA / SMK with a score of 2.97. The mean score obtained all levels of 2.87. Based on the value / score of 2.87 is the level of implementation of the curriculum in schools is still not good (a value of less than 3). When seen from this perspective the level / school level turns out there is no increase in the tendency of scores from basic education to upper secondary education. This means that implementation of the curriculum implementation in SMA / SMK better than in elementary and junior high school.

From the point of view of aspects of those asked in the questionnaire, can be explained as follows. From the data in Table 3 above is reduced to opinion of students of junior high, high school / vocational obtained the following data.

Table 4. Summary of Opinion Student Data SMP / SMA / SMK

| No. | ASPECTS | SCHOOL LEVEL | | | Average per aspect |
|-----|--|--------------|------|---------|--------------------|
| | | SD | SMP | SMA/SMK | |
| 1 | Opinion of students about ability of teachers in the implementation of K-13 *) | | 3.20 | 3.10 | 3.15 |
| 2 | Opinion of students about impact on students K-13 *) | | 3.09 | 2.73 | 2.91 |
| | Average | | 3.14 | 2.92 | 3.03 |

Based on data in Table 4 above it can be seen that the opinions of students on curriculum implemntasi 2013 is to provide a score 3:03. This is the meaning of scores of students considered that the teachers have been able to implement the curriculum of 2013. But the students gave a score of 2.91 to the impact in 2013 of the student's own curriculum. That is, in fact students have not / not sure Curriculum 2013 have an impact on him.

Table 5. Summary of Data Opinion Guru

| No. | ASPECTS | SCHOOL LEVEL | | | Average per aspect |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--------------|------|---------|--------------------|
| | | SD | SMP | SMA/SMK | |
| 1 | Opinion about teachers K-13 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.95 | 2.82 |
| 2 | Opinion teacher textbooks about book | 2.84 | 2.83 | 2.80 | 2.82 |
| 3 | Opinion about teacher teacher manual | 2.95 | 2.84 | 2.63 | 2.81 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|------|------|------|-------------|
| 4 | Opinion about teacher training K-13, on the aspect of training experience | 2.73 | 2.60 | 2,93 | 2.75 |
| 5 | Opinion about teacher training K-13, sarpras aspects and institutional support | 2.80 | 2.85 | 2.70 | 2.78 |
| 6 | Opinion about teacher learning process, the planning aspect | 2.00 | 1.94 | 2.93 | 2.29 |
| 7 | Opinion about teacher learning process, in the aspect of implementation | 2.86 | 2.81 | 2.88 | 2.85 |
| 8 | Opinion about teacher impact on students K-13 | 2.71 | 2.89 | 2.95 | 2.85 |
| 9 | Opinion of teachers about impact on teachers K-13 | 2.79 | 2.90 | 2.95 | 2.88 |
| Average per school level | | 2.71 | 2.72 | 2.86 | 2.76 |

In this study, most teachers get their share of questions related to the implementation of the teacher Kuriukulm 2013. Opinions about the understanding and effectiveness of the curriculum in 2013 is reflected by a score of 2.76. The meaning of these scores is teachers do not understand the curriculum, 2013. Teachers also provide an assessment that the implementation of Curriculum 2013 has not been effective (Lewis, Anne C., 2008).

Opinions of teachers about textbooks reflected on the score 2.82. Meaning this figure is textbooks that there was enough detailed, easy to understand, it looks nice, and easy to understand. As for the teacher manual only obtained a score of 2.81, meaning the book is not enough to help or are not sufficiently clear.

Associated with the training curriculum in 2013, specialized in the aspect of the experience acquired during the training, the teacher gives a score of 2.75. The scores meaning teachers felt that the material obtained is not in accordance with purposes. In other words, training materials not include / load the sake of learning. Still in the context of training, seen from the aspect of infrastructure and institutional support, the teacher gives a score of 2.78. That is, the facilities and infrastructure provided was sufficient, and the agency also has provided sufficient support.

Judging from the planning aspect of learning, be it from learning design, implementation and evaluation of teachers view the implementation of Curriculum 2013 terahap acquired range of numbers 2.8. This value indicates that the process of learning the curriculum in 2013 is still not good / not appropriate.

Table 6. Summary of Data Opinions Principal

| No. | ASPECTS | SCHOOL LEVEL | | | Average per aspect |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------|------|---------|--------------------|
| | | SD | SMP | SMA/SMK | |
| 1 | Opinion of principal about learning process, the planning aspect | 3.03 | 3.57 | 3.89 | 3.50 |
| 2 | Opinion of principal about learning process, the implementation aspects of | 2.65 | 3.12 | 3.36 | 3.04 |
| 3 | Opinion of principal about impact on teachers K-13 | 2.80 | 3.03 | 3.43 | 3.09 |
| The average of per school level | | 2.83 | 3.24 | 3.56 | 3.21 |

In general score obtained from the view of principals to implement the curriculum in 2013 by teachers and students received a score of 3.21. This score indicates that the teachers in implementing the curriculum in 2013 umumdapat well.

Overall opinion of students, teachers, and principals from elementary, junior high, and high school / vocational school in the province on the implementation of Curriculum 2013 in various aspects of being in a score of 2.90. The meaning of these figures show that the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the school in good DIY approach.

D. Conclusion

Based on the results of this study can be summarized as follows

1. Implementation of the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the primary school level in Yogyakarta is not good
2. Implementation of the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the junior high school in Yogyakarta is not good.
3. Implementation of the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the level of SMA / SMK in Yogyakarta is not good

Based on these results, the research team on this occasion provides the following recommendations:

1. It should be reviewed implementation of Curriculum 2013 at all levels of education
2. There needs to be some changes in concepts that are considered less appropriate in the script Curriculum 2013
3. It needs preparation devices and other equipment that support the implementation of Curriculum 2013
4. Need more socializing and training gradually to all stakeholders and users of the curriculum continuously.

E. Refference

- Arifin Zaenal. (2012). *Konsep dan Model Pengembangan Kurikulum*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Benchmark. (2010). *Mutu Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hamalik,Oemar.(2003). *Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Jalal, F. dan Supriadi, D. (2001). *Reformasi Pendidikan dalam Konteks Otonomi Daerah*. Yogyakarta: Adicitra Karya Nusa.
- Lewis, Anne C (2008). *Teacher Development*. Teach Directions; Jan 2008; 67, 6; ProQuest Education Journals pg.5
- Mulyasa, E. (2013).*Pengembangan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Bandung:PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Muh. Nuh. (2013), *Sosialisasi Kurikulum 2013*. Kemendikbud. Jakarta
- Loeloek, EP.(2013). *Panduan Memahami Kurikulum 2013*. Bandung: Prestasi Pustakarya.
- Oliva, Peter F. (1982). *Developing the Curriculum*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Sudjana dan Ibrahim. (2007). *Penelitian dan Penilaian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Sugiyono. (2008). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R& D*. Bandung: Alfabet.