



EVALUATION OF THE 2013 CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION, SPORT AND HEALTH

Lukas Maria Boleng¹✉, Tandiyo Rahayu²

¹Faculty of Sports Pedagogy Undana Kupang Nusa Tenggara Timur, Indonesia.

²Faculty of Sports Science Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Received 10 August 2016

Accepted 15 September 2016

Published 20 November 2016

Keywords:

evaluation; implementasi; 2013 curriculum.

Abstract

This research is meant to find out the students' reaction on the learning environment and learning achievement of Physical Education, Sport and Health (PESH) based on 2013 curriculum, to find out the students' behaviour in PESH teaching and learning, and to find out the overall implementation of 2013 curriculum. This is an evaluation study by using a quantitative method. The sample was seventh and eighth graders, teachers, and parents. The data were collected by using questionnaires and analyzed by using a descriptive quantitative analysis. The results of the study show that the students' learning achievement is not yet high and the students perceive that the learning environment for the 2013 curriculum implementation pada pilot JHSs in South Central Timor District is not yet adequate. On the students' behaviour on the school learning environment, the students have not applied them in their daily life activities. Additionally, the 2013 curriculum is not yet implemented comprehensively as expected.

© 2016 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉Correspondence:

Jl. Adisucipto, Penfui-Kupang, Lasiana, Klp. Lima, Kota Kupang, Nusa Tenggara Timur. FKIP Undana Kupang Nusa Tenggara Timur, Indonesia

E-mail: bolenglukas@yahoo.co.id

p-ISSN 2085-4943

e-ISSN 2502-4469

INTRODUCTION

Changes in the community and advances in science and technology influence curriculum changes. The change of 2006 curriculum (school-based curriculum) to 2013 curriculum is initiated by such problems as graduate competences, teaching materials, assessment, teachers and educational staff, and curriculum management. The existing problems in 2006 curriculum is the basis for the development of 2013 curriculum and its implementation throughout Indonesia from the academic year of 2013/2014 in all educational levels, including Primary Schools (PS), Junior High Schools (JHS), and Senior High Schools (SHS)/Vocational High Schools (VHS). In the JHS level in South Central Timor District, there are three pilot state schools that implement the 2013 curriculum.

Preliminary observation shows that not all PESH teachers take part in the training and understand 2013 curriculum. They do not have teachers' manuals and students' books, have difficulties in preparing lesson plans, have not fully understood the scientific approach, still use teaching strategies recommended for 2006 curriculum, and have not fully understood the assessment and assessment reports as assigned for the 2013 curriculum. There are also some problems in District Office of Education and Culture. The budget for textbook procurement is not yet allocated, and the training and mentoring for teachers have not yet implemented for all subject teachers.

The school curriculum innovation could be motivated by top down or bottom up initiatives, but in many cases the change of the curriculum is mostly initiated by the top management (Fullan, Locke, Markee dalam Wright, et al., 2006). A similar situation occurs with the existing curriculum in Indonesia. The current educational system in Indonesia keeps changing as a result of temporary suspension and evaluation of the 2013 curriculum. Therefore, the evaluation curriculum is related to where the curriculum is developed, applied and implemented (Hasan, 2008:41).

There are various models of curriculum evaluation proposed by experts including Bradley, Stufflebeam, Criven, Stake, and Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation Model. This study adopts the Kirkpatrick's model because this model allows the evaluation to be conducted from one to three month implementation of the curriculum. Meanwhile, the 2013 curriculum has been implemented for 2 to 3 years, so it can be evaluated by using this model. In South Central Timor Regency, the 2013 curriculum is still newly implemented. This curriculum also emphasizes character education and the student's behavior in school is realized in their family and community.

This study examines the students' reaction, learning achievement, students' behaviour in their learning environment, and output of the 2013 curriculum implementation in the pilot JHSs in South Central Timor Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province, and will be used as input to teachers, schools, relevant institutions and government on the 2013 curriculum implementation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concepts of Curriculum

Curriculum is defined as a series of formal experience that teachers plan and deliver in the classroom. It can also refer to a teaching program, learning contents, a plan of learning experience under the school responsibility and a written plan to be implemented (Dimiyati and Mudjiono.2002:33). The curriculum as a plan means that the educational contents should be mastered by the students after graduating from their education. Additionally, the curriculum as a process refers to the learning experience in a certain level of education to master educational contents as prepared in the proposed plan, the implementation of the teaching and learning process, and the impacts on the students' learning achievement, reflected in their overall behavior in the society.

Curriculum is developed based on standard competences, including attitude,

knowledge, thinking skills, and psychomotoric skills for a number of subject courses. A competence-based curriculum is more demanding and complicated than an objective-oriented curriculum because "competence is not the goal but something to be mastered by learners" (Arifin, 2013:146). Curriculum evaluation involves activities for making the data continuously available. Therefore, an evaluation program is a series of activities intentionally and carefully conducted to assess the extent of the implementation and achievement of a program by finding out the effectiveness of each component, both for the on-going and previous programs (Widoyoko, 2015: 9-10).

Curriculum evaluation refers to a process of gathering information to assess the value and effectiveness of a certain program. This includes the assessment of the future of the program whether it is maintained, modified, or discarded altogether (Issac and Michael, 1982: 22). There are four types of decision that will be useful for a framework in the curriculum evaluation (Guba and Stufflebeam in Hussain, et al., 2011: 265). They involve planning, for example, setting up objectives, planning procedures, for example, assigning personnel, methods and material, procedures implementation, for example, maintaining, modifying or discarding procedures, and results, for example, achieving objectives and by whom.

Evaluation Model

Scriven first proposes an evaluation model based on free objectives. In this model, the evaluator acts as an observer to describe the profile of the group implementing the curriculum. By using a qualitative method, the evaluator assesses the effect of the program. If the program has a responsive effect on one of the identified needs, it will be considered to be useful.

Another model was proposed by Bradley. The model suggests ten key indicators to assess the curriculum effectiveness and to evaluate whether the school has met the indicators in the curriculum implementation. In addition, Tyler

proposes a model based on objectives as one of the early model that influences various process of curriculum evaluation. He uses a large scale evaluation with a systematic and rational approach. Furthermore, Stufflebeam model provides data for four stages of curriculum evaluation. Context evaluation assesses the needs and problems in contexts to facilitate decision makers to determine objectives and targets. Procedure evaluation provides some inputs and assesses a number of ways to achieve the objectives to facilitate decision makers to select the most effective way. Process evaluation monitors that the process is conducted properly and correctly and assures that the procedure is followed properly and, if necessary, modified. Product evaluation compares the objectives and their implementation.

Kirkpatrick model proposes four levels. Level 1 deals with learners' reaction on learning environment, level 2 deals with expected learning achievement, level 3 deals with the change of learners' behavior, and level 4 is about the output achievement (Kirkpatrick, et al., 2006:8). Robert Stake model is not as a responsive model. Curriculum evaluation is classified as responsive because it is explicitly based on the concern from those conducting the evaluation that should be made as the main issue in the evaluation. This model can be used in education if the focus is on the program activities. This model is preferred because of its flexibility. The evaluator can select a method and identify the concern of the program users.

Kirkpatrick Evaluation Model

Kirkpatrick points out that evaluation should begin from level 1, on the students' reaction and then, if time and budget allow, orderly proceed to level 2 on the students' perception on their learning experience, what they have learned, then to level 3 on the expected change of behaviour from evaluation, and to level 4 on the learning achievement expected by the government. The last level is the highest of the the first three levels. This level is good in the long term to assess the on-going process in the previous levels and to find out the

correlation between graduation level, workforce placement, or competition in obtaining scholarship for the learners (Kirkpatrick in Worlf, et al., 2006: 8). Information from each previous level functions as the basis for evaluating the following level. Even though not all levels are assessed, each level respectively indicates more accurate assessment of the effectiveness of training programs, but at the same time deeper and time consuming analysis is required.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This is an evaluation research by using a quantitative approach. To evaluate the implementation of 2013 curriculum, the Kirkpatrick's model framework of evaluation is adopted. The sample includes seventh and eighth graders, PESH teachers, parents in three pilot schools for the 2013 curriculum in South Central Timor Regency. The data were collected by using multiple choice type questionnaires with Likert scales. The validity was checked by using Cronbach alpha (α). The α value of the validity of the questionnaires for students, PESH teachers, parents is an average of 0.9 indicating that the questionnaires are valid. The study is focused on the 2013 curriculum implementation from the academic year of 2013/2014 to present. The data were analysed by using a descriptive quantitative analysis, assisted with SPSS Version 21, and presented in percentage.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The data on the learners' reaction toward indicators of all school environment, including code of ethics, generally the students' answers are strongly agree (34.18%), agree (48.58%), disagree (16.17%), and strongly disagree (1.07%). This means that the students who agree and strongly agree know that the school has current rules and code of ethics, and punishment is imposed to those violating the rules. With respect to classroom organization and management, including good classroom

arrangement, playgrounds/fields for free movement, generally the students' answers are strongly agree (25%), agree (45.55%), disagree (20.6%) and strongly disagree (8.85%). This shows that the students who agree and strongly agree experience good classroom organization and management, whereas those who disagree and strongly disagree experience bad classroom organization and management.

On the issue of classroom rules, routines, expectation, appreciation and punishment, the students' answers are strongly agree (24.42%), agree (35.94%), disagree (29.44%), and strongly disagree (10.2%). The students who strongly agree and agree perceive that the classroom rules, routines, expectation, appreciation and punishment have been implemented in their school, whereas those who disagree perceive that the classroom rules, routines, expectation, appreciation and punishment have not been implemented as expected.

On the support from all learners in all levels, generally the students' answers are agree (30.8%), strongly agree (42.35%), and disagree (26.85%). The students who strongly agree and agree perceive that the rules are applicable to all members of the school community, including students, teachers and staff, that the school environment is comfortable, orderly and safe, and that the students are encouraged to achieve their potentials, including their wellbeing. The students who strongly disagree perceive that their experience is not the same as their expectation.

On the students' learning achievement in the 2013 curriculum implementation, including all school environment that students have initiatives on the benefits of school regulation, and that students are punished if they violate the school regulation, generally the students' answers are strongly agree (43.43%), agree (44.17%), and disagree (12.4 %). The students who strongly agree and agree assume that they observe all regulations and that the school accommodates their initiatives on the regulations, whereas those who disagree assume that they often receive punishment or they do

not care about the regulations applicable to their school.

Classroom management and organization, including the level of tolerable external noise and the students' punctuality, generally the students' answers are strongly agree (41.24%), agree (43.22%), and disagree (15.54%). The students who strongly agree and agree assume that they do not make or experience any noise in their learning and always come to school on time. Those who strongly disagree assume that they often make noise in the teaching learning process and sometimes do not come on time or they have seen teachers and other students coming late.

With respect to classroom rules, routines, expectation, appreciation and punishment, including giving awards, consistently imposing punishment, and the students' understanding of the regulations, generally the students' answers are strongly agree (34.4%), agree (42.7%), disagree (20.3%) and strongly disagree (2.6%). The students who disagree and strongly disagree perceive that the punishment is not consistently imposed and the award is not given fairly and equitably.

On the students' behavior in the implementation of 2013 curriculum including the students' understanding of the reasons for establishing school rules, generally the students' answers are strongly agree (67.4%) and agree (32%) because all students observe the regulations prepared by the school. In addition, there is a school policy that students are not allowed to bully other students. Generally the students' answers are strongly agree (41.1%), agree (15.3%), and disagree (43.6%). The students who disagree perceive that they experience to have bullied and been bullied by other students. Those who strongly agree and agree perceive that they never bully or are bullied by others.

On the issue that a school is a good, comfortable, orderly and safe environment, with high expectation, generally the students' answers are strongly agree (68.4%), agree (30%) and disagree (16%). The students who agree perceive that they create orderly and safe environment

and expect to learn in an comfortable manner, but those who disagree perceive that they do not freely move and experience school environment that is not conducive for learning.

Discussion

The learners' reaction, learning achievement, and behavior toward the implementation of the 2013 curriculum, especially toward the school environment show that generally the students agree that the school has code of ethics that is passed on to their parents, and that they follow the regulations because they are aware that the regulations are formed for their benefits. One of the regulations states that the students should return the sport facilities to their original location after they use them. They feel that they are required to do so as their obligation. This rule is implanted so that they will do the same in their daily life, that is, when they use something, they need to return it to its original place. This is supported by some experts who state that "good behaviour or attitude is a need" because someone will not be able to live harmoniously and will not be well acceptable in the community if they do not demonstrate good attitude or behaviour (Aunurrahman, 2013:115).

On the question whether the students have initiatives about the benefits of the school regulations and they are punished on violating the regulations, the students generally agree and strongly agree because they are aware of the benefits of adopting ideas or initiatives to be accommodated in the school regulations so those who violate the regulations will be punished. Some students indeed disagree because they are possibly ignorant of the regulations and often receive some punishment due to violating them.

On the issue of classroom organization and management, in relation with the students' reaction, learning achievement and behavior, including good environment, large school yards for various activities, seat/desk/other furniture arrangement, the student generally agree because they experience conducive learning environment that support teaching and learning

activities and provide comfort for them. Keefe in Huda (2014:53-54) points out that " education reform is an important key to improve the teachers' responsibility for understanding individual students' needs". The students are happy to conduct sport activities if the school has large yards and playgrounds. The school community is aware that "the level of shady school environmental could have a significant impact on the energy consumption during school hours" (Kent Olah, 2001:142-148) because trees are considered to be an important source of oxygen so trees should be planted and taken care of.

On the issue of the level of external noise that does not obstruct the teaching and learning process and seat/desk/other furniture arrangement that affects learning, the students generally strongly agree and agree because most of the teaching and learning activities in PESH is conducted outdoor in the fields. However, some students disagree with this statement because when the teaching and learning activities of health education is conducted indoor, the external noise greatly affects them. It is the students who experience the learning activities, so the school environment affects them.

On the issue that teachers and students are punctual, the students generally strongly agree and agree. This means that students and teachers usually come on time. However, some students disagree because they see some students or teachers coming to school late, or they themselves come late.

On the issue of classroom rules, routines, expectation, appreciation and punishment whether the school grants awards and gifts, how small they are, in a fairly manner, and whether the rules are applied to teachers and administrative staff, the students generally agree and strongly agree because they see and experience that the awards are given by the school and the rules are applied to all school community. To generate the students' learning motivation, a number of approaches are adopted, among other things, by giving grades, gifts, compliments and others. The basic skill in reinforcement is by giving all responses to

modify the students' behavior as a feedback for the students' behaviors (Sanjaya, 2006:163). Some students disagree probably because the statement does not reflect the school actual conditions.

On the support of all students to all classes, on the question whether the students feel that they are taken care of or appreciated and that the school environment is comfortable, orderly and safe, the students generally strongly agree and agree because they feel that they are taken care of or appreciated. For example, students with better skills and performance are asked by the teachers to demonstrate certain forms of sport movement in front of their friends. This corresponds with the activities in PESH. Verbal and visual communication is used and visual communication is often made by demonstration (Rahayu, 2013:137-138). The students who disagree and strongly disagree with this statement might perceive that they are not taken care of or they have not performed well so they do not receive some awards as their friends do.

On the issue of comfortable, orderly, and safe school environment, the students generally strongly agree and agree. On the statement about the school policy and the students' welfare, for example, no bullying among students or school community, the students generally strongly agree and agree because they have never bullied or been bullied, but some students disagree and strongly disagree because they possibly experience some bullying or commit bullying to others.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The conclusion can be drawn on the 2013 curriculum implementation in pilot JHSs in South Central Timor Regency as follows: (1) the students perceive that the learning environment is not yet adequate because some problems still exist, for example, limited facilities and infrastructure, lack of school appreciation to the learners' achievement, bullying among learners, and teachers' dominant roles in learning. (2) The teaching and learning process and learning

achievement are not yet adequate. Some problems should be solved, such as poor implementation of the scientific approach, inactive students, lack of generating motivation and appreciation, and lack of supporting facilities and infrastructure. (3) The learners' behaviour is not yet observed, so the change of behaviour leading to developing the learners' character should be encouraged, and the participation from parents, teachers and educational staff is not yet clearly seen either. (4) The 2013 curriculum is not yet fully implemented. It is suggested that standards of education should be improved, and the 2013 curriculum for PESH should be revised and evaluated.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Principals of pilot JHSs for the 2013 curriculum in Kupang City, Kupang Regency, South Central Timor Regency, and North Central Timor Regency, who allow us to conduct studies on their schools. We also thank to Office of Education and Sport of Kupang, Kupang City, Kupang Regency, South Central Timor Regency, and North Central Timor Regency, who have permitted us to conduct this research.

REFERENCES

- Agus Mahendra, 2008, " Landasan Pengembangan Curriculum Prodi PJKR and PGSD Penjas" Makalah Disajikan dalam Lokakarya Pengembangan Curriculum Prodi PJKR and PGSD Penjas, in FIK Universitas State Padang, Padang, 18-20 April 2008.
- Anderson Lorin W. and Krathwohl David R. 2001, A Taxonomi for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing, New York, Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Arifin, Zainal. 2013. Konsep and Model Pengembangan Kurikulum. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Aunnurrahman. 2014. Belajar and Pembelajaran. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Dimiyati and Mudjiono, 2002, Belajar and Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Hasan, Hamid. 2008. Evaluasi Kurikulum. Bandung: PT Remaja Rodakarya.
- Huda, Miftahul. 2014. Model-Model Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran, Isu-Isu metodis and Pragmatis. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Primrose, K. & Alexander, C. R. 2013. Curriculum development and implementation: factors contributing towards curriculum development in Zimbabwe higher education system. European Social Sciences Research Journal, 1(1), pp. 55-65. Download 27-01-2015 from www.marinsam.co.uk.
- Rahayu, T. E. 2013. Strategi Pembelajaran Pendidikan Jasmani, Implementation pada Implementasi Pendidikan Jasmani, Olahraga and Kesehatan. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sanjaya, Wina. 2006, Pembelajaran dalam Implementasi Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Widoyoko, S. Eko Putro. 2015, Evaluation Program Learning, Pandun Praktis Bagi Teachers and Calon Pendidik. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Wright, S., NecNeill, M., Fry J., Tan, S., Tan, Clara, and Schemp, P. 2006. Implications of Student Teachers' Implementation of a Curricular Innovation. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 25, pp. 310-328. (downloaded 27-01-2015)