IJCETS 10 (2) (2022): 119-136

Indonesian Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology Studies

http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jktp

The tension between national and international interest in curriculum policymaking: an Indonesian higher education experience

Edi Subkhan,[1]✉ Budiyono,[1] & Riche Chyntia Johan[2]

[1] Department of Curriculum and Educational Technology, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
[2] Educational Technology Study Program, Faculty of Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcets.v10i2.74305

Article History

Received : October 2022
Accepted : October 2022
Published : November 2022

Keywords

competency-based curriculum; curriculum policymaking; Indonesian higher education; international accreditation; national standards; world-class university

Abstrak

Artikel ini mengkritik pembuatan kebijakan pengembangan kurikulum untuk perguruan tinggi di Indonesia yang resmi dikeluarkan oleh pemerintah pada tahun 2020. Dengan menggunakan kerangka analisis kebijakan kritis, peneliti memfokuskan mengkaji buku panduan pengembangan kurikulum untuk Pendidikan tinggi dan dokumen terkait yang secara signifikan memengaruhi arah pendidikan tinggi di Indonesia. Analisis kami mengungkap adanya tegangan antara kepentingan nasional dan internasional dalam pembuatan kebijakan kurikulum. Tegangan ini, dan juga tumpang tindih dari kedua kepentingan tersebut, telah membuahkan beberapa masalah, terutama penurunan iklim akademis dan demokratis di kampus akibat adanya perendahan akademik dan intervensi, kurikulum yang sarat materi, lebih menekankan keterampilan ketimbang pengetahuan, dan kontrol ketat terhadap kurikulum. Selain itu, desain kurikulum yang kaku dan sarat materi juga menimbulkan menyulitkan implementasinya. Dengan demikian dapat disimpulkan bahwa bahwa kebijakan kurikulum untuk perguruan tinggi dari pemerintah ini terbatas potensinya dalam memberdayakan lulusan agar dapat berkontribusi bagi kepentingan nasional dan internasional.

Abstract

This article critically examines the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking officially issued by the government in 2020. Employing the framework of critical policy analysis, we scrutinize the manual of curriculum policymaking and its associated influential documents that have significantly shaped Indonesian higher education. Our analysis reveals a tension between national and international interests in curriculum policymaking. This tension, and the resulting overlap of these interests, has given rise to several issues, notably the deterioration of the academic and democratic climate on campuses due to academic humiliation and intervention, overload curriculum design, a curriculum that prioritizes skills over knowledge, and strict control over curriculum. Furthermore, the inflexible and overloaded curriculum design has resulted in challenges during implementation. This suggests that the policy exhibits a limited potential to empower graduates to effectively serve both national and international interests.

✉ Corresponding author :
Address: Department of Curriculum and Educational Technology, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
E-mail: edi.subkhan@mail.unnes.ac.id

p-ISSN 2252-6447
e-ISSN 2527-4597

INTRODUCTION

Internationalization of higher education is something indispensable. It almost become the common desire and movement accepted and encouraged by higher education all over the world, especially since the rise and recognition of world class university ranks such as THE, QS, Webometrics, and Shanghai Jia Tong university (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Robson & Wihlborg, 2019; Subkhan, 2016). Once such organizations release their survey result on university's world rankings based on certain criteria, such higher education institution will post their university's rank on their website, especially when their ranks were increased as a means to impress and attract public interest. This means that world class university rank has been perceived as an important factor to thrive the quality of the higher educations (Lane, 2015; Sakhiyya, 2018). Of course, world university's rank is not the only form of internationalization of higher education, other forms of this phenomenon can be found in curriculum internationalization, international accreditation, international students and lecturers' mobility, scientific publications, etc (de Wit, 2017; Helms & Rumbley, 2017; Leask, 2015; Sawir, 2013).

For decades the Indonesian government encourages all universities to become world class universities, especially by supporting them to be recognized by international accreditation agencies and world class ranks such as in Time Higher Education, Webometrics, Quacqerly Symmond (QS) (Subkhan, 2016). In this regard, the Indonesian government's support can be seen, for example, in the allocation of funds of approximately 7 trillion for semi-private universities to elevate their ranks (*Dana Abadi Rp 7 Triliun untuk PTN Badan Hukum*, 2022; *Mendukung World Class University USU*, 2020).

One of the main issues in the internationalization of higher education is the internationalization of the curriculum, particularly because having an international curriculum is a crucial aspect considered in world class university survey, for example by THE and QS. Additionally, having an international curriculum also useful for the university's promotion and public image as if it will automatically improve the graduates' skills and professionalism.

Unfortunately, due to Indonesia's centralistic notion of the national education system, even after the implementation of the education decentralization policy in the early 2000s, it seems to have resulted in a contradiction between two intentions, characters, and frameworks of curriculum policymaking. On one hand, the Indonesian government has established an official national standard for higher education curriculum policymaking; on the other hand, the government also encourages Indonesian higher education to adhere to international curriculum standards, such as those set by international accreditation organizations like the Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programs (AQAS) (see aqas.eu). As individuals involved in several curriculum development activities within the university, we have experienced the challenges of negotiating between the national standard of curriculum policymaking and the international standard/framework of curriculum policymaking. Therefore, a study focusing on this topic is important, especially to reveal the complexities of curriculum development in higher education.

However, most of the prior studies on higher education curriculum internationalization in the Indonesian context primarily focus on general strategies and policies of internationalization. Examples include studies on self-governance (Fuadi *et al*., 2021), international collaboration (Tian, 2022). Only a few scholars specifically address curricular issues on higher education internationalization in Indonesia, such as Abduh *et al*. (2018), Assegaf *et al*. (2022), and Nursalam (2020). No studies have focused on the complexities of university's level of curriculum making, especially amid the intention to be recognized as world a class university and to meet the Indonesian national standard of curriculum policy as well. Therefore, a study that focuses on revealing the differences between the Indonesian higher education national curriculum policy and its international counterpart is crucial. In this regard, this paper aims to fill the gap in previous research on this topic by revealing the problems of the Indonesian higher education curriculum, its context of productions, and possible consequences. In the conclusion of this paper, we also give some recommendations and possible future discourse and directions for research and curriculum policymaking.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Curriculum internationalization stands as a prominent trend in higher education internationalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007). A comprehensive definition of curriculum inter-

nationalization has been articulated by Leask (2009, 2015, p. 9), who describes it as the integration of intercultural and/or global dimensions into the content, learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a study program. Despite debates regarding the dominance of nation-states in political decisions and the inclusion of whose knowledge in international curricula, the primary goal of curriculum internationalization is to cultivate global citizenship or graduates with global perspectives (de Wit & Leask, 2015; Leask, 2015). Leask (2014) emphasizes that internationalizing the curriculum should prioritize students' learning experiences beyond mere knowledge acquisition. She advocates for engaging students in internationally informed research, exposing them to cultural and linguistic diversity, and purposefully fostering their international and intercultural perspectives to develop them into global professionals and citizens (see also Johansen & Tkachenko, 2019).

Since the internationalization of the curriculum in higher education has become a prevailing trend worldwide, numerous scholars have conducted studies on this topic, addressing several crucial issues. A primary concern is the Westernization of knowledge, particularly because curriculum internationalization is perceived as a consequence of globalization, where the power dynamics between the global south and global north are unequal. In a globalized world dominated by Western countries in almost every aspect of human life, the Westernization of education is seen as reasonable (Leask, 2015). Consequently, the spirit of decolonialization has emerged, manifested in initiatives like integrating local knowledge into international curricula (Le Grange, 2016; Mheta *et al*., 2018) and recentring the context to which the university belongs (Heleta, 2016). In this context, du Preez (2018) proposes that the internationalization of the curriculum is not inherently opposed to decolonialization.

Other significant issues include job-related considerations, such as students' aspirations for more international experiences in the implementation of international curricula as preparation for their future careers (Cheng *et al*., 2018). Additionally, the presence of neoliberal agendas in higher education curriculum internationalization is noteworthy (Gyamera, 2015; Gyamera & Burke, 2018). Given these considerations, the internationalization of the curriculum in higher education should take into account the international market demand to ensure that students acquire the necessary skills to meet market needs. Consequently, the internationalization of the curriculum shifts the primary purpose of higher education from a commitment to a broader notion of public goods to an overemphasis on employability as the central concern in curriculum development. As a result, international standards for employees and workers become the primary basis for international curriculum development, highlighting the importance of considering international curriculum frameworks (see Burke *et al*., 2015; Gyamera & Burke, 2018; Subkhan, 2016).

Furthermore, autonomous universities are required to design international programs, recruit foreign lecturers, and allocate more budget to support these programs. In doing so, the government plays a vital role in encouraging higher education, especially state higher education, to become more autonomous. Unfortunately, in the Indonesian context of higher education, this ideal government role has resulted in ambiguity due to the centralization of government decision-making and policy on one hand, and the simultaneous encouragement for greater autonomy for state higher education on the other hand. Moreover, to some extent, the movement toward autonomous universities for state higher education in Indonesia has also led to a crucial problem related to the tendency for policy to become a vehicle for the neoliberalization of higher education (Subkhan, 2016, 2022). In this case, the government has produced a centralistic notion of a national curriculum policy as a manual guide for Indonesian higher education to create curricula (Junaidi *et al*., 2020) while concurrently advocating for higher education autonomy (Subkhan, 2022).

METHOD

In order to elucidate the problems within the Indonesian higher education curriculum policy, we employ critical policy analysis in education. This approach has been developed by scholars to scrutinize educational policies by considering the indispensable relationship of text and context, policy and power, and its consequences in practices. Acknowledging that policy is a text and the political, cultural, and societal circumstances constitute the context of policy production and reception, critical policy analysis examines the text by focusing on the issues within it and identifies the context that sha-

ped the text. In this regard, Ratas' (2014) three stages of critical policy methodology serve as a useful guide for the research. These three stages commence with political economy analysis as a means to identify global forces and local responses in policymaking, followed by analysing the policy itself in relation to its context, and ultimately conducting empirical research to examine the implementation of the policy.

However, recontextualizing Ratas's three proposed stages of critical policy analysis is necessary, especially to adapt to the specific context and circumstances of the research and the researcher's position. In contrast to Ratas's methodology, which places text analysis in the second stage, we position text analysis as the initial step of critical policy analysis, followed by context analysis and empirical research, respectively. Based on our experience, commencing with text analysis was beneficial as it allowed us to better identify the context of production and understand how we engage with the text in the process of curriculum making.

During the first two steps of analysis, our focus was on the official guidance of the Indonesian higher education national curriculum policy and its related policies. We meticulously read the texts to uncover problems within them and their potential consequences in practice. Simultaneously, we identified the context of text production, particularly by examining the global forces and local or national considerations in curriculum policymaking. Finally, we conducted empirical research, as proposed by Rata (2014) as the final stage of her critical policy analysis, by reflecting on our involvement experiences in curriculum making at the higher education level. The results of our reflection enhance the critical analysis of the text by relating it to the empirical experiences in which we were involved.

Furthermore, we incorporate critical discourse analysis (CDA) and autoethnography to fortify our critical analysis of the policy and its context. CDA is employed to scrutinize the text and context critically, drawing mainly on the works of Janks (1997), Taylor (1997), van Dijk (1993, 1995), and Bacchi (2000). In general, these scholars provide proposals and guidance on how to conduct a critical analysis of the policy and its context. Additionally, we utilize autoethnography (see Adam *et al*., 2015; Clandinin, 2006) as a guide to conduct empirical research based on our own experiences.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section has been divided into three main sub-sections as a means to make clear for the audience to comprehend our findings and its significance. The first part of this section will address the results of our analysis used critical discourse analysis upon the Indonesian higher education curriculum documents followed by elucidating its context of production and ended by the third part, that is our critical reflection upon our curriculum making experiences. A brief illustration of our findings can be found in table 1.

The following discussion will elucidate the results of our analysis, with a distinct focus on illuminating the findings in each sub-section. In the first stage of the analysis, the emphasis was on revealing both the overt and hidden messages of the policy. Meanwhile, during the second stage of the analysis, there was an intention to elucidate the connection between national and international discourses within the text. Lastly, critical reflection on practices based on our experiences in the making of the study program's curriculum at the final stage of analysis will enrich the previous findings.

A. Text analysis: revealing the overt and hidden messages

In analysing the text, we categorize the findings into seven main themes in accordance with the primary elements of the curriculum development process (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018). The first category is related to the foundation of curriculum development; the second and third categories pertain to purposes and approaches; the fourth to sixth categories are associated with content, method, media, and assessment; and the seventh category focuses on curriculum policy. Further explanations can be found as follows.

First, there are shallow, weak, and unclear curriculum foundations. According to Ornstein and Hunkins (2018), curriculum development should have strong philosophical, historical, psychological, and social foundations. Unfortunately, in the official manual, the philosophical, psychological, and historical foundations of the curriculum policy are not clear. Instead of defining the philosophical foundation of the curriculum policy or proposing philosophical considerations for the campuses and study programs, the manual only states that philosophy is impor-

Table 1 The main findings of the research

	Text analysis	**Findings**
1	The foundations of the curriculum development	• Shallow, weak, and unclear foundations • Strong dependent on Law as the legal protection
2	Aims of the curriculum	• Skilled workers & with strong national identity
3	Education approach	• Outcome-based Education (OBE)
4	Proposed content knowledge, skills, and values	• Four domain of expected learning outcomes • National identity and 21st century skills
5	Proposed learning method, media, and assessment	• Student-centred learning, MBKM policy • Blended & hybrid learning as alternatives
6	Proposed evaluation model and quality assurance system	• Provus' curriculum evaluation model • PPEPP curriculum cycle as the quality assurance system
7	Curriculum making policy	• Inconsistency between educational policies
	Context analysis	
	International context	*National context*
1	Market driven education	1 Maintaining national identity
2	Industrial revolution 4.0	2 Boosting economic growth/development
3	Internationalization of higher education	3 Strong position of Law as the legal protection of educational policies
4	Global education reform (GERM)	4 Lack of scientific work behind the policymaking
		5 The dominant discourse of Bloom's theory
	Critical reflection on practices	
1	Academic humiliation & intervention	
2	Overload curriculum design	
3	Strict control over curriculum	
4	Difficulties in implementing the curriculum	
5	More skills, less knowledge	

tant in the process of curriculum making and becomes the guidance to understand the importance of knowledge in enhancing the quality of life (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 4). Similarly, for the psychological and historical foundation of the curriculum, the manual does not clearly state its underpinned theories.

Furthermore, the manual only proposes that the curriculum should recognize and honor history to facilitate students' learning without illustrating what historical reflections have been made and should be recognized in the process of curriculum making (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 5). However, it seems that the proposed sociological foundation of curriculum development was quite clear, especially by proposing a vision that the curriculum should preserve values and traditions from generation to generation amid the forces of globalization. The manual refers to the work of Caligiuri (2012) to argue that students need to have what she called cultural agility. Unfortunately, in this part, the manual claims that Caligiuri's proposal is in line with Ki Hadjar Dewantara's *Trikon* teaching (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 4–5), but without adequate argumentations.

Second, producing skilled workers with a strong national identity. It is quite clear that the manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking proposes study programs to produce graduates with a strong national identity and high-level skills. In this regard, the strong emphasis on nationalism is evident in the official policy that mandates certain courses in all higher education institutions in Indonesia. Based on Law No. 12 of 2012 on higher education (Article 35), the manual proposes four mandatory courses: religious studies, Pancasila (Indonesia's official state ideology), civic education, and Indonesian language. According to the manual and the law, the purpose of religious studies is to instil in students' faith in God and good manners, while the other courses aim to produce students who love and take pride in being Indonesian citizens and prioritize their loyalty to their nation (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 8; Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, 2012).

Meanwhile, the intention to produce skilled workers can be seen in the official ma-

nual when it references the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (INQF) and the ASEAN Qualification Framework as the primary considerations for arranging the curriculum levels in the curriculum-making process (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 2–3 & 9). Given that INQF depicts the qualification level of the workers, this means that the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking encourages study programs to produce highly skilled workers that match the workers' level of competencies. In doing so, by referring to INQF, the learning outcomes should contain attitudes and values, working skills, knowledge acquisition, and work authority and responsibility (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 2–3; Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2013).

Third, Outcome-based Education (OBE) is employed as the main approach along with a competency-based curriculum to develop, implement, and evaluate the curriculum in the official manual (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 21). The central idea of OBE is that all processes of curriculum making and its implementation should be based on the desired learning outcomes. To ensure that the learning processes stay on the right track to achieve standardized learning outcomes, assessments and remedial services are deemed crucial (see more in Spady, 1994). Additionally, OBE encourages the description of students' learning outcomes as specific, observable, demonstrable, measurable, achievable, and time-bound, especially in formulating Courses Learning Outcomes (CLO) and Lesson Learning Outcomes (LLO) (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 39–40). Theoretically, the incorporation of OBE into the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policy strengthens the current basis of the curriculum document, namely the competency-based curriculum (see for example Direktorat Jenderal Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, 2018).

Fourth, accommodating 21st-century skills in the curriculum is considered in the official manual, recognizing the importance of preparing higher education graduates for 21st-century challenges and the disruptive impact of the fourth industrial revolution on civilization. The manual encourages universities to produce graduates with new literacies, including data literacy, technology literacy, human literacy, as well as critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and computational logic (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 2 & 7). To address these desired competencies, the official manual refers to the Ministry of Education Regulation No. 3 of 2020 on the national standard of higher education, formulating four domains of student learning outcomes: attitude, knowledge, general skills, and specific skills.

Top-down and definitive items have been formulated by the government for the attitude and general skills domain, leaving the other two domains for the authority of study programs to define. In this context, the attitude domain focuses on equipping students with a sense of nationalism, religious belief, and good behavior, while 21st-century skills should be integrated into the general skills domain. For instance, one item in the general skills domain states that graduates should "*be able to implement logical, critical, systematic, and innovative thinking in developing or implementing science and technology, considering and employing humanities values according to the specific field of expertise*" (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 32). Additionally, to ensure that these learning outcomes are delivered and learned by students properly, the official manual proposes using the scientific work of Gagne, Bloom, Anderson, Krathwohl, Masia, and Dave as the main reference to create lesson plans (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 37).

Fifth, proposing student-centered learning and the MBKM policy. To achieve the desired learning outcomes based on the outcome-based education approach, the official manual recommends employing student-centered learning, blended learning, authentic assessment, and incorporating the MBKM policy. In a specific chapter, the manual explains and proposes certain basic principles of student-centered learning—how to encourage students to actively construct their own knowledge through meaningful experiences, design appropriate learning environments, and best support students' preferences for learning (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 63–64). Furthermore, the manual advocates for blended learning, grounded in personalized learning theory and the integration of the internet into education. It provides explanations of various blended learning models and their potential implementations (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 67–69).

Furthermore, the official manual also incorporated the MBKM policy, which provided students with the opportunity to study outside of their study program for three semesters, including off-campus activities. In this case, MBKM stood for Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Mer-

deka (MBKM), which might be best translated into English as autonomous learning-autonomous campus (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 19). The MBKM policy offered students the chance to spend three semesters off-campus, aiming to enhance their capacity to become skilled workers. During students' off-campus studies, they engaged in preferred programs such as student exchange, internships, teaching assistantships, research, humanitarian projects, entrepreneurship, independent study, and community services/real-work study (KKN program) (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 73–76; Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2020a).

Given that assessment was one of the most crucial parts of the outcome-based curriculum, the official manual proposed several assessment principles and explained how to create rubrics. Unfortunately, when the manual explained either the three types of rubrics (holistic, analytic, and perception scale rubrics) or about portfolio assessment and assessment procedures, no clear reference could be found (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 50–57). Likewise, the weakness in scientific reference also appeared when the official manual formulated a new term instead of using more familiar academic terms. In this case, the official manual used the term "*bentuk pembelajaran*" to define and classify lectures, tutorials, seminars, practicums, internships, student exchanges, and etc (Junaidi et al., 2020, pp. 45–46). "*Bentuk pembelajaran*" or form of learning is something rarely used in the academic discourse of education.

Sixth, proposing an evaluation model and quality assurance system. In order to continuously improve the quality of the curriculum the official manual introduced a curriculum cycle as the basis for curriculum improvement. The proposed curriculum cycle is called PPEPP which stands for (1) *penetapan kurikulum* (defining the curriculum), (2) *pelaksanaan kurikulum* (curriculum implementation), (3) *evaluasi kurikulum* (curriculum evaluation), (4) *pengendalian kurikulum* (curriculum control), and (5) *peningkatan kurikulum* (curriculum improvement). Unfortunately, there was no clear scientific reference for PPEPP. The official manual also encouraged the study programs to evaluate and define their curriculum at least once every four or five years. Moreover, every semester study programs should also evaluate the quality of the curriculum by identifying student learning outcomes achievement and the appropriateness of learning materials, methods, media, and assessment. More specifically, the official manual proposed the Discrepancy Evaluation Model developed by Malcolm Provus (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, p. 83).

Seventh, inconsistency in policies. A well-designed curriculum policymaking process should provide a clear curriculum policy as a manual guide on how to conduct the curriculum. However, inconsistency in policy appears in the official manual. On the one hand, the curriculum policy offers several preferences for study programs to choose the most appropriate learning approaches and methods, such as using the ADDIE and Dick & Carey models of instructional design (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 33–34). On the other hand, the official manual requires them to employ student-centered learning (SCL), blended learning, and Provus' model of curriculum evaluation. This means that the former policy gives lecturers autonomy to choose the most appropriate learning approaches and methods, while the latter constrains lecturers by defining certain preferred approaches and methods. Additionally, the enactment of the Minister of Education and Culture Decree No. 3 of 2021 on key performance indicators for state-owned universities (well-known as IKU PTN) strengthens this deep and unnecessary intervention of the government by pushing lecturers to use case method and project-based learning practices (Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, 2021).

B. Context analysis: connecting the discourse and text

In this section, we focus on two different contexts of text production to reveal the influential factors' connection with the text. Referring to the work of Priestley *et al*. (2015), supra, and macro layers of curriculum making are indispensable factors that influence and guide the process of curriculum policy making in a certain direction. In this regard, we use the national and international contexts to depict the most influential factors in curriculum policy making.

1. National context

At the national context, we are examining the dominant educational discourse and historical trajectories that influence text production.

First, maintaining national identity is a key aspect of the official manual for curriculum development. The framework strongly suggests

that Indonesian national curriculum policymaking should serve the national interests. The manual begins by acknowledging that Indonesia is confronting globalization forces, particularly from Western countries that advocate for pragmatism and materialism in response to economic demands. It emphasizes that without appropriate measures to address these challenges, the national spirit, social justice, and humanity that benefit Indonesians may erode. Therefore, the manual encourages readers to revisit the valuable teachings of Ki Hadjar Dewantara, a renowned Indonesian education thinker. It underscores the importance of Ki Hadjar's teachings of Trikon, namely *kontinyu, konvergen*, and *konsentris*, and summarizes them into one basic understanding of combining foreign and domestic ideas. The manual stresses the significance of preserving local values in the midst of globalization (Junaidi et al., 2020, pp. 1–3).

As a nation with a long history of struggle for freedom from colonialism, Indonesia places strong emphasis on instilling nationalism in the young generation. Additionally, in the early years of Indonesian independence, the government prioritized nationalism as the main purpose of education, even at the expense of economic development (Subkhan, 2018). Presently, through the enactment of Law No. 12 of 2012 on higher education, the Indonesian government upholds this conservative notion by mandating universities to offer four compulsory courses: religious studies, Pancasila (Indonesia's official state ideology), civic education, and the Indonesian language. Given Indonesia's diverse composition of ethnicities, races, religious beliefs, regions, cultures, and political preferences, along with social stratification based on economic status, instilling nationalism through the national education system is considered the most suitable and politically correct approach. Accommodating national interests, in this context, is viewed as a means to preserve Indonesia's diversity and prevent conflict and chaos, as undertaken by previous administrations (Latif, 2011, 2020; Soedijarto, 2009).

Second, stimulating economic growth. Since the New Order era under the administration of President Suharto, the economic sector has been perceived as the most crucial factor in promoting economic growth, modernization, and industrialization. Embracing the mantra of developmentalism, education has been directed toward producing professional graduates who can contribute to national development programs. To realize this economic vision, Wardiman Djoyonegoro, the Minister of Education and Culture at the time, officially promoted the "link-and-match" paradigm as the basis for the development and implementation of the national education system (Khurniawan & Haryani, 2015). Despite ongoing debates and the evolution of "link-and-match," economic mainstreaming is evident in almost every education policy enacted by the Indonesian Ministry of Education. Curriculum policy and vocational schools have received the most attention from the government (Subkhan, forthcoming). Higher education is no exception, especially when the official manual of MBKM mentions "link-and-match" as the fundamental paradigm for the relationship between higher education and market demand (Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, 2020, p. 2). This implies that the government encourages Indonesian higher education to produce highly skilled workers to boost economic growth and reduce unemployment, necessitating well-developed curricula to align with this direction.

Third, a strong legal foundation for educational policies. Historically, the Indonesian government has consistently upheld its national education system through the formulation and enactment of laws, providing legal protection for educational policies. Recognizing that law holds legitimate and political power to ensure curriculum implementation and achievement, the government has, since the early stages of the Indonesian curriculum reform, produced legal products as a means of legal protection for curriculum policies (Hidayat *et al.*, 2017; Junaidi *et al.*, 2020, p. 5). Furthermore, since the official manual includes law as one of the main foundations of curriculum development, several legal products serve as the principal references of the manual. These include the National Constitution of 1945, Law No. 12 of 2012 on higher education, the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 3 of 2020 on the national standard of higher education, and Presidential Instruction No. 8 of 2012 on the Indonesian national qualification framework (Junaidi *et al.*, 2020, pp. 5–6).

As a result, many academic terms used in the official manual, such as curriculum, graduate learning outcomes, and form of learning, refer to the Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 3 of 2020 on the national standard of higher education (see Junaidi *et al.*, 2020, pp. 8–11). Similarly, several terms related to learning processes and assessment, such as interactive, active, holistic, integrative, scientific,

contextual, thematic, effective, collaborative, student-centered learning, authentic, objective, accountable, and transparency, also refer to the same regulation (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 47–49). Rather than using more familiar academic terms such as learning approach, method, or model, the manual refers to the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 3 of 2020 on the national standard of higher education that uses the term "bentuk pembelajaran" to define and classify lectures, tutorials, seminars, practicums, internships, student exchanges, etc. (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 45–46). "Bentuk pembelajaran" or form of learning is something rarely used in the academic discourse of education. This finding leads us to another observation that the manual seemingly attempts to define its own concepts related to specific terms in education or curriculum making.

Fourth, the lack of scientific work behind policymaking. The poor quality of policies, which often leads to public debates and controversies, has been accused of not meeting the good standards of policymaking. In the Indonesian context of policy enactment, several previous educational policies can be mentioned as igniting controversies, such as the privatization of public education through the enactment of Law Number 9 of 2009 on education legal entities and the national examination. Both policies have been abolished by the authorities, mainly because of their inconsistency with the spirit of the Indonesian constitution and the five pillars of Pancasila, leading to detrimental effects on education. This case has led to many criticisms toward the policymaking process, especially regarding the lack of scientific work behind the policymaking process (*Analysis: Indonesian Policymaking*, 2019; Blomkamp *et al*., 2017). Unfortunately, the weak foundation of the curriculum and the inclusion of numerous terms referencing non-academic sources are evident in the manual for Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking. The robust role of the law in the policymaking process, serving as the legal safeguard for educational policies, raises concerns about the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking process.

Fifth, the dominant discourse of Bloom's theory. According to our experiences as lecturers in the field of education, Bloom's theory of learning domains has gained popularity for decades. Widely accepted by scholars, including in Indonesia's higher education, Bloom's theory classifies three learning domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. In certain study programs where the authors belong, Bloom's theory became the main theoretical basis for syllabus and lesson plan development. The main idea of Bloom's theory is that learning could and should be divided into several domains as a means to easily classify and define "learning outcomes." This idea was based on and in line with the modernist, positivist, linear, and objective notions of curriculum development, as proposed by Tyler and his colleagues. In this regard, the proposed four domains of learning outcomes from the government for Indonesian higher education curriculum making resemble Bloom's three learning domains. Both classifications contain "knowledge" as one of the mandatory domains. Moreover, the terms "affective" and "psychomotor" from Bloom's theory have been replaced by the terms "attitude" and "skills" in the official manual of Indonesian higher education curriculum policy and its supported regulations.

2. International context

The international context of Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking can be traced through the dominant discourse of global education as follows.

First, market-driven education is a global phenomenon that prioritizes the global market or economic interests as the main consideration in developing and maintaining education. This means that the global market influences education and utilizes it as a tool to boost economic growth. As a result, the curriculum structure, its content, and other educational processes and services should be designed to produce high-skilled workers to meet market demand. The basic principles of market-driven education align with neoliberal agendas, and in the higher education context, they seem to have resulted in many problems (see for more deep comprehensive discussion in Connell, 2013; *Market-Driven Education*, 2012; Rakhmani, 2019; Sakhiyya, 2018; Tomlinson, 2015; Veldman, 2018). In this regard, market-driven education encourages education policies that close the gap between education and the economic sector, including higher education policy. The MBKM policy within the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking overtly shows the intervention of market-driven education (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2020a).

Second, the narrative of the Fourth In-

dustrial Revolution (4.0). The massive advancement of digital technology and its integration into education has brought the grand narrative of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4.0) as well as Society 5.0 to the forefront of government concerns, including for the higher education sector. The Fourth Industrial Revolution (4.0) is perceived as the latest advancement in industrialization based on digital technology, holding enormous promises and potentials to enhance the quality of higher education, mainly by digitalizing learning practices and their supporting systems (Lim, 2019).

Specific terms such as the Internet of Things (IoT), digital literacy, human literacy, digital ethics, blended learning, and hybrid learning have been officially introduced and widely used through government policies. In this case, the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking has already employed these terms and referred to the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4.0) and its associated issues, such as the disruptive era, knowledge society, and 21st-century skills (Junaidi *et al.*, 2020). This means that the official Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking recognizes the important role of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4.0) for the sake of Indonesia's national building and development in the future.

Third, the internationalization of higher education. Internationalization of education is one among several trends in higher education, including in Indonesia, as the government encourages all universities to enhance their ranking at the international or world-class university levels. To be recognized as a world-class university, the "international standard" of higher education is crucial, exemplified by international certificates and accreditation. The official manual for the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking addresses international accreditation and its epistemological basis in the form of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) (Junaidi *et al.*, 2020).

Moreover, achieving world-class university status is deemed important for higher education due to its prestigious position and potential for additional benefits. In many countries, including Indonesia, a university's world-class rank is one of the considerations for prospective students when choosing where to continue their education. Likewise, corporations and high-quality, world-class universities view a university's world rank as a key factor in deciding whether to initiate collaborative projects or not (Lane, 2015). Despite the potential disadvantages of the internationalization of education in higher education, the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking supports the internationalization of Indonesian higher education (Junaidi *et al.*, 2020, pp. 13–14).

Fourth, the global education reform movement. According to the main message of the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policy, it seems that the global education reform movement influenced the "hidden" idea behind the policy. The global education reform, or as Sahlberg calls it, GERM (Sahlberg, 2016), features education policies that emphasize standardization, a narrow curriculum focusing on core subjects/knowledge, high-stakes accountability, and the implementation of corporate management practices. Fuller and Stevenson (2019) refer to it as a turn toward a new orthodoxy in education policy.

Related to the previous discussion about the ideology behind the policy, GERM is underpinned by the neoliberal vision that encourages the privatization of public education by withdrawing government subsidies for public education and placing public education into the free market. Other scholars use terms such as New Managerialism, corporatization of education, and privatization of education instead of GERM (Fallon & Poole, 2014; Lynch *et al.*, 2012). In this case, the presence of the MBKM policy and Outcome-Based Education (OBE) in the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking, as policies that address the curriculum to provide students with more practical experiences that are closely aligned with market demand, shows the influence of GERM.

C. Critical reflection on practices

In this section, we present our critical reflections on our experiences regarding the process of curriculum making in our universities and the study programs we have been involved in. The discussions presented are based on the emerging themes we identified during our process of analysis. In each theme, we discuss the problems and add our critical reflections to enrich and strengthen the analysis.

Building on the earlier findings about the textual and contextual issues surrounding Indonesian national higher education curriculum policymaking, there are at least five major prob-

lems related to the government-led implementation of the national higher education curriculum policymaking guidance: (1) academic humiliation and intervention, (2) overload curriculum design, (3) strict control over the curriculum, (4) difficulties in implementing the curriculum, and (5) more skills, less knowledge. A more detailed discussion follows.

1. Academic humiliation and intervention

The top-down curriculum policymaking has reduced the lecturer's authority, resulting in the degradation of the academic climate within the university. Since the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum-making policy refers to and incorporates several legal products, primarily the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 3 of 2020 on the national standard of higher education, MBKM policy, and key performance indicators for state-owned university (IKU PTN), it seems that the main focus of the top management of the university, faculty, and study program is solely on how to meet the standards required by these policies.

In our experience, there has been no discussion about the possibility of rejecting the policy, seeking alternatives, or creating more scientifically and professionally accepted policies regarding the problems faced with higher education curriculum policymaking. Lecturers occasionally express their disappointments and critiques about the policy, but it seems that they have never been officially listened to or accommodated by the top management of our university, faculty, and study program.

As an example, to meet and increase the key performance indicators for state-owned universities, the top management of the university, supported by the quality assurance body of the university, pushed all the lecturers to create lesson plans by integrating "case study" and "project-based" learning as the main approaches for all courses. In this regard, IKU PTN or the key performance indicators encourage the university to employ these learning approaches. While there is no official obligation from the government that all courses should use these approaches, the top management of the university partially pushed this policy as a means to increase the IKU PTN score. The higher the key performance indicators of the university, the more rewards will be received from the government since IKU PTN has been established as a competitive system among state-owned universities to receive more financial support. Moreover, the government's encouragement for us to employ OBE, student-centered learning, Provus' curriculum evaluation model, and the PPEPP curriculum cycle through the enactment of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking shows an act of academic humiliation and intervention.

Instead of encouraging our university to become the center of excellence by broadening our academic freedom, the government, through this policy, led the university—mainly our home base—to become more concerned with something superficial in the form of meeting the key performance indicators (IKU PTN) and fulfilling all policy requirements. In our critical reflection, this policy will never be the most appropriate vehicle to boost the academic quality of our university.

2. Overload curriculum design

Since the government has many interests, especially in producing highly skilled workers to cope with the challenges of the industrial revolution 4.0 narratives and in fostering good members of society with a strong sense of nationalism, the current curriculum policymaking enacted by the government has led the study programs to develop a curriculum with excessive content. In accordance with the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 3 of 2020 on the national standard of higher education, as one of the main references of the official manual, Article 17 clearly states that undergraduate study programs should consist of at least 144 credits.

Hence, lecturers are burdened with overloaded tasks in the form of creating many lesson plans, learning materials, and assessment instruments, not to mention their pedagogical tasks (e.g., supporting students, giving feedback, grading). The long teaching hours of the lecturers potentially lead to detrimental effects not only on lecturers' pedagogical competence but also on their other responsibilities, such as in research and community service programs. The author of this article has mostly experienced these overloaded tasks and their impact on our other professional responsibilities.

In our experience, to meet the international accreditation standard as encouraged by the government, including through the official

manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking, particularly with AQAS as one of the leading international accreditation agencies from Europe, the overloaded curriculum design in our curriculum structure is always questioned by assessors. This is especially true concerning the overload of tasks to be done by students, which should be assessed by lecturers. For instance, considering the definitive student expected learning outcomes in the form of attitude, knowledge, general skills, and specific skills, the assessors wonder how we could professionally measure all these outcomes.

In this regard, too many items and criteria should be observed and measured, ranging from students' behavior, their knowledge acquisition, to their competencies. Meanwhile, OBE—as the main reference of AQAS—proposes more concise, simple, and measurable forms of expected learning outcomes (ELO). In response to AQAS requirements, we created new ELO to meet the AQAS standard, which is different and avoids government official regulation. In other words, we have two versions of curriculum documents: one document to meet government policy and the other document to meet AQAS requirements.

Furthermore, the overloaded curriculum also puts students at a significant disadvantage, especially as they are compelled to cover a vast number of courses. This translates to long study hours, and many tasks that should be completed within a time-bound schedule, as promoted by the OBE. Generally, the more courses and tasks students have, the higher the possibility of academic challenges and failures. In Indonesia, for undergraduate study programs, the requirement of 144 credits is typically divided into numerous courses or subjects. Each semester usually encompasses at least 20 to 24 credits, implying that each student will study a minimum of 10 to 12 courses per semester.

In this context, an important question from the AQAS assessor regarding the overloaded curriculum structure in our undergraduate study program was also related to the alignment of content across courses. In response to this issue, we encountered difficulty in structuring the courses for each semester, resulting in occasional instances where courses were not well aligned with others in terms of their sequence.

3. Strict control over curriculum

According to the official manual, it appears that the government seeks to ensure that curriculum development and implementation in higher education align with the main directions of national higher education policy, particularly in producing high-skilled workers and responsible members of society. This conservative approach aligns with the culture of positivism and learning theory, notably Bloom's theory, resulting in stricter curriculum control. The regulation is stringent, defining ten official attitude points and various points of general skills by referencing the Ministry of Education and Culture's regulation on the national standard of higher education (Junaidi *et al.*, 2020, p. 23; Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2020b).

Moreover, the national standard of higher education regulation formulates similar general skills points for different types of tertiary education programs (academic, vocational, and professional), but the points vary based on the education levels (diploma, undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral programs). As the regulation officially formulates and enacts the points and their descriptions, there is no room for different interpretation and recontextualization. Fortunately, the regulation allows study programs a limited opportunity to autonomously formulate student expected learning outcomes (ELO), specifically the points of knowledge and specific skills, considering the unique features and desired professional skills of the study program (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2020b).

Furthermore, the notion of standardization of outcomes in OBE also tightens control because, in order to meet the expected learning outcomes, lecturers should strictly control learning processes and their assessment (Junaidi *et al.*, 2020; Spady, 1994).

According to our experience in developing our study program's curriculum document and its subsequent documents, especially lesson plans and assessment instruments, in the process of formulating expected learning outcomes, especially in the attitude and general skills domains, we are required to translate them into course learning outcomes for every course. This means that each course is responsible for supporting students' attitude and general skills. Hence, lecturers have an additional task to not only teach students specific content knowledge and assess their achievement but also indirectly teach and assess students' attitude and general skills. Officially, in each lesson plan document, there are written course learning outcomes (CLO) and their division in the form of lesson

learning outcomes (LLO) for each phase or stage of learning. Each LLO should be supported by specific content knowledge and be assessed by certain appropriate assessment techniques.

As the official manual of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking incorporates OBE, even though it does not follow its original version as proposed by AQAS, the basic principles of OBE still become the main framework of curriculum making in study programs. In this regard, OBE requires lecturers to design and implement appropriate assessment strategies to ensure that students stay on track to achieve the desired course learning outcomes and lesson learning outcomes. Given that assessment is important, in one of our (the authors) universities, the quality assurance body determined six types of assessments following OBE and key performance indicators policy for state-owned universities (IKU PTN) requirements.

In our experiences, the mandatory requirements in terms of assessment leave lecturers with only a few spaces to choose the most appropriate approaches and methods according to our professional judgment. Likewise, other requirements such as student-centered learning, certain assessment techniques, and MBKM policy also tend to restrict our academic autonomy and professional judgment to stay updated and follow other theories in learning and assessment.

Additionally, at one of our universities, the official encouragement of using blended learning led to misinterpretation in practice due to a lack of theoretical understanding about it. One of the university's policies only required lecturers to conduct synchronous meetings four times a semester. The mindset of policymakers at the university's top management level seemed to be dominated by traditional and conventional modes of learning, indicating a belief that face-to-face teaching practices were superior to online learning practices.

Other lecturers might have different perceptions about the policy. They might argue, for example, that it was not strict control of the policy over the curriculum, but rather provided guidance for the lecturers to support and simplify the curriculum-making process. However, in our reflection, the disadvantages of the policy outweigh its advantages, especially in terms of undermining our academic autonomy and professional judgment as lecturers.

4. Difficulties in implementing the curriculum

As the official manual also provides study programs and lecturers with several examples of lesson plan templates, all lecturers were obliged to create lesson plans in accordance with the "official" templates provided (Junaidi *et al*., 2020, pp. 100–140). In this case, we were encouraged to follow our university's official lesson plan template by filling out the form. Several pieces of information were required, including the name of the course, number of course credits, expected learning outcomes (ELO), course learning outcomes (CLO), lesson learning outcomes (LLO), course description, references, learning materials, forms of learning, study time allocation, assessment techniques and their indicators, load percentage of each LLO, and assessment policy.

In some cases, it was difficult to translate the CLO into LLO, especially in the attitude and general skills domain, because LLO focused on specific content knowledge and skills. Hence, if we use a positivist view of the lesson plan, it causes a contradiction and inconsistency. The official manual encouraged lecturers to teach attitude and general skills, and it should be officially written in the lesson plan, but in practice, both skills in ELO and CLO are hardly written because of their potential complexities in sentence structure when filling out the lesson plan form. Complexities in the description of ELO and CLO will confuse lecturers and students, making it difficult to implement in class.

Furthermore, challenges emerged in the implementation of the written curriculum due to various factors. In our experiences, it does not seem practical to strictly adhere to teaching all the ELO, CLO, and LLO in the class. For example, it was challenging for us to simultaneously instruct and observe students' attitudes and acquire specific content knowledge at the same time. Additionally, the stringent blended learning regulations do not align with the basic principles of contextual learning, such as differentiated or personalized learning theories (Holmes & Gardner, 2006; van Geel *et al*., 2019; Walkington & Bernacki, 2020).

Beyond the existing curriculum policy, there is a need for a policy that acknowledges our academic autonomy and professional judgment, providing space for us to stay updated with advancements in our field of expertise. To

address this issue, most lecturers—based on our conversations with others and our own experiences—perceive the written curriculum mainly as an official document created to meet the requirements of the quality assurance system. In most cases, lecturers do not strictly adhere to the written curriculum; instead, they implement different approaches, methods, and principles according to their professional judgment.

5. More skills, less knowledge

Since the official manual incorporated Outcome-Based Education (OBE) as the basis for the curriculum-making process, aligning with the idea of a competence-based curriculum and market-driven education, the curriculum's structural emphasis will be on skills over knowledge. As discussed by various scholars, this phenomenon has resulted in several problems, particularly concerning students' knowledge acquisition. In our experience teaching educational study program students, we are concerned about their preference for emphasizing skills—such as pedagogical skills, learning media creation, and assessment techniques—at the expense of mastering foundational issues in education, such as the philosophy of education, learning theories, sociology of education, and education policy. Fortunately, we have retained several knowledge-based courses in our curriculum, such as philosophy of education, educational studies, and contemporary educational paradigms. This indicates that, in practice, we do not strictly adhere to the basic principles of OBE, a competence-based curriculum, and market-driven education.

However, given that the official narrative of curriculum policymaking is Outcome-Based Education (OBE), it becomes challenging to cultivate a greater interest in knowledge over skills among our students. Based on our teaching experiences, the majority of our students show a higher interest in practicing learning methods and producing learning media than engaging in discussions about the essence of learning methods, their underlying paradigms and philosophies, sociological considerations, as well as their overt and hidden political and ideological aspects.

Furthermore, in our conversations and interactions with student union representatives, they acknowledge that, since the implementation of the Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) policy, attracting more students to join student unions has become challenging. The financial incentives provided in various MBKM programs are more enticing than mere participation in student unions. This implies that students are inclined to prioritize something immediately beneficial to them, especially concerning their future careers upon graduation. Consequently, this trend may result in graduates who are skilled but lack a strong vision and academic standing as educators.

Moreover, the Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) policy, as an integral component of Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking, also places our students at a disadvantage. On one hand, the university permits students to participate in various available MBKM programs starting from the sixth semester. On the other hand, the curriculum structure of the study program still includes several crucial courses, particularly those aimed at equipping students with research skills. Consequently, we often encounter students who wish to fulfill their academic requirements by undertaking research as the final component for earning their bachelor's degree. Unfortunately, their understanding and proficiency in research fall below the required standard.

This predicament arises because, since the sixth semester, some students opt to engage in off-campus MBKM programs to gain more practical and contextual learning experiences, such as internship programs, humanitarian projects, and independent studies. Consequently, they choose not to enroll in several courses related to research skills. In essence, the MBKM policy prioritizes skills over knowledge. Unfortunately, there is a lack of available studies on this issue and its potential impact on students' competence.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, it is clear that global forces and national interests have influenced Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking, resulting in several disadvantages for both lecturers and students. The national and international considerations behind the formulation of the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking illustrate the government's fundamental understanding that the curriculum is a powerful tool to shape the future of the nation. Furthermore, the na-

tional curriculum policymaking exhibits a conservative and reproductive notion toward the national interests of the nation (see for example Apple, 2004).

Amid the debates between proponents of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and the several failure stories of its implementation (see for example *Australia's Troubles with Outcome-Based Education*, 2020; Donnelly, 2017; Nakkeeran *et al*., 2018; Wheelahan, 2007), the Indonesian government seems to believe that OBE is the right answer to face the challenges of the 21st century and to boost the economic sector. This is evident in the Indonesian higher education curriculum policymaking underpinned by the OBE framework. Additionally, Global Education Reform Movement (GERM) and neoliberal agendas such as New Managerialism appear to have become integral parts of the curriculum policymaking for higher education in Indonesia.

Despite the critiques mentioned previously about Outcome-Based Education (OBE), the spirit of "simplicity" in formulating students' learning outcomes can be embraced with several improvisations to decrease the number of expected learning outcomes (ELO) and course learning outcomes (CLO), making them more concise. Drawing inspiration from our experience with the AQAS accreditation process in one of our study programs, reducing the total number of credits for our undergraduate study program and consolidating courses becomes necessary.

Guided by a robust theoretical basis in curriculum policy that emphasizes the importance of contextualization and balances personal interests with the social context, skills with knowledge, and international with national interests, lecturers will have more space to create meaningful learning opportunities for their students. Lecturers with fewer administrative tasks in curriculum making and reduced teaching hours can focus more on enhancing their performance in research, community services, and publications. Therefore, we recommend that the national higher education curriculum policymaking be well-formulated based on scientific works to avoid theoretical ambiguity and weaknesses. Additionally, other educational policies that undermine lecturers' integrity and professionalism should be revised.

Moreover, in line with the recontextualization of Rata's (2014) proposal of critical policy methodology in this research, we methodologically reorganized the phases of analysis and the writing process. Drawing from our experiences in conducting this research project, we advocate for a more measured approach and stages of critical policy analysis. By recontextualizing Rata's critical policy analysis approach and integrating critical discourse analysis with autoethnography, we present a refined set of stages for critical policy analysis in education as follows.

Firstly, placing textual analysis as the initial stage of analysis proves beneficial. As lecturers, we are well-acquainted with the text, and analyzing it provides deeper insights into the messages and their potential linkages with the contexts. Contextual analysis then logically succeeds textual analysis. *Secondly*, critical discourse analysis is employed in both textual and contextual analyses, as it sheds light on the relationship between the text and context. Textual analysis directly identifies the potential context of text production. *Thirdly*, autoethnography or personal narrative proves valuable in enhancing our critical reflections on the curriculum-making practices at the study programs. Throughout this research, we discovered that our experiences as lecturers involved in the curriculum-making process at the study programs supported our analysis at both textual and empirical research levels in Rata's terms. Given that the policy under analysis pertains to higher education curriculum, autoethnography aids in substantiating the data and information about the policy's enactment.

FUNDING

This article is the research outcome funded by the research grant from the Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang (DIPA No. 023.17.2.677507/2021, Nov 23, 2020).

REFERENCES

Abduh, A., Rosmaladewi, R., & Basri, M. (2018). Internationalization awareness and commitment of indonesian higher education. *New Educational Review, 51*(1), 162–172. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2018.51.1.13

Adam, T. E., Jones, S. H., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding Qualitative Research*. Oxford University Press.

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3–4), 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542

Analysis: Indonesian policymaking is not supported by

quality research and academic freedom. (2019, November 7). The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/analysis-indonesian-policymaking-is-not-supported-by-quality-research-and-academic-freedom-126023

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and Curriculum* (3rd ed.). RoutledgeFalmer.

Assegaf, A. R., Zainiyah, H. S., & Fahmi, M. (2022). Curriculum Innovation for the Internationalization of Islamic Education Study Program at Higher Education Institutions in Surabaya, Indonesia. *Millah: Journal of Religious Studies, 21*(3), 671–706. https://doi.org/10.20885/MILLAH.VOL21.ISS3.ART3

Australia's troubles with outcome-based education should concern everyone, mothers say. (2020, January 24). MooseJawToday.Com. https://www.moosejawtoday.com/local-news/australias-troubles-with-outcome-based-education-should-concern-everyone-mothers-say-2043345

Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse, 21*(1), 45–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300050005493

Blomkamp, E., Sholikin, M. N., Nursyamsi, F., Lewis, J. M., & Toumbourou, T. (2017). *Understanding Policymaking in Indonesia: in search of a policy cycle.*

Burke, J. P., Stevenson, J., & Whelan, P. (2015). Teaching "Excellence" and pedagogic stratification in higher education. *International Studies in Widening Participation, 2*(2), 29–43. http://shura.shu.ac.uk/11087/

Caliguri, P. (2012). *Cultural Agility: Building a Pipeline of Successful Global Profesionals.* Jossey-Bass.

Cheng, M., Adekola, O. A., Shah, M., & Valyrakis, M. (2018). Exploring Chinese students' experience of curriculum internationalisation: a comparative study of Scotland and Australia. *Studies in Higher Education, 43*(4), 754–768. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1198894

Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative Inquiry: A Methodology for Studying Lived Experience. *Research Studies in Music Education, 27*, 44–54.

Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education, 54*(2), 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2013.776990

Dana Abadi Rp 7 Triliun untuk PTN Badan Hukum dari Pemerintah, Buat Apa? (2022, June 27). Detik.Com. https://www.detik.com/edu/perguruan-tinggi/d-6149001/dana-abadi-rp-7-triliun-untuk-ptn-badan-hukum-dari-pemerintah-buat-apa

de Wit, H. (2017). Global: Internationalization of Higher Education: Nine Misconceptions. *Understanding Higher Education Internationalization,* 9–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-161-2_2

de Wit, H., & Leask, B. (2015). Internationalization, the Curriculum and the Disciplines. *International Higher Education, 83*(Special), 10–12. https://doi.org/10.6017/IHE.2015.83.9079

Direktorat Jenderal Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan. (2018). *Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi di Era Industri 4.0* (1st ed.). Direktorat Jenderal Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi, Kementerian Riset, Teknologi dan Pendidikan Tinggi.

Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. (2020). *Buku Panduan Merdeka Belajar - Kampus Merdeka* (1st ed.). Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. (2021). *Buku Panduan Indikator Kinerja Utama Perguruan Tinggi Negeri.* Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Donnelly, K. (2017). Australia's adoption of outcomes based education: A critique. *Issues in Educational Research, 17*(1). http://www.iier.org.au/iier17/donnelly.html

du Preez, P. (2018). On decolonisation and internationalisation of university curricula: What can we learn from Rosi Braidotti? *Journal of Education,* 74. https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/I74A02

Fallon, G., & Poole, W. (2014). The emergence of a market-driven funding mechanism in K-12 education in British Columbia: creeping privatization and the eclipse of equity. *The Journal of Education Policy, 29*(3), 302–322. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2013.820354

Fuadi, D., Harsono, H., Syah, M. F. J., Susilo, A., Suhaili, S., & Wahyono, B. (2021). Self-Governance: Internationalization Management of Distinctive Higher Education Towards The World Class University. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education (IJOLAE), 3*(2), 96–113. https://doi.org/10.23917/IJOLAE.V3I2.11754

Fuller, K., & Stevenson, H. (2019). Global education reform: understanding the movement. *Educational Review, 71*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1532718

Gyamera, G. O. (2015). The internationalisation agenda: a critical examination of internationalisation strategies in public universities in Ghana. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 25*(2), 112–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2015.1034290

Gyamera, G. O., & Burke, P. J. (2018). Neoliberalism and curriculum in higher education: a post-colonial analyses. *Teaching in Higher Education, 23*(4), 450–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1414782

Heleta, S. (2016). Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/THE.V1I1.9

Helms, R. M., & Rumbley, L. G. (2017). Global: National Policies for Internationalization—do they work? *Understanding Higher Education Internationalization*, 131–134. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-161-2_28

Hidayat, R., Siswanto, A., & Bangun, B. N. (Eds.). (2017). *Dinamika Perkembangan Kurikulum di Indonesia: Rentjana Pembelajaran 1947 hingga Kurikulum 2013*. Labsos UNJ.

Holmes, B., & Gardner, J. (2006). *E-Learning: Concepts and Practice*. SAGE Publications.

Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse, 18*(3), 329–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180302

Johansen, J. S., & Tkachenko, E. (2019). Exploring the dynamics of cultures of learning in internationalised higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 24*(5), 633–648. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1619546

Junaidi, A., Wulandari, D., Arifin, S., Soetanto, H., Kusumawardani, S. S., Wastutiningsih, S. P., Utama, M. S., Cahyono, E., Hertono, G. F., Syam, N. M., WY, H. J., Putra, P. H., Wijayanti, C., & Jobih. (2020). *Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi di Era Industri 4.0 untuk Mendukung Merdeka Belajar - Kampus Merdeka*. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2013). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 73 Tahun 2013 tentang Penerapan KKNI bidang Perguruan Tinggi*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2020a). *Merdeka Belajar: Kampus Merdeka*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2020b). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 3 Tahun 2020 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Khurniawan, A. W., & Haryani, T. (Eds.). (2015). *SMK dari Masa ke Masa*. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Lane, J. E. (2015). Higher Education Internationalization: Why Governments Care. *New Perspectives on Internationalization and Competitiveness,* 17–30.https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11979-3_3

Latif, Y. (2011). *Negara Paripurna: Historisitas, Rasionalitas, dan Aktualitas Pancasila*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Latif, Y. (2020). *Pendidikan yang Berkebudayaan: Histori, Konsepsi, dan Aktualisasi Pendidikan Transformatif*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Le Grange, L. (2016). Decolonising the university curriculum. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 30*(2). https://doi.org/10.20853/30-2-709

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 205–221. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308329786

Leask, B. (2014). Internationalizing the Curriculum and all Students' Learning. *International Higher Education, 78*(Special), 5–6.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. Routledge.

Lim, T. W. (2019). *Industrial Revolution 4.0, Tech Giants, and Digitized Society*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Lynch, K., Grummell, B., & Devine, D. (2012). *New Managerialism in Education: Commercialization, Carelesness and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Market-driven education is destroying university values. (2012, December 25). The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2012/sep/25/market-education-destroying-university-values

Mendukung World Class University USU, Kemendikbud Alokasikan Rp 2,5 Miliar. (2020, October 20). Analisadaily.com. https://analisadaily.com/berita/baca/2020/10/20/1010906/mendukung-world-class-university-usu-kemendikbud-alokasikan-rp2-5-miliar/

Mheta, G., Lungu, B. N., & Govender, T. (2018). Decolonisation of the curriculum: A case study of the durban university of technology in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education, 38*(4). https://doi.org/10.15700/SAJE.V38N4A1635

Nakkeeran, R., Babu, R., Manimaran, R., & Gnanasivam, P. (2018). Importance of Outcome Based Education (OBE) to Advance Educational Quality and enhance Global Mobility. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 119*(17), 1483–1492.

Nursalam. (2020). Glocal Vision to Deconstruct Internationalization in Indonesian Higher Education. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 11*(1), 137–152.

Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2012). *Undang-Undang No. 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi*. Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.

Rakhmani, I. (2019). Reproducing Academic Insularity in a Time of Neo-liberal Markets: The Case of Social Science Research in Indonesian State Universities. *Journal of Contemporary Asia, 51*(1), 64–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2019.1627389

Rata, E. (2014). The Three Stages of Critical Policy Methodology: An Example from Curriculum Analysis. *Policy Futures in Education, 12*(3), 347–358. https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2014.12.3.347

Robson, S., & Wihlborg, M. (2019). *Internationalisation of higher education: Impacts, challenges and future possibilities*. 18(2), 127–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904119834779

Sahlberg, P. (2016). The Global Educational Reform

Movement and Its Impact on Schooling. In K. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard, & A. Verger (Eds.), *The Handbook of Global Education Policy* (pp. 128–144). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118468005.CH7

Sakhiyya, Z. (2018). *Knowledge and the Market: The Internationalisation of Indonesian Higher Education* [The University of Auckland]. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/37642

Sawir, E. (2013). Internationalisation of higher education curriculum: The contribution of international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 11*(3), 359–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2012.750477

Soedijarto. (2009). Some Notes on the Ideals and Goals of Indonesia's National Education System and the Inconsistency of its Implementation: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities, 2*, 1–11.

Spady, W. G. (1994). *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers.* American Association of School Administrators.

Subkhan, E. (2016). *Pendidikan Kritis: Kritik atas Praksis Neo-Liberalisasi dan Standardisasi Pendidikan.* Ar-Ruzz Media.

Subkhan, E. (2018). Ideologi, Kekuasaan, dan Pengaruhnya pada Arah Sistem Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia (1950-1965). *Journal of Indonesian History, 7*(1), 19–34.

Subkhan, E. (2022). Merdeka Belajar: Antara Esensi dan Kontradiksi. In E. Subkhan, Moh. I. Mabruri, & Mu'arifuddin (Eds.), *Memikirkan Kembali Arah Pendidikan Indonesia: Kritik, Potensi, dan Rekomendasi* (pp. 3–24). Rajawali Pers.

Subkhan, E. (forthcoming). Vocationalizing Education: The Dangers of Link-And-Match Paradigm for the Student's Future. In Z. Shakiyya & T. W. Mulya (Eds.), *Education in Indonesia: Critical Perspectives on Equity and Social Justice.* Springer Nature.

Taylor, S. (1997). Critical Policy Analysis: Exploring Contexts, Texts and Consequences. *Discourse, 18*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180102

Tian, M. (2022). Development Experience and Enlightenment of Internationalization of Higher Education in Indonesia. *Transactions on Comparative Education, 4*(2), 17–23. https://doi.org/10.23977/trance.2022.040203

Tomlinson, M. (2015). The Impact of Market-Driven Higher Education on Student-University Relations: Investing, Consuming and Competing. *Higher Education Policy, 29*(2), 149–166. https://doi.org/10.1057/HEP.2015.17

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 249–283.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese Discourse, 1*, 17–27.

van Geel, M., Keuning, T., Frèrejean, J., Dolmans, D., van Merriënboer, J., & Visscher, A. J. (2019). Capturing the complexity of differentiated instruction. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 30*(1), 51–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2018.1539013

Veldman, F. J. (2018). Market Driven Global Directives and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. *African Journal of Business Ethics, 12*(1), 78–103. https://doi.org/10.15249/12-1-168

Walkington, C., & Bernacki, M. L. (2020). Appraising research on personalized learning: Definitions, theoretical alignment, advancements, and future directions. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 52*(3), 235–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2020.1747757

Wheelahan, L. (2007). How competency-based training locks the working class out of powerful knowledge: A modified Bernsteinian analysis. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 28*(5), 637–651. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690701505540