
INDONESIA NATIONAL CURRICULUM REFORM IN THE CONTEXT OF STANDARD-BASED EDUCATION: POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION

Bambang Suryadi¹, Yuli Rahmawati², Bahrul Hayat¹, Suprananto³

¹Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University of Jakarta, Indonesia

²Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

³Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Indonesia

E-mail: bambang.suryadi@uinjkt.ac.id

Received: 28th April 2019; Revised: 28th May 2019; Accepted: 28th June 2019

Abstract

Curriculum reform plays an essential role in assuring the success of systematic educational change. The purpose of this study is to portray the government policy and the issues of the Curriculum 2013 implementation. This study employed qualitative methodology using document analysis, observation and Focused Group Discussion (FGD) as data collection techniques. The results of this study show that the curricula philosophy of curriculum reform was well-articulated and relevant to meet the requirements of twenty-first century learning competencies. However, the curricula implementation process faced substantial challenges with technical problems regarding the national standards of education document, teacher training and competences, the availability of school textbooks, and classroom assessment implementation. The findings of this study have several implications for implementing the national curriculum in Indonesia. Therefore, alignment between the national standards of education document, the curriculum structure, and the assessment system is required in order to ensure the successful implementation of Curriculum 2013 throughout the nation.

Keywords: curriculum reform; education standard; assessment; competence; policy analysis

Abstrak

Reformasi kurikulum memainkan peran penting dalam memastikan keberhasilan perubahan pendidikan yang sistematis. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menggambarkan kebijakan pemerintah dan isu-isu implementasi Kurikulum 2013. Penelitian ini menggunakan metodologi kualitatif menggunakan analisis dokumen, observasi dan diskusi kelompok terpusat sebagai teknik pengumpulan data. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa filosofi reformasi kurikulum diartikulasikan dengan baik dan relevan untuk memenuhi persyaratan kompetensi pembelajaran abad kedua puluh satu. Namun, proses implementasi kurikulum menghadapi tantangan besar dengan masalah teknis mengenai dokumen yang terkait dengan standar nasional pendidikan, pelatihan dan kompetensi guru, ketersediaan buku pelajaran di sekolah, dan implementasi penilaian di dalam kelas. Temuan penelitian ini memiliki beberapa implikasi untuk menerapkan kurikulum nasional di Indonesia. Oleh karena itu, diperlukan keselarasan antara dokumen standar nasional pendidikan, struktur kurikulum, dan sistem penilaian untuk memastikan keberhasilan implementasi Kurikulum 2013 di seluruh negara.

Kata kunci: reformasi kurikulum; standar pendidikan; asesmen; kompetensi; analisis kebijakan

How to Cite: Suryadi, B., Rahmawati, Y., Hayat, B., Suprananto. (2019). Indonesia National Curriculum Reform in the Context of Standard-Based Education: Policy and Implementation. *TARBIYA: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 6(1), 76-87. doi:10.15408/tjems.v6i1.12883.

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v6i1.12883>

Introduction

Curriculum plays a vital role as “a product - a document which includes details about goals, objectives, content, teaching techniques, evaluation and assessment, and resources [which are issued by the government]” (Marsh, 2000). Haberman (1992) stated that curricula which are, “what’s in the textbooks, what the teacher teaches, what the students learn, and what is included on tests.” However Grundy (1987) “curriculum is a cultural reproduction, it is not an abstract concept which is outside or before human experience.” Even though “curriculum is often portrayed as a formal and technical process...[it could] involve great give and take, sharing of ideas, questions about philosophy, and so on by professional teachers” (Beane and Lipka, 1986), they need to shift their paradigms for facilitating student inquiry (Magestro and Stanford-Blair as cited in Henderson and Kesson, 2004). Therefore curriculum reform plays a vital role in assuring the success of systematic educational change.

During the past 20 years, increasing globalization has focused on international comparative education and how various countries approach similar educational problems (ACER, 2017). Many educators and education systems today are concerned about equipping their students with the knowledge, skills, work habits, and character traits that have come to be known as 21st-century skills. These include critical thinking and problems solving; creativity and innovation; research and data analysis and synthesis; leadership and teamwork; ability to deal with diversity; useful oral, written, and visual communication; and self-management and emotional intelligence (Ssekamanya, 2016). Therefore, the classroom learning experiences need to be designed to develop these competencies and empower students as individuals and citizens to be agents of change and to be responsible, creative, innovative and

able to contribute to society, a nation, and the world (Hadinugrahaningsih, Rahmawati and Ridwan 2017).

In the Indonesian context, national curriculum reform was recently implemented in 2013 and become well known as Curriculum 2013. The goal of Curriculum 2013 is to prepare Indonesian citizens who have life skills both as an individual and a citizen who are faithful to God, are productive, creative, innovative, effective, as well as contributive to society, nation, and world civilization. The changes in the Indonesian curriculum during the past 15 years emphasize: (a) objective for knowledge and skills competencies at each grade level, (b) student-centered learning, (c) 21st century learning skills including citizenship, and (d) religious and moral education (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013).

Also, Curriculum 2013 integrates the concept of character education within education which involves cultural ethics and values. In the education process, curriculum cannot be separated from teaching and assessment. The three aspects of curriculum, teaching, and assessment are connected in a way that influences teaching practices and students learning. In the diverse range of cultural values and ethics in Indonesia, there are 18 national characters should be integrated into education process which can be categorized in the values of spirituality, nationality, cultural awareness, humanity, and environment. In this context, teachers have the opportunity to shape their teaching in the classroom for meaningful learning for the students, especially in integrating cultural values and ethics (Rahmawati & Ridwan, 2017).

The curriculum changes made in Curriculum 2013 are similar to the global pattern of shifting curriculum emphases as reported by UNESCO-International Bureau of Education (UNESCO, 2013). According to this

report, there are 12 changes in international trends for curriculum reform. These include change from teaching to learning, from transfer of facts to students construction of knowledge, from memorization of information to analysis, synthesis, evaluation and application of information, from focus on knowledge to development of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes, from summative assessment of academic achievement to authentic and formative assessment of competency, from categorized knowledge (traditional subjects) to integrated knowledge (broader learning areas), from schooling to lifelong learning, from focus on inputs to focus on outcomes and processes, from didactic teaching to participatory, activity-centered approaches that incorporate interactive methods, from assumptions that there is one “learning style” to recognize that there are several “preferred learning style”, and from curriculum as product to curriculum as both a process and a product.

Despite the many changes to the national curriculum over the years the quality of national education still needs to be improved. Student achievement in national assessments and on the Program for International Students Assessment (PISA) remained at low levels compared to other countries. National examination results in 2015 and 2016 show that the achievement of junior high school students in mathematics was low and decreasing; their scores were 56.28 in 2015 and 50.24 in 2016 (Educational Assessment Centre-Puspendik, 2016). These scores were lower than the other three subjects tested on the national examination, namely Bahasa Indonesia (70.75), English (57.17), and the Natural Sciences (56.27). The results of the 2015 PISA survey indicated that Indonesia was ranked 65th out of the 72 OECD member countries, while Vietnam ranked 22nd with a score of 495, and Malaysia was 44th with a score of 446 (OECD, 2016). Given that Indonesian students’

competence is poor compared to other countries in the region, a common question is: what are the problems associated with the national curriculum about low Indonesian students’ academic achievement?

The purpose of this study is to portray government policy and the issues associated with the implementation of Curriculum 2013. This study aims to address the following research questions: (a) What are the policies made by Ministry of Education and Culture for curriculum reform in 2013?, (b) What are policies made by Board for National Standard in Education (BSNP)?, and (c) What issues arose during the implementation of Curriculum 2013? The findings of this study have several implications for implementing the national curriculum in Indonesia. A necessary implication is that alignment between national standards of education document, curriculum structure, and assessment system is required in order to make the implementation of Curriculum 2013 a success throughout the nation.

Method

This study used a qualitative method with document analysis, observation, and focused group discussion (FGD) technique as data collection. The in-depth analysis was conducted on various documents related to the national education system law, government regulations, ministry regulations, and standard-based education system. The documents were analyzed by comparing, contrasting, criticizing, and synthesizing. Most documents reviewed in this study are documents from BSNP and the Ministry of Education and Culture.

The observation was conducted during the national training for curriculum instructors and during teaching-learning processes in selected schools in Jakarta. The purpose of observation was to acquire information on the teaching and

learning process in Curriculum 2013 implementation. Focused group discussions involved school principals, teachers, parents, and students, selected on the bases of different levels, type of schools (primary and secondary schools, public and private schools), and gender. The participants were asked on the implementation of Curriculum 2013. Data analysis through qualitative approach with finding the coding for results of document analysis, observation, and focused group discussion (FGD). Data were presented through the description of each topic.

Results and Discussion

Based on the research questions, the findings of this study are organized in the following topics.

Policies made by the Ministry of Education and Culture

In Indonesia, most educational policy is decided by the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) that creates, mandates and monitors educational policies. At this level, the following policies related to curriculum reform were made. MoEC adjusted the regulation with the amendment of Government Regulation Number 19, 2005, regarding National Education Standard to Government Regulation Number 32, 2013. The fundamental and essential part of this change is the enactment of a legal umbrella for the implementation of Curriculum 2013. This can be seen from Articles 77 A through 77 Q in Government Regulation No. 32, 2013. As an implication of the amendment of Government Regulation Number 19, 2005 to Government Regulation Number 32, 2013, is the centralized curriculum. That is, for primary and secondary education, in contrast to higher education, the implementation of a national curriculum that binds all units of education in the territory of Indonesia, both public and private schools.

Regarding human resources, MoEC has conducted teacher training with the aim to improve teachers' competences in teaching and learning process and assessment. Given a large number of teachers from elementary to high school level, the training has been conducted at different levels by national instructors, provincial instructors, and district instructors. However, it faced the challenges in teachers' understanding of the concept of Curriculum 2013. In the context of the school textbook quality, the MoEC conducted a national textbook assessment as the authority of BSNP (Government Regulation No. 19, 2005) which involved four aspects of assessment; content, language, presentation, and graphics. Also, syllabus development is developed by the MoEC, while Lesson Preparation Plan (RPP) is developed by each teacher. Before 2013, the syllabus was developed by teachers at the school level.

It is important to point out that the policies described above were implemented by Muhammad Nuh as Minister of Education and Culture (2009-2014) under the presidential leadership of Soesilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY). However, in the succeeding government (2014-2019) under Minister of Education and Culture, Anies Baswedan, policy changes were made to Government Regulation Number 19 the year 2005 to government Regulation Number 13 the year 2015. Within this context, Baswedan eliminated the function of a National Examination as the determinant criteria of student passing education levels. Thus, there are now only three criteria for student passing the educational levels. The criteria are spelled out that in order to graduate from schools, students should: (a) complete the entire education program, (b) have good moral conduct, and (c) pass the school examination (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2003). As a consequence

of this policy, the function and utilization of National Examination results are only for mapping national education quality, selection considerations for progression to the next level of education, and as a reference in assisting schools at the district province level.

Policies made by the Board for National Standard in Education (BSNP)

According to the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20, 2003, of the National Education System Article 35 item (3), the development of National Education Standards, as well as monitoring and reporting of its achievements throughout the country, is implemented by the Board for National Standards in Education (BSNP)⁹. The task of BSNP is to assist the Minister of Education and Culture, and has the authority to perform the following tasks: (a) develop the national education standards; (b) organize the National Examination; provide recommendations to the central and local governments in guaranteeing and controlling the quality of education; (c) formulate the graduation criteria of each education unit for elementary and middle school levels; (d) assess the appropriateness of the content, language and graphics of the textbooks; and (e) monitor and evaluate the implementation of the National Education Standards (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2005).

The primary objective of national education standards is to ensure the quality of national education at the national level for developing national character, civilization, and dignity, and facing international challenges (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2005). The national standard of education is implemented throughout all educational levels from kindergarten to tertiary or higher education levels. For both kindergarten and secondary levels of education, the national standard of

education consisted of eight standards. These are graduates competency, content, process, assessment, facilities and infrastructure, educators and education personnel, management, and finance standards. It is essential that the standards developed by BSNP, and endorsed by the Minister, are adequate and guide all education system at the national level. The national education standards play an essential role as the basis for education planning, implementation and monitoring in order to achieve a high quality of national education. The national education standards are refined in a planned, targeted and continuous manner in line with the changes in the local, national and global way of life.

In the context of Curriculum 2013 implementation, four types of national education standards; graduates competency standard, content standard, process standard, and assessment standard, function as the primary reference for curriculum development. The focus of this study is on the implementation of Curriculum 2013 concerning the national standard of education in primary and secondary education. BSNP has formulated the relationship between national standards of education, curriculum, school textbooks, teachers, and national examination (BSNP, 2017).

Basically, four national standards of education serve as a reference for curriculum development, namely, graduate competency standards, content standards, process standards, and assessment standards. The authority for the development of these four national standards is in BSNP. Based on these four standards, the Center for Curriculum and Text Books (Puskurbuk) developed a curriculum structure. The school text-book writing process involved experienced teachers, lecturers, and graphics experts. Only books that passed the assessment may be used in educational units. Considering the importance of textbook availability in

schools, the Ministry of Education and Culture has stipulated in Regulation No. 8, 2016 about Books Used by the Education Units (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016). Figure 1 also shows that teachers are the main actors in curriculum implementation, regarding learning planning, learning process, and assessment of learning outcomes. The implementation of the national standards of education, curriculum descriptions, and textbooks depend on teachers competencies. Student performance is assessed through national examination organized by BSNP.

The policy changes made by BSNP related to Curriculum 2013 implementation can be explained as follows. For graduate competence standard (SKL), there is a difference between SKL in 2013 and SKL in 2016. In the Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 54, 2013, the type of knowledge acquisition at an elementary school level is limited to actual and conceptual types, while for junior high school level it is limited to factual, conceptual, and procedural. At senior secondary school level, factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive knowledge is included. This means that there is either a broader or limited expectation of knowledge acquisition at each level. Therefore, an officially endorsed revision was made by BSNP to regulation Number 20 the year 2016 to include the four types of knowledge in all school levels from primary to senior secondary. The difference between the three school levels occurs during implementation by considering the level of students' psychological development. BSNP also made changes related to thinking processes, which originally measured recall and understanding for elementary school students and up to the applying level for junior secondary school students. In this newly revised standard, cognitive processes for all school level students include six levels, namely, remembering,

understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. However, in implementing the standard, teachers must take into account students' psychological differences.

The fundamental change made by BSNP about the content standard is the exclusion of the curriculum structure from the content standard. This means that the authority for curriculum structure development falls under the Center for Curriculum and Text Books (Puskurbuk). Also, BSNP also made changes for the use of the terms competence standard (SK) and basic competence (KD) into core competence (KI) and basic competence (KD). The fundamental change in the process standard is the application of a scientific approach in the learning process which includes an inquiry approach, problem-based learning, activity-based learning, and student-centered learning, as described in the introduction of this article. Finally, on assessment standards, the Curriculum 2013 emphasizes the existence of authentic assessment, including attitude assessment.

Issues in Curriculum 2013 Implementation

About the emerging issues in curriculum implementation, the results of this study indicate that several issues could be categorized into four categories: the targeted population of implementing schools for Curriculum 2013, human resources, regulation, and infrastructure. A brief description of each issue category is explained as follows.

Targeted population of implementing schools for Curriculum 2013

Indonesia is well known as the world's largest archipelago comprised of more than 17,000 islands across the nation, with a total area of 1.910.931.32 km² and a total population of 248.818.100 throughout 34 provinces (BPS, 2017). Besides the geographical conditions,

Indonesia has around 300 ethnic groups which hold different values and beliefs. In short, Indonesia is a multicultural nation, and this condition has developed many differences throughout Indonesia, including how citizens view education. According to the Center for Educational Data and Statistics under the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemdikbud, 2014), there are about 208.965 primary and secondary schools across the country (Table 1). This number is seen as the targeted school population for implementing Curriculum 2013.

Table 1. Number of schools in Indonesia based on levels and status of public and private schools

Level	Public	Private	Total
Primary School (SD)	132.609	14.904	147.513
Junior Secondary School (SMP)	22.209	14.309	36.518
Senior General Secondary School (SMA)	6.232	6.281	12.513
Senior Vocational Secondary School (SMK)	3.250	9.171	12.421
Total	164.300	44.665	208.965

Data in Table 1 show that out of the total number of schools in Indonesia (208.965), the number of public schools is higher than the number of private schools with a percentage of 78.62 percent and 21.37 percent respectively. The data indicate that school management in Indonesia is done by both government and private sectors including non-government organizations.

Data from the Ministry of Education and Culture further indicated that the number of schools implementing Curriculum 2013 in the first batch (2013) was 44.609 primary schools, 36.434 junior secondary schools, 11.535 senior general secondary schools (SMA), and 9.875 Secondary Vocational Schools (Ministry of

Education and Culture, 2013). These schools were selected using the following criteria: (a) accredited with A or B status, (b) availability of teachers and education personnel as required, and (c) availability of infrastructure and facilities. Overall, around 49 percent of the total schools implemented Curriculum 2013 in the first batch. This number was increased every year, and it is expected that Curriculum 2013 will be fully implemented in all schools by 2018.

Human resources

As previously mentioned, one of the requirements for schools to implement Curriculum 2013 was the availability of teachers and education personnel. Data from the Center for Educational Data and Statistics under the MoEC (Kemdikbud, 2014) showed that the number of teachers in all schools across the nation is 2.808.915 as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Number of teachers in Indonesia based on the level and status of public and private schools

Level	Public	Private	Total
Primary School (SD)	1.524.445	163.646	1.688.091
Junior Secondary School (SMP)	464.440	167.137	631.577
Senior General Secondary School (SMA) and Senior Vocational Secondary School (SMK)	290.733	198.514	489.247
Total	2.279.618	629.297	2.808.915

Data in Table 2 indicate that the total number of teachers for all levels across the nation is 2.808.915 with a percentage of 81 percent for public schools and 19 percent for private schools respectively. This means that most teachers involved in implementing Curriculum 2013 are from public schools. The imbalance between

state and private teachers can be considered both an opportunity and a challenge for the government. It is an opportunity because those teachers are critical persons in the school teaching and learning process. On the other hand, they have to be trained in order to improve their competences as required by Curriculum 2013.

Despite extensive training in the teaching and learning process, a significant improvement of teachers' competencies in implementing a new curriculum was not found. This is most probably they were not ready for shifting the paradigm to the student-centered learning. Therefore, many of them still found teaching with a conventional method instead of a new one. As a consequence, teachers' competence also affects students' performance. As for the number of students at all levels is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Number of students in Indonesia based on the level and status of public and private schools

Level	Public	Private	Total
Primary School (SD)	23.138.933	2.993.208	26.132.141
Junior Secondary School (SMP)	7.402.381	2.528.266	9.930.647
Senior General Secondary School (SMA) and Senior Vocational Secondary School (SMK)	4.888.851	3.554.966	8.443.817
Total	37.008.608	11.843.582	48.852.190

The data in Table 3 further indicates that the number of students from primary to senior secondary school is 48.852.190 with a percentage of 76 percent and 24 percent for both public and private schools respectively. This

shows that most students involved in implementing Curriculum 2013 are from public schools. Therefore, the government has a big responsibility for assisting regarding financial and management for those students. According to Law No. 23, 2014, about Local Governance (Kemdikbud, 2014), the management of senior secondary schools (SMA and SMK) is under the authority of Provincial Education Offices, while the management of primary and junior secondary schools (SD and SMP) is under the authority of District Education Offices. Coordination and a united effort are required in order to make the national curriculum a success.

Regulation

The implementation of Curriculum 2013 within standard-based education, there were several regulations issued by the MoEC as follows: 1) Government Regulation Number 32, 2013 about the changes of Government Regulation Number 19, 2005, about the National Standard of Education; 2) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 54, 2013, about Competence Standard for Primary and Secondary Education; 3) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 64, 2013, about Content Standard for Primary and Secondary Education; 4) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 65, 2013, about Process Standard for Primary and Secondary Education; 5) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 66, 2013, about Assessment Standard for Primary and Secondary Education; 6) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 67, 2013, about Basic Frame and Structure of Curriculum for Primary Education; 7) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 68, 2013, about Basic Frame and Structure of Curriculum for Junior Secondary Education; 8) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 69, 2013, about Basic Frame and Structure of Curriculum for Public Senior

Education; 9) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 70, 2013, about Basic Frame and Structure of Curriculum for Secondary Vocational Education; 10) Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 81A, 2013, about Curriculum Implementation.

Considering shortcomings and weaknesses found in the above regulation, BSNP revised four principal regulations as a reference for curriculum implementation, namely, graduate competence standard, content standard, process standard, and assessment standard. Based on the recommendations made by BSNP, the Ministry of Education and Culture endorsed four new regulations replacing the previous four regulations. These regulations have been implemented in 2016.

Despite numerous regulations being endorsed, specific issues arose during curriculum implementation. One of the most critical issues was that the regulations were perceived differently by teachers, school principals, District Education Officers, and other stakeholders. Also, specific regulations were not in line with other regulations. As a consequence, teachers' time was spent trying to interpret and understand the regulation contents rather than on the teaching preparation and assessment process.

Infrastructure

In implementation of national curriculum, the issues of infrastructure concerning the characteristics of national curricula in term of character education, student-centered and scientific approaches. One of the infrastructures that are concerned is the textbooks. Textbooks are considered an essential component of education for curriculum implementation in Indonesia. According to the policy of the MoEC, there are two types of textbooks; student textbooks and teacher textbooks. A critical problem, especially in the first batch of curriculum implementation, was the

unavailability of textbooks in certain schools. Where textbooks were available, issues of pornographic content and racial and gender discrimination were found that brought into question the suitability of the content. The provision of workshop and laboratory facilities also emerged as an issue during curriculum implementation. In senior secondary vocational schools, primarily in rural private schools, many workshops were not sufficiently equipped with the necessary facilities to run successfully.

The findings of this study indicate that the number of teachers involved in implementing the curriculum changes, at the school level from primary schools to senior secondary schools, was considered sufficient. However, they were not equally distributed across the country as most of them were placed on Jawa Island. A resulting imbalance occurred between the distribution of teachers on Jawa Island and other islands, especially in rural areas. Unequal distribution, no doubt, lead to the burden of teachers outside Jawa Island as they have to perform more duties and responsibilities.

About teacher competences, approximately 310.331 (18%) teachers of primary schools, 53.554 (8%) teachers of junior secondary schools, and 55.854 (11.%) teachers of senior secondary schools did not possess the academic qualifications as required by law, that is Diploma IV or bachelor degree 14. This condition might have contributed to the poor performance of teachers in conducting the teaching and learning process. Therefore, the government should address the issue of teacher competence by providing an affirmative program for teachers to continue their study. Also, as the ACER research team recommended (ACER, 2017), pre-service teachers need to be recruited from among the best students at universities. Pre-service teachers need to be trained on current MoEC policies and practices requiring university

instructors to have explicit connections to MoEC staff and agencies.

This study found that the MoEC endorsed numerous regulations as a legal requirement for teachers and other stakeholders in implementing a new curriculum. Since standards-based education is the core philosophy of the national education system in Indonesia, there should be flexibility in implementing curriculum by minimizing the regulations and optimizing the efforts to achieve the intended curriculum. Currently, policy makers at central and district level, teachers, and principals are focused on secondary issues such as students' and teaching administration rather than the core issues such as achieving students' competences. As a consequence, teachers prefer to do their duties as a routine activity instead of being creative and innovative in the teaching and learning process. Also, the idea of a centralized curriculum needs to be reviewed due to the geographical conditions and cultural diversity of Indonesia. The intended outcomes from every school level as indicated in the graduate competence standard need to be established. Policy makers at provincial or district levels could have more authority in determining their curriculum design and contents, whereas the role of central government is to ensure that the national standards of education are successfully achieved.

About school textbooks, effective practice that was found in the previous years by providing electronic school textbooks (E-book) could be continued and improved. This will help the government anticipate the problem of delay in delivering the textbooks. However, the government needs to ensure that the E-book contents meet the criteria of school textbooks as required in the MoEC regulation number 8 the year 2016. According to the ACER report (2017), many countries provide online resources for principals and teachers for informing,

sharing, and communicating information about the curriculum with educators across Indonesia.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that the implementation of Curriculum 2013, in the last three years to the present, still faces considerable challenges and opportunities. Conceptually, the grand design of Curriculum 2013 is in line with the international trends in curriculum reform. However, in the implementation process, numerous barriers and obstacles were found; issues related to the national standard of education document (graduate competence, content, process, and assessment), teacher competencies, availability of school textbooks, learning and assessment processes.

This study also confirmed that standard based education is a fundamental requirement in order to enhance the competencies, competitiveness, and quality of national education in Indonesia context. BSNP and all agencies under the MoEC, such as the Directorate, the Centre for Curriculum and Text Books, and the Center for Education Assessment, play vital role in implementing the national standard of education. However, the coordination among these agencies and provincial or district level needs to be strengthened and enhanced. The government needs to provide the grand design in implementing the new curriculum concerning the national standards of education.

The findings of this study are limited in some ways of number participants, length study and research focus on policy and implementation. Therefore, the authors suggest that further research in this area is needed such as teachers' competencies in delivering content in curricula. As this study used qualitative methods with document analysis, observation,

and FGD as a data collection technique, further research could be conducted using mixed methods with a larger sample size to ensure more comprehensive findings.

References

- Australian Council for Educational Research/ACER. (2017). *Executive summary of the final report on curriculum reform (43273-012)* prepared for The Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP). Jakarta: ACER.
- Badan Pusat Statistik-BPS. (2014). *Penduduk Indonesia Hasil Sensus Penduduk 2010*. Available in: <https://www.bps.go.id/index.php/publikasi/14> [retrieved on 30 June 2017]
- Beane, J. A., & Lipka, R. P. (1986). *Self-concept, self-esteem, and curriculum*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Board for National Standards in Education (BSNP). (2017). *National Examination Socialization for Academic Year 2016/2017*. Jakarta: BSNP.
- Educational Assessment Centre-Puspendik. (2016). *Report of National Exams Analysis, Academic Year 2015/2016*. Jakarta: Puspendik, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Haberman, M. (1992). The role of the classroom teacher as a curriculum leader. *NASSP Bulletin*, Vol. 76, No.547, pp.11-19.
- Hadinugrahaningsih, T., Rahmawati, Y., and Ridwan, A. (2017). Developing 21st-century skills in chemistry classrooms: Opportunities and challenges of STEAM integration. *AIP Conference Proceedings* 1868, 030008 (2017); doi: 10.1063/1.4995107.
- Henderson, J. G., & Kesson, K. R. (2004). *Curriculum wisdom*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Marsh, C. (1996). *Handbook for a beginning teacher*. New South Wales: Longman.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2003). *Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud..
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2005). *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 19 Tahun 2005 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2013). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 67 Tahun 2013 Tentang Kerangka Dasar dan Struktur Kurikulum Sekolah Dasar/Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2013). *Sasaran Sekolah Pelaksana Kurikulum 2013*. Available in: <http://kemdikbud.go.id/kemdikbud/berita> [retrieved on 25 June 2017]
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2014). *Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2015). *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 13 Tahun 2015 tentang Perubahan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 19 Tahun 2005 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.

- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2016). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 8 Tahun 2016 Tentang Buku Buku yang Digunakan oleh Satuan Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. Center for Educational Data and Statistics. (2014). *Indonesia Educational Statistics in Brief 2013/2014*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- OECD. (2016). *PISA 2015 Results in Focus*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org>.
- Rahmawati, Y. and Ridwan, A. (2017). Opportunities and Challenges in Integrated Cultural Ethics and Values in Curricula And Instructions: Lesson Learnt From Indonesia, *World Council for Curriculum and Instruction*, 17-19 Augustus 2017, Manila, Philippines.
- Ssekamanya, S. A. (2016). Editorial: 21st Century Curriculum and Instruction Challenges in Muslim Educational Institutions. *IIUM Journal Of Educational Studies*, 4:2 (2016) I - III
- UNESCO-International Bureau of Education. (2013). *Training tools for curriculum development: A resource pack*. Geneva: UNESCO.