AN ANALYSIS OF LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND LEARNING INDICATORS IN CURRICULUM 2013 LESSON PLANS

Avrita Ayu Kusuma Wardani

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

ayuavrita@gmail.com

Lies Amin Lestari

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

lies.aminlestari@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Dengan adanya kurikulum baru, yakni Kurikulum 2013, terdapat beberapa perubahan mendasar pada kurikulum saat ini. Salah satu perubahan tersebut ialah konsep kurikulum. Jika dibandingkan dengan KTSP, maka penyusunan kompetensi dasar (KD) diturunkan dari standar kompetensi (SK). Hal ini berbeda dengan Kurikulum 2013 karena istilah SK kini sudah diganti menjadi kompetensi inti (KI). Perumusan inilah yang akhirnya digunakan untuk merumuskan indikator pencapaian kompetensi. Rumusan indikator pencapaian kompetensi itulah yang kemudian digunakan untuk menyusun kegiatan pembelajaran. Peneitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi apakah rumusan kegiatan pembelajaran yang terdapat dalam RPP sudah sesuai dengan rumusan indikator pencapaian kompetensi. Pendekatan yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif dengan mengambil 6 guru Bahasa Inggris dari beberapa sekolah yang terjangkau sebagai subjek. Dari keenam subjek itulah lalu didapatkan enam sampel RPP; 3 RPP kelas 7 dan 3 RPP kelas 8. Setelah mengumpulkan RPP, hal yang selanjutnya dilakukan ialah mengumpulkan data melalui *checklist* dan interview. Untuk mempermudah analisis, data yang telah dikumpulkan diberi kode sebagai berikut LP 7A, LP 7B, LP 7C, LP 8A, LP 8B dan LP 8C. Dari hasil analisis, dapat dikatakan bahwa rumusan kegiatan pembelajaran yang terdapat pada RPP guru tidak berterima. Kegiatan pembelajaran yang dirumuskan tidak sesuai dengan rumusan indikator pencapaian kompetensi, bahkan beberapa perumusan indikator juga tidak relevan dengan KD. Dari hasil penelitian ini dapat disimpulkan bahwa rumusan kegiatan pembelajaran dalam RPP tidak sesuai dengan rumusan indikator pencapaian kompetensi.

Kata kunci: *kurikulum 2013, RPP, kegiatan pembelajaran, indikator pencapaian kompetensi*

Abstract

There are some substantial differences between KTSP and Curriculum 2013, one of them is the concept of curriculum. In KTSP, base competence (KD) is developed from standard competence (SK), in this curriculum KD is developed from four main competences (KI). The formulation of KD then becomes the focal point to formulate learning indicators which could be used to formulate the learning activities in the classroom. This study was aimed to identify whether the learning activities formulated in the teachers' lesson plans meet the learning indicators. This study was a descriptive qualitative study. Six English teachers from the accessible school were selected as the subjects, from which 3 lesson plans of 7th grades and 3 lesson plans for the 8th grades were collected. The obtained data were then analyzed by using observation checklist and interview. The data was then labelled them as LP 7A, LP 7, LP 7C, LP 8A, LP 8B, and LP 8C. The results showed that the learning activities were not arranged in such a way that it could help the students to achieve the learning indicators. What has been stated in the learning activities were not in line with the formulated learning indicators. Furthermore, it was found some learning indicators which were not relevant with KD.

Keywords: *curriculum 2013, lesson plans, learning activities, learning indicators*

AN ANALYSIS OF LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND LEARNING INDICATORS IN CURRICULUM 2013 LESSON PLANS

INTRODUCTION

Due to the reformation of national curriculum, there are some differences between KTSP and Curriculum 2013. One of the basic changes is the concept of curriculum (Kemendikbud, 2014). In the new curriculum, the formulation of basic competences (KD) is developed from core competences (KI). The formulation of KD then becomes the focal point to develop learning indicators whenever the lesson plan designer, i.e. the teacher creates a lesson plan, a planned document which is used by the teacher to describe the teaching procedure and teaching management derived from syllabus (Tim PEKERTI-AA PPSP LPP Universitas Sebelas Maret, 2007). Shrawder & Warner (2006) also state that lesson plan plays as a blueprint to plan a lesson.

From the above explanation, it can be said that designing a lesson plan is necessary to do since the teacher know what to do during the teaching and learning process. That is why the teacher should pay attention on the course identity, time allocation, KI, KD, learning indicator, learning process, materials, assessment, and learning source/media, when designing a lesson plan (Permendikbud No. 103 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pembelajaran pada Pendidikan Dasar dan Pendidikan Menengah, 2014).

Learning indicator is one of the main aspects in a lesson plan which is formulated to measure the students' achievements in the classroom (Taher, 2013). In response to this, the latest regulation from the Ministry of Education and Culture also states that learning indicators are developed to indicate the students' attainment through assessment since the term of learning objectives is omitted. The formulated learning indicators are also used to design the learning activities by focusing on what the students will be able to do and what they should do with that (Duncan & Met, 2010). From this view, it can be concluded that after the teacher decides what targets that will be achieved by the students, the teacher start to design what learning activities help the students to meet the targets.

That is why, formulating learning indicators is crucial to do since they are used to develop learning activities and assessment. It is stated in *Permendikbud No.65 Tahun 2013 Tentang Standar Proses* that learning indicators are generated from KD. The formulation of learning indicators should cover the spiritual, affective, cognitive, and psychomotoric competences. Furthermore, it is highlighted that the formulation of learning indicators should be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-limited (College of Nurses of Ontario, 2014). Thus, the teacher should use the action words to measure the students' competences in formulating learning outcomes (Kennedy, 2007). For example, to measure affective domain, the teacher can use the words appreciate, demonstrate, and praise while recognize, identify, differentiate, classify are some verbs used to measure cognitive domain. The last, to measure psychomotor domain, arrange, combine, operate, and perform are some words recommended as the operational verbs.

Dealing with the prominence of the learning indicators in a lesson plan, therefore this study aims to identify whether the learning activities formulated are in line with the learning indicators. For that reason, the researcher analyzed the learning indicators and the learning activities formulated in the lesson plan to investigate whether the formulation of the learning activities meet the learning indicators or not.

METHODS

Descriptive qualitative study was conducted to gain the information about the relationship between learning activities and the learning indicators in 2013 curriculum lesson plans. In a nutshell, this study analyzed and interpreted the components of lesson plan and the relationship between learning activities and learning indicators.

The samples were collected using purposive sampling by selecting six junior high school English teachers from the accessible

schools. From the selected subjects, it was collected 3 lesson plans of the 7th grades and 3 lesson plans of 8th grades as the source of data.

There were two instruments used in this study, namely checklist and interview. Checklist was used to examine whether the learning activities were relevant with the learning indicators or not. In addition, semi-structured interview was used to ensure the validity of the data and to answer whether the learning activities met the learning indicators.

The data collected was analyzed as follows: the first stage were managing and organizing the data. Next, the data were labeled using codes. The codes were very useful to organize the documents. In this step, the data were classified into more specific one. The other data were reduced except two components in the lesson plan, namely learning activities and learning indicators. Finally, the data presented by describing and providing examples to support them.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. **RESULTS**

The Relationship between Learning Activities and Learning Indicators

Regrettably, it was found that the learning activities from the six samples were poorly formulated and they were not in line with the learning indicators. Those samples showed that the learning indicators were not relevant with basic competences (KD).

For example, in lesson plan (LP) 7A, the activities dealt with speaking activity and in the end of the lesson, the students were expected to be able to introduce themselves or other persons. Based on the learning indicators, the cognitive competence of identifying social function of the text was not stated in the learning activities since in the third indicator, the students dealt with the structure of the text, social function, and linguistic features. The teacher only mentioned the learning activities related to the structure and linguistic features of short functional text of introduction. In the next indicator, the students were asked to

make a written and verbal text of introduction, but it was not reflected in the learning activities.

Next, in LP 7C, it was clearly stated in the third learning indicator that the students identify the structure of the text, linguistic features, and social function of introduction text. In the learning activities, the teacher did not include the material about structure text in the learning activities. It could be said that the learning activities formulated by the teacher only engaged with social function and linguistic features of introduction. What is more, there was an indicator which was considered irrelevant with cognitive domain, showed by; *3.4.2 Merespon nama dan hubungan keluarga yang tepat sesuai dengan gambar family tree yang ditunjukkan*. Based on KD *3.4 Memahami fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan dari teks pemaparan jati diri, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya*, the formulation of the above indicator was not in line with related KD.

In case of LP 8A, there were four learning indicators of cognitive domain and two learning indicators of psychomotor domain formulated. Here are the learning indicators; *3.7.1 Mengidentifikasi fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan untuk menyatakan dan menanyakan tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, sesuai dengan konteks kegunaannya, 3.7.2 Mencontohkan menyatakan dan menanyakan tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, sesuai dengan konteks kegunaannya, 3.7.3 Menanyakan tentang perbedaan antara cara menyatakan dan menanyakan tentang tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, dalam bahasa Inggris dengan yang ada dalam bahasa Indonesia, 3.7.4 Menggunakan bahasa Inggris untuk menyatakan dan menanyakan tentang tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, sesuai dengan konteks kegunaannya, 4.8.1 Menuliskan dalam bahasa Inggris untuk menyatakan dan menanyakan tentang tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, sesuai dengan konteks kegunaannya, 4.8.2 Menyusun dialog untuk menyatakan dan menanyakan tentang tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/ berlangsung saat ini, sesuai dengan konteks kegunaannya*. From these learning indicators, there were only observing and questioning stage formulated in

the lesson plan. In the observing stage, the teacher asked the students to focus on the activities that happen in the present. Beside that, the students were led to learn about the linguistic features and social function of the text. Based on the learning indicator 3.7.1, it could be seen that the structure of the text was neglected; it was not reflected in the learning activities. The learning indicators which covered psychomotoric domain were not reflected in the learning activities either since the teacher only formulated two stages in the learning process.

In LP 8B, the inappropriateness between learning indicators and KD also proved by this following sentences. In KD 3.13, it was written that *Menerapkan struktur teks dan unsur kebahasaan untuk melaksanakan fungsi sosial dari teks pesan singkat dan pengumuman/pemberitahuan (notice), sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya*. From the above KD, the learning indicators generated were; *3.13.1 Menyebutkan berbagai macam short notice/ pemberitahuan yang sering ditemui di tempat umum, 3.13.2 Menentukan tujuan dari pengumuman/pemberitahuan (short notice) sesuai dengan konteks dan penggunaanya, 3.13.3 Menentukan macam pengumuman/pemberitahuan (short notice) yang sesuai dengan situasi yang diberikan*. The teacher did not mention the aspect of the structure and linguistic features of the text. Beside that, the learning indicators *4.16.1 Menyebutkan informasi rinci atau tanpa informasi rinci dari berbagai teks pengumuman/pemberitahuan (short notice) yang ditampilkan*, and *4.16.2 Menyebutkan tujuan dari pengumunan/pemberitahuan (notice) yang dibaca oleh siswa* were not reflected in the learning activities.

The inappropriateness between learning indicators and KD also existed in LP 8C. It was proved by learning indicators of the cognitive domain which did not exist in the learning activities. Even more, the learning activities written in the lesson plan did not indicate that domain. The students were led to directly search the information outside the classroom without having prior knowledge about structure text, social function, and linguistic features of the materials.

Another case was the use of action words to formulate the learning indicators. In LP 7B, the formulation between learning activities and learning indicators was in disordered arrangement and it might be caused by the formulation of the learning indicators. The learning indicators were written as follows: *1. Terkait dengan diri dan lingkungan sosial dan alam di sekitar rumah dan sekolah, 2. Menyiapkan sebuah "identity card" yang dapat dibuat dari kertas ukuran A4 yang kemudian dibagi menjadi 8 bagian, 3. Menggunakan kalimat "My name is …, What is your name?"*. From those three indicators, there were no criteria of what competences would be measured. There were also no operational verbs used to indicate the students' competences. Moreover, it was assumed that the topic of the lesson was about introduction since in the indicator the teacher used identity card as media, while in the last stage of learning activities, the students were required to practice the English about greeting, parting, thanking, and apologizing expressions. In fact, the material was about greeting expressions, as it is stated in the KD.

There were four learning indicators which covered cognitive domain formulated in LP 8A, three out of four operational verbs used in the learning indicators were inappropriate. It was proved by these following examples: *3.7.2 **Mencontohkan** menyatakan dan menanyakan tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, sesuai dengan konteks kegunaannya, 3.7.3 **Menanyakan** tentang perbedaan antara cara menyatakan dan menanyakan tentang tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, dalam bahasa Inggris dengan yang ada dalam bahasa Indonesia, 3.7.4 **Menggunakan bahasa Inggris untuk menyatakan dan menanyakan** tentang tindakan/kejadian yang sedang dilakukan/berlangsung saat ini, sesuai dengan konteks kegunaannya*. According to the third KD, the students dealt with the basic knowledge to comprehend the structure, social function, and linguistic features of the text while the formulated learning indicators above did not represent the cognitive domain. It was obvious that the operational verbs used did not measure the

students' cognitive instead of students' psychomotor.

The result from LP 8C also showed that the learning indicators were poorly generated in terms of the use of action words. It could be seen from the fourth indicator as follow; *Menangkap makna teks tanda peringatan (warning/caution), notice, dan pesan singkat (short messages)*. From the above indicator, the teacher did not specifically state the verb on how to measure students' psychomotoric skill. The clarity of the learning indicators then appeared in the learning activities in which the teacher wrote: *a. Peserta didik menyebutkan tanda peringatan/warning caution dan notice lain dan pesan singkat (short messages) yang ada di luar lingkungan sekolah, b. Peserta didik menjelaskan arti dari tanda peringatan/warning caution, notice yang telah disebutkan, c. Peserta didik menjelaskan arti dari pesan singkat yang telah disebutkan*.

b. DISCUSSION

From the results, it can be seen that there are no relationship between learning activities and learning indicators formulated in the teachers' lesson plan. Even more, some of the learning indicators are too general and to make it specific, the learning outcomes should be drawn by using action words or operational verbs (Kennedy, 2007).

It is also showed that there is no synchronization between KD and learning indicators found in the lesson plans, whereas, the formulation of learning indicators should be in line with KD. On the other words, KD is used as the main point to generate the learning indicators in the teaching and learning process (Permendikbud Nomor 103 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pembelajaran pada Pendidikan Dasar dan Pendidikan Menengah, 2014). In fact, the inappropriateness between KD and learning indicators affects to the formulation of the learning activities. According to Taher (2013), learning indicators are used to measure students' accomplishment beside it is used as the criteria to develop learning activities.

The findings of this recent study are similar with the findings of Wahyuni's (2007) research. In

her research, she reported that the learning indicators were poorly formulated because some of the learning indicators were not relevant with standard competence (SK), basic competence (KD), and the use of operational verbs. On the same point, this study reported that there were some learning indicators which are not in line with KD. As a result of it, the formulation between learning activities and learning indicators are not relevant each other.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

All in all, it can be concluded that from the six teachers' lesson plans selected, no learning activities which is relevant with the learning indicators. This exists because there are some inappropriateness of the learning indicators generated from basic competences (KD).

In response to this case, there are some suggestions addressed for two related stakeholders. First, the teachers are recommended to revise the lesson plan, concerning to the relevancy between learning activities and learning indicators. It is noted that the formulation of the learning indicators should be in line with KD and it should be formulated using operational verbs.

Second, it is also suggested for the Ministry of Education and Culture to give in-house training for the teachers. The Ministry of Education and Culture could regularly monitor them on how to design good lesson plans. It is expected that the teacher will be able to make an acceptable lesson plan.

REFERENCES

College of Nurses of Ontario. (2014). *Developing Smart Learning Goals*. College of Nurses of Ontario: Toronto.

Duncan, G., & Met, M. (2010). *STARTALK: From Paper to Practice.* College Park, MD: National Foreign Language Center at University of Maryland.

Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2014). *Paparan Wakil Menteri Pendidikan dan*

Kebudayaan R.I Bidang Pendidikan: Konsep dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013. Jakarta: Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan

Kennedy, Declan. (2007). *Writing and Using Learning Outcomes*. University College Cork: Watermans Printers.

Permendikbud No.65 Tahun 2013 Tentang Standar Proses.

Permendikbud No.103 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pendidikan Dasar dan Pendidikan Menengah.

Shrawder, Jack H., Warner, David. (2006). *Planning a Successful Lesson*. South Lake Tahoe: Pentronics Publishing.

Taher, M. (2013). *Urgensi Taksonomi Bloom Domain Kognitif Versi Terbaru Dalam Kurikuum 2013*. Available at http://sumut.kemenag.go.id/

Tim PEKERTI-AA PPSP LPP Universitas Sebelas Maret. (2007). *Panduan Penyusunan Silabus dan Rancangan Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran*. Surakarta: Lembaga Pengembangan Pendidikan Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Wahyuni, Lina. (2007). *Junior High School Lesson Plans*. Unpublished Thesis: State University of Surabaya.