

An Analysis of Teacher's Lesson Plans in Implementing the 2013 Curriculum (Revised Version 2016)

Anggita Dwi Primasiwi

Department of English Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia
anggitadwiprimasiwi@gmail.com

Keywords: The 2013 Curriculum (Revised Version 2016), elements of lesson plan, teacher's consideration.

Abstract: Several studies showed that many teachers found difficulties in applying one of the lesson planning principles, such as considering the conformity of each element, one to another, in designing a lesson plan (Badriyah, 2013; Jasmi, 2014; Puspita, 2015). Since lesson planning affects the success of the 2013 Curriculum implementation for the sustainability of English teaching process, this study was conducted to analyse to what extent the elements of teacher's lesson plans conformed one to another and to reveal the teacher's consideration in lesson planning. A qualitative case study was applied as the method. The data were obtained by collecting five lesson plans designed by a teacher and by interviewing the teacher. The data analysis was done through analysing the conformity of seven elements of the lesson plans, namely, indicators, objectives, materials, method, instructional model, activities, media, and assessment. The findings from document analysis showed the elements in each lesson plan conformed to each other, though several elements, namely indicators, objectives, activities, and assessment, only conformed partly one to another. As the interview data indicated, the teacher was aware of the importance of the lesson plan elements' conformity, and in designing the lesson plans, basic competence is his main consideration.

1 INTRODUCTION

In 2016, Indonesia Ministry of National Education (Kemdikbud) stipulated the 2013 Curriculum (Revised Version 2016), new version of the 2013 Curriculum, in response to the findings from Direktorat PSMP (2015), which showed that teachers found difficulties in implementing the old 2013 Curriculum. Through Ministry Regulation No 22 in 2016, a new prescribed format of lesson plan was published, as well as the eight fundamental principles of lesson planning.

From the eight principles, several studies have shown that teachers found difficulties in applying the principle which stated, in designing a lesson plan, teachers should consider the conformity of each element of the lesson plan, one to another (Badriyah, 2013; Jasmi, 2014; Puspita, 2015). Since the lesson planning affects the success of the 2013 Curriculum (Revised Version 2016) implementation for the sustainability of English teaching process, this research was conducted to analyze the conformity of each element of the lesson plan, as well as the teacher's consideration in designing the elements of the lesson plans.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Principles of Lesson Planning

As stated in Ministry Regulation No 22 in 2016, in designing a lesson plan, a teacher needs to consider the eight principles as follow: 1) individual differences of the students; 2) active participation of the students; 3) student-centered; 4) developing the students' reading and writing habit; 5) providing positive feedback, reinforcement, enrichment, and remediation; 6) emphasizing the conformity and integration among the basic competence, materials, activities, indicators, assessment, and resources; 7) accommodating thematic-integrated learning, cross integrity among the subjects, cross-learning aspects, and cultural diversity; and 8) integrating information and communication technology.

2.2 Elements of Lesson Plan

In implementing the 2013 Curriculum (Revised Version), a lesson plan has seven essential elements (*Permendikbud No 103 Tahun 2014*), which are:

1. Indicators, which includes two learning domains, knowledge and skills; as well as contains observable and measurable operational verbs and the materials (Direktorat PSMP, 2016);
2. Objectives, which are composed using the "ABCD" (audience, behavior, condition and degree) formula (Kosasih, 2016);
3. Materials;
4. Instructional models;
5. Activities, which consist of preliminary, whilst, and post activities;
6. Media, which utilizes technology (Kosasih, 2016);
7. Assessment, which covers two learning domains; cognitive and psychomotor (Ministry Regulation No. 53 in 2015).

2.3 Scientific Approach

According to Wicander and Monroe (in Wahyudin 2015), scientific approach is considered as a logical systematic approach that involves gathering data, formulating and testing the hypothesis, and proposing theories. As stated in Ministry Regulation No 22 in 2016, scientific approach applies five different

procedures of learning; observing, questioning, experimenting, associating, and communicating.

3 METHODS

Qualitative research method was used in this study, since this study was intended to explore a problem in order to obtain a detailed understanding of the issue (Creswell, 2007). In addition, case study was employed to reveal a comprehensive understanding of the event under the study (Fidel, 1984). Document analysis and interview were administered to collect the data. An English teacher of a public junior high school in Cianjur volunteered as the participant in this study. He contributed five lesson plans to be analyzed based on the theories and principles proposed by Direktorat PSMP (2016), Kosasih (2016), Baker (1971), Mager (1975), Arends (2008), Keser & Karagoca (2010), Sudjana (2002), and Syahmadi (n.d.), Ministry Regulation No 103 in 2014, Ministry Regulation No 22 in 2016 and Ministry Regulation No 53 in 2015. The theories were arranged in the form of a rubric which is presented in the table below.

Table 1: Analysis Rubric.

No	Lesson Plan's Elements	Conformity			Notes
		Not Related	Partly Related	Related	
Indicator					
1.	Operational verbs conformity to measured competence				
2.	Indicators' conformity to cognitive basic competence				
3.	Indicators' conformity to psychomotor basic competence				
Objectives					
1.	Objectives' conformity to basic competence				
2.	Objectives' conformity to indicators				
3.	Objectives' conformity to the aspects of ABCD				
Materials					
1.	Materials' conformity to basic competence				
2.	Materials' conformity to objectives				
3.	Systematization of the materials.				
Media					
1.	Media's conformity to objectives				
2.	Media's conformity to materials				
3.	Media's conformity to scientific approach				
Instructional Model					
1.	Instructional model's conformity to objectives.				
2.	Instructional model's conformity to materials' characteristics.				
Activities					
1.	Mentioning preliminary, whilst and post activity clearly.				
2.	Activities' conformity to objectives.				
3.	Activities' conformity to scientific approach.				
4.	Activities' conformity to instructional model.				
5.	Activities' conformity to materials organization.				
Assessment					
1.	Assessment form's, technique's and instrument's conformity to the indicators of cognitive domain.				

2.	Assessment form's, technique's and instrument's conformity to the indicators of psychomotor domain.				
3.	Score rubric's conformity to the test instruments.				

Adapted from Kemdikbud (2014).

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Lesson Plan Analysis

4.1.1 Indicators

The findings showed that the teacher formulated indicators that contained congruent operational verbs for each measured competence and the materials. However, it is found that the indicators only conformed partly to the Basic Competence for the cognitive and the psychomotor domain. The indicators did not cover several aspects that have been explicitly stated in the Basic Competence of both the cognitive and the psychomotor domains.

4.1.2 Objectives

The analysis in this study focuses on 43 objectives contained in the lesson plans, which were derived from the cognitive and the psychomotor domain.

Table 2: Basic Competence and Objectives of each Lesson Plan.

LP	Basic Competence	Objectives
1	The students are expected to be able to arrange oral and written text of greeting, taking leave, thanking & apologizing expressions.	The students are only expected to be able to use the interpersonal expression.
2	The students are expected to be able to identify and arrange the expression of asking and giving self-introduction and introducing others.	The students are expected to be able to identify and arrange the expression of giving self-introduction and introducing others.
3	The students are expected to be able to identify and arrange the expression of asking and giving information about the date.	The students are expected to be able to identify and arrange the expression of asking and giving information about the date.
4	The students are expected to be able to identify and arrange the expression of asking and giving information	The students are expected to be able to identify and arrange the expression of giving information about the things around them.

	about the things around them.	
5	The students are expected to be able to interpret the song lyrics about teenage life.	The students were expected to be able to identify and interpret the song lyrics, identify their favourite singers' characteristics as well as their good manners.

Firstly, the result showed that the objectives only matched partly to the Basic Competence. This can be spotted in LP 1, 2 and 4, which lacked some requirements that have been clearly stated in the Basic Competence. Moreover, in lesson plan 5, it is written that the students were expected to be able to identify their favorite singers' characteristics as well as their good manners, this objective is not matched to the demand of the Basic Competence.

Secondly, the analysis result showed that all objectives fully conformed to the indicators of each learning domain. This can be seen from the similar operational verbs used in the indicators and the objectives.

Lastly, it is found that none of the objectives of the lesson plans corresponded to the existence of ABCD formula. 11 out of 43 objectives contained only the A and B aspects, while the other 25 objectives contained ABC aspects, and the rest three objectives contained ABD aspects. Thus, this finding implies that the teacher did not compose the ideal objectives, since he did not derive the Basic Competence clearly, completely, and specifically using the "ABCD" formula (Kosasih, 2016).

4.1.3 Materials

Each lesson plan provided different materials. The result of the analysis showed that most of the materials conformed to the Basic Competence and objectives. However, regarding the systematization of the materials, it was found that the teacher systematized the materials poorly since the presentation of the materials did not follow the conversation syntax, as required by the Basic Competence.

4.1.4 Media

The media utilized in each lesson plan is presented in the table below.

Table 2: Media and Materials of each Lesson Plan.

LP	Media	Materials
1	Dialog transcript, pictures, Laptop, LCD projector, social interaction with people around the school.	Expressions of greeting, taking leave, thanking & apologizing.
2	Laptop; board; pictures & labels of trees with flowers, rubbish bin, mountain bike, & school canteen; & projector	Self-introduction and introducing others.
3	Textbook, Ppt of the name of the days, the video about the name of the days, schedule board, calendar, invitation cards.	Expression of asking and giving information about the date.
4	Realia, pictures of the realia.	Things in the classroom.
5	Song, song lyrics, projector, laptop, & speaker.	Interpreting song lyrics.

From the table above, three lesson plans (LP 1, 4, & 5) utilized media that conformed totally to the objectives, while the other two lesson plans (LP 2 & 3) conformed partly to the objectives due to the mismatch between the media and the objectives.

Next, one lesson plan (LP 2) utilized media that conformed partly to the materials, while the rest conformed completely. Lastly, the media in all lesson plans utilized technology and employed real experience, therefore, those media conformed to the scientific approach.

4.1.5 Instructional model

The result showed that the instructional model from two lesson plans (LP 2 & 3) did not correspond to the objective. LP 2 employed project-based learning in which the students' final products did not correspond to the objective. While the LP 3 occupied discovery learning which only covered one out of two objectives. In relation to the materials' characteristics, the employed instructional models conformed to the materials which characterized as transactional text. However, the instructional models did not serve the requirement of the transactional texts. Overall, the result indicates that the teacher has employed the instructional models that were suggested in implementing the 2013 Curriculum (Revised Version 2016).

4.1.6 Activities

In implementing the 2013 Curriculum (Revised Version 2016), the activities should reflect several points explained in Ministry Regulation No 22 in

2016 and Directorate of PSMP (2016). In this study, the teacher has fulfilled the requirements of designing activities in terms of mentioning the preliminary, whilst and closing stage; employed the scientific procedures; and arranging activities that conformed to the materials organization. However, the teacher has not met the requirements for carrying out corresponding activities to the objectives and instructional models.

4.1.7 Assessment

The analysis result showed that the teacher designed proper assessments for the cognitive domain in LP 2, 3 & 5 by employing written test, however for the LP 1, the teacher employed oral test which is not suitable for assessing cognitive domain.

However, the analysis showed only in two lesson plans, the teacher designed assessment which conformed to the indicators of psychomotor domain. Regarding the conformity of the scoring rubric to the test instruments, in two lesson plans (LP 1 & 5), the scoring rubric conformed to the test instrument, while LP 2's scoring rubric conformed partly to the test instruments as it is only served for some specific numbers of the test instruments, therefore, the total score of the test could not be determined. However, the other two lesson plans, (LP 3 & 4), did not include the scoring rubric.

4.2 Interview Data Analysis

The teacher's answer showed that he was knowledgeable that Basic Competence is the eminent basic element of the lesson planning. It served as the main consideration of all elements. Therefore, he took Basic Competence to his consideration while designing every lesson plans element. Moreover, the result revealed that he was aware that the seven elements of the lesson plan should be related one to another. This is in line with Ministry Regulation No 103 in 2014, which stated that in designing lesson plans, the elements within the lesson plan should be related, supporting each other to fulfil the demands of the curriculum. Furthermore, the teacher utilized technology to assist him, this corresponded to what the scientific approach demanded.

5 CONCLUSION

From the discussion presented earlier, it can be concluded that the teacher took Basic Competence as his main consideration while designing every element

of the lesson plans, and he is aware of the importance of the conformity of each element in the lesson plan, although the seven elements (indicators, objectives, materials, instructional model, media, activities & assessment) in his lesson plans still conformed one to another inadequately to some extent. These findings leave a gap for future research to find out the reason despite the teacher's awareness and knowledge of lesson planning, it is still difficult for the teacher to integrate his knowledge to design the lesson plans that follow the principles of lesson planning.

REFERENCES

- Badriah. 2013. *Lesson Planning: The Development and Implementation in the Teaching of English*. (Thesis). School of Post Graduate Studies, Indonesia University of Education, Bandung.
- Creswell, J. W. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Direktorat Pembinaan Sekolah Menengah Pertama. 2016. *Materi Pelatihan Guru Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Edisi Revisi 2016 Tahun 2016 Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris - SMP*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Fidel, R. 1984. *The Case Study Method: A Case Study*. *LISR*, 6, 273-288.
- Jasmi. 2014. English Teacher's Difficulties in Designing Lesson Plan Based on 2013 Curriculum (A Case Study in a Senior High School in Cipatat, West Java). *The 61st TEFLIN International Conference 2014*. Solo: TEFLIN.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. 2014. *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 103 Tahun 2014*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. 2015. *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 53 Tahun 2015*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. 2016. *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2016*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud.
- Kosasih, E. 2016. *Strategi Belajar dan Pembelajaran Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Puspita, A. D. 2015. *An Analysis of Teachers' Lesson Plans Based on 2013 Curriculum*. (Skripsi). Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Indonesia University of Education, Bandung.