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Abstract: This study attempted to describe and analyze how one of English teachers in SMAN 3 Malang, coded as T1 implements an English syllabus and lesson plan. This study was a descriptive qualitative research and employed a case study and a content analysis as the inquiry approaches. The findings were: (1) T1 did not implement an English syllabus and lesson plan in accordance with SBI regulation, and (2) T1’s syllabus and lesson plan have not satisfied all criteria to develop syllabi and lesson plans based on KTSP yet.
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In the era of globalization, people need the ability to compete internationally. To respond that need, the Indonesian government is boosting its human resources through educational system improvement. In attempts of realizing the goal, Indonesian government set a benchmark upon Act of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 Year 2003 (UUSPN 20/2003) Article 50 Verse 3 on the System of National Education stipulating that the government and local government of Indonesia give the opportunity for primary as well as secondary schools to be developed further as national schools with international standard. In Indonesia, this program is renowned as Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (SBI).

In order to be SBI, the Ministry of Education and Culture(2007) declared that schools must be categorized as national schools standard, SekolahStandarNasional (SSN), which applies the eight Standards of National Education (SNP) in its school-based curriculum, Kurikulum Tingkat SatuanPendidikan (KTSP). After becoming SSN, national schools are given option to upgrade the level to be SBI with the purpose of graduating students who have both national and international excellence. Then, they are under government supervision and monitoring for five years. This program so far has been under the government project since 2006. While schools try to be SBI, they are well-known as Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI), pre-national schools with international standards. After five years, the Ministry of Education and Culture will evaluate the implementation of the program at schools to decide whether the particular school will carry the program or not.

As stated in the previous paragraph, RSBI requires qualifications of adapting international standard including in its national curriculum. The Ministry of Education and Culture (2007) obliges RSBI to develop a modified curriculum. It means that the national curriculum must be reinforced, enriched, developed, extended, and adapted from a curriculum that has wide recognition around the world as a curriculum which has international standard. It can be a curriculum from one of countries who gets involved in Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) or one of other developed countries with worldwide educational aspect acknowledgement. Though, the reality of the implementation does not match the regulation. Maulidiyah (2010) found that the English teacher in one of upper secondary schools in Malang, SMAN 1 Malang used the same syllabus, teaching techniques, instructional materials and assessment systems in teaching English in national and international standard classes. The English curriculum mapping for RSBI classes which adapted an OECD curriculum in its school-based curriculum has so far been applied theoretically.
Based on the findings of the previous research, the researcher is engrossed by the implementation of a curriculum in a national school with international standard in the level of upper secondary. *SMAN 3 Malang* was selected to be the subject of the research since it is the first batch of national schools which try to be SBI in Indonesia. Interestingly, there were two distinct curricula which were *KTSP* and an OECD curriculum implemented in English subject in *SMAN 3 Malang*. This practice actually is opposite to the Ministry of Education and Culture Act in Chapter II No. 78 Year 2009 in part two about curriculum, Article 4, Paragraph 1 saying that SBI curriculum is designed based on Standards of Content and Standards of Graduate Competences with enrichment from standards of a country which is an OECD member or other developed countries. This uniqueness catches the researcher’s interest to conduct the present study with the objectives to describe and analyze how one of the English teachers in *SMAN 3 Malang* implements an English syllabus and lesson plan.

**METHOD**

The design of this study is descriptive qualitative. The researcher employed a case study and a content analysis as inquiry approaches. The study was conducted in *SMAN 3 Malang* because it is the first batch of RSBI in Indonesia. The data were obtained from an interview with English teacher coded as Teacher 1 (T1) as one of English teachers. The researcher then crosschecked the data gathered with the results of the interview with the Vice Principal for Curriculum Affairs, the Coordinator of English subject, and two other English teachers coded as Teacher 2 (T2) and Teacher 3 (T3). After that, the researcher analyzed T1’s syllabus and lesson plan with evaluation sheets for syllabi and lesson plans. The analyses of T1’s syllabus and lesson plan focused on one standard of competence, writing skills in odd semester of XI grade in 2011/2012 since it was the newest document submitted to the Vice Principal for Curriculum Affairs.

The procedure of the research follows five stages. First of all, the researcher designed the instruments of this study. The researcher made interview guidelines with three variables to be questioned: general overview of RSBI implementation, the implementation of the English syllabus, and the implementation of the English lesson plan. Also, the researcher developed two evaluation sheets: for syllabi and/or lesson plans in purpose of analyzing whether the evaluated syllabus and lesson plan meet the requirements of KTSP regulation or not. The variables in the evaluation sheets were adapted from the documents by Teacher Certification Program in State University of Malang. The variables assessed in the evaluation sheet for syllabi comprise (1) syllabus identity, (2) standards of competences and basic competences, (3) indicators, (4) learning materials, (5) learning activities, (6) assessment, (7) learning resources, and (8) instructional media. Besides, the evaluation sheet for lesson plans examines (1) lesson plan identity, (2) standards of competences and basic competences, (3) indicators, (4) learning objectives, (5) learning materials, (6) learning resources, (7) learning resources, (8) the instructional media, (9) clarity of the teaching learning process syntax, (10) detail description of the teaching learning process syntax, (11) the appropriateness between teaching method and learning objectives, and (12) assessment.

For the purpose of interpreting the results of the analysis, the researcher made rating scale for each evaluation sheet. The minimum scale is 0 meaning that variables do not exist; while the maximum scale is 4 explaining that all variables are presented. The highest score for a syllabus is 32 and the lowest score is 0; whereas, the highest score for a lesson plan is 44 and the lowest score is 0. To make the interpretation easier, the researcher designed scoring categories. The first is evaluation sheet for syllabi with categorization as follows: poor: ≤ 8, fair: 9-16, good: 17-24, and excellent: 25-32. The second one is for lesson plans with categorization: poor: ≤ 11, fair: 12-22, good: 23-33, and excellent: 34-44.
Prior to the utilization of instruments toward the subjects of this research, all research instruments were tried out in another upper secondary school in Malang with the same qualifications—SMANI Malang. The try-out was meant to validate the instruments. The subject of this research was one of the English teachers, namely Teacher 4 coded as T4. The procedures of the try-out were explained further. Firstly, the researcher raised all questions in the interview guide to T4. Secondly, the researcher requested T4’s syllabus and lesson plan to be analyzed by the evaluation sheets. Finally, the researcher made improvement of the descriptors of each evaluation sheet pursuant to the results of the try-out.

Afterward, the researcher began collecting the data supported by the validated instruments as described henceforth. Firstly, the researcher interviewed the main subject—T1. The result of the interview was later crosschecked with the Vice Principal for Curriculum Affairs, the Coordinator of English subject, T2, and T3. The researcher asked questions using the interview guideline and was recorded by an MP3 recorder. At the juncture of displaying the data, the researcher interviewed the subjects again based on three main discovered evidenceregarding two distinct curricula, the curriculum mapping, and the existence of English syllabi and lesson plans until reaching saturation point. Next, the researcher observed T1’s syllabus and lesson plan and assessed them based on each variable in the evaluation sheets. In the process of giving score in relation to T1’s syllabus and lesson plan, the researcher revised the evaluation sheets’ content for the scoring equality reason. Then, the researcher reported all the data gathered descriptively in order to answer the research questions.

At last, the researcher analyzed and made an interpretation of the findings. The results of the data collection from the interview were analyzed based on the related theories about KTSP and SBI regulation. Further, the results of categorizing the evaluation sheets for the syllabus and the lesson plan were analyzed in line with the ways to implement and develop each component aiming for good syllabi and lesson plans based on KTSP.

FINDINGS

There were two major findings discussed in this study. Based on the results of the interview with T1, the first finding was T1 did not implement an English syllabus and lesson plan in accordance with SBI regulation. This practice occurred due to the fact that in context analysis, T1 merely was asked to classify which standards of competences and basic competences (SK/KD) belong to tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grade. She was not asked to make a proper curriculum mapping which combined SK/KD of KTSP and an OECD curriculum. Related to the curriculum development in English at SMAN 3 Malang, T1 stating that there was socialization of SBI curriculum by the former Vice Principal of Curriculum Affairs in the school through a Compact Disc (CD) about general regulation of SBI. Yet, there was no further explanation about how to develop syllabi and lesson plans based on SBI standards. Moreover, there was no coordination among English teachers to discuss further a detail ideal of curriculum implementation with SBI standards. Consequently, T1 was under misapprehension that KTSP and an OECD curriculum were taught separately. English in regular classes was taught based on KTSP; while English in additional classes apart from regular class hours was taught based on an OECD curriculum through ESL classes. T1 later commented that as the result, official curriculum documents (syllabi and lesson plans) for English which met SBI standards did not exist yet.

The evidence was strengthened by the results of interview with the Coordinator of English subject, T2, and T3. After crosschecking the findings from T1, the researcher discovered the same notion with T1: English teachers did not implement English syllabi and lesson plan pursuant to SBI regulation as the evidence mentioned later on. First, there was no curriculum mapping as well as no official legal curriculum documents with SBI standards in
English subject. Second, English teachers taught English with two distinct curricula. They taught KTSP in regular classes and an OECD curriculum in additional classes apart from regular class hours through ESL classes. They then said that there was socialization of SBI curriculum by the former Vice Principal of Curriculum Affairs but there was no further explanation about how to develop syllabi and lesson plans based on SBI standards.

In spite of the aforementioned evidence, the Vice Principal of Curriculum Department gave different opinions. Firstly, teachers in each subject were responsible to adapt and adopt SK/KD from an OECD curriculum into the school curriculum through a curriculum mapping which resulted in a blended SBI curriculum. Secondly, the implementation of two distinct curricula was inappropriate according to SBI regulation. He said that all subject in the school were taught based on the blended SBI curriculum. Lastly, there were curriculum documents with SBI standards in SMAN 3 Malang, including English subject.

Based on the results of the analysis of the evaluation sheets, the second finding was T1’s syllabus and lesson plan have not satisfied all criteria to develop syllabi and lesson plans based on KTSP yet. The result of the evaluation sheet for syllabi showed that syllabus identity: 4, SK/KD: 3, indicators: 2, learning materials: 1, learning activities: 2, assessment: 2, learning resources: 1, and instructional media: 0. In conclusion, the total score of those eight variables was 15. Therefore, T1’s syllabus was categorized as fair. However, according to T1, she just copied, pasted, and translated SK/KD from Standards of Content in KTSP from Bahasato English; then arranged the time allotment. After that, she copied and pasted other contents in the syllabus from another teacher’s syllabus. Last, she submitted the syllabus to curriculum department due to curriculum document administration.

The ideal theory is that a lesson plan is developed from a syllabus. Nevertheless, T1 said that she did not develop the lesson plan based on the existed syllabus. In designing the lesson plan, T1 looked at SK/KD in Standards of Content as a benchmark for establishing each component. Next, T1 imagined how she wanted to teach her students upon her students’ characteristics and condition. Even though T1 taught regular classes and ESL classes, T1 did not design any lesson plan for teaching ESL classes. T1 just gave her students CIE test from previous years in every meeting in ESL classes. Since lesson plans with an OECD curriculum did not exist, the evaluation would be on T1’s lesson plan pursuant to KTSP regulation. Based on the evaluation sheet for lesson plans, the total score was 31 and was categorized as good. The descriptions of the score of each variable could be summarized that lesson plan identity: 4, SK/KD: 4, indicators: 2, learning objectives: 3, learning materials: 0, learning resources: 4, instructional media: 4, clarity of teaching learning process syntax: 2, detail description of teaching learning process syntax: 3, the appropriateness between teaching method and learning objectives: 1, and assessment: 4.

DISCUSSION

The Board of Standards of National Education (2006) said that the curriculum development team consists of teachers, counselors, and the Headmaster as the chairman. In designing a curriculum, school committee and other related people are involved. Procedures for developing a curriculum comprises of preparing, designing a draft, reviewing and revising, finishing, consolidating, and evaluating. These activities are supervised by the local Ministry of Education and Culture. The purposes of doing context analysis are to identify Standards of Content and Standards of Graduate Competences as the benchmark in designing a curriculum, to analyze school’s condition (students, teachers and administrators, facilities, finance, and programs), and to analyze opportunities and challenges in society.

Unfortunately, the context analysis held in the school seemed to lead to misunderstanding. The fact that English teachers just copied and pasted SK/KD from PDF to
blank table format in order to classify which one belongs to tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grade was inappropriate due to the fact that the school is RSBI. Based on SBI criteria launched by Surya Dharma (2009), SBI must fulfill Standards of Content by showing adaptation and adoption of lesson content with international standard documents. The regulation also outlined that SBI must apply KTSP and Standards of Content for SBI minimum standards and SBI’s lesson content quality has to be equal to or more than superior schools in OECD countries and/or in other developed countries which have excellent quality in education. The conclusion is that the school is supposed to enrich its school based-curriculum by adapting and adopting a curriculum from one of OECD countries and formulating SK/KD from both curricula in the form of a curriculum mapping in each subject.

As the result of the non-existent curriculum mapping, English was taught in two distinct curricula. For the idea of applying school-based curriculum and Standards of Content, it matches with the SBI curriculum minimum standards by Surya Dharma. Yet, this curriculum understanding was a misleading concept. The school must enrich its national curriculum with SK/KD from a curriculum with worldwide acknowledgement as the Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No. 78 Year 2009 in part two, Article 4, Paragraph 1 announced that SBI curriculum is designed based on Standards of Content and Standards of Graduate Competences with enrichment from standards of a country which is an OECD member or other developed countries. The misunderstanding of curriculum implementation in English was presumed due the lack of monitoring and controlling from the Principal and the Vice Principal for Curriculum Affairs.

As the consequence of the non-existent curriculum mapping and two distinct curricula, there was no SBI curriculum document. As cited in the Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No.41 Year 2007 in Article 1 Verse 1 that Standard of Process for elementary and secondary schools comprises teaching and learning process planning, teaching and learning process development, teaching and learning result evaluation, and teaching and learning control, meaning that schools must fulfill qualifications of one of SNP which is Standard of Process including teaching and learning process planning which consists of syllabi and lesson plans. In view of the fact that SMAN 3 Malang was RSBI, English teacher should think higher standard of their teaching and learning process planning which was outlined in the regulation by the Ministry of Education and Culture (2007) that SBI must fulfill complete documents of curriculum comprising standards of competences, objectives, school based-curriculum, syllabi, lesson plans and materials and show Information and Communication Technology based- teaching and learning process in the document.

Based on the findings, it was discovered that firstly, T1 only copied and pasted from another teacher’s syllabus. It was inappropriate because according to the Ministry of Education and Culture (2006), a syllabus should be designed in accordance with SNP, students’ and school’s condition. Secondly, T1’s syllabus was designed based on KTSP. It was opposite to SBI curriculum regulation that obliges SBI to enrich a national curriculum with a curriculum from OECD or other developed countries. Thirdly, T1’s syllabus and lesson plan did not have the ideal link in developing curriculum documents based on KTSP regulation. It was declared by the Ministry of Education and Culture (2010) that the definition of lesson plan is a plan describing lesson procedure and organization to achieve one basic competence in Standards of Content and already described in syllabus. It also mentions that a good lesson plan is developed from a systematic syllabus which was opposite to the regulation of the syllabus and lesson plan development above. T1 should design the lesson plan based on the established syllabus. Unlike the syllabus, T1 made a lesson plan by herself for the purpose of teaching and learning planning in the classroom. T1 imagined how she taught then formulated it in the lesson plan. Ultimately, T1 should design the syllabus.
herself by considering students’ and school’s want based on SBI curriculum regulation instead of KTSP; then use it to develop the lesson plan.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this research, it was discovered that T1 did not implement her English syllabus and lesson plan in accordance with SBI regulation ruled by the Ministry of Education and so did other English teachers in SMAN 3 Malang. It could hereafter be seen upon the descriptions as follows. Firstly, English teachers did not make the curriculum mapping with SBI standards. Secondly, English was taught in two distinct curricula. Finally, those aforementioned practices resulted in non-existent of curriculum document with SBI standards and the implementation of curriculum document based on KTSP regulation.

Furthermore, after analyzing T1’s syllabus and lesson plan, it was also found out that her syllabus and lesson plan have not satisfied all criteria in developing syllabi and lesson plans based on KTSP yet. As the result of evaluation sheet for syllabi, T1’s syllabus was categorized as fair and T1’s lesson plan was categorized as good. In conclusion, T1’s syllabus and lesson plan were implemented somewhat in line with the standards in developing syllabi and lesson plans based on KTSP regulation. Even so, T1 was supposed to implement the English syllabus and lesson plan in SBI standards due to the fact that SMAN 3 Malang is RSBI. Moreover, T1’s syllabus and lesson plan also have not satisfied all criteria to develop syllabi and lesson plans based on KTSP yet. T1 should look at KTSP regulation in how to develop each component then implement it to develop her syllabus and lesson plan.

Suggestion

Based on aforementioned evidence, the researcher wants to provide some suggestions. Firstly, the researcher wants to propose the local Ministry of Education and Culture in Malang to give more attention and supervision for the implementation of RSBI in Malang. Secondly, the Principal and the Vice Principal for Curriculum Affairs of SMAN 3 Malang should give much more intense monitoring and supervision in the SBI curriculum development, particularly, in how to enrich the school based-curriculum with SK/KD from a curriculum of the OECD countries or other developed countries, especially for the English subject. They should also control the curriculum document completeness. Thirdly, the English teachers in SMAN 3 Malang should actively search the information of SBI curriculum and its document development and motivate themselves to make a curriculum mapping and develop the result of mapping into good syllabi and lesson plans. Last but not least, for future researchers who wish to do research with the same topic, the researcher suggests making syllabi and lesson plans evaluation sheets for SBI curriculum.
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