

# The Evaluation Of Curriculum 2013 Implementation Of Class I And IV At Sd Kecamatan Air Kumbang

Irmi Suyanti

**Abstract:** The objective of this study was to find out how many students were able to absorb the lessons, curriculum 2013 as well as the facilities and infrastructure that support learning of curriculum 2013 at Kecamatan Air Kumbang and how many teachers were able to implement curriculum 2013 at Kecamatan Air Kumbang. In this study, the method used was a qualitative method where the method used emphasizes the process of searching data or information until it was felt to be sufficiently used to contain an interpretation. The research instrument consisted of observations and questionnaires. The conclusions of this study included; (1) the condition of students was seen from the aspect of readiness in accordance with the standard, with a percentage of 52.4% and categorized as sufficient; (2) The condition of the teacher was not yet fully in accordance with the standard, with a percentage of 56.86%, and was categorized sufficient; (3) The condition of the infrastructure was very good category with a percentage of 90%; (4) Teacher's understanding was in accordance with the standard, with a percentage of 52.94% categorized as good; (5) The condition of learning planning was 85%, but it was categorized very well; (6) Authentic assessment was not fully in accordance with the standard, with a percentage of 52.9% and sufficient category, while at the outcomes stage, the results of authentic assessment have met the standards and very good category with a percentage of 100%.

**Keywords:** Evaluation, Implementation, Curriculum 2013

## Preliminary

This research begins with the application of the 2013/2014 academic year curriculum which is the first year of the 2013 Curriculum implementation. The application of the 2013 curriculum at the elementary, junior high and high school levels is based on Ministerial Regulation Number 81a concerning the implementation of the 2013 curriculum. 20 of 2003; states that demands on all aspects of life raise demands for renewal of the education system. The renewal of the education system includes curriculum reform. Renewal of the curriculum relating to diversification of the curriculum that takes into account the diversity of students and regional potential, the diversification of professional types of education, the preparation of Graduate Competency Standards that apply nationally and regionally with due regard to local conditions. This is in line with the enactment of the 2013 curriculum which is a renewal in the education system. Minister of Education and Culture No. 67 of 2013 concerning Elementary Curriculum, 2013 curriculum for elementary school is designed with the following characteristics 1) Developing a balance between developing spiritual and social attitudes, having curiosity, creativity, cooperation with intellectual or cognitive and psychomotor abilities; 2) Schools are part of the community that provides a planned learning experience where students apply what is learned in school to the community and use the community as a learning resource; 3) Develop attitudes, knowledge, and skills and apply them in various situations in schools and communities; 4) Give sufficient time to develop various attitudes, knowledge, and skills; 5) Competencies are expressed in the form of competencies which are further detailed in the subject competencies; 6)

Core class competency becomes an organizing element of basic competencies, where all basic competencies and learning processes are developed to achieve competencies expressed in core competencies; 7) Basic competencies are developed based on accumulative principles, mutually reinforcing and enriching education levels and between subjects. In the 2013/2014 school year there were 15 schools in the Air Kumbang Subdistrict which were appointed by the government as the 2013 curriculum executing school pilots. The implementation was still limited and only carried out for grades I and IV. In the early stages of the study, researchers conducted interviews with class I and IV teachers and principals as implementers of the new curriculum. The results of the interview were also summarized in the 2013 Curriculum Evaluation Assistance Meeting of School Principals in Air Kumbang Subdistrict and found several problems that were felt to still be obstacles in the implementation of the 2013 curriculum including the preparation, implementation and evaluation / assessment stages. At the preparation stage, not all teachers are skilled at operating IT media so that it impedes the smooth running of tasks such as RPP production, value processing, using multimedia learning media, and others. Some of the material in the Student Books in classes I and IV is less in order of difficulty because they are arranged according to the theme. Learning material in the student books and teacher books is very minimal so it must use the relevant companion book. The teacher also experienced obstacles in implementation, including class I students still unable to read and write fluently. While based on the opinions of 2013 Curriculum implementing teachers (2013 Curriculum Evaluation Meeting of School Principals in Air Kumbang District, 2013), the material in the Student Book requires mastery of reading and writing. Another obstacle is the implementation of learning cannot be completed in one meeting or one day because of the many activities that must be done by teachers and students. This difficulty is added when the child is less active, even though the demands with this scientific approach, students must be active. For the fourth grade students, at first they were still confused with the concept of integrated thematic learning

- Irmi Suyanti
- Students of Education Management Masters Program  
University of PGRI Palembang

because they were accustomed to the subject approach. In certain themes often there is no connection or even if there is an association it seems forced. This is based on the opinions of teachers summarized in the 2013 Curriculum Evaluation Meeting of School Principals in Air Kumbang District. In learning the teacher performs authentic assessments for each aspect, and students complete solid learning activities. Based on the above background in order to foster learners to be better, especially at 78 Public Elementary Schools in Palembang City, researchers felt the need to research further regarding "Character Education Evaluation in Fostering Students in Palembang Public Elementary School 78". The evaluation results of the 2013 Curriculum implementation team in the first year found that there were still obstacles / obstacles, researchers wanted to know whether in the fifth year of the 2013/2018 Academic Year implementation in the piloting school (Rusman, 2009) there were obstacles or obstacles in implementation and to the extent where the 2013 curriculum implementation is viewed from various aspects such as the condition of the students, the condition of the teacher, the condition of the infrastructure, the preparation of learning plans, the implementation of learning, and the assessment of learning. Therefore, from that situation, an evaluation will be carried out. Based on the description above the evaluation is very necessary for the purposes of taking education policy for all relevant education elements in the Air Kumbang District. If the obstacles have been evaluated and known and the most rational solutions are sought, the results of the research can serve as a reference for the smooth implementation of the coming year. On this basis, this research was conducted with the title "Evaluation of the Implementation of 2013 Class I and IV Elementary Curriculum in Air Kumbang Subdistrict"

## STUDY RESULTS

### Curriculum

In the beginning, the term curriculum came from Greek, namely *curir*, meaning "runner" and *curere* which means "place to race". The curriculum means the distance that must be traveled by runners from start to finish to be able to get an award. In the world of education, distance is defined as an educational program that contains subjects. Thus, a simple understanding of the curriculum of the original language is an education program containing subjects that must be taken by students to be able to obtain a diploma (Zaenal Arifin, 2013). In this case, the curriculum is structured to provide various opportunities for students to study. Students are given the opportunity to increase their abilities. The term curriculum is basically not only limited to a number of subjects, but includes all learning experiences that affect personal development (Hernawan, 2011). Understanding the curriculum is constantly evolving and continues in line with the development of educational theory and practice. With the diversity of opinions regarding the notion of the curriculum, there are theoretically several difficulties in determining one understanding that can summarize all opinions. Based on the results of the study, several dimensions of curriculum understanding were obtained. According to Said Hamid Hasan (in Hernawan, 2011), argues that at this time, the term curriculum has four dimensions of understanding, where one dimension with

other dimensions are interconnected. The four dimensions of the curriculum, namely:

#### a. The curriculum is linked to the Dimension of Ideas or Ideas;

The curriculum as a dimension related to ideas and ideas implies that the curriculum is a set of ideas that will be used as guidelines and instructions in developing the next curriculum.

#### b. The curriculum is linked to the Dimension of Plans;

The meaning of this curriculum dimension is as a set of plans and how to administer the contents, and learning materials, and the methods used to guide the implementation of learning activities to achieve certain educational goals.

#### c. The curriculum is associated with the Activity Dimension;

Understanding the curriculum as a dimension of activity, meaning seeing all activities of the teacher and students in the learning process in school is the curriculum.

#### d. The curriculum is associated with the Dimension of Results;

The definition of the curriculum as the outcome dimension views the curriculum as paying close attention to the results to be achieved by students to fit what has been planned and which is the goal of the curriculum.

Based on some of the above meanings, it can be concluded that the curriculum is a plan / program of learning activities that contains goals, content, and material / subject matter that will provide learning experiences for students, provide general skills and knowledge to achieve certain educational goals. The view or presumption that is currently still commonly used in the world of education and schooling in our country is that the curriculum is a written plan prepared to facilitate the learning process. Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System states that "a set of plans and arrangements that are used as guidelines for implementing learning activities to achieve certain educational goals regarding objectives, content and learning materials are curriculum." Primary school (SD) is the most basic level of formal education in Indonesia that is pursued within a period of 6 years, from grades 1 to 6. Primary students are generally 7-12 years old. In Indonesia and every citizen aged 7-15 years is obliged to attend basic education, namely elementary school (SD) 6 years and junior high school (SMP) 3 years. Primary schools are organized by the government and the private sector. In the National Education System Law (Law Number 20 of 2003) Article 17 defines basic education as follows:

- a. Basic education is the level of education that underlies the level of secondary education.
- b. Primary education, elementary school (SD) and madrasah ibtidaiyah (MI) or other forms of equal and junior high school (SMP) and madrasah tsanawiyah (MTs), or other forms of equal.

In order for the purpose of education in elementary school to be achieved, a curriculum is needed, where in the curriculum there are competencies that are in accordance with the characteristics and abilities of each student. The implementation of the curriculum is the operationalization of

curriculum concepts that are still potential (written) to be actual in the form of learning, Mulyasa (2009). Thus, the implementation of the primary school curriculum is the result of the teacher's translation of the curriculum (SK-KD) which is described in the syllabus and the learning implementation plan (RPP) as a written plan. The National Education Objectives formulated in Law Number 20 of 2003 are for the development of potential students to become human beings who believe and devote to God Almighty, have noble, physically and mentally healthy, possess knowledge, have proficient, creative personalities, and independent, as well as being a democratic and responsible citizen. Smart in terms of intelligent spiritual and intelligent social / emotional aspects of attitude, intelligent intellectual in the aspect of knowledge, and intelligent kinesthetic in the aspects of skills. The 2013 curriculum aims to prepare Indonesian children to have the ability to live as individuals and citizens who are creative, productive, creative, innovative, affective and able to contribute to the life of the world, nation, state and world civilization (Kemdikbud, 2013). In Permendikbud No. 65 of 2013 concerning the standard process, it was explained that the learning used for elementary / MI levels in the 2013 curriculum is integrated thematic learning. Integrated thematic learning is a learning approach that integrates various competencies from various subjects into a unifying theme. The theme brings together various basic concepts so that students do not learn the basic concepts in bits and pieces. Integrated thematic learning, in learning activities provides meaning that is not piecemeal or intact to students. Thematic learning, can be interpreted as a learning activity by integrating the material of several subjects in one topic / topic of discussion. Thematic learning is carried out with the aim of efforts to improve and improve the quality of education, especially to balance the density of the curriculum (Suryosubroto, 2009). Thematic learning will provide opportunities for integrated learning that emphasizes more on student participation / involvement in learning. According to Rusman (2009), the integrated learning approach places more emphasis on applying the concept of learning while doing something (learning by doing). In its implementation, this thematic learning approach is in the form of a theme chosen and developed by the teacher together with students by noting the relevance of the subject matter. The purpose of this theme is not only to master the concepts in a subject, but also the connection with the concepts of other subjects (Poerwardarminta, in Rusman, 2009).

## Discussion

This research is planned to be carried out in Elementary Schools in Air Kumbang District. With the time of the study planned to be implemented starting December 11, 2018 until January 18, 2019. In this study, the evaluation stages used are the stages of evaluation proposed by Stake (Wood, 2001) which includes context, process, outcomes. The evaluation of the 2013 I & IV grade 2013 curriculum implementation in Banyuasin District in the 2017/2018 school year emphasized two main things, namely description and judgments. These two things are obtained through portrayal of the antecedent, transaction, and outcome stages.

## 1. Introduction (antecedent)

At this stage the 2013 curriculum implementation was described which included: the condition of the students, the condition of the teacher, the conditions of supporting facilities and infrastructure, the teacher's understanding of the 2013 Curriculum, and the planning of learning.

### a. Condition of students

The description of the condition of students includes readiness to follow learning and the activity of participating in learning. The condition of students in general is as follows: The number of students with very good category conditions to implement the 2013 curriculum is 3 students (3.6%). The condition of students is categorized as good as 34 (47.6%). The condition of students in the less category was 31 (29.8%) and students in the very less category were 15 (19%). But the difference is only 1.2%. Students' readiness to take part in the study included 8.3% excellent category, and 44.1% good or very good and good category of students which was 52.4%. While students who fall into the category of less 36.9% and very less 10.7%, in other words the number of students in the less category and very less is 47.6%. Data of students with good categories is more than the data of students in the less category. The activeness of students in participating in the study included a very good category of 20.2%, and both 46.4% or the category of students that included very good and good were 66.6%. While students who fall into the category of less than 31% and very less 2.4%, in other words the number of students in the less category and very less is 33.4%. Data of students with good categories is more than the data of students in the less category.

### b. Teacher's condition

The description of the condition of the teacher to implement the 2013 curriculum which includes academic qualifications, pedagogical competencies, personality competencies, social competencies, and professional competencies as follows: Mean / average overall score is 134.4 with standard deviation of 6.58. The number of teachers included in the excellent category for implementing the 2013 Curriculum was 3 teachers (5.88%), good categories as many as 28 teachers (54.90%), less categories 14 teachers (27.45%), and very poor categories 3 teachers (11.76%). Teacher's academic qualifications included in the excellent category were 40 teachers (78.4%), good categories were 3 teachers (5.9%). Academically qualified teachers with less categories were 6 teachers (11.8%) and very less 2 teachers (3.9%). Teachers with pedagogical competencies included very good categories as many as 2 teachers (3.92%), in good category as many as 27 teachers (52.94%). With the number of teachers categorized as very good and good as much as 56.86%. Teachers with pedagogical competencies which are included in the less category are 22 people (43.14%) and are very less 0 teachers (0%). The number of teachers categorized as less and very less seen from pedagogic competence as much as 43.14%. Very good category of teacher personality competencies 6 people (11.76%), as many as 30 good categories (58.82%). Less categories are 13 people (29.41%). There is no category for very less. Teachers' conditions related to social competence were 8 teachers (15.69%) categorized as very good, 23 teachers (45.10%) categorized as good. While the

less category is 17 teachers (33.33%) and very less categories 3 people (5.88%). The teacher's condition is related to professional competence, for the teacher data is very good as many as 3 people (5.88%), 26 good categories (50.98%), 22 people less (43.14%), and very less categories (0 %).

### c. Conditions of infrastructure

The mean for the overall score of observation of the condition of infrastructure is 55.7 with a standard deviation of 5.5. The condition of facilities and infrastructure includes the condition of the classroom with its completeness, the condition of the library space, and the condition of the teaching aids / learning media (laboratories). As a result of the condition of facilities and infrastructure, in line with the research conducted on the Implementation of 2013 Curriculum in piloting schools or schools that are pioneers in the implementation of the curriculum as well as independent implementers, it is necessary to conduct evaluations to maintain consistency in achieving the curriculum objectives themselves. This study aims to evaluate the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum in independent implementing schools which include (1) Readiness of implementation; (2) Learning learning and evaluation processes, (3) results of implementation; and (4) the level of successful implementation. The evaluation method used in this study is the Countenan Stake model which divides curriculum components in the observation matrix and consideration matrix which includes antecedent, transaction, and stage outcomes. The results showed that the preliminary stage or implementation readiness included the readiness of teachers, books, infrastructure, and learning plans very well (95%), the process stage which included very good learning and evaluation activities (90%), and implementation results which included responses students and learning outcomes are also very good (94%). Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum in independent implementing schools can run very well and get support in meeting national education standards.

### d. The condition of the teacher's understanding of the 2013 curriculum

Conditions related to teacher understanding of the 2013 curriculum consist of syllabus studies, analysis of teaching materials, and completeness of curriculum documents. The mean / overall score is 78.6 with a standard deviation of 8.8. Conditions related to teacher understanding of the 2013 curriculum, 7 teachers (13.7%) were categorized very well, 24 teachers (47.06%) were categorized well, 15 teachers (29.41%) were categorized as poor, and 5 teachers ( 9.80%) very poorly categorized. From the answers to the questionnaires filled out by the teacher related to the implementation of authentic assessments, data obtained by 6 teachers (11.76%) had carried out authentic assessments in very good categories. A total of 21 teachers (41.18%) carried out authentic assessments in good categories. 20 teachers (39.22%) carried out authentic assessments with less categories, and 4 teachers (7.84%) carried out authentic assessments with very less categories.

## 2. Transaction

The transaction of authentic assessment implementation. Related to the condition of authentic assessment implementation with categorized was very good 11.67%, good 41,18%, less 39,22% and very less 7,84%. The data was included in good category amount 52,94%.

## 3. Stage of results (Outcomes)

The results of authentic assessment include aspects of attitudes, knowledge, and skills obtained from observations of the list of values against class samples (20 samples consisting of 10 samples of class I and 10 samples in class 4). Data from authentic assessment results, there are 4 very good categorized schools 26.67%, 11 schools categorized good 73.33%, and none categorized as less and very less. The data obtained in this study are divided into three parts, namely preliminary (antecedent), process (transaction), and results (outcomes). At each stage will be seen (horizontally) conformity (congruence) between planning (intents) and implementation data obtained from field observations (observations). If there is a discrepancy, consideration / advice / input will be given to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum according to the conditions in the field. Furthermore, the gaps in each stage will also be seen. The learning process includes teachers, students, and interactions between teachers and students in learning activities. So that each aspect can complement each other to produce a good learning process.

## CONCLUSION

Based on data from the results of research and discussion in CHAPTER IV, the researcher can conclude a number of things as follows. The condition of students seen from the aspect of readiness to study and activeness during learning is not yet fully in accordance with the standard with a percentage of 52.4% and sufficiently categorized. The condition of the infrastructure seen from the classrooms and its facilities, library space, and teaching aids / media in the laboratory is very well categorized with a percentage of 90%. The condition of the teacher seen from the aspect of academic qualifications, pedagogic competence, personality competence, social competence, and professional competence is not yet fully in accordance with the standards with a percentage of 56.86%, and sufficiently categorized. The teacher's understanding of the curriculum is not fully in accordance with the standard with a percentage of 52.94%, but has been categorized well. The condition of learning planning is not yet fully compliant with a percentage of 85%, but has been categorized very well. At the transaction stage, the implementation of authentic assessments is not yet fully in accordance with the standard with a percentage of 52.9% and sufficient category, whereas in the outcomes stage the authentic assessment results have met very good standards and categories with a percentage of 100%.

**DAFTAR PUSTAKA**

- [1]. Agustyana, W. &. (2014). Evaluasi Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Kelas IV SD Negeri Banaran 1 Kertosono. *Jurnal Maha Peserta Didik Teknologi Pendidikan Universitas Surabaya*, diakses tanggal 29 september 2018.
- [2]. Ahmad. (2014). Problematika Kurikulum 2013 & Kepemimpinan Instruksional Kepala Sekolah. *Jurnal Pencerahan*, 8(2): 98-108, <http://www.jurnal.ac.id/JPP/article/view/2158>, diakses pada tanggal 15 September 2018.
- [3]. Arifin, Z. (2013). Konsep dan model pengembangan kurikulum. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.
- [4]. Arifin, Z. (2009). Evaluasi Pembelajaran. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.
- [5]. Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2010). Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- [6]. Asyhar, Rayandra. 2011. Kreatif Mengembangkan Media Pembelajaran. Gaung Persada. Jakarta.
- [7]. Awaliyah. (2014). Peningkatan Keteladanan akhlak mulia dan kompetensi pendidik dalam menyongsong implementasi kurikulum 2013. Prosiding seminar nasional dan temu alumni "peran pendidikan dalam pembangunan karakter bangsa". Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- [8]. Budiani, Sri. dkk. (2017). Evaluasi Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 di Sekolah Pelaksana Mandiri. *Innovative Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology IJCET* 6(1); 45-57. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jktp/article/view/15998>. diakses pada tanggal 16 September 2018
- [9]. Emzir, (2011). Analisis Data: Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif. Jakarta: Rajawali Press
- [10]. Fogarty. (2009). The mindful school how to integrate the curricula. Palatine Skylight Publishing.
- [11]. Fullan, M. (2007). School development; the new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- [12]. Gerde. (2013). Using The Scientific Method to Guide Learning; an Integrated Approach to Early Childhood Curriculum. *Early Childhood Curriculum Journal*, 41(5):315-323.
- [13]. Hamalik, O. (2008). Dasar-Dasar Pengembangan Kurikulum. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya.
- [14]. Hamalik, O. (2008). Manajemen pengembangan kurikulum. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- [15]. Hamalik, O. (2007). Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- [16]. Hamm, R W. (1985). A Systematic evaluation of environment investigation course. Doctoral dissertation. Georgia State University.
- [17]. Handayani, Oktio W.K. (2015). Evaluasi Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 pada Pembelajaran Penjaskesorkes di Sekolah Menengah Pertama Negeri Kota Palembang. <http://journal.Unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jpes/article/view/9893>, 6(1) November 2015. diakses pada tanggal 20 Januari 2018
- [18]. Hapsari. (2015). Kemampuan rata-rata guru dalam mengembangkan, mengimplementasikan, dan mengevaluasi kurikulum 2013. *Indonesia Journal Of Curriculum and Educational Technology Studies*, 3(1);22-28, <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jktp/article/view/8680>. diakses pada tanggal 16 September 2018
- [19]. Hasan, H. (2009). Evaluasi Kurikulum. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- [20]. Helvaci, M. (2009). An evaluation of changes in the curriculum of elementary school level in turkey. *Educational Vol 130.2*;308-322.
- [21]. Hergenhahn, B.R., Matthew H. Olson. (2008). Theories of Learning. Jakarta: Kencana
- [22]. Hernawan, A. (2011). Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.
- [23]. Hosnan. (2014). Pendekatan saintifik dan kontekstual dalam pembelajaran abad 21. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- [24]. Iskandar. (2009). Psikologi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Gaung Persada.
- [25]. Kebudayaan, K. P. (2013). Paten No. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI No.64 tahun 2013 tentang Standar Isi. Jakarta.
- [26]. Kemdikbud. (2013). Materi Pelatihan guru kurikulum 2013 SD kelas IV. Jakarta: Dirjen Dikdasmen Kemdikbud.
- [27]. Kemdikbud. (2013). Permendikbud no 81a tentang Implementasi Kurikulum 2013. Jakarta: Dirjen Dikdasmen Kemdikbud.
- [28]. Kunandar. (2013). Penilaian autentik. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [29]. Kurniasih, dkk. (2014). Sukses Mengimplementasikan Kurikulum 2013. Surabaya: Kata Pena.

- [30]. Majid, A. (2014). Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 kajian teoritis dan praktis. Bandung: Interest Media.
- [31]. Majid, R. &. (2014). Pendekatan Ilmiah dalam Implementasi Kurikulum 2013. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosda Karya.
- [32]. Mardapi, Djemari. (2013). Pengukuran Penilaian & Evaluasi Pendidikan. Bandung: Nuha Medika
- [33]. Marsh, C. (2009). Key concept for understanding curriculum. New York: Routledge.
- [34]. Mendikbud. (2007). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI No.16 tahun 2007 tentang Standar Kualifikasi Akademik dan Kompetensi Guru. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [35]. Miarso, Y. (2011). Menyemai Benih Teknologi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Grup.
- [36]. Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1986). Qualitative Data Analysis: a Sourcebook of New Methods. California: SAGE Publication Inc
- [37]. Moelong, Lexy.J. (2011). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya
- [38]. Mulyana. (2009). Implementasi Kurikulum KTSP. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- [39]. Nurmin, N & Kartowagiran B. (2013). Evaluasi kemampuan guru dalam mengimplementasikan pembelajaran tematik di SD Kecamatan Salahutu Kabupaten Maluku Tengah. Jurnal prima edukasia, [http://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/article/view/diakses\\_tanggal\\_29\\_september\\_2018](http://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/article/view/diakses_tanggal_29_september_2018).
- [40]. Oliva. (1992). Developing The Curriculum. Harper: Collins Publishers.
- [41]. Omstein, A.C & Hunkins F.P. (2009). Curriculum : Foundation, Principles, and Issues. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [42]. Peraturan Menteri dan Kebudayaan RI No.24 tahun 2007 Tentang sarana dan prasarana untuk Sekolah Dasar/Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (SD/MI). (2007b). Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [43]. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No.66 tahun 2013 tentang Standar Penilaian . (2013). Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [44]. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI No 65 tahun 2013 tentang Standar Proses. (2013) Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [45]. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI No. 67 tahun 2013 tentang KD dan Struktur Kurikulum SD/MI.(2013). Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [46]. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI Nomor 81a Tahun 2013 Tentang Implementasi Kurikulum . (2013). Jakarta. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [47]. Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI No.54 tahun 2013 tentang Standar Kompetensi Lulusan. (2013a) Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [48]. Pribadi, Benny A. (2009). Model Desain Sistem Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.
- [49]. Republik Indonesia. (2003). Undang-Undang Nomor 20 tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.
- [50]. Republik Indonesia. (2005). Undang-Undang Nomor 14 tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen.
- [51]. R. Ibarahim. (2011). Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.
- [52]. Rusman. (2009). Manajemen Kurikulum. Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.
- [53]. Sanjaya, Wina. (2010). Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta : Kencana.
- [54]. Sardiman. (2011). Interaksi Motivasi Belajar Mengajar. Jakarta. Raja Grafindo Persada. Sanders, J.R, Worthen B R & Fitzpatrick, J. (2011). Program evaluation; alternative approaches and practical guidelines. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [55]. Schubert. (1986). Curriculum; Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility. Chicago: Macmillan Publishing Company .
- [56]. Schunk, D. (2009). Learning Theories. Boston: Pearson Education.
- [57]. Scriven, M. (1967). The Metodology of evaluation . Chicago. Rand McNally
- [58]. Setiono, I. (2013). Evaluasi implementasi kurikulum program studi listrik industri smk teknik berstandar internasional. Disertasi Doktor tidak diterbitkan . Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- [59]. Setiono, I. (2013). Evaluasi implementasi kurikulum program studi listrik industri smk teknik berstandar internasional. Disertasi Doktor tidak diterbitkan . Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- [60]. Setiadi, Hadi. (2016). Penilaian Kurikulum 2013. Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan, vol.20,

No.2 : 166-178, <http://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/jpep>, diakses pada tanggal 18 Januari 2019.

- [61]. Siskandar. (2016). Evaluasi Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 di Madrasah Aliyah. Cendikia, 10(2):117-183, [web:cendikia.pusatbahasa.or.id](http://web.cendikia.pusatbahasa.or.id), diakses pada tanggal 18 Januari 2019.
- [62]. Stake, R E. (1967). Forward technology for the evaluation of educational programs. Chicago. Rand McNally
- [63]. Syukria, Hatma (2013). Evaluasi Implementasi Penilaian Kurikulum 2013 Mata Pelajaran Kimia Kelas XI di Kabupaten Taanggamus, Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan, Universitas Lampung, diakses pada tanggal 18 Januari 2019.
- [64]. Sugiyono. (2008). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R & D. Yogyakarta: Alfabeta
- [65]. Sugiyono. (2012). Metode Penelitian Pendidikan. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [66]. Sugiyono. (2013). Metode Penelitian Kombinasi ( mixed method ). Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [67]. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- [68]. Wahyudin, Dinn. (2011). Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.
- [69]. Wood, B. B. (2001). Stake's Countenance Model; Evaluating an Environmental Education Profesional Development Course. Journal of Environmental Education, 00958964, Winter 2001, Vol 32, Issue 2, diakses tanggal 29 september 2018.