



A MODEL OF EDUCATION DISTRICT CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT: INDONESIA CASE

DinnWahyudin*

Indonesia University of Education

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 18th May, 2017

Received in revised form 14th

June, 2017 Accepted 26th July, 2017

Published online 28th August, 2017

Key words:

Curriculum Management, Governance In Education, Decentralization In Education

ABSTRACT

In the context of decentralization of education in Indonesia, it is found discrepancies between district level education curriculum management policy and school level curriculum implementation. This situation is likely to lead to a potential distortion in approved curriculum policy at district or provincial level and school level curriculum implementation. This study is aimed to develop a model of education curriculum management in the era of regional autonomy in order to improve the accountability of district education officer and school administrators and teachers in planning, implementing, and evaluating school level curriculum. Through a research and development approach and qualitative and quantitative approach taking into account the results of pre-survey that were conducted at district level. Then, a hypothetical model of district curriculum management has been invented, and designed on the basis of capacity development planning for education at district level model. The model is called Development Plan of Curriculum Management Model (DPCMM). Findings show that the hypothetical DPCMM model has positive effects on district strategic plan. The proposed theory is that DPCMM is an education district curriculum planning, implementing, and evaluation model with vast effects on instructional processes at school level. Its dimension comprises planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling all sub systems of curriculum management, including organizational structure, human resources, funding, transparency, and the culture of accountability. The implication of study is that education district level curriculum management is crucial and seemingly puts a high priority on the students' needs, transparency, accountability, and participation. It is recommended that strategic plan of educational sector should consider school curriculum planning with the spirit of regional autonomy.

Copyright©2017 DinnWahyudin. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The change of decentralization of educational policy has implication for curriculum innovation and curriculum management. The implication of these curriculum management changes occur at the national, provincial, district or school level. (OECD, 2015; Kemdikbud -MOE, 2015, UNESCO, 2012). Nevertheless, policy and curriculum reform that occurred has not been offset by the existence of an optimal system of curriculum management, both at the district level or at the school level. In fact, an important element of the democratization of education decentralization, local wisdom, and participation still need to be improved.

In addition, decentralization of education in Indonesia has encouraged local governments to make their own decisions relative to some portion of curricular space in the form of the use of some learning hours for what has become known as "local contents" (Jalal & Musthafa, as quoted by

Musthafa, 2016). As result of this decentralized decision-making, since last decade, public interest on local content subjects have become enhanced. This is evidence in increasing number of district and city governments all over the country offer local content curriculum based their own perspective in every school level. While decisions to prepare subjects on local content curriculum have been made, requirements for teachers to be able to teach local content or subjects well at this level are seldom discussed in public forum. As results, knowledge about this important issue is very limited.

OECD (2015) reports that the decentralization process in Indonesia has disempowered provincial offices leaving their role to that of co-ordination of education among districts and verifying statistics and funding transfers. Each semester the provincial office meets with school principals to update them on developments from the center. However, it is noted that the provincial education offices have no responsibility for linking schools such SMK to specific industries targeted, which is a concern given that its proposed economic corridors

*Corresponding author: DinnWahyudin
Indonesia University of Education

encompass many districts. It is also found that The World Bank report as quoted by Wahyudin (2016) stated that Indonesia's ambitious decentralization program is transforming the nature and level of public service delivery, including education. How decentralization is applied to the education system has been defined in Education Law 20/2003, which transfers the principal responsibilities, authority, and resources for the delivery of education to lower levels of government, while some decision making power is transferred to schools themselves. Furthermore, the World Bank reported that there are four key conditions for decentralization to overcome barriers and stimulate educational development: (i) clear division of responsibilities and power among the different levels of government, (ii) greater decision making power and autonomy to local governments, (iii) greater voice of teachers and parents on how schools operate, and (iv) effective accountability mechanisms and financial structures that are consistent with educational goals. By distributing power and responsibility more widely throughout the education sector, decentralization has potential chance to increase efficiency of the system and its responsiveness to the needs of communities.

Supporting this and the decentralization effort in general, the government has moved to anchor the principles of school-based management, where considerable decision-making authority is transferred to individual schools, in the national education system and also to provide a framework of National Standards for Education. (OECD, 2015; UNESCO, 2000, 2012; the World Bank, 1998).

Considering that decentralization is a new important phenomenon in education program, McGinn and T Welsh (Wahyudin, 2016) stated that the decentralization is one of the most important phenomena to have affected educational planning in the last 15 years. Responses for decentralization are numerous. In some cases it is a questioning of increasing efficiency in management and governance. It also helps in clarifying lines of accountability, increasing transparency, and allows for mobilization of resources at the local level, through community participation that would be available.

In Indonesia, local government in district level has the authority to manage education program. It has some responsibilities for (1) preparing and establishing management guidelines in kindergarten, primary, secondary school and vocational school under guidelines set by the central government, (2) establishing local curriculum, secondary school and vocational school under the national curriculum set by the central government, (3) implementing a national curriculum based on government established guidelines, (4) developing competency standards at kindergarten, primary schools, secondary schools and vocational schools on the basis of minimal competence set by the central government, (5) monitoring, controlling, and assessing the implementation of learning and school management, and (6) establishing learning outcomes assessment guidelines.

Curriculum management in the era of autonomy demands more need oriented. This is done through the analysis of external and internal environment. Thus, the planning and implementation of district curriculum management can result in strategic changes of the curriculum implementation in school setting. The focus of curriculum management significantly determines the success of school curriculum in

achieving its instructional objectives. If management crippled the curriculum in the form of documents, it will be curriculum plan as *inertia*. (Billick, 2001; Boseman, 1992; Bush and Bell, 2002; Hasan as quoted by Wahyudin, 2014). In the dimension of curriculum development, curriculum management respects to the distribution and availability of documents curriculum in schools, dissemination of ideas and documents, providing professional assistance to principals, school planning in the implementation, qualification and workload of teachers, atmosphere and facilities of teacher, process monitoring, and follow-up program. Management largely focuses in determining the success of the curriculum goals. It was stated in the document and carried out in the process. If management is paralyzed it can be said that the curriculum in the form of the document will be a plan that inertia (Hasan, 2010).

The implementation of curriculum becomes less meaningful, because there is obviously difference between what is planned and what is implemented in school setting. Curriculum implementation cannot be carried out optimally in conducive environment. This makes the burden to each subject to develop material that is characterized by cognitive, attitudes, and psychomotor learning experiences. Meaningful learning experience that is characterized by intellectual exercise, critical thinking, contextual learning, social and emotional interaction, and communicative interaction will be difficult to create in such poor circumstances. Similarly, instructional activities such as reading habits, increasing curiosity, creativity, honesty, hardworking and hard learning, and respect of other opinions would be difficult to be implemented properly.

Thus, the management of curriculum development related to the degree of management or management aspect in planning, implementation, and evaluation of the curriculum. This is with regard to the distribution and availability of documents curriculum in schools, dissemination of ideas and documents, provision of professional assistance, planning and implementation of programs, qualifications and workload of the teaching staff, the atmosphere and working facilities, process monitoring, and follow-up program (Clark, 1999; Dessler, 1977; Hunkins and Ornstein, 2009). It is confirmed that the curriculum should be an instrument of reconstruction of knowledge systematically developed to control managerial educational institutions; curriculum as that reconstruction of knowledge and experience systematically developed under the auspices of the school and university to enable the learners to increase his or her control of knowledge and experience (Oliva, 1988; and Wahyudin, 2014; Bar-Yam, 2012).

Each country has a national education system and curriculum that was followed. It is aligned with the philosophies, policies, and national education strategy as a whole will be influenced by the state system adopted and the objectives to be achieved within the framework of the state and nation. In a universal dimension, Olivia (1992: 33) calls the curriculum as "as a product of its time. Curriculum responds to and is changed by the forced social, philosophical positions, psychological principles, accumulating knowledge, and educational leadership at its moment in history". The curriculum is a product produced by the age of a civilization in the size of the dimension of time. Therefore, the curriculum developed will be strongly colored by a variety of factors that occur in the community, both social and cultural factors, economic,

political, as well as the dimensions of advances science and technology.

There is a very strong link between the political dimension of a nation with the development of national education, including curriculum development adopted. Hasan (2004: 2-4) writes in its broadest sense is the answer curriculum planners and curriculum expert of the issues facing the nation today and the quality of the nation's future. The curriculum of the answer to the problems faced in the present and future challenges for the life of the nation. According to Hasan (2004:3), the concept of curriculum development in the narrow sense includes three phases, namely: (1) the construction of the curriculum (curriculum construction), (2) the implementation of the curriculum (curriculum implementation); and (3) evaluation of the curriculum (curriculum evaluation).

The first phase, construction of curriculum begins with the process of consolidation of the idea of a curriculum in which the developers formulate a response to the problem of the nation's education. After the curriculum ideas considered mature enough and have the ability to meet the challenge of new developers identify and assess the curriculum model is most appropriate. Model agreed curriculum used to develop the curriculum document.

The second phase, the implementation of the curriculum by involving many parties, including teachers, education administrators group (principals, supervisors, other education officials). When in this phase all parties do their job properly, the curriculum is successful.

The third phase, the evaluation of the curriculum. In the construction phase of the curriculum, evaluation is a process that helps provide information to the developers if they design a curriculum ideas are valid as an answer to the problem. While in the second phase, the evaluation provides information on the readiness of the field, about the implementation process is in conformity with the idea and the model curriculum. The first and second phase can be said to be sequential, while the evaluation of the curriculum starting from the initial development of the idea of curriculum to produce graduates curriculum.

However, there should be coherence between curriculum with learning undertaken at the institution. *First*, the curriculum rests on purposes or goals of the curriculum – curriculum objectives to be achieved. Likewise, when the curriculum is conceived as the transmission of cultural heritage, the curriculum should serve as a glue instrument for cultural heritage to the younger generation next. *Second*, the curriculum which is based on a point of view based on the context of the curriculum used. Meaning of curriculum which is based on the viewpoint of context, for specialist curriculum wing essentialism is seen as the transmission of cultural heritage by teaching the younger generation for the preparation of a better life in the future. *Third*, the curriculum is based at strategic vantage points on the chosen curriculum development. The development also can't be separated from the processes, which have better teaching strategies, teaching techniques used (Oliva, 1988; Stobie, 2013; Wahyudin, 2014; and Boye, Allison, 2015).

That's the other side of view of the curriculum as a process. Likewise, the experts who looked at the curriculum as a way

of learning through learning individually programmed, basically this definition is also based on the rules of the development strategy of the curriculum used (c/Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall eds., 2009). In this context, Oliva again refer to it as the curriculum as individualized learning and the curriculum as programmed instruction are in reality specifications of systems by which the learners encounter curricular content through the process of instruction. On this understanding, the curriculum experts refer to the curriculum as a process (Oliva, 1988; Kalantziz, 2010; Hunsaker, 2001; and Wahyudin, 2017)

Those will be significantly influenced by curriculum management, in terms of planning, implementing, and evaluating curriculum development. Foundation curriculum management is reflected on the basis of steady, reliable, systematic, participatory, transparency and accountable development. Curriculum management can be observed as a sustainable system process to achieve educational goals. District curriculum management can be viewed as an instrumental strategic input to achieve instructional process in school setting curriculum.

In relation to accountability in curriculum, Anderson as quoted by Wahyudin (2015) writes that in education there are three types of accountability system: (a) compliance with regulation, (b) adherence to professional norm, and (c) result driven. The first is educational accountability to perform in accordance with regulations. The second relates to accountability in education that is based on adherence to professional norms in conducting educational programs. The third, educational accountability is characterized by the result driven, with an emphasis on students' achievement. Accountability systems are based on the expectation that students can and will achieve intended competencies as described on instructional objectives. Furthermore, Anderson suggests five components in the education accountability system: objectives, assessments, instructions, resources, and rewards or sanctions.

According to Mario Yango as quoted by Wahyudin (2015), there are four dimensions of accountability. The first dimension is traditional accountability focusing on the regular transactions to obtain information on compliance with regulations. The second one is managerial accountability, which focuses on efficiency and use of funds, assets, resources. The third dimension is accountability program that focuses on achieving results by operating activities which provide the best service for other clients. The last dimension, process accountability, focuses on information about the level of social welfare for the implementation of policies and activities of the organization. On the other hand, McLaughlin (Wahyudin, 2015), in education perspective, there are problems of policy implementation, the uncertain relationship between implemented policies and program. In curriculum management dimension, discrepancies between district level curriculum management policy and school level curriculum implementation will likely lead to potential distortion in approved curriculum policy at district and school level curriculum implementation. This study discusses the development of a model curriculum management in district level in order to increase accountability among district education staffs and school stakeholders.

Leadership in schools will be also influenced by education district leadership and policy. It comes in many forms and extends beyond the role of the formal leadership roles, such as Principals and management structures. The principalship is often perceived to be a position synonymous with school leadership. The role is integral in leading and managing schools and may provide vision for the school. Many managerial tasks are part of the principal's brief in terms of overall management and accountability within schools, so some aspects of leadership may be taken by other members of the school community. Leadership comes in many forms and through a range of roles both formal and informal. As quoted by Jorgensen (2012), curriculum leadership may fall into the ambit of the principal but may also be part of a devolved or distributed model of leadership where a key teacher may assume a role in leading curriculum innovation. As such, curriculum leadership may be an amorphous role within the structure of the school and fall to a person or group of people who assume responsibility for curriculum as a whole or for a particular curriculum area such as mathematics/numeracy.

It seems that there is some consensus that there are a number of key principles that are core to successful school leadership. Leithwood *et al* as quoted by Jorgensen (2012), suggest that these include: "building vision and setting direction; understanding and developing people; redesigning the organization; and managing the teaching and learning program". The importance of the principal in providing vision and strategic direction for the school is critical to the overall direction of the school. In many small schools, the principal may take on the role of leader and manager as well as curriculum leader. The principal may have particular leadership style within the school and share leadership and roles across the school through to being quite autocratic in decision making. The complexity of schools, systems and personalities shape the possibilities of curriculum leadership. Principals exert an influence on student outcomes (broadly conceived) through a focus on teaching and learning which is driven by their own values and vision, an agreed school vision, elements of transformational leadership, and increasing school capacity, across four dimensions (personal, professional, organizational, and community), taking into account and working within the school context, and using evidence-based monitoring, and critical reflection to lead to change and transformation. (Drysdale, Goode & Gurr, 2009).

Undeniably, the principal has a key role in the overall school culture and direction. In their study of leadership and principals, Walters *et al* (2003) reported the strong relationship between the impact of the leadership and student achievement. The principal was key in terms of quality curriculum but inclusive of the overall school environment and support mechanisms within the school. The notion of distributed leadership closely aligns with the devolution of curriculum leadership to key staff members within the school community. In some cases, the devolution of curriculum leadership within the school may be a strategic decision that aligns with the vision of the school to be inclusive of the strengths of the staff (and possibly students). Alternatively, the move to involve staff in curriculum leadership may be more of an ad hoc or opportunistic decision where a particular staff member may have an interest in the area.

As comparison, Gronnas quoted by Jorgensen (2012) has argued that the social context of the school must be

considered when investigating the impact and roles of leadership within a particular site. Policies, such as national testing or curriculum, can be contentious and open to interpretation. Hayes *et al* as quoted by Jorgensen (2012) have argued that there is a need for productive leadership to be considered in how different interpretations of policy are not only possible, but of considerable value, as the contexts in which policies are implemented can vary considerably. More specifically, in schools where there are challenging circumstances, Hayes reported that it was important to have devolved models of leadership so that staff could build positive relationships across the school and where staff were empowered to lead.

In every country, curriculum is the national as well as provincial/district formal plan to ensure students graduate with the college-and career-ready skills they will need to be self-sufficient citizens, lifelong learners and competitive in today's world. It means in philosophical point of view, the curriculum links the national and local's beliefs, expectations for student learning and instructional practices. The strength of that link is dependent upon the professional staff's commitment in schools and office of education in provincial level as well as deistrict level to manage synergic involvement in a comprehensive, ongoing review of the curriculum. According to IFSDas quoted by Wahyudin (2017), curriculum should provide a clear, valid, and measurable set of standards and learning targets. Quality curriculum will: (i) increase the probability that all students receive appropriate and adequate instruction; (ii) increase the consistency of what is taught among teachers within the same grade or subject area and across grade levels; (iii) contribute to high achievement among all groups of students over time; (iv) increase the district's ability to effectively use resources.

In order to keep achieving the educational goals and objectives of the national and local's mission, vision, continuous improvement and school improvement plan goals, it is necessary to create an aligned curriculum that promotes success for all students. In brief, curriculum alignment is the coordination of what is written, taught, and assessed. It is also articulation of knowledge and skills from schools stages, as well as the alignment of instruction within the department or grade level and from school to school. Curriculum alignment principles are to be reflected in the curriculum guides, instructional resources, staff development, instructional practices, student assessments, facilities, and budgeting. When the curriculum is aligned, there is congruence both horizontally and vertically.

METHOD

This study used research and development model with qualitative and quatitative approaches for collecting and analyzing data. The research refers to research and development approaches developed by Borg and Gall (1989) with a necessary simplification steps: (i) a preliminary study, (ii) planning and preliminary design plan, (iii) development of curriculum management model at district level (iv)developing final model through serial focus group discussion, and (v) reporting. As qualitative and quantitive approaches, the study is also uses a mixed-methods research. (Ali, 1993; Ali, 2011; and Attride-Stirling, 2001). Specifically, as to qualitative methods, content analysis, interviews, and Focused Group Discussion (FGD) have been conducted for collecting data.

The content analysis method will be employed to cull from documents.

The research question is how model of curriculum management can increase the accountability of the district education managers in the planning, implementing, and evaluating curriculum at school level. The focus of this study is to design a model of curriculum management to improve the accountability of education in school curriculum planning at the district level. This study has two advantages which are theoretical benefit that is to develop curriculum management principle in the era of regional autonomy, and practical benefit that is to provide information and substance of district curriculum management on the basis of capacity development planning for education at district level model.

The research was primarily conducted at district education office in Bandung regency, West Java Indonesia. Respondents are head of education office, head of section for basic education, school supervisors, head teachers of primary school, head teachers of secondary school, district parliament members who are in charge on education affairs, board member of district education committee, and NGOs on education affairs. All data were collected and analyzed through serial of focus group discussions (FGDs).

DISCUSSION AND RESULT

Based on FGDsheld with the head of district education office, head of basic education section, school supervisors, and several head teachers of primary and secondary schools, it can be noted that the district education office has already planned and implemented education program in district level in accordance with Law No. 32 of 2004. In addition, educational program has been implemented based on education district strategic plan (Renstra), but the process of initiating and finishing strategic plan document was not conducted and shared in fully participation among stakeholders. It can be noted also that the district education office has formulated master plan and its implementation guideline that shall be carried out during 5 years term program. However, in terms of its implementation, all programs should be supervised and monitored properly. District education plan covers education guidelines, policies, budget allocation, academic programs, and monitoring and evaluation activities that shall be implemented in district education office management and its staffs. In terms of preparing and establishing education management guidelines, the district office has set guidelines to conducting capacity building as well as monitoring education program for all education level in kindergarten, primary schools, secondary school and vocational schools. However, according to the supervisors and head teachers, they have been not yet intensively involved in discussing the draft of district education strategic plan. In addition, NGO's in education felt that they were not invited yet to share some important and necessary issues and public aspiration for the next 5 years education program. Supervisors and head teachers thought that district office has not properly conducted monitoring, controlling, and assessing the implementation of learning and school management properly. In establishing learning outcomes assessment guidelines, district office shall conduct program based on need analyses and consider heterogeneous of pupils in urban, semi urban, and rural area across district.

In relation to the planning, implementation and evaluation of curriculum, district office shall act actively as a facilitator and a supervisor in the implementation of curriculum in school level. However, curriculum management needs to be more integrated and systemic to be carried out to all level of schools.

By considering the empirical data and FGDs during pre-survey, a hypothetical model of district curriculum management shall be developed and constructed on the basis of capacity development planning for education at district level model. The hypothetical model is called Development Plan of Curriculum Management Model (DPCMM). The model is a district curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation model with having effects on instructional processes at school level. Its dimension will be developed and comprises planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling of all sub system of curriculum management. It includes organizational structure, human resources, funding, transparency, culture of accountability, and participation from all stakeholders.

This hypothetical model of curriculum management was adopted and modified based on the model of Capacity Development Planning for Education in District level that has been developed and implemented in 2009 by Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) program to several districts in 6 provinces in Indonesia. Basically, the model has three main stages: preparation and building commitment, capacity assessment, and development plan of district education management.

Based on FGDs, a draft of district-level curriculum model is illustrated as follows:

Revised District Curriculum Management Model

After serial FGDs among district stakeholders, it can be described that there are three phases of development of district level curriculum management model.

First phase: Preparation and Building Commitment. This phase includes several core activities, namely: (i) Commitment to Leadership Education Agency, by asking the head of district education office to be willing and having commitment to facilitate and conduct serial focus group discussions on the basis of capacity development planning for education at district level; (ii) Performance Assessment and the Popular Public Image. Based on discussion with the supervisors and head teachers, it is necessary to have data and empirical facts on district achievement in education program. Most data are collected from newspaper clippings as well as from other printed publication concerning progress that has been achieved in education from media publication perspective. During six month periods, it can be found 60 clippings on education, published on local newsletters, from the total 64 clippings, 41 clippings (64%) concerning with complaint and dissatisfaction of community, while 23 clippings (36%) concerning with education achievement and good news; (iii) Service User Satisfaction Poll. The education satisfaction polling was conducted in cooperation with education NGO's. The results of interview sessions with pupils' parents and community with the total of 50 respondents showed that 31 respondents (62 %) were not satisfied with the existing public education services, while 29 respondents (38%) feel satisfied with the existing education

services carried out in school level as well as in district level. That fact is also relevant with the finding of OECD (2015) that the decentralisation process in Indonesia has disempowered provincial offices leaving their role to that of co-ordination of education among districts and verifying statistics and funding transfers. Each semester the provincial office meets with school principals to update them on developments from the center.

Second phase: Capacity Assessment. The main activities are as follow: (i) identification of management function the curriculum. From the FGDs it is agreed that curriculum dimensions comprise planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling all sub systems of curriculum management, including organizational structure, human resources, funding, transparency, and accountability. Headteachers and teachers' forum agree to describe curriculum management function, in terms of planning, implementing, and evaluating on the basis of capacity curriculum development. By having capacity assessment, it has positive effects on district strategic curriculum plan as well as on instructional processes at school level: (ii) the assessment capacity management function curriculum. That findings are relevant with Law No. 20 of 2003 on National Education System that state the curriculum as a set of plans and arrangements regarding the objectives, content and learning materials as well as the means used to guide the implementation of learning activities to achieve specific educational objectives. The scope of the management of curriculum development (curriculum development) includes planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating the curriculum. Thus the management of curriculum development related to the degree of management or management aspect in planning, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum. This is partly regard regarding the distribution and availability of documents curriculum in schools, dissemination of ideas and documents, providing professional assistance to principals, school planning in the implementation, qualification and workload of teachers, atmosphere and amenities teacher work, process monitoring, and follow-up program (Hasan, 2010). It is also supported with the terminology of curriculum management in the era of regional autonomy demands more efforts are oriented to the needs by first analyzing the external and internal environment. Analysis of the internal environment of the organization micro-level organizer curriculum and external environment (stakeholders) educational personnel, need a formulation that is deep, so that in the implementation of the curriculum to produce a changes-positioned as a result of implementation of the curriculum, and finally evaluation and control from planning, implementation, and follow-up curriculum to produce an outcome that can be measured in quantity and quality (degree of effectiveness).

Related to curriculum leadership, as quoted by Jorgensen (2012), curriculum leadership may fall into the ambit of the principal but may also be part of a devolved or distributed model of leadership where a key teacher may assume a role in leading curriculum innovation. As such, curriculum leadership may be an amorphous role within the structure of the school and fall to a person or group of people who assume responsibility for curriculum as a whole or for a particular curriculum area such as mathematics/numeracy. In this case, it seems that there is some consensus that there are a number of key principles that are core to successful school leadership.

Leithwood *et al* as quoted by Jorgensen (2012), suggest that these include: "building vision and setting direction; understanding and developing people; redesigning the organization; and managing the teaching and learning program". The importance of the principal in providing vision and strategic direction for the school is critical to the overall direction of the school. In many small schools, the principal may take on the role of leader and manager as well as curriculum leader. The principal may have particular leadership style within the school and share leadership and roles across the school through to being quite autocratic in decision making. The complexity of schools, systems and personalities shape the possibilities of curriculum leadership.

Third phase: Development Plan of Curriculum Management Model (DPCMM). In this activity, there are some important events: (i) improving the program plan, (ii) draft for development plan of curriculum management model (DPCMM). Findings show that the hypothetical DPCMM model has positive effects on district education strategic plan. It is a district curriculum planning, implementing, and evaluation model with vast effects on instructional processes at school level.

In the context of the curriculum, curriculum change is a normal, expected consequence of changes in the environment (Oliva, 1992). Curriculum change is something normal and the expected consequences of the existence of a number of changes to the environment. The above statement confirms that the change in the education system, including curriculum adopted, it is a common thing, inevitable as a form of curriculum responds to the challenges of the times, because basically curriculum adopted is a reflection of the society of his day products. A school curriculum not only reflects but is a product of its time. It means the hypothetical DPCMM model has positive effects on district education strategic plan, especially in conducting curriculum planning, implementing, and evaluation model with vast effects on instructional processes at school level.

Based on focus group discussion, a revised hypothetical district curriculum management model can be illustrated as follows:

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

In line with the spirit of regional autonomy and decentralization of education in Indonesia, the development of district curriculum management is very important and can be considered for development as an integral part of the design and implementation of District Education Strategic Plan. It is developed in order to improve the accountability of district education officer and school administrators and teachers in planning, implementing, and evaluating school level curriculum.

The Development Plan of Curriculum Management Model (DPCMM) in district level in Indonesia has positive effects on district strategic plan. It is a district curriculum planning, implementing, and evaluation model that has vast effects on instructional processes at school level. Its dimension comprises planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling all sub systems of curriculum management, including organizational structure, human resources, funding, transparency, and the culture of accountability.

As a hypothetical model, district curriculum management model consists of three main stages: (a) Preparing and Developing Commitment, including several major activities such as commitment of the leadership of the education office, assessment of performance and the popular public image, and service user satisfaction survey; (b) Assessment of Capacity, which includes identification of curriculum management functions, and assessment of the capacity of curriculum management functions; (c) Development Plan of Curriculum Management Model (DPCMM), consisting of improvement program plan, and develop final hypothetical curriculum management model.

The implication is that district level curriculum management in Indonesia is crucial and seemingly puts a high priority on the students' needs, transparency, accountability, and participation. It is recommended that strategic plan of educational sector should consider curriculum planning with the spirit of regional autonomy.

Bibliography

- Ali, Mohammad. (2011). *Memahami Riset Perilaku & Sosial*. Bandung: PustakaCendikiaUtama.
- Ali, Mohammad. (1993). *Strategi Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Penerbit Angkasa.
- Anderson, J. A. (2005). *Accountability in Education*. Paris: The International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.
- Bar-Yam, Miriam et al. (2002). "Changes in the Teaching and Learning Process in a Complex Education System". Available online at: <http://www.necsi.edu/research/management/education/teachandlearn.html> [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: July 17, 2016].
- Brady, L. (1990). *Curriculum Development*. Sydney: Prentice Hall of Australian Limited.
- Billick, B., & Peterson, J.A. (2001). *Competitive Leadership: Twelve Principles for Success*. Chicago: Triumph Books Illinois.
- Boseman, G., & Phatak, A. (1992). *Strategic Management: Texts and Cases*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational Research*. London: Longman.
- Boye, Allison. (2015). "Writing Your Teaching Philosophy". Available online at: https://www.depts.ttu.edu/tlpdc/Resources/Teaching_resources/TLPDC_teaching_resources/Documents/WritingYourTeachingPhilosophywhitepaper.pdf [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: July 17, 2016].
- Bush, T., & Bell, L. (2002). *The Principles and Practice of Educational Management*. London: SAGE Publication Company.
- Clark, R.W. (1999). *Effective Professional Development Schools. Agenda for Education in a Democracy*. California: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Decentralized Basic Education (DBE1), (2007). *BagaimanaMenyiapkanRencanaKapasitasPendidikanKabupaten/Kota*. Jakarta: DBE-1 Management and Governance.
- Decentralized Basic Education (DBE1), (2007). *PanduanPenyiapanRencanaStrategisPendidikanKabupaten/Kota (Renstra SKPD)* Jakarta: DBE-1 Management and Governance.
- Dessler, G. (1977). *Human Resources Management*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Drysdale, Goode, & Gurr. (2009). "An Australian model of successful school leadership: Moving from success to sustainability". *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47 (6).
- Hunsaker, P.L. (2001). *Training in Management Skills*. New Jersey: University of San Diego and Prentice Hall.
- Fry, H., S. Ketteridge & S. Marshall [eds]. (2009). *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice*. New York and London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, third edition. Available online also at: http://biblioteca.ucv.cl/site/colecciones/manuales_u [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: July 17, 2016].
- Hunkins, F.P. & A.C. Ornstein. (2009). *Curriculum, Foundations, Principles, and Issues*. Boston: Pearson.
- Jorgensen, Robyn. (2012). *Curriculum Leadership: Reforming and Reshaping Successful Practice in Remote and Regional Indigenous Education*. Griffith: Griffith Research Online
- Kalantzis, Mary & Bill Cope. (2010). "The Teacher as Designer: Pedagogy in the NewMediaAge" in *E-Learning and Digital Media*, Vol.7, No.3. Available online also at: http://newlearningonline.com/_uploads/3_Kalantzis_ELEA_7_3_web.pdf [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: July 17, 2016].
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, (2015). *Rencana Strategis Kementrian Pendidikandan Kebudayaan 2015-2019*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, (2014). *Konsepdan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud
- Musthafa, B. (2016). Preparing Competent EFL Teachers For Young Learners: Lessons From Indonesia. Paper presented on TESOL International Conference, Lombok, August 11-13, 2016.
- Niesche, R. & Jorgensen, R. (2010). Curriculum reform in remote areas: The need for productive leadership. *Journal of Education Administration.*, 48(1), 102-117.
- OECD/Asian Development Bank (2015). *Reviews of National Policies for Education, Education in Indonesia. Rising to the Challenge*. Paris: OECD Publishing
- Oliva, Peter F. (1988). *Developing Curriculum: A Guide to Problems, Principles, and Process*. New York: Harper & Publisher.
- Stobie, Tristian. (2013). *Implementing the Curriculum with Cambridge: A Guide for School Leaders*. London: Cambridge International Examinations. Available online also at: <http://www.cie.org.uk/images/134557-implementing-the-curriculum-with-cambridge.pdf> [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: July 17, 2016].
- Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistempendidikan Nasional. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal DepartemenPendidikanNasional.
- UNESCO, (2015). *Education for All 2000-2015: Achievements and Challenges. Global Monitoring Report*. Paris: UNESCO Publication.
- UNESCO (2012). *Education Sustainable Development. Sourcebook*. Paris France: the United Nations

- Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Publication.
- UNESCO [United Nations for Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization].(2009). *Teaching Philosophy in Asia and the Pacific*. Paris, France: UNESCO for Social and Human Sciences Sector.
- Wahyudin, Dinn. (2016). "A View on Teaching Philosophy in Curriculum Implementation at the Indonesia University of Education" in *SOSIOHUMANIKA: Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan*, Vol.9(2) November, Bandung, Indonesia: MindaMasagi Press and UPI Bandung, ISSN 1979-0112.
- Wahyudin, Dinn. (2014). *Manajemen Kurikulum*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Wahyudin, Dinn. (2017). *Curriculum Development and Teaching Philosophy*. Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Walters, T. W., Marzano, R. J. & McNulty, B. (2003) *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tell about the effect of leadership on student achievement: A Working paper*. McRel
- World Bank. (1998). *Education in Indonesia: From Crisis to Recovery*. Bangkok: EducaSector Unit. East Asia and Pacific Region Office.
- _____, (2004). *Education In Indonesia: Managing The Transition to Decentralisation*.
- UNESCO (2012). *Education Sustainable Development. Sourcebook*. Paris France: the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Publication.
- Walters, T. W., Marzano, R. J. & McNulty, B. (2003) *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tell about the effect of leadership on student achievement: A Working paper*. McRel

How to cite this article:

DinnWahyudin (2017) 'A Model of Education District Curriculum Management: Indonesia Case ', *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 06(08), pp. 5176-5183. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2017.5183.0666>
