NOVATEUR PUBLICATIONS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIONS IN ENGINEERING RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY [IJIERT]
ISSN: 2394-3696 Website: ijiert.org
VOLUME 7, ISSUE 11, Nov.-2020

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED THEMATIC LEARNING PLAN BASED ON SYNTHIFIC IN CLASS V ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DUPRISNA IBRAHIM
Kepala SDN 6 Bulango Selatan Kecamatan Bulango Selatan
Kabupaten Bone Bolango Gorontalo Indonesia
dupriana@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine (1) the input of implementing a scientific-based integrated thematic learning plan. (2) The process of implementing integrated thematic learning based on science. (3) The outcome of implementing scientific-based integrated thematic learning. Sources of data in this study are primary data through observation and interview sheets. The data analysis technique used is a mix method combined with Impossible Performance Analysis. The results of this study indicate that (1) The results of the teacher's achievements in making learning implementation plans still 83.32% of expectations, which means that the reality in the field still has to be addressed so that it is in accordance with the standard process in making RPP. Some teachers made lesson plans without variations in the learning scenario and also the assessment aspects with different rubrics and even inappropriate implementation of the assessment rubrics. (2) The achievement of the implementation process learning implementation of thematic learning scientifically based integrated by 80.42%, which shows that the absence of an optimal achievement of teachers in the implementation of learning. Of the three stages, the preliminary activities have been carried out by the teacher in accordance with the standard process but still need to be addressed, especially in the delivery of learning objectives, activity steps and assessment techniques. Meanwhile, what needs to be addressed with crucial attention is the implementation of the core activities of mastery of learning materials and information technology and the use of learning resources and media in accordance with process standards. (3) Actualization of the achievement of the benefits of the learning implementation plan in integrated thematic learning based on science on the effectiveness of learning by 80.98% where the teacher has not been able to be more creative in learning activities. Student learning outcomes are mostly in accordance with the minimum completeness criteria but are still close to the threshold because learning has not been carried out as interestingly as possible so that student interest and motivation are still minimal.

KEYWORDS: Evaluation of the lesson plan, Integrated Thematic, Scientific Based

INTRODUCTION

Learning equipment is an important instrument that must be monitored so that the implementation of learning is more directed to achieve the expected competencies (Rusman, 2014: 126). The existence of planning for the implementation of learning, a learning process will be easier to carry out in schools. Thus, what is in the lesson plan must contain things that are directly related to learning activities in an effort to achieve mastery of a basic competency (Amri, 2013: 50). This is so that learning runs effectively. As mandated in the 2013 curriculum, that the implementation of learning for the elementary school level uses integrated thematic learning and the process uses a scientific approach. The Ministry of Education and Culture (2013: 9) explains that the 2013 curriculum emphasizes modern pedagogical dimensions in learning, namely using a scientific approach / scientific approach, including observing, asking questions, gathering information / trying, associating / reasoning, and communicating. Learning with a scientific approach is a learning process designed in such a way that students actively construct concepts, laws and principles through stages or what is known as 5 M, namely observing, asking, reasoning, trying, and communicating.

The ideal expectation of a learning activity and its tools is that it runs well in accordance with the predetermined achievement indicators, but sometimes this is not in line with the reality in the field so it is necessary to conduct an evaluation. Lukum (2015: 28) argues that learning evaluation is an activity to evaluate things that are done in the learning process including planning, implementation and the assessment process and their impact on students. In this study, the evaluation used the Stake model design. The relevant Stake evaluation stages are Input, Process, and Product. Regarding the evaluation of learning implementation plan

(RPP) in the thematic learning is done in 7 SD State in the District of South Bulango Bone Bolango District. This is based on the fact that according to preliminary observations on several learning implementation plans made by the teacher, even though they have met the requirements for the components of the learning implementation plan regulated in the regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture, there are still many that need to be improved through scientific studies. The important thing that was found was that there was no equality between basic competencies and their indicators as well as with learning objectives.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted in SDN throughout Bulango Selatan District Bone Bolango Regency which consisted of 7 schools. This study uses a mix method research that is a combination of quantitative Importance Performance Analysis with qualitative. The method used in this study is an evaluation of the stake countenance model.

RESEARCH RESULT

A. Input (antecedent)

The results of the analysis regarding the input (antecedent) plan for implementing scientific-based integrated thematic learning in Public Elementary Schools in Bulango Selatan District Bone Bolango Regency, as well as using a stake evaluation analysis are presented in the following table:

Table 1: Evaluation of Stake Model in Input (Antecedent)

Description Matrix		Judgment Matrix	
Intense	**Research result**	**Standard**	**Research result**
RPP made in accordance with Permendikbud No 65 of 2013. Then applied in accordance with Permendikbud number 22 of 2016	The results of the teacher's achievements in making learning implementation plans were still 83.32% of expectations, which means that the reality in the field still has to be addressed so that it is in accordance with the standard process in making learning implementation plans .	Making a learning implementation plan must meet the existing standards which include Subject Identity, Core Competencies, Basic competencies, Achievement Indicators Competence, Learning objectives, Learning materials, Learning Scenarios, Learning Resources and assessments	Some teachers make lesson plans without variations in the learning scenario and also the assessment aspects with different rubrics and even inappropriate implementation of the assessment rubrics.

Source: Data processed, 2020

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the input or planning is still not optimal so that it still has to be addressed and strived for by the teacher and through supervision and guidance from the principal and school supervisor. Intense suitability with observation, in the description matrix, it was found that there was no match between the availability of learning implementation plans made by teachers in elementary schools in Bulango Selatan District Bone Bolango Regency and the Learning Process Standards, especially in the component of learning resource selection on indicators of conformity with scientific approaches, and characteristics learners; the component of learning media selection on the suitability indicator with the scientific approach and using a variety of learning methods so as to make students actively learn; components of learning methods and learning scenarios on indicators of learning activities are designed to make students actively learn, while in the closing component, namely in indicators of making lesson summaries / conclusions, conducting assessments and / or reflecting on activities that have been implemented, providing feedback on the learning process and outcomes , and planning follow-up activities (remedies, enrichment, counseling, and / or assignments) and submitting lesson plans at the next meeting.

The results of the suitability of the lesson plans made by SDN teachers in South Bulango are also strengthened by the study of the learning implementation plans made by researchers classified based on each school assessed based on the evaluation criteria according to Arikunto (2012) as follows:

Table 2 Summary of Study on Learning Implementation Plans prepared by teachers at SDN Bulango Selatan

No.	School	Achievements	Percentage (%)	Criteria
1	SDN 1 Bulango Selatan	76	95.00	Very good
2	SDN 2 Bulango Selatan	74	92.50	Very good
3	SDN 3 Bulango Selatan	73	91.25	Very good
4	SDN 4 Bulango Selatan	76	95.00	Very good
5	SDN 5 Bulango Selatan	77	96.25	Very good
6	SDN 6 Bulango Selatan	78	97.50	Very good
7	SDN 7 Bulango Selatan	73	91.25	Very good
Average			**94.11**	**Very good**

Source: Processed Primary Data 2020

Based on the summary results, it shows that based on the assessment of the researcher, it is known that the study of RPP for teachers is 94.11% with very good criteria.

B. Process (transaction)

The results of the analysis regarding the process (transactions) for implementing integrated thematic learning based on science in SDN in Bulango Selatan District, Bone Bolango Regency, as well as using a stake evaluation analysis are presented in the following table:

Tabe 3: Evaluation of Stake Model in Process (transaction)

Description Matrix		Judgment Matrix	
Intense	**Research result**	**Standard**	**Research result**
Learning activities are divided into 3 core categories namely introduction, implementation of core and closing activities carried out by the teacher in accordance with established process standards	Process Achievements (transactions) for implementing integrated thematic learning based on science is 80.42% which indicates that there has been no optimal achievement from the teacher in the implementation of learning	1. In preliminary activities the teacher must (a) prepare students physically and psychologically, (b) make apperception, (c) convey the benefits of learning, objectives, activity plans and assessment techniques. 2. The core activities are adjusted to a scientific approach which is then supported by (a) mastery of the material, (b) implementing good strategies, (c) using media, (d) involving students and (e) using appropriate language 3. The closing activities were carried out by (a) making a summary, (b) reflection, (c) follow-up and assignments	Of the three stages, the preliminary activities have been carried out by the teacher in accordance with the standard process but still need to be addressed, especially in the delivery of learning objectives, activity steps and assessment techniques. Meanwhile, what needs to be addressed with crucial attention is the implementation of the core activities of mastering teaching metrics and information technology and the use of learning resources and media in accordance with process standards.

Source: Data processed, 2020

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the implementation of lesson plans by teachers still needs to be addressed, especially regarding preliminary activities and closing activities in learning at school. This is because there is no conformity between the implementation of learning in schools with the standard of the learning implementation process that is on the goal. This discrepancy is found in the preliminary component, namely in the indicators of asking challenging questions, conveying the benefits of learning material, demonstrating something related to the theme, and checking entry behavior. Likewise, in the core learning activities, not all science teachers have implemented contextual learning that allows the growth of positive habits, as a result of accompanying learning outcomes (nurturant effect or a hidden curriculum). In addition,

there were also difficulties for SDN teachers in Bulango District. Selatan Bone Bolango Regency in applying the scientific learning approach (observing, asking, reasoning, trying, communicating). In the closing activity, it was found that there was a mismatch in the indicators of reflecting or making a summary by involving students, collecting work results as portfolio material, and carrying out follow-up with provide direction for subsequent activities and enrichment tasks.

The results of the implementation of the learning implementation plan based on process observations found the results of each school as follows:

Table 4 Assessment of integrated thematic learning processes based on science at SDN Bulango Selatan

No.	School	Achievements	Percentage (%)	Criteria
1	SDN 1 Bulango Selatan	93	75.00	Good
2	SDN 2 Bulango Selatan	111	89.52	Very good
3	SDN 3 Bulango Selatan	113	91.13	Very good
4	SDN 4 Bulango Selatan	114	91.94	Very good
5	SDN 5 Bulango Selatan	107	86.29	Very good
6	SDN 6 Bulango Selatan	117	94.35	Very good
7	SDN 7 Bulango Selatan	93	75.00	Good
Average			**86.18**	**Very good**

Source: Processed Primary Data 2020

Based on the summary results, it shows that the process of implementing learning in schools has been carried out very well by the teacher.

C. Output

The results of the analysis regarding the integrated thematic learning output based on science (student learning outcomes) in SDN in Bulango Selatan District Bone Bolango Regency, as well as using a stake evaluation analysis are presented in the following table:

Table 5: Evaluation of the Stake Model at the Output

Description Matrix		Judgment Matrix	
Intense	**Research result**	**Standard**	**Research result**
Process effectiveness and student learning outcomes in classroom learning activities	Actualization of the achievement of the benefits of integrated thematic learning lesson plans based on science on the effectiveness of learning is 80.98% where teachers have not been able to be more creative in learning activities	Benefits to (1) effective learning, (2) systematic learning, (3) interesting learning, (4) meaningful learning, (5) student interest and motivation, (6) student learning outcomes	Student learning outcomes largely sud a h according to KKM but still close to the threshold that caused the learning has not been going m e n a rik so the interest and motivation of students is still minimal.

Source: Data processed, 2020

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the benefits of the learning implementation plan in producing good learning outcomes are still not very good because the learning implementation plan must still be optimized by the teacher so that students learn according to the expectations of the teacher and also various parties in order to understand the concept and context of the eye. lessons in classroom learning. The relationship between antecedent and transaction, transaction with outcome and antecedent, transaction and outcome, both on intense and observation, all evaluation results are in sufficient category. This is in accordance with the phenomenon of the observation that there are still some teachers who do not understand how to prepare a good learning implementation plan and carry out learning in accordance with the learning implementation plan made. Some teachers still do "copy and paste" the lesson plan and this has an impact on

the unsuccessful learning that the teacher does. This illustrates that there is a contingency between planning, implementation and learning outcomes. The lesson plan made by the teacher illustrates the teacher's ability to plan learning is in the sufficient category. This is influenced by some teachers who do not understand how to prepare lesson plans so that the learning design is difficult to implement in class. This has an impact on the implementation of learning in class that is not optimal.

The implementation of learning illustrates that the teacher's ability to manage learning is not in accordance with process standards. This factor is influenced by the difficulty of the teacher in planning learning, especially in the indicators causing active students and students to be able to ask challenging questions in class. As a result, everything that is planned is difficult to implement in class. If the teacher can compile a good lesson plan, the implementation of learning in the classroom is also good so that it has an impact on good student learning outcomes. Learning outcomes in the category sufficiently describe the lesson plan and the implementation of learning is not fully in accordance with the standards of the learning process. As a result, there were still students who did not complete the daily test, midterm and final semester exams. These results are also reinforced by the results of the percentage of student completeness achievement for each school whose average scores are as follows:

Table 6 Summary of Evaluation of Learning Outcomes conducted by Teachers at SDN Bulango Selatan

No.	Aspect	Criteria	Average Achievement
1	Daily Value	Student scores on daily tests and completed assignments	89.20
2	UTS scores	Midterm grades completed	75.42
3	UAS Value	Complete semester grades	72.65
	Average		**79.09**

Source: Processed Primary Data 2020

Based on the summary results, it shows that good student achievement is related to learning outcomes, namely high daily test scores because students' understanding of assignments and tests on a day is still good, but for midterm and final semester exams, they are still not good.

DISCUSSION

1. Input (antecedent)

The test results found that the results of input (antecedent) integrated thematic learning implementation plan (RPP) based on science lies in criteria that are "quite effective" with an average of 83.32%. This shows that Public Elementary School (SD) teachers in Bulango Selatan District Bone Bolango Regency are able to implement integrated thematic lesson plans (RPPs) based on science by making a good plan or input through the conformity of lesson plans made by teachers with set standards. in 2013. An evaluation of the curriculum input (antecedent) lesson plan (RPP) scientifically based integrated thematic has been good, but the lack of precision of the Ministerial Regulation No. 22 of 201 6 on the standard process where competence achievement indicator that has not been fully assessed, the subject matter that still rely 1 learning resources and learning scenarios that have not been designed properly by the teacher.

This result is in accordance with the opinion of Rauf (2009), the difficulty in making lesson plans is one of the inhibiting factors in curriculum implementation. Therefore, a teacher must try to understand the preparation of the 2013 curriculum RPP so that the implementation of learning can take place well and be organized so that it can implement the 2013 curriculum as expected. The composition or format of the lesson plans prepared by teachers is mostly not in accordance with the provisions of Permendikbud no. 22 of 2016. However, if seen from the contents, most of them are appropriate. The thing that causes the format of the RPP for teachers is not yet suitable is because most of the RPP K-13 analyzed are RPP K-13 with the initial format when the 2013 Curriculum was just launched and until 2017 the composition and content of the K-13 RPP has undergone changes and improvements.

The design of the lesson plan must be made by the teacher as best as possible in accordance with the provisions in the Minister of Education regulation but must pay attention to the local aspects of the area. This is as

according to Kunandar (2011: 264) RPP acts as a scenario for the learning process. Therefore, the lesson plan should be flexible (flexible) and provide the possibility for teachers to adjust to student responses in the actual learning process. In preparing indicators, teachers adjust to Competency Standards and Basic Competencies to be achieved. Learning objectives are developed based on the basic competencies to be achieved. The material used is from student handbooks, LKS (Student Worksheets), supporting books, and Electronic School Books. The methods and strategies used by the teacher in learning are adjusted to the material to be delivered. Teachers use methods that are in accordance with the material and student needs and prioritize students to actively participate in learning. In the learning step, all teachers have implemented the exploration, elaboration, and confirmation steps. In the assessment, the teacher uses written and oral assessments.

Through good planning, teachers will find it easier to carry out learning and students will be more assisted and easier to learn. Learning planning is developed according to the needs and characteristics of students, schools, subjects, and so on. With careful planning, it can encourage teachers to be more ready to carry out learning activities. Therefore, every time you carry out learning, the teacher is obliged to plan. With good planning, the implementation of learning will run smoothly, directed, and systematically. This can be achieved because basic competencies, subject matter, indicators, learning experiences, time allocation, resources, learning steps, and assessment plans have been well formulated and clearly described (Wahyuni and Ibrahim, 2012: 11-12).

2. Process (transaction)

The test results based on the observations taken found that the average score of the focus of the process (transaction) for implementing integrated thematic learning based on science lies in the criteria that are "quite effective" with an average of 80.42%. This shows that scientific-based integrated thematic learning can be carried out by teachers in State Elementary Schools (SD) in South Bulango District, Bone Bolango Regency in accordance with ideal learning steps, namely the introduction, core and closing activities. However, the implementation process still needs to be improved so that it is more in line with the standard process, such as preliminary activities, which convey technical matters more optimally to students, in the core activities, namely time management, must be appropriate and the integration of material with other materials and science and technology as well as in activities cover that has not been optimized with assignments to students.

This less than optimal result must get the attention of education stakeholders where teachers must continue to improve their professionalism. This is as according to Hasan (2010) that the development of teacher professionalism is of global concern, because teachers have a duty and role not only to provide information on science and technology, but also to form attitudes and souls that can survive in the era of hypercompetition. The empowerment of these students includes aspects of personality, especially intellectual, social, emotional, and skills.

Musfiqon and Nurdiyansyah (2015: 54) reveal that a learning process carried out in classrooms can be matched as a scientific process. For this reason, the 2013 Curriculum mandates what exactly is the essence of the scientific approach in learning activities. There is a belief that the scientific approach is a form of golden point for the development and development of attitudes (affective domains), skills (psychomotor domains), and knowledge (cognitive domains) of students. Through this approach, students are expected to be able to answer their curiosity through a systematic process as scientific steps. So that these results are in accordance with the statement from Utami (2015: 86) that the teacher is an educator, mentor, trainer, and curriculum developer who can create conditions and a conducive learning atmosphere, namely an atmosphere of learning that is fun, interesting, gives a sense of security, provides space for students to think actively, creatively, and innovatively in exploring and elaborating on their abilities.

3. Learning output

The test results found that the average focus score of integrated thematic learning output based on science (student learning outcomes) in SDNs in Bulango Selatan District Bone Bolango Regency lies in the criteria that are "quite effective" with an average of 80.98%. This shows that there are positive benefits from the scientific-based integrated thematic learning plan (RPP) to improve effective learning in the classroom which in turn will make students have more optimal learning outcomes. To further optimize these benefits, teachers must develop their creativity so that learning becomes more interesting and able to make students more

interested and motivated in learning, where the development of this creativity must also be contained in the lesson plan as evidence of teacher creativity from planning, implementing and evaluating learning.

This statement shows that how important the lesson plan is in the implementation of learning so that a teacher can teach more directed and have thorough preparation for the teaching and learning process. The teacher knows what he will do in class, how to treat students and how to convey material and create an attractive and effective learning climate so that learning objectives can be achieved. In the lesson plan the teacher regulates learning so that it runs effectively and efficiently. The planning will not be successful without the action / implementation of the plan. With proper planning and proper application it will also affect learning outcomes. This result is in accordance with the opinion of Sudrajat (2009) that the existence of RPP is one of the benchmarks for a teacher's pedagogical competence, which means that pedagogic competence is the ability to manage student learning which at least includes understanding of educational insights and foundation, curriculum / syllabus development, use of technology. learning, understanding students, planning learning, implementing educational and dialogical learning, evaluating the process and learning outcomes and developing students to actualize their various potentials. RPP is a more detailed description of the syllabus in an effort to achieve Basic Competence. Each teacher must compile a complete and systematic lesson plan so that learning takes place in an interactive, inspirational, fun, challenging, motivating students to actively participate, and provides sufficient space for initiative, creativity, and independence according to their talents, interests, and physical development as well as psychological learners.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussion described in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that:

1. The results of the teacher's achievements in making lesson plans were still 83.32% of expectations, which means that the reality in the field still has to be addressed so that it is in accordance with the standard process in making RPP. Some teachers make lesson plans without variations in the learning scenario and also the assessment aspects with different rubrics and even the implementation of the assessment rubrics that are not appropriate
2. Achievement the process (transaction) for the implementation of the integrated thematic learning plan (RPP) based on science is 80.42% which indicates that there has been no optimal achievement from the teacher in the implementation of learning. Of the three stages, the preliminary activities have been carried out by the teacher in accordance with the standard process but still need to be addressed, especially in the delivery of learning objectives, activity steps and assessment techniques. Meanwhile, what needs to be addressed with crucial attention is the implementation of the core activities of mastering teaching metrics and information technology and the use of learning resources and media in accordance with process standards.
3. Actualization of the achievement of the benefits of lesson plans (learning outcomes) in integrated thematic learning based on science to the effectiveness of learning is 80.98% where teachers have not been able to be more creative in learning activities. Student learning outcomes are mostly in accordance with the KKM but still close to the threshold because learning has not been carried out as interestingly as possible so that student interest and motivation are still minimal.

SUGGESTION

Based on the above conclusions, in connection with the results of this study the authors propose several suggestions, namely

1. The preparation of the RPP must fully refer to Permendikbud No. 65 of 2013 and be applied in accordance with Permendikbud number 22 of 2016. So that in making lesson plans, teachers must be more flexible and innovate that does not deviate from existing provisions, especially in terms of learning scenarios, learning resources and assessments. learning outcomes (output) carried out. Then the teacher must be more active in evaluating himself in relation to the lesson plans made and the suitability of the lesson plans with the hopes and realities that are the goals in preparing the lesson plans before learning is carried out.
2. The principal should be active in monitoring the extent to which the lesson plans made by the teacher are in line with the applicable process standards as well as monitoring how the teacher's performance is as well as being active in including teachers in various activities, both workshops and educational seminars. Then for teachers it is better to develop their abilities by continuing to carry out self-evaluation and not hesitate to

ask the principal to carry out clinical supervision where supervision is to assess the extent of the teacher's ability in the learning planning process, implementation to evaluation of learning.

3. For the district education offices Bone Bolango must continue to strive for the building of capacity (capacity building) to all educators as school superintendent in order to get better at doing its job, the principal who made strengthening of the principal and most importantly the teachers by allocating for teachers who take advanced formal education (master) and also make activities that can increase the competence and commitment of teachers in carrying out their responsibilities as educators.

REFERENCES

1) Al-Tabany, Trianto Ibn Badar. 2014. Designing Innovative Learning Models . Progressive and Contextual. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
2) Amri, Sofan. 2013. Development & Learning Models in the Curriculum. 2013. Library achievements. Jakarta.
3) Arikunto Suharsimi. 2008. Basics of Educational Evaluation. Prints X, Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
4) Arikunto, et al. 2010. Evaluation of Educational Programs Practical Theoretical Guidelines for Students and Educational Practitioners. Prints II, Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
5) Arikunto, West Java. 2010. Evaluation of Educational Programs . Jakarta: Earth Literacy
6) Coaley, K. 2010. An introduction to psychological assessment and psychometrics. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
7) Daryanto, Tutik Rachmawati. 2015. Learning Supervision. Yogyakarta, Gava Media.
8) Dimyati and Mudjiono. 2006. Learning and Learning. Jakarta: PT Rineke Cipta.
9) Hadisubroto, Trisno, 2014. Integrated Learning, Jakarta: University Publishing Center . Open
10) Hakim, Lukmanul. 2009. Learning Planning. Bandung: CV . Wacana Prima
11) Hanafiah and Suhana. 2012. The Concept of Learning Strategy. Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama.
12) Hasan, Ani M. 2010. Development of Teacher Professionalism in the Age of Knowledge. https://www.blog-guru.web.id . Accessed August 2020
13) Hasan, Said H. 2008. Curriculum Evaluation . Bandung: SPS UPI and PT Remaja. Rosdakarya.
14) Hosyatul Aliyah. 2017. Development of Project-Based Thematic Learning Models to Improve Students' Creative Thinking Ability.
15) Indisusilo, S. 2014. Character Value Learning of Constructivism and VCT as an Innovative Approach to Affective Learning. Jakarta: Ramedia Pustaka Utama
16) Indrawan, S. 2014. Implementation of 2013 Curriculum Process Standards in the Department of Light Vehicle Engineering, State Senior High School 1 Sedayu. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarya State University
17) Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2010 concerning the Acceleration of Education. Jakarta: P2TK Directorate General of Higher Education.
18) Irwan, Muh. Idrus, Agil, and Karnan. 2018. Analysis of the 2013 Curriculum Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) for Biology Teachers at Public High Schools in Central Lombok City. Journal of Tropical Biology. 1411-9587
19) Kadir Karding, Abdul 2008. Evaluas and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP) as a Comprehensive Framework to. Guide. Semarang: Diponegoro University
20) Khoiri Ahmad. 2010. Construction of Learning Development (Effect on Curriculum Mechanisms and Practices). Jakarta: Prenada Media Group
21) Lukum, Astin. 2015. Evaluation of Ipa Junior High School Learning Program Using the Countenance Stake Model. Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation Volume 19, No 1, June 2015 (25-37) Available Online: http://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/jpep
22) Majid, Abdul. 2014. Learning Planning and Developing Standards. Teacher Competence. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosda Karya
23) Miftha Indasari, Linda Lia, and Asnurul Isroqmi. 2018. Evaluation of the 2013 Curriculum Learning Implementation Plan for Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Teachers.
24) Mulyasa, E. 2013. Development and Implementation of 2013 Curriculum . Bandung: Youth Rosdakarya.
25) Mulyatiningsih, E. 2011. Applied Research Methods in Education. Yogyakarta: Alfabeta.

26) Musfiqon, H., and Nurdyansyah, d. (2015). Scientific Learning Approach. Sidoarjo: Nizamia Learning Center.
27) Ratuma v nan, TG 2003. Evaluation of Learning Results Relevant to Competency-Based Curriculum. Surabaya: YP3IT.
28) Rauf AW. 2009. Description of the Barriers to Teachers in Implementing the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) at SMA Negeri 4 Watampone. Journal of MediaTeknologi Volume 1 Number (1): 12.
29) Rusman. 2014. Learning Models, Developing Teacher Professionalism. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada
30) Sabarguna B S. 2005. Hospital Management Information Systems. Yogyakarta: Central Java and DIY RSI Consorium.
31) Stufflebeam, DL 2003. The CIPP model for evaluation, the article presented at the 2003 annual conference of the Oregon program evaluators network (OPEN) 3 October 2003
32) Subroto, T et al. 2016. Guidelines for Writing Classroom Action Research in. Sports physical Education and health. University of Education.
33) Sudijono, Anas. 2012. Introduction to Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada
34) Sudrajat, Akhmad. 2009. Understanding Approaches, Strategies, Methods, Techniques and Learning Models. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.
35) Sugiyono. 2014. Quantitative Research Methods, Qualitative and R & D. Bandung: Alphabet
36) Sukandi, Ujang. 2014. Active Learning. Jakarta: Ramedia Pustaka Utama
37) Sukmadinata, Nana Syaodih. 2013. Educational Research Methods. Bandung: PT. Rosdakarya youth.
38) SupRYiningrum, Jamil. 2016. Learning Strategies. Jogjakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
39) Suryosubroto, B. 2014. Teaching and Learning Process in Schools: New Insights on Supporting Methods and Special Services, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
40) Sutrisno. 2008. Educational Psychology, Bandung: Youth Rosdakarya
41) Uno, Hamzah B. 2014. Learning Mo del. Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
42) Utami, et al. 2015. SPM Plus US / M for SD / MI 2015. Jakarta: PT Gelora Aksara Pratama
43) Vaulina, Jenitta. 2015. Application of the Scientific Approach in Economic Learning for Class XI Senior High School Employment Material. Journal: Surabaya State University. (25): 2-3.
44) Winaya, Kadek et al. 2015. "Analysis of the Learning Implementation Plan according to the 2013 Curriculum for Class IV SD No. 4 Banyuasri ”in the e-journal of PGSD, Universitas PendidikanGanesha, Department of PGSD Vol. 3 No. 1 .Singaraja .
45) Hero. 2011. Evaluation of Application and Professional Standard Model Theory, Examples of Program Evaluation Applications: Human Resource Development, Independent Rural Community Empowerment National Program (PNPM), Curriculum, Libraries, and Test Books. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.