Development of short Indonesian lesson plan to improve teacher performance
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Abstract. The developmental research was motivated by the results of preliminary study through interviews, which revealed almost all of the teachers did not create lesson plan themselves. As a result of this load, the performance of the real learning in the classroom becomes inadequate. Moreover, when lesson plan was not made by teachers themselves, the learning process becomes ineffective. Therefore, this study designed to develop a prototype of the short lesson plan, in particular, Indonesian language teaching, and to investigate its effectiveness. The participants in the study were teachers who were trained through lesson study group to design short model’s lesson plan. Questionnaires and open-ended questions were used; and the quantitative and qualitative data obtained were analyzed accordingly. The analysis of the quantitative data, aided with SPSS, were frequency, percentage, and means, whereas the qualitative data were analyzed descriptively. The results showed that the teachers liked the model, and they were willing to design their own lesson plan. The observation data revealed that the classroom learning process became more interactive, and classroom atmosphere was more engaging and natural because the teachers did not stick to the lesson plan made by other teachers.

1. Introduction
The curriculum has a vital role as a blueprint for teachers and students in achieving learning objectives [1]. So it is regarded as a dogmatic powerful grip so that teachers do not dare to do re-creations [2]. Lesson plan (LP) as a component of the operational curriculum implementation is also considered as a rigid document by many teachers. It means the existing components in the LP is a fixed. On the contrary, in the teaching process, teachers have academic autonomy in determining teaching materials, methods, assessments, etc [3]. Even so, the academic autonomy is not intended that the teacher can be as free as possible without proper preparation.

The National Education System Law (NES Law) has ordered that teachers are obliged to design LP. It at least consists of learning objectives, what is taught (material), how to teach (method), and learning assessment. Based on that, it is necessary to rethink the direction of LP that the law requires. Only four components are at least required in the LP. Meanwhile, the LP developed by the government currently is very complex, contains many components, and each component is described in detail so it is like a drama scenario that the implementation will be rigid and less contextual.

It is very burdensome to the teachers. It is revealed from the preliminary study results through interviews in February-March 2016 from twenty Indonesian Secondary School teachers in Surabaya, who among them is also a student of Master Program at State University of Surabaya. The results show that indeed all teachers (100%) have LP, but none (0%) of teachers make it themselves. They
copy and paste the existing LP from their friends. Among these respondents, 60% feel overwhelmed in designing the LP, while the 40% feel not. Those who claim unencumbered because of its preparation through copy paste. Because the preparation of this LP is an obligation as The NES Law, according to them (100%) the burden is reasonable but they want a simpler and easier LP. Most respondents (85%) promised to make their own LP if the format is simpler. According to them, LP made by the teacher will be implemented more effectively because the teachers are aware of the state of the students and the class.

It is in line with the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 65 of 2013 [4] on Process Standards which reveals that every teacher is obliged to develop a complete and systematic LP so that learning takes place interactively, inspiration, fun, challenging, motivates learners to participate, and provide sufficient space for initiative, creativity, and independence in accordance with the talents, interests, and physical and psychological development of learners. Thus, it is very important that there is an effective Indonesian LP of secondary school to improve teacher performance. Based on these facts, this study aims to develop a more concise LP prototype but does not violate the applicable law of the NES Law so that it is expected that teacher performance will increase. In addition, it is also studied the effectiveness of model LP after being applied by teachers in the classroom.

2. Research Methods

2.1 Research design

This research is a development research using Fenrich cycle model [5], covering 5 major phases, namely analysis, planning, design, development, and implementation. Each phase is always followed by evaluation and revision phase. This phase is very important because it is a continuous activity carried out at each major phase throughout the cycle. At each of the main phases of the examination activities in the form of evaluation and revision to produce a product that is steady. Thus, a subsequent major phase will not be carried out before the prior main phase produces a steady product after the follow-up phase above.

2.2 Subject

The subjects of this study are 40 Indonesian language teachers in secondary school at Surabaya formed in 8 groups of lesson study (LS). Each group consisted of 5 teachers with 1 teacher who acted as a model teacher, while 4 other teachers became partners doing the discussion (reflection) after doing an observation on learning performance of a model teacher.

2.3 Procedure

The analysis, planning, and design phase were carried out by the research team (RT). Nevertheless, in these phases the RT involved the officials of the Education Office at Surabaya and Secondary School Indonesian Teacher Discussion Group (ITDG), especially to present the model LP as well as the teacher engagement plan in the development phase. The result is support from both institutions for the implementation of this research.

The development phase begins to involve the teacher. This phase was carried out in several workshops: workshop I (introduction of prototype model and guided LP), workshop II (preparation of independent LP), workshop III (LS preparation), workshop IV (LS act), and V workshop (program evaluation).

Training activities with this LS model have also been done by Janjai [6], but the respondents are college teacher students. This LS model uses the basic theory of constructivism and metacognition. LS is basically chosen to solve problems and improve the quality of learning in the classroom by way of coaching by lecturers or peers of teachers in a collaborative and sustainable activity based on the principles of a colleague and the formation of professional learning community [7–9]. Cerbin & Kopp
[10] and Haithcock [7] added that LS activities are also beneficial for lecturers or colleagues in order to obtain an analysis of learning objectives, teaching practices, assessment of learning outcomes, and observation of students' thought processes in the classroom. About the advantages of this LS ever reported Murata & Takahashi [11] that teachers in Japan feel the benefits in the long term in developing learning. A survey of 125 LS actors found that 98% of them said that LS had helped them develop the learning and teaching process and 91% of respondents believed that LS was very effective in developing teacher professionalism.

2.4 Data Analyzing
The data collected in the form of qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data (in an overview of the model LP development process through several workshops and supporting and inhibiting factors obtained through observation and field notes) were analyzed using content analysis techniques, which considered its context and content. Meanwhile, the quantitative data related to the effectiveness of the model (from questionnaires and observations) were analyzed using descriptive statistics.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of The Short LP
In the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 65 of 2013 [4] mentioned that teachers are obliged to develop a complete and systematic LP. What does it mean here? Is it written in detail the contents of the LP component? Does complete reference to the adequacy of LP components? Or is it understood that the LP should be accompanied by the teaching materials, assessment sheets, etc.? In the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 81A of 2013 [12] on the implementation of the curriculum mentioned that the LP developed in detail of a subject matter or a specific theme that refers to the syllabus. LP includes: (1) school data, subject, and class/semester; (2) subject matter; (3) time allocation; (4) learning objectives, basic competencies and indicators of achievement of competence; (5) learning materials; learning methods; (6) media, tools and learning resources; (7) steps of learning activities; and (8) assessment.

Meanwhile, the previous document states that as a follow up of the NES Law, the Government Regulation No. 19 of 2005 [13] was made. In it was revealed that the LP contains learning objectives, learning materials, learning methods, learning resources, and assessment of learning outcomes.

Based on a preliminary study that revealed teachers' complaints due to the complexity of the LP, both the editorial and the content, and the consideration of non-violation of The NES Law, this study developed a short LP with only the main components. In detail, the components in question are as revealed in the following table. To give a complete picture of the short LP profile in the table presented the difference with the current LP.

A short LP contains components a) identity, b) learning objectives, c) learning materials, d) learning resources/materials, d) methods/learning models, e) assessment, and f) learning activities steps. The learning objective is formulated with just one line with all indicators (without repetition as usual). Component A (audience) and C (condition), as ideally formulate a learning objective, in this LP are not used. The material is also only written the subject matter. Sources/materials contain student books with reference to how many pages, such worksheets (if any), and other materials (eg audio recording). In the method written what the model (eg scientific). In the assessment is written the type of assessment and the level (eg written assessment of knowledge). For learning activities steps are filled in accordance with the model syntax. However, each step describes its activity and its learning resources (eg reading individually to find the object and purpose of the description text in SB: 3-5).
| Description                          | Current LP                                                                 | Short LP                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Components and sequences            | a) identity, b) core competencies, c) basic competencies and indicators of  | a) identity, b) learning objectives, c) learning materials, d) learning   |
|                                    | achievement of competencies, d) learning objectives, e) learning materials, | resources/materials, d) methods/learning models, e) assessment, and f)    |
|                                    | f) learning approaches, g) learning resources, h) learning media, i), and  | learning activities steps.                                               |
|                                    | j) assessment.                                                            |                                                                          |
| Identity                            | Yes                                                                       | Yes                                                                      |
| Core competence                     | Yes                                                                       | No                                                                       |
| Basic competencies and indicators   | Yes                                                                       | No                                                                       |
| Learning objectives                 | • Formulated with four elements (A, B, C, and D)                          | • Formulated with two elements (B and D)                                 |
|                                    | • Each indicator is a goal statement                                      | • Several indicators in one objective formula                           |
| Learning materials                  | Presented the topic title and details                                     | Presented the topic (subject matter)                                     |
| Approach/learning method            | Mentioned the name of method/learning model                               | Mentioned the name of method/learning model                              |
| Learning Resources                  | • Mentioned titles of books used                                          | • Mentioned titles of books (abbreviated) and page numbers               |
|                                    | • Expressed separately from instructional media (independently)           | • Served a series of teaching materials/media used                       |
| Instructional Media                 | • Mentioned media used                                                    | • Mentioned teaching materials used                                      |
|                                    | • Expressed separately from learning resources (independently)            | • Served a series of teaching materials/media used                       |
| Learning activities steps           | • Divided into three parts of activities: preliminary activities, core    | • Only presents steps according to the syntax of the learning model      |
|                                    | activities, and closing activities                                       | without mentioning the introduction, core, and closing                   |
|                                    | • The syntax component of the learning model used is explicitly written    | • The syntax component of the learning model used is not explicitly      |
|                                    | • Presented in complete sentences, including mentioning the actors, such   | written                                                                  |
|                                    | as teachers or learners                                                  | • Presented in concise but complete sentences (containing the types and  |
|                                    | • Time allocation for each part of the activity is written down           | forms of activities), without mentioning the actors, such as teachers or |
|                                    | • Learning activities steps is written **before** the assessment           | learners                                                                 |
|                                    | component                                                                 |                                                                          |
| Assessment                          | • Written the types, techniques, and references to assessment instruments  | • Written type, technique, and reference of assessment instruments in    |
|                                    | in attachments in a separate form                                        | attachments in an integrated form                                        |
|                                    | • **Assessment** is written **after** the learning activities steps       | • **Assessment** is written **before** the learning activities steps     |
|                                    | component                                                                 |                                                                          |
|                                    | • Not explicitly indicated in the learning activities steps              | • Explicitly demonstrated in the learning activities steps               |
| Number of pages                     | 2-3 pages                                                                 | 1 page                                                                   |
3.2 Effectiveness of Application of Model LP Through LS

The results of LS group reflection concluded that a) model LP is easy to apply, b) teachers rarely see LP at the time of teaching, c) the learning direction is systematic, d) the learning process in the class seems smooth, e) the students are passionate about questioning, f) teachers are more animated what is taught, g) tasks assigned to students seem natural, and h) textbooks take role in learning.

Questionnaire data showed that this LP is easy to use in learning. All teachers (100%) stated that the test LP is easier to design than the LP currently in use. All teachers (100%) said that it was because there was no need to write core competencies, 70% of teachers stated the formula was more concise because some parts were similarly put together, and 85% of teachers said sentences were not repeated.

According to eight model teachers, all teachers (100%) stated that LP of the trial was easy to use in the classroom because the textbook page presentation was clear (according to 87.5% of teachers), all prepared by teachers (100% teachers), and the short LP was easy to understand and do not need to see often when using it (87.5% of teachers). In this case, 25% of the model teachers still saw the LP at the time of teaching because they find obstacles and the rest (75% of teachers) said that they do not see the LP at the time of teaching. It showed that the teacher was very animating what will be taught.

The questionnaire data from the partner teacher who acted as an observer (32 teachers) showed that according to 85% observer, the learning process went smoothly, 85% observer thought the class was alive and natural, and 100% observer said that the weld is not rigid. With respect to student activity in the classroom, all observers (100%) agreed that teacher-student communication was smooth, 93% observers stated that students actively used textbooks, and 85% observers saw that students readily understood teacher commands.

Table 2. The Required Time Duration for Preparing an LP (In Minutes)

| Group | LP 1 | LP 2 | LP 3 | LP 4 | LP 5 | Total | Average |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| 1     | 70   | 54   | 40   | 35   | 33   | 232   | 46.4    |
| 2     | 62   | 50   | 46   | 37   | 35   | 230   | 46      |
| 3     | 67   | 60   | 52   | 45   | 37   | 261   | 52.2    |
| 4     | 63   | 51   | 43   | 37   | 31   | 225   | 45      |
| 5     | 60   | 57   | 46   | 38   | 36   | 237   | 47.4    |
| 6     | 73   | 60   | 57   | 42   | 36   | 268   | 53.6    |
| 7     | 57   | 50   | 42   | 37   | 30   | 216   | 43.2    |
| 8     | 66   | 61   | 52   | 45   | 38   | 262   | 52.4    |
| Total | 518  | 443  | 378  | 325  | 276  | 1940  |         |
| Average| 64.75| 55.38| 47.25| 40.62| 34.5 | 48.5  |         |

The data and chart above show the average teacher only takes 48.5 minutes to produce an LP. If at the initial time the teacher took 64.75 minutes to produce an LP, when making the 5th LP, they took only 34.5 minutes.
4. Conclusion

Based on the exposure in front it can be concluded that teachers, in general, will not require a long time when preparing their own LP when textbooks are available. Therefore, it is recommended that the LP format that has been used should be reviewed and further simplified as in the results of the development of this research so that the teachers are eager to make themselves. This fact shows that teachers generally will not take long to preparing their own LP if the textbook has been available. Thus, a contextual class climate, planned, passionate, and conducive can be realized.

References

[1] Richard J C 2010 Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching: Forward, Central, and Backward Design ELC J. 44 pp 5—33
[2] Musyaddad K 2013 Problematika Pendidikan di Indonesia Edu-Bio 4 pp 51–7
[3] Kuscu S and Unlu S 2015 Teaching Translation: A suggested lesson plan on translation of advertising through the use of authentic materials Procedia – Soc. Behav. Sci. 199 pp 407–14
[4] Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 65. 2013 Tentang Standar Proses Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah
[5] Fenrich P 1997 Practical Guidelines for Creating Instructional Multimedia Application (Fort Wort: The Dryden Press)
[6] Janjai S 2012 Improvement of The Ability of The Students in an Education Program to Design The Lesson Plans by Using an Instruction Model based on The Theories of Constructivism and Metacognition Procedia Eng. 32 pp 1163—8
[7] Haithcock F 2010 Lesson Study for District and School Leadership Teams in Differentiated Accountability Schools
[8] Hiebert J, Gallimore R and Stigler J 2002 A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can we get one? Educ. Res. 31 pp 3–15
[9] Indprasidh and Al M et 2004 The mathematics subject, using the lesson study approach Proceedings of a workshop on instructional development project under the 1000 national education reform act (Faculty of Education, Khon Kaen University)
[10] Cerbin W and Kopp B 2006 Lesson Study as a Model for Building Pedagogical Knowledge and Improving Teaching Int. J. Teach. Learn. High. Educ. 18 pp 250–7
[11] Murata A and Takahashi A 2002 District-level lesson study. How Japanese Teacher Improve Their Teaching of Elementary Mathematics Paper presented at a Research Pre-Session of The Annual Meeting of The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (Las Vegas)
[12] Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 81A 2013 Tentang Implementasi Kurikulum
[13] Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 19 2005 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan