

The Curriculum Of Inclusion Education In Madrasah In Indonesia

A.M. Wibowo*¹, Fakhruddin Fakhruddin², Joko Sutarto³, Titi Prihatin⁴

¹Postgraduate of Educational Management, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

²Postgraduate of Educational Management, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

³Postgraduate of Educational Management, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

⁴Postgraduate of Educational Management, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract

The article discussed the reality of developing the curriculum of inclusive education at madrasah as formal educational institutions in Indonesia. Since 2016, madrasah have administrated inclusive education programs, which was through the regulation of the Decree of the Directorate of Islamic Education No. 3211 in 2016. After 5 years of the program, the article intended to evaluate the development and implementation of inclusive education curricula in madrasah, which included the participation of educational components in content standards, process standards, and assessment standards. The benchmarking method was used in the research. And, it was found out that, the inclusive education curriculum in inclusive madrasah as educational institutions was developed by inviting the participation of the MI Principal, teachers, madrasah committees, madrasah supervisors, and foundations, but the role of counselors and assessors have not been involved on inclusive education. The curriculum was structured in two models, namely the regular curriculum model and the individual learning model for students with special needs. The teachers have also been participated and implemented the content standards, process standards, and assessment activities of inclusive education in madrasah.

Keywords Evaluation, benchmarking, curriculum, education, inclusion, madrasah

Introduction

Education is a human right, that is guaranteed by religion, the Declaration of Human Rights, and the Constitution in every country, including Indonesia. But, the implementation of the vision of education for all has not been yet touched all the students, especially students with special needs. Many citizens, especially children with special needs, have not received the right to education, such as the case in the Solomon Islands (Kilinc, 2019), Turkey (King and Julie, 2019), Australia (Forlin, 2006; 2013), United Kingdom (Florian, Black-Hawkins and Martyn Rouse; 2017),

European (Bartolo et al., 2021), Arab (El Arbid, SS, & Tairab, 2020), and Indonesia (Darma, 2015; MoEC, 2016; Hafiz, 2017). Then, children with special needs need a lot of struggles to have justice in accessing education.

In Indonesia, Central Statistics Agency (BPS) in 2017 reported that 1.6 million children are children with special needs. By that number, only 30% have received an education, and 18% of them have received inclusive education (Kemendikbud, 2017). The small number of children with special needs who receive an education is caused by various factors, such as an un-ideal curriculum for inclusive education, poor inclusive academic management, infrastructure, number of teachers, and the negative stigma of society towards children with special needs (Sakari Moberg, Etsuko Muta, Kanako Korenaga and Savolainen 2020;Darma 2015;Sofwan, A., Mujiyati, & Hendrowati 2019).

The teacher's competency is also a problem, especially when understanding the characteristics of students with special needs, and how to design individual learning programs for students (Tirri, 2017). Many teachers believe the development of an inclusive curriculum is not the responsibility of the teacher but lies on the government (Putri, 2019). The government's efforts are also assumed not optimal in providing educational services for students with special needs, especially in the standards and indexes of inclusive education which, currently, there are none in Indonesia (Purba, 2019).

Ideally, a curriculum on inclusive education aims to provide the widest opportunity for all students either with physical, emotional, mental, and social disabilities, or students who have the potential for academic and talents to obtain a quality education, according to the needs and abilities (Ainscow, M., Booth and Dyson 2006; Fernandez 2019). Adopting Tyler (1949), four goals in the curriculum development on inclusive education are (1) educational goals, (2) educational experiences to achieve the educational goals, (3) organizing educational experiences, and (4) determining the achieved goals of inclusive education. The end goal is, the students with special needs have a proper education like other regular students (Ismadi, 2017).

Madrasah is a formal education institution in Indonesia. Madrasah is one of the pillars in the implementation of Law No. 20 of 2003 on the Indonesian National Education system. In Indonesia, there is a dichotomy on the administration of educational institutions, which is under the Ministry of Education and Culture, and the Ministry of Religion. The Ministry of Education and Culture administrates Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, And Senior High Schools. Moreover, the Ministry of Religion administrates Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, Madrasah Tsanawiyah, and Madrasah Aliyah. The similarity is that both of them use the national education curriculum for general subjects. Meanwhile, the difference is in Islamic education subjects, which are divided into 4 subjects, and added by Arabic subject.

Discussing the regulation aspect in Indonesia, inclusive education in madrasah is regulated by the government through the issuance of the Decree of the Director General of Islamic Education No. 3211 of 2016 on the establishment of twenty two 22 Madrasah on inclusive programs, that spread across 5 provinces in Indonesia. Currently, the regulation has been running for five years. Then, it needs to be evaluated. Because, the curriculum on inclusive education in madrasah is a strategy to realize education for all, as well as is responsive to the various educational needs of students with special needs who have been marginalized (Ni'matuzahroh 2016;Stubbs 2002).

Research Problem

This article intends to evaluate the development of the curriculum on inclusive education and its implementation in madrasah for five years. The evaluation is related to who and how the curriculum is developed in the madrasah. There are 51.452 schools of Madrasah from 2019 to 2021. Of this number, only twenty two madrasahs

have implemented inclusive education programs, including eighteen madrasahs sibtidaiyah (MI) at the elementary school level, 2 Madrasah Tsanawiyah (junior high school level), and 2 Madrasah Aliyah (high school level) (MORA 2016; MORA 2021).

This evaluation research on inclusive education curriculum was conducted at the MI level in Central Java province. The schools are MI Maarif Keji Semarang, MI Maarif Kebarongan Banyumas, MI Maarif Sidomulyo Kebumen, and MI Muhammadiyah Kartosuro Sukoharjo. These four schools are the first generation of inclusion programs in Indonesia. The evaluation aims to know the question, how does the curriculum of inclusive education structured on content standards, process standards, and student assessment standards by principals and teachers. This evaluation could be the scientific evidence to decide whether the curriculum needs to be preserved or improved so that the curriculum becomes better.

The agenda of inclusive education

Inclusive education is the agenda of education for all. It prioritizes justice and quality, as well as equal rights of every student. But, a recent study finds out that the education system on Special Schools (SLB) built a wall of exclusivity for children with special needs (Operti 2009; Paseka 2019; Darma 2015). Inclusive education with a good curriculum is a solution to create a fun, friendly school environment and foster confidence among students with special needs (Paseka, 2019) by using adaptive technology (Ariyanto, 2017).

The factor of failure or success of inclusive education is not only on the curriculum but also the management of education administration. The current inclusive madrasa curriculum is still very simple (Muzayanah, 2016). Teachers have not been able to translate the inclusive education curriculum for students with various special needs, into inclusive teaching practices (Villa, R. A. 2000; Forlin, C. 2011; Fernandez, 2019). The inclusive curriculum serves as a guide to lead the educational policies and programs into the classroom level (Opperti 2011; Yan 2019). It is a major challenge for stakeholders to develop the curriculum, such as MI teachers at the regional, national, and local levels to ensure future educational progress (Yan, 2019). Madrasahs have an advantage compared to public schools, that madrasahs not only teach general subjects but also Islamic Education subjects on a wider scale. For example, Hadith and the Quran, Arabic, Fiqh, Theology and Islamic Character (ethics), and Islamic Cultural History. In the output, religion learning is more comprehensive and in-depth (Istiyani, 2017).

The importance of evaluating inclusive curriculum

The curriculum on inclusive education is simply described as a set of learning plans to strengthen the awareness that, human is individual who are diverse in social, cultural, and physical conditions, intending to prepare students to interact with diverse populations (Wilson, Jeffery L, Katrina A mayer, 2012). Everything that has been planned, organized, and implemented in the curriculum needs to be evaluated in terms of appropriateness between the

curriculum and goals in the organization (Trewatha, 1982). The evaluation of the curriculum on inclusive education in Madrasah is closely related to the problems of increasing the innovation diffusion in the quality of madrasah as educational institutions, and the management itself. The goal, the curriculum can be accepted and welcomed by the community (A. M. Wibowo et al., 2020). Also, it is closely related to efforts to develop diverse students, following the goals that are written in a document containing the vision and mission, fundamental goals, organizing learning experiences, and evaluation (Print 1993; Tyler 1949).

The development of curriculum on inclusive education at madrasah is monitored through madrasah self-evaluation. Madrasah Self-Evaluation is a process of assessing the quality of education at the madrasah level based on the 8 indicators on National Education Standards. Through self-evaluation, madrasah may identify aspects that need to be improved, and the strengths and weaknesses. The results were used as material to determine the types of priority programs for improvement and development plans as outlined in the madrasah work plan and budget.

Research Method

The analysis unit of this evaluation research was about the development of a curriculum on inclusive education at the elementary school level, which was Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI) in Central Java Province. This research was conducted at four MI schools that implemented inclusion programs. The school was spread in the regency of Semarang, Sukoharjo, Kebumen, and Banyumas. The main focus was the evaluation of the development of the educational curriculum in inclusive education at the MI level.

The research instrument consisted of an evaluation questionnaire for MI principals and teachers about their participation in developing the curriculum, syllabus, and lesson plans. Also, it evaluated teacher participation in the development of content standards, process standards, facilities, and infrastructure standards. The curriculum and syllabus review instruments consisted of the number of competency standards and basic competencies of each subject in school. The connection between the syllabus includes six things. They were the suitability between competency standards and basic competencies, standard content and learning activities, learning assessment and subject, learning activities and time allocation, subject and resources of learning, and the developing syllabus and the syllabus at each grade level. The evaluation on the implementation activities of the learning plan included the elements in the learning plan document prepared by the teacher, namely the relationship between the learning implementation plan components and the syllabus, and learning feasibility activities.

Evaluation of curriculum development was carried out using benchmarking methods through interviews, observation, documentation, and questionnaire techniques. Interviews were conducted to explore qualitative data, namely the compatibility between MI policies and inclusive education programs, such as the vision and mission, educators and education personnel, and supporting and inhibiting factors in the implementation of inclusive education. In the interview method, the researcher acted as a key instrument (Bogdan, 1982). The documentation method aimed to see the suitability among curriculum documents, educational

facilities and infrastructure, teacher competencies, and inclusive programs. The questionnaire method was conducted to collect data on the suitability of curriculum development and inclusive education programs.

The information from the curriculum evaluation was interpreted qualitatively to obtain descriptions on the quality of the curriculum on inclusive education at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah that administrated the inclusive program. The analysis output was a description of the strengths and weaknesses of the inclusive education curriculum at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah that implement the inclusive program. And, it concluded to improve the curriculum on inclusive education at the madrasah Ibtidaiyah level.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Overview of research site

The four schools at the MI level as the research site have officially administrated inclusion programs in madrasah as educational institutions through the regulation of the Decree of the Director General of Islamic Education Number 3211 of 2016. The similarity of the four educational institutions was that the schools had accepted and had students with special needs, far before they enacted the inclusion program regulations. The implementation of inclusion-based education programs at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah requires a development process, starting from human resources, facilities infrastructure, and so on. The diffusion process of inclusive program innovations, especially in madrasah, requires several stages of development, such as strengthening teachers and management that are supported by the social conditions of the surrounding community, as the findings of previous research (A. M. ; T. P. Wibowo, 2020). The adoption of inclusive education by MI was carried out by conducting an analysis of facilities and infrastructure, inventory of human resources, workshops, and inclusive training by institutions such as AUSAID, USAID, foundations, and inclusive schools, as well as Special Schools in several nearby cities such as Semarang. In implementing the inclusive education program, MI developed four steps. They were, a) based on the number of students with special needs, b) the discussion among madrasah, foundations, and the community, c) the decision to administrate an inclusive madrasah education program, and d) accelerating the process of accepting community innovation to support the inclusion program by involving opinion leaders, such as religious and community leaders around the madrasah.

The social structure of the community around the school tends to be the largest religious community organizations in Indonesia, such as Nahdlotul Ulama and Muhammadiyah. The organization strongly supports the school. The characteristics of rural communities in the social system prefer pesantren-style education and believe in the opinion of their leaders, such as Kiai. And, madrasah teachers may influence the acceleration of the process of diffusion and innovation of the inclusion programs. The diffusion process and innovation include four stages, namely dialogue, access, structure, and flexibility (Millson, Murray R dan Wilemon, 2008).

The acceptance of new students is carried out in several steps, namely academic calendar, the age for normal students, the capacity, and the location of students' domicile with the schools. Assessments and psychological tests were conducted for children with special needs, both intellectually and physically. The tests aim to identify the initial conditions and the needs of

students to provide appropriate treatment for learning. At MI Keji and MIM PK Kartosuro, all the prospective students with special needs are accepted because human resources and infrastructure can handle students with special needs, such as special assistant teachers and shadow teachers for each student. Meanwhile, MI Sidomulyo Kebumen and MI Salafiyah Kebaorangan might not be able to accept students with Celebrity Palsy and prefer to accompany children with autism and slow learners.

Types of Special Needs on MI Inclusion

The article succeeded in identifying the types of students with special needs in four schools at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah level that administrated inclusive education. In more detail, the types of special needs in each school are presented in table 1.

Table 1 Types of Special Needs in each school of MI

Types of special need	MI Maarif Keji	MI Maarif Sidomulyo	MI Salafiyah Kebarongan	MIM PK Kartosuro	Total
Slow learner	3	6	2	1	12
Autis	5	-	1	3	9
Cerebral Palasy	1	-	-	3	4
Severe deafness	2	-	-	5	2
Intellectual disorder	10	-	-	6	16
ADHD	2	-	5	1	8
LSD (Emotional Disorder)	-	-	-	3	3
Mild deafness	-	-	-	3	3
Down syndrom	-	2	-	1	3
Anxiety	-	-	-	1	1
Low Vision	-	-	2	-	2
Speech Delay	1	-	1	-	2
Learning difficulties of ADD, Specific Language Disorder	2	-	-	-	2
Thalassemia	1	-	-	-	1
Speech impaired	-	1	-	-	1
Number of Childreen with Special Needs	28	9	11	27	75
Total number of students	224	130	246	535	1.155
Percentage of Number of Childreen with Special Needs	12.5 %	6.92%	4.47%	5.04%	28,93%

Table 1 shows that the highest percentage number of students with special needs is in MI Maarif Keji with 12.5%. MI Maarif Sidomulyo only serves 6.9% of students with special needs. Meanwhile, MIM PK Sukoharjo serves 5.05% and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan Banyumas serves 4.47% of students with special needs.

Seen from the variations types of students with special needs, MIM PK Kartosuro Sukoharjo had the most variations. It has nine types of students with special needs. MI Maarif Keji provides eight types. Then, MI Salafiyah Kebarongan Banyumas provides five types. And, MI Maarif Sidomulyo provides three types of students with special needs. The students with special needs are spread out in each regular class in each school of MI.

Number of Shadow Teachers

The existence of shadow teachers who have special competencies is needed for students with various types of special needs. Of the four schools of the object, only MI Salafiyah Kebarongan Banyumas did not have a shadow teacher. In this condition, students with special needs are only accompanied by common teachers and they added additional tasks to teach students with special needs. MI Maarif Keji has 6 shadow teachers. Meanwhile, MI Sidomulyo has 3 shadow teachers. And, MIM PK Kartosuro Sukoharjo has 27 shadow teachers.

Unfortunately, most of the shadow teachers for inclusive in MI do not have a special educational background. The competence is obtained through training by local, national, and international institutions in the field of special education. For example, special schools, Autism foundations to training from international institutions such as UNICEF and AUSAID.

Benchmarking of Curriculum Evaluation on Madrasah Inclusive Education

Development of Content Standards by the head of MI

Benchmarking of evaluation on content standards contains the participation of the various parties in the Curriculum development in Madrasah. The four principals of the subject were asked to fill out an evaluation questionnaire that contains the participation of parties in developing the curriculum, reference documents, the ways or step in developing the curriculum, and the determination of the learning load. The results of the questionnaire are presented in table 2.

Table 2 Partipation in the curriculum development of the madrasah inclusion

Partipation in the curriculum development	MI Keji	MIM PK	MI Sidomulyo	MI Salafiyah
Principal	√	√	√	√
Teacher	√	√	√	√
Counselor or college element	-	-	-	-
School committee or educational institution	√	√	√	√
Madrasah Supervisor	√	√	√	√
Inclusive education assessor	-	-	-	-
Foundation	√	√	√	√

Based on table 2, the curriculum development never invited an assessor for inclusive education. The role of education assessors is only on the initial assessment of student admissions, conducted at the beginning of the school year. But, not all objects implement it. Involving assessors in an assessment needs a lot of budgets that are not covered by the madrasah budget. Curriculum development invites the participation of elements, including Principals, teachers, madrasa committees, madrasa supervisors, and foundations. The participation aims to establish content standards, graduate competency standards, learning process standards, and assessment standards, which will use as guidelines for implementing inclusive education in madrasah.

In fact, the curriculum development process can be different from MI to another in implementing the inclusion program. Based on the evaluation questionnaire, found that MI Maarif Keji and MIM PK Kartosuro referred to the guidelines of the Indonesian National Education Standards Agency. The other object has modified the curriculum set by the Indonesian National Education Standards Agency.

Moreover, each school's subject applies a different learning load, such as based on 3 criterias or 6 criterias. They use a thematic approach for grades I to grade III and a subject approach for grades IV to VI.

Processes Standards on regular and inclusive education

The process standard includes the availability of a syllabus for each subject, starting from grade I to class VI. The subject from grade I to grade III consists of thematic lessons, religion, sports, local content, and self-development. The syllabus in grades IV to grade VI consists of religion, Civics, Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian), Mathematics, Science, Social Sciences, Cultural Arts and skills, sports, and local content.

In terms of the standard process, there are some differences between MI with one another. For example, MI Keji and MI Sidomulyo Kebumen have a syllabus for each subject, starting from religious education, Civics, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Social Studies, Physical Education, cultural arts, local content, and self-development. Meanwhile, the syllabus in MIM PK Kartosuro and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan is still incorporated in thematic subjects, religious education, but special subjects such as Mathematics, Indonesian, and Social Sciences have no specific syllabus.

In terms of developing talents and interests, each MI has its method and way. The development of talents and interests is carried out using an individual learning program (PPI) for students with special needs to train their non-academic potential. For example, there are students with slow learner conditions. They are very difficult to write, their hands droop limply when asked to write, but they are very excited to drum (percussion) instruments. They can play drums for more than two hours with occasional breaks. So, the ability to play musical instruments is developed by the teacher. Some students are very weak academically but it is very easy to memorize short letters in the Quran. Moreover, the ability is better than other regular children's, so the teacher developed the ability to memorize the Quran. The development of talents and interests is mostly carried out in the school's facilities, such as the Islamic boarding school in MI Keji, Semarang Regency. However, several other subjects only

have limited source space, un-optimal use of the source space because they do not have complete facilities, unlike in MI Keji.

The participation of teachers and principals in the development the content standards of a curriculum includes 6 things, namely in compiling a curriculum on the religious subject and noble character, citizenship and personality, science and technology, and aesthetic material. Table 3 shows the participation of teachers in the content standards of the curriculum.

Table 3 Self-evaluation of the teacher’s participation on the development of content standards

MI Inclusion	Teacher’s participation on the development of inclusive curriculum	
	Participate	Not
MI Keji	75 %	25 %
MIM PK Kartosuro	31.25 %	68.75 %
MI Maarif Sidomulyo	100 %	-
MISalafiyah Kebarongan	31.25 %	68.75 %

Table 3 shows the teacher’s participation in developing content standards on the curriculum. For example, teachers’ participation in MI Keji and MI Sidomulyo, in developing the content standards. Some teachers even claim to be involved in developing the substance more than one subject. Meanwhile, teachers’ participation in MIM PK Kartosuro and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan Banyumas in curriculum development is only 31.25%.

Developing material in the subject group conducted by the teacher includes the number of document implementation plans for each subject as well as the appropriateness of the madrasah textbook and the syllabus. Table 4 shows the number of learning plan documents and the appropriateness of the madrasah textbooks and the syllabus prepared by the teacher.

Table 4 The material of subject groups on inclusive MI

Inclusive MI Educational unit	Average lesson plan per subject	The appropriateness of the madrasah textbooks and the syllabus		
		appropriate	Partial appropriate	Not appropriate
MI Keji	6-11	84,61%	7.69%	-
MIM PK Kartosuro	6-10	14.28%	78.57%	7.142%
MI Maarif Sidomulyo	6-8	66.66%	16.66%	16.66%
MI Salafiyah Kebarongan	6-8	14.28%	78.571%	7.142%

Average	44.96%	45.37%	10.31%
---------	--------	--------	--------

Table 4 proves that the average number of documents of learning implementation plan prepared by the teacher in each subject is 6 to 11 documents. Meanwhile, the teachers' judgment of the madrasah textbook and syllabus were appropriate (44,96%), partially appropriate (45,37%), and not appropriate (10,31%).

Evaluation of learning preparation activities

Evaluation of learning preparation activities for teachers on inclusive MI includes the use of teachers' guidelines for inclusive education, preparation of syllabus and lesson plans, selecting the textbooks by teachers, review of textbooks and preparation of teacher teaching materials following to students' characteristics. Table 5 shows the results of the teacher's evaluation of learning preparation.

Table 5. teachers' evaluation on learning preparation

MI	Assessment guideline for students' with special needs	Syllabus & Lesson Plan coordinated by Madrasah	Evaluation to source book	Source of learning following the students' characteristic
MI Keji	27,27 %	27,27 %	24,24 %	21,21 %
MIM PK Kartosuro	23,08 %	25,64 %	23,08 %	28,21 %
MI Sidomulyo	33,33 %	28,57 %	19,05 %	19,05 %
MI Salafiyah Kebarongan	23,08 %	25,64 %	23,08 %	28,21 %
Average	26,69 %	26,78 %	22,36 %	24,17 %

Table 5 shows that, in the learning preparation process, some teachers have used the assessment guideline for students with special needs, conducted a review of syllabus and lesson plans, selected the teaching materials, and developed teaching materials following the students' characteristics. The use of these four instruments for the preparation of the inclusive-based learning process is almost evenly distributed with an average of 19% for each instrument to a maximum of 33%.

Then, the process is supervised by the principal. The evaluation provided by the principal includes the document of teachers' lesson plan, the implementation of the learning document, and the assessment of student learning outcomes. In reality, teachers believe that generally, principals are evenly distributed in these three aspects with a certain time-frequency and model. Supervision is carried out by the principal with the method of observation, giving notes, recording documentation, interviews, focused discussions, and giving examples. In more detail, the monitoring and supervision process is carried out by the principal and presented in table 6.

Table 6 Monitoring and supervision by principals

MI	Giving example	FGD	Observation	giving Note	Interview	documentation
MI Keji	2,5 %	5 %	30 %	20 %	12,5 %	30 %
MIM PK Kartosuro	2,56 %	17,95 %	25,64 %	25,64 %	7,69 %	20,51 %
MI Maarif Sidomulyo	8,11 %	5,41 %	29,73 %	16,22 %	8,11 %	32,43 %
MI Salafiyah Kebarongan	2,56 %	17,95 %	25,64 %	25,64 %	7,69 %	20,51 %
Average	3,93 %	11,58 %	27,75 %	21,87 %	9 %	25,86 %

Table 6 show that most of the supervision conducted by principals to teachers is carried out through observation, that is in terms of appropriateness of the curriculum and implementation. Another supervision model is carried out on the curriculum documentation prepared by the teacher and provides notes by the principal. The supervision model of the interview, FGD, and giving examples are rarely done by the principal to teachers. The frequency of supervision, carried out by the principal to teachers from all subjects of the study, is mostly carried out twice a year. And, it is seldom for teachers to be supervised once a year.

Management Standard

The evaluation of the management standard for the inclusion program is based on benchmarking the self-evaluation of the teacher and principal. Most of the principals and teachers stated that the curriculum of education unit level in each madrasah was developed by including the vision of inclusion through the regular education model and individual learning program (PPI). It becomes the four-year work plans and annual work plans prepared by each MI.

But, a few of the research subjects consider the opinion of the madrasah committee in the development of madrasah work, both the work plan and budget. They are MI Keji and MIM PK accommodate the suggestion or opinion of the madrasah committee. Meanwhile, MI Sidomulyo and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan are less sensitive to suggestions from the Madrasah Committee.

Assessment standard

Curriculum evaluation at MI that implements inclusion programs on assessment standards is carried out by benchmarking self-evaluation of the activities process of the teacher assessment plans and the preparation of the assessment rubrics. For example, making academic assessment sheets, daily test rubrics, character assessment rubrics, rubrics for skills, and rubrics for activity observation. Not only the evaluation on the student assessment rubric but also evaluation of the assessment standards is also carried out to assess how teachers assess,

use and report the learning outcomes. The evaluation result of the assessment standard is carried out by teachers, and presented in table 7.

Table 7 evaluation of assessment standards by teachers

Teacher assessment form	Yes (%)	No (%)
Test (student cognitive assessment)	89,83	10,16
Behavioral observation sheet (student affection assessment)	84,74	15,25
Observation sheet (student psychomotor assessment)	89,83	10,16
Portfolio (evidence of student performance)	88,13	11,86
Compose a guideline of questions	81,35	18,64
Write the questions	100	0
Review the questions	61,01	38,98
Observation sheet for student affection	84,74	15,25
Observation sheet for Student psychomotor	76,27	23,72
Activity observation sheet	79,66	20,33
Analyzing the assessment results	69,49	30,50
Using the assessment results for student progress	81,35	18,64
Report the results of behavior assessment to religious teachers	83,05	16,94
Report the results of character assessment to Civics teachers	76,27	23,72

Table 7 shows the assessment standard for teachers at inclusive MI uses 14 criteria, namely tests, observation sheets, portfolios, compiling guidelines, writing questions, reviewing exam questions, making behavioral observation sheets, making psychomotor observation sheets, making activity observation sheets, carrying out assessment results, using the assessment results, making reports on the results of affective assessments to religious teachers, and report the results of character assessments to Civics teachers. All the teachers (100%) only conduct one assessment standard of the fourteen points standard, namely compiling test items. About 80-89% of teacher also makes the tests of learning outcomes, making observation sheets for process skills, giving assignments in a portfolio for the students' performance, making observation sheets to assess student behavior, making behavioral observation sheets, and compiling question guidelines. And, 70-79% of teachers also conduct assessments through the sheets of activity and skill observation.

Individual learning tools and regular curriculum

Based on the data collection, generally, the curriculum of MI that implements inclusion programs is the same as other regular MI, including core competencies, basic competencies, and lesson plans. In core competencies, all thematic and subject separately consist of four core competencies, such as spiritual, social, knowledge, and skills. But, in basic

competencies, there are differences in the number of basic competencies in the same subjects (thematics) in each MI.

Moreover, the most prominent difference is individual learning tools. The tools are used to help children with special needs when they encounter difficulties. The tools are varies and differents from one school to another, depending on the type of students with special needs. This program is sometimes only a form of curriculum administration, but at the practical level, it is not used. For example, the tool is not even compiled by the teacher at MI Kebarongan because there is no shadow teacher for students with special needs.

Meanwhile, the tool in MI Sidomulyo is not work well as the students with special need is not join the regular class during the learning hours. There is no interaction between regular students and students with special needs. The fact made the threeshadow teachers overwhelmed in teaching.

Different from MIM PK Kartosuro and MI Keji, in Semarang Regency, both individual learning tools and implementation can run well. For example in MIM PK Kartosuro, each student with special needs has a shadow teacher who accompanies them, both inside and outside the classroom. The success of implementation is supported by the fact that almost all teachers often receive training on growth and development and education for students with special needs. Moreover, individual learning activities are also given at night at an inclusive boarding school.

From 2020 until mid-August 2021, face-to-face learning programs in madrasah are fully stopping during the pandemic of COVID-19. The curriculum for inclusive MI uses an emergent curriculum that automatically changes the learning process from face-to-face to online learning. The changes have an impact on the learning process. Based on the data, only MI Keji implemented the individual learning tool for children with special needs. The tool is carried out by ways of visiting them at homes or collaborating with parents by developing a learning framework for parents. The tool contains information about students, types of special needs, academic/cognitive therapists, and how to stimulate children.

CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation of the curriculum for inclusive education at the MI level, it obtained three conclusions. First, the development of the curriculum for inclusive education at MI has invited the participation of the principal, teachers, committees of educational institutions, madrasah supervisors, but counselors and assessors for inclusive education are not participating.

The second, the development of the curriculum for inclusive education at MI, the committee has used the regular curriculum and considered the needs of students with special needs in learning. However, it found a discrepancy between textbooks in madrasah and the syllabus prepared by teachers. And, the talents and interests of students with special needs are developed in the non-academic field through an individual learning tool.

The third, the teachers have been participated and implemented content standards, process standards, learning management, and inclusive education assessment activities. The teacher's participation is seen in both documents for regular education programs and an individual learning tool for children with special needs.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the Research and Development Agency and Education and Training of the Ministry of Religion of Indonesia for the research funding assistance. Also to Aji Sofanudin and Nugroho Eko Atmanto, the researchers from the Ministry of Religion who assisted in data collection activities for this research.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. Routledge.
- Ariyanto, D. (2017). The role of learning technology in supporting the implementation of inclusive education. In Malang (Ed.), *International Conference On Special Education In Southeast Asia Region*. Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Bogdan, R. C. dan B. K. S. (1982). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Darma, I. P. ; B. R. (2015). Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Inklusi di Indonesia. *Prosiding Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 223–227. <https://doi.org/http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/prosiding/article/view/13530/6317>
- Fernandez, T. M. (2019). Attitudes toward Inclusive Education and Practical Consequences in Final Year Students of Education Degrees. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 237, 1184–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2017.02.187>
- Forlin, C., and D. C. (2011). Teacher Preparation for Inclusive Education: Increasing Knowledge But Raising Concerns. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 17–32.
- Ismadi, H. (2017). Pendidikan Inklusif Menyatukan Anak ABK dengan Anak Normal. <https://www.kompasiana.com/hanifatulismadi/59c66ae6bd57985b91026fe2/pendidikan-inklusif-menyatukan-anak-abk-dengan-anak-normal>
- Istiyani, D. ; Z. S. A. (2017). A model of madrasa ibtdaiya quality evaluation. *Research and Evaluation in Education*, 3(1), 28–41. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21831/reid.v3i1.13902>
- Millson, Murray R dan Wilemon, D. (2008). Educational Quality Correlates of Online Graduate Management Education. *Journal of Distance Education*, 22(3), 1.
- Keputusan Direktur Jenderal pendidikan Islam Nomor 3211Tahun 2016 Tentang Penetapan 22 (Dua Puluh Dua Madrasah Inklusif, Pub. L. No. 3211 (2016).
- MORA, M. of R. A. (2021). Rekapitulasi Data Pokok Pendidikan Islam. Data EMIS, Ministry of Religious Affair. http://emispendis.kemenag.go.id/emis_madrasah/
- Muzayanah, U. (2016). Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif Pada Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI) Keji Ungaran Jawa Tengah. *Penamas*, 29(2), 211–226.
- Ni'matuzahroh, Y. (2016). *Individu Berkebutuhan Khusus & Pendidikan Inklusif* (1st ed.). UMM Press.

- Opertti, R. and J. B. and L. D. (2009). Moving forward: Inclusive education as the core of Education for All. *Prospects*, 39, 205–215. <https://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/s11125-009-9112-3>
- Opperti, R.; J. B. (2011). Developing inclusive teachers from an inclusive curricular perspective. *Prospect*, 41, 459–472. <https://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/s11125-011-9205-7>
- Paseka, A. and S. S. (2019). Parents' attitudes towards inclusive education and their perceptions of inclusive teaching practices and resources. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(2), 254–272. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1665232>
- Print, M. (1993). *Curriculum Development and Design*. Allen & Unwin.
- Purba, T. A. (2019). 70 Persen Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus Tak Dapat Pendidikan Layak. 26 Maret 2019. <https://lifestyle.bisnis.com/read/20190326/236/904431/70-persen-anak-berkebutuhan-khusus-tak-dapat-pendidikan-layak>
- Putri, A. A. and C. S. O. A. (2019). Gambaran Kompetensi Pengajar di yayasan Wahana Inklusif Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Inklusi*, 2(2), 59–64. <https://doi.org//10.26740/inklusi.v2n2.p59-64>
- Sakari Moberg, Etsuko Muta, Kanako Korenaga, M. K. & H., & Savolainen. (2020). Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(1), 100–114. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1615800>
- Sofwan, A., Mujiyati, & Hendrowati, T. Y. (2019). Perceptions of Inclusion Education by Parents of Elementary School-Aged Children in Lampung, Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 199–212. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12113a>
- Stubbs, S. (2002). *Inclusive education where there are few resources*. The Atlas Alliance.
- Tirri, K. & S. L. (2017). Ethical Challenges In Inclusive Education: The Case Of Gifted Students. *International Perspectives on Inclusive Education*, 9, 239–257. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-363620170000009010>
- Trewatha, R. L. ; M. G. N. (1982). *Management* (third edit). Business Publication.
- Tyler, W. R. (1949). *Basic Principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Villa, R. A., and J. S. T. (2000). *Restructuring for Caring and Effective Education: Piecing the Puzzle Together*. MD: Paul H. Brooks.
- Wibowo, A. M. ; T. P. (2020). The Diffusion Innovation of Madrasa Ibtidaiya Inclusion from Regular School to Inclusive. *International Conference on Science and Education and Technology (ISET 2019)*, 205–209. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200620.040>
- Wibowo, A. M., Fakhruddin, Rifa'i, A., & Prihatin, T. (2020). Model Peningkatan Sumber Daya Pendidik Pada Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Berbasis Inklusi Menghadapi Era Society 5.0

Dan Revolusi Industri 4.0. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana (Prosnampas), 1–1161. <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/snpasca/article/view/247>

Wilson, Jeffery L, Katrina A mayer, L. M. N. (2012). Mission and Diversity Statements: What They Do and Do Not Say. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(2), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-011-9194-8>

Yan, T. and M. D. (2019). Regular education teachers' concerns on inclusive education in China from the perspective of concerns-based adoption model. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(4), 384–404.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1435741>