

AN IMPLEMENTATION TO DETERMINE THE KKM OF MUSIC SUBJECT AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Mutiara Arlisyah Putri Utami¹, Syaiful Syamsuddin²

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

²Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received July 15, 2022

Revised September 13, 2022

Accepted September 20, 2022

Keywords:

Junior High School

KKM

Music Art

Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A KKM determination is the initial stage of assessment. However, there are still some issues related to the topic, especially in musical some issues related to the topic, especially in music. Therefore, this research used a discrepancy evaluation model to describe the purpose of (1) the implementation level of KKM determination in music, specifically in terms of intake, complexity and carrying capacity. (2) The teachers' constraints in determining KKM There were six music and art teachers from a junior high school who were taken as subjects in this research. Those subjects were selected using purposive sampling. Data were collected through interviews, documentation, and observations. Data analysis used qualitative analysis and descriptive statistics supported by quantitative data. The results showed that the implementation level of KKM determination in terms of technical procedures was categorized as "good" or "in accordance with predetermined criteria standards." The level of implementation in terms of weighting the value of KKM on the aspect of intake and carrying capacity was categorized as "not very good," while in complexity aspects it was categorized as "good." The teachers' constraints in determining KKM include: a) determining the value of complexity; b) identifying the student's ability; c) determining the value of the intake; and d) weighing the value of KKM.

Copyright © 2022 ETDCI.
All rights reserved.

Corresponding Author:

Mutiara Arlisyah Putri Utami,
Departement of Tadris Matematika,
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
Email: mutiara.arlisyah@fitk.uin-malang.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

The assessment of learning outcomes at elementary and secondary education levels is based on educational assessment standards. Permendikbud No. 23 of 2016 on educational assessment standards stressed that an assessment should consider assessment guidelines, such as assessment criteria; by definition, the learning assessment must be based on the size of the reference basis for the assessment or determination of the achievement of learning outcomes (Kemendikbud, 2016). Therefore, the educational unit or each subject should use the KKM as an assessment instrument in assessing the achievement of the competence of

learners in each subject. A good assessment system can provide information to improve the teaching process in accordance with procedures or mechanisms, one of which is the use of appropriate assessment instruments (Samritin & Suryanto, 2016; Syamsuddin & Utami, 2021)

The criteria or passing limit becomes a crucial matter to determine through a systematic and accurate process, so there is a need to provide a standard in determining the KKM as a reference in assessment. With the determination of the criteria, the result obtained from the standard-setting procedure can be well understood, but it can still be suspected if the assessment is made by individuals with inadequate criteria (Horn et al., 2000; Syamsuddin & Istiyono, 2018)

One of the standards for determining KKM is the technical procedure contained in the Assessment Guide composed by Kemendikbud in 2017. Permendikbud No. 23 of 2016 stated that the determination of KKM refers to the competency standards of graduates by considering the characteristics of learners, characteristics of subjects, and conditions of the educational unit. These three aspects are considered and use weighting values based on predetermined requirements to become the criteria referenced in the evaluation process of the learning outcomes assessed (Kemendikbud, 2017).

Learners characteristic or intake is the average ability of learners that can be seen at the beginning of learning; the value of intake can be determined by observing the average value of student learning outcomes in the previous semester (Daryanto & Amirono, 2016). Subjects characteristic or complexity is the difficulty level of the material in a subject, as stated the complexity is the difficulty level of a visible indicator of competence difficulty verb of the material.

Carrying capacity is the condition of the educational unit or potentials owned by the school in supporting the learning activities, the determination of the carrying capacity can be carried out by considering components such as teacher competence, school accreditation predicate and the feasibility of facilities and infrastructure (Kemendikbud, 2017). Determination of value on intake aspect, complexity and carrying capacity should be determined by subject teachers in accordance with the conditions of each educational unit, since the teacher is the only one who fully understands about the students' level to the degree of material difficulty taught and the available means of support. Passing limit is better determined by the person who knows about what should be known and can be done by the students based on instructions received (Mukti et al., 2020; Zieky & Perie, 2006)

Ability in determining the value of KKM based on applicable standards is a capability that must be owned by the teachers in evaluating learning outcomes. (Mochere, 2017; Syamsuddin et al., 2018) stated that a competent teacher requires one of his skills; evaluating student learning outcomes. However, in reality there are teacher problems related to determining the value of KKM. In fact, It is not uncommon to find the determined KKM scores which cannot be fulfilled because the preparation and determination are not appropriate and less guided by the existing provisions (Utami & Syamsuddin, 2020; Widodo, 2009). Inaccuracy in preparing and determining the minimum accomplishment criteria will affect the learning process and assessment. If the value of the KKM is too high, it can cause students to fail to attain that value, while when it is too low, it can also lead to unqualified

learning standards. Mesrawati (2016) in her findings suggested for improvement on teachers' understanding of KKM, in addition, teachers must proportionally know the aspects of the KKM and its weighting on each aspect, because in reality, the teachers have not and even may not be able to set KKM, even though existing, determination KKM is not based on analysis and not on the principle as well as the steps of determination.

The art subject is one of the most difficult in determining its assessment criteria, especially the assessment of skills in the art of music because subjectivity tends to take place in the process of assessment, as (Mudjilah, 2013) stated high subjectivity (human error) often interferes in evaluating music, especially in the affective and psychomotor aspects, because it has not been done properly. (Gruber, 2008) observed that subjectivity in assessing art will be reduced if explicit assessment criteria are developed in the process of lesson planning. The determination of criteria or standards in the assessment of art can reduce the teacher's subjectivity in the assessment process, this is in line with the findings conducted by (Astuti, 2015) which stated that the standardization of evaluation of the learning achievement of musical art needs to be provided as a reference to direct the learning process to the clear objectives. Spooren et al. (2013) found that some teachers evaluate art products based on unclear categories without considering a certain criteria that can help determine academic development and learning. (Department, 1995) stated that the criteria used by art educators to make judgments are based solely on teacher training and experience as artists and educators, that is, the teachers' shared understanding of the standards of each art form, and the level of achievement expected for the student. Therefore, the policy makers, curriculum planners should be able to evaluate the teacher evaluation process in the music subject (Chew et al., 2012) recommended that the policy makers, curriculum planners should guide the music subject teachers in the formulation of programs and implementations related to music education.

Based on some of these findings, it can be suggested that the public has not much knowledge about the implementation of music subject teachers' standards for determining and implementing the competencies of teachers in preparing assessment plans. Therefore, there should be an evaluation of the implementation of the KKM value of music and art in junior high. This research is expected to be a reference, especially in terms of KKM determination of music subjects, and can be possibly used as self-reflection for music subject teachers in the process of determining KKM, as a review for the principal and the Education Office on the process of determining KKM so that it can refer the organization of special training for music subject teachers about KKM determination.

2. METHOD

Explanation This research was evaluation study focusing on the application of a determination standard in order to see the implementation of the technical procedures and the determination of the weighting KKM music subject at Junior High School based on Assessment Guide (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2016). This study used a positivistic approach using qualitative data backed up by quantitative data. A discrepancy evaluation model developed by Malcolm Provus was used in this study, this model was chosen to see the gap that occurs in the implementation of the determination of complexity

value in the music subject KKM in SMP Negeri Kulon Progo Regency. The evaluation criteria used was evaluation criteria (Mardapi, 2017) as in table 1.

Table 1. Technical Evaluation Criteria Procedures

Criteria	Procedural Technique Score	Weighting Value Score
Very good	$X \geq 91.5$	$X \geq 97$
Good	$91.5 > X \geq 69$	$97 > X \geq 55$
Not good	$69 > X \geq 46.5$	$55 > X \geq 13$
Not Very Good	$X \leq 46.5$	$X \leq 13$

The subject of evaluation were 6 music teachers using the 2013 curriculum and MBKM Curriculum with a total. Determination of the subject was done by purposive sampling. Data were collected through interviews, documentation and observation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Level of Implementation and Constraints in Determining KKM

In aspects analyzed in determining sheet KKM used by the music teachers were the accordance of procedural technique and intake value weighting, complexity and resources to support the determination of the standard on (Kemendikbud, 2017). The descriptive statistical analysis can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Level of Technical Implementation of KKM Procedures of Music Subjects in Junior High School

Aspect	2013 Curriculum	MBKM	Average	Criteria
Intake	0%	0%	0%	Not very good
Complexity	100%	100%	100%	Very good
Carrying capacity	66.67%	44.44%	55.55%	Good

Based on Table 2 above, the implementation level of KKM determination in Junior High School using 2013 and MBKM Curriculum in terms of technical procedure determination, the intake aspect obtained 0%, an average percentage and can be categorized as "not very good". The complexity aspect obtained 100%, an average percentage and can be categorized as "excellent", while the carrying capacity aspect obtained an average percentage of 55.55% and can be categorized as "good".

The level of implementation in terms of KKM value weighting can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Level of Implementation of Weighted Value of KKM Subject of Music Art in Junior High School

Aspect	2013 Curriculum	MBKM	Average	Criteria
Intake	35%	14%	24.5%	Not very good
Complexity	71%	66.67%	78.3%	Good
Carrying capacity	0%	47.67%	23.83%	Not very good

Based on Table 3 above, it can be seen that the level of implementation of weighting values on intake aspect at schools using 2013 and MBKM curriculum obtained 24.5%, an

average percentage which can be categorized as "very good", while the complexity aspects obtained 78.3%, average percentage categorized as "good" and the carrying capacity aspect obtained 23.83%, average percentage categorized as "very unfavorable".

The constraints in determining KKM were identified by interviews with six music art teachers as subjects evaluation, can be seen based on the table 4 below.

Table 3. Constraints in The Determination of KKM

Type of Constraints	Teachers Identity					
	Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3	Subject 4	Subject 5	Subject 6
Determine the value of complexity			√			
Identify students' abilities		√	√		√	√
Determine the value of intake		√			√	
There is no complexity value established from the MGMP forum					√	
Weighting the value of KKM	√					

According to the Table 4, one subject of evaluation has constraints in determining the value of complexity, the four subject evaluations have constraints in identifying students' abilities, the two subjects have constraints in terms of determining the value of the intake, one subject of evaluation has constraints because there is no agreement of complexity value in the forum MGMP, and one subject person has constraints in weighting the value of KKM

3.2. Discussion

Implementation level of value determination in intake aspect was categorized as "not very good", it shows that the intake value which is determined by the teacher is inconsistent with (Kemendikbud, 2017) based on analysis results interviews show that in determining the intake value, the teachers were not paying attention to the average music subject score of students in the previous semester, but only by paying attention to students' abilities in general without using instruments, these findings are in line with findings conducted by (Mesrawati, 2016) that the determination of KKM by some teachers is not based on analysis and does not pay attention to the principles and steps of determination. In addition Spooren et al. (2013) found that some music subject teachers evaluate art based on unclear categories without regard to certain criteria that help determine academic development and learning.

Implementation level of value determination in complexity aspect was categorized as "very good", indicating that the technical procedure used was already in line with determination, because the teachers generally have determined the complexity value by considering the material difficulty with the students ability, in line with the statement of (Anas, 2014) that the level of subject difficulty usually requires analysis steps in the diverse order, i.e. the students ability to absorb the subject matter and the learning process as a whole, in addition, it also must take into account the availability of time, and as well as teacher's

ability to generate ideas, creativity, innovation with learning methods that can generate student learning enthusiasm.

Implementation level of value determination in carrying capacity aspect was categorized as "good", indicating that the technical procedures used are in accordance with standard determination of carrying capacity value. The result of interview analysis shows that generally the teachers have determined the value of carrying capacity by paying attention to teacher competence, school accreditation, and infrastructure and facilities availability. As (Kemendikbud, 2017) affirmed that the carrying capacity component is the condition of educational unit which including (1) teacher competence (2) predicate of school accreditation; and (3) the feasibility of school facilities and infrastructure. However, the determination of the carrying capacity was done only by estimating, without using special instruments. The result of academic supervision and assessment in determining the KKM was found that the teachers determined the KKM without going through the correct procedure (Yendarman, 2016).

Implementation level in KKM value weighting in intake and carrying capacity aspect was categorized as "not very good". This shows that there are some music teachers who have not done the proper weighting of KKM values, (Mesrawati, 2016) in his findings suggested to improve teachers' understanding of KKM because teachers must know the aspects in the KKM and its weighting proportionally, because in fact it is explained that the teacher has not and even some are not able to establish KKM. In accordance with (Poerwanti et al., 2012) found that teachers or schools did not clearly define KKM and the determination of KKM was not socialized to be a common understanding and a benchmark of success and learning.

Based on analysis of interviews, the difficulty in determining the complexity value was caused by the subjects' inability to know the students ability in the previous semester. This is caused by the regulation that does not allow all levels classes to get the music subject, which in turn leave the music subject to be taught with unsustainable system. Besides, there is no agreement on the complexity value of the MGMP forum, as (Kemendikbud, 2017) that the value of complexity can be determined, among others, through expert judgment of subject teachers through the Subject Teachers Consultative Forum.

A less effective class division in music subject causes difficulty in identifying the ability of students through the average value of music students in the previous semester. It also affects the difficulty in determining the value of the intake, (Daryanto & Amirono, 2016) determines the value of the intake based on the achievement level of the KKM learners in the previous semester or class. (Margareta et al., 2012) findings also stated that teachers have difficulty in determining the value of intake because of the different students' ability to understand the material.

The results of the interview analysis also show that the lack of socialization in preparing the KKM in terms of weighting values, generally the teachers understand the concept of KKM determination, but not the ability of teachers in determining the weighting of KKM values in every aspect, so there is still weighting the value of KKM which is not determined proportionally. Similarly, (Margareta, 2012) suggested that schools should provide technical guidance to teachers in determining KKM.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the presentation of findings and discussion, it can be concluded as follows.

- a. What was learned The implementation level of KKM determination of musical art in Kulon Progo State Junior High School in terms of technical procedures on the aspect of intake was categorized as "very unfavorable" or very unsuitable, on the aspect of complexity, categorized as "excellent" or very appropriate and on the aspect of carrying capacity categorized as "good" or in accordance with predefined criteria standards. Implementation level in terms of weighting the value of KKM on the aspect of intake and carrying capacity was categorized as "not very good" while in complexity aspects it was categorized as "good".
- b. The music subject teachers' constraints in determining KKM in Kulon Progo State Junior High School included: (a) determining the complexity value; (b) identifying students' abilities; (c) determining the intake value; and (d) weighting the KKM value.

Here are some considerations to think before determining the KKM of music subject in junior high school : a. there should be a need analysis on the number of art teachers at some schools, which will overcome the problems regarding to the incompatibility of teacher education background with the subjects being taught; b. there should be an evaluation related to the zoning system policy, which will enable all schools to meet the minimum number of students in one class, and at the same time teachers can meet the required teaching hours; c. there should be a socialization or training related to assessment, particularly on KKM determination of music subject, so that teachers not only understand the technical procedures for determining the KKM but also weighting the value of KKM in each aspect proportionally and the value of KKM which is determined based on the analysis is not the result of estimation only.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is fully supported by LPDP.

REFERENCES

- Astuti, K. S. (2015). Standardisasi Evaluasi Hasil Belajar Seni Musik Pada Pendidikan Dasar Dan Menengah. In *Imaji* (Vol. 2, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.21831/imaji.v2i2.6945>
- Chew, L. Z., Chang, P. K., & Piaw, C. Y. (2012). A Relationship Between Creativity and Musical Achievement: A survey of music major trainee teachers in a teacher education institution. *Malaysian Journal of Music*, 1(2), 59–71. <https://ojs.upsi.edu.my/index.php/MJM/article/view/572>
- Daryanto, & Amirono, M. . (2016). *Evaluasi & Penilaian Pembelajaran Kurikulum 2013*. Gava Media.
- Department, N. Y. S. E. (1995). *Assesment in The Arts*. Albany.
- Gruber, D. D. (2008). Measuring Student Learning in Art Education. *Art Education*, 61(5), 40–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2008.11518995>
- Horn, C., Ramos, M., Blumer, I., & Madaus, G. (2000). Cut Scores - Results May Vary. *Nbetpp*, 1(1), 1–32.

- Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan. (2016). *Standar Penilaian Pendidikan*.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan. (2017). Panduan Penilaian oleh Pendidik dan Satuan Pendidikan Sekolah Menengah Pertama. *Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar Dan Menengah*, 43–45. <http://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/18051/1/1>. Panduan Penilaian SMP - Cetakan Keempat 2017.pdf
- Mardapi, D. (2017). Pengukuran, Penilaian, dan Evaluasi Pendidikan. In *Academia Edu* (Vol. 7, Issue 2). Yogyakarta Nuha Medika.
- Margareta, M., Katin, Y. E., & Nazar, E. (2012). Hambatan Pelaksanaan Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal Mata Pelajaran Produktif Tata Busana SMKN 1 Lembah Gumanti. *Journal of Home Economics and Tourism*, 1(1).
- Mesrawati. (2016). Meningkatkan Kemampuan Guru dalam Menetapkan Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM) Di SD Negeri 081 Rambah. *Trabajo Infantil*, 53(9), 1689–1699.
- Mochere, J. M. (2017). The future of music education in Kenya: implementation of curriculum and instructional teaching strategies. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(6), 171–180.
- Muhammad Anas, M. M. P. (Muhammad A. 2014), hlm. 27. (2014). *Mengenal Metodologi Pembelajaran*. CV Pustaka Hulwa.
- Mukti, T. S., Arlisyah, M., Utami, P., Fantika, D., & Puspitasari, F. (2020). Sekolah alam: evaluasi program sekolah dalam menumbuhkan kecerdasan naturalistik dan kinestetik pada pendidikan anak usia dini. *Insania : Jurnal Pemikiran Alternatif Kependidikan*, 25(1), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.24090/INSANIA.V25I1.3542>
- Poerwanti, E., AM, I., & Yayuk, E. (2012). Analisis Ketidak Tercapaian Rerata KKM Peserta Didik pada SDM Pagak, SDM 4 Lawang dan MI Nurul Islam Tajinan. *Jurnal Humanity*, 8(1), 11281.
- Samritin, & Suryanto. (2016). Developing an Assessment Instrument of Junior High School Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills in Mathematics. *Research and Evaluation in Education*, 2(1), 92–107.
- Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598-642. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870>
- Sri Mudijah, H. (2009). Pengukuran Dalam Penelitian Pendidikan Seni. *Kajian Penelitian Seni*, 2, 1–16.
- Syamsuddin, S, Setiawati, F. A., & Syamsuddin, S. (2018). The influence of problem solving ability, emotional intelligence and formative tests on learning outcomes of mathematics. *International Conference on Mathematics and Science Education of Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*, 3, 803–808. <http://science.conference.upi.edu/proceeding/index.php/ICMScE/article/view/174>
- Syamsuddin, Syaiful, & Istiyono, E. (2018). The effectiveness of mathematics learning through contextual teaching and learning approach in Junior High School. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2014(1), 020085. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5054489>
- Syamsuddin, Syaiful, & Utami, M. A. P. (2021). Efektivitas pembelajaran matematika melalui pendekatan contextual teaching and learning. *Jurnal Riset Dan Inovasi Pembelajaran*, 1(1), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.51574/JRIP.V1I1.14>
- Utami, & Syamsuddin. (2020). Preschool jurnal perkembangan dan pendidikan anak usia dini perubahan perilaku nomophobia melalui pendekatan interaksi sosial: single case research (SCR). *Preschool: Jurnal Perkembangan Dan Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 2(1), 133–140. <http://ejournal.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/preschool/article/view/10307>

- Widodo. (2009). Mencapai Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal Menggunakan Bilangan Baku. *Jurnal Pendidikan Penabur*, 13.
- Yendarman. (2016). Peningkatan Kemampuan Menetapkan KKM Dengan Diskusi Kelompok Kecil Bagi Guru. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 16(3), 122–129. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/225351-peningkatan-kemampuan-menetapkan-kkm-den-bdfe1101.pdf>
- Zieky, M., & Perie, M. (2006). A primer on setting cut scores on tests of educational achievement. *ETS Report*, 1–26. papers3://publication/uuid/12EE77FA-8EAD-4E4F-8611-181AA31426BF