

CURRICULUM ISSUES IN VISUAL ART EDUCATION: INDONESIAN EXPERIENCE

Sofyan Salam

Professor in Art Education at The Art Education Department,
Faculty of Arts and Design of State University of Makassar

Abstract

Kurikulum dalam pengertiannya yang populer sebagai program akademik formal di sekolah untuk memberikan pengalaman belajar bagi peserta-didik, berperan penting dalam praktik pembelajaran. Atas dasar itulah, pemerintah Indonesia mengontrol pengembangan dan implementasi kurikulum. Paper ini mengungkap berbagai isu yang berkaitan dengan kurikulum pendidikan seni rupa yang seringkali menjadi sorotan para pemangku kepentingan, yakni: (1) tingkat kurikulum: nasional atau lokal?; (2) cakupan kurikulum di sekolah umum: apresiasi seni rupa atau kreasi seni rupa, atau keduanya?; (3) kurikulum tersembunyi dalam kaitannya dengan dampak pengiring yang negatif; (4) basis perubahan kurikulum-tertulis yang tidak didasari atas evaluasi yang komprehensif; (5) pertanyaan yang belum terjawab tentang Kurikulum 2013. Karena pemerintah berada pada posisi yang menentukan dalam pengembangan dan implementasi kurikulum, maka pihak pemerintahlah yang paling memiliki otoritas untuk menangani isu-isu tersebut. Tugas kita adalah membangkitkan kesadaran akan pentingnya isu-isu tersebut untuk ditangani secara cerdas dan profesional.

Keywords: curriculum, visual arts education,

1. INTRODUCTION

First of all, I would like to thank God for His merciful and blessing. Secondly, many thanks go to the Faculty of Languages and Arts, the State University of Padang of Indonesia for organizing an international seminar on “Empowering Theories and Pedagogical Application of Languages and Arts.”

Permit me to present a paper related to the one of the sub-themes of this seminar, namely “Current Issues in Languages and Arts Instruction in schools and Universities.” The title of my paper is “Curriculum Issues in Visual Art Education: Indonesian Experience.” I Choose “curriculum issues” as the topic of my paper on the basis that curriculum plays an important role in the practice of instruction in schools and universities. It is the curriculum that determines the instruction in a classroom in terms of goals/objectives, contents, delivery methods, and performance assessments. Eisner reminds us that curriculum is “a mind-altering device” (Sacramento, 2008). Before going further, let me briefly outline the meaning of curriculum used as departing point in this paper.

2. CURRICULUM: WHAT IT IS AND WHY IT COUNTS

2.1. The Meaning of Curriculum

The term “curriculum” came from the Latin word which means *race course*. Marsh (2004) speculated concerning the use of the term “curriculum” in educational field by saying: “for many students, the school curriculum is a race to be run, a series of obstacles or hurdles (subjects) to be passed. During the Greek classical era, the term curriculum was used in educational field with specific meaning, that was classical subjects taught to students.”

The meaning of the term “curriculum” broadened in the twentieth century: “the course of study” both in macro level covering the complete course of study to get a degree or diploma, and in micro level covering only certain courses and their components such as goals/objectives, content, system of delivery, learning materials/ setting, and method of assessment. Kentli (2009) formulated the definition of curriculum as “an explicit, conscious, formally planned course with specific objectives.” This is in accordance with the definition given by the American Heritage Dictionary which defines the “curriculum” as “(1) all the courses of study offered by an

educational institution; (2) A particular course of study, often in a special field.” The definition of curriculum as school subjects to be learned by students is the most popular one. The subjects in which students are expected to gain certain knowledge, attitudes, and skills include language and literature, mathematics, natural and social sciences, religion, sport and fine arts/craft. Despite its popularity, the definition of curriculum as school subjects to be learned by students (also known as syllabi) does not satisfy many. For the progressivists, a school program prescribing school subjects offered to students does not make a curriculum. According to them, written materials prescribed in a school program can only be called curriculum if they are actualized by students. For them, school curriculum is the total learning experiences of students, as Caswell and Campbell stated: curriculum is “all experiences children have under the guidance of teachers.” Marsh and Willis go further by stating that curriculum is “all the experiences in the classroom which are planned and enacted by teacher, and also learned by the students” (Wikipedia). Hilda Taba one of the supporter of the conception of curriculum as learning experiences insists that the curriculum consists of two different things namely the content and the learning experiences. The two are in constant interaction during the teaching-learning process: “one cannot deal with content without having a learning experience” (Lunenburg, 2011).

The idea of curriculum as product is advocated by behaviourists. For the behaviourists, school curriculum is the product of well-planned and systematic activities starting from the formulation of behavioural objectives to the evaluation of students’ learning performances. This curriculum approach is influenced by the system approach. Briggs defined the system approach in education as “an integrated plan of operation of all components (sub-systems) of a system, designed to solve a problem or meet a need” (Smith and Ragan, 1993). Contrary to the behaviourists who consider that curriculum should be systematically developed, curriculum thinkers such as Elliot Eisner, Maxine Greene and others believe that the curriculum “cannot be precisely planned-it evolves as a living organism as opposed to a machine which is precise and orderly” (Lunenburg, 2011).

More recently, new approaches to curriculum are introduced by contemporary curriculum thinkers (and also activists) of feminists, posmodernists and multiculturalists. The feminists, posmodernists and the multiculturalists firmly reject the traditional conception of curriculum. According to them, curriculum should be used to promote gender equality and social/cultural diversity and students should understand how to use curriculum to consolidate power and to create a “new and more equitable” society.

The variety of conception of curriculum is clearly reflected in so many definitions of curriculum. According to Portelly, there are more than 120 definitions of curriculum appear in scientific educational literature (Marsh, 2004). The variety of ideas regarding the term curriculum produce many specific term such as “written curriculum,” “implemented curriculum,” “learned curriculum,” and “hidden curriculum.”

2.2.The Importance of Curriculum

Eisner emphasized the importance of curriculum by stating that “curriculum is a mind-altering device.” The reason behind his statement is that curriculum describes school activities to give direction to the development of students. Furthermore, Eisner added: “When policymakers define a curriculum for a school (or classroom), they are also defining the forms of thinking that are likely to be promoted in the school. They are in effect, laying out an agenda for the development of mind” (Sacramento, 2008). Certainly the questions around what is considered necessary for students to know or experience, what should be prescribed in curriculum, how teaching-learning process organized, and how students’ performance evaluated stimulate debates among educators, parents, administrators, educational critics, and interest groups. It is realized that not all things can be included in school curriculum. The policy makers or the curriculum designers should make hard choices concerning that matter. What ever their decision, the choices they made reflect the policy makers or curriculum designers’ ideological preference. It is therefore, the decision about school curriculum is basically a political activity. It is for this reason that most of curriculum thinkers have been well aware of the social or political function of education. Hence the curriculum making can be seen as the battleground of many competing ideologies to answer the fundamental questions of curriculum

development: “(1) what educational purposes should the school seeks to attain? (2) what educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes, (3) how can these educational experiences be effectively organized; and (4) how can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?”¹ The idea of “national curriculum” or “decentralized curriculum” is clearly a reflection of political interest of national or local government to control the schooling system in national or in provincial/district level. The curriculum control is certainly has practical arguments such as the need for providing a standardized program for all students or the need for promoting students’ national awareness. A study conducted by National Institute for Educational Research (NIER) of Japan found that in most Asia and Pacific countries curriculum development was controlled by the central government through a range of regulations from curriculum development to curriculum implementation (NIER, 1999). Kelly (2004) reminded us by stating that education and politics are “inextricably interwoven with each other, so that one cannot productively discuss curriculum issues in a political vacuum.”

In terms of theoretical debates, Eisner and Vallance (Westbury, nd) identify at least four themes in which the debates on curriculum are centred, namely: (1) child centered versus society-centered; (2) futurist versus presentist; (3) values-centered education versus skill-training; and (4) humanist versus behaviorist. The debates among educational stakeholders concerning the nature and the scope of curriculum based on philosophical, political, theoretical, or practical reasons are understandable as they reflect different views of people. Certainly, such debates will continue in the future.

2.3.School Curriculums in Indonesia

2.3.1.A Brief Review

Schooling system was introduced in Indonesia by the Dutch in the nineteenth century during the colonization time. The Dutch schooling system at that time employed a segregation policy: “first-class schools” for the native upper classes and “second-class schools” for the native common people. The curriculums of that schools were Western-oriented and in accordance to the Dutch colonial policy in Indonesia that was to create skilled and loyal personells to fill the colonial administrative positions. Dutch educational system stimulated dissatisfaction among the educated natives. Several national private schools then were launched. Two of them had a good quality. They were Taman Siswa of Yogyakarta and INS of Kayutanam, West-Sumatra. The Taman Siswa and INS offered curriculums that were intended to develop students’ knowledge and skills, as well as students’ personal and national pride.

With the Indonesian independence in 1945, Indonesian leaders who had opposed the Dutch educational system were in a position to implement a national education system for Indonesia. Soon after the independence proclamation, Indonesian leaders passed the Constitution of 1945. Article 31 of the constitution states that every Indonesian citizen entitled to education and the Indonesian Government has the responsibility to promote a national educational system. However, it was not easy to implement the constitutional task. Only after struggling for five years, the Indonesian government finally had the opportunity to implement, for the first time, a unified educational system for the whole nation.

In the early years of Indonesian independence, under Soekarno administration, Indonesian government developed and implemented three curriculums. They were curriculum of 1947 (called *Rencana Pelajaran 1947* or course plan of 1947, implemented in 1950), curriculum 1952 (called *Rencana Pelajaran Terurai 1952* or detailed course plan of 1952), and curriculum of 1964 or *Pancawardhana* curriculum.² The three curriculms reflected the efforts of the Indonesian government to move from Duth’s colonial curriculum style to Indonesian national curriculum style so the goals of national development and the unity of the nation amidst ethnic, social, and cultural diversity could be achieved. National ideology (*Pancasila*)

¹ These four questions were posed by Ralph Tyler in his classical book *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949).

² In *Pancawardhana*, school subjects were grouped into five categories based on the orientation of the subjects: moral, intellectual, artistic/emotional, technical skill, and physical.

and preservation of Indonesia heterocultural heritage were emphasized. Since the beginning, the curriculum development in Indonesia has been centralized in a “top-down manner” under the authority of the ministry of education. The task of schools throughout the nation is to implement the “ready to use” curriculums.

Under the Suharto administration (from 1966 to 1998) four curriculums were developed and implemented. They were curriculum of 1968, curriculum of 1975, curriculum of 1984, and curriculum of 1994. The curriculum of 1968 was the improvement of curriculum of 1964 to further emphasized the internalization of *Pancasila* values. The emphasis on national ideology of the Curriculum 1968 was closely related to the political situation at that time in which Soekarno administration viewed as “not implemented the authentic Pancasila values”

The curriculum of 1975 marked a new phase in the history of curriculum development in Indonesia. It was the first goals-oriented curriculum introduced in Indonesia. The introduction of the Curriculum was closely related to the efficiency and accountability movement in the curriculum development advocated by curriculum thinkers such as Franklin Bobbet and B.F. Skinner. The curriculum of 1975 was developed according to the System Approach, a curriculum system that places the goals/objectives as the principal component of a curriculum. For this reason, teachers all over the country were introduced to Instructional System Design (ISD) popularly known in Indonesian term as *Pengembangan Program Sistem Instruksional*. It was realized by the government that without understanding the essence of the ISD, the teachers were not able to properly implement the Curriculum of 1975 in their classrooms. After eight years of implementation, the Curriculum of 1975 was replaced by the Curriculum of 1984. It was noted that the Curriculum of 1975 had been difficult to implement because there were too much curriculum content to be taught. The Curriculum 1984 and later the Curriculum of 1994 were basically to present some improvements. Two significant improvements of these curriculums were the introduction of local content curriculum (*Kurikulum Muatan Lokal*) and Students Active Learning Approach (*Pendekatan Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif*) Both the curriculum 1984 and 1994 employed “goals-oriented curriculum approach.”

The falling of Suharto administration (called as New-Order regime) in 1998 marked a new era in Indonesian history: Indonesian political system moved from authoritarianism to democracy. Certainly this had a great influence on education. A new educational law then passed, namely *Undang-Undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional Tahun 2003* (National Education System Act of 2003). The Curriculum of 2004 (called *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi Tahun 2004* or Competency-Based Curriculum of 2004) then was introduced. Two years later, as required by the National Education System Act of 2003, a National Education Standard was developed by National Education Standard Agency (*Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan, BSNP*). As a consequence, a new curriculum to fulfill the National Education Standard then was developed. The new curriculum called *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi Tahun 2006* or Competency-Based Curriculum of 2006. Different from the Competency-Based Curriculum of 2004, the Competency-Based Curriculum of 2006 gave a full authority to schools to develop their own curriculums into lesson units. For this reason, the Competency-Based Curriculum of 2006 was called *Kurikulum Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)* or Education Unit Level Curriculum. To facilitate the schools in developing their curriculums, The National Education Standard Agency provided curriculum models.

Nowadays, the government is implementing a new curriculum in certain chosen schools. The curriculum, called the Curriculum of 2013 is intended to make students more active in learning. The presence of the Curriculum 2013 is quite unpredicted because two years earlier the government popularized a quite different curriculum draft called *Kurikulum Masa Depan*.

2.3.2. Visual Art Curriculum in General Public School

Visual art as a curriculum subject in the Dutch sponsored schools was primarily in the form of drawing. This subject was intended to provide students with drawing skills needed by the Dutch colonial administration such as map, illustrative, and architectural drawing. Method of instruction employed by teachers emphasized the mastering of drawing techniques. Manual

books used at that time were similar with the books used in Holland (Zainuddin, 1968). In privately owned schools such as Taman Siswa and INS, visual art subjects (drawing, printmaking) were directed to develop students' self-expression and cultural consciousness (Soebadio, 1978).

There was no a significant change in the practice of drawing teaching in general public schools in the early decades after Indonesian independence. The objective of the drawing subject was to develop students' drawing skills using the traditional eye-hand coordination method.

In the general public school Curriculum of 1964, drawing (*menggambar*) and singing (*menyanyi*) were incorporated into a new school subject called "arts education or *Pendidikan Kesenian*." The arts education subject consists of visual art, music, dance and theatre. The introduction of the new subject (*Pendidikan Kesenian*) was in accordance with the spirit of Curriculum of 1964, popularly known as *Pancawardhana* Curriculum, to develop students' artistic sensitivity and skills. Unfortunately, due to political situation at that time, the Curriculum of 1964 could not be implemented effectively.

Coinciding with the introduction of the system approach in the school Curriculum of 1975, visual art subject became more comprehensive in content. It included not only studio activities such as drawing, printmaking, clay modeling, etc., but also art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. Apparently, the visual art subject in the Curriculum of 1975 reflected the Discipline-Based Art Education Approach (DBAE). According to the DBAE approach, visual art subject in school curriculum should provide students with a broad and rich art experience in four ways: by making art, by responding to art forms, by acquiring knowledge about art, and by understanding the peoples' philosophical judgment about visual art objects. The problem with this new comprehensive visual art subject was the lack of competence of most teachers (especially in elementary schools) in the implementation phase of the subject. This was understandable as the number of visual art teachers produced by The Visual Art Program of Institute of Education and Teacher Training (*Jurusan Pendidikan Seni Rupa Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan IKIP*) could not meet the need for visual art teachers in schools. The Curriculum of 1984, and later the curriculum of 1994 and 2004 were the improvement of the curriculum of 1975.

The introduction of National Standard in Education (*Standar Nasional Pendidikan*) in 2005 marked a new phase in curriculum development for visual art subject in schools. The National Standard consists of nine components namely standard on graduate competency, curriculum content, (teaching-learning) process, teacher and administrative staff, school facilities, management, financing, and standard on assessment/evaluation. The content standard for visual art in the first semester of senior high school, for example, was formulated as follows: " (1) visual art appreciation: identifying and showing appreciative attitudes to the uniqueness of local traditional art in terms of their ideas and techniques; and (2) visual art creation: designing and creating applied visual art using local techniques and styles." In the Curriculum of 2006, teachers were required to refer to the national standard, especially the content standard, in developing teaching-learning program in their classrooms. That is why the Curriculum of 2006 called as "education unit level curriculum or *Kurikulum Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)*."

The Curriculum of 2013 which is being introduced nowadays by the Ministry of Education and Culture is basically the continuation of the Curriculum of 2006. The emphasis of the Curriculum of 2013 is the implementation process of the content standard.

3. SOME CURRICULUM ISSUES IN VISUAL ART EDUCATION

The following are some curriculum issues related to visual art education in Indonesia.

3.1. Visual art curriculum: national or local level?

Indonesia is a multicultural nation. It consists of no less than 13.667 islands, big and small, and has over 300 ethnic groups. The socio-economic conditions of Indonesian people are also greatly varied. This diversity is perfectly reflected in the Indonesian national motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* which means "unity in diversity." The standardized national curriculum since 1950s

for the purpose of achieving equality and quality in education throughout the nation, inevitably stimulated the question of relevance of education. School curriculums should not only promote equality, uniformity, or national standards, but they should also pay attention to the Indonesia's cultural diversity. This statement is certainly not applicable to school subjects that are not particularly bound up in certain cultures such as mathematics, biology, physics, and chemistry. It is relevant to school subjects such as arts (visual arts, music, dance, and theatre) that are firmly bound up in local cultures that make them not easy to be standardized. This is the reason behind the demand for a local level curriculum. With the local level curriculum, local government (province/district level) or schools are responsible to determine the content of certain school subjects. The National Education Standard Agency was well aware about this issue when developing the Content Standard for the Curriculum of 2006. In the Curriculum of 2006, the content standard for arts subject included local arts topics in which teachers were given the freedom to choose topics relevant to their schools. Sadly, the content of text books used in schools were mostly java oriented. In 2010, the Curriculum Center Office of the Ministry of Education and Culture proposed a curriculum alternative in which arts subject was grouped in "local level curriculum." Unfortunately, the proposal was discarded.

I believe that school curriculum should be flexible so it can accommodate the particular need of certain subjects or communities. It does not matter, whether it is developed in national or local level.

3.2. Visual art content for general public school: art appreciation or art creation or both?

School curriculums in Indonesia from elementary to senior high school offer both visual art appreciation and visual art creation activities. However there are discussions around us questioning the suitability of art activities offered in school curriculums. In 1990s, The Nusantara Arts Education Movement (*Gerakan Pendidikan Seni Nusantara*) under the sponsorship of Ford Foundation advocated the idea that "arts programs in general public schools should be focused on appreciating the traditional arts of Indonesia, known as *Seni Nusantara*." The supporters of the movement argued that students should have a good understanding about their own culture. For them, Western culture/arts are not suitable topics to be included in Indonesian school curriculums. Since time allocations for art subjects in school curriculums were very limited, they suggested that arts creation activities were excluded from schools curriculums. In addition, they argued, that teachers in general public schools, especially in elementary school level, had not been well prepared to teach arts creation topics. To disseminate these ideas, the Nusantara Arts Education movement published books and disseminated them to schools. It also trained hundreds of teachers throughout the nation.

The idea of including only arts appreciation activities (while excluding art creation activities) in school curriculums is still around us. I personally do not agree with this idea. I believe that students should be given art creation experiences in schools as early as possible. By providing art creation experiences in schools students' perceptual skills, social awareness and creativity¹ will be stimulated and developed. The creative skills gained by students will make them become more easy in adjusting to new situations and more flexible in solving new challenges. This is the intrinsic value of art education and it should be facilitated by teachers. UNESCO reminded us by stating that "the encouragement of creativity since the early years of students will guarantee the development of students' self esteem and mutual respect, which in turn will promote a culture of peace" (Into, 2009). The importance of providing art creation experiences in schools was stressed by Lowenfeld and Brittain by stating that every school "should try to encourage each youngster to identify with his own experiences and help him to go as far as he can in developing concepts that express his feeling and emotions..." (1972). This is in accordance to Dave Brubeck²'s statement that by providing arts creation experiences "we are inculcating a sense of discipline and respect and channeling energies into forms of self-

¹ Lowenfeld and Brittain in his classical book *Creative and Mental Growth 5th edition* stated that "creativity means flexibility of thinking or fluency of ideas; or it may be the ability to come with new and novel ideas, or to see things in new relationships; in some cases creativity is defined as the ability to think in ways that are different from other people" (1972).

² Dave Brubeck is a jazz musician and composer.

expression that have positive social impact” (Ball, 2002). We should realize that art creation experiences are needed by student to develop their artistic potencial. It is our responsibility to include the art creation experiences in school curriculums.

3.3. Hidden Curriculum: How to cope with negative nurturant effects?

Students’ experiences in schools are not limited to learning experiences offered by school written (formal) curriculum. Through their social interactions with school environment students learn behaviours, principles, and values that are not formally specified in school planned curriculum. In this informal interaction, students experience another curriculum, that is “unwritten curriculum.” The unwritten curriculum, popularly known as “hidden curriculum,” is defined by Giroux as “those unstated norms, values, and beliefs embedded in and transmitted to students through the underlying rules that structure the routines and social relationships in school and classroom” (Kentli, 2009). In the context of teaching-learning process, the hidden curriculum is notably important as it serves to transmit positive as well as negative or unintended messages about behaviours, values, and principles to students (popularly known as “nurturant effects”).

The hidden curriculum becomes an important issue here because a lot of messages transmitted through school settings unintentionally affect the practice of art teaching in schools. The priority given by schools to school subjects that are included in national examination such as mathematics, natural sciences, social science, and languages send a negative message to teachers and students that “art subject is not a priority in schools.” Consequently, art is viewed as not a an important subject to learn. The lack of facilities to support art programs in most schools in Indonesia as well as the unsupportive attitudes of school administrators toward visual art instruction justify the message. So, what should we do to solve the problem? In my opinion, all of us should conduct an aggressive advocacy to educate people around us so they will be aware of the importance of art education.

3.4. The basis for curriculum change: assumption or evaluative study?

To be relevant to the need of society and the advancement of science and technology, school curriculums need to change. The change of school curriculums should be based on a comprehensive evaluative study. Through an evaluative study, useful informations needed in revising the existing school curriculums or developing a new curriculum can be gathered. It is not appropriate to change school curriculums on the basis of assumption by using “trial and error” approach. In fact, the change of school curriculums in Indonesia has not always been based on a comprehensive evaluative study. In many cases, the Ministry of Education has inclined to change “the existing written curriculum” with the new one without conducting a comprehensive evaluative study. For example, the Curriculum of 2006 had not been well understood by most teachers when the Ministry of Education and Culture launched the Curriculum of 2013.

It is understandable when the jargon “*ganti menteri ganti kurikulum*” (meaning a new minister will always introduce a new school curriculum) is very popular among the Indonesian. It is the time to stop the practice of changing school curriculum without proper reasons.

3.5. The Curriculum of 2013: some questions.

There are some questions raised by visual art teachers concerning the Curriculum of 2013 which is now being implemented in selected schools all over Indonesia. They are:

1. It is stated in the rationale of Curriculum of 2013 that the schools curriculums before the Curriculum of 2013 emphasized the cognitive domain of learning. This statement raises questions, especially by art teachers, as it does not portray the fact. For example, the content standard of arts subject in the school Curriculum of 2006, from elementary to senior high school, clearly stated that the competences to be achieved through arts learning were: (1) the competence in arts appreciation (perceiving and responding to arts forms); and (2) the competence in arts production (creating or performing arts). Both arts appreciation and arts production are not cognitive oriented activities.
2. In the Curriculum of 2013, activities in perceiving and responding to visual art works are not specifically mentioned. This is in contrast to the Curriculum of 2006 in which such activities were clearly stated. The question is: “are art appreciation activities (perceiving and responding to artistic phenomena) no longer recommended in the Curriculum of 2013?”

3. Traditional visual art topics are relatively absent in the Curriculum of 2013 for senior high school. In the Curriculum of 2006, traditional visual art topics were dominant, especially for the first and second grade. Why does the Curriculum of 2013 pay a little attention to traditional visual art topics? I raise this question because Article 22 of The Constitution of 1945 clearly stated that “the government has the obligation to develop the national culture of Indonesia.” The explanation of the article 22 reveals that traditional culture all over Indonesia are a definite part of Indonesian national culture.

Certainly, the three questions above need a thoughtful explanation from those who are involved in designing the Curriculum of 2013.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The central government of Indonesia plays a vital role in the practice of instruction in schools. Under the direction and supervision of The Ministry of Education and Culture, schools' curriculums are developed and implemented. Curriculum issues raised in this paper are basically related to the educational policy of the government. It is our task to make the government aware of these curriculum issues. Hopefully, the government will take necessary steps relating to these issues.

REFERENCE

- Ball, Don (ed) 2002. *Learning through the Arts*. Washington DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Harianti, Diah. 2007. *Kajian Kebijakan Kurikulum Seni Budaya*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum Balitbang Depdiknas.
- Irish National Teacher's Organization. 2009. *Creativity and the Arts in the Primary School*. Dublin: INTO.
- Kelly, A.V. 2004. *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*. Fifth Edition. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Kemendikbud RI. 2013. *Kurikulum 2013: Kompetensi Dasar Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA)/Madrasah Aliyah (MA)*. Jakarta: Balitbang Kemendikbud.
- Kentli, Fulya Damla.2009. “Comparison of Hidden Curriculum Theories.” *European Journal of Education Studies* 1 (2). ISSN 1946-6331. Ozean Publication.
- Lowenfeld, Viktor and W. Lambert Brittain. 1972. *Creative and Mental Growth*. London: The Macmillan Company.
- Lunenburg, Fred C. 2011. “Theorizing about Curriculum: Conceptions and Definitions.” *International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity*. Volume 13 No.1
- Marsh, Colin J. 2004. *Key Concepts for Understanding Curriculum*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.
- McKim, Judy. 2007. *Curriculum Design and Development*. London: Imperial College Centerfor Educational development.
- NIER. 1999. *An International Comparative Study of School Curriculums*. Tokyo: NIER
- Sacramento, office of Education.2008. *Perspectives on Arts Education and Curriculum Design*. California: CCSESA
- Smith, Patricia L and Tillman J. Ragan. 1993. *Instructional Design*. New York, Toronto: Macmillan.
- Soebadio, Haryati and Carine A du Marchie Sarvaas (ed). 1978. *Dynamics of Indonesian History*. Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Company
- Tyler, Ralph W. 1949. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO, 1985. *National Education Planning, Evaluation and Curriculum Development*. Paris: UNDP.
- Westbury, Ian. Nd. “Curriculum, School: Overview.” *Encyclopedia of Education*. Second Edition.
- Zainuddin, Ailsa. 1968. *A Short History of Indonesia*. Melbourne, Victoria: Cassel.