
Developing Model of Improvement of Supervisor Professionalism Trough Self Evaluation and Colleague Evaluation in Yogyakarta Special Region Province

Widodo¹, Suharsimi Arikunto²

^{1,2}Ahmad Dahlan University

Corresponding email: widodo@mp.uad.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The supervisor is personal that has a very important role. Supervisor on duty to foster and develop the professionalism of teachers, principals and school itself as a whole. To improve the ability and professionalism, there is a party to foster teachers, the principals, and supervisors. However, no party is responsible for enhancing the professionalism of supervisors. The purpose of this study was to determine: the approval of the supervisor to the model of self-evaluation (SE) as a model to improve the professionalism, the approval of the supervisor to the model of colleague evaluation (CE) as a model to improve the professionalism, the high acceptance of the supervisor of the SE and the CE as a model to improve professionalism supervisors, and barriers and the difficulty of implementing SE and CE as two models to improve the professionalism of supervisors.

The research model used in this research is the Research and Development (R & D) theorized by Borg and Gall (2007). According to both of these experts, because the researchers wanted to find a model, then the research procedure carried out in three stages, namely (1) the preliminary study, (2) development model, and (3) test the model. This research will be conducted in three years. In the first year the research just conducted the preliminary study. There are three methods of data collection used in this study, which scrutiny, observation, and interviews in the Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The qualitative data obtained by researchers from the observation of the process of discernment supervision reports, analyzed and drawn its meaning. The qualitative data analyzed to find the meaning of any statements and observations that researchers do the activity process.

The results showed that the supervisor agrees to the model of SE as a model to improve the professionalism, but it can not be done. Supervisors agreed to the model of CE as a model to improve the professionalism and can be done either directly on the implementation of the supervision sat together, and CE documents report on the implementation of supervision. The supervisor's acceptance rate on the SE and CE as a model to improve the professionalism is high, except in the district of Bantul. The barriers are not yet accustomed to evaluating himself. While the implementation barriers of supervision in school are because of the supervisors to focus on assisting the school to set up a school accreditation.

Keywords: Supervision, Development, Professionalism, Self-evaluation, Colleague Evaluation.

1 INTRODUCTION

In all educational activities, the supervisor is personal that has a very important role. Supervisor on duty to foster and develop the professionalism of teachers, principals, and school. In the study, the task of the teacher is to educate,

train and teach students. The new paradigm of supervisor includes all of the following; (1) A colleague rather than a hierarchical, (2) Supervisor is the province of the teacher, (3) A focus on teacher improvement, (4) Facilitate teacher, (5) Always involve teacher (Glickman et.al, 2009). To improve the ability and professionalism, there is a party to foster teachers, that are principal and supervisor. To improve the professionalism of principals also fostered by the supervisor. Then who should develop supervisor? Until now the question no one has been able to answer, because no one has done, especially with the results of coaching.

According to the experience, if there is a new policy on the curriculum and the learning of the Ministry of Education and Culture, who received training are teachers and principals, who are considered will direct to immediately implement the new policy at the school. Supervisors in charge of fostering teachers and school principals are not included in the socialization of the new policy. As a result, the new policy is not smooth in the implementation, because the supervisor can not help to solve the problems because they do not know anything about the new policy. Supervisors also feel uncomfortable when asked by the teacher can not give a satisfactory answer. In this case, the supervisor may feel inferior because of his knowledge is lower than the people who should be fostered.

In the organizational structure of the Ministry of Education and Culture, the supervisor is in the Regional Office with the functional job, directly under the Head of the Department of Education. In the procedure of Provincial Departments of Education and District/City Education Office, it is mentioned that the Head of Department has the task of coaching and management development of teachers and educational staff. Thus, the Head of Department who work together with the supervisor has the task of fostering personnel who are under their responsibility, including supervisors, either in what intentions. However, from the author's observation over the years visited the Provincial Education Office and District/City Education Office, has never been a coaching. When visiting office where the supervisor on duty, the author always noticed a stack of report, which was written after school supervision duties. The stack of the report seems only to get higher due to increased implementation of supervision, but there was no sign of an examination of the stack of the report, which indicates a correction and the like.

When visiting room supervisors, the author also is interested to note the contents of the report made after the supervision at school. In the contents of the report were always suggestions were given to teachers to do something or trying to repair such a way that there is an increase in the performance of teachers on learning. The author immediately examines whether these suggestions were claimed or not when the supervisor came again on the next supervision, there was no follow-up of the suggestions that have been given. Thus, whether the meaning of the supervision for teachers? When the supervisor came on the next time, should there is a check to teachers, whether the advice given has been acted upon by the teacher concerned or not. For teachers, in particular, might follow up on the suggestions that have not been claimed are 'grateful,' but for teachers who are diligent, creative and want to move forward, to feel disappointed because it did

follow up, but was not claimed by the supervisor. The teacher did not have the courage to demonstrate to supervisors that already done, and finally just stay quiet. If it persists, it may once teachers were creative and willing to carry the regulatory advice, become apathetic and do not want to do again the phenomenon exists and perhaps a lot, but it would seem that there has been no attention

From some of these events can be concluded, that the work supervisor can be said to be 'stagnant' from time to time. The question is whether the quality of the performance of supervisors needs to be improved? If the answer is needed, the next question is who should be in charge of improving the quality of the performance of supervisors, and the next question, how should we do or what is the model to improve? Questions that will be attempted resolved through this research.

According to Nana, the Supervisory Quality Standards (2006), the principal task of school supervisor is to conduct assessments and to coach to perform the functions of supervision, supervision both academic and managerial supervision. Given that the focus of the implementation of the regulatory supervision task is to improve the quality of learning, so in this study will only discuss the academic supervision duties, so that the scope of its development is not too wide so easily monitored results. Thus, the focus of the research is also just a supervision report related to the academic supervision.

Still according to the National Education Ministry, quoted by Nana (2006), there are three activities that must be implemented by supervisor, namely: (1) Fostering the development of quality schools, the performance of the principal, teacher performance, and the performance of the entire school staff, (2) To evaluate and monitor the implementation of the school program and its development, and (3) Conducting an assessment of the process and the result of a school development collaborative program with school stakeholders. The task that becomes the focus of this research is to reassess the work already done.

Furthermore, if we refer to the decree by the minister No. 118, 1996 on the functional position of superintendent and credit number, Joint Decree of Minister of Education No. 03420/O/1996 and the Head of the Administration of the State Personnel Number 38, 1996 on the implementation guidelines functional position of the controller and Ministerial Decree of Education Number 020/U/1998 on technical guidelines implementing functional position of school superintendent and credit number, can be told about the main tasks and responsibilities of the school superintendent that includes: (1) supervise the provision of education in schools in accordance with the assignment in kindergarten, primary schools, special schools, both secondary and (2) improve the quality of teaching and learning process / guidance and learning achievement results / guidance of students in order to achieve educational goals. In the early, already mentioned that in this paper focuses only on the supervisory duties of the tasks associated with the teacher alone, and even then limited to the teacher's task in carrying out the task of teaching. In other words, the focus of talks only on nurturing and help teachers to improve the quality of the learning process/guidance and the quality of student learning outcomes.

Supervision about it is deemed important because the task has a direct impact on student success in working out problems national final examination.

Based activities focused on improved, as already mentioned, the researchers limited to a particular object, namely supervision related to the duties of teachers in implementing the profession, which is implementing the learning. Attention needs to be directed to the superintendent these activities so that it first needs to be improved. If traced in order, the task of carrying out the teaching profession is (1) to make preparation for teaching, (2) implementing learning and (3) evaluate the results of learning. Although supervisors are already adept at analyzing and assessing the three activities, these capabilities must be improved, to better examine whether the teachers in making and implementing these tasks are by the duties. To improve the quality of the performance, supervisors need to be upgraded once. For the coaching, supervisors can more clearly, the following tasks are identified more details related to the teaching profession.

a. Teacher makes a lesson plan.

In Permendiknas Number 13 Year 2007 stated that the principal also has the task of supervision. Compared with the supervisors, principals more have the opportunity to carry out the task, among others, to the task of checking the lesson plan is very urgent to carry out the implementation of learning in the classroom. But it is not a secret considering the number of teachers to be examined her RPP, the principal direct only just signed the lesson. Also, the task of supervision is only one of the other tasks. Supervisory more rarely come to school are expected to watch the lesson plan more seriously, especially in implementing the curriculum 2013. Many things are different between the curriculum in 2013 with the previous curriculum. In the provision mentioned that in the curriculum this 2013 syllabus has been created by the center, but the teacher still has to make a lesson plan, in this case, the supervisor should be able to see whether the principles contained in the curriculum in 2013 can already be implemented by teachers or not. As the capital to watch the lesson plan according to the 2013 curriculum written by teachers, supervisors need to learn to understand the basis and implementation of the curriculum.

b. Teacher implements learning in the classroom.

In every opportunity to meet with the supervisor, the author always ask, what or who need to be considered by supervisor when conducting classroom visits? The answer obtained in general supervisor only observe the appearance of the teacher who is teaching because the primary purpose of supervision is to improve the ability of teacher in implementing the learning. The object of supervision is not only the appearance of teacher alone, but students are learning, in the event of learning, the impact of methods and ways of teaching used by the teacher, keenly felt and seen from the behavior and activity of students. How the impact of the activity of teacher, good or not the student learning outcome is a result of the performance and activities of the teacher. Has all this time supervisor noticed that students learn? In addition to students who are learning, supervisors also need to consider the atmosphere that occurs in the learning. Is evidence that the classroom atmosphere when learning takes place already fulfill the principle: Active,

Innovative, Creative, Effective, and Fun? The supervisor is required to respond to everything that is determined by the ministry or directorate, as all the provisions issued have been studied, analyzed, and discussed extensively. Activeness of teachers depends on the direction of a supervisor. If the supervisor has not been able to, we need to hold coaching.

c. Teachers carry out an evaluation of learning outcomes.

Does supervisor observe a carefully teacher in implementing the evaluation of student learning outcome? Evaluation is an integral part of learning. The entire evaluation process which needs to be observed by the supervisor are: (a) The questions prepared by the teacher. Whether such questions are valid and good enough to use by teachers to assess student learning outcomes? (b) The evaluation, whether teachers have carried out an evaluation of learning outcomes in a good manner, so that every student working on assessment seriously, honestly and sincerely? (c) How to determine a score, how to change the score to value? If you follow the rules in the curriculum 2013, whether the teacher has made a description of assessment of students with truly conscientious and precise?

From the description presented above is of the organizational structure of the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Education and Culture, it appears that neither party to guide supervisors so that the quality of the performance of supervisors are low. Until now, the ability of supervisors to supervise teachers in a state of permanent, unless the supervisor's interest in developing themselves.

Hopefully, we agreed that supervisors need guidance to improve its ability to carry out supervision. Therefore there is no a party should do the coaching, so in this study designed a model, that those who do coaching is supervisors themselves. This idea was inspired by a dissertation written by Enny Wijayanti. The title of the dissertation is as follows: "Implementation and Instruments Model Self Evaluation (SE) and Colleague Evaluation (CE) Competence of Study Field in Physics Education Students." In this case, the author argues that this model is good and can be applied to the regulatory guidance that in fact more mature and can certainly carry out.

In addition to the research inspired by Enny, in research (Suharsimi, 2006). The evaluation model among these students, not only exchanged between two students evaluate each other, but spread to the entire class. After the evaluation cross with classmates, student jobs are returned to their owners. From the analysis of the results of the evaluation of cross and self-evaluation, it turns out the correlation is quite high, namely 0.78. From this correlation, the number can be concluded that self-evaluation is not much affected by the subjectivity of the students.

Mentioned in the dissertation Enny Wijayanti that the use of models SE and CE in learning was supported by a lot of experts, such as Black & William - 1998, Chappuis & Stiggins 2002, Rolbeiner & Ross in 2001, and White & Frederikson 2008. By doing SE, students get feedback, with their three advantages, namely (1) the redefinition of the objectives to be achieved, (2) evidence of his position while receiving feedback, and (3) an understanding of how to close the gap between the two. Three advantages should be realized by every student involved in the model. Many times they were aware that their activities would be beneficial for him.

In this study, researchers offered two models that researchers modification of the model to improve the supervisor competence in supervision. The purpose of modification of the model SE and CE are: (1) Self Assessment Student Self-Evaluation replaced by Supervisor (SE) .and (2) students CE replaced with supervisor SE.

In this case, the researchers found a job close watch friend is a job that's fun. During the work of correcting a friend, someone will look at what has been done wrongly by that friend. Correcting mistakes is looking for people, so his scrutiny be done seriously. This is consistent with the results of research et al Kulkarni (2013) that the peer evaluations to help to learn

It also fits with the 360 evaluation techniques that are already familiar. As we know a 360-degree evaluation methods/techniques used in performance evaluations. This evaluation is used in both private and government organizations.

This technique measures the performance of employees in completing their work. This evaluation technique that gives priority to quality assessment results of impartial, objective, and provides feedback by combining a person's performance appraisal of superiors, subordinates, peers and themselves. This evaluation technique has advantages: more objective, reduce bias, able to increase awareness of the organization, there is an element of fairness in the implementation of performance assessment, facilitate the process of identifying strengths to develop further capabilities, and support the development of the team. The aim of 360-degree evaluation is to provide feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the performance, identify the strategic direction for further development, enhance mutual understanding between the units in collaboration, recognize/reward achievement and performance incentives, develop a learning process for disclosure of behavior and constructive criticism. Three things need to be considered in the evaluation of the performance of 360 degrees, namely: (1) the type of information required, (2) the method of information collection, evaluation and feedback.

2 METHOD

2.1 Location

The study was conducted in Yogyakarta which includes the city of Yogyakarta, Bantul district, Gunung Kidul district, Kulon Progo district, and Sleman district that concentrated in the Office of the Yogyakarta Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah. As the subject of this study is the supervisors of the Yogyakarta Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah, there are 20 people spread to five districts and city mentioned above.

The study was continued in the Bantul district. The reason for choosing Bantul district for the previous research was not implemented because the supervisor was busy with the preparation and mentoring school accreditation.

2.2 Model Development

The research model used in this research is the Research and Development (R & D) theorized by Borg and Gall (2007). According to both of these experts,

because the researchers wanted to find a model, then the research procedure carried out in three stages, namely (1) the preliminary study, (2) development model, and (3) test the model. This research will be conducted in three years. In the first year the research just conducted the preliminary study.

2.3 Data Collection Method

There are three methods of data collection used in this study, which scrutiny, observation, and interviews in the Focus Group Discussion (FGD).

2.4 Data Analysis Methods

The model that used in this research is the development, so obtained quantitative so that it can be taken conclusion. The qualitative data obtained by researchers from the observation of the process of discernment supervision reports, analyzed and drawn its meaning. The qualitative data analyzed to find the meaning of any statements and observations that researchers do the activity process.

3 RESULTS

The study began with a consultation with the Head of the Council of Elementary and Secondary Education of Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, namely Prof. Dr. Mundzirin Yusuf. In the Consultation Meeting showed that the Chairman of the Elementary and Secondary Education Council of Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta support the full implementation of this study and suggest the research centered in the office of Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah in Gedong Kuning Yogyakarta. He is also willing to invite supervisors of Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah to be present in the activities of the Focus Group Discussion (FGD). FGD is done three times, the first FGD dated June 23, 2015, FGD both dated 8 September 2015, and the third FGD dated October 17, 2015, all of which were held at the Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.

3.1 Focus Group Discussion 1

The first FGD was held at the Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta on June 23, 2015, was attended by Chairman of the Council of Primary and Secondary Education, Prof. Dr. Mundzirin Jusuf and 20 supervisors of Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta Special Region of the five district and city. In FGD First of all supervisors have unanimously approved the SE as a model to improve professionalism. The supervisors also agreed to the model CE as a model to improve professionalism. In this first FGD, we agreed to supervise the school to start in early July 2015 and ending mid-August 2015.

3.2 Focus Group 2

The second FGD was held at the Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta Special Region on 8 September 2015, was attended by 11 supervisors

from all five districts in Yogyakarta. In this FGD supervisors stated obstacles and difficulties of implementation of supervision because of all schools focus on preparing the accreditation of the school. At the end of this FGD supervisors agreed to supervise the school until the beginning of October 2015. There were several supervisors of Sleman already carry out supervision. Schools are supervised comprising: SMA Muhammadiyah Wonosari (Gunung Kidul), Madrasah Aliyah Galur (Kulon Progo), SMA Muhammadiyah Mlati, SMK Muhammadiyah I Tempel, SMK Muhammadiyah Cangkringan (Sleman), SMA Muhammadiyah 1 and SMA Muhammadiyah 3 Yogyakarta (Yogyakarta). Name of the supervisor is Dra, Sri Wahyu Dwiyanti, S.Pd. (Gunung Kidul), Mrs. Kalima, S.Ag, Mr. Marwadi, Mr. Tukiran, and Mrs. Suhartati, S.Pd. (Kulon Progo). Drs. Sumaryanto Marzuki and Drs. Sumaryanto (Yogyakarta). Drs. H. Sujadi, Drs. Sutrisno, and Drs. Maryana (Sleman).

3.3 Focus Group 3

Third FGD were held at the Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta Special Region on 17 September 2015 was attended by nine supervisors. All supervisors collected the school supervision.

3.3.1 Yogyakarta

Supervision was done by Drs. Sumaryanto Marzuki and Drs. Bunyamin. Schools that be supervised is SMA Muhammadiyah 1 and school Muhammadiyah 3 Yogyakarta. Both supervisors supervised jointly by coming to school together supervises the curriculum. The instruments used were the instruments that they use for this. The both supervisor did not conduct the SE and CE in the document of supervision implementation report, but during the performance of their supervision implementation report, but during the performance of their supervision to perform mutual CE. Both supervisor also did SE.

3.3.2 Sleman

Supervision was done by Drs. H. Sujadi, Drs. Sutrisno, and Drs. Maryana. Schools that are supervised are SMA Muhammadiyah I Mlati, SMK Muhammadiyah Cangkringan, and SMA Muhammadiyah Tempel. They conducted supervision independently on learning device administration, management standards, and managerial. The instruments used were the instruments that they use for this. They conducted CE on document reports on the implementation of supervision by gave comments.

3.3.3 Kulon Progo

Supervision is done by Dra. Kalima, Drs. Mawardi, Drs. Tukiran, and H. Suhartati, S.Pd. The supervised schools are MA Muhammadiyah Strain, SMK Muhammadiyah I Wates, Wates and SMK Muhammadiyah. The third supervisor supervises the accreditation mentoring, academic (learning), and the principal.

The instruments used were the instruments they use The instruments used were the instruments that they use for this. Supervisors did not conduct SE.

3.3.4 Gunung Kidul

Supervision was done by Dra. Sri Wahyu Dwiyanti, M.Pd, and Drs. Muryadi. Schools which are supervised SMA Muhammadiyah Wonosari. They conducted administrative supervision of learning, academic (learning), learning assessment, and managerial. The instruments used were the instruments they use for this. Both supervisors implemented CE to give comments on the document reports on the implementation of supervision but did not conduct SE.

3.3.5 Bantul

Supervisors did not collect the document of a report on the implementation of supervision, so they did not conduct SE and CE. They should accompany the school accreditation. Based on the results, author will conduct a special FGD in Bantul, FGD conducted on 15 August 2016 attended by eight school supervisors. At the FGD supervisors divided into four groups to conduct SE and CE supervision, but until now, supervisors didn't conduct SE supervision as well as CE supervision.

4 DISCUSSION

In this study, the implementation of supervision in schools except in Bantul can run well. According to the author, this is because it is a routine task supervisor, so they are used to perform supervision.

All supervisors in the Sleman district, Kulon Progo district, and Gunung Kidul district, except Bantul district, all supervisors conducted CE had but didn't conduct SE. According to the author, this is because of they have not been used to assess themselves, judging others is easier than judging yourself.

Implementation of supervision in this study was not running in Bantul, so that is also not implemented SE and CE. According to researchers, this is caused by the preoccupations of the supervisor to prepare the school's accreditation. It is estimated that if this study were conducted when school is not preparing the school's accreditation, supervision would go well.

5 CONCLUSION

Supervisors agreed to the SE model as a model to improve the professionalism, but it can not be done. Supervisors agreed to the CE model as a model to improve the professionalism and can be done either directly on the implementation of the supervision together when they supervise CE on report documents and on the implementation of supervision. The level of acceptance of the supervisor of the SE and the SE as a model to improve the professionalism is high, except in the district of Bantul. Barriers to conducting SE is not yet accustomed to SE. While the implementation barriers of supervision in school are because now, the supervisors focus on assisting to prepare school accreditation.

6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Acknowledgments submitted to (1) LPP UAD, which has funded this research, (2) Regional Chairman of Muhammadiyah who have supported this research, (3) supervisors that involved in this study.

REFERENCES

- Borg R.W. & Gall, M.D. (2007). *Educational Research, an Introduction*. English Edition. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Enny Wijayanti. (2014). *Penerapandan instrument model ADM dan ATS Kompetensi Bidang Studi pada Mahasiswa Pendidikan Fisika*. Penelitian Disertasi. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Glickman, Carl D., Stephen P. Gordon, and Jovita M. Rose Ross-Gordon. (2009). *The Basic Guide to Supervision and Instructional Leadership*. 2nd ed. Boston. Pearson Education.
- Keputusan Bersama Mendikbud Nomor 03420/O/1996 dan Kepala Badan Administrasi Kepegawaian Negara Nomor 38 Tahun 1996 tentang Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Jabatan Fungsional Pengawas.
- Keputusan Mendikbud Nomor 020/U/1998 tentang Petunjuk Teknis Pelaksanaan Jabatan Fungsional Pengawas Sekolah dan Angka Kreditnya.
- Kulkarni, Chinmay.et.all. (2013). Peer and Peer Assesment in Masive On- line Classes. *ACM Transaction on Computer Human Interaction Vol. 20 No 6 Article 33*. December 2013.
- Nana Sujana. (2006). *Standar Mutu Pengawas*. Rosda Karya. Bandung.
- Permendiknas Nomor 13 Tahun 2007.
- Suharsimi Arikunto. (2006). *Penelitian dengan Model Penilaian Diri dan Penilaian antar Mahasiswa pada Matakuliah Pengawasan*. Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Surat Keputusan Menpan Nomor 118 Tahun 1996 tentang Jabatan Fungsional Pengawas dan Angka Kreditnya.