

Conference Paper

The Students' Lesson Plans in the In-Service Ppg-Elt Program

Utari Praba Astuti and Sri Andreani

Universitas Negeri Malang

Abstract

In the *Program Pendidikan Profesi Guru Dalam Jabatan* (In-service PPG Program), as in other teacher training programs, lesson plans are a prerequisite for peer teaching. In this program, seven out of 17 sessions are allotted for lesson plan writing, finalization, presentation, discussion, and revision. This arrangement is meant to enable the PPG students to develop lesson plans, discuss them with their facilitators and fellow students, get feedbacks, and improve them. At the end of this process, the students are expected to produce acceptable and feasible lesson plans. Do the students fulfil this expectation? To answer this question, all the components of their lesson plans are analyzed. The analysis focuses on the lesson plans the students prepared for high school level.

Keywords: lesson plan, in-service, PPG, ELT

Corresponding Author:

Utari Praba Astuti

utari.praba.fs@um.ac.id

Received: 17 February 2020

Accepted: 20 February 2020

Published: 27 February 2020

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Utari Praba Astuti and Sri Andreani. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the Isolec Conference Committee.

Teachers in Indonesia are required to possess, among others, academic qualification and educator certificate (Law No. 14 Year 2014 on Teachers and Lecturers, Article 8). Educator certificates are awarded to teachers who have gone through professional education, known as *Pendidikan Profesi Guru* (henceforth PPG or Teacher Professional Education). PPG is post-graduate education that prepares students for professions requiring special expertise (Law No.12 Year 2012 on Higher Education Article 17(1)). Upon completing the one-year in-service program, teachers are certified as professional teachers.

Universitas Negeri Malang is one of the higher education institutions that has been assigned to carry out the PPG program. This program is held in two stages, the on-line and face-to-face sessions, in which students (previously referred to as 'teachers') develop their professional and pedagogical competences. One of the tasks that students have to do to develop their pedagogical competence is writing Lesson Plans.

This study aims at analyzing the Lesson Plans written by the students of the in-service ELT- (English Language Teaching) PPG program at the Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang, to see whether they comply with the prevailing regulations

 OPEN ACCESS

and the Lesson Plan development manual/model. If they are not, then, this study identifies which components of the Lesson Plans cause problems for the students. The findings of this study are expected to provide a basis for the next batch of PPG program to give more emphasis on the Lesson Plan components that are found to be problematic.

1. Method

The design of this study is Qualitative Content Analysis as the sources of the qualitative data were mostly in the form of texts (Cavanagh, 1997). The texts analyzed in this study were 23 Lesson Plans written by 23 students of the second batch of the in-service ELT-PPG program at the Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang. These are Lesson Plans for the high school level written for the peer teaching session. Schreier (2012) states that qualitative content analysis requires the examination of every single part of the materials. In this study, the analysis is focused on the 10 components of Lesson Plans, i.e. course identity, core competences, basic competences, indicators, instructional objectives, instructional materials, approach and method, instructional media, learning resources, learning procedure, and assessment. These Lesson Plans were presented in the face-to-face session to get feedback from peers and facilitators (a lecturer and a high school teacher). The discussion of the Lesson Plans provides additional data for this study.

Each component of the Lesson Plans is analyzed to see if it is acceptable and to identify any problems that may be present. It is discussed based on the Regulations of the Minister of Education and Culture, the Lesson Plan Development Model (*Model Pengembangan RPP*, 2017), the High School Lesson Plan Development Manual (*Panduan Pengembangan RPP SMA*, 2008), the consensus among teachers in the Course Teachers Forum (*Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran/MGMP*) in Malang, and the relevant theories.

2. Findings and Discussion

This study reveal that not all the Lesson Plans are acceptable. Problems are identified in all the components of the Lesson Plans, regardless of the frequency of occurrence. These problems are presented in the following sections alongside the illustrations (whenever available), the prevailing regulations/model/manual, teachers' consensus, and the relevant theories.

2.1. Course Identity

The first section of the Lesson Plans, Course Identity, is presented well. There is no problem with the school name, the course name, the class, and the core materials. The following are two examples of the Course Identity section of the students' Lesson Plans.

Sekolah	: SMA PPG Daljab Tahap 2
Mata Pelajaran	: Bahasa Inggris
Kelas/Semester	: XI/Ganjil
Materi Pokok	: Teks Khusus Dalam Bentuk Undangan Resmi
Alokasi Waktu	: 2 x 2 Jam Pelajaran @45 Menit

Satuan Pendidikan	: SMA.....
Mata pelajaran	: Bahasa Inggris
Kelas/Semester	: XII/1
Materi Pokok	: <i>Caption</i>
<i>Skill</i>	: <i>Writing</i>
Alokasi Waktu	: 4 x 45 menit (2 pertemuan)

According to The Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No.22 Year 2016 (*Permendikbud No 22 Tahun 2016*), the Course Identity in a Lesson Plan should state the name of the school name, the course, the class and the semester, the core materials, and the time allotment. Even though the two examples generally follow the regulation, there are three components that follow different patterns. The first component is the Class/Semester. In the first example, semester is stated as *ganjil* and in the second example, it is stated as "1 (*satu/one*)". There is a consensus among teachers in MGMP in Malang that semesters are stated in numbers, 1 through 6. Thus, there are semesters 1 and 2 for Class X, semesters 3 and 4 for Class XI, and semesters 5 and 6 for Class XII. The second component is the Skill in Focus which appears in the second example, but not in the first. The Skill in Focus is required by neither the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 22 Year 2016 nor the Lesson Plan Development Model (2017), but apparently some students feel the need to include it in the Course Identity, to help them stay focused and prevent them from going off course. The third component that follows different patterns is the time allotment. In the first example, the time allotment is stated as 2 X 2 *jam pelajaran @ 45 menit* (2 times 2 class hours @ 45 minutes). In the second example, it is formulated as 4 X 45 *menit (2 pertemuan)* or 4 times 45 minutes (2 sessions). Even though these formulations are commonly found in Lesson Plans, they

are not in accordance with the Lesson Plan Development Model (2017), where time allotment is formulated into 4 JP (2 pertemuan) or 4 Class Hours (2 sessions).

2.2. Core Competence

The second component of the Lesson Plans is the Core Competence. This indicates that the Lesson Plans follow a combination of the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 103 Year 2014 and No. 22 Year 2106. To be consistent with the Regulations, the Lesson Plans should mention only the third and the fourth core competences (the knowledge and skill competences) because the first and second competences (the religious and social competences) fall within the scopes the religion and civics courses. Students who mention all four core competences in their Lesson Plans do so to remind them that they are responsible not only for delivering their own course materials, but also for cultivating good attitude. The Lesson Plan Development Model (2017) states that good attitude is to be developed indirectly through modelling, accustomization, and school culture, by taking into account the characteristics of the course as well as the needs and the condition of the students. In the implementation, all teachers are required to write journals and turn in their scores concerning their students' attitude to the class academic advisors. As stated in Article 9(1)b of the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 23 Year 2016 on Assessment Mechanism, students' attitude is evaluated by teachers through observation/other relevant evaluation techniques and is reported by the academic advisors.

2.3. Basic Competences and Indicators

The first problem with the Basic Competences and the Indicators is that the Lesson Plans do not use the same presentation format. The Basic Competences and the Indicators are mostly presented in a table—another indication that the Lesson Plans follow a combination of the Regulations of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 103 Year 2014 and No. 22 Year 2106. Actually, the use of a table makes it easier to show the elaboration of each Basic Competence into its Indicators. However, some students prefer not to use a table, referring only to the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 22 Year 2016.

Besides the presentation of the Basic Competences, there is another problem with the Indicators that are merely a restatement of the Basic Competences. As a result, the Indicators are too general and are not in line with the skill in focus. They do

not point at a particular type of text (spoken/written) or refer to specific language features/text structure. According to the High School Lesson Plan Development Manual (2008), an indicator states the measurable behavior that denotes the achievement of the Basic Competence and is formulated with operational verbs that are observable and measurable. Thus, a mere copy of the Basic Competence does not make a good Indicator.

2.4. Instructional Objectives

Indicators are translated into Instructional Objectives that are specific, observable and measurable. The Instructional Objectives in the students' Lesson Plans are sometimes identical with the indicators. According to the Lesson Plan Development Model (2017), objectives are formulated from the Basic Competence with operational verbs that are observable and measurable. This is exactly the same as the definition of Indicators in the High School Lesson Plan Development Manual (2008). Thus, the content of Indicators and Objectives can possibly be the same even though the formulation is different. The formulation of an objectives should follow the A-B-C-D (Audience-Behavior-Condition-Degree) format (Teachers' Modules/*Modul Guru Pembelajaran*, 2016), but many of the students mention only the audience and the behavior, leaving behind the condition and degree. Condition should be included in the objectives for two reasons (Rink, 2009). First, condition describes the situation where the behavior is demonstrated. Second, it points at the domain of the instructional objectives. Degree should also be included because of its evaluative nature, providing a criterion for acceptable performance.

This is the first problem with the instructional objective. The second, some students attempted to formulate more specific objectives, but the verbs used are not observable/measurable as dictated by the Lesson Plan Development Module (2017). Third, some students use two verbs in the same objective. Fourth, some of them come to objectives that are fewer than the indicators. Logically, the number of the objectives should be more than or at least the same as that of the Indicators because they are elaborated from the Indicators.

2.5. Instructional Materials

The Lesson Plan Development Module (2017) states that instructional materials are taken from textbooks, teachers' manual, and other learning resources, including local

content, updated materials, or learning contexts in the neighborhood. These materials are classified into materials for regular learning, enrichment, and remedial programs.

There are four problems related to the instructional materials. First, the materials do not reflect the instructional objectives. As an illustration, there is a task in a Lesson Plan that requires students to write a narrative text with dialogs in it, whilst the objective is actually for the students to produce a Transactional Text. This is against one of the Lesson Plan principles (The Lesson Plan Development Module, 2017) which requires that instructional materials be in conformity with the Basic Competence, the learning activities, the indicators, the assessment, and the learning resources, making up a learning experience as a whole.

The second problem, the description of the instructional materials is not complete, as shown by the following example.

D. Materi Pembelajaran

- Fungsi sosial
Mendeskripsikan, mengomentari gambar, foto, tabel, grafik, bagan.
- Struktur teks
Dapat mencakup:
 - Tindakan/peristiwa/kegiatan
 - Orang/benda yang terlibat
 - Lingkup situasi
- Unsur kebahasaan
 - Frasa nominal untuk benda, orang, binatang, lokasi, dsb. yang menjadi fokus, dengan atau tanpa *a, the, this, those, my, their*, dsb.
 - Frasa verbal terkait gambar/foto/tabel/grafik dalam tense yang sesuai
 - Ucapan, tekanan kata, intonasi, ejaan, tanda baca dan tulisan tangan
- Topik
Kegiatan, peristiwa, data, fakta aktual dari koran yang dapat menumbuhkan perilaku yang termuat dari KI

The example shows that Section D of the Lesson Plan merely outlines the course materials. A Lesson Plan should be self-explanatory, but Section D in the example is lacking in details. To make it worse, no materials are provided in the Appendix. As stated in Chapter III of The Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 22 Year 2016, instructional materials include facts, principles, and the relevant procedures. This Chapter states further that teachers are required to prepare a complete and systematic Lesson Plan for an interactive, inspiring, joyful, challenging, and efficient.

The third problem related to instructional materials is the instruction in the worksheet. They may be unclear, wordy, and redundant as illustrated by the following example.

A. Fill in the blank dialogue correctly!

are going to	Would you like	Are you going to	would you like
What would you like	are going to	would like	

A long weekend is coming. Riri, Santi, and Bayu are talking about their plans. Pay attention to the pronunciation and intonation.

Riri : It will be a long weekend soon. Do you have any plans?
 Santi : Uhm, I'm not sure. I don't have any idea yet. I think I might stay at home.
 Bayu : Stay at home? Well, you could do something more interesting!
 Santi : So, what about you Bayu? Do you have any plans?
 Bayu : Definitely! My dad and I go fishing.

The example shows that Task A has two instructions in a row. The first one comes before the words in the box and the second comes right after it. This may be very confusing for some students. A task may have two instructions, but the second one should be given when the first is accomplished. In this example, the second instruction is not very clear as to what the students are expected to do—whether they have to read the dialog with correct pronunciation and intonation or they have to listen to a recording and pay attention to the pronunciation and intonation.

The fourth problem with the instructional materials is that the materials are not appropriate.

Video 2	Video 3
Farid : Hi Davi! What are you doing? Davi : Oh, Hi! I'm making coffee. Farid : For whom? Davi : For my guest, but I hate him. Farid : Oh, why don't you give some poison to this coffee? Davi : yeah, that's a good idea. But, what kind of poison I will give? Farid : How about sianida acid? Davi : Oh, thanks you. I like that. Farid : Oh yes.	Nada: Hi Anin, why are you so happy? Anin : because after this is a conversation lesson. Nada :Do you likr your conversation teacher? Anin : Yes, how can I stop it? Nada : How about moving on? Anin : I tried, but I can't. Nada : May I write a love letter for you? Anin : No, I'm too shy. Nada : May I give you "top" to keep you on fighting? Anin : Wow, that sounds good. Thank you.

The topics of these two videos are not very common. In Video 2, Farid suggests that Davi poison his guest. In Video 3, Nada is offering her friend to help him write a love letter to his teacher. Considering that the government is now encouraging character building (the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No.20 Year 2018 (*Permendikbud No.20 Tahun 2018*), topics such as these are obviously not acceptable. Tomlinson (2010) asserts that materials should be interesting, relevant and enjoyable to exert a positive influence on the students' attitude to the language and to the process of learning it. He also states that the language the students are exposed to should be authentic, that is it represents how the language is typically used. The language

should also be contextualized. The examples indicate that there is an attempt to put the language in the context, but the context neither show how the language is typically used nor incites a positive influence on the students' attitude towards the language or language learning.

Not all the Lesson Plans mention the remedial and enrichment program. Some mention only the remedial program or the enrichment program. Some other mention both but do not explain clearly how it is to be implemented and do not mention specifically the materials to be used. Even if remedial/enrichment materials are mentioned, they are not attached as appendices to some of the Lesson Plans, or they are attached but are incomplete.

2.6. Approach & Method

According to the High School Lesson Plan Development Manual (2008), teachers can select approaches like contextual teaching and learning (CTL), direct learning, or problem-based learning (PBL) and methods like lecturing, enquiry, observation, question-answer, or e-learning. Approaches and methods should be selected carefully to create learning atmosphere and learning process to help students achieve the basic competence or the predetermined indicators. They should be selected based on the students' situation and condition and the characteristics of each indicator and the target competence.

There are two problems related to the approach and method used. First, the approach is not reflected in the instructional procedure. In this case, the instructional procedure refers to a completely different method. In the following example, in Section E (Teaching Method) of a Lesson Plan, the approach used is claimed to be Contextual Teaching and Learning.

E. METODE PEMBELAJARAN

Pertemuan Pertama:

Model	: <i>Think Pair Share</i>
Pendekatan	: <i>Contextual Teaching and Learnings</i>
Teknik	: Tanya jawab, diskusi, presentasi

The following is the instructional procedure that should be derived from the approach.

b. Kegiatan Inti (70 menit)

- **Mengamati**

1. Peserta didik mengamati video yang disajikan guru terkait caption teks. (<http://youtube.com/watch?v=JBb3DDITNMQ&t=32s>)
2. Peserta didik menganalisis video yang disajikan guru terkait caption teks.

- **Menanya**

1. Peserta didik mengajukan pertanyaan terkait dengan caption teks berdasarkan video yang telah disajikan oleh guru.

- **Mengumpulkan Informasi/Mencoba**

1. Peserta didik secara individu menjawab pertanyaan tentang tujuan terkait caption teks berdasarkan video yang diberikan guru yang relevan dengan kehidupan nyata peserta didik.
 - *What is the purpose of the caption?*
2. Peserta didik secara individu menjawab pertanyaan tentang fungsi terkait caption teks berdasarkan video yang diberikan guru yang relevan dengan kehidupan nyata peserta didik.

- *What is the function of the caption?*

3. Peserta didik secara individu menjawab pertanyaan tentang pesan terkait caption teks berdasarkan video yang diberikan guru yang sesuai dengan kehidupan nyata peserta didik.

- *What is the message of the caption?*

- **Mengasosiasi**

1. Peserta didik secara berpasangan dengan teman sebangkunya berdiskusi tentang pendapat yang menjadi ide utama terkait caption teks berdasarkan gambar yang diberikan oleh guru (appendix)
2. Peserta didik secara berpasangan dengan teman sebangkunya berdiskusi tentang peristiwa terkait caption teks berdasarkan gambar yang diberikan oleh guru (appendix).
3. Peserta didik secara berpasangan dengan teman sebangkunya berdiskusi tentang pendapat yang menjadi ide utama caption teks berdasarkan gambar yang diberikan oleh guru.
4. Peserta didik secara berpasangan dengan teman sebangkunya berdiskusi tentang deskripsi terkait caption teks berdasarkan gambar yang diberikan oleh guru.

- **Mengkomunikasikan**

1. Setiap siswa dengan pasangannya mempresentasikan hasil diskusi bersama-sama secara bergiliran.
2. Peserta didik menerima umpan balik dan/atau penguatan (isi, fungsi sosial, struktur teks dan unsur kebahasaan teks) dari guru.

The learning procedure depicted above does not show the steps of Contextual Teaching and Learning. They belong to the Scientific Approach. Some students claim to use a particular approach (e.g. the Scientific Approach) and elaborate the learning procedure that does not belong to any known method/approach, e.g.

MAIN ACTIVITIES

- Observing & Questioning
- Pre-Speaking Activity
- Grammar Focus
- Speaking Activity
- Communicating

The example shows that the first and the last steps refer to the first, the second, and last steps of the Scientific Approach (Observing – Questioning – Experimenting – Associating - Communicating), whilst the second one is the first step of the Three Phase Technique (Pre-Speaking – Whilst-Speaking – and Post-Speaking Activities). This learning procedure is invented by the student by combining steps from different Approach/Technique.

The second problem with the approach and technique concerns the misinterpretation of the Three Phase Technique. The three steps of the Three Phase Techniques, i.e. Pre-Activity, Whilst-Activity, and Post-Activity are often mistaken for the Opening Activity, Main Activity, and Closing Activity.

2.7. Instructional Media

According to the Lesson Plan Development Model (2017), the choice of media should reflect the use of information and communication technology to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of learning. The application of the information and communication technology should be integrated, systematic, effective, and suitable with the class situation and condition. The students' Lesson Plans do not show any problems with the choice of media and their application, yet two problems with the instructional media are identified. First, the Instructional Media section is incomplete. It does not include all the media used. Video, for example is considered as a part of the materials and is not mentioned in this section. Cellphones that is used to share materials/tasks are not considered as media because they belong to the students. The second problem with the instructional media is the print out of the power point slides and the pictures that is not attached as appendices to the Lesson Plan.

2.8. Learning Resources

According to the Lesson Plan Development Model (2017), students should be facilitated to learn from various learning resource. Instructional materials may be taken from textbooks, teachers' manuals, local contents, updated materials, or learning contexts in the neighborhood. The students use both printed and online learning resources. The problem with the learning resources is that it is incomplete because some of the learning resources used are sometimes not included in the list. Students are often unaware that they have to acknowledge the sources of the videos and recording they use. The Lesson Plan Development Model (2008) states that learning resources should include

references, neighborhood, resource person, media, and materials. Learning resources should be operational and specify the materials. If a book is used, the title, the author, and the page numbers should be clearly stated. If ICT-based materials are used, the file name, the folder, the link file, or the website address should be mentioned.

2.9. Learning Procedure

The learning procedure falls into three stages, i.e. opening activities, main activities, and closing activities. According to the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 22 Year 2016, the opening activities consist of preparing the students, motivating them, relating the previous materials with the present one, explaining the objectives and the basic competence, explaining the scope of the materials and the learning procedure. The main activities consist of systematic steps to help students develop the intended behavior stated in the objectives and indicators. The main activities follow a particular learning model and a learning method and involve the use of instructional media and learning resources that are suitable with the characteristics of the students and the course. The closing activities consist of reflecting on all the learning activities, giving feedbacks on the learning process and outcomes, assigning follow-up activities, and informing the students about the plan for the following session.

There are two problems related to the opening activities. First, the activities in the opening stage does not relate to the previous materials. Second, the motivation is given by emphasizing the general advantage of learning English. There is nothing wrong the content of the motivation, but it is not given in the appropriate time as the students are already in their second year. It would be better if the motivation is given in the first semester of the first year. Second, there are three problems related to the main activities (See Section on Approach and Method). Third, the activities in the closing stage do not include reviewing/summarizing nor giving homework. Actually, according to the Lesson Plan Development Manual (2008), the learning procedure can be arranged into one whole learning experience, following the learning model chosen. Thus, the opening, main, and closing activities, according to the Lesson Plan Development Manual, are optional, even though in the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 22 Year 2016, they are all compulsory.

2.10. Assessment

The Lesson Plan Model (2017) requires that teachers develop assessment of process and outcome and elaborate it into scope, technique, instruments, and scoring rubric. In the students' Lesson Plans, the aim of the assessment refers to Chapter III Article 4 of the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 23 Year 2016, i.e. assessment by teachers to observe and evaluate the process, achievement, and improvement in the outcome of learning. Chapter IV Article 5 of the same Regulation states that assessment is criteria-based, that is, it measures the achievement of the target competence. It should also be accountable in its mechanism, procedure, technique, and results.

There are four problems with the assessment section of the Lesson Plans. First, the assessment instruments do not reflect the instructional objectives. They assess the students' writing skill while the objectives relate to the speaking skill (This happens because the ending stage of the learning process is writing a dialog, not actually practicing it).

Second, the assessment blueprints vary. Some use the Core Competence as the basis and elaborate it into the objective (skipping the indicators), technique of assessment (written/spoken, project), and type of questions (e.g. completion, essay). Some start with the indicators, followed by the test items, and the type of test. Another version start with subject of assessment (spiritual attitude, social attitude), assessment technique (observation, written/spoken, project), and type of assessment instrument (observation sheet, multiple choice/essay test). Another version of the blueprint consists of assessment technique, form of assessment, and time of assessment.

Third, the evaluation grid is not practical. The example below show an evaluation grid consisting of aspects of evaluation, scores, and notes.

b) Instrumen Penilaian speaking

No.	Aspects	1	2	3	4	Notes
1.	Quantity of information communicated					
2.	Pronunciation					
3.	Vocabulary					
4.	Grammar					

The format of the evaluation grid indicates that it is intended for one student only. This means that a class of 30 students requires 30 such tables, which is inapplicable. Brown (2004) affirms that one of the features of a good evaluation grid is that it should be practical. To make it more feasible, this individual evaluation grid can be modified into a class evaluation grid, by inserting a column with all the students' name into it,

presenting the aspects and scores horizontally, and substituting the “Notes” column with two columns, i.e. total and average.

No	Name	Aspect/Score																Total	Average
		Content				Pronunciation				Vocabulary				Grammar					
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
1	Akbar M																		
2	Aulia A.																		

The inclusion of the students’ name in the evaluation grid and the rearrangement of the Aspects and Scores, and the addition of “Total” and “Average” columns enable the teacher to use only one table in assessing all the students’ speaking performance and record the total and the average scores.

The fourth problem with assessment is that the evaluation rubric is very elaborate. In a speaking rubric, for example, there are many aspects to assess and each aspect is provided with a range of scores with its interpretation. This grid is detailed and time-consuming, while speaking assessment has to be done very quickly because the students speak at almost the same time. This kind of scoring rubric is applicable when only one student performs at a time.

The findings of this study are similar in some way to the findings of the previous studies. The findings of the studies by Kustijono dan Wiwin (2014), Krisdiana dkk. (2015), dan Sidiq (2015), for example, reveal that teachers find it difficult to write a Lesson Plan, especially in formulating indicator, finding operational verbs, choosing a suitable approach/method/strategy, designing learning activities, allotting time, constructing tests and assessment rubric, accessing learning resources, designing varied instructional media, understanding the Scientific Approach, and designing authentic assessment. This study does not detect any problems concerning time allotment, but it identifies problems in formulating course identity, determining which core competences to mention, formulating objectives, constructing materials, listing the media, listing the learning resources, as well as describing the remedial and enrichment programs.

3. Concluding Remarks

Based on the research findings, several conclusions can be drawn. First, regardless of the frequency of occurrence, problems occur in all the components of the students’ Lesson Plans. Second, the Indicators that are identical with the Basic Competences, or the Objectives that are fewer in number than the indicators indicate that the students do not elaborate the basic competences or the indicator. Third, description of some

components (e.g. instructional materials and media, learning resources, and remedial/enrichment program) is incomplete. This indicates that the students are unaware that Lesson Plans should be self-explanatory. Fourth, the instruction and the content of the teacher-made materials are sometimes not acceptable. This indicates that the teachers do not know how to formulate the instructions and design the materials. Fifth, the problems in Lesson Plans may result from the absence of standard format (e.g. assessment blueprint). Sixth, problems may also occur due to conceptual misinterpretation (e.g. mistaking the Three Phase Technique for Opening, Main, and Closing activities). Seventh, ignorance of approaches/methods/techniques results in mixing up steps from different methods. It is suggested, therefore, that the coming in-service PPG-ELT Program address these problems and allot more time to the discussion and training of these elements of the Lesson Plans. As for the future researchers, it suggested that they focus on the implementation of the students' Lesson Plans to see whether or not they are applicable.

References

- [1] Brown, H.D. 2004. *Language Assessment. Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [2] Cavanagh, S. 1997. Content Analysis: Concepts, Methods and Applications. *Nurse Researcher*, 4, 5-13. From <http://dx.doi.org/10.7748/nr1997.04.4.3.5.c5869>
- [3] Ernawati & Safitri, R. 2017. Analisis Kesulitan Guru Dalam Merancang Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Mata Pelajaran Fisika Berdasarkan Kurikulum 2013 Di Kota Banda Aceh. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Science Education)* Vol.5, No.2, hlm. 49-56, 2017. From <http://jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/jpsi>.
- [4] Krisdiana, I., Apriandi, D, dan Setiansyah, R.K. 2015. Analisis Kesulitan Guru dan Peserta Didik Sekolah Menengah Pertama dalam Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 pada Mata Pelajaran Matematika. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Matematika*,1(1):143-154. From <http://e-journal.unipma.ac.id/index.php/jipm/article/view/492>
- [5] Kustijono, R. dan Wiwin, E. 2014. Pandangan Guru terhadap Pelaksanaan Kurikulum 2013 dalam Pembelajaran Fisika SMK di Kota Surabaya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Fisika dan Aplikasinya*. 4(1):1-14. From <https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/jpfa/article/view/180>
- [6] *Model Pengembangan RPP*. 2016. Jakarta: Direktorat Pembinaan Sekolah Menengah Atas, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

- [7] *Modul Guru Pembelajar*. 2016. Jakarta: Direktorat Jenderal Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [8] *Permendikbud Nomor 20 Tahun 2018 tentang Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter*
- [9] *Permendikbud Nomor 22 Tahun 2016 tentang Standar Proses Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*
- [10] *Permendikbud Nomor 23 Tahun 2016 tentang Penilaian Hasil Belajar*
- [11] Rink, J.E. 2009. *Designing Physical Education Curriculum for a Physically Active Lifestyle*. (Online), (http://works.bepress.com/judith_rink/6/), accessed on 1 October 2019.
- [12] Schreier, M. 2012. *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. (Online), ([https://www.researchgate.net > profile > post > attachment > download > Sc...](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael_Schreier/post/attachment/download/Sc...)), accessed on 26 September 2019.
- [13] Sidiq, F. 2015. *Analisis Kesiapan Guru dalam Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 di MIN Se-Kota Banda Aceh*. Tesis tidak dipublikasikan. Medan: Program Pascasarjana Unimed. (Online), (<http://digilib.unimed.ac.id/1491/>), accessed on 30 September 2019.
- [14] Tomlinson, B. 2010. Principles and procedures of materials development. In N. Harwood (ed.) *Materials in ELT: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [15] *Undang-undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2014 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi*
- [16] *Undang-undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Guru dan Dosen*