ATLANTIS PRESS

Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 388

3rd International Conference on Special Education (ICSE 2019)

The Evaluation of Field Experience Program in Special Education Department: Pedagogy Competence of Master Students

Asri Wijiastuti, Budiyanto, Siti Masitoh
Special Education Department, Faculty of Education
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
asriwijaistuti@unesa.ac.id, budiyanto@unesa.ac.id, masitoh@unesa.ac.id

***Abstract*—Field Experience Program (FEP) in the special education department is important for prospective teachers to gain a foundation of knowledge about pedagogy and subject matter, as well as early exposure to the practical classroom experience. The purpose of this study was to evaluating the effectiveness of FEP in 2014 and 2015 classes by preparing master students to work in undergraduate classrooms. The research design was quantitative and qualitative evaluative which showed procedure and process program implementation by Cronbach evaluation approach and responsive evaluation Stake. Data were collected from 128 graduate students and 12 supervising professors through questionnaire and interview. The result showed FEP is very effective with pedagogy competence indicates the average performance of 3.55 standard 1 to 5. The highest score especially regarding use media appropriate of characteristics of students with score 4.25.**

Keywords— field experience; master students; pedagogy

I. INTRODUCTION

It is generally believed that prospective lecturers and teachers will gain significant experience and teaching competencies through the practice of direct teaching and learning in the classroom and in the lecture hall. The Field Experience Program (FEP) in the master program of Special Education is a central subject in Teachers College Institutions as this program is the subject of work behavior resulting from scientific and the skills crystallization and the real implementation of work skills. FEP is a series of activities programmed for teacher candidates, which includes, both teaching exercises and training outside of teaching. This activity is an event to foster the professional competencies required by the work of teachers or other education personnel. The goals to be achieved are personal prospective educators who have a set of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes, as well as behavioral patterns that are needed for their profession and appropriate competencies to be used in administering education and teaching, both at school and outside the school [1]. Competency that must be achieved in implementing FEP refers to Indonesia's Minister of Education Regulation No. 16 of 2007 [2]. Point B's teacher competency standards are fully developed from four main competencies, namely pedagogic, personality, social, and professional competencies. The fourth competency integrated in teacher performance. Teacher competency standards include teacher core competencies developed into the competencies of early childhood teachers, elementary school class teachers, and subject teachers in elementary school, junior high school, senior high school, and vocational high school. In accordance with the mandate of Government Regulation No. 19 of 2005 concerning National Education Standards, especially Chapter V article 26 paragraph 4 which reads "The graduate competency standard at the tertiary level aims to prepare students to become noble members of society, possess knowledge, skills, independence, and attitude to find, develop, and apply knowledge, technology and art that is beneficial to humanity " [3]. Furthermore, it is also emphasized in Chapter VI article 28 paragraph 1 which reads "Educators must have academic qualifications and competencies as agents of learning, physically and mentally healthy, and have the ability to realize national education goals" [3]. Based on these competency standards the Special Education master program is directed at the results of graduates with the capacity of (1) having the ability to develop and update science by mastering and skillfully applying scientific approaches, methods and rules; (2) have the ability to solve problems in their field of expertise; and (3) have the ability to develop professional performance as indicated by the sharpness of problem analysis, sufficiency of reviews, and problem solving coherence. Moreover, the capacity of postgraduate program students are scientific practice capacity in accordance with the master level, relevance to the scientific field, and adequate quality.

The implementation of FEP practices will provide life skills for students, namely teaching experience, along with broaden horizons, train and develop student competencies in their fields, improve skills, independence, responsibility and ability to solve problems, and build networks so that the existence of FEP programs is useful for students as educational staff in supporting their profession. FEP activities carried out in 2014 and 2015 classes included teaching practices, administration, and other activities both extra and non-curricular, including helping children study in

the dormitory and assisting in learning orientation and mobility of children living in the dormitory. In this FEP activity, students are deployed to campuses, schools and the community to be able to recognize, observe, and practice all the competencies needed by a prospective teacher and lecturer in the school environment besides teaching. The provision obtained in FEP activities is expected to be used as essential to develop themselves as lecturers and teachers who are aware of their duties and responsibilities as an academic workforce besides teaching in the classroom. The issue of the quality of teaching and learning in higher education has been the focus of studies in several countries for decades [4], [5]. Furthermore, [4] states that evaluation of teaching effectiveness is a complex, subjective and multidimensional process. This is in accordance with constructivist theory from [6] who states that meaningful learning will provide an understanding of basic concepts so that we can apply concepts and it is challenging to reach its understanding. The same thing stated by [7] the impact of understanding concepts derived from self-interpretation is to produce the ability to feel what is seen, read and said, and able to integrate new information in accordance with our current way of thinking. Evaluation of teaching and learning activities is an understanding of internal evaluation which becomes the university's policy to the instructor to ensure the achievement of learning objectives. Evaluations carried out are based on the desire to foster an organizational culture based on the dedication and achievements of its members ([8]). The good news is that current empirical evidence can validate institutions from teaching material content and the quality of learning in class that is different from student performance [9], [10]. The targets to be achieved in the implementation of this FEP are the graduates of the Special Education master program will have a set of knowledge, value skills, attitudes, and behavioral patterns that are needed for the profession and competent and appropriate to use them in the implementation of education and teaching, both at school and outside school [1] The essence of a teacher who is professional in solving problems is to recognize the issues and problems that occur in his class and solve them to improve the quality of his teaching learning [11]. This is in accordance with constructivist learning theory put forward by Vygotsky quoted by [12] stating that students must find themselves and transform complex information, examine new information according to existing information. Learning implementation will be effective if basic knowledge and skills are mastered by the students.The implementation of the FEP as an initial experience required students to construct basic teaching knowledge and skills to achieve competencies as mandated in Indonesia's Minister of Education Regulation No. 16 of 2007 [2] . Based on this background, the aims of this study is to find out the effectiveness of the 2014 and 2015 FEP implementation on the pedagogical competence of masters students of Special Education Program of Universitas Negeri Surabaya (Unesa).

II. METHOD

The current research applied the evaluative design with quantitative and qualitative data. The evaluative design used was the Cronbach evaluation approach [13] by evaluating the reorientation of educators on objectives focused on better program policies. The evaluation also focused on the accreditation approach in accordance with Indonesia's Minister of Education Regulation No. 16 of 2007 and the responsive evaluation approach [14]. The evaluation model consisted of quantitative evaluation of the activities of master students of Special Education program in the FEP process and qualitative evaluation of student responses related to the implementation of the FEP program. Quantitative evaluation was obtained from questionnaires for teaching tutors. Qualitative evaluation was obtained from the responses of students in the class of 2014 and 2015 related to the quality of preparation, the performance of supervisors, lecturer, and teaching tutors, as well as the facilities supporting the learning process. The research was done in 8 eight months from May to December 2016, and was held in the second semester for the preparation of instruments and in the first semester for the stages of data collection and reporting of results. The stages of evaluative research began with compiling instruments. The stages of the process began by calculating student assessment scores while implementing FEP according to the assessment criteria in implementing FEP. Furthermore, distributing questionnaires to teachers and students to obtain data on the effectiveness of the FEP program refers to four competencies (pedagogic, professional, social, and personality). Data were processed using a computer. The stages of obtaining response data related to the implementation of the FEP program were carried out by conducting interviews and giving questionnaires to students to be able to describe qualitatively the preparation, performance of supervisors, lecturer, and teaching tutors. In general, the evaluation process that will be carried out was as follows: (1) Preparing evaluation instruments, (2) Determining research samples, (3) Implementing evaluation processes using prepared instruments, (4) Processing evaluation data, (5) Formulating the recommendations based on evaluation results and reporting process. Moreover, the flowchart of evaluative research refers to the approach of Cronbach [13]and Stake [14].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the research on the pedagogical competency of masters students of Special Education Program of Universitas Negeri Surabaya (Unesa) on the implementation of the FEP in 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 joint classes of 66 students and 62 regular students through the evaluation results of the teaching were presented on Table 1. Moreover, indicator aspects refer to the Indonesia's Minister of Education Regulation No. 16 of 2007 [2].

TABLE I THE RESULTS OF THE PEDAGOGIC COMPETENCE OF FEP'S STUDENTS BY THE TEACHING TUTORS

No.	Rated aspect	Respondent's Average Value
		8 teachers, 66 students
Pedagodic Competence		
1.	Master the characteristics of the students in the aspect of physical, intellectual , socio-emotional ,moral, spiritual, and socio-cultural background.	

No.	Rated aspect	Respondent's Average Value
		8 teachers, 66 students
1.1	Understand the characteristics of the school-aged students in the aspect of physical, intellectual , socio-emotional ,moral, spiritual, and socio-cultural background.	5
1.2	Identify the potentials of the students	4.1
1.3	Identify the ability of the students	4.1
1.4	Identify the students' learning difficulties	4.6
2.	Mastering the theory of learning and principles of learning	
2.1	Understand various theory of learning and principles of learning	4.5
2.2	Apply vityvarious approaches , strategies , methods and techniques to educate creatively	4.7
2.3	Apply the thematic learning approach	4.3
3	Develop a curriculum related to the subject / field of development that is being taught	
3.1	Understand the principles of curriculum development	4
3.2	Arrange the learning goals which are relevant with the students' characters	4.5
3.3	Determine the learning experience which are relevant with the children with special needs	4.6
3.4	Choose appropriate materials for the children with special needs	4.7
3.5	Arrange the learning content appropriately in accordance with the selected approach and students' characters	4.2
3.6	Develop indicators and evaluation instrument	4.2
4.	Organizing learning experience	
4.1	Understand learning preinciples	4.2
4.2	Develop the components of learning plan	4.3
4.3	Arrange the complete lesson plan for in class and out class activities	4.4
4.4	Doing learning that educates in class and out class	4.4
4.5	Using learning media corresponding with the characteristic of the student	4.2
5.	Utilizing information and communication technology for the benefit of learning.	
5.1	Make use of informational and commun icational technology in learning	4.2
6.	Facilitating the development of potential students to actualize their various potentials	
6.1	Provide various learning to support the students' learning achievement optimally.	4.6
6.2	Provide various learning activities learning for actualizing the stduents' potentials including their creativity Communicate effectively, empathetically,and politely with the student	4.3
7.1	Understand the various strategy to communicate effectively, empathetically,and politely in oral or written ways	4.3
7.2	Communicate effectively, empathetically,and politely with the student using the typical language during the learning process	4.3
8.	Organize the assessment and evaluation of learning processes and results	
8.1	Understand principles of assessment and evaluation of processes and learning result in accordance with the characteristics of students with special needs	4.7
8.2	Determine the aspects of process and learning results which are essential to be evaluated.	4.2
8.3	Determine the assessment procedure evaluation of processes and learning results	4.2
8.4	Develop the instrument for assessment and evaluation of processes and learning result	4.4
8.5	Administer the evaluation of	4

No.	Rated aspect	Respondent's Average Value
		8 teachers, 66 students
	process and learning result	
8.6	Analyze the result of the evaluation of process and learning result	4.2
8.7	Implement the evaluation of process and learning results	4.3
9.	Use the results of assessment and evaluation for the benefit of learning	
9.1	Use the information of learning assessment and evaluation for deciding the learning mastery	4
9.2	Use the information of learning assessment and evaluation to design the remedial and enrichment programs	4.1
9.3	Make use the information of learning assessment and evaluation to improve the quality of learning	4
10.	Implement the reflective action to improve the quality of learning	
10.1	Implement the reflection of the learning	4.8
10.2	Make use the results of reflection for improving and developing the learning process	4.1
	Average	4.4

The overall average value for pedagogic competencies from 66 students is 4.4 which shows that having very good competence. The highest indicator related to the component conducts a reflective action to improve the quality of learning, namely 4.7. The lowest indicator on the component utilizes the results of assessment and evaluation for the benefit of learning, namely 4, this condition is caused by the learning process that is carried out not in the same class but using a moving model class.

IV. Conclusion

In accordance with the results of the questionnaire analysis and the assessment of teaching tutors, as well as student responses related to the implementation of the FEP. It can be concluded that FEP program in the Faculty of Education in 2014 and 2015 classes on the achievement of master students pedagogical competencies were very effective by showing 4.4 average performance, especially concerning the components of understanding the characteristics of students, using the media and reflecting on results of the evaluation.

References

[1] O. Hamalik, “Pendidikan Guru,” *Jakarta PT. Bumi Aksara*, 2003.

[2] M. of Education, *Academic Standards and Teacher Competencies*. Indonesia, 2007.

[3] R. of Indonesia, *Teachers and Lecturers*. Indonesia, 2005.

[4] Y. Chen and L. B. Hoshower, “Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: An assessment of student perception and motivation,” *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 71–88, 2003.

[5] J. R. Slate, K. N. LaPrairie, D. P. Schulte, and A. J. Onwuegbuzie, “Views of effective college faculty: A mixed analysis,” *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 331–346, 2011.

[6] D. P. Ausubel, “The facilitation of meaningful verbal learning in the classroom,” *Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 162–178, 1977.

[7] E. Von Glasersfeld, “Cognition, construction of knowledge, and teaching,” *Synthese*, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 121–140, 1989.

[8] C. B. Schmeiser and C. J. Welch, “Test development,” *Educ. Meas.*, vol. 4, pp. 307–353, 2006.

[9] E. A. Hanushek, *Making schools work: Improving performance and controlling costs*. Brookings Institution Press, 2010.

[10] L. S. Shulman, “Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching,” *Educ. Res.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 4–14, 1986.

[11] W. Carr and S. Kemmis, “Becoming Critical: Education,” *Knowl. Action Res. London Falmer*, 1986.

[12] R. E. Slavin, “Cooperative learning and student achievement,” *Educ. Leadersh.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 31–33, 1988.

[13] L. J. Cronbach, “Evaluation for course improvement,” *Teach. Coll. Rec.*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 672–683, 1963.

[14] R. E. Stake, “Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation,” in *Evaluation models*, Springer, 1983, pp. 287–310.