

paradigm and approving the subject-subject paradigm of social organization as the basis for forming a new type of understanding of the essence of education.

Key words: education, upbringing, pandemic, subject-object paradigm, subject-subject paradigm, distance learning technologies, social space, social time

Сведения об авторах:

Шуматов Эльдар Галимжанович, кандидат философских наук, исполняющий обязанности начальника кафедры Кокшетауского технического института Министерства по чрезвычайным ситуациям Республики Казахстан.

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Шуматов Эльдар Галимжанович, философия ғылымдарының кандидаты, Қазақстан Республикасы Төтенше жағдайлар министрлігі Көкшетау техникалық институты кафедрасы бастығының міндетін атқарушы

About author:

Shumatov Eldar Galimzhanovich, PhD, acting head of the Department of Kokshetau technical Institute of the Ministry of emergency situations of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

УДК 37.06

Ratih Adiputri¹

University of Jyväskylä (JYU), Finland

**GLOBAL EDUCATION POLICY ON ASSESSMENT AND ITS APPLICATION
IN INDONESIA (LEARNING FROM THE FINNISH EDUCATION SYSTEM)**

Abstract. *Replacing the standardized National Test, the new policy of the Indonesian Ministry for Education and Culture introduces a Minimum Competency Assessment. It looks good on paper but show potential weakness. A dominant theme in this assessment policy announcement so far has been related to its “survey” type of assessment, which clearly follow the global education policy, like PIA, TIMSS and NAPLAN. The assessment will completely change the assessment practices in Indonesia. Moreover, this assessment system will affect all elementary and high-school students, while the international survey, like PISA test, are proposed for certain target groups, for example elementary students, notably for 15-year olds, and **not** for high-school students.*

The paper outlines the content of the new policy and its weaknesses. Particular attention is paid to the implied result based on international ‘policy borrowing’ and the extent to which the system might be unable to incorporate these features. The possible impact of such an assessment system on teaching in schools is also considered, along with the role teachers might play in carrying out the assessment. Finally, a recommendation for assessing students in the Indonesian context, based on Finnish education system is proposed.

Key words: *Indonesia, assessment, global education policy, AKM, Finnish education system*

¹ Dept. Social Sciences and Philosophy, PO BOX 35 (Opinkivi), FI-40014 Jyväskylän Yliopisto, Finland. Email: ratih.adiputri@juu.fi. I wrote this paper as the author of popular book in Indonesian language “Finnish Education System: note and experience from a mother” [*Sistem Pendidikan Finlandia: Catatan dan Pengalaman seorang Ibu*] (KPG Jakarta, 2019) and as the lecturer for the course “International Education Policy and Practices”, a master-degree lecture at the Education Science department (Faculty of Education and Psychology), JYU.

Introduction

According to the World Bank report on Equity, children that cannot learn and understand simple texts by the age of 10, in low and middle income countries has increased during the Covid19 pandemic, from 53% to 63% (Alasuutari, 2020). Such “learning poverty” is worrying. In Indonesia, as a middle income country, even around 40% of students have not been able to attend school, to access distance education, during the pandemic (Korpi, 2020). Indeed, the Covid19 pandemic has widened the gap between high and low-middle income countries. The high income countries; with good infrastructure, a relatively reliable internet connection and education support; are capable to continue distance education by using the new information technologies, while low and middle income countries have found difficulties in lowering the number of increased health corona cases, thus facing complications in delivering effective education, especially when distance learning technology is necessary.

The global education policy this year tries to cover the *innovation* and *vessels* to deliver good education, but the data revealed by the HundrEd organization¹ shows that countries are interested in “pedagogical practices and solution rather than devices and online tools, or *vessels*, to deliver the education” (Leponiemi, 2020). Again, this is relevant to the Indonesian case. The Indonesian ministry of education has delivered mobile data credit and internet quota to students at all levels of education to support distance education, but instead of focusing on modernizing such distant learning² or digitalization to be accessible to all students, the recent policy has focused on another ‘pedagogical practice, that is introducing a new policy of assessment!

The new Indonesian *Asesmen Kompetensi Minimum/AKM* or Minimum Competency Assessment is a new education policy from the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture, introduced on 14 October 2020. This AKM program is an assessment as a survey intended for school students grade 5, 8 and 11 (both primary to high school levels). The assessment focuses on literacy and numeracy, but also investigates characters and the learning environment. The Education Ministry vows to upgrade the quality of education in Indonesia with tagline “accommodate the ability of future generation to face 21st century” (*mengakomodasi penerus bangsa yang mampu menghadapi abad 21*).

With this policy, it appears Indonesia has not only been uninterested in modernizing distance learning quality, but it also faces a degradation of education, if this survey-type of assessment is applied. The AKM is degrading, a backward step of the previous assessment system because students do not have an individual assessment in their learning process, as a survey type of assessment benefits the government rather than the students education, especially if only random or selected students are chosen, and not all students can be accommodated by the assessment. The previous or current national assessment has not been ideal, but introducing this new AKM will not help to improve education. Instead of modernizing distance education during the Covid19 pandemic for example, the Ministry offers a bold transformation for an assessment policy which completely changes everything. It has not only brought confusion to both teachers/educators and students/parents, but the basic training needed to apply for this new policy to run has not yet been made available.

The aim of this paper is to share concerns that arise from a common approach of assessment and policy borrowing from a global education policy (of survey), particularly the new Indonesia policy of using a survey assessment. It outlines the problems as follows:

- the new assessment covers all students, including high-school students that are young adults whom are ready for competition. A comprehensive individual assessment covering all subjects

¹ <https://hundred.org/en/about>

² The data is not yet available and since the government support is for the internet connection, many students in rural/remote areas whom do not have devices/gadget to use the internet connection, for example, the support is useless.

that high school students seek are needed for entering university study, and not enough are covered if only using a survey based on the AKM policy

- the AKM policy adopts international practices of assessment while neglecting local or national values

In explaining this, the paper will be divided into 3 sections. The following section will describe in detail the Indonesian new education policy on assessment or the AKM. Then, we discuss the concept of assessment itself and the policy borrowing. The AKM assessment follows the international practices utilized in the PISA, TIMS and NAPLAN, which we discuss in brief and show the implications of policy borrowing. Before the conclusion, we look at and compare Finnish education as a model for assessment, based on my book showing the Finnish Education System, from an Indonesian perspective.

Indonesian new education policy on assessment

In Indonesia, the education system is divided into 4 levels:

1. Early childhood education (*pendidikan anak usia dini* or PAUD) for 2-6 years old
2. Elementary schools (*sekolah dasar* or SD), Grade 1-6, for 7-12 years old
3. Lower secondary school (*sekolah menengah pertama* or SMP), Grade 7-9, for 13-15 years old
4. Upper secondary school or high school (*sekolah menengah atas* or SMA), Grade 10-12, for 16-18 years old
5. Higher education such as university or polytechnic level

The school runs from mid-June to mid-July every year (1 month of school holiday and other national holidays, including religious day celebrations). From these four levels of schools, usually by the end of school year, all students in **Grade 6, 9 and 12** would face the National Exam or *Ujian Nasional* or UN, which runs at the same time nationally and the test questions come from the Central Government spread thought-out the country like election ballots.

The students Grade 6, 9 and 12 would perform the national exam as their points determine the eligibility to enter school at the upper level (Grade 6 to enter SMP, Grade 9 to enter SMA, and Grade 12 to enter university, although the university will also require another university entrance exam for students to take, even after having the result of the final high school exam). The competition has been quite high as the students' performance determines the students' chance to enter good public schools, which are more affordable than private schools. However, good grades from the national exam also determine a lower fee for going to private schools, for example.

Because the students' performance has only been determined based on this specific National Exam (called *Ujian Nasional* or UN in Indonesian language), there have been problems: students are stressed due to anxiety and pressure, lower students' cognitive ability and thinking skills and no social emotional aspects included (Qudsyi and Putri, 2016). Moreover, cases such as parents' cheatings (by buying illegal test questions) and teachers/schools disregard of ethics (by giving answers to students to enhance grades and thereby to improve points of the school etc) have been heard often during the time prior to or even during the national exam. It is also not fair, that after around 3 years studying at school, the students' fates are determined by the National Exam, which runs for a few days, instead of observing the students over the entire years of studying and learning. With these problems, for sure, a revised assessment system is urgently needed. Indeed, the Indonesian decay of education must be tackled in all comprehensive manner, not only from the assessment aspect, but also from standardisation, accountability, school facilities, teachers' quality, social supports and budget (Komisi X, 2020).

With the Covid19 pandemic, the National Exam/UN has no longer become a requirement for the students' graduation, and thus the entire assessment from the students 3-years grades (or more) from their class teachers (year-end annual report) has become the assessment tool for students this 2020 year. This is good, and somehow similar to what Finland schools have, as Finnish primary

schools do not have a national exam. In Finland, the only national exam, matriculation test, is introduced in high school to show their learning progress. For other levels, students receive assessment from their class/course teachers. Teachers in Finland, however, are known to be skilful and trustworthy for their pedagogical skills. Teachers must graduate with a masters-degree.

The new assessment, called Minimum Competency Assessment (*Asesmen Kompetensi Minimum* or AKM) will assess *selected*¹ students from Grades 4, 8 and 11, and the test includes literacy, numeracy, surveys on characters and the learning environment. The teachers and school principals² are also assessed in a *survey type* of their learning environment. Focusing on these general skills, like literacy and math, are necessary but we know that these skills only are not sufficient in today's labour market. Moreover, if this survey based assessment is applied to high school students, these students will suffer from having an intensive assessment of their skills that is used for focusing on their higher education whether in vocational (polytechnic) and in academic (university) lessons/courses.

Assessment for “learning with understanding” and policy borrowing

The AKM policy is adopted from the PISA, TIMSS and NAPLAN assessment model (Go, 2020). Let us see one by one what they are. The PISA (*Programme for International Student Assessment*) is an international survey to test students, aged 15-16 years old (or students in **Grade 8 or 9**) for understanding literacy, math and science. This survey is introduced by the OECD (*Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development*, with 36 countries of high-income states seeking innovation to develop welfare and economic growth. The PISA test has been run since the year 2000, conducted every 3 years with the last test conducted in 2018 with 79 states participating.

The TIMSS (*Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study*) and the PIRLS (*Progress In International Reading Literacy Study*)³ are “international assessments that monitor trends in student achievement in mathematics, science, and reading”. This is similar to the PISA and is currently used in around 70 countries who participate in the assessments (conducted since 1995) for every four years for **Grade 4 and 8** students.

Finally, the NAPLAN⁴ (*National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy-*) is the test to assess literacy and numeracy skills for students in Grades **3, 5, 7 and 9!** Thus, all these tests are for primary schools students, maximum 16-years old, testing basic or general skills of literacy and math, sometimes science. They are also survey- based and not all students are required to participate.

Having viewed these international assessments, we learn that they are intended more for primary school students, at the height the lower secondary school, but **not** for upper secondary schools or high school students. Thus, if the AKM assessment is also covering high school students in Indonesia, these students will suffer for not get assessed from ALL aspects of their learning ability, including skills and competence. The simple character of the survey in the AKM assessment, while it has good intentions, will not be useful for high school students, especially for their higher education, or for those who plan to enter universities, especially abroad. What certificate of assessment can they use to show their credits, skills or abilities?

Moreover, this type of survey aimed at random students, means not all students participate in this AKM assessment. This risks de-motivating students towards their own interests as the aspects

¹ The selection of students or random sampling is not yet known whether it is based on social economic background, specific age or skills.

² The reason for this is also still unknown.

³ <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/index.html>

⁴ <https://www.nap.edu.au/naplan>

they are interested in are not measured. It is likely that this AKM survey will serve merely for (country?) statistics, and not for an individual students assessment of learning. We need to maybe step back to understand the concept of assessment.

What is assessment and its purpose? In general understanding, assessment is evaluation, it is needed to promote students learning. According to Kampen (2020), “there’s so much more to assessments than delivering an end-of-unit exam or prepping for a standardized test. Assessments help shape the learning process at all points, and give you insights into student learning”. From six types of assessment, Kampen proposes three purposes of assessments:

1. Assessment *of* learning
2. Assessment *for* learning
3. Assessment *as* learning

First, Assessment *of* learning are usually grade-based (exams, standardized test). It is “a way to find out what students have learned and if they’re aligning to curriculum or grade-level standards”. Meanwhile, second, Assessment *for* learning will provide the teacher “with a clear snapshot of student learning and understanding of the teaching process. It allows teachers during the teaching process to adjust everything from strategies to lesson plans. This should always be ongoing and actionable in their assessments. Finally, with third, Assessment *as* learning: it “actively involves students in the learning process. It teaches critical thinking skills, problem-solving and encourages students to set achievable goals for themselves and objectively measure their progress” (Kampen, 2020).

Harlen and James also point out that “learning with understanding” and an indication that people are able “to translate and interpret what they learn that makes the case for universal schooling” (1997: 367) must describe education. Thus, it is important for learners to be *assessed* whether they have understood and internalised something they learned and therefore, there are two types of assessments. Please also see different types of assessments, from diagnostic, formative, summative, ipsative, norm-referenced and criterion-referenced (Kampen 2020, Harlen and James, 1997 etc.). These different characteristic of assessment importantly must support and encourage learning further. This is what assessment is about. Feedback for both the teacher and students of their present understanding and skill development and it is important to be assessed in order to determine the way forward (Harlen and James, 1997: 369).

It is clearly seen here that the Indonesian AKM assessment does not consider students as the purpose of assessment, but simply as a survey or data collecting solely for the government. While it is part of the assessment’s purpose, the main idea still should be for highlighting the learning development of the students and for the teachers strategies for improvement.

Moreover, in relation to “education transfer” or “policy borrowing” of global education policy, such as the PISA, TIMSS, PIRLS, and NAPLAN, Indonesia’s adoption of important ideas of assessment of literacy, math and science, without acknowledging its own national context, planning strategically and referencing its own cultural frame, so it should be for policy borrowing (McDonald, 2012: 1817). Policy borrowing is indeed common in the globalization era of today, especially if a country is also a member of a global organization as Indonesia is with the ASEAN and G20. However, it is important to note that in borrowing policy, the tendency for middle income countries will be about “uncritical adoption of Western thoughts and models into other countries” implying that the local context is the one needing to adapt to new ideas (ibid, p. 1818). In fact, this issue is part of a concern in global education policy that:

“national institutions and domestic politics are key to understanding, on the one hand, the uneven level of diffusion and penetration of global education policy ideas in different territories, and, on the other, the re-contextualization and (on occasion) the

drastic transformation of such global ideas within local institutions networks of rules, and local practices” (Mundy et al, 2016: 9).

As seen in international tests of the PISA, TIMSS, PIRLS, and NAPLAN assessments, Indonesia is desperate to catch up with *change*, to improve its low standard of international testing by pushing to adopt and respond to global policy of high income countries (say, Western thinking) to find a fast solution. Indonesia seems to follow these international surveys in order to show political credibility following the policy, even though it would probably not be effective in the highly competitive education that Indonesia resides.

Indonesia with its previous system of National Exam/UN, has standardized national tests and students are used to tougher competitions in every level of education, since Grade 6, at least in 4 subjects (math, Indonesian language, English, science, and one additional subject for high school students). School and staff were pushed to be the best compared to others, and even use performance-based payment for teachers. With the introduction of the AKM policy, not only would the tough competition disappear instantly (instead of gradually), the survey-based approach would not be appreciated as it is a survey geared for selected students. The AKM policy will also push only the subjects of literacy, math, and science as the “main determinants of perceived success or failure” for students, teachers and the schools, thus neglecting arts, social science, music, and sport, for example (Sahlberg, 2016: 135). It should be noted that the decay in Indonesia is seen from the low quality of education, despite its increasing budget; the teachers’ certification without proper teaching skills; 89% of schools are under minimal standards (even without public toilets); and only 2% of universities (96 out of 4713) have high proper accreditation (Komisi X, 2020).

Sahlberg (2016: 138-139) outlines a table of common features of the Global Education Reform Movement/GERM: competition and choice; standardization of teaching and learning; focus on reading, mathematics, and science; corporate models of change; and test-based accountability. However, he found out that Finland (with Alberta, Singapore and South Korea) is one of the most successful education systems with a consistent high performance on the PISA test, yet it does not even apply these elements of GERM above (ibid, p. 142). This means that the elements are not treated as “primary drivers of change in an education system”. It is important to find balance between international development policy, while maintaining the local culture at the same time.

Learning from the Finnish education system

Last year, 2019, I published a book about the Finnish Education System from an Indonesian perspective. Writing in the Indonesia language, this is my contribution by telling the personal story of an Indonesian educated in the Finnish education system. The book becomes popular as Indonesians like the content, as it relates to the Indonesian context (the book has been reprinted for second edition and I have been invited to speak in many education webinars and gatherings).

Sahlberg (2016: 142) has written that successful education reform is actually based on:

1. an education system that gives school autonomy over curricula and students assessment.
2. equity. This matters as it gives “universal” early childhood program, comprehensive health (including school meals), special education services in schools and a balanced curriculum with balanced weight in the arts, music, sports and academic studies.
3. school choice and competition do not improve the performance of an education system (to avoid segregation), and high salary teachers (to attract young people to choose teaching as a career)

Relevant to what has been stated above, my book outlines each level of education (early childhood education, primary schools, secondary school, higher education, and special education), with the Finnish philosophy of lifelong learning, school facilities, curricula, teachers’ quality, budget, assessment (personal not based on competition among others), PISA test achievement, and cultural context and its weaknesses (with an Indonesian context) and lesson learnt (Adiputri, 2019).

Indeed, what Sahlberg put in the GERM table, that while the model is usually adopted in many countries (with standardized test, focusing on literacy and numeracy and performance-based), Finland does differently. In Finland, a school has autonomy, flexibility and diversity in developing programs based on the general curricula; the emphasis on wider knowledge including creativity aspects and handcraft; and trustworthiness based on professionalism. This trust is ingrained in teachers, parents, students and the whole of society in such a way that the professionalism shows education merit.

To emphasize on the meaning of “education for all”. In Finland, it means quality education for all people, unlike in Indonesia where I think good education is only meant for those who can afford it giving them accessibility. I could not image if I were to study in primary school today in Indonesia with a low income as my father had, being the sole bread winner. I am sure that I could not have had access to a good basic education.

Even so, I believe the Finnish educational system has its own weaknesses based on my Indonesian perspective. It may work in Finland, but not in Indonesia. I noted the generality that everybody is the same and learning is only for fun, not for excellence. I have this view, probably based on my Indonesian background which favours competition and hierarchy, that sometimes, we need to show hard work to achieve a higher grade and to excel in competition. I don’t see this in Finland.

My teacher of the course, Pasi Ikonen, has said in the class (2019) that “education is about culture. The Finnish education system cannot be copied exactly to other place”. This remark is relevant to the Indonesian case that in order to have a good assessment policy, it can copy the best practices from other countries, but it must be adapted to the local context. Indonesia is known to be rich in culture, if rice irrigation system, batik-making, traditional and religious practices, animal husbandry, traditional music playing (like *angklung* and gamelan orchestra), dancing or any local richness etc. are not taught at schools, because they only emphasized math, literacy and science, these local cultural riches will soon disappear and only be sustained sporadically and for touristic purposes, rather than something to be learned, preserved and renewed in the modern world. These traditional skills can be accredited as school lessons, as in Finland, where in suburban area, the students’ skills in farming or in animal husbandry in their home environment can be recognised as 10 credit lessons in high schools.

Based on my book discussion with many Indonesian readers, apart from the accreditation system above, they were surprised to know also that Finland has only one national exam, which is the matriculation test, during or even after high school. High school students can even take the test whenever they are ready with the exam topic, from the second grade to repeating the national test again when they are not satisfied with the results. It is possible. If only that practice can be adopted in Indonesia! The Indonesian readers also learn that assessment at primary schools does not need to be standardized. It is enough from the class teachers’ assessment and those students do not need to be compared among their classmates in grades and ranking as in Indonesia. This is a huge lesson-learnt for Indonesians whom are used for ranking and competition in all levels of education.

Back to assessment system of the AKM policy, instead of pushing the survey-based system prioritizing only literacy and numeracy, it is better that type of assessment is conducted at a certain time (a year before PISA test, may be?) or every 3 years. A personal assessment for students is still needed, but it needs to be differentiated for primary students. Also the assessment for primary school students, as in Finland, until Grade 9, can be conducted by its own school, class or school teachers only, and not necessarily on a national level. Later the national exams can only be given to all high school students. Students may participate in the test when they are ready for the exam, with more an effective, and less stressful system, and there should be an opportunity for improvement too (a repeated test, for example). In today’s national test, students are only assessed based on

certain lessons, it is probably time to expand the subjects based on a students' personal interest, like in Finland.

Conclusion

From the description above, the Indonesian assessment, the AKM policy posts many weaknesses, that it shows it backwards in assessing Indonesian students. It is wrong to claim that it would foster Indonesian students fitting into the globalized world, as a survey-based assessment of literacy and numeracy skills, while necessary, are not sufficient to face all the world's new challenges including information technology. In order to modernize the education system, Indonesia needs human capital that are needed to address the technological challenge, as the limited AKM policy clearly cannot show Indonesian students skills to face distance education, for example.

Innovation is needed to foster effective assessment system in Indonesia, but definitely not a survey-based system limited to random students. All students (including teachers) need proper assessment, especially young adults like high-school students. The traumatic national exams for all levels of education may be have to be removed, but as the Indonesian education structure has run this system for ages, it should be conducted only for high-school students.

Innovation to standardize the quality of all schools throughout Indonesia is seriously needed. Due to the Covid19 pandemic and the need for distance education as a result, it is obviously necessary for *digitalization* in the education system, as Indonesia has different geographical challenges from the urban to rural areas. Such digitalization may still take time to be accomplished. While modernization of distance education using new information technologies is underway, at least a basic general education system addressing the quality of teachers, school facilities including school meals, standardized tests and consistent curriculum preserving cultural Indonesian heritage can enhance this diverse and multicultural nation which is challenged with addressing change.

REFERENCES

1. Adiputri, Ratih. 2019. *Sistem Pendidikan Finlandia: Catatan dan Pengalaman seorang Ibu* ["Finnish Education System: note and experience of a mother"], In Indonesian language. Jakarta: Penerbit Gramedia/KPG.
2. Alasuutari, Hanna. 2020. "From Learning Poverty to Learning of the Future: Focusing on Equity" Presentation during SDG 4 seminar, General session, Panel Discussion (view from World Bank). University of Jyväskylä 22-23 October. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jyu.fi/edupsy/en/events/sdg4seminar>. Youtube video is available here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cKINuElvV8c&list=PLqiuNximiuwVaDLo4YUgBZ_rYK14S4CI7&index=4&t=26s.
3. Go, Adelina Mulyani. 2020. "Assessment in Indonesia: New Assessment Plan and Assessment in Inclusive Education". Presentation during SDG 4 seminar, Panel B- Inclusion in Indonesian Context. University of Jyväskylä 22-23 October. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jyu.fi/edupsy/en/events/sdg4seminar>
4. Harlen, Wynne and Mary James. 1997. "Assessment and Learning: differences and relationship between formative and summative assessment" in *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practices*, Vol. 4, No. 3, p. 365-379.
5. Kampen, Maria. 2020. "The 6 types of Assessment [+ How to Use Them]" June 23, available in [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/types-of-assessment/>, accessed on 12 November 2020.
6. Komisi X, DPR RI [Indonesian parliament]. 2020, 17 November. Hearing meetings with education experts on *Road map to Education* [in Indonesian language]. Available in [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YfVvWgRXaAI&feature=youtu.be>. Followed streamed on 17.11.2020.
7. Korpi, Anna. "Science and education policies in Asia: Southeast Asian perspective". Presentation during "Asian Studies Days 2020", organized by the Finnish University Network

- for Asian Studies, University of Turku, 6 November 2020. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.asianet.fi/2020/asian-studies-days-2020/>
8. Leponiemi, Lasse. 2020. "Inclusion from HundrEd Organization". Presentation during SDG 4 seminar, General session, Panel Discussion (view from HundrEd organization). University of Jyväskylä 22-23 October. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jyu.fi/edupsy/en/events/sdg4seminar>. Youtube video is available here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cKlNuElvV8c&list=PLqiuNximiuwVaDLo4YUgBZ_rYK14S4Cl7&index=4&t=26s
 9. McDonald, Lex. 2012. "Educational Transfer to Developing Countries: Policy and Skill Facilitation" in *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 69, Pages 1817-1826.
 10. Mundy, Karen; Green, Andy; Lingard, Bob; and Verger, Antoni. 2016. "Introduction: The Globalization of Education Policy – Key Approaches and Debates" in *The Handbook of Global Education Policy*, edited by Karen Mundy, Andy Green, Bob Lingard, and Antoni Verger. Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 1- 20.
 11. Qudsyi, Hazhira and Putri, Meiliza Irma. 2016. "Self-efficacy and anxiety of National Examination among high school students" in *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* no. 217, pp. 268-275.
 12. Sahlberg, Pasi. 2016. "The Global Education Reform Movement and its impact on Schooling" in *The Handbook of Global Education Policy*, edited by Karen Mundy, Andy Green, Bob Lingard, and Antoni Verger. Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 128-144.
 13. [Electronic resource]. URL: www.education-progress.org/en/articles/access/
 14. [Electronic resource]. URL: www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/types-of-assessment/

Рати Адипутри

Глобальная образовательная политика по оцениванию и ее применение в Индонезии (изучение финской системы образования)

Аннотация. Вместо стандартного национального теста новая политика Министерства образования и культуры Индонезии вводит оценку минимальной компетентности. Формально это выглядит хорошо, но реально предполагает потенциальную слабость. До сих пор доминирующей темой в этой представленной реформе о политике оценивания был тип «опросный», который четко соответствует глобальной политике в области образования, такой как PIA, TIMSS и NAPLAN. Данный тип полностью изменит практику оценивания в Индонезии. Более того, эта система оценивания затронет всех учащихся начальной и средней школы, в то время как международные исследования, такие как тест PISA, предлагаются для определенных целевых групп, например, учащихся начальной школы, особенно для 15-летних, а не для учащихся старших классов.

В данной статье излагается содержание новой политики и ее слабые стороны. Особое внимание уделяется предполагаемому результату, основанному на международном «политическом заимствовании», и степени, в которой система может оказаться неспособной включить эти функции. Также рассматривается возможное влияние такой системы оценивания на обучение в школах, а также роль учителей в проведении оценки. Наконец, предлагается рекомендация по оценке учащихся в индонезийском контексте на основе финской системы образования.

Ключевые слова: Индонезия, оценка, глобальная образовательная политика, АКМ, финская система образования

Рати Адипутри

Бағалау бойынша әлемдік білім беру саясаты және оны Индонезияда қолдану (Финляндияның білім беру жүйесін зерттеуінің негізінде)

Аңдатпа. Стандартты ұлттық тесттің орнына Индонезия Білім және мәдениет министрлігінің жаңа саясаты құзыреттіліктің минималды бағалауын енгізеді. Ресми түрде тиімді

көрінеді, бірақ іс жүзінде әлсіз тұстары бар екенін болжайды. Осы уақытқа дейін ұсынылған бағалау саясатын реформалаудағы басым тақырып «сауалнама» түрі болды, ол PIA, TIMSS және NAPLAN сияқты әлемдік білім беру саясатына сәйкес келеді.

Аталған реформа Индонезиядағы бағалау практикасын толығымен өзгертеді. Сонымен қатар осы бағалау жүйесі барлық бастауыш және орта мектеп оқушыларына әсер етеді, ал PISA тесті сияқты халықаралық зерттеулер жоғары сынып оқушылары үшін емес, бастауыш сынып оқушылары, әсіресе 15 жас аралығындағы оқушылар үшін ұсынылады.

Бұл мақалада жаңа саясаттың мазмұны және оның әлсіз жақтары көрсетілген. Халықаралық «саяси алып пайдалану» негізінде жоспарланған нәтижеге және жүйенің осы функцияларды енгізе алмау мүмкіндігіне басты назар аударылады. Сондай-ақ мұндай бағалау жүйесінің мектептердегі оқуға тигізер әсерімен және сол сияқты мұғалімдердің бағалаудағы рөлі туралы айтылады. Дегенмен Финляндияның білім беру жүйесіне негізделген Индонезия жағдайында, студенттерді бағалауға ұсыныс жасалады.

Түйінді сөздер: Индонезия, бағалау, әлемдік білім беру саясаты, АКМ, финдік білім беру жүйесі

Автор туралы:

Рати Адипутри, PhD, әлеуметтік ғылымдар және философия бөлімі, Ювяскюля университеті, Финляндия

Сведения об авторе:

Рати Адипутри, PhD, Департамент Общественных наук и философии, университет Ювяскюля, Финляндия

About author:

Rati Adiputri, PhD, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

УДК 811.161.1

Г.С. Мырзакулова

Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

ТІЛДІ ҚАШЫҚТЫҚТАН ОҚЫТУДЫҢ ӨЗЕКТІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада тілді қашықтықтан оқытудың өзекті мәселелері қарастырылады. Сондай-ақ тілді қашықтықтан оқыту кезінде әртүрлі ақпараттық жүйелерді қолданудың артықшылықтарын түсінуге және көруге оң мүмкіндік береді және білім беру бағдарламаларына жаңа курсты енгізу қажеттілігіне назар аударылады.

Түйінді сөздер: қашықтықтан оқыту, онлайн сабақ, тіл, ақпарат, компьютерлік сауаттылық, платформа

Қазақстандық білім, әлемдегі барлық білім сияқты, бүгінгі таңда ең қиын кезеңдерді бастан өткеруде. Коронавирустық Пандемия бұрынғы ұстанымдар мен дәстүрлі тәсілдерді өзгертті. Жекелеген оқу орындарының қашықтықтан оқыту технологияларын тез және сапалы енгізуге дайын еместігі, интернетке қолжетімділіктің әлсіздігі, компьютерлік бағдарламаларды тұтынушылардың көпшілігінің интернет платформаларын белсенді қосуға