The Curriculum of Inclusion Education at Madrasah Educational Institutions in Indonesia

A.M. Wibowo[1], **Fakhruddin**[2], **Joko Sutarto**[3], **Titi Prihatin**[4]

[1,2,3,4]Postgraduate of Educational Management, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
Email: [1]amwibowo@student.unnes.ac.id, [2] fakhruddin@mail.unnes.ac.id, [3]jokotarto@mail.unnes.ac.id,[4]Email: titiprihatin@mail.unnes.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the article is to discussed the reality of developing the curriculum of inclusive education at madrasah as formal educational institutions in Indonesia. Since 2016, madrasah have administrated inclusive education programs, which was through the regulation of the Decree of the Directorate of Islamic Education No. 3211 in 2016. After 5 years of the program, the article intended to evaluate the development and implementation of inclusive education curricula in madrasah, which included the participation of educational components in content standards, process standards, and assessment standards. The benchmarking method was used in the research. And, it was found out that, the inclusive education curriculum in inclusive madrasah as educational institutions was developed by inviting the participation of the MI Principal, teachers, madrasah committees, madrasah supervisors, and foundations, but the role of counselors and assessors have not been involved on inclusive education. The curriculum was structured in two models, namely the regular curriculum model and the individual learning model for students with special needs. The teachers have also been participated and implemented the content standards, process standards, and assessment activities of inclusive education in madrasah.

Keywords: Benchmarking, Curriculum, Education, Evaluation, Inclusion, Madrasah

I. INTRODUCTION

Education is a human right, that is guaranteed by religion, the Declaration of Human Rights, and the Constitution in every country, including Indonesia. But, the implementation of the vision of education for all has not been yet touched all the students, especially students with special needs. Many citizens, especially children with special needs, have not received the right to education, such as the case in the Solomon Islands (1), Turkey (2), Australia (3) (4) United Kingdom (5), European (6), Arab, and Indonesia (7)(8)(9) Then, children with special needs need a lot of struggles to have justice in accessing education.

In Indonesia, Central Statistics Agency (BPS) in 2017 reported that 1.6 million children are children with special needs. By that number, only 30% have received an education, and 18% of them have received inclusive education (10). The small number of children with special needs who receive an education is caused by various factors, such as an un-ideal curriculum

for inclusive education, poor inclusive academic management, infrastructure, number of teachers, and the negative stigma of society towards children with special needs (11)(7)(12).

The teacher's competency is also a problem, especially when understanding the characteristics of students with special needs, and how to design individual learning programs for students (13). Many teachers believe the development of an inclusive curriculum is not the responsibility of the teacher but lies on the government (14). The government's efforts are also assumed not optimal in providing educational services for students with special needs, especially in the standards and indexes of inclusive education which, currently, there are none in Indonesia (15).

Ideally, a curriculum on inclusive education aims to provide the widest opportunity for all students either with physical, emotional, mental, and social disabilities, or students who have the potential for academic and talents to obtain a quality education, according to the needs and abilities (16)(17). Adopting Tyler (1949), four goals in the curriculum development on inclusive education are; ducational goals, educational experiences to achieve the educational goals, organizing educational experiences, and determining the achieved goals of inclusive education. The end goal is, the students with special needs have a proper education like other regular students (19).

Madrasah is a formal education institution in Indonesia. Madrasah is one of the pillars in the implementation of Law No. 20 of 2003 on the Indonesian National Education system. In Indonesia, there is a dichotomy on the administration of educational institutions, which is under the Ministry of Education and Culture, and the Ministry of Religion. The Ministry of Education and Culture administrates Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, And Senior High Schools. Moreover, the Ministry of Religion administrates Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, Madrasah Tsanawiyah, and Madrasah Aliyah. The similarity is that both of them use the national education curriculum for general subjects. Meanwhile, the difference is in Islamic education subjects, which are divided into 4 subjects, and added by Arabic subject.

Discussing the regulation aspect in Indonesia, inclusive education in madrasah is regulated by the government through the issuance of the Decree of the Director General of Islamic Education No. 3211 of 2016 on the establishment of twenty two 22 Madrasah on inclusive programs, that spread across 5 provinces in Indonesia. Currently, the regulation has been running for five years. Then, it needs to be evaluated. Because, the curriculum on inclusive education in madrasah is a strategy to realize education for all, as well as is responsive to the various educational needs of students with special needs who have been marginalized (20)(21).

This article intends to evaluate the development of the curriculum on inclusive education and its implementation in madrasah for five years. The evaluation is related to who and how the curriculum is developed in the madrasah. There are 51.452 schools of Madrasah from 2019 to 2021. Of this number, only twenty two madrasahs have implemented inclusive education programs, including eighteen madrasas ibtidaiyah (MI) at the elementary school level, 2 Madrasah Tsanawiyah (junior high school level), and 2 Madrasah Aliyah (high school level) (22)(23).

This evaluation research on inclusive education curriculum was conducted at the MI level in Central Java province like in district Semarang, Banyumas, Kebumen, and Sukoharjo. These four schools are the first generation of inclusion programs in Indonesia. The evaluation aims to know the question, how does the curriculum of inclusive education structured on content standards, process standards, and student assessment standards by principals and teachers. This evaluation could be the scientific evidence to decide whether the curriculum needs to be preserved or improved so that the curriculum becomes better.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Inclusive education is the agenda of education for all. It prioritizes justice and quality, as well as equal rights of every student. But, a recent study finds out that the education system on Special Schools (SLB) built a wall of exclusivity for children with special needs (24)(25)(7). Inclusive education with a good curriculum is a solution to create a fun, friendly school environment and foster confidence among students with special needs (26) by using adaptive technology (27).

The factor of failure or success of inclusive education is not only on the curriculum but also the management of education administration. The current inclusive madrasah curriculum is still very simple (28). Teachers have not been able to translate the inclusive education curriculum for students with various special needs, into inclusive teaching practices (29)(30)(17). The inclusive curriculum serves as a guide to lead the educational policies and programs into the classroom level (24)(31). It is a major challenge for stakeholders to develop the curriculum, such as MI teachers at the regional, national, and local levels to ensure future educational progress (31). Madrasas have an advantage compared to public schools, that madrasas not only teach general subjects but also Islamic Education subjects on a wider scale. For example, Hadith and the Quran, Arabic, Fiqh, Theology and Islamic Character (ethics), and Islamic Cultural History. In the output, religion learning is more comprehensive and in-depth (32).

The curriculum on inclusive education is simply described as a set of learning plans to strengthen the awareness that, human is individual who are diverse in social, cultural, and physical conditions, intending to prepare students to interact with diverse populations (33). Everything that has been planned, organized, and implemented in the curriculum needs to be evaluated in terms of appropriateness between the curriculum and goals in the organization (34). The evaluation of the curriculum on inclusive education in Madrasah is closely related to the problems of increasing the innovation diffusion in the quality of madrasah as educational institutions, and the management itself. The goal, the curriculum can be accepted and welcomed by the community (35). Also, it is closely related to efforts to develop diverse students, following the goals that are written in a document containing the vision and mission, fundamental goals, organizing learning experiences, and evaluation (36)(18).

The development of curriculum on inclusive education at madrasah is monitored through madrasah self-evaluation. Madrasah Self-Evaluation is a process of assessing the quality of education at the madrasah level based on the 8 indicators on National Education Standards.

Through self-evaluation, madrasah may identify aspects that need to be improved, and the strengths and weaknesses. The results were used as material to determine the types of priority programs for improvement and development plans as outlined in the madrasah work plan and budget.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted at four MI schools that implemented inclusion programs in the province of Central Java.. The MI schoolare MI Keji, MIM PK Sukoharjo, MI Sidomulyo, and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan. The main focus was the evaluation of the development of the educational curriculum in inclusive education at the MI level.

The research instrument consisted of an evaluation questionnaire for MI principals and teachers about their participation in developing the curriculum, syllabus, and lesson plans. Also, it evaluated teacher participation in the development of content standards, process standards, facilities, and infrastructure standards. The curriculum and syllabus review instruments consisted of the number of competency standards and basic competencies of each subject in school, they were the suitability between competency standards, standard content, activities learning assessment subject, learning activities and time allocation, resources of learning, and the developing syllabus at each grade level. The evaluation on the implementation activities of the learning plan included the elements in the learning plan document prepared by the teacher, namely the relationship between the learning implementation plan components and the syllabus, and learning feasibility activities.

Evaluation of curriculum development was carried out using benchmarking methods through interviews, observation, documentation, and questionnaire techniques. Interviews were conducted to explore qualitative data, namely the compatibility between MI policies and inclusive education programs, such as the vision and mission, educators and education personnel, and supporting and inhibiting factors in the implementation of inclusive education. In the interview method, the researcher acted as a key instrument (37). The documentation method aimed to see the suitability among curriculum documents, educational facilities and infrastructure, teacher competencies, and inclusive programs. The questionnaire method was conducted to collect data on the suitability of curriculum development and inclusive education programs.

The information from the curriculum evaluation was interpreted qualitatively to obtain descriptions on the quality of the curriculum on inclusive education at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah that administrated the inclusive program. The analysis output was a description of the strengths and weaknesses of the inclusive education curriculum at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah that implement the inclusive program. And, it concluded to improve the curriculum on inclusive education at the madrasah Ibtidaiyah level.

IV. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Overview of research site

The four schools at the MI level as the research site have officially administrated inclusion programs in madrasah as educational institutions through the regulation of the Decree of the Director General of Islamic Education Number 3211 of 2016. The similarity of the four educational institutions was that the schools had accepted and had students with special needs, far before they enacted the inclusion program regulations. The implementation of inclusion-based education programs at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah requires a development process, starting from human resources, facilities infrastructure, and so on. The diffusion process of inclusive program innovations, especially in madrasah, requires several stages of development, such as strengthening teachers and management that are supported by the social conditions of the surrounding community, as the findings of previous authors (38). In implementing the inclusive education program, MI developed four stepswhich are; a) based on the number of students with special needs, b) the discussion among madrasah, foundations, and the community, c) the decision to administrate an inclusive madrasah education program, and d) accelerating the process of accepting community innovation to support the inclusion program by involving opinion leaders, such as religious and community leaders around the madrasah.

The social structure of the community around the school tends to be the largest religious community organizations in Indonesia, such as Nahdlotul Ulama and Muhammadiyah. The organization strongly supports the school. The characteristics of rural communities in the social system prefer pesantren-style education and believe in the opinion of their leaders may influence the acceleration of the process of diffusion and innovation of the inclusion programs. The diffusion process and innovation include four stages, namely dialogue, access, structure, and flexibility (39).

The acceptance of new students is carried out in several steps, namely academic calendar, the age for normal students, the capacity, and the location of students' domicile with the schools. Assessments and psychological tests were conducted for children with special needs, both intellectually and physically. The tests aim to identify the initial conditions and the needs of students to provide appropriate treatment for learning.

Types of Special Needs on MI Inclusion

The research succeeded in identifying the types of students with special needs in four schools at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah level that administrated inclusive education. The highest percentage number of students with special needs is in MI Keji with 12.5%. MI Sidomulyo only serves 6.9% of students with special needs. Meanwhile, MIM PK Sukoharjo serves 5.05% and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan serves 4.47% of students with special needs.

From the four schools of the object, only MI Salafiyah Kebarongan Banyumas did not have a shadow teacher or special assistance teacher. In this condition, students with special needs are only accompanied by common teachers and they added additional tasks to teach students with

special needs. MI Keji has 6 shadow teachers. Meanwhile, MI Sidomulyo has 3 shadow teachers. And, MIM PK Sukoharjo has 27 shadow teachers.

Unfortunately, most of the shadow teachers for inclusive in MI do not have a special educational background. The competence is obtained through training by local, national, and international institutions in the field of special education. For example, special schools, Autism foundations to training from international institutions such as UNICEF and AUSAID.

Benchmarking of Curriculum Evaluation on Madrasah Inclusive Education

Benchmarking of evaluation on content standards contains the participation of the various parties in the curriculum development in Madrasah which includes of parties in developing the curriculum, reference documents, the ways or step in developing the curriculum, and the determination of the learning load. The results of the questionnaire are the curriculum development never invited an assessor for inclusive education. The role of education assessors is only on the initial assessment of student admissions, conducted at the beginning of the school year. But, not all objects implement it. Involving assessors in an assessment needs a lot of budgets that are not covered by the madrasah budget. Curriculum development invites the participation of elements, including Principals, teachers, madrasah committees, madrasah supervisors, and foundations. The participation aims to establish content standards, graduate competency standards, learning process standards, and assessment standards, which will use as guidelines for implementing inclusive education in madrasah. Based on the evaluation questionnaire, found that MI Keji and MIM PK Sukoharjo referred to the guidelines of the Indonesian National Education Standards Agency. The other object has modified the curriculum set by the Indonesian National Education Standards Agency.

Moreover, each school's subject applies a different learning load, such as based on 3 criterias or 6 criterias. They use a thematic approach for grades I to grade III and a subject approach for grades IV to VI.

Processes standards on regular and inclusive education

The process standard includes the availability of a syllabus for each subject, starting from grade I to class VI. The subject from grade I to grade III consists of thematic lessons, religion, sports, local content, and self-development. The syllabus in grades IV to grade VI consists of religion, Civics, Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian), Mathematics, Science, Social Sciences, Cultural Arts and skills, sports, and local content.

In terms of the standard process, there are some differences between MI with one another. For example, MI Keji and MI Sidomulyo Kebumen have a syllabus for each subject, starting from religious education, Civics, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Social Studies, Physical Education, cultural arts, local content, and self-development. Meanwhile, the syllabus in MIM PK Sukoharjo and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan is still incorporated in thematic subjects, religious education, but special subjects such as Mathematics, Indonesian, and Social Sciences have no specific syllabus.

In terms of developing talents and interests, each MI has its method and way. The development of talents and interests is carried out using an individual learning program (PPI) for students with special needs to train their non-academic potential. For example, there are students with slow learner conditions. They are very difficult to write, their hands droop limply when asked to write, but they are very excited to drum (percussion) instruments. They can play drums for more than two hours with occasional breaks. So, the ability to play musical instruments is developed by the teacher. Some students are very weak academically but it is very easy to memorize short letters in the Quran. Moreover, the ability is better than other regular children's, so the teacher developed the ability to memorize the Quran. The development of talents and interests is mostly carried out in the school's facilities, such as the Islamic boarding school in MI Keji, Semarang Regency. However, several other subjects only have limited source space, un-optimal use of the source space because they do not have complete facilities, unlike in MI Keji.

The participation of teachers and principals in the development the content standards of a curriculum includes 6 things, namely in compiling a curriculum on the religious subject and noble character, citizenship and personality, science and technology, and aesthetic material. Table 1 shows the participation of teachers in the content standards of the curriculum.

Table 1 Self-evaluation of the teacher's participation on the development of content standards

MI Inclusion	Teacher's participation on the development of inclusive curriculum	
	Participate	Not
MI Keji	75 %	25 %
MIM PK Sukoharjo	31.25 %	68.75 %
MI Maarif Sidomulyo	100 %	-
MI Salafiyah Kebarongan	31.25 %	68.75 %

Table 1 shows the teacher's participation in developing content standards on the curriculum. For example, teachers' participation in MI Keji and MI Sidomulyo, in developing the content standards. Some teachers even claim to be involved in developing the substance more than one subject. Meanwhile, teachers' participation in MIM PK Sukoharjo and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan in curriculum development is only 31.25%.

Developing material in the subject group conducted by the teacher includes the number of document implementation plans for each subject as well as the appropriateness of the madrasah textbook and the syllabus. The research found that the average number of documents of learning implementation plan prepared by the teacher in each subject is 6 to 11 documents. Meanwhile, the teachers' judgment of the madrasah textbook and syllabus were appropriate (44,96%), partially appropriate (45,37%), and not appropriate (10,31%).

Evaluation of learning preparation activities

Evaluation of learning preparation activities for teachers on inclusive MI includes the use of teachers' guidelines for inclusive education, preparation of syllabus and lesson plans, selecting the textbooks by teachers, review of textbooks and preparation of teacher teaching materials following to students' characteristics. The research show that in the learning preparation process, some teachers have used the assessment guideline for students with special needs, conducted a review of syllabus and lesson plans, selected the teaching materials, and developed teaching materials following the students' characteristics.

Then, the process is supervised by the principal. The evaluation provided by the principal includes the document of teachers' lesson plan, the implementation of the learning document, and the assessment of student learning outcomes. In reality, teachers believe that generally, principals are evenly distributed in these three aspects with a certain time-frequency and model. Supervision is carried out by the principal with the method of observation, giving notes, recording documentation, interviews, focused discussions, and giving examples. In more detail, the monitoring and supervision process is carried out by the principal and presented in table 2.

Table 2 Monitoring and supervision by principals

MI	Giving example	FGD	Observation	giving Note	Interview	Documentation
MI Keji	2,5 %	5 %	30 %	20 %	12,5 %	30 %
MIM Sukoharjo	2,56 %	17,95 %	25,64 %	25,64 %	7,69 %	20,51 %
MI Sidomulyo	8,11 %	5,41 %	29,73 %	16,22 %	8,11 %	32,43 %
MI Salafiyah Kebarongan	2,56 %	17,95 %	25,64 %	25,64 %	7,69 %	20,51 %
Average	3,93 %	11,58 %	27,75 %	21,87 %	9 %	25,86 %

Table 2 show that most of the supervision conducted by principals to teachers is carried out through observation, that is in terms of appropriateness of the curriculum and implementation. Another supervision model is carried out on the curriculum documentation prepared by the teacher and provides notes by the principal. The supervision model of the interview, FGD, and giving examples are rarely done by the principal to teachers. The frequency of supervision, carried out by the principal to teachers from all subjects of the study, is mostly carried out twice a year. It is seldom for teachers to be supervised once a year.

The evaluation of the management standard for the inclusion program is based on benchmarking the self-evaluation of the teacher and principal. Most of the principals and teachers stated that the curriculum of education unit level in each madrasah was developed by including the vision of inclusion through the regular education model and individual learning program. It becomes the four-year work plans and annual work plans prepared by each MI.

However, some research subjects consider the opinion of the madrasah committee in developing madrasah work, both work plans and budgets. They are MI Keji and MIM PK to accommodate the opinion of the madrasah committee. Meanwhile, MI Sidomulyo and MI Salafiyah Kebarongan are less sensitive to proposals from the Madrasah Committee.

Curriculum evaluation at MI that implements inclusion programs on assessment standards is carried out by benchmarking self-evaluation of the activities process of the teacher assessment plans and the preparation of the assessment rubrics. For example, making academic assessment sheets, daily test rubrics, character assessment rubrics, rubrics for skills, and rubrics for activity observation. Not only the evaluation on the student assessment rubric but also evaluation of the assessment standards is also carried out to assess how teachers assess, use and report the learning outcomes. The evaluation result of the assessment standard is carried out by teachers, and presented in table 3.

Table 3 evaluation of assessment standards by teachers

Teacher assessment form	Yes (%)	No (%)
Test (student cognitive assessment)	89,83	10,16
Behavioral observation sheet (student affection assessment)	84,74	15,25
Observation sheet (student psychomotor assessment)	89,83	10,16
Evidence of student performance	88,13	11,86
Compose a guideline of questions	81,35	18,64
Write the questions	100	0
Review the questions	61,01	38,98
Observation sheet for student affection	84,74	15,25
Observation sheet for Student psychomotor	76,27	23,72
Activity observation sheet	79,66	20,33
Analyzing the assessment results	69,49	30,50
Using the assessment results for student progress	81,35	18,64
Report the results of behavior assessment to religious teachers	83,05	16,94
Report the results of character assessment to Civics teachers	76,27	23,72

Table 3 shows the assessment standard for teachers at inclusive MI uses 14 criteria, namely tests, observation sheets, portfolios, compiling guidelines, writing questions, reviewing exam questions, making behavioral observation sheets, making psychomotor observation sheets, making activity observation sheets, carrying out assessment results, using the assessment results, making reports on the results of affective assessments to religious teachers, and report the results of character assessments to Civics teachers. All the teachers (100%) only conduct one assessment standard of the fourteen points standard, namely compiling test items. About 80-89% of teacher also makes the tests of learning outcomes, making observation sheets for process skills, giving assignments in a portfolio for the students' performance, making observation sheets to assess student behavior, making behavioral observation sheets, and compiling question guidelines. Teachers also conduct assessments through the sheets of activity and skill observation is 70% to 79%.

Based on the data collection, generally, the curriculum of MI that implements inclusion programs is the same as other regular MI, including core competencies, basic competencies, and lesson plans. In core competencies, all thematic and subject separately consist of four core competencies, such as spiritual, social, knowledge, and skills. But, in basic competencies, there are differences in the number of basic competencies in the same subjects (thematics) in each MI.

Moreover, the most prominent difference is individual learning tools. The tools are used to help children with special needs when they encounter difficulties. The tools are varies and differents from one school to another, depending on the type of students with special needs. This program is sometimes only a form of curriculum administration, but at the practical level, it is not used. For example, the tool is not even compiled by the teacher at MI Kebarongan because there is no shadow teacher for students with special needs. Meanwhile, the tool in MI Sidomulyo is not work well as the students with special need is not join the regular class during the learning hours. There is no interaction between regular students and students with special needs. The fact made the three shadow teachers overwhelmed in teaching. Different from MIM PK Sukoharjo and MI Keji, in Semarang Regency, both individual learning tools and implementation can run well. For example in MIM PK Sukoharjo, each student with special needs has a shadow teacher who accompanies them, both inside and outside the classroom. The success of implementation is supported by the fact that almost all teachers often receive training on growth and development and education for students with special needs. Moreover, individual learning activities are also given at night at an inclusive boarding school.

From 2020 until mid-August 2021, face-to-face learning programs in madrasah are fully stopping during the pandemic of COVID-19. The curriculum for inclusive MI uses an emergent curriculum that automatically changes the learning process from face-to-face to online learning. The changes have an impact on the learning process. Based on the data, only MI Keji implemented the individual learning tool for children with special needs. The tool is carried out by ways of visiting them at homes or collaborating with parents by developing a learning framework for parents. The tool contains information about students, types of special needs, academic/cognitive therapists, and how to stimulate children.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation of the curriculum for inclusive education at the MI level, it obtained three conclusions. First, the development of the curriculum for inclusive education at MI has invited the participation of the principal, teachers, committees of educational institutions, madrasah supervisors, but counselors and assessors for inclusive education are not participating.

The second, the development of the curriculum for inclusive education at MI, the committee has used the regular curriculum and considered the needs of students with special needs in learning. However, it found a discrepancy between textbooks in madrasah and the syllabus prepared by teachers. And, the talents and interests of students with special needs are developed in the non-academic field through an individual learning tool.

The third, the teachers have been participated and implemented content standards, process standards, learning management, and inclusive education assessment activities. The teacher's participation is seen in both documents for regular education programs and an individual learning tool for children with special needs.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Kilinc S. Who will fit in with whom?' Inclusive education struggles for students with dis/abilities. Int J Incl Educ [Internet]. 2019;23(12):1296–314. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13603116.2018.1447612
2. King, Julie NEHW and SH. Barriers to disability-inclusive disaster management in the Solomon Islands: Perspectives of people with disability. Int J Disaster Risk Reduct. 2019;34:459–66.
3. Forlin C. Inclusive Education in Australia ten years after Salamanca. Eur J Psychol Educ. 2006;XXI(3):265–77.
4. Forlin C. Issues of inclusive education in the 21st century. J Learn Sci [Internet]. 2013;6:67–81. Available at: https://ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/files/public/3/35243/20141016204633474404/JEducSci_6_67.pdf
5. Florian L, Black-Hawkins K, Martyn Rouse. Achievement and Inclusion in Schools. London and New York: Routledge; 2017.
6. Bartolo PA, Kyriazopoulou M, Björck-Åkesson E, Giné C. An adapted ecosystem model for inclusive early childhood education: a qualitative cross European study. Int J Sch Educ Psychol [Internet]. 02 Ocak 2021;9(1):3–15. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21683603.2019.1637311
7. Darma IP; BR. Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Inklusi di Indonesia. Içinde: Prosiding Penelitian dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat [Internet]. Universitas Padjajaran; 2015. s. 223–7. Available at: http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/prosiding/article/view/13530/6317
8. MoEC M of E and C. Gambaran Sekolah Inklusif Di Indonesia Tinjauan Sekolah Menengah Pertama [Internet]. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Pusat Data Dan Statistik Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Jakarta; 2016. Available at: http://publikasi.data.kemdikbud.go.id/uploadDir/isi_14D0F106-F4EE-486B-A74F-84A191B4AD25_.pdf
9. Hafiz A. Sejarah dan Perkembangan Pendidikan Inklusif di Indonesia. J As-Salam [Internet]. 2017;1(3):9–15. Available at: https://jurnal-assalam.org/index.php/JAS/article/view/14/11
10. Minsitry of Education and culture of The Republic Indonesia. Sekolah Inklusi dan Pembangunan SLB Dukung Pendidikan Inklusi. Şubat 2017; Available at: https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2017/02/sekolah-inklusi-dan-pembangunan-slb-dukung-pendidikan-inklusi
11. Sakari Moberg, Etsuko Muta, Kanako Korenaga MK& H, Savolainen. Struggling for inclusive education in Japan and Finland: teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. Eur J Spec Needs Educ. 2020;35(1):100–14.
12. Sofwan, A., Mujiyati, & Hendrowati TY. Perceptions of Inclusion Education by Parents of Elementary School-Aged Children in Lampung, Indonesia. Int J Instr [Internet]. 2019;12(1):199–212. Available at: http://e-iji.net/dosyalar/iji_2019_1_13.pdf
13. Tirri K& SL. Ethical Challenges In Inclusive Education: The Case Of Gifted Students. Int Perspect Incl

Educ. 2017;9:239–57.

14. Putri AA, Ajikusumo CSO. Gambaran Kompetensi Pengajar di yayasan Wahana Inklusif Indonesia. J Pendidik Inklusi [Internet]. 2019;2(2):59–64. Available at: https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/ji/article/view/4263

15. Purba TA. 70 Persen Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus Tak Dapat Pendidikan Layak [Internet]. 26 Maret 2919. 2019 [kaynak 08 Kasım 2019]. Available at: https://lifestyle.bisnis.com/read/20190326/236/904431/70-persen-anak-berkebutuhan-khusus-tak-dapat-pendidikan-layak

16. Ainscow M, Booth T, Dyson A. Improving Schools, Devoloping Inclusion. Londres: Routledge; 2006.

17. Fernandez TM. Attitudes toward Inclusive Education and Practical Consequences in Final Year Students of Education Degrees. Procedia - Soc Behav Sci. 2019;237:1184–8.

18. Tyler WR. Basic Principles of curiculum and instruction. Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press; 1949.

19. Ismadi H. Pendidikan Inklusif Menyatukan Anak ABK dengan Anak Normal [Internet]. 2017 [kaynak 04 Eylül 2019]. Available at: https://www.kompasiana.com/hanifatulismadi/59c66ae6bd57985b91026fe2/pendidikan-inklusif-menyatukan-anak-abk-dengan-anak-normal

20. Ni'matuzahroh Y. Individu Berkebutuhan Khusus & Pendidikan Inklusif. 1. baskı. Malang: UMM Press; 2016. 137 s.

21. Stubbs S. Inclusive education where there are fiew resources. Oslo: The Atlas Alliance; 2002.

22. MORA M of RA. Keputusan Dirjen Pendis Nomor 3211 Tahun 2016 Tentang Penetapan 22 Madrasah Inklusif. 3211 Tahun 2016 Indonesia; 2016.

23. Ministry of Religious Affair Of The Republic Indonesia. Rekapitulasi Data Pokok Pendidikan Islam [Internet]. Data EMIS, Ministry of Religious Affair. 2021 [kaynak 29 Nisan 2021]. Available at: http://emispendis.kemenag.go.id/emis_madrasah/

24. Opertti R, Brady J, Duncombe L. Moving forward: Inclusive education as the core of Education for All. Prospects. 2009;39:205–15.

25. Paseka, Angelika. Schwab S. Parents' attitudes towards inclusive education and their perceptions of inclusive teaching practices and resources. Eur J Spec Needs Educ. 2020;35(2):254–72.

26. Paseka A and SS. Parents' attitudes towards inclusive education and their perceptions of inclusive teaching practices and resources. Eur J Spec Needs Educ [Internet]. 2019;35(2):254–72. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08856257.2019.1665232?needAccess=true

27. Ariyanto D. The role of learning technology in supporting the implementation of inclusive education. İçinde: Malang, editör. International Conference On Special Education In Southeast Asia Region. Universitas Negeri malang; 2017.

28. Muzayanah U. Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif Pada Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI) Keji Ungaran Jawa Tengah. Penamas. 2016;29(2):211–26.

29. Villa RA, Thousand JS. Restructuring for Caring and Effective Education: Piecing the Puzzle Together. Baltimore: MD: Paul H. Brooks.; 2000.

30. Forlin C, Chambers D. Teacher Preparation for Inclusive Education: Increasing Knowledge But Raising Concerns. Asia-Pacific J Teach Educ. 2011;39(1):17–32.

31. Yan T, Deng M. Regular education teachers' concerns on inclusive education in China from the perspective of concerns-based adoption model. Int J Incl Educ. 2019;23(4):384–404.

32. Istiyani D, Zamroni, Arikunto S. A model of madrasa ibtidaiya quality evaluation. Res Eval Educ [Internet]. 2017;3(1):28–41. Available at: https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/reid/article/viewFile/13902/9904

33. Wilson, Jeffery L, Katrina A mayer LMN. Mission and Diversity Statements: What They Do and Do Not Say. Innov High Educ [Internet]. 2012;37(2):125–39. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10755-011-9194-8

34. Trewatha RL, Newport MG. Management. third edit. Plano Texas: Business Publication; 1982.

35. Wibowo AM, Fakhrudin, Rifa'i A, Prihatin T. Model Peningkatan Sumber Daya Pendidik Pada Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Berbasis Inklusi Menghadapi Era Society 5.0 Dan Revolusi Industri 4.0. İçinde:

Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana (Prosnampas) [Internet]. Semarang: Pasca Sarjana Universitas Negeri Semarang; 2020. s. 1–1161. Available at: https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/snpasca/article/view/247

36. Print M. Curriculum Development and Design. Sydney: Allen & Unwin; 1993.

37. Bogdan RC, Sari BK. Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon; 1982.

38. Wibowo AM, Prihatin T. The Diffusion Innovation of Madrasa Ibtidaiya Inclusion from Regular School to Inclusive. İçinde: International Conference on Science and Education and Technology (ISET 2019) [Internet]. Semarang: Atlantis Press; 2020. s. 205–9. Available at: https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/iset-19/125941486

39. Millson, Murray R dan Wilemon D. Educational Quality Correlates of Online Graduate Management Education. J Distance Educ. 2008;22(3):1.