Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam
e-ISSN: 2775-2933
Volume 3, Issue 3, 2033, pp. 294-305

Learning Achievements at Graduate Level: Bloom's Taxonomy Analyze

Hartono*[1]

[1]*Universitas Islam Negeri Prof.K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, Indonesia*

e-mail:

Submitted: 15-11-2022 Revised : 12-12-2022 Accepted: 30-12-2022

ABSTRACT. Improving high-level thinking skills (high-order thinking) has become a basic requirement in national higher education. The problem is, has higher education in Indonesia implemented learning that improves the highest level thinking skills? It is common for national tertiary education at the undergraduate level to carry out learning that is oriented towards increasing the level of higher order thinking. To answer this question, research has been carried out through document analysis in the form of semester syllabus (RPS) for undergraduate level. Normatively, the undergraduate level has the task of making students at least able to apply theories/concepts/methods/rules/laws when carrying out learning. The revised version of Bloom's Taxonomy has formulated the levels of thinking that students must experience during learning, including the lowest level is 'remembering' and the highest level is 'creating'. The results of the document analysis show that the undergraduate level learning in most lesson plans still uses the word 'explain'. The word 'explaining' is an operationalization of the word 'understanding' which has two levels. This second level shows that learning in higher education is still at a lower level (low-order thinking).

Keywords: *Taxonomy Bloom, syllabus, implement, and HOTS*

https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v3i3.275

How to Cite Hartono. (2023). Learning Achievements at Graduate Level: Bloom's Taxonomy Analyze. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 3(3), 294-305.

INTRODUCTION

The results of the PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) Survey in 2018 placed Indonesia's education ranking at 69 out of 78 participants in The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development-OECD (https://litbangkemendikbud.go.id//). This condition is actually reasonable considering that learning in national tertiary institutions is still carried out below national standards. The results of the analysis of learning tool documents at several universities in the cities of Malang, Surabaya, Madura, Yogyakarta, and Purwokerto show that the formulation of learning outcomes is still dominant using the verb 'to explain'. When compared between the IQF descriptions, namely 'applying' and 'explaining' in the lesson plan, there is a gap between the two where the learning design designed by a teacher is still below the IQF standards. If reviewed with Bloom's taxonomy 'explain' which is an operational verb 'understand' the level is two (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001) whose category is still in the low order thinking skills (LOTS).

The Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia has issued Ministerial Regulation Number 03 of 2020 concerning National Higher Education Standards as an effort to improve the quality of national education. However, the problem is whether national higher

education actors have implemented these national standards seriously? Has the IQF-based curriculum (Indonesian National Qualifications Framework) been properly and consistently formulated in each study program? Has learning been designed and implemented in accordance with the mandate of the IQF-based curriculum? For example, the description of the IQF qualification level for undergraduate level is to 'apply' their field of expertise and 'utilize' science, technology and/or art in their field in solving problems and being able to adapt to the situation at hand (Appendix to PP No. 08 of 2012 p. 2) . Referring to this description, has learning at the undergraduate level made the word 'apply' or only understand (explain) the minimum standard of learning outcomes?

The using of word "explain" in higher education syllabi indicated the low order of thinking which still massively applied in various educational institution. The Indonesian Qualification Frameworks mandates to transform low order of thinking framework into high order thinking by changing the using or term "explain" into at least "apply" in higher education syllabi. However, a little number of higher education institutions conduct the transformation. Therefore, by analyzing syllabi from five faculties of State Islamic University (UIN) Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri, this paper aim to demonstrate the significant of the implementation of high order thinking and its result on skill improvement in students of State Islamic University Prof K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto. Moreover, the purpose of this research is as a motivation and insist to implementing high order thinking in other higher education institutions as mandated by the Indonesian Qualification Framework.

This research focuses on the analysis of high order thinking word in higher education syllabi as mandated by the Indonesian Qualification Framework as a complementary of other previous researches which only concentrates on the training of syllabi formulation (Syafrizal & Ahmad, 2021) or the macro and micro level of its implementation (Nurdin, 2017), and merely ignore on the choice of word in th syllabi. Even though, Bloom's taxonomy has already explained learning objective by implementing certain words which should used in higher education syllabi in order to achive learning outcomes, but the implementation of it has not been a concern in many syllabi formulation. This research indicates that the using of Bloom's taxonomy terms in higher education syllabi is still in a minimal level. Therefore, it is crucial to start the implementation of Bloom's taxonomy learning objective in higher education syllabi by using the term described by this taxonomy.

METHOD

According to Corbin & Strauss 2008 document analysis is a systematic procedure of evaluating documents with the aim of gaining understanding, meaning, and developing them into empirical knowledge (Bowen 2009, 28). The documents referred to in this study are Syllabi and Permendikbud No. 03 of 2020. Syllabus as primary data was purposively selected stage I as many as 35 syllabi stage II to 15 Syllabi from different faculties UIN SAIZU Purwokerto. The data analysis technique of this research is content analysis. Silverman (2009) document analysis research design commonly uses content analysis (Bowen 2009, 31). Stages of data analysis: 1) classifying the words/syllables used in the SLP document, 2) making criteria for classifying the words/syllables used in the SLP, 3) making judgments and conclusions to find the suitability of the words/syllables in the SLP.

THEORY

In 1956 Benjamin Bloom led an educational psychology group to develop a leveling system for thinking skills in teaching. Bloom's taxonomy consists of cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor domains. The cognitive domain is the level of one's thinking ability starting from simple to complex structures (low to high). Bloom's taxonomy of the old version of the cognitive domain

includes: 1) knowledge, 2). comprehension, 3) application, 4) analysis, 5) synthesis, and 5) evaluation (Bloom 1956). In 1999, Anderson and Krathwohl updated Bloom's taxonomy. In the old version it uses nouns, while in the new version it uses verbs, so that it emphasizes the thought process (revised edition), not the result of thinking (old edition). The new version emphasizes "knowing how", not on "knowing what" as in the old version. "Knowing how" describes the procedure of thinking. The process of thinking in problem solving. "Knowing what" describes the content of thinking or the end result of the thinking process (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001).

Chung 1994, Lewy and Bathory 1994, and Postlethwaite 1994 state that Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive domain is one of the basic frameworks for categorizing educational goals, preparation of tests, and curriculum around the world (Gunawan 2012, 99). The revised edition of Bloom's Taxonomy is a change from noun categories, namely: 1) knowledge, 2). comprehension, 3) application, 4) analysis, 5) synthesis, and 5) evaluation (Bloom 1956), into verbs, namely 1) remembering is a thought process to remember information/learning material that has been stored in memory, 2) understanding is the process of thinking to construct the meaning of the information/learning material that has been received in writing or orally, 3) applying is the process of thinking to use information/learning material in certain situations, 3) analyzing is the process of thinking in detailing the information/learning material in more detail then associating one detail (section) with other details (sections) that appear as a single unit, 5) evaluating is a thinking process to evaluate information/learning material based on certain criteria as a form of criticism (truth check), 6) creating is a thinking process to derive (generate) a new idea or create a new point of view from an information information or learning materials (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001).

The change does not mean eliminating the noun category and replacing it completely with a verb, but the use of the verb category must be accompanied by a noun category. The function of this revised edition of the taxonomy is to formulate educational objectives which contain verbs and nouns. Verbs generally describe expected cognitive processes and nouns describe expected knowledge to be mastered (Gunawan 2012, 103). The unification of the two is called a two-dimensional category, namely a verb followed by a noun. The nouns referred to here are the dimensions of knowledge, namely 1) factual knowledge, 2) conceptual knowledge, 3) procedural knowledge, 4) metacognitive knowledge (Anderson and Krathwohlt 2001, 21). Tyler (1994) the most useful formulation of objectives is that which indicates the type of behavior that will be taught to students and the learning content that makes students exhibit that behavior. Based on this, the formulation of educational goals must contain two dimensions, the first dimension to show the type of student behavior using the verb dimension, and the second dimension to show the content of learning using the knowledge dimension (Gunawan 2012, 103). The formulation of educational goals must describe what is to be achieved (6 levels of thinking) and with what these goals are achieved (4 levels of knowledge). The six levels of thinking in the revised version of Bloom's taxonomy are understood as a unified whole thinking process. The process starts from the lowest 'remembering' to the highest 'creating' (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001).

Permendikbud. No. 3 of 2020 Article 6 that the formulation of graduate learning outcomes is used as a basic reference for developing learning content standards (paragraph 2) and the main reference for developing learning process standards (paragraph 3). Article 10 that the learning process standard is a minimum criterion regarding the implementation of study program learning to obtain graduate learning outcomes. Article 12 that the planning of the learning process is prepared for each subject and presented in the semester learning plan (paragraph 1) and includes, among other things, the learning outcomes of graduates entrusted to the course (article 3 point b) and the final abilities planned at each learning stage to fulfill graduate learning outcomes (article 3 point c), and others (points a, d, e, f, g. h, i). Graduate learning outcomes for the undergraduate

level that differentiate between other levels (D2, D3, D4, undergraduate, masters/specialist/profession, or doctoral) are the word apply as described in:

> "able to apply logical, critical, systematic, and innovative thinking in the context of developing or implementing science and technology that pays attention to and applies humanities values according to their field of expertise" (Appendix to Permendikbud. No. 3 of 2020).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result (Paparan Data)

1) Development of the Syllabus in the KKNI (The Indonesian Qualification Framework) Curriculum Flow

The development of an IQF-based curriculum within the State Islamic Religious College (PTKIN) has been carried out since 2014, although several PTKIN (State Islamic Religious College)s have only developed it in 2016/2017. This development refers to Presidential Regulation Number 8 of 2012 concerning IQF and Permendikbud. Number 73 of 2013 concerning Application of the IQF in the Higher Education Sector with the objectives a) externally to deal with globalization and the ratification of various international conventions, b) internally to reduce disparities in tertiary quality, unemployment and poverty. Through the IQF curriculum, it is hoped that the quality of tertiary graduates will be the same between one tertiary institution and another. What makes the IQF-based curriculum different from previous curricula is the grading of outcomes for each level of education, and making outcomes the basis for developing learning content. The IQF-based curriculum describes a set of competencies that students must possess. In simple terms, competence can be interpreted as basic abilities or learning outcomes that must be mastered by students, both in the realm of attitudes/values, knowledge, and skills.

The preparation of the IQF curriculum follows the template (basic pattern) of the IQF curriculum. Using this template, the study program's IQF curriculum is developed. The IQF curriculum template document contains matrix sheets: 1) formulation of graduate profiles, 2) formulation of study program learning outcomes, 3) required study materials, 4) grouping of study materials labeled with a certain name then becomes the name of the course, 4) credit calculation (after there is a calculation of the breadth of study material - the depth of learning outcomes), and 5) the course structure (KKNI template document). The first step is based on the template, the profile of the study program graduates must be determined first. Based on the formulation of the profile, the learning achievements of the study program are derived, which basically describe the abilities that students must have after college. To achieve these basic abilities, study materials are derived according to the learning outcomes that have been formulated. This study material then becomes the main basis for developing learning materials in a syllabus.

Study materials derived from learning outcomes are of course very varied and numerous. The various study materials are grouped based on their similarity (similar) according to the existing scientific family. A collection of similar/similar study materials is then labeled and the label becomes the name of the course. The amount of study material in one label (course name) is called breadth. Breadth in this context is the amount of study material (material) that is in one course. With the formula that has been set in the excel program through this breadth, the depth and number of credits of the course will be determined later. The depth in the program displays the numbers 1 to 6 which refer to the revised version of Bloom's taxonomy. If what appears in the depth column is 3, then the final ability that must be realized in this course is at least applying

(KKNI FUAH UIN SAIZU Purwokerto curriculum document). With the word apply, it is possible to formulate the learning outcomes of the course, namely that students are able to apply learning material (theory/method/principles/etc.) in the relevant context. This means that the choice of using operational verbs in the syllabus learning outcomes ideally refers to the study material matrix whose contents are the depth, breadth, and weight of the course credits.

This depth and breadth is basically the level of achievement attached to the course. Lecturers as developers and field implementers of the IQF-based curriculum are required to be able to realize the achievement of graduate competency standards (SKL) through the level of learning outcomes and study materials that have been determined in the study program study material matrix. The initial step after the IQF curriculum is established is to compile a syllabus. Several components of the syllabus are course learning outcomes and study materials are formulated and developed based on the breadth and depth of the course. For example, in the matrix of study material and the number of credits there is a number 3 in the depth column, which means that the learning achievement that must be determined is to apply, the number 9 in the breadth column means that there are 9 theories/concepts that become learning material, and the number 2 in the column credits means the number of credits in the syllabus as an instrument for improving the quality of lecturers which has implications for the quality of learning in the classroom. Improving the quality of learning also has implications for improving the quality of study programs and tertiary institutions (Asmawati 2014, 6). syllabus as an instrument for improving the quality of lecturers which has implications for the quality of learning in the classroom. Improving the quality of learning also has implications for improving the quality of study programs and tertiary institutions (Asmawati 2014, 6). those courses. Based on the analysis of the IQF and SILABUS Curriculum documents, it was found that there were faculties that did not formulate the IQF curriculum as described above. As a consequence, the syllabus that was compiled was not based on the above format which resulted in the learning outcomes formulated in the syllabus explaining which if traced were equivalent to level 2. This means that the syllabus developed was still below standard, especially in terms of achievements and materials. In fact, syllabus is a lesson plan document that has a strategic position in achieving SKL, study program learning outcomes, and course learning outcomes. Through the syllabus, lecturers can organize lecture activities in a systematic, innovative, accurate and controlled manner (Sanjaya 2010, 35).

2) Use of Operational Verbs in the syllabus

The revised version of Bloom's Taxonomy is a basic reference for developing a syllabus, especially for developing learning outcomes formulations. Syllabus is the main tool of learning which contains activities or actions to coordinate learning components, including: 1) Study program name, course name, course code, semester, credits, lecturer name, 2) Graduate learning outcomes assigned to courses . 3) Final abilities of each learning stage, 4) Study material related to the abilities to be achieved, 5) Learning methods, 6) Time allotted to achieve the abilities of each learning stage, 7) Student learning experience which is manifested in the description of the tasks to be done by students for one semester, 8. Criteria, indicators, and assessment weights, 9) List of references used (Permendikbud. No. 03 of 2020 Article 12).

Syllabus is an instrument for improving the quality of lecturers which has implications for the quality of learning in the classroom. Improving the quality of learning also has implications for improving the quality of study programs and tertiary institutions (Asmawati 2014, 6). Therefore, it is important to formulate the contents of the syllabus components seriously and follow the established provisions, especially in the formulation of learning outcomes for courses and meetings. The learning outcomes of courses and meetings are an important component of the syllabus, because starting from the formulation of these learning outcomes the formulations of other components are compiled. Based on the analysis of the syllabus document of UIN

SAIZU Purwokerto which was selected as the sample document for this study, especially in the component of subject learning outcomes, it can be described as follows:

Table 1 Use of Operational Verbs in the CP Course Formulations

No	SILABUS	Lemb.	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
1	Islamic Education	Tr	-	√	√	-	-	-
2	Psychology of Education	Tr.	-	√	-	-	-	-
3	Models of Alternative Education	Tr	√	√	-	-	-	-
4	Development of learning resources	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
5	Development of Teaching Proffesion	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
6	Educational research methods	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
7	Development of APE PIAUD	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
8	Da'wa (Preaching) Management and Strategy	Dk.	-	√	√	-	-	-
9	Guidance and Counseling in School	Dk.	-	√	√	-	-	-
10	Communication Studies	Dk.	-	√	-	-	-	-
11	Da'wa and Cross Cultural Communication	Dk	-	√	-	-	-	-
12	Strategic Management	Dk.	-	√	-	-	-	-
13	Religious Norm Operational System	Us	-	-	√	-	-	-
14	Philosophy of History	Us	-	√	√	-	-	-
15	Al-Quran Education Insights	Us	-	√	√	-	-	-
16	Philosophy of Education	Univ.	-	√	√	-	-	-
17	Sufism Morality	Univ.	√	√	-	-	-	-

Note: C1: remember, C2: understand, C3: apply, C4: analyze, C5: evaluate, C6: create.

The table above provides an overview of the use of Bloom's taxonomy verbs as a formulation of study program learning outcomes:

- There are 16 syllabi using the verb 'explain' and 1 syllabus which directly uses the verb 'apply' as an outcome. This process presupposes that before students are able to apply, students must be able to understand, and before being able to understand students must know first.

- Seventeen (16) syllabi which use the verb 'explain', there are 2 syllabi which use the verb 'identify'. In this syllabus, we want to start learning outcomes from the lower level, namely identifying (1) and explaining (2).

- Seventeen (16) syllabi which use the verb 'explain', there are 6 syllabi which also use the verb 'understand'. In this section, it seems that the compiler is not aware that the position of the verbs to explain and to understand are one level, namely both are level 2 where explaining is an operational verb to apply.

- Seventeen (16) syllabi which uses the verb 'explain'. there are 7 syllabi which also use the verb 'to apply'. In this section, the leveling starts from level 2, then rises to level 3, namely implementing.

Below is the result of analysis of the UIN SAIZU Purwokerto syllabus document which was selected as the sample of this study which is specifically related to learning outcomes per meeting, namely:

Table 2 Use of Operational Verbs in CP Meetings

No	• Syllabus	Fac/ Un	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
1	Islamic Education	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
2	Psychology of Education	Tr.	-	√	-	-	-	-
3	Models of Alternative Education	Tr	√	√	-	-	-	-
4	Development of learning resources	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
5	Development of Teaching Proffesion	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
6	Educational research methods	Tr	-	√	√	-	-	-
7	Development of APE PIAUD	Tr	-	√	-	-	-	-
8	Da'wa (Preaching) Management and Strategy	Dk.	-	√	-	-	-	-
9	Guidance and Counseling in School	Dk.	-	√	-	-	-	-
10	Communication Studies	Dk.	-	√	-	-	-	-
11	Da'wa and Cross Cultural Communication	Dk	-	√	-	√	-	-
12	Strategic Management	Dk.	-	√	-	√	-	-
13	Religious Norm Operational System	Us	-	-	√	√	-	-
14	Philosophy of History	Us	-	√	√	-	-	-
15	Al-Quran Education Insights	Us	-	√	√	-	-	-
16	Philosophy of Education	Univ.	-	√	√	-	-	-
17	Sufism Morality	Univ.	√	√	-	-	-	-

Based on the table above, it can be described about the use of verbs as a formulation of learning outcomes per meeting:

- Of the seventeen (17) syllabi analyzed, there are 16 syllabi that use the verb 'explain'.

- Sixteen (16) syllabi which use the verb 'explain', there are 2 syllabi which use the verb 'identify'.

- Sixteen (16) syllabi which use the verb 'explain', there are 4 syllabi which use the verb apply together.

- Six (16) syllabi which use the verb 'explain', there are 2 SYLLABUSsyllabi which use the verb 'analyze' together and one syllabus does not use the verb 'explain', but directly uses the verbs 'apply' and 'analyze' ' together.

Below is presented the percentage of the use of verbs in the formulation of learning outcomes:

Table 3 Percentage of Verb Usage in the SYLLABUS

• CP-L	• C1	• C2	• C3	• C4	C5	C6
• Subject	11 %	94 %	41 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
• Each Meeting	11 %	94 %	29 %	17 %	0 %	0 %

Syllabus with remembering learning outcomes is only 11% (2 syllabi), both in subject learning outcomes and meetings, but this 2% syllabi also uses higher learning outcomes, namely understanding (explaining). The number of 94% who use verbs to explain also use higher verbs, namely applying 41% for course learning outcomes and 29% for learning outcomes per meeting.

11% percent of syllabi that use verbs to explain (do not use verbs to apply) use verbs to analyze, but 5.5% syllabi use verbs to explain (not to use verbs to explain, but to use verbs to apply). This is when viewed from the point of view of higher education standards at the undergraduate level which states that the minimum ability that must be achieved is 'applying theory' (Appendix to Permendikbud. No. 3 of 2020), then the learning process that has taken place is still below national education standards. Only 41% have met the national higher education standards for subject learning outcomes and 29% for learning outcomes per meeting. Only 17% used the verb 'analyze' for learning outcomes per meeting and 0% for course learning outcomes. From the point of view of developing level thinking skills (HOTS), which are characterized by analytical, critical, and creative thinking (Indersari 2019, 114 and Susilowati 2020, 64), the formulation of learning outcomes in the SYLLABUS is still not included in the HOTS category. As the verb used using 'analyze' is only 17% for learning outcomes per meeting and 0% for course learning outcomes.

The findings above, 94% of syllabi using the verb 'explain' cannot be separated from the systemic condition of the higher education institution concerned which is less massive in adapting to curriculum and syllabus changes. This is as the result of the interview:

> "So far I always use the word 'explain'. It's easiest to remember and use the word. And that was what the lecturers taught me when I was in college" (interview with lecturer A).
>
> 'when I chose the verb 'explain' I never thought about the IQF curriculum. And indeed there is no specific explanation from the parties concerned to compile the syllabus in relation to the IQF curriculum" (interview with lecturer C).

In fact, there was a lecturer (B) who strenuously said that he refused to equate academic and non-academic curricula, the KKNI (The Indonesian Qualification Framework), which was actually a standard in the world of work ensuring syllabus that was compiled continued to use the old standard (before the implementation of the KKNI). There are also those who admit that this equalization is an effort to bring the academic world closer to the world of work so that there is no disparity between the two, so they are willing to accommodate the IQF standards as the results of the interview below:

> "I use the words 'explain' and 'apply' together, because at my place (the faculty) I set the use of the word as the IQF standard" (interview with lecturer D).
>
> "At that time there was a discussion at the faculty with the theme "ICQC Curriculum and Bloom's Taxonomy". An informant said that the bachelor's level qualification is applying theory. Because of that, the syllabus that has been compiled has at least applied it" (interview of lecturer E).

The dominance of the use of the verb 'explain' in the learning outcomes of the undergraduate syllabus should be of concern to all parties so that students' thinking skills are higher.

3) Development of CP Syllabus Curriculum KKNI (The Indonesian Qualification Framework)

After identifying the problem, an overview is obtained about: 1) the lecturer pays little attention that the IQF curriculum for undergraduate level qualifications is to apply, 2) seen from the IQF curriculum document, several study programs do not raise the issue of undergraduate qualifications to apply, but there are study programs that raise it, 3) the use of the verb 'explain' for all SYLLABUS in this research sample indicates that the syllabus compiler does not pay attention to the minimum standards that have been set. Based on these problems then raised in a focus group discussion (FGD) as part of this research method. The FGD participants were several lecturers at UIN Saizu who are considered experts in the field of IQF curriculum, higher education standards, and Bloom's taxonomy and obtained the following constructive inputs:

a) It is necessary to reaffirm the qualifications of the IQF curriculum and undergraduate higher education standards, namely at least 'apply'. Departing from these standards, all academic activities of an undergraduate study program are at least able to apply principles, theories, concepts, rules, methods, verses, or hadiths, both factually, conceptually, procedurally, and meta-cognitively.

b) To prevent the thinking process in learning from taking place in stages, it is necessary to return to the original revised version of Bloom's taxonomy, namely: 1) remember, 2) understand, 3) apply, 4) analyze, 5) evaluate, and 6) create and select a knowledge dimension, factual, conceptual, procedural, or meta cognitive. If you use operational words that represent each of the 6 original verbs, for example explaining, identifying, comparing, etc., there are difficulties in making the stages equivalent and sequential from the lowest to the highest. By returning to the original work it is easier to remember and understand, the implications of which are easier to implement.

Based on the approach above, it is possible to formulate the learning outcomes of the course by referring to the revised version of the original Bloom's taxonomy. The development of the formulation of learning outcomes for the course starts with the selection of the syllabus for this research sample, Syllabus for the Alternative Education Model course sample:

- Students can explain the philosophical basis in the development of alternative educational models (subject CP).

- Students can explain the right-brain-based educational model (CP Meeting -5).

Referring to the learning outcomes in the courses above, it will produce an overview of the ability of students who are only able to remember and explain (understand) the material being taught. With simple language students only understand, but do not know what this understanding is for (its application). For example, if the learning outcomes of the 5th course and meeting are designed to be at level 3, then:

Learning achievements in courses:

- Students are able to apply a philosophical foundation in the development of alternative educational models (level 3).

Learning achievements at the 5th meeting:

- students are able to remember the right brain learning model (level -1),

- students are able to understand the right brain learning model (level -2), and

- students are able to apply the right-brain learning model in learning science in Class IV MI (level -3).

An overview of students' abilities after college with a level-3 learning achievement design, namely students are able to know, understand, and apply the right-brain learning model in learning science in Class IV MI.

If the formulation of learning outcomes reaches level -5, then after level -1, -2 , -3, resulted:

- students are able to analyze (break down the parts with the whole) the right brain learning model (level -4).

- students are able to evaluate (assess) the right-brain learning model (level -5).

The description of the ability of students who study with the level 5 learning achievement design is that students are able to know, understand, apply, analyze, and evaluate right-brain learning models. Students not only know, understand, are able to apply, analyze, but are able to

assess the strengths (strengthening thesis) or deficiencies (anti-thesis) of the right-brain learning model. With this model, it is expected that students' thinking skills will be higher, so that they are included in the high order thinking skill (HOTS) category. Not only is the level of thinking high, but can find meaning in the learning process. Education is not just acquiring new knowledge, but finding the meaning or use of that information. Students are active and functional, if the cognitive dimension in learning uses active verbs and achieves implementation (Gunawan 2012, 104). Lecturers not only understand theory, but are also able to apply this theory in a certain (tentative) context. Learners are assumed to be active actors choosing and constructing information and interpreting it (Gunawan 2012, 106).

The ability to think analytically (analyzing), critically (evaluating), especially creatively (creating) is a marker of higher order thinking skills (HOTS). Meanwhile, remembering, understanding, and applying are included in the low order thinking skills (LOTS) level (Susilowati 2020, 64). HOTS is a high-level thinking skill that demands analytical, critical, and creative thinking about information in solving problems (Inderasari 2019, 114). For this reason, the evaluation of learning must follow the same path, that is, if what is achieved is the ability to 'analyze', then what is evaluated is the analytical ability (Ananda and Fadhilaturrahmi 2017, 17). This consistency is very determining the success of learning. The questions or assignments must be designed by students according to the achievements formulated by the lecturer in the SYLLABUS.

CONCLUSION

The learning process includes planning, implementation, and evaluation. The general form of learning planning is the syllabus. One component of learning is learning outcomes. The formulation of syllabuslearning outcomes, both in courses and meetings, is still dominated by the use of the verb 'explain', so that it can be said from a learning planning perspective that it is still below the standards of higher education, IQF, and HOTS. Not only is it still below standard, but the verb used is very monotonous, almost the same as in all syllabus, namely using the verb 'to explain'. If so, the conditions seem very difficult to improve the quality of national higher education that is able to compete at the global level. Any improvement efforts will still be lacking in results, if very basic and core issues like this are neglected. In fact, the team of assessors for the national higher education accreditation body (BAN PT) during the visitation did not touch the core of this standard process. Therefore, the government, through the rector at each tertiary institution, invites lecturers to "look" (evaluate) again the syllabus they have developed and assessors to be willing to seriously examine the syllabus by looking at higher education standards, the IQF, and the Bloom's taxonomy version. Moreover, it is crucial for next researches to analyze the impact of Bloom taxonomy learning objective term and the improvement of student skill in three aspect; cognitive, affective, and psychomotor as a prove of the significance of word chhoice in higher education syllabi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akbar, Ali, 2016. Studi Implementasi Kurikulum Berbasis KKNI pada Programa Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di LPTK SE-Kota Bengkulu, Jurnal Manhajj, Vol. 4, Nomor 1, Januari – April 2016.

Alwasilah, A. Chaedar. 2015. Pokoknya Studi Kasus: Pendekatan Kualitatif. Bandung: Kiblat.

Ananda, Rizki dan Fadhilaturrahmi, 2017. Evaluasi Pembelajaran IPS Berbasis Taksonomi Bloom Dua DImensi di Sekolah Dasar. Jurnal Basicedu. Vol. 1 No. 2 Tahun 2017 hal. 12-21.

Anderson, L.W.dan Krathwohl, D.R. 2001. A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assesing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Education Objectives, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Ardi Cahya Direja, "Studi Implementasi Kurikulum Berbasis KKNI pada Program Studi S1 Ilmu Komunikasi Universitas Informatika dan Bisnis Indonesia", Jurnal Edutech, Vol.16, No.2, Juni 2017.

Arikunto, Suharsimi dan Cepi Safrudin Abdul Jabar. 2014. Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Pedoman Teoritis bagi Mahasiswa dan Praktisi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Asmawati, Luluk. 2014. Perencanaan Pembelajaran PAUD. Bandung: Rosda.

Beslina Afriani Siagian, Golda Novatrasio Sauduran Siregar "Analisis Penerapan Kurikulum Berbasis KKNI Di Universitas Negeri Medan", dalam Pedagogia: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, hlm. 327-342.

Bloom, Benyamin. 1956. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals Handbook I: Cognitif Domain. New York: David Mackay Company.

Bowen, Glenn A., 2009, 'Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method', Qualitative Research Journal, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 27-40. DOI 10.3316/QRJ0902027.

Casmini, "Evaluasi dan Peninjauan Kurikulum BKI Berbasis KKNI", Jurnal Hisbah, Vol. 11, No. 1, Juni 2014.

Deny Setiawan "Pengembangan Model Kurikulum Berorientasi KKNI di Fakultas Ilmu Sosial Universitas Negeri Medan", dalam Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial, Vol. 9, No. 2, 2017, hlm. 112-120.

Didik Setiawarno, "Relevansi Kurikulum S1 Pendidikan Fisika Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta terhadap KKNI Level 6 Pendidikan Fisika", Jurnal EduSains, Vol., 2 No. 1, Juni 2017.

Diktis. 2018. Buku Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum PTKI yang Mengacu pada KKNI dan SN-Dikti. Jakarta: Kemenag RI.

Eko Wahyu Nugrahadi, Indra Maipita, La Ane, Pasca Dwi Putra "Analisis Implementasi Kurikulum Berbasis KKNI Di Fakultas Ekonomi UNIMED", dalam Jurnal NIAGAWAN Vol. 7, No. 1, Maret 2018, hlm. 8-13.

Gunawan, Imam. dkk. 2012. Taksonomi Bloom - Revisi Ranah Kognitif: Kerangka Landasan untuk Pembelajaran, Pengajaran, dan Penilaian, Jurnal Premiera Educandum, Vol. 02 No. 02.

Hidayat, Sholeh. 2013. Pengembangan Kurikulum Baru. Bandung: Rosda.

Inderasari, Elen. dkk. 2019. "Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) pada Analisis Kebahasaan Butir Soal Bahan Ajar Bahasa Indonesia Tingkat SMA/MA". Konferensi Nasional Bahasa dan Sastra ke -5 , UNS Surakarta.

Kemenag. 2018. Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum PTKI Mengacu Pada KKNI dan SN-DIKTI.

Lampiran Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2012 tentang Kerangka Kuliafikasi Nasional Indonesia.

M. Asri "Dinamika Kurikulum di Indonesia", dalam Modeling: Jurnal Program Studi PGMI, Vol. 4, No. 2, September 2017, hlm. 192-202.

Mashlahah, Any Umi. 2018. "Penerapan Kurikulum KKNI dan Implementasinya terhadap Kulitas Pendidikan di PTKIN". Edukasia: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Islam. Vol. 13, No. 1, Februari 2018.

Nurdin, Syafriddin. 2017. "Pengembangan Kurikulum Dan Rencana Pembelajaran Semester (Rps) Berbasis Kkni Di Perguruan Tinggi". Jurnal al-Fikrah, Vol. V, No. 1 Januari-Juni 2017. P 21-30.

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 03 Tahun 2020 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi.

Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia No 8 Tahun 2012 tentang Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia.

Programme for International Students Assessement. https://litbangkemendikbud.go.id//pisa.

Sanjaya, Wina. 2010. Perencanaan dan Desain Sistem Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Kencana.

Susilowati, Yayuk, dan Sumaji, 2020. "Interseksi berpikir kritis dengan High Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) Berdasarkan Taksonomi Bloom". Jurnal Silogisme: Kajian Ilmu Matematika dan Pembelajarannya. Desember 2020, Vol. 5, No.2. ISSN: 2527-6182.

Suteja, Jaja. 2018. "Model-Model Pembelajaran Dalam Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi KKNI Di Perguruan Tinggi (Perubahan Dari Teacher Centered Learning Ke Arah Student Centered Learning), dalam Jurnal Edueksos Vol. VI, No. 1, Juni 2018, hlm. 81-100.

Syafaruddin dan Irwan Nasution. 2005. Manajemen Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Quantum Teaching.

Syafrizal, S., & Ahmad, A. (2021). Pelatihan Pembuatan RPS Berstandar Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia (KKNI) di Era Revolusi Industri 4.0. ABDIMASY: Jurnal Pengabdian Dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat, 2(2), 68–76.