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Abstract
This study aims to compare the policy of the 2005-2013 National Examination (UN, hereafter) version with the latest one 2014-now. The implementation of the later UN has received considerable critics. Now that the recent UN has upgraded the policy, we attempt to see if the problems or critics found in the previous UN are solved in the latest one. By reviewing the UN’s obstacles and controversy in later versions, we compared this with the current policy regulation. The present study identifies the controversy of later UN from various areas and years by employing library research. The study revealed several issues from earlier UN version, such as growing anxiety for students and teachers, high risk of cheating, disregarding the value of the other subjects that are not tested, as well as questioning the purpose of conducting the test itself, which cannot stand for evaluation as it did not fully support national education goal. The contemporary UN laws, on the other hand, can solve the previously concerning reason to review UN policy such as reducing cheating possibility by applying the computer-based test, storing UN questions out of school, so teachers do not use this as a material to learn in the classroom, as well as the plurality of test content that is specified for different school goals such as Aliyah and Kejurusan.

Keywords: critics, national examination, policy, test
A. Introduction

Education plays a significant role in national development. The difference in economic growth between developed and less-developed societies is under education management (Fägerlind, I., & Saha, 1983). Education will impact the quality of human resources and, in turn, the quality of a nation’s productivity. This is why education has started at an early age with various goals to ensure not only cognitive skill but also socialization, communication, morals, culture, spiritual beliefs, and behavior until every citizen can contribute their ability to develop better life quality for more people as what the constitution (UUD 1945) stated. Establishing a dedicate future generation requires advanced preparation. This progress is another definition of national education from another point of view.

Organized under the regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan or Kemendikbud) and the Ministry of Religion (Kementerian Agama or Kemennag), national education in Indonesia has been provided solutions to elevate social participation. Scholarships are one of the solutions supported, and the adjustment of school fees based on parents’ monthly income ease broader society to pursue higher-level education (Supardi, 2012). In Indonesia, people must undergo a twelve-year compulsory education of six years at the elementary level and three, respectively, at the secondary and high school levels.

As efforts are issued to enhance people’s involvement, an evaluation is required to ensure national education quality. As stated in Law Number 20 Year 2003, education is a conscious and planned effort to create an atmosphere of learning and the learning process. This is to nurture students to actively develop their potential to have religious, spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and the skills they need, the community, nation, and state. The rightful government-organized curriculum is a series of plans and objectives, content, material, and teaching methods to achieve this goal. A curriculum is a guide in implementing the predetermined learning process to direct the final standard goal to every school nationally (Komarudin, 2020). To see whether national education has reached its goal, evaluation takes a role. In Indonesia, this is called the UN (Ujian Nasional) or National Examination, which is a national education standard that students have to achieve before leaving a school level (primary, secondary or high school). National Final Examination is conducted by the Center for Educational Assessment, The Department of Education.

The National Final Examination is one of the evaluation tools issued by the government. However, according to its history, the UN has changed names several times, and each of the names carried a different goal and implementation. The UN in this paper is UN year 2014, named as UNBK or computer-based national examination. Implementing the National Final Examination (UN) has become a problem that is often discussed and controversial (Alawiyah, 2011; Sulistyo, 2007). Several times the plan or desire of some parties came up to erase or negate the UN. Recently, the latest Minister of Education and Culture. Nadiem Makariem stated that evaluation for national education would have some review, and it is clear that the UN is officially abolished starting from 2021 (Prabowo, n.d.). Due to the ongoing issue about the spreading virus of COVID-19, UN or UNBK (computer-based national examination) for 2020 is not conducted to prevent worse national health conditions.

The changing of names and regulations of the National Examination is an effort to comprehend better and equal national education for all. Since 1950, the national examination has developed to adopt the necessity of the field’s ongoing issue (Mahmudah, Beki, Febriyan, Siwi, & Sari (2019). These improvements might have a backwash in which national education quality decreases since the available method keeps changing to benefit not even a single generation. Even so, development and adoption are needed, so it keeps getting a better version.

An older name of the national examination is UN, valid from 2005 until 2013. This version of the UN is stated as one of the requirements to graduate from primary and secondary school levels. However, what happened in the field is that the UN is the only standard for graduate students from a school level (Alawiyah, 2011). This high-stake test turns out as a negative emotion for students as well as teachers. The anxiety to fail the test makes not only students but also teachers cheat. Another case also supports a negative conclusion in which students are accepted in universities but fail the UN. These two samples show that the UN’s implementation is not aligned with its purpose to evaluate national education.

Thus, in its implementation, the UN has experienced a policy crisis where factors causing the crisis can be viewed from various dimensions. A simple example of a crisis can occur due to deficiencies in formulating policies and programs, mistakes in the planning process, or even deviations in implementation.
Thus, there are several questions in this paper. Now that a new regulation is released about the UN’s latest version, we have formulated 2 research questions: 1) What are the obstacles and contradictions found in implementing the UN 2005-2013 version? 2) In what way was the new version of the UN developed from the earlier version?

B. Methodology

1. Research Design

This study used a qualitative approach with library research methods. This method aims to examine the UN based on several views of the authors in their researches. A qualitative procedure is used to produce a theory that explains at a broad conceptual level process, actions, or interactions about substantive topics (Barrett, 2007).

2. Instruments

In qualitative research, the researchers acted as the instruments (Barrett, 2007; Xu & Storr, 2012). In library research, researchers collect data and extract the required information from the selected previous studies to answer the stated research questions (Xu & Storr, 2012).

3. Technique of Data Collection

The data in this study were obtained by collecting research journals, corresponding books, or related government laws to identify the development of the UN from time to time. The literature research methodology is to read, analyze, and sort literature to identify materials’ essential attributes. Its significant difference from other methodologies that do not directly deal with the object under study but indirectly access the information from various kinds of literature is generally referred to as a “non-contact method”.

4. Technique of Data Analysis

Once empirical studies and related laws are collected, afterward, these studies and texts are evaluated by reading to obtain relevant information to answer the research questions.

C. Findings and Discussion

1. Findings

1.1 Problems and Contradiction of UN (2005-2013) Implementation

One of the UN purposes in the Decree of the Minister of National Education No. 20 Year 2003 concerning the National Final Examination is to measure the quality of education and take responsibility for implementing education at the national, provincial, district, and school level (Sulistyo, 2007). In other words, the UN is supposedly an instrument to check the quality of national education, and students or test takers are the objects of the analysis. The government is also stated as in charge of enforcing the UN in every area and school level. This is ironic and contradictory that the UN is used as standard accountability in organizing education because education in Indonesia in every province, district, and rural area are different. A study examined students’ chemistry learning competency based on the UN in the rural area. It showed that students in rural areas steadily get lower scores than those in urban areas from 2008 to 2010. This is due to the lack of laboratory-based practice, textbooks, time, and low competency teachers (Soewarno et al., 2014). This result shows that schools in every area have different problems that impact students’ learning process. The lack of UN results is not always impacted by students' low motivation to study or, worse, the teachers’ incapability of teaching but the involvement of facilities and infrastructure that is not available.

Moreover, the UN is violating one of the principles adopted in curriculum development related to the curriculum, namely, curriculum diversification. This policy is enforced to support continuous growing diversity without abandoning national education (Sutjipto, 2015). Education diversification is changing to match education’s orientations and operations with its context (Varghese, 2014). The evolution of human necessity is among factors that will highly impact education goals, such as diversification of abroad school that has been changing from 1965 until now (DeWinter & Rumbley, 2010). Thus, the contradiction is the question of the point of every area adapting the curriculum according to their characteristics, necessity, and potential when the UN is the same for every area?

Indonesia consists of diverse cultures, and every area has its own distinct culture and potency. It is impossible to equalize every area, especially in remote and rural areas. Schools in every area are different due to their city development. It sparks contradiction on how injustice they are to set a law that the UN has similar grade standards for every Indonesian student regardless of their ability to access the internet or qualified teachers, let alone teaching and learning media. Sulistyo (2007) stated that primary and secondary teachers’ study background...
in every area is different. Some areas lack qualified teachers’ and some others have too many of them. Another contradiction is that the UN only tests on a few considered “important” subjects invites its own problems. Students can only see the four subjects in their life because those are the subjects they will have to confront in the UN. Is it not clear why Indonesian students have less confidence in other subjects they advance at, such as painting, dancing, singing, and many others? Those born with such talents will never find their potential due to their only focus on the four subjects. Another deficiency is that teachers will teach students how to answer the four tested subjects and abandon the rest of the subjects just as important as the four tested subjects. Even though not every student is born to have such expected skill in these four subjects, they still have to go through it. Consequently, they will never know their talent, which will badly impact their future, such as low self-efficacy and insecurities. Indeed, the UN is not the only requirement to graduate students, so the rest of the subjects are tested at school; however, another purpose of the UN is also a quality check, which is why every other subject, including attitude, is important. Supardi (2012) stated that the direction of Indonesian education policy is enhancing the nation’s intellectual with faith and piety; however, cognitive skill is the main focus in its implementation, so the goal is not yet achieved. The contradiction here is, how can anybody know the achievement of national education if it is only tested in four subjects? Not to mention that it is only enforced at the end of the school year.

The quality of education is related to all subjects and habits learned and instilled in school, not just cognitive knowledge. What are the other taught subjects in school like arts, sports, culture, and many others? Once again, the UN will never show whether we have achieved national education or not, which is limited by cognitive skill and behavior, attitude, and faith. It is a cognitive skill required, and confidence, time-management, communicative skill, and many other life skills.

Another contradiction to highlight is that teachers are urged to teach students not how to understand the material but how to answer UN questions (Silverius, 2010). They already have limited time to teach the material, yet they are haunted by the image of passing UN minimal score. Supposedly, the teacher has freedom regarding how to teach their students according to their creativity. In the daily implementation, teachers compete to finish materials in the book and teach students to answer the UN instead of teaching them to understand the subject. UN raises students’ and teachers’ anxiety and society in general (Silverius, 2010). This overreaction indicates that the UN negatively impacted a lot of involved people.

Teachers are an important component of the learning and teaching process. If they do not have good quality, they will not reach the objective of learning. A competent teacher is an expectation of every educational institution because the adjective “competence” changes the learning process and its result or output. Furthermore, “being competent” for the teacher is not merely exist in every teacher, especially in Indonesia, because the concept of a good teacher needs to be proven not only by the theories of “competent” itself but also the practice of being “good in becoming a teacher”.

Law Number 14 Year 2005 regarding Teachers and Lectures clearly describes the meaning of competency. Competency is a set of knowledge, skill, and character that the teachers should have existed and attained. Further, it defines some teachers’ competencies that end up with the definition of a professional teacher. Teachers have two main roles based on that law. First, a teacher as a professional means teachers must have appropriate background knowledge, competency, and a legal certificate, mental and psychological health. The second role is as an agent of learning, which consists of some competencies. There are pedagogic, personality, social, professional. Those competencies are the standard of teacher professionalism in Indonesia.

Additionally, the UN received so many critics from years to years due to its purpose: evaluation system (Alawiyah, 2011, 2015; Silverius, 2010; Sulistyo, 2007). According to the Decree of the Minister of National Education Number 153/U/2003 concerning the National Final Examination, the UN aims to measure student learning outcomes by giving tests to primary and secondary school students, even making it a graduation standard. This policy received so many controversial opinions. Consequently, in 2015 under Law Number 20 Year 2003, the UN was not a graduation standard but a national education evaluation. Supposedly, evaluation for national education can provide a picture of the achievement of objectives, as stated in Law Number 20 of 2003. The evaluation must be able to provide three important points, as explained by McNeil (1977). Besides, in Law Number 20 of 2003, students are
expected to have faith in God Almighty, increase democratic attitudes, creativity, and independence.

Another critic seen from its questionable progress of this long education is that, is it enough to test students’ achievement only at the end of the school year? To know students’ attitudes and behavior itself, can we test their behavior and/or attitudes at the end of the school year? People change dynamically. There is a limitation of such a specific time when they will be better or worse. Now the question is whether the purpose of the UN is to evaluate national education. Because if it is, then supposedly, the UN can illustrate students’ achievement from year to year, including the incline and its decline with their specific reason. UN cannot describe year to year development because every student’s questions are different from one another to avoid cheating. It works, but as a consequence, then we cannot compare this year and last year’s results.

Lastly, it is difficult to ensure that the UN is free from fraud or cheating without impacting shortcomings. Across the nation, schools under intense pressure to show better test results have allowed those tests to cannibalize the curriculum (Kohn, 2000). As stated earlier, if the UN question is different from year to year, even if every student has a different question type, it cannot illustrate national education evaluation. As standard, the UN minimum grade is 5.5 for this year. Even though students are stressed that the standard grade keeps increasing by the year, 5.5 is still too low to set a national standard. To illustrate, a grade of 5.5 means students can only answer 55% of the questions. How can the UN stipulate 5.5 when for daily assignments, students have to get minimally 7? If students’ daily assignments have such high grades, how can they still fail or be challenged by the UN? Secondary data showed that despite the UN having a different goal as graduation standard, the UN is still considered high-stakes testing due to its low honesty in scoring (Saukah & Cahyono, 2015).

On the other hand, without the pressure of high standard grades itself, students cheat with or without the teacher’s consciousness. Panjaitan (2017) wrote a master dissertation about Indonesian cases of cheating students in the UN. Several factors caused students to cheat due to self-esteem, time pressure, custom, and lack of punishment. However, it is also stated that 19 respondents said the teacher provided the answer key among the cheating method. Cheating is now part of a habit that everyone in Indonesia keeps acting as if it is a secret when everybody knows it.

1.2 How 2014 UN Version Improves

According to Alawiyah (2015), 6 things changed from the previous UN version. First of all, the UN’s function as a requirement to graduate from school is no longer a valid system. Regulation of the Ministry of Education and culture (Permendikbud) Number 4 Year 2018 chapter 6, article 19 (2), stated that the school’s graduation is considered by the school concerned. With this new regulation, schools are in charge of graduating their students.

Secondly, the implementation of the UN is also different. With the advantage of technology, now UN can be enforced on the computer or CBT (computer-based test), so this UN version is called UNBK or Ujian Nasional Berbasis Komputer (CBT National Exam). However, considering not every school is equipped with sufficient technology units before the UN begins, the preparation starts with checking the school’s capability to carry on CBT. There are criteria in which to state a school is ready for CBT. This is why CBT status is being encouraged, not obligated, just as stated in Permendikbud 43 Year 2019 Chapter 2 Article 14.

Thirdly, the university’s role in the UN is more specific as an observer in the area according to the city level. The university is still a coordinator of the answer sheet scan. The only difference is the area level of observing. It will decrease the possibility of cheating from teachers and schools.

Furthermore, the UN auction process and material printing are handled by each of the provinces. Previously, there were only eight regions in charge of doing this.

Lastly, UN worksheets are no longer kept in schools. More specifically, schools store them for a month to demolish along with their event reports/news. This way, it is impossible for teachers to use the worksheet as a daily practice to have a high score in the UN. Though it is not a problem to use them as a practice, when it comes to focusing “practice to pass the UN,” it will diminish the purpose and effectiveness of learning.

2. Discussion

From the findings, National Examination has developed from year to year but still has pros and cons in education, especially since the UN (2005-2013) has received considerable
controversies with its own purpose in evaluating national standard education. On the other hand, UN improvement, which is increasing as to the UNBK system, has not solved the previous controversy.

The Head of BSNP said that BSNP Regulation Number 0051/P/BSNP/XI/2019 concerning 2019/2020 National Examination Standard Operational Procedure is no longer valid. BSNP replaced it by issuing a new National Examination Standard Operational Procedure. In line with this, the amendment was also made in connection with the issuance of Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture Number 43 of 2019 concerning the implementation of exams organized by the education unit and the national exam.

The first UNBK was enforced online in 2014. The increasing number of UNBK schools in 2017 is in line with the resources sharing policy issued by the Ministry of Education and Culture that allows schools with limited computer facilities to implement UNBK in other schools with adequate computer facilities. Based on the BNSP evaluation, the UNBK (computer-based national exam) provides better accuracy and efficiency in its implementation.

This new policy attracts new debate in determining Indonesia's quality of education, even it may add to new problems or anxiety. The existence of controversy is caused by the imperfection in the pattern measurements in each region. The increased standard National Examination (UN) measuring tool may not be relevant compared with the material contents in certain areas.

As long as the UN is still stipulated as a national education evaluation, there is no solution to the injustice standard, education purpose, and many other violation principles. Neither can we know the level of our national education achievement. There is no integration between principles and their realization, causing chaos and endless debates. Supposedly, school and national education can be a place where students find their potential in short children-centered. Based on Atmanti (2005), the higher quality of human resources, the higher the efficiency and productivity. School should have been where they know what they need to be a better nation generation and develop this country. However, this will never happen as teachers are locked in their perception of teaching students to answer the UN. Students are too busy memorizing material they should have understood.

Several researchers have carried out studies on the National Examination, including Asiah and Rofieq (2011), who analyzed the national exam policy at the Vocational High School (SMK) level. Firmantyo and Alsa (2016) also conducted a study regarding academic integrity and anxiety facing the Student National Exam. Next, Silverius (2010) study was about the all-time National Examination controversy. Meanwhile, Mardapi (2009) examined the evaluation of the implementation of school final exams based on national standards, and Suwandi (2013) explored the evaluation implementation of the national standard school final examination (UASBN).

Further, Ghofur (2014) has renewed his research by eliminating the UN results' graduation requirements. The UN results are only used to map the quality of education, not as a graduation requirement. Based on his research results, Sulistyo (2007) explained that the National Examination must be seen with a positive attitude and optimism to spur further regions to advance in the corridor of national development, not a baseless defensive attitude. This is seen as a technical refinement of the National Examination as a testing system.

What is more, Nasution (2016) said that the Government must continue to seek patterns and models so that the UN does not waste the government budget every year carelessly. In his study, he tried to explore the potential of the national exam and government policies to improve the workforce’s quality according to the times' demands depending on how the potential of the National Examination could be explored. He said that the UN has a huge potential to build the nation, but it will potentially reduce the nation's status in the arena of global competition if it is mismanaged.

Therefore, the evaluation should be left entirely to the school and teacher. Based on Government Regulation no. 19 year 2005, on National Education Standards, passing the national examination is only one of the conditions for students to graduate and get a diploma from the school. Teachers are the ones who arrange their own material, teaching method, and goal. Why should the government be the one who designs the question when teachers are the ones who know more about their students? Even so, teachers also take part in this imbalance. No law states that teachers should use any specific book, so there is no law that any book should provide students. However, what happens in the field now is the teacher being locked into their preferred book. It is as if the teacher has to spend every material in the book by the end of the semester when they are not obligated to. Once teachers understand this and the UN is abolished,
we now need teachers to understand national education purposes and the right evaluation standard. Students do not have to be depressed over school anymore, and teachers are free from the preferred book. In that way, it can trigger students to lack readiness in learning. In line with this, Baden and Major (2004) stated that activities learners need to match or balance with their cognitive aspects and readiness. Further, remember that national education’s purpose is not limited to cognitive skill but also psychomotor, attitudes, behavior, and faith. The abolishment of the preferred book and the UN will help boost our education.

Additionally, what is the right national education standard? To answer this question, we have to first look at the goal of our national education. As stated in Law Number 20 Year 2003, education is a conscious and planned effort to create an atmosphere of learning and the learning process. Students aim to actively develop their potential to have religious, spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and the skills needed by students, the community, nation, and state. Law should include each of the goals, as stated in Law Number 20 Year 2003. It sounds difficult to do unless characterization and faith can be included in every subject. It is about teacher creativity to teach their students every goal in their subject. However, once again, this will never happen if teachers are locked in the preferred book.

Besides, the supposedly national education’s objective is like what is stated in Law Number 20 Year 2003. In that case, the government should have been aware that the UN, as an evaluation, cannot describe this purpose. To simplify, just like an instrument in quantitative research, before anyone clarifies the next evaluation standard, it is better to validate that this evaluation instrument will result in the expected information instead of just stating them as new laws without any proper test of this instrument. How many more generations should this country sacrifice understand that the national education evaluation standard needs review and validation? UN will only describe the students’ cognitive skills; meanwhile, our education objective is cognitive skill and behavior and many others.

Several terms are sometimes not well understood regarding the National Examination, such as measurement, assessment, and evaluation. Measurement in learning is an activity measured through a process by comparing something and using one particular measure. Ebel (1972) describes measurement as giving a number to someone or something intended to distinguish the level of character of that person or object and is measured systematically. In line with this, Keeves and Masters (1999) also explain that measurement gives a number to an object or event according to a rule. Based on several often misunderstood terms, Soedijarto (1993a) believes that the UN should not follow America and Germany, which did not apply to the final evaluation. However, the policy that should be prioritized is to help students optimally by providing professional teachers. These teachers work full-time as educators, providing adequate facilities and supporting teacher and student performance, providing rich learning media to increase student learning motivation such as complete libraries and laboratories, and continuous, comprehensive, and objective evaluation.

Evaluations must describe the achieved level of a student’s learning process in all predetermined aspects. Education directed at building a smart workforce capable of working and smart cannot be measured only by mere tests (Soedijarto, n.d.). Therefore, an evaluation must illustrate students’ cognitive skills and their future implications in the workplace. Soedijarto (1993) asserted that the UN’s evaluation system also aims to know students’ cognitive skills. This is why Indonesian students’ learning style is memorizing, which is the least in the blooming taxonomy level. Therefore, it can be highlighted that the UN informs students’ memorizing skill rather than their life skills or ability in the workplace. Supposedly, an evaluation system must be developed according to its learning purpose, which is the one that can answer all abilities learned and obtained while attending education. This way, there are so many dissimilarities between those who attend education and not. In other words, evaluation cannot be done only at certain times but must be done comprehensively in various forms and carried out continuously (Soedijarto, n.d.).

McNeil (1977) stated that the evaluation must provide three important information: placement, mastery, and diagnosis. Placement relates to the level of learning in which a student can be challenging but not frustrating. Mastery is related to whether the child already has enough knowledge and abilities to go to the next level. The diagnosis is related to which part of the child feels difficult.

To implement the education program properly, a measurable and directed guideline or reference is needed. Therefore, the government has issued Government Regulation Number 19
of 2005 concerning National Education Standards, later refined with PP Number 32 of 2013. Besides, National Education Standards (SNP) are minimum criteria regarding the education system in the Republic of Indonesia's entire territory. SNP functions as the main guideline in planning, implementing and supervising education to realize quality national education.

Based on National Education Standards Board, there are three Functions and Purposes such as (1) National Education Standards serve as the basis for planning, implementing, and supervising education in the context of realizing quality national education; (2) National Education Standards guarantee the quality of national education to educate the nation's life, shape the character and civilization of the nation with dignity; (3) National Education Standards are completed in a planned, directed, and sustainable following the changing demands of local, national and global life.

National Education Standards include eight criteria that must be fulfilled in the efforts towards quality education. The eight national standards consist of:

1. **Content**
   Content is a material component and competency level to achieve graduate competencies at certain levels and education types. The content standard contains the curriculum's basic framework and structure, learning load, SBC, and academic calendar.

2. **Process**
   The second standard relates to the implementation of learning in each education unit. The implementation and achievement of standard processes are conducted in an interactive, inspiring, enjoyable, participatory manner based on graduate competency standards.

3. **Standard Graduate Competence**
   Standard Graduate Competence (SKL) is a criterion or qualification that concerns graduates divided into attitude, knowledge, and skills. The SKL aims to lay out the foundation of intelligence, insight into knowledge, noble character, and the skills to live independently and attend further education at the elementary school level.

4. **Educator and Education Staff Standard**
   Other national standards in the field of education relate to educators and education personnel. Educational Standards and Education Personnel are pre-service education criteria and physical and mental worthiness and education in the office.

5. **Facilities and Infrastructure Standards**
   This benchmark covers the minimum criteria for facilities and media that support learning, such as study rooms, places to exercise, places to carry out worship, libraries, laboratories, play facilities, etc.

6. **Management Standards**
   The sixth standard regulated in government regulations is related to management. The management standard covers the planning, implementation, and supervision of educational activities effectively and efficiently at the education unit, district/city, province, and national level management level.

7. **Budget Plan**
   A budget plan in the implementation of education needs to be set according to certain standards. Financing standards specify the components and magnitude of an education unit's operating costs valid for one year. The standard costs are divided into investment costs, operating costs, and personal costs.

8. **Educational Assessment Standards**
   This assessment standard relates to mechanisms, procedures, and assessment instruments to determine student learning outcomes. At the level of primary and secondary education, educational assessment consists of assessing educators' learning outcomes, assessing learning outcomes by education units (schools), and assessing the government's learning outcomes.

Since UNBK 2014 under Anies Baswedan as the Minister of Education and Culture that changed UN's policy as a requirement to graduate schools, Nadiem Makariem, as the current
minister, also released another policy new content of UN test. Here is a comparison of 2005-2013 UN problems and the latest UN version policy that helps to solve them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Comparison of UN Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-2013 UN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only testing cognitive skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk of cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test enforce at the end of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school year before graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the latest UN policy has changed and solved previous UN version problems. One of the most significant changes is the UN as a graduation requirement. Now, schools can decide students’ graduation as schools enforce the test. It solved the previous UN version backwash, preventing teachers from considering graduating their students even though school examination is also another requirement. However, what happened in the field is different where the UN score is more dominant than the right of schools in graduating students.

Also, the second change in UN policy is the content of the test. Previously, the UN only tested 4 subjects, and all of them are cognitive skills. However, now the UN's content is developed in which private high schools of “Aliyah” and “Kejurusan” have practical UN test content according to the focus of their major. It solved the previous controversy where every high school student undertaking distinct majors has a similar tested subject. Though we think it might be better if science-focus or social-focus high schools, students can also have practical tests; they are just as significant.

In cheating, computer-based help to reduce this possibility even though not every school is capable of implementing this. Moreover, the observer of every school is not local teachers. Despite all these changes, cheatings are still found. There is no statistical proof to compare the frequency of cheating before and after employing a computer-based, but it has more benefits. Fewer paper works and time effectiveness are an example of the positive effects.

However, there is still one point left unchanged, which is the time the UN enforces. The elder UN version is controversial in that the UN is enforced only once after years of learning and is still called “evaluation of national education”. Nevertheless, now that the purpose of the UN itself is changed, this change is unnecessary. It is not a problem to test students once before graduation to ensure schools and teachers' quality because it is the perfect time to evaluate it.

D. Conclusion

Previous UN (2005-2013) received some critics due to some reasons. The UN’s policy as a graduation requirement increases the anxiety not only to students and teachers but also to society. This impacted the high risk of cheating conducted by not only students but also teachers and schools. Another impact is that teachers focus on teaching students how to answer UN questions rather than exposing them to the determined knowledge supposed to teach. Besides, the chosen tested subject has decreased the value of other subjects. Lastly, the UN's enforcement at the end of the school year and called its evaluation is questionable. As national education purpose is not limited to cognitive skill, examining behavior and attitude cannot be described in such limited time.

Recent UN policy, on the other hand, has solved these problems. By eliminating the UN as graduation requirements, the latest UN version answered the previous UN’s obstacles. Another change is the test’s content in which private schools of “Aliyah” and “Kejurusan” have a practical test. Also, by implementing the computer-based test, the risk of cheating might be decreasing.
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