Teaching Planning Models: A Critical Analysis of the Tyler, Taba, Dick & Carey Models, and Backward Design

Dewi Kurniawati[1]
[1] Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Ibnurusyd, Indonesia, kasidinratijah45@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Instructional planning,
Tyler's model,
Taba's model,
Dick & Carey's model,
Backward Design,
learning effectiveness.

Article history:

Received 2021-08-14
Revised 2021-11-12
Accepted 2022-01-17

ABSTRACT

Instructional planning is an essential foundation for creating an effective, systematic, and goal-oriented learning process. This article presents a critical analysis of four influential instructional planning models: the Tyler Model, the Taba Model, the Dick & Carey Model, and the Backward Design Model. Each model has a different approach, both in terms of philosophy, stages, and planning focus. The Tyler Model emphasizes measurable learning objectives, the Taba Model is oriented towards learners' needs and interests, the Dick & Carey Model emphasizes a comprehensive instructional system, while the Backward Design Model focuses on determining learning outcomes before designing learning strategies. This analysis highlights the strengths and limitations of each model and recommends that the choice of planning model should consider the learning context, learner characteristics, and educational objectives. Thus, a flexible combination of various models can be a more adaptive and relevant strategy in addressing the challenges of modern learning.

Corresponding Author:
Dewi Kurniawati
Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Ibnurusyd, Indonesia, kasidinratijah45@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Teaching planning is a fundamental aspect in the world of education that determines the direction, quality and effectiveness of a learning process **(Susanto, 2024a).** General facts show that every human activity, especially in education, requires careful planning in order to achieve the desired goals **(Susanto & Syahrudin, 2024; Wahyudi, Nuriana, & Irfan, 2025).** Good education does not only rely on delivering material, but also requires a planned strategy that can guide students to develop competencies, skills, and character. Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System emphasizes that learning is a process of interaction between students, educators, and learning resources in a learning environment **(Fadhilah H.M, Rivai, & Syamsul, 2023)**. This demonstrates that instructional planning is integral to ensuring effective interaction. Without clear planning, the educational process tends to be haphazard, unfocused, and at risk of failing to achieve learning objectives.

Socially, the world of education faces increasingly complex challenges. Social change, technological advancements, and the diverse characteristics of students require teachers to act not

only as instructors but also as skilled planners. The reality on the ground shows that many teachers still struggle to design learning that meets their students' needs **(Anta, Sampurna, & Susanto, 2025)**. This results in low student engagement, a lack of relevance of the material to real life, and poor competency achievement. For example, in the context of education in Indonesia, learning plans often tend to be purely administrative and formal, without truly considering the social and cultural contexts and learning needs of students **(Kasus & Cepu, n.d.)**. This phenomenon shows that there is a gap between learning planning theory and implementation practices in schools.

The main problem that arises is educators' suboptimal understanding of lesson planning models that should serve as guidelines. Many teachers remain stuck in monotonous traditional patterns, resulting in learning that fails to stimulate creativity, critical thinking, or 21st-century skills **(Sampurna & Jannah, 2025).** Furthermore, there is still a tendency for teachers to focus solely on cognitive curriculum achievement, while the affective and psychomotor aspects receive less attention. This is due to the lack of critical analysis of learning planning models that have actually been developed by experts for a long time. The Tyler, Taba, Dick & Carey, and Backward Design models actually offer different but complementary approaches to helping teachers design effective learning **(Firoza, Barlinty, & Mokhamad, 2025)**. However, due to a lack of understanding and limited training, these models are rarely optimally implemented in the classroom. As a solution, a more critical review of lesson planning models is needed so that teachers have broader insight in choosing the right approach. The goal-oriented Tyler Model can help teachers emphasize measurable outcomes, while the Taba Model, which focuses on student needs, can deliver relevant learning. The Dick & Carey Model offers a comprehensive instructional system, while Backward Design emphasizes the importance of formulating learning outcomes from the outset. By understanding the strengths and limitations of each model, educators can combine various approaches to produce more adaptive, contextual, and innovative lesson plans. This critical review is expected to serve as an applicable guide for teachers, lecturers, and prospective educators in navigating the dynamics of learning in the digital and global era.

A review of previous research also reinforces the urgency of this study. Tyler's (1949) research emphasized that planning must be oriented toward specific goals, while Taba (1962) emphasized the importance of student involvement in determining learning concepts. Dick & Carey (1978) later developed a systematic instructional approach with nine planning steps. Meanwhile, Wiggins and McTighe (2005) introduced Backward Design, which emphasizes the formulation of learning outcomes before designing activities. Several studies in Indonesia also confirm the effectiveness of this model. For example, Widoyoko (2020) showed that a structured planning model can improve the effectiveness of classroom learning, while Istiq'faroh's (2020) research highlighted the importance of the relevance of Ki Hajar Dewantara's educational philosophy in national learning planning. However, these studies are still partial, discussing each model separately without providing an in-depth comparative analysis.

In this research, the method used is a literature study with a qualitative approach **(Sugiyono, 2016).** The author analyzed various literature, including books, journal articles, and relevant academic documents. The analysis was conducted descriptively by comparing each instructional planning model, highlighting its strengths, weaknesses, and implementation context. This method is expected to produce a comprehensive and applicable analytical framework for educators. The purpose of this study is to provide a critical overview of four influential instructional planning models, enabling educators to understand the characteristics of each model and adapt them to the learning context. Furthermore, this study aims to strengthen the literature on instructional

planning in Indonesia and contribute to the development of more adaptive and relevant instructional strategies to meet the needs of the times.

The urgency of this research lies in the fact that 21st-century education demands more creative, collaborative, and competency-based learning. Teachers are no longer sufficient to simply deliver material; they must also be able to design meaningful learning experiences. The teaching planning models reviewed in this article can serve as a foundation for developing learning that aligns with the demands of the independent learning curriculum, while also addressing the challenges of globalization and digitalization in education. Therefore, this critical analysis is urgently needed so that teachers and education practitioners are not trapped by conventional approaches but are able to introduce innovation into the learning process. The novelty of this research lies in its comparative approach and critical analysis, which integrates four teaching planning models within a single framework. Unlike previous research that discussed models in isolation, this study presents a comprehensive analysis of how the strengths and limitations of each model can complement each other. Thus, this research serves not only as a theoretical study but also offers practical implications in the form of recommendations for implementing planning models that are more flexible, contextual, and relevant to educational needs in Indonesia.

2. METHODS

This research uses a qualitative approach with the type of library research **(Huberman & Jhonny, 2014; Sugiyono, 2015).** Library research was chosen because the focus of the study lies in the theoretical and conceptual analysis of instructional planning models developed by educational experts. This method allows researchers to collect, identify, analyze, and interpret data from various academic literature sources, such as books, journal articles, proceedings, and relevant policy documents. This library research stage is carried out through several steps. First, data collection is carried out by searching for literature that specifically discusses instructional planning models, including the Tyler Model, the Taba Model, the Dick & Carey Model, and the Backward Design Model. The literature search uses keywords such as instructional design, curriculum development, teaching planning models, and educational effectiveness. The main sources used are the original works of prominent model developers, for example, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* by Ralph Tyler (1949), *Curriculum Development* by Hilda Taba (1962), *The Systematic Design of Instruction* by Dick & Carey (1978), and *Understanding by Design* by Wiggins and McTighe (2005). In addition, researchers also accessed secondary literature in the form of previous research that was relevant in the context of implementing the four models at various levels of education.

Second, data selection and classification were conducted. Not all literature found was used for analysis, but only that which met the criteria of relevance, credibility, and currency. The selected literature was then grouped by theme, such as the basic principles of the model, planning steps, advantages, limitations, and relevance to the modern learning context. This classification process is crucial to ensure the data used truly supports the research objectives and facilitates the analysis phase. Third, the data analysis phase was conducted using content analysis techniques. Content analysis helps researchers examine the main ideas, concepts, and concepts of each teaching planning model. Data were analyzed descriptively and comparatively by comparing the characteristics of each model, both in terms of philosophical approach, planning procedures, and practical implications for learning. This analysis was conducted inductively, drawing conclusions from the literature data to reach a more general understanding of the relevance of these planning

models. Fourth, the synthesis and interpretation phase was conducted to integrate the analysis results into a more comprehensive framework. In this phase, researchers identified relationships between models, identified similarities and differences, and formulated the strengths and weaknesses of each. From this synthesis, recommendations were drawn regarding how teachers or educators can utilize a combination of various models to improve learning effectiveness.

The validity of the research was maintained through source triangulation, comparing findings from primary literature with secondary literature and previous empirical studies. Furthermore, the researcher ensured the validity of the data by using sources from trusted publishers or academic journals, ensuring that the analysis had a strong academic basis. This library research method was deemed appropriate because the study was conceptual and analytical, rather than empirical in the field. The primary objective of this research was to provide a deeper and more critical understanding of instructional planning models, thereby providing theoretical contributions to the development of educational literature and practical contributions for educators in selecting appropriate planning strategies. Therefore, this research method emphasized literature review, critical analysis, and conceptual synthesis. The expected outcome is an analytical framework that not only explains the differences in instructional planning models but also offers new perspectives on the possibility of integrating these models to address the challenges of 21st-century learning.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Aspect	Tyler Model (1949)	Taba Model (1962)	Dick & Carey Model (1978)	Backward Design Model (2005)
Main Concept	Oriented towards clear and measurable learning objectives (objective model).	Using an inductive and student needs-based approach (grassroots approach).	An instructional system model that emphasizes the integration of goals, strategies, media, and evaluation.	"Begin with the end in mind." Focus on students' final competencies.
Planning Stages	(1) Determine goals, (2) Select learning experiences, (3) Organize experiences, (4) Evaluate results.	(1) Diagnosing needs, (2) Formulating objectives, (3) Selecting content, (4) Organizing content, (5) Selecting experiences, (6) Organizing experiences, (7) Evaluation.	(1) Identification of objectives, (2) Instructional analysis, (3) Identification of initial behavior, (4) Formulation of specific objectives, (5) Assessment instruments, (6) Learning strategies, (7) Teaching materials, (8) Formative evaluation, (9) Revision.	(1) Identification of desired learning outcomes, (2) Determination of evidence of achievement (assessment), (3) Designing learning experiences.
Excess	- Systematic and clear. - Goals are easy to measure. - Efficient in	- Participatory and relevant. - Responsive to student needs. - Flexible.	- Systematic and comprehensive. - Data-driven. - Suitable for various contexts (education & training).	- Focus on final competencies. - Encourage authentic learning. - Deepen student

	planning.			understanding.
Limitations	- Lack of attention to individual needs. - Tends to be rigid.	- Long and complicated process. - Requires a lot of data.	- Requires a lot of time, effort, and cost. - High complexity.	- Requires high teacher skills. - Takes longer. - Constrained by resources.
Practical Relevance	Aligned with the Independent Curriculum which emphasizes learning outcomes.	Suitable for thematic and project-based learning in schools.	Highly relevant for technology-based learning and e-learning.	In line with authentic assessment and learning outcomes of the Independent Curriculum.

DISCUSSION

Model Tyler

The Tyler Model was first introduced by Ralph W. Tyler in 1949 through his work entitled *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. This model has since become widely recognized as one of the most influential approaches in curriculum planning and teaching. The background to the birth of the Tyler Model is inseparable from the needs of post-World War II education, where the world of education emphasized the importance of directed, efficient teaching, and the ability to produce graduates with skills in accordance with the demands of society **(Neuman, 2014).** The central principle of Tyler's Model is that the entire instructional planning process must be based on clear and measurable objectives. In other words, learning objectives serve as the starting point and foundation for every decision made in planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction. Tyler views education as a systematic process, so teachers need to first determine what they expect students to achieve. Learning experiences are then structured to support the achievement of these objectives.

Tyler's approach is often referred to as the objective model because it emphasizes the determination of specific instructional goals. Thus, each learning activity is not merely a routine classroom activity but is directed toward achieving observable, measurable, and evaluable outcomes. This principle makes the Tyler Model relevant today, especially in educational contexts that demand high accountability for student learning outcomes.

Planning Stages

Tyler's model outlines four main stages in lesson planning. These stages are cyclical, meaning teachers can repeat or refine the process as needed **(Junaidi, Sileuw, & Faisal, 2023).**

1. Determining learning objectives

   Teachers specifically formulate the competencies they expect students to achieve after participating in the lesson. These objectives should be formulated by considering student needs, societal demands, and scientific developments. For example, in a biology subject, an objective might be: "*Students will be able to explain the process of photosynthesis coherently and correctly*."

2. Choosing a learning experience

Once objectives are determined, teachers select the most relevant learning experiences to help students achieve them. Learning experiences here involve more than just delivering material, but also direct interaction between students and learning resources. For example, to understand photosynthesis, students can conduct a simple experiment using plants and light.

3. Organizing learning experiences

The selected learning experiences are then systematically organized. This organization is important to ensure that the learning experiences are interconnected, gradual, and continuous. Teachers need to pay attention to the sequence, continuity, and integration between activities. In the example of photosynthesis, the activity could begin with a discussion, continue with an experiment, and conclude with a group presentation.

4. Evaluating learning outcomes

The final stage is evaluating the extent to which students have achieved the set objectives. Evaluation is conducted through tests, observations, or assignments. Evaluation results are used not only to assess students but also as feedback for teachers in improving learning planning and implementation.

These four stages demonstrate that Tyler's Model emphasizes the close relationship between objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation. All components must be aligned for effective and measurable learning.

Taba Model

The Taba Model was developed by Hilda Taba in 1962 as a critique and refinement of instructional planning approaches deemed too rigid and centralized. Unlike Ralph Tyler, who began planning from learning objectives, Taba employed an inductive approach, starting with the needs and interests of students. The main principle of this model is that curriculum and learning should be designed "from the bottom up" (grassroots approach), not solely determined by educational authorities or policy makers. According to Taba, students are not merely objects of education, but active subjects with diverse backgrounds, needs, and interests **(Aisi, Susanto, & Isa, 2025)**. Therefore, learning planning must start from the realities of students in the classroom, then develop toward broader goals in line with the educational vision. Teachers, in Taba's view, play a crucial role as curriculum designers and facilitators who directly understand the conditions of their students. This way, learning becomes more contextual, relevant, and meaningful for students. Taba's approach emphasizes active student participation in learning. Teachers are not simply "conveyors of material," but designers of learning experiences that align with the real needs of students. Therefore, this model is considered more humanistic and democratic than previous models, as it provides greater space for recognizing students' individual potential.

The Taba model has great potential for application in Indonesian education, particularly in the Merdeka Curriculum era, which emphasizes student-centered learning. The principle of diagnosing student needs and selecting content relevant to real life aligns closely with the concepts of differentiated learning and project-based learning developed in the Merdeka Curriculum. For example, in project-based learning (PjBL), teachers can begin by identifying real-world problems students face in their environment, such as waste management or water conservation. Based on this diagnosis, teachers then formulate learning objectives, select relevant content, and organize learning experiences into collaborative projects **(Kurniawati & Susanto,**

2025). Evaluation is conducted through assessment of the process and products of student projects. Furthermore, the Taba Model is also relevant for integrative thematic learning in elementary schools. Because this model emphasizes student needs, teachers can design learning themes relevant to everyday life, such as "Clean and Healthy Environment." In this way, students not only gain knowledge but also develop a caring attitude toward the environment.

However, the main challenges to implementing the Taba Model in Indonesia are time constraints, the large number of students in a class, and the varying abilities of teachers in conducting needs assessments. Therefore, teacher training support and educational policies that allow teachers flexibility in designing learning according to student characteristics are needed.

Dick & Carey Model

The Dick & Carey Model was first introduced by Walter Dick and Lou Carey in 1978 through their work, *The Systematic Design of Instruction*. This model was born from the tradition of systems theory, which emphasizes that the learning process is a system consisting of various interrelated components. Unlike earlier, simpler models, such as the Tyler Model, which focuses on objectives, or the Taba Model, which starts from student needs, the Dick & Carey Model positions learning as a series of integrated elements that must be designed holistically. The basis of this model is that the success of learning depends not only on objectives or materials alone, but also on the integration between objectives, strategies, media, teaching materials, and evaluation. This means that if one component is not well designed, the effectiveness of learning will decrease. Therefore, this model is called an instructional systems model, in which all components are arranged in a logical sequence and support each other. The main principle of the Dick & Carey Model is the use of a data-driven approach. Each stage of learning planning must be supported by a needs analysis, initial assessment, and ongoing evaluation. This makes this model more scientific, measurable, and systematic than previous models. It is not surprising that to this day, the Dick & Carey Model is still widely used in curriculum development, training, and technology-based learning systems.

Backward Design Model

The Backward Design model was developed by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe in 2005 through their work entitled Understanding by Design. This model emerged from a critique of traditional learning planning practices, which generally begin with determining the material, then methods, and only then conclude with assessment. Wiggins and McTighe argued that such an approach often leads to learning focusing on the content, rather than on the deep understanding that students should have. Therefore, Backward Design introduced the "end-as-start" approach. This means that teachers must first determine the competencies or final understandings expected of students, then design assessments to measure those achievements, and finally select strategies and learning experiences that support the achievement of these goals. In other words, Backward Design emphasizes the principle of beginning with the end in mind. The central concept in Backward Design is deep understanding. Students are not only required to memorize facts or information, but also to apply knowledge, analyze, evaluate, and create something based on what they learn. Therefore, this model is very much in line with the demands of 21st-century education, which prioritizes critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and communication skills.

The Backward Design model is highly relevant to the Merdeka Curriculum currently being implemented in Indonesia. The Merdeka Curriculum emphasizes learning outcomes (CP) that students must achieve at each stage, not simply mastering the material. This aligns with the

Backward Design principle, which begins planning with the end result in mind. Furthermore, the Merdeka Curriculum also encourages the implementation of authentic assessments that assess students' actual skills, whether through projects, portfolios, or real-world performance. This aligns with the second stage of Backward Design, which emphasizes the importance of concrete evidence of achievement. For example, in Indonesian language subjects, students are tested not only with multiple-choice questions but also through their ability to create texts, presentations, or digital literacy works. Furthermore, Backward Design also supports project-based learning, one of the main strategies in the Merdeka Curriculum. By designing learning experiences that begin with the end goal in mind, teachers can create projects relevant to students' lives, encouraging collaboration, creativity, and social awareness. However, the main challenge in implementing Backward Design in Indonesia is teacher readiness. Many teachers are still accustomed to traditional planning that focuses on delivering content. Therefore, intensive training for teachers in designing authentic assessments and contextual learning experiences is crucial.

Comparative Analysis of Tyler, Taba, Dick & Carey, and Backward Design Models

The instructional planning models developed by Tyler, Taba, Dick & Carey, and Wiggins & McTighe (Backward Design) have had a significant influence on modern education. Although these four models emerged from different contexts and periods, they all aim to improve learning effectiveness through a clear, systematic planning. Overall, the main similarity between the four models is their emphasis on the importance of systematic planning and evaluation. Each model emphasizes that the learning process should not be spontaneous or haphazard, but rather must be well-designed, structured, and measurable through clear evaluation mechanisms. Therefore, Tyler, Taba, Dick & Carey, and Backward Design all believe that planning is the foundation of meaningful learning.

However, upon closer analysis, the four models have fundamental differences that demonstrate their unique characteristics. Tyler's model places objectives as the starting point. All learning activities are directed toward achieving specific, measurable instructional objectives. This approach emphasizes the importance of clear direction in education **(Sahroni, Furqoni, & Martoyo, 2025).** In contrast, the Taba Model starts from student needs as the basis for planning. With an inductive approach, Taba emphasizes that students must be at the center of planning, so that learning is not top-down but more relevant to students' real lives. The Dick & Carey Model presents a comprehensive instructional systems approach. In this model, learning planning is seen as a system consisting of interrelated components, starting from objectives, instructional analysis, initial student behavior, to formative evaluation and revision. Meanwhile, Backward Design, introduced by Wiggins & McTighe, begins planning from the end result as a reference. Teachers must first determine the expected learning outcomes or final understanding, then determine assessments that can prove these achievements, and then design learning experiences that support them.

These differences in approach demonstrate that the four models offer complementary perspectives. Tyler emphasizes clarity of purpose, Taba emphasizes student needs, Dick & Carey emphasize system integration, and Backward Design emphasizes outcome orientation. Therefore, model selection cannot be absolute or exclusive; it must be tailored to the context, needs, and learning characteristics **(Ekawati, 2025).**

From these differences, a very important practical implication emerges: that the combination of the four models can produce a more adaptive planning strategy. Teachers can take the clarity

of purpose from the Tyler Model, integrate the student-needs orientation from the Taba Model, adopt the systematic strategies from the Dick & Carey Model, and utilize the authentic assessment approach from Backward Design. For example, in designing project-based learning, teachers can first establish clear objectives according to the curriculum (Tyler), align them with the needs of students in the class (Taba), develop a structured and data-driven learning strategy (Dick & Carey), and then conclude with authentic assessment that demonstrates students' deep understanding (Backward Design). This combination will make learning planning richer, more flexible, and more relevant to the demands of the 21st century.

Implications for Modern Education

The application of these four instructional planning models has broad implications for modern education, particularly in the context of Indonesia, which is currently implementing the Independent Curriculum. The Independent Curriculum emphasizes clear learning outcomes, differentiated learning, authentic assessment, and the development of 21st-century competencies. When viewed from these principles, the four instructional planning models can serve as both a conceptual and practical foundation. First, the Tyler Model is highly relevant because it aligns with the learning outcomes orientation of the Independent Curriculum. Establishing clear instructional objectives helps teachers direct learning toward expected competencies **(Susanto, 2024b).** Teachers can use Tyler's framework to ensure that each learning activity truly leads to the achievement of predetermined objectives.

Second, the Taba Model contributes to the implementation of student-centered learning. By diagnosing student needs as a first step, teachers can design more contextual and differentiated learning. This aligns closely with the principles of the Independent Curriculum, which emphasizes differentiated learning, where teachers must adapt teaching strategies to students' interests, learning styles, and ability levels. Third, the Dick & Carey Model supports the implementation of technology-based learning and e-learning. In the digital era, education increasingly relies on online platforms, interactive multimedia, and digital learning resources. The systematic, data-driven Dick & Carey Model is well-suited for designing online courses or blended learning. Teachers can use this framework to integrate objectives, strategies, media, and assessments into one structured system.

Fourth, Backward Design makes a crucial contribution to developing authentic assessments, one of the pillars of the Independent Curriculum. By starting with the end result in mind, teachers can ensure that the assessments used truly reflect the expected competencies. For example, instead of testing students with rote learning, teachers can design projects, portfolios, or performance assignments that require students to demonstrate in-depth understanding and concrete skills. From these four models, it is clear that teachers can no longer be positioned merely as transmitters of material. Instead, teachers must act as learning designers capable of continuously designing, implementing, evaluating, and revising learning strategies. This role requires teachers to possess advanced pedagogical, technological, and managerial skills **(Ambarwati, Wibowo, Arsyiadanti, & Susanti, 2022)**.

However, implementing these four models also presents a number of challenges in the context of modern education. First, many teachers are still accustomed to conventional planning that focuses on delivering content. This makes it difficult for them to design authentic assessments or project-based learning. Second, resource constraints, such as large class sizes, limited technological resources, or time constraints, often hinder the implementation of complex models such as Dick & Carey or Backward Design. Third, there are still gaps in teacher

competency in analyzing student needs (the Taba Model) or formulating measurable instructional objectives (the Tyler Model) **(Anta et al., 2025; Noer Syo Im & Achmad Muhibin Zuhri, 2024).** However, these challenges also provide opportunities to improve the quality of education through teacher training, ongoing professional development, and the provision of adequate support resources. With the right understanding, teachers can integrate the best elements of each model to create adaptive learning.

In the era of globalization and digitalization of education, the integration of these four models is becoming increasingly urgent. Today's workforce requires graduates who are not only academically intelligent but also able to think critically, collaborate, communicate, and innovate. By combining clear objectives (Tyler), relevance to student needs (Taba), a comprehensive instructional system (Dick & Carey), and meaningful, authentic assessment (Backward Design), modern education can be better prepared to produce a generation competent in facing global challenges.

5. CONCLUSION

Instructional planning is a crucial foundation for a successful educational process. An analysis of four major models Tyler, Taba, Dick & Carey, and Backward Design shows that each has its own unique characteristics. Tyler's model emphasizes objectives as the starting point, Taba's model starts with student needs, Dick & Carey emphasizes a comprehensive instructional system, while Backward Design begins with the desired end result. These differences in orientation demonstrate that each model offers complementary perspectives. All four models have their own strengths and limitations. Tyler excels in clarity of objectives but tends to be rigid; Taba is more participatory but requires data and a lengthy process; Dick & Carey is highly systematic but complex and requires significant resources; and Backward Design focuses on authentic assessment but demands high teacher skills. Despite their differences, all agree that planning must be systematic and that evaluation is a crucial part of learning. In the context of the Independent Curriculum, all four models are highly relevant when integrated. Tyler's clarity of purpose, Taba's student-needs orientation, Dick & Carey's system integration, and Backward Design's authentic assessment can be combined to create adaptive and transformative learning. In this way, teachers act not merely as transmitters of material but as learning designers capable of addressing the challenges of globalization, digitalization, and the demands of 21st-century competencies.

REFERENCES

Aisi, O. K., Susanto, R., & Isa, K. (2025). Bridging Gender Gaps In Education Through Islamic Values And Technology At Pptq Al-Hasan. *Egalita : Jurnal Kesetaraan Dan Keadilan Gender*, *20*(1), 13–26. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18860/egalita.v20i1.30589

Ambarwati, D., Wibowo, U. B., Arsyiadanti, H., & Susanti, S. (2022). Studi Literatur: Peran Inovasi Pendidikan pada Pembelajaran Berbasis Teknologi Digital. *Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi Pendidikan*, *8*(2), 173–184. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.21831/jitp.v8i2.43560

Anta, P., Sampurna, C., & Susanto, R. (2025). Implementation of STEAM in Pesantren Experimental Study Based on Local Wisdom Curriculum. *JISEI: Journal of Islamic Studies and Educational Innovation*, *01*(02).

Ekawati, R. N. (2025). Education Secularism in Indonesia and Society ' s Interpretation. *JISEI: Journal of Islamic Studies and Educational Innovation*, *01*(01).

Fadhilah H.M, N., Rivai, A. T. O., & Syamsul, S. (2023). Development of Interactive Learning Media

Based on Applications Articulate Storyline 3 Human Coordination System Material. *JURNAL PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran)*, *7*(3), 658. https://doi.org/10.33578/pjr.v7i3.9437

Firoza, R. N. W., Barlinty, S. A., & Mokhamad, K. Y. (2025). The Implementation of Akhlaq-Based Curriculum in Islamic Schools. *JISEI: Journal of Islamic Studies and Educational Innovation*, *01*(01).

Huberman, A. M., & Jhonny, S. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis a Methods Sourcebook*. America: Arizona State University.

Junaidi, Sileuw, M., & Faisal. (2023). Integration of the Independent Curriculum in Islamic Religious Education (PAI) Learning. *Indonesian Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(12), 40–47.

Kasus, S., & Cepu, M. (n.d.). *Implementasi Manajemen Kurikulum Dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pendidikan*. *01*(01). https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.21111/educan.v1i1.1288

Kurniawati, D., & Susanto, R. (2025). Analysis of the Minister of Education ' s Curriculum Policy in the 2019-2024 Vs . 2024-2029 Era. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, *17*(1), 741–754. https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v17i1.7127

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (7th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Noer Syo Im, & Achmad Muhibin Zuhri. (2024). Adaptation of Islamic Boarding School-Based Educational Institutions to the Capitalist Economy. *Jurnal Budi Pekerti Agama Islam*, *2*(4), 264–276. https://doi.org/10.61132/jbpai.v2i4.473

Sahroni, Furqoni, H., & Martoyo. (2025). Comprehensive Review of the Book Ta ' lim al-Muta ' alim in the Context of Developing Teaching Materials for Creed and Morals in Madrasah Aliyah. *JISEI: Journal of Islamic Studies and Educational Innovation*, *01*(01), 93–100.

Sampurna, P. C., & Jannah, P. N. (2025). Recontructing Islamic Pedagogy : A Critical Analysis of Traditional and Modern Teaching Approaches. *JISEI: Journal of Islamic Studies and Educational Innovation*, *01*(01), 48–62.

Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan R&D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian : Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.

Susanto, R. (2024a). Konsep Pendidikan Karakter dalam Islam. In *Pendidikan Karakter Berbasis Islam* (pp. 20–32). U ME Publishing.

Susanto, R. (2024b). *Penerapan Metode Musyafahah dalam Menjaga Autentisitas Qiraat Sab'ah (Studi Analisis di PPTQ al-Hasan Ponorogo dan PP al-Munawwir Krapyak)* (IAIN Ponorogo). IAIN Ponorogo. Retrieved from http://etheses.iainponorogo.ac.id/id/eprint/29381

Susanto, R., & Syahrudin, S. (2024). Social Transformation Through Education: Building a Caring and Empowered Generation. *Ngabari : Jurnal Studi Islam Dan Sosial*, *17*(2), 37–48.

Wahyudi, A., Nuriana, A. Q., & Irfan, M. (2025). Cultural Adaptation in Islamic Education : Navigating Between Tradition and Modernity. *JISEI: Journal of Islamic Studies and Educational Innovation*, *01*(01), 101–114.