Carakde Class Learning Program from the Sigi Community: Evaluation for Improving Student Learning Outcomes

Andi Afrinaramadhani Hatta[1], Ali Muhtadi[2]
[1] Instructional Technology, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, IndonesiaI
Email: afrina092904032@gmail.com
[2]Science Education, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Email: alimuhtadi1@gmail.com

Abstract. This study aims to determine the suitability of (1) context, (2) input, (3) process, and (4) product of the Carakde class learning program carried out by Sahabat Indonesia Berbagi (SIGi Community) in the Makassar Region based on predetermined success criteria. This research is evaluation research with the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) approach model and uses a quantitative research method. The population in this study is students of Carakde Class of 21 people. The sample in this study used purposive sampling. This research used analysis data and descriptive and inferential statistics. The data analysis technique used statistic t-tes . After being analyzed using statistical formulas, it can be seen that student learning outcomes after the CIPP model evaluation were applied. Besides, Context evaluation involves program objectives and program relevance to environmental needs. Input Evaluation encompasses environmental, instrumental, and raw input. This can be seen from the increase in the students' mean scores from pre-test and post-test results. Process evaluation covers the implementation of Carakde Class learning based on student learning outcomes. The mean value of the pre-test is 39, while the mean value of the post-test is 61.42. From these calculations obtained thitung: 11.284 while ttable : 2.086, which means thitung > ttable. So that the alternative hypothesis Ha can be accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. This means that student learning outcomes after the CIPP model evaluation are applied. Furthermore, product evaluation comprises the program graduates and the achievement of program objectives...

Keywords: context, input, process, product, evaluation, learning program.

INTRODUCTION

The essence of education aims to educate the life of the nation as stated in the Preambule of 1945 Constitution. Various ways and policies have been made by the government to achieve this goal. However, until now there is still an uneven distribution of education in Indonesia. This is reinforced by a statement in an article presented by the Ministry of Education and Culture, namely "the current education services in all regions of Indonesia are not evenly distributed, the government is very committed

in efforts to overcome these problems" (Bahari, 2015). The uneven distribution of education in Indonesia has resulted in a variety of impacts both positive and negative.

In a UNESCO publication (Melzer 1978) formal/ non-formal and informal learning systems are treated equally/ but the latter are reference values for the other two rather than independently identifiable. One of the positive impacts is the number of non-formal educational institutions that have sprung up. These non-formal institutions are usually in the

form of study groups and supporting activities forthe learning process in the community.

Non-formal education, itself, is education outside of formal institutions established by the government but its implementation still follows the rules of formal education standards and is carried out in a tiered and structured manner. The attention is more focused on efforts to help realize the learning process in the community. "(Journal of Basic Education, 2005). Besides that, Non-formal education is an organized and systematic learning activity carried on outside the formal system (Malik, 1994).

According to Weiss (2015), Learning communities at community colleges have the potential to improve student outcomes through several mechanisms described briefly here. According to Tinto (1975) regarding on dropout from higher education, he posits, It is the person's normative and structural integration into the academic and social systems that lead to new levels of commitment. Other things being equal, the higher the degree of integration of the individual into the college systems, the greater will be his commitment to the specific institution and to the goal of college completion.

A community in Makassar opens a learning class called *Carakde* Class. The main purpose of *Carakde* Class is to help meet learning needs especially reading, writing, and calculating for children in marginal environmentsusing the concept of fun learning so that the children also understand that learning is fun. Non-formal education as focusing on 'situated learning' (Malcolm, Hodkinson, & Colley, 2003) views the differences between formal, informal, and non-formal in terms of attributes of formality and informality.

The Indian Education Commission (1964:65) defined the concept of literacy and conditions necessary for the success of literacy and programmes in the light of the recommendations of the World Conference by UNESCO 1965.

Yus Diana (2015) stated that the condition of marginal communities if left in a protracted manner would have an impact on several issues, namely: (a) The increasing number of dropouts and illiteracy among them, (b) the declining quality of human resources, (c) the higher unemployment rate, (d) the higher social diseases and social insecurity, and (e) the index of educational progress in Indonesia is increasingly lagging behind with other countries. Furthermore, Yus Diana stated that "the role of education among marginalized people is more likely in the realm of non-formal education."

Based on this statement, it can be said that marginal people are one of the reasons why even distribution of education in Indonesia is still not well implemented and that non-formal education is one of the most possible means to realize equitable distribution of education. Therefore, the existence of *Carakde* Class is important and is one of the solutions in reducing the impact that results from the lives of marginalized people, especially in terms of education, so that the realization of equal distribution of education in Indonesia can be helped by the presence of *Carakde* Class.

The *Carakde* class was chosen as a research site because until now no evaluation had been carried out externally. The implementation of *Carakde* Class has also been quite long and has been implemented in various places. In addition, based on the results of the assessment studies, students seemed enthusiastic and spirited in participating in each lesson given by the *Carakde* Class, and the results of interviews with community activists revealed that during the *Carakde* Class implementation in some places there must be illiterate children and as far as they stated that they had succeeded in helping these students to be able to read, write, and count.

Based on these phenomena, the researcher feels that it is necessary to do an evaluation of the *Carakde* Class to find out what learning programs are planned and implemented in *Carakde* Class as well as to what extent the Carakde Class learning program has been running. This study uses CIPP evaluation model developed by Stufflebeam. The indicators in eachcomponent of the CIPP model are then further developed based on theories that are appropriate to evaluation.

According to Alvarez, et al (2004) evaluation is one of the important stages in a training program. Through it, the success or failure of the program with respect to content and design, changes in the learners, and their impact on the organization, can be observed. Kuo, et al (2012) add that evaluation is an activity that aims to understand how things happen. According to Sundoyo, et al (2012), it is a systematic and continuous process for collecting, describing, interpreting and

presenting information about a program for use as the basis for decision making.

According to Stufflebeam (1971), the evaluation made by the CIPP model is an activity that provides an overview, collecting and providing useful information to make decision alternatives. Tokmak, et al (2013) added that the model is based on program evaluation and redesign by defining participants' needs in terms of context, strategy, plans, activities, interactions and assessment. In other words, the CIPP model is an evaluation model that views the program being evaluated as a system (Alexandra et.al, 2019).

Context evaluation according to Ega R. Wati (2016: 47) covers program objectives and their relevance to the environmental needs of the program. In addition, Zainal Arifin (2013: 78) states that context evaluation aims to assist administrators in planning decisions, determining program needs, and formulating program objectives. The context evaluation carried out on the *Carakde Class* learning program includes an evaluation of the program objectives and their relevance.

Input evaluations made on *Carakde Class* learning program are based on the opinion of Djudju Sudjana (2006) who divides input into three parts, namely environmental input in the form of natural, socio-cultural, and institutional environments; instrumental input in the form of curriculum, teaching staff, facilities and infrastructure, and costs; and raw input, namely students themselves.

Process evaluation according to Djudju Sudjana (2006) is an educational interaction between instrumental input and raw input through learning activities. Process evaluation, according to Zhang, et al (2011), is evaluation aimed at monitoring program execution and emerging obstacles, as well as identifying any program improvement needs. Based on the statement, the evaluation was carried out on the implementation of *Carakde Class* learning. Evaluation is carried out on student activities and educator activities.

Product evaluation according to S. Eko Putro W. (2016: 183) is an assessment conducted to measure success in achieving predetermined goals. Product evaluation indicators are once again based on the opinion of Djudju Sudjana (2006) who categorizes product evaluations of program graduates into two parts, namely the quantity and quality of program graduates. To evaluate the achievement of program objectives, indicators are adjusted to the objectives of the *Carakde Class* learning program which can be seen from the results given by students.

The evaluation of the *Carakde Class* learning program is expected to provide suitable and decent recommendations for the development of *Carakde* Class in the future in order to be an alternative education and a solution as well as an answer to the problems of educational equity in Indonesia.

METHOD

This study carried out the evaluation of the Carakde class learning program conducted by SIGi Community in the Makassar Region using CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, and Product). The evaluation was to obtain information about *Carakde* Class learning program so that the advantages and disadvantages of the learning program can be identified. Therefore, a comparison of data from research results with predetermined success criteria has been made to obtain information that can be used as recommendations, policies, and material considerations to improve the quality of the upcoming *Carakde* Class learning program. This research is evaluation research with Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) approach model and uses quantitative research method.

The study was conducted from June to October 2017 with the subject of evaluation in this study namely *Carakde* Class management amounting to one person. The population in this study is students of *Carakde* Class with a total of 21 people. The sample in this study used purposive sampling. The data collection techniques used in this study are interviews, observation, and documentation. The instruments used are arranged based on predetermined components in the form of interview guidelines, observation sheets, and document check list sheets. This research used analysis data, descriptive and inferensial statistic. The data analysis technique used statistic t-tes . After being analyzed using statistical formulas, it can be seen that student learning outcomes after the CIPP model evaluation applied.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The research data are presented through four aspects of evaluation, namely context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation, and product evaluation. The data of the four aspects of evaluation are described as follows.

Context evaluation is divided into two parts, namely program objectives and program relevance. Based on the results of the evaluation of the program objectives, it can be seen that the reasons for setting program objectives have been adjusted based on the identification results of learning needs, potential barriers, and description of environmental area where the program is conducted.

Topno (2012) adds that context evaluation can determine the extent to which program objectives and targets correspond to the needs of the assessed organization, and whether or not the needs assessment accurately identifies the needs of the organization and work culture. The marginal environment where the program takes place is very relevant to the learning programs provided by *Carakde* Class based on the results of identification of learning needs, potential barriers, and description of the area. Parents and the surrounding community are enthusiastic and fully support *Carakde* Class learning program such as giving permission for the program, facilitating support in the form of learning places, and enthusiasm of students' parents who always prepare their children to attend classes each week.

The input evaluation in this study is divided into three parts, namely environmental input, instrumental input, and raw input. The tradition and language of the environment greatly affected the implementation of the program. It can be seen from the main focus of *Carakde* Class in dealing with illiteracy problems caused by the traditions or habits of the surrounding community or parents who prefer their children to collect garbage and make money rather than go to school. Besides that, the influence of language is also seen froine local language used in the learning process. The curriculum or learning program possessed by *Carakde* Class does not contain a description of the learning outcome assessment. There are four teachers; however, only two have the same educational background with the lesson. They only have syllaa bus but do not have a learning plan. The facilities and infrastructure owned by *Carakde* Class are only in the form of non-conducive and comfortable learning places, but teaching and learning tools are available in good conditions, as well as the availability of teaching tools and materials that are adjusted every week based on the material to be taught. *Carakde* Class funding sources have come from cash collected each month by community members and the available cash funds are sufficient to meet the needs of the learning activities carried out by *Carakde* Class. The age of students who participate in *Carakde* Class varies between 3-15 years and all of them live in the vicinity of the program. Based on the results of interviews with students, all students admitted that it is their own initiative to take part in the classes. They are enthusiastic to take the classes and feel motivated to continue learning.

The process evaluation in this study was carried out on the implementation of Carakde *Class* learning which was seen from the activities of students and educators. Based on the evaluation results of students' activities, the data obtained have met the overall predetermined success criteria, except that there are a number of criteria that students are still lacking and some are not met by students, students cannot determine themselves what subject matter will be studied later because the managers and educators have determined the material to be given in the next meeting and some students are still less active in giving questions based on their own initiatives. As for the results of the evaluation of the educators' activities, the data obtained in general also met the criteria of success, except that the criteria for using appropriate and varied methods of educators were still unable to meet these criteria and educators did not carry out remedial activities based on the assessment of students' learning activities.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Student Learning Outcomes Before the Implementation of the CIPP Model Evaluation.

Interval	F	Middle value (Xi)	Fi.Xi	$(x-\bar{x})$	$(x-\bar{x})^2$	$F(x-\bar{x})^2$	$\sum f_i \cdot Xi/n$
36 – 44	3	40	120	-21.42	458.8164	1376.4492	
45 – 53	3	49	147	-12.42	154.2564	462.7692	$\dfrac{1290}{21}$
54 – 62	4	58	232	-3.42	11.6964	46.7856	
63 – 71	5	67	335	5.58	31.1364	155.682	
72 – 80	6	76	456	14.58	212.5764	1275.4584	$= 61.42$
$\sum$	21	-	1290	-	868.482	3317.1444	

Based on the Frequency Distribution of Student Learning Outcomes before to the Implementation of the CIPP Model Evaluation, the frequency of participants' learning outcomes namely 39

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Student Learning Outcomes after the Implementation of the CIPP Model Evaluation

Interval	F	Middle value (Xi)	Fi.Xi	$(x-\bar{x})$	$(x-\bar{x})^2$	$F(x-\bar{x})^2$	$\sum f_i \cdot Xi/n$
20 – 28	5	24	120	-15	225	1125	
29 – 37	6	33	198	-6	36	216	$\dfrac{819}{21}$
38 – 46	4	42	168	3	9	36	
47 – 55	3	51	153	12	144	432	
56 – 64	3	60	180	21	441	1323	$= 39$
$\sum$	21	-	819	-	855	3132	

Based on the Frequency Distribution of Student Learning Outcomes after to the Implementation of the CIPP Model Evaluation, the frequency of participants' learning outcomes namely 61.42.

After knowing the value of tcount , then give an interpretation of the value above. The value of T_{table} (t-test) at = 0.05 and db (n-1) = 21-1=20 is 2.086. From these results, it can be seen that t_{count} > t_{table}, with t_{count} of 11.284 and t_{table} of 2.086. Thus Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, which means that there is a significant positive effect between variable x (evaluation of the CIPP model in learning programs) and variable y (student learning outcomes). From the results of the analysis it can be concluded.

Product evaluation in this study is a graduate program that covers the quantity and quality of program graduates, as well as the achievement of program objectives which include the objectives of the program itself. Based on the results of the evaluation, there is no data on the number of program graduates who have successfully completed the learning process and the evaluation instruments are merely in the form of notes about deficiencies.

Discussion

Based on the description of the evaluation data on *Carakde* Class learning program, the following is a discussion of the evaluation data to determine whether the learning program is in accordance with predetermined success criteria based on context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation, and product evaluation.

Table 3.Correlation Index Numbers Between Variable X and Variable Y

No	Before (x)	After(y)	Gain (d) (y-x)	Xd (d-Md)	Xd²
1	28	36	8	-15.23	2319529
2	36	52	16	-7.23	52.2729
3	56	68	12	-11.23	126.1129
4	24	48	24	0.77	0.5929
5	32	56	24	0.77	0.5929
6	28	56	28	4.77	22.7529
7	40	68	28	4.77	22.7529
8	32	60	28	4.77	22.7529
9	36	40	4	-19.23	369.7929
10	48	68	20	-3.23	10.4329
11	40	72	32	8.77	76.9129
12	32	52	20	-3.23	10.4329
13	48	80	32	8.77	76.9129
14	24	56	32	8.77	76.9129
15	20	40	20	-3.23	10.4329
16	40	64	24	0.77	0.5929
17	48	80	32	8.77	76.9129
18	32	64	32	8.77	76.9129
19	56	80	24	0.77	0.5929
20	64	72	8	-15.23	231.9529
21	40	80	40	16.77	281.2329
∑			**488**		**1779.8109**

Determine the t_{hitung} used formula: t = 111284

The success criteria determined for context evaluation in this study are based on Djudju Sudjana's opinion on program context evaluation which presents data on the reasons underlying the setting of program objectives and goal priorities, relevant environmental conditions, descriptions of existing and desired conditions, and identifications of unmet needs and untapped opportunities (2014: 54). Based on the statement, the success criteria for context evaluation, namely the program objectives in this study include the reasons for setting program objectives and identifying learning needs, potential barriers that might be encountered, and description of the area where the program is implemented.

The evaluation results in the input component of this study are still not suitable; this is based on the success criteria which are not fulfilled as a whole. The purpose of *Carakde* Class learning program is to provide fun learning or have fun. According to Darmansyah (2011) the excitement and pleasure of students in learning can be created through various ways, one of which is a clean and conducive environment for learning. Then for the curriculum standard component according to Sudjana (2014: 90), the curriculum or learning program includes learning objectives, learning material (materials), techniques and learning media, and evaluation tools for learning outcomes. Whereas for syllabus and lesson plans based on the success criteria of educators, at least they must have both components. The results of the aspects of instructor characteristics are in accordance with Hasibuan's theory (2011), which explains that the requirements for becoming an instructor include teaching skills, communication skills, personality authority, social skills, technical competence and emotional stability.

The evaluation results on the components of the research process are the implementation of learning which includes the activities of students and educators. According to Darmansyah (2011), an indication that can be seen in plain view is students' faces which emit a sense of excitement and extraordinary pleasure. Students are more active and creative in asking questions, discussing, and answering various questions given. The educators will become an idol that is very liked by their

students. In addition, according to Muhammad Fadlillah (2014), fun learning is created from good and familiar interactions between students and teachers. There is the existence of reciprocal relationships without coercion during the learning activities. Success criteria based on the theory and based on the results of observations on student activities and interviews with students revealed the findings which almost met the overall criteria of success. From these calculations obtained t_{hitung}: 11.284, the value of T table (t-test) at = 0.05 and db (n-1) = 21-1=20 is 2.086. From these results, it can be seen that $t_{hitung} > t_{tabel}$, with tcount of 11.284 and ttable of 2.086. Thus Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, which means that there is a significant positive effect between variable x (evaluation of the CIPP model in learning programs) and variable y (student learning outcomes). From the results of the analysis it can be concluded.

The evaluation results on product component of this study are still not suitable, according to Suparman (2012: 40), the second basic component of a learning system is that graduates achieve competencies as stated in learning objectives. Graduates who have such competencies are called successful in completing the learning process. Competencies that contain knowledge (cognition), skills (psychomotor), and behavioral attitudes (affections) that can deliver students at the level of achievement (performance) to meet the demands of the working world or proceed to the next level of education. As for the achievement of program objectives, although some components of the success criteria are suitable, one thing that remains a challenge both for students and for educators as well as the managers of *Carakde* Class is boredom. As said by the manager in the interview, feeling of boredom can be a potential obstacle during the learning activities. Therefore educators and managers always think of ways to make the learning activities interesting and fun in accordance with the objectives of *Carakde* Class learning for a fun learning.

The presented effect estimates represent the combined effect of learning communities and the types of instructors delivering those services, or teacher effects, whereas we are most interested in the effects of learning communities alone (Weiss, 2010).

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The context evaluation on *Carakde* Class Learning Program is suitable with predetermined success criteria. The input evaluation on *Carakde* Class Learning Program still does not fit the predetermined success criteria. Process evaluation covers the implementation of *Carakde* Class learning can be seen based on student learning outcomes. The alternative hypothesis H_a can be accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. This means that student learning outcomes after the CIPP model evaluation is applied. Product evaluation on *Carakde* Class Learning Program still does not meet the predetermined success criteria.

Before carrying out the next *Carakde* Class, providing a comfortable learning place such as a place with good air circulation and green area is a priority in order that *Carakde* Class learning is more conducive and fun. The curriculum or learning program should follow or adjust to the standard based on theory and government policy. Educators with relevant educational backgrounds should be prioritized and syllabus and lesson plans should be provided before starting the learning process. It is better to do a data collection on the number of students who have successfully completed the learning process in *Carakde* Class to find out how far Carakde Class has been running. In addition, it is a must for the program to provide an assessment of student learning outcomes including the realm of cognition, affection, and psychomotor to find out changes in students' behaviour.

REFERENCE

Arifin, Zainal. (2013). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Alexsandra1., Ganefri., & Usmedi. 2019. Evaluation of Vocational School Pratic Program CIPP Model. *Journal.* Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation Volume 3, Number 3 Tahun 2019, pp. 180-184. Bali: Ejournal Undiksha.

Alvarez, K., Salas, E., & Garofano, C. M. (2004). An Integrated Model of Training Evaluation and Effectiveness. Human Resource Development Review, 3(4), 385-416. doi: 10.1177/1534484304270820.

Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan. (2016). Melalui Program GGD, Pemerintah Upayakan Pemerataan Pendidikan di Indonesia. *litbang.kemdikbud.go.id* (online).

Bahari, Agi. (2015). *Melalui Program GGD, Pemerintah Upayakan Pemerataan Pendidikan di Indonesia*. Kemendikbud: Jakarta.

Darmansyah. (2011). *Strategi Pembelajaran Menyenangkan Dengan Humor*. Jakarta: PT.Bumi Aksara.

Diana, Yus. (2016). Dilema Kaum Marjinal. *Kompasiana* (online).

Fadlillah, Muhammad. (2014). *Desain Pembelajaran PAUD*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.

Hasibuan, S.P.M. (2011). Manajemen Dasar, Pengertian, dan Masalah. Jakarta: CV. Haji Masagung.

Kuo, L.H., Huei, M.W., Li, M. C., Ming, C. W., Miao, K.H., & Hung, J.Y. (2012). An Evaluation Model of Integrating Emerging Technology into Formal Curriculum. International. Journal of Education and Information Technologies, 6(3), 250-259.

Malcolm, J., Hodkinson, P., & Colley, H. (2003). *The interrelationships between informal and formal learning. Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15(7/8), 313–318.

Malik, Abdul. (1994). *Non-Formal And Adult Education In India A Select Annotated Bibliography*. Department Of Library And Information Science Aligarh Muslim University Aligarh: India.

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation A System Approach Seventh Edition*. USA: Sage Publication.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). The use of experimental design in educational evaluation. Journal of Educational Measurement, 8(4), 267-274.

Sundoyo, H., T. Sumaryanto, & Dwijanto. (2012). Evaluasi Program Pendidikan Sistem Ganda Berdasarkan Stake Countenance Model. Innovative Journal of Curriculum, 1(2), 69-73.

Sudjana, Djudju. (2006). *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan Luar Sekolah*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Suparman, Atwi. (2012). *Desain Instruksion Modern*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout From Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis Of Recent Research. Review Of Education Research. *Journal.* 45, 89–125. USA: SAGE Publishing.

Tokmak, H.S., Baturay, H. M., & Fadde, P. (2013). Applying the Context, Input, Process, Product Evaluation Model for Evaluation, Research, and Redesign of an Online Master's Program. The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 14(3), 273-293. doi: 10.19173/irrodl.v14i3.1485

Topno, H. (2012). Evaluation of Training and Development: An Analysis of Various Models. IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 5(2), 16-22.

UNESCO and the Indian National Commission for Co-operation with UNESCO. 1964. Life Skills in Non-formal Education: USA.

Wati, E. R. (2016). *Kupas Tuntas Evaluasi Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Kata Pena.

Weiss, M. J. (2010). The Implications Of Teacher Selection And The Teacher Effect In Individually Randomized Group Treatment Trials. *Journal.* Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 3, 381–405. USA: SAGE Publishing.

Weiss, M. J., Mary G. Visher., Evan Weissman., & Heather Wathington. (2015). The Impact of Learning Communities for Students in Developmental Education: A Synthesis of Findings From Randomized Trials at Six Community Colleges. *Journal.* USA: SAGE Publishing.

Widoyoko, S. E. P. (2016). *Evaluasi Program Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Zhang, G., Nancy, Z., Robin, G., Debbie, M., Jennifer, W., Christine, S., & Katherine, M. (2011). Using the Context, Input, Process, and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP) as a Comprehensive Framework to Guide the Planning, Implementation, and Assessment of Service-learning

Programs. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15(4), 57-83.