SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN

	SURABAYA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL CURRICULUM AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY S1 STUDY PROGRAM					Document Code
	SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN					
COURSES (MK)	**CODE**	**MK family**	**WEIGHT (credits)**		**SEMESTER**	**Compilation Date**
Program Evaluation		Evaluation	T=2	P=2	3	April 29, 2022
AUTHORIZATION	**RPS Developer**		**RMK Coordinator**		**Head of Study Program**	
			-		Dr. Andi Kristanto., M.Pd.	

Learning Outcomes(CP)	**CPL-PRODI charged to MK**	
	CPL-Attitude	Applying educational technology science as a Learning Technology Developer, Education and Training Analyst.
	CPL-Knowledge	Design and carry out research independently or in groups to provide alternative solutions to problems in the field of educational technology, by evaluating educational programs.
	CPL-KK	Able to produce outcomes in the form of high performance and commitment as a task as a Learning Technology Developer, Education and Training Analyst.
	CPL-KU	Able to demonstrate a scientific, critical and innovative attitude in scientific learning of educational technology in a professional and responsible manner.
	Course Learning Outcomes (CPMK)	
	CPMK-S..	Students are able to apply the knowledge of Educational Technologyas a Learning Technology Developer, Education and Training Analyst, by carrying out evaluations on the program.

	CPMK-P..	Students are able to design and carry out research independently or in groups to provide alternative solutions to problems in the field of educational technology, by evaluating educational programs.
	CPMK-KK…	Students are able to produce outcomes in the form of high performance and commitment as tasks as Learning Technology Developers, Education and Training Analysts related to program evaluation.
	CPMK-KU..	Students have a sense of responsibility and a scientific, critical and innovative attitude in evaluating programs as developers of Educational Technology and Analysts of educational needs.

The final ability of each learning stage (Sub-CPMK)

Sub-CPMK1	Understand the concept of class-based assessment
Sub-CPMK2	Understand the basic concepts of program evaluation models
Sub-CPMK3	Understanding Kirkpatrick's evaluation model
Sub-CPMK4	Understand the Countenance Stake evaluation model
Sub-CPMK5	Understand the CSE-UCLA evaluation model
Sub-CPMK6	Understanding the Discrepancy evaluation model
Sub-CPMK7	Understand the CIPP evaluation model
Sub-CPMK8	Understand the CIPPO evaluation model
Sub-CPMK9	Implementing model evaluation according to the program being evaluated
Sub-CPMK10	Presenting the results of the program evaluation using the appropriate model

Correlation between CPL/CPMK and Sub-CPMK

	Sub-CPMK1	Sub-CPMK2	Sub-CPMK3	Sub-CPMK4	Sub-CPMK5	Sub-CPMK6	Sub-CPMK7	Sub-CPMK8	Sub-CPMK9	Sub-CPMK10
CPMK-S..	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
CPMK-P…									✓	✓
CPMK-KK…									✓	✓
CPMK-KU…	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		

DescriptionShort MK	This course discusses the definition of objectives, functions, and various approaches/models used, as well as obstacles that are often encountered in the practice of evaluating educational programs through scientific learning.
Study Materials:	**Meeting 1**

Learning Materials	Program definition
	Definition of program evaluation
	The importance of program evaluation
	Meeting 2
	Program evaluation objectives, functions and principles
	Meeting 3
	Definition of program evaluation model
	Differences in the concept of program evaluation
	Meeting 4
	Kirkpatrick's evaluation model
	Meeting 5
	Countenance Stake evaluation model
	Meeting 6
	CSE-UCLA evaluation model
	Meeting 7
	Understanding the Discrepancy evaluation model
	Meeting 8
	UTS
	Meeting 9
	CIPP evaluation model
	Meeting 10
	Understand the CIPPO evaluation model
	Meeting 11
	Evaluating the program with the model that has been discussed
	Meeting 12
	Evaluating the program with the model that has been discussed
	Meeting 13
	Evaluating the program with the model that has been discussed

	Meeting 14 Materials that have been discussed **15 meeting** Materials that have been discussed **Meeting 16** <mark>UAS</mark>	
References	**Main:**	Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara
	Supporter:	Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa
Supporting lecturer		
Subjectcondition	-	

Week to-	The final ability of each learning stage (Sub-CPMK)	Evaluation		Learning Forms, Learning methods, Student Assignment, [Estimated time]		Learning materials [References]	Rating Weight (%)
		Indicator	**Criteria & Form**	**Offline Learning**	**Online Learning (online)**		
(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**	**(6)**	**(7)**	**(8)**
1.	Understand the concept of class-based assessment	Can understand 1. Definition of test, measurement, and assessment. 2. The difference between assessment and		Lectures, discussions, questions and answers. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers. *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement	2%

No.	Learning outcome	Ability		Method	Method	References	%
		evaluation.				methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto, 3. Kirkpatrick, DL, 2009. Implementing the four levels: A practical guide for effective evaluation of training programs: Easyread super large 24pt edition. ReadHowYou Want. com.	
2.	Understand the concept of class-based assessment	Can understand the purpose, function,		Lectures, discussions,	Lectures, discussions,	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips,	2%

| | | and principles of program evaluation. | | questions and answers. *4x50* | questions and answers. *4x50* | PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge.
2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto,
3. Kirkpatrick, DL, 2009. Implementing the four levels: A practical guide for effective evaluation of training programs: Easyread | |

						super large 24pt edition. ReadHowYou Want. com.	
3.	Understand the basic concepts of program evaluation models

4% | Can understand Definition of program evaluation model Differences in the concept of program evaluation. | | Lectures, questions and answers, practice. *4x50* | Lectures, questions and answers, practice. *4x50* | 1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge.
2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto,
3. Kirkpatrick, DL, 2009. Implementing the four levels: A practical | 4% |

						guide for effective evaluation of training programs: Easyread super large 24pt edition. ReadHowYou Want. com.	
4.	Understanding Kirkpatrick's evaluation model	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model.	Group 1 presented the basic concepts and scope of Kirkpatrick's evaluation.	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto,	8%

					3. Kirkpatrick, DL, 2009. Implementing the four levels: A practical guide for effective evaluation of training programs: Easyread super large 24pt edition. ReadHowYou Want. com.	
					4. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library	
					5. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement,	

						Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing 6. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
5.	Understand the Countenance Stake evaluation model 8%	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the Countenance Stake evaluation model.	Group 2 presented the basic concept and scope of Countenance Stake evaluation.	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The	8%

| | | | | | Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto, 3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library 4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing 5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program | |

						Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
6.	Understand the CSE-UCLA evaluation model	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the CSE-UCLA evaluation model.	Group 3 presented the basic concepts and scope of the CSE-UCLA evaluation.	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto, 3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of	4%

No.							
						Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library 4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing 5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
7.	Understanding the Discrepancy evaluation model	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the Discrepancy evaluation model.	Group 4 presented the basic concept and scope of the Discrepancy	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of	8%

			evaluation.			training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge.	
						2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto,	
						3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library	
						4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and	

No.							
						Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing 5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
8.	**UTS**						**10%**
9.	Understand the CIPP evaluation model	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the CIPP evaluation model.	Group 5 presented the basic concepts and scope of the CIPP evaluation.	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of	4%

					Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto, 3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library 4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing 5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation	

						Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
10.	Understand the CIPPO evaluation model	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the CIPPO evaluation model.	Group 6 presented the basic concepts and scope of the CIPPO evaluation.	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto, 3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning	8%

						Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library 4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing 5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
11.	Implementing model evaluation according to the program being evaluated	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Students conduct group discussions to evaluate a program by determining the right evaluation	Asynchronous *4x50*	Asynchronous *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training	4%

			model.			evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge.	
						2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto,	
						3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library	
						4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of	

						Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing 5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
12.	Implementing model evaluation according to the program being evaluated 8%	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Students conduct group discussions to evaluate a program by determining the right evaluation model.	Asynchronous *4x50*	Asynchronous *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation.	8%

					Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara	
					3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta: Learning Library	
					4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing	
					5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya:	

						Education Technology FIP Unesa	
13.	Implementing model evaluation according to the program being evaluated	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Students conduct group discussions to evaluate a program by determining the right evaluation model.	Asynchronous *4x50*	Asynchronous *4x50*	1. Phillips, JJ and Phillips, PP, 2016. Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge. 2. Arikunto, S. 2013. The Basics of Educational Evaluation. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara Kristanto, 3. Eko Putro Widoyoko. 2010. Evaluation of Learning Programs. Yogyakarta:	4%

No	Ability	Criteria	Assessment	Learning method	Learning method		References	Weight
							Learning Library	
							4. Mardapi, D. 2017. Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation of Education. Yogyakarta: Parama Publishing	
							5. Rusijono, et al. 2020. Program Evaluation Handout. Surabaya: Education Technology FIP Unesa	
14.	Presenting the results of the program evaluation using the appropriate model	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Groups 1, 2 & 3 presented the evaluation results.	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*		-	8%
15.	Presenting the results of the program evaluation using the appropriate model	Can provide arguments about the selection of	Groups 4, 5 & 6 presented the evaluation results.	Lectures, discussions and consultations. *4x50*	Lectures, discussions and consultations.		-	8%

		evaluation models.			*4x50*		
16.		**UAS**					**10%**

Notes:
1. **Learning Outcomes of Graduates of Study Program (CPL-PRODI)**is the ability possessed by every graduate of the study program which is the internalization of attitudes, mastery of knowledge and skills in accordance with the level of study program obtained through the learning process.
2. **CPL charged to the course**are some of the learning outcomes of study program graduates (CPL-PRODI) which are used for the formation/development of a course consisting of aspects of attitude, general skills, special skills and knowledge.
3. **CP Course (CPMK)**is the ability that is described specifically from the CPL that is charged to the course, and is specific to the study material or learning material for the course.
4. **Sub-CP Course (Sub-CPMK)**is the ability that is described specifically from the CPMK that can be measured or observed and is the final ability that is planned at each stage of learning, and is specific to the learning material of the course.
5. **Rating indicators**ability in the process and student learning outcomes is a specific and measurable statement that identifies the ability or performance of student learning outcomes accompanied by evidence.
6. **Rating Criteria**is a benchmark that is used as a measure or benchmark for learning achievement in an assessment based on predetermined indicators. Assessment criteria are guidelines for raters so that the assessment is consistent and unbiased. Criteria can be either quantitative or qualitative.
7. **Assessment technique:**test and non-test.
8. **Learning form:**Lecture, Response, Tutorial, Seminar or equivalent, Practicum, Studio Practice, Workshop Practice, Field Practice, Research, Community Service and/or other equivalent forms of learning.
9. **Learning methods:**Small Group Discussion, Role-Play & Simulation, Discovery Learning, Self-Directed Learning, Cooperative Learning, Collaborative Learning, Contextual Learning, Project Based Learning, and other equivalent methods.
10. **Learning materials**are details or descriptions of the study material that can be presented in the form of several main points and sub-topics.
11. **Rating weight**is the percentage of assessment of each achievement of the sub-CPMK which is proportional to the level of difficulty of achieving the sub-CPMK, and the total is 100%.
12. **PB**= Learning Process,**PT**=Structured Assignments,**KM**= Independent Activities.

Portfolio of Student CPL Achievement Assessment & Evaluation

Mg	CPL	CPMK (CLO)	Sub-CPMK (LLO)	Indicator	Question Form - Weight(%)*)		Weight (%) Sub-CPMK	Mhs value (0-100)	1d((Mhs Grade) X (Weight %)*))	Achievement of CPL at the Constitutional Court (%)
1	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK1	Can understand 1. Definition of test, measurement, and assessment. 2. The difference between assessment and evaluation.		2%	2%			
2	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK1	Can understand the purpose, function, and principles of program evaluation.		2%	2%			
3	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK2	Can understand Definition of		4%	4%			

				program evaluation model Differences in the concept of program evaluation.						
4	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK3	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model.	Group 1 presented the basic concepts and scope of Kirkpatrick's evaluation.	8%	8%			
5	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK4	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the Countenance Stake evaluation model.	Group 2 presented the basic concepts and scope of Countenance Stake evaluation	8%	8%			
6	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK5	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the CSE-UCLA evaluation model.	Group 3 presented the basic concepts and scope of the CSE-UCLA evaluation.	4%	4%			
7	CPL-	CPMK-	Sub-	Can explain the	Group 4 presented	8%	8%			

	S	KU	CPMK6	basic concepts and scope of the Discrepancy evaluation model.	the basic concept and scope of the Discrepancy evaluation.					
8	Mid-Semester Evaluation (ETS)									
9	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK7	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the CIPP evaluation model.	Group 5 presented the basic concepts and scope of the CIPP evaluation.	4%	4%			
10	CPL-S	CPMK-KU	Sub-CPMK8	Can explain the basic concepts and scope of the CIPPO evaluation model.	Group 6 presented the basic concepts and scope of the CIPPO evaluation.	8%	8%			
11	CPL-P	CPMK-KK	Sub-CPMK9	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Students conduct group discussions to evaluate a program by determining the right evaluation model.	4%	4%			
12	CPL-	CPMK-	Sub-	Can provide	Students conduct	8%	8%			

	P	KK	CPMK9	arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	group discussions to evaluate a program by determining the right evaluation model.					
13	CPL-P	CPMK-KK	Sub-CPMK9	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Students conduct group discussions to evaluate a program by determining the right evaluation model.	4%	4%			
14	CPL-P	CPMK-KK	Sub-CPMK10	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Groups 1, 2 & 3 presented the evaluation results.	8%	8%			
15	CPL-P	CPMK-KK	Sub-CPMK10	Can provide arguments about the selection of evaluation models.	Groups 1, 2 & 3 presented the evaluation results.	8%	8%			
16	**End of Semester Evaluation (EAS)**									
	Total weight (%)					100	100			
	Student's final grade (ÿ(Mhs Grade) X (Weight%))									

Notes: CLO = Courses Learning Outcomes, LLC = Lesson Learning Outcomes