

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

Based on the quantitative data table of the results of the evaluation of ESCO's work program using the CIPP model, the following is a detailed and concise conclusion: ESCO's work program shows that ESCO's work program is relevant and in accordance with the needs of members (total summative score of 2 in the Context aspect). However, the results of the overall evaluation identified significant weaknesses that hindered the effectiveness of the program. Major Disadvantages of the Program: Weak Planning (Context): With the highest frequency of 22% and a total score of 6 on the formative evaluation, it is evident that the program lacks a strong planning foundation. Problems include a lack of needs analysis, unclear member aspirations, and a lack of external data or coordination to support program design. Resource Constraints (Input): This problem has the second highest frequency, at 25%, with a total score of 7 on the formative evaluation. The program is not supported by adequate resources (funds, facilities, human resources), lack of university/sponsor support, and minimal management competence due to lack of training. Less Than Optimal Results (Product): Although relevant, the program was not fully successful (total summative score of 3). This is demonstrated

by the achievement of non-optimal targets and a lack of follow-up after the program is completed, which has the potential to reduce its long-term impact. Additional Operational Issues: In the Process aspect, even though the score is the lowest (total formative score of 2), problems are still identified in the documentation of activities and budget allocations that are not in accordance with the planning.

Based on interviews that have been conducted with all the speakers (from Code 1 to Code 10), it shows that there is a strong consensus that the ESCO Saturday program faces serious structural and fundamental problems. The main problem is not in the technical implementation, but in the weak foundation of the organization. It mainly lies in the absence of a strong organizational foundation, such as AD/ART (Articles of Association/Bylaws), which results in unclear governance. There is even a minimal power supply crisis where there is a significant shortage of resources, both Human Resources (HR) and finance. The administrators and tutors did not receive adequate debriefing or training, and the financial planning was unprofessional. Then the organizational planning system shows weaknesses so that this program is considered to lack comprehensive long-term planning and tends to be reactive. This causes the activities carried out to be sporadic and have no clear purpose. All of these can certainly be said to be systemic problems so that these problems are felt

equally in all divisions, ranging from academics, publications, to the creative, debate, and writing divisions. This shows that the issue is a systemic problem, not just isolated in one part of the program.

B. SUGGESTION

Here is a quick suggestion for ESCO work program improvements: **Improve Planning:** Conduct a member needs analysis and involve external parties (university, community) from the beginning. **Increase Resources:** Focus on fundraising, find sponsors, and hold mandatory training for administrators and committees. **Optimize Implementation:** Strengthen the documentation system and ensure budget use is as planned. **Maximize Results:** Set realistic targets and hold follow-ups after the program is complete, such as mentoring or advanced training.

To address the existing problems, it is recommended that ESCO Saturday prioritize improvements from a strategic level. The first fundamental step is to prepare the Articles of Association/Bylaws (AD/ART) to build a strong legal and governance foundation. After that, it is important to conduct a comprehensive needs analysis to design a structured, relevant, and sustainable program. In addition, investment in Human Resources (HR) is crucial, namely by providing adequate training and debriefing for administrators and tutors, so that the quality of the program can be improved. Finally, careful

planning is needed with clear and measurable vision, mission, and goals, to ensure that programs no longer run sporadically, but rather become effective initiatives and provide long-term impact.



REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Arikunto, S., & Jabar, C. S. A. (2014). *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Pedoman Teoritis Praktis Bagi Mahasiswa dan Praktisi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Bhakti, Y. B. (2017). *Evaluasi program model CIPP pada proses pembelajaran IPA*. *JIPFRI (Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Fisika dan Riset Ilmiah)*, 1(1), 22–28. <https://journal.unuha.ac.id/index.php/JIPFRI/article/view/109>
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. While Plains, New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Bowen, P. W., Rose, R., & Pilkington, A. (2017). *Mixed methods-theory and practice. Sequential, explanatory approach*. *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, 5(2), 10.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Ekayana, A. A. G., & Ratnaya, I. G. (2022). *Evaluasi kurikulum program sarjana sistem komputer menggunakan model CIPP Stufflebeam*. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 6(3), 366-376
- Fadli, M. (2021). *Pengaruh komunikasi organisasi ekstra dan intra kampus terhadap kemampuan public speaking di kalangan mahasiswa fakultas ilmu sosial uinsu* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara).

- Hamilton, C. (1999). *Essentials of public speaking*. Wadsworth Pub
- Hamilton, M. J. (2024). *Examining Prayer as a Method for Reducing Public Speaking Anxiety* (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University)
- Irwanto. (2019). *Evaluasi proses belajar dan pembelajaran dengan model CIPP untuk Penjasorkes*. *Jurnal Kejaora*, 4(1), 33–41.
<https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/kejaora/article/view/656>
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). *Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice*. *Field methods*, 18(1), 3-20
- Jabar, S. B. (2008). *Panduan Penulisan Proposal dan Skripsi Penelitian Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Diva Press
- Khodijah, S., Nurajizah, S., & Irham, I. (2024). *Kontribusi Organisasi Terhadap Pendidikan Karakter dan Kesiapan Profesional Mahasiswa*. *Al-Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan dan Kemasyarakatan*, 18(3), 1773-1789.
- Kurniawati, D. (2020). *Evaluasi program pendidikan perspektif model CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product)*. *GHAITSA: Islamic Education Journal*, 2(2), 120–132.
<https://siducat.org/index.php/ghaitsa/article/view/168>
- Lindner, P., Dagöö, J., Hamilton, W., Miloff, A., Andersson, G., Schill, A., & Carlbring, P. (2021). *Virtual Reality exposure therapy for public speaking anxiety in routine care: a single-subject effectiveness trial*. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 50(1), 67-87
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications
- Mukarromah, L., Mulyadi, D., & Akbar, H. (2023). *Evaluasi program character building berbasis model CIPP*. *TARBAWI: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 8(1), 1–12. <https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/tarbawi/article/view/9368>
- Nastiti, D. (2023). *Peran organisasi mahasiswa dalam pembentukan sikap demokratis*. *Prima Magistra: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 4(1), 64-76.
- Nurhayani, N., Yaswinda, Y., & Movitaria, M. A. (2022). *Model evaluasi CIPP dalam mengevaluasi program pendidikan karakter sebagai fungsi pendidikan*. *Jurnal Inovasi Penelitian*, 2(8), 2353-2362.
- Putri, I. R., & Yusuf, N. F. (2022). *Pengaruh budaya organisasi dalam menciptakan perkembangan organisasi*. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 18(1), 143-154.
- Rahayu, I., & Ghani, R. A. (2021). *Evaluasi pelaksanaan program kepemimpinan SMA menggunakan model CIPP Stufflebeam*. *Rausyan Fikr: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pencerahan*, 17(2), 135–147. <https://jurnal.umt.ac.id/index.php/RausyanFikr/article/view/5976>
- Rahmadani, D. N. (2021). *Pengaruh antar Kepercayaan Diri dan Keaktifan dalam Organisasi Mahasiswa terhadap Kemampuan Public Speaking pada Mahasiswa Pendidikan Sejarah Universitas Jambi* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Jambi).
- Rahmat, A., & Ambiyar. (2025). *Model evaluasi CIPP dalam program sekolah: Systematic literature review*. *Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan (JKIP)*, 6(1), 45–54.

<https://journal.al-matani.com/index.php/jkip/article/view/1170>

- Robbins, H. G., & Bailey, I. L. (1975). *The organisation and findings of a school vision screening service*. Clinical and Experimental Optometry, 58(11), 392-401.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (1st ed.). SAGE Publications
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *Thinking qualitatively: Methods of mind*. SAGE Publications.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *Ethnotheatre: Research from page to stage* (2nd ed.). Left Coast Press.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications
- Sirait, A. J., & Siahaan, C. (2020). *Peran organisasi dalam pembentukan karakter mahasiswa*. Action Research Literate, 4(2), 32-37.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (1986). *Systematic evaluation: A self-instructional guide to theory and practice*. Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Sanders, J. R. (2002). *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation* (2nd ed.). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*. Jossey-Bass.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Zhang, G. (2017). *The CIPP evaluation model: How to evaluate for improvement and accountability* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian kombinasi (mix methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

- Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode penelitian kombinasi (mixed methods) (Edisi Revisi)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Supriyadi, S. T. P., & Zaharuddin, S. E. (2023). *Evaluasi kinerja organisasi. Manajemen & Evaluasi Kinerja Organisasi: Implementasi Pada Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 1, 308-320.
- Syahrir, M. (2022). *Evaluasi kurikulum belajar mandiri TK menggunakan model CIPP Stufflebeam*. Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education, 8(4), 899–909. <https://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JIME/article/view/2779>
- Visakha, J. A. (2019). *Pengaruh Penguasaan Kosakata dan Tata Bahasa Terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Teks Deskriptif Bahasa Inggris*. INFERENCE: Journal of English Language Teaching, 2(1), 68-79
- Wan Azman, W. M. F., & Decky, D. (2021). *Evaluasi program pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam: Studi literatur model CIPP*. EDUKASI: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 9(2), 89–97. <https://ejournal-fkip.unisi.ac.id/judek/article/view/2934>
- Widoyoko, Eko P. (2017). *Evaluasi program pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Williams, J. W. (2018). *Public Speaking: 10 Simple Methods to Build Confidence, Overcome Shyness, Increase Persuasion and Become Great at Public Speaking*. Alakai Publishing LLC.