

## Universitas Negeri Surabaya Faculty of Education, Doctoral Study Program in Educational Technology

Document Code

## SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN Courses CODE **Course Family Credit Weight** SEMESTER Compilation Date Compulsory Study Program Subjects T=2 P=0 ECTS=5.04 **Program Evaluation** 8600302045 2 January 5, 2024 Course Cluster Coordinator AUTHORIZATION SP Developer Study Program Coordinator Dr. Bachtiar Sjaiful Bachri, M.Pd. Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd. Dr. Fajar Arianto, M.Pd Learning **Project Based Learning** model Program PLO study program which is charged to the course Learning **Program Objectives (PO)** Outcomes (PLO) PO - 1 Able to find a basis for program evaluation PO - 2 able to implement program evaluation models PO - 3 able to determine scientific methods of program evaluation PO - 4 able to develop program evaluation plans PO - 5 able to implement program evaluation research **PLO-PO** Matrix P.O PO-1 PO-2 PO-3 PO-4 PO-5 PO Matrix at the end of each learning stage (Sub-PO) P.O Week 2 14 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 15 16 PO-1 PO-2 PO-3 PO-4 PO-5 Short reviewing program evaluation models, research methods in program evaluation, and planning and implementation in the implementation of education or training carried out using project based learning. Course Description References Main :

	2. David Wads 3. Donn York;	I Royse, Bruce A. sworth, Cengage Le a M. Mertens, Amy The Guilford Press	T. Wilson (2018) Progra	. Padgett am Evalua	(2010) Program Evaluation Theory and Practice	ation: An Introduc	tion. Belmont; e Guide. New
	Supporters:						
Support lecturer	Dr. Bachtiar S Dr. Fajar Aria	n Hadi Susarno, M. Sjaiful Bachri, M.Pd. nto, S.Pd., M.Pd. Maureen, S.Pd., N				1	
	Final abilities of each	Ev	aluation	Le Stue	Help Learning, earning methods, dent Assignments, Estimated time]	Learning	Assessmer
Week-	learning stage (Sub-PO)	Indicator	Criteria & Form	Offline ( offline )	Online ( <i>online</i> )	- materials [References]	Weight (%)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
2	Able to find a basis for program evaluation	<ol> <li>able to describe the meaning of program evaluation</li> <li>able to determine program evaluation components</li> <li>able to determine the benefits of program evaluation</li> <li>able to describe the domain of program evaluation</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.able to describe the meaning of program evaluation correctly 2.able to determine program evaluation components appropriately 3.able to determine the benefits of program evaluation appropriately 4.able to describe the program evaluation domain accurately Form of Assessment Portfolio Assessment	Inquiry 100 minutes		Material: foundations for program evaluation References: Joseph S. Wholey, Harry P. (2015). Handbook of practical program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Material: understanding program evaluation References: David Royse, Bruce A. Thyer, and Deborah K. Padgett (2010) Program Evaluation: An Introduction. Belmont; Wadsworth, Cengage Learning	2%
2	able to implement program evaluation models	<ol> <li>able to identify program evaluation models</li> <li>able to determine the weaknesses and strengths of each program evaluation model</li> <li>able to determine the right model according to the evaluation subject</li> </ol>	Criteria:	inquiry 100 minutes		Material: evaluation model References: Donna M. Mertens, Amy T. Wilson (2018) Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide. New York; The Guilford Press	10%

3	able to implement program evaluation models	<ol> <li>able to identify program evaluation models</li> <li>able to determine the weaknesses and strengths of each program evaluation model</li> <li>able to determine the right model according to the evaluation subject</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.able to identify program evaluation models correctly 2.able to determine the weaknesses and strengths of each program evaluation model accurately 3.able to determine the right model according to the evaluation subject appropriately Form of Assessment Project Results Assessment, Portfolio Assessment	inquiry 100 minutes	Material: evaluation model References: Donna M. Mertens, Amy T. Wilson (2018) Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide. New York; The Guilford Press	0%
4	able to implement program evaluation models	<ol> <li>able to identify program evaluation models</li> <li>able to determine the weaknesses and strengths of each program evaluation model</li> <li>able to determine the right model according to the evaluation subject</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.able to identify program evaluation models correctly 2.able to determine the weaknesses and strengths of each program evaluation model accurately 3.able to determine the right model according to the evaluation subject appropriately Form of Assessment Project Results Assessment, Portfolio Assessment	inquiry 100 minutes	Material: evaluation model References: Donna M. Mertens, Amy T. Wilson (2018) Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide. New York; The Guilford Press	0%
5	able to implement quantitative methods in program evaluation	<ol> <li>Able to determine quantitative research design in program evaluation</li> <li>able to determine research instruments</li> <li>able to determine data collection techniques</li> <li>able to determine data analysis techniques</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.Able to determine the appropriate quantitative research design for program evaluation 2.able to determine research instruments correctly 3.able to determine appropriate data collection techniques 4.able to determine data analysis techniques appropriately Form of Assessment Portfolio Assessment	inquiry	Material: quantitative research References: Stufflebeam, Daniel L (2014) Evaluation theory, models, and applications. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass	5%

6	able to implement qualitative methods in program evaluation	<ol> <li>Able to determine qualitative research design in program evaluation</li> <li>able to determine research instruments</li> <li>able to determine data collection techniques</li> <li>able to determine data analysis techniques</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.Able to determine the appropriate qualitative research design for program evaluation 2.able to determine research instruments correctly 3.able to determine appropriate data collection techniques 4.able to determine data analysis techniques appropriately Form of Assessment	inquiry	Material: Qualitative research References: Stufflebeam, Daniel L (2014) Evaluation theory, models, and applications. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass	5%
7	able to implement mixed methods in program evaluation	<ol> <li>Able to determine mixed method research design in program evaluation</li> <li>able to determine research instruments</li> <li>able to determine data collection techniques</li> <li>able to determine data analysis techniques</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.Able to determine mixed method research design in program evaluation correctly 2.able to determine research instruments correctly 3.able to determine appropriate data collection techniques 4.able to determine data analysis techniques appropriately Form of Assessment	inquiry	Material: mixed method References: Stufflebeam, Daniel L (2014) Evaluation theory, models, and applications. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass	5%
8	Midterm exam					0%

9	able to develop	1.able to	Criteria:	Project	Material:	25%
	program	develop	1.able to develop	based	program	
	evaluation	program	program	learning	evaluation	
	plans		evaluation plans	100	design	
		evaluation		minutes	References:	
		plans based	based on		Joseph S.	
		on needs	appropriate		Wholey, Harry	
		analysis	needs analysis		P. (2015).	
		2.able to	<ol><li>able to prepare</li></ol>		Handbook of	
		prepare	plans according		practical	
		plans in	to program		program	
		accordance	evaluation steps		evaluation. San	
		with	appropriately		Francisco:	
		program			Jossey-Bass	
		evaluation	Form of Assessment		5033Cy-Da33	
		steps			Meterial	
		sieps	Project Results		Material:	
			Assessment / Product		program	
			Assessment		evaluation	
					design	
					References:	
					David Royse,	
					Bruce A. Thyer,	
					and Deborah K.	
					Padgett (2010)	
					Program	
					Evaluation: An	
					Introduction.	
					Belmont;	
					Wadsworth,	
					Cengage	
					Learning	
					Material:	
					program	
					evaluation	
					design	
					References:	
					Donna M.	
					Mertens, Amy	
					T. Wilson	
					(2018) Program	
					Evaluation	
					Theory and	
					Practice: A	
					Comprehensive	
					Guide. New	
					York: The	
					Guilford Press	
					Guillolu Pless	

able to develop	1.able to	Criteria:	Project	M	laterial:	0%
program	develop	1.able to develop	based		rogram	
evaluation	program	program	learning		valuation	
plans		evaluation plans	100		esign	
	evaluation	based on	minutes		eferences:	
	plans based				oseph S.	
	on needs	appropriate			holey, Harry	
	analysis	needs analysis			. (2015).	
	2.able to	2.able to prepare			andbook of	
	prepare	plans according			ractical	
	plans in	to program		,	rogram	
	accordance	evaluation steps			valuation. San	
	with	appropriately			rancisco:	
	program				ossey-Bass	
	evaluation	Form of Assessment			bussey buss	
	steps	:		NA NA	laterial:	
	51043	Project Results			rogram	
		Assessment / Product			valuation	
		Assessment			esign	
					eferences:	
					avid Royse,	
					ruce A. Thyer,	
					nd Deborah K.	
					adgett (2010)	
					rogram	
					valuation: An	
					troduction.	
					elmont;	
					/adsworth.	
					engage	
					earning	
					carning	
				м	laterial:	
				p	rogram	
				ev	valuation	
				de	esign	
				R	eferences:	
				D	onna M.	
				M	lertens, Amy	
				T.	. Wilson	
				(2	2018) Program	
				Ē	valuation	
				T	heory and	
				P	ractice: A	
				С	omprehensive	
					uide. New	
					ork; The	
					uilford Press	

11	able to develop program evaluation plans	<ul> <li>1.able to develop program evaluation plans based on needs analysis</li> <li>2.able to prepare plans in accordance with program evaluation steps</li> </ul>	Criteria: 1.able to develop program evaluation plans based on appropriate needs analysis 2.able to prepare plans according to program evaluation steps appropriately Form of Assessment : Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Project based learning 100 minutes	Pro eva des Ref Jos Wh P. ( Hai pro eva Fra Jos Pro eva des Ref Dav Bru anco Pro Eva Intr Bel Wa Cei Lea Eva Intr Bel Wa Cei Eva Intr Bel Wa	tterial: ogram aluation sign ferences: seph S. holey, Harry (2015). indbook of actical ogram aluation. San ancisco: ssey-Bass tterial: ogram aluation sign ferences: wid Royse, uce A. Thyer, d Deborah K. dgett (2010) ogram aluation: An roduction. Imont; adsworth, mgage arning tterial: ogram aluation sign ferences: mna M. retens, Amy Wilson D18) Program aluation eory and actice: A mprehensive tide. New rk; The uilford Press	0%
12	able to implement program evaluation research	<ol> <li>able to determine a program evaluation model that suits program needs</li> <li>Able to plan program evaluation</li> <li>able to develop research instruments for program evaluation</li> <li>able to analyze data from program evaluation results</li> <li>able to implement the results of program evaluation</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.able to determine program evaluation models that suit program needs appropriately 2.Able to plan program evaluation appropriately 3.able to prepare research instruments for program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately Form of Assessment Project Results Assessment / Product	project based learning 100 minutes	Pro eva res Rei Don Me T. N (20 Eva The Pra Con Gui Yor Gui Yor Gui Yor Gui Yor Su Dav Eva the anc Stu Dav Eva Stu Dav Sa	tterial: bgram aluation search ferences: mna M. ertens, Amy Wilson D18) Program aluation eory and actice: A mprehensive tide. New rk; The uilford Press tterial: ogram aluation search ferences: ufflebeam, miel L (2014) aluation eory, models, d plications. n Francisco; ssey-Bass	48%

13	able to implement program evaluation research	<ol> <li>able to determine a program evaluation model that suits program needs</li> <li>Able to plan program evaluation</li> <li>able to develop research instruments for program evaluation</li> <li>able to analyze data from program evaluation results</li> <li>able to implement the results of program evaluation</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.able to determine program evaluation models that suit program needs appropriately 2.Able to plan program evaluation appropriately 3.able to prepare research instruments for program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately Form of Assessment	project based learning 100 minutes	Material: program evaluation research References: Donna M. Mertens, Amy T. Wilson (2018) Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide. New York; The Guilford Press Material: program evaluation research References: Stufflebeam, Daniel L (2014) Evaluation theory, models, and applications. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass	0%
14	able to implement program evaluation research	<ol> <li>able to determine a program evaluation model that suits program needs</li> <li>Able to plan program evaluation</li> <li>able to develop research instruments for program evaluation</li> <li>able to analyze data from program evaluation results</li> <li>able to implement the results of program evaluation</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.able to determine program evaluation models that suit program needs appropriately 2.Able to plan program evaluation appropriately 3.able to prepare research instruments for program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately Form of Assessment	project based learning 100 minutes	Material: program evaluation research References: Donna M. Mertens, Amy T. Wilson (2018) Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide. New York; The Guilford Press Material: program evaluation research References: Stufflebeam, Daniel L (2014) Evaluation theory, models, and applications. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass	0%

15	able to implement program evaluation research	<ol> <li>able to determine a program evaluation model that suits program needs</li> <li>Able to plan program evaluation</li> <li>able to develop research instruments for program evaluation</li> <li>able to analyze data from program evaluation results</li> <li>able to analyze data from program evaluation results</li> </ol>	Criteria: 1.able to determine program evaluation models that suit program needs appropriately 2.Able to plan program evaluation appropriately 3.able to prepare research instruments for program evaluation appropriately 4.able to analyze data from program evaluations correctly 5.able to implement the results of program evaluation appropriately	project based learning 100 minutes	Material: program evaluation research References: Donna M. Mertens, Amy T. Wilson (2018) Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide. New York; The Guilford Press Material: program evaluation research References: Stufflebeam, Daniel L (2014) Evaluation theory, models, and applications. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass	0%
16	Final exams					0%

## Evaluation Percentage Recap: Project Based Learning

No	Evaluation	Percentage
1.	Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	78%
2.	Portfolio Assessment	22%
		100%

## Notes

- 1. Learning Outcomes of Study Program Graduates (PLO Study Program) are the abilities possessed by each Study Program graduate which are the internalization of attitudes, mastery of knowledge and skills according to the level of their study program obtained through the learning process.
- The PLO imposed on courses are several learning outcomes of study program graduates (CPL-Study Program) which are used for the formation/development of a course consisting of aspects of attitude, general skills, special skills and knowledge.
- 3. **Program Objectives (PO)** are abilities that are specifically described from the PLO assigned to a course, and are specific to the study material or learning materials for that course.
- 4. Subject Sub-PO (Sub-PO) is a capability that is specifically described from the PO that can be measured or observed and is the final ability that is planned at each learning stage, and is specific to the learning material of the course.
- 5. Indicators for assessing ability in the process and student learning outcomes are specific and measurable statements that identify the ability or performance of student learning outcomes accompanied by evidence.
- 6. Assessment Criteria are benchmarks used as a measure or measure of learning achievement in assessments based on predetermined indicators. Assessment criteria are guidelines for assessors so that assessments are consistent and unbiased. Criteria can be quantitative or qualitative.
- 7. Forms of assessment: test and non-test.
- 8. Forms of learning: 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 study materials which can be presented in the form of several main points and sub-topics.
- **11.** The assessment weight is the percentage of assessment of each sub-PO achievement whose size is proportional to the level of difficulty of achieving that sub-PO, and the total is 100%.
- 12. TM=Face to face, PT=Structured assignments, BM=Independent study.