Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan
Volume 16, Nomor 1, 2025

Curriculum Evaluation Model: Paradigm and Implications in Improving the Quality of Education

Bambang Afriadi[1], Fitri[2]
Universitas Islam Syekh-Yusuf[1], Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Correspondence:
bambang.afriadi@unis.ac.id

ABSTRACT
This study analyzes various curriculum evaluation models and their implications for improving education quality through a comprehensive literature review. Curriculum is seen as a planned framework shaped by paradigms such as behavioristic, cognitive, constructivist, and humanistic, and by thinkers like Tyler, Bloom, Bruner, and Dewey. Key models reviewed include the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Model, the Stake Responsive Model, Formative and Summative Evaluations, and Tyler's Goal-Oriented Model. The CIPP Model provides a comprehensive view from planning to outcomes, while the Stake Responsive Model emphasizes the role of stakeholders. Formative and Summative approaches support continuous improvement and decision-making. Tyler's model focuses on goal achievement. The study concludes that no single model fits all contexts; evaluation should align with specific objectives and philosophies. It recommends using a multiparadigm and blended approach, emphasizing stakeholder involvement and formative evaluation to foster ongoing educational enhancement. Understanding these models is essential for educators and policymakers.

Keywords: Curriculum Evaluation, Evaluation Model, Curriculum Paradigm, Education Quality, Literature Study.

1. Introduction

The curriculum is an integral component in the educational process that establishes a framework for the student's learning experience. Referring to the views of experts such as (Almadani et al., 2024); (HR et al., 2024), the curriculum serves not only to deliver content, but also to encourage student engagement and promote social justice through critical pedagogy (Almadani et al., 2024). In addition, an effective curriculum is designed with the individual needs of students in mind through differentiation. The curriculum framework should be systematic, which includes content, teaching methods, and assessment techniques that are aligned to achieve the educational goals that have been set (Stefan, 2010); (Stefan, 2010); (Mariani et al., 2024). This is important so that the curriculum can provide a relevant and meaningful learning experience that is adapted to the demands of the times.

Curriculum development is a crucial process that involves continuous analysis and adjustment to improve the effectiveness of education. It demands an approach that is not only technical but also political, as a curriculum goal with far-reaching implications for individual identity and development (Schneiderhan et al., 2019). Educational institutions have a responsibility to support curriculum designers in creating a coherent curriculum framework, which is reflected in curriculum documentation and other learning resources. The quality of education depends heavily on how the curriculum is structured, taking into account cross-sectoral techniques and extracurricular activities that support learning (Voogt et al., 2013); (Rachmania et al., 2023). Furthermore, the existence of a structured formal curriculum is necessary as a guide for the targeted and sustainable acquisition of Knowledge, as stated by IBE-UNESCO.

In the discourse on curriculum evaluation and development, various paradigms emerged to provide context for how the learning process occurs. The behavioristic

curriculum paradigm, for example, focuses more on observable behaviours, emphasising positive reinforcement aspects to achieve specific learning goals (Saul McLeo, 2014); (Samad et al., 2019). In contrast, the cognitive curriculum is oriented towards critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Afriadi, 2022); (McClelland & Others, 1970); (Zhu et al., 2021). At the same time, the constructivist curriculum emphasises inquiry-based learning and collaboration, with the aim that students can build their Knowledge. Finally, the humanistic curriculum focuses on students' personal and emotional growth in a positive learning environment (Abdullah et al., 2022); (Bachri, 2018); (Kobiah, 2021).

The work of educational figures such as Ralph W. Tyler contributed significantly to shaping thinking about the curriculum. The fundamental question of educational goals became the basis for curriculum evaluation as well as the emphasis on societal values and student character (Tyler, 1950). The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, introduced by Benjamin Bloom, also serves as a guide in curriculum development to enhance the quality of learning (Voogt et al., 2013). These approaches and concepts are highly relevant to the design and evaluation of today's curriculum, which is more responsive to the dynamics of educational needs.

2. Methods

This study uses a comprehensive literature review approach to analyse various curriculum evaluation models. This approach allows researchers to synthesise, analyse, and critique information from a variety of sources, such as scientific journals and research reports (Afriadi & Dahlia, 2021). Research conducted by Nouraey et al. states that the curriculum plays a significant role in the effectiveness of educational programs. It is essential to understand how different models of curriculum evaluation function in this context (Nouraey et al., 2020). In this way, the study of literature facilitates an in-depth understanding of the evolution of curriculum evaluation concepts and practices, which have been extensively documented in previous research (Choudhari et al., 2020). The use of this literature is also helpful in identifying existing research gaps, pointing to the need for a more inclusive and comprehensive evaluation model as exemplified in the research conducted by Hutahaean (Hutahaean et al., 2022). Additionally, this approach offers the opportunity to compare theory and practice from different perspectives, enabling researchers to construct a cohesive narrative.

The data collection process in this literature review is carried out systematically, including the identification of relevant keywords such as "curriculum evaluation" and "Tyler model". According to research by Zhang et al., the use of proper keywords is crucial to ensure that relevant publications are efficiently accessible in academic databases (Zhang et al., 2016). The inclusion criteria set—including publications in English and Indonesian as well as articles on curriculum evaluation models—help filter out irrelevant sources. Furthermore, Hattab and Abidin emphasised that clear criteria in the selection of sources can improve the quality of literature study results by providing a strong basis for further analysis (Hattab & Abidin, 2023). The sorting is also important to avoid bias in the selection of literature that may not present information in depth, a strategy similar to that applied in the study by Pamuji and Sun (Pamuji & Sun, 2023).

Once the data is collected, the information analysis stage becomes important to identify the basic definitions and concepts in curriculum evaluation. As Cantoni et al. express, the thinking of key experts such as Dewey and Bloom provides a strong foundation for developing a relevant and practical curriculum (Cantoni et al., 2017). This analysis process also involves classifying various theoretical paradigms underlying curriculum evaluation, including behavioristic and constructivist approaches (Choudhari et al., 2020). Research by Hutahaean highlights the need for a multidimensional evaluation model to capture the complexity and dynamics of the curriculum (Hutahaean et al., 2022). In this synthesis, the

themes that emerge from the analysis of information are organised to create a coherent and comprehensive narrative, supporting the arguments and conclusions drawn in this article.

The science of curriculum evaluation has a rich understanding of how theory and practice can interrelate (Afriadi & Dudung, 2021); (Afriadi et al., 2024). Therefore, it is essential to conduct a critical synthesis and analysis of the existing literature to complement this understanding. This research aims to make a significant contribution to the development of a better curriculum evaluation model by utilising insights from various relevant literature sources. A process in which all this information is integrated not only for academic purposes, but also for the development of the best educational practices. Through this approach, it is hoped that this study can highlight the importance of curriculum evaluation and demand more research efforts in under-recognised areas in the literature.

3. Results And Discussion

Curriculum evaluation is a fundamental element in maintaining the quality and efficiency of education, which not only functions as a measuring tool, but also as a comprehensive analytical process to identify and assess the value of a curriculum, both in a specific context and as a whole (Hoang et al., 2020); (Hadi et al., 2019); (AFRIADI, 2022). Some of the main reasons that emphasise the importance of curriculum evaluation include: (a) ensuring accountability for policymakers and educational institutions in the delivery of quality education; (b) determine the need for curriculum modification to be able to meet the demands of students; (c) provide the information needed for more precise and informative decision-making; (d) maintain the integrity of education by evaluating the relevance of the program (Kindratt et al., 2019); (Jovanović & Crvenica, 2020); (e) inviting participation from various stakeholders such as teachers, students, and parents; and (f) ensuring the achievement of high-quality education that will support students' future success (Zhao et al., 2020); (Westein et al., 2019).

While several evaluation methods focus on achieving goals, criticism often arises regarding the potential neglect of the teaching and learning process itself (Lee et al., 2019). This dissatisfaction stems from a methodology that is perceived as too rigid in determining achievements (Lee et al., 2019). To address this challenge of complexity, researchers have developed a variety of evaluation models, each with a specific emphasis and methodology (Andrian et al., 2018); (Cahapay, 2020). Modifications and adaptations of existing curriculum practices are also needed to accommodate the needs of different contexts, emphasising that there is no 'one size fits all' in curriculum evaluation (Hoang et al., 2020); (Uysal & Ergünay, 2020).

Furthermore, an evidence-oriented evaluation approach can improve not only the teaching process but also student learning outcomes. This includes data analysis from student feedback that can provide important insights into curriculum development (Uljens, 2018); (Szymusiak et al., 2018). In more specific fields of education, such as medicine, the integration of competency-based evaluations is successful in improving students' skills and readiness for medical practice (Pearson et al., 2020). By using evaluation models such as CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product), institutions can be more systematic in designing, evaluating, and improving the curriculum to meet expected educational standards and relevance to student learning (Yusof et al., 2018).

In the context of concerns about the quality and relevance of education, curriculum evaluation is not only beneficial internally for the educational institution itself but also has broader implications in meeting the needs of society, industry, and global educational standards. Therefore, the importance of implementing and developing effective and evidence-based evaluation strategies needs to be continuously encouraged to create education that is responsive and adaptive to changing times and evolving needs (Hui-qiu, 2020); (Acar, 2020);

(Daga, 2020). The discussion of the curriculum evaluation model highlights three main approaches: Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Model, Stake Responsive Model, and Formative and Summative Evaluation.

a. Model CIPP Stufflebeam

The CIPP model, developed by Stufflebeam in 1996, is one of the most comprehensive evaluation frameworks. This model generates valuable data for decision-makers by evaluating the four dimensions of the program (Glatthorn et al., 2012); (Stufflebeam, 2003):

a) **Context Evaluation:** Assess the needs, problems, assets, and opportunities within the program environment to inform the determination of goals and priorities. It provides initial information for targeted program planning and development.
b) **Input Evaluation:** Analyse various alternative approaches, action plans, staff, and budgets to achieve the set goals. The goal is to help select the optimal strategy and formulate a specific procedural design.
c) **Process Evaluation:** Monitor the implementation of program plans and activities to ensure effective execution and ensure that the program is delivered as intended. This evaluation aims to ensure that objectives are achieved, identify any obstacles or deviations in implementation, and assess the program's performance.
d) **Product Evaluation:** Measures the success of achieving preset goals, including both intentional and unintended outcomes, as well as short-term and long-term results. This model helps staff maintain a focus on achieving key outcomes and assess the program's success in meeting targeted needs.

The advantage of the CIPP model lies in its comprehensive and descriptive nature, allowing for detailed reporting that ranges from supporting facilities and implementation processes to final program results. This model is particularly suitable for program evaluations that have context, input, process, and product components that are interconnected in achieving goals.

b. Model Responsif Stake

In contrast to a strict focus on goals, **Model Responsif Stake** (Stake, 2003) emphasises the identification and documentation of program quality based on key issues or concerns identified by on-site stakeholders. This model is less tied to the program's theory and stated goals, but rather more responsive to issues relevant to the program's users. The evaluation design in this model is gradual, with continuous adaptation in goal setting and data collection as the evaluator becomes familiar with the program and its context.

This responsive evaluation process involves a series of interactive and recursive steps: meetings with clients and audiences to understand perspectives; determination of the scope of the evaluation project; observation of the program to understand its operation; identification of program objectives and stakeholder concerns; development of evaluation designs for each problem; selection of data collection methods; implementation of data collection procedures; organisation of information into themes and the preparation of "depictions" (e.g., video recordings, case studies); and determining the most appropriate report format for each audience. This model stands out for its ability to capture the complexity and nuances of the program from various stakeholder perspectives.

c. Formative and Summative Evaluation

The concepts **of formative and summative evaluation** offer different time frames and objectives in curriculum assessment. Implementation evaluation, sometimes called "process evaluation", aims to assess whether a project is going as planned (Li et al., 2002).

a) **Formative Evaluation:** Conducted during the development or implementation process of the program for improvement purposes (Scriven, 1991); (Rogers, 2014). These evaluations are comprehensive and dynamic, providing ongoing feedback to modify materials, lesson plans, and overall instructional system performance (Gordon Welty, 2008). The focus is on identifying deficiencies and deviations so that they can be corrected

immediately. Formative evaluation is crucial for enhancing student performance and promoting the success of teaching and learning.

b) **Summative Evaluation:** Conducted at the end of program implementation to assess overall success and final impact (Rogers, 2014); (Frechtling, 2010). This evaluation measures the program's final outcomes, including service impact, client perception, cost-effectiveness, achievement of general and specific objectives, benefits to clients, most effective components, unexpected outputs, and program costs and benefits (Wirawan, 2011). Scriven (1967) was the first to distinguish these two types of evaluations, stating that summative evaluations are aimed at external audiences or decision-makers to determine the sustainability of the program.

The formative-summative model is often carried out in four successive stages: (1) *Needs Assessment*, identifying the long-term needs and goals of the program; (2) *Program Planning*, planning programs based on needs analysis; (3) *Formative Evaluation*, monitoring and improving the program during implementation; and (4) *Summative Evaluation*, assessing the final results and impact of the program.

d. Tyler's Goal-Oriented Model

Tyler's Goal-Oriented Model (Tyler, 1950) is a classic paradigm in curriculum evaluation that emphasises the achievement of predetermined learning goals. Tyler proposes a logical and methodical approach, involving the following steps (Glatthorn et al., 2012):

a) Set clear and measurable behavioural goals.
b) Identify situations that enable students to exhibit the desired behaviours.
c) Select, modify, or create an objective, reliable, and valid evaluation instrument.
d) Using instruments to obtain assessment results.
e) Estimate the rate of change by comparing results before and after a given period.
f) Analyse the results to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and look for potential explanations.
g) Modify the curriculum based on the findings of the evaluation.

The Tyler model puts goals at the heart of the evaluation, ensuring that all evaluation efforts are geared toward achieving specific learning outcomes. Although this model has been criticised for its narrow focus on outcomes and the potential for process abandonment, its basic framework is still relevant as an evaluation guide in many educational initiatives.

Discussion

This section analyses in more depth the relevance and implications of the various curriculum evaluation models described earlier. The selection and application of the right evaluation model are not just technical decisions, but reflections of the educational paradigm adopted and the specific goals to be achieved through the evaluation process itself.

a. Paradigm Comparison in Evaluation Models

Curriculum evaluation models, such as CIPP (Stufflebeam), Stake Responsive, Formative-Summative, and Tyler Goal-Oriented, represent a diverse range of evaluation philosophies found in educational practice. The Tyler model, as a pioneer in this field, is heavily focused on the efficiency and accountability of quantitatively measurable results. Using a behavioristic approach, this model considers learning to be a clear and measurable behavioural change (Barber et al., 2020); (Darras et al., 2020). Although it is easy to apply and measure, criticisms of this model say that it often ignores complex social contexts and the dynamics of the learning process that cannot be simplified into clear targets. Thus, the evaluation in this model can be considered an "audit" of the achievement of the goals set at the beginning (Zhao et al., 2020); (Kamsurya, 2020).

The paradigmatic conflict with the Tyler model is seen in the Stake Responsive Model, which places more emphasis on stakeholders' understandings and perceptions of the learning process (Al-Shanawani, 2019); (KARTAL, 2020). Within this framework, evaluation aims not

only to determine whether goals are achieved, but also to understand how the subjective experiences of learners influence learning outcomes (Castro-Calviño et al., 2020; Rukhiyah et al., 2020). This approach is consistent with the paradigms of constructivism and humanism that focus on meanings formed by individuals in diverse social contexts. The Responsive Model encourages a more dialogical and exploratory evaluation, which seeks to understand the nuances that exist in the context of the education (Supriyantoko et al., 2020; Peer et al., 2020).

On the other hand, the CIPP Model proposed by Stufflebeam offers a more holistic approach than the previous two models. By focusing on context, input, process, and product dimensions, CIPP seeks to integrate accountability—as applied by Tyler—with a broader and richer understanding of context, as exemplified by Stake (Sarkadi et al., 2020); (Jumari & Suwandi, 2020); (Divayana et al., 2019); (Goh et al., 2020). The CIPP provides a framework for evaluating needs and resources prior to program implementation, thus presenting a more proactive approach than is prevalent in the Tyler model. The evaluation process in the CIPP also answers criticism of Tyler by paying more careful attention to how goals are achieved in practice (Matthew & Yamat, 2020); (Garland et al., 2019).

Meanwhile, the concepts of formative and summative evaluation provide an important classification based on the time of their application in the evaluation process. Formative evaluations conducted during program implementation are considered essential for continuous learning and continuous improvement, reflecting the plan-do-check-act cycle in education management (Ilyas et al., 2020); (Isnanto et al., 2020); (Utomo et al., 2020). In this case, formative evaluation serves to identify strengths and weaknesses during the course of the program, while summative evaluation is carried out at the end for the determination of the sustainability or replication of the program (Sefrianto et al., 2020); (Allugar & Suharjana, 2019). The synergy between these two types of evaluation is important; Without formative evaluations, programs cannot develop optimally, and without summative evaluations, decisions about program impact will be less evidence-based. (Only, 2020); (Bilasa & Taşpınar, 2020).

With the above analysis, it can be concluded that each evaluation model has significant advantages and disadvantages, which depend on the context of its implementation. Therefore, it is important for educators and policymakers to choose the evaluation model that best suits the objectives and characteristics of the program being implemented, while taking into account the specific needs of the stakeholders involved (Naz et al., 2020); (Torio & Torio, 2019); (Morro et al., 2019).

b. Theoretical and Practical Implications in Curriculum Evaluation

Analysis of several curriculum evaluation models indicates that there is no one model that is absolutely superior in every situation. The selection of a curriculum evaluation model must be based on the purpose of the evaluation, the stages of curriculum development, the available resources, and the philosophical orientation of the evaluation taken by the party concerned. This is due to the inherent complexity in the curriculum and the variation in educational contexts that can affect the outcome of the evaluation. To ensure relevance and relevance in the evaluation process, educators need to consider factors such as local and cultural contexts that influence curriculum implementation (Yang & Li, 2020); (Afshari et al., 2019).

Theoretically, mastery of various curriculum evaluation models deepens understanding in the discipline of curriculum and evaluation itself. Seminars such as the one conducted by Hadar et al. explain how various theories of learning—including behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism—explicitly influence the evaluation design used (Hadar et al., 2020). For example, if a curriculum focuses on specific, measurable learning, an approach such as the one proposed by Tyler or the CIPP model may be better suited to that context. However, in cases where those goals include the development of critical thinking skills and creativity, a more

responsive approach, such as process evaluation, should be implemented (Jeffers & Poling, 2019).

From a practical perspective, an in-depth understanding of these evaluation models provides strategic advantages for educators, curriculum developers, and education policymakers. By integrating formative and summative evaluations, educators can make continuous curriculum improvements, as well as provide empirical evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of programs for accountability and decision-making in the future (Gedifew, 2020). This practice not only encourages improvements in the quality of academic programs but also ensures that evaluations can serve as a critical tool in understanding how and for whom the curriculum is designed (Rao et al., 2020); (Schachter et al., 2020).

In the context of a dynamic and competency-oriented modern education in the 21st century, curriculum evaluation needs to go beyond just measuring the achievement of goals. A multiparadigm approach or blended evaluation, which combines elements from different models, can provide a more comprehensive picture of the quality and effectiveness of the curriculum implemented. Evaluations that combine CIPP principles with responsive process evaluations can enrich understanding of successful curriculum implementation, as well as increase stakeholder engagement throughout the curriculum lifecycle (Hadi et al., 2019). Through this approach, curriculum evaluation not only serves to measure academic outcomes but also to understand the dynamics and functions of the curriculum in the broader context of education, thereby supporting continuous improvement of the quality of education (Nicklas et al., 2019).

4. Conclusion

Curriculum evaluation is an essential foundation for ensuring the quality and effectiveness of the education system. Based on the analysis of the literature study, it can be concluded that the curriculum is a planned framework that guides the learning experience, involving the setting of goals, content, methods, and assessments. The curriculum development process is dynamic, influenced by various educational paradigms (behavioristic, cognitive, constructivistic, humanistic), as well as the thoughts of key figures such as Ralph W. Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, Jerome S. Bruner, and John Dewey. Each of these paradigms and thinking fundamentally shapes the way the curriculum is designed, implemented, and evaluated.

Various models of curriculum evaluation offer different lenses for assessing effectiveness. Stufflebeam's CIPP model provides a comprehensive framework, including context, input, process, and product evaluations, making it well-suited for holistic Assessment. The Responsive Stake Model stands out in capturing stakeholder perspectives and field concerns, providing an in-depth qualitative understanding of how the curriculum functions in practice. Meanwhile, Formative and Summative Evaluation provide a temporal dimension, where formative evaluation focuses on continuous improvement during implementation, and summative evaluation assesses the final impact for strategic decision-making. Finally, Tyler's Goal-Oriented Model emphasises accountability through clear measurement of goal achievement, although it needs to be complemented by other approaches to capture process complexity.

Overall, there is no single model of curriculum evaluation that is universally superior; Its effectiveness depends mainly on the specific objectives of the evaluation, the stage of the curriculum, and the educational context. An in-depth understanding of these various models allows education stakeholders to design more strategic, relevant, and adaptive evaluation approaches, which will ultimately support sustainable improvement of the quality of education.

Based on the findings and discussion above, several recommendations can be made for future curriculum evaluation practices:

a. Multiparadigm Approach and Mixed Methods: Educational institutions are advised not to be fixated on one single evaluation model. In contrast, adopting a multiparadigm approach that blends elements from different models (e.g., the CIPP framework for structure, the responsive principle for perspective, and the formative-summative function for time) will provide a more comprehensive and nuanced picture of evaluation. The use of *mixed methods*, which integrates quantitative and qualitative data, will also enrich the evaluation findings.
b. Focus on Process and Context: While achieving goals is important, evaluation must go beyond just results. It is recommended to pay more attention to process evaluation (how the curriculum is implemented) and context evaluation (the environmental factors that affect the curriculum). This will help identify the root of the problem and the opportunities for improvement that may be missed if you focus only on the result.
c. Active Stakeholder Engagement: Evaluation should be a participatory process. It is essential to actively involve all stakeholders – including students, teachers, parents, administrators, and the broader community – throughout the planning stage and the dissemination of results. Their perspectives are invaluable in ensuring the relevance of the curriculum and the sustainability of the proposed changes.
d. Utilisation of Formative Evaluation for Continuous Improvement: Formative evaluation should be an integrated and routine practice, not just a formality. The implementation of effective and rapid feedback mechanisms during the curriculum development and implementation process will enable real-time improvement and progressive quality enhancement.
e. Evaluator Capacity Development: To conduct effective evaluations, competent human resources are essential. It is recommended to invest in capacity building for curriculum evaluators, including training on various evaluation models, research methodologies, and analytical and interpretive skills.

5. References

Abdullah, U., Yunus, B. M., Musthafa, I., & Syafei, I. (2022). Curriculum Development to Improve Arabic Language Skill in the Institute of Umul Qro Al-Islam (IUQI), Bogor and the Islamic Religious Institute of Sahid (INAIS) Bogor. *International Journal of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (Ijhess)*, *1*(5). https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v1i5.146

Acar, A. (2020). A Critical Analysis of the 2014 and 2018 High Schools Elt Curricula of Turkey. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Research*, *14*(34), 510–528. https://doi.org/10.29329/mjer.2020.322.24

Afriadi, B. (2022). Management of Behavior Problems at School. *JISAE: Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation*, *8*(1), 29–34. https://doi.org/10.21009/JISAE.V8I1.26589

AFRIADI, B. (2022). MULTIPLE CRITERIA DECISION MAKING (MCDM) FOR QUALITY EDUCATION MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: SYSTEMATIC REVIEW. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, *3*(3), 173–180. https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v3i3.66

Afriadi, B., & Dahlia, D. (2021). TEACHER SUPERVISION USING TEACHER COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT IN THE ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING IMPLEMENTATION COMPONENTS IN PRIMARY SCHOOL JURUMUDI 5 TANGERANG STATE. *JISAE: Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation*, *7*(1), 55–63. https://doi.org/10.21009/JISAE.V7I1.21461

Afriadi, B., & Dudung, A. (2021). EVALUATION OF TEACHING SKILL PRACTICE PROGRAMS, IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

INSTITUTION JAKARTA. *JISAE: Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation*, *7*(2), 120–129. https://doi.org/10.21009/JISAE.V7I2.23781

Afriadi, B., Komarudin, & Sutisna, A. (2024). Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Civic Education Curriculum in Indonesia: A Case Study of the KTSP Curriculum, the 2013 Curriculum, and the Independent Curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, *13*(5), 331–343. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v13n5p331

Afshari, M., Witek, N., & Galifianakis, N. B. (2019). Education Research: An Experiential Outpatient Teleneurology Curriculum for Residents. *Neurology*, *93*(4), 170–175. https://doi.org/10.1212/wnl.0000000000007848

Aldapit, E., & Suharjana, S. (2019). CIPP Evaluation Model for the Coaching Program of Running Athletes. *Psychology Evaluation and Technology in Educational Research*, *1*(2), 104. https://doi.org/10.33292/petier.v1i2.10

Almadani, T. N. F., Mirza, A. A., & Qamariah, Z. (2024). The Analysis Four Curriculum Development Approach in English Teaching. *JFLLT*, *3*(2), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.23971/jfllt.v3i2.6880

Al-Shanawani, H. M. (2019). Evaluation of Self-Learning Curriculum for Kindergarten Using Stufflebeam's CIPP Model. *Sage Open*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018822380

Andrian, D., Kartowagiran, B., & Hadi, S. (2018). The Instrument Development to Evaluate Local Curriculum in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(4), 921–934. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11458a

Bachri, B. S. (2018). *Curriculum Development and Implementation on Higher Education in Indonesia*. https://doi.org/10.2991/icei-18.2018.106

Barber, C., Vleuten, C. v. d., Leppink, J., & Chahine, S. (2020). Social Accountability Frameworks and Their Implications for Medical Education and Program Evaluation: A Narrative Review. *Academic Medicine*, *95*(12), 1945–1954. https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000003731

Bilasa, P., & Taşpınar, M. (2020). Opinions of the Students From Foreign Language Teaching Departments About Their Undergraduate Programs. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, *6*(2), 367–380. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.6.2.367

Cahapay, M. B. (2020). An Internal Evaluation of Higher Education Curriculum Using Data Transformation Model. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, *10*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.37134/ajatel.vol10.2.1.2020

Cantoni, D., Chen, Y., Yang, D. Y., Yuchtman, N., & Zhang, Y. J. (2017). Curriculum and Ideology. *Journal of Political Economy*, *125*(2), 338–392. https://doi.org/10.1086/690951

Choudhari, S. G., Rawekar, A., Mishra, V., Srivastava, T., & Vagha, S. (2020). Curriculum Evaluation of Physiology Subject of Medical Undergraduate Using 'FIPO Model.' *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, *9*(7), 3487. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_175_20

Daga, A. T. (2020). Curriculum Development Orientation for Primary School in the Perspective Miller and Seller. *Primary Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, *9*(5). https://doi.org/10.33578/jpfkip.v9i5.7987

Darras, K. E., Forster, B. B., Spouge, R., Anique B. H. de Bruin, Arnold, A., Nicolaou, S., Hu, J., Hatala, R., & Jeroen J. G. van Merriënboer. (2020). Virtual Dissection With Clinical Radiology Cases Provides Educational Value to First Year Medical Students. *Academic Radiology*, *27*(11), 1633–1640. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acra.2019.09.031

Divayana, D. G. H., Ariawan, I. P. W., & Adiarta, A. (2019). Development of Countenance Application Oriented on Combining ANEKA-Tri Hita Karana as a Mobile Web to Evaluate the Computer Knowledge and Morality. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (Ijim)*, *13*(12), 81. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v13i12.10858

Frechtling, J. (2010). *The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation*. Directorate for Education and Human Resources Division of Research and Learning in Formal and Informal Settings National Science Foundation.

Garland, C., Wilson, J. A. B., Parsons, M. H., & Dubrowski, A. (2019). The Application of Low-Fidelity Chest Tube Insertion Using Remote Telesimulation in Training Healthcare Professionals. *Cureus*. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.6273

Gedifew, M. T. (2020). Exploring the Instructional Leadership Development Practices in Ethiopia. *Journal of Education and Learning (Edulearn)*, *14*(3), 402–410. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v14i3.15375

Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F., & Whitehead, B. M. (2012). *Curriculum Leadership: Strategies for Development and Implementation*. SAGE.

Goh, L. K., Sow, C. F., & Jaafar, S. (2020). Implementation of an Immunisation Project for the Refugees Using the Logic Model. *Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine*, *20*(3), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.37268/mjphm/vol.20/no.3/art.604

Gordon Welty. (2008). Formative Evaluation in the ADDIE Model. *Journal of GXP Compliance*, *12*(3), 66–73.

Hadar, L. L., Alpert, B., & Ariav, T. (2020). The Response of Clinical Practice Curriculum in Teacher Education to the Covid-19 Breakout: A Case Study From Israel. *Prospects*, *51*(1–3), 449–462. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09516-8

Hadi, S., Andrian, D., & Kartowagiran, B. (2019). Evaluation Model for Evaluating Vocational Skills Programs on Local Content Curriculum in Indonesia: Impact of Educational System in Indonesia. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *19*(82), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2019.82.3

Hattab, M., & Abidin, M. (2023). Development of Arabic Language Curriculum With Integration-Interconnection Paradigm Referring KKNI and SN-DIKTI. *Sustainable Jurnal Kajian Mutu Pendidikan*, *6*(2), 421–431. https://doi.org/10.32923/kjmp.v6i2.3412

Hoang, A.-D., Pham, H., Nguyen, Y.-C., Nguyen, L.-K.-N., Vuong, Q., Dam, M. Q., Tran, T., & Nguyen, T. (2020). Introducing a Tool to Gauge Curriculum Quality Under Sustainable Development Goal 4: The Case of Primary Schools in Vietnam. *International Review of Education*, *66*(4), 457–485. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-020-09850-1

HR, S., Wakia, N., & Aziz, M. B. (2024). Examining the Concept of Principles in Curriculum Development. *Didaktika Jurnal Kependidikan*, *18*(1), 26–34. https://doi.org/10.30863/didaktika.v18i1.6278

Hui-qiu, G. (2020). Effect of Curriculum Planning for Physical Education in Colleges on Innovation Ability. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Ijet)*, *15*(12), 103. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i12.14527

Hutahaean, B., Telaumbanua, S., & Tamba, L. (2022). Development of a Multidimensional Curriculum Evaluation Model for the Independent Curriculum in Elementary Schools. *Qalamuna Jurnal Pendidikan Sosial Dan Agama*, *14*(2), 705–724. https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v14i2.3617

Ilyas, M. R., Anjum, R. Y., Azam, S., & Munir, A. (2020). Evaluation of the Practical Implications of the ESL Curriculum at Intermediate Level. *Journal of Communication and Cultural Trends*, *2*(2), 39–53. https://doi.org/10.32350/jcct.22.03

Isnanto, S. H., Akbar, M., & Tunas, B. (2020). Deradicalisation of Terrorism Prisoner: Evaluation of the Terrorism Client Guidance Program at the Surakarta Correctional Facility. *Ijhcm (International Journal of Human Capital Management)*, *4*(2), 96–113. https://doi.org/10.21009/ijhcm.04.02.09

Jeffers, J., & Poling, S. (2019). The Development and Implementation of a 12-Month Simulation-Based Learning Curriculum for Pediatric Emergency Medicine Fellows Utilising

Debriefing With Good Judgment and Rapid Cycle Deliberate Practice. *BMC Medical Education*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1417-6

Jovanović, M., & Crvenica, J. C. (2020). Comparative Analysis of the Curriculum for the Subject Solfeggio (Ems) in Slovenia, Montenegro, Croatia and Serbia. *Facta Universitatis Series Visual Arts and Music*, 091. https://doi.org/10.22190/fuvam1902091j

Jumari, J., & Suwandi, S. (2020). Evaluation of Child-Friendly Schools Program in Islamic Schools Using the CIPP Model. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 323–341. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v20i2.2580

Kamsurya, R. (2020). Learning Evaluation of Mathematics During the Pandemic Period COVID-19 in Jakarta. *International Journal of Pedagogical Development and Lifelong Learning*, *1*(2), ep2008. https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdll/8439

KARTAL, M. (2020). İnsan Kaynaklari Yönetïmï Eğïtïm Programinin Değerlendïrïlmesï. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *20*(4), 1808–1833. https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2020.20.58249-779498

Kindratt, T. B., Bernard, B., Webb, J., & Pagels, P. (2019). Parent-Provider Paediatric Literacy Communication: A curriculum for Future Primary Care Providers. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, *8*(2), 110–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-0503-8

Kobiah, L. K. (2021). Piloting a New Curriculum: Teachers' Perspective. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *10*(4). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v10-i4/11709

Lee, S. young, Shin, J.-S., & Lee, S.-H. (2019). How to execute Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluation model in medical health education. *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions*, *16*, 40. https://doi.org/10.3352/jeehp.2019.16.40

Mariani, M., Akbar, A. F. R., Rabbi, M. F., & Salamah. (2024). Enhancing Islamic Religious Education: Principles and Implications for Curriculum Development in the 2013 and Independent Curriculum Era. *Jise*, *3*(2), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.63120/jise.v3i2.52

Matthew, V. R., & Yamat, H. (2020). Evaluation of Highly Immersive Program (HIP) Using CIPP Model. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *10*(4). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i4/7152

McClelland, D., & Others, A. (1970). *The Cognitive Curriculum. Ypsilanti Preschool Curriculum Demonstration Project*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED049832

Morro, T., Fink, A., Carmienke, S., Frese, T., & Guenther, S. (2019). Learning Types and Learning Success in a Structured Diabetes Education Programme for Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: Study Protocol of a Prospective, Longitudinal Study. *BMJ Open*, *9*(8), e030611. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030611

Naz, S., Jabeen, S., & Rashid, A. (2020). Evaluation of Punjab Education and English Language Initiative (PEELI) Project in Pakistan. *Global Regional Review*, *V*(I), 332–339. https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2020(v-i).36

Nicklas, D., Lane, J. L., & Hanson, J. L. (2019). If You Build It, Will They Come? A Hard Lesson for Enthusiastic Medical Educators Developing a New Curriculum. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *11*(6), 685–690. https://doi.org/10.4300/jgme-d-19-00246.1

Nouraey, P., Al-Badi, A. H., Riasati, M. J., & Maata, R. L. R. (2020). Educational Program and Curriculum Evaluation Models: A Mini Systematic Review of the Recent Trends. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(9), 4048–4055. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080930

Nur, R. (2020). Students' Perception on the Implementation of Intensive English Course for Freshmen at Universitas Indonesia Timur: A Program Evaluation. *Jisip (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan)*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.36312/jisip.v4i3.1262

Pamuji, S., & Sun, L. (2023). The Managerial Competence of the Madrasa Head in Improving Teacher Professionalism and Performance at Mi Al-Maarif Bojongsari, Cilacap District. *Pengabdian Jurnal Abdimas*, *1*(2), 66–74. https://doi.org/10.55849/abdimas.v1i2.158

Pearson, M., Barker, A. M., Battistone, M. J., Bent, S., Odden, K., & O'Brien, B. C. (2020). Implementing an Established Musculoskeletal Educational Curriculum in a New Context: A Study of Effectiveness and Feasibility. *Medical Education Online*, *25*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2020.1760466

Rachmania, S., Nabilla, F., Therapi, B., Herdha, R., & Amalia, K. (2023). Strategi Manajemen Kurikulum Yang Berorientasi Pada Hasil Belajar Di Sekolah Kreatif SD Muhammadiyah 20 Surabaya. *Arzusin*, *4*(1), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.58578/arzusin.v4i1.2275

Rao, X., Lai, J., Wu, H., Li, Y., Xu, X., Browning, C., & Thomas, S. (2020). The Development of a Competency Assessment Standard for General Practitioners in China. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00023

Rogers, P. (2014). Overview of Impact Evaluation. *Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 1*, *1*, 20.

Samad, M. R. A., Iksan, Z. H., & Khalid, F. (2019). Acceptance and Readiness to Use M-Learning among Primary School Science Teachers. *Creative Education*, *10*(12), 3003–3011. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1012224

Sarkadi, Casmana, A. R., & Rahmawati, Y. (2020). Improved Learning Design for Pre-Service Teacher in a Character Education Course. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(1), 212–224. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080126

Saul McLeo. (2014). *Classical Conditioning. Common Lit.* CommonLit. https://www.commonlit.org/en/texts/classical-conditioning

Schachter, R. E., Piasta, S. B., & Justice, L. M. (2020). An Investigation Into the Curricula (And Quality) Used by Early Childhood Educators. *HS Dialog*, *23*(2). https://doi.org/10.55370/hsdialog.v23i2.1021

Schneiderhan, J., Guetterman, T. C., & Dobson, M. L. (2019). Curriculum development: A how to primer. *Family Medicine and Community Health*, *7*(2), e000046. https://doi.org/10.1136/fmch-2018-000046

Scriven, M. (1991). Chapter II: Beyond Formative and Summative Evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, *92*(6), 19–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819109200603

Sefrianto, Badrujaman, A., & Komarudin, K. (2020). Validity of Instruments as Measuring Instrument Evaluation Program on the Job Training Students SMK Negeri 1 Cariu Bogor Regency. *Jisae Journal of Indonesian Student Assesment and Evaluation*, *6*(2), 188–195. https://doi.org/10.21009/jisae.v6i2.16021

Stake, R. (2003). Responsive Evaluation. In T. Kellaghan & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation* (pp. 63–68). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0309-4_5

Stefan, D. C. (2010). *Informing Curriculum Development in Health Sciences*. 299–314. https://doi.org/10.18820/9781920338671/15

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP Model for Evaluation. *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation*, 31–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0309-4_4

Szymusiak, J., Fox, M. D., Polak, C., Jeong, K., Rubio, D. M., Dewar, S., Urbach, A. H., & Gonzaga, A. M. (2018). An Inpatient Patient Safety Curriculum for Pediatric Residents. *Mededportal*. https://doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.10705

Torio, M. Z. C., & Torio, V. A. G. (2019). Midterm Evaluation of the Implementation of the First Phase of the Practice Teaching Program: Field Studies Using CIPP Model. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2019.4001

Tyler, R. (1950). Ralph W. Tyler's principles of curriculum, instruction and evaluation: Past influences and present effects (Doctoral dissertation). *Loyola University Chicago*, *1985*, 1–475.

Uljens, M. (2018). Understanding Educational Leadership and Curriculum Reform. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (Njcie)*, *2*(2–3), 196–213. https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.2811

Utomo, U., Supriyati, Y., & Akbar, M. (2020). The Evaluation of Swimming Sports Coaching Programs for Disabled Athletes in the National Paralympic Committee. *Jurnal Pendidikan Teori Penelitian Dan Pengembangan*, *5*(4), 544. https://doi.org/10.17977/jptpp.v5i4.13410

Uysal, D., & Ergünay, O. (2020). Yüksek Öğretim Düzeyinde Savunulabilir Akademik Amaçlı Bir İngilizce Öğretim Programı: İhtiyaç Analizi Çalışması. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim*, *13*(2), 424–439. https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.629689

Voogt, J., Knezek, G., Cox, M., Knezek, D., & ten Brummelhuis, A. (2013). Under which conditions does ICT have a positive effect on teaching and learning? A Call to Action. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *29*(1), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2011.00453.x

Westein, M. P. D., Vries, H. d., Floor, A., Koster, A. S., & Buurma, H. (2019). Development of a Postgraduate Community Pharmacist Specialization Program Using CanMEDS Competencies, and Entrustable Professional Activities. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *83*(6), 6863. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe6863

Wirawan. (2011). *Evaluasi: Teori, Metode, Standar, Aplikasi, dan Profesi*. Rajawali Press. https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?id=139

Yang, W., & Li, H. (2020). The Role of Culture in Early Childhood Curriculum Development: A Case Study of Curriculum Innovations in Hong Kong Kindergartens. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *23*(1), 48–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949119900359

Yusof, R., Yin, K. Y., Norwani, N. M., & Jaafar, H. (2018). Conceptualizing Curriculum Evaluation in Education Degree Programmes in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *8*(6). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i6/4299

Zhang, J., Schmidt, K., & Li, H. (2016). BIM and Sustainability Education: Incorporating Instructional Needs Into Curriculum Planning in CEM Programs Accredited by ACCE. *Sustainability*, *8*(6), 525. https://doi.org/10.3390/su8060525

Zhao, X., Goldman, E. F., Banani, T. A., Kline, K., Brown, K., Lee, J., & Jurjus, R. A. (2020). The Process of Curricular Integration and Its Effects on Anatomical Knowledge Retention. *Clinical Anatomy*, *33*(6), 960–968. https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.23632

Zhu, G., Raman, P., Xing, W., & Slotta, J. (2021). Curriculum design for social, cognitive and emotional engagement in Knowledge Building. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1), 37. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00276-9