Article

JURNAL KEPEMIMPINAN PENDIDIKAN
2021, Vol. 5(1)PAGE 695-701

p-ISSN 2086-2881
e-ISSN 2598-621X

METAEVALUATION ACCREDITATION RESULTS OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM FACULTY OF ENGINEERING STATE UNIVERSITY OF JAKARTA 2010

Readysal MONANTUN[1], Ihsana El KHULUQO[2], Istaryatiningtias[3]
Universitas Negeri Jakarta[1], Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA[2,3]
readysalmonantun@gmail.com [1], ihsana_khuluqo@uhamka.ac.id [2], iis_ningtias@uhamka.ac.id [3]

ABSTRACT

The Study Program's accreditation process is very important to to maintain the continuity of education services quality and to provide assurance that the accredited Study Program has met the quality standards set by BAN-PT. This study aims to determine the percentage level of achievement in the meta-evaluation process, the higher percentage level achievement of the meta-evaluation results means that this research instrument can be used to measure the primary evaluation with a high level of achievement. This research is a evaluation research using metaevaluation approach, the subject in this study is the primary evaluation in the form of the accreditation results of Electrical Engineering Education Study Program, Faculty of Engineering, State University of Jakarta in 2010. The research instrument is a development of the BAN-PT accreditation assessment instrument which is guided by Book VI Assessment Matrix Instrument of Undergraduate Study Program Accreditation. Data and information collection's method by observations, documentations, group discussions and interviews. The results showed that the percentage of achievement level given by meta-evaluation calculation in average of 10 respondents was 84.59%. It can be concluded that the meta-evaluation instrument in this research can measure primary evaluations with a high percentage of achievement.

Keywords: Accreditation, Primary Evaluation, Metaevaluation, Program Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

The existence of formal and non-formal educational institutions is not only determined by buildings, infrastructure, teachers, students, managements and alumnus. What is no less important is the accreditation of educational institutions as an acknowledgment. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1985), state that "Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining and providing descriptive and judgmental

information abaut the worth and merit of same object's goal, design, implementation and impact in order to guide decision making, serve need for accountability and promote understanding of the involved phenomena". Educational institutions in carrying out their functions must be evaluated as the form of control over the institution as well as to ensure and determine the quality of the institution. Evaluation process is in the form of institutional accreditation. Accreditation is also an assessment of service appropriateness and quality determination of programs or educational institutions known as service quality in education as an accountability to society. Educational institutions always make every effort to improve the competitiveness of graduates and other academic products, including through improving the quality of education. To achieve education quality, a new paradigm in education is focused on independence, accountability, accreditation and program evaluation. It is hoped that the four pillars of management will eventually be able to produce quality education (Wirakartakusumah, 1998).

Electrical Engineering Education Study Program hereinafter abbreviated as PSPTE is one of study programs at the State University of Jakarta (UNJ) and has been accredited by the Board of University National Accreditation (BAN-PT) in 2010. In the accreditation process PSPTE has been evaluated, compiled, and prepared accreditation documents. Constraints in the accreditation process of study programs are due to 2 (two) important factors, namely the unpreparedness of the study program in preparing and arranging documents related to the accreditation process and the limited number of assessors at the Board of University National Accreditation (BAN-PT). Main Issue in the accreditation process are study programs unpreparedness in compiling and preparing accreditation documents in the form of: Self-Evaluation, Accreditation Forms and Attachments. Accreditation program evaluation process the can help study programs to compile and prepare the necessary documents related to the accreditation process. The appropriate evaluation process for the evaluation of accreditation program is meta-evaluation, by evaluating the results of the primary evaluation conducted by the assessors from BAN-PT.

Meta-evaluation has several functions, namely re-evaluating the primary evaluation results, data updating using the latest data, compiling and preparing documents for re-accreditation for the next period and predicting the re-accreditation results for the next period. Based on its function, meta-evaluation can be used as a reference for compiling accreditation instruments based on Book VI of the Undergraduate Study Program Accreditation Instrument Assessment Matrix and facilitating acceleration preparation and preparation of accreditation documents, because it already has a reference for the primary evaluation results in the form of accreditation documents assessed by assessors from BAN. -PT, so that one of the important factors constraining the accreditation process can be resolved.

In order to prepare re-accreditation process for the next 5 (five) years in order to produce an accreditation score with the criteria "A" and based on 2 (two) important factors causing the slowness of the accreditation process, especially the study program unpreparedness factor in compiling and preparing accreditation documents in the form of: Self-Evaluation, Accreditation Forms and Accreditation Form Attachments, the researcher is interested in conducting an evaluation study entitled: "Metaevaluation Accreditation Results of Electrical Engineering Education Study Program Faculty of Engineering State University of Jakarta 2010"

METHOD

This research is a evaluation research with meta-evaluation approach. The method used in this research is mixed methods, quantitative methods that use data, facts and information from observations presented in numerical form, and qualitative methods that describe findings and interpretations of data, facts and information in narrative form (descriptions). This research was conducted on the whole research object including the focus of program evaluation consisting 7 (seven) accreditation standards that have been set by BAN-PT with sample of all studies in the form of a population included in the

evaluation scope that has been established as the accreditation standard of BAN-PT. Data and information collection method's are by means of observation, documentation, group discussions and interviews, with 10 sources of information or respondents consisting of leaders at the faculty, department and study program levels 3 respondents, lecturers 3 respondents, students of The Electrical Engineering Education Study 2 respondents and Alumnus 2 respondents. Data analysis are using descriptive qualitative analysis model to analyze the feasibility of each aspect of each component in the scope of program evaluation with accreditation standards that have been set and used by BAN-PT. Data analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel software.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Electrical Engineering Education Study Program has been accredited by BAN-PT by Decree No. 020 / BAN-PT / Ak-XIII / S1 / XI / 2010 with B result and a score of 327 validity period from 8 October 2010 to 8 October 2015. In the accreditation process, the documents that must be prepared are Study Program Accreditation Form, Self-Evaluation Forms and Management Unit Form in this case are Faculty Accreditation Form. Accreditation Forms and Self-Evaluation Forms are prepared by the Study Program while Management Unit Accreditation Documents are prepared by the Faculty as the manager of the Study Program. In the assessment, each document has a different assessment weight. The weight of the assessment can be seen in the table below.

Table 1. Weight of Accreditation Form Assesment

No	Forms	Weight
1.	Study Program Accreditation Form	0,75
2.	Study Program Self Evaluation Form	0,10
3.	Faculty Accreditation Form (Management Unit)	0,15

Study program accreditation form have a large weight with the assumption that these documents are performance documents, while study program self-evaluation and faculty form are administrative documents (compliance documents) of the study program to be accredited. The assessment of study program accreditation form as performance documents has a weight in accordance with the aspects to be assessed, the greater the performance results, the greater the weight of the assessment. The weighting system in the assessment instrument has become standardized. The value, predicate and achievement of the accreditation score can be seen in the table below.

Table 2. Accreditation Scale Rating Model

No	Result	Predicate	Score
1	**A**	**Very Good**	**361 - 400**
2	**B**	**Good**	**301 - 360**
3	**C**	**Enough**	**200 - 300**
4	**D**	**Not Accredited**	**< 200**

Initially this thesis research was focused on designing an instrument that can be used as a meta-evaluation instrument as primary evaluation is the result of the accreditation of the Electrical Engineering Education Study Program in 2010. To be more focused, it was specifically selected for study program form documents with consideration of very high weight scores and as an assessment of a performance document. Meta-evaluation appraisal system for filling in the meta-evaluation instrument is carried out with a qualitative descriptive analysis model in the sense that each filling in a certain value

contains a qualitative interpretation value. For more details, the descriptive assessment ratio can be seen in the table below.

Table 3. Research Instrument Rating Ratio

No	Score	Interpretation
1.	4	All the quality performance of every aspect of the components in the program evaluation scope is very well measured and very well documented
2.	3	All the quality performance of every aspect of the components in the program evaluation scope is measured well and there are no significant deficiencies and is well documented
3.	2	All the quality performance of every aspect of the components in the program evaluation scope is sufficiently measured, but nothing stands out and is poorly documented.
4.	1	All the quality performance of every aspect of the components in the measured program evaluation scope is insufficient and undocumented.

The weight score in the research instrument is based on the standardized weight of the BAN-PT accreditation instrument with a total weight score 100. More details can be seen in the table below.

Table 4. Weight Score per Standard

No	Standard	Weight Score
1.	Vision, Mission, Goals & Targets, and Achievement Strategies	**3,12**
2.	Good Governance, Leadership, Management Systems, and Quality Assurance	**6,24**
3.	Students and Graduates	**14,95**
4.	Human Resources	**21,55**
5.	Curriculum, Learning, and Academic Atmosphere	**21,09**
6.	Financing, Facilities & Infrastructure, and Information Systems	**14,27**
7.	Research, Service / Community Service, and Cooperation	**18,78**
Total		**100,00**

Meta-evaluation was carried out using the method of observation and documentation, FGD (Forum Group Discussion) and interviews. Meta-evaluation's results in this study are based on evaluation standards as in the following table.

Table 5. Metaevaluation Results per Standard

No	Standard	Total Score
1.	Vision, Mission, Goals & Targets, and Achievement Strategies	**12,48**
2.	Good Governance, Leadership, Management Systems, and Quality Assurance	**24,96**
3.	Students and Graduates	**50,51**
4.	Human Resources	**71,09**
5.	Curriculum, Learning, and Academic Atmosphere	**70,51**
6.	Financing, Facilities & Infrastructure, and Information Systems	**47,05**
7.	Research, Service / Community Service, and Cooperation	**61,05**
Total		**338,56**

In this research, researcher use 10 respondents as the source of information as following table.

Table 6. Metaevaluation Score of 10 Respondents per Standard

No	Respondents										Final Result
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1. Standard 1	12,48	12,48	12,48	12,48	12,48	12,48	12,48	12,48	12,48	12,48	**124,8**
2. Standard 2	24,96	24,96	24,96	24,96	24,96	24,96	24,96	24,96	24,96	24,96	**249,6**
3. Standard 3	54,60	49,40	51,35	52,65	49,40	46,15	45,50	52,65	52,65	50,70	**505,05**
4. Standard 4	72,57	70,41	71,13	66,81	66,81	72,55	72,55	73,27	72,92	71,83	**710,85**
5. Standard 5	76,88	67,36	68,97	69,54	67,85	72,96	70,11	70,11	71,25	70,68	**705,11**
6. Standard 6	50,36	45,16	47,18	42,81	46,84	46,59	45,17	49,02	50,36	47,01	**470,5**
7. Standard 7	73,26	58,22	56,34	56,34	58,22	58,22	61,98	56,34	65,72	75,12	**619,74**
Total	**364,59**	**327,89**	**332,41**	**325,59**	**326,54**	**333,91**	**332,75**	**338,83**	**350,34**	**352,78**	**338,56**

The discussion in this research uses a qualitative descriptive analysis model to analyze the meta-evaluation results of each respondent. In qualitative descriptive analysis techniques, data presentation using a percentage scale to determine the level of achievement of all research respondents. Calculations in data analysis that will produce a percentage which is then interpreted on the value obtained. The achievement of the meta-evaluation results can be seen in the table below.

Table 7. Achievement's Percentage of Meta-Evaluation Results

No	Respondents	Ideal Score	Score	Achievement's Percentage
1.	1	400	364,59	91,15 %
2.	2	400	327,89	81,97 %
3.	3	400	332,41	83,10 %
4.	4	400	325,59	81,40 %
5.	5	400	326,54	81,64 %
6.	6	400	333,91	83,48 %
7.	7	400	332,75	83,19 %
8.	8	400	338,83	84,71 %
9.	9	400	350,34	87,59 %
10.	10	400	352,78	88,20 %
Average				**84,59 %**

Based on the results given table above, results with an average percentage of achievement of 84.59%, it is assumed that the percentage level of achievement is very high which means that the meta evaluation instrument in this research thesis can measure primary evaluation with a very high percentage of achievement. The above statement is supported by the comparison table of the meta-evaluation calculation to the primary evaluation as below.

Table 8. Comparison Results of Meta-Evaluation Calculations

No	Primary Evaluation Score	Predicate	Metaevaluation Score	Predicate
1.	327	B	338,56	B

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and discussion, it can be concluded that the implementation of metaevaluation generally can be carried out by developing the BAN-PT accreditation instrument into a meta-evaluation instrument while still referring to Book VI Accreditation Assessment Guidelines for Undergraduate Study Program. Metaevaluation can be a reference in compiling accreditation instruments and helping to simplify and speed up the preparation and preparation of accreditation documents, so that one of the important factors that become obstacles to the accreditation process can be resolved. Based on the calculation of meta-evaluation achievement, the average achievement is

84.59%. It is assumed that the percentage level of achievement is very high, which means that the meta-evaluation instrument in this thesis can measure the primary evaluation

REFERENCES

Akreditasi Universitas Ditenggat 2012. 2010. Seputar Indonesia. 19 Septermber 2010: Hal 11.

Arikunto, S. 2009. Manajemen Penelitian. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Arikunto, S. 2010. Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Azwar, S. 1986, Validitas dan Reliabilitas. Jakart: Rineka Cipta.

Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi. 2007. Akreditasi Institusi Perguruan Tinggi : Buku I Naskah Akademik Akreditasi Institusi Perguruan Tinggi. Jakarta: BAN-PT.

Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi. 2007. Akreditasi Institusi Perguruan Tinggi : Buku II Standar dan Prosedur Akreditasi Institusi Perguruan Tinggi. Jakarta: BAN-PT.

Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi. 2008. Akreditasi Program Studi Sarjana : Buku V Pedoman Penilaian Akreditasi Program Studi Sarjana. Jakarta: BAN-PT.

Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi. 2008. Akreditasi Program Studi Sarjana : Buku VI Matrik Penilaian Instrumen Akreditasi Program Studi Sarjana. Jakarta: BAN-PT.

Badriah, I. dan Setiadi, H. 2015. Evaluasi Program Layanan Pendidikan Berbasis ICT. Jakarta: Jurnal Penelitian dan Penilaian Pendidikan Vol. 1 No.1.

Blake, A.M. 2013. An Empirical Examination and Metaevaluation of The Impact Evaluation Process. Michigan. Wayne State University.

Enam Ribu (6000) Program Studi PT Belum Terakreditasi. 2012. Kompas. 19 Mei 2012: Hal 12.

Fakultas Teknik. 2007. Standar Mutu Pendidikan. Jakarta: Fakultas Teknik Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

Fakultas Teknik. 2012. Buku Panduan Akademik. Jakarta: Teknik Elektro Fakultas Teknik Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

Tayibnapis, F.Y. 2008. Evaluasi Program dan Instrumen Evaluasi untuk Program Pendidikan dan Penelitian. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Fraenkel, J.R. dan Wallen, N.E. 2009. How to design and evaluate research in education (7th ed.). New York. McGraw-Hill Companies.

Helder, H.C. & Gibram, N. 2009. The Contribution of Metaevaluation to Program Evaluation : Proposition of a Model. Brasilia. Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation Volume 6 Number 12.

Iskandar, F. 2012. Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Program Pendampingan Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Kejuruan Direktorat SMK (Studi Kasus di Universitas Sebelas Maret). Jakarta: FISIP Universitas Indonesia.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. 2001. Profesional Standar for Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Instutution. Washington: NCATE.

Nawawi, H.H. 1983. Metode Penelitian Deskriptif. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.

Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia No.19 Tahun 2005 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia.

Provus, M.M. 1969. The Discrepancy Evaluation Model : An Approach to Local Program Improvement and Development. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare.

Universitas Negeri Jakarta. 2007. Portofolio Institusi. Jakarta: UNJ.

Program Studi Tidak Terakreditasi Segera Ditutup. 2009. Kompas. 24 Desember 2009: Hal 12.

Scriven, M.S., Stufflebeam, D.L., dan Madaus, G.F. 1983. Evaluation Models (Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services). Boston: Kluwer Nijholl Publishing.

Shanahan, K.A. 2014. Metaevaluation of a University Teacher Education Assessment System. Kentucky: University of Louisville.

Stufflebeam, D.L. & Shinkfield, A.J. 1985. Systematic Evaluation. Boston: Kluwer Nijhof Publishing.

Stufflebeam, D.L. 2007. CIPP Evaluation Model Checklist : A Tool for Applying the CIPP Model to assess long-term enterprises. Michigan: Western Michigan University.
Stufflebeam, D.L. 2011. Meta-Evaluation. Michigan: Western Michigan University.
Sugiyono. 2018. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif. Bandung: Alfabeta.
Sugiyono. 2010. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan. Bandung: Alfabeta.
The Western Association of School and Colleges. 2001. Handbook of Acreditation. California: WASC.
Tyler, R.W. 1950. Models of Teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Soekamto, T. 2004. Evaluasi Program : Modul Kuliah. Jakarta: Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 Tentang Pendidikan Tinggi. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia.
Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2003.
Wirakartakusumah, M.A. 1998. Pengertian Mutu Dalam Pendidikan. Bogor: Lokakarya MMT IPB.
Wirawan. 2010. Evaluasi Program : Modul Kuliah. Jakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka.
Wirawan. 2011. Evaluasi : Teori, Model, Standar, Aplikasi dan Profesi. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.