

CIPP-Based Evaluation of an Education Quality Assurance Program for Grade 10 at a Private Senior High School in Tangerang

Wiputra Cendana*

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Nur Indah Eriyathi

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Wiginj Kusliawan

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Budi Wibawanta

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Niko Sudibjo

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: wiputra.cendana@uph.edu

Abstract

This article examines a Grade 10 academic transition program at one anonymized private senior high school in Tangerang through the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model. The evaluation report summarizes questionnaires from 40 students, focus groups with eight students and four teachers, two leadership interviews, 12 program documents, work samples, and academic records. Numeracy and mathematical reasoning had the lowest reported questionnaire mean ($M = 3.21$ on a five-point scale). Work samples indicated that modelling, justification, inference, and evidence-based argumentation were less consistently demonstrated than routine procedures or retrieval of explicit information. Assessment and academic support were available, while readiness criteria and intervention review procedures were less clearly established. The report documents support for 12 of 14 identified students; the other two had unspecified support status. Higher follow-up mean scores were reported in mathematics and literacy, but assessment comparability cannot be established from the available materials. The evaluative judgment is to continue the program while strengthening shared readiness criteria, targeted support for reasoning, and

2701



documented progress review. Findings remain descriptive and do not establish a causal program effect.

Keywords: CIPP evaluation; academic transition; education quality assurance; Grade 10; mathematical reasoning; program improvement

INTRODUCTION

Entering senior high school can change the pace, complexity, and independence expected of students. Differences in prior learning become consequential when a school must decide which students need additional support and what form that support should take. Research on transitions at other school levels shows that academic and school factors interact, although those findings cannot be transferred directly to the Indonesian junior-to-senior-high-school transition (Kaur et al., 2022; Beatson et al., 2023)

The school examined in the evaluation report receives students from varied junior high school backgrounds. The feeder schools provide context for differing entry experiences; they are not units of evaluation. The program evaluated here concerns the receiving school's decisions: how it assesses readiness, interprets findings, identifies priority needs, delivers support, monitors progress, and reviews subsequent action.

An assessment alone cannot complete this cycle. Its value for quality assurance depends on whether teachers can connect evidence of need with an appropriate response and determine whether that response helped. This evaluation therefore asks what academic needs the program should address; whether its assessment, resources, and decision criteria are adequate; how the program operates; what outputs and early outcomes are reported; and what improvement decision follows from the combined evidence.

CIPP EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The CIPP model examines Context to establish needs, Input to assess plans and resources, Process to examine implementation, and Product to consider outputs and outcomes. It is intended to support decisions about improving a program as well as judging its value (Stufflebeam, 2007).

Table 1. CIPP evaluation design

Component	Evaluation question	Evidence described in the evaluation report
Context	Which Grade 10 academic needs should the program address?	Student and teacher accounts, questionnaire summaries, entry evidence, work samples

2702



Input	Are assessment, support arrangements, and decision criteria adequate?	Program documents, teacher accounts, leadership interviews
Process	How are identification, support, monitoring, and review carried out?	Intervention records, progress documentation, teacher and student accounts
Product	Which outputs and early outcomes are reported?	Support records, questionnaire summaries, academic records, work samples

The program was examined as a sequence from assessment to interpretation, support, monitoring, and review. The evaluation focuses particularly on whether a decision to continue, change, or end support can be traced to evidence of student progress.

METHOD

Design and setting

The evaluation report describes a mixed-method evaluation of the Grade 10 academic transition program at one private senior high school in Tangerang. Quantitative summaries describe student perceptions, academic scores, and access to support. Focus groups, interviews, work samples, and documents provide perspectives on how the program operates. Combining these sources by evaluation question allows one type of evidence to clarify another, consistent with mixed-method evaluation (Greene et al., 1989).

This article uses the summary findings contained in the evaluation report. Individual responses, transcripts, assessment files, and intervention logs were not available for independent reanalysis in preparing this manuscript. The findings below therefore retain the status of report-level summaries.

Participants and sources

The report lists 40 Grade 10 questionnaire respondents, eight students in one focus group, four teachers in another focus group, two academic leaders or quality assurance personnel interviewed, and 12 program documents reviewed. It also describes 20 mathematics work samples, 20 literacy work samples, and academic records for the student group.

The accompanying instrument contains a questionnaire with 30 five-point items and five open-ended questions, together with guides for the student focus group, teacher focus group,

2703



and leadership interviews. The questionnaire addresses perceived initial readiness, numeracy and mathematical reasoning, literacy and reasoning, transition demands, school support, and current academic adaptation. Questionnaire responses indicate perceptions; work samples and academic records address different aspects of performance.

Analysis and reporting boundaries

The questionnaire means and counts presented below are transcribed from the evaluation report. Accounts from students, teachers, and leaders are considered alongside documents and work samples under the relevant CIPP component. Academic score means are presented descriptively. Paired-test results and effect sizes are not reported because the underlying paired dataset and evidence that the entry and follow-up assessments measured comparable constructs were not supplied.

The report also lists implementation fidelity percentages. Those percentages are omitted because the scoring rubric, rated indicators, and denominators needed to interpret or recalculate them were not available. Process findings are therefore described through the reported practices and documentation gaps.

Anonymity and ethical documentation

The school and participants are unnamed in this manuscript. The available files describe intended procedures for institutional permission, voluntary participation, consent or assent, and protection of identities. They do not contain the corresponding approval or consent records. Consequently, this draft does not claim that ethical approval or completed consent procedures have been verified. An ethics statement based on the actual records is required before submission.

RESULTS

Context and academic needs during the transition

The evaluation report identifies numeracy and mathematical reasoning as the lowest-rated questionnaire construct. Table 2 presents the reported construct summaries.

Table 2. Reported questionnaire construct summaries (n = 40)

Construct	Mean on a five-point scale	SD
Initial academic readiness	3.42	0.58

2704



Numeracy and mathematical reasoning	3.21	0.62
Literacy and reasoning	3.48	0.55
Perceived transition demands	3.65	0.60
School support	3.88	0.51
Current academic adaptation	4.03	0.49

The focus-group summaries give the numerical pattern greater specificity. Six of eight students reportedly identified non-routine problems or the selection of a solution strategy as an early difficulty; five mentioned inference or drawing conclusions from text. The four teachers described variation in prerequisite knowledge and difficulty with unfamiliar problems.

The work-sample summaries show a similar distinction between routine and more demanding tasks. Fourteen of 20 mathematics samples demonstrated adequate routine procedures, while nine showed appropriate modelling and eight contained complete justification. In literacy, 16 of 20 samples retrieved explicit information, compared with ten demonstrating adequate inference and nine presenting an argument supported by sufficient evidence. Taken together, the reported sources point to mathematical reasoning and inferential literacy as priorities for the transition program.

Input and the need for shared criteria

According to the report, the school had an entry assessment, teacher access to student information, academic support or remedial arrangements, and a means of tracking progress. The main input concern was the lack of consistently stated criteria for interpreting readiness across domains and deciding when additional support should begin, change, or end.

All four teachers reportedly had access to initial student data. Three described continued reliance on individual professional judgment for some intervention decisions. Such judgment remains valuable, but shared criteria would make the reasoning behind decisions easier to communicate and review.

Process and documentation of review

The process evidence indicates that assessment, identification, and provision of support occurred. Teacher accounts and the report's description of records also indicate variation in how progress indicators, review points, and subsequent decisions were documented. Consequently, a student might receive helpful support while the school still lacks a consistent record showing

2705



whether that support addressed the identified need.

This finding concerns the traceability of decisions. A complete record would connect the initial concern, selected support, evidence gathered during support, and the decision to continue, modify, or end it. Research on evaluating school interventions likewise emphasizes examining implementation alongside outcomes (Schultes, 2023).

Product and reported academic patterns

Of 40 students, 14 were identified as needing additional support; support was reported as documented for 12. The resulting 85.7% (12/14) represents documented coverage among identified students, rather than intervention success. The summary does not specify the support status of the remaining two or explain the gap. Cohort-level mathematics means were 62.4 at entry and 70.8 at follow-up; literacy means were 68.1 and 74.0. These cohort summaries do not describe outcomes specifically for the 12 supported students.

These are reported descriptive summaries. The available materials do not establish whether the assessments used the same instrument, scale, difficulty, and administration conditions. The differences therefore cannot be interpreted here as measured gains attributable to the program. Likewise, a higher rating of current academic adaptation describes students' perception at the time of the questionnaire; it is not itself a longitudinal measure.

DISCUSSION

Across the four CIPP components, the report points to a coherent improvement priority. The Context evidence identifies needs in reasoning, modelling, justification, inference, and argumentation. The Input evidence indicates that assessment and support mechanisms exist, but shared criteria are incomplete. The Process evidence points to variation in documenting progress and review. The Product evidence shows reported access to support for most identified students, while the available academic summaries permit only a descriptive reading.

A broad remedial response would not address these findings precisely. In mathematics, support can target representation, modelling, strategy selection, and justification. In literacy, tasks can target inference and the use of textual evidence. Repeated work samples assessed with consistent criteria would help teachers decide whether those specific skills are developing. Data-based differentiation research supports the importance of linking assessment information to aligned instructional material, while its findings from other settings should not be treated as an



effect estimate for this school (Karst et al., 2022).

The recommended judgment is continue with strengthening. The program addresses an identifiable transition need and has working assessment and support arrangements. Its most practical improvement is a common decision record: the identified need, initial evidence, support provided, progress evidence, review point, and resulting decision.

Table 3. Recommended program improvements

Priority	Recommended action	Evidence of implementation
Shared readiness criteria	Define observable Grade 10 indicators for relevant mathematics and literacy skills	Teachers use the same indicators when interpreting entry evidence
Targeted support	Align activities with the specific reasoning or literacy difficulty identified	Follow-up work samples address the same target skill
Progress documentation	Record the initial concern, support provided, and evidence gathered	Each support case has a reviewable record
Review decisions	Document whether support continues, changes, or ends	Each review produces a recorded decision and next action

Limitations

This is a single-school evaluation based on the summaries available in the evaluation report. Individual-level data, full transcripts, the complete assessment administration record, and the original scoring files were not available for independent checking. The reported means do not by themselves establish assessment equivalence or a causal program effect. The calculation behind the report's fidelity percentages and the documentation of institutional permission and consent also remain unresolved. In addition, conflicting source-version statements about the status of the reported figures require reconciliation with the original field records before empirical submission. Conclusions remain provisional within these limits.

CONCLUSION

The available CIPP summaries describe a Grade 10 transition program with a relevant academic purpose, functioning assessment and support arrangements, and reported

2707



documentation of support for 12 of 14 students identified as needing it. The support status of the remaining two students is unresolved in the available summary. The summaries also identify a practical weakness: progress evidence and subsequent intervention decisions are not described consistently. The program should be continued while the school clarifies readiness criteria, targets higher-order mathematics and literacy needs, and records decisions after each support cycle. Reported academic score differences are descriptive and do not establish that the program caused improvement.

REFERENCES

- Beatson, R., Quach, J., Canterford, L., Farrow, P., Bagnall, C., Hockey, P., Phillips, E., Patton, G. C., Olsson, C. A., Ride, J., McKay Brown, L., Roy, A., & Mundy, L. K. (2023). Improving primary to secondary school transitions: A systematic review of school-based interventions to prepare and support student social-emotional and educational outcomes. *Educational Research Review*, 40, 100553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100553>
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737011003255>
- Karst, K., Bonefeld, M., Dotzel, S., Fehringer, B. C. O. F., & Steinwascher, M. (2022). Data-based differentiated instruction: The impact of standardized assessment and aligned teaching material on students' reading comprehension. *Learning and Instruction*, 79, 101597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101597>
- Kaur, T., McLoughlin, E., & Grimes, P. (2022). Mathematics and science across the transition from primary to secondary school: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 9, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-022-00328-0>
- Schultes, M.-T. (2023). An introduction to implementation evaluation of school-based interventions. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 20(1), 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2021.1976633>
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2007). CIPP evaluation model checklist (2nd ed.). The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University. https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u350/2014/cippchecklist_mar07.pdf

