



EVALUATING ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING IN WRITING CLASSROOMS USING CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS, AND PRODUCT (CIPP) MODEL

Haris Santosa Nugraha*, Syihabuddin, Yeti Mulyati, and Vismaia S. Damayanti
School of Postgraduate Studies, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

*Corresponding author's E-mail address: harissantosa89@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

Effective and efficient assessment of learning in writing classrooms plays an important role in improving students' writing ability. Students' writing skills tend to be low so that they have not been able to achieve the expected learning objectives. Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the implementation of high school students' learning in writing classrooms assessment using the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model. This evaluative method was conducted at high schools in the Bandung Raya area using purposive sampling technique. The research sample consisted of 120 students, 6 teachers, and 3 school leaders. Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, and documentation which were analyzed using descriptive data analysis. The findings showed that the evaluation of the implementation of the assessment of learning to write on the average components of context, input, process, and product was in the good enough category with an average score of 2.91 and 2.87. The evaluation aspects analyzed include conditions, needs, teacher competencies, learner characteristics, availability of facilities and infrastructure, planning, implementation, implementation results, and the impact of the implementation of learning in writing classrooms assessment in high school. Based on the findings of the analysis, improvement efforts are needed, especially in the component of learning in writing classrooms assessment products that can be adapted to the diversity of students.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 18 Dec 2023

Revised 03 Jun 2024

Accepted 10 Jul 2024

Available online 25 Aug 2024

Keywords:

CIPP Model; program evaluation; writing assessment

To cite this paper (in APA style):

Nugraha, H.S., Syihabuddin, Mulyati, Y., & Damayanti, V.S. (2024). Evaluating assessment of learning in writing classrooms using the context, input, process, product (CIPP) model. *International Journal of Education*, 17(2), 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v17i2.65546>

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing skills are one of the important aspects of language skills in this modern century (Zainab et al., 2021). Writing is not only considered a formal skill, but as a foundation in effective communication as a means of solving problems and developing critical thinking (Putri et al., 2016). A person's skill in writing can characterize that person is educated (Sugiyarni & Rini, 2023; Suryadi et al., 2022; Weda et al., 2022). A person's eligibility at a certain level of education is often measured based on their written work. Furthermore, writing skills are seen as one of the complex language skills and are classified as difficult language competencies (Trismanto, 2017; Utami, 2023). Writing activities at least involve aspects of language use and content processing, so that writing skills include communicative language skills (Yogyantoro, 2016). According to Abidin (2015) in his book entitled *Language Learning based on Character Education*, writing skills will not come suddenly but must be achieved by continuing to practice writing diligently. These writing skills require a systematic and structured process as well as continuous practice and habituation (Nurhayati, 2018).

Students' writing skills are currently still a cause for concern and have a red mark in language learning (Heriyudanta, 2021; Kharizmi, 2019; Qadaria et al., 2023; Trismanto, 2017; Widiastuti et al., 2022; Yusrumaida, 2021). This is due to some serious problems that have not been resolved in learning to write. The problems of writing skills are caused by several things, including the suboptimal learning process carried out by teachers (Widiastuti et al., 2022) and there are still many schools that do not have assessment tools to measure writing skills (Simanjuntak et al., 2019). In addition, many students think that writing is one of the activities that are boring and waste a lot of time (Ati et al., 2018) so that this has an impact on the quality of writing that has not reached the specified target. Furthermore, learning to write is considered a difficult thing by some students because it requires a thinking process in developing various ideas into a form of writing (Sari et al., 2020; Agusti et al., 2021; Widiastuti et al., 2022). If this situation is allowed to continue, it can certainly have a negative impact on the achievement of learning in writing classrooms and students' writing ability.

To overcome this, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive evaluation study on all aspects, one of which is the assessment aspect. Assessment plays an important role in the teaching and learning process (Menggo & Gunas, 2022; Setiadi, 2016). Assessment is important in determining the success of a learning activity (Nurgiantoro, 2013; Nugraha et al., 2022). Good learning can be seen from the quality of the assessment, and the quality of the assessment can show the quality of the learning (Rosnaeni, 2021). Appropriate and continuous assessment keeps students engaged and on track with the learning process (Chapman & King, 2012). Assessment can be a powerful tool to prove students' involvement in learning and teachers' involvement in the process of building students' minds (Majuddin et al., 2022; Nasri et al., 2010). From these activities, teachers are expected to be able to improve their pedagogical quality so that they have a better picture in identifying students' abilities from the continuous interaction process between assessment and teaching (Al-Mahrooqi & Denman, 2018; Ashari, 2020).

Assessment of students' writing is an important part of a language teacher's job. Assessment in learning to write is an important component of students' academic growth (White, 2009). Understanding this assessment method is very important for teachers because the results can affect the quality of education (Popham, 2009; White, 2009) including language learning. In conducting writing assessment, teachers must be able to know how to create fairness in assessment by informing the assessment results based on rubrics and clear assessment criteria.

To overcome this problem, an evaluation of the writing assessment process carried out so far was carried out. The evaluation of this assessment program was studied using the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) evaluation model developed by Daniel L. Stufflebeam in 1967. The choice of this model is based on its ability to evaluate a program in detail and specifically, so that it makes it easier for researchers to make decisions (Aspriyanti et al., 2022; Mulyasari & Sutrisno, 2014). In addition, CIPP is an evaluation model that views the program being evaluated as a system (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017).

The CIPP model used in this study is directed to consider the implementation of the writing assessment program so far which can be used as a reference in an effort to develop a better writing skills assessment model. The CIPP model focuses on evaluating the aspects of the program to be evaluated (Rachmaniar et al., 2021) which can make a recommendation about the description of the assessment program that has been carried out, things that must be improved, developed, or continued.

The CIPP model is seen as one of the evaluation models often used by evaluators (Damayanti & Dwikurnaningsih, 2020). There are various studies that have been conducted to evaluate the implementation of assessment programs through the CIPP model, including: first, research conducted by Legi Aspriyanti and friends in 2022 which examined extracurricular activities of poetry writing classes using the CIPP evaluation model. The results showed that the poetry writing class program in all its aspects was in the good category (Aspriyanti et al., 2022). Second, research conducted by Sofinatun and Musringudin on the reading and memorization of the Quran program at SMP Muhammadiyah 30 showed satisfactory results (Sofinatun & Musringudin, 2022). Third, research on evaluating inclusive education programs in elementary schools using the CIPP model conducted by Suharjo and Supratman Zakir with the results of the study showing that the evaluation of the content component has a good category, the input component is in the medium category, the process component is in the good category, and the product component is in the good category (Suharjo & Zakir, 2021). Fourth, research conducted by Anwar Sanusi, et al. in 2021 on evaluating students' writing skills using the CIPP model in Arabic language learning. The results showed that the CIPP model is an appropriate evaluation model to evaluate the learning outcomes of writing skills (Sanusi et al., 2021). Fifth, research from Nova Indah Wijayanti and friends in 2019 on evaluating user education programs with the CIPP Model at the UGM Faculty of Engineering Library with the results showing that the four CIPP components are in the good category (Wijayanti et al., 2019).

Based on the above, the CIPP Model research is not a new research, but this research is focused on examining the assessment of Indonesian learning in writing classrooms. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to evaluate the learning in writing classrooms assessment program that has been implemented in Indonesian language learning at the high school level. The results are expected to be a recommendation for teachers, schools, and researchers to improve the quality of learning and students' writing skills appropriately, accurately, and comprehensively.

2. METHOD

The method used in this research is descriptive evaluative method using the CIPP model. The research procedure includes four things namely context, input, process, and product (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). In the context aspect, data were collected and analyzed based on the purpose of the assessment which includes the objective conditions and needs of high school students' writing assessment. The second component is input which analyzes the planning or assessment resources including aspects of teacher competence, characteristics of learners, and facilities and infrastructure for writing assessment. The third component is the process that analyzes the implementation of the assessment including aspects of planning and conducting writing assessments. The last component is the product that analyzes the outcomes of the assessment including aspects of the results of the application and the impact of the application of writing assessment. The design framework of the CIPP model in learning in writing classrooms assessment can be described as Figure 1 below.




Figure 1 Framework of the CIPP Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam, 2015)

Figure 1 above presents the framework of the CIPP model used to evaluate the implementation of a comprehensive learning in writing classrooms assessment. The analysis of the four components using the CIPP model helps identify the core of weaknesses and shortcomings in the existing writing assessment system (Silviariza et al., 2023). This is then recommended as an alternative in improving the quality of learning in writing classrooms assessment and developing a more effective and efficient assessment system (Rebia et al., 2023).

The population and samples selected in this study are closely related to the problem under study. Sampling was conducted randomly using purposive sampling technique based on the diversity of population characteristics in terms of geography, academic competence, and the learning curriculum used. Respondents involved totaled 120 students, 6 teachers, and 3 school leaders at the high school level in the Greater Bandung area.

Data collection was conducted using questionnaires, interviews, and documentation techniques. The questionnaire was given simultaneously to students and teachers using the Google Form application. Interviews were conducted for about one hundred minutes with teachers and school leaders, by asking questions based on the interview guidelines that had been prepared. The documentation technique was carried out by reviewing the assessment tools used so far. The research instrument was validated by 3 experts to test the readability of the instrument based on construction, content, and language aspects. The data collection and interpretation process was carried out for five months, from February to June 2022.

In this analysis process, data processing is used using descriptive analysis techniques with the help of MS. Excel and SPSS applications. The data from the questionnaire is then processed and displayed in the form of an average score, which is interpreted and narrated properly. The validity test of the instrument was carried out through the product moment method, with the reliability value of the teacher and student questionnaires being 0.957 and 0.922, respectively. In addition, the data analysis of this instrument was carried out using mean analysis. The calculation of the scores obtained on each evaluation aspect is as follows,

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\text{Average sum per indicator}}{\text{Sum of components per indicator}}$$

From this equation, the score range obtained becomes a category limit in decision making. The data is then interpreted through the following rating scale.

Table 1.
Assessment Criteria Score

Formula	Score Range	Category
$X \leq \mu - 1.5 \alpha$	≤ 2.1	Unsatisfactory
$\mu - 1.5 \alpha < X \leq \mu - 0.5 \alpha$	2.2 – 2.6	Poor
$\mu - 0.5 \alpha < X \leq \mu + 0.5 \alpha$	2.7 – 3.1	Average
$\mu + 0.5 \alpha < X \leq \mu + 1.5 \alpha$	3.2 – 3.6	Good
$\mu + 1.5 \alpha \leq X$	> 3.6	Very good

Source: (Azwar, 2012)

Structured interview data was analyzed and interpreted using Miles and Huberman's interactive analysis model. This model contains three stages, namely reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. The documentation data served to confirm the questionnaire and interview data that had been analyzed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In line with the objectives, the results and discussion of this study report four things, namely the evaluation of the context, input, process, and product components of learning in writing classrooms assessment in high school.

Context Component

The evaluation of the context component in this study is assessed based on aspects of the conditions and needs of learning in writing classrooms assessment in high school. The assessment condition aspect analyzes the purpose of the assessment and the target of the assessment, while the assessment needs analyze the writing assessment system that needs to be carried out and used. The following are the findings of the evaluation of the context component of learning in writing classrooms assessment in high school based on the results of questionnaires to students and teachers.

Table 2
Description of Context Component Evaluation Data

Component	Aspects	Student		Teacher	
		Average Aspect	Average Component	Average Aspect	Average Component
Context	Conditions for writing assessment	3,65	3,16	3,75	3,23
	Writing assessment needs	2,68		2,70	

As shown in table 2, the presentation of the results of the context component based on questionnaire data shows some significant findings. The findings reveal an overview of the evaluation of the student and teacher assessment context based on aspects of assessment conditions and assessment needs showing scores of 3.16 and 3.23. In this case, both scores are included in the good category, which means that the implementation of writing assessment is still carried out according to the context. But apart from these results, there are interesting data between conditions and needs. The condition context based on goals and objectives appears to have a very good score, while the assessment needs have a low score, meaning that the context is not in accordance with the needs of writing assessment.

Based on the analysis of documentation data, the conditions for assessing writing lessons have mostly referred to regulations on assessment, including Permendikbud No. 23 of 2016 concerning Educational Assessment Standards for those still using the 2013 curriculum or educational assessment standards based on Permendikbudristek No. 21 of 2022 for those using the latest curriculum. However, for the assessment needs of learning to write, only 4 out of 6 schools have clear procedures for implementing writing assessments (such as portfolio assessment procedures, essay assessments, and writing practice assessments), while the rest still do not use complete designs or tools.

Based on the interview results, there are several assessment contexts that need to be improved. For the assessment condition aspect, it is necessary to conduct regular socialization of the writing assessment policy to all stakeholders. In addition, it is necessary to increase language teachers' competence in writing assessment, especially in preparing assessment instruments and providing feedback. Furthermore, there are several things that need to be adjusted in the indicators of the objectives and assessment system of writing skills. In the objective indicators, assessment activities have not fully referred to the learning outcomes/basic competencies, especially in the achievement of competency levels and learning in writing classrooms content. As for the assessment system indicator, it is still carried out in general and has not been directed to accommodate the diversity of students. As a result, the assessment results do not fully reflect the real condition of students' writing abilities and skills.

Similarly, for the assessment needs, the aspects that need to be improved are the assessment of data that must be collected based on the relevance and management of writing skills assessment. Ideally, the assessment of learning in writing classrooms is carried out starting from the assessment of students' initial writing ability, process of learning in writing classrooms, attitude assessment during the learning process, and the final assessment of learning in writing classrooms outcomes. However, at this time, it is still not done holistically. The most dominant aspect carried out by most teachers is only assessing the results of students' writing at the end of the lesson. This aspect is included in summative assessment or product assessment at the end of learning. As for the assessment at the beginning of learning (diagnostic assessment) and assessment during the learning process (formative assessment) is still rarely done. This happens because teachers' knowledge and ability in using assessment during writing lessons are still limited. Some teachers argue that this is due to limited learning time, so that assessment at the beginning of learning cannot be carried out. Likewise, assessment during the learning process has not been a priority that must be done.

The context findings described describe and detail various problems, substances and opportunities to help decision makers. It is assessed based on the situation or background that influences the type of educational goals and strategies (Purwanto, 2011; Akbar & Syamsurijal, 2023). In line with previous research, the conditions of the learning environment and learning needs greatly affect the effectiveness of the learning process carried out (Sanusi et al., 2021). This is done to help map the goals and priorities of a program including writing assessment (Aspriyanti et al., 2022). If the results of context evaluation are followed up properly, it can certainly affect the improvement of students' abilities, including writing in high school.

Input Component

The evaluation of the input component is analyzed based on aspects of teacher competence, learner characteristics, and facilities and infrastructure that support the assessment of learning in writing classrooms in high school. The aspect of teacher competence analyzes pedagogical, professional, personality, and social competencies. The aspect of student characteristics analyzes students' interest in writing assessment. The facilities and infrastructure aspect examines classroom conditions and the availability of tools and materials. The following are the findings of the evaluation of the input component in the assessment of learning to write in high school based on the responses of student and teacher questionnaires.

Table 3.
Description of Input Component Evaluation Data

Component	Aspects	Student		Teacher	
		Average Aspect	Average Component	Average Aspect	Average Component
Input	Teacher competence	3,11	3,26	3,16	3,01
	Learner Characteristics	3,38		2,75	
	Facilities and Infrastructure	3,30		3,13	

Table 3 shows that the description of the input component evaluation data shows some significant findings. The findings reveal a description of the evaluation of student and teacher assessment inputs based on aspects of teacher competence, student characteristics, and infrastructure that show an average score of 3.26 and 3.01. Both average scores are in the good enough category which means that the input or carrying capacity for writing assessment is carried out quite well.

Based on the analysis of documentation data, the evaluation of the input component, 5 out of 6 Indonesian language teachers already have teaching competence or are certified teachers. However, documents analyzing the characteristics of learners have not been carried out in most schools. As for the facilities and infrastructure for learning in writing classrooms assessment, they are quite complete but most of them have not been used optimally.

Based on the interview results, there are several assessment inputs that need to be improved. For the aspect of teacher competence, although it is generally good, it must continue to be improved, especially in the pedagogical aspect. This is so that it is more relevant and renewable both in the aspects of preparation, implementation, and assessment of writing skills. In the planning indicator, teachers are not fully able to plan assessments that refer to the learning outcomes/basic competencies of writing. For indicators of the implementation of the assessment, teachers must still be carried out in general and have not been directed to accommodate the diversity of students. As a result, the assessment results do not fully reflect the real condition of students' writing abilities and skills. Based on this, it is necessary to improve teacher competence in writing assessment through training and technical guidance.

For the percentage aspect of learner characteristics, the tendency of students' interest in learning to write is lacking. It can be seen in students' activeness during learning, students' interest in digging up information, students' performance during the learning process, and students' cooperation in groups during the learning in writing classrooms. The lack of students' interest in learning to write is due to the fact that the process has not involved students' interest in learning to write. Therefore, it is necessary to survey students' interest at the beginning of learning through diagnostic assessment in learning in writing classrooms.

As for the infrastructure aspect, it is also an important input component of writing assessment. Adequate infrastructure will make it easier for teachers to conduct writing assessment. Based on the results of the interviews, most high schools have provided infrastructure for writing assessment, such as assessment guidebooks, stationery, and assessment rooms. Furthermore, the existing facilities should be used optimally by both teachers and students. By improving the quality of the input component of writing assessment, it is expected that writing assessment in senior high schools can be more objective, accurate, and useful.

Evaluation findings on the input component can be used in determining the achievement of a program's objectives. This evaluation helps related parties to make a decision, determine existing resources, choose an alternative work, plans and strategies to achieve goals, and procedures for achieving them (Rachmaniar et al., 2021). In line with previous research, input support, especially facilities, still needs to be improved to achieve the expected program objectives (Rebia et al., 2023; Nur & Rasyid, 2024). Improving the input component is expected to improve the quality of learning in writing classrooms assessment.

Process Component

The evaluation of the process component is analyzed based on the planning and implementation aspects of writing assessment in high school. The planning aspect analyzes the preparation that must be done before conducting a writing assessment. The implementation aspect analyzes the application of the assessment tool which includes

the implementation of the process, measurement of aspects, and filling in the writing assessment instrument. The following are the findings of the evaluation of the process component in the assessment of learning to write in high school based on students' and teachers' questionnaire responses.

Table 4.
Description of Process Component Evaluation Data

Component	Aspects	Student		Teacher	
		Average Aspect	Average Component	Average Aspect	Average Component
Process	Assessment Planning	2,75	2,76	3,10	2,85
	Assessment Implementation	2,77		2,60	

In Table 4, the description of the process component evaluation data shows some significant findings. The findings first reveal the average score of the evaluation of the process component of student and teacher assessment based on the planning and implementation of the assessment shows an average score of 2.76 and 2.85. Both average scores are in the good enough category which means that the writing assessment process is carried out quite well.

Based on the analysis of documentation data, several documents were found to confirm the writing assessment planning process used, such as lesson plans or teaching modules and writing assessment worksheets. For the writing assessment implementation documents, most of them have been used in the learning process. However, these tools have not been comprehensively prepared. This is evidenced by the worksheet instruments that tend not to be adjusted to the diversity of students in writing.

Based on the interview data, there are several things that need to be improved in the process component. For the planning aspect, program objectives need to be more detailed and specific so that they are easier to achieve, program targets need to be more measurable so that they can be used to assess the success of the program, program strategies need to be more detailed and realistic so that they can be implemented effectively, and program resources need to be more adequate so that program implementation can run smoothly. As for the implementation aspect, there are several things that need to be improved, including the program implementation schedule needs to be more detailed and realistic so that it can be followed properly, tasks and responsibilities need to be clearer and more directed so that program implementation can run smoothly, and monitoring of program implementation needs to be more routine and systematic so that improvements and adjustments can be made if needed.

The evaluation findings on the process component generally show quite good results. In line with previous research, there are several things that need to be improved as consideration in making improvements and refining the next process. The planning aspect is an important component in the process of implementing a program (Sofinatun & Musringudin, 2022). This aspect includes activities carried out to prepare for program implementation, such as the preparation of goals, objectives, strategies, and resources (Suharjo & Zakir, 2021). As for the assessment implementation aspect, it includes activities carried out to carry out the assessment process. This analysis is adjusted to the standards or plans that have been made (Sanusi et al., 2021). This aspect includes operational activities, such as preparing schedules, distributing tasks, and monitoring program implementation. The findings of the process component evaluation can then be designed by related parties as an effort to improve the quality of learning in writing classrooms assessment.

Product

The evaluation of the product component is analyzed based on the aspects of the results and impacts of the assessment of learning to write in high school. The result aspect of the assessment analyzes the accuracy of the assessment tool in measuring students' writing ability. The impact aspect of the assessment examines the improvement of skills and the effectiveness of the use of assessment in learning to write. The following are the findings of the evaluation of the product component in the assessment of learning in writing classrooms in high school based on the responses of student and teacher questionnaires.

Table 5.
Description of Product Component Evaluation Data

Component	Aspects	Student		Teacher	
		Average Aspect	Average Component	Average Aspect	Average Component
Product	Assessment Results	2,70	2,48	2,50	2,40
	Impact Assessment	2,48		2,30	

As shown in Table 5, the presentation of the results of the product component based on questionnaire data shows some significant findings. The findings reveal a description of the evaluation of student and teacher assessment products based on aspects of the results and impact of the assessment which show scores of 2.48 and 2.40. In this case, both scores fall into the poor category, which means that the implementation of writing assessment has not produced the expected products.

Based on the results of the documentation data analysis, not too many documents were found that could confirm the products of the writing assessment that had been carried out. This shows that the results and impact of the implementation of the writing assessment are still not optimal so that the products produced are not in accordance with the expectations or goals that have been set.

Based on the results of the interview, there are several aspects in the assessment product component that need to be improved. For the aspect of assessment results, things that need to be improved include improving the quality of assessment instruments, improving the quality of human resources involved in the assessment, and increasing the objectivity of the assessment. In the aspect of the impact of implementation. As for improving the impact of the implementation of writing assessment, including increasing the socialization and advocacy of student writing assessment, conducting regular monitoring and evaluation to see the development of the impact of implementation, and making modifications or adjustments to writing assessment according to the needs and conditions of the community.

The findings of the evaluation of the product component in learning in writing classrooms assessment serve to measure the success in achieving a predetermined writing assessment goal by examining aspects of the results of implementation and the impact of implementation. In line with previous research, this product component measures, interprets, and determines the achievement of a program's results. This ensures how much the program has met the needs of the group of programs served (D. L. Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2012). The resulting data will largely determine whether the program is continued, changed, or discontinued (Sanusi et al., 2021; Rebia et al., 2023). The findings on the product component in writing assessment should receive more attention because of the lowest results compared to other components. This shows that the assessment of high school students' learning in writing classrooms has not been able to fully produce products that are in accordance with the learning objectives.

Based on the entire description of the data that has been found, the percentage of evaluation of learning in writing classrooms assessment on all CIPP components is quite good with an average on all components based on student and teacher responses showing scores of 2.91 and 2.87. The following is a description of the findings of the average score of the context, input, process and product components in the assessment of learning in writing classrooms in high school based on student and teacher questionnaire responses.




Figure 2 Average CIPP Component Evaluation Score

Of the four components in figure 2, students' responses to the input component have the highest score compared to the other components, while the product component is the component that has the lowest score. As for the teacher's response, the input component has the highest score, while the product component has the lowest score.

The results of this analysis provide knowledge and an overview to related parties in making decisions, assessing available resources, looking for alternatives, and choosing ways to achieve the objectives of an assessment program evaluation (Wijayanti, et al., 2019). For this reason, in the process of assessing learning in writing classrooms, an assessment model is needed that can help improve the process of expressing ideas, opinions, and ideas in a series of sentences influenced by one's heart, mood, and background (Meyers, 2005; Trismanto, 2017). In this case, through a good writing assessment, it can be used to express ideas in written form to others as a manifestation of one's language application, communication, and expression skills (Menggo & Gunas, 2022).

The evaluation findings in the writing assessment show that the writing assessment still has some shortcomings that need to be improved. However, even so, there is still potential to be developed further. Therefore, there are several things that should be done to improve the writing assessment. First, periodic evaluations should be conducted to see the progress of the implementation results and the impact of the implementation. The results of the evaluation should be used to make improvements or modifications to the writing assessment. Second, there needs to be support from various parties, both from the government, the community, and other parties. Third, continuous improvement and development should be carried out, so that the results of writing assessment can achieve their goals more optimally.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion of the research above, it can be concluded that the CIPP model can provide a prescriptive and flexible description of the assessment of high school students' learning in writing classrooms. The results also show that the evaluation of the context component of writing assessment is in the good category although the needs aspect is still not in line with the context. In evaluating the input or carrying capacity, it shows that the writing assessment is carried out quite well, by improving aspects of learner characteristics. The process component shows that writing assessment is prepared and implemented quite well, with optimization of

implementation tailored to the diversity of learners. As for the product component, it shows that the results and impact of writing assessment are still not optimal so that the products produced are not in accordance with the expectations or goals that have been set. From the results of this analysis, it is necessary to improve the assessment components that are still low, adjusted to the diversity of students.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank all parties involved in this research, especially all students and lecturers who were involved in this research.

6. REFERENCES

- Agusti, R., R. S., & Hakim, R. (2021). Peningkatan kemampuan menulis narasi berbasis pendekatan konstruktivisme di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 5(2), 930–942. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v5i2.820>
- Akbar, A., & Syamsurrijal, S. (2023). Evaluation of online learning for PGSD study program students using the CIPP Model. *Riwayat: Educational Journal of History and Humanities*, 6(2), 296–303. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v6i2.30163>
- Al-Mahrooqi, R., & Denman, C. (2018). Alternative Assessment. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0325>
- Ashari, H. (2020). *Praktek Baik sebagai Alternative Penilaian Sikap dan Ketrampilan Saat BDR Dimasa Pandemi Covid 19*. LPMP Lampung. <http://lpmplampung.kemdikbud.go.id/detailpost/praktek-baik-sebagai-alternative-penilaian-sikap-dan-ketrampilan-saat-bdr-dimasa-pandemi-covid-19>
- Aspriyanti, L., Arbangi Nopi, R., & Luriawati Naryoatmojo, D. (2022). Evaluasi Program Kelas Menulis Puisi Menggunakan Model Evaluasi CIPP di Mts Negeri 1 Banjarnegara. *Edu Cendikia: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 2(3), 513–520. <https://doi.org/10.47709/educendikia.v2i3.1914>
- Ati, A. P., Widiyanto, S., & Suyana, N. (2018). Penerapan metode picture and picture untuk peningkatan keterampilan menulis narasi pada siswa kelas VIII SMP Al Ihsan dan SMP Tashfia Kota Bekasi. *Adimas : Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 2(1), 30. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24269/adi.v2i1.887>
- Azwar, S. (2012). *Reliabilitas dan Validitas*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Chapman, C., & King, R. (2012). *Differentiated assessment strategies: One tool doesn't fit all* (p. 199).
- Damayanti, W. R., & Dwikurnaningsih, Y. (2020). Evaluasi program ekstrakurikuler di SDN Candirejo Kabupaten Semarang. *Refleksi Edukatika : Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 11(1), 59–69.
- Heriyudanta, M. (2021). Analisis kompetensi menulis karya tulis ilmiah mahasiswa di Indonesia. *ASCARYA*, 1(1).
- Kharizmi, M. (2019). Kesulitan siswa sekolah dasar dalam meningkatkan kemampuan literasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Almuslim*, 7(2), 94–102.
- Majuddin, C., Khambari, M. N. M., Wong, S. L., Ghazali, N., & Norowi, N. M. (2022). Students' Perspectives on the Use of Differentiated Assessment Tool: Results from an Explanatory Sequential Mixed-Method Pilot Study. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/11667>
- Menggo, S., & Gunas, T. (2022). College Student's Perception of Performance-Based Assessment Use in Boosting Speaking Ability. *International Journal of Language Education*, 6(4), 423–436. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v6i4.22910>
- Meyers, A. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing: Effective Sentences Paragraph and Essay*. Longman.
- Muyasaroh, M., & Sutrisno, S. (2014). Pengembangan Instrumen Evaluasi Cipp Pada Program Pembelajaran Tahfiz Al-Qur'an Di Pondok Pesantren. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 18(2), 215–233. <https://doi.org/10.21831/pep.v18i2.2862>
- Nasri, N., Roslan, S. N., Sekuan, M. I., Bakar, K. A., & Puteh, S. N. (2010). Teachers' perception on alternative assessment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7(C), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.006>
- Nugraha, H. S., Mulyati, Y., & Damaianti, V. S. (2022). Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Kota Bandung pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 22(2).
- Nur, M., & Rasyid, A. (2024). *Evaluating indonesian language learning in indonesian islamic higher education using CIPP model*. 17(1), 32–43. <https://doi.org/10.26858/retorika.v17i1.56555>
- Nurgiantoro, B. (2013). *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi*. BPFE Yogyakarta.
- Nurhayati. (2018). Upaya peningkatan keterampilan menulis teks prosedur kompleks menggunakan model penilaian autentik pada siswa kelas X TP Smk N 1 Bangkinang T.P 2017/2018. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 2, 500–509.
- Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory into Practice*, 48(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577536>

- Purwanto. (2011). *Evaluasi Hasil Belajar*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Putri, T., Roro Anggun Wijayanti, & Chairunisa. (2016). Effective Strategies For Improving writing Skills Of Elementary English. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 6, 128.
- Qadaria, L., Rambe, K. B., Khairiah, W., Minta, R., Pulungan, I., Zahratunnisa, E., Fakultas, M., Tarbiyah, I., Keguruan, D., Sumatera, U., & Medan, U. (2023). Analisis Faktor Penyebab Rendahnya Keterampilan Menulis Belajar Siswa SD Kelas IV. *Jurnal Bintang Pendidikan Indonesia (JUBPI)*, 1(3), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jubpi.v1i3.1675>
- Rachmaniar, R., Yahya, M., & Lamada, M. (2021). Evaluation of Learning through Work Practices Industry Program at University with the CIPP Model Approach. *International Journal of Environment, Engineering and Education*, 3(2), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.55151/ijeedu.v3i2.55>
- Rebia, P. S., Suharno, Tamrin, A. G., & Akhyar, M. (2023). Evaluation of Product-Based Education Training Class at Vocational High School using the CIPP Model. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 12(3), 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v12n3p135>
- Rosnaeni, R. (2021). Karakteristik dan asesmen pembelajaran abad 21. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 5(5), 4341–4350. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v5i5.1548>
- Sanusi, A., Maulana, D., & Sabarno, R. (2021). Evaluation of Students Writing Skills Using CIPP model in Arabic Learning: The Concept and its Implementation. *The 4th Proceeding International Conference on Arabic Language and Literature (ICALL) 2021*, 208–213. <http://proceedings2.upi.edu/index.php/ical/article/view/1723%0Ahttp://proceedings2.upi.edu/index.php/ical/article/download/1723/1599>
- Sari, Y., Luvita, R. D., Cahyaningtyas, A. P., Iasha, V., & Setiawan, B. (2020). Pengaruh Metode Pembelajaran Struktural Analitik Sitentik terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Permulaan di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 4(4), 1125–1133. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v4i4.515>
- Setiadi, H. (2016). Pelaksanaan Penilaian pada Kurikulum 2013. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 20(2), 166–178. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21831/pep.v20i2.7173>
- Silviariza, W. Y., Sumarmi, Utaya, S., Bachri, S., & Handoyo, B. (2023). Development of Evaluation Instruments to Measure the Quality of Spatial Problem Based Learning (SPBL): CIPP Framework. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(2), 413–436. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16223a>
- Simanjuntak, I. A., Akbar, S., & Mudiono, A. (2019). Asesmen Formatif Perkembangan Bahasa Anak. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, Dan Pengembangan*, 4(8), 1097. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17977/jptpp.v4i8.12686>
- Sofinatun, S., & Musringudin, M. (2022). Evaluasi program Baca Tulis dan Hafalan Qur'an (BTHQ) di SMP Muhammadiyah 30 dengan menggunakan model CIPP. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 6(1), 16237–16242.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2012). *Systematic evaluation: A self-instructional guide to theory and practice*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Zhang, G. (2017). *The CIPP evaluation model (how to evaluate for improvement and accountability)*. The Guilford Press.
- Stufflebeam, D.L., & Coryn, C. L. S. (2014). *Evaluation theory, models, and application*. Josey-bass.
- Stufflebeam, Daniel L. (2015). CIPP evaluation model checklist: A tool for applying the CIPP model to assess projects and programs. *Journal of Western Michigan University*, 5(1), 1–51. <https://wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists>
- Sugiyarni, & Rini, S. (2023). Exploring writing assessment in EFL classroom. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 7(1), 148–161.
- Suharjo, S., & Zakir, S. (2021). Evaluasi program pendidikan inklusif di sekolah dasar menggunakan model CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product). *Sultra Educational Journal*, 1(3), 51–59.
- Suryadi, E., Milawasri, F. A., & Lustina, L. (2022). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Berbasis Masalah Terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Teks Prosedur Siswa. *Jurnal Bindo Sastra*, 6(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.32502/jbs.v6i1.3503>
- Trismanto. (2017). Keterampilan menulis dan permasalahannya. *Bangun Rekaprima*, 03(1), 62–67.
- Utami, M. (2023). *Teknik SMART sebagai Trik Pembelajaran Menulis Teks Cerita Inspiratif*. NaikPangkat.Com. <https://naikpangkat.com/teknik-smart-sebagai-trik-pembelajaran-menulis-teks-cerita-inspiratif/>
- Weda, D., Ariyanthi, N. K. M., & Adhikara, I. N. A. (2022). Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa Dalam Karangan Deskripsi Pada Siswa Kelas V Sd Negeri 2 Siangan. *SPHOTA: Jurnal Linguistik Dan Sastra*, 14(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.36733/sphota.v14i1.2092>
- White, E. (2009). Are you assessment literate? Some fundamental questions regarding effective classroom-based

- assessment. *OnCUE Journal*, 3(1), 3–25.
- Widiastuti, N. P. K., Putrayasa, I. B., & Adnyana, K. S. (2022). Instrumen Penilaian Keterampilan Menulis Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Pedagogi Dan Pembelajaran*, 5(1), 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jp2.v5i1.42473>
- Wijayanti, N. I., Yulianti, R., & Wijaya, B. (2019). Evaluasi program pendidikan pemakai dengan model CIPP di perpustakaan Fakultas Teknik UGM. *Tik Ilmeu: Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan Dan Informasi*, 3(1), 37.
- Wijayanti, Nova Indah, Yulianti, R., & Wijaya, B. (2019). Evaluasi program pendidikan pemakai dengan Model CIPP di Perpustakaan Fakultas Teknik UGM. *Tik Ilmeu : Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan Dan Informasi*, 3(1), 37. <https://doi.org/10.29240/tik.v3i1.790>
- Yogyantoro, A. (2016). Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Karangan Deskripsi Menggunakan Media Diorama Siswa Kelas Iv Essays Description Writing Skills Improvement Using Media Diorama At Class Iv. *Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 1–10. <http://journal.student.uny.ac.id/ojs/index.php/pgsd/article/viewFile/5378/5085>
- Yusrumaida, Y. (2021). Penerapan Teknik Mind Maps dalam Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis Siswa. *Journal of Education Action Research*, 5(4), 472. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jear.v5i4.12345>
- Zainab, I., Jaya, G. B., & Artini, L. P. (2021). Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis Peserta Didik Melalui Whatsapp Diary Writing. *Indonesian Gender and Society Journal*, 1(2), 60–68. <https://doi.org/10.23887/igsj.v1i2.39082>