

Evaluation of Curriculum Development with the CIPP Approach in the Context of Improving the Quality of Education at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i4.1134>

*Rusda, Nasri, Sutrisno, Sulistiyana^{abcd}

¹²³⁴Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

Corresponding Author : rusdakhalifa460@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

This study is grounded in the importance of curriculum development in improving the quality of education at the secondary school level. An adaptive curriculum that aligns with the needs of both students and the wider community is expected to foster the optimal achievement of educational goals. This research employs a qualitative descriptive approach, with data collected through interviews, observations, and documentation. Data analysis followed the stages of reduction, presentation, and conclusion drawing to provide an in-depth understanding of the curriculum development process at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara. The findings reveal that curriculum development at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara has been implemented in accordance with established procedures, particularly in the aspects of planning, implementation, and evaluation. The results align with the CIPP model of curriculum evaluation, which emphasizes the integration of context, input, process, and product. Nevertheless, challenges remain, particularly the limited involvement of teachers and the community in each stage, indicating that the principle of relevance to learners' and environmental needs has not been fully realized. Overall, the developed curriculum has contributed positively to educational quality, yet it still requires strengthened coordination, collaboration, and continuous adaptation to both national policy dynamics and local needs.

Keywords: *Evaluation, Curriculum Development, Educational Quality, Senior High School*

Article History:

Received 08th August 2025

Accepted 29th August 2025

Published 06th September 2025



INTRODUCTION

Education is the main pillar in the development of quality and competitive human resources. In this context, the curriculum plays a central role as a guideline in the learning process that determines the direction, content, and strategy of education. Therefore, the development of a relevant, adaptive, and contextual curriculum is an urgent need in the current era of disruption. The curriculum not only functions as an administrative document, but also as a strategic instrument in realizing national education goals (Mulyasa, 2022).

One of the important components of the education system is the curriculum that serves as a tool to achieve national education goals. Curriculum development is a necessity so that educational institutions remain relevant to the demands of the times (Sukmadinata, 2019; Arifin, 2022). In other words, the curriculum must be able to bridge the gap between the needs of students and changing social, economic, political, and technological developments.

This research is motivated by the importance of curriculum development in improving the quality of education at the secondary school level. An adaptive curriculum that is in accordance with the needs of students and the community is expected to be able to encourage the achievement of educational goals optimally. Thus, evaluation of the curriculum is an important step to determine the effectiveness and relevance of its application in learning practices.

In the context of curriculum evaluation, this study refers to several theoretical frameworks, including the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model which emphasizes

a thorough evaluation starting from the needs to the final results of the program (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). In addition, the Tyler model, which focuses on the compatibility between educational objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation of learning outcomes (Tyler, 1949), as well as the Stake model, which emphasizes the description and assessment of educational programs comprehensively (Stake, 1995), are also referenced in this study.

In Indonesia, curriculum changes are a phenomenon that often occurs along with social, economic, political, and technological developments. One of the latest policies in curriculum development is the Independent Curriculum which gives flexibility to educational units to develop the Operational Curriculum of Education Units (OCEU). The Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (Kemendikbudristek) through this policy encourages schools to prepare KOSP independently by paying attention to the characteristics of students, regional potential, and community needs (Kemendikbudristek, 2022).

The Merdeka Curriculum is expected to be able to answer the challenges of the times and equip students with 21st century competencies, such as critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and digital literacy (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). However, in reality, curriculum development at the school level does not always run optimally. Various obstacles are still found, ranging from limited facilities, lack of training for teachers, to lack of community participation.

As revealed by Suryosubroto (2020), effective curriculum implementation requires synergy between policies, human resources, and school environment support. Without adequate support, curriculum development risks becoming a mere formality that has no real impact on the quality of learning. This is also experienced by SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara, one of the high schools in Kotabaru Regency, South Kalimantan, which is required to be able to develop its curriculum in an adaptive and responsive manner.

In its implementation, SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara formed a curriculum development team involving the deputy principal for curriculum, teachers, and school committees on several occasions. The preparation of the KOSP document refers to national policies with local content adjustments according to regional characteristics. The school also conducts periodic evaluations and encourages the improvement of teacher competence through training. However, a number of challenges are still faced, including limited facilities, low community participation, and suboptimal budget allocation. Based on this, this research is important to explore how the curriculum development process is carried out at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara, the extent of its impact on the quality of education, as well as the supporting and inhibiting factors faced.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive method. The location of the research was conducted at SMAN 1 North Kelumpang. The research informants consisted of school principals, vice principals for curriculum, teachers, and school committees.

The data collection technique in this study was carried out through in-depth interviews with the main informants, namely the principal, the deputy principal for curriculum, teachers, and the school committee. In addition, direct observation was made of the process of planning, implementing, and evaluating the curriculum in the school environment. Data was also obtained through documentation studies that included Education Unit Operational Curriculum (EUPC) documents, school work programs, and reports on the results of internal evaluations related to curriculum development.

The data in this study was analyzed using the interactive analysis technique of the Miles and Huberman (2014) model, which includes three stages, namely data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawn. Data reduction is carried out by selecting and simplifying relevant data, data presentation is carried out in the form of narratives or tables to facilitate understanding, while drawing conclusions is carried out continuously until valid and accountable findings are obtained.

The validity of the data in this study was obtained through triangulation techniques, both source triangulation and method triangulation. Source triangulation is carried out by comparing information from various informants, while method triangulation is carried out by comparing the results of interviews, observations, and documentation. In addition, the validity of the data is strengthened by the extension of the participation of researchers in the field to ensure the accuracy and consistency of the data obtained.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Curriculum Development Process at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara

Curriculum development is carried out through the formation of a curriculum development team chaired by the vice principal for curriculum. The development process involves subject teachers, homeroom teachers, and on some occasions involves school committees. However, the involvement of the school committee is still a formality and not optimal.

The KOSP document that was prepared refers to the policy of the Ministry of Education and Culture, with local content that is adjusted to regional characteristics. The preparation process also pays attention to the needs of students and the surrounding community. Thus, the curriculum development process at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara shows a commitment to adapt national policies to local needs, although there is still a need for optimization in the participation of stakeholders as a whole.

Evaluation of Curriculum Development Results on Education Quality

In general, the results of the evaluation show an improvement in the quality of education. This can be seen from the increase in students' academic scores, the success of students in academic competitions, and the increasing relevance of learning materials to daily life. Evaluations are carried out periodically by the school through academic supervision and reflection on learning by teachers. These results confirm that the curriculum development implemented has had a positive impact on improving the quality of education, although a thorough evaluation of the final product still needs to be strengthened to ensure quality sustainability.

Supporting Factors

Visionary Principal Leadership

School principals play a central role in the curriculum development process at the education unit level. Visionary leadership means that the principal is able to see the long-term needs of education in his or her school, including reading the development of the national curriculum as well as global education trends. Visionary principals will encourage innovation, facilitate teachers to actively participate in curriculum development, and establish good communication with all school stakeholders. At SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara, the principal plays the role of a motivator, facilitator, and director so that the curriculum development process runs in accordance with the school's visions and missions and the needs of students. This is in line with the opinion of Mulyasa (2022) who states that school principals as leaders have the responsibility to build a culture of educational quality through the development of an adaptive curriculum. Therefore, the role of school principals as visionary leaders has proven to be a key driver of the success of curriculum development in schools, while ensuring that policy direction is aligned with the long-term vision of education.

Improved Teacher Competence Through Training

Teachers are the main implementers of the curriculum in the classroom. The quality of curriculum development is highly dependent on the teacher's competence in understanding curriculum concepts and applying them in learning. SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara periodically involves teachers in workshops, in-house training (IHT), and technical guidance (bimtek) related to the implementation of the Independent Curriculum and the preparation of KOSP. This teacher competency improvement includes aspects of learning planning, innovative learning methods, and competency-based assessments. With this competency improvement, teachers are able to design learning that is more in line with the needs of students, so that

curriculum development can be carried out effectively. This is in line with the results of research by Arifin (2022) who emphasized that good teacher competence is the main factor in the success of curriculum development in schools. With continuous training, teachers at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara are increasingly ready to play a strategic role in the implementation of the curriculum, which ultimately supports the achievement of effective and contextual learning.

Support from the Regional Government Through Education Programs

Local governments have an important role to play in supporting curriculum development in schools, especially in terms of facilitation, funding, and local education policies. At SMAN 1 North Kelumpang, support from the local government can be seen in the form of teacher training programs, school operational assistance, and policies that support the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) program. In addition, the local government also supports the development of local content that is relevant to regional potential, so that learning materials are more contextual and in accordance with the characteristics of local students. This support is in accordance with the concept of school-based management, where schools are given wider autonomy to develop their curriculum while still receiving facilitation from the government (Suryosubroto, 2020). This proves that synergy between schools and local governments can create an educational environment conducive to curriculum innovation that is relevant to local characteristics and needs.

Inhibiting Factors

Limited Learning Support Facilities

One of the main obstacles in the curriculum development process at SMAN 1 North Kelumpang is the limited learning support facilities. Some classrooms are still not equipped with interactive learning media, laboratory equipment, and adequate information technology facilities. This causes limitations in the application of project-based learning methods, digital-based learning, and the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) program.

Limited facilities also affect the process of adapting the curriculum to technological developments and 21st century needs. In fact, one of the indicators of the success of curriculum development is the availability of educational facilities and infrastructure that support the active, innovative, and contextual learning process (Permendikbud Ristek No. 12 of 2024). This condition is a challenge for schools to optimize the creativity of teachers and students in carrying out learning even with limited facilities. This limitation is a real obstacle in realizing innovative and contextual learning, so special attention is needed so that curriculum development is not only conceptual but also applicative.

Lack of active community participation

The involvement of the community, especially parents of students and school committees, in the curriculum development process at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara is still not optimal. In some KOSP preparation activities, the role of the community is often only a formality, such as attending meetings without providing substantive input related to the direction of curriculum development.

In fact, active community participation is very important to ensure that the curriculum developed is relevant to local needs and parents' expectations of their children's educational outcomes (Tilaar, 2018). The lack of community participation also has an impact on low support for innovative school programs, such as project-based learning activities that require the involvement of the surrounding environment. This shows that *the school-community partnership* approach has not been fully running optimally in this school. With a lack of substantive support from the community, curriculum development risks becoming uncontextual and losing social carrying capacity, which should be a major force in community-based education.

Budget Limitations for Curriculum Development

Curriculum development requires special budget allocation, both for document preparation, teacher training, procurement of teaching materials, and continuous monitoring

and evaluation of the curriculum. However, the budget available at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara is still limited and is allocated more for routine school operations. This condition causes the curriculum development program to only be implemented minimally. Some activities such as advanced training for teachers or the procurement of innovative teaching materials are often delayed or cannot be implemented due to limited funds. Support from the local government has also not been able to fully overcome this budget shortfall.

Budget limitations are a serious obstacle because curriculum development is not only a matter of compiling formal documents, but also ensuring that implementation in the field runs effectively, supported by trained human resources, and the availability of adequate facilities and learning media (Suryosubroto, 2020). This shows that the success of curriculum development is highly dependent on the adequacy of resources, so a more sustainable funding strategy is needed to support all stages of curriculum implementation to the maximum.

Discussion

Curriculum Development Process at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara

Based on the results of interviews, observations, and documentation, the curriculum development at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara has followed the flow set by the government, starting from the planning, implementation, to evaluation stages. Teachers are involved in the preparation of Learning Implementation Plans (RPP) and teaching tools, while school principals play a role in coordinating policies and ensuring the involvement of various stakeholders. However, it was found that the involvement of the school committee and the community was still limited.

These findings are in line with the principles of curriculum evaluation of the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model which emphasizes the importance of thorough evaluation, not only in implementation, but also in inputs in the form of stakeholder involvement (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Thus, even though the curriculum development process is ongoing, participation that is not optimal is one of the obstacles in achieving curriculum goals. The finding that SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara has formed a special team in curriculum development shows alignment with curriculum development theory that emphasizes collaboration between various parties (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018). However, the participation of the school committee, which is still formal, indicates the weak aspect of *stakeholder engagement*, which is important to ensure that the curriculum is relevant to the needs of the community (Print, 2020). Within the framework of CIPP, *the context* and *input* levels are quite good, but community involvement in the *process* still needs to be improved (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014).

Obstacles in Curriculum Implementation

The main obstacles found are the lack of coordination between schools, the lack of training for teachers related to the latest curriculum, and the limitations of facilities and infrastructure according to standards (Permendikbudristek, 2024). The teacher admitted that it was still difficult to adjust the material to the needs of students and the local context. According to Tyler (1949), curriculum development should be based on four fundamental questions, namely: what educational goals are to be achieved, what learning experiences should be provided, how the experience is structured, and how success is measured. If the involvement of stakeholders is limited, then the goals prepared have the potential to not be in accordance with the real needs of the community and students.

Improving students' academic achievement and the relevance of learning to daily needs shows that curriculum development contributes positively to the quality of education. This is in line with the Tyler model which emphasizes the importance of alignment between educational objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation of learning outcomes (Tyler, 2013). However, weaknesses in the comprehensive evaluation of products according to CIPP suggest that schools need to strengthen long-term monitoring of outcomes to ensure quality sustainability (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014).

The Impact of Curriculum Development on Education Quality

Although there are still obstacles, curriculum development at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara contributes to improving the quality of education. This can be seen from the increase in student learning outcomes, especially in the aspects of material understanding, learning attitudes, and the relevance of learning to daily life. Stake (1995) emphasized that curriculum evaluation not only assesses the final results, but also pays attention to the student's learning experience as an important part of the quality of education. This is evident in SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara, where the relevance of learning to the needs of the community (for example, strengthening materials based on local wisdom) is considered to be getting better.

The evaluation model used refers to the CIPP (*Context, Input, Process, Product*) model as proposed by Stufflebeam (2003). Based on these four components, schools have evaluated at the input and process stages, but the evaluation of results (*products*) still needs to be improved so that the quality of education can continue to improve sustainably. Schools need to increase the involvement of the community and school committees in the curriculum development process. It is necessary to increase the capacity of teachers through trainings that are relevant to curriculum development. Local governments are expected to provide more optimal support, both in the form of policies and budgets.

The results of this study show that curriculum development in secondary schools needs to integrate curriculum evaluation theory more comprehensively. The CIPP model provides a comprehensive overview of context, inputs, processes, and outcomes. While Tyler's model emphasizes the importance of clear goals, and Stake highlights the dimension of the learning experience. The integration of these three perspectives can help schools in formulating curriculum policies that are more relevant and contextual.

With a qualitative descriptive approach, the findings of this study emphasize the importance of the involvement of all parties in curriculum development. Teachers are not only as implementers, but also as developers; The community is not only the recipient of results, but also as a determinant of relevance. Therefore, there needs to be a strategy to strengthen teacher capacity through training, as well as effective communication mechanisms between schools, committees, and the community.

These findings reflect that SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara has shown strategic steps in developing a curriculum that is in line with the direction of national policy, although there is still room for improvement. The active involvement of school principals and teacher competency improvement should be appreciated as an internal strength of the school, but weak community participation and limited facilities indicate that a collaborative approach has not been fully realized. This indicates the need to strengthen partnerships between schools, communities, and local governments so that curriculum development can run comprehensively, sustainably, and have a direct impact on the quality of learning. Thus, the success of curriculum implementation is determined not only by the school's internal readiness, but also by consistent and synergistic external support.

CONCLUSIONS

This study shows that the development of the curriculum at SMAN 1 Kelumpang Utara has been carried out according to procedures, especially in the aspects of planning, implementation, and evaluation. The results are in line with the CIPP curriculum evaluation model that emphasizes the integration of contexts, inputs, processes, and products. However, there are still obstacles in the form of less than optimal involvement of teachers and the community at every stage. This condition shows that the principle of relevance of the needs of students and the environment has not been fully realized. In general, the curriculum developed has made a positive contribution to the quality of education, but still requires strengthening coordination, collaboration, and continuous adjustment to national policy dynamics and local needs.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2008). Making education for all inclusive: Where next? *Prospects*, 38(1), 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-008-9055-0>
- Arifin, Z. (2022). *Manajemen Pengembangan Kurikulum Berbasis Sekolah*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Arifin, Z. (2022). *Pengembangan kurikulum: Teori dan praktik*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Arsyad, A. (2020). *Media Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Azra, A. (2018). *Pendidikan Islam: Tradisi dan Modernisasi Menuju Milenium Baru*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Pearson.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational Research: An Introduction* (5th ed.). Longman.
- Cahyono, B. Y. (2019). Implementasi Kurikulum di Era Digital. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 24(1), 45–58.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Daniel L. Stufflebeam dan Anthony J. Shinkfield (2007), *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Daryanto. (2019). *Pengembangan Kurikulum Sekolah*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2020). *Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum Operasional Satuan Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.
- Hasan, H. (2021). Pengembangan Kurikulum Berbasis Kearifan Lokal. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 13(2), 99–110.
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (2015). *Models of Teaching*. Pearson Education.
- Kemendikbudristek. (2022). *Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum Operasional Satuan Pendidikan (KOSP) pada Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*. Jakarta: Direktorat Jenderal PAUD, Dikdas, dan Dikmen.
- Kemendikbudristek. (2024). *Permendikbudristek No. 12 Tahun 2024 tentang Kurikulum dalam Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kemdikbudristek.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Mulyasa, E. (2022). *Manajemen pendidikan karakter*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyasa, E. (2022). *Pengembangan dan Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nana Sudjana. (2019). *Dasar-Dasar Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Ngalimun, N. (2023). Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah dan Mutu Pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 12(2), 98–112.
- Oliva, P. F. (2013). *Developing the curriculum* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Oliva, P. F. (2013). *Developing the Curriculum* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues*. Pearson.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2024 tentang Standar Sarana dan Prasarana Pendidikan.
- Permana, E. (2020). Model Evaluasi Kurikulum dalam Pendidikan. *Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 8(1), 67–75.
- Prasetyo, A., & Haryanto, E. (2021). Kurikulum Merdeka: Konsep dan Implementasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Nasional*, 10(1), 55–64.
- Purnomo, H. (2020). Manajemen Pengembangan Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 27(2), 83–94.
- Qodir, Z. (2021). Pendidikan Kontekstual dan Kurikulum Berbasis Karakter. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*, 11(3), 355–368.
- Ralph W. Tyler, (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Richards, J. C. (2013). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Riduwan. (2020). *Metode dan Teknik Menyusun Tesis*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

- Robert E. Stake, (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications).
- Sari, D., & Ngalimun, N. (2023). Evaluasi Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka di SMA. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 12(2), 115–127.
- Slavin, R. E. (2019). *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice*. Pearson.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP Model for Evaluation. In *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation*. Springer.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suprihatiningrum, J. (2020). *Konsep dan Aplikasi Kurikulum Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Suryosubroto, B. (2020). *Proses Belajar Mengajar di Sekolah*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Suyanto, S., & Asep Jihad. (2019). *Menjadi Guru Profesional*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Tilaar, H. A. R. (2018). *Kebijakan pendidikan: Kajian teoretis dan analisis praktis*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Tilaar, H. A. R. (2018). *Manajemen Pendidikan Nasional: Kajian Strategis Kebijakan Pendidikan dalam Era Otonomi Daerah*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Tilaar, H. A. R. (2018). *Perubahan Sosial dan Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Trianto. (2021). *Model Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka.
- Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st Century Skills: Learning for Life in Our Times*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wibowo, A. (2022). Manajemen Kurikulum SMA. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 14(2), 134–145.
- Wina Sanjaya. (2020). *Perencanaan dan Desain Sistem Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Zulkifli, H. (2021). Tantangan Pengembangan Kurikulum Era Digital. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Teknologi*, 7(1), 43–58.