

THE EVALUATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM THROUGH CIPPO APPROACH

Imam Yuwono¹, M. Najeri Al Syahrin², Dzul Rachman³, Setia Budhi⁴, Siti Mauliana Hairini⁵

^{1,2,4,5} Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

³ Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur, Indonesia

Email: Imam.plb@ulm.ac.id

ABSTRACT: This evaluation study aimed to determine the effectiveness of the implementation of inclusive education in elementary school in South Kalimantan Province by involving 128 elementary schools through the CIPPO approach (context, input, process, product and outcome). This study used questionnaire instruments, interviews, observations and documents. Data analysis used qualitative descriptive techniques developed by Glickman with quadrant type. Based on an evaluation of the context component, the goals of inclusive education in the Ministry of Education Regulation regarding the needs of inclusive schools need to be reviewed. In the input component, the availability of infrastructure is inadequate, and special training for teachers is not distributed evenly. On the evaluation process showed that the results of teachers' competency were acceptable in dealing with children with special needs. ABK academic and non-academic developments were quite good on the product component. The obtained outcome component data showed that children with special needs could pursue higher education. The result of this study concluded that the implementation of the inclusive education program in South Kalimantan had been carried out less effectively.

KEYWORDS: CIPPO Evaluation Model, Inclusive Education, Program Evaluation.

1 INTRODUCTION

Great efforts are being made to get all primary age children into school and to complete primary education as part of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA). The Government of Indonesia made political commitments at the World Education Forum for achieving Basic Education for All. Guided by the mission of education and educational strategies, the Republic of Indonesia enacted a new Law on National Education System (Act NO. 20/ 2003). The Law has its roots in the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia, Article 31, Section (1), which states that each citizen has the fundamental right to education.

Support from the international world through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for inclusive education is also increased (Sheehy, Budiyanto, Kaye, & Rofiah, 2019). There are 158 countries that have adopted the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which is explicitly carried out by the state to develop an inclusive education system (Rieser, 2014). The slogan of Education for all is also increasingly supported by consensus (consensus of moving forward) by various countries in the world (Heung & Grosmenn, 2007). All children, including those labelled as having intellectual disabilities, are also expected to have equal access to education. At a more systemic level, policymakers are aware that this activity in support of inclusive education is a new initiative in promoting more massive education (Budiyanto, 2011).

As a commitment of the Indonesian government in implementing inclusive education for the disabled, in 2002 the government officially started pilot projects in nine provinces which have resource centres, and since then more than 1500 students with disabilities were enrolled in mainstream schools, and in 2005 the number increased to 6,000 students or 5.11% of the total number of children with special needs. Other research results that have been conducted on 186 inclusive schools found 12% of students with special needs but 85% of this group; a majority is children with intellectual disabilities (Sunardi et al., 2011).

Inclusive education is not another name of education, inclusive education applies different approach in identifying and trying to solve the difficulties that arise in the school (Poernomo, 2016). The initiative for the importance of Indonesia's inclusive education also began with directives from the central government to the provincial government to have at least four inclusive schools in the region. This regulation was officially implemented in 2003 (Aprilia, 2017). In this system of inclusive school implementation, it is also distinguished from 'Extraordinary Schools', which accommodate children in conditions of special categories of disability, such as blindness or deafness (Purbani, 2013).

The result of observation on schools that implement elementary inclusive education in South Kalimantan showed that they have not implemented friendly learning for children, the perceptions of schools that what matters is how children with special needs can enrol in regular school. Even public schools still refuse the presence of children with special needs. The real conditions in elementary schools that implement inclusive education have not yet received serious attention by the Government as stated in the law. For example, there is no clear guidance for development either at the central, provincial or city level government. The structure of inclusive education provider schools that include students, teachers, curriculum, infrastructure, funding, which should have been prepared so that they can support the successful implementation of the program has also not been carried out optimally.

Based on other observations, elementary schools that are implementing inclusive education in South Kalimantan, also still complained about how to modify the curriculum, teacher competency is still low, inadequate infrastructure, special learning media is still lacking, as well as the number of classrooms for teaching and learning purposes. One way to support students with significant disabilities is to ensure that educators have the expertise to apply teaching and learning practices that are compatible with inclusive education. (Ryndak, Jackson, & White, 2013). There is an urgent need in efforts to prepare the skills and knowledge of educators as

well as readiness in implementing inclusive practices so that they can influence their attitudes and beliefs about inclusive practices (Ajuwon et al., 2012; Zagona1, Kurth, & MacFarland, 2017) Unpreparedness of educators in the practice of inclusive education makes them doubt the potential of students to succeed in the classroom (Lohrmann & Bambara, 2006).

According to the results of research conducted by Sofyan, (2012) the implementation of inclusive education in South Kalimantan has not been optimal, because regular school admissions to the presence of children with special needs are still low. In addition, the availability of infrastructure is not yet adequate. Whereas, inclusive education is a locally determined, flexible, and individual process based on the needs of the children and families that are being served. In this case, inclusive education is certainly very locally defined (Schwartz, Sandall, Odom, Horn, & Beckman, 2002 & Love & Horn, 2019).

Research conducted by Yuwono, (2013) about teachers in elementary schools that are implementing inclusive education in the city of Banjarmasin (Capital of South Kalimantan province), the ability to evaluate learning outcomes is still low, the way of identification and assessment of children with special needs is still low. The results of the study indicate that elementary schools in South Kalimantan as providers of inclusive education have not been supported with adequate human resources, especially in terms of assessment of learning outcomes. The success of students in inclusive education is very much influenced by the collaboration and readiness of teachers in teaching for their students (Fisher, Frey, & Thousand, 2003; Montgomery & Mirenda 2014).

This study aimed to evaluate and determine the effectiveness of the context component, input component, process component, product component, outcome component in inclusive schools in South Kalimantan Province.

2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The method used in this research is evaluation research which refers to the evaluation model developed by D.L. Stufflebeam (2001) known as the CIPPO evaluation model (context, input, process, product and pay attention to outcomes).

The data obtained were analyzed qualitatively using the CIPPO model with triangulation of data relevant to the implementation of inclusive education programs by referring to predetermined criteria then mapping quadrants in accordance with predetermined evaluation criteria in accordance with the prototype image of Glicman quadrant (1981) as follows:

Figure 1. A prototype of Glicman Quadrant

Quadrant II					Quadrant I				
C	I	P	P	O	C	I	P	P	O
+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
+	-	-	-	+					
+	-	-	+	+					
+	-	+	+	+					
-	+	+	+	+					
(Quite Effective)					(Very Effective)				
Quadrant III					Quadrant IV				
C	I	P	P	O	C	I	P	P	O
-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
					+	+	-	+	-
					+	+	-	-	+
					+	-	+	-	+
					+	-	-	+	+
					+	-	-	+	-
					+	+	+	-	-
					-	-	-	-	+
					-	-	-	-	-
					-	-	-	-	-
(Ineffective)					(Less Effective)				

The data collection stage of research on evaluating the inclusive education program for elementary schools in the province of South Kalimantan, is listed in the following table:

Evaluation Stage	Indicator	Source	Data Collection Technique
<i>Context</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal foundation, purpose and guidance 2. Community Needs 3. School Eligibility 	School Archive Teacher Principal The community Principal	Document Study Interview Interview SWOT analysis Interview
<i>Input</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student Recruitment 2. Parents' Socio-economic 3. Teacher administrative requirements 4. Curriculum 5. Facilities and Infrastructure 6. Financing 	Principal Parents Teacher Teacher Vice-principal Principal	Interview Questionnaire Questionnaire Interview Questionnaire Interview
<i>Process</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher Competencies 2. Teacher Teaching Interests 3. Learning Process 	Teacher Teacher Teacher	Questionnaire Questionnaire Observation
<i>Product</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cognitive 2. Social Attitude 	The Assistant Principal of Curriculum Regular Students School Counselor	Document Inventory Study

3 RESULT

The results of the study related to the evaluation of the context of the implementation of inclusive education in South Kalimantan, are visualized in the following table:

Table 2. Evaluation of the Context of Inclusive Education Implementation in South Kalimantan

Indicator	East Banjarmasin Sub-district	Central Banjarmasin Sub-district	North Banjarmasin Sub-district	West Banjarmasin Sub-district	South Banjarmasin Sub-district
Goal	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Foundation	High	High	High	High	High
Coaching	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Analysis of Needs	High	High	High	High	High
The eligibility for inclusive programs	High	High	High	High	High

Analysis of the needs of inclusive education conducted in the province of South Kalimantan obtained data on community needs about the presence of inclusive schools that is very high; this is derived from the results of a SWOT analysis conducted on 128 elementary schools providing inclusive education at a high scale. Many people in all regions anticipated the presence of inclusive education because every school has children with special needs. Their parents want their children to go to school near where they live.

Since its initiation at the World Conference on Special Needs Education in Salamanca (1994), inclusive education is, indeed, a very promising new pedagogical approach. In the next stage, inclusive education has also been promoted in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) (Kruse & Dederling, 2018). Since then, inclusive education has become a discourse of study in the world of education which is always interesting to discuss (Göransson & Nilholm, 2014).

The results of the evaluation on the input component found that the process of student recruitment in schools that provide inclusive education was still ineffective due to several factors including: (1) parents' lack of awareness of the importance of identification so that examinations to experts were not carried out; (2) lack of teacher's knowledge about children with special needs. The emphasis of these social concepts is based on the premise that social relationships between students can make a difference (Field, 2017; Allan & Perrson, 2018). This makes it possible for individuals to progress on with others because of the values and trust that are generated between them (Allan & Catts, 2014).

In general, the socio-economic condition of the parents of students who enrol in schools with inclusive education in 5 sub-districts of South Kalimantan come from a lower-middle-class family. If the family's economic situation is inadequate, it can be a barrier for children in learning. Regarding the Requirements for Inclusive Teacher Administration, the results of the study show that the administrative requirements of teachers in inclusive education provider schools in South Kalimantan province are still not appropriate. This can be seen that the level of education of most teachers who teach in inclusive schools is not S1 PLB. The inclusive education curriculum at SD Kecamatan Banjarmasin Timur and SD Kecamatan Banjarmasin Barat are considered in the relevant category which means that the school differentiate the curriculum, student-oriented, and adjusts it to the child's condition.

The availability of inclusive school facilities and infrastructure in Banjarmasin, namely SD Kecamatan Banjarmasin Timur is classified as high; the results which showed that 75% of facilities and infrastructure at SD Kecamatan Banjarmasin Timur were in good and complete condition while 25% had not available yet. As for the condition of facilities and infrastructure in, SD Kecamatan Banjarmasin Tengah, SD Kecamatan Banjarmasin Timur, and SD Kecamatan Banjarmasin Selatan are relatively low, the results of the study show that in the three sub-districts, the availability of facilities and infrastructure is only around 35% and is not used.

Sources of funding for inclusive education providers in South Kalimantan Province generally rely on the Central BOS and Regional BOS. The GPK honorarium comes from school committees in from Rp100,000 to Rp800,000 / month. The results of the

research related to the evaluation of the inclusive education program process include four indicators namely teacher competency, teacher interest in teaching, the required teacher profile, and the learning process in the classroom.

Table 3. Indicators such as Teacher Competency, Teacher Interest in Teaching, Teacher’s Profiles Requirement, and the Learning Process in Class

Indicator	East Banjarmasin Sub-district	Central Banjarmasin Sub-district	North Banjarmasin Sub-district	West Banjarmasin Sub-district	South Banjarmasin Sub-district
Teacher Competency	Good	Good	Quite Good	Quite Good	Quite Good
Teacher Interest In Teaching	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Teacher’s Profiles Requirement	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not Appropriate	Not Appropriate
Learning Process In Inclusive Class	Quite Good	Baik	Quite Good	Very Good	Quite Good

Teacher’s competence in East Sub-district and Central Sub-district of Banjarmasin are in a good category which means that teachers already have several competencies, including curriculum differentiation, curriculum modification, individual learning, cooperative learning, motivating learning and flexible assessment, but still need to be improved in order to become very good. Teachers' interest in teaching in all sub-districts as an inclusive education provider school falls into the good category, this shows that the teacher feels happy, can receive ABK, is unconditional and takes pride in implementing learning in which there are children with special needs.

The results showed that the required teacher profiles were appropriate in the three districts of inclusive education providers, namely elementary schools in East Banjarmasin sub-district, Central Banjarmasin sub-district, and North Banjarmasin sub-district. The required profiles are the level of education (Bachelor Degree), teaching in accordance with the educational background and have attended scientific meetings about inclusion. The learning process in elementary schools in West Banjarmasin sub-district and Central Banjarmasin sub-district shows good and very good categories and this needs to be maintained. The learning process in the districts of East, South and North Banjarmasin is still in the sufficient category because teachers are still weak in conditioning students to study, lacking in the mastery of teaching materials.

The results of the evaluation of the product component found information that all primary schools that were evaluated experienced an increase in national exam scores when they became providers of inclusive education, meaning that inclusive in a school did not affect the national exam scores. The social aspects of schools that have long held inclusive education show effective criteria, whereas those that have only recently held inclusive education show less effective criteria. The results of the evaluation of the outcome component found information that five districts of inclusive SD administrators evaluated had good outcomes, according to the evaluation criteria.

The effectiveness of the implementation of inclusive education programs, at the elementary school level in South Kalimantan province, is seen in the mapping of data obtained from the analysis of the context, input, process, product and outcome components. The results of evaluating the implementation of inclusive elementary school education in 128 South Kalimantan in accordance to the prototype of the Glikman quadrant.

Table 4 . Analysis of Glikman Quadrant Prototype per Sub-district.

Sub-district	Value Context	Valued Input Context	Valued Process	Valued Product Context	Valued Outcome Context
South Banjarmasin	+,-,+,-	+,+,+,+,+,+	+,+,-	+,+	+
East Banjarmasin	+,-,+,-	-,+,+,+,-,-	+,+,+	+,-	+
West Banjarmasin	+,-,+,-	-,+,+,+,-,-	-,+,-	+,-	+
Central Banjarmasin	+,-,+,-	-,+,+,-,-,-	-,+,+	+,-	+
North Banjarmasin	+,-,+,-	-,+,+,+,-,-	+,+,+	+,-	+

Based on the results of the mapping, it shows the CIPPO criteria. If they are converted into the Glikman prototype quadrant, the effectiveness of the implementation of inclusive education programs lies in quadrant IV (fourth) or less effective which means that the context component is effective, the input component is ineffective, the process component is effective, the product component is ineffective, and the outcome component is effective. Thus, the implementation of an inclusive education program in elementary schools in South Kalimantan Province is classified as less effective.

4 CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, it was concluded that based on an evaluation of the input component, indicating the availability of facilities and infrastructure, in general, had met the needs of all students. But the availability of special facilities and infrastructure for children with special needs have not been adequate. The curriculum has been modified according to the characteristics of students. Specific training for teachers in schools has not been distributed evenly. Schools also do not have GPK in accordance with their competencies.

Based on the evaluation of the process components, teacher competence is sufficient in handling students with special needs, they did it individually. Funding for program implementation in schools is still taken from the allocation of BOS funds. Based on the evaluation of the product component, the impact of the implementation of the program lies in the development of students with special needs' achievements. Children with-special-needs' academic and non-academic development is good enough hence 99% of children with special needs can continue their education to a higher level.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abin Syamsuddin Makmun. (2003) Psikologi Pendidikan. Bandung : PT Rosda Karya Remaja. 93.
- [2] Ajuwon, P. M., Lechtenberger, D., Griffin-Shirley, N., Sokolosky, S., Zhou, L., & Mullins, F. E. (2012). General education pre-service teacher's perceptions of including students with disabilities in their classrooms. *International Journal of Special Education*, 27(3), 100-107
- [3] Alimin, Zaenal. (2006) Implementasi Pendidikan Inklusif di Sekolah Reguler. Bandung: Rineka Cipta, 105.
- [4] Alison L. Zagona1 , Jennifer A. Kurth2 , and Stephanie Z. C. MacFarland1. (2017). Teachers' Views of Their Preparation for Inclusive Education and Collaboration.
- [5] Allan J and Catts R (2014) Schools, social capital and space. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 44: 217–228.
- [6] Aprilia ID (2017) Flexible model on special education services in inclusive setting elementary school. *Journal of ICSAR* 1(1): 50–54. Available at: <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/icsar/article/view/369> (accessed 4 January 2017).
- [7] Berit Johnsen. (2003) Menuju Inklusi Pendidikan Kebutuhan Khusus Sebuah Pengantar (Bandung: Program Pascasarjana UPI.
- [8] Budiyanto (2011) Best Practices of Inclusive Education in Japan, Australia, India and Thailand: Implications for Indonesia. Tsukuba, Japan.
- [9] D. Skorten, Mariam. (2003) Menuju Inklusi Pendidikan Kebutuhan Khusus Sebuah Pengantar. Bandung: Program Pasca Sarjan UPI.
- [10] Daniel P. Hallahan. (2009) *Exceptional Learners: An Introduction to Special Education*, (Boston: Pearson Education Inc., 202.
- [11] Direktorat PSLB. (2009). *Pedoman Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif* (Jakarta: Direktorat PKLK, 102.
- [12] Djaali, Puji Mulyono, dan Ramli. (2000) *Pengukuran Dalam Bidang Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PPs UNJ, 97.
- [13] Field J (2017) *Social Capital*, 3rd edn. London: Routledge
- [14] Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Thousand, J. (2003). What do special educators need to know and be prepared to do for inclusive schooling to work? *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 26, 42-50. doi:10.1177/088840640302600105
- [15] George, F. Madaus, Michael S. Scriven, dan Daniel L. Stufflebeam. (1993) *Evaluation Models Viewpoints On Educational And Human Services Evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer Nijhoff Publishing, 204.
- [16] Göransson, K., & Niholm, C. (2014). Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings: A critical analysis of research on inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29, 265–280.
- [17] Hailey R. Love & Eva Horn (2019). Definition, Context, Quality: Current Issues in Research Examining High-Quality Inclusive Education. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education* 1–13 © Hammill Institute on Disabilities 2019. DOI: 10.1177/0271121419846342
- [18] Heung V and Grossman D (2007) Inclusive education as a strategy for achieving education for all: perspectives from three Asian societies. In: Baker DP and Wiseman AW (eds) *International Perspectives on Education and Society*. Bradford: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 155–180. DOI:10.1016/S1479-3679 (06)08005-4
- [19] Imam Yuwono, (2011) *Sistem Penilaian Dalam Pendidikan Inklusif di SD Banua Hanyar 8 Banjarmasin*. Banjarmasin: Unlam Pers.
- [20] James R. Sanders et all. (2004) *The Program Evaluation Standards* (California: Sage Publication Inc.
- [21] Julie Allan & Elisabeth Persson, (2018). Social capital and trust for inclusion in school and society. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. 1–11. DOI: 10.1177/1746197918801001
- [22] Kieron Sheehy, Budiyanto, Helen Kaye, & Khofidotur Rofiah (2019). Indonesian teachers' epistemological beliefs and inclusive education, *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities* 2019, Vol. 23(1). Pp 39–56. DOI: 10.1177/1744629517717613
- [23] Lohrmann, S., & Bambara, L. M. (2006). Elementary education teachers' beliefs about essential supports needed to successfully include students developmental disabilities who engage in challenging behaviors. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 31, 157-173.
- [24] Marhaeni. (2007) *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan*. Singaraja: Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, 96.
- [25] Mel Ainscow. (2003) *Developing inclusive education systems: what are the levers for change?*, (Paper to be presented at conference 'Inclusive Education: A Framework for Reform' in Hong Kong : The University of Manchester, 173.
- [26] Mitchell, *Special Education Needs and Inclusive Education*. New York: Publisher's Note, 2006.
- [27] Montgomery, A., & Miranda, P. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, sentiments, attitudes and concerns about the inclusion of students with developmental disabilities. *Exceptionality Education International*, 24, 18-32
- [28] Permendiknas No. 70, 2009 on Inclusive Education.
- [29] Poernomo, Baby. (2016). The implementation of inclusive education in Indonesia: current problems and challenges. *American International Journal of Social Science* Vol. 5, No. 3 pp. 144-150.

- [30] Purbani W (2013) Equity in the Classroom: The System and Improvement of Inclusive Schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia (A Case Study). *US-China Education Review B* 3(7): 507–518.
- [31] Rieser R (2014) What's Happening with Inclusive Education Around the World, *World of Inclusion*. Available at: <http://worldofinclusion.com/whats-happening-with-inclusive-education-around-the-world/> (accessed 13 July 2019).
- [32] Rieser, Richard. (2012). *Implementing inclusive education: a commonwealth Guide to implementing article 24 of the UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. United Kingdom: Charlesworth Press.
- [33] Ryndak, D., Jackson, L. B., & White, J. M. (2013). Involvement and progress in the general curriculum for students with extensive support needs: K-12 inclusive-education research and implications for the future. *Inclusion*, 1, 28-49.
- [34] Sofyan. (2009) *Manajemen Pendidikan Inklusif di Kalimantan Selatan* (Banjarmasin: Unlam Pers, 59).
- [35] Stefan Kruse and Kathrin Dederig. (2018). The idea of inclusion: Conceptual and empirical diversities in Germany. *Improving Schools* 2018, Vol. 21(1) 19–31. DOI: 10.1177/1365480217707835
- [36] Stufflebeam. D. L. (2001) *Evaluation Model Viewpoints On Educational And Human Services Evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 101.
- [37] Sudarwan Darwin. (2001) *Inovasi pendidikan dalam upaya peningkatan profesionalisme tenaga kependidikan*. Bandung. Pustaka setia.