Proceeding The ICON-INSIMA : International Conference Institut Agama Islam KH Sufyan Tsauri Majenang , Cilacap, Indonesia *2026*
ISSN : xxx-xxx; DOI: xx.xxxx

Evaluation of IPAS Learning Using the CIPP Model in Public Elementary Schools in Banguntapan District

Junita Nur Anggraeni[1], Taufan Jannata[2]
[12]Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Faculty of Education, Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Yogyakarta
email: junitanuranggraeni06@gmail.com

Abstract
Pembelajaran IPAS dalam Kurikulum Merdeka mengintegrasikan ilmu pengetahuan alam dan sosial, serta diharapkan dapat menghubungkan fenomena ilmiah dan sosial dengan kehidupan sehari-hari siswa. Namun, implementasinya masih menghadapi kendala berupa perbedaan fasilitas sekolah, kesiapan guru, perencanaan pembelajaran, dan praktik di kelas. Penelitian ini mengevaluasi pembelajaran IPAS menggunakan model Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) di sekolah dasar negeri se-Kecamatan Banguntapan. Metode: Penelitian evaluasi ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif deskriptif dan melibatkan empat sekolah dasar negeri yang dipilih melalui teknik purposive-random sampling. Data dikumpulkan melalui observasi, angket, dan analisis dokumen, kemudian dianalisis menggunakan analisis persentase. Hasil: Komponen context memperoleh nilai 87%, komponen input 88,9%, dan komponen process 84,8%, yang semuanya dikategorikan sangat baik. Komponen product menunjukkan rata-rata nilai belajar siswa sebesar 83,4, sedangkan ketuntasan belajar secara keseluruhan mencapai 92,1%. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa sarana dan prasarana masih menjadi aspek utama yang memerlukan perbaikan, sementara pembelajaran di kelas masih membutuhkan praktik yang lebih berpusat pada siswa (student-centered). Kesimpulan: Secara keseluruhan, pembelajaran IPAS dikategorikan sangat baik berdasarkan evaluasi CIPP. Meskipun demikian, perbaikan pada fasilitas pendukung, kelengkapan rencana pembelajaran, dan praktik pembelajaran di kelas yang berpusat pada siswa masih tetap diperlukan.

Keywords: evaluasi pembelajaran, IPAS, model CIPP, sekolah dasar

Abstract
IPAS learning in the Independent Curriculum integrates natural and social sciences and is expected to connect scientific and social phenomena with students' everyday lives. However, its implementation still faces differences in school facilities, teacher readiness, learning planning, and classroom practice. This study evaluated IPAS learning using the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model at public elementary schools in Banguntapan District. Methods: This evaluation research used a descriptive quantitative approach and involved four public elementary schools selected through purposive-random sampling. Data were collected through observation, questionnaires, and document analysis and were analyzed using percentage analysis. Results: The context component obtained 87%, the input component 88.9%, and the process component 84.8%, all classified as very good. The product component showed an average student learning score of 83.4, while the overall learning mastery reached 92.1%. The findings indicate that facilities and infrastructure remained the main aspect requiring improvement, while classroom learning still needed stronger student-centered practices. Conclusions: Overall, IPAS learning was categorized as very good based on the CIPP evaluation. Nevertheless, improvement in supporting facilities, learning-plan completeness, and student-centered classroom practices is still needed.

Keywords*: learning evaluation, IPAS, CIPP model, elementary school*

1. Introduction

Elementary education plays an important role in developing children's cognitive abilities, including thinking, problem solving, and memory. In the Independent Curriculum, Natural and Social Sciences (IPAS) is integrated into one subject to help students understand the relationship between natural phenomena and social life in a more holistic way (Pepilina et al., 2024; Kemendikbudristek, 2022). Thus, IPAS learning is expected not only to develop conceptual understanding but also to encourage scientific thinking, curiosity, critical thinking, and the ability to relate knowledge to everyday life.

Despite these expectations, the implementation of IPAS at the elementary-school level still encounters challenges. Previous research has identified problems related to student readiness, limited teacher workshops, changes in learning outcomes information, limited learning resources, time constraints, and teachers' difficulties in developing learning strategies (Andreani & Gunansyah, 2023). Other studies have also reported limitations in learning media, teacher training, and the continued use of conventional methods in IPAS learning (Hidayatullah et al., 2025). These conditions indicate that evaluating IPAS learning should not be limited to student achievement because the quality of learning is also influenced by the conditions, resources, planning, and implementation that precede the learning outcomes.

Previous studies have demonstrated the usefulness of the CIPP model for examining educational programs. Mutaqin et al. (2024) used the CIPP model to obtain a comprehensive picture of IPAS implementation, including context, resources, implementation, and learning outcomes, but the study was conducted at one institution. Ramadhan et al. (2023) also evaluated IPAS learning in the Independent Curriculum using CIPP, with greater emphasis on the process component and with a different research setting. Research on the implementation of the Independent Curriculum at elementary schools has likewise reported that teacher readiness and understanding remain important issues (Rofiah & Samporno, 2023). These studies show that CIPP can be used to examine IPAS learning, but empirical evidence that evaluates the four components simultaneously across public elementary schools with different school characteristics in Banguntapan District remains limited.

Banguntapan District has 21 public elementary schools, all of which have adopted the Independent Curriculum, while their implementation varies according to school resources and teacher innovation. School-index data cited in the thesis also place Banguntapan at 64.43, indicating a context in which differences among schools are relevant to evaluation. According to Stufflebeam's CIPP perspective, evaluation should provide information about the conditions, resources, implementation, and outcomes of a program as a basis for improvement. In contrast, school-level evaluation of IPAS learning has tended to emphasize learning outcomes, while facilities, teacher understanding, planning, and classroom implementation have not always been examined together. This gap provides the basis for evaluating IPAS learning comprehensively in the Banguntapan context.

Accordingly, this study asks: (1) What is the quality of facilities and infrastructure and teachers' understanding of the objectives and needs of IPAS learning at public elementary schools in Banguntapan District? (2) Are the teaching modules used by teachers consistent with the objectives and learning outcomes of IPAS? (3) Is the implementation of IPAS learning consistent with the applicable standards? and (4) What are the learning outcomes of students in IPAS? The study specifically aims to evaluate the context, input, process, and product components of IPAS learning and to provide an empirical picture that can be used as a basis for improving IPAS learning at public elementary schools in Banguntapan District.

2. Method

This study was evaluation research using a survey method and a descriptive quantitative approach. The evaluation used the CIPP model, consisting of Context, Input, Process, and Product. The population comprised 21 public elementary schools in Banguntapan District. The sample consisted of four schools: Wiyoro State Elementary School and Wirokerten State Elementary School with accreditation A, and Plakaran State Elementary School and Sekarsuli 1 State Elementary School with accreditation B. The schools were selected through purposive-random sampling based on the criteria of being public elementary schools in Banguntapan District, having accreditation A or B, and having school-index values. The selection was intended to capture differences in school conditions.

Data for the context component were collected through direct observation of school facilities and infrastructure and through questionnaires completed by teachers who taught IPAS. The observation examined the availability and condition of learning facilities, learning spaces, supporting educational spaces, health and sanitation facilities, places of worship, play or sports areas, and the school canteen. The questionnaire examined teachers' self-reported

understanding of the objectives and needs of IPAS learning. Input data were obtained through document analysis of the teaching modules or lesson plans used by teachers, focusing on nine planning indicators. Process data were collected through direct observation of IPAS classroom learning using indicators concerning student participation, teacher–student interaction, learning methods and media, contextual learning, problem solving, teacher roles, and assessment. Product data were obtained from school documents containing students' IPAS learning results and were used to identify the proportion of students who reached the mastery criterion established by each school.

All instruments were reviewed through expert judgment to assess their content suitability and clarity. The data were analyzed using descriptive quantitative percentage analysis with the formula

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

where
P= the percentage obtained f= the score obtained
N= the maximum score
The resulting percentages were interpreted using five categories: 81–100% very good, 61–80% good, 41–60% fair, 21–40% poor, and 0–20% very poor. The success criteria were 80% for the context component, 85% for input and process, and at least 80% of students reaching the mastery criterion for the product component.

3. Results and Discussion

The evaluation results show that the four CIPP components were generally in the very good category, although the level of achievement differed among components and schools. The overall results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of IPAS learning evaluation results

Component	Indicator	Result	Category

Context	Facilities and infrastructure; teacher understanding	87%	Very good
Input	Teaching module/lesson plan	88.9%	Very good
Process	IPAS learning implementation	84.8%	Very good
Product	Learning mastery; average score	92.1%; 83.4	Very good

a. Context evaluation

The context component obtained 87%, classified as very good. This result was derived from two aspects: facilities and infrastructure, which obtained 74.5%, and teachers' understanding of the objectives and needs of IPAS learning, which obtained 99.5%. The facilities and infrastructure scores were 67.3% at Wiyoro State Elementary School, 74.5% at Wirokerten State Elementary School, 80% at Plakaran State Elementary School, and 76.4% at Sekarsuli 1 State Elementary School. Thus, the facilities and infrastructure aspect was generally good but did not reach the 80% success criterion.

The observed limitations were mainly related to supporting facilities. The school health unit was not optimally organized or equipped, and school canteens still required improvement in cleanliness. These findings are relevant to the standard that elementary schools should provide learning and supporting facilities that enable educational activities (Permendikbudristek No. 22 Tahun 2023). Agustina et al. (2022) also emphasized that facilities and infrastructure support the smooth implementation of learning and therefore need to be adequately managed. The present findings are consistent with Saputri and Pratikno (2024), who found that school facilities supporting IPAS learning generally met national standards while some facilities still required improvement. Ansori et al. (2025) further noted that inadequate periodic maintenance can reduce the usefulness of educational buildings, equipment, and learning media.

The second context aspect, teachers' understanding of IPAS learning objectives and needs, reached 99.5% and was categorized as very good. The scores were 99% at Wiyoro and Wirokerten and 100% at Plakaran and Sekarsuli 1. Because the questionnaire measured teachers' self-assessment, the result represents teachers' confidence in their own understanding rather than a direct measurement of their competence. The finding nevertheless indicates that teachers perceived themselves as understanding the objectives and learning needs of IPAS, including learning media and resources, active learning strategies, observation or experimentation, contextual learning, and assessment. This is consistent with Evitasari et al. (2025), who associated teacher readiness with understanding the curriculum, student characteristics, subject matter, and requirements of the learning process.

Taken together, the context findings indicate that the initial conditions for IPAS learning were generally supportive, but the two aspects did not contribute equally. Teacher self-reported understanding was very high, whereas facilities and infrastructure were lower and remained below the specified success criterion. The CIPP perspective therefore helps show that a generally positive learning context can coexist with specific resource limitations that still require attention.

b. Input evaluation

The input component obtained 88.9%, classified as very good and exceeding the 85% success criterion. The analysis of teaching modules showed that Plakaran State Elementary School and Sekarsuli 1 State Elementary School fulfilled all nine indicators, each with 100%. Wiyoro State Elementary School fulfilled eight indicators with 88.9%, while Wirokerten State Elementary School fulfilled six indicators with 66.7%. Therefore, the overall input component met the success criterion even though one school remained below the required level.

The main deficiency was found in the Wirokerten teaching module, which did not explicitly state the learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are important because they provide a basis for determining learning objectives, materials, activities, and assessment. Permendikbudristek No. 16 Tahun 2022 places learning planning within a structure that supports the implementation of learning, while Salsabilla et al. (2023) explain that a teaching module should contain coherent components that correspond to the learning phase and support students' learning interests. Abdurrohman (2022) similarly describes planning components as interconnected, including objectives, materials, methods, and evaluation, while Ningrum and Sofwan (2023) emphasize systematic preparation of teaching modules based on learning outcomes.

The findings indicate that most teachers had prepared learning plans that could function as a basis for IPAS implementation. However, the variation among schools shows that the completeness of planning documents was not uniform. The 66.7% result at Wirokerten is particularly important because it demonstrates that a school may have good general conditions while still having a specific weakness in planning documentation. Thus, the input component provides a more detailed picture than a general assessment of whether learning plans exist.

c. Process evaluation

The process component obtained 84.8%, which was categorized as very good but remained slightly below the 85% success criterion. Wirokerten State Elementary School obtained 100%, Sekarsuli 1 State Elementary School obtained 91.3%, while Wiyoro State Elementary School and Plakaran State Elementary School each obtained 73.9%. The results therefore show variation in classroom implementation despite the generally very good overall category.

The implementation standard used in the study emphasized opportunities for students to participate actively, interaction between teachers and students, discussion and question- and-answer activities, varied methods, use of media and learning resources, connections between learning materials and everyday life, opportunities for analysis or problem solving, teacher roles as model, companion, and facilitator, and assessment of learning objectives. Permendikbudristek No. 16 Tahun 2022 emphasizes an interactive, meaningful, enjoyable, and student-centered learning atmosphere. The findings indicate that these principles were generally present, but several indicators were not implemented optimally. The main issue was the persistence of teacher-centered learning in some classrooms.

Students were not always accustomed to asking questions, and some teachers still relied on conventional lecture-based methods with limited variation. Tang (2023) explains that teacher-centered approaches tend to position the teacher as the main source of knowledge and can limit student involvement. Ramadani et al. (2025) also highlight the importance of conditions that allow teachers to develop student-centered learning. In the

present study, these conditions are reflected in the differences among schools, with two schools achieving very high process scores and two remaining at 73.9%.

The process findings are important when interpreted together with the input and product results. Although the teaching plans were generally well prepared and student learning outcomes were high, classroom implementation still contained elements that had not fully reached the established standard. This indicates that the completeness of planning does not automatically ensure equally strong classroom practice. The finding also supports the use of CIPP because process evaluation identifies aspects of implementation that cannot be inferred from learning outcomes alone.

d. Product evaluation

The product component showed an average student learning score of 83.4, while the proportion of students reaching the mastery criterion across the sampled schools was 92.1%, placing the component in the very good category. Wiyoro State Elementary School and Plakaran State Elementary School recorded 100% mastery. Wirokerten State Elementary School recorded 81.5%, with 22 of 27 students reaching mastery, while Sekarsuli 1 State Elementary School recorded 86.7%, with 13 of 15 students reaching mastery. Thus, all four sampled schools exceeded the minimum 80% mastery criterion used in the evaluation.

The high level of learning mastery indicates that students generally achieved the learning criteria established by their respective schools. In the study, student learning results were obtained from existing school assessment documents rather than from a test administered directly by the researcher. The product findings therefore describe the available school learning results. This distinction is important because the CIPP model considers outcomes together with the conditions and processes that support them rather than interpreting achievement as an isolated indicator.

The product result is also consistent with the other components. The input component was very good, indicating that most teaching modules contained the required planning elements, and the process component was also very good even though it remained slightly below the success criterion. Karis et al. (2026) argue that learning evaluation needs to consider planning, implementation, processing of results, and student development in an integrated manner. The present findings similarly show that high learning outcomes were accompanied by generally strong planning and implementation, while specific weaknesses remained in facilities and student-centered classroom practices.

e. Integrated interpretation of the CIPP evaluation

Across the four components, IPAS learning in the sampled public elementary schools in Banguntapan District was categorized as very good: context 87%, input 88.9%, process 84.8%, and product 92.1% based on learning mastery. These results provide a more complete picture than an evaluation focused only on student achievement. The context findings identify facilities and infrastructure as an area that had not reached the specified criterion, the input findings identify differences in the completeness of teaching modules, and the process findings identify the need to strengthen student-centered learning. At the same time, the product findings show that the proportion of students reaching the school mastery criteria was high.

The integrated result is broadly consistent with earlier CIPP-based studies. Mutaqin et al. (2024) found that CIPP could provide a comprehensive picture of IPAS implementation, while Ramadhan et al. (2023) reported that IPAS implementation in the

Independent Curriculum was generally good but still involved teacher-related challenges. Research on CIPP implementation in other elementary-school learning contexts has also shown that the model can identify conditions, resources, implementation, and outcomes within one evaluation framework (Qadriah et al., 2022; Wedayanthi et al., 2024). The contribution of the present study lies in applying the four components simultaneously to IPAS learning across four public elementary schools in Banguntapan District with different school characteristics.

Therefore, the meaning of the overall result is not simply that IPAS learning was very good. Rather, the CIPP profile shows that the quality of learning was supported by strong teacher self-reported understanding, generally adequate planning, and high student mastery, while facilities, completeness of some planning documents, and student-centered classroom implementation remained aspects requiring improvement. This integrated interpretation is consistent with the purpose of CIPP evaluation as a basis for identifying areas that should be maintained and areas that should be improved..

4. Conclusion

The evaluation of IPAS learning using the CIPP model at public elementary schools in Banguntapan District showed that the context component reached 87%, the input component 88.9%, the process component 84.8%, and the product component 92.1% based on student learning mastery, with an average learning score of 83.4. These results answer the research questions by showing that the initial context was generally very good although facilities and infrastructure remained below the specified criterion; teaching modules were generally consistent with the required planning components although one school had incomplete documentation; classroom implementation was very good but slightly below the process success criterion; and student learning mastery exceeded the minimum criterion in all sampled schools. Overall, IPAS learning in the sampled schools was categorized as very good.

The findings imply that schools need to maintain the aspects that have already met the evaluation criteria while improving supporting facilities, the completeness of teaching modules, and student-centered classroom practices. The use of the CIPP model provides a comprehensive basis for considering conditions, planning, implementation, and outcomes together. The study is limited by its coverage of four public elementary schools, one observation of classroom implementation at each school, the use of existing school documents for the product component, and self-assessment questionnaires for teachers' understanding. Further studies can involve more schools and use additional data-collection techniques, such as interviews or tests, to obtain a more objective picture of teachers' understanding.

References

Abdurrohman, M. C. (2022). Perencanaan kurikulum pendidikan Islam. 6(1).

Agustina, D., Nurjannah, A., Harahap, A., Lestari, V., & Hafizhah, Z. (2022). Konstruksi pemahaman pentingnya sarana prasarana di sekolah. 6(1).

Andreani, D., & Gunansyah, G. (2023). Persepsi guru tentang IPAS pada Kurikulum Merdeka. JPGSD, 11(9).

Ansori, Ahmad, Faizah, N., Fajariah, P., & Saputra, R. (2025). Efektivitas pengelolaan sarana dan prasarana pendidikan dalam meningkatkan kualitas pembelajaran. Al-Ikhtiar: Jurnal Studi Islam, 02(1).

Evitasari, A. D., Utaminingtyas, S., & Indahswari, D. A. (2025). Kesiapan guru dalam pelaksanaan pembelajaran IPAS pada Kurikulum Merdeka. Social, Humanities, and Educational Studies, 8(3).

Halimah, S. M. N., Rosyidah, R., Ratnasari, Y., & Fakhriyah, F. (2025). Analisis miskonsepsi bahan ajar IPAS Kurikulum Merdeka pada siswa kelas III sekolah dasar. Multidisciplinary Journal of Education, Economic and Culture, 3(1), 46–62. https://doi.org/10.61231/mjeec.v3i1.348

Hidayatullah, M. I., Udayani, N. W. A., Nurhidayati, Isra, M., Rachmawati, R. A., & Sukarso,

A. A. (2025). Implementasi pembelajaran IPAS di sekolah dasar: Studi kasus di SD Negeri 1 Giri Tembesi, Lombok Barat. Journal of Classroom Action Research, 7. https://doi.org/10.29303/jcar.v7iSpecialIssue.10914

Kamilia, F. F. S., Wahyudin, D., & Dewi, L. (2023). CIPP evaluation model: E-learning based life skills training. AIP Conference Proceedings, 2679. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0111265

Karis, Isdaryanti, B., & Isnaeni, W. (2026). Efektivitas evaluasi pembelajaran dalam mengukur capaian kompetensi peserta didik. 12(03).

Kemendikbudristek. (2022). Capaian pembelajaran mata pelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam dan Sosial (IPAS) fase A–fase C. Merdeka Mengajar. https://guru.kemdikbud.go.id/kurikulum/referensi-penerapan/capaian-pembelajaran/sd-sma/ilmu-pengetahuan-alam-dan-sosial-ipas/

Mukhdlor, M. F., Syam, A. R., & Syahri, M. A. (2024). Evaluasi Kurikulum Merdeka menggunakan model CIPP di sekolah dasar. Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Pendidikan Indonesia, 3(2), 316–323. https://doi.org/10.36841/cendekiapendidikan.v3i1.4117

Mutaqin, I., Pattisahusiwa, P., Nurjanah, E., & Widiana, G. T. (2024). Analisis implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka dengan teori model evaluasi CIPP pada mata pelajaran IPAS di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. 6(2).

Qadriah, L., Wicaksono, B. A., Somadiyono, S., & Nindiasari, H. (2022). CIPP model as a mathematics learning evaluation model in elementary school. International Journal of Science and Society, 4(3), 435–444. https://doi.org/10.54783/ijsoc.v4i3.536

Ramadani, A. R., Rohmaniah, H. F. R., Syafitri, D. L. S., Hermawan, C. H., & Mustikawati, A.

M. (2025). Perspektif guru tentang rancangan pembelajaran yang berpusat pada siswa (student centered learning). Biologiei Educația, 5(1), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.62734/be.v5i1.406

Ramadhan, W., Prastowo, A., & Nebres, K. J. (2023). Evaluating the implementation of Natural and Social Science learning (IPAS) in the Independent Primary School Curriculum. GENTALA PENDIDIKAN DASAR, 8(1).

Rofiah, U. A., & Samporno. (2023). Evaluasi pelaksanaan Kurikulum Merdeka di sekolah dasar: Tinjauan dampaknya terhadap prestasi belajar siswa. TADZKIRAH: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 7.

Salsabilla, I. I., Jannah, E., & Juanda. (2023). Analisis modul ajar berbasis Kurikulum Merdeka. Jurnal Literasi dan Pembelajaran Indonesia.

Saputri, R. D. R., & Pratikno, A. S. (2024). Analisis pengelolaan sarana dan prasarana pendidikan di sekolah dasar. Jurnal Inovasi, Evaluasi, dan Pengembangan Pembelajaran (JIEPP), 4(2), 340–347. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i12.3297

Tang, K. H. D. (2023). Student-centered approach in teaching and learning: What does it really mean? Acta Pedagogia Asiana, 2(2), 72–83. https://doi.org/10.53623/apga.v2i2.218

Wedayanthi, L. M. D., Pradnyan, P. B., & Adiwijaya, P. A. (2024). The implementation of CIPP as evaluation model on teaching assistance in SD Bali Bilingual School as the practice of Kurikulum Merdeka. EDUHUMANIORA: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 16(1), 37–44.

Permendikbudristek No. 16 Tahun 2022 tentang Standar Proses Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar, dan Jenjang Pendidikan Menengah.

Permendikbudristek No. 22 Tahun 2023 tentang Standar Sarana dan Prasarana pada Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar, dan Jenjang Pendidikan Menengah.

Permendikbud No. 23 Tahun 2016 tentang Standar Penilaian Pendidikan.