Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online, 2021; Vol 20 (Issue 5): pp. 6251-6258
http://ilkogretim-online.org
doi: 10.17051/ilkonline.2021.05.703

Model of Implementation of Education Management at An-NurHusada Midwifery Academy WaliSongo North Lampung (Evaluation Study)

YOCKI YUANTI, Email: yockiyuanti_7617157917@mhs.unj.ac.id
Ivan Hanafi, Email: ivan.hanafi@unj.ac.id
Suryadi, Email: hcsuryadi.unj@gmail.com

Abstract. The research conducted is evaluative research on the program through CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product) with ROI (Return of Invesment). The objectives of the research implementation include; 1) describe the design of CIPP model evaluation with ROI on the implementation of education management of Annur Husada Midwifery Academy; 2) describe the implementation of CIPP model with ROI on the implementation of education management of Annur Husada Midwifery Academy; 3) describe the preparation of CIPP modelreport with ROI on the implementation of Education management of Annur Husada Midwifery Academy and; 4) describe the follow-up of CIPP model results with ROI on the implementation of education management of Annur Husada Midwifery Academy. Supporting theory in research using evaluation theory, CIPP model, ROI evaluation, evaluation model program management of An Nur Husada Midwifery Academy Education. The research was conducted in the education program of Diploma-III (D- III) Midwifery Academy of Midwifery An Nur Husada. Research using descriptive methods through qualitative approach. Data collection techniques are conducted using interviews, observations and documentation studies, data validity studies are conducted using data triangulation. The results of the research obtained include; 1) the design of the evaluation of the program is carried out top down by the education program D-III Midwifery Academy Of Midwifery Annur Husada, 2) the application of the CIPP model is carried out in accordance with the stages of reaction conducted in the implementation of midwifery education, and 3) the application of the ROI evaluation model to determine the benefits of the return value obtained by graduates of Akbid An NurHusadaWalisongo North Lampung both tangible and untangible.

Keywords: Program Evaluation, CIPP Evaluation Model, ROI, An NurHusada Midwifery Academy

I. INTRODUCTION

Midwives are health workers who have an important and strategic position in efforts to reduce maternal mortality (AKI) and infant mortality (AKB). Midwives provide comprehensive and sustainable midwifery services, focusing on preventive and promotive efforts based on partnership and community empowerment (Kesga, 2016). Midwives are recognized as responsible and accountable professionals in providing services to women during their life cycle. Midwives are trusted to work in the community to run government programs related to national health development, especially maternal and child health.

Lampung Province reported cases of maternal deaths from government health care facilities in the city / district in 2009-2015 tend to be volatile, namely in 2009 as many as 125 cases of maternal death, in 2010 increased to 143 cases, in 2011 increased back to 152 cases, increased back to 178 cases in 2012, then slightly decreased to 158 in 2013 and Again decreased 130 cases in 2015. The figure still does not describe the actual death case in the community, considering this death case is a case of death handled by health workers (Lampung Provincial Health Office, 2015).

The United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), 2014, said: "Maternal and neonatal mortality is often sigificant in low and middle-income countries, where the majority of the global population lives. In these countries, competent midwives have the potential to reduce maternal and neonatal mortality." The above statement explains that competent midwives have the potential to reduce the problem of AKI and AKB (UNFPA et al., 2014). Given the large role and responsibility of midwives in contributing to lower aki and AKB, the government in this case is the ministry of health and other relevant ministries together with the Indonesian Midwives Association (IBI) continues to strive for education for midwives in order to produce professional and skilled midwife graduates in providing midwifery services in the community. This is what underlies the establishment of the first three midwifery diploma education in Indonesia in 1996.

To know the competency of graduates of D-III Midwifery Education, the government conducts competency tests for health workers for graduates of midwifery and other vocational education

graduates as well as professional education, whose implementation is regulated in Law No. 36 of 2014 on health workers article 21. In the period 2015-2019 Akbid An Nur HUsada Walisongo graduates who took the midwife competency exam numbered 165 people, while the participants who passed numbered 92 people (55.75 %) and people (44.25 %) who did not pass the test. The phenomenon gives an idea that the competence of midwife graduates is not currently in line with expectations. Therefore, the implementation of Midwifery D-III Education in Akbid An Nur needs intensive and sustainable development in order for this program to be sustainable.

Evaluation of educational programs is intended to determine the success rate or failure of an educational program. The evaluation results can be used as input to determine the follow-up of the program that is or has been implemented (Arikunto &Jabar, 2008). Some experts present the definition of evaluation, including *The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation* (1994) mengatakan bahwa: *"evaluation is the systematic assessment of the worth or merit of an object".*(Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014).

While according to Scriven is: *"*evaluation is the process of determining the merit, worth and value of things.These words capture the basic, natural meaning of the term evaluation. Evaluation is the process of distinguishing the worthwhile from the wortless, the precius from the useless*."* (Donaldson & Scriven, 2003).

Stufflebeam suggests that, " evaluation is the process of delinieting, obtaining, reporting, and applying descriptive and judgmental information about object's merit, worth, probity, and significance and/or equity in order to guide desicion making, support accountability, disseminate effective practises, and increase understanding of the involved phenomena".(Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014)

However, Ralph Tyler (1967) said that :"evaluation the process of determining to what extent the educational objectives are actually being realized". (Djaali dan Puji Muldjono, 2008).Guba dan Lincoln (1985:35), the definition of evaluation as "a process for describing an evaluand and judging its merit and worth". Gilbert Sax (1980:18) argues that "evaluation is a process through which a value judgement or decision is made from a variety of observations and from the background and training of the evaluator" (Djaali dan Puji Muldjono, 2008).

From the various expert opinions above, the term evaluation is interpreted by experts in different ways although the meaning is relatively the same, thus it can be concluded that evaluation is a systematic process to determine the value of something (provisions, activities, decisions, performances, processes, people, objects and others) based on certain criteria through assessment. Thus evaluation has keywords: the existence of an assessment process, certain criteria as standard, and recommendations. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess how far a program is achieved in accordance with the goals set.

Evaluation is a systematic process of obtaining information in the form of qualitative and quantitative data, to determine the effectiveness of a program, by comparing the results achieved during the implementation of the program against certain standards / criteria that have been set, to obtain the "worth" and "merit" required in the decision-making process.

Program evaluation is a series of activities that are done deliberately to see the success rate of the program. There is some understanding of the program itself. In the dictionary (a) the program is the plan, (b) the program is a carefully carried out activity. Evaluating the program is an activity that is intended to find out how high the success rate of the planned activities (Arikunto &Jabar, 2008).

The development of evaluation began with writings from its originators, chronologically beginning in 1940 by Tyler (1942,1950) Campbell and Stanley (1963), Cronbach (1963), Stufflebeam (1966), Tyler (1966). 6), Scriven (1967), Stakes (1967), Stufflebeam (1967), Suchman (1967), Alkin (1969), Guba (1969), Provus (1969), Stufflebeam et al. (1971), Parlett and Hamiltin (1972), Eisner (1975), Kaca (1975), Cronbach and Asociates (1980), and Patton (1980). A few years later it began to be projected that there was an alternative endekatan for the evaluation of the program.

According to Tyler (1950) quoted by S.Arikunto (2008:5), the evaluation of the program is a process to find out if the educational objectives have been realized. Furthermore, according to Cronbach (1963) and Stufflebeam (1971) cited by Suharsimi Arikunto and Cepi Safruddin Abdul Jabar (2008:5), the evaluation of the program is an effort to provide information to be conveyed to decision makers (Arikunto &Jabar, 2008)

Other Opinions by Grinnell and Unrau (2018): "A form of appraisal, using valid and reliable reseacrh methods, that examines the process or outcomes of an organization that exists to fulfill some social need", (Richard M. Jr Grinnell & Yvonne A. Unrau, 2018).

Program evaluation has meaning as a process of identifying and gathering information to assist decision makers in choosing alternative decisions. While Fitzpatrick, Sanders &Worthen, suggests that: "*evaluation program is 1) determining standards for judging quality and deciding whether those standards*

should be relative or absolute; 2) collecting relevant information; and 3) applying the standards to determine value, quality, utility, effectiveness, or significance."(Fitzpatrick et al., 2010).

Meanwhile, according to Hatry et al, "*program evaluation is the application of systematic methods to address questions about program operations and results. It may include ongoing monitoring of a program as well as one-shot studies of program processes or program impact. The approaches used are based on social science research methodologies and professional standard.* (Hatry, Harry P.; Newcomer, Kathryn E.; Wholey, 2015).

Approaches and evaluation models with each other do seem varied, but the purpose and purpose is the same is to conduct data collection activities or information related to the object being evaluated. Furthermore, the information collected can be given to decision makers in order to precisely determine the follow-up about the program that has been evaluated.

Evaluation approaches are widely used in the context of programs in different countries and disciplines. The selection of evaluation models in a program specifically needs to pay attention to the context and purpose of the program. Many of the evaluation approaches used today contribute well to solving important problems. This view is supported by many experts including Worthen et al. (1997) and Owen (1993). There are six evaluation approaches: 1) Experimental approach; 2) test-purpose approach; 3) decision management approach; 4) assessment approach; 5) Pluralist-intuitionist approach; and 6) the theory-driven approach. These six approaches are a combination of the meta-models Smith (1994), Stake (1973), House, (1978), Stufflebeam and Webster, (1981) and Worthen et al. (1997).

Fitzpatrick et al generally suggest that evaluation approaches and models are classified into five approaches, namely: 1) *Objectives-oriented approaches (vs. Goal-free); 2) management-oriented approaches (e.g., CIPP, UCLA model); 3) consumer-oriented approaches (e.g., Scriven's model); 4) expertise-oriented approaches (e.g., accreditation, funding agency review panel, blue-ribbon panel); 5) participant-oriented approaches (e.g., naturalistic, participatory, utilization-focused, empowerment)* (Fitzpatrick et al., 2010).

The selection of the evaluation model to be used depends on the evaluation objectives to be achieved. The evaluation model is oriented towards the 'The Objectives Oriented Evaluation Approach'.

Logic model is a goal-oriented evaluation, giving a little idea of how the program achieves its goals. Typically, logic models require a program planner or evaluator to identify program inputs, activities, outputs, and results. The results achieved reflect the long-term goals or objectives of a program, representing the direct impact of the program.

Logic models are widely used in planning and evaluating current programs. Assessors can use logic models to help articulate and discuss assumptions about how a program can achieve its goals and what elements are important to evaluate at any given time and generally to build internal evaluation capacity or the ability to think in an evaluative way (Fitzpatrick et al., 2010).

The ROI evaluation model is a development of the Kirkpatrick program evaluation model. Roi includes impact evaluation after level 4 result evaluation on Kirkpatrick model. ROI is a phase 5 evaluation of the Kirkpatrick model that measures the benefits gained from the implementation of the program compared to the costs incurred for the implementation of the program.

Phillips and Stone, pointing out, "This is an evaluation of the monetary value of the business impact of the training, compared to the costs of the training. The business impact data is converted to a monetary value in order to apply it to the formula to calculate return on investment. This shows the true value of the program in terms of its contribution to the organization's objectives. It is pre-sented as an ROI value or cost-bene- fit ratio, usually expressed as a per-centage. An improvement in a spark plug- ness impact measure as a result of training may not necessarily produce a positive ROI (e.g., if the training was very expensive). This evaluation is to find out the value for money from the impact of the training program, which is compared to the cost of training as an investment benefit of the training. Data is converted to a value of money by applying a formula to calculate the return/return on investment. It shows the true value of the program in terms of its contribution to the goals of the organization. This is presented as an ROI value or cost-benefit ratio, usually expressed as a percentage. An increase in the size of the business impact as a result of training may not necessarily result in a positive ROI (e.g., if the training is very expensive) (Phillips &Stone, 2000).

II. METHODOLOGY

This research is an evaluative research that is oriented to the value and benefits of the implementation of a program. Stufflebeam and Srinkfield (2007) stated the objectives of the evaluation are:

1. Find out if and how well the objectives of the program are met.

2. Determine the reason for the success or failure of the program.

3. Open the principles that make the program successful.

4. Direct the process of experiments with techniques to increase its effectiveness.And plus ROI evaluation to find out the benefits of value obtained by alumni both tangible and intangible

The management-based evaluation model generally measures whether goals set by policies, programs, or projects can be achieved or not. The main purpose of evaluation as a research for the development of science in a particular field and contribute to the development of theory. Evaluative research is a combination of research and evaluation. Program evaluation can use cipp approach by using context criteria, namely background, legal basis, objectives and objectives of the program, inputs that are resources used in the maintenance of the program, the process of implementation of tri dharma college and product which is the output or results of the program that refers to SNPT and ROI to evaluate the impact felt by alumni as the outcome of the program of organizing education D-III Midwifery.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Evaluation model that can be used to evaluate a program. Although one model and another model are different, but basically have the same goal of conducting data collection activities and accurate information related to the object to be evaluated, providing material as consideration for decision makers in determining the follow-up of a program.

To know the extent to which the D-III Midwifery education program takes place in accordance with the goals to be achieved, as well as the success that has been achieved, as well as how much the criteria for successful implementation of the program in the form of impacts or results, it is necessary to have a thorough evaluation on every aspect, including looking at the financial effectiveness issued in the implementation of the D-III Midwifery education program.

The complete program evaluation model to know the success or achievement of the objectives of the D-III Midwifery Education Program includes context, input, process, product produced and the impact caused and the value of perceived benefits, namely the evaluation model according to Stufflebeam, namely context, input, process, product (CIPP) coupled with outcomes according to Philips and Stone, namely Return of Invetment (ROI).

Cipp evaluation model is an evaluation model consisting of five evaluation components namely Context, Input, Process, Product and Outcome (CIPP). CIPP stands for context evaluation means evaluation of context, input evaluation means evaluation of inputs, process evaluation means evaluation of processes, and product evaluation means evaluation of results, outcome evaluation which means evaluation of the impact caused.

Roi Evaluation Model (Return on Invesment) is a measure in the form of monetary gain obtained by an organization or a person after a certain period of time as a reciprocity against investment or an educational/training program. ROI is a measure that represents the true value developed by comparing the cost of training interventions with the resulting benefits. In this study, it is expected to describe the return obtained by students by comparing the costs incurred during the study period of D-III Midwifery education with the benefits that can be felt. The two most common measures are Benefits Cost Ratio (BCR) and Return of Invesment (ROI).

The process of calculating ROI is:

1) Collect data during the education program

2) Isolating the influence of educational programs

3) Convert data to monetary value

4) Identify program costs

5) Calculating Return on Invesment (ROI)

6) Identifying Intangible Benefits

7) Generalize the impact of educational/training results

The advantages of cipp evaluation model and ROI is that it can describe more information from each stage / phase and can increase the exposure of predetermined standards used in the assessment.

Evaluate context to find out the background, legal basis, objectives, and goals of the program to help decision makers, priorities, and outcomes. The questions that can be asked in relation to the evaluation of context, namely: 1) how is the background and legal basis that underlies the implementation of the program? ; 2) how is the conformity of the program objectives with the applicable standards? ; 3) how is the achievement of the program objectives? ; 4) Which objectives are easily achieved in the implementation of the program?

Input Evaluation includes existing resources and their utilization in the implementation of the program. The questions asked related to the implementation of the D-III Midwifery Education Program

are as follows: 1) how are the qualifications of educators and educational personnel involved in the learning process? ; 2) what is the procedure for recruiting students who are the target of the D-III Midwifery education program? ; 3) how does the source of financing come from, operational procedures and effective management of program financing? ; 4) what is the need for infrastructure and maintenance facilities in supporting program activities?

Process Evaluation in cipp model shows "what" (what) activities are carried out in the education program D-III Midwifery, "who" (who) the person appointed as the person in charge and "when" (when) activities will be completed. In the evaluation process is directed at the extent to which activities are carried out in accordance with the plan. Evaluation of the process in the D-III Midwifery education program includes tri dharma activities of universities, namely: educational / teaching activities, research and community service. Therefore, the questions for process evaluation include: 1) how to learn in D-III Midwifery education program; 2) how is the application of the learning curriculum in the D-III Midwifery education program; 3) how is the implementation of research in the education program D-III Midwifery; and 4) how are community service activities in the Midwifery D-III education program implemented?

Product evaluation is the result of a series of program activities, in which case students are the product of the D-III Midwifery education program. Questions that can be asked include: 1) whether the planned goal has been achieved? ; 2) how is the GPA value obtained by students during the D-III Midwifery education program? ; 3) can learning achievements be fulfilled according to planning? ; 4) how are the competencies of graduates achieved?

Based on the evaluation models presented above, and the reasons for the selection of CIPP and ROI models in the evaluation of the following midwifery D-III education programs are presented the advantages and disadvantages of each evaluation model as follows:

Table 2.1: Program Evaluation Models

No	Evaluation Model	Evaluated Components					
		Kontext	In put	Pro cess	Pro duct	Out come	Reverse Value
1.	Goal Oriented Evaluation (Tyller)	√	-	-	-	-	-
2.	Goal Free Evaluation Model (Scriven)	-	-	√	-	-	-
3.	Formatif-Summatif Evaluation Model (Scriven)	-	-	√	√	-	-
4.	Countenance Evaluation Model (Stake)	√	-	√	√	-	-
5.	CSE-UCLA Evaluation Model	√	√	√	√	√	-
6.	Descrepancy Model (Malcolm Provus)	√	-	-	√	-	-
7.	CIPP Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam)	√	√	√	√	√	-
8.	ROI (Philip & Stone)	-	-	-	-	-	√

In this study the authors chose the CIPP (Stufflebeam) evaluation model and combined it with a more comprehensive ROI evaluation model for the evaluation of midwifery D-III education programs.

In the implementation of the evaluation of education program D-III Midwifery required evaluation criteria in the implementation of data analysis. The evaluation criteria used represent considerations concerning what is considered important and the purpose of a program. Evaluation criteria that will be used to determine the effectiveness of the implementation of the D-III Midwifery Education Program refers to the Midwife Education Standard in Indonesia compiled by AIPKIND in accordance with Permendikbud No.03 year 2020 on National Standards of Higher Education (SNPT), which include: (1) educational standards; (2) research standards; and (3) standards of community service.

To determine the success rate of achievement per-component above there needs to be a predetermined evaluation criteria compared to the standards used. The evaluation criteria submitted as a reference assessment, as follows:

Table 2.2.: Evaluation Criteria for Implementation of D-III Midwifery Education Programin Lampung Province

Components evaluated	Aspects evaluated	Evaluation Criteria
Context	Policy on the implementation of education programs D-III Midwifery.	1. Background and Legal Basis
		2. Documents of vision, mission, objectives and objectives of D-III Midwifery program.
		3. Renstra and Renop Documents
Input	Educators and educational personnel	1. The ratio of permanent lecturers and non-permanent lecturers to the number of students in accordance with the applicable rules include: • Lecturers remain in accordance with the field of PS • Lecturers remain in areas of expertise outside the PS • Non-permanent lecturers
		2. The number of educational personnel in supporting the implementation of tri dharma college consists of: • Librarian • Laboran • Technicians • Operator • Administrative personnel • Driver • Security
	Learners	1. A woman 2. Maxial age of 24 years at the time of 3. Graduates of high school (SMA) or madrasah aliayah from science and social sciences majors 4. Minimum height 150 cm; 5. Good behavior as evidenced by the Police Record Certificate (SKCK); 6. Pass the test of knowledge, English and Indonesian; f) pass health tests and are not free to use NAPZA; 7. Lack of tunaan that can interfere with work (disable); 8. Pass the interview test; 9. For foreign nationals (FOREIGNERS) in accordance with applicable regulations.
	Curriculum	1. Curriculum Structure 2. Learning expenses 3. Long study 4. Academic Calendar 5. RPS and Modules
	Facilities and Infrastructure	1. Buildings and Lecturer Rooms, Classrooms, Libraries, Midwifery Labs, Labs. Computer 2. Learning room facilities and equipment 3. Living room facilities 4. Library facilities and equipment 5. Facilities and equipment of midwifery laboraturium 6. Computer laboraturium facilities and equipment 7. Administrative room facilities and equipment 8. Counseling room facilities and equipment 9. Wifi facilities 10. Parking lot
	payment	Have a budget plan (RAB) semester and year in particular, clearly the magnitude and sustainable.

Process	Implementation of education and teaching	1. Student Recruitment • Recruitment procedures • Student criteria • Number of students 2. Recruitment of educators and education 3. Learning Process • Face-to-face learning • Tutorial activities 4. The learning assessment process includes: • assessment principles; • assessment techniques and instruments; • assessment mechanisms and procedures; • implementation of assessments; • assessment reporting; • student graduation in each semester both sumative and formative evaluation 5. Procedures for the use of learning infrastructure
	Implementation of research activities	1. Lecturer research involving students in it in accordance with applicable standards. 2. Research lecturers at least 1 time a year according to the roadmap 3. Publication of national and international research journals
	Implementation of community service activities	1. Community service activities utilizing the results of lecturer research 2. Community service activities are conducted every semester 3. Publication of the results of community service activities in national and international journals.
Product	Competency of graduates is expected (average GPA value of students above kkm value).	Student learning outcomes include the following aspects: • Cognitive • Affective • Psychomotor

ROI Component

Components evaluated	**Aspects evaluated**	**Evaluation Criteria**
ROI**	Tangible benefits	The benefits felt by alumni after attending D-III Midwifery education include: 1. Long waiting time for alumni in getting the first job according to the field of expertise 2. Financial benefits obtained by alumni based on competence
	Intangible benefits	1. User and stakeholder responses to graduate performance 2. Customer satisfaction

IV. CONCLUSION

Cipp model is the most widely known model and applied by evaluators. CIPP model that includes, namely Context: evaluation of context, Input: evaluation of input, Process: evaluation of process, Product: evaluation of results. The four words mentioned in the cipp abbreviation are the target of evaluation, which is nothing but to evaluate the implementation of education management at the Midwifery Academy an-Nur Husadawali Songo North Lampung.

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion, the conclusions that can be taken from this study are:

- **Context:** Policy on the implementation of education programs D-III Midwifery.

- **Input:** Educators and educational personnel, Learners, Curriculum, Facilities and Infrastructure, and payment.
- **Process:**Implementation of education and teaching, Implementation of research activities, Implementation of community service activities,
- **Product:** Competency of graduates is expected (average GPA value of students above kkm value).

REFERENCES

1. AIPKIND. (2018). *Buku 1 : Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum Pendidikan Diploma III Kebidanan*. AIPKIND.
2. Ananda, R., & Rafida, T. (2017). *PENGANTAR EVALUASI PROGRAM PENDIDIKAN* (M. P. Dr. Candra Wijaya (Ed.); 1st ed.). PERDANA PUBLISHING. http://repository.uinsu.ac.id/2842/1/Evaluasi Program Pendidikan.pdf
3. Andrews, M., Brewer, M., Buchan, T., Denne, A., Hammond, J., Hardy, G., Jacobs, L., McKenzie, L., & West, S. (2010). Implementation and sustainability of the nursing and midwifery standards for mentoring in the UK. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *10*(5), 251–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2009.11.014
4. Arikunto, S., & Jabar, C. S. A. (2008). *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Pedoman Teoritis Praktis bagi Mahasiswa dan Praktisi Pendidikan* (F. Yustianti (Ed.); 2nd ed.). Bumi Aksara.
5. Djaali dan Puji Muldjono. (2008). *Pengukuran dalam Bidang Pendidikan* (Djaali (Ed.)). PT.Grasindo.
6. Donaldson, S. I. (Stewart I., & Scriven, M. (2003). *Evaluating social programs and problems : visions for the new millennium* (S. I.Donaldson, M. Scriven, & C. G. University (Eds.); 1st ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum. https://b-ok.cc/book/1092180/1d7934
7. Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2010). *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines* (4th ed.). https://b-ok.cc/book/3411470/0df39a
8. Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs : the four levels*. Berrett-Koehler.
9. Matthew B. Miles, A. Michael Huberman, J. S. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. https://b-ok.asia/book/3593988/83e08f
10. Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019). *Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide* (D. M. Mertens & A. T. Wilson (Eds.); 2nd ed.). THE GUILFORD PRESS. https://b-ok.cc/book/3711247/d805be
11. Michael Quinn Patton. (2014). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. https://b-ok.asia/book/5010876/31aaa9
12. Nyoni, C. N., & Botma, Y. (2019). Implementing a competency-based midwifery programme in Lesotho: A gap analysis. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *34*, 72–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2018.11.005
13. Phillips, J. J., & Stone, R. D. (2000). *How to measure training results: a practical guide to tracking the six key indicators*. McGraw-Hill. https://doi.org/10.1036/0071406263
14. *Provinsi Lampung*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 28, 2021, from https://kompaspedia.kompas.id/baca/profil/daerah/provinsi-lampung
15. Richard M. Jr Grinnell & Yvonne A. Unrau. (2018). *Social Work Research and Evaluation* (R. M. Grinnell & Y. A. Unrau (Eds.); 11th ed.). Oxford University Press. https://b-ok.cc/book/5023013/7871a3
16. Stufflebeam.D.L & T. Kellaghan (Eds.). (2003). *The CIPP model for evaluation* (The intern). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
17. Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. S. (2014). *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications.* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass. https://b-ok.cc/book/2385056/275004
18. Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (19th ed.). Alfabeta. https://b-ok.asia/book/5686376/9d6534