Evaluation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project Program at Public Middle Schools in Badung Regency

I Gusti Ayu Dian Purnamasari[*], Kadek Rihendra Dantes, I Made Yudana

Department of Administration Education, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Bali, Indonesia

*Corresponding Email: Ayudianpurmana4@gmail.com

Abstract. This study aims to evaluate the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Enhancement Project program at SMP Negeri Badung Regency, a case study of *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*. This study is an evaluative study with a quantitative descriptive approach using the CIPP method (context, input, process and product). The population of this study was the P5 Project Team (Principal, School Treasurer and project implementing teachers) of class VIII totaling 18 people, and class VIII students of *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* in the 2024-2025 academic year totaling 235 people. The research sample was a saturated sample for the project team totaling 18 people and 148 students determined by the simple random sampling method. The data collection techniques used were interviews to obtain initial information regarding the implementation of P5, questionnaires as the main data source, and observations to strengthen the results of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was compiled using a Likert scale (1-5). Data analysis was carried out on the CIPP variables using the direction of the T value of each variable to determine the effectiveness of the program. The results of this study are the effectiveness of the P5 program from the contact aspect obtained positive (+) or effective results. The input aspect obtained positive (+) or effective results, the process aspect obtained positive (+) or effective results, and the product aspect obtained negative (-) or ineffective results.

Keywords: Evaluation, Pancasila student profile, Project for Strengthening the Profile of Pancasila Students, CIPP

1   Introduction

The P5 program as an education to build the character of Pancasila student profiles requires self-awareness from all parties, especially teachers. Awareness of the nature of a child that we cannot change [1]. Teachers should understand the basics of education according to Ki Hajar Dewantara, one of which is "Education is only a guide in the growth of our children's lives [2]. Teachers as facilitators understand how to provide the best guidance to students in carrying out project [3]. As something new, the implementation of P5 at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* still needs improvement to get the best results. Various efforts have been carried out routinely, such as instructing teachers to attend training and share good practices in learning communities. However, it still has not obtained satisfactory results. Even some parts cannot be defined whether they need improvement or not.

Research on the evaluation of the P5 program at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* has so far not explicitly explained the extent of involvement of key stakeholders—namely teachers, students, and parents—in the evaluation process. Although it was mentioned that teachers had been instructed to attend training and share good practices, this was more directed at implementation efforts than their participation in the evaluation itself. It has not been explained whether teachers were involved in the evaluation process through interviews, surveys, or discussions that could describe their experiences and views on the implementation of the program. Meanwhile, the voices of students and parents were not mentioned at all in the evaluation process, even though their involvement is very important for capturing real experiences in the classroom and support from the home environment.

In addition, although the purpose of the evaluation was stated to determine achievements and obstacles in the implementation of the program, there has been no in-depth explanation of the specific aspects that were evaluated, including whether real classroom experiences were part of the considerations. If the evaluation does not cover the dynamics and challenges in the field—such as student involvement in the project, teacher readiness, and parental participation—then the evaluation results are at risk of not reflecting the actual conditions. Therefore, in order for the evaluation of the P5 program to be more comprehensive and representative, it is recommended to actively involve these three stakeholder groups. In addition, it is necessary to develop evaluation instruments that include relevant contextual aspects that have a direct impact on the success of the program. A participatory evaluation approach will help obtain more accurate and useful information as a basis for decision making in efforts to improve the implementation of the P5 program in the future.

Assessment of teacher readiness and support is very important considering that the success of the P5 program is highly dependent on the role of teachers as facilitators. In the evaluation framework using the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model, aspects of teacher readiness, training quality, and ongoing support mechanisms can be integrated into the input and process dimensions. In the input dimension, evaluation can focus on the extent to which teachers are ready to understand the philosophy and principles of the P5 program, their initial competencies, and awareness of their role as mentors in the project. In addition, it is also important to assess the quality of training that teachers have attended, including the suitability of training materials to real needs in the field, delivery methods, and their usefulness in practice. Ongoing support mechanisms such as mentoring, supervision, learning communities, and other supporting facilities are also important parts of assessing program input. Meanwhile, in the process dimension, evaluation can be directed at real implementation in the field, namely how teachers carry out their roles when facilitating students in the project. Evaluation can include the effectiveness of teacher interactions with students, the application of training results in learning activities, and teacher involvement in monitoring and reflecting on program implementation. The existence of discussion forums, routine supervision, and documentation of the learning process are also important indicators in the evaluation process. By integrating data from the input and process dimensions, program evaluation can provide a more comprehensive picture of the extent to which teacher readiness and support influence the success of the P5 program. Triangulating data from these

two dimensions can help identify whether the problems that arise are caused by a lack of readiness, suboptimal training, or minimal ongoing support. Therefore, if the research has not explicitly included these components, it is recommended to add instruments such as teacher readiness questionnaires, classroom observations, in-depth interviews, and documentation studies to strengthen the evaluation results.

As a relatively new program and still in the early stages of implementation in certain educational units, the evaluation of the P5 program at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* has limitations in terms of scope and generalization. This evaluation was conducted in the context of a single school, so the results do not necessarily represent conditions in other schools that have different levels of readiness, resources, and organizational culture. In addition, the absence of clearly defined indicators related to the success of the program is also a challenge in the evaluation process. Therefore, the findings in this study should be understood as a contextual portrait that is local in nature and cannot be generalized widely, but can still be used as an initial basis for further, more in-depth studies in different contexts and regions.

One of the efforts to ensure the shortcomings and advantages of the implementation of the P5 program at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* is to carry out a program evaluation. Evaluation in educational management is important, especially in decision making. This decision aspect is what distinguishes evaluation as measurement. Evaluation is making considerations according to a set of agreed and accountable criteria [4]. The evaluation that will be carried out in this study is an effort to obtain information about what has been achieved and what has not been achieved. In addition, the evaluation of this program also aims to obtain facts about the difficulties and obstacles of the P5 program as seen from certain aspects. Thus, the results obtained from the Evaluation of the P5 program at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* can be a reference for further decision making.

The implementation of program evaluation to obtain the expected results requires using an appropriate model. In this case, the model that will be used in this study is Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP). The selection of this model is based on the suitability between the objectives of the P5 program evaluation and the objectives of the CIPP evaluation model according to Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, namely "the CIPP approach is based on the view that the most important purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve" [5] [6] [7] Umam & Saripah, 2018; Husnaini et al., 2024). Thus, the results of this study are expected to be an improvement in the implementation of P5 in the future. Therefore, the aspects that are the focus of research in the evaluation of the P5 program are only related to the context, input, process and product of the P5 program.

The P5 program evaluation research is relatively new, considering the implementation of the new independent curriculum which has only been implemented since the 2022-2023 academic year. However, there are several previous research references that examine the same topic, including:

Evaluation of the P5 Local Wisdom Activity Program Phase D in Junior High Schools by Lilik Nur Kholidah et al., Sultan Agung Tirtayasa University, 2022. This program evaluation research aims to determine the level of enthusiasm of students in participating in P5 activities as stated in the implementation of the current new

curriculum, by taking the theme of local wisdom [9]. The development of this activity program is based on project learning.

The selection of the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model in this study was based on the suitability between the objectives of the P5 program evaluation and the characteristics of the CIPP model. This model emphasizes that evaluation is not just to prove success, but to improve program implementation on an ongoing basis. This is in line with the conditions of the P5 program at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* which is still in the early stages of implementation and requires improvement in various aspects. CIPP allows researchers to evaluate not only the final results (products), but also the background of the program (context), resource readiness (input), and implementation of activities (process), thus providing a comprehensive picture of the program's strengths and weaknesses. Although the P5 program is still in the development stage and the final results (products) are not yet fully visible, the CIPP model remains relevant because it not only focuses on evaluating results, but is also very strong in analyzing the process and readiness of implementation. However, product evaluation will be carried out by considering early indicators that have emerged and are in accordance with program objectives, such as student involvement, project results, and teacher and student perceptions. With its flexibility, the CIPP model allows evaluation to be carried out in stages and adaptively to the dynamics of program implementation. Therefore, this model is considered the most appropriate for identifying aspects that need to be improved to support the successful implementation of P5 in the future.

This evaluation study of the P5 program using the CIPP model provides a significant contribution to the existing literature, especially in the context of the implementation of the Independent Curriculum which is still relatively new. Unlike previous studies which were generally descriptive and only focused on certain aspects such as student enthusiasm or local wisdom themes, this study adopts a more comprehensive evaluation approach. By using the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model, this study not only describes the implementation of the program, but also assesses the suitability of the program to the needs, resource readiness, implementation process, and the results achieved by students as a whole.

This broadens the understanding of the effectiveness of the P5 program and provides more complete data to support decision-making and policy improvements in the future. In addition, because it was conducted at the early stage of the implementation of the Independent Curriculum, this study offers unique insights in the form of an early portrait of the implementation of P5, so that it can be an important reference for other schools that are or will implement similar programs. The use of the CIPP model also reflects a formative approach that focuses on continuous improvement, not just proving success, in line with the evaluation principles put forward by Stufflebeam. If this study also raises aspects of local wisdom or specific school contexts, then its novelty value is even stronger because it shows the integration between the national curriculum and local values that are an important part of character education in Indonesia. Thus, this study not only complements the existing literature, but also provides a conceptual and practical basis for the evaluation and development of P5 programs in various educational units.

Evaluation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project Activity Program (P5) Phase B at Kalicacing 02 Elementary School, Salatiga by Tika Yuniar Utami et

al., PGSD FKIP Satya Wacana Christian University, 2024. This study aims to evaluate the Pancasila student profile strengthening project program (P5) in the independent curriculum for grade IV Phase B at Kalicacing 02 Elementary School, Salatiga [10].

Evaluation of the P5 Education Program (Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project) using CIPP by Heni Prasetyowati, Satya Wacana Christian University Salatiga, 2024. This study aims to evaluate the implementation program of the Pancasila student profile strengthening project (P5) in the independent curriculum at SDN Genting 02, Jambu District, Semarang Regency, which is a driving school [11]. The research method used is an evaluation research type using a qualitative descriptive method. This study uses the CIPP evaluation model (context, input, poses, product).

The profile of Pancasila students is a character that is ideally possessed by Indonesian students. The character that is intended to be developed through the P5 program as part of the education system in Indonesia. As a character, similar research related to character education is as follows:

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Character Education Strengthening Program at SMP Negeri 1 Tabanan by I Made Wiratnyana, 2020. This study aims to describe the effectiveness of the implementation of the character education strengthening program seen from the context, input, process and product variables at SMP Negeri 1 Tabanan [12]. This research includes evaluation research with a quantitative approach by analyzing the role of each variable according to the CIPP model (context, input, process and product).

Evaluation Study of Strengthening Local Wisdom-Based Character Education for Students of Harapan Nusantara Middle School, Denpasar by Uttami Wijaya, 2022. This study aims to evaluate the strengthening of local wisdom-based character education for students of Harapan Nusantara Middle School, Denpasar [13]. This research is an ex-post facto research with CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) design.

2   Methods

2.1   Types of Research

This research is program evaluation research conducted to measure the effectiveness of the implementation of the Pancasila student profile strengthening project (P5) program at SMP Negeri Badung Regency with a case study of the Pancasila student profile strengthening project at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* with the theme of the voice of democracy. While methodologically, the research conducted is an evaluative research with a quantitative descriptive approach, which shows the procedures and processes of program implementation.

2.2   Population and Research Sample

The population of this study was all students of class VIII at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal* in the 2024-2025 academic year. With a population of 235 students spread across 8 study groups (rombel). 20 teachers became the class 8 project team. The number of samples was 148 students.

2.3   Data Collection Techniques

Interview

The use of the interview method in this study was carried out with an unstructured interview method to ensure that the interview results were related to the research data obtained in accordance with the data needed in this study. The interview technique in this study was used to collect initial data regarding the implementation of P5 at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire is a data collection technique carried out by giving a set of written questions or statements to respondents to answer [14]. In this study, a questionnaire method was used to obtain data regarding the effectiveness of the P5 program in terms of CIPP components.

Observation

Observation method is a complex process, a process composed of various biological and psychological processes [15]. In this study, the observation method is used to strengthen the data that has been collected through the questionnaire method.

Data analysis

The data in this study consists of 2 types, namely primary data and secondary data. Primary data is obtained from questionnaires, while secondary data is obtained from observations to strengthen the results of the questionnaire. The data obtained from the questionnaire is data in the form of numbers (quantitative) regarding context, input, process and product.

In this study, the data collection tools used include unstructured interviews, questionnaires, and observations. Unstructured interviews were used to gather initial data on the implementation of P5 at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*, but it has not been explained in detail how the interview guide was validated. The questionnaire used refers to the CIPP evaluation model to assess the effectiveness of the program, although the instrument validation process such as validity and reliability tests has not been mentioned. Observations are used as supporting data to strengthen the results of the questionnaire, but it has not been explicitly explained whether an observation guide or checklist is used. Methodological accuracy would be stronger if it were explained that these instruments had gone through a validation process and were used by involving various stakeholders such as students, teachers, and administrators, thus allowing for data triangulation. In terms of practical impact and usefulness, it is not yet clear whether the research results go beyond description to provide evidence-based recommendations. This research has the potential to make a significant contribution to improving the implementation of the P5 program if the findings can be developed into concrete suggestions addressed to schools or policy makers. To influence decision-making at the school level and local policies, it is important that research results not only present a picture of conditions, but also include in-depth analysis and recommendations that can be

implemented. The preparation of a final report that includes data-based recommendations will strengthen the practical utility of this research in the context of education evaluation and policy development.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Research result

Context Variable Data Description

Based on the respondents, the most answers were in the interval 53-56 and the middle value was 54.5, which was 6 people or 33.33% of the total respondents. While the least value was in the interval 45-48 and the middle value was 46.5 with 1 respondent answering or 5.56% of the total respondents. The average score of the context variable is 52.39. Based on the calculation, the context variable is in the very good category, where the value of X (52.39)> 48. Based on these data, respondents in answering the questionnaire questions gave a positive (good) response. Therefore, this data can be used to measure all indicators in the context variable.

Based on descriptive data of context and input variables, it can be seen that each variable has been operationalized quite well through the arrangement of value intervals, mean values, and frequency distribution of respondents. The context variable shows that most respondents gave positive responses with an average value of 52.39 which is in the very good category. Meanwhile, the input variable has an average value of 44.78 which is in the good category. This shows that the evaluation instrument has been designed to capture respondents' perceptions quantitatively. However, to ensure that the context, input, process, and product variables are truly aligned with the specific objectives of the P5 program at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*, it is necessary to include further explanations regarding the operational definition of each variable, as well as its relationship to the principles of the Pancasila Student Profile which is the basis of the P5 program. Although the form and presentation of the data show that the indicators used are measurable and have been analyzed quantitatively, there is no clear information regarding the validity and reliability tests of the instruments used. To ensure that the indicators are truly valid and reliable, validity tests (such as content or construct validity) and reliability tests (for example through Cronbach's Alpha calculations) are needed. In addition, it will be stronger if the indicators for each variable are described specifically and adjusted to the context of the P5 program in the school. Thus, the CIPP evaluation will be more comprehensive and able to describe the achievements and effectiveness of the program objectively and systematically.

Input Variable Data Description

Based on the table and image above, it can be seen that the respondents answered the most in the interval 48-50 and the middle value was 49, which was 7 people or 38.89% of the total respondents. While the least value was 39-41 with a middle value of 40, which was 1 person who answered or 5.56% of the total respondents. The average score of the input variable is 44.78. Based on the category table above, the input

variable is in the good category, where the value of $44.59 < X \le 46.76$. Based on these data, respondents in answering the questionnaire questions gave a positive (good) response. Therefore, this data can be used to measure all indicators in the Input variable.

Process Variable Data Description

Based on the respondents, the most answers were in the interval 39-42 and the middle value was 40.5, which was 48 people or 29.27% of the total respondents. While the least value was in the interval 23-26 and the middle value was 24.5 with 2 respondents or 1.22% of the total respondents. The average score of the process variable is 39.79. Based on the category table above, the input variable is in the good category, where the value of $39.59 < X \le 43.76$. Based on these data, respondents in answering the questionnaire questions gave a positive (good) response. Therefore, this data can be used to measure all indicators in the process variable.

Product Variable Data Description

Based on the respondents, the most answers were in the interval 39-41 and the middle value was 40, which was 44 people or 26.83% of the total respondents. While the least value was in the interval 27-29 and the middle value was 28 with 1 respondent answering or 0.61% of the total respondents. The average score of the product variable is 42.16. Based on the category table above, the input variable is in the good category, where the value of $41.25 \le X < 44.75$. Based on these data, respondents in answering the questionnaire questions gave a positive (good) response. Therefore, this data can be used to measure all indicators in the product variable.

Data Analysis Results

The following table shows the direction of the T-score of all context, input, process and product variables:

Table 4.5 Direction of T-score of each variable

Variables	Number of Samples	T Score Direction		Re-sults	Infor-mation
		$\sum(+)$	$\sum(-)$		
Context	18	10	8	+	Positive
Input	18	10	8	+	Positive
Process	146	87	77	+	Positive
Product	146	78	86	-	Negative

3.2 Discussion

The implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) is one part of the implementation of the independent curriculum at all levels of schools in

Indonesia. The implementation of P5 is an effort carried out to foster the Pancasila Student Profile in students. The P5 program is something new for most educators in Indonesia, as well as for teachers at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*. Not only for teachers, but for students themselves, the implementation of P5 is something new that they have never done before. Since the beginning of the implementation of P5, there have been many things that must be learned both through training, peer study and independently through literature studies, in order to design, implement and produce an effective P5 program. The implementation of evaluation in the implementation of a program is very important for a learning program, as is the case with the P5 program at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*. Of course, with the limitations of researchers, not all classes can be used as evaluation materials. The implementation of P5 which takes different themes for each grade level and a minimum of 3 themes in one year, but the object of research is the Implementation of P5 in class VIII, with the theme "Sustainable Lifestyle".

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out through the distribution of questionnaires, it was found that the implementation of the P5 program was classified as effective, three of the 4 variables had a positive T score direction and 1 variable had a negative T score direction. However, to be clearer, each variable can be reviewed again to be able to understand the effectiveness of the program more accurately.

In the context variable, the data obtained is related to the P5 program policy, the basis for choosing the theme, the expected objectives of the program implementation and the project theme to be implemented. All parts of the context variable are part of the project planning stages carried out by the Principal, BOS Treasurer, and Teachers. The results obtained from the evaluation of the context variable, the level of program effectiveness is classified as effective. The direction of the T score shows a dominant positive direction.

However, if examined again based on the direction of the T score on each question item. In question number 5, the direction of the T score shows a negative result with a very large difference from the other questions. Question number 5 concerns the basis for selecting the theme, "The selection of the P5 program theme does not pay attention to the potential of the school and the environment around the school". Some respondents gave positive answers to this statement. Based on the results of observations that have been carried out to strengthen the questionnaire data, the selection of the P5 program theme has been carried out at the beginning of the new school year when the school curriculum was being prepared. From this statement, there are shortcomings in the references that are the basis for selecting the P5 program theme. In the input variables, the data obtained relates to the resources used in implementing the program, the quality of teachers who implement P5, and the P5 implementation plan contained in the P5 module. All parts of the input variables are still part of the project planning stage carried out by the Principal, BOS Treasurer, and Teachers. The results obtained from the evaluation of the context variable, the level of program effectiveness is classified as effective. The direction of the T score shows a dominant positive direction.

However, if we look again at the direction of the T score on each question. In questions number 3, 4, and 5, the direction of the T score shows negative results. Questions number 3 and 4 are related to the resources used in the implementation of the program, namely: "The principal and teachers are not collaborative in supporting the

implementation of P5 at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*" and "The environment and facilities are inadequate for the implementation of P5 at *SMP Negeri 4 Abiansemal*". From this statement, it seems that there are shortcomings in optimizing the use of resources to support the implementation of P5, both human resources and facilities and infrastructure. Based on the results of observations, it was seen that several respondents had not optimally utilized school facilities and infrastructure for the implementation of P5. Meanwhile, for question number 5, it is related to the quality of teachers who implement P5, "The principal and teachers understand the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project". Most respondents gave answers that disagreed with this statement. Based on the observation results, it appears that some respondents do not fully understand P5, so they have difficulty implementing P5 with students.

In the process variable, the data obtained relates to the initial assessment, project implementation according to the scheduled stages and formative assessment. All parts of the process variable are part of the project implementation stages carried out by teachers and students. The results obtained from the evaluation of the process variable, the level of program effectiveness is classified as effective. The direction of the T score shows a dominant positive direction.

If we look again based on the direction of the T score on each question item. In question items number 5, 6, 9, and 10 the direction of the T score shows negative results. In question items 5 and 6 relate to project implementation according to the scheduled stages, namely: "Starting a project with authentic (real) problems experienced by students" and "Project implementation is centered on students". From the two statements, it appears that in its implementation, several stages in the implementation of P5 were not carried out properly, especially those related to optimizing students as the center of the implementation of P5. When associated with the results of observations, these stages were skipped by project assistants and there were still project assistants who played a greater role than students during the implementation of P5. Meanwhile, for questions number 9 and 10 regarding Formative Assessment, namely: "Formative assessment is carried out to understand the process of student learning development" and "Formative assessment results are not used to provide feedback to students". These two statements provide an overview of how respondents understand the function of formative assessment and the implementation of formative assessment. From the results of the respondents' answers, it appears that respondents do not understand the function of formative assessment. When associated with the results of observations, it appears that several respondents did not carry out formative assessment, or carried it out but did not understand when carrying out formative assessment and after that did not understand how to use the results of formative assessment.

Finally, in the product variable, the data obtained relates to the learning outcomes of students who have reflected the dimensions of the Pancasila student profile and summative assessment. All parts of the product variable are part of the project implementation stages carried out by teachers and students. The results obtained from the evaluation of the product variable, the level of program effectiveness is classified as ineffective. The direction of the T score shows a dominant negative direction. To be able to clarify why the level of effectiveness of the product variable is ineffective, it can be re-examined based on the direction of the T score on each question item. In question items

number 4, 6, 7, and 8, the direction of the T score shows negative results. In questions 4, 6, and 7 related to student learning outcomes that have reflected the dimensions of the Pancasila student profile, namely: "Students demonstrate an independent character during the implementation of P5", "Students demonstrate flexibility in thinking in finding alternative solutions to problems in producing original ideas, during the implementation of P5" and "Students demonstrate self-understanding of the situation faced in recognizing the qualities and interests of themselves and the challenges faced" during the implementation of P5 "These three statements have a negative T score direction which indicates: (1) Of the 3 characters of the Pancasila student profile that are the focus of the assessment in this project (mutual cooperation, creative and independent) students have not been able to demonstrate an independent character during the implementation of P5, especially understanding their abilities and interests. (2) In producing products as the final result of the project, students have not been able to demonstrate creativity in thinking and finding truly new ideas. When associated with the findings in the observation, students tend to act or carry out an activity while waiting for instructions from the project implementer in their class, in addition, the products produced by students during the P5 activity are relatively similar to the products produced by students in the previous academic year. In question 8 related to summative assessment, namely: "Students indicate "Summative assessment is not carried out at the end of the implementation of the P5 program, and". This statement has a negative T score direction which indicates that the implementation of summative assessment as an important part of the implementation of P5 is not optimal. When associated with the results of observations, where the P5 summative assessment is not in the form of a structured test like summative learning, but can be in the form of products or actions, so that its implementation receives less attention from teachers and students. The results of this study show an anomaly, where the results of the context, input and process variables are effective, but the results of the product variable are ineffective. The assumption is that the context variable is a variable related to the basis of P5 planning and the input variable is a resource related to P5 planning, effective results in these two variables will also provide effective results in the next variable, namely process. It is also assumed that effective results in the process variable will provide effective results in the product variable. conducting formative assessments and after that does not understand how to utilize the results of formative assessments.

Finally, in the product variable, the data obtained is related to the learning outcomes of students which have reflected the dimensions of Pancasila student profiles and summative assessments. All product variable parts are part of the project implementation stages carried out by teachers and students. The results obtained from the evaluation of product variables, the level of effectiveness of the program is classified as ineffective. The direction of the T score indicates the direction of the dominant negative. To be able to clarify why the level of effectiveness of the product variable is ineffective, it can be re-examined based on the direction of the T score on each question item. In question items 4, 6, 7, and 8, the direction of the T score indicates a negative result. In questions number 4, 6, and 7 related to student learning outcomes that have reflected the dimensions of Pancasila student profiles, namely: "Students show independent character during the implementation of P5", "Students show flexibility in thinking in finding

alternative problem-solving in producing original ideas, during the implementation of P5" and "Students show self-understanding of the situation faced in recognizing their qualities and interests as well as the challenges faced" in during the implementation of P5. The three statements have a negative T score direction that shows: (1) Of the 3 Pancasila student profile characters that are the focus of the assessment in this project (mutual cooperation, creative and independent) students have not been able to show independent character at the time of the implementation of P5, especially understanding their abilities and interests. (2) In producing products as the final result of the project, students are not yet able to show creativity in thinking and finding completely new ideas. When associated with the findings in observation, students tend to do or carry out an activity while waiting for instructions from the project implementer in their class, besides that the products produced by students in P5 activities are relatively the same as the products produced by students in the previous school year. In question number 8 related to summative assessment, namely: "Students stated "Summative assessment is not carried out at the end of the implementation of the P5 program, and". This statement has a negative T score direction which shows that the implementation of summative assessment as an important part of the implementation of P5 is not optimal. When associated with the results of observation, where the P5 summative assessment is not in the form of a structured test like summative learning, but can be in the form of products or actions, so that its implementation receives less attention from teachers and students. The results of this study show that there is an anomaly, where the results of context, input and process variables are effective, but the results of product variables are ineffective. The assumption is that the context variable is a variable related to the basis of P5 planning and the input variable is a resource related to P5 planning, then an effective result in these two variables will also give an effective result in the next variable, namely the process. It is also assumed that an effective result in a process variable will give an effective result in a product variable.

4   Conclusion

Based on the research that has been conducted on "Evaluation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Program in Junior High Schools in Badung Regency", it can be concluded that the effectiveness of the Pancasila student profile strengthening program is reviewed from the context of obtaining positive (+) or effective results. The principal, BOS treasurer and teachers understand the P5 program policy, the basis for selecting the theme, the expected objectives of the program implementation and the project theme that will be implemented as part of the P5 Program planning stage. The effectiveness of the Pancasila student profile strengthening program is reviewed from the input of obtaining positive (+) or effective results. The principal, BOS treasurer and teachers understand the resources used in implementing the program, the quality of teachers who are implementing P5, and the P5 implementation design contained in the P5 module when designing the P5 program. The effectiveness of the Pancasila student profile strengthening program is reviewed from the process of obtaining positive (+) or

effective results. Teachers as project implementers and students as project implement-ers understand the function and implementation of initial assessment, project imple-mentation according to each scheduled stage, and the function and implementation of formative assessment in the implementation of P5. The effectiveness of the Pancasila student profile strengthening program reviewed from the product obtained negative re-sults (-) or was ineffective. Teachers as project implementers and students as project implementers understand the dimensions of the Pancasila student profile that did not grow optimally during the implementation of the project until the end of the project, as well as the implementation of the summative assessment that was not appropriate at the end of the implementation of P5. Based on the Glickman quadrant, the effectiveness of the Pancasila student profile strengthening program is included in the effective category (+ + + -). However, there are several notes and recommendations for improving the implementation of the program in the future.

References

[1] T. Triwiyanto, *Pengantar Pendidikan*. Madiun: Bumi Aksara, 2021.

[2] I. M. Sugiarta, I. B. P. Mardana, A. Adiarta, and W. Artanayasa, "Filsafat Pendidikan Ki Hajar Dewantara (Tokoh Timur)," *JFI*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 124–136, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.23887/jfi.v2i3.22187.

[3] M. Husnaini, E. Sarmiati, and S. M. Harimurti, "Pembelajaran Sosial Emosional: Tinjauan Filsafat Humanisme terhadap Kebahagiaan dalam Pembelajaran," *J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1026–1036, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.37985/jer.v5i2.887.

[4] I. M. A. Giri, "Supervisi Pendidikan dalam Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan di Sekolah," *J.PM*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 44, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.25078/jpm.v2i1.60.

[5] D. L. Stufflebeam and G. Zhang, *The CIPP Evaluation Model: How to Evaluate for Im-provement and Accountability*. New York: Guilford Publications, 2017.

[6] D. L. Stufflebeam, "The CIPP Model for Evaluation," in *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation*, D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, and T. Kellaghan, Eds., Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2000, pp. 279–317. doi: 10.1007/0-306-47559-6_16.

[7] S. Aziz, M. Mahmood, and Z. Rehman, "Implementation of CIPP Model for Quality Eval-uation at School Level: A Case Study," *Journal of Education and Educational Develop-ment*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 189–206, Jun. 2018.

[8] K. A. Umam and I. Saripah, "Using the Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Model in the Evaluation of Training Programs," *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education*, vol. 2, p. 19, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.20961/ijpte.v2i0.26086.

[9] S. Yuliastuti, I. Ansori, and M. Fathurrahman, "Pelaksanaan Projek Penguatan Profil Pela-jar Pancasila (P5) Tema Kewirausahaan Kelas 4 SD Labschool UNNES Kota Semarang," *Jurnal LEMBARAN ILMU KEPENDIDIKAN*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2022.

[10] T. Y. Utami and A. T. A. Hardini, "Evaluasi Program Kegiatan Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila (P5) Fase B di SD Negeri Kalicacing 02 Salatiga," *Pendas : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, vol. 9, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.23969/jp.v9i2.14575.

[11] A. Monalisa, "Implementasi Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila pada Sekolah Penggerak di SDN 198/1 Pasar Baru," other, UNIVERSITAS JAMBI, Jambi, 2024. Ac-cessed: Apr. 03, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://repository.unja.ac.id/

[12]   I. M. Wiratnyana, I. M. Yudana, and D. G. H. Divayana, "Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Program Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter," *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan Indonesia*, vol. 11, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.23887/japi.v11i2.3427.

[13]   N. M. D. Pratiyaksi, I. W. Suja, and I. B. P. Arnyana, "Analisis peran modul ajar Kurikulum merdeka dalam penerapan profil Pancasila terhadap pembentukan karakter siswa SMP terkait Tri Hita Karana," *JPBPP*, vol. 4, no. 12, p. 23, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.17977/um065.v4.i12.2024.23.

[14]   I. Muhammad, "Pengaruh Perkuliahan Daring Terhadap Kemandirian Belajar Mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan Matematika Universitas Malikussaleh," *1*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 24–30, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.32505/qalasadi.v4i1.1567.

[15]   H. Hasanah, "Teknik-Teknik Observasi (Sebuah Alternatif Metode Pengumpulan Data Kualitatif Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial)," *At-Taqaddum*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 21–46, 2016, doi: 10.21580/at.v8i1.1163.