



CIPP, Stake Model, Goal Free Model, Formative-Sumative Model (Applications in Education)

Ahmad SUGIAN NOOR^{a*}, Dina HERMINA^b, Yahya MOF^b

^a*Postgraduate Islamic Education, Universitas Negeri Islam Negeri Antasari, Banjarmasin, Indonesia*

^b*Universitas Negeri Islam Negeri Antasari, Banjarmasin, Indonesia*

Abstract

Program evaluation is a crucial component in efforts to improve educational quality. This article examines four primary evaluation frameworks CIPP (Context–Input–Process–Product), the Stake Model (Antecedents, Transactions, Outcomes), Goal Free Evaluation, and the Formative–Summative Model and illustrates their practical applications in the field. The CIPP model provides a comprehensive evaluation guide from needs analysis through outcome measurement, supporting ongoing decision-making. The Stake Model emphasizes both descriptive and judgmental activities across initial conditions, instructional processes, and final outcomes, offering a complete picture of program effectiveness. Goal Free Evaluation adopts a fresh perspective by observing all real impacts including unanticipated effects without being bound by formal goal statements, thereby uncovering opportunities for innovative improvements. In contrast, the Formative–Summative Model divides evaluation into formative feedback during the process and summative assessment at the end, enabling timely interventions and comprehensive outcome measurement. By understanding the characteristics and advantages of each model, educators can select or combine the most appropriate frameworks to create adaptive, responsive, and sustainable learning.

Keywords: CIPP, Stake Model, Goal Free Model, Formative-Sumative Model, Education.

Acknowledgments: Thank you to my postgraduate friends who have provided encouragement to write this article, as well as to the lecturers at the graduate school who provided materials to be used as the basis for this writing.

For citation:

Noor, A. S. Hermina, D., & MOF, Y. (2025). CIPP, Stake Model, Goal Free Model, Formative-Sumative Model (Applications in Education). *Journal of Digital Learning and Distance Education*, 4(3), 1585-1592. <https://doi.org/10.56778/jdlde.v4i3.539>.

Introduction

In general, evaluation has two main functions: to know achievement results of students and results of teaching (Winkel, 1989). Knowledge about student results related to how far students have reached objective learning or competencies that have been applied.

While results teaching related teachers with to what extent teachers as manager Study student in matter planning, managing, leading and evaluating (Rohmad, 2017). Reality show that still many reduce evaluation as activity test, thing This proven with activity prominent evaluation in institutions and units education is implementation tests conducted after completion main discussion certain (competence) base certain) as test formative and test end of semester known with test summative as well as test held at the end level education certain in form exam end school and exams national. From the test formative, summative, to exam end school and exams national, part big in form test, and test the part big in form test written. Even though test written just one of them form test (beside test oral and action), and tests just one of them from technique evaluation (in addition to non- test techniques / alternative tests).

Use technique test written for measure penca paian results Study participant education that includes various domains/ areas (cognitive, affective and psychomotor) have goods Of course No can give valid and reliable information as well as No in harmony with principle continuity, objectivity, balance and comprehensiveness a evaluation (Rohmad, 2017). Arikunto (2013) mention base other evaluations such as validity, reliability, objectivity, practicability and economy. Test appropriate used for measure cognitive domain achievement, but no appropriate for measure achievement realm affective. Even though coverage educational goals both at the level of national, level level education, unit education, even until objective eye lesson (standard) competence eye lessons) focus on cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains. So that ironic of course a long learning process (3 to with 6 years), sometimes determined by the results test written and implemented a few hours on the eyes lesson certain. In this article will described in a way summary per development studies about evaluation that has been give birth to various evaluation models. With know a variety of evaluation models are expected will add treasury information to the perpetrators education specifically power teacher, that for know achievement results Study students and the effectiveness of the learning process can done with choose one of the evaluation models or merge two evaluation models or more.

Methodology

A study can be considered good according to (Snyder, 2019), if it produces data that can be accounted for. Therefore, a research methodology is necessary to ensure that the study remains within the procedures and norms that have been established. Regarding the research methodology, there are several aspects that need to be considered, one of which is the type of research, which in this case is a literature review. For the data collection technique in this study, the author uses the technique of literature review. Defensively, a literature review, according to Goertel (2023), is a methodological approach that involves the examination and analysis of existing written sources such as articles, books, and documents to collect data and insights for a research project. The process undertaken by the author includes searching for relevant literature, summarizing previous studies, identifying gaps in the review, presenting research questions or hypotheses, and ensuring that the selected literature constructs a clear argument leading to the current research.

Results and Discussion

This model developed by a team led by Stufflebeam at the *National Study Committee on Evaluation of Phi Delta Kappa* at Ohio State University (Ibrahim, 2018). This model is an evaluation modal that uses management - oriented *evaluation* approach or called as form evaluation program management (*evaluation in program management*) (Latip). The CIPP evaluation model in principle strongly supports the decision-making process. decision with submit alternatives and follow-up consequence from a decision (Nurchayawati et al., 2022). So that in accordance with its name is CIPP model own four type evaluation namely: Evaluation *Context* (context), Evaluation *Input* (input), Evaluation *process*, and Evaluation *Product* (result) (Rohmad, 2017). Fourth type evaluation the is as following: Evaluation Context interpreted as situation or background the back that affects types

goals and needs that will be achieved by the program. Evaluation context This help plan decision, determine the needs that will be achieved by the program, and formulate program objectives, such as; policies department or the work unit concerned, the target to be achieved achieved by the work unit in period time certain, problems the power faced in the work unit concerned, and so on. This means evaluation context evaluate needs, problems, assets and opportunities for help maker decision set goals and priorities as well as help stakeholders assess goals, priorities, and outcomes Context in system equivalent with objectives of the program to be evaluated (Ibrahim, 2018).

Main purpose from evaluation *context* is for know strengths and weaknesses evaluator. The evaluator identifies various factors teachers, participants educate, management, facilities work, atmosphere work, regulations, roles committee school, society and other possible factors influential to curriculum (Ratnawulan & Rusdiana, 2014). This is related with background behind an Institution for identify the need stage change or the emergence of programs from a number of the subjects involved in taking decision. The information that was mined among others whether decision generating the idea for the program taken Already in accordance with needs and potential institution For implement it. Evaluation context is also done For test whether the program's objectives and priorities have been designed based on analysis need (Ibrahim, 2018). Second stage from the CIPP model is evaluation input. Main purpose evaluation This is for to hook purpose, context, input, process with program results. Evaluation this is also for determine conformity environment in help achievement the goals and objectives of the program. Besides that, evaluation This made For fix the program not For prove a truth (*The purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to Improve*) (Ibrahim, 2018). Evaluation This important Because for giving consideration to success implementation curriculum. The evaluator determines level benefit various factors studied in context implementation curriculum. Considerations about This become base for evaluators to determine whether need There is revision or changeover curriculum (Ratnawulan & Rusdiana, 2014).

Input evaluation is carried out for identify and assess capability resource materials, tools, people and costs (*material, machine, man, money*) for implement the program that has been done selected. Evaluation done with method compare what is the solution strategy problems and design stages activity Already relevant, feasible and economical in accordance with source the power possessed. For example with identify: 1) suitability between plan Work with costs and time available; 2) capabilities source Power man For implementing the program; 3) availability materials and tools For implement the program. Process evaluation is evaluation about implementation from a innovation curriculum. The evaluator collects various information about implementation implementation curriculum, various strengths and weaknesses of the implementation process. The evaluator must record various the influence of input variables on the process (Ratnawulan & Rusdiana, 2014). Process evaluation in the CIPP model is directed at how much far activities carried out Already implemented in accordance with plan. Process evaluation in the CIPP model refers to "what" activities are carried out. in the program, "who" is *the* person appointed as guarantor answer the program, "when" (*when*) the activity will finished.

Process evaluation is strategy implementation and use means /capital, materials in the activity real in the field, for help implement decision. Until how far along is the plan has applied? What should be revised? So question the answered, procedure can monitored, controlled, and repaired and the process components are equivalent with implementation. With another meaning that process evaluation is used for detect or predict design procedure or design implementation during stage implementation, providing information for program decisions and as recording or archive procedures that have been occurs. Process evaluation includes collection of assessment data that has been determined and implemented in practice implementation of the program. Basically process evaluation for know until how far along is the plan has applied and components what is needed fixed. Other tasks of process assessment is see notes events that arise during the program from time to time. Note notes kind of That perhaps would be very useful in determine weaknesses and strengths or factor Supporter as well as factor program inhibitor. A good program (which is worthy of for assessed) of

course Already designed about who is given not quite enough answer in division, what form its activities, and when the activities the Already implemented.

Process evaluation aims for identify or predict obstacles in implementation activity or program implementation. Evaluation done with take notes or documenting every incident in implementation potential activities inhibit and cause difficulties that are not expected, found information special that is outside plan; assess and explain the process in detail actual. During the process evaluation, the evaluator is required interact with staff program implementer in Keep going continuously (Ibrahim, 2018). As for the purpose main from evaluation results is For determine to what extent the curriculum is implemented the has can fulfil need the group that uses it (Ratnawulan & Rusdiana, 2014). This is in line with statement from Ibrahim that the main goal evaluation product is For measure, interpret and decide the results that have been achieved by the program namely whether has can fulfil need in accordance with expected goal or not yet. Evaluation products are also often done For measure impact term long that is expected / unexpected program impact expected or impact positive and negative (Ibrahim, 2018). In its implementation evaluation program results implemented with gather evaluation from every individual and also collective with review from achievement purpose. Its application evaluation products also check the impacts of good programs that are appropriate with objective or not according to the results negative and also positive, and sometimes expanded with evaluation impact term long from implementation product. So that function Finally is determination a program that can continued, repeated, can developed elsewhere or even must stopped (Aristya et al., 2023).

According to Ibrahim there is a number of benefit from evaluation products, namely 1) Give bait come back about the results that have been achieved by the program if the program will implemented again; 2) Become base For determine Where location the success of the program that can continued, repeated or expanded to other areas; 3) Modify the program so that can serve all target program users with more effective; 4) Report incident special found or notes important as material consideration in designing other programs that will use the same strategy; 5) Help other program developers for decide similar policies; 6) Decide whether accept, change, end the program with use related criteria direct with objective (Ibrahim, 2018). Advantages and Weaknesses of the CIPP Model Such as as if a approach in knowledge social, CIPP has a number of advantages and disadvantages; 1) Advantages of the CIPP model CIPP own a holistic approach in evaluation, aims give a very detailed and extensive overview to a project, start from the context until during the implementation process. CIPP has potential for moving in the area of formative and summative evaluation. So that The same the good thing is in help do repair while the program is running, or give final information; 2) The weaknesses of the CIPP model are too take importance how the process should be than reality on the ground, impression too top down with characteristic managerial in his approach Tend focus on rational management rather than confess complexity reality empirical (Ibrahim, 2018).

1. Stake Model

Stake analysis of the evaluation model he proposed bring enough impact big in field this and put simple basics However is quite a concept strong for further development Far in field evaluation. Stake emphasizes existence two base activity in evaluation namely description and judgment and differentiation existence three stage in the education program, namely: *Antecedents (Context)*, *Transaction (Process)*, and *Outcomes (Output)* (Ibrahim, 2018).

Stake stated that if evaluate an educational program, then must do relative comparison between one program with another. In this model antecendent (input), transaction (process) and outcomes (results) of data are compared No only For determine whether There is difference between objective with the actual situation, but also compared with absolute standard For evaluate program benefits (Tayibnapis, 2000).

Stake identifies 3 (three) stages from evaluation of educational programs and factors that influence them that is: 1) Input (*Antecedents phase*); before the program is implemented: Conditions / events what is there before program implementation? Is condition / event This will affect the

program?; 2) Process (*Transactions phase*); program execution : What actually happens happen during the program implementation ? What is the program that is being implemented? implemented That in accordance with program plan?; 3) Results (*Outcomes phase*), knowing consequence implementation at the end of the program. What is the program? implemented in accordance with what is expected? Is it client show behavior at a higher level compared to when they is at before the program is implemented?

Every stages the shared become two part namely description and judgment. The Stake Model will can give description implementation of the program in-depth and detailed. Therefore That perceptions of the people involved in system education like teacher behavior, role head school, behavior students and learning process situations teaching at school is the reality that must be be noticed.

Stake says that if We evaluate an educational program we, do relative comparison between one program with another, or comparison absolute (one program with standards). General emphasis or the important thing in this model is that the evaluator who makes evaluation about the program being evaluated. Stake said that description in one party different with judgment or assess. In this model, *antecedents* (inputs), *transactions* (processes), and *outcomes* (results) of data are compared. No only for determine whether There is difference objective with the actual situation, but also compared with absolute standard, for evaluate benefits of the program. Stake said that not There is study can reliable if no assessed (Ibrahim, 2018).

2. Goal Free Model

This evaluation model was developed by Michael Scriven. can it is said opposite with the first model developed by Tyler, the evaluator continuously monitor purpose, namely since start of the process continues see how far is the goal the Already achieved, in the goal free evaluation model (evaluation) off from purpose) precisely turn around from purpose. According to mechael scriven, in carry out program evaluation evaluator does not need notice what is it program objectives. What is needed be noticed in the program is How the program works, with road identify the appearances that occurred Good matter positive (what is expected) and matter negative (indeed no expected) (Mardiah & Syarifudin, 2019).

The reason why the purpose of the program is not need be noticed because There is the possibility of the evaluator being too Details observe each and every objective special. If each goal special achieved, meaning fulfilled in appearance, but the evaluator forgot notice how far each performance the support appearance last expected by the goal general so the result amount appearance special This No Lots useful. From the description this explained that which is meant with evaluation off from objective in this model instead of off The same very from objective but only off from objective special (Arikunto & Jabar, 2010).

Characteristic features evaluation free objective is, 1) Avoid know program objectives; 2) The goals that have been formulated moreover formerly No justified narrow down focus evaluation; 3) Evaluation free objective focus on actual results, not planned results; 4) Relationship between evaluator and manager or with employee project made as minimal as possible possible; 5) Evaluation add possibility found impact that is not predicted (Wardani et al., 2022).

From the explanation above can writer conclude that the Goal Free Evaluation Model (evaluation model) off from objectives). Evaluation model This developed by Michael Scriven. This model opposite with the first one above is goal- oriented, while the second model is This is a loose evaluation model from purpose. However, the emphasis here is that off from objective It means is off from objective special, not from objective general. this model Still still consider objective general from a program.

3. Formative-Sumative Model

In addition to the Goal Free model. Michael Scriven also developed another model, namely the formative-summative model. This model show existence stages and scope the object being evaluated, namely evaluation carried out while the program is still running walking (called evaluation formative) and when the program is already finished or ended (called as summative) (Harahap et al., 2024).

Different with the first model developed, the second model This when carry out evaluation, the evaluator does not can release self from objectives. Objectives of evaluation formative of course different with objective evaluation summative. With thus, the model put forward by Michael Scriven pointing about “what”, “when”, “purpose” of evaluation the implemented.

Evaluation formative in a way principle is evaluation carried out when the program is still ongoing. The goal evaluation formative the is for know how much far program designed can taking place, at the same time can identify obstacles. With it is known obstacles and things that cause the program not to smooth, taker decision in a way early can stage Supporting fixes smoothness achievement program objectives (Mardiah & Syarifudin, 2019).

Evaluation summative done after the program ends. The purpose of evaluation summative is for measure program achievement. Function evaluation summative in learning program evaluation intended as means for know position or position individual in the his group. Considering that object target and time implementation different between evaluation formative and summative, then scope The targets being evaluated are also different (Arikunto & Jabar, 2010).

4. Application of CIPP, Stake Model, Goal Free Model, Formative-Summative Model in Education

CIPP Model, in practice education, CIPP model is used for support taking decision sustainable in every learning program phase. Context, School do analysis need beginning. for example, survey interests and difficulties Study students, as base formulation objective learning; Input, Curriculum Team evaluate adequacy source power (eg. budget, books, and teacher competencies) before launch module new; Process: During the semester, the evaluator documents implementation activities, such as method discussion or practice laboratory and give bait come back weekly to the teacher; Product: After the end of the semester, the results Study measured No only through mark tests, but also portfolios assignments and observations attitude, to evaluate success of the program in general comprehensive. For example, a high school wants to increase ability students' scientific literacy. In the Context phase, they stage interview with students and parents For formulate purpose; in the Input phase, check availability laboratory; in the Process phase, carry out observation teaching every months; and in the Product phase, measure improvement ability experiment student through project end.

Stake Model. Stake Model emphasizes two activity evaluation, description and judgment, on three levels stage namely, Antecedents, taking inventory condition beginning class or program (eg. profile academic students), Transactions, describe the teaching and learning process daily and assess its suitability with plan (eg. take notes method learning, teacher- student interaction; Outcomes: Measure results end, good in a way quantitative (value) exam) and qualitative (portfolio, interview) then compare with standards that have been determined. For example, in a madrasah, the evaluator describes condition Antecedents of ability Arabic language students, monitoring activity learning look at face (Transactions) with make journal daily, then evaluate results end ability read-write the Qur'an (Outcomes) and compare them with syllabus targets.

Goal Free Model, In Goal Free Evaluation, the evaluator deliberately " removes " the focus on the goal. special that has been formulated, and vice versa observe all impact of the program, both anticipated and and also No as primary data. In case This Evaluator noted all results real activity learning without see the teacher's “goal statements” or curriculum. This is allow found effect side positive (eg. improvement creativity) or negative (eg. decline motivation on topic certain) which during This missed. Example, an evaluator infiltrates as an “observer” without an agenda” in class art appearance: he documenting all interactions and results work student without care syllabus, up to

seen that use music background it turns out to be very influential concentration students, insights that are not unexpected from objective beginning.

The Formative-Summative Model separates evaluation become two phase, Formative (formative); Done while the program is still walk for identify obstacles and provide repair soon. For example, a quiz weekly live analyzed by the teacher for adapt plan next week's lesson. Summative: Implemented after the program or unit of study finished, aiming measure achievement as a whole, for example exam end of semester or presentation project end. For example, in courses teaching the Koran, teachers use pre-tests and assignments practice every two week (formative) for map difficulty students, then close with exam reading and memorization (summative) for determine graduation and recommendations act carry on.

Conclusion

Evaluation model own role important in evaluate effectiveness a program. The CIPP model developed by Stufflebeam is management oriented with four aspect evaluation: *context* (assess background behind program needs), *input* (identifying source power and strategies used), *process* (assessing program implementation), and *product* (determining success and impact of the program). This model nature holistic but tends to be top-down. The Stake Model developed by Robert Stake emphasizes two aspect main in evaluation, namely *description* (description) and *judgment* (judgment). This model share evaluation to in three stage: *antecedents* (input before the program starts), *transactions* (program implementation process), and *outcomes* (results). end of program). This model compare program data with standard absolute For evaluate its benefits. The Goal Free Model developed by Michael Scriven has approach different, namely evaluate the program without bound to purpose special that has been set previously. This model more focused on results real thing that happened during the program, both planned or not. Approach This aiming avoid evaluator bias towards the objectives of the program that have been determined. Finally, the Formative-Summative Model, also developed by Scriven, differentiates evaluation become two stage: *formative evaluation* done while the program is still walk For identify obstacles and enablers repair immediately, while *summative evaluation* done after the program ends For measure achievement objective in a way overall. In general overall, each evaluation model own approach and excellence alone depends on the purpose evaluation that you want achieved.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest

References:

- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. PT. Bumi Aksara.
- Arikunto, S., & Jabar, C. S. A. (2010). *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Pedoman Teoretis Praktis Bagi Praktis Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara.
- Aristya, S., Zurqoni, & Sugeng. (2023). CIPP: Implementation of the Educational Evaluation Model. *Jurnal Evaluasi Dan Pembelajaran*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.52647/jep.v5i1.84>
- Goertel, R. A. (2023). *Literature Review*. In A. L. Nichols & J. Edlund (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Research Methods and Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harahap, H., Zulqaidah, Tanjung, R. S., & Silalahi, K. A. (2024). Model Evaluasi Dalam Program Pendidikan. *IMJEIJ: Indo-MathEdu Intellectuals Journal*, 5(3).
- Ibrahim, M. M. (2018). *Penelitian Evaluasi Bidang Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kualitatif)*. Alauddin University Press.

- Latip, A. E. (n.d.). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran: Inovasi Penilaian Hasil Belajar*. Puslitpen LP2M UIN Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Mardiah, M., & Syarifudin, S. (2019). Model-Model Evaluasi Pendidikan. *Mitra Ash-Shibyan: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Konseling*, 2(1), 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.46963/mash.v2i1.24>
- Nurchayawati, E., Suryadin, A., Djollong, P. A. F., & Supadmi. (2022). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran di Era Digital 5.0* (1st ed.). Yayasan Wiyata Bestari Samasta.
- Ratnawulan, E., & Rusdiana, H. A. (2014). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran*. Pustaka Setia.
- Rohmad. (2017). *Pengembangan Instrumen Evaluasi dan Penelitian* (1st ed.). Kalimedia.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Tayibnapis, F. Y. (2000). *Evaluasi Program*. Rineka Cipta.
- Wardani, H. K., Darusuprati, F., & Hajaroh, M. (2022). Model-Model Evaluasi Pendidikan Dasar (Scriven Model, Tyler Model, dan Goal Free Evaluation). *Jurnal Pendidikan: Riset Dan Konseptual*, 6(1), 36. https://doi.org/10.28926/riset_konseptual.v6i1.446
- Winkel, W. S. (1989). *Psikologi Pengajaran*. Gramedia.