# EVALUATION OF THE CIPP MODEL IN THE TAX ADMINISTRATION CORE SYSTEM BUSINESS PROCESS E-LEARNING PROGRAM AT THE TAX EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER

**Yudi Ristu Prihawan**[1]
**Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia**
yudiristu.2023@student.uny.ac.id

**Sugeng Bayu Wahyono**[2]
**Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia**
sugeng_bw@uny.ac.id

## Abstract

This study evaluates the SIAP Core Tax Administration System Business Process E-learning Program delivered by the Tax Training Center, Ministry of Finance, Indonesia, using the CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, Product). The evaluation examines alignment with organizational needs, resource readiness, implementation quality, and impacts on participants' performance and their work units within the Directorate General of Taxes' digital transformation agenda. A descriptive quantitative design was applied at the Tax Training Center and the Directorate General of Taxes (Special Region Jakarta). Participants were program alumni. Data were collected through a CIPP-based questionnaire and complemented by interviews with e-learning managers, with triangulation supported by relevant documents. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while interview findings were used to enrich interpretation. Results indicate that the program is rated very good across all CIPP components: the context shows clear needs-based design and policy support; inputs reflect adequate instructors, learning materials, and facilities; the process demonstrates structured delivery with interactive elements; and the product reveals positive effects on participants' competence and job performance. The study recommends continuous improvement and periodic evaluation of the program to strengthen human resource capacity for SIAP implementation.

**Keywords:** CIPP, E-Learning, Evaluation, Employee Performance, Learning Technology

## INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation in public administration increasingly depends on the readiness of civil servants to adopt new business processes and information systems. In the tax domain, changes in core systems reshape workflows, data governance, and service delivery, making structured competency development essential. E-learning is frequently selected to scale training efficiently across geographically distributed units and to standardize learning experiences. However, large-scale e-learning initiatives require continuous assurance that training goals, resources, delivery, and outcomes remain aligned and effective (Yustanti & Novita, 2019; A. Yusup, 2018).

The Directorate General of Taxes has introduced the SIAP Core Tax Administration System as a strategic modernization agenda. To support its implementation, the Tax Training Center provides the SIAP Business Process E-Learning program for employees who must operationalize new workflows. Because the program targets applied competence in operational settings, evaluation needs to move beyond participation-oriented indicators. In practice, program monitoring in many public training contexts tends to rely primarily on basic metrics, such as registration, completion rates, and participant satisfaction, which are insufficient to determine whether participants can transfer learning into workplace performance and execute SIAP-related tasks effectively (Bercu, 2017a; E. Damanik et al., 2020).

Program evaluation literature emphasizes that effectiveness should be judged against explicit criteria and decision needs, particularly when training is closely linked to organizational change. The CIPP model is widely used for this purpose because it positions evaluation as decision support for planning, implementation monitoring, and summative judgment. Within the CIPP model, evidence is organized to assess whether program objectives respond to needs (context), whether resources and design are adequate (input), whether delivery is implemented as intended (process), and whether outcomes are meaningful for work performance (product). Prior studies in Indonesian education and training settings also indicate that the CIPP model is practical for identifying program strengths as well as actionable gaps for improvement (Bhakti, 2017; M. A. Christiani, 2018).

Despite the strategic importance of SIAP-related training, empirical evidence on the quality and workplace relevance of the SIAP Business Process E-Learning program remains limited in the context of public-sector training institutions. Without such evidence, training investments may not produce the required competency shifts, which can undermine successful SIAP adoption and, ultimately, the broader modernization agenda.

This study therefore aims to evaluate the SIAP Business Process E-Learning program using the CIPP model to determine its overall status and to map priority areas for refinement. It addresses four research questions corresponding to the context, input, process, and product components, drawing on the perceptions of program alumni. The findings are expected to provide actionable insights for program improvement and contribute to the body of knowledge on systematic evaluation of digital learning programs in government training institutions (Aryanti et al., 2016; Sutanta, 2009).

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

E-learning is a learning approach that leverages networked digital technology to deliver instruction and facilitate learner interaction with content and support services. In organizational training, e-learning is expected to enable flexibility, ensure consistent messaging, and allow rapid updating of materials as policies and information systems evolve. These characteristics are especially crucial in public administration, where regulatory changes and system modernization—such as the introduction of a new core tax administration system—require training to be disseminated quickly and uniformly across dispersed units. Nevertheless, effectiveness depends on content quality, the usability of the learning platform, and adequate learner support throughout participation. Prior research shows that learner experience and system usability substantially influence engagement and learning outcomes (Yustanti & Novita, 2019; Yusup, 2018).

Within the CIPP approach, evaluation is positioned as a decision-oriented activity that supplies information for continuous improvement and accountability. Context evaluation examines the alignment between needs, objectives, and policy direction; input evaluation focuses on strategy, resources, and design feasibility; process evaluation monitors implementation and identifies deviations; and product evaluation assesses intended outcomes as well as unintended effects. Empirical applications suggest that the CIPP model can provide a transparent basis for program continuation, revision, or scaling (Bhakti, 2017; Christiani, 2018). Its comprehensive and phased structure makes it particularly suitable for evaluating complex training interventions such as SIAP Business Process E-Learning, where assessing alignment from needs identification and instructional design through delivery quality to workplace impact is critical.

The ultimate aim of such a decision-oriented evaluation is to assess training outcomes, which in organizational contexts are commonly discussed in terms of learning transfer and contribution to performance. A strong program is not only well designed and implemented but also produces knowledge and skills that are applied to work tasks, thereby improving productivity and service quality. Evidence from workplace learning indicates that perceived relevance, facilitation quality, and supportive work environments are associated with higher levels of application on the job. For a program like SIAP Business Process E-Learning—where the objective is applied operational competence—product evaluation should therefore examine the extent to which participants perceive that they can execute new workflows and perform SIAP-related tasks more effectively, in addition to reporting perceived performance impacts (Bercu, 2017b; Fibriany & Oktaviani, 2019).

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a descriptive evaluative approach to assess the SIAP Business Process E-Learning program using the CIPP model. In practice, a descriptive evaluative approach focuses on comprehensively describing the program's current condition and generating value judgments about its merit, worth, and improvement priorities, rather than testing interventions or estimating causal effects. This approach was selected because it enables a systematic appraisal of program quality while supporting summative judgments for managerial decision-making. Evaluation criteria were operationalized into indicators across

the four CIPP components—context, input, process, and product—to capture goal–needs alignment, resource and design readiness, implementation quality, and perceived outcomes. This indicator-based structure is consistent with evaluation practices that emphasize explicit criteria and evidence-based interpretation (Arikunto, 2019; Bhakti, 2017).

The participants were 109 alumni who had completed the SIAP Business Process E-Learning program and responded during the study period. Respondents were recruited from the program's alumni database maintained by the Tax Training Center using total (census) recruitment of reachable alumni within the survey window, with voluntary participation. Data were collected primarily through a structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale to measure participant perceptions for each CIPP indicator. To strengthen interpretive credibility, the survey results were triangulated with semi-structured interviews and document review. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with four key informants representing core program functions: one key informant for e-learning implementation departement at the Tax Training Center, one key informants from evaluation departement, one key informants from finance departement, and one key informants from Kemenkeu Learning Center (KLC) Learning Management System platform. The interviews explored issues that could explain survey patterns, including the responsiveness of technical support, interaction and facilitation practices, platform usability, and perceived applicability to workplace tasks. Document review was conducted to corroborate and contextualize participant perceptions by examining key program and governance documents, including the program terms of reference (kerangka acuan program), internal reports on e-learning implementation and evaluation (laporan evaluasi penyelenggaraan e-learning), and the official decree authorizing the e-learning delivery (surat keputusan penyelenggaraan e-learning). Triangulation strengthens interpretive credibility by combining convergent and complementary evidence across sources (Aryanti & Supriyono, 2016; Christiani, 2018).

Data analysis relied on descriptive statistics—primarily means and standard deviations—to summarize performance at the indicator and component levels. Mean scores were translated into evaluative categories using equal interval widths across the 1–5 scale, with the following labels: 1.00–1.80 = Very Poor, 1.81–2.60 = Poor, 2.61–3.40 = Fair, 3.41–4.20 = Good, and 4.21–5.00 = Very Good. Component-level synthesis was then used to identify priority areas for program refinement and to formulate practical recommendations, consistent with evaluative studies aimed at diagnosis rather than causal inference (Arikunto, 2019; Damanik et al., 2020). While this approach provides a robust diagnostic snapshot, the findings are primarily perception-based and do not establish causal relationships between the program and observed workplace performance changes.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To support interpretive clarity, mean scores were translated into qualitative categories using equal-interval cut-offs on the 1–5 scale: 1.00–1.80 = Very Poor, 1.81–2.60 = Poor, 2.61–3.40 = Fair, 3.41–4.20 = Good, and 4.21–5.00 = Very Good. Overall, the mean scores range from 4.138 to 4.404, indicating consistently positive judgments and suggesting that the program is perceived to perform at a **Good to Very Good** level across evaluation domains. The highest ratings appear in indicators related to program grounding and delivery discipline, such as clarity of needs analysis and adherence to schedule (Mean = 4.404), as well as

perceived contribution to unit performance (Mean = 4.404). At the same time, several indicators show comparatively lower—though still positive—scores, particularly learning access stability and technical support responsiveness (Mean = 4.138), which falls within the **Good** category, as well as learner interaction and engagement (Mean = 4.211), which lies at the threshold of **Very Good**. This pattern implies that while the program's design foundation, instructional readiness, and perceived outcome relevance are well established, practical aspects of learner support and interactive experiences remain priority areas for continuous improvement. Building on these tendencies, the following sections discuss the findings by CIPP component—Context, Input, Process, and Product—to specify strengths and targeted refinement priorities.

**Table 1.**
**Selected Indicator Results by CIPP Component**

| Component | Indicator (abridged) | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Context | Needs analysis is clear | 4.404 | 0.694 |
| Context | Objectives match required competence | 4.266 | 0.724 |
| Context | Supported by internal e-learning policy | 4.229 | 0.714 |
| Input | Instructors are competent | 4.376 | 0.623 |
| Input | Methods match the material | 4.284 | 0.688 |
| Input | Stable access during learning | 4.138 | 0.726 |
| Input | KLC is easy to use | 4.294 | 0.708 |
| Process | Implemented according to schedule | 4.404 | 0.674 |
| Process | Materials are clear and understandable | 4.358 | 0.676 |
| Process | Interaction and engagement are sufficient | 4.211 | 0.735 |
| Process | Technical support responds to issues | 4.138 | 0.741 |
| Product | Increased SIAP-related knowledge | 4.394 | 0.592 |
| Product | Apply learning in the job | 4.266 | 0.629 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Product | Improves unit performance | 4.404 | 0.566 |

**Context Evaluation**

**Table 2.**
**Context Component Evaluation Results**

| No. | Indicator | Response Category | Frequency | % | Mean | SD | Max | Min | Overall Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | This e-learning program is based on a clear training needs analysis. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.404 | 0.694 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 11 | 10.09 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 43 | 39.45 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 55 | 50.46 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 2 | The program objectives match the competencies required by the organization. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.266 | 0.724 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 19 | 17.43 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 42 | 38.53 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 48 | 44.04 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 3 | This program is supported by the institution ’s internal e-learning policies. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.229 | 0.714 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 20 | 18.35 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 44 | 40.37 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 45 | 41.28 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |

The context findings indicate that the SIAP Business Process E-Learning program is grounded in a clear needs rationale and is perceived as strategically relevant. Participants rated the clarity of the training needs analysis as Very Good (Mean = 4.404; SD = 0.694), suggesting that learners recognized a credible and well-articulated basis for the program design. This alignment is important because competency-focused e-learning tends to be more effective when learning objectives are derived from verified performance demands and clearly defined workflow changes. From a CIPP perspective, a strong context foundation

enhances the legitimacy of the program as a targeted response to the operational requirements associated with SIAP implementation.

The second context indicator shows that the program objectives are also perceived to match the competence demanded by the organization and are categorized as Very Good (Mean = 4.266; SD = 0.724). This result suggests that participants did not view the training as generic compliance content, but rather as addressing specific knowledge and workflow understanding needed to operationalize SIAP-related processes. When online training is perceived as directly relevant to job tasks, participants are more likely to invest effort, sustain engagement, and translate learning into workplace application. Such relevance is frequently associated with stronger learning transfer and perceived performance contribution (Bercu, 2017b; Fattah, 2017).

The third context indicator further indicates that participants perceive institutional policy support for e-learning at a Very Good level (Mean = 4.229; SD = 0.714). Policy support is critical in public-sector training because it provides governance legitimacy and enables consistent expectations regarding participation, assessment, and follow-through after training. In addition, clear policy backing can facilitate resource allocation and reinforce accountability mechanisms for both delivery quality and post-training application. Overall, these findings suggest that the program has a strong contextual foundation that supports its continuation; however, periodic needs reassessment remains advisable as SIAP workflows and implementation requirements evolve over time.

**Input Evaluation**

**Table 3.**
**Input Component Evaluation Results**

| No. | Indicator | Response Category | Frequency | % | Mean | SD | Max | Min | Overall Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Instructors have adequate digital and pedagogical skills. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.376 | 0.603 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 4 | 3.67 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 60 | 55.05 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 45 | 41.28 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 2 | The KLC platform supports interaction and progress tracking and is easily accessible. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.303 | 0.707 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 16 | 14.68 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 44 | 40.37 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 49 | 44.95 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | The e-learning materials are designed using effective multimedia principles. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.284 | 0.702 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 19 | 17.43 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 40 | 36.70 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 50 | 45.87 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 4 | Facilities and budget are adequate to support e-learning implementation. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.138 | 0.776 | 5 | 3 | Good |
| | | Disagree | 1 | 0.92 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 24 | 22.02 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 43 | 39.45 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 41 | 37.61 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 5 | Technical assistance is available for participants and facilitators. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.294 | 0.709 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 1 | 0.92 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 13 | 11.93 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 48 | 44.04 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 47 | 43.12 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |

Input evaluation examined the adequacy of resources and design elements that enable effective learning delivery. Participants rated instructor competence as Very Good (Mean = 4.376; SD = 0.623), indicating that facilitators were perceived as credible and capable of supporting the learning process. Instructor credibility remains important even in largely asynchronous environments because it shapes learners' trust in the materials, acceptance of guidance, and willingness to engage with complex procedural content. This finding is consistent with the view that facilitation quality supports learner confidence and can sustain engagement throughout online modules.

Instructional strategy and methodology were also categorized as Very Good (Mean = 4.284; SD = 0.688), suggesting that learning activities were perceived as appropriate for the complexity of SIAP business processes. When instructional methods are aligned with procedural content, learners are more likely to develop coherent mental models of workflows and reduce confusion during system use—an important consideration for operational training where errors may have downstream effects on compliance and service quality. From an instructional design standpoint, systematic alignment is a cornerstone of scalable digital training (Chamisijatin & Permana, 2020; Dick & Carey, 2015).

From a technical perspective, stable access during learning received a comparatively lower, though still positive, rating and falls within the Good category (Mean = 4.138; SD = 0.726). In contrast, usability of the Kemenkeu Learning Center (KLC) platform was rated Very Good (Mean = 4.294; SD = 0.708), implying that most participants could navigate the system effectively once access was available. This pattern suggests that usability may be less of a constraint than reliability of access, which can create uneven learning experiences and disproportionately affect participants in units with limited connectivity, device readiness, or local technical support. Accordingly, input improvement priorities should emphasize platform reliability and equitable technical readiness across units to preserve training quality at scale.

**Process Evaluation**

**Table 4.**
**Process Component Evaluation Results**

| No. | Indicator | Response Category | Frequency | % | Mean | SD | Max | Min | Overall Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Learning activities are interactive, flexible, and aligned with adult learners' needs. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.404 | 0.595 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 5 | 4.59 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 55 | 50.46 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 49 | 44.95 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 2 | Instructors actively guide participants and facilitate discussion during the training. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.358 | 0.620 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 10 | 9.17 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 50 | 45.87 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 49 | 44.95 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 3 | Participants receive timely and useful feedback during the training. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.211 | 0.772 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 24 | 22.02 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 38 | 34.86 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 47 | 43.12 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 4 | Participants engage in | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.138 | 0.739 | 5 | 3 | Good |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| collaborative activities and discussions with other participants. | Disagree | 1 | 0.92 |
| | Neutral | 21 | 19.27 |
| | Agree | 49 | 44.95 |
| | Strongly Agree | 38 | 34.86 |
| | Total Responses | 109 | 100 |

Process evaluation examined how the program was implemented and experienced during delivery. Participants reported that implementation followed the planned schedule and was categorized as Very Good (Mean = 4.404; SD = 0.674), indicating operational discipline and predictable learning timeframes. Schedule adherence is a practical quality marker for e-learning in organizational settings because participants typically complete modules alongside daily workloads. It also strengthens accountability by clarifying timelines for participation, assessment, and completion requirements.

The clarity and understandability of learning materials were also rated Very Good (Mean = 4.358; SD = 0.676). This suggests that content was delivered in a form that participants could follow, which is essential when training targets procedural knowledge, workflow sequencing, and system navigation. Clear materials may reduce rework, decrease repetitive support requests, and improve completion rates—thereby increasing training efficiency. In curriculum and training design literature, material clarity is frequently associated with smoother implementation and higher learner satisfaction (Chamisijatin & Permana, 2020; Fauzan, 2017).

Interaction and engagement received a comparatively lower rating but still fell within the Very Good category (Mean = 4.211; SD = 0.735). In contrast, technical support responsiveness during learning was rated Good (Mean = 4.138; SD = 0.741), indicating a more salient area for process improvement. A plausible explanation is that the delivery model prioritizes standardization and scalability—reflected in strong schedule discipline and clear materials—yet this structure may limit opportunities for facilitated discussion, timely feedback, and individualized clarification. Resource constraints (e.g., limited facilitator availability relative to participant volume), asynchronous participation patterns, or platform-support workflows may further contribute to slower or less visible support responsiveness. This pattern also suggests a potential trade-off: strong delivery discipline and tightly structured materials may come partly at the expense of flexible interaction time. Strengthening facilitation mechanisms (e.g., structured discussion prompts, scheduled Q&A windows, and explicit feedback cycles) and improving help-desk coverage and response protocols could enhance the learning experience without undermining scalability (Fibriany & Oktaviani, 2019; Yusup, 2018).

**Product Evaluation**

**Table 5.**
**Product Component Evaluation Results**

| No. | Indicator | Response Category | Frequency | % | Mean | SD | Max | Min | Overall Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | After the training, participants | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.394 | 0.679 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | experience improved knowledge and skills. | Neutral | 12 | 11.01 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 42 | 38.53 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 55 | 50.46 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 2 | Participants are able to apply the training outcomes in their work. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.266 | 0.709 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 14 | 12.84 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 53 | 48.62 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 42 | 38.53 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |
| 3 | This training contributes to improved performance in participants' work units. | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | 4.404 | 0.689 | 5 | 3 | Very Good |
| | | Disagree | 0 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | | Neutral | 12 | 11.01 | | | | | |
| | | Agree | 41 | 37.61 | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Agree | 56 | 51.38 | | | | | |
| | | Total Responses | 109 | 100 | | | | | |

Building on the generally strong implementation process, the evaluation now examines whether these delivery efforts translated into meaningful outcomes for participants and their workplaces. Product evaluation assessed perceived learning outcomes and workplace benefits. Participants reported a Very Good increase in SIAP-related knowledge (Mean = 4.394; SD = 0.592), indicating that key learning objectives were achieved at the cognitive level. This outcome is important because system modernization depends on a shared understanding of workflows, roles, and data processes; in organizational training, knowledge gains provide a necessary foundation for learning transfer and subsequent performance improvement.

Participants also indicated that they could apply the training results to their work and categorized this outcome as Very Good (Mean = 4.266; SD = 0.629). This finding suggests positive perceived learning transfer, which is particularly relevant for training aimed at procedural and operational competence. Transfer is more likely when training content is aligned with job tasks, supported by supervisors, and reinforced through accessible job aids and continuing support. Accordingly, sustaining outcomes requires not only strong instructional content but also reinforcement mechanisms in the work environment (Fattah, 2017; Fibriany & Oktaviani, 2019).

Participants further reported that the program contributed to improved unit performance at a Very Good level (Mean = 4.404; SD = 0.566). While strongly positive, this indicator should be interpreted with appropriate caution because unit-level performance is

influenced by multiple organizational factors beyond training, and participants may not always be able to observe or attribute unit outcomes reliably. The high score may therefore reflect strong perceived relevance and confidence in improved task execution rather than a direct measurement of unit performance change. Future evaluations could complement these perception-based findings by triangulating them with objective indicators (e.g., performance records, post-training assessments, or supervisor evaluations) to strengthen evidence of organizational impact. Overall, the product results support a summative conclusion that the program is feasible to maintain, while targeted enhancements to interaction quality and technical support responsiveness may further strengthen sustained transfer and workplace contribution.

## CONCLUSION

This study evaluated the SIAP Business Process E-Learning program using the CIPP model to provide an evidence-based picture of program quality. Across the four CIPP components, participant perceptions indicate that the program is generally in a very good category and is feasible to continue. The context component shows strong alignment between needs, objectives, and policy support, which provides a robust foundation for sustaining the program. These findings reinforce the value of decision-oriented evaluation to ensure e-learning remains relevant during ongoing organizational transformation.

Input and process assessments indicate that the program is supported by competent instructors, an appropriate instructional strategy, and a learning platform that is largely usable. At the same time, variations in access stability and the responsiveness of technical support suggest that quality assurance should include infrastructure and service standardization across units. Process findings also indicate that interaction and feedback are improvement opportunities, even when overall implementation is rated positively. Improving facilitation and support can strengthen learner experience and reduce the risk of uneven outcomes in large-scale digital training.

The product component indicates that participants gain SIAP-related knowledge, can apply learning at work, and perceive performance benefits for their units. To maximize long-term impact, program managers should reinforce transfer through post-training guidance, refreshed resources, and consistent supervisory support. Future evaluations may add learning analytics or longitudinal tracking to complement perception data and better capture impact over time. Overall, the CIPP framework provides a practical structure for continuous improvement and accountability in public-sector e-learning programs.

## REFERENCES

A Arikunto, S. (2019). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. Rineka Cipta.

Aryanti, T., Supriyono, I., & Ishaq, M. T. (2015). Evaluasi program pendidikan dan pelatihan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Nonformal*, *10*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.17977/um041v10i1p1-13.

Bercu, A. M. (2017). Impact of employees' training programmes on job satisfaction. *Current Science*, *112*(7), 1340–1345. https://doi.org/10.18520/cs/v112/i07/1340-1345

Bhakti, Y. B. (2017). Evaluasi program model CIPP pada proses pembelajaran IPA. *JIPFRI (Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Fisika dan Riset Ilmiah)*, *1*(2), 75–82. https://doi.org/10.30599/jipfri.v1i2.109

Chamisijatin, L., & Permana, F. H. (2020). *Evaluasi kurikulum*. UMMPress.

Christiani, M. A. (2018). Evaluasi program pendidikan dan pelatihan menggunakan model CIPP. *Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan*, *6*(1), 35–45.

Christiani, Y. (2018). Penerapan model CIPP dalam evaluasi implementasi Kurikulum 2013. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JUPE)*, *6*(1), 1–6.

Damanik, E., Sinaga, R., & Silalahi, A. (2020). Training evaluation and organizational performance in public sector. *Jurnal Administrasi*, *8*(2), 55–68.

Damanik, M. P., Nugroho, A. C., Mahmudah, D., & Purwaningsih, E. H. (2020). Evaluasi program pengembangan sumber daya manusia (Studi pada program pelatihan di BPSDMP Kominfo Jakarta). *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi dan Media, 24*(2), 187–201. https://doi.org/10.31445/jskm.2020.3575

Dick, W., & Carey, L. (2015). *The systematic design of instruction* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Fattah, H. (2017). *Kepuasan kerja & kinerja pegawai: Budaya organisasi, perilaku pemimpin, dan efikasi diri*. Elmatera.

Fauzan, A. (2017). *Kurikulum dan pembelajaran* (F. Arifin (ed.)). GP Press.

Fibriany, F. W., & Oktaviani, N. H. (2019). Evaluasi hasil pelatihan karyawan terhadap kinerja karyawan (studi kasus PT Bank Bukopin). *Jurnal Ecodemica*, *3*(2), 141–150. https://doi.org/10.31311/jeco.v3i2.6140

Isbahi, M. B., Zuana, M. M. M. ., & Mariana, E. R. . (2022). The Technology Strategy in Website Communication Media in Improving Business Activities. *Majapahit Journal of Islamic Finance and Management*, *1*(2), 126–138. https://doi.org/10.31538/mjifm.v1i2.17

S Sutanta, E. (2009). Konsep dan implementasi e-learning (Studi kasus pengembangan e-learning di SMA N 1 Sentolo Yogyakarta). *Jurnal DASI, 10*(2), 1–15.

Yustanti, I., & Novita, D. (2019). Pemanfaatan e-learning bagi para pendidik di era digital 4.0. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Program Pascasarjana Universitas PGRI Palembang* (pp. 338–346). https://jurnal.univpgri-palembang.ac.id/index.php/Prosidingpps/article/view/2543

Yusup, A. (2018). Pengembangan e-learning dalam organisasi: Perspektif desain dan evaluasi. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, *20*(1), 1–14.

Yusup, A. (2018). Pengembangan e-learning dalam organisasi: Studi pada Kemenkeu Learning Center. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan, 20*(1), 1–14.

Zuana, M. M. M., Toha, M., & Isbahi, M. B. (2024). Exploration of Community Empowerment in a Village as the Entrance to a Lake in East Java. *Malacca: Journal of Management and Business Development* , *1*(1), 47–55. https://doi.org/10.69965/malacca.v1i1.52