Instrument model to evaluate children-friendly school program at elementary school in Indonesia

Siti Maisaroh[1], Samsul Hadi[2], Dedek Andrian[3]
[1]Department of Primary School Teacher Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[2]Department of Educational Research and Evaluation, Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[3]Department of Mathematics Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

Article Info

ABSTRACT

This study aims to develop an instrument to evaluate Indonesia's children-friendly school program (CFSP). This development research is then used to evaluate CFSP in Indonesia. Instrument development using the context, input, process, product (CIPP) approach and outcome evaluation. The population of this study was all students in the provinces of Riau and Yogyakarta. The research sample is of the students taken randomly from 108 schools that run CFSP. Data analysis used content validity, construct analysis, construct reliability, and descriptive statistics to evaluate the current CFSP. The content validity result shows that only 50 can be used of 56 of the developed items. The construct validity analysis result shows that all indicators obtained from theoretical exploration are valid and reliable. The model fit test shows that the instruments and data obtained from the respondents fit statistically. The results of the evaluation analysis show that the CFSP has been running well, but three indicators are still at a poor level and need to be improved so that the CFSP can run optimally. Indicators needing improvement are the completeness of documents and indicators of student participation, parental participation, community institutions, and the business world. This instrument became the new product to evaluate completely CFSP program because this instrument evaluates not only the process or implementation program but also every process until the program's outcome. Recommendations that need to be considered by stakeholders are to improve CFSP performance so that CFSP can maximally develop student character.

Corresponding Author:

Dedek Andrian
Department of Mathematics Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Riau
St. Kaharuddin Nst No.113, Simpang Tiga, Bukit Raya, Pekanbaru, Riau 28284, Indonesia
Email: dedekandrian@edu.uir.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Instilling morals through learning is an essential part of education [1], [2]. Designed learning with a relevant curriculum can develop the personality, talents, and mental and physical abilities of children at the elementary school [3]. The education system that the designed maximum can easily instill moral and character [4], [5]. An education system with adequate facilities can help schools educate students to have good morals according to the demands of life [6]–[8]. Moral education is the foundation of school learning activities and impacts students.

Child-friendly programs are an ideal concept for instilling character in school-age children [9], [10]. This concept states that the child-centered learning process must be supported by favorable, healthy, safe

social, physical, and emotional conditions. UNICEF explained that children-friendly school program (CFSP) is a children's rights-based school with healthy and protective indicators for all children, effective with children, and engaging with families, communities, and children. Therefore, schools that run child-friendly programs need to ensure that every child is in an environment that is physically safe, emotionally safe, and psychologically possible [11]. Schools implementing CFSP must recognize, encourage, and support children's growth through a good school culture, providing adequate facilities, collaborating with parents to the maximum, and creating a child-friendly learning environment. [12], [13]. CFSP is expected to be able to create a safe and fun school for students because it is free from violence that occurs between students, teachers, and education staff.

The government has implemented moral education/characteristic education at the elementary school level through the children-friendly school program. CFSP is a program created by the government through Law No. 23 of 2022 to meet the basic needs of science and technology, arts, and culture. CFSP is a program that guarantees the fulfillment of children's rights, such as the health, safety, and comfort of children in elementary school. CFSP is expected to be a solution from the Government to develop children's personalities into strong children and characters. CFSP is implemented in primary schools in selected schools that are adequate in facilities and curriculum. CFSP is expected to be an indicator of the Government's success in developing children's character through the elementary school curriculum. The CFSP program is implemented in elementary schools because the age level of elementary school children is elementary to instill good character. Students at the elementary school level efficiently receive information conveyed by teachers at school. Child-friendly school programs are regulated in the ministry of women's empowerment and child protection regulations through ministerial regulation number 8 years.

Indonesian schools have implemented CFSP. Still, this program has not run optimally, supporting documents are not optimally available, infrastructure needs to be improved, and children's rights still need to be fulfilled in learning activities. Several research results evidence these findings [14]–[18]. The study evaluated the implementation of the child-friendly school program, described child-friendly schools at the district level, and involved only one school. Therefore, more comprehensive research with a higher coverage area must be carried out. In addition, evaluation needs to be carried out holistically by evaluating the context, input, process, product, and outcome of the impact of CFSP on people's lives. Instruments that can represent the complexity of CFSP problems need to be developed with proper and correct procedures so that these instruments can provide accurate information about CFSP that has been running in Indonesia. The novelty of this research is this research involves a more comprehensive aspect of process evaluation: context, input, process, product, and outcome. The developed instrument gives recommendations based on the field findings about the weakness or shortcomings of the CFSP program. Five factors or variables reveal the fault of the CFSP program through the developed instrument based on the best procedure. There were 20 indicators describe the CFSP program problem, from CFSP policy to environmental care.

The word child-friendly means guaranteeing the rights of children as citizens of the city [19], [20]. In Indonesia, child-friendly is the definition of an open society, involving children and youth to participate in social life, as well as encouraging the growth and development, and welfare of children [21]. Child-friendly education is education against discrimination, paying attention and protecting children from all violence by involving parents [22]. Child-friendly education is education that gives children the rights that must be obtained at school so that children feel happy to study [23].

In addition, child-friendly education is a unit of educational institutions that can facilitate and empower children's potential [24], [25]. Therefore, it can be said that child-friendly means placing, treating, and respecting children as human beings with all their rights. Child-friendly can be interpreted as a conscious effort to guarantee and fulfill children's rights in every aspect of life in a planned and responsible manner. The main principle of this effort is "non-discrimination," the best interests of the child, the right to life, survival, and development as well as respect for the opinion of the child. Based on the explanation, child-friendly schools are schools that are open to involving children and adolescents to participate in social life, as well as encouraging the growth and development and welfare of children.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses research development and evaluation. Development research is used to develop a valid and reliable evaluation instrument both in terms of content and constructs. Evaluation to find out whether the CFSP program has been running well and with the right procedures. this evaluation is done by checking the context, inputs, processes, products, and outcomes as indicators of the success of the CFSP. Valid and reliable instruments are used to obtain accurate information on the context, input, process, product, and outcome of the CFSP. The population in this study were all elementary school students in the provinces of Riau and Yogyakarta who run CFSP with a total of 108 schools. The sample of this research was all

elementary school students who were taken randomly using the cluster random sampling technique with a total of 987 students and teachers. The data collection technique used a survey approach with a questionnaire instrument. For example, I returned a friend's money when I found it dropped in the classroom. Data analysis in this study used data analysis of Aiken validity, Cronbach Alpha reliability, construct validity with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), construct reliability, and continued the evaluation analysis of context, input, process, product, and outcome of CFSP run by schools in Riau and Yogyakarta Provinces. The research procedure begins with a holistic study of CFSP and explores theories from various sources about CFSP. Next, determine a complete evaluation model that can provide a complete picture of the success of the CFSP.

The next step is to develop success criteria to compare the evaluation results in the field with predetermined criteria. The next step is developing the instrument and validating the instrument with experts and practitioners who are directly related to the CFSP. Limited-scale trials to see whether the instrument has been validated by experts and practitioners are content valid. Large-scale trials with a larger sample to test the validity and reliability of the constructs and finally evaluate the context, inputs, processes, products, and outcomes of CFSP implemented by schools. The success of the CFSP from the components of context, input, process, product, and outcome is compared with the success criteria in Table 1. A comparison of the evaluation results with Table 1 will determine whether each component and its indicators are able to support the CFSP.

Table 1. Evaluation criteria [26]

No	Score comparison	Category
1	$X \geq \bar{X}\ 1 + SB_x$	Very high
2	$\bar{X}\ 1 + SB_x > X \geq \bar{X}$	High
3	$\bar{X} > X \geq \bar{X} - 1\ SB_x$	Low
4	$X \leq \bar{X} - 1\ SB_x$	Very low

Note: $\bar{X}$=score average, SB=standard deviation, X=acquired score

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Validation results

Three methods have done the validation process: Aiken's index, first-order of CFA, and second-order of CFA. The expert and practitioner assessment results of the development of the CFSP instrument were analyzed using the Aiken formula and shown in Table 2. The table explains that 50 items can be used for further testing while the rest cannot be used because the items are in the weak or invalid category. Invalid items are items 13, 16, 20, 25, 27, and 53. Experts suggest that the six items must be discarded because it can make it difficult for respondents to understand them. Invalid items are too long and have multiple meanings, so respondents find it difficult to choose the relevant option.

Table 2. Aiken' index result from Aiken' formula

No.	Aiken' index	Criteria	No.	Aiken' index	Criteria	No.	Aiken' index	Criteria
1	0.889	High	20	0.333	Low	39	0.889	High
2	0.111	Low	21	0.778	Middle	40	0.778	Middle
3	0.778	Middle	22	0.889	High	41	0.889	High
4	0.889	High	23	0.889	High	42	0.889	High
5	0.778	Middle	24	0.889	High	43	0.778	Middle
6	0.889	High	25	0.111	Low	44	0.778	Middle
7	0.778	Middle	26	0.778	Middle	45	0.778	Middle
8	0.778	Middle	27	0.889	High	46	0.778	Middle
9	0.778	Middle	28	0.111	Low	47	0.889	High
10	0.889	High	29	0.778	Middle	48	0.889	High
11	0.889	High	30	0.889	High	49	0.889	High
12	0.778	Middle	31	0.778	Middle	50	0.778	Middle
13	0.222	Low	32	0.778	Middle	51	0.778	Middle
14	0.778	Middle	33	0.889	High	52	0.889	High
15	0.778	Middle	34	0.778	Middle	53	0.222	Low
16	0.778	Middle	35	0.778	Middle	54	0.889	High
17	0.889	High	36	0.889	High	55	0.889	High
18	0.889	High	37	0.889	High	56	0.778	Middle
19	0.778	Middle	38	0.889	High			

Furthermore, the empirical validity test was analyzed using CFA. The results of the CFA analysis are summarized in Table 3. There were 50 items can be used to obtain valid information about CFSP in Indonesia. Table 3 describes the 50 items analyzed using CFA first-order. All items analyzed using first-order have a load value greater than 0.3, so it can be concluded that all items are in the valid category. Then find the reliability results from the CFA data using Cronbach's, and it can be seen in Table 4.

Table 3. Analysis of content validity used CFA

Item	Loading	Criteria	Item	Loading	Criteria	Item	Loading	Criteria
1	0.57	Valid	18	0.6	Valid	35	0.5	Valid
2	0.51	Valid	19	0.47	Valid	36	0.56	Valid
3	0.56	Valid	20	0.59	Valid	37	0.59	Valid
4	0.41	Valid	21	0.67	Valid	38	0.56	Valid
5	0.58	Valid	22	0.53	Valid	39	0.54	Valid
6	0.64	Valid	23	0.6	Valid	40	0.53	Valid
7	0.47	Valid	24	0.6	Valid	41	0.55	Valid
8	0.61	Valid	25	0.61	Valid	42	0.59	Valid
9	0.48	Valid	26	0.52	Valid	43	0.51	Valid
10	0.6	Valid	27	0.55	Valid	44	0.53	Valid
11	0.5	Valid	28	0.38	Valid	45	0.48	Valid
12	0.54	Valid	29	0.5	Valid	46	0.52	Valid
13	0.47	Valid	30	0.55	Valid	47	0.68	Valid
14	0.57	Valid	31	0.37	Valid	48	0.56	Valid
15	0.6	Valid	32	0.54	Valid	49	0.67	Valid
16	0.55	Valid	33	0.52	Valid	50	0.63	Valid
17	0.53	Valid	34	0.7	Valid			

Table 4. Cronbach's alpha index used SPSS software

Cronbach's alpha	N of items	Criteria
0.957	50	Reliable

The validity and reliability of the instrument with a constructive approach will strengthen the validity and reliability of the instrument that experts and first-order CFA have validated. Table 4 explains that the CFSP instrument developed as many as 50 items is in the reliable criteria. Tables 5, 6, and 7 demonstrate the construct validity and reliability results.

Table 5 describes the model fit criteria that must be met in analyzing the construct validity and reliability using eight criteria. The analysis results show that the eight criteria fit so that the construct analysis of validity and reliability can be carried out. Table 6 presents a summary of construct validity.

Tabel 5. Fit model index of construct

Goodness of fit index	Criteria	Achieved value	Conclusion
Chi square	< 2df	172.86 (df=170)	Met
Significance (p-value)	> 0,05	0.42457	Met
RSMEA	< 0,08	0,010	Met
Goodness of fit index (GFI)	> 0,90	0,91	Met
Normed fit index (NFI)	> 0,90	0,98	Met
Comparative fit index (CFI)	> 0,90	1.00	Met
Incremental fit index (IFI)	> 0,90	1.00	Met
Non-normed fit index (NNFI)	> 0,90	1.00	Met
Relative fit index (RFI)	> 0,90	0,97	Met

Table 6 explains that the 20 indicators used to evaluate the context components, inputs, processes, products, and outcomes are valid. These indicators support the context, input, process, product, and outcome components. Table 7 shows the results of construct reliability with the CR formula.

Table 7 explains that the instrument for evaluating CFSP has good construct reliability with an index of 0.87. This construct reliability index is the final standard for the quality of an instrument being developed. The results of the analysis of the validity and reliability of both content and construct are in a good category so that this instrument can accurately evaluate the CFSP that the Indonesian government has created in schools that are able and eligible to apply CFSP.

Table 6. Construct validity summary [27]–[29]

Variable	No	Indicators	Loading	Criteria
Context	1	CFSP policy	0.71	Valid
	2	CFSP documents	0.79	Valid
Input	3	Teachers and staff	0.83	Valid
	4	Facilities and infrastructure	0.77	Valid
	5	Students' participation	0.76	Valid
	6	Participation of parent, alumnus, traditional institutions, business world	0.7	Valid
Process	7	Favoritism	0.77	Valid
	8	Non-violent punishment	0.68	Valid
	9	Showing affection to students	0.77	Valid
	10	Democracy in teaching	0.58	Valid
	11	Set an example in teaching	0.67	Valid
Product	12	Process assessment	0.59	Valid
	13	Final assessment	0.82	Valid
Outcome	14	Honest	0.71	Valid
	15	Tolerance	0.75	Valid
	16	Communicative	0.72	Valid
	17	Democracy	0.68	Valid
	18	Social care	0.65	Valid
	19	Responsibility	0.76	Valid
	20	Environmental care	0.76	Valid

Table 7. Construct reliability of CFA analysis [30]

Variable	Indicators	Loading	Error	Index reliability	Conclusion
Context	CFSP policy	0.71	0.49	0.87	Reliable
	CFSP documents	0.79	0.37		
Input	Teachers and staff	0.83	0.3		
	Facilities and infrastructure	0.77	0.4		
	Students' participation	0.76	0.42		
	Participation of parent, Alumnus, traditional institutions, business world	0.7	0.51		
Process	Favoritism	0.77	0.41		
	Non-violent punishment	0.68	0.54		
	Showing affection to students	0.77	0.41		
	Democracy in teaching	0.58	0.67		
	Set an example in teaching	0.67	0.55		
Product	Process assessment	0.59	0.65		
	Final assessment	0.82	0.33		
Outcome	Honest	0.71	0.49		
	Tolerance	0.75	0.44		
	Communicative	0.72	0.48		
	Democracy	0.68	0.54		
	Social care	0.65	0.58		
	Responsibility	0.76	0.42		
	Environmental care	0.76	0.43		

3.2. Evaluation result

The first step to determine the CFSP program quality was to describe the evaluation component. Table 8 describes the results of the CFSP evaluation component which were analyzed using descriptive statistics and compared with the success criteria. This table describes five components based on descriptive statistics; minimum, maximum, sum, mean, standard deviation, and variance.

Table 8. Descriptive analysis of CFSP evaluation

Evaluation component	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Stdv.	Variance
Context component	6.00	12.00	1518.00	9.81	1.28	1.64
Input component	10.00	13.00	2114.00	14.03	0.72	2.87
Process component	5.00	9.00	1143.00	6.19	1.14	1.30
Product component	6.00	11.00	1167.00	7.17	1.22	1.49
Outcome component	4.00	8.00	1023.00	6.14	1.36	1.85

Table 8 explains six descriptions of the evaluation components, first is the evaluation of the context component. From the analysis results, the highest score was 12, and the lowest score was 6 with the total data being 1518.00. From the data analysis, the standard deviation value is 1.28, and the variance is 1.64. The second is the input components with the lowest score of 10 and the highest score of 13, with a total of 2114

data, with an average score of 14.03. From the analysis results, the standard deviation value is 0.72 with a variance value of 2.87. The third evaluation answers research questions about process components with the lowest score of 5 and the highest score of 9, the total amount of data is 1143 with an average score of 619. The fourth evaluation will answer research questions about products with the lowest score of 6 and the highest score of 11. The total data is 1167 with an average score of 7.09. The fourth evaluation will answer research questions about the outcome of CFSP with the lowest score of 4 and the highest score of 10.23. The total amount of data is 1023 with an average score of 6.14. Table 9 describes a summary of the evaluation of each indicator from the context, input, process, product, and outcome components.

Table 9. CFSP evaluation results of indicators [31], [32]

Component	Indicators	VA	A	DA	SDA	Conclusion
Context	CFSP policy	77.38	22.62			Good
	CFSP documents	41.13	27.65	31.22		Not good
Input	Teachers and staff	85.21	14.79			Good
	Facilities and infrastructure	20.13	41.78	27.99	10.1	Not good
	Students' participation	82.91	17.09			Good
	Participation of parent, alumnus, traditional institutions, business world	21.21	26.72	52.07		Not good
Process	Favoritism	19.47	80.53			Good
	Non-violent punishment	12.72	87.28			Good
	Showing affection to students	24.29	75.71			Good
	Democracy in Teaching	20.75	79.25			Good
	Set an Example in teaching	26.73	73.27			Good
Product	Process assessment	18.74	81.26			Good
	Final assessment	26.58	73.42			Good
Outcome	Honest	20.73	79.27			Good
	Tolerance	27.72	72.28			Good
	Communicative	18.22	81.78			Good
	Democracy	16.74	83.26			Good
	Social care	20.77	79.23			Good
	Responsibility	26.86	73.14			Good
	Environmental care	17.89	82.11			Good
Total	CFSP	31.309	62.622	5.564	0.505	Good

VA=Very agree, A=Agree, DA=Disagree, SDA: Very disagree

Table 9 describes the trend of scores obtained in the CFSP evaluation indicators, that is; the CFSP policy and the CFSP document. The CFSP policy is in the good category, and the CFSP Documents are in a bad category. Input components with indicators of educators in the good category, indicators of infrastructure in the bad category, indicators of student participation in the good category, and participation of parents, alumni, and the business world in the bad category. The process component with indicators of favoritism is in a good category, punishment without violence in the good category, indicators showing compassion in teaching in the good category, indicators of democracy in teaching in the good category, and indicators providing examples in teaching in the good category. Product components with the middle-value indicator in the good category, and the final score indicator in the good category. CFSP impact components for students outside of school with indicators of honesty, tolerance, communication, democracy, social care, responsibility, and environment care, and the seven indicators are in a good category. In general, the results of the evaluation of the CFSP are in a good category. The CFSP instrument developed got good results based on the results of expert assessments and field trials. These results indicate that content and empirically, the CFSP instrument has met the requirements to obtain actual data in the field. Content and empirically valid instruments are very strong concepts for obtaining accurate information from various respondents [26], [33]. The key to obtaining accurate, precise and reliable information depends on an instrument that has been validated both content and empirically [26], [34]. Every researcher who pays attention to strict procedures and correct steps in developing the instrument, the instrument can rely on obtaining valid and reliable information [35], [36]. Finding validity and reliability in research is an absolute requirement that needs to be considered in developing instruments [37], [38]. Researchers who do not specifically prioritize the level of validity and reliability in developing instruments will have an impact on poor decisions that will be made in making policies [39]–[41]. Valid and reliable is the best way to get the accurate data or information in field.

The evaluation of the CFSP is generally in the good category. These results are illustrated by the scores tendency obtained from the analysis results. From the analysis results of each component context, input, process, product and impact are also in the good category. However, there are indicators that the evaluation results are not good, that is; the indicators of CFSP documents, CFSP supporting infrastructure

and participation of parents, alumni, traditional institutions and the business world. The three indicators have not run according to standards so that these indicators need to be improved by stakeholders. Documents for the implementation of a CFSP are important things that need to be prepared by schools as a strong basis for implementing CFSP in every school. Weaknesses or shortcomings of the CFSP can be seen from the standards made from the document so that improvements can be made to the maximum. The accuracy or determination of a policy is highly dependent on the availability of documents so that the implementation of the CFSP policy can be carried out optimally [42]. Policies can be communicated through neatly arranged documents so that policies can be implemented, analyzed, evaluated and weak elements can be corrected early [43]. Policies that have been implemented in education need to be analyzed and criticized so that there are improvements so that input or suggestions can give birth to improvement policies and even new policies to improve existing policies [44], [45]. Documents are an important part of implementing CFSP policies in schools because they are the basis for making the best decisions [46]. Policies in an educational program need to be designed to the maximum so that the ideals of the educational program can be achieved.

Context evaluation with CFSP policy indicators and CFSP documents is generally in the good category, but the CFSP document indicators have not been maximized in CFSP implementation. Schools are still not able to meet the maximum standard due to limitations from the material aspect so that the CFSP policy has not run optimally. Facilities are important because educational programs are impossible without adequate infrastructure [47], [48]. Infrastructure in carrying out educational programs is a basic and decisive aspect in the success of a program and an aspect that must be fulfilled in the implementation of educational programs [47], [49]. The key to the success of the CFSP program is adequate facilities and infrastructure because without adequate facilities and infrastructure, CFSP is difficult to implement optimally [50]. The effectiveness of the CFSP program is very dependent on the facilities and infrastructure owned by the school because good infrastructure can make it easier for teachers and students to implement CFSP [51], [52]. Educational program facilities and infrastructure are part of supporting all educational program activities to improve and enhance educational programs [48].

Evaluation of the process with indicators of educators, infrastructure, student participation, participation of parents, community institutions and the business world in general is in the good category. However, indicators of student participation and participation of parents, community institutions, the business world still need to be improved because they are in the bad category. The participation of parents, alumni and the business world are highly expected in developing CFSP. Participation from outside the school is very much needed to develop the CFSP program so that the education program developed can realize national education goals [47]. Facilities and infrastructure that meet the requirements or are adequate are a support in improving the quality of education in child-friendly school programs [47]. Elements involved in education need to pay attention to the importance of educational program facilities and infrastructure and make infrastructure the most important aspect in implementing educational programs run by schools [53], [54], because facilities are the main support that needs to be there and available to organize education [55], [56]. Facilities are an absolute requirement that are the main indicators of success in implementing education programs [52]. Therefore, facilities or infrastructure in learning need to be of concern to anyone in order to create maximum educational outcomes.

Process evaluation is in the good category. The evaluation results of the indicators of favoritism, punishment without violence, affection for children, democracy in teaching, providing examples are also in the good category. These results indicate that the process in the CFSP program is in good condition. The program process that runs well can produce maximum output of a program. The process becomes an indicator of the success of a program that is running at a particular institution [26], [33], [57]. Processes that run optimally can produce maximum output, so the process needs to be carried out properly in accordance with the prepared procedures [58]. The best intervention is to carry out the process according to the right procedure and measure the achievement by achievement even if only a little [59]. Process evaluation can make it easier and faster to correct deficiencies in ongoing education programs [60]. Gaps in program implementation are easy to diagnose so programs can be fixed and upgraded quickly [61], [62]. The process is the core of every activity of a program education so a process that does not run optimally can be a big weakness in achieving success.

Product evaluation is in a good category, all indicators are process assessment, and final assessment is in a good category. These results explain that CFSP can provide a good product for students. A process that runs well will produce a good product, otherwise, a bad process will produce bad results [63]–[67]. Everything that is done through a good process is the reflection of the success of the educational program [68], [69]. Programmers must ensure that the process runs well so that the chances of success of a program will be better [70]. Ongoing program activities become a force and have a direct effect on the outcomes of an education program [71], [72]. Of course, the process will run well when all the factors have been met and function properly [73]–[76]. Good education program practices are always supported by adequate facilities and infrastructure and continuous evaluation.

The evaluation results of the outcome component are in a good category. Outcome indicators of honesty, tolerance, communication, democracy, social care, responsibility, and environmental care are also in the good category. The CFSP program has shaped the positive character of students. Student awareness increases after running the CFSP program. The outcome of a program will increase often with good program management [77]–[79]. Good education management will ensure that everything goes with strict procedures and controls so that the results obtained do not disappoint [80]. The outcome of a program will be maximally successful when it has been executed with the steps that have been prepared correctly [81]–[83]. Educational programs that run with the right strategies, methods, procedures, steps based on the right theories will produce the maximum impact on the program object.

4. CONCLUSION

The instruments developed have been declared valid and reliable in terms of content and constructs. In content, through expert judgment, the instrument can be used with revisions, and the results of the analysis show that the items developed are valid and reliable. Constructively through CFA analysis, the instrument has been declared valid and reliable. All indicators of context, input, process, product, and outcome variables are in the valid category. The results of construct reliability also show that the instrument is constructively reliable. The fit of the model through CFA analysis also shows that the data is in the fit category, which means that the data obtained in the field with the designed instrument model is fit. In general, the CFSP program has been running with proper procedures. However, several indicators need to be improved, such as student participation, participation of parents, alums, and the business world, and documents that have not been completed properly. The CFSP program needs to be carried out optimally by stakeholders because this program has a very positive impact on the formation of student character. The formed students' character from CFSP becomes a provision for students when continuing their education at a higher level. In addition, the student's character obtained from the CFSP program can be a strength in interacting or communicating with the community wherever the student lives.

REFERENCES

[1] D. K. Lapsley and D. Narvaez, *Handbook of Child Psychology*. New York: Willey, 2007.
[2] J. Baehr, "The Varieties of Character and Some Implications for Character Education," *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 1153–1161, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1007/s10964-017-0654-z.
[3] A. Peterson, "Character education, the individual and the political," *Journal of Moral Education*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 143–157, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1080/03057240.2019.1653270.
[4] A. Bull and K. Allen, "Following policy: A network ethnography of the UK character education policy community," *Sociological Research Online*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 438–458, 2018.
[5] R. White and N. Warfa, "Building Schools of Character: A Case-Study Investigation of Character Education's Impact on School Climate, Pupil Behavior, and Curriculum Delivery," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 45–60, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00701.x.
[6] S. Moran, "Purpose-in-action education: Introduction and implications," *Journal of Moral Education*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 145–158, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1080/03057240.2018.1444001.
[7] A. Cooley, "Legislating Character: Moral Education in North Carolina's Public Schools," *Educational Studies*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 188–205, Jun. 2008, doi: 10.1080/00131940802117563.
[8] C. A. Was, D. J. Woltz, and C. Drew, "Evaluating character education programs and missing the target: A critique of existing research," *Educational Research Review*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 148–156, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2006.08.001.
[9] J. Putra, E. Sari, and M. Akbar, "Evaluation of the Children Friendly School Policy Implementation in the Depok City," *Proceedings of the 1st Paris Van Java International Seminar on Health, Economics, Social Science and Humanities (PVJ-ISHESSH 2020)*, vol. 535, 2021, doi: 10.2991/assehr.k.210304.043.
[10] A. Muarifah, N. H. Rofi'ah, and E. N. Hayati, "Embodying Children-Friendly School Through Nganggung Culture," *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Early Childhood Care Education and Parenting (ICECCEP 2019)*, 2020, doi: 10.2991/assehr.k.201205.103.
[11] D. Lupitasari and S. I. A. Dwiningrum, "Decreasing the Violence in the School Through the Initiation Policy of Children Friendly School," *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Social Science and Character Educations (ICoSSCE 2019)*, 2020, doi: 10.2991/assehr.k.200130.038.
[12] Jumakir, S. Milfayetty, and I. Hajar, "The Effect of Transformational Leadership of School Principles, School Committee Participation, Teacher Performance, and School Culture on Children-Friendly School Performance at Public Primary School in Deli Serdang Regency," *Proceedings of the 6th Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL 2021)*, vol. 591, 2022, doi: 10.2991/assehr.k.211110.155.
[13] E. King, "Implications for the child friendly schools policy within Cambodia's cultural and primary school context," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 375–388, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2019.1645811.

[14]   S. Supeni, "Implementation of Children Friendly School To Realize Javanese Cultural Character Based Social Environment," *GeoEco*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 209, 2020, doi: 10.20961/ge.v6i2.42675.

[15]   G. K. Mahendra and R. Y. Sujanto, "Evaluation of the Child Friendly City (KLA) Policy of Yogyakarta City 2016-2018," (in Indonesian), *Jurnal of Goverment - JOG: Kajian Manajemen Pemerintahan & Otonomi Daerah*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–19, 2019.

[16]   M. Modipane and M. Themane, "Teachers' social capital as a resource for curriculum development: lessons learnt in the implementation of a Child-Friendly Schools programme," *South African Journal of Education*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1–8, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.15700/201412052105.

[17]   M. Hajaroh, R. Rukiyati, L. A. Purwastuti, and R. Nurhayati, "Development of the Evaluation Instrument of the Child-Friendly School Policy in Elementary Schools," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 327–340, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.29333/iji.2021.14319a.

[18]   A. Shakya, "The UNICEF policy program of Child-Friendly School in practice in Sunrise Boarding School," Master's Thesis, University of Lapland, 2017.

[19]   S. P. Dewi, "How Does The Playground Role in Realizing Children-Friendly-City?" *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 38, pp. 224–233, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.344.

[20]   G. He *et al.*, "Creating a Children-Friendly Reading Environment via Joint Learning of Content and Human Attention," *SIGIR 2020 - Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2020, pp. 279–288, doi: 10.1145/3397271.3401062.

[21]   S. A. Ekawati, "Children – Friendly Streets as Urban Playgrounds," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 179, pp. 94–108, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.413.

[22]   N. Clair, S. Miske, and D. Patel, "Child Rights and Quality Education," *European Education*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 5–22, Jul. 2012, doi: 10.2753/EUE1056-4934440201.

[23]   M. C. Makwarela, K. J. Mammen, and E. O. Adu, "An Assessment of the Implementation of DoE and UNICEF Guidelines for Creating Safe, Caring and Child-friendly Schools: A South African Case Study," *Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 50, no. 1–3, pp. 1–7, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1080/09718923.2017.1311720.

[24]   A. Soleh, *Accessibility to Higher Education for Persons with Disabilities*. Yogyakarta: PT LKIS Printing Cemerlang (in Indonesian), 2016.

[25]   E. King, "Translating policy into practice: Cambodian primary schoolteachers' sense-making of the Child Friendly Schools policy," *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 1314–1331, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1080/03057925.2020.1866495.

[26]   S. Hadi, S. Maisaroh, A. Hidayat, and D. Andrian, "An Instrument Development to Evaluate Teachers' Involvement in Planning the Schools' Budgeting at Elementary Schools of Yogyakarta Province," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1087–1100, 2022, doi: 10.29333/iji.2022.15260a.

[27]   M. Mikolajczak, O. Luminet, C. Leroy, and E. Roy, "Psychometric Properties of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire: Factor Structure, Reliability, Construct, and Incremental Validity in a French-Speaking Population," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, vol. 88, no. 3, pp. 338–353, Jun. 2007, doi: 10.1080/00223890701333431.

[28]   U. Ravens-Sieberer *et al.*, "Reliability, construct and criterion validity of the KIDSCREEN-10 score: a short measure for children and adolescents' well-being and health-related quality of life," *Quality of Life Research*, vol. 19, no. 10, pp. 1487–1500, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1007/s11136-010-9706-5.

[29]   K. Hakan and F. Seval, "CIPP evaluation model scale: development, reliability and validity," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 15, pp. 592–599, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.146.

[30]   J. C. MacDermid, "Outcome evaluation in patients with elbow pathology: Issues in instrument development and evaluation," *Journal of Hand Therapy*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 105–114, Apr. 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0894-1130(01)80040-5.

[31]   T. L. Finney, "Confirmative Evaluation: New CIPP Evaluation Model," *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 2–24, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.22237/jmasm/1598889893.

[32]   D. L. Stufflebeam and G. Zhang, "The CIPP Evaluation Model: How to Evaluate for Improvement and Accountability," *The CIPP Evaluation Model: How to Evaluate for Improvement and Accountability*, p. 570670, 2017.

[33]   D. Andrian, B. Kartowagiran, and S. Hadi, "The instrument development to evaluate local curriculum in Indonesia," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 921–934, 2018, doi: 10.12973/iji.2018.11458a.

[34]   E. Istiyono, W. S. B. Dwandaru, R. Setiawan, and I. Megawati, "Developing of Computerized Adaptive Testing to Measure Physics Higher Order Thinking Skills of Senior High School Students and its Feasibility of Use," *European Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 91–101, 2019.

[35]   R. Risnawati, D. Andrian, M. P. Azmi, Z. Amir, and E. Nurdin, "Development of a Definition Maps-Based Plane Geometry Module to Improve the Student Teachers' Mathematical Reasoning Ability," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 541–560, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.29333/iji.2019.12333a.

[36]   D. Andrian, "Developing an instrument to evaluate the influential factors of the success of local curriculum," *Research and Evaluation in Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 75–84, 2019, doi: 10.21831/reid.v5i1.23980.

[37]   E. Salsabila, W. Rahayu, and P. Deniyanti Sampoerno, "Performance Assessment to Measure Student's Mathematical Proving Ability Based on the Abductive-Deductive Approach," *KnE Social Sciences*, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.18502/kss.v4i14.7892.

[38]   A. Setiawan, D. Mardapi, S. Supriyoko, and D. Andrian, "The Development of Instrument for Assessing Students' Affective Domain Using Self- and Peer-Assessment Models," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 425–438, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.29333/iji.2019.12326a.

[39]   S. Maisaroh, Slamet, and S. Hadi, "The Budget Planning Determinant Factors at State Primary Schools in Yogyakarta Province," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 353–368, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.29333/iji.2019.12223a.

[40]   S. N. Ismail, F. Ab Rahman, F. M. Zain, and A. Yaacob, "The validity and reliability of quality improvement and accreditation system instrument in managing childcare center," *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 1258, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v11i3.22522.

[41]   S. Kullan, M. Mansor, and R. Ishak, "The validity and reliability of an instrument to evaluate the practices of learning organization," *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 1725, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v11i4.22974.

[42]   B. Williamson and N. Piattoeva, "Objectivity as standardization in data-scientific education policy, technology and governance," *Learning, Media and Technology*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 64–76, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1080/17439884.2018.1556215.

[43]   K. N. Gulson and S. Sellar, "Emerging data infrastructures and the new topologies of education policy," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 350–366, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0263775818813144.

[44]   D. Gillborn, P. Warmington, and S. Demack, "QuantCrit: education, policy, 'Big Data' and principles for a critical race theory of statistics," *Race Ethnicity and Education*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 158–179, 2018, doi: 10.1080/13613324.2017.1377417.

[45] P. S. Aithal and S. Aithal, "Analysis of the Indian National Education Policy 2020 towards Achieving its Objectives," *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences*, pp. 19–41, 2020, doi: 10.47992/ijmts.2581.6012.0102.

[46] M. Glackin and H. King, "Taking stock of environmental education policy in England – the what, the where and the why," *Environmental Education Research*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 305–323, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1080/13504622.2019.1707513.

[47] H. Herwan, A. Aswandi, and M. Chiar, "The Role of School Committee in Supporting The Fulfillment of Education Facilities and Infrastructure," *JETL (Journal Of Education, Teaching and Learning)*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 282, 2018, doi: 10.26737/jetl.v3i2.763.

[48] A. Ritonga, K. Anwar, and Suhaimi, "Accountability of the Head of Madrasah in Managing Language Laboratory Facilities and Infrastructure at Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Jambi Province," *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 87–95, 2020.

[49] M. Rumia and R. Simorangkir, "Inclusion School Education Facilities and Infrastructure," *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 22–25, 2021, doi: 10.35629/7722-1005032225.

[50] E. F. Banamtuan, "Evaluation of the Value-Based Child Friendly School (SRA) Program at Inpres Liliba Elementary School, Kupang City, 2012/2013 Academic Year," (in Indonesian), *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 4, 2019.

[51] H. Irmayani, D. Wardiah, and M. Kristiawan, "The strategy of SD Pusri in improving educational quality," *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 113–121, 2018.

[52] S. C. Eze, V. C. Chinedu-Eze, and A. O. Bello, "The utilisation of e-learning facilities in the educational delivery system of Nigeria: a study of M-University," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 34, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s41239-018-0116-z.

[53] S. Kärnä and P. Julin, "A framework for measuring student and staff satisfaction with university campus facilities," *Quality Assurance in Education*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 47–66, 2015, doi: 10.1108/QAE-10-2013-0041.

[54] C. Uline and M. Tschannen-Moran, "The walls speak: the interplay of quality facilities, school climate, and student achievement," *Journal of Educational Administration*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 55–73, Feb. 2008, doi: 10.1108/09578230810849817.

[55] O. Ilomo, B. Mlavi, and M. A. Ed, "The Availability of Teaching and Learning Facilities and Their Effects on Academic Performance in Ward Secondary Schools in Muheza," *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches*, vol. 5, no. 12, pp. 61–72, 2018.

[56] P. Shih, G. M. Velan, and B. Shulruf, "Shared values and socio-cultural norms: E-learning technologies from a social practice perspective," *Issues in Educational Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 550–566, 2017.

[57] S. Hadi, D. Andrian, And B. Kartowagiran, "Evaluation Model for Evaluating Vocational Skills Programs on Local Content Curriculum in Indonesia: Impact of Educational System in Indonesia," *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 19, no. 82, pp. 1–18, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.14689/ejer.2019.82.3.

[58] M. W. Rodrigues, S. Isotani, and L. E. Zárate, "Educational Data Mining: A review of evaluation process in the e-learning," *Telematics and Informatics*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1701–1717, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.tele.2018.04.015.

[59] G. F. Moore *et al.*, "Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance," *BMJ*, vol. 350, no. 6, pp. h1258–h1258, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.1136/bmj.h1258.

[60] T. Mathimani *et al.*, "Review on cultivation and thermochemical conversion of microalgae to fuels and chemicals: Process evaluation and knowledge gaps," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 208, pp. 1053–1064, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.096.

[61] T. Bailey, L. Wundersitz, K. O'Donnell, and A. Rasch, "Identifying best practices in a process evaluation of a novice driver education program," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, vol. 93, p. 102105, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2022.102105.

[62] S. Ahlstedt Karlsson, I. Henoch, R. Olofsson Bagge, and C. Wallengren, "An intervention mapping-based support program that empowers patients with endocrine therapy management," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, vol. 92, p. 102071, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2022.102071.

[63] E. E. Verhulp, G. W. J. M. Stevens, J. Thijs, T. V. M. Pels, and W. A. M. Vollebergh, "Ethnic Differences in Teacher–Student Relationship Quality and Associations with Teachers' Informal Help for Adolescents' Internalizing Problems," *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 101–109, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1177/1063426618763117.

[64] M. N. Gavareshki, F. Haddadian, and M. HassanzadehKalleh, "The Role of Education, Educational Processes, and Education Culture on the Development of Virtual Learning in Iran," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 46, pp. 5379–5381, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.442.

[65] D. M. Panagoret, A. A. Panagoret, and C. Coporan, "The impact of the educational management on the educational process quality in the context of school education decentralization," *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 45–51, 2014.

[66] E. Engkizar, I. Muliati, R. Rahman, and A. Alfurqan, "The Importance of Integrating ICT Into Islamic Study Teaching and Learning Process," *Khalifa: Journal of Islamic Education*, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 148, 2018, doi: 10.24036/kjie.v1i2.11.

[67] M. Khalifa and R. Lam, "Web-based learning: Effects on learning process and outcome," *IEEE Transactions on Education*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 350–356, 2002, doi: 10.1109/TE.2002.804395.

[68] S. W. Ng and Y. W. Kwan, "Inclusive Education Teachers—Strategies of Working Collaboratively with Parents of Children with Special Educational Needs in Macau," *International Journal of Educational Reform*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 191–207, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1177/1056787919886579.

[69] W. T. V. Leung, T. Y. T. Tam, W.-C. Pan, C.-D. Wu, S.-C. Lung, and J. D. Spengler, "How is environmental greenness related to students' academic performance in English and Mathematics?" *Landscape and Urban Planning*, vol. 181, pp. 118–124, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.09.021.

[70] G. Rivera-Singletary and A. Cranston-Gingras, "Students with Disabilities from Migrant Farmworker Families: Parent Perspectives," *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 60–70, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1177/8756870519887159.

[71] R. A. Shannon and C. F. Yonkaitis, "The Role of the School Nurse in the Special Education Process: Part 2: Eligibility Determination and the Individualized Education Program," *NASN School Nurse*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 249–254, Jul. 2017, doi: 10.1177/1942602X17709505.

[72] S. L. Barrett-Williams, P. Franks, C. Kay, A. Meyer, K. Cornett, and B. Mosier, "Bridging Public Health and Education: Results of a School-Based Physical Activity Program to Increase Student Fitness," *Public Health Reports*, vol. 132, no. 2_suppl, pp. 81S-87S, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.1177/0033354917726328.

[73] C. Leathwood and D. Phillips, "Developing curriculum evaluation research in higher education: Process, politics and practicalities," *Higher Education*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 313–330, 2000, doi: 10.1023/a:1004183527173.

[74] M. B. Paulsen and J. C. Smart, *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy, and practice*. New York: Agathon Press, 2001.

[75] E. E. J. Thoonen, P. J. C. Sleegers, F. J. Oort, T. T. D. Peetsma, and F. P. Geijsel, "How to Improve Teaching Practices," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 496–536, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.1177/0013161X11400185.

[76] G. Aglazor, "The role of teaching practice in teacher education programmes: designing framework for best practice," *Global Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 16, no. 2, p. 101, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.4314/gjedr.v16i2.4.

[77] N. A. Boateng, "Does public expenditure management matter for education outcomes?" *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 535–552, Jul. 2014, doi: 10.1080/0376835X.2014.906299.

[78] C. K. R. C. Jackson, A. Johnson, and C. Persico, "The effect of School Spending on Educational and Economic Outcome: Evidence from School Finance Reform," *Quartely Journal of Economic*, vol. 131, no. 1, pp. 157–218, 2015.

[79] M.-H. Lin, H.-C. Chen, and K.-S. Liu, "A Study of the Effects of Digital Learning on Learning Motivation and Learning Outcome," *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 3553–3564, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.12973/eurasia.2017.00744a.

[80] M. B. Dalimunthe, E. T. Djatmika, H. Pratikto, P. Handayati, R. Dewi, and S. S. Mustakim, "Academic resilience for preservice teachers among field of sciences: A measurement scale in education," *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 1262, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21859.

[81] T. Loreman, "Measuring inclusive education outcomes in Alberta, Canada," *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 459–483, May 2014, doi: 10.1080/13603116.2013.788223.

[82] M. Edo and M. Marchionni, "The impact of a conditional cash transfer programme on education outcomes beyond school attendance in Argentina," *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 230–252, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1080/19439342.2019.1666898.

[83] O. S. Imhangbe, I. O. Victor, and R. I. Osarenren-Osaghae, "Teachers' Classroom Job Performance: How Teachers' Tasks Impact Their Classroom Job Performance in Edo Central School District, Nigeria," *Journal of Education*, vol. 200, no. 3, pp. 164–174, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1177/0022057419881146.

BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS

Siti Maisaroh [ID] [g] [SC] [C] is a Teacher Educator at Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Universiti PGRI Yogyakarta. She has been a lecturer at Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta since 2000. Her research focuses on Elementary School Teachers Education, classroom management, education product development. She can be contacted at email: sitimaisaroh@upy.ac.id.

Samsul Hadi [ID] [g] [SC] [C] is a Professor at Department of Educational Research and Evaluation, Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia. His research focuses on Electrical Engineering, Evaluation, Assessment, Measurement, Software for data analysis. He can be contacted at email: samsul_hd@uny.ac.id.

Dedek Andrian [ID] [g] [SC] [C] is a lecturer at Department of Mathematics Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia. His research focuses on Mathematics Education, Development of Education Product, Evaluation Program, Classroom Assessment, Instrument development and Software for data analysis. He can be contacted at email: dedekandrian@edu.uir.ac.id.