



# EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN IN THE ISLAMIC EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM AT STAIN MAJENE

Usri<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Yaumi<sup>2</sup>, Misykat Malik Ibrahim<sup>3</sup>, & Saprin<sup>4</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Majene, Indonesia

<sup>2,3,4</sup>Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia

Correspondence email: [usri@stainmajene.ac.id](mailto:usri@stainmajene.ac.id)

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to evaluate the Instructional design in the Program Studi Pendidikan Agama Islam of STAIN Majene by using Provus's Discrepancy Evaluation Model. This model compares instructional design performance with predetermined standards, including aspects of Rencana Pembelajaran Semester (RPS), teaching materials, Rencana Tugas Mahasiswa (RTM), and assessment instruments. The methodology used in this research is mixed method, where quantitative data is obtained through a documentation checklist sheet, while qualitative data is collected from interviews. The research was conducted on four courses in the even semester of the 2023/2024 academic year. The results showed variations in Instructional design performance between courses. Strategi Pembelajaran PAI course was in the low category, while Kewirausahaan Pendidikan and Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif were in the medium category, and Bimbingan dan Konseling reached the very high category. Analysis of the components of the CPMK Formulation, learning strategies, teaching materials, and assessment instruments revealed gaps in each course, especially in the CPMK Formulation and assessment instruments which showed the largest gaps. The implications of this study highlight the need for action by relevant parties to improve the quality of instructional design. Lecturers must deepen their understanding in CPMK Formulation and compiling relevant assessment instruments. The Head of Study Programme needs to organise periodic training for lecturers on effective instructional design. The Quality Assurance Centre is advised to develop and socialise clear and measurable instructional design standards, in order to ensure the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process.

**Keywords:** Instructional design; discrepancy evaluation model; assessment instruments

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Quality instructional design is a key factor in creating effective and efficient learning experiences (Setyosari, 2020), especially in the context of higher education. In the program studi Pendidikan Agama Islam at Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Majene, the development of innovative instructional designs that are responsive to student needs is crucial to ensure that graduates are ready to face the challenges of society. (Prasetyo et al., 2024). However, the implementation of learning design often still faces obstacles (Mufaridah et al., 2022). Many lecturers are trapped in conventional methods that are not in accordance with the characteristics of students, resulting in a lack of engagement and motivation, as well as suboptimal learning outcomes. (Santoso et al., 2023). This is reflected in the data on the results of the comprehensive examination of Islamic Religious Education Study Programme students, which shows that many students repeat because they do not pass the comprehensive examination (Jurusan Tarbiyah dan Keguruan STAIN Majene, 2022).

The gap between idealised theory and practice in the field requires serious attention (Mariyono, 2024). Therefore, it is necessary to identify and evaluate the real conditions of learning design in the Islamic Education study programme, as well as to analyse the factors that cause discrepancies (Ahyar et al., 2023). Thus, a systematic approach is needed that can provide a comprehensive picture of the implemented instructional design. One solution that can be used is Provus' discrepancy evaluation model. This model provides a comprehensive framework for analysing the difference between standards and performance in the implementation of instructional design. (Provus, 1969).

In this context, the discrepancy model will help identify learning design gaps in the Islamic Education study programme. instructional design components such as the formulation of Course Learning Outcomes (CPMK), learning strategies, teaching materials and assessment instruments (Yaumi, 2024) applied, may be the cause of significant nonconformities. This research aims to give an in-depth insight into the condition by highlighting aspects that need to be corrected and improved.

The research question posed is: "What are the gaps in learning design in the Program Studi Pendidikan Agama Islam of STAIN Majene?". The main purpose of this research is to evaluate the instructional design implemented in the study programme using Provus' discrepancy evaluation model. Using this model, the research will explore and analyse the data collected to identify areas of improvement needed. Hopefully, this research will provide evidence-based recommendations that can be used to improve the quality of learning.

In addition, the results of this study are expected to not only provide a clear picture of the current state of learning design, but also contribute to the development of better learning policies and practices in the academic environment of Majene State Islamic College. Furthermore, the results of this study can be a reference for educators in designing learning programmes that are more interesting and relevant for students, so that they are ready to face challenges in the increasingly complex world of work and society.

## 2. METHODS

### Type of Research

This research is an evaluation study based on field research procedures. Data presentation is done by combining quantitative and qualitative methods in one series of research so that this research design is mixed method. (Creswell & Clark, 2017).

#### a. Research location

This research is located at the Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) Majene, Balai Latihan Kerja street Number 17, Passarang neighbourhood, Totoli sub-district, Banggae district, Majene regency, West Sulawesi. This research was conducted to lecturers and students from 4 courses that became the object of this research, namely: Strategi Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam course, Kewirausahaan Pendidikan course, Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif course, and Bimbingan dan Konseling course in the Program Studi Pendidikan Agama Islam.

#### b. Data source

The main data source of this research is learning tools consisting of: RPS documents, Student Task Design (RTM), and assessment instruments as primary data on learning programme design. In addition, lecturers are the main source as informants to collect data related to instructional design.

#### c. Research Instruments

##### 1) Documentation cecklist

Documentation in research means records in the form of documents or archives that are used to complement the data (Kurniawan, 2018). This research instrument was used by researchers to obtain data related to learning programme design. The documents studied include RPS, Student Task Design, teaching materials in accordance with the research focus. Documentation checklist is made based on learning design criteria to be compared with existing learning design documents.

##### 2) Interview guidelines

Interview is a process of collecting data through direct questioning. In the context of the research, the interviews conducted included semi-structured interviews by preparing interview guidelines to be submitted to informants, but the submission of the sequence of questions was flexible because it depended on the direction of the conversation. (Fadhallah, 2020). The lecturer in charge of the course and students from 4 courses became informants in the interviews conducted.

#### d. Data Analysis Technique

Quantitative data was obtained from the document checklist sheet. Furthermore, the data was analysed using descriptive statistical techniques in order to provide a clear picture through average scores and percentages (Saprin et al., 2023). Selajutnya, Berdasarkan persentase skor yang diperoleh, data yang terkumpul dianalisis melalui kategorisasi. In the category scale, the researcher based the categorisation table on Azwar's information, who chose to make a simple

(detailed) range, such as very high, high, medium, low, and very low (Saifuddin, 2021). The categorisation in the context of this research which is converted into a percentage score can be seen in the following table:

*Table 2.1 Categorisation*

Rentang Skor Nilai	Rentang Persentase Skor	Kategorisasi
$15 < x$	$75\% < x$	Sangat Tinggi
$12 < x \leq 15$	$58\% < x \leq 75\%$	Tinggi
$9 < x \leq 12$	$43\% < x \leq 58\%$	Sedang
$6 < x \leq 9$	$25\% < x \leq 43\%$	Rendah
$x \leq 6$	$x \leq 25\%$	Sangat Rendah

The qualitative data analysis of this research consists of: First, data condensation is the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming field notes, interview transcripts, documents, and other empirical material (findings); Second, Data Presentation is a collection of organised data or information that allows conclusions to be drawn and actions taken; and third, Conclusion Drawing (Miles et al., 2014).

**e. Data Validity Testing**

To avoid errors or confusion in the data that has been collected, it is necessary to check the validity of the data. Checking the validity of the data is based on the criteria of degrees of trust (credibility) with triangulation techniques, persistence of observation, checking peers, and checking the quality of the data (Susanto & Jailani, 2023).

This research uses qualitative methods applied at the design stage, which is to interview lecturers related to the design of learning programmes. So the suitable technique for this method is triangulation technique.

**3. RESULTS**

Evaluation of instructional design in the discrepancy model begins with collecting learning tools consisting of RPS, RTM, and assessment instruments from 4 courses. Next, the learning tools from the 4 courses are compared with the standard indicators outlined in the document checklist sheet. The document checklist sheet consists of 4 components: First, the formulation of course outcomes (CPMK) which contains ABCD elements; second, learning strategies which contain elements of learning activities, methods and learning media; third, face-to-face and independent teaching materials; and fourth, assessment instruments to measure students' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains.

There are 17 indicators from 4 components of learning design that become standards in this stage of evaluation. The standards are compared with the existing learning design performance. If any indicator is not found, it means there is a discrepancy as the result of learning design evaluation. The following are the results found in the learning design stage evaluation process.

Table 3. 1 Course Design Evaluation of PAI Learning Strategies

Components	Performance Percentage	Discrepancy
Formulation of CPMK	33%	67%
Learning Strategy	67%	33%
Teaching Materials	50%	50%
Assessment Instrument	0%	100%
Mean	37,5%	62,5%

Based on table 3. 1, from the results of the comparison between the standards and the reality of the learning design of the PAI Learning Strategy Course in each component, it is known that: First, the fulfilment of the CPMK formulation criteria is only 33%. This means that most of the elements in the formulation of CPMK are not fulfilled. The gap that reaches 67% indicates that the formulation of CPMK is still far from the predetermined standards; Second, the fulfilment of learning strategy design criteria that reaches 67% indicates that most of the elements in the learning strategy design have been fulfilled. However, the 33% gap indicates that there is still room to improve the design of learning strategies in order to achieve the specified standards;

Third, fulfilment of teaching material design criteria is only 50%. This figure shows that the design elements of teaching materials that are fulfilled are only half of the expected standard target. The existence of a 50% gap indicates that the current design of teaching materials only meets half of the standards set; Fourth, fulfilment of the assessment instrument design criteria which is only 0% indicates that all elements in the assessment instrument design are not met. A gap of 100% indicates that there is a total difference between the performance of the assessment instrument design and the expected standard. This means that the assessment instrument design is completely out of compliance with the expected standard.

The mean intruactional design performance of PAI Learning Strategy Course with 37.5% is included in the low category based on the data in table 2.1. So that the gap level which reaches 62.5% is included in the high category. This means that there is a significant difference between the reality of learning strategy course design and the standards that have been set. In other words, this high level of gap indicates that the learning strategy design criteria set have not fulfilled most of the expected standards.

Table 3. 2 Evaluation of the Kewirausahaan Pendidikan Course Design

Components	Performance Percentage	Discrepancy
Formulation of CPMK	33%	67%
Learning Strategy	67%	33%
Teaching Materials	100%	0%
Assessment Instrument	33%	67%
Mean	58%	42%

Based on table 3.2, the results of the comparison between the standards and the design performance of the Entrepreneurship Education Course in each component are: First, the performance of the CPMK formulation of 33% indicates that only one-third of the expected standards have been achieved in the CPMK formulation. The existence of a gap that reaches 67% indicates a very large difference between the performance of the CPMK formulation and the

expected standard. This means that the current CPMK formulation has not fulfilled most of the elements that are standard in the Entrepreneurship Education course; second, the performance of the learning strategy design for the Entrepreneurship Education course reaches 67%. This means that two-thirds of the expected standards have been met. In other words, most of the elements in the learning strategy design component have been fulfilled. The 33% gap shows that there is still a difference between the performance of learning strategy design and the expected standard;

Third, the performance of the teaching material design reached 100%. This figure indicates that the design of teaching materials fully meets the set standards. In other words, the existing teaching material design has fulfilled all elements of the teaching material design standards that have been set. The 0% gap figure indicates that there is no difference between the performance of the teaching material design and the expected standard. This means that the design of existing teaching materials is fully in accordance with the standard, without any shortcomings or discrepancies.

Fourth, the design performance of the assessment instruments reached 33%. This figure indicates that the existing assessment instruments only fulfil one-third of the expected standards. In other words, the existing assessment instruments do not fulfil most of the elements of the set standards. Thus, there is a large room for improvement from the 67% gap figure. The figure indicates that there is a difference between the reality of the assessment instrument design and the expected standard.

The mean percentage of learning design performance in educational entrepreneurship courses is 58% and the gap is 42%. This figure shows that there is a relatively small difference between learning design performance and expected standards. This means that most of the learning design has met the standard, and only one-third of the standard components still require attention.

Based on table 2.1, the average design performance rate of 67% is in the high category and the gap of 33% is in the low category. This means that the learning design performance of entrepreneurship courses is not yet high and the low gap indicates that there are still quite a number of learning design components in the course that need to be improved and receive attention to be fulfilled.

Table 3. 3 Evaluation of Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif Course Design

Components	Performance Percentage	<i>Discrepancy</i>
Formulation of CPMK	50%	50%
Learning Strategy	67%	33%
Teaching Materials	100%	0%
Assessment Instrument	33%	67%
Mean	62,5%	37,5%

Based on table 3.3 presented, the comparison between the standard and the performance of learning design in the Qualitative Research Methodology course in each component is: First, the fulfilment of the CPMK formulation criteria by 50% indicates that half of the standards or

expectations that have been set have been achieved. However, the gap of 50% indicates that there is a significant difference between the fulfilment of the CPMK formulation criteria and the expected standard. In other words, there are half of the elements of the CPMK formulation that have been determined have not been fulfilled; second, the fulfilment of learning strategy design criteria is 67%. This figure shows that the design of learning strategies in the Qualitative Research Methodology course has reached two-thirds of the set standards. This shows that most of the elements of the learning strategy have been fulfilled. However, the 33% gap indicates that there is still room to improve the learning strategy design to meet the expected standards;

Third, the performance of the teaching material design in the Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif course which reaches 100% indicates that the design fully meets all the criteria set. This means that the existing teaching material design has fulfilled all elements of the predetermined standards. The 0% gap rate indicates that there is no difference between the reality of the teaching material design and the expected standard. Thus, the design of existing teaching materials is fully in accordance with the expected standards;

Fourth, the assessment instrument design performance of 33% indicates that only one-third of the expected standard has been achieved. A gap of 67% indicates a significant difference between the performance of the assessment instrument design and the desired standard. This means that the current assessment instrument design does not fulfil most of the criteria set in the Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif course.

The average percentage of learning design performance in the Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif course is 62% and the gap is 38%. This figure shows that there is a relatively small difference between the fulfilment of learning design criteria and the expected standard. In other words, most of the learning design components are in line with the standard, although there are some components that still need attention and improvement.

According to table 2.1, the average design performance of Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif Course which shows an average of 62.5% is included in the high category. The gap with 37.5% is included in the low category. A low gap indicates that the difference between the existing learning design and the expected standard is relatively small. This indicates that most components of the learning design are fully in line with the set standards.

*Table 3. 4 Evaluation of Bimbingan dan Konseling Course Design*

Components	Performance Percentage	Discrepancy
Formulation of CPMK	83%	17%
Learning Strategy	67%	33%
Teaching Materials	100%	0%
Assessment Instrument	67%	33%
Mean	79%	21%

Based on table 3.4, the comparison between the standard and performance of learning design in Guidance and Counselling courses for each component is: First, the design performance of CPMK formulation touched 83%. This means that most of the standard elements of the CPMK formulation have been met. However, the 17% gap indicates that there are still things that need

few components that require improvement or adjustment, because overall, the learning to be improved to achieve the expected standard of CPMK formulation; second, the learning strategy design performance of 67% indicates that the learning strategy for Guidance and Counselling courses has met about two-thirds of the expected standard. This indicates that most of the elements in the learning strategy have been fulfilled. However, the gap of 33% indicates that there are still opportunities for improvement so that the learning strategy design can fully meet the desired standards.

Third, the design performance of the teaching material design in the Guidance and Counselling course which reaches 100% indicates that the design has fully met all the criteria set. This means that all elements of the specified standard have been met by the teaching material design. A 0% gap indicates there is no difference between the performance of the teaching material design and the expected standard. In other words, this teaching material design is fully aligned with the desired standard.

Fourth, the performance of the assessment instrument design in the Guidance and Counselling course which reached 67% indicates that the design has met most of the criteria set. This means that most elements of the specified standards have been met by the design of the assessment instrument. The gap of 37% indicates a relatively low difference between the performance of the assessment instrument and the expected standard. Thus, the design of this assessment instrument is largely in line with the desired standard.

The average learning design gap for Guidance and Counselling courses of only 21% indicates that most of the learning design components have met the expected standards referring to the performance which shows 79%. This 13% gap reflects that there is little room for improvement or refinement in some learning design components in order to achieve full conformity with the set standards.

Based on table 2.1, the average design performance of the Guidance Course with 79% is included in the very high category. While the gap is included in the very low category. This indicates that the difference between the reality of the Guidance and Counselling Course design and the expected standard is very insignificant. In other words, most aspects of the learning design are close to or in accordance with the predetermined standards. The very low category indicates that there are very design for this course has almost completely fulfilled all elements of the desired standard.

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

Based on the results of the evaluation of the instructional design of four courses in the Bachelor of Islamic Education Programme at STAIN Majene, some important points can be discussed to provide a comprehensive picture of the existing learning design. This analysis includes key components such as the formulation of CPMK, learning strategies, teaching materials, and assessment instruments. The evaluation also highlights and identifies areas that still require improvement. Findings about shortcomings in the learning design will be used as a basis to modify the learning design of each course. Modifications are necessary because the standards in



the next stage of evaluation refer to the components of the learning design that have been prepared.

Instructional design performance in each course shows varying numbers. The PAI Learning Strategy course falls into the low category. While Entrepreneurship and Research Methodology courses fall into the medium category. The Guidance and Counselling courses are in the very high category. This means that the lecturers of the four courses have shown commitment and competence in designing learning although at different levels. This is indicated by the fulfilment of criteria in several components of learning design that almost and/or have met the standards. Especially in the teaching material component which contributes the most to the learning design performance score.

Strategi Pembelajaran PAI and Bimbingan dan Konseling lecturers streng then the achievement of the teaching material component criteria by relying on articles and reference books that are carefully integrated into each meeting session. Moreover, the lecturer's qualitative research methodology that combines digital teaching materials in the form of videos and readings not only enriches students' learning experience but also reflects a positive and adaptive response to changes in educational technology.

This is in line with previous research that assessed the use of digital technology by college lecturers in the United States based on perceived importance, competence, and motivation (Martin et al., 2020). The results showed that lecturers consider digital technologies including learning management systems and online resources, as important components in the learning process. The main motivation for using these technologies is their benefits to improve the quality of learning, not external factors such as appointment or promotion. This is in line with the findings in learning design performance on the aspect of teaching materials that utilise YouTube and research articles as teaching materials, showing their awareness of the importance of integrating digital resources in learning. Despite the different research contexts (United States vs Indonesia), the similarities in lecturers' perceptions and motivations towards the use of digital technology indicate a global trend in higher education to adopt and utilise technology to improve learning effectiveness.

However, it needs to be reiterated that the learning design performance shown in each course has not fully met the existing standards. The fact that there is a gap between performance and learning design standards in the 4 courses is very important to be discussed further in this section. the mean instructional design gap rate shown in each course is in different categories.

The gap in the PAI Learning Strategy course is in the high category. The gaps shown in the Educational Entrepreneurship and Qualitative Research Methodology courses fall into the low category. While the learning design gap in Guidance and Counselling courses is in the very low category. This indicates that there are components of learning design that have not been fulfilled in each course although at different levels. When explored more deeply, all components require improvement although the level varies in each course.

First, the formulation of CPMK is a derivative of the Study Programme's Graduate Learning Outcomes (LLOs). As a key component in the RPS, CPMK must be designed in such a way that it

is aligned with the broader learning targets set by the study programme. To achieve effectiveness and comprehensiveness in learning planning, it is important for the formulation of CPMK to follow the ABCD model, namely Audience (learning objectives), Behaviour (expected skills or knowledge), Condition (conditions or context in which learning occurs), and Degree (desired level of success) (Yaumi, 2024). This model not only helps in creating specific and measurable learning objectives, but also ensures that these objectives can be achieved in a structured way that is focused on students' needs and development.

The findings on the performance of the CPMK formulation aspect of the PAI Learning Strategy and Educational Entrepreneurship course show alarming results. Only 33% of the standards were met, leaving a gap of 67%. This figure indicates that the formulation of the CPMK of the two courses is still far from ideal and needs significant revision. This large gap indicates a weakness in formulating CPMK that includes ABCD elements. This condition has the potential to cause difficulties in evaluating student learning achievements and hinder the effective learning process. While in the Qualitative Research Methodology and Guidance and Counselling courses, although it shows a relatively low number of 50% and 17%, it indicates that there are still aspects in the CPMK formulation component that have not been fulfilled by the course.

To get a deeper understanding of the challenges and needs for improvement in each aspect of the CPMK formulation, interviews were conducted with each lecturer teaching the course, which are presented below:

When confirmed about the RPS, especially in the CPMK formula component, the PAI Learning Strategy lecturer stated that:

“When I formulated the CPMK, I did not pay attention to the CPL Prodi. I also just heard the term ABCD formula now, my RPS including CPMK in it is an adaptation of RPS from other universities that I downloaded from the internet.” (Strategi Pembelajaran PAI lecturer, *Interview*, Majene, 13 Maret 2024)

A similar statement was made by the lecturer of the Educational Entrepreneurship course:

“Until now, I have never seen Prodi's SLOs, so far I have compiled the RPS based on references from the RPS of the same course from other campuses and then I modified it.” (Kewirausahaan Pendidikan lecturer, *Interview*, Majene 14 Maret 2024)

Based on this information, it is known that the lecturers of PAI Learning Strategies and Educational Entrepreneurship courses are less familiar with the appropriate standards and procedures in formulating CPMK. In addition, the lecturers' lack of understanding of the proper method of formulating CPMK, such as the use of the ABCD formula, also contributed to the low performance of the formulation of CPMK. Lecturers tend to adopt or modify Semester Learning Plans (RPS) from other universities obtained from the internet, without making adequate adjustments to the context and needs of STAIN Majene's Bachelor of PAI Study Programme. This practice indicates a lack of originality and contextualisation in the development of CPMK, which ultimately leads to a gap between the existing CPMK formulation and the expected standards.

Furthermore, when interviewed at a different place and time, the Qualitative Research Methodology lecturer answered briefly:

"I haven't got the CPL Program Studi" (Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif, *Interview*, Majene 15 Maret 2024)

A different statement was delivered by a Guidance and Counselling lecturer, namely:

"I have referred to the SLOs of the study programme, but because the study programme has not yet determined the SLOs imposed on my course, I took the initiative to take the relevant SLOs. Then I lowered it down to the CPMK. Although it is still not perfect, but I have tried"

The results of interviews with Qualitative Research Methodology lecturers as well as Guidance and Counselling lecturers show differences in the process and challenges faced in formulating CPMK that refer to the SLOs of the study programme. The lecturer of Qualitative Research Methodology revealed the main obstacle, which is not receiving the SLOs from the study programme. This indicates a communication problem or distribution of important documents needed for the design of appropriate CPMK. Without the SLO guidelines, the lecturer did not have a strong basis for developing CPMK that was aligned with the programme standards.

On the other hand, the Guidance and Counselling lecturer stated that despite referring to the ELOs of the study programme, there were obstacles because the study programme had not specifically determined the ELOs for the courses he taught. In this situation, the lecturer took the initiative by selecting SLOs that were considered relevant and then reducing them to CPMK. This statement highlights a proactive effort on the part of the lecturer to close the existing gap, although recognising that the results are still not perfect.

These two interviews indicate that the success of effective CPMK formulation, according to the ABCD model, requires coordination and clarity from the study programme regarding the establishment of SLOs. To improve the quality of CPMK formulation, there needs to be better communication and explicit guidance from the study programme, so that lecturers can be more confident in formulating complete and accurate CPMK. For this reason, further confirmation from the person in charge of the Undergraduate Programme in Islamic Education is required. The following is his statement:

"The CPL imposed on each course have actually been partially compiled, but they have not yet been finalised. That's why we haven't distributed them to lecturers..." (Head of the Islamic Education Study Programme at STAN, *interview*, Majene, 30 Juli 2024)

The statement revealed that the Graduate Learning Outcomes (CPL) for each course were actually in the preparation stage, but not yet fully completed, so the distribution to lecturers was delayed. This delay has a direct impact on the obstacles experienced by lecturers in preparing Course Learning Outcomes (CPMK).

This condition not only reflects the challenges faced by lecturers, but also has implications for the effectiveness of the learning process in the Bachelor of PAI Study Programme of STAIN Majene. Lecturers' unfamiliarity with the standards of CPMK formulation has the potential to cause a mismatch between what is taught and what is expected to be achieved by students, thus contributing to the low quality of learning. In addition, the adoption of RPS from other institutions without an adequate adaptation process can eliminate the context that is important for the relevance of the material, which should be tailored to the characteristics and needs of students.

This practice not only reduces the level of originality, but also creates a larger gap between the existing CPMK formulation and the standards applied by the wider educational institution.

This condition is in line with the results of previous research on the analysis of learning objectives in ABCD aspect lesson plans. The findings in the study revealed that teachers experienced challenges in formulating ABCD aspects, especially the condition and degree aspects effectively (Sari et al., 2020).

This finding indicates an ongoing gap in the understanding and application of ABCD principles in lesson planning, both at the level of curriculum preparation and implementation in the field. The difficulties faced by teachers in writing the Condition and Degree aspects in the previous study are also connected to similar challenges found earlier in formulating a complete and structured CPMK. This indicates that improvement and professional development support for educators is essential to strengthen the essential aspects in planning and implementing more effective and measurable learning.

Second, the development of assessment instruments. An effective assessment instrument is an important component of learning design, as it provides a way for educators to measure and evaluate students' overall learning achievement. These instruments ideally comprise a variety of elements, including cognitive tests, performance assessments, work products, projects and attitudinal assessments.

The results showed a performance rate that was far from the standard, namely 0% for the PAI Learning Strategy course and 33% for the Qualitative Research Methodology course. From this data, there are significant challenges in terms of the preparation of assessment instruments that contribute to the learning design gap in these courses.

The 0% performance shown by the PAI Learning Strategy course indicates that none of the components of the assessment instrument were fulfilled. As for the Qualitative Research Methodology course and the Educational Entrepreneurship course with a performance of 33%. This means that although there are aspects of the assessment instrument that are fulfilled, namely the assessment of work results, the fact is that other aspects are not fulfilled, especially the assessment criteria of each aspect assessed. As a result, the performance of learning design in the assessment instrument component in these courses also shows a gap.

The data is consistent with the results of interviews with lecturers teaching the course. The lecturer of PAI learning strategy admitted that:

"This course is new to me this semester, therefore I have not yet developed the assessment instrument. As for other courses so far, I have only made written questions when approaching the mid semester and/or final exam and even then I did not make an assessment guide.." (Strategi Pembelajaran PAI lecturer, *interview*, Majene, 13 Maret 2024)

Based on the lecturer's confession in the interview, it revealed that this was the first time the lecturer taught the course and had not had time to develop an adequate assessment instrument. The lecturer also admitted that in his other courses, assessment tends to be limited to written questions carried out before the midterm or final exam, without clear assessment guidelines.

Meanwhile, the lecturer of Qualitative Research Methodology tried to survive and justify the assessment instrument that had been prepared as revealed in the following interview results:

“I conduct holistic assessment, with just the work assessment instrument, I can already assess students' abilities comprehensively”

In fact, planning and developing more comprehensive and systematic assessment instruments can contribute to the performance of learning design which leads to the achievement of better learning outcomes. An integrated approach to assessment can not only improve student learning outcomes, but also enrich the overall learning experience.

This condition shows that the main challenge faced in the preparation of assessment instruments in the PAI Learning Strategy and Qualitative Research Methodology courses is the lack of comprehensive and systematic coverage in the assessment design used. For PAI Learning Strategy, the absence of assessment instruments fully reveals the challenges faced by new lecturers who have not prepared adequate evaluation tools. Meanwhile, in Qualitative Research Methodology, although there is an attempt to assess through work output, the incompleteness of other instruments creates gaps in the assessment of students' overall ability. The implication of this challenge is that learning design performance is far from standard, potentially hindering the achievement of optimal learning outcomes. Without comprehensive and integrated assessment instruments, the ability to effectively evaluate and improve learning is limited, which in turn can affect the quality of the educational experience for students.

Thirdly, learning strategy in learning design is a crucial aspect that includes learning activities, methods, and media used. An effective combination of activities, methods, and media in learning strategies not only enriches the learning experience but can also improve students' understanding and retention of information, contributing to better achievement of educational goals.

In the context of this study, the gap indicated in the aspect of learning strategies contributes significantly to the learning design gap in the four courses studied. Within this strategy component, the learning activity aspect is the factor that contributes the most to the learning design gap. The results showed that the four courses did not include in writing the learning activities that would be carried out in the RPS.

When confirmed to the lecturers in charge of the course, the four lecturers gave uniform answers which essentially revealed that the four lecturers were not aware that learning activities should be planned and included when preparing the course RPS. This finding indicates a gap in lecturers' understanding of the important components of learning design. The absence of learning activity planning in the RPS indicates that lecturers do not fully understand the importance of integration between components in learning design to be able to create effective learning experiences for students.

This finding is in line with the results of previous research on the development of the RPS preparation model for general courses at Tidar University. The study revealed that lecturers at Tidar University experienced difficulties in preparing Semester Learning Plans (SSP) for general courses (MKU) due to the lack of clear guidelines. This difficulty causes variations in the content

of the RPS between lecturers, even though the components must be the same. To overcome this problem, the second year of research seeks to develop a model of guidance for the preparation of RPS for MKU at Tidar University. The results showed that this guide is effective in helping lecturers in preparing RPS better and correctly (Wahyono & Widiyanto, 2024).

Related to the learning strategy gap, especially in the aspect of learning activities, it is significant to the learning design gap in the four courses studied, with lecturers not including learning activities in the RPS. This highlights the lecturers' lack of understanding of important elements in learning design, which impacts on the integration of the RPS and threatens the effectiveness of students' learning experience. This is in line with the finding that lecturers at Tidar University had difficulty developing MKU RPS due to a lack of clear guidelines, causing variations in RPS content. Both indicate the need for clear RPS guidelines so that lecturers can develop RPS with integrated learning strategy components, ensuring an effective learning experience for students.

Learning design is a blueprint that guides learning. Good design, in line with standards, will promote learning effectiveness and goal achievement. Conversely, if learning design does not meet standards, there are a number of serious implications that can hinder the learning process and negatively impact the quality of education.

Once the design stage of the evaluation has been completed, the next stage in the discrepancy model of programme evaluation is modification. These modifications are made to the existing performance and/or standards before proceeding to the next stage of evaluation (Provus, 1969). In this study, modifications were made to learning design performance and learning design standards.

Performance modification is carried out through adjustments to the Semester Learning Plan (RPS) of the course by each lecturer in charge of the course. Each lecturer made adjustments to the RPS based on the RPS worksheet that had been provided with reference to the Higher Education Curriculum Guidelines. The results show an increase in the fulfilment of learning design criteria in each course. However, the level of fulfilment of these criteria has not fully met the established standards. Therefore, the researcher took the next step of modifying the learning design standards.

The modification of this standard is focused on the components of the CPMK formulation. Previously, the standard used referred to the ABCD aspect in the formulation of CPMK. However, interviews showed that many lecturers were still unfamiliar with the term, reflecting a lack of understanding of this concept in the context of higher education. This finding is in line with the results of previous research which revealed the difficulties faced by educators in formulating specific and measurable learning objectives.

For this reason, the modification of learning design standards is carried out by referring to Tyler's theory, which prioritises aspects of abilities and materials in the preparation of learning objectives as the formulation of this CPMK in the 2024 Higher Education Curriculum Preparation Guidelines (KPT) which states that it must contain elements of learning abilities and materials (Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Riset, 2024). Thus, the modification of learning design

standards that refer to Tyler's theory as stated in KPT 2024 is expected to improve lecturers' understanding in formulating CPMK that is clearer, specific, and measurable, so as to improve the quality of learning in higher education.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

The evaluation of learning design showed variations in performance between courses. Islamic Education Learning Strategy is in the low category (37%), Entrepreneurship (67%) and Qualitative Research Methodology (62%) in the medium category, and Guidance and Counselling (87%) in the very high category. Each course has gaps in the learning design component, especially in the formulation of Course Learning Outcomes and the planning of learning strategies in the Semester Learning Plan. Assessment instruments are also still less comprehensive in the Student Assignment Design.

After conducting a comprehensive evaluation of learning design in the Bachelor of Islamic Education Programme at STAIN Majene, gaps were found in each component of learning design as previously described. The following recommendations are prepared as a guide for continuous improvement. These recommendations are intended to address the identified gaps in learning design, as well as to maximise the potential of lecturers in achieving optimal learning outcomes.

Furthermore, the recommendations are aimed at various parties involved in the implementation of learning programmes. Firstly, lecturers need to improve their understanding and skills in formulating Course Learning Outcomes (CPMK), as well as ensuring that each course has a comprehensive and relevant assessment instrument. Secondly, the Head of the Study Programme is advised to provide periodic training for lecturers regarding the preparation of effective learning designs and in accordance with applicable educational standards. Third, the Quality Assurance Centre is advised to develop and socialise learning design standards.

### **Acknowledgment**

The author would like to express his deepest gratitude to Prof. Dr. Muhammad Yaumi, M.Hum., M.A Prof. Dr. Hj Misykat Malik Ibrahim, M.Si., Dr. Saprin, M.Pd., Prof. Dr. Sitti Mania, M.Ag., Prof. Dr. Hj Amrah Kasim, M.A., and Dr. Hj St. Syamsudduha, M.Pd., who have provided valuable guidance, direction, and support throughout the research and writing process of this paper. The patience and knowledge they have shared have greatly influenced the author's understanding. I feel very fortunate to have learnt from their experience and expertise, and to have received constructive feedback that helped improve the quality of this paper. May all the kindness and dedication they have shown be honoured by Allah SWT.

## REFERENCES

- Ahyar, D. B., Tuerah, P. R., Irani, U., Subroto, D. E., Masita, E., Gultom, E., Asmara, A., Akbar, M., Evitasari, A. D., & Ariyani, D. (2023). *DESAIN SISTEM PEMBELAJARAN*. PT. Mifandi Mandiri Digital.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publications Inc.
- Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Riset, dan T. (2024). *Buku Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi Mendukung Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Merdeka Menuju Indonesia Emas* (Edisi ke-V). Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Riset, dan Teknologi; Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
- Fadhallah, R. A. (2020). *Wawancara*. UNJ Press.
- Jurusan Tarbiyah dan Keguruan STAIN Majene. (2022). *Rakapitulasi Nilai Ujian Komprehensif Mahasiswa*.
- Kurniawan, A. (2018). *Buku Ajar Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mariyono, D. (2024). *Strategi Pembelajaran dari Teori ke Praktik Pendekatan Pembelajaran Kolaboratif di Perguruan Tinggi*. Nas Media Pustaka.
- Martin, F., Polly, D., Coles, S., & Wang, C. (2020). Examining higher education faculty use of current digital technologies: Importance, competence, and motivation. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 32*(1), 73–86.
- Miles, M. B., Hubberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Mufaridah, F., Yono, T., Ikhtiar, M. F., & Raharjo, P. (2022). Kreatifitas Guru Mendesain Pembelajaran: Kajian Fenomenologi Dalam Pembelajaran Daring Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Science (IJES), 4*(2), 176–184.
- Prasetyo, A. R., Ratnawati, I., Aruna, A., Surya, E. P., Roziqin, M. F. A., & Marcelliantika, A. (2024). Pengembangan Konten Terintegrasi Smart Design Media Platform Mata Kuliah Media Pembelajaran Seni dalam Sistem Pembelajaran Jaringan. *EduInovasi: Journal of Basic Educational Studies, 4*(3), 1408–1423.
- Provus, M. M. (1969). *The Discrepancy Evaluation Model: An Approach to Local Program Improvement and Development*. Pittsburgh Public Schools.
- Saifuddin, A. (2021). *Penyusunan Skala Psikologi*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Santoso, H., Surono, S., Ainia, D. K., Putri, K., & Hastangka, H. (2023). MEMBANGUN JIWA MERDEKA BAGI DOSEN PANCASILA RELEVANSINYA BAGI PENGUATAN KARAKTER MAHASISWA. *Waskita: Jurnal Pendidikan Nilai Dan Pembangunan Karakter, 7*(2), 112–123.
- Saprin, Achruh, A., & Rumasukun, muhammad R. (2023). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan Islam*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sari, P. P., Luardini, M. A., & Asi, N. (2020). An Analysis of Learning Objective in English Teacher Lesson Plans Based on Abcd Aspect. *Journal Compound, 8*(3), 21–43.
- Setyosari, P. (2020). *Desain Pembelajaran*. Bumi Aksara.
- Susanto, D., & Jailani, M. S. (2023). Teknik Pemeriksaan Keabsahan Data Dalam Penelitian Ilmiah. *Jurnal QOSIM: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial & Humaniora, 1*(1), 53–61.
- Wahyono, H., & Widiyanto, D. (2024). Development of RPS preparation model in Tidar University



general course. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 3116(1).

Yaumi, M. (2024). *Pendekatan Sistematis dalam Proses Desain Pembelajaran: Analysis, Instructional Goal Setting, Production, Evaluation, & Dissemination (Model AIPED)*. Kencana.

### **Interview**

Dosen Strategi Pembelajaran PAI (34 Tahun), Wawancara, Majene 13 Maret 2024

Dosen Bimbingan dan Konseling (36 Tahun), Wawancara, Majene 12 Maret 2024

Dosen Kewirausahaan Pendidikan (33 Tahun), Wawancara, Majene 14 Maret 2024

Dosen Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (33 Tahun), Wawancara, Majene 15 Maret 2024

Dosen Strategi Pembelajaran PAI (32 Tahun), *Wawancara*, Majene, 13 Maret 2024

Dosen Kewirausahaan Pendidikan (33 Tahun), *Wawancara*, Majene 14 Maret 2024

Dosen Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (33 Tahun), *Wawancara*, Majene 15 Maret 2024

Ketua Program Sarjana Pendidikan Agama Islam STAN Majene (33 Tahun), *Wawancara*, Majene, 30 Juli 2024

Dosen Strategi Pembelajaran PAI (32 Tahun), *Wawancara*, Majene, 13 Maret 2024