

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the previous chapter, data analyses from both the student and the administrator survey questionnaires have been displayed and discussed. This chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the results of the evaluation of the English Education Program (EEP) in Universitas Terbuka (UT) which was conducted in a period from April to June, 2012 and subsequently the recommendations for which the evaluation is intended to address. The first part summarizes and concludes the study based on the results of the evaluation which adopted the four evaluation stages of the Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM). The evaluation research was intended to formatively assess the performance of EEP in developing and implementing the program components comprising objectives, student, staff, content, delivery method, learning assessment, support systems, and facilities. In line with the model, the EEP program performance was assumed to include performances in: (1) the program definition; (2) the program installation, (3) the program process, and (4) the program product.

Document Survey was done in the first stage to collect standard statements from various official documents as bases for comparison analyses of the performances of the program definition (or design) and the standards. Cross-sectional survey using questionnaires and interviews were used to collect the data of the students' and the administrators' perceptions and assessment on the actual performance of EEP in implementing the standards. The previous chapter has

displayed and discussed the results of the data analysis in attempts to systematically obtain evidences which support inferences for answering the research questions as follows:

1. Are EEP performances in developing and implementing the program components congruent with the standards?
2. Which EEP components have discrepancies?

A. Conclusions

Based on the results of the evaluation, and in line with the research questions, it can be concluded that the English Education Program at Universitas Terbuka was developed and implemented at incongruence with the standards as indicated by the existence of discrepancies in several program components obtained in two stages: the program definition evaluation and in the program installation evaluation. Discrepancies were found in the EEP performance in defining and installing input components of learning assessment, support system, and staff

First, that EEP-UT has only once administration of learning assessment every semester, namely Ujian Akhir Semester (Post Semester Exam), and no mid-term exam is conducted, was not in line with the standard, the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture Decree No. 24 Year 2012. According to the Decree, every distance higher education institution should administer at least twice regularly planned learning assessment every semester (Paragraph 7 Section 2).

Second, tutorial in EEP UT is part of the support systems which means that providing tutorial is not a must. Not every course is supported with tutorial. Discrepancy was found in the component of support system due to the failure of EEP-UT in defining the tutorial as part of the support system subcomponent. The standard, that is the Permendikbud Decree No.24, Paragraph 8, Section 3, Article a), states that every USBJJ (regional offices or learning centers) of a distance higher education institution should provide learning-teaching processes in form of tutorials for the enrolled students; and every USBJJ (regional offices or learning centers) of a distance higher education institution should provide learning supports in form of provisions of academic and non academic services for the enrolled students (Paragraph 8, Section 3, Article b). Obviously, based on the Decree, tutorial is part of academic services which should be provided by every distance higher education institution. Based on the survey, both the students and the administrators agreed that tutorial should be provided for every course.

Third, discrepancy was also found in input component of staff. EEP has 36 academic staff distributed in the head office and regional centers, now three of which are still at undergraduate level. The standard states that teachers in undergraduate programs should possess masters' degrees and they are physically and mentally healthy and certified in their professions (UU No. 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen:V.46 and PP No. 19 Tahun 2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Pendidikan Tinggi:31).

The result of the standard document analysis supplied by two experts in distance education and distance program development indicates that there was

sufficient information of standard statements for defining or redefining EEP. However, several international and national standard statements on distance program components were not yet accommodated by EEP or UT in general. This was especially related to failure of EEP to clearly define the (sub) components of student entry behavior and facilities. Furthermore, many other standard statements were not compatible with EEP.

No standard statement on the administration of entry test for distance learners was the reason for the researcher to judge that information on standard statements on the student entry behavior is not complete, which therefore should be specified, or at least it should be defined by the program.

The result of program process evaluation indicates that EEP has performed educational processes congruent with the standards. Evidences of congruence of the program processes were found in most of program process components. However, some discrepancies occur in two sub-components of program process components, the learning materials (one of the delivery method subcomponents) and the library services (one of the facilities subcomponents).

The result of program product evaluation allows the researcher to conclude that EEP has achieved its aims (ultimate objectives or vision, terminal objectives or missions, and enabling objectives or curricular objectives).

The result of content analysis on the open-ended item in the questionnaires was supportive to the extent that the tutorial support as one of the subcomponents of the support system becoming the most frequent topic asked by the students was in accordance with the certain degree of discrepancy in the support system

component in the quantitative survey. Another result shows that learning material, as one of the sub-components of the delivery method, becomes the second most frequent topic addressed by the respondents in the open-ended item of the surveys

The result of Friedman test on the close-ended responses in the installation stage proved that the support systems component placed the highest priority level for correction actions. On the other hand, the result of Friedman test on the close-ended responses in the process stage revealed that facilities placed the highest priority for improvement.

That the results of content analysis and Friedman Test supplemented, even strengthened, the results of the previous evaluation research by surveys enables the researcher to finally conclude that there are at least five EEP sub-components with some degrees of discrepancy can be considered occur in the program development and implementation namely tutorial support, learning materials, library services, and information services, and staffs qualification.

Some of the results of this study were in agreement with the previous evaluations conducted by EEP: the 2010 EEP SWOT analysis and the 2009 EEP Tracer Study. Similar findings were found in three sub-components: the tutorial support, information services, and the staff qualification.

B. Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to the EEP program manager and UT in general.

1. Tutorial support should be available for all EEP courses.
2. Tutorial support should be available in various forms to meet the dispersed EEP students' needs.
3. Tutorial support should not be categorized as part of support systems but it should be part of academic services.
4. The minimum requirement of the staff qualification (master's degree) should be met.
5. Evaluation of EEP learning materials should be conducted to select those which should be revised or changed
6. EEP learning materials development should include some criteria of attractiveness, as well as readability.
7. Information about EEP should be made available in various forms and in sufficient number for the students and other people can access easily.
8. There is a need to improve EEP students' awareness of the benefits of using library services to support distance learning success.
9. Further evaluation of the EEP may focus on such areas of tutorial support, learning materials, and information services which were found, in this research, to be the weakest sub-components.