

Evaluation of the Implementation of Scientific Work of S1 Pgpaud Fkip Ut Students

St. Maria Ulfah
Universitas Terbuka

Abstract: This study was conducted with the aim of evaluating the implementation of scientific work of PG PAUD undergraduate students at FKIP UT. The evaluation targets of the research objectives are to: (1) obtain an overview of the ability of students to apply the principles of writing scientific papers; (2) determine the ability of tutors / mentors in carrying out guidance whether it is in accordance with the procedures for guiding scientific work patterns. This research is an evaluation that serves as input for the improvement of future scientific work. The design of this evaluation research is correlational, meaning that it does not hypothesize specifically about the existence of a causal relationship, but only an associative relationship. The reason for using this design is because this study will evaluate the implementation of scientific work by implementing a new mentoring pattern. This research will use a questionnaire data collection method as the main method, interviews and observation and documentation as a complement. While the data analysis techniques used in this research are qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Qualitative data analysis for processing data from interviews and observations, while quantitative data analysis for processing data from the questionnaires collected. This evaluation research resulted in: (1) Scientific work guidance is carried out in accordance with the schedule and guidelines; (2) Scientific work guidance is carried out through online tutorials and webinar tutorials that have been determined; (3) All students improve the results of plagiarism checks with turnitin by a maximum of 30%.

Keywords: Innovation, technology, research projects

I. INTRODUCTION

Worthen and Sanders (1973, in Suharsimi, 2002) say that evaluation is an activity of looking for something valuable about something; in looking for something, it also includes looking for information that is useful in assessing the existence of a program, production, procedure, and alternative strategies proposed to achieve predetermined goals. Still from the same source that a well-known expert in program evaluation, Stufflebeam (1971), said that evaluation is a process of describing, searching and providing information that is very useful for decision makers in determining alternative decisions.

From the various opinions of these experts, the author can conclude that evaluation is a process or activity to find various important information to determine an appropriate alternative that is carried out carefully in making a decision and can be accounted for. Meanwhile, evaluation research as stated by Stufflebeam (1971), is a process to reveal, search for and analyze and present information to make a decision. According to Suchman (1973, in Suharsimi, 2008) that evaluation research is used, among others, to find out whether the objectives of an activity can be achieved and how far it can be achieved.

achieved. Scriven (1977) argues that part of the function of evaluation research is for decision making. In addition to these opinions, Livine & Robert (1981) suggest that evaluation research is research conducted to reveal the results of the program. Furthermore, the results of the program are compared with the expected objectives. So the author can conclude that evaluation research can be used to see the extent to which a program/activity has been implemented and the suitability of the results with the expected objectives.

Worthen and Sandes (1987, in Suharsimi 2006) argue that evaluation research can use inquiry and judgment methods which contain three important things: (1) determine program quality standards, and decide whether the criteria used are relative or absolute; (2) collect information that is relevant to the program context; (3) apply criteria in the evaluation to determine program criteria. So it can be concluded that evaluation research is used to see the extent to which the activity has been carried out and the extent to which the activity is with the expected objectives. Implicitly, the purpose of evaluation according to Sudjana (2006) has been formulated in the definition of evaluation, namely to present data as input/information for decision makers. The purpose of evaluation can be formulated as follows:

1. Provide input for program planning
2. Provide input for program continuation, expansion and discontinuation.
3. Provide feedback for program modifications.
4. Obtain information about the supporting and inhibiting factors of the program.
5. Provide input for motivation and coaching of program managers and implementers.

Jihad and Haris (in Arikunto Suharsimi, 2008) suggest that evaluation functions as a performance monitor of the components of the teaching and learning process activities, in this case the activities of the implementation of scientific work, namely to achieve the expected goals.

It can be concluded that the function of evaluation: (1) to provide reliable and valid information about policy performance or results; (2) to clarify and criticize voters and goal setting; (3) to help structure and redefine alternative program policies.

As for the research that the author will carry out now is an evaluation that functions to help re-structure and redefine alternative policies, the author hopes that the results of this evaluation research will serve as a consideration for determining policies, especially the implementation of future scientific work.

Implicitly, the purpose of evaluation according to Sudjana (2006) has been formulated in the definition of evaluation, namely to present data as input/information for decision makers. The purpose of evaluation can be formulated as follows:

- a. Provide input for program planning
- b. Provide input for program continuation, expansion and discontinuation.
- c. Provide feedback for program modifications.

- d. Obtain information about the supporting and inhibiting factors of the program.
- e. Provide input for motivation and coaching of program managers and implementers.

F. Procedures and Guidance for Scientific Work S1 PG PAUD

Student participation in Karil course guidance is MANDATORY. Each guidance class consists of 1 (one) supervisor or instructor with a maximum number of 15 students. Students are required to improve parts or all of the scientific article by paying attention to the direction and input of supervisors and peers.

The series of learning activities in the Karil course guidance consists of:

- 1) Self-study, namely student activities studying Karil Course Orientation materials, Karil Course Guidelines, and independent assignments before the start of the tutorial;
- 2) Assignment, which is the activity of working on a number of assignments that will be uploaded to the tutorial / guidance page and improving the scientific article writing assignment;
- 3) Online Tutorials (Tuton) and Webinar Tutorials (Tuweb), namely supervisor / instructor - student and student interactions to discuss, discuss, and strengthen mastery of concepts and practices of writing scientific articles and provide comments or feedback on assignments done by students. Tuton activities are asynchronous with a duration per session of about one week, while Tuweb activities take place face-to-face with a duration of 2 hours per session.

During tutorials or mentoring, tutors/mentors are obliged to:

- 1) help students to consolidate their mastery of essential concepts and rules for writing scientific articles;
- 2) direct students in doing article writing assignments;
- 3) provide comments or suggestions for improvement for each part or all parts of the scientific articles produced by students, both in terms of content, language, reasoning, format and systematics of articles, how to cite, and how to write a bibliography.
- 4) help students not to do plagiarism prevention and other disgraceful actions in writing scientific articles by utilizing the Turnitin application.

II. Research Methods

A. Research Location and Research Design

1. Research Location

This evaluation research will be conducted in Majene Regency on undergraduate PG PAUD students in semester 9 consisting of 14 students during registration 2022, namely between April and June who are taking scientific work courses. The reason for the selection in the study is because students who come from the same area.

2. Research Design

This evaluation research was carried out based on the results of monitoring the guidance of scientific papers in the previous semester or during the 2022 registration period. The research design in this evaluation

research is correlational as written by M Toha Anggoro et al (2007), which means that it does not hypothesize specifically about the existence of a causal relationship, but only an associative relationship. The reason the author applies this research design is because this research will evaluate the implementation of scientific work by applying a new mentoring pattern.

In this study, the instrument used consisted of a questionnaire given to students during mentoring to be filled in. Observations during the mentoring were aimed at students, especially regarding the preparation of reports because this evaluation research implies that there is an expectation of a close link between program evaluation and the type of program being evaluated. In accordance with the form of activities that will be evaluated is the processing program.

C. Research Subject

This research was conducted to evaluate the implementation of scientific work, therefore the data sources in this evaluation research include parties directly related to the implementation of scientific work in the PG PAUD undergraduate program in Majene Regency for the 2022 registration period.2. The parties involved in organizing scientific work are students, of which there are 15 in total.

D. Data Collection Methods

The data collection used in this evaluation research is a questionnaire. The data collection technique that will be used is by distributing questionnaires to students via googledrive. Technically, the main data collection from student sources through questionnaires will be designed with a grid

QUESTIONS

Questionnaire on the Implementation of Karil Mentoring

| Dimensions | Indicator | No. Item | Criteria | Source |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------|---|--|
| Availability | Provide sufficient consultation time Guidance and training | 1 | Understand the competencies must be achieved Problem Suitability Active in activities | Student Supervisor |
| Perception of Material mastery | Mentors master research methodology | 2 | Strategic/easy to reach Meets the requirements which is determined | Student, supervisor, manager manager |
| Perception of development improvement | Mentors help provide solutions to the obstacles to writing scientific articles faced by students. | 3 | Understand the procedure preparation of SKH | Student |
| | Supervisors monitor the progress of students' scientific articles | | Implementation findings repair Assessment procedure Assessment procedure | Student, supervisor 2 Student Student |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Perception of the process of completing scientific work | Mentors monitor student progress uploading scientific articles | 5 | Understand the procedure report preparation The process of writing the work scientific Assessment procedure | Student Student, supervisor 1 Student, supervisor 1 |
|---|--|---|---|---|

E. Data Analysis Technique

For data processing in this evaluation research using quantitative data analysis. Quantitative data analysis for processing data from questionnaires. Then the data obtained must be organized in a structure that is easy to understand and describe. Each evaluation result that has been carried out will be given an assessment, therefore the assessment criteria must first be determined. The assessment criteria are based on references or considerations from the provisions of the scientific work implementation guidelines and based on criteria developed in the field such as to evaluate the results of the evaluation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data obtained from students is by distributing questionnaires to all PG PAUD undergraduate program students in semester 9, from the questionnaires collected then the data is tabulated in accordance with the data analysis used. Students' opinions on the implementation of scientific work guidance can be known from the questionnaires collected. There are 4 items / questions that must be answered by respondents in the questionnaire. The 4 items/questions reveal the orientation/direction which consists of 4 items (no 1-4), the perception of the location consists of 2 items (no 5-6), the perception of development improvement ~~only~~ items (no 7-10) and the perception of report preparation and simulation consists of 3 items (no 11-13). Each of these items/questions has a maximum score of 3, so that the maximum score (ideal score) expected to be achieved by each respondent is 39 while the minimum score is 1 so that the minimum score that might be achieved is 13. The questionnaire items/questions include:

1. Provide sufficient consultation time for guidance and practice.
2. Mentors master research methodology
3. Mentors help provide solutions to the obstacles to writing scientific articles faced by students.
4. Supervisors monitor the progress of students uploading scientific articles

The 4 items/questions in the questionnaire above must be answered by students according to the reality they experience. The questionnaires collected back amounted to 64 out of 71 questionnaires given to students as respondents.

1.1. Answers from Respondents on Orientation/direction

| No. Item | Question | No. | Answer | f | % | weight |
|----------|---|-----|-----------|----|------|--------|
| 1 | Provide sufficient consultation time for guidance and practice. | 1 | Yes | 10 | 71,4 | 3 |
| | | 2 | sometimes | 2 | 14,3 | 2 |
| | | 3 | No | 2 | 14,3 | 1 |
| 2 | Mentors master research methodology | 1 | Yes | 10 | 71,4 | 3 |
| | | 2 | sometimes | 3 | 21,4 | 2 |
| | | 3 | No | 1 | 7,1 | 1 |
| 3 | Mentors help provide solutions to the obstacles to writing scientific articles faced by students. | 1 | Yes | 10 | 71,4 | 3 |
| | | 2 | sometimes | 2 | 14,3 | 2 |
| | | 3 | No | 2 | 14,3 | 1 |
| 4 | Supervisors monitor the progress of students uploading scientific articles | 1 | Yes | 10 | 71,4 | 3 |
| | | 2 | sometimes | 2 | 14,3 | 2 |
| | | 3 | No | 2 | 14,3 | 1 |

From item/question no 1, namely Providing sufficient consultation time for guidance and training from the incoming questionnaire 10 respondents said yes, there were 2 respondents who answered sometimes and 2 respondents who said no. Item/question no 2 regarding the supervisor mastering the research methodology 10 respondents answered yes, there were 3 respondents who answered sometimes and 1 respondent who answered no. Item/question no 3 explanation regarding the supervisor helps provide solutions to the obstacles to writing scientific articles faced by students from the incoming questionnaire 10 respondents answered yes, there were 2 respondents who answered sometimes and 2 respondents who answered no and for item/question no 4 regarding the supervisor monitoring the progress of students uploading scientific articles there were 10 respondents who answered yes, 2 respondents answered sometimes and 2 respondents said no. Furthermore, the calculation is based on the weighting score of the answer option

(yes=3, sometimes=2, no=1) (Suharsimi, et al., 2004)

with the formula

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum f(\text{code})}{\sum f}$$

$$X = \frac{\sum f(\text{code})}{\sum f}$$

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the research and data analysis conducted by the author, the author can conclude that the supervisor has carried out the guidance in accordance with the instructions in the scientific work guide.

LITERATURE

- [1] ArikuntoSuharsimi (2002). *Research Procedure: A Practice Approach Review Edition V*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- [2] -----(2006). *Research Procedures: A Practice Approach Review Edition VI*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- [3] ArikuntoSuharsimi, CepySafrudin and Abdul Jabar (2008). *Basics of Educational Evaluation Revised Edition*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- [4] Livine, Robert A. Et al (1981). *Evaluation Research and Practice*. Beverly Hill; Sage Prodc
- [5] Scriven, M. (1977). *The Methodology Of Evaluation, Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*.Chicago: Rand-Mc Nally.
- [6] Stufflebeam, Daniel L. (1971). *Educational Evaluation and Decision Making*.Itaca Illinois: FE Peacock
- [7] Sudjana. (2006). *Introduction to Educational Evaluation*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo PersadaJakarta: Open University.
- [8] Toha Anggoro, M. et al. (2007). *Research Methods*. Jakarta: Open University