JRSSEM 2023, Vol. 03, No. 02, 556 – 574
E-ISSN: 2807 - 6311, P-ISSN: 2807 - 6494

DEVELOPMENT OF AN EVALUATION MODEL FOR ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND CHARACTER EDUCATION (PAI-BP) AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL: BETWEEN URGENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Ahmad Muhtadi[1*]
Mulyoto[2]
Dardiri Hasyim[3]
[1,2,3]Program Doktor Pascasarjana UNU Surakarta, Indonesia
Email: ahmadmuhtadi1008@gmail.com[1], mulyoto_tp_uns@yahoo.com[2]
adardirihayim@gmail.com[3]
*Correspondence: ahmadmuhtadi1008@gmail.com

Abstract: The research is aimed to: (1) identify a factual model of learning evaluation of Islamic Religious and Moral Education (PAI-BP); (2) develop the PAI-BP learning evaluation model to suit the needs of the high school education level; and (3) knowing and analyzing the effectiveness of the PAI-BP learning evaluation development model at the high school education level in Karanganyar Regency for the 2020/2021 academic year. The type of the research is development research targetting the evaluation model for Islamic Religious and Moral Education (PAI-BP) for high school level. The data collection method was done using observation, in-depth interviews, document analysis, tests, and questionnaires techniques. Data analysis was carried out by qualitative and quantitative analysis. The research concluded that: (1) The factual model of the evaluation of Islamic Religious Education and Moral Education (PAI-BP) at the high school education level currently done separately between the process of learning and its product; (2) The evaluation model developed has two main components, namely: the learning process and output. The learning process includes four subcomponents, namely: (a) teachers' performance in the classroom, (b) teachers' personality, (c) students' behavior, and (d) learning facilities. Whereas the learning output includes four sub-components, namely aspects: (a) akidah akhlaq, (b) Qur'an-Hadith, (c) Fiqh, and (d) Islamic history; and (3) The effectiveness of the PAI-BP learning evaluation model developed shows that based on the experts, user and practitioner assessments, the model developed is considered as a Good model to evaluate PAI-BP learning at high school level education.

Keywords: learning model evaluation; development; Islamic religion and moral education; learning process; learning output; effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

Islamic Religious Education (PAI) which is taught in public schools from basic education (SD and SMP) to higher education has a strong position. This is mandated in Law no. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System in Article 37 paragraphs (1) and (2). The mandate of Article 37 paragraph (1) states "*The curriculum for primary and secondary education must contain religious education, civic education*". The purpose of the mandate of Article 37 is that religious education is intended to shape students into human beings who believe and fear God Almighty and have noble character.

The follow-up to the mandate of Article 37 of Law Number 20 of 2003 is realized in the form of Government Regulation Number 19 of 2005 concerning National Education Standards. This is stated in Article 6 paragraph (1) of PP Number 19 of 2005 which states as follows:

"*The curriculum for general, vocational, and special education types at the primary and secondary education levels consists of (a) groups of religious subjects and noble character; (b) civics and personality subject groups; (c) Science and technology subject groups; (d) group of aesthetic subjects; (e) group of physical subjects, sports, and health*."

The follow-up form of the mandate of Article 37 paragraphs (1) and (2) of Law Number 20 of 2003 in the form of a mandate implied in Article 6 of PP Number 19 of 2005 concerning National Education Standards, when associated with Islamic Religious Education, gave birth to a merger between Religious Education Islam (PAI) with Character Education (PBP) so that it becomes the Learning of Islamic Religion and Character Education (PAI-BP). PAI-BP has a portion of 4 hours of lessons per week at the elementary school level (SD) and 3 hours of lessons per week at the secondary school level.

The name change, which is a merger of the two subjects, actually has implications in the form of narrowing the meaning of Islamic Religious Education which is taught according to the 2013 Curriculum. This can be seen from the scope of the material contained in the combined learning.

The scope of material covered in Islamic Religious Education learning consists of aqidah, morality, worship, and mu'amalah. Thus, the scope of the PAI material actually contains material on the rules regarding the relationship between humans as creatures of God and God as the Creator (akhlaq bil Khaliq) and regulates the relationship between human beings (Akhlaq bil Mujtama'). In addition, the PAI also regulates the relationship between humans and the surrounding natural environment (Akhlaq bil Kaun). As for the moral material, which is one of the scopes of material in Islam, it teaches how to behave properly and correctly to anyone in accordance with the instructions contained in the holy book of the Qur'an. The relationship consists of behaving well to God, to fellow humans, and to the natural surroundings.

Budi Pekerti education, on the other hand, is nothing but moral education, character education, moral education, and value education (Ahmad Hanbal, 2019). Thus, the scope of Budi Pekerti Education, in general, is the cultivation and

development of values, and student behavior in accordance with noble character values. The values that need to be instilled consist of the values of courtesy, discipline, faith and piety, responsibility, honesty, and others.

Learning Islamic Religious Education and Character Education (PAI-BP) K-13 is the result of the merger of Islamic Religious Education (PAI) with Moral Education (PBP), thus having a new name, namely Islamic Religious Education and Character Education (PAI-BP). PAI-BP has a portion of 4 hours of lessons per week at the elementary school level (SD) and 3 hours of lessons per week at the secondary school level.

The name change, which is a merger of the two subjects, has implications in the form of narrowing the meaning of Islamic Religious Education which is taught according to the 2013 Curriculum. This can be seen from the scope of the material contained in the combined learning.

The scope of material covered in Islamic Religious Education learning consists of aqidah, morality, worship, and mu'amalah (Ahmad Hambal, 2019). Thus, the scope of the PAI material contains material on the rules regarding the relationship between humans as creatures of God and God as the Creator (akhlaq bil Khaliq) and regulates relationships with fellow humans (Akhlaq bil Mujtama'). about the relationship between humans and the surrounding natural environment (Akhlaq bil Kaun). As for the moral material, which is one of the scopes of material in Islam, it teaches how to behave properly and correctly to anyone in accordance with the instructions contained in the holy book of the Qur'an. The relationship consists of behaving well to God, to fellow humans, and to the natural surroundings.

Budi Pekerti education, on the other hand, is nothing but moral education, character education, moral education, and value education (Ahmad Hanbal, 2019). Thus, the scope of Budi Pekerti Education, in general, is the cultivation and development of values, and student behavior in accordance with noble character values. The values that need to be instilled consist of the values of courtesy, discipline, faith and piety, responsibility, honesty, and others.

The material in character learning is based on the above understanding, so it is similar to the material taught in morality. Morals are one part of the teachings of Islamic Religious Education. Thus, it can be said that Moral Education is already covered in the scope of material in Islamic Religious Education, this shows that the scope of material covered in Moral Education is narrower than Islamic Religious Education or it can even be said that Moral Education is actually only one a small part of the scope of Islamic Religious Education material. On this basis, it becomes quite clear that the decision made by the Ministry of Education and Culture to combine Islamic Religious Education and Character Education in the 2013 curriculum into Islamic Religion and Character Education (PAI-BP) was a wrong decision. The Ministry of Education and Culture, in this way, has indirectly replaced the Morals material from the material included in the scope of Islamic Religious Education with character. So that it can be said to have narrowed the meaning of Islamic Religious

Education itself.

The narrowing of the meaning of Islamic Religious Education as happened in PAI-BP according to the 2013 Curriculum shows that the Ministry of Education and Culture indirectly wants to say that "*people who study Islam do not necessarily have good character, so that person must learn manners*", or "*Islam does not include the character in it, so Islam must add character to make it perfect*". This condition is inseparable from the rampant moral decadence that is happening in the current generation.

The material covered in Islamic Religious Education is actually based on the Islamic creed which contains the oneness of Allah SWT, as the main source of life values for humans and the universe (Nurhayati & Hamid, 2020); (Wainscott, 2015). Another source is morality which is a manifestation of aqidah, which is also the basis for developing the values of the Indonesian nation's character. Thus, Islamic Religious Education is education aimed at being able to harmonize (Azis et al., 2022); (Amirudin & Muzaki, 2019), harmonize and balance between faith, Islam, and Ihsan.

Character formation through Islamic religious education for the Indonesian people in general and high school graduates (SMA) is so important, PAI is taught to students from elementary school, junior high school, to high school. his behavior far deviates from the characteristics of students with noble character. The less optimal formation of students' character from the PAI learning they receive is indicated by various findings that there are still many students who experience a moral crisis.

The moral crisis experienced by high school students was stated by the Deputy Regent of Karanganyar, Rohadi Widodo in the socialization of Prevention, Eradication, Abuse and Illicit Trafficking of Drugs (P4GN) at the bupati's official residence. In front of the participants of the discussion forum, the Vice Regent said that the consumption of cigarettes in congregation among students outside school hours brought it closer to the consumption of alcohol. Likewise, the consumption of alcoholic beverages can lead to drugs. Free sex is the next level of moral damage (De Goeij et al., 2015); (Soares et al., 2019).

Problems related to the occurrence of moral decadence in school-age children as exemplified above are not caused by the lack of content in learning Islamic Religious Education as implicitly taken into consideration by the Ministry of Education and Culture in integrating Islamic Religious Education with Character Education. The assumption that is implicitly developed that 'who studies Islam does not necessarily have good character, so that person must learn manners' is a big mistake.

The main factor that causes a moral crisis in school-age children above is the lack of religious education, both in formal education and in non-formal education, such as the lack of recitations. This was stated by Mahmud Arif who said that Islamic Religious Education (PAI) seeks to teach students to be able to carry out the mandate of life from Allah by creating a life that is rahmatan lil alamin and can carry out their duties as caliphs on earth (Arif, 2012); (Al Karimah, 2020). This is explained in the following description.

Islam is as a universal religion, as a

religion for humanity (all humankind), or as a religion for the entire world because of its' mission as rahmatan li al-'alamin. To realize such mission in Indonesian context, education activity is aimed to raise up a multicultural wisdom and global awareness of the pupils, so in next time they will be able to contribute in preservation of heterogeneity and to develop it for attaining a prosperous life (Yusupova et al., 2015); (O'Flaherty & Liddy, 2018), besides to face globalization current appropriately. In this case, Islamic education has a duty in transferring inclusive-multiculturalism Islamic teachings to students so that they can appreciate global values of Islam, like inclusivism, humanism, tolerance, and democracy.

The reality shows that there are still many students who experience a moral crisis, indicating that PAI-BP learning has not succeeded in forming character. The results of interviews with PAI-BP high school teachers in Karanganyar show that more than 50% of students have not been able to read the Qur'an. This contrasts with the PAI-BP subject scores obtained by students on report cards on average > 70.00. This condition is not directly proportional to the value of other subjects which usually show a linear comparison between the value of learning outcomes and students' abilities.

The significant discrepancy between students' learning achievement scores in PAI-BP learning and their inability to read the Qur'an is of course a big question mark. This is because the Qur'an is one of the scopes of PAI-BP learning teaching materials. So, if student achievement in PAI-BP learning is very good, surely their ability to read the Qur'an is also good.

The striking difference between the score on paper and the real ability shows that there are still not right in the evaluation of learning that has been carried out so far. The same thing was also stated by several school principals who stated that if the grades in PAI-BP learning were carried out according to applicable standards and regulations, many students would not be able to pass. Therefore, it is necessary to have a learning evaluation model that can meet the needs. The PAI-BP learning evaluation model that has been carried out so far needs to be reviewed to meet the demands of the needs.

The explanation above shows that the current PAI-BP learning evaluation model needs to be reviewed so that it can meet the competency needs of graduates in accordance with the standards set. An important evaluation is carried out as stated by Dunn et al., which states that evaluation is a process consisting of 4 (four) basic components. According to Dunn et al., it is said that: Assessment is a process that includes four basic components: (1) Measuring improvement over time; (2) Motivating students to study; (3) Evaluating the teaching methods; and (4) Ranking the students' capabilities in relation to the whole group evaluation (Taghi Jabbarifar, 2019: 2). The evaluation aims to provide information about what students have successfully mastered the material they have learned in class.

Based on the explanation above, this research aims to: (1) identify a factual model of evaluation of Islamic Religious Education and Moral Education (PAI-BP); (2) develop the development of the PAI-BP

learning evaluation model to suit the needs of the high school education level; and (3) knowing and analyzing the effectiveness of the PAI-BP learning evaluation development model at the high school education level for the 2020/2021 academic year.

METHODS

The type of research used is research and development (Research & Development) which aims to produce a product in the form of an evaluation model for learning Islamic Religious Education and Morals (PAI-BP) at the SMA level and a guide for evaluating PAI-BP learning in SMA.

Research and Development (Research and Development), according to Sugiyono is defined as a research method used to produce certain products, and test the effectiveness of these products (Sugiyono, 2013). In this study, Research and Development were used to produce an evaluation model for PAI-BP learning at the high school level to improve the character of religiosity in students.

The development model used is a procedural model, which shows the steps that must be followed to produce a product. Model development is tailored to the development cycle according to Borg & Gall.

Conceptually and procedurally, the development model used as a study in research and development refers to the Borg and Gall model by modifying the 10 research stages into 4 research stages, which are essentially the same through the Borg and Gall steps. Steps (1) research and information gathering, in this model referred to as the preliminary research stage; steps (2) planning and (3) initial product development are referred to as planning stages because basically these two steps are planning stages, both planning for data collection instruments, evaluation tools, as well as evaluation model trial designs; step (4) preliminary testing, (5) main product revision, (6) main trial, (7) operational product revision, in this model, referred to as the trial, evaluation, and revision stages; and steps (8) field operational trials, (9) final product revision, (10) dissemination and implementation, in this research model, referred to as the implementation phase (Plomp, 2013); (Le Thi Thu et al., 2021).

The research on the evaluation model of Islamic Religious Education and Moral Education (PAI-BP) was carried out at the high school level in Karanganyar Regency. The schools where the research was conducted were chosen randomly so that 2 (two) public high schools and (2) private high schools were selected. The schools that became the research sites included: (1) SMA Negeri 2 Karanganyar; (2) Karangpandan State High School, Karanganyar Regency; (3) SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar; and (4) Bung Karno High School Karangpandan, Karanganyar Regency.

Techniques used in data collection include observation techniques, in-depth interviews, documents, tests, and questionnaires. The data analysis technique used in this study consisted of a mixed model (mixed model), namely quantitative and qualitative.

Quantitative data analysis was used to analyze the validity of the data collection

instrument which was analyzed by Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), using the SPSS AMOS program. CFA is used to check the validity of existing constructs (Garraghan et al., 2018). If the results of the analysis show that the measurement model is in accordance with the data (fit model), then these results indicate that the instrument is valid to use.

The qualitative data analysis was carried out with three main steps, which consisted of 1) data condensation, 2) data presentation, 3) drawing conclusions or verification (Miles et al., 2018); (Sgier, 2012). The three components are involved in the process and are interrelated and determine the result of the analysis and this analysis model is called interactive analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Factual Model of Evaluation of Islamic Religious Education and Moral Education (PAI-BP)

The factual model for evaluating PAI-BP learning at the SMA level carried out in Karanganyar Regency is known from the results of interviews, document analysis, and observations. The results of the analysis show the following findings.

The evaluation of PAI-BP learning in the cognitive domain was carried out by means of a written exam, an oral exam, and a list of questions. The implementation of the PAI-BP learning evaluation carried out by the teacher used five types of bills in the evaluation, including daily tests, oral tests, block tests, group assignments, and individual assignments.

Evaluation of the affective domain in PAI subjects is carried out in several stages, from planning, implementing, analyzing to reporting the evaluation results. Evaluation of the affective domain is an effort that is carried out systematically and specifically to measure and assess the development of students' attitudes because of the teaching and learning process. The purpose of implementing effective evaluation is to find out how far the students' attitudes in the teaching and learning process are, whether the values of the PAI lessons have been mastered by students or not. The function of implementing affective evaluation is to motivate children to do better, children who have done well are given awards so that it will encourage them to do better.

The evaluation principles used in the implementation of effective evaluation include three principles, namely comprehensive, referring to the goal, and objective. The implementation of effective evaluation activities for PAI subjects is carried out in accordance with the plans that have been designed previously. The time for implementing the affective evaluation of PAI subjects is not carried out every day, affective evaluation by means of observation is only carried out when the teacher is in the classroom for learning activities.

The techniques used to evaluate the affective domain of PAI subjects are observation, interview, and attitude scale techniques. Attitudes that are considered by PAI teachers in the classroom are students' attitudes towards PAI subjects, attitudes towards teachers, and attitudes towards the teaching and learning process itself.

The analysis of the results of the effective assessment was carried out by collecting data on the results of the

effective assessment and then conclusions were drawn by giving a score to each child to determine the value that was in accordance with the competence of each child. The results of this assessment are classified according to the provisions for children with very good attitudes, the score is between 81-100, while good children score between 69-80, and for children who are not good or less, the score is below 69. If the child gets an attitude score below 69, is not allowed to take the national exam, and certainly does not pass. The form of the report is given to the homeroom teacher and then included in the report card for the parents, guardians of the students, and the students themselves.

Evaluation in the psychomotor domain shows that the implementation of the assessment by PAI teachers at the high school level in Karanganyar Regency refers to the syllabus, lesson plans, proposals, and instruments prepared. Preparation activities for the psychomotor domain assessment carried out by the teacher are physical and psychological conditioning and notification of the assessment criteria to be tested. The assessment carried out by the teacher is carried out using a non-test technique using direct non-participant observation with assessments carried out individually or in groups and the instruments used are member checks along with a value scale, when the teacher's assessment is written directly in the previously prepared instrument. After the data is collected, the closing activities of the psychomotor domain assessment carried out by the teacher are in the form of concluding the overall activity and providing positive and educational feedback.

The results and follow-up of the psychomotor domain assessment by the PAI teacher are: Processing of the psychomotor aspect assessment results is carried out directly by the PAI teacher through converting scores into grades and processing them from raw values into final grades in the form of numbers, letters or descriptions. The result is passed or not passed. Follow-up assessment is based on passing and failing through the KKM reference in the form of enrichment and remedial. The remedial program has been implemented, while the enrichment program exists but has not been realized. Reports on the results of the psychomotor assessment are submitted to teachers, homeroom teachers, and parents through verification meetings, plenary meetings, and the distribution of report cards to utilize the results of the PAI psychomotor domain assessment for teachers to improve learning and for students as motivation.

The output of PAI-BP learning at the high school level, so far, has been evaluated separately from the evaluation of the PAI-BP learning process so that the causes or obstacles faced by teachers in managing learning activities in the classroom have not been fully revealed. Likewise, the problem of the teacher's personality, the facilities needed to support learning, and student behavior towards PAI-BP learning have not been fully disclosed. On this basis, the process and outputs of PAI-BP learning really need to be evaluated in a single unit.

The findings above indicate that the factual model of the PAI-BP learning evaluation that has been carried out is not yet a holistic model that combines

evaluation of the learning process and output.

The model used is more inclined towards the model proposed by Tyler with the term "*objective-oriented (or objectives-referenced) evaluation*" (de Casterlé et al., 2012). The model focuses more on curriculum development, goal development, and accompanying evaluation. The evaluation model used is more of a behavioral approach such as that used by Tyler which has mechanistic characteristics, regardless of any benefits from the inherent measurability.

PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model Developed

The learning evaluation model for Islamic Religious Education and Morals (PAI-BP) was developed in three stages, namely the first trial, the second trial, and the third phase of testing (implementation). At each stage of the trial, respondents were asked to comment on the PAI-BP EP model.

The development of the first stage is in the form of clarity of instruments for the learning process of Islamic Religious Education and Budi Pekerti. The test of the clarity of the learning process instrument for Islamic Religious Education and Character (PAI-BP) is based on the results of the evaluation of the respondents, namely the school principal (model user), colleagues of Islamic Religious Education teacher, and Budi Pekerti (PAI-BP), Religious Education teacher Islam and Morals (PAI-BP), and students. The assessment of the clarity of the instrument for the learning process of Islamic Religion and Character Education (PAI-BP) is directed at the aspects of the clarity of the instrument instructions, the scope of the learning process for Islamic Religion and Character Education (PAI-BP), the language used and writing and general assessment.

The scope of the learning process for Islamic Religious Education and Morals (PAI-BP) is divided into a) clarity of performance indicators of Islamic Religious Education and Character Education (PAI-BP) teachers in the classroom, b) clarity of personality indicators of Islamic Religious Education teachers and good manners (PAI-BP), d) clarity of indicators of learning facilities for Islamic Religious Education and Character (PAI-BP), and c) clarity of indicators of student behavior in the classroom. Assessment of language aspects, namely a) the use of standard Indonesian, b) the formulation of communicative statements, c) the use of sentences and words that are easy to understand. The writing assessment is directed at assessing the shape of the letters, the size of the letters, and the format or layout of the instrument.

The assessment of the clarity of the instrument for the learning process of Islamic Religion and Character Education (PAI-BP) was carried out in three stages. The first phase of the trial assessment was carried out on 36 respondents, consisting of one principal, one teacher of Islamic Religious Education, and Budi Pekerti (PAI-BP) who taught in class XII IPA 2, and 34 students in class XII IPA 2 from Karangpandan Public High School Karanganyar. The second phase of the trial assessment was carried out on 43 respondents, consisting of one PAI-BP teacher, one PAI-BP teacher who taught in class XII IPA 1, one principal, and 40

students in class XII IPA 1 from SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar. The third stage of the trial assessment was carried out on 122 respondents, consisting of 6 PAI-BP teachers, 3 school principals, and 113 class XII students from SMA Negeri 2 Karanganyar, SMA Bung Karno Karangpandan, Karanganyar, and SMA Muhammadiyah. 1 Karanganyar.

Based on the results of measurements carried out during 3 (three) stages, it can be seen that the average score of the first stage measurement results obtained an average score of 3.62. The average score obtained in the second stage of the trial is better than the average score of the first stage of the trial, with an average score of 3.83. The results of the assessment at the implementation stage or the 3rd stage obtained an average score of 3.86.

The results of the assessment can be summarized in the following table.

Table 1. Summary of Results of Assessment of Clarity of Learning Process Instruments

No	Aspects	of Research Results		
		Phase 1	**Phase 2**	**Phase 3**
1.	Instructions			
	Questionnaire Instructions	3.72	3.73	3.87
2.	Scope of the Learning Process Teacher			
	a. Performance Indicators	3.83	4.05	4.08
	b. Teacher personality indicators	3.56	4.24	4.17
	c. Indicators of Completeness of Learning Facilities	3.89	3.51	3.56
	d. Student Behavior Indicators	3.58	3.49	3.55
3.	Language			
	a. Use of Standard Language	3.47	3.70	3.73
	b. Formulation of Communicative Statements	3.50	3.62	3.66
	c. Use of Sentences	3.75	3.78	3.91
4.	Font			
	a. Format	3.39	3.95	3.96
	b. Font Size	3.56	4.03	4.04
	c. Writing Format/*Lay out*	3.44	3.89	3.85
5.	General			
	Assessment Instrument Assessment In General	3.69	3.97	3.99
Average score		3.62	3.83	3.86

Based on the results above, the results of the assessment at the implementation stage obtained an average score of 3.86. The average score obtained in the third stage or implementation stage can be classified into the good classification.

The next assessment is an assessment of the PAI-BP learning process measurement model. The trial of the PAI-BP learning process measurement model was

directed at examining the validity of the instrument items and the suitability of the measurement model for each aspect of the learning process, namely by positioning teacher performance, teacher personality, student behavior, and PAI-BP learning facilities as latent variables.

The test results were analyzed by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the help of the IBM AMOS 22 program. Item validity is based on the magnitude of the factor load value (λ) of each instrument item, ie if the factor load > 0.3 means that the item is valid. Determination of the validity of the instrument using the IBM AMOS 22 program is based on the magnitude of the factor load (λ), if the value of = 0.3 then the instrument is considered valid (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). If the value of l (Lamda) is greater than 0.3 then the item of the instrument is considered valid (Prakash et al., 2020).

The measurement results of all assessments of the PAI-BP learning process measurement model from the 1st phase of the trial to the implementation phase can be presented in the following table.

Table 2. Recapitulation of the Results of the Development of the Measurement Model for the Learning Process Aspects of PAI-BP

Index	Stage	Teacher Performance	Teacher Personality PAI-BP	Student Behavior in Learning Learning	Facilities PAI-BP
Chi Square	1	2036.32	397.19	39.88	37.27
	2	1621.57	439.62	41.15	85.22
	3	0.04	0.015	0.08	0.046
df	1	1080	252	35	35
	2	1080	252	35	275
	3	2	1	7	253
P-	1	0.000	0.000	0.260	0.000
	2	0.000	0.000	0.219	0.000
	3	0.932	0.643	0.346	RMSEA
0.66	1	Value	0.117	0.058	0.161
	2	0.109	0.133	0.065	0.224
	0.66	0.000	0.026	0.009	0.003

Determining the fit or not of the measurement model is based on three indicators, namely: 1) P-value > 0.05, and 2). Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) < 0.05. "*The RMSEA value less than 0.0 indicates a fit model*". Based on the test data, the implementation of the measurement model shows that the model is fit.

The next stage is the assessment of the PAI-BP learning output instrument. The assessments carried out include assessments of 1) the clarity of the PAI-BP learning output instruments; 2) PAI-BP learning output measurement model; 3) evaluation model; 4) empirical model of

PAI-BP learning evaluation; and 5) PAI-BP learning evaluation guide.

The clarity test of the PAI-BP learning output instrument is based on the results of the assessments of the respondents (PAI-BP teachers, and class XII SMA students), users of the evaluation model (school leaders), and practitioners who provide input in order to improve the PAI-BP learning output instrument. BP. The assessment of the clarity of the PAI-BP learning output instrument is focused on: 1) clarity of instructions for the PAI-BP learning output instrument, 2) clarity of indicators; 3) the use of sentences and words that are easy to understand, and 4) the assessment of writing is directed at the assessment of the shape of the letters, the size of the letters and the format or layout of the PAI-BP learning output instrument.

The assessment of the clarity of the PAI-BP learning output instrument in the first phase of the pilot trial was a sample of 36 people, consisting of one principal, one PAI-BP teacher who taught in class XII IPA 2, and 34 students in class XII IPA 2 from Karangpandan Public High School Karanganyar.

The second stage of the assessment was 43 people, consisting of one PAI-BP teacher, one PAI-BP teacher who taught in class XII IPA 1, one principal, and 40 students in class XII IPA 1 from SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar. The evaluation of the implementation stage or the third stage was carried out with a sample of 122 people, consisting of 6 PAI-BP teachers, 3 school principals, and 113 class XII students from SMA Negeri 2 Karanganyar, SMA Bung Karno Karangpandan Karanganyar, and SMA Muhammadiyah. 1 Karanganyar.

The results of the assessments from the first, second, and implementation stages can be summarized in the following table.

Table 3. Results of Assessment of Clarity of PAI-BP Learning Output Instruments

No	Aspect	Learning Outcomes		
		Phase 1	**Phase 2**	**Phase 3**
1.	Instructions			
	Clarity of Instructions Instruments	4.07	3.63	3.92
2.	Scope of Learning Outputs	4.12	3.56	3.69
	a. Indicators of Aqidah Akhlak	4.14	3.56	3.72
	b. Indicators of Qur'an Hadith	4.14	3.74	3.79
	c. Indicators of Fiqh	3.74	4.12	4.13
	d. Indicators of Islamic History	3.86	3.93	3.97
3.	Language			
	Use of Sentences and Words Easy to understand	3.70	4 .02	4.05
4.	Font			
	a. Format	3.74	4.12	4.13
	b. Font size	4.04	4.95	4.03
	c. Writing format/*lay out*	4.05	4.02	4.08
Average score		3.94	3.87	3.93

Based on Table 3 above, from the three clarity tests, although the average total score has decreased slightly when consulted with the assessment standards, the average score is more than 3, the instrument remains in the same classification, namely the classification of the instrument is good in terms of clarity.

The next assessment was carried out on the PAI-BP learning output measurement model. The output of PAI-BP learning is divided into 4 aspects, namely aspects of moral aqidah, Qur'an and Hadith, fiqh, and Islamic history. In the structural model test, the learning output is positioned as an endogenous latent variable, and each aspect of the learning output, namely moral Aqedah, Qur'an and Hadith, fiqh, and Islamic history as visible variables.

The assessment is carried out in three stages, namely the 1st trial phase, 2nd trial phase, and implementation phase. Based on the three stages of developing the PAI-BP learning output instrument, a recapitulation of the development of the measurement model suitability indicators from the first stage to the third stage (implementation) is compiled as follows.

Table 4. Recapitulation of the Results of the Development of the Learning Output Instrument Measurement Model PAI-BP

Index	Stage Test	Output Instrument PAI-BP
Chi Square	1	0.29
	2	0.357
	3	0.046
Df	1	1.03
	2	2.35
	3	2.0
P-value	1	0.857
	2	0.725
	3	0.965
RMSEA	1	0.000
	2	0.039
	3	0.000

The results of the first phase of the trial show that: (1) All item numbers have a loading factor (λ) > 0.3; (2) P-Value is 0.965, and (3) RMSEA is 0.000. The results of the second stage of the trial obtained the results that: (1) All item numbers have a loading factor value (λ) > 0.3; (2) P-Value is 0.8572, and (3) RMSEA is 0.0386. The results of the third stage of the trial obtained the following results: (1) All item numbers have a loading factor value (λ) > 0.3; (2) P-Value is 0.7254, and (3) RMSEA is 0.000.

The next assessment is an assessment of the PAI-BP learning evaluation model. The PAI-BP learning evaluation model is divided into two, namely qualitative data and quantitative data. Qualitative data were obtained from the results of the

assessment of experts (experts) and evaluation model users (school leaders), as well as practitioners who provided input in the context of improving the evaluation model, while quantitative data was obtained from the results of the analysis of the suitability of the hypothetical model with empirical data. analyzed using the AMOS 22 program.

The PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model is assessed in terms of the completeness of the evaluation coverage or its comprehensiveness, practicality, and economics in use. The results of the evaluation model assessment can be summarized as follows.

Table 5. Summary of Assessment Results of the PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model

No.	Aspects of Assessment	Average Result of Assessment		
		1st	Phase 2nd	Phase 3rd
1.	Scope of Evaluation Capital	4.00	4.00	4.00
2.	Practicality of Evaluation Model	4.00	4.00	4.00
3.	Ease of Use of Evaluation Time	4.00	3.90	4.00
4.	Efficiency of Use of Evaluation Fee	3.92	4.00	4.00
5.	Efficiency of using Evaluation Personnel	4.05	4.20	4.00
Total Mean Score		3.99	4.02	4.02

The results of the assessment of the evaluation model from the first stage to the third stage have varied developments. The results of the first stage of the assessment obtained an average score of 3.99, the results of the second stage of the trial obtained an average score of 4.02, and the results of the implementation stage of the assessment obtained an average score of 4.02. These results indicate that the results of the respondent's assessment of the evaluation model are classified as good.

Quantitative evaluation of the evaluation model was carried out using a suitability analysis between the hypothetical model and empirical data which was analyzed using the AMOS 22 program.

The PAI-BP learning evaluation model, hypothetically, is based on the assumption that the learning process has an influence on the learning output. Learning evaluation is not enough just to be based on learning outcomes data alone but also data about the learning process that has been running.

Evaluation of the PAI-BP learning process includes an assessment of the PAI-BP teacher's performance in the classroom, the PAI-BP teacher's personality, student behavior, and PAI-BP learning facilities. The assessment of the PAI-BP learning output is divided into four aspects, namely the assessment of aspects of moral aqidah, Qur'an and Hadith, fiqh, and Islamic history.

To test the suitability of the hypothetical model of evaluation of the PAI-BP learning evaluation model with empirical data, it is based on three indicators, namely: 1) P-value > 0.05, and 2). Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) < 0.05. Based on the test data on the implementation of the PAI-BP learning evaluation model in a

number of classes that were analyzed using the Amos 22 program, the following results were obtained: (1) All variables seen from exogenous and endogenous latent variables had loading factor values (λ) > 0.3; (2) P-Value is 0.7254, and (3) RMSEA is 0.000.

The next assessment is carried out on the developed evaluation model guide. Evaluation guide data is qualitative data obtained from the results of assessments from experts (experts) and evaluation model users (school leaders), as well as practitioners who provide input in order to improve the evaluation guide. The evaluation guide evaluation of the PAI-BP Learning Evaluation model focused on aspects of the content of the guide and the language used.

Assessment of the contents of the evaluation guide is aimed at 1) clarity of general guidelines; 2) clarity of evaluation steps; 3) clarity of direction and purpose of evaluation recommendations, and 4) clarity on the timing of the evaluation. Furthermore, the assessment of language aspects is directed at 1) the formulation of communicative statements; and 2) the use of sentences and words that are easily understood by users of the evaluation model.

The evaluation model appraisers involved in the development of the first phase to the implementation phase amounted to 9 people, consisting of one principal, two PAI-BP teachers from SMA Negeri Karangpandan, Karanganyar; one principal, two PAI-BP teachers from SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar; one principal, two PAI-BP teachers from SMA N 2 Karanganyar. The results of the full assessment of the evaluation guide are presented below.

Table 6. Summary of Assessment Results PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model Guide

No	Aspect of Assessment	Average Score of Assessment Results		
		Stage 1	Phase 2	Phase 3rd
1	Clarity of General Instructions	4.08	4.10	4.20
2	Clarity of Evaluation Steps	4.92	4.00	4.10
3	Clarity of recommendations	4.00	4.00	4.00
4	Clarity of Evaluation Implementation Time	4.00	4.00	4.10
5	Formulation of Communicative Statements	4.00	4.10	4.20
6	Use of sentences and words that are easy to understand	4.08	4.10	4.10
Total mean score		4.04	4.06	4.13

Based on the data presented in Table 6 above, from the three assessment results, the average total score has increased. However, if this value is consulted with the assessment standard, the value will still be in the same classification, which is in the guide classification with a very good classification.

The Effectiveness of the Developed PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model

The effectiveness of the PAI-BP

learning evaluation model can be seen from the two main components of learning, namely the learning process itself and the output of the learning. In terms of process components, PAI-BP learning includes four sub-components, namely: a) PAI-BP teacher performance in the classroom, b) PAI-BP teacher personality, c) student behavior, and d) facilities, PAI-BP learning media. BP. In terms of output components, PAI-BP learning includes four sub-components, namely aspects: a) moral aqidah, b) Qur'an and Hadith, c) Fiqh, and d) Islamic history.

The PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model is assessed in terms of the completeness of the evaluation coverage or its comprehensiveness, practicality, and economics in use. There were 9 assessors involved in the evaluation model development, consisting of one principal, two PAI-BP teachers from SMA Negeri Karangpandan, Karanganyar; one principal, two PAI-BP teachers from SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar; one principal, two PAI-BP teachers from SMA Negeri 2 Karanganyar.

The results of the first to the third stage of the trial assessment or implementation stage can be summarized in the following table.

Table 7. Summary of Results of Assessment of the Effectiveness of the PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model

No.	Assessment Aspect	Average[2] Scores of Assessment Results		
		Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
1.	Objectivity	3.56	3.78	3.89
2.	Practical	3.78	3.89	4.00
3.	Economical	3.56	3.67	3.78
Total Average Score		3.63	3.78	3.89

The results of the assessment in the table above show that the assessment in the first stage of the trial obtained an average objectivity score of 3.56; the average practicality score was 3.78; the economic means is 3.56. Thus, the average total score is 3.63. The results of the second stage of the trial assessment obtained an average objectivity score of 3.78; the average practicality score was 3.89; the economic means is 3.67. Thus, the average total score is 3.78. The results of the assessment at the implementation stage or the third stage obtained an average objectivity score of 3.89; the average practicality score is 4.00; the economic means is 3.78. Thus, the average total score is 3.89.

If the average score is compared with the standard of assessment, the evaluation model can be concluded to be classified as "*good*". From the aspect of evaluation coverage (objectivity, practicality, and economy), the EPAI-BP model can be used to evaluate PAI-BP learning at the high school level.

Based on the model test data, the following results were obtained: (1) All variables seen from exogenous and endogenous latent variables had loading factor values (λ) > 0.3; (2) has a P-Value = 0.72541 or > 0.05; and (3) has an RMSEA

value of 0.000 or <0.05. The results of the analysis above show that there is no difference between the EPAI-BP model and the field data. In other words, the model is in accordance with the data, so it can be used to evaluate the PAI-BP learning program in high school.

CONCLUSIONS

Referring to the results of data analysis carried out, this development research resulted in the following conclusions.

The factual model of evaluation of Islamic Religious Education and Character Education (PAI-BP) at the high school education level for the 2020/2021 academic year is that the existing model only covers the evaluation of learning output which includes the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. The evaluation of the learning process carried out in schools so far has not been carried out thoroughly.

The results of PAI-BP learning at the high school level, so far, have been evaluated separately from the evaluation of the PAI-BP learning process so that the causes or obstacles faced by teachers in managing learning activities in the classroom have not been fully revealed. Likewise, problems regarding the personality of PAI-BP teachers, the facilities needed to support PAI-BP learning, and student behavior towards PAI-BP learning have also not been fully disclosed.

The PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model developed has two main components, namely: the PAI-BP learning process and output. The PAI-BP learning process includes four subcomponents, namely: (a) PAI-BP teacher performance in the classroom, (b) PAI-BP teacher personality, (c) student behavior, and (d) PAI-BP learning media facilities. The output of PAI-BP learning includes four sub-components within the scope of the PAI-BP learning materials, namely aspects: (a) Akhlaq, (b) Qur'an-Hadith, (c) Fiqh, and (d) Islamic history.

The effectiveness of the PAI-BP learning evaluation development model at the high school education level for the 2020/2021 academic year shows that the results of expert, user, and practitioner assessments indicate that the developed PAI-BP Learning Evaluation model evaluation guide is well used as a reference for model implementation in the field.

The PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model is considered a good model for evaluating PAI-BP learning in SMA because this model is supported by things that include: (1) The PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model developed has a fairly comprehensive evaluation scope, namely covers the process as well as the output of PAI-BP learning. The learning output includes all of the student's PAI-BP competencies, namely student mastery of the material covered in PAI-BP learning; (2) The suitability of the PAI-BP Learning Evaluation model with field data (P-value = 0.72541 > 0.05; RMSEA = 0.000 < 0.05; GFI = 1.70 > 0.9; AGFI = 1.43 > 0.9; PGFI = 1.37 > 0.9) indicates that the PAI-BP Learning Evaluation model is fit; (3) The evaluation guide is quite practical and the model is simpler so that it will be faster and easier to collect, process, and deliver/present information; and (4) The data collection instrument is considered valid if the loading

factor (λ) > 0.3. The model is considered appropriate if 1) P-value > 0.05; and 2) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) < 0.08, so the model is considered fit.

Referring to the conclusions of the research results that have been described in the previous section, several recommendations can then be put forward. First, the developed PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model can be used as an alternative for school leaders, PAI-BP subject supervisors, schools, and the Provincial Education Office in evaluating the learning of Islamic Religion and Character Education (PAI-BP) at the high school level. Second, the PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model can be further developed to make it more perfect because the evaluation of the EPBI model does not yet involve independent assessors from outside. On this basis, it is necessary to consider the involvement of independent assessors in the development of the evaluation model by integrating the assessment into the model to be developed. Third, the PAI-BP Learning Evaluation Model that was developed is a very simple and practical model so that the application by users is very easy. On this basis, it would be even more interesting if this model could be further developed into a computer-based program, so that in the end an evaluator could analyze the data quickly and accurately.

REFERENCES

Al Karimah, N. R. (2020). Pola Komunikasi Guru dalam Model Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam Berbasis Islam Inklusif-Multikultural. *Jurnal Pustaka Komunikasi*, *3*(1), 135–147. https://doi.org/10.32509/pustakom.v3i1.1014

Amirudin, A., & Muzaki, I. A. (2019). Life Skill Education And It's Implementation In Study Programs Islamic Religious Education. *Jurnal Tarbiyah*, *6*(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.30829/tar.v26i2.485

Arif, M. (2012). Pendidikan Agama Islam Inklusifmultikultural. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *1*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2011.11.1-18

Azis, A., Abou-Samra, R., & Aprilianto, A. (2022). Online Assessment of Islamic Religious Education Learning. *Tafkir: Interdisciplinary Journal of Islamic Education*, *3*(1), 60–76. https://doi.org/10.31538/tijie.v3i1.114

de Casterlé, B. D., Gastmans, C., Bryon, E., & Denier, Y. (2012). QUAGOL: A guide for qualitative data analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *9*(3), 360–371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.09.012

De Goeij, M. C. M., Suhrcke, M., Toffolutti, V., van de Mheen, D., Schoenmakers, T. M., & Kunst, A. E. (2015). How economic crises affect alcohol consumption and alcohol-related health problems: a realist systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*, *10*(11), 131–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.025

Garraghan, P., Yang, R., Wen, Z., Romanovsky, A., Xu, J., Buyya, R., & Ranjan, R. (2018). Emergent failures:

Rethinking cloud reliability at scale. *IEEE Cloud Computing*, *5*(5), 12–21. 10.1109/MCC.2018.053711662

Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2015). Konsep, teknik, aplikasi menggunakan Smart PLS 3.0 untuk penelitian empiris. In *BP Undip. Semarang*.

Le Thi Thu, H., Tran, T., Trinh Thi Phuong, T., Le Thi Tuyet, T., Le Huy, H., & Vu Thi, T. (2021). Two Decades of STEM Education Research in Middle School: A Bibliometrics Analysis in Scopus Database (2000–2020). *Education Sciences*, *11*(7), 353. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11070353

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage publications.

Nurhayati, N., & Hamid, A. (2020). Radicalism Prevention through Islamic Religious Education Learning at Elementary School. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *6*(1), 109–126.

O'Flaherty, J., & Liddy, M. (2018). The impact of development education and education for sustainable development interventions: a synthesis of the research. *Environmental Education Research*, *4*(7), 1031–1049. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1392484

Plomp, T. (2013). Educational design research: An introduction. In *Educational design research*.

Prakash, C., Singh, S., & Davim, J. P. (2020). *Characterization, Testing, Measurement, and Metrology*. CRC Press.

Sgier, L. (2012). Qualitative data analysis. In *An Initiat. Gebert Ruf Stift* (Vol. 9).

Soares, F. R. R., Farias, B. R. F. de, & Monteiro, A. R. M. (2019). Consumption of alcohol and drugs and school absenteeism among high school students of public schools. *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem*, *7*(2), 1692–1698.

Sugiyono, P. D. (2013). Metode penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif dan R&D [Quantitative and qualitative and R & D research methods]. *Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta*.

Wainscott, A. M. (2015). Defending Islamic education: War on Terror discourse and religious education in twenty-first-century Morocco. *The Journal of North African Studies*, *2*(4), 635–653. https://doi.org/10.1080/13629387.2015.1041108

Yusupova, G. F., Podgorecki, Jă., & Markova, N. G. (2015). Educating Young People in Multicultural Educational Environment of Higher Education Institution. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, *10*(4), 561–570.