Evaluation of the Accreditation Program for Pancasila Ideology Development Training Organizers with an Approach*Assessment Evaluability* and *Performance Monitoring* (AEPM)

Fikri Nurcahya[1], Aip Badrujaman[2], Sugeng Priyanto[3], Faisal Madani[4]
Sekolah Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Article Info	Abstract
	This study aims to evaluate the implementation of the accreditation program for Pancasila Ideology Education and Training (Diklat PIP) providers conducted by BPIP. The evaluation employs the AEPM model, which analyzes four key dimensions: Context, Input, Activity, and Performance Monitoring. Data were collected from 46 respondents representing accredited institutions through a closed-ended Likert-scale questionnaire. Descriptive analysis shows that the Context and Input dimensions received the highest scores, indicating strengths in program planning and institutional readiness. Conversely, the Performance Monitoring dimension obtained the lowest score, highlighting weaknesses in the sustainability of implementation and post-accreditation follow-up. Spearman correlation analysis reveals significant positive relationships among the dimensions, with the highest correlation observed between Context and Input (r = 0.795). These findings suggest that program success largely depends on the integration of design, implementation, and monitoring aspects. The study concludes that although the accreditation has progressed well in administrative terms, the substantive transformation toward sustainable implementation of Diklat PIP still requires further reinforcement. It recommends reform in post-accreditation monitoring and future research using a mixed-method approach to enrich program evaluation holistically.

Corresponding Author:
Fikri Nurcahya
Sekolah Pascasarjana UNJ
Email: fikri.nurcahya@mhs.unj.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

As the philosophical basis of the state, Pancasila has a central position in every aspect of state administration, including in the practice of public services by government officials. State administrators are truly a representation of a social contract built on the values of Pancasila, so that their policies and actions must always reflect the values of divinity, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice (Firmanda, 2020). However, the current reality shows that the practice of these values among ASN is not yet optimal. Research shows that although in general the values of Pancasila are still internalized, among young ASN there is an erosion of values due to the influence of foreign ideologies and a lack of historical understanding of Pancasila (Ali et al., 2022). This is exacerbated by the uneven implementation of Pancasila values in the public service system which should uphold the principles of justice, transparency, and participation (Made Anggriyani & Gusti Agung Ayu Yuliartika Dewi, 2025). The application of Pancasila values in policies and services is not only normative idealism, but also a practical need to ensure that the foundation of the

state of Pancasila remains alive and working in every public policy that is implemented. Therefore, strengthening Pancasila values in the government sector is a strategic agenda in building governance that is integrated, responsive, and just.

In line with efforts to answer these challenges, the Indonesian government established the Pancasila Ideology Development Agency (BPIP), with one of its mandates being to prepare standardization and organize education and training for Pancasila ideology development. However, institutionally, BPIP faces significant challenges. Until now, BPIP still carries out functions that are more recommendatory in nature without imperative authority in implementing ideological development across institutions and regions. This condition causes the development process to not run optimally, especially due to the existence of sectoral egos between government agencies and limited reach to regions in Indonesia (Arifin, 2024).

In response to these problems, BPIP initiated an accreditation program for organizers of Pancasila Ideology Development Education and Training (Diklat PIP) through the Decree of the Head of BPIP Number 52 of 2024 concerning Guidelines for Accreditation of Organizers of Pancasila Ideology Development Education and Training, 2024. This program aims to improve the quality, efficiency, and accountability of the implementation of PIP Education and Training nationally, by providing accreditation to training institutions that meet certain standards. With the accreditation mechanism, it is hoped that training institutions will have institutional capacity, human resources, facilities and infrastructure, and quality assurance systems that are in line with the standards set by BPIP.

The PIP Training organizer accreditation program aims to ensure that training institutions have adequate capacity to organize PIP Training. The stages and assessment elements of this program are designed comprehensively, covering institutions, human resources, financing, infrastructure, and quality assurance. In the context of a quality assurance system, accreditation is not merely an administrative formality but an instrument of legitimacy and improvement of institutional capacity (Duarte & Vardasca, 2023). Challenges in Indonesia show that accreditation is often trapped in fulfilling documents without touching on quality culture (Irawati & Suwarno, 2020). Therefore, an outcome-oriented, participatory, and results-based accreditation system needs to be developed so that accreditation becomes a driving force for transformation, not just an administrative label.

However, the administrative achievements of the PIP Training organizer accreditation program have not been followed by substantive realization. Until now, two official decisions have determined the accreditation status of 23 central and regional government institutions, but not one has actually organized PIP Training. Accreditation, which should be the gateway to implementing training, has instead stopped as a symbolic status, creating a gap between administrative output and substantive outcomes. This phenomenon indicates the need for in-depth evaluation so that accreditation does not only become a formal procedure without a real impact on strengthening the nation's ideology. This situation is in line with the findings of various previous studies that emphasize the importance of post-accreditation monitoring and follow-up. Hutagaol & Kosasih (2024), showed that in the health sector, the sustainability of service quality and patient safety is highly dependent on post-accreditation evaluation. Busron & Titi Rachmi (2020), and Made et al. (2022) also showed the weak impact of accreditation without follow-up in the context of education. Nugroho et al. (2023), even highlighted that accreditation often stops as a symbol without institutional transformation. Therefore, a comprehensive evaluation of the PIP Training accreditation program is a must to produce effective policy recommendations.

As a conceptual basis, this study is based on program evaluation theory which views evaluation as a systematic assessment of the value, benefits, and meaning of a social

intervention (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). Evaluation does not stop at achieving goals, but also examines the reasons behind the results and the potential for improvement. The purpose of evaluation, in addition to decision-making and quality improvement, also includes public accountability and strengthening social justice (Fitzpatrick et al., 2012). This research framework is strengthened by the evaluability assessment (EA) approach from Wholey et al. (2004) to assess program readiness before being fully evaluated. EA steps such as developing program logic, reviewing implementation, and assessing data are essential to avoid wasted evaluation. Studies by Hamilton-West et al. (2019), MacPherson et al. (2022), Soemodinoto & Pedju (2022), Plumet et al. (2024), and Zoh et al. (2024), show the role of EA in ensuring evaluation readiness in various public programs. On the other hand, performance monitoring is an important tool to track program progress continuously and detect early deviations that require follow-up Wholey et al. (2010). Monitoring provides data for improvement, initial evidence of impact evaluation, and a basis for implementation revision. Studies such as Akdemir et al. (2020), Asadzandi et al. (2022), Gabalán-Coello et al. (2022), Mondal (2025), and Priyanto et al. (2024) show the importance of monitoring in certification and accreditation programs.

Based on this background, this study attempts to evaluate the implementation of the PIP Training organizer accreditation program by focusing on the assessment of accredited institutions regarding the implementation of the program, obstacles faced in the realization of training, and forms of support and monitoring from BPIP. As an evaluation framework, this study adopts the AEPM model (*Assessment, Evaluability, Performance Monitoring*) which assesses context, input, activities, and performance monitoring (Priyanto et al., 2024). This study presents novelty by being the first study to specifically evaluate the effectiveness of the PIP Training organizer accreditation program using the AEPM approach in the context of fostering the Pancasila ideology in Indonesia. By focusing on the gap between the administrative status of accreditation and the substantive realization of the implementation of PIP Training, this study is expected to fill the gap in the literature and provide evidence-based recommendations for strategically strengthening the BPIP accreditation program. This study also recognizes the limitations of its scope as a preliminary evaluative study based on perceptions, sourced from questionnaires from accredited institutions.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study is an evaluative study using a quantitative approach, which aims to systematically describe the perceptions of institutions towards the PIP Training organizer accreditation program. In accordance with the characteristics of quantitative research as explained by (Creswell & Creswell, 2023), this approach is used to obtain objective information regarding the tendencies, distributions, and patterns of respondents' responses through descriptive statistical analysis.

In this study, data were collected through the distribution of closed questionnaires to accredited institutions. According to Cohen et al. (2018), descriptive research is used to organize and describe existing data as it is, without manipulation or treatment intervention. Thus, the results of this study are expected to be able to present a factual picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the accreditation program based on the perceptions of accredited institutions.

The subjects in this study were training institutions that had obtained accreditation status from BPIP as organizers of PIP Training. There were 23 accredited institutions, all of which were involved as research subjects. These institutions became the main source of data through filling out a closed questionnaire that had been developed based on the AEPM model. The use of this model aims to develop a systematic and comprehensive evaluation

framework. This model is adapted into four main dimensions, namely*Context, Input, Activity*, And *Performance Monitoring*. Each dimension consists of a number of evaluation aspects that represent key areas that need to be analyzed in the implementation of the accreditation program. These aspects are displayed in a grid table that is used as the basis for compiling the evaluation instrument.

Table 1. Evaluation Grid for PIP Training Accreditation Program with AEPM Model

Dimensions	Subdimensi	Code	No. Item
Context	1. Program Objectives and Rationale	TR	1, 2, 3
	2. Relevance of the Program to Strategic Needs	RK	4, 5, 6
	3. Legal and Policy Basis	LH	7, 8, 9
	4. Clarity of Program Logic	LP	10, 11, 12
Input	5. Accreditation Implementing Organizational Structure	SO	13, 14, 15
	6. Availability and Competence of Assessors	THE	16, 17, 18
	7. Facilities and Infrastructure, and Supporting Documents	SP	19, 20, 21
	8. Accreditation Administration and Information System	AI	22, 23, 24
Activity	9. Implementation of Assessment and Visitation	OF	25, 26, 27
	10. Data Assessment and Verification Mechanism	PV	28, 29, 30
	11. Publication and Dissemination of Accreditation Results	PD	31, 32, 33
	12. Post-Accreditation Mentoring and Coaching	PP	34, 35, 36
Performance Monitoring	13. Institutional Barriers	HK	37, 38, 39
	14. Regulatory and Technical Barriers	HR	40, 41, 42
	15. Monitoring and Follow-up System	SM	43, 44, 45
	16. Readiness for Training Implementation as a Short-Term Result	JP	46, 47, 48

The data collection technique in this study used a scale questionnaire to facilitate quantitative analysis with five response options, namely, Not Appropriate (TS), Less Appropriate (KS), Quite Appropriate (CS), Appropriate (S), and Very Appropriate (SS). The questionnaire was distributed to all institutions that had been accredited by BPIP, with the aim of obtaining responses that represented the institution's experience in participating in the accreditation program. The instrument first went through content validation by*Subject Matter Experts*(SME) consisting of two assessors and one person from the accreditation organizing team to assess the suitability of each item on the instrument with the measured dimension construct. The assessment given by the SME ranges from 1 (not relevant), 2 (somewhat relevant), 3 (quite relevant), and 4 (very relevant). The assessment results are then calculated and compared with the critical value.*Content Validity Ratio*(CVR). The result is that all items on the instrument get a value of 1, which is greater than the critical value for 3 SMEs, which is 0.99.(Lawshe, 1975). This shows that the instrument used has met the content validity criteria.

In this study, the main analysis was conducted quantitatively with a descriptive and non-parametric inferential statistical approach. Descriptive statistics were used to describe respondents' perceptions of each dimension of program evaluation, which were presented through mean values, standard deviations, and frequency distributions. Furthermore, Spearman's correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between evaluation

dimensions, especially in examining the coherence between aspects.*Context, Input, Activity,* And *Performance Monitoring*. This technique was chosen because it is more suitable for ordinal scale data and does not require the assumption of normal distribution. All analyses were performed with the help of SPSS statistical software to ensure the accuracy of calculations and consistency of interpretation.

Before analysisThe main thing is to conduct validity and reliability tests on each dimension to ensure that the instrument used meets the measurement quality requirements. Validity tests are conducted using the method*Corrected Item–Total Correlation*, with a minimum threshold of 0.30. The results of the analysis show that most items in the four dimensions have total item correlation values that meet the validity criteria. Items number 9, 24, 32, 33, 36, and 44 were found to have values below 0.30 but still above 0.24. In the context of exploratory research, these values are still acceptable as long as the items in question are substantively relevant and do not significantly reduce the reliability of the scale. The reliability test uses the coefficient*Cronbach's Alpha Shows* that all dimensions have a high level of internal consistency. Dimensions*Context*has an Alpha value of 0.829, *Input of* 0.847,*Activity of* 0.792, and Performance Monitoring of*0,799*. Based on the general interpretation category, an Alpha value of ≥0.70 indicates that the instrument is reliable.(Taber, 2018).

3. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
3.1. Research result
3.1.1. Statistical Description of Program Evaluation Dimensions

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to provide a general overview of respondents' perceptions regarding the implementation of the PIP Training Provider Accreditation Program based on the four main dimensions in the AEPM model, namely:*Context, Input, Activity*, And *Performance Monitoring*. Each dimension is measured through 12 statement items on the evaluation instrument, which are then compiled into a total score per dimension. The total score is calculated by summing the values of the 12 related items.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Each AEPM Dimension

Dimensions	Mean	Min	Max	Std. Dev
Context	51,43	37	59	5,612
Input	51,35	38	60	6,104
Activity	51,13	37	59	5,201
Performance Monitoring	50,28	41	59	5,524

The descriptive statistics table shows that in general the four dimensions obtained a fairly high average score, ranging from 50.28 to 51.43 out of a maximum total score of 60. The Context dimension obtained the highest average of 51.43 (SD = 5.612), indicating that most respondents viewed the background, relevance, legal basis, and logic of the accreditation program as well-designed and in accordance with the strategic needs of the institution. The Input dimension followed with an average score of 51.35 (SD = 6.104), indicating that the implementing organizational structure, assessor competence, and accreditation support facilities and systems were considered quite adequate. Meanwhile, the Activity dimension has an average value of 51.13 (SD = 5.201), reflecting that the accreditation implementation process such as assessment, evaluation, dissemination of results, and post-accreditation assistance are considered to be running relatively well, although there is still

room for improvement. Finally, the Performance Monitoring dimension obtained the lowest average of 50.28 (SD = 5.524), indicating that the aspects of sustainability of implementation, performance monitoring, and readiness for organizing PIP Training after accreditation are still felt to be less than optimal by some respondents.

These findings indicate that although all dimensions have relatively positive perceptions, there are differences in the level of perception between dimensions that can be indicators of areas that require further attention in efforts to improve the effectiveness of the accreditation program. In general, high scores on the Context and Input dimensions indicate strengths in the planning and institutional readiness aspects, while relatively lower scores on Performance Monitoring indicate the importance of strengthening the aspects of sustainable implementation and post-accreditation monitoring systems.

3.1.2. AEPM Sub Dimension Statistics Description

To obtain a more detailed picture of the implementation of the accreditation program, descriptive statistical analysis was also conducted on 16 sub dimensions that form the four main dimensions in the AEPM model, namely Context, Input, Activity, and Performance Monitoring. Each sub dimension consists of 3 statement items on the evaluation instrument.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Each AEPM Sub Dimension

Dimensions	Sub Dimensi	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Context	Program Objectives and Rationale (TR)	12.35	1.61	8	15
	Relevance of the Program to Strategic Needs (RK)	12.43	1.71	7	15
	Legal and Policy Basis (LH)	12.26	1.64	8	15
	Clarity of Program Logic (LP)	12.39	1.52	9	15
Input	Accreditation Implementing Organization (SO) Structure	12.87	1.53	8	15
	Availability and Competence of Assessors (KA)	12.52	1.62	8	15
	Facilities and Infrastructure and Supporting Documents (SP)	12.43	1.58	7	15
	Accreditation Administration and Information System (AI)	12.78	1.62	8	15
Activity	Implementation of Assessment and Visitation (AV)	12.70	1.47	9	15
	Data Assessment and Verification (PV) Mechanism	12.35	1.63	8	15
	Publication and Dissemination of Accreditation Results (PD)	11.98	1.74	6	15
	Post-Accreditation Mentoring and Coaching (PP)	11.59	1.88	6	15
	Institutional Barriers (HK)	11.98	1.82	7	15

Dimensions	Sub Dimensi	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Performance Monitoring	Regulatory and Technical Barriers (HR)	12.09	1.72	7	15
	Monitoring and Follow-up System (MS)	11.63	1.95	6	15
	Readiness for Implementing Training as a Short-Term Result (JP)	12.07	1.77	7	15

The results of the analysis show that the subdimension with the highest average is the Accreditation Implementing Organizational Structure (SO) with a value of 12.87 (SD = 1.53), followed by the Accreditation Administration and Information System (AI) with an average of 12.78 (SD = 1.62). This indicates that the institutional aspects and administrative support systems in the accreditation process are considered quite strong by respondents. In contrast, the subdimensions with the lowest average are Post-Accreditation Mentoring and Guidance (PP) at 11.59 (SD = 1.88), and Monitoring and Follow-up System (SM) at 11.63 (SD = 1.95). These two aspects highlight the weak post-accreditation follow-up which is a serious challenge in maintaining the continuity of the quality of the implementation of PIP Training. In general, these results indicate that the administrative and institutional dimensions have higher perceptions than the operational dimensions of post-accreditation. This confirms the indication that the implementation of accreditation has not been fully integrated with the continuous monitoring and guidance system.

3.1.3. Correlation Between AEPM Dimensions

Spearman correlation analysis is used to test the relationship between the four main dimensions in the AEPM model, namely Context, Input, Activity, and Performance Monitoring. This correlation test aims to determine the extent of alignment between aspects evaluated in the implementation of the PIP Training accreditation program, especially in terms of consistency of perception between program areas.

Table 3. Spearman's Correlation Between AEPM Dimensions

Dimensions	Context	Input	Activity	PM
Context	1	0.795	0.785	0.779
Input	0.795	1	0.699	0.593
Activity	0.712	0.699	1	0.785
PM	0.779	0.593	0.785	1

p < 0.01 (2-tailed)

The results of the analysis show that all dimensions have a significant positive relationship with each other. The highest correlation occurs between the dimensions *Context* And *Input* ($r = 0.795$), which shows that perceptions of clarity of objectives, rationality, and the basis of program policies are highly correlated with the readiness of the organization, assessors, and accreditation support facilities. This high correlation indicates that the clearer and stronger the program foundation, the better the institutional readiness in supporting the implementation of accreditation. Meanwhile, the lowest correlation is between *Input* And *Performance Monitoring* ($r = 0.593$), but still falls into the

strong and significant category because it is close to the threshold of 0.60.(Papageorgiou, 2022).This indicates a relationship between the clarity of the initial objectives of the program and the sustainability of monitoring after implementation. Overall, these findings confirm that each dimension in the AEPM model is systematically interconnected, and the success of the implementation of the accreditation program is largely determined by the strength of the relationship between its components.

3.2. Discussion

3.2.1. AEPM Program Evaluation Dimensions

The results of the descriptive analysis show that the four dimensions in the AEPM model, namely*Context, Input, Activity,* And *Performance Monitoring*, obtained a relatively high average score. This indicates that in general the institution's perception of the implementation of the PIP Training accreditation program is quite positive. Dimension*Context*obtained the highest average (4.65), followed by*Input* (4,60), *Activity*(4.52), and*Performance Monitoring*(4.35). Although all dimensions are in the "Appropriate" category, there are differences in the level of strength between dimensions which reflect aspects of program implementation that still require further strengthening.

High scores on the dimensions*Context*shows that the accreditation program has a normative basis and strategic planning that is considered relevant by the target institution. This is in line with the principles in program evaluation that emphasize the importance of clarity of objectives, rationality of intervention, and policy support as initial components of evaluability.(Wholey et al., 2004). This score also indicates that the logic of the program designed by BPIP is understood and accepted by the institution, which strengthens the initial legitimacy of the program implementation. It also shows that the theoretical aspect of accreditation as an instrument of strengthening ideology has been fulfilled, although substantive success has not been fully realized.

Dimensions*Input*, which includes resource readiness, institutional structure, and support systems, also showed high scores. This finding is in line with the principle capacity *building in* public policy evaluation, where program effectiveness is largely determined by the adequacy of input.(Fitzpatrick et al., 2012). However, this high score needs to be read critically, because there are still implementation challenges indicated by the dimensions.*Activity* And *Performance Monitoring*. In other words, the availability of input is not necessarily directly proportional to the success of program implementation if it is not supported by an effective implementation and monitoring system.(Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014).

Dimensions*Activity*reflects the technical implementation of accreditation, including assessment, visitation, assessment, and publication of results. High scores on this dimension indicate that the administrative process and formal mechanisms have been running relatively according to standards. However, a number of items with low correlations to the total item validity, such as items 32 and 33 related to the dissemination of accreditation results, indicate gaps in the optimal dissemination of results. This strengthens the literature's criticism that accreditation in Indonesia often stops at administrative fulfillment, not at a living quality culture.(Irawati & Suwarno, 2020).

As for the dimensions*Performance Monitoring Recorded* the lowest score compared to other dimensions. This shows that the post-accreditation evaluative aspects, such as the monitoring system, follow-up, and readiness for training

implementation as short-term results, are still not optimal. This condition strengthens the findings of various studies that highlight the weakness of sustainability mechanisms in public sector accreditation programs.(Busron & Titi Rachmi, 2020; Nugroho et al., 2023). In fact, in program evaluation theory, monitoring and follow-upPost-accreditation is a key aspect to ensure the sustainability and accountability of policies(Plumet et al., 2024; Wholey et al., 2010).

Overall, these findings confirm that the PIP Training accreditation program has met the basic dimensions of evaluability and administrative implementation, but still faces serious challenges in the substantive monitoring dimension. This evaluation places the importance of strengthening the system*post-accreditation support*, including mentoring and assessment of training performance, so that accreditation does not just stop as a symbolic status, but becomes a lever for real institutional and ideological change.

3.2.2. AEPM Program Evaluation Subdimensions

Analysis subdimensional the AEPM model provides a deeper understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of each aspect in the implementation of the PIP Training accreditation program. In general, all subdimensions obtained an average score above 4.00 which indicates a positive perception from accredited institutions, but there is still significant variation in scores between subdimensions.

The subdimensions with the highest scores are the Availability and Competence of Assessors (4.70) and the Structure of the Accreditation Implementing Organization (4.67). The high perception in this aspect reflects that the human resources involved in the accreditation process, including assessors, are considered to have good capabilities and credibility. This is important considering that the success of the assessment and quality assurance is highly dependent on the quality of the evaluator (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). This score also indicates that BPIP has succeeded in identifying and managing the right personnel in implementing the accreditation process.

On the other hand, the lowest score was in the subdimensions of Post-Accreditation Mentoring and Coaching (4.17) and Readiness for Implementing Training as a Short-Term Result (4.22). This strengthens previous findings that the dimensions*Performance Monitoring Is* still a weak area in this program. Hutagaol & Kosasih's study (2024) emphasized that without ongoing coaching, accreditation tends to lose its driving force for long-term change. In the context of program evaluation, weak post-accreditation mentoring means missing opportunities to strengthen sustainability, performance reflection, and iterative improvement (Wholey et al., 2010).

Other subdimensions such as Program Relevance to Strategic Needs (4.64), Program Logic (4.60), and Data Assessment and Verification Mechanism (4.59) show that in terms of design and process, the accreditation program has met the rational expectations of the implementing agency. This confirms that accreditation has been designed by taking into account actual needs in the field, as recommended in the approach.*evaluability assessment* (Hamilton-West et al., 2019; Wholey et al., 2004).

However, the Publication and Dissemination of Accreditation Results sub dimension score (4.26) also shows room for improvement in the transparency and openness of information aspects. In fact, ideal accreditation should encourage participation and accountability through open publication of results

(Fitzpatrick et al., 2012). In many cases in the public sector, the openness of accreditation results not only increases stakeholder trust but also accelerates the dissemination of good practices between institutions.

Thus, the discussion of subdimensions shows that although the input and design of the program have been running well, the aspects of the dynamics of implementation and strengthening of post-accreditation results need to be the focus of BPIP's future interventions. The AEPM-based evaluation approach has proven to be able to identify critical points from the institutional side to sustainability.

3.2.3. Correlation Between AEPM Dimensions

The results of the Spearman correlation analysis show that all dimensions in the AEPM model, namely *Context, Input, Activity*, And *Performance Monitoring*, have a significant positive relationship with each other. This finding strengthens the main premise in program evaluation theory that the success of an intervention is systemic and multidimensional (Fitzpatrick et al., 2012; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). The highest correlation occurs between the dimensions *Context* And *Input*(r = 0.795), which supports the opinion of Wholey et al. (2004), within the framework evaluability *assessment*, that strong program logic tends to result in better implementation readiness.

A high correlation was also found between *Activity* And *Performance Monitoring*(r = 0.785), indicating that the quality of technical implementation such as assessment, verification, and dissemination of results has direct implications for the effectiveness of monitoring and post-accreditation follow-up. This finding is consistent with the evaluation literature that positions monitoring as a logical continuation of program implementation (Akdemir et al., 2020; Wholey et al., 2010). Effective monitoring activities can only occur if program implementation is well documented and implemented according to quality standards. In the context of accreditation, this also reflects the importance of documentation and transparency as prerequisites for ongoing evaluation.

Meanwhile, the lowest correlation was recorded between *Input* And *Performance Monitoring*(r = 0.593), although it remains significant. This gap indicates that structural and technical readiness has not been fully optimally connected to the post-accreditation monitoring function. This may be due to a weak internal monitoring system or the absence of a mechanism that requires institutions to report follow-up after receiving accreditation status. This condition is in line with the findings of Made et al. (2022) and Busron & Titi Rachmi (2020), who criticized the weak sustainability of post-accreditation quality in the public sector because accreditation is often treated as an end goal, not as the beginning of institutional transformation.

The significant relationships between dimensions also indicate that the AEPM model has an empirically consistent logical structure. The relationships between dimensions *Context–Activity*(r = 0.785) and *Context–Performance Monitoring*(r = 0.779) indicates that the formulation of program objectives and logic not only impacts institutional readiness, but also determines the quality of implementation and monitoring. In the context of value-based evaluation (*value-based evaluation*), this is important because it ensures that core program values such as accountability and participation are maintained throughout the program cycle (Fitzpatrick et al., 2012).

Thus, the findings of this correlation support the importance of integrated program design, where good planning must be accompanied by professional technical implementation and ongoing monitoring mechanisms. Program evaluation is not enough to only assess the achievement of output, but must trace the extent to which each dimension strengthens each other in realizing the final goal of the program.

4. CONCLUSION

This study evaluates the implementation of the PIP Training organizer accreditation program initiated by BPIP, using the AEPM model evaluative approach which includes the dimensions*Context, Input, Activity,* And *Performance Monitoring*. Based on the results of the analysis of the perceptions of accredited institutions, it can be concluded that this accreditation program has shown relatively strong performance in terms of planning and institutional structure, but still faces serious challenges in terms of the sustainability of implementation and post-accreditation monitoring.

Dimensions *Context* and *Input* obtained the highest score, reflecting that in terms of objectives, legal basis, and organizational readiness, this program has been designed quite well. However, the score was relatively lower on the dimensions *Performance Monitoring* indicates a weak mechanism to ensure that accreditation has a real impact on the implementation of PIP Training. This confirms the gap between administrative achievements in the form of accreditation status and substantive realization in the form of ongoing training and fostering of Pancasila values.

Furthermore, the results of the correlation between dimensions show a significant and strong relationship, especially between *Context* and *Input*, as well as *Activity* and *Performance Monitoring*. This indicates that the success of the program is systemic and interrelated, programs with strong logic and design will be more likely to succeed if supported by adequate technical implementation and an active monitoring system. Conversely, the weakest correlation between *Input* And *Performance Monitoring Is* an important signal that institutional readiness has not been fully transformed into program sustainability.

Overall, this study concludes that the BPIP accreditation program is on the right track normatively and structurally, but is still vulnerable in terms of outcome substantive. Without strengthening the post-accreditation aspects such as mentoring, monitoring, and utilization of accreditation results to encourage the implementation of real training, accreditation is at risk of becoming merely an administrative procedure. Thus, a more progressive institutional reform strategy and follow-up policies are needed so that the accreditation program truly becomes a transformative instrument in fostering the Pancasila ideology nationally. In addition, this study has limitations in its fully quantitative and perception-based approach, and has not included long-term data. Therefore, further research is recommended to use mixed methods and expand the scope of the program's implementation and actual impact aspects, in order to obtain a more comprehensive and in-depth picture.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akdemir, N., Peterson, L. N., Campbell, C. M., & Scheele, F. (2020). Evaluation of continuous quality improvement in accreditation for medical education. *BMC Medical Education*, *20*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02124-2

Ali, B., Provinsi, B., Timur, K., Kunci, K., Asn, P., & Berakhlak, P. (2022). Optimalisasi Pelayanan Aparatur Sipil Negara dalam Upaya Pelestarian Nilai-Nilai Pancasila (Studi Kasus di Kalimantan Timur). *Jurnal Widyaiswara Indonesia*, *3*(3), 161–168.

Arifin, H. (2024). Politik Hukum Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila dalam Sistem Kelembagaan Negara Republik Indonesia. *Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan*, *4*(1), 48–57. https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v4i1.426

Asadzandi, S., Mohammadi, A., Esteghamati, A., Mojtahedzadeh, R., Hashemian, A., & Jabbari, M. (2022). Development of an Accreditation System for Evaluating Biomedical Scientific Associations Through a Participatory Process in Iran. *Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, *36*(1). https://doi.org/10.47176/mjiri.36.63

Busron, & Titi Rachmi. (2020). Analisis Capaian Standar dan Pemanfaatan Hasil Akreditasi PAUD Provinsi Banten. *Ceria: Jurnal Program Studi Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, *8*(2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.31000/CERIA.V11I2.2335

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (Eighth edition). Taylor & Francis Group.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, And Mixed Methods Approaches* (Sixth Edition). SAGE Publications.

Duarte, N., & Vardasca, R. (2023). Literature Review of Accreditation Systems in Higher Education. In *Education Sciences* (Vol. 13, Issue 6). MDPI. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13060582

Firmanda, H. (2020). Nilai-Nilai Pancasila Sebagai Pedoman Kebijakan dan Tindakan Bagi Penyelenggara Negara dalam Wujud Kontrak Sosial Bernegara. *JURNAL ILMU HUKUM*, *9*(1), 1–14. https://jih.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JIH/index

Fitzpatrick, J. L. ., Sanders, J. R. ., & Worthen, B. R. . (2012). *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. Pearson Education.

Gabalán-Coello, J., Balcero-Molina, A. L., Vasquez Rizo, F. E., Martínez-González, A., & Fonseca-Grandón, G. (2022). An Analysis of Accredited Colombian Universities, Based on Performance Variables Associated with Their Quality. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *21*(4), 379–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2019.1665523

Hamilton-West, K., Gadsby, E., Zaremba, N., & Jaswal, S. (2019). Evaluability assessments as an approach to examining social prescribing. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, *27*(4), 1085–1094. https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12726

Hutagaol, T., & Kosasih, K. (2024). Pemantauan dan Evaluasi Pasca Akreditasi di Rumah Sakit TK II Dr. R. Harjanto Balikpapan (Persiapan Survey Dilakukan Oleh Tim Akreditasi). *Action Research Literate*, *8*(9), 2487–2493. https://doi.org/10.46799/ARL.V8I9.1192

Irawati, E., & Suwarno, Y. (2020). Efektifkah Pelaksanaan Penjaminan Mutu Melalui Akreditasi Lembaga Pelatihan Pemerintah di Indonesia? *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, *16*(3), 291–312. https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v16i3.713

Keputusan Kepala BPIP Nomor 52 Tahun 2024 Tentang Pedoman Akreditasi Penyelenggara Diklat Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila (2024).

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A Quantitative Approach to Content Validity. *Personnel Psychology*, *28*(4), 563–575. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1744-6570.1975.TB01393.X

MacPherson, R., Jersild, A., Bours, D., & Holo, C. (2022). Assessing the Evaluability of Adaptation-Focused Interventions: Lessons from the Adaptation Fund. In *Sustainable Development Goals Series: Vol. Part F2689* (pp. 173–186). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78853-7_12

Made Anggriyani, N., & Gusti Agung Ayu Yuliartika Dewi, I. (2025). Efektivitas Aktualisasi Nilai-Nilai Pancasila Dalam Pelayanan Publik Berbasis Digitalisasi (Studi Kasus: Dpmptsp Kabupaten Gianyar, Provinsi Bali). *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, *16*(1).

Made, A. M., Ambiyar, A., Rizal, F., Riyanda, A. R., Pujiati, P., & Rahmawati, R. (2022). Evaluasi Akreditasi Program Studi di Perguruan Tinggi Merujuk pada Peraturan

1679 | Evaluation of the Accreditation Program for Pancasila Ideology Development Training Organizers with an Approach *Assessment Evaluability* and *Performance Monitoring* (AEPM)

(*Fikri Nurcahya*)

Pemerintah No 3 Tahun 2020 (SN DIKTI). *EDUKATIF : JURNAL ILMU PENDIDIKAN*, *4*(4), 5228–5238. https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v4i4.3173

Mondal, S. R. (2025). Automating KPI Measurement: A Sustainable Solution for Educational Accreditation. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *17*(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/su17051968

Nugroho, A. P., Ardani, I., & Effendi, D. E. (2023). Dampak Kebijakan Akreditasi Puskesmas dalam Upaya Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Kesehatan. *Aspirasi: Jurnal Masalah-Masalah Sosial*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.46807/aspirasi.v14i1.3039

Papageorgiou, S. N. (2022). On correlation coefficients and their interpretation. In *Journal of Orthodontics* (Vol. 49, Issue 3, pp. 359–361). SAGE Publications Inc. https://doi.org/10.1177/14653125221076142

Plumet, R., Gautier, S., Lefebvre, N., Gautier, H., & Herr, M. (2024). The prevention school diary: Evaluability assessment of a widely adopted intervention in Ile-de-France. *Journal of Epidemiology and Population Health*, *72*(3), 202752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeph.2024.202752

Priyanto, S., Badrujaman, A., & Sahara, S. (2024). Evaluation approach of the mechanical engineering competency test certification using the assessment evaluability and performance monitoring model. *Canada. Decision Science Letters*, *13*, 249–260. https://doi.org/10.5267/dsl.2023.9.002

Soemodinoto, A., & Pedju, M. (2022). Evaluability Assessment of Indonesian Marine Conservation Areas for Management Effectiveness Evaluation. *Ilmu Kelautan: Indonesian Journal of Marine Sciences*, *27*(1), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.14710/ik.ijms.27.1.61-72

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. S. (2014). *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications*.

Taber, K. S. (2018). The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education*, *48*(6), 1273–1296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2

Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2004). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (Second Edition). Jossey-Bass.

Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (Thrid Edition). Jossey-Bass. www.josseybass.com/email

Zoh, Y., Paul, L. A., & Crockett, M. J. (2024). How the evaluability bias shapes transformative decisions. *Synthese*, *203*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-023-04474-y