

**PLANNING EVALUATION TECHNIQUES COURSE LEARNING PLAN
EVEN SEMESTER OF ACADEMIC YEAR 2021–2022**

Week	Expected Learning Outcomes	Scope	Learning Methods	Course Duration	Methods of Delivery	Grading Policy	Assesment (%)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
1	Students able to understand the basic concepts of evaluation	Evaluation of public policy management and spatial planning	Lecture and Discussion	100	Discussion		
				100	Literature assistance		
				120	Finding literatures		
2		Definition, purpose, characteristic, and the function of evaluation	Lecture and Discussion	100	Discussion		
				100	Assistance		
				120	Literature reading		
3		Approaches of evaluation (pseudoevaluations, formal, theoretical decisions)	Lecture and Discussion	100	Discussion		
				100	Assistance		
				120	Literature reading		
4		Evaluation criterias	Lecture and Discussion	100	Discussion		
				100	Assistance		
				120	Literature reading		
5		Basic concepts of	test	100	Quiz	Accuracy in understanding the	Individual 20%

Week	Expected Learning Outcomes	Scope	Learning Methods	Course Duration	Methods of Delivery	Grading Policy	Assesment (%)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
		evaluation				basic concepts of evaluation techniques and their applications	
				100	Assistance		
				120	Individualal learning		
6	Students able to understand the utilization of various evaluation techniques	Evaluation technique: CBA	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in reviewing the basic concepts of evaluation techniques and their applications	Teamwork 30%
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
7		Evaluation technique: Impact Assesment	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in reviewing the basic concepts of evaluation techniques and their applications	
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
8		Evaluation technique: Participatory Evaluation	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in reviewing the basic concepts of evaluation techniques and their applications	
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
9		Evaluation technique: Delphi	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in reviewing the basic concepts of evaluation techniques and	

Week	Expected Learning Outcomes	Scope	Learning Methods	Course Duration	Methods of Delivery	Grading Policy	Assesment (%)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
						their applications	
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
10		Evaluation technique: AHP	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in reviewing the basic concepts of evaluation techniques and their applications	
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
11		Evaluation technique: Participatory Evaluation	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in reviewing the basic concepts of evaluation techniques and their applications	
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
12		Formal evaluation technique	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in reviewing the basic concepts of evaluation techniques and their applications	
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
13	Students able to conduct simple evaluation on a policy/program according to the techniques	Explanation of evaluation case	Lecture and Discussion	100	Asistensi dan Discussion		
				100	Assistance		

Week	Expected Learning Outcomes	Scope	Learning Methods	Course Duration	Methods of Delivery	Grading Policy	Assesment (%)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
				120	Survey		
14		Public policy evaluation case	Discussion	100	Presentation and Discussion	Accuracy in the formulation of issues on public policy evaluation, evaluation criterias, and deciding the proper analysis technique, and evaluation process	Teamwork: 40% Individual: 10%
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
15		Public policy evaluation case	Discussion	100	Presentation and		
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		
16		Public policy evaluation case	Discussion	100	Presentation and		
				100	Assistance		
				120	Report Completion		

Suggested course materials : (Max 5)

1. Borri, Dino, dll (1997), Evaluating Theory-Practice and Urban-Rural Interplay in Planning, Kluwer Academic Publishers
2. Chadwaick, George (1978), A System View of Planning, Pergamon Press
3. Dunn, William N (2000), Pengantar Analisis Kebijakan Publik, Gajah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta
4. Gray, Clive (2002), Pengantar Evaluasi Proyek, PT Gramedia Utama
5. Krueckeberg, dkk (1974), Urban Planning Analysis: Methods and Models, John Wiley & Sons Inc

COURSE EVALUATION

Proportion and mechanism of the Development Evaluation Techniques assessment are :

1. Evaluation I (30%) : Critical Review (C1, C2)
 - Individual Task
 - Able to describe evaluation concept and techniques
2. Evaluation II (30%) : Writen Exam (C1, C2,C3)
 - Individual Task
 - Able to summarize the lecture material with a complete, concise, and with its ownexplanation
3. Evaluation III (20%) : Public Policies Evaluation Study (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5)
 - Task Group
 - Compose planning evaluation document
4. Evaluation IV (20%) : Presentation of Public Policies Evaluation (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5)
 - Task Group
 - Able to describe evaluation document made

EVALUATION PLAN AND ASSESSMENT PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

1. EVALUATION I :

ASSIGNMENT 1 – Critical Review (C1, C2)

Course Name	Teknik Evaluasi Perencanaan
Credits	2 credits
Module	Module 1, 2, 3
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students are able to know public regulation and evaluation concepts• Students are able to understand evaluation basic concepts
Objective Learning of Critical Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students are able to understand the concepts and techniques in evaluation planning
Dept Level of Assignment 1 (C1 upto C6)	C1, C2
Assignment 1 Details	The description of tasks and assessment criteria is attached bellow

EVALUATION I: ASSIGNMENT I – CRITICAL REVIEW

A. OBJECTIVE

Evaluation I aims to explore students' understanding of concepts and techniques in the evaluation of the development plan.

B. MATERIAL

The form of tasks is compiling a review journal article regarding public policy development and evaluation. The journal used the reference is a reputable journal (national accredited or ter index scopus). Before becoming the reference materials for the task, the selected journal articles can be diasistensikan for the approval of the professor.

C. IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION I

The task is done individually

One article references should only be reviewed by a student

D. REPORT FORMAT

Write a review not merely summarizing, but it also provides ideas and opinions to the topic/writing disintasikan, it can be done through comparisons with other relevant cases. Length of writing/review a maximum of 5 pages, A4 paper, spacing 1.5. (excess pages will not be examined)

Attach reading resources

The entire task review student in order to be compiled in the form of e-book class, and collected softcopy with uploads on the drive online

E. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

- Source quality of journal (30%)
- Accuracy of review the article's content (40%)
- Lesson learned or writer opinion (30%)

F. ASSISTING AND SUBMISSION OF REPORTS

Evaluation 1 submitted in week 8 of the material Evaluation I is not presented.

G. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The assessment weight of evaluation I is 30%, consists of :

No	Scoring Aspect	Excellent	Good	Enough	Bad	Very Bad	Score
1	Fitness of the substance of the discussed issue with the topic	Issue fit the topic, up to date, have proper issue formulation	Issue fit the topic, does not up to date, have proper issue formulation	Substance fit the topic, up to date, but the issue formulation are not precise	Substance does not fit the topic, the issue formulation are not precise	Substance does not fit the topic, there are no issue	
2	Accuracy on summarizing the important idea on the article	Precise, with comprehensive idea of the issue	Precise, but with less comprehensive idea	Precise	Less precise	There is no summary of the issue concept	
3	Accuracy of critical review towards the substance of the journal	Critical, Precise on giving the critical review, Appropriate on picking the up to date reference	Precise on giving the critical review, Correct on picking the up to date reference	Precise on giving critical review, but the references used are not precise	Critics have less precise, Reference used are not precise	Reviewer give inappropriate critical review and choose the wrong reference	
4	Result discussions and lessons learned	The discussion is structured and comprehensive, Lessons Learned answers the issue and give the example of best practices	The discussion is structured and comprehensive, Lessons Learned answers the issue	There are discussions but not structured nor comprehensive, The lessons learned are correct	There are discussions but not structured nor comprehensive, The lessons learned are not correct	The discussions are not structured, lessons learned are not correct	
5	Accuracy of summarizing	The conclusions	The conclusions and lessons	The conclusions	The conclusions	The conclusions	

the and lessons learned are and lessons and lessons and lessons

No	Scoring Aspect	Excellent	Good	Enough	Bad	Very Bad	Score
	conclusions and lessons learned	learned are correct and comprehensive	correct	learned are correct enough	learned has less precise	learned are not correct	
	Average score obtained						

2. EVALUATION II :
ASSIGNMENT II – Written Exam

Course Name	Development Evaluation Techniques
Credits	2 credits
Module	Module 1, 2, 3
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students do know the context of evaluation in public policy • Students understand the basic concepts in the evaluation of • Students understand the utilization of various techniques in evaluation
Objective Learning of Assignment II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are able to summarize the concepts and techniques in the evaluation of public policies
Dept Level of Assignment II (C1 up to C6)	C1, C2, C3
Assignment II Details	The description of tasks and assessment criteria is attached bellow

EVALUATION II: ASSIGNMENT II –

WRITEN EXAM

A. FORMAT

Evaluation 2 is formed of written exam that summarize the material techniques of Evaluation planning with open-book.

B. OBJECTIVE

The purpose of the Evaluation 2 is to assess the ability of the reason students in summarize lecture material relating to the concepts and techniques in the evaluation of public policies. Students are expected to summarize the material with its own language and patterns with precise, concise, systematic, and structured.

C. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Summarize substance Summarize
structure

D. IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION 2

Individual evaluation

Evaluation 2 will be implement in week 10

E. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The assessment weight of Evaluation 2 is 30 %, consists of :

No	Assessment aspect	Excellent 86-100	Good 76-85	Enough 66-75	Bad 56-65	Very Bad 0-55	Skor
1	Summarize Substance	Complete, comprehensive, systematic, and structured	Complete, comprehensive, and systematic	Complete and comprehensive	Complete	Not complete	
2	Summarize Structure	Structured in a systematic diagram	Structured with a combination of tables and systematic sentence description	The form of description sentences that systematic	In the form of point-point discussion of the less systematic	Unstructured	
Average Score							

3. EVALUATION III :

ASSIGNMENT III – PUBLIC POLICIES EVALUATION

Course Name	Development Evaluation Techniques
Credits	2 credits
Module	Module 1,2,3,4
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students do know the context of evaluation in public policy• Students understand the basic concepts in the evaluation of• Students understand the utilization of various techniques in evaluation• Students are able to do a simple evaluation of a policy/program basedon techniques that have been understood
Objective Learning of Assignment III	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students are able to undertake the evaluation of a public policy case
Dept Level of Assignment III (C1 up to C6)	C1, C2, C3, C4, C4, C5, C6
Assignment III Details	The description of tasks and assessment criteria is attached bellow

**EVALUATION III:
PUBLIC POLICIES EVALUATION REPORT**

A. OBJECTIVE

This task aims to apply the concepts and techniques of evaluation in the case of public policy that will be evaluated. Public policy being evaluated can be either spatial plan and the development plan. The spatial plan can be either RTRW, RDTR spatial plans, and more. Meanwhile, the development plan can be either RPJP, RPJM, renstra, to the thematic programmes, such as poverty reduction programs, infrastructure programs are integrated, and so on. Specifically, through these assignments, students are expected to:

- a. Define rationally the policies to be evaluate
- b. Formulate evaluation approach and techniques used
- c. Provide an assessment of the policy
- d. Provides recommendations from the results of the assessment conducted

B. SUBSTANCE

The substance that must be loaded in the task:

1. The formulation of evaluation issues
2. An overview of the policy will be evaluated
3. Approaches, techniques and evaluation criteria
4. Assessment based on the criteria of evaluation
5. Conclusions and recommendations

C. OUT PUT and WRITING FORMAT

The output of this task in the form of a working paper drawn up in accordance with the provisions of the substance that was mentioned above. Writing format is as follows:

- Writing created on A4 paper; free font size 11-12; 1.15 spacing note the procedures of scientific writing
- A maximum of 15 pages, excess pages will not be checked

D. ASSIGNMENT IMPLEMENTATION

Task done in a group, each group consisting of 4-5 people. In the implementation of the work assignment, each group can discuss. problems faced on the lecturer. Duties collected in week 14 and presented the 14 up to 15.

E. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

- Accuracy evaluation of problem formulation
- The precision of the evaluation approach
- Accuracy analysis of evaluation

F. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA OF MAJOR REPORT TASK (20%)

Dimension	Excellent 86-100	Good 76-85	Enough 66-75	Bad 56-65	Very Bad 0-55	SKOR
Accuracy evaluation of problem formulation	Choosing the right policy to be evaluated. The rationality problem formulation based on facts and logic that is right	Choosing the right policy to be evaluated. The rationality problem formulation is largely already based on facts and logic that is right	Choosing the right policy to be evaluated. The rationality problem formulation based on the relative facts and logic are insufficient	Choosing the right policy to be evaluated. The rationality problem formulation is less based on facts and logic that is right	Choosing the right policy to be evaluated. The rationality problem formulation is not based on facts and logic that is right	
The precision of the evaluation approach	Types, techniques and evaluation criteria are correct	Types, techniques and evaluation criteria the majority is correct	Types, techniques and evaluation criteria are already quite correctly	Types, techniques and evaluation criteria the majority of less precise	Types, techniques and evaluation criteria are wrong	
Accuracy analysis of evaluation	The entire outline of the evaluation results and analysis are correct	Most of the analysis and evaluation of the results of the formula are correct	Half of the analysis and evaluation of the results of the formula are correct	Most of the analysis and evaluation of results less precise formulation	Analysis and evaluation of the results of the formula wrong	
AVERAGE SCORE						

4. EVALUATION IV :

ASSIGNMENT IV – PRESENTATION OF PUBLIC POLICIES EVALUATION

Course Name	Development Evaluation Techniques
Credits	2 credit
Module	Module 1,2,3,4
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students do know the context of evaluation in public policy• Students understand the basic concepts in the evaluation of• Students understand the utilization of various techniques in evaluation• Students are able to do a simple evaluation of a policy/program based on techniques that have been understood
Objective Learning of Assignment IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students are able to present the case of evaluation of public policies that have been forward orally
Dept Level of Assignment IV (C1 up to C6)	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5
Assignment IV Details	The description of tasks and assessment criteria is attached below

**EVALUATION IV: PRESENTATION
OF MAJOR TASK**

A. FORMAT

Evaluation 4 is presentation task from case studies undertaken on evaluation 3. The presentation is done in a group. Presentation tasks performed within a maximum of 15 minutes, the rest of the time followed by discussion. Presentation materials can be composed with a power point or similar media. Evaluasi 4 berbentuk presentasi dari tugas studi kasus yang dikerjakan pada evaluasi 3.

B. OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the Evaluation is a students are able to describe the case study evaluations of public policies that have been forward orally.

C. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

- Presentation media
- Clarity of the substance of the presentation
- Discussion

D. IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION 4

Group task

Implementation Evaluation 4 will be implemented starting week 14 to 16

E. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA OF MAJOR TASK (20%)

Dimension	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	Very Bad	Score
Technique of Presentation	The presentation was organized with showing fact that supported by example that already analyzed based on concept	The presentation was organized and showing fact that make sure to support the conclusions	The presentation has focus point and showing some evidence that support the conclusions	The presentation has focus point, but evidence were insufficient to used for make a conclusions.	There's no specific organization. Facts are not used to support their statement	
	(10-8)	(6-8)	(4-5)	(3-2)	(0-1)	
Content	Content that can be inspire listener to develop their minds.	Has an accurate and complete presentation .The listener has a new knowledge about that topics	Has an accurate content but not complete. The listener less active to discuss that topics	The content was less accurate because there's no data and fact that supports it	The content are not accurate and very common. Listener didn't get any lessons from this presentation	
	(10-8)	(6-8)	(4-5)	(3-2)	(0-1)	
Discussion	The right argumentation with example or the fact	The right argumentation but lacking of the fact	The lack of argumentation but have fact or example	The lack of argumentation and not have example	Argumentation is wrong	

For criteria depth adjusted to TAXONOMY BLOOM

- COURSE Basic : Remembering, Understanding
- COURSE Intermediate : Applying, Analyzing
- COURSE Advance : Evaluating, Creating