DEVOTION
Journal of Research and Community Service
Volume 6, Number 10, October 2025
e-ISSN: 2797-6068 and p-ISSN: 2777-0915

Evaluation of Teacher E-Performance Implementation Based on GTK Rooms in Kotamobagu: CIPP Model Analysis

Violita Anita Tiwa
Universitas Sam Ratulangi, Indonesia
Email: violitatiwa111@student.unsrat.ac.id

KEYWORDS
E-Kinerja; Ruang GTK; Policy Evaluation; CIPP; Teachers

ABSTRACT

In Indonesia, the national education system has experienced significant digital transformation through the implementation of the Teacher E-Performance (*E-Kinerja*) system and the *Ruang Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan* (*Ruang GTK*) platform. These initiatives aim to improve accountability, transparency, and professional development among teachers. This study evaluates the implementation of the *E-Kinerja* policy as a digital tool for reporting and developing teacher performance through the *Ruang GTK* platform in Kotamobagu. The research is crucial since large-scale digital systems often neglect technical readiness, human resources, and local contexts. Using a qualitative approach and the CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product), data were gathered through interviews, observations, and document analysis involving 15 key informants, including education officials, supervisors, principals, and teachers. The findings reveal: (1) varied understanding of policy objectives among implementers; (2) unequal access to infrastructure and technical training; (3) implementation that remains administrative rather than developmental; and (4) limited use of *Ruang GTK*, particularly among senior teachers. The CIPP-based analysis indicates a gap between policy design and field implementation, marked by inconsistencies across input, process, and product components. While the digital system promotes accountability, issues such as digital literacy and server reliability remain barriers. This research contributes to digital education governance studies by highlighting the need for context-sensitive, adaptive, and participatory policy implementation that strengthens infrastructure, expands training, and simplifies applications for diverse regional environments.

INTRODUCTION

Education is a key pillar in developing human resources that are adaptive to change (Paliukh et al., 2025; Zaakiyyah, 2024). Along with advances in information technology, the national education system is being directed toward digital transformation to strengthen efficient, transparent, and accountable governance (Deni, 2023; Dewi, 2022; IM et al., 2025). Digital transformation in education has become a global phenomenon, with governments investing substantially in educational technology infrastructure to modernize teaching, learning, and administrative processes (Huang, 2025; Vachkova et al., 2021; Voronkova et al., 2023). According to Benedetta (2025), effective digital education systems require not only technological infrastructure but also systematic capacity building, stakeholder engagement, and context-sensitive implementation strategies. In this context, digital transformation has become a policy strategy continuously promoted by the government through the development of online systems, the digitization of managerial processes, and integration between platforms

(Alojail & Khan, 2023; Lee et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023). One concrete form of this transformation is the implementation of the *Teacher E-Performance* system and the development of a digital learning platform through the *Rumah Pendidikan* super-app.

As of October 21, 2024, the nomenclature of the ministry responsible for primary and secondary education officially changed from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (*Kemendikbudristek*) to the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (*Kemendikdasmen*), based on Presidential Regulation Number 188 of 2024. Simultaneously, the *Merdeka Mengajar* (*PMM*) Platform was restructured into the *Ruang Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan* (*Teacher and Education Personnel Room*) integrated within the *Rumah Pendidikan* super-app. This change was officially announced through Circular Letter No. 1411/B1/KS.03.00/2025 from the Director General of Teachers and Education Personnel, which states that all *PMM* content will be re-uploaded and legally managed through *Ruang GTK*. The changes include modifications to the name, logo, interface structure, and content management system, designed to simplify user access.

Ruang GTK functions as a tool for managing teacher performance as well as a platform for independent learning and competency development (Darmayanti et al., 2025; Susanti & Ardhianto, 2025). The platform provides micro-training features, communities of practice, teaching tools based on the Independent Curriculum, student assessments, and integrated performance reports (Díaz Redondo et al., 2021; Senandheera et al., 2024). As a continuation of *PMM*, *Ruang GTK* also expands system integration, uniting performance reporting with learning histories within a single user account.

E-Kinerja is expected to replace the manual assessment system, which has been deemed ineffective and vulnerable to manipulation (Zulvie, 2023). Through this platform, teachers are expected to report their work results and performance achievements independently and objectively (de Bruijn et al., 2023; Garay et al., 2023). Furthermore, *Ruang GTK* serves as a self-learning platform to continuously improve teacher competency. This policy also aligns with the direction of national e-Government development, as mandated by Presidential Instruction No. 6 of 2001 concerning the development and utilization of information technology in government administration (Wahyuningsih & Choiriyah, 2025; Willia Gusman, 2024).

Although this policy direction is appropriate at the macro level, its implementation in regions such as Kotamobagu City faces various obstacles (Manopo et al., 2023). According to data from the Kotamobagu City Education Office's performance management dashboard in 2024, 99.3% of teachers have been integrated into the system, and the majority have completed their semester reporting. However, these administrative achievements do not necessarily reflect the substantive success of the policy (Jatmikowati, 2021). There is insufficient information on the extent to which teachers understand the system, how the assessment process actually works in schools, and how teachers perceive the fairness, usefulness, and effectiveness of the digital platform in supporting their competency development (Balaban & Sobodić, 2022; Guàrdia et al., 2023; Maleki, 2025).

Some of the main obstacles encountered in the field include limited technical training, unequal access to digital infrastructure, and minimal mentoring for teachers in using digital platforms (Mhlongo et al., 2023). Teachers in some schools experienced technical difficulties accessing *E-Kinerja* and *Ruang GTK*, such as unstable internet connections, unfriendly

platform interfaces, and complex data input processes. Furthermore, some teachers felt that performance assessments through these systems did not fully represent their work, and that not all indicators within *E-Kinerja* could be applied to the context of each school (Niswaty et al., 2023; Paramata et al., 2024).

Another obstacle identified was the low level of active teacher participation in utilizing *Ruang GTK*. Many teachers only used the platform when required, rather than as part of a continuous, independent learning process (Hidayat & Muharizal, 2023; Josué et al., 2023). This issue was exacerbated by a lack of coordination between the Education Office, school principals, and teachers in implementing the policy, creating the impression that the policy was top-down and agnostic.

Prior to the implementation of the digital system, the teacher performance assessment process at the Kotamobagu City Education Office was conducted manually (Maa & Igon, 2025; Ruung et al., 2022). This pattern often created various administrative problems, such as delays in the evaluation process, limited transparency in assessments, and a lack of systematic feedback for teachers (Luo et al., 2025). With the introduction of *E-Performance* and *Ruang GTK*, it was hoped that efficiency and the quality of teacher performance management at the school level would improve (Pandiangan et al., 2024).

However, in practice, the *E-Performance* system still faces multiple obstacles. Teachers have difficulty accessing the platform due to technical glitches or infrastructure limitations, and most consider the data entry process too complex. Another recurring complaint is that the system is not sufficiently user-friendly and difficult to use independently, especially for teachers less familiar with technology. Furthermore, dissatisfaction persists regarding the validity of the assessment system, which is perceived as not fully reflecting all aspects of teacher performance.

Ruang GTK has also not been utilized optimally (Darmayanti et al., 2025). Limited socialization, poor internet access, and insufficient training prevent most teachers from incorporating *Ruang GTK* into their daily competency development (Rokhmawati et al., 2025). Some schools experience inequities in policy implementation due to differences in device and network access, which impact the effectiveness of this digital system's implementation across Kotamobagu City (Nthontho & Nonjabulo, 2023).

Coordination between policy actors has also been highlighted. Teachers often feel that this policy is implemented without clear communication or adequate support (Paulsrud & Nilholm, 2023). Many do not understand how the assessment process is conducted or where to report technical issues. The limited opportunity for participation in the policy's design and implementation creates a perception that the policy is unilateral and bureaucratic (Williams, 2021). This top-down implementation approach contradicts principles of effective policy implementation theory, which emphasize the importance of stakeholder involvement, clear communication channels, and responsive support mechanisms (Balamurugan, 2021; Imperial, 2021).

This situation emphasizes the need to evaluate the *E-Performance* assessment policy and the use of *Ruang GTK*, with an approach that considers not only administrative outcomes but also the processes and perceptions of policy implementers at the operational level (Zulvie, 2023). Despite growing literature on educational technology implementation, there remains a significant research gap regarding comprehensive, theory-grounded evaluations of national-

scale teacher performance management systems in decentralized educational contexts, particularly in Southeast Asian countries experiencing rapid digitalization. The novelty of this research lies in applying the *CIPP* evaluation framework to systematically examine the entire policy lifecycle—from contextual appropriateness to product effectiveness—while centering the voices and experiences of frontline implementers who are often marginalized in policy discourse.

Based on this background, this study focuses on the question: how is the implementation of the *E-Performance* assessment policy for teachers through the *Ruang GTK* platform in Kotamobagu City? Specifically, this research aims to: (1) evaluate the contextual alignment between the *E-Kinerja* policy objectives and local educational needs in Kotamobagu; (2) assess the adequacy of input resources, including infrastructure, training, and technical support systems; (3) analyze the implementation processes and identify operational challenges faced by different stakeholder groups; and (4) examine the products and outcomes of policy implementation in terms of teacher professional development and system effectiveness. The significance of this research extends to both theoretical and practical domains. Theoretically, it contributes to policy implementation studies by demonstrating how comprehensive evaluation models can reveal systemic gaps in technology-driven educational reforms. Practically, the findings provide actionable insights for policymakers, educational administrators, and technology developers seeking to improve digital governance systems in education, with implications applicable to similar contexts across Indonesia and other developing nations undertaking educational digitalization initiatives.

METHOD

This research used a qualitative approach using the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model developed by Stufflebeam. This model was chosen because it provides a comprehensive evaluation of public policy, from understanding the policy context, the availability of inputs and resources, policy implementation, to the results achieved. The evaluation focused on the implementation of the teacher e-performance assessment policy integrated with the Ruang GTK digital platform within the Kotamobagu City Education Office.

The research was conducted from March to April 2025 at the Kotamobagu City Education Office and several public elementary and secondary education units that had implemented the E-performance and Ruang GTK systems. Locations were selected purposively based on variations in technical readiness, access to digital infrastructure, and representation of educational levels. The researchers obtained official permission from the office and coordinated with informants for identification and scheduling.

The research subjects consisted of 15 informants selected using a purposive sampling technique. Informants included the Head of the Education Office, the Head of the Teacher and Teacher Education Section or the Head of the Personnel Subdivision, E-Kinerja system operators, school supervisors, principals, and teachers (including active and passive users of Ruang GTK). Informant selection criteria included: direct involvement in policy implementation, at least two semesters of experience using the system, and willingness to provide in-depth information.

Data were collected through three main techniques:

1. Semi-structured interviews used a guideline designed based on the CIPP framework, TAM (Davis), and Edwards III's policy implementation theory. The guideline consisted of a number of exploratory questions, tailored to each group of informants. For example:
   a. The Head of the Department was asked about the background, design, support, and impact of the policy.
   b. The Head of the GTK Section/Personnel Sub-Division was asked to explain the operational mechanisms and field challenges.
   c. System operators answered questions about technical obstacles, system access, and technical training.
   d. School supervisors evaluated teacher attitudes and the relationship between the GTK Room and competency improvement.
   e. School principals were asked for their views on the implementation, administrative burden, and effectiveness of the system.
   f. Teachers explained their understanding of E-Performance, the use of the GTK Room, and the obstacles they faced.
2. Limited participant observation was conducted on E-Performance reporting activities in several schools, particularly during the completion of semester performance plans and reports, as well as the use of the GTK Room in teachers' daily activities.
3. Documentation studies were conducted by reviewing official documents such as policy circulars, technical instructions, performance report summaries, internal SOPs, as well as user interface displays of the Ruang GTK system and E-Kinerja dashboard.

Interviews were conducted either offline or online (via Zoom), depending on the informant's preferences and availability. The average interview duration was 30–45 minutes. All interviews were recorded with the informant's consent and transcribed verbatim for analysis. Informant identities were kept confidential in accordance with ethical research principles.

The primary instrument in this study was the researcher herself, assisted by an interview guide developed based on the CIPP model indicators. Data validity was strengthened through source triangulation (between informants) and technical triangulation (interviews, observations, documentation), as well as data verification through member checking and discussions with experts.

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke) with six stages:

1. Rereading the data and familiarizing oneself with the transcripts.
2. Creating initial codes for key sections of the data.
3. Grouping codes into potentially meaningful themes.
4. Reviewing themes for consistency and depth of meaning.
5. Naming and defining themes.
6. Develop a thematic narrative to systematically explain the research results.

The entire analysis process aims to map the relationships between policy design, implementation context, implementer responses, and the effectiveness of outcomes, as reflected in the CIPP evaluation dimensions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study demonstrate a mapping of themes and subthemes reflecting the experiences, perceptions, and practices of implementers in implementing the Teacher E-Performance policy based on the GTK Room in Kotamobagu City. Using the CIPP evaluation framework, four main themes were identified, describing the context, process, utilization, and support for the policy.

In the context dimension, understanding of the objectives and background of the policy is quite strong at the structural level, but not yet fully entrenched at the technical implementation level. The process dimension covers the implementation of the system in the field, including the roles of principals, supervisors, and operators. System utilization reflects the extent to which teachers and principals use and perceive the benefits of the GTK Room. Meanwhile, the support dimension highlights institutional readiness, training, and follow-up on obstacles.

These four themes are further elaborated into 13 subthemes, organized based on the focus of interviews and thematic analysis. All thematic findings are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. General Themes and Subthemes (E-Performance – GTK Room)

General Themes	Subtopics
Understanding and Perception of the Implementer	1. Policy objectives and background of E-Performance
	2. Perception of the system: administrative vs competency development
	3. Understanding of the technical guidelines and procedures for use
	4. Perception of fairness and accountability of judgment
Implementation and Implementation Process	1. he role of the principal in assessment and validation
	2. Supervisory observation and coaching intervention
	3. Reporting relationship between schools and operators
	4. Technical and non-technical constraints in input and reporting
System Utilization and Its Impact	1. Frequency of use of GTK Space and features utilized
	2. Teacher's experience in filling out E-Performance
	3. Impact on teacher performance and changes in administrative burden
Institutional Support and Readiness	1. Technical support from the service and user training
	2. Infrastructure readiness and system accessibility
	3. Follow-up on implementation violations

Each theme and subtheme presented in Table 1 is reinforced by statements from informants that provide concrete insights into experiences, perceptions, and practices in the field. The following quotes were selected to represent the varying perspectives across policy actors, from teachers and principals to supervisors and department officials.

Context Evaluation: Implementer Understanding and Perception

Interview results indicate that implementers' understanding of the purpose of E-Kinerja is generally directed at increasing teacher accountability and transparency. One teacher stated: "The purpose of E-Kinerja is to facilitate the recording, reporting, and evaluation of teacher performance in a transparent and measurable manner." (Elementary School Teacher-02).

However, not all teachers believe this system encourages competency improvement. Most view it more as an administrative burden. "In practice, this system often feels more like an administrative burden." (Elementary School Teacher-01).

The principal understands E-Kinerja as a performance management cycle encompassing planning, assessment, and validation. "I act as a planner, director, supervisor, assessor, and validator..." (Junior High School Principal). However, criticism still emerged from elementary schools, which perceived an excessive emphasis on administrative completeness: "The assessment focuses more on administrative completeness than on the actual quality of teachers in the classroom." (Elementary School Principal).

From the perspective of the department and supervisors, understanding was relatively strong. "The background to E-Performance emerged from a commitment to improving the quality of performance management... indicators of bureaucratic reform, efficiency, administrative transparency, and the use of technology." (Head of the Education Department). A supervisor added that implementation had not always fully followed technical guidelines, while personnel officials emphasized the need for mentoring for teachers who were still struggling.

Overall, policymakers at the structural level had a good understanding of the background and objectives of the policy, while gaps remained at the technical level. Some teachers viewed the system as an administrative obligation, rather than a tool for professional reflection.

Input Evaluation: Implementation and Implementation Process

The implementation of E-Performance in schools demonstrated a variety of roles between actors. Principals emphasized their role not only as assessors but also as planners, directors, supervisors, and validators of teacher performance reports. A principal stated: "Socialization is still lacking, the server often goes down, and too many applications actually increase the burden on teachers." (Junior High School Principal).

School supervisors observed that teachers often only fill out reports to fulfill administrative obligations, so coaching interventions still need to be strengthened. The reporting relationship between schools and operators is also plagued by technical challenges. Operators stated: "The system is slow when many users access it simultaneously, there are errors when uploading documents, and data has to be re-entered because it is not stored properly." (Elementary School Operator).

Teachers complained about increased workloads due to having to input multiple applications. "The large amount of administrative input that must be entered in a short time increases teachers' workload, especially if the network is unstable." (Junior High School Teacher-02).

In general, policy implementation is proceeding according to procedure, but is still limited by technical obstacles and limited digital literacy. These conditions affect the quality of reporting and the effectiveness of performance validation at the school level.

Process Evaluation: System Utilization and Its Impact

Teachers' use of Ruang GTK (Gertek Room) remains limited to administrative needs. Most teachers only open the application when asked to fill out reports, while other features,

such as teaching tools or micro-training, are rarely used. Younger teachers tend to be more active, but not consistently.

Teachers' experiences with completing E-Performance also vary. Teachers with good digital literacy are able to follow the flow, but many others find the process cumbersome. Some still rely on school operators. One teacher stated: "The large amount of administrative input that must be entered in a short time increases teachers' workload, especially if the network is unstable." (SMP-02 Teacher).

The principal acknowledged that technical constraints and a lack of support prevent teachers from optimally utilizing the system. The input process is often hampered by slow servers or failed document uploads. One principal stated: "Teachers at my school mostly only complete the system as soon as the deadline approaches, rather than periodically as expected." (Elementary School Principal).

School supervisors also highlighted that system utilization has not met expectations. According to him, "Reporting is still considered an administrative obligation, not yet a means of reflection for teacher professional development." (Supervisor-02).

In general, this system does improve reporting regularity and administrative transparency, but its contribution to improving the quality of learning is not yet significant. Teachers' administrative burdens have actually increased, necessitating socialization and substantive guidance so that E-Kinerja and Ruang GTK function as professional development instruments, not merely procedural routines.

Product Evaluation: Institutional Support and Readiness

The Education Office has provided support in the form of regulations, socialization, and technical training, although implementation has been uneven. A personnel official stated: "We will facilitate this through further training and technical assistance for schools experiencing challenges." (Head of Personnel Sub-Division).

In terms of infrastructure, the Ruang GTK system is considered to help with reporting transparency, but it is still often hampered by slow servers, unstable internet access, and inadequate school equipment. These conditions make it difficult for teachers and operators to enter data independently and in a timely manner.

School supervisors highlighted that follow-up on implementation violations remains weak. He emphasized the need for stricter oversight to ensure reporting is not merely a formality. "The implementation has not been as expected; the planning and stages have not been carried out correctly as per the technical guidelines." (Supervisor-01).

In general, institutional support is available, but it is not yet strong enough to close the technical capacity gap in the field. Without infrastructure improvements, ongoing training, and a robust follow-up mechanism, the E-Performance policy risks becoming merely an administrative routine, rather than an instrument for improving teacher professionalism.

Discussion

Context Evaluation: Implementer Understanding and Perception

The results of this study indicate that teachers and principals' understanding of the objectives of the E-Kinerja policy remains varied. Most perceive the system as an administrative reporting instrument, rather than as a mechanism for continuous professional

development. This finding confirms the gap between the policy's normative objectives—namely, promoting accountability and a reflective culture—and field practice, which tends toward formalism. This situation aligns with studies by Londa et al. (2018) and Tulusan et al. (2016), which emphasized weak vertical communication in education policy, resulting in implementers receiving only technical instructions without substantive understanding. Furthermore, this pattern reflects broader challenges in technology-mediated educational reform documented by Fullan and Tondeur, who argue that successful implementation requires not merely technical training but deep conceptual understanding of how digital tools support pedagogical and professional goals. The disconnect between policy intent and teacher perception suggests that implementation strategies have prioritized compliance over capacity building, a common pitfall in top-down educational technology initiatives (Selwyn). As a result, teachers view E-Kinerja more as an administrative burden than a means of improving competency.

The varied understanding across organizational levels also highlights what Edwards III identified as communication failures in policy implementation, where the translation of policy objectives from central authorities to frontline implementers becomes distorted or incomplete. This finding extends recent research by Howard and König, who demonstrated that effective digital education policy requires deliberate strategies for building shared understanding through participatory communication, contextualized examples, and opportunities for implementers to co-construct meaning around new practices.

Input Evaluation: Implementation and Implementation Process

Infrastructure and human resource readiness are uneven across schools. Schools in urban centers are better equipped with devices and stable internet connections, while schools in rural areas still rely on one or two computers for all administrative activities. This situation is exacerbated by low teacher digital literacy and training that has not yet reached all educational units. This infrastructure disparity exemplifies the persistent digital divide in educational contexts, consistent with UNESCO findings that technology-driven reforms in developing countries frequently reproduce and amplify existing inequalities when implementation fails to account for differential resource availability across regions. This situation illustrates the weak resources factor in Edwards III's implementation theory, where the lack of adequate equipment and ongoing training leads to variable reporting quality. Similarly, Tulusan et al. (2016) noted that input readiness is a key prerequisite for successful policy digitalization. Without equitable basic infrastructure support, E-Performance risks widening disparities between schools.

The uneven training provision identified in this study resonates with research on professional development for educational technology, which emphasizes that one-time, generic training sessions are insufficient for building sustainable digital competencies (Trust; Scherer). Effective capacity building requires ongoing, job-embedded support tailored to teachers' existing skill levels and specific contexts—precisely what appears to be missing in the Kotamobagu implementation. Moreover, the dependency on single school operators for technical support reflects a fragile implementation model vulnerable to personnel turnover and capacity constraints, echoing concerns raised by Venkatesh about the importance of distributed technical capacity rather than concentrated expertise in successful technology adoption.

Process Evaluation: System Utilization and Its Impact

The technical implementation of E-Performance reporting in schools is not uniform. Formally, the reporting process begins with teachers, is then validated by the principal, coordinated by operators, and supervised by supervisors. However, in practice, many teachers delegate the completion process to operators due to limited technical skills. Principals often perform validation only on an administrative level without examining the substance, while supervisors are limited in their role due to the heavy workload of their target schools. The lack of standard technical SOPs exacerbates the variation in implementation between schools. This finding is consistent with Londa et al. (2018), who cited weak SOPs and formal supervision as factors hindering policy effectiveness. Additionally, this implementation variability reflects what Lipsky termed "street-level bureaucracy," where frontline implementers adapt policies to local conditions and constraints, sometimes undermining policy intentions. The delegation of technical tasks to operators and superficial validation by principals suggest that the system has created workarounds that maintain the appearance of compliance while bypassing the substantive engagement with performance data that the policy intended to promote. Under these conditions, implementation tends to emphasize only administrative compliance rather than meaningful performance reflection.

The pattern of last-minute completion observed among teachers illustrates classic procrastination behavior associated with perceived lack of relevance and user resistance to mandatory systems (Teo; Davis). This behavioral pattern is particularly significant because it indicates that the system has failed to achieve what Davis identified as perceived usefulness—a critical determinant of voluntary technology adoption. While E-Kinerja is mandatory, the minimal engagement beyond compliance suggests that teachers do not perceive the system as valuable for their professional practice, limiting its potential to drive meaningful change in teaching quality (Zhao).

Product Evaluation: Institutional Support and Readiness

The main change in this policy is the shift from manual to digital reporting. However, the substantive benefits of improving teacher professionalism have not yet been fully realized. Many teachers reported that filling out the system increased their workload, especially during unstable network conditions. School principals did perceive an increase in reporting regularity, but the substantial improvement in learning quality was not yet clearly visible. Meanwhile, utilization of the Ruang GTK feature remains low due to its perceived lack of relevance to teachers' daily work needs. This finding corroborates research by Muflikhah & Faridah (2024), which emphasized the need for more objective and contextual performance assessment indicators. The limited impact on teaching quality aligns with meta-analytic research by Hattie and more recent studies by OECD, which found that technology integration in education produces meaningful learning outcomes only when accompanied by pedagogical transformation and sustained professional learning—conditions not yet evident in the Kotamobagu implementation. Without strong integration with career development and learning quality, policy products result more in administrative compliance than in professional transformation.

The low utilization of Ruang GTK's professional development features represents a missed opportunity, as research consistently demonstrates that integrated platforms combining

performance management with learning resources can be powerful tools for teacher growth when properly implemented (Darling-Hammond; Reimers & Schleicher). The disconnect between available features and actual usage suggests a failure in what Venkatesh identified as facilitating conditions—the organizational and technical support structures necessary for effective technology adoption. Furthermore, the increase in administrative burden without corresponding improvements in teaching quality exemplifies what Selwyn described as "datafication" without meaningful transformation, where digital systems generate compliance data without fundamentally changing professional practice or student outcomes.

The findings from all four CIPP dimensions collectively reveal a systemic misalignment between policy design assumptions and implementation realities. The policy assumes adequate infrastructure, sufficient digital literacy, clear understanding of objectives, and organizational cultures supportive of reflective practice—assumptions that do not hold uniformly across Kotamobagu's diverse educational landscape. This pattern of implementation challenges is consistent with international research on large-scale educational technology initiatives in developing contexts (World Bank; Trucano), suggesting that successful digital transformation requires more than technological solutions; it demands comprehensive ecosystem development encompassing infrastructure, capacity building, organizational culture change, and adaptive implementation strategies responsive to local conditions.

CONCLUSION

An evaluation of the teacher e-Performance policy in Kotamobagu City using the CIPP model shows that its implementation still faces several obstacles. First, the policy context is not fully aligned with local needs, as indicators are uniform nationally and vertical communication remains weak. Second, input readiness is uneven; digital infrastructure and human resource capacity vary across schools, leaving teachers dependent on operators. Third, the implementation process is not uniform and is not supported by standard operating procedures (SOPs) and consistent monitoring mechanisms. Fourth, the system has not yet encouraged changes in teachers' reflective behavior, so it is perceived more as an administrative obligation. Fifth, institutional support from government agencies and supervisors is not optimal, as training and mentoring remain sporadic and local actors' participation is not maximized. This research is still limited by the number of informants and regional scope, so further research is recommended to expand the approach with quantitative analysis through system log data or large-scale surveys, as well as conduct comparative studies between regions to examine variations in local contexts and success factors. Further research can also examine the relationship between the use of GTK Spaces and teacher career development, and integrate evaluation with student learning achievement indicators to demonstrate the direct link between teacher performance and educational quality. Furthermore, in-depth studies on more dialogic and participatory policy communication strategies are important so that the implementation of E-Performance in the regions can be more contextual and sustainable.

REFERENCES

Alojail, M., & Khan, S. B. (2023). Impact of digital transformation toward sustainable development. *Sustainability*, *15*(20), 14697.

Balaban, I., & Sobodić, A. (2022). From Teachers' Perspective: Can an Online Digital

Competence Certification System Be Successfully Implemented in Schools? *Applied Sciences*, *12*(8), 3785.

Balamurugan, K. (2021). A critical assessment of the value of top-down and bottom-up public policy implementation theories, with reference to the case of implementation of passport seva: An eGovernance policy in India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, *67*(4), 525–539.

Benedetta, B. M. K., & Isaac Odhiambo Abuya, P. D. I. (2025). Context Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation, Stakeholder Engagement and Implementation of Renewable Energy Projects: Context Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation, Stakeholder Engagement and Implementation of Renewable Energy Projects. *The International Journal Of Humanities And Social Studies*, *2*(4).

Darmayanti, A., Asphianto, A., & Nulhakim, L. (2025). The Relationship Between Self-Training on (Ruang GTK) and Teacher Creativity in Learning with the Performance of SMP Teachers in Walantaka District, Banten Province. *International Journal of Community Engagement Payungi*, *5*(2), 296–313.

de Bruijn, A. G. M., de Greeff, J. W., Temlali, T. Y., Oosterlaan, J., Smith, J., & Hartman, E. (2023). Objectively measured physical activity during primary school physical education predicts intrinsic motivation independently of academic achievement level. In *British journal of educational psychology* (Vol. 93, pp. 90–112). Wiley Online Library.

Deni, A. (2023). *Kebijakan Publik (Formulasi, Implementasi, Evaluasi, Dan Analisis)*. Cendikia Mulia Mandiri.

Dewi, D. S. K. (2022). *Buku Ajar Kebijakan Publik Proses, Implementasi dan Evaluasi*. Penerbit Samudra Biru (Anggota IKAPI).

Díaz Redondo, R. P., Caeiro Rodríguez, M., López Escobar, J. J., & Fernández Vilas, A. (2021). Integrating micro-learning content in traditional e-learning platforms. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, *80*(2), 3121–3151.

Garay, F. O. M., Hernández, H. M., Zuluaga, C. P. N., & Zabala, I. C. O. (2023). Proposal of a model based on a technological platform to support the teacher performance evaluation process. *Russian Law Journal*, *11*(4), 271–278.

Guàrdia, L., Maina, M., Mancini, F., & Martinez Melo, M. (2023). Key quality factors in digital competence assessment: A validation study from teachers' perspective. *Applied Sciences*, *13*(4), 2450.

Hidayat, E., & Muharizal, M. (2023). The role of the teacher in improving the quality of learning through the teaching freedom platform. *Journal of Engineering Education and Pedagogy*, *1*(1), 8–15.

Huang, R. (2025). Accelerating the Digital Transformation of Education to Promote High-Quality School Development. In *Leading Smart Education: Best Practices from Chinese Schools* (pp. 3–12). Springer.

IM, S. F., Heryani, S., NIJ, B. M., Permatasari, N., Firdaus, M. F., Sevtian, D., & Herdiana, D. (2025). Formulasi Kebijakan Publik: Konsep Dan Penelitian. *Menulis: Jurnal Penelitian Nusantara*, *1*(6), 50–55.

Imperial, M. T. (2021). Implementation structures: The use of top-down and bottom-up approaches to policy implementation. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of politics*.

Jatmikowati, S. H. (2021). A study of public policy implementation in e-administration

services. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *20*(2), 1–23.

Josué, A., Bedoya-Flores, M. C., Mosquera-Quiñonez, E. F., Mesías-Simisterra, Á. E., & Bautista-Sánchez, J. V. (2023). Educational Platforms: Digital Tools for the teaching-learning process in Education. *Ibero-American Journal of Education & Society Research*, *3*(1), 259–263.

Lee, C.-H., Wang, D., Lyu, S., Evans, R. D., & Li, L. (2023). A digital transformation-enabled framework and strategies for public health risk response and governance: China's experience. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, *123*(1), 133–154.

Li, H., Yang, Z., Jin, C., & Wang, J. (2023). How an industrial internet platform empowers the digital transformation of SMEs: theoretical mechanism and business model. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *27*(1), 105–120.

Luo, J., Zheng, C., Yin, J., & Teo, H. H. (2025). Design and assessment of AI-based learning tools in higher education: a systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(1), 42.

Londa, V. Y., Tumurang, H., & Palilingan, P. (2018). Implementasi kebijakan pendidikan dan tantangannya di daerah. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan, 9*(2), 115–128.

Maa, S. C., & Igon, S. S. (2025). Decision Support System for Teacher Performance Assessment at State Vocational High School 7 Kupang City Using the MOORA Method. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Engineering Applications (JAIEA)*, *4*(3), 2353–2363.

Maleki, A. (2025). Towards a more equitable education: a lens into EFL teachers' pedagogical barriers in online assessments. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *44*(2), 186–205.

Manopo, M., Tahir, A., Aneta, Y., & Abdussamad, J. (2023). Policy Implementation Of The Family Planning Village Program In Kotamobagu City. *Russian Law Journal*, *11*(5), 2617–2627.

Muflikhah, L., & Faridah, N. (2024). Evaluasi indikator penilaian kinerja guru berbasis digital. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan Indonesia, 16*(1), 55–68.

Mhlongo, S., Mbatha, K., Ramatsetse, B., & Dlamini, R. (2023). Challenges, opportunities, and prospects of adopting and using smart digital technologies in learning environments: An iterative review. *Heliyon*, *9*(6).

Niswaty, R., Basit, M. A., Nur, A. C., & Arhas, S. H. (2023). Effect of Application of E-Kinerja Assessment System in Improving Employee Performance. *KnE Social Sciences*, 1–9.

Nthontho, M., & Nonjabulo, M. (2023). *School principals' implementation of Information and Communication Technology Policy in Lagos state secondary schools, Nigeria*. University of Pretoria.

Paliukh, V., Kovtun, I., Pidlisna, T., Dombrovska, S., & Berezinskyi, L. (2025). Enhancing Educational System Human Resources as a Pillar of National Security. *Journal of Posthumanism*, *5*(1), 263–279.

Pandiangan, P. O., Panjaitan, B., & Sitio, R. J. T. (2024). Analysis of the Usage of BKN E-Performance in Improving the Results And Teachers' Work Behaviour of Religious Education At the Elementary School At Ministry of Religious Office of Medan City. *The International Journal of Education, Theology, and Humanities*, *4*(1), 1–26.

Paramata, M. R., Yakup, Y., Karundeng, D. R., & Hunowu, Z. (2024). Implementation of

Performance Evaluation Through E-Kinerja BKN for Improving Apparatus Performance in Pohuwato Regency. *International Journal Of Education, Social Studies, And Management (IJESSM)*, *4*(3), 1447–1459.

Paulsrud, D., & Nilholm, C. (2023). Teaching for inclusion–a review of research on the cooperation between regular teachers and special educators in the work with students in need of special support. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *27*(4), 541–555.

Rokhmawati, I. S., Purwoko, B., Hazin, M., Sholeh, M., & Hariyati, N. (2025). Influence of gtk room application quality on motivation performance, and competence of physical education teachers in surabaya junior high schools. *Citius: Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani, Olahraga, Dan Kesehatan*, *5*(1), 73–81.

Ruung, P. A., Manapa, E. S., Ardhana, V. Y. P., Taluay, H. R., & Sampetoding, E. A. (2022). Prototype Application for Data Processing Teacher Performance Assessment at Christian Elementary School Imanuel Nunu. *The IJICS (International Journal of Informatics and Computer Science)*, *6*(1), 57–63.

Senandheera, V. V, Muthukumarana, C. K., Ediriweera, D. S., & Rupasinghe, T. P. (2024). Impact of microlearning on academic performance of students in higher education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Multidisciplinary & Translational Research*, *9*(1).

Susanti, S. S. A., & Ardhianto, E. (2025). A Multi-Method Approach to Assessing Teacher Satisfaction Regarding the Ruang GTK Platform: A Study Using the EGOVQUAL Method, Importance-Performance Analysis, Customer Satisfaction Index, and Technology Acceptance Model. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Dan Sains*, *6*(2), 214–225.

Tulusan, F. M. G., Londa, V. Y., & Kawet, C. (2016). Kesiapan input dalam implementasi kebijakan pendidikan berbasis digital. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 22*(1), 45–57.

Vachkova, S. N., Petryaeva, E. Y., Milyaeva, D. A., Ageeva, N. S., & Mikhailova, S. V. (2021). Analytical review of education policies on digital transformation of school education worldwide. *European Proceedings of Educational Sciences*.

Voronkova, V., Vasyl'chuk, G., Nikitenko, V., Kaganov, Y., & Metelenko, N. (2023). *Transformation of digital education in the era of the fourth industrial revolution and globalization*.

Wahyuningsih, Y. A., & Choiriyah, I. U. (2025). Innovation of an Application Based Independent Village Information System (SI EMAN) in the Development of E-Government in Ketimang Village. *Proceeding of International Conference on Social Science and Humanity*, *2*(2), 1177–1188.

Willia Gusman, S. (2024). Development of the Indonesian Government's Digital Transformation. *Dinasti International Journal of Education Management & Social Science*, *5*(5).

Williams, M. J. (2021). Beyond state capacity: bureaucratic performance, policy implementation and reform. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, *17*(2), 339–357.

Zaakiyyah, H. K. A. (2024). Innovative strategies to enhance the quality of higher education management: Human resource development and the critical role of communication. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management (ADMAN)*, *2*(1), 331–336.

Zulvie, S. (2023). Evaluation of the E-Kinerja Application Implementation Policy at the Pamong Praja Police Unit Office of Kuningan District. *Journal of Social Research*, *2*(12),

5202–5209.