LETTERS IN BIOMATHEMATICS
**An International Journal**

RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

# An Evaluation Model for Professional Certification Body Governance Programs Integrating CIPP and GCG: A Qualitative Multi-Site Study in Jakarta

Agustini[1], Teguh Trianung DS[2]

[1]Doctoral Program in Educational Management, Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia
**Corresponding author.** Email: tiniagus1608.at@gmail.com. ORCID: 0009-0006-7781-432X
[2]Lecturer in Educational Management Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia
Email: teguhtrianungdjokos@unj.ac.id. ORCID: 0000-0002-8652-1741

**ABSTRACT**

Background: Professional Certification Bodies (Lembaga Sertifikasi Profesi, LSP) conduct competency assessments within Indonesia's national certification system under the National Professional Certification Agency (BNSP), so the credibility of certificates depends on the quality of their governance. Studies that systematically evaluate LSP governance remain limited. This study evaluates the implementation of LSP governance programs and constructs an evaluation model integrating the Context–Input–Process–Product (CIPP) model with Good Corporate Governance (GCG) principles.

Methods: A qualitative evaluative multi-site design was applied to three LSPs in Jakarta: a first-party LSP (Universitas Mercu Buana), a second-party LSP (BRI), and a third-party LSP (Microfinance Indonesia). Data were collected through in-depth interviews with 18 informants (July–October 2026), observation, and document study, and analysed in NVivo 14 using deductive and inductive coding, within-site analysis, and cross-site analysis.

Results: All three LSPs had policy foundations, resources, procedures, and competency recognition mechanisms aligned with BNSP regulations. Gaps were found in the currency of national competency standards (SKKNI) and assessment materials, equitable distribution of assessor assignments, consistency of procedure implementation, conflict-of-interest control, affordability, accommodation for participants with disabilities, and post-certification evaluation. Cross-site synthesis produced a model mapping four CIPP dimensions against five GCG principles into 20 evaluation aspects, complemented by a CMR (Achievements, Problems, Recommendations) approach.

Conclusions: LSP governance quality cannot be judged by administrative compliance and certificate counts alone, but by policy relevance, resource management, assessment integrity, and the credibility of results. The resulting model is conceptual and operational and requires testing in more diverse LSPs.

**ARTICLE HISTORY**
Received September 17, 2026
Accepted October 28, 2026

**KEYWORDS**
Program Evaluation, Governance, Professional Certification Body, Cipp, Good Corporate Governance, Multi-Site Study, Competency Certification, Bnsp

## 1. Introduction

Industry 4.0 and the transition toward Society 5.0 require education and training systems to produce human resources who master technology and have adaptive competencies. Indonesia's 2045 vision places human resource development as a strategic priority. Indonesia's Human Development Index rose from 72.81 in 2020 to 75.02 in 2024, yet the open unemployment rate in August 2025 was 4.85 percent and reached 7.58 percent among those with secondary education, indicating a persistent gap between the supply of educated labour and labour market absorption.

In response, the government built a work competency certification system under BNSP, referencing the Indonesian National Work Competency Standards (SKKNI). LSPs conduct the competency assessments, so good governance, impartiality, and accountability are prerequisites for their sustainability (BNSP, 2014). BNSP's performance reports record 6,148,848 certified candidates over five years against a labour force of about 153 million, seven LSPs sanctioned with licence suspension in 2024, and two LSPs whose licences were revoked in 2025 (BNSP, 2025). These data cannot be generalised to all LSPs, but they underline the need for empirical study of how governance principles are applied in practice.

Earlier studies mostly applied CIPP to learning and training programs, while research on professional certification has focused on

the effect of certificates on careers and labour market recognition, scheme formulation, barriers to online assessment, and assessment models (Adeosun & Adegbite, 2022; Manggalasari et al., 2023; Muslim et al., 2024; Sutarna et al., 2023). This leaves room for development on empirical (evaluative studies linking governance standards to implementation in LSPs), theoretical (integrating CIPP and GCG for LSPs), methodological (procedures operationalising the integration), and contextual (differences among first-, second-, and third-party LSPs) grounds.

CIPP was developed as an evaluation framework oriented to decision-making and program improvement (Madaus et al., 1983; Stufflebeam, 2007). The five GCG principles, namely transparency, accountability, responsibility, independence, and fairness, are used as normative criteria. Agency theory explains why oversight mechanisms are needed to manage divergent interests between principals and agents (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). The relationship between CIPP and GCG here is conceptual and evaluative, not a statistically tested relationship between variables.

The object of evaluation is the implementation of governance programs in delivering competency certification, not the LSP as an organisational entity. The aims of this study are (1) to evaluate the context, input, process, and product dimensions of LSP governance against GCG principles at three sites, and (2) to construct an evaluation model for LSP governance programs integrating CIPP and GCG from cross-site synthesis.

## 2. Methods

### Study design

This study used a qualitative evaluative approach with a constructivist–interpretivist paradigm and a multi-site design (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2018). Evaluation compared empirical evidence against criteria derived from the four CIPP dimensions and five GCG principles. The evaluative steps were: identifying evaluation questions for each indicator, determining reference regulations or standards, collecting evidence, comparing evidence with criteria, identifying gaps, assigning evaluative decision categories, and formulating recommendations.

### Study sites

Three LSPs in Jakarta were purposively selected for their differing institutional characteristics (Table 1): LSP Universitas Mercu Buana (P1, higher education setting), LSP BRI (P2, corporate setting), and LSP Microfinance Indonesia (P3, microfinance profession sector). Site selection aimed not at statistical representation but at understanding variation in governance implementation. A preliminary study was conducted in November 2025 through a grand tour and semi-structured interview with the director of an LSP in Jakarta.

### Participants and sampling

Informants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Patton, 2015). Criteria were at least one year of experience, direct involvement in planning, managing, conducting, supervising, or evaluating certification, understanding of LSP governance policies, and willingness to participate voluntarily. There were 18 informants, six per site, comprising LSP leaders, certification managers, quality managers, administration and finance managers, assessors, and candidates (Table 2).

### Data collection

Data were collected through semi-structured in-depth interviews guided by a protocol derived from the CIPP dimensions and GCG principles, observation using observation sheets, and document study (regulations, SOPs, and quality documents). Interviews took place between July and October 2026, were audio-recorded with informants' consent, and were transcribed. Triangulation was carried out across sources (informants in different positions) and across techniques (interviews, observation, documents).

### Data analysis

Transcripts, observation notes, and documents were analysed in NVivo 14. Deductive coding used the CIPP and GCG categories, while inductive coding captured themes emerging from the data (Miles et al., 2014). Within-site analysis was conducted separately for each LSP using the same structure, followed by cross-site analysis to identify patterns, similarities, and differences. The synthesis was used to retain, develop, or revise the initial indicators and evaluation mechanisms to form the final model.

### Trustworthiness

Credibility was strengthened through triangulation, member checking, and peer debriefing; transferability through thick description; dependability through an audit trail; and confirmability through researcher reflexivity (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

# 3. Results

## Overview of sites and informants

The three sites operate within the BNSP regulatory framework but differ in setting, target group, scheme orientation, and competency standards (Table 1). Results are presented by CIPP dimension; the cross-site synthesis underpins the model presented in the Discussion.

## Context evaluation

All three LSPs used BNSP regulations as their policy basis, with different orientations. LSP P1 implements university rules alongside BNSP guidelines; its chair stated that, being on campus, they follow campus regulations and must also follow BNSP guidelines (A1). LSP P2 links certification to annual needs mapping, recognition of high-performing employees, and talent development. LSP P3 is oriented to recognising microfinance professionals' competence. Policy socialisation used letters, online meetings, and scheme flyers, but internalising the purpose of policies still needs strengthening. LSP P1's links with industry were still being explored, and the use of SKKNI more than five years old indicates a need for a standards review mechanism. Policy independence took different forms: a supervisor may not assess his or her own thesis advisee (A1); assessors who know a candidate are replaced at the technical meeting (A6); and LSP P3 assessors commit to rejecting client intervention. At LSP P1, certification fees were still borne by students and not yet part of tuition fees (A1); affordability and digital access were issues at all three sites.

## Input evaluation

All three LSPs had assessors, assessment venues (TUK), and management systems suited to their characteristics: LSP P1 used lecturers as assessors and study-program laboratories as venues, LSP P2 mapped needs through its Human Capital function, and LSP P3 estimated budgets per certification batch. Main findings: assessor information was not always current; assessment materials (MUK) needed review for relevance to SKKNI and actual jobs; assignment frequency was unequal among equally qualified assessors; and fee disparities and geographic spread affected service equity. Administrative availability of resources did not guarantee operational readiness without transparent, accountable, independent, and proportionate resource governance.

## Process evaluation

SOPs and quality control were applied at all sites. LSP P1 integrated certification with academic activities but faced coordination and assessor punctuality challenges in scheduling. LSP P2 showed relatively structured control through assessor briefings, stage documentation, and plenary meetings. LSP P3 showed an adaptive process through assessor mentoring, communication with candidates, and quality supervision. Across sites, procedural information needed plainer language and consistent updating; SOP supervision needed direct observation and follow-up of non-conformities; independence declarations and assignment oversight needed to complement conflict-of-interest prevention; and inclusive assessment procedures for participants with disabilities were not yet developed.

## Product evaluation

All three LSPs had mechanisms for determining results and issuing certificates. LSP P1 provided an appeal mechanism; LSP P2 had a scheme committee, Quality Assurance oversight, and clarification and review of assessment records; LSP P3 emphasised leadership oversight through certificate distribution and offered reassessment. Areas to strengthen were certainty of certificate issuance and distribution time, verification of assessment evidence and documentation of plenary results, documented and accessible appeal and reassessment procedures, and post-certification evaluation of the benefit of competence for performance and industry needs.

## Relationships between dimensions

Weakness in one dimension carried implications for the next: unclear policies or standards (context) affected resource readiness (input); outdated MUK and unequal assessor assignment (input) affected assessment validity and consistency (process); and weak independence and process integrity affected the credibility and fairness of results (product).

# 4. Discussion

## Constructing the CIPP–GCG–CMR evaluation model

Two findings underpin the model. First, governance principles can be applied consistently, but their mechanisms must adapt to

institutional characteristics; independence, for example, took different forms in P1, P2, and P3. Second, evaluation that only checks the existence of documents, procedures, or certificate counts is inadequate because gaps appear in implementation quality. This is consistent with findings that labour market recognition of certificates varies (Muslim et al., 2024) and that assessment tools must keep pace with developments in work practice (Manggalasari et al., 2023).

The model has three components: CIPP as the evaluation dimensions (what is evaluated), GCG as the evaluation principles (against which criteria quality is judged), and CMR as the analysis and follow-up mechanism (Figure 1). Mapping four dimensions against five principles yields 20 evaluation aspects (Table 3), which serve as a matrix for developing indicators, criteria, evidence sources, and evaluative decisions rather than 20 statistical variables. For each aspect, *Achievement* is a practice already consistent with GCG and certification requirements; *Problem* is a gap between practice and criteria that requires sufficient evidence before being declared a violation; and *Recommendation* is a measurable corrective action within the organisation's authority that can be monitored.

## Implications

Theoretically, this study extends CIPP from educational program evaluation to institutional governance evaluation, with GCG as the normative criteria. Practically, the model can serve as an internal evaluation framework for LSP managers and as a reference for BNSP in guidance and quality assurance. Policy recommendations include: (1) periodic review of SKKNI (proposed at most every five years, or sooner when significant changes occur); (2) updating assessor data, equalising assignments, and forming an MUK development and validation team involving assessors and industry practitioners; (3) internal audits covering assessment observation, conflict-of-interest declarations, and reasonable accommodation for participants with disabilities; and (4) tracer studies, certificate-user satisfaction surveys, and industry consultation forums to evaluate results.

## Limitations and further research

The study was conducted at three LSPs in Jakarta with 18 informants, so findings are not intended for statistical generalisation but for theoretical generalisation and transferability to similar LSP types. Most data came from interviews, so they remain open to informant perception bias despite triangulation. The model is conceptual and operational and has not yet been tested for indicator feasibility, inter-rater consistency, or applicability. Further research should test the model in LSPs of more varied regions, schemes, and characteristics.

## Ethical considerations

Research access was obtained with permission from each LSP. All informants were informed of the study purpose, scope of questions, use of information, and their right to decline questions or withdraw, and gave written informed consent. Informant identities were anonymised with codes (A1–A18), and internal documents were used only for analysis within the access limits granted.

# References

Adeosun, O. T., & Adegbite, W. M. (2022). Professional certification and career development: A comparative analysis between local and foreign certifications. *Management & Economics Research Journal, 5*(1), 1–14.

Badan Nasional Sertifikasi Profesi. (2014). *Peraturan BNSP Nomor 1/BNSP/III/2014 tentang Pedoman Penilaian Kesesuaian: Persyaratan Umum Lembaga Sertifikasi Profesi*. BNSP.

Badan Nasional Sertifikasi Profesi. (2025). *Laporan Kinerja BNSP Tahun 2024*. BNSP.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305–360.

Madaus, G. F., Scriven, M. S., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1983). The CIPP model for program evaluation. In *Evaluation models* (pp. 117–141). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6675-8_7

Manggalasari, L. C., Koehler, T., Jantos, A., Yuliastuti, Y., Wijayanti, Y., Setyandito, O., Sutarto, & Septiarti, S. W. (2023). The barriers in online assessment for professional certification: A case study in Indonesia. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v7i1.53839

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Muslim, A., Sabarudin, Sriharini, & Faradis, J. (2024). The effectiveness of Professional Certification National Agency's competency certificate in supporting a successful work world. *International Journal of Social Science Research, 12*(2).

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. Guilford Press.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2007). *CIPP evaluation model checklist* (2nd ed.). Western Michigan University, The Evaluation Center.

Sutarna, A., Bahri, E. S., Wiharjo, S. M., & Aslam, M. M. M. (2023). Review of the formulation of the professional certification scheme. *International Journal of Science Education and Cultural Studies, 2*(2). https://doi.org/10.58291/ijsecs.v2n2.131

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

## Figure legends

Figure 1. Evaluation model for governance of Professional Certification Bodies (LSP) integrating CIPP and GCG with a CMR approach. CIPP: Context, Input, Process, Product; GCG: Good Corporate Governance; CMR: Achievements, Problems, Recommendations. (Source: Figure 5.1 of the dissertation; the figure file is to be uploaded separately as TIFF/JPEG at >300 dpi.)

## Tables

**Table** 1. Characteristics of the study sites. Abbreviations: LSP, Professional Certification Body; P1/P2/P3, first/second/third party; SKKNI, Indonesian National Work Competency Standards; KKNI, Indonesian National Qualifications Framework; BPR, rural bank; LKM, microfinance institution.

| Characteristic | LSP P1 Universitas Mercu Buana | LSP P2 BRI | LSP P3 Microfinance Indonesia |
|---|---|---|---|
| Setting | Higher education | Corporate/BRI Group | Microfinance profession sector |
| Main target | Students | BRI Group employees | Microfinance sector professionals |
| Scheme orientation | Multidisciplinary | Banking job and function competencies | Microfinance, BPR, cooperatives, and LKM |
| Competency standards | SKKNI and KKNI | SKKNI, KKNI, and BRI-specific standards | SKKNI and KKNI |

**Table 2**. Distribution of informants (N = 18). Informant codes: A1–A18.

| Site | Informant roles | n |
|---|---|---|
| LSP P1 Universitas Mercu Buana | Chair; head of certification and TUK; head of quality assurance; head of administration and publication sub-division; assessor; candidate | 6 |
| LSP P2 BRI | Chair; certification manager; quality management manager; administration and finance staff; assessor; candidate | 6 |
| LSP P3 Microfinance Indonesia | Director; certification and IT staff; quality management manager; administration and finance manager; assessor; candidate | 6 |

**Table 3**. CIPP–GCG integration matrix in the LSP governance evaluation model (20 evaluation aspects). Abbreviations: CIPP, Context, Input, Process, Product; GCG, Good Corporate Governance; SOP, standard operating procedure.

| CIPP dimension | Transparency | Accountability | Responsibility | Independence | Fairness |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Context*** | Openness of regulations and policies | Clarity of objectives and institutional responsibility | Compliance with regulations and standards | Policy free from intervention | Equal access to certification policies |
| ***Input*** | Transparency of human resource and facility information | Accountability in resource use | Fulfilment of competency and facility standards | Resource management free from conflict of interest | Fair distribution of resources |
| ***Process*** | Transparency of assessment and certification procedures | Accountability in SOP implementation and decisions | Compliance with operational standards | Assessor impartiality and assessment independence | Equal treatment during assessment |
| ***Product*** | Transparency of certification results | Accountability of assessment decisions | Quality assurance and relevance of competence | Validity of results and independence of decisions | Fairness in recognising competence |