Evaluating Facilitator Training Effectiveness Using Kirkpatrick Model in Indonesian Legislative Institution

Hilalatus Sorayya[1], Muhammad Iqbal[2], M. Ary Irawan[3]

[1,2,3] Faculty of Education and Psychology, Mandalika University of Education.
*Corresponding Author: muhammadiqbal@undikma.ac.id

Abstract: This study aims at evaluating the facilitator capacity building training program at the Legislative Human Resources Competency Development Center of the Indonesian House of Representatives Secretariat General, using the Level 1 and 2 Kirkpatrick evaluation model. This descriptive quantitative research employed total sampling technique with 28 participants from 12 different functional positions and work units. The evaluation was conducted using questionnaires based on Kirkpatrick's evaluation model, focusing on Level 1 (Reaction) and Level 2 (Learning). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics with scores classified into five categories ranging from "Very Poor" to "Very Satisfactory". Level 1 evaluation showed excellent results across all indicators: lecturers scored 87.09, instructors averaged 90.48-94.64 across four training days, examiners achieved 95.12, and training organizers received 92.02. All scores fell within the "Very Satisfactory" category. Level 2 evaluation demonstrated successful learning outcomes, with all 28 participants achieving competent ratings in microteaching sessions (average score: 87.43, range: 79.7-92.4). The facilitator capacity building training program effectively met participants' expectations and learning objectives. The consistently high satisfaction scores and successful practical applications in microteaching indicate that the training successfully enhanced participants' facilitation competencies.

How to Cite: Sorayya, H., Iqbal, M., & Irawan, M. A. (2025). Evaluating Facilitator Training Effectiveness Using Kirkpatrick Model in Indonesian Legislative Institution. *Transformasi : Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pendidikan Non Formal Informal*, *11*(2), 477–485. https://doi.org/10.33394/jtni.v11i2.17339

Introduction

Training and development programs are fundamental components of organizational capacity building, particularly in government institutions where continuous learning and skill enhancement directly impact service delivery quality (Nurhayati & Atmaja, 2021). The effectiveness of training programs cannot be assumed but must be systematically evaluated to ensure optimal resource utilization and achievement of learning objectives (Abraham & Hartini, 2023). Program effectiveness in the educational context can essentially be understood as the extent to which the objectives of each component within the system—inputs, processes, and outputs—are achieved (Iqbal, 2019).

The Kirkpatrick model, developed by Donald Kirkpatrick, remains one of the most widely used frameworks for training evaluation due to its comprehensive approach to measuring training effectiveness across four distinct levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and results (Susanty, 2022). This model provides a structured methodology for assessing not only immediate participant satisfaction but also knowledge acquisition, behavioral changes, and organizational impact (Budhianto, 2020).

In the Indonesian legislative context, the Legislative Human Resources Competency Development Center of the DPR RI Secretariat General plays a crucial role in enhancing the capabilities of civil servants through various training programs. The facilitator capacity building training program represents a strategic initiative aimed at developing internal facilitation capabilities to support institutional learning and development (Pusat Pengembangan Kompetensi SDM Legislatif, 2023).

Previous studies have demonstrated the importance of systematic training evaluation in government institutions. Nurhayati (2018) applied the Kirkpatrick model to evaluate technical training programs in the Riau Islands Province, finding that comprehensive evaluation contributes significantly to program improvement. Similarly, Syafitri and Tumanggor (2024) utilized the Kirkpatrick model to evaluate disaster preparedness training for civil servants, highlighting the model's applicability in diverse governmental contexts.

The effectiveness of facilitator training programs depends on multiple factors including content relevance, delivery methods, instructor competence, and organizational support (Anwar & Rahayu, 2021). Sari et al. (2021) emphasized the critical relationship between facilitator quality and learning achievement in technical training, while Fitriyah and Sulastri (2020) highlighted the influence of instructor teaching styles on participant engagement.

Despite the growing recognition of training evaluation importance, there remains a gap in systematic evaluation of facilitator capacity building programs within Indonesian legislative institutions. This study addresses this gap by providing a comprehensive evaluation of the facilitator capacity building training program at the DPR RI Secretariat General, focusing specifically on participant reactions and learning outcomes as defined by Kirkpatrick's Level 1 and Level 2 evaluation criteria.

The research objectives are twofold: (1) to assess the quality of participant reactions to the facilitator capacity building training program, and (2) to evaluate the quality of learning outcomes achieved through the program. By addressing these objectives, this study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on training evaluation in governmental contexts while providing practical insights for program improvement.

Research Method

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research approach aimed at analyzing numerical data collected through questionnaires to evaluate the effectiveness of the facilitator capacity building training program. According to Sugiyono (2018), descriptive quantitative approaches are used to describe phenomena under investigation in numerical form, which are then interpreted to understand specific patterns or trends.

The research utilized the Kirkpatrick evaluation model, focusing specifically on Level 1 (Reaction) and Level 2 (Learning) evaluations. This selective approach aligns with recommendations by Susanty (2022) and Budhianto (2020), who noted that all four levels of the Kirkpatrick model need not be implemented simultaneously but can be applied separately according to research needs and constraints.

The study was conducted at the Legislative Human Resources Competency Development Center of the DPR RI Secretariat General, Jakarta. The training program under evaluation was implemented from October 28 to November 1, 2024, at Wisma Griya Sabha Kopo, Bogor, with a total duration equivalent to 44 lesson hours. The training was conducted in collaboration with the Indonesian National Institute of Public Administration (LAN RI).

Jurnal Pengembangan
Pendidikan Non-Formal Informal

478

Hilalatus Sorayya,
Muhammad Iqbal,
M. Ary Irawan

The study population comprised all participants in the facilitator capacity building training program organized by the Legislative Human Resources Competency Development Center. The training involved 28 participants representing diverse functional positions and work units within the DPR RI Secretariat General.

Total sampling technique was employed, wherein all population members were included as research subjects. As noted by Sugiyono (2018), total sampling is appropriate when the population is relatively small and all elements possess uniform and relevant characteristics for investigation. This technique was selected because the number of training participants was limited and all had undergone the same evaluation process.

The research instrument consisted of questionnaires developed by the Legislative Human Resources Competency Development Center as part of the training program evaluation process. According to Sugiyono (2018), questionnaires are data collection techniques involving written questions presented to respondents for completion.

The questionnaire comprised two main sections based on the Kirkpatrick evaluation model:

Level 1 (Reaction) Evaluation included five indicators:

1. Evaluation of participants (exploratory questions with open-ended format)
2. Evaluation of lecturers
3. Evaluation of instructors
4. Evaluation of examiners
5. Evaluation of training organizers

Level 2 (Learning) Evaluation included two indicators:

1. Post-training evaluation
2. Evaluation of changes in participant understanding and skills

Since this study utilized secondary data from questionnaires already developed and implemented by the organizing institution, direct validation and reliability testing by the researcher were not conducted. The instrument's validity was established through its foundation on the proven Kirkpatrick evaluation model and its repeated use in various training programs at the institution.

The questionnaire's reliability was demonstrated through its systematic development process and consistent application across multiple training programs, indicating high consistency levels as described by Sugiyono (2018).

Data analysis employed descriptive statistics to describe the results of the facilitator capacity building training program evaluation. Descriptive statistics were used to process questionnaire data collected by training organizers, providing insights into participant responses to the program.

For Level 1 evaluation, data were analyzed using mean calculations, percentages, and frequency distributions. To facilitate interpretation, a 1-100 scale was classified into five categories:

1. 90-100: Very Satisfactory
2. 76-89: Satisfactory
3. 61-75: Adequate

Jurnal Pengembangan
Pendidikan Non-Formal Informal

479

Hilalatus Sorayya,
Muhammad Iqbal,
M. Ary Irawan

4. 41-60: Poor
5. 0-40: Very Poor

Level 2 evaluation data were analyzed through post-training evaluation responses and microteaching assessment scores, using the same classification system to determine participant skill improvement levels.

The research adhered to scientific research ethics principles, including academic honesty, participant consent, data confidentiality protection, non-discrimination principles, harm prevention, scientific use of data, and scientific accountability. All ethical guidelines were strictly followed throughout the research process.

Results and Discussion

A. Results

1. Level 1 Evaluation: Participant Reactions

The Level 1 evaluation in the Kirkpatrick model aims to understand participant perceptions and satisfaction with the training they attended. In this study, evaluation was conducted across five main indicators, with four using a numerical scale of 1-100 and one using open-ended exploratory questions.

a. Participant Self-Evaluation

The exploratory evaluation of participants revealed high levels of preparation, motivation, and expectations. Analysis of participant responses throughout the five-day training period showed that the majority prepared by reviewing previous training materials, reflecting on their role as facilitators, and preparing mentally and administratively. Nearly all participants stated that the training content was relevant to their functional duties as facilitators.

Participant motivations were classified into three categories: desire for self-capacity development, fulfilling work obligations, and gaining recognition for facilitation competencies. Most participants expressed hopes that the training would provide new knowledge, deeper understanding of facilitator roles, and technical skills for immediate application.

b. Lecturer Evaluation

Lecturer evaluation was conducted on the first day of training across four aspects: material mastery, presentation style, question-answering ability, and motivation/inspiration provision. Results showed material mastery achieved the highest average score of 89.96, while presentation style received the lowest at 85.19, though still in the "Very Satisfactory" category. The overall average score was 87.09, placing lecturer performance in the "Very Satisfactory" category. Participant feedback was predominantly positive, praising material mastery, clear explanations, and convincing communication style. Some participants suggested more interactive approaches and direct participant involvement for enhanced training dynamics.

c. Instructor Evaluation

Instructor evaluation was conducted throughout four training days, assessing ten important aspects from presentation systematicity to teamwork. Results showed consistent improvement across training days:

Jurnal Pengembangan
Pendidikan Non-Formal Informal

480

Hilalatus Sorayya,
Muhammad Iqbal,
M. Ary Irawan

1) Day 1: Four instructors achieved an overall average of 90.48
2) Day 2: Two instructors averaged 90.76
3) Day 3: One instructor scored 92.22
4) Day 4: One instructor achieved the highest score of 94.64

The consistently increasing trend from day to day demonstrated improved participant perception of teaching quality, likely influenced by learning method approaches, increased instructor-participant interaction, and effective material delivery. Individual instructor performance varied, with strengths in punctuality and attendance consistently rated highest across all instructors. Areas for improvement were primarily in method and training facility utilization, though all scores remained in the "Very Satisfactory" category.

d. Examiner Evaluation

Examiner evaluation was conducted on the final day across three main aspects: ability to explore participant potential, motivation provision, and inspiration delivery. Results showed exceptional performance with motivation provision scoring highest at 95.74, followed by inspiration delivery at 95.53, and potential exploration at 94.11. The overall average of 95.12 placed examiner performance in the "Very Satisfactory" category. Participant feedback indicated that examiners successfully created supportive, non-pressuring evaluation environments while providing wise feedback accompanied by motivational elements that enhanced learning spirit.

e. Training Organizer Evaluation

Training organizer evaluation was divided into two main groups:

1) Service and Training Facilities (average: 91.69):
a) Training kit quality scored highest (93.75)
b) Catering quality scored lowest (88.38), though still "Very Satisfactory"
2) Training Material Substance and Delivery (average: 92.35):
a) Material and topic relevance scored highest (94.13)
b) Material difficulty level scored lowest (87.69)

The overall average of 92.02 indicated that participants rated the training implementation as excellent in both technical-administrative aspects and content quality-delivery effectiveness.

2. Level 2 Evaluation: Learning Outcomes

Level 2 evaluation focused on the extent to which participants experienced increased understanding and skills following training completion, conducted through two main indicators.

a. Post-Training Evaluation

Post-training evaluation revealed significant benefits for participants, particularly in enhanced knowledge and understanding of facilitator roles, facilitation techniques, and adult learning approaches. Participants reported increased communication skills, facilitation planning abilities, and group dynamics management skills.

Jurnal Pengembangan
Pendidikan Non-Formal Informal

481

Hilalatus Sorayya,
Muhammad Iqbal,
M. Ary Irawan

Regarding workplace application, participants described immediate applicability of acquired knowledge and skills in presentation material preparation, technical training delivery, and meeting or coordination activity facilitation. Most participants confirmed that the training met their expectations in terms of content, methods, and instructors. Improvement suggestions included training duration extension, increased practical application time, and enhanced technology facilities for digital-based training support.

b. Changes in Understanding and Skills

Evaluation of changes in participant understanding and skills was conducted through microteaching activities on the final training day. All 28 participants successfully completed microteaching with competent ratings, achieving scores ranging from 79.7 to 92.4, with an overall average of 87.43.

Diverse materials were presented including policy brief preparation, meeting minute writing, archive management, teaching material presentation methods, and visual communication media design. This variety demonstrated the breadth of participant work scope and their ability to adapt content to respective work unit needs.

B. Discussion

The evaluation results demonstrate the high effectiveness of the facilitator capacity building training program. The consistently high scores across all Level 1 evaluation indicators (87.09-95.12) reflect exceptional participant satisfaction with various training aspects. This aligns with findings by Suharyanto and Prasetya (2019), who emphasized the critical relationship between participant reactions and training effectiveness.

The improvement trend in instructor evaluation scores from day 1 (90.48) to day 4 (94.64) suggests successful adaptation and enhancement of delivery methods throughout the training period. This finding supports Haris et al. (2019) research on competency development strategies through experience-based training, where continuous improvement during implementation contributes significantly to learning effectiveness. The exceptional examiner evaluation scores (95.12) indicate successful creation of supportive evaluation environments that enhance rather than intimidate participant learning. This aligns with adult learning principles that emphasize the importance of psychologically safe learning environments (Rahmawati & Kurniawan, 2020).

Level 2 evaluation results, particularly the 100% competency achievement rate in microteaching with an average score of 87.43, demonstrate successful knowledge and skill transfer. This outcome supports the findings of Rahmawati and Saputra (2021) regarding the effectiveness of competency-based training evaluation through participant satisfaction analysis. The diverse range of microteaching topics presented by participants reflects their ability to contextualize learning within their respective work environments, indicating successful achievement of training transfer objectives as emphasized by Hidayat and Priyanto (2020) in their evaluation of government training programs.

The high scores in training organizer evaluation (92.02) suggest comprehensive program implementation excellence, encompassing both service quality and content relevance. This holistic approach to training organization aligns with best practices in adult learning and professional development (Pribadi, 2016).

Jurnal Pengembangan
Pendidikan Non-Formal Informal

482

Hilalatus Sorayya,
Muhammad Iqbal,
M. Ary Irawan

However, areas for improvement were identified, particularly in method and facility utilization, material difficulty appropriateness, and training duration. These findings provide actionable insights for future program enhancement, consistent with continuous improvement principles in training and development (Engriyani & Rugaiyah, 2022).

The study's limitation to Level 1 and Level 2 evaluation, while methodologically justified, suggests opportunities for future research to examine behavioral changes (Level 3) and organizational results (Level 4) to provide more comprehensive training impact assessment.

Conclusion

The evaluation of the facilitator capacity building training program at the Legislative Human Resources Competency Development Center of the DPR RI Secretariat General demonstrates exceptional effectiveness across both reaction and learning dimensions of the Kirkpatrick model.

Level 1 (Reaction) evaluation revealed consistently high participant satisfaction across all indicators, with scores ranging from 87.09 to 95.12, all falling within the "Very Satisfactory" category. Lecturers, instructors, examiners, and training organizers all received excellent ratings, with particular strengths in material mastery, punctuality, motivation provision, and overall program organization. The progressive improvement in instructor evaluation scores throughout the training period (90.48 to 94.64) indicates successful adaptation and enhancement of delivery methods.

Level 2 (Learning) evaluation demonstrated successful knowledge and skill acquisition, with all 28 participants achieving competent ratings in microteaching assessments (average score: 87.43). The diversity of topics presented and participants' ability to contextualize learning within their work environments confirm effective training transfer and practical application capabilities.

The study findings indicate that the training program successfully met participant expectations, enhanced facilitation competencies, and prepared participants to serve as effective internal facilitators within their respective work units. The high satisfaction levels across all evaluation dimensions suggest that the program design, implementation, and delivery methods were well-aligned with participant needs and adult learning principles.

Recommendation

Based on the evaluation findings, the following recommendations are proposed for future program enhancement:

1. For training organizers

   a. Method and Media Enhancement: While scores were satisfactory, there is room for improvement in training method variety and facility utilization. Incorporating more interactive techniques, digital tools, and multimedia resources could further enhance participant engagement.
   b. Duration Optimization: Consider extending training duration to provide more time for hands-on practice and application, as suggested by participant feedback.
   c. Material Difficulty Calibration: Review and adjust material difficulty levels to ensure optimal challenge without overwhelming participants, particularly for technical content areas.

Jurnal Pengembangan
Pendidikan Non-Formal Informal

483

Hilalatus Sorayya,
Muhammad Iqbal,
M. Ary Irawan

    d. Technology Infrastructure: Invest in enhanced technology facilities to support digital-based training delivery and modern learning approaches.

2. For future research

    a. Comprehensive Kirkpatrick Evaluation: Conduct Level 3 (Behavior) and Level 4 (Results) evaluations to assess long-term behavioral changes and organizational impact of the training program.

    b. Longitudinal Follow-up: Implement follow-up studies 3-6 months post-training to evaluate knowledge retention, skill application, and workplace impact.

    c. Comparative Analysis: Compare this program's effectiveness with similar facilitator training programs in other government institutions to identify best practices and improvement opportunities.

Acknowledgment

References

Abraham, A., & Hartini. (2023). *Evaluasi program pelatihan dalam siklus manajemen*. CV Jejak, Anggota IKAPI.

Anwar, R., & Rahayu, S. (2021). Peran fasilitator dalam menyampaikan materi pelatihan secara efektif. *Jurnal Pelatihan dan Pengembangan SDM, 9(1), 91-100.*

Budhianto, B. (2020). Evaluasi pelaksanaan pelatihan kepemimpinan administrator (PKA) di Kementerian Pertanian berdasarkan level 1 dan level 2 Kirkpatrick's evaluation model. *Jurnal Agriwidya, 1(3), 37-51.*

Engriyani, E., & Rugaiyah, R. (2022). Evaluasi program pendidikan dan pelatihan menggunakan model Kirkpatrick pada institusi pemerintah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan, 8(23), 683-692.*

Fitriyah, N., & Sulastri, R. (2020). Pengaruh gaya mengajar instruktur terhadap keaktifan peserta dalam pelatihan. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pelatihan, 11(1), 60-70.*

Haris, A., Utami, N. W., & Arifin, Z. (2019). Strategi pengembangan kompetensi fasilitator melalui pelatihan berbasis pengalaman. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pelatihan, 10(2), 92-100.*

Hidayat, A., & Priyanto, D. (2020). Evaluasi pelatihan dan pengembangan SDM pada lembaga pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen dan Bisnis, 11(2), 157-168.*

Nurhayati, A., & Atmaja, H. E. (2021). Efektifitas program pelatihan dan pengembangan terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Kinerja, 18(1), 24-30.*

Nurhayati, Y. (2018). Penerapan model Kirkpatrick untuk evaluasi program diklat teknis subtantif materi perencanaan pembelajaran di wilayah kerja Provinsi Kepulauan Riau. *Andagogi Jurnal Diklat Teknis, 6(2), 170-187.*

Pribadi, B. A. (2016). *Desain dan pengembangan program pelatihan berbasis kompetensi implementasi model ADDIE*. Prenada Media Group.

Pusat Pengembangan Kompetensi SDM Legislatif Sekretariat Jenderal Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia. (2023). Laporan kinerja Pusat Pengembangan Kompetensi SDM Legislatif DPR RI.

Rahmawati, S., & Kurniawan, H. (2020). Hubungan kesiapan peserta dan keberhasilan pelatihan berbasis kompetensi. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Evaluasi Pendidikan, 11(1), 38-45.*

Rahmawati, S., & Saputra, M. (2021). Analisis efektivitas evaluasi program pelatihan berbasis kepuasan peserta. *Jurnal Evaluasi dan Pelatihan, 5(1), 70-80.*

Sari, T. N., Susilo, H., & Nugroho, A. (2021). Hubungan kualitas fasilitator dengan pencapaian hasil belajar dalam pelatihan teknis. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Evaluasi, 7(1), 40-48.*

Suharyanto, A., & Prasetya, A. (2019). Pengaruh reaksi peserta terhadap efektivitas pelatihan: Studi evaluatif model Kirkpatrick. *Jurnal Evaluasi dan Pengembangan SDM, 7(1), 70-78.*

Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Susanty, Y. (2022). Evaluasi program pengembangan kompetensi berdasarkan model evaluasi Kirkpatrick level 1 dan level 2. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik, 18(2), 172-191.*

Syafitri, I., & Tumanggor, B. F. (2024). Evaluasi pelatihan kebencanaan bagi pegawai negeri sipil dengan model Kirkpatrick di Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Sumber Daya Aparatur, 6(1), 36-48.*