

# Evaluating the Management of Physical Education Facilities and Infrastructure in State Elementary Schools in Yogyakarta

Aziza Puspawati Safitri<sup>1</sup>, Erwin Setyo Kriswanto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Sport Science, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta Indonesia

Email address: azizapuspadewi.2022@student.uny.ac.id, erwin\_sk@uny.ac.id

**Abstract**— This study aims to analyze the management evaluation of Physical, Sport and Health Education facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta, examining it from the aspects of objectives, input, activities, product, and outcomes. It also aims to determine whether the management of Physical, Sport and Health Education facilities and infrastructure in these schools has been managed well. This research is an evaluative study that applies McDavid's evaluation method. The subjects of this research were school principals from state elementary schools in Yogyakarta, with a total of 89 respondents, and a sample of 53 respondents randomly selected. Data was collected using a survey with a questionnaire instrument, which had a reliability coefficient of 0.996. Data analysis techniques included descriptive analysis for quantitative data and qualitative analysis. The results show that the evaluation of management in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta falls into the moderate category. This was demonstrated by 2 respondents (3.77%) being in the very poor category, 11 respondents (20.75%) in the poor category, 28 respondents (52.83%) in the moderate category, and 12 respondents (22.64%) in the good category, with no respondents rating it as very good (0.00%). The evaluation will be further reviewed by each aspect: (1) The objective aspect of the management of physical education and sports facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta is still inadequate, as evidenced by 22 respondents (41.51%) rating it as moderate; (2) The input aspect is considered good, with 18 respondents (33.96%) rating it as good; (3) The activity aspect remains insufficient, with 23 respondents (43.40%) rating it as moderate; (4) The product aspect is still lacking, with 23 respondents (43.40%) rating it as moderate; and (5) The outcome aspect is also insufficient, with 23 respondents (43.40%) rating it as moderate.

**Keywords**— Evaluation, Management, Physical Education, Sports, Health Facilities and Infrastructure.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Education is a means to holistically develop and mature individuals, providing them with a broader view of the world. Humans are expected to possess various skills and experiences that serve as a foundation for navigating life. In Indonesia, education is mandatory for 12 years, starting from elementary to secondary education. One of the subjects taught from elementary to secondary education is Physical, Sport and Health Education (PSHE).

The aim of PSHE is to improve and develop students' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects. Moreover, PSHE plays a role in enhancing students' physical fitness. As a subject that involves a lot of practical activities and teaches students through direct experience in the field, PSHE cannot be

separated from the facilities and infrastructure that support the learning process. The PSHE learning process is closely related to the use of facilities and infrastructure, which highlights the importance of managing these resources properly.

Facilities and infrastructure management refers to the methods employed to manage resources, from planning and procurement to organization, ensuring that these resources are used optimally. Management of facilities and infrastructure can also be understood as the utilization of resources to manage them effectively in order to achieve predetermined goals.

The goal of facilities and infrastructure management in schools is to provide professional services in education, ensuring that the learning process can proceed effectively and efficiently while achieving the desired educational outcomes. Providing adequate PSHE facilities and infrastructure is one of the school's and government's obligations to ensure that the learning process runs smoothly, effectively, and efficiently. Adequate PSHE facilities and infrastructure contribute to quality PSHE learning. Conversely, a lack of facilities and infrastructure can diminish the quality and outcomes of the learning process. To improve the management of facilities and infrastructure, evaluation is necessary to inform future action plans.

Educational evaluation serves to assess the success of a program that has been implemented, aiming to improve and enhance the program in progress and to develop follow-up action plans, ultimately producing a program that aligns with the school's vision and mission. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine the success level of an activity, from planning to processes and outcomes that have been previously outlined. Evaluation in PSHE education is essential to improve and enhance what exists, so that PSHE learning objectives can be maximally achieved, leading to better learning outputs and outcomes than before.

In the learning process, problems arise from various sources, including students, teachers, educational staff, school principals, facilities and infrastructure, and even parents. In PSHE learning, one of the main problems encountered is the lack of facilities and infrastructure. PSHE learning, which involves physical activities, requires good facilities and infrastructure to ensure effective learning.

One issue identified by several school principals is that poor management of facilities and infrastructure leads to suboptimal PSHE learning. This is supported by Lisnawati et al. (2023, pp.

30987-30993), who found that the availability of school facilities and infrastructure is crucial for supporting the learning process, as it can enhance students' motivation, learning outcomes, and the overall quality of education.

Another issue is that elderly PSHE teachers are less active in managing equipment and creating innovative solutions for PSHE learning facilities, leading to less effective and efficient PSHE learning. This finding is reinforced by Winda & Dafit (2021, pp. 211-221), who emphasized that teachers play a role as facilitators for students in the learning process, and any component of learning should be oriented towards increasing students' interest, thus improving their motivation to learn.

Finally, several teachers pointed out that inadequate management of facilities and infrastructure is due to a lack of understanding and willingness among school personnel to manage these resources. School facility managers should be able to identify the causes of poor facilities management. Beyond these problems, the purpose of evaluation is to guide policy decisions for managing, maintaining, and organizing facilities and infrastructure more effectively.

Based on the problems mentioned above, further research on the management of facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta is necessary, with the title: "Evaluating the Management of Physical Education Facilities and Infrastructure in State Elementary Schools in Yogyakarta."

## II. METHODS

### Study Participant

The population in this study consists of principals from state elementary schools in Yogyakarta, totaling 89 schools. The sample used by the researchers was the incidental sampling of state elementary school principals in Yogyakarta, with a total of 53 participants.

### Study Organization

This study is an evaluative research that applies the McDavid evaluation method. The McDavid evaluation method was chosen because it aligns with the research focus and is appropriate for the context of state elementary schools in Yogyakarta. Data collection techniques involved closed-ended questionnaires and open-ended interviews. The analysis technique used was a mix-methods approach, with qualitative data strengthening the quantitative data.

### Statistical Analysis

This study employed two types of data analysis techniques. Quantitative data was analyzed using a categorical or criterion-based scale, while qualitative data was analyzed using the Miles and Huberman technique.

## III. RESULT

This evaluation research will ultimately yield recommendations from the perspective of educational management. These recommendations will be directed to the facility management administrators, as they have the authority and responsibility to implement changes in the management of facilities and infrastructure. The research findings and

recommendations will be described comprehensively and followed by further discussion.

### Objective Aspect

The results of the study for each indicator of the objective aspect are explained in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1. Objective Aspect

| No    | Score Range          | Category  | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1     | $X \leq 3085$        | Very Poor | 3         | 5.66%      |
| 2     | $3085 < X \leq 3738$ | Poor      | 9         | 16.98%     |
| 3     | $3738 < X \leq 4391$ | Moderate  | 22        | 41.51%     |
| 4     | $4391 < X \leq 5044$ | Good      | 19        | 35.85%     |
| 5     | $5044 < X$           | Very Good | 0         | 0.00%      |
| Total |                      |           | 53        | 100.00%    |

Based on the table above, the results for the objective aspect of facility management objectives fall into the "moderate" category, with 3 respondents (5.66%) in the very poor category, 9 respondents (16.98%) in the poor category, 22 respondents (41.51%) in the moderate category, and 19 respondents (35.85%) in the good category. No respondents were in the very good category.

### Input Aspect

The results for each indicator of the input aspect are explained in Table 2 below:

Based on the table above, the results for the objective aspect of facility management objectives fall into the "moderate" category, with 3 respondents (5.66%) in the very poor category, 9 respondents (16.98%) in the poor category, 22 respondents (41.51%) in the moderate category, and 19 respondents (35.85%) in the good category. No respondents were in the very good category.

### Input Aspect

The results for each indicator of the input aspect are explained in Table 2 below:

TABLE 2. Input Aspect

| No    | Score Range          | Category  | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1     | $X \leq 2145$        | Very Poor | 2         | 3.77%      |
| 2     | $2145 < X \leq 2820$ | Poor      | 16        | 30.19%     |
| 3     | $2820 < X \leq 3494$ | Moderate  | 17        | 32.08%     |
| 4     | $3494 < X \leq 4168$ | Good      | 18        | 33.96%     |
| 5     | $4168 < X$           | Very Good | 0         | 0.00%      |
| Total |                      |           | 53        | 100.00%    |

Based on the table above, the results for the input aspect of facility management objectives fall into the "good" category, with 2 respondents (3.77%) in the very poor category, 16 respondents (30.19%) in the poor category, 17 respondents (32.08%) in the moderate category, and 18 respondents (33.96%) in the good category. No respondents were in the very good category.

### Activity Aspect

The results for each indicator of the activity aspect are explained in Table 3 below:

TABLE 3. Activity Aspect

| No    | Score Range          | Category  | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1     | $X \leq 1432$        | Very Poor | 1         | 1.89%      |
| 2     | $1432 < X \leq 1783$ | Poor      | 14        | 26.42%     |
| 3     | $1783 < X \leq 2134$ | Moderate  | 23        | 43.40%     |
| 4     | $2134 < X \leq 2485$ | Good      | 15        | 28.30%     |
| 5     | $2485 < X$           | Very Good | 0         | 0.00%      |
| Total |                      |           | 53        | 100.00%    |

Based on the table above, the results for the activity aspect of facility management objectives fall into the "moderate" category, with 1 respondent (1.89%) in the very poor category, 14 respondents (26.42%) in the poor category, 23 respondents (43.40%) in the moderate category, and 15 respondents (28.30%) in the good category. No respondents were in the very good category.

*Product Aspect*

The results for each indicator of the product aspect are explained in Table 4 below:

TABLE 4. Product Aspect

| No    | Score Range          | Category  | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1     | $X \leq 1341$        | Very Poor | 3         | 5.66%      |
| 2     | $1341 < X \leq 1700$ | Poor      | 10        | 18.87%     |
| 3     | $1700 < X \leq 2059$ | Moderate  | 23        | 43.40%     |
| 4     | $2059 < X \leq 2417$ | Good      | 17        | 32.08%     |
| 5     | $2417 < X$           | Very Good | 0         | 0.00%      |
| Total |                      |           | 53        | 100.00%    |

Based on the table above, the results for the product aspect of facility management objectives fall into the "moderate" category, with 3 respondents (5.66%) in the very poor category, 10 respondents (18.87%) in the poor category, 23 respondents (43.40%) in the moderate category, and 17 respondents (32.08%) in the good category. No respondents were in the very good category.

*Outcome Aspect*

The results for each indicator of the outcome aspect are explained in Table 5 below:

TABLE 5. Outcome Aspect

| No    | Score Range          | Category  | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1     | $X \leq 574$         | Very Poor | 1         | 1.89%      |
| 2     | $574 < X \leq 816$   | Poor      | 12        | 22.64%     |
| 3     | $816 < X \leq 1059$  | Moderate  | 23        | 43.40%     |
| 4     | $1059 < X \leq 1302$ | Good      | 17        | 32.08%     |
| 5     | $1302 < X$           | Very Good | 0         | 0.00%      |
| Total |                      |           | 53        | 100.00%    |

Based on the table above, the results for the outcome aspect of facility management objectives fall into the "moderate" category, with 1 respondent (1.89%) in the very poor category, 12 respondents (22.64%) in the poor category, 23 respondents (43.40%) in the moderate category, and 17 respondents (32.08%) in the good category. No respondents were in the very good category.

IV. DISCUSSION

The results of this study reveal that the evaluation of the management of physical education (PSHE) facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta, based on the responses of school principals, generally falls into the "moderate" category. Across all aspects, whether objective, activity, product, or outcome, the evaluation results were classified as moderate, with the only exception being the input aspect, which was rated as good. This indicates that the management of PSHE facilities and infrastructure in Yogyakarta's state elementary schools still needs improvement to ensure higher quality PSHE learning.

The primary goal of managing facilities and infrastructure in schools is to provide professional services in education, allowing the learning process to occur effectively and efficiently while achieving educational objectives. In this context, the roles of school administrators, PSHE teachers, and the government are crucial in managing PSHE facilities and infrastructure.

Providing adequate PSHE facilities and infrastructure is one of the school's and the government's responsibilities, ensuring that the learning process runs smoothly, effectively, and efficiently. Adequate facilities and infrastructure lead to high-quality PSHE learning. Conversely, a lack of these resources can degrade the quality and outcomes of the learning process. This finding is supported by Elvira (2021, pp. 93-98), who noted that poor student achievement can, in part, be attributed to the lack of adequate learning facilities.

Based on the problems highlighted, several school principals noted that poor management of facilities and infrastructure results in suboptimal PSHE learning outcomes. Lisnawati et al. (2023, pp. 30987-30993) further reinforced this finding, emphasizing that the availability of school facilities and infrastructure plays a critical role in supporting the learning process and enhancing students' motivation, achievement, and the overall quality of education.

PSHE learning cannot be separated from the availability of adequate facilities and infrastructure, as these resources contribute to making the learning process more engaging, enjoyable, and safe for students, ultimately facilitating the achievement of learning objectives. However, the mere existence of adequate facilities and infrastructure is not sufficient for long-term program success; the condition of these resources must also be maintained. This is where effective management of school facilities and infrastructure becomes essential in ensuring an efficient and effective learning process, which involves proper planning, procurement, usage, and maintenance.

The results of this study indicate that the evaluation of the management of PSHE facilities and infrastructure in Yogyakarta's state elementary schools is generally rated as moderate. This suggests that school principals perceive their management of PSHE facilities and infrastructure as falling into the moderate category. Principals today face a significant workload, with daily responsibilities both within and outside the school, including various internal activities and participation in inter-school or cross-sector educational events. The heavy workload of school principals could be one factor

contributing to the lower evaluation scores for PSHE facilities and infrastructure management in Yogyakarta's state elementary schools. Most school principals trust their PSHE teachers to manage the facilities, which may lead to them overlooking or neglecting the evaluation of these resources. In some cases, school principals may perceive PSHE as a less important subject, further contributing to the lack of attention given to PSHE facilities and infrastructure management.

Given the current state of PSHE facilities and infrastructure management in Yogyakarta's state elementary schools, which is generally rated as moderate, there is a clear need for improvement to ensure that PSHE learning becomes more effective and continues to improve in quality. School principals must collaborate with PSHE teachers and other educators to regularly evaluate the management of PSHE facilities and infrastructure. By doing so, schools can ensure that all aspects of facility management, from planning and procurement to usage and maintenance, are well managed, which will ultimately improve the quality of PSHE learning.

#### V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study and the discussion, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The evaluation of the management of physical education (PSHE) facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta from the objective aspect falls into the "moderate" or "inadequate" category.
2. The evaluation of the management of physical education (PSHE) facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta from the input aspect falls into the "good" category.
3. The evaluation of the management of physical education (PSHE) facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta from the activity aspect falls into the "moderate" or "inadequate" category.
4. The evaluation of the management of physical education (PSHE) facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta from the product aspect falls into the "moderate" or "inadequate" category.
5. The evaluation of the management of physical education (PSHE) facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta from the outcome aspect falls into the "moderate" or "inadequate" category.
6. Overall, the evaluation of the management of physical education (PSHE) facilities and infrastructure in state elementary schools in Yogyakarta is classified as "moderate" or "inadequate."

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is supported by Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.

#### REFERENCES

1. Aedi, N. (2018). *Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana Sekolah* (2nd ed.). Gosyen Publishing.
2. Alfian, E. (2017). Manajemen Kelas Dalam Meningkatkan Efektifitas Proses Belajar Mengajar. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 5(2).
3. Ambiyar dan Muharika. (2019). *Metodologi Penelitian Evaluasi Program*. ALFABETA.
4. Ananda, R., & Banurea, O. K. (2017). *Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana Pendidikan*. Rosdi Karya.
5. Antariksa, W. F., Fattah, A., & Utami, M. A. P. (2022). Evaluasi Program Pendidikan Pesantren Mahasiswa Model Cipp (Context, Input, Process, Product). *Evaluasi: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(1), 75. <https://doi.org/10.32478/evaluasi.v6i1.848>
6. Danim, Sudarwan dan Danim, Y. (2010). *Administrasi Sekolah Dan Manajemen Kelas*.
7. Dwiayama, F. (2018). Unsur Manajemen dalam Pengelolaan Lembaga Pendidikan Islam di Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 7(1), 675–695. <https://jurnal.iain-bone.ac.id/index.php/adara/article/view/312/239>
8. Fatmawati, N., Mappincara, A., & Habibah, S. (2019). Pemanfaatan Dan Pemeliharaan Sarana Dan Prasarana Pendidikan. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Keguruan, Dan Pembelajaran*, 3(2), 115–121. <https://doi.org/10.26858/pembelajar.v3i2.9799>
9. Gesi, B. (2019). Manajemen dan EKsekutif. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 3(2), 51–66. <https://e-journal.unmuhkupang.ac.id/index.php/jm/article/view/62/51>
10. Hamiyah, N., & Jauhar, M. (2015). *Pengantar Manajemen Pendidikan di Sekolah*. Prestasi Pustaka.
11. Iswanto, A., & Widayati, E. (2021). Pembelajaran pendidikan jasmani yang efektif dan berkualitas. *MAJORA: Majalah Ilmiah Olahraga*, 27(1), 13–17. <https://doi.org/10.21831/majora.v27i1.34259>
12. Khimah, N. (2020). Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana untuk Mengembangkan Mutu Pendidikan. *Jurnal Administrasi Dan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 3(2), 123–130. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um027v3i22020p123>
13. Matin, & Fuad, N. (2016). *Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana Pendidikan*. Rajawali Pers.
14. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (2005). *Qualitative Data Analysis (terjemahan)*. UI Press.
15. Nurmadiyah. (2018). Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana. *Al-Afkar*, VI(1), 30–50. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32520/afkar.v6i1.190>
16. Risman, I., & Argatos. (2022). Evaluasi Program Pendidikan Jasmani Olahraga dan Kesehatan Materi Aktivitas di Air di SMP Negeri 14 Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani, Olahraga, Dan Kesehatan*, 10(3), 114–121. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23887/jjp.v10i3.51566>
17. Sinta, I. M. (2019). Manajemen Sarana Dan Prasarana. *Jurnal Islamic Educational Management*, 4(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15575/isema.v4i1.5645>
18. Sopian, A. (2019). Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana. *Jurnal Tarbiyah Islami*, 4(2), 43–53.
19. Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Evaluasi* (Y. Yuniarsih (ed.); 1st ed.).
20. Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. ALFABETA.
21. Sulfemi, W. B. (2019). *Manajemen Pendidikan Berbasis Multi Budaya*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/647wy>
22. Sulistiyono. (2017). *Tes Pengukuran dan Evaluasi Olahraga*. UNY Press.
23. Sutisna, N. W., & Effane, A. (2022). Fungsi Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana. *Jurnal Karimah Tauhid*, 1(2).
24. Syafaruddin. (2016). *Administrasi Pendidikan*. Perdana Publishing.
25. Yanti, S. D. (2019). *Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana*.