

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

Sarjono¹, Ahmad Nasrulloh²

^{1,2}Department of Sports Science, Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT: This research aims to determine: (1) the evaluation results of the planning of archery infrastructure and facilities of Sekolah Laboratorium Olahraga (Selabora) of Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences of Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta (FIKK UNY); (2) the evaluation results of the organization of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY; (3) the evaluation results of the actuation of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY; (4) the evaluation results of the control of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY; and (5) management evaluation consists of planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY. This research was an evaluative study using a quantitative approach. The research subjects were administrators, coaches, and athletes at Selabora FIKK UNY. The research sampling technique used purposive sampling, totaling 3 coaches/administrators and 20 athletes. The research instruments were observation sheets, closed questionnaires, and documentation. The data analysis used descriptive quantitative analysis. Based on the research results, it shows: (1) Planning scores 2.99 (good), indicating that planning has been carried out systematically, with a clear vision, mission, and objectives. However, improvements in stakeholder involvement and long-term planning are needed. (2) Organizing scores 2.67 (good). The organizational structure and division of tasks are appropriate, but the implementation of SOPs is not optimal. Strengthening coordination, human resource development, and work systems are needed. (3) Actuating scores the highest, at 3.12 (good), with the leadership and effective communication sub- indicators scoring very good (3.74). However, creativity and innovation are still lacking (2.57), requiring the development of new ideas in program implementation. (4) Controlling scores 2.70 (good), but it is the weakest aspect. Progress monitoring is still low (2.43/poor category), so a more structured, performance-based evaluation and monitoring system is needed. (5) Evaluation of the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY results in an average overall score of 2.87, which is considered good.

KEYWORDS: evaluation, management, infrastructure and facilities

INTRODUCTION

Sport is a vital activity in modern society. In addition to its role in maintaining physical fitness and mental health, it also serves as a means of character development and a means of achieving recognized achievements at the local, national, and international levels. Efforts to achieve sporting success are inseparable from a systematic, planned, integrated, and sustainable development process. This development process requires the support of various components, including human resources, structured training programs, and adequate facilities and infrastructure. Yulitania and Raharjo (2024, p. 574) emphasize that serious government attention and cross-sector synergy are key requirements for advancing sporting achievement in Indonesia.

The government must be the driving force so that all elements of the nation are called to contribute to the nation. Currently, sports make a positive and tangible contribution to improving public health. Furthermore, sports play a role in enhancing the nation's ability to implement a sustainable development system. To achieve optimal sports performance, sports development is necessary through the establishment of sports associations. Then, tiered and ongoing competitions are held to measure the success of the sports development.

The role of achievement development is crucial in the context of national sports development. Sport is not merely a healthy activity but also a strategic competitive platform for building the nation's image and prestige on the international stage. Highachieving sports development must be carried out continuously, in stages, and sustainably through the synergy of various parties, including the government, sports organizations, coaches, and the community. Aji & Supriyono (2021, p. 95) state that

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

sports achievement is the result of a structured development system, where the quality of the output is strongly influenced by the quality of the input and the ongoing development process.

High-performance sports cannot develop independently and require synergy from all parties to ensure sustainable development. The lack of sustainable high-performance sports development is in stark contrast to the demands of high-performance sports, which will only succeed when the principles of long-term, consistent, and sustainable development are adhered to. Ideally, high-performance sports development should foster the development of athletes' talents to achieve maximum performance.

Athlete talent can be enhanced through guidance from coaches who fulfill their roles as teachers, leaders, parents, and servants. Coaches truly understand the field of coaching, including the issues of training methods and systems (Culver et al., 2019; Stone et al., 2021).

The success of systematic, integrated, directed, and programmed athlete performance development can be clearly seen from several influencing factors, namely: (1) the availability of sufficient potential athletes, (2) the availability of professional coaches who can apply science and technology, (3) the availability of adequate sports facilities and infrastructure, (4) the existence of a tiered and sustainable program, supported by the existence of, (5) an adequate budget and good relations between all parties (athletes, coaches, coaches, administrators, Pengprov, KONI, and the Government), (6) the need for periodic tests and measurements of athlete condition (Jopang, 2018, p. 2).

One of the sports that has attracted attention is archery. Archery is a combination of sport and art. Archery is called a sport because it utilizes the body's components, including the hands, back, and shoulders, and requires physical endurance. Archery is called an art because it requires touch, subtlety of feeling, patience, tenacity, and mental resilience. The sport itself aims to develop physical, spiritual, and social abilities, as well as shape the character and personality of a dignified nation (Fahrizqi, et al., 2021: 43).

Archery is a sport that emphasizes accuracy as a key element every athlete must possess. This static sport requires good physical condition, including strength and endurance, particularly in the upper body muscles. Archery focuses more on the continuous push or pull of an external object. Archery requires specialized skills, including precision, coordination, and mental fortitude (Mukhtar & Rubiono, 2020, p. 1). Archery involves releasing an arrow along a specific trajectory toward a target at a specific distance (Sarro et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2021: 2962; Ortiz & Miyazaki, 2020: 1).

One crucial aspect of developing competitive sports is the availability of adequate facilities and infrastructure. Sports facilities and infrastructure are essential for supporting training and competitions, as well as ensuring the safety and comfort of athletes (Talita et al., 2024). Yuliyanti et al. (2022) state that sports facilities include the primary equipment used in sports activities, while infrastructure refers to physical facilities such as fields, sports halls, and other supporting spaces that meet standards. Ideally, sports facilities and infrastructure should meet international standards in terms of size, quality, and supporting equipment to ensure the safety, comfort, and effectiveness of training and competitions.

Specifically, in archery, the availability of standard facilities and infrastructure is crucial because this sport has unique characteristics that require high accuracy, physical stability, and a safe and comfortable training environment. Fahrizqi et al. (2021, p. 43) argue that archery demands not only physical ability but also mental strength, emotional resilience, and concentration. Therefore, the need for standard archery ranges, quality archery equipment, and supporting facilities such as storage space and an automated scoring system is essential.

Research by Mukhtar & Rubiono (2020, p. 1) revealed that archery requires a field with a minimum distance of 18 meters for short-range training and up to 122 meters for long-range competitions, with supporting facilities such as targets, arrow stands, and adequate safety protection areas. Sarro et al. (2021) and Kim et al. (2021, p. 2962) also emphasized the importance of archery facilities that meet international standards to support optimal athlete performance development.

Archery equipment is also a crucial component of archery. Bows and arrows must meet high quality standards to ensure the safety and comfort of athletes during training or competitions. Furthermore, archery equipment must be properly cared for and maintained to ensure optimal performance. Adequate facilities and infrastructure are crucial for the safety and comfort of athletes when organizing archery activities. Therefore, proper planning and management of archery infrastructure and facilities are necessary to support effective and efficient archery activities.

Archery is a rapidly growing sporting event in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The Sports Laboratory (Selabora) of the Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences (FIKK) of Yogyakarta State University (UNY) is a center for developing athletes, particularly in archery. However, the FIKK UNY Archery Sports Laboratory faces several challenges, particularly related to the maintenance of sports facilities. Facilities and infrastructure have not been managed according to standard operating procedures, as they have not been handled by professionals in their field. Furthermore, the infrastructure management staff also have dual roles as athletes,

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

and the allocation of time is less than optimal. As a result, equipment is in disorganized condition, with some even being lost or damaged due to improper placement.

Based on the results of initial observations carried out by researchers, the main problems found include: (1) The limited number of administrators as managers of infrastructure facilities, so that carrying out dual duties results in the neglect of equipment and maintenance of infrastructure facilities which appear not to be in accordance with SOP. (2) Stakeholders appear not to be able to provide full funding facilities to meet achievement needs.

The above observations illustrate the existence of problems that need to be analyzed in order to find solutions. This proves that excellence in achievement is inseparable from an implicit threat that can quickly undermine high achievement. The problem of archery achievement at Selabora FIKK UNY is certainly closely related to the poor management system of archery infrastructure and facilities. In connection with these problems, researchers seek to explore more deeply related to the problems that need to be evaluated in the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY.

Sports facility and infrastructure management is the process of managing sports facilities and equipment to support sports activities. This management aims to ensure that available sports facilities and infrastructure are used effectively and efficiently to improve the quality of sports activities. In sports facility and infrastructure management, careful planning is required to determine the required facilities and infrastructure. This planning must consider factors such as the type of sport, the number of athletes, and the available budget. With proper planning, sports facilities and infrastructure can be optimally utilized to support sports activities.

In addition to planning, managing sports facilities and infrastructure also requires good organization. This organization includes determining the organizational structure, tasks and responsibilities, and operational procedures for managing sports facilities and infrastructure. With good organization, sports facilities and infrastructure can be managed effectively and efficiently. Management of sports facilities and infrastructure also requires continuous monitoring and evaluation. This monitoring and evaluation aims to ensure that available sports facilities and infrastructure are used effectively and efficiently to support sports activities. With good monitoring and evaluation, improvements and enhancements to the quality of sports facilities and infrastructure can be made.

Hoeber (2012, p. 2) states that a person's sports management skills will indicate their level of success in leading a sports organization. Sports organizations encompass many areas, which are crucial components that must be controlled to achieve a goal. Management is a regulatory process that has a clear conceptual basis and can operate a project. The management process begins with a well-thought-out conceptual plan and ends with an evaluation phase.

Comprehensive evaluation research is urgently needed to provide solutions to address gaps in the development and promotion of archery achievements. Evaluation is the process of determining the value of something or an object using specific benchmarks, so that the data obtained will be analyzed to determine the level of success of a program or policy that has been implemented and as a reference for formulating the next program (Utomo, 2021, p. 2). The objectives of the evaluation are: (1) evaluation aims to (1) identify the level of achievement of goals, (2) measure the direct impact that occurs on the target group, (3) identify and analyze other consequences that may occur outside of social.

Managing archery infrastructure and facilities requires careful planning. During the planning stage, it is necessary to identify the necessary facilities and infrastructure to support archery activities. This includes archery fields, archery equipment, and other supporting facilities. Once the planning is complete, the next stage is organizing. This stage requires organizing the available resources to manage the archery facilities and infrastructure. This includes determining the organizational structure, tasks and responsibilities, and operational procedures.

Staffing is also a crucial aspect in managing archery facilities and infrastructure. This phase requires the placement of competent and trained personnel to manage the facilities and infrastructure. This includes coaches, referees, and other support staff. Directing is the next phase in managing archery facilities and infrastructure. This phase requires directing and supervising the activities of the personnel involved in managing the facilities and infrastructure.

Coordination is also a crucial aspect in managing archery facilities and infrastructure. This stage requires coordination between the various parties involved in managing archery facilities and infrastructure, including coaches, referees, support staff, and athletes. Controlling is the final stage in managing archery facilities and infrastructure. This stage requires monitoring and evaluation of activities carried out in managing archery facilities and infrastructure. This aims to ensure that archery facilities and infrastructure are managed effectively and efficiently and meet established standards.

However, the facts on the ground show that many sports organizations in Indonesia still face problems in managing facilities and infrastructure, including in archery. Talita et al. (2024) in their study at the Banjarbaru Archery School Club found that only a small portion of the infrastructure met competition standards, while the rest was still used alternately by novice athletes. Similar

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

problems also occurred at Selabora Olahraga FIKK UNY, where based on the researchers' initial observations, several problems were found, including a limited number of facility and infrastructure managers, maintenance implementation that did not comply with standard operating procedures (SOPs), and suboptimal equipment inventory management.

These issues indicate a gap between the ideal needs for archery infrastructure and facilities and actual conditions in the field. Furthermore, research related to the evaluation of archery infrastructure and facilities management in higher education institutions, particularly in the Selabora FIKK UNY environment, remains very limited. Most previous studies have focused more on the technical aspects of athlete development or the impact of infrastructure on training outcomes, without comprehensively evaluating the planning, organization, implementation, and supervision of archery facilities and infrastructure.

The novelty of this research lies in the systematic evaluation of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY. The evaluation covers all aspects, from facility needs planning and management organizational systems, maintenance implementation, to supervision and evaluation of archery facilities. This research not only maps the actual conditions but also provides recommendations for improvement based on the evaluation results. Furthermore, this study uses a management evaluation approach that refers to modern sports management concepts, focusing on the quality of sports facility services (Hoeber, 2012; Utomo, 2021). This approach is expected to serve as a reference for developing sports facilities and infrastructure policies in academic environments.

This research is expected to provide theoretical and practical contributions in the field of sports management, particularly the management of archery infrastructure and facilities in the university environment, as well as being the basis for developing an effective, efficient, and nationally standardized sports facility management model. Based on the problems described above, the researcher is interested in conducting further research with the title "Evaluation of Archery Infrastructure and Facilities Management in Selabora Olahraga FIKK UNY". Sports facilities and infrastructure must be designed and managed to ensure the safety of athletes and other users. Thus, the management of sports facilities and infrastructure can support safe and quality sports activities.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design

This research is an evaluative study using a quantitative approach. Evaluative research aims to assess the extent to which a program, policy, or activity has been implemented in accordance with its stated objectives and to provide a basis for making decisions about improvements or further development (Arikunto, 2020). Evaluation in this context serves not only as a means of measuring achievement but also as a strategic tool for assessing the effectiveness of the managerial components involved.

According to Sugiyono (2019), evaluation is a systematic process for obtaining and analyzing information as a basis for determining the value of an object, so that the results can be used as a basis for decision-making. In this study, an evaluation was conducted on four main functions in management: planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling, in the context of managing archery sports facilities and infrastructure at the Sports Laboratory School (Selabora), Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, Yogyakarta State University (FIKK UNY). Data were collected through a closed-ended instrument in the form of a questionnaire compiled based on indicators from each management function. The results of the questionnaire were then analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the level of achievement of each managerial aspect. This approach was chosen because it allows for objective and systematic measurement of the performance of facility and infrastructure management, which is the focus of the evaluation.

Participants

Research subjects refer to objects, things, or people that serve as data sources for the research variables being studied (Arikunto, 2019, p. 126). Research subjects play a crucial role in research because they are the ones from whom data regarding the variables being observed is obtained. The subjects of this evaluation were the administrators, coaches, and athletes at Selabora FIKK UNY. A sample is a subset of the objects studied and is considered representative of the entire population (Nurdin & Hartati, 2019, p. 104). Darwin et al. (2020, p. 106) state that a sample is a subset of the objects studied and is considered representative of the entire population. The sampling technique used in this study was purposive sampling. Purposive sampling, according to Sugiyono (2019, p. 138), is sampling using certain considerations according to desired criteria to determine the number of samples to be studied. The sample criteria are as follows:

1. Coaches and Administrators

- a.** Be an active coach or administrator in the FIKK UNY Sports Laboratory (Selabora Olahraga) activities.
- b.** Have at least one year of experience in archery management and coaching.

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

- c. Willing to provide comprehensive information regarding the management of archery facilities and infrastructure.

2. Athletes

- a. Registered as active athletes in the FIKK UNY Sports Laboratory (Selabora Olahraga).
- b. Have participated in archery training for at least six months, thus gaining sufficient experience to assess the facilities and training program.
- c. Willing to be research respondents and provide honest data regarding their experiences and perceptions of the training program.

With these criteria, the researcher ensured that the selected sample was able to provide valid, accurate information that supported the research objectives regarding the evaluation of archery facilities and infrastructure management.

Instruments

Data collection techniques refer to a method, the form of which is shown in its use in collecting data using instruments.

Arikunto (2019, p. 175), explains that data collection methods are methods used by researchers to obtain the required data. The steps taken in collecting data in this study are as follows. (1) Researchers conducted observations at Selabora FIKK UNY regarding the management of archery sports infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY. (2) Researchers documented archery sports infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY. (3) Researchers requested a research permit. (4) Researchers provided research instruments in the form of questionnaires to the subjects who were the research samples. (4) Researchers conducted interviews with the subjects who were the samples. (5) Researchers recorded and summarized the results of the data obtained.

According to Hardani et al. (2020, p. 284), research instruments are "measuring tools used to obtain quantitative information about variations in variable characteristics objectively, so that scale development techniques or measuring tools are needed to measure variables in more systematic data collection." These instruments will be used to obtain data on the evaluation of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY.

RESULTS

The Sports Laboratory School (Selabora) of the Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, Yogyakarta State University (FIKK UNY) is a sports training institution that serves as a vehicle for the development of sports science and practice. One of the sports intensively developed at Selabora is archery, which has become a flagship sport and an icon of achievement development within the FIKK UNY environment. Archery activities at Selabora are designed not only as extracurricular activities, but also as an integral part of the structured and sustainable development of young athletes. The archery branch at Selabora has representative training facilities, such as a standard archery field, training equipment that meets World Archery regulations, and the support of coaches who have professional competence and qualifications.

The approach used in the evaluation research is planning, organizing, actuating, controlling, meaning obtaining accurate and objective information and comparing what has been achieved from the management of archery sports infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY with what should be achieved based on established standards. The dimensions that can be used to determine the success of archery sports infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY are as follows.

1. Planning Evaluation

Planning evaluation is a crucial initial stage in the management cycle, including the management of sports facilities and infrastructure. Planning evaluation focuses on two main indicators: clarity of objectives and needs analysis. Clarity of objectives refers to how specific, measurable, and relevant the policy direction and program for procurement and management of facilities and infrastructure designed by the management of the Selabora Archery Branch of the FIKK UNY are. Meanwhile, needs analysis includes the process of identifying the type, quantity, and condition of facilities and infrastructure needed to support athlete training and development activities, based on age group, training intensity, and desired performance targets.

Evaluation of these two indicators is crucial to ensure that the planning process is systematic and data-driven, not simply based on assumptions or old habits. The Selabora Archery Branch of FIKK UNY demonstrates the need for careful planning, particularly in procuring archery equipment tailored to each group's needs. Furthermore, the intensity of the training program, which takes place almost every day of the week, also demands adequate facilities, both in quantity and quality.

He results of this research related to the planning evaluation provide an overview of the extent to which the policy direction related to the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY has been clearly established, as well as how appropriate the analysis of the needs for these facilities has been carried out. The planning evaluation covers various aspects, including clarity of management objectives, mapping of facility and infrastructure needs, determining procurement and maintenance priorities, and the suitability between the plans that have been made and implementation practices in the field.

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

Detailed findings from the evaluation of each planning indicator for archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY are presented systematically in Table 4 below, so that readers can understand the overall level of effectiveness of the plans that have been implemented.

Table 1. Average Planning Results

Indikator	Mean	Kategori
Kejelasan tujuan	3.25	Sangat Baik
Analisis kebutuhan	2.73	Baik
Perencanaan (<i>Planning</i>)	2.99	Baik

Evaluation of the planning aspect of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY includes two main indicators: clarity of objectives and needs analysis. The quantitative analysis results show that the clarity of objectives indicator obtained an average score (mean) of 3.25, which is included in the very good category. This indicates that the management unit has a clear direction and objectives in the development and management of archery sports facilities. Clarity of objectives is crucial in determining the direction of managerial policies and strategies, so that all forms of planned activities have a measurable basis and are relevant to the institution's vision.

Meanwhile, the needs analysis indicator achieved an average score of 2.73, which is categorized as good. This score reflects that the needs identification process for facility and infrastructure management has been carried out, although there is still room for improvement. Needs analysis is crucial to ensure that every available facility meets standards and meets the real needs of users, whether athletes, coaches, or students involved in coaching or academic activities.

Overall, the average score for the planning component was 2.99, which is considered good. This indicates that the planning for the management of facilities and infrastructure at Selabora FIKK UNY is generally well-executed, but still requires improvement, particularly in the area of needs analysis. Strengthening planning through a more participatory and data-driven approach will significantly support the long-term optimization of archery facilities.

2. Organizational Evaluation

Organization is a crucial component of management, serving as a bridge between planning and implementation. In the context of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY, the organizational evaluation encompasses two main indicators: resource management and the availability of standard operating procedures (SOPs). These two indicators serve as the basis for assessing the extent to which organizational systems have been effectively established to support the operationalization of archery activities, from equipment management to scheduling facility use.

Resource management, in this case, includes the organization and empowerment of coaching staff, support staff, and personnel involved in facility and infrastructure management, including maintenance, inventory, and administration personnel. Meanwhile, the availability of standard operating procedures (SOPs) reflects the level of formalization in facility and infrastructure management. SOPs serve as standard guidelines for the use, maintenance, replacement, and safety of archery equipment. The existence and implementation of SOPs also serve as benchmarks for maintaining service consistency and quality, as well as a form of accountability in sports facility management.

This evaluation demonstrates how the organizational structure, roles and responsibilities, and work procedures have been implemented and developed within the Selabora Archery Branch of FIKK UNY. The analysis of these two indicators is presented in detail in Table below.

Table 2. Average Organizational Results

Indikator	Mean	Kategori
Pengelolaan sumber daya	2.88	Baik
Ketersediaan SOP	2.46	Kurang
Pengorganisasian (<i>Organizing</i>)	2.67	Baik

The evaluation of the organizational component in the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY includes two indicators: resource management and the availability of standard operating procedures (SOPs). Based on the quantitative analysis, the resource management indicator obtained an average score of 2.88, which is included in the good

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

category. This finding indicates that the utilization of available resources, including human resources, budget, and physical facilities, has been implemented quite effectively. Good resource management reflects the management's efforts to distribute roles and responsibilities proportionally, and ensure that the operational needs of archery activities can be met.

However, the SOP availability indicator only achieved an average score of 2.46, which is categorized as inadequate. This result indicates weaknesses in the documentation and implementation of standard operating procedures related to facility and infrastructure management. The lack of systematic and documented SOPs can lead to inconsistencies in task execution, a lack of service quality standards, and the potential for disorganization in both routine and incidental activities.

Overall, the average score for the organization component was 2.67, which is considered good. However, this score still indicates room for improvement, particularly in the development and implementation of standard operating procedures (SOPs). Therefore, to strengthen the organization dimension, it is recommended that management immediately develop comprehensive SOPs and disseminate them to all relevant parties, in order to create a more orderly, focused, and accountable work system.

3. Implementation Evaluation (Actuating)

The actuating or implementation component of management is a crucial stage that emphasizes the process of mobilizing all organizational resources to achieve predetermined goals effectively and efficiently. In the context of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY, implementation evaluation focuses on two main indicators: leadership creativity and innovation, and effective communication.

The leadership creativity and innovation indicator reflects the extent to which managers are able to deliver breakthroughs in the utilization and development of archery facilities, including facility maintenance, improving training quality, and implementing training programs that adapt to changing times and athlete needs. Visionary leadership is essential to maintaining the sustainability and relevance of development programs, particularly amidst the dynamics of the sporting world and the demands of competition at the regional and national levels.

Indicators of effective communication refer to the smooth flow of information between implementing elements, including coaches, facility managers, athletes, and other relevant parties. Open and structured communication is crucial to prevent miscommunication regarding facility use, activity scheduling, and responding to various technical and administrative challenges on the field.

These two indicators illustrate the extent to which the implementation components of facility and infrastructure management at the Selabora Archery Unit, FIKK UNY, have been optimally implemented, both in terms of leadership and internal coordination. The research results related to this implementation, or actuation, are summarized and presented in detail in the following table.

Table 3. Average Implementation (Actuating) Results

Indikator	Mean	Kategori
Kreativitas dan Inovasi	2.57	Baik
Kepemimpinan dan Komunikasi yang Efektif	3.74	Sangat Baik
Actuating (Pelaksanaan)	3.12	Baik

The evaluation of the actuating component or implementation in the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY includes two main indicators: creativity and innovation, and effective leadership and communication. The analysis results show that the creativity and innovation indicator obtained an average score of 2.57, which is classified as good. This achievement reflects that there are initiatives and efforts to implement new ideas in the management of facilities and infrastructure, although not yet fully optimal. There is still potential to improve the quality of innovation, both in sports activity planning, technology utilization, and the arrangement of training facilities to be more adaptive to user needs.

Meanwhile, the leadership and effective communication indicator achieved an average score of 3.74, which falls into the very good category. This score indicates that the leadership style implemented in Selabora FIKK UNY tends to be participatory and communicative, which allows for harmonious working relationships between managers, coaches, and users of sports facilities. Effective communication allows for clear information delivery, rapid problem resolution, and the creation of a conducive and productive work environment.

Overall, the average score for the actuating component was 3.12, which is categorized as good. This result indicates that the implementation of managerial functions in managing facilities and infrastructure has been quite successful, particularly supported

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

by strong leadership and communication. However, continuous efforts to improve creativity and innovation are still needed to ensure the management of archery infrastructure and facilities becomes more adaptive and competitive.

4. Control Evaluation

The controlling stage is a crucial component of the management cycle, ensuring that activity implementation proceeds according to plan and early detection of any potential deviations. Control evaluation focuses on four main indicators: periodic reports, performance evaluation, progress monitoring, and quality improvement. The periodic report indicator reflects the management unit's commitment to documenting operational activities and routine facility maintenance. Furthermore, performance evaluation focuses on the assessment mechanism for the effectiveness of program implementation and the use of archery facilities, both from a technical and administrative perspective.

Progress monitoring indicators include regular monitoring of progress, both in terms of improving the quality of facilities and the utilization of infrastructure by users (athletes, coaches, and students). Systematic monitoring will facilitate the identification of emerging obstacles and assist in determining appropriate follow-up actions. Finally, the quality improvement indicator emphasizes ongoing efforts to improve and enhance existing facilities and infrastructure to optimally support the achievement of archery development goals.

Overall, the four indicators of controlling the management of archery infrastructure and facilities provide an overview of the extent to which the management of facilities and infrastructure in the Selabora FIKK UNY archery sport branch has carried out its control function comprehensively and sustainably. The results of the analysis of each indicator of controlling the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY are presented in detail in Table below.

Table 4. Average Control Results

Indikator	Mean	Kategori
Laporan berkala	2.55	Baik
Evaluasi kinerja	2.84	Baik
Pemantauan progres	2.43	Kurang
Peningkatan kualitas	2.97	Baik
Controlling (Pengendalian)	2.70	Baik

The evaluation of the controlling function in the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY covers four main indicators: periodic reports, performance evaluation, progress monitoring, and quality improvement. The analysis results show that the periodic report indicator obtained an average score of 2.55, which is classified as good. This indicates that routine reporting mechanisms have been implemented, although there is still room to improve the consistency, systematicity, and completeness of report content to better support the managerial decision-making process.

The performance evaluation indicator scored 2.84, also in the good category, indicating that management performance evaluations have been conducted periodically. However, to achieve greater effectiveness, these evaluations should be based on measurable performance indicators and supported by empirical data, resulting in more targeted recommendations.

Meanwhile, the progress monitoring indicator received an average score of 2.43, which is considered inadequate. This score highlights the importance of suboptimal monitoring of program progress, facility utilization, and achievement of short- and medium-term goals. Weaknesses in this aspect can result in delays in identifying problems and taking necessary corrective measures in sports facility management.

The quality improvement indicator achieved an average score of 2.97, which is considered good. This indicates that initiatives are underway to make continuous improvements, both in terms of physical facilities and the services provided. However, for quality improvements to have a more significant impact, strategic planning is needed that aligns with national and international quality standards in sports facility management.

Overall, the average score for the controlling component was 2.70, which falls into the good category. This finding reflects that the control function in managing archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY has been implemented effectively. However, progress monitoring remains a weak point that requires special attention in efforts to strengthen the control system comprehensively and sustainably.

Based on the results above, the success criteria for managing archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY can be determined as in Table 5.

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

Table 5. Success Criteria for Management of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY

No	Aspek	Skor	Kriteria
1	<i>Planning</i> (Perencanaan)	2.99	Baik
2	<i>Organizing</i> (Pengorganisasian)	2.67	Baik
4	<i>Actuating</i> (Pelaksanaan)	3.12	Baik
5	<i>Controlling</i> (Pengendalian)	2.70	Baik
Rata-Rata		2.87	Baik

Based on the evaluation results of the four main management functions—planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling—a general overview of the success rate of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora, Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, Yogyakarta State University. Each managerial aspect was assessed using an average score classified into qualitative categories.

Overall, the average score for the four managerial aspects was 2.87, which falls into the good category. This finding indicates that the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY has been implemented quite optimally. However, to achieve the excellent and superior standard category, efforts are needed to strengthen the SOP aspect in organization, increase innovation in implementation, and a more structured progress monitoring system in the control function. With these improvements, the quality of service and the sustainability of archery sports facilities in the academic environment can be significantly improved.

DISCUSSION

Based on the research results, it is known that the overall average score for the four management functions consisting of planning, organizing, implementing (actuating), and controlling is 2.87. This score is included in the good category, indicating that the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY has met the minimum operational standards required to support the sports education and training process. In general, this indicates that functional management has been carried out quite effectively, although it has not yet reached an optimal level. This finding is in line with the basic principles of sports facility management which emphasize the importance of alignment between planning, implementation, and evaluation aspects (Schwarz et al., 2019).

Despite meeting the criteria for the good category, several aspects still require special attention to improve management effectiveness towards the very good category. One aspect that needs significant improvement is the implementation of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), which have not been fully implemented consistently across all management levels. Furthermore, creativity and innovation in program implementation have not been optimally explored, as reflected in the less than optimal actuating aspect score. This is crucial, considering that the context of sports facility management demands adaptive and innovative capabilities to remain relevant to the dynamic needs of sports development and education (Chelladurai & Kerwin, 2017).

Furthermore, the monitoring and evaluation system is also a weak point that requires immediate strengthening. Based on the scores obtained for the controlling function, it was found that progress monitoring and activity documentation have not been carried out optimally and systematically. Weak monitoring can lead to a lack of direction in the follow-up process and make it difficult to measure success. Therefore, developing an evaluation system based on measurable performance indicators and accurate progress documentation are crucial to ensuring management sustainability and accountability (Bayle & Clausen, 2024). This overall evaluation demonstrates that the management of archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora FIKK UNY has been implemented quite well, but requires strengthening strategies in critical managerial aspects. Improvement efforts in the form of improved SOPs, the use of information technology for monitoring, and the development of innovative programs will significantly contribute to elevating management quality to a higher level. If these efforts can be implemented systematically and sustainably, the management of archery infrastructure and facilities will not only function as supporting facilities but also as an integral part of achieving holistic, quality-oriented sports education goals (Min, 2022; Hill et al., 2024).

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, the following conclusions can be drawn regarding the evaluation of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora, FIKK, UNY.

1. The planning aspect received an average score of 2.99, which is in the good category. This indicates that the planning process for managing archery infrastructure and facilities at Selabora, FIKK, UNY has been carried out fairly systematically. Indicators

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

of a clear vision, mission, and objectives, along with field-based planning, indicate that management is guided by rational and measurable management principles. However, improvements in stakeholder engagement and long-term planning are still needed to promote efficiency and sustainability of archery facilities.

2. The organizing aspect received a score of 2.67, which is in the good category. This indicates that the organizational structure and division of tasks are operating according to management needs, but not yet fully optimal. The main weakness lies in the implementation of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), which have not been fully and consistently implemented. Strengthening the coordination function, developing human resources, and improving work systems are needed to make the organization more effective and adaptable to the dynamics of archery activities.
3. The actuating function (implementation) scored 3.12, categorized as good, with the leadership and effective communication subindicator scoring very good (3.74). This reflects that program implementation and managerial activities are carried out with a collaborative spirit, performance-driven leadership, and open communication. However, there is still room for improvement in the creativity and innovation aspect (2.57), indicating the need to encourage program breakthroughs and develop new initiatives that support the quality of facility management.
4. The controlling function scored 2.70, categorized as good, but recorded the lowest score compared to other managerial aspects. Several indicators, such as periodic reports, performance evaluations, and quality improvement, showed good results, but the progress monitoring indicator scored low (2.43, categorized as poor). This suggests that the monitoring and follow-up system for implementation is not yet fully effective. A more structured performance indicator-based evaluation system and progress documentation are needed to ensure the success of overall management control.

Overall, the average score for the four aspects of archery infrastructure and facilities management at Selabora FIKK UNY is 2.87, which is categorized as good. This means that management has met adequate functional standards in the aspects of planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling. However, to achieve optimal and sustainable managerial effectiveness, improvements are still needed in terms of strengthening SOPs, implementing innovations, and a more integrated monitoring and evaluation system. Comprehensive improvements in these aspects are expected to push the management of archery infrastructure and facilities towards the very good category, while also supporting the achievement of sports education goals holistically.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the analyzed findings and implications, the researcher recommends several strategic steps that can be implemented by the archery sports facility management at Selabora FIKK UNY to improve the overall quality of facility and infrastructure management:

1. Structured and Systematic Development and Socialization of SOPs. The low score on the SOP availability indicator indicates an urgent need to develop standard operating guidelines covering all aspects of facility management, from equipment usage procedures, periodic maintenance, equipment loans, to the field usage monitoring system. The development of these SOPs must be carried out collaboratively between management, coaches, technicians, and users to ensure the resulting procedures are truly contextual and applicable. Once developed, the SOPs must be widely disseminated through training, workshops, and internal campus media to ensure all involved elements understand and consistently implement them.
2. Strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation Function through a Data-Driven Performance Management System To address the weak control identified in this study, the management is advised to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation (monev) system in a structured manner with clear, quantitative, and measurable performance indicators. Monitoring should not only focus on physical aspects such as equipment suitability and facility condition, but also encompass the effectiveness of use, user satisfaction, and the productivity of ongoing training programs. Evaluations should be conducted periodically, involving an independent team or the faculty's internal supervisory unit, to ensure more objective results. Monitoring data should also be used as a basis for decision-making and annual budget planning.
3. Organizational Leadership Development and Strengthening Inter-Unit Communication Although leadership and communication aspects scored high, this success needs to be maintained through a planned leadership development program. This recommendation includes the importance of sports management-based leadership training, improving interpersonal communication capacity between units (facility managers, coaches, technicians, and students), and strengthening a collaborative work culture within the archery ecosystem. Two-way communication between managers and users should also be encouraged, for example through aspiration forums or regular satisfaction surveys, to ensure policy-making is more responsive to needs on the ground.

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

4. Innovation in Information Technology-Based Facilities and Infrastructure Management: The next recommendation is the need to implement digital innovation in sports facilities and infrastructure management systems. In the current era of digital transformation, the use of information technology can be an effective solution to increase management efficiency and transparency. Some alternative innovations that can be considered include: an online field booking system, a mobile application for reporting equipment damage, and the use of a digital dashboard to monitor inventory status and facility usage schedules. These innovations not only support more orderly and efficient management but also increase user satisfaction and convenience.
5. Improving Strategic Collaboration with External Partners to Strengthen Support and Resources Facing the challenge of limited resources, institutions are also recommended to build strategic partnerships with various external parties, such as local archery clubs, the Indonesian National Sports Committee (KONI), sports communities, coaching training institutions, and industry stakeholders interested in sports development. These collaborations can be utilized to improve logistical support, develop more advanced training facilities, and provide training for management personnel. These partnerships can also strengthen Selabora FIKK UNY's position as a leading sports laboratory with a significant role in producing competent archery athletes and coaches at the national and international levels.

REFERENCES

- 1) Abidin, K. Z., & Yuwono, C. (2021). Pembinaan prestasi atlet paracycling national paralympic committee of Indonesia di Surakarta tahun 2020. *Indonesian Journal for Physical Education and Sport*, 2(1), 130-136.
- 2) Adio, Y. O., Oluwatosin, W. L., & Olatunde, F. A. (2021). Assessment of the implementation of economics curriculum and students' learning achievement in public high schools in Osun State, Nigeria. *KIU Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 239-251.
- 3) Aji, S. W., & Supriyono, S. (2021). Survei pembinaan prestasi atlet dayung pada PODSI Kabupaten Pati tahun 2020. *Indonesian Journal for Physical Education and Sport*, 2, 94-99.
- 4) Akamigbo, I. S., & Eneja, R. U. (2020). Evaluation of financial accounting curriculum in senior secondary schools in Nigeria. *Nnadiebube Journal of Education*, 5(3).
- 5) Al-Shanawani, H. M. (2019). Evaluation of self-learning curriculum for kindergarten using Stufflebeam's CIPP model. *SAGE Open*, 9(1), 2158244018822380.
- 6) Ananda, R., & Rafida, T. (2017). *Pengantar evaluasi program pendidikan*. Medan: Perdana Publishing.
- 7) Arikunto, S. (2019). *Prosedur penelitian; suatu pendekatan praktik*. (Edisi revisi) Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- 8) Aslan, M., & Uygun, N. (2019). Evaluation of preschool curriculum by stufflebeam's context, input, process and product (CIPP) evaluation model. *Education & Science/Egitim ve Bilim*, 44(200).
- 9) Aziz, S., Mahmood, M., & Rehman, Z. (2018). Implementation of CIPP model for quality evaluation at school level: A case study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), 189-206.
- 10) Azwar, S. (2018). *Penyusunan skala psikologi*. Edisi II. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- 11) Bari, S., Incorvia, J., Iverson, K. R., Bekele, A., Garringer, K., Ahearn, O., ... & Beyene, A. (2021). Surgical data strengthening in Ethiopia: results of a Kirkpatrick framework evaluation of a data quality intervention. *Global Health Action*, 14(1), 1855808.
- 12) Basaran, M., Dursun, B., Gur Dortok, H. D., & Yilmaz, G. (2021). Evaluation of preschool education program according to CIPP model. *Pedagogical Research*, 6(2).
- 13) Bayle, E., & Clausen, J. (2024). A conceptual model to understand and assess international sport federations' organizational performance. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 1-25.
- 14) Bilan, N., Negahdari, R., Hazrati, H., & Moghaddam, S. F. (2021). Examining the quality of the competency-based evaluation program for dentistry based on the CIPP model: A mixed-method study. *J Dent Res*, 15(3), 204.
- 15) Bompas, T. O., & Haff, G. (2019). *Periodization theory and methodology of training*. USA: Sheridan Books.
- 16) Budi, B., & Lismadiana, L. (2020). Evaluasi program pembinaan atletik di Pengcab PASI Kabupaten Kuningan. *JUARA: Jurnal Olahraga*, 5(2), 209- 221.
- 17) Budiwanto, S. (2017). *Metode statistika untuk mengolah data keolahragaan*. Malang: UM Pres.
- 18) Bukit, A. V., Bastari, A., & Putra, G. E. (2019). Evaluation of learning programs in Indonesian Naval Technology College with the context, input, process, and product (CIPP) model. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 14(20), 38233827.
- 19) Chelladurai, P., & Kerwin, S. (2017). *Human resource management in sport and recreation* (3rd ed.). Human Kinetics.

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

- 20) Collins, D., MacNamara, Á., & Cruickshank, A. (2019). Research and practice in talent identification and development—Some thoughts on the state of play. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 31(3), 340-351.
- 21) Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2019). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. USA: Sage Publications.
- 22) Culver, D. M., Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2019). Coach developers as ‘facilitators of learning’ in a large-scale coach education programme: One actor in a complex system. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 6(3), 296-306.
- 23) Darwin, M., Mamondol, M. R., Sormin, S. A., Nurhayati, H., Sylvia, D. (2020). *Metode penelitian pendekatan kuantitatif*. Bandung: CV. Media Sains Indonesia.
- 24) Dehghansai, N., Spedale, D., Wilson, M. J., & Baker, J. (2020). Comparing developmental trajectories of elite able-bodied and wheelchair basketball players. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 37(3), 338-348.
- 25) Dewi, P. C. P., & Vanagosi, K. D. (2019). Evaluasi program pembinaan prestasi panahan pengkab perpani Karangasem. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kesehatan Rekreasi*, 5(2), 101-111.
- 26) Dodd, J. R., Smithwick, J., Call, S., & Kasana, D. (2023). The current state of benchmarking use and networks in facilities management. *Benchmarking: an international journal*, 30(7), 2377-2407.
- 27) Doncaster, G., Medina, D., Drobnic, F., Gómez-Díaz, A. J., & Unnithan, V. (2020). Appreciating factors beyond the physical in talent identification and development: insights from the FC Barcelona sporting model. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 2, 91.
- 28) Doufexi, T., & Pampouri, A. (2020). Evaluation of employees’ vocational training programmes and professional development: A case study in Greece. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 1477971420979724.
- 29) Ebtesam, E., & Foster, S. (2019). Implementation of CIPP model for quality evaluation at Zawia University. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 8(5).
- 30) Fahrizqi, E. B., Gumantan, A., & Yuliandra, R. (2021). Pengaruh latihan sirkuit terhadap kekuatan tubuh bagian atas unit kegiatan mahasiswa olahraga panahan. *Multilateral: Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani Dan Olahraga*, 20(1), 43-54.
- 31) Febriana, R. (2021). *Evaluasi pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- 32) Fitri, M., Zainal Abidin, N. E., Novan, N. A., Kumalasari, I., Haris, F., Mulyana, B., ... & Yaacob, N. (2022). Accessibility of inclusive sports facilities for training and competition in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 14083.
- 33) Fitriyani, F., & Robiasih, R. H. (2021). An evaluation of Muhadatsah Program at Pondok Modern Daarul Abror using CIPP Model. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, Translation, and Literature*, 1(1), 7-16.
- 34) Gregori-Faus, C., Crespo, J., Calabuig, F., & Parra-Camacho, D. (2025). State-of- the-art of sustainability in sports facilities: a systematic review. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1-22.
- 35) Guidotti, F., Demarie, S., Ciaccioni, S., & Capranica, L. (2023). Knowledge, competencies, and skills for a sustainable sport management growth: a systematic review. *Sustainability*, 15(9), 7061.
- 36) Gullickson, A. M. (2020). The whole elephant: Defining evaluation. *Evaluation and program planning*, 79, 101787.
- 37) Hakim, H., Sahabuddin, S., & Bismar, A. R. (2025). The role of sports facility management in supporting competitive tennis player development. *Indonesian Journal of Sport Management*, 5(2), 290-306.
- 38) Hammerschmidt, J., González-Serrano, M. H., Puumalainen, K., & Calabuig, F. (2024). Sport entrepreneurship: the role of innovation and creativity in sport management. *Review of Managerial Science*, 18(11), 3173-3202.
- 39) Hardani, Auliya, N. H., Andriani, H., Fardani, R. A., Ustiwaty, J., Utami, E. F., Sukmana, D. J., & Istiqomah, R. R. (2020). *Metode penelitian kualitatif & kuantitatif*. Wonosari: CV. Pustaka Ilmu.
- 40) Hartini, H., Rugaiyah, R., & Kahar, A. (2020). Evaluasi program pendidikan pengembangan spesialisasi Polri TA 2018 di sekolah pimpinan tingkat pertama Polri. *Visipena*, 11(2), 416-426.
- 41) Haryanto. (2020). *Evaluasi pembelajaran (konsep dan manajemen)*. Yogyakarta: UNY Press.
- 42) Hasan, I., & Maâ, J. A. R. Z. (2019). Lesson study program evaluation for English teachers in Tidore. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 2(2).
- 43) Hassin, M. A., Zaidi, M. A., & Ali, I. M. (2022). Strategic indicators for strategic intervention in sports facilities management performance in Malaysia. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, 8(04), 691-702.
- 44) Hill, J., Kim, M., Oja, B. D., Kim, H. S., & Lee, H. W. (2024). Innovation is the key: Identifying factors to increase career satisfaction and psychological well-being in millennial and generation Z sport employees. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 14(3), 360-379.
- 45) Hoeber, L. (2012) Determinants of an innovation process: a case study of technological innovation in a community sport organization. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(3).

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

- 46) Hoff, K. J., Leopkey, B., & Ellis, D. (2022). Sport event innovation: a preliminary conceptualization and directions for future research. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 12(5), 618-638.
- 47) Huber, S. G., & Helm, C. (2020). COVID-19 and schooling: evaluation, assessment and accountability in times of crises—reacting quickly to explore key issues for policy, practice and research with the school barometer. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 32(2), 237-270.
- 48) Ishak, M., Awaluddin, A., & Hasanuddin, M. I. (2025). A comprehensive approach to facility management in enhancing physical fitness and sports performance. *Indonesian Journal of Sport Management*, 5(2), 307-322.
- 49) Jinkins, L. (2021). Innovation opportunities in sport management: Agile business, flash teams, and human-centered design. *Sports Innovation Journal*, 2, 19- 32.
- 50) Jopang, J. (2018). Kebijakan pembinaan atlet pusat pendidikan dan latihan pelajar dinas kepemudaan dan olah raga Propinsi Sulawesi Tenggara. *Journal Publicuho*, 1(1), 1-15.
- 51) Kellison, T., & Hong, S. (2023). Innovation diffusion in the sustainable design of sport venues. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 15(4), 2.
- 52) Kelly, A. L., & Williams, C. A. (2020). Physical characteristics and the talent identification and development processes in male youth soccer: a narrative review. *Strength & Conditioning Journal*, 42(6), 15-34.
- 53) Kim, T. W., Lee, J. W., Kang, S. K., Chae, K. Y., Choi, S. H., & Song, Y. G. (2021). A feasibility study of kinematic characteristics on the upper body according to the shooting of elite disabled Archery athletes. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(6), 2962.
- 54) Kipli, M., & Khairani, A. Z. (2020). Content Validity Index: An application of validating CIPP instrument for programme evaluation. *Int Multidiscip Res J*, 2(4), 31-40.
- 55) Kitivo, E. M., & Kavulya, J. M. (2021). Evaluation of training programmes: a review of selected models and approaches. *Practice*, 4(1-4), 1-16.
- 56) Kumar, A., Brar, V., Chaudhari, C., & Raibagkar, S. S. (2023). Performance management through the balanced scorecard approach by the South African Revenue Service. *Public Organization Review*, 23(3), 1143-1165.
- 57) Kuzu, E., Özkan, Y., & Bada, E. (2021). An EFL program evaluation: a case from Turkey. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 21(1).
- 58) Lascu, A., Spratford, W., Pyne, D. B., & Etxebarria, N. (2021). Talent development in women's cricket: Perceptions and practices of elite players and coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 17479541211012943.
- 59) Li, L., Xu, Y., Li, T., & Liu, Y. (2022). Research on performance management evaluation of public sports venues based on GFAHP. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2022(1), 2317397.
- 60) Liqiang, Y., Zang, X., & Dunjie, L. (2024). Transforming youth sports team performance in the Era of digitalization: The Interplay of charismatic leadership, satisfaction, and team engagement drivers. *Heliyon*, 10(15).
- 61) Lismadiana. (2017). *Dasar-dasar manajemen olahraga*. Yogyakarta: UNY Press.
- 62) Liu, Z., An, Z., & Osmani, M. (2023). Integration of building information modeling with sport and facility: Current status and future directions. *Buildings*, 13(7), 1829.
- 63) Livingston, L. A., Cunningham, I., & Forbes, S. L. (2023). Using technological innovation to manage and develop sport officials. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 1-3.
- 64) Lussier, R. N., & Kimball, D. C. (2023). Applied sport management skills. *Human Kinetics*.
- 65) Macmahon, C., & Rix-Lièvre, G. (2019). Modelling and supporting the career development of sports officials. In *15th European Congress of Sport & Exercise Psychology*.
- 66) Manap, R., Othman, N., Roslan, S. N., Ismail, K., & Kamarubahrin, A. F. (2019). Measuring the effectiveness of university programmes based on evaluation models: a meta-analysis. *AL-ABQARI: Journal of Islamic Social Sciences and Humanities*, 20(1), 78-95.
- 67) McCullough, B. P., Orr, M., & Kellison, T. (2020). Sport ecology: Conceptualizing an emerging subdiscipline within sport management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 34(6), 509-520.
- 68) Min, D. (2022). Exploring the structural relationships between service quality, perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty in nonprofit sport clubs: empirical evidence from Germany. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 31(3), 198- 211.
- 69) Mukhtar, A., & Rubiono, G. (2020, December). Analisis gerak anak panah dengan kecepatan awal. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional IPTEK Olahraga (SENALOG) (Vol. 3, No. 1)*.
- 70) Mustafa, P. S. (2021). Model discrepancy sebagai evaluasi program pendidikan. *PALAPA*, 9(1), 182-198.

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

- 71) Najimi, A., Shafiee, F., & Haghani, F. (2019). Evaluation of self-care diabet program in health system based on CIPP evaluation model. *Iranian Journal of Medical Education*, 19, 472-482.
- 72) Nalbant, K. G., & Aydın, S. (2022). Literature review on the relationship between artificial intelligence technologies with digital sports marketing and sports management. *Indonesian Journal of Sport Management*, 2(2), 135-143.
- 73) Nasihi, A., & Hapsari, T. A. R. (2022). Monitoring dan evaluasi kebijakan pendidikan. *Indonesian Journal of Teaching and Learning (INTEL)*, 1(1), 77-88.
- 74) Nasri, N. (2019). Evaluasi program pembinaan cabang olahraga karate dan pencak silat Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Prestasi*, 3(5), 1-12.
- 75) Nurdin, I., & Hartati, S. (2019). *Metodologi penelitian sosial*. Surabaya: Penerbit Media Sahabat Cendekia.
- 76) Okoroipa, N. I., Ihenacho, I. J., Bodang, J. R., & Oluka, B. N. (2020). Evaluation of parents and peers without special needs roles in sustaining inclusive practices in Enugu State, Nigeria. *KIU Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(4), 193-199.
- 77) Ortiz, J., & Miyazaki, M. A. T. (2020). Numerical simulation of wind drift of arrows on the Olympic venue for Tokyo 2020. *Athens Journal of Sports*, 7(1), 1-20.
- 78) Özsaydı, Ş., Uslu, Ö. S., Kaplan, K., & Gorucu, A. (2024). Communication and Its Importance in Sports. *Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise*, 26(3), 451-459.
- 79) Padli, P., Kiram, Y., Arifianto, I., Setiawan, Y., Haryanto, J., & Lesmana, H. S. (2022). The effect of online-based assignment responses and student creativity in PJOK during pandemic in rural and urban area. *Jurnal Keolahragaan*, 10(1), 127-136.
- 80) Pane, I., Hadju, V. A., Maghfuroh, L., Akbar, H., Simamora, R. S., Lestari, Z. W., ... & Aulia, U. (2021). *Desain penelitian mixed method*. Aceh: Yayasan Penerbit Muhammad Zani.
- 81) Parena, A. A., Rahayu, T., & Sugiharto, S. (2017). Manajemen Program Pembinaan Olahraga Panahan pada Pusat Pendidikan dan Latihan Pelajar (PPLP) Provinsi Jawa Tengah. *Journal of Physical Education and Sports*, 6(1), 1-6.
- 82) Pelana, R., & Oktafiranda, N. D. (2017). *Teknik dasar olahraga panahan*. Depok: PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- 83) Pierce, D. (2019). Analysis of sport sales courses in the sport management curriculum. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 24, 17-29.
- 84) Prasetyo, Y. (2018). *Teknik dasar panahan. Trik jitu menembak akurat dan tepat sasaran*. Yogyakarta: Thema Publishing.
- 85) Prasetyo, Y., Nasrulloh, A., & Komarudin, K. (2018). Identifikasi bakat istimewa panahan di Kabupaten Sleman. *Jorpres (Jurnal Olahraga Prestasi)*, 14(2), 195-205.
- 86) Prasetyo, H., & Siswantoyo, M. (2018, December). Holding bow digital test for strength and endurance arm muscles of archery. In 2nd Yogyakarta International Seminar on Health, Physical Education, and Sport Science (YISHPESS 2018) and 1st Conference on Interdisciplinary Approach in Sports (CoIS 2018) (pp. 409-411). Atlantis Press.
- 87) Ramadhan, R., Amir, N., & Nusufi, M. (2020). Pendataan sarana prasarana olahraga prestasi Kabupaten Bener Meriah. *Pendidikan Jasmani, Kesehatan dan Rekreasi*, 6(3).
- 88) Rowe, K., Karg, A., & Sherry, E. (2019). Community-oriented practice: Examining corporate social responsibility and development activities in professional sport. *Sport Management Review*, 22(3), 363-378.
- 89) Ryanto, A. K. Y., Nurwansyah, R. S., & Resita, C. (2020). Manajemen atlet panahan pada Club Altius Singaperbangsa Archery Karawang dari tahun 2016-2019. *JSPEED*, 3(1).
- 90) Sager, F., & Mavrot, C. (2021). Participatory vs expert evaluation styles. In *The Routledge Handbook of Policy Styles* (pp. 395-407). London: Routledge.
- 91) Santoso, A. T., & Rahayu, S. (2023). Optimalisasi manajemen sarana dan prasarana olahraga Kelas Khusus Olahraga di Kabupaten Demak. *SPRINTER: Jurnal Ilmu Olahraga*, 4(3), 307-316.
- 92) Sari, D. R., Tangkudung, J., & Hanif, A. S. (2018). Evaluasi Program Pemusatan Latihan Daerah (Pelatda) Bolavoli Pasir Putri Dki Jakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sport Coaching and Education*, 2(1), 8-16.
- 93) Sarro, K. J., Viana, T. D. C., & De Barros, R. M. L. (2021). Relationship between bow stability and postural control in recurve archery. *European journal of sport science*, 21(4), 515-520.
- 94) Satria, G. Y., Juntara, P. E., & Ramadhani, A. (2021). Evaluasi pembinaan prestasi Judo Kota Bandarlampung. *Musamus Journal of Physical Education and Sport (MJPES)*, 3(02), 168-177.
- 95) Scriven, M. (2019). The checklist imperative. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2019(163), 49-60.
- 96) Setiawan, I., Helmi, B., Sari, I. E. P., & Saputra, R. (2022). analysis of facilities and infrastructure management government sports institutions. *Journal Management of Sport*, 1(1), 1-8.
- 97) Sopha, S., & Nanni, A. (2019). The CIPP model: Applications in language program evaluation. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(4), 1360.

Evaluation of Archery Sports Infrastructure and Facilities Management at the Sports Laboratory School of the Faculty of Sports and Health Sciences (FIKK), Yogyakarta State University (UNY)

- 98) Shynkaruk, O., Shutova, S., Serebriakov, O., Nagorna, V., & Skorohod, O. (2020). Competitive performance of elite athletes in modern ice hockey. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 20, 511-516.
- 99) Smyth, E. A., Newman, P., Waddington, G., Weissensteiner, J. R., & Drew, M. K. (2019). Injury prevention strategies specific to pre-elite athletes competing in Olympic and professional sports—a systematic review. *Journal of science and medicine in sport*, 22(8), 887-901.
- 100) Sofianto, M. H., & Irawan, R. (2020). Penelusuran minat dan bakat olahraga pada siswa sekolah menengah pertama di Kabupaten Pekalongan. *Indonesian Journal for Physical Education and Sport*, 1(2), 345-354.
- 101) Stone, J. A., Rothwell, M., Shuttleworth, R., & Davids, K. (2021). Exploring sports coaches' experiences of using a contemporary pedagogical approach to coaching: An international perspective. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 13(4), 639-657.
- 102) Stufflebeam, D. L., & Zhang, G. (2017). *The CIPP evaluation model: how to evaluate for improvement and accountability*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- 103) Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- 104) Suhartini, S., & Pratama, M. (2024). Analisis manajemen pelatihan olahraga panahan di Klub Kobar Archery Jambi. *Score*, 4(1), 55-69.
- 105) Sunarso, B. (2024). Communicative leadership strategy: Optimizing inter-division interaction to enhance organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management (ADMAN)*, 2(2), 523-529.
- 106) Susanto, N. (2022). *Buku Ajar Manajemen Olahraga*. Jawa Barat: Perkumpulan Rumah Cemerlang Indonesia Anggota Ikapi Jawa Barat.
- 107) Schwarz, E. C., Hall, S. A., & Shibli, S. (2019). *Sport facility operations management: A global perspective*. Routledge.
- 108) Talita, N. A., Warni, H., & Rakhman, A. (2024). Analisis manajemen Club banjar baru Archery school. *Jurnal Porkes*, 7(1).
- 109) Thurab-Nkhosi, D. (2019). The evaluation of a blended faculty development course using the CIPP framework. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 15(1), n1.
- 110) Toriqlarif, M. (2019). Penelitian evaluasi pendidikan. *Addabana: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 2(2), 66-76.
- 111) Tresnowati, I., Panggraita, G. N., Aisyah, A. N., & Balfasa, S. A. (2021). *Evaluasi pembinaan senam artistik di Kabupaten Pemalang*. CV. Pilar Nusantara.
- 112) Tuna, H., & Başdal, M. (2021). Curriculum evaluation of tourism undergraduate programs in Turkey: A CIPP model-based framework. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 29, 100324.
- 113) Vanagosi, K. D., & Dewi, P. C. P. (2019). Evaluasi program pembinaan prestasi cabang olahraga panahan di Bali. *Jurnal Penjakora*, 6(1), 24-34.
- 114) Wani, B. (2020). Evaluasi program pembinaan prestasi bela diri Shoto-Kai Kabupaten Nagekeo. *Jurnal Imedtech (Instructional Media, Design and Technology)*, 4(1), 15-21.
- 115) Widiyanto, J. (2018). *Evaluasi pembelajaran*. Madiun: UNIPMA Press.
- Winaryati, E. (2021). *E-book model-model evaluasi, aplikasi dan kombinasinya*. Jawa Timur: KBM INDONESIA.
- 116) Yazdimoghaddam, H., Samadipour, E., Ghardashi, F., Borzoei, F., Akbarzadeh, R., Zardosht, R., & Khalili, S. (2021). Designing a comprehensive clinical competency test for operating room technology student: Using Delphi technique and CIPP model evaluation. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 10.
- 117) Young Lee, S., Shin, J. S., & Lee, S. H. (2019). How to execute context, input, process, and product evaluation model in medical health education. *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions*, 16.
- 118) Yulitania, R., & Raharjo, A. (2024). Manajemen pembinaan prestasi organisasi PSTI Kabupaten Batang pada Pekan Olahraga Provinsi XVI Jawa Tengah tahun 2023. *Indonesian Journal for Physical Education and Sport*, 5(2), 574-585.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.