Study Program Accreditation: Importance and Performance

Amrun Rosyid[1,*] and Ikhsan Budi Riharjo[1]

Management Doctoral Program, STIESIA, Menur Pumpungan No.30, Menur Pumpungan, Sukolilo, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia, 60118

*Corresponding author, Email address: amrunsby@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this is to analysis importance and performance level of study programs in the accreditation process. This is a qualitative study and analysis start from calculate the gap between the level of importance and the performance of seven standards for the assessment of accreditation of study programs. The analysis was continued by using cause effect diagram to find out the causes of several problems in the study program accreditation process. The results of the study show that standards 1, 2 and 5 have the highest level of importance. While based on the guidelines from BAN PT, standards 7, 3, 4, and 6 are the standards with the highest weighting ratings. Gap from the biggest to the smallest gap is for standards 7, 3, 6, 4, 6, 2 and 1. Using Cause Effect Diagram can find out some of the causes of problems in the accreditation process and also provide some recommendations.

Keyword: *Importance, Performance, Accreditation, Study Program*

1. Introduction

Many study programs and universities in East Java have not been accredited. As of June 2019, there were 322 universities in East Java. An A accredited tertiary institution is 7, an accredited B university is 99, an C accredited university is 127, and an un accredited college is 89 (Ginanjar, 2019). The number of study programs that have not been accredited is 204 (Sugiyarto, 2018). This condition shows that the quality of education at the tertiary level in East Java is not in accordance with what is expected and does not meet established standards.

Higher Education in Indonesia today is confronted with the fact that measures of success and quality of education are determined and monitored by many parties. The government through the Higher Education Accreditation and Higher Education Database (PD-DIKTI) system continues to monitor the progress of Higher Education and provides quality level status that can guarantee the quality of education services for the community. Other institutions such as professional associations and alumni associations also have different qualifications related to the success of higher education. Do not miss the graduate users and parents have hopes and views that may vary. The success of a tertiary institution is seen from many aspects, including the success of achieving predicate accreditation, the success of producing graduates who are easily absorbed by the market, the success of developing human resources, both educators and education personnel become more outstanding and increase in ability and income, success in publishing many works scientific reputation and success in moving the organization to support the creation of an independent society that is more advanced in thought through community service, as well as other achievements that can increase public confidence in the quality offered by these tertiary institutions (Dewi, 2018).

In order to realize public accountability, universities must actively build an internal quality assurance system. To prove that the internal quality assurance system has been implemented properly and correctly, universities must be accredited by an external quality assurance agency. With a good and right quality assurance system, universities will be able to improve quality, establish autonomy, and develop themselves as academic institutions and the moral strength of the community in a sustainable manner (Sugiyono, Sutopo and Nuryanto, 2012).

The tertiary institution deals with students as the main consumers who receive and enjoy the entire educational process. Unfortunately opinions, assessments and student satisfaction are not easily seen or measured. Many things make education service providers doubt the results of the satisfaction survey. Starting from the maturity level of students who are considered not ready enough to provide an assessment of the learning process and overall quality, as well as limited free time for students and they are reluctant to take customer satisfaction questionnaires seriously. So the quality or success of quality assurance in higher education must look at other aspects. In ISO 9001: 2015 it is stated that there are many requirements to be met if a university intends to obtain ISO 2009: 2015 certification or certification. The Government through the Higher Education National Accreditation Board (BAN-PT) also regulates the prerequisite components of the quality recognition of higher education, not to mention the existence of 24 minimum standards in the Internal Quality Assurance System that are required by the government to be fulfilled by all universities in Indonesia. The number of components or factors that must be fulfilled makes the energy implementing quality assurance is divided and it is difficult to focus on determining priorities in their work. With this background in reality, the writer wants to know what factors actually support the successful implementation of quality assurance in tertiary institutions so that the quality assurance bureau can exert its energy by focusing on several factors to achieve successful implementation of the quality assurance system in its tertiary institutions (Dewi, 2018).

This study aims to determine the level of interest and performance of study programs in meeting the seven study program accreditation standards. In addition this research also aims to find out the problems faced by the study program and provide appropriate recommendations to overcome the existing problems.

2. Materials and Methods

The type of research chosen was qualitative and the approach used was a case study. This study discusses cases related to the accreditation of study programs at tertiary institutions in East Java. There are two universities chosen, namely Yos Soedarso University and Sunan Giri University. The selected research informants were six people, three from Yos Soedarso University and three from Sunan Giri University. Data collection was carried out using interviews and participatory observation. The data analysis technique used is qualitative data analysis using the concept of Miles and Huberman, namely data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion making (Miles, Huhermen and Saldana, 2014).

3. Result and Discussion

In Government Regulation No. 19/2005 concerning National Education Standards stipulates that accreditation by the Government is carried out by the National Accreditation Board for Higher Education (BAN-PT) on programs and / or units of tertiary education (Article 87 Paragraph 1b). In Book II - Standards and Accreditation Procedures for Undergraduate Study Programs it is explained that accreditation standards for undergraduate study programs include standards on undergraduate study program commitment to institutional capacity and commitment to the effectiveness of educational programs, which are packaged in seven accreditation standards, that is:
Standard 1 - Vision, Mission, Objectives and Targets, and Achievement Strategies.
Standard 2 - Governance, Leadership, Management System and Quality Assurance.
Standard 3 - Students and Graduates.
Standard 4 - Human Resources.
Standard 5 - Curriculum, Learning and Academic Atmosphere.
Standard 6 - Financing, Facilities and Infrastructure, and Information Systems.
Standard 7 - Research and Services / Community Service, and Cooperation.
Performance assessment of undergraduate study programs is based on meeting the demands of accreditation standards. Accreditation documents for undergraduate study programs that can be processed must meet the initial requirements (eligibility) that are marked by valid and valid permits in the administration of undergraduate study programs from authorized officials; have a statute and by-laws / statutes and strategic plan documents or master plan for development that clearly shows the vision, mission, goals and objectives of undergraduate study programs; basic values adopted and various aspects regarding the organization and management of undergraduate study programs, the decision making process of implementing the program, and the quality assurance system.(Wibowo, 2010).
The results showed that based on the level of difficulty of achieving standards and the importance of these standards used in the accreditation assessment it can be concluded that if the standard is difficult to achieve by the study program, the study program considers the standard is not important to be used as a performance indicator. Instead standards that are easily achieved will be important to assess. If you look at the ranking position on each standard it can be seen that standards 3 and 4 have the same difficulty and importance ranking position. Standards 1 and 3, have a low / easy difficulty ranking, which is 7th out of 7 accreditation standards. The 6th and 7th Standard has a high difficulty ranking. Standards 2, 4 and 5 have moderate difficulty levels. Based on the level of importance for performance evaluation, standards 1, 2 and 5 have a higher level of importance than standards 3, 6 and 7. Respondents' perceptions of the order of difficulties in achieving accreditation standards are highly dependent on the experience of their individual positions. Common problems that often occur in standard 1 when the accreditation process is: the formulation of vision, mission, goals, and objectives is unclear, less specific, less realistic, does not show the superiority of the Study Program, is not measurable; The translation of vision into missions, goals, and targets is still weak, lacking showing priority, no time frame / phasing; Socialization of vision, mission, goals, and targets is lacking, if any, there is no description of evidence of understanding by internal stakeholders; The preparation of the vision and mission does not involve external stakeholders; and Strategic plans, operational plans, or similar documents are not available, or if there are contents that do not explain their relationship with vision, mission, goals, and targets. Common problems that often occur in standard 1 when the accreditation process is: the formulation of vision, mission, goals, and objectives is unclear, less specific, less realistic, does not show the superiority of the Study Program, is not measurable; The translation of vision into missions, goals, and targets is still weak, lacking showing priority, no time frame / phasing; Socialization of vision, mission, goals, and targets is lacking, if any, there is no description of evidence of understanding by internal stakeholders; The preparation of the vision and mission does not involve external stakeholders; and Strategic plans, operational plans, or similar documents are not available, or if there are contents that do not explain their relationship with vision, mission, goals, and targets.

Common problems that often occur in standard 2 when the accreditation process are: A description of civil service arrangements to realize the vision by carrying out the mission and goals are not specific / unclear; Tata pamong level PT managers have not been oriented towards general management and the level of the Study Program is not yet operational management; Weak leadership, especially public leadership; Civil Service Management is not supported by SOPs and complete management system guidelines so that the quality of the process is difficult to assess; New quality assurance is carried out informally; not yet sustainable; or still in the academic field only; Documentation of the implementation of quality assurance is incomplete or even non-existent; Monitoring and evaluation related to the implementation of quality assurance is not continuous, and documentary evidence does not exist; and Follow up on evaluation or feedback does not exist.

Common problems that often occur in standard 3 when the accreditation process is: Very few study program enthusiasts, or even do not have students; Study programs have not produced graduates, or only 1 batch, graduates <10; Do not have written guidelines for new student admissions; Does not have a database of students and alumni so that the learning performance and uptake of graduates in the community is unknown; Student achievement data is missing; or data exists but is out of sync with data from the faculty; some of the data are considered dishonest; Sarpras and service facilities for students are lacking; High DO rate or withdrawal; The role of alumni is absent; and have never done a tracking study.

Common problems that often occur in standard 4 when the accreditation process is: There are no written guidelines on HR management, ranging from recruitment, qualifications, coaching, and HR retention, or unclear descriptions; The number, qualifications and suitability of lecturers is low; there are still lecturers with S1 qualifications and do not yet have academic positions; Average lecturer SKS load (FTE) is low_there is likely due to an error in how to calculate FTE; The planning, monitoring, evaluation, and track record of lecturers' performance is not clear; not working; no documentary evidence; Lecturer participation in academic activities such as publications, seminars, low training; participation in professional organizations is still very low; Lecturer achievement in awarding grants, funding programs and academic activities at national and international levels is very low; Educational staff is still lacking, both in numbers and qualifications; Development of lecturers and education staff is lacking (further study, training).

Common problems that often occur in standard 5 when the accreditation process is: The curriculum has not described the profile and competence of graduates clearly / completely; Curriculum orientation is not in accordance with the vision and mission of study programs; Subjects are not in accordance with the standard / formulation of competence; Distribution of study load / courses between semesters is not balanced; Practicum weight is still very lacking (specifically diploma study program); Never / no evidence of having undertaken a curriculum review; Curriculum compilation / review does not involve external stakeholders; The presence of lecturers in learning is low (<70%); There was no policy regarding the development of the academic atmosphere; The academic atmosphere is difficult to develop because it is hampered by the availability of sarpras; and Discussion among the civitas academica is still lacking.

Common problems that often occur in standard 6 when the accreditation process is: Provision of facilities and infrastructure is still lacking, or, if there is not yet fully own property (still rent); Insufficient lecturer space; Funding sources still rely only on students; Low acquisition of research funds and PPM; Low / insufficient operational funds; Literature is lacking, both in terms of quantity and type (textbooks, scientific journals, thesis / thesis / dissertation, proceedings); and Information systems are still very weak / minimal.

Common problems that often occur in standard 7 when the accreditation process are: The number of research & PPM by lecturers is still lacking; Student involvement in lecturer research is low; Lecturer-rich scientific publications are low / no data; Does not have a system of data collection, monitoring, and research reporting and PPM lecturers, also about the involvement of lecturers in scientific forums; and Do not have cooperation with any external parties.

Some things that can be done to overcome the existing problems are: Develop and implement consistently the Internal Quality Assurance System; Improving the data management system; Involve relevant units in filling out accreditation forms; Hold a discussion to gain a shared understanding of criterion 4 (very good) before filling out the forms; conduct a simulation evaluation before the forms are sent to BAN-PT using the Assessment Matrix (Book VI); and Make final improvements according to the simulation results

Basically, every study program can conduct a self-assessment before submitting all accreditation documents to BAN-PT. The study program can calculate the adequacy of the accreditation score, and make a more thorough preparation so that the accreditation forms document submitted truly reflects the condition and / performance of the study program as a whole, and is supported with a complete portfolio collection. In this connection, the following study fully refers to the provisions stipulated in the accreditation tool above (Wibowo, 2010).

In Book I, it is stated that in carrying out the whole process of the accreditation of study programs, there are several key aspects that need to be considered by each related party, namely assessors, accredited undergraduate study programs, and BAN-PT itself. These aspects are (BAN PT, 2008):

1. accreditation standards for undergraduate study programs used as benchmarks in evaluating and assessing the quality of performance, circumstances and educational equipment of undergraduate study programs;

2. accreditation procedures for undergraduate study programs which are stages and steps that must be taken in the framework of accreditation of undergraduate study programs;
3. undergraduate study program accreditation instruments used to present data and information as material in evaluating and assessing the quality of undergraduate study programs, prepared based on established accreditation standards; and
4. code of ethics of undergraduate study program accreditation which is a "rule of the game" to ensure the smooth and objective process and results of undergraduate study program accreditation.

4. Conclussion

The purpose of this is to analysis importance and performance level of study programs in the accreditation process. This is a qualitative study and analysis start from calculate the gap between the level of importance and the performance of seven standards for the assessment of accreditation of study programs. The analysis was continued by using cause effect diagram to find out the causes of several problems in the study program accreditation process. The results of the study show that standards 1, 2 and 5 have the highest level of importance. While based on the guidelines from BAN PT, standards 7, 3, 4, and 6 are the standards with the highest weighting ratings. Gap from the biggest to the smallest gap is for standards 7, 3, 6, 4, 6, 2 and 1. Using Cause Effect Diagram can find out some of the causes of problems in the accreditation process and also provide some recommendations.

References

Dewi, Y. K. (2018) 'Successful Supporting Factors For The Application Of Quality Guarantee Systems In College', *Business Management Journal,* 14(1), pp. 37–48.

Ginanjar, D. (2019) *89 PTS Jatim Belum Terakreditasi, 50 Persen Berdiri Lebih dari 2 Tahun*. Available at: https://www.jawapos.com/surabaya/29/07/2019/89-pts-jatim-belum-terakreditasi-50-persen-berdiri-lebih-dari-2-tahun/ (Accessed: 8 August 2019).

Miles, M. B., Huhermen, A. M. and Saldana, J. (2014) *Qualitative Data Analysis, A Methods Souce Book*. 3rd edn. New York: Sage.

Sugiyarto (2018) *142 Perguruan Tinggi dan 204 Prodi di Jatim Belum Terakreditasi - Halaman 2 - Tribunnews.com*. Available at: https://www.tribunnews.com/regional/2018/12/25/142-perguruan-tinggi-dan-204-prodi-di-jatim-belum-terakreditasi?page=2 (Accessed: 8 August 2019).

Sugiyono, Sutopo and Nuryanto, A. (2012) *Laporan Penelitian Studi Evaluasi Performance Program Studi Pgsd Pasca* Akreditasi. Jakarta: BAN PT.

Wibowo, U. B. (2010) *Strategi Percepatan Akreditasi Program Studi Sarjana*. Surabaya: PGRI Adibuana Press University.