

---

## Development of Lecturer Performance Evaluation Tools in the Implementation of *Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka*

Maman Nurjaman<sup>1\*</sup>, Udin Syaefudin Sa'ud<sup>2</sup>, Eka Prihatin<sup>3</sup>, Endang Herawan<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>[mamannurjaman71@upi.edu](mailto:mamannurjaman71@upi.edu), <sup>2</sup>[usaud@upi.edu](mailto:usaud@upi.edu), <sup>3</sup>[ekaprihatin@gmail.com](mailto:ekaprihatin@gmail.com),

<sup>4</sup>[endangherawan@gmail.com](mailto:endangherawan@gmail.com)

\*Corresponding Author

<sup>1, 2, 3, 4</sup>Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

### Abstract

*This research aims to develop a model for assessing lecturer performance that includes tools, evaluation standards, standard-setting, computer programs, assessment standards, and instructions for using evaluation results. This is a development project. Nine experts approved the instrument design before using Aiken's V formula to determine content validity, exploratory factor analysis to determine construction validity, and Cronbach's alpha to determine reliability. The study's findings revealed that: 1) the entire instrument meets the criteria for validity; 2) an instrumental analysis of the teacher's instructional activities revealed reliability of the preparation, implementation, and evaluation components of 0.843; and finally, 3) the effectiveness of teaching, the efficacy of research, the efficacy of dedication to the community, and the qualifications of lecturers were all taken into account when evaluating the efficiency of the lecturer's employment.*

**Keywords:** *performance levels, quality management, Universitas Bhakti Kencana*

### Abstrak

Tujuan dari studi ini adalah untuk memberikan model untuk menilai kinerja dosen yang terdiri dari alat, standar evaluasi, pengaturan standar, program komputer, standar penilaian, dan instruksi untuk menggunakan hasil evaluasi. Ini adalah proyek yang berkaitan dengan pembangunan. Sembilan ahli menyetujui desain instrumen sebelum rumus V Aiken digunakan untuk menentukan validitas konten, analisis faktor eksploratif digunakan untuk menetapkan validitas konstruksi, dan alpha Cronbach digunakan untuk mengukur keandalan. Temuan penelitian ini mengungkapkan bahwa: 1) instrumen lengkap memenuhi kriteria validitas; 2) analisis instrumen dari kegiatan pengajaran Dosen menunjukkan keandalan komponen persiapan, implementasi, dan evaluasi 0.843; dan akhirnya, 3) Efektivitas pengajaran, efisiensi penelitian, efektivitas dedikasi kepada masyarakat, dan kualifikasi dosen semuanya dipertimbangkan saat mengevaluasi efektivitas pekerjaan dosen.

**Kata Kunci:** Pengembangan Perangkat

## INTRODUCTION

Higher education is one of the educational facilities that comprise the public education system. According to Law No. 20 of 2003, universities must organize teaching, research, and social work. Higher education's primary goal is to assist student learning (Forbes et al., 2022; X. F. Lin et al., 2022; Struyven et al., 2010). Employers have always been concerned about the quality of higher education, whether they are hiring graduates or working on research and learning teams (Cardoso et al., 2016; Harvey & Green, 1993; Schindler et al., 2015). Of course, to perform their responsibilities, universities must be supported by other components. Infrastructure, students, professors, and support personnel are the components of this situation. To meet the responsibilities of higher education, these components must, of course, work in tandem.

Lecturers serve a critical role in the administration of high-quality higher education. As stated by Mananuwe, Salamor, and Tuharea, quality educators are an indispensable prerequisite for a quality education system and practice (Mananuwe et al., 2022). This is consistent with the primary goal of higher education, which is to generate quality human resources at the university level. These educational institutions aim to produce human resources through the educational process.

According to Law No. 14/2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, the primary responsibility of lecturers is to change, develop, and disseminate science, technology, and art through teaching, scientific research, and community service. As a result, within these constraints, a lecturer's dedication to becoming a professor must be comprehensive and multifaceted. This is where the importance of lecturers in higher education comes into play.

Because professors play such an essential role in higher education, the quality of their work must be maintained, according to Armstrong (Armstrong, 2000). Furthermore, Jones, Jenkin, and Lord claim that "performance leads to the conclusion that an individual's performance needs to be gauged with both behaviours and outcomes in mind" (Jones et al., 2006). The concept of performance is defined as a set of behaviours demonstrated by an employee. In contrast, lecturer performance is

defined as the result of lecturers carrying out the tasks assigned to them and their responsibilities throughout time based on skills, experience, and sincerity (Yang, 2022).

This idea is consistent with research that has indicated that lecturer expertise, curriculum innovation, and classroom management all have an impact on student learning performance (Kartiwi et al., 2021; Retnowati et al., 2021). Mastery of the material under study, clarity of presentation, communication with students, inventiveness in class, identification of learning objectives, and class participation are all substantially related to student satisfaction (Adler et al., 2021).

Furthermore, understanding the courses offered, teaching skills, lecturers' presence, and attitudes significantly impact student academic success (Abidin, 2021). Furthermore, lecturers are essential in guiding students to better comprehend the subject in various ways that are determined systematically in specific scenarios and conditions to achieve learning objectives (Rince & Sitorus, 2022).

The more pleasant classroom activities lecturers engage in, the greater the student learning achievement (Cranston, 2019). Other experts believe that good lecturers and principals contribute to students' academic achievement (Malik, 2019). Students assigned to high-performing lecturers progress three times quicker than those assigned to low-performing lecturers (Malik, 2019).

According to Article 60 of Law No. 14 of 2005, lecturers must do teaching, research, and public service as part of their obligations. These three elements make up Tridharma. He maintained that research and community service (PPM) should take precedence over teaching in academic culture. As professionals in education, lecturers should be able to use research and community services to identify solutions. As a result, it's critical to evaluate how successfully lecturers perform research and community services. According to the Law on Teachers and Lecturers, lecturers should constantly update and develop their academic background and professional competence following the advancement of science, technology, and art. Tridharma must be maintained, but professors must also enhance their academic and scientific credentials.

Some of the research, as mentioned above, findings, rules, and regulations demonstrate that academic achievement is a crucial aspect of sustaining educational quality. If the performance of the teaching personnel can be maintained, the training process's outputs will stay of high quality. To get up-to-date information on the status of lecturer performance, applying this criterion necessitates constant evaluation of lecturer performance. If the lecturer's performance deteriorates, perhaps it will be noticed soon, and necessary steps will be taken.

This finding is consistent with research findings suggesting that higher education providers ensure thorough and continuous faculty evaluation activities to improve the quality of lecturers and higher education administration (Sujudi et al., 2022). More specifically, teacher performance evaluation is a significant difficulty for higher education administration (Tapia-Leon et al., 2018). Furthermore, faculty performance evaluation aims to provide higher education administrators with a better understanding of evaluation techniques to ensure that the learning process is carried out correctly (Evans, 2013; Nicol et al., 2014).

Performance appraisal is the act of acquiring information about persons by systematic observation (Berk, 1986; Budiastuti et al., 2019; Kane & Freeman, 1997), (Budiastuti et al., 2019). Process, data collection, systematic observation, data integration, and individual judgment are the five primary implicit and explicit parts of this description. Furthermore, all tests are essentially designed to quantify performance from a single point of view (Abu-Rabia & Abu-Rahmoun, 2012; Cronbach, 1980). Performance evaluations are commonly utilized for nonverbal tasks such as teaching, drawing, singing, and comedic practice tests. Because performance tests refer to an attainable or minimum standard that test takers should be able to reach, the attainable standard should be determined ahead of time.

During a performance evaluation, one may be expected to answer many questions in a particular order (Tondeur et al., 2016). These responses provide the information required to assess success in a particular area. As a result, there is more than one dimension to be measured in performance appraisal. The evaluation of lecturer performance is intimately tied to reward and punishment, but its execution is

complex. As previously noted, linking lecturer performance evaluation with the reward and punishment system is complicated (Dani et al., 2019). As a result, a complete mechanism for evaluating lecturer performance is required.

It is vital to evaluate rather than simply assess lecturer performance. It is worth noting that performance evaluation findings are used to develop the overall performance of lecturers' work and describe each Lecturer's performance. This is in agreement with the University of Bhakti Kencana (UBK) 2019-2034 Development Master Plan (RENIP) in strategic areas of education number 097/01/UBK/VII/2019 on research and community service development (Rencana Induk Pengembangan UBK 2019-2034, 2019). According to the UBK RENIP, educational research that examines the activities of educators and education professionals is one of the study subjects to strengthen educational institutions.

The central issue is how lecturer performance assessments can provide accurate and reliable information that can be used to improve instructor performance comprehensively and continuously. This study aims to develop a lecturer performance evaluation model that can generate reliable and accurate data. Based on the outcomes of this study, faculty leadership can analyze lecturer performance and then provide training based on the evaluation results.

## **METHODS**

Design and development studies are the nature of this research. In this study, the Lecturer assessment model consists of the following components: instruments, scoring instructions, standard setting, computer applications for analyzing and displaying evaluation results, directions for performing evaluations, and instructions for using evaluation results. During the first step, accurate and reliable instruments, point instructions, and criteria for meeting requirements are developed. The draft instruments were also assessed for their estimated validity and reliability to generate accurate and reliable instruments.

When performing research and community service works, the academic section of the faculty and the information section of the UBK Institute for Research and

Community Service (LPPM) analyzed the assessment forms filled out by lecturers, faculty academic sections, and teaching staff. Furthermore, each lecturer completes appropriate papers with instruments relevant to their degrees.

This study investigated the lecturer performance evaluation instruments' validity and reliability. Through experimentation, the construction outline of the instrument for evaluating a lecturer's work was determined using exploratory factor analysis. The instrument experiment included 23 randomly selected lecturers and 199 Bhakti Kencana University (UBK) students.

The test results data were then evaluated using exploratory factor analysis. Respondents from the faculty academic section and the LPPM UBK database were also incorporated to synchronize the research datasets and the data filled in by PPM professors. Nine specialists validated the instrument design, and the Aiken V formula was utilized to evaluate its considerable validity. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to assess the data obtained throughout the experiment to confirm the accuracy of the constructs.

## **RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

During the initial stage of developing lecturer performance tools, the following actions were carried out: 1) prepare lecturer performance tools; 2) prepare performance assessment grids; 3) examine tool grids; 4) refine lecturer performance tools; 5) prepare lecturer performance tools; 6) examine lecturer performance items; 7) Improved lecturer performance items The following eight steps were to implement validation tools, give lectures, analyze the correctness of information included in instructor performance tools, test lecturer tools, and prove the accuracy of lecturer instruments. The tools developed analyze how well professors accomplish their duties, such as 1) teaching effectiveness, 2) research productivity, 3) community service dedication, and 4) lecturer qualifications.

A set of tools also evaluated lecturer performance based on construction. Following that, the study team analyzed and refined the instrument. Then, begin by preparing the lecturer's performance instrument. The expert-controlled instrument was

validated using the peer review technique. Nine experts utilized focus group discussions (FGDs) to validate the technique for evaluating lecturer performance. Validators assigned scores as well as a measure of the instrument's accuracy. The scores ranged from one to four, with four being the highest. The Aiken V algorithm was applied to the expert evaluation results to determine content validity scores.

According to the findings of the validity analysis of the instruments employed in the lecturer performance evaluation model conducted using Aiken V, all items met the content validity requirement of 0.73. The FGD results gave information on areas of lecturer performance not addressed by the three parameters indicated above. These variables, along with the qualifications of lecturers, shape their lecturer performance, which includes the quality of their research, their commitment to society, and their effectiveness as lecturers. Performance is evaluated on four different fronts, according to the conclusions of the construction of an instrument to evaluate lecturer performance: teaching efficiency, research effectiveness, community service effectiveness, and lecturer credentials.

The questionnaire contained 22 statements, 20 of which were converted using the Likert scale and two using the Guttman Scale. A semi-closed question is utilized as a performance tool for lecturers regarding research, community service, and teaching competence. Furthermore, research, PPM forms from the LPPM UBK academic division, and data filling were employed to validate lecturers' work.

The KMO score was 0.832 as a result of applying exploratory factor analysis to test the validity of the Lecturer performance instrument design. Since  $KMO > 0.5$ , factor analysis is possible. According to the factor analysis findings, the three components comprising a lecturer's performance in the teaching profession are preparation, implementation, and evaluation. Six points were allocated to the planning phase, eight points to the execution phase, and six points to the evaluation phase. The findings of the exploratory factor analysis corroborate the findings of the theoretical research. Furthermore, the field lecturer performance gadget's Cronbach's Alpha formula reliability evaluation got a score of 0.843.

According to the findings, lecturer performance is evaluated on four fronts: classroom efficacy, research efficiency, community service effectiveness, and lecturer qualifications. These findings are consistent with Law No. 14 of 2005, which specifies that a lecturer's fundamental obligations are community service, research, and education. Based on the content validity study of the instrument models used to evaluate lecturer performance, all instruments met the content validity requirement of 0.73. (Aiken, 1985; Krumrei-Mancuso & Rouse, 2016).

According to research into connected topic areas, planning, implementation, and evaluation are three components of lecturer performance. According to Article 60 of Law No. 14 of 2005, lecturers must process, evaluate, and assess learning outcomes while carrying out their tasks. The factor analysis results are also compatible with the notion that the three primary components of the learning process are instructors' planning, implementation, and evaluation of learning (Shafa, 2014).

The performance of lecturers in the classroom necessitates a high level of academic skill. According to the research of Torlak, Demir, and Budur, lecturers' academic achievement has a considerable effect on lecturers' work performance (Torlak et al., 2022). Personal skills and the instruction process are the most critical aspects in evaluating Lecturer effectiveness compared to administrative skills, responsibility and punctuality, reward, safety, and environmental factors (Upadhyay & Upadhyay, 2016). Evaluating faculty success in research, PPM, and faculty skills is also critical. Institutions should evaluate how effectively faculty members obtain research grants, maintain research profiles, grade students, publish, and be responsible in the classroom (Q. Lin et al., 2021). The study also discovered that lecturer competence influences instructor effectiveness (Yusaini et al., 2021). Teaching expertise, research, and community service are the qualifications of the teaching staff here.

The findings of the restricted trial revealed that there were still flaws in lecturers' performance in terms of learning, namely in terms of assessment. Lecturers' performance in lesson planning is excellent and in the high category. Most parts of learning implementation are satisfactory, while some are inadequate. When assessed,



however, the majority fall into the low category. This is because lecturers can arrange and facilitate learning but cannot make choices. The evaluation of instructor performance should be a high priority. This is congruent with the findings of a study that found a substantial association between student ratings of lecturers and their efficacy (Herawati & Rinofah, 2019). Furthermore, lecturers continue to be under-capitalized in teaching experience, examinations, teaching, guest teaching at other universities, and publishing research articles in indexed national and international journals.

Furthermore, academics continue to perform poorly in PPM and research. Furthermore, some professors who participated in the study still work on duties connected to their PhD studies. This research tool also includes different weighted scales or degrees of activity, such as local, national, and international scales.

## CONCLUSION

The study findings and discussions can lead to several conclusions, including the following: 1) The findings of the theoretical study, the findings of the focus group discussions, and the development of tools to evaluate lecturer performance based on empirical evidence revealed that lecturers were rated as four in terms of performance; 2) The findings of the content validity analysis revealed that all instruments met the content validity standard of 0.73; and 3) The findings of the factor analysis revealed that the preparation, implementation, and evaluation stages of teaching were all rated as four. Based on the findings, several recommendations can be made, including 1) using references such as lecturer performance evaluation tools is preferable. Several recommendations can be made based on the findings, including 1) it is preferable to use references such as lecturer performance evaluation instruments, guidelines for evaluation, and lecturer performance standards when evaluating faculty performance; and 2) the lecturers who served as the research sample cooperated and were proactive.

## REFERENCES

- Abidin, M. (2021). Stakeholders evaluation on educational quality of higher education. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 287–308. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14317a>
- Abu-Rabia, S., & Abu-Rahmoun, N. (2012). The role of phonology and morphology in developing basic reading skills of dyslexic and normal native Arabic readers. *Creative Education*, 3(7), 1259–1268. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2012.37185>
- Adler, R., Roberts, H., Crombie, N., & Dixon, K. (2021). Determinants of accounting students' undergraduate learning satisfaction. *Accounting and Finance*, 61(4), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12756>
- Aiken, L. R. (1985). Three coefficients for analyzing the reliability and validity of ratings, Educational and Psychological Measurement. *Journal Articles; Reports - Research; Numerical/Quantitative Data*, 45(1), 131–142.
- Armstrong, M. (2000). *Performance Management: Key strategies and practical guidelines* (2nd ed.). Kogan Page Business Books.
- Berk, R. A. (1986). *Performance assessment: Methods & applications* (R. A. Berk (ed.)). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Budiastuti, E., Sugiyono, & Jerusalem, M. A. (2019). Quality analysis of final test in the faculty engineering of Yogyakarta State University. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1273(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1273/1/012047>
- Cardoso, S., Rosa, M. J., & Stensaker, B. (2016). Why is quality in higher education not achieved? The view of academics. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6), 950–965. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1052775>
- Cranston, J. (2019). Improving the outcomes of the “Prediction Problem”: A framework approach to teacher hiring. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 7(7), 455–462. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-7-7-4>
- Cronbach, L. J. (1980). *Essentials of psychological testing* (4th (ed.)). Harper & Row.
- Dani, A. A., Hikmawati, A., & Fathan, F. (2019). Implementasi Digital Assurance dalam Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan di Sastra Inggris IAIN Surakarta. *Jurnal Penjaminan Mutu*, 5(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.25078/jpm.v5i1.721>
- Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in Higher Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 70–120. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350>
- Forbes, M., Alderman, L., & Murphy, A. (2022). Course enhancement conversations:

- A holistic and collaborative evaluation approach to quality improvement in higher education. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 22(4), 221–236.
- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining Quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1), 9–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102>
- Herawati, J., & Rinofah, R. (2019). Faktor-Faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja dosen untuk mencapai “career ready professional.” *Akmenika: Jurnal Akuntansi dan Manajemen*, 13(2), 148–155. <https://doi.org/10.31316/akmenika.v16i2.395>
- Jones, J., Jenkin, M., & Lord, S. (2006). *Developing effective teacher performance*. Paul Chapman Publishing. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446213155>
- Kane, J. S., & Freeman, K. A. (1997). A theory of equitable performance standards. *Journal of Management*, 23(1), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300103>
- Kartiwi, A. P., Nupan, A., & Romlan. (2021). A Learning Quality in Master Program of Educational Administration. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Sciences and Teacher Profession (ICETeP 2020)*, 532(532), 73–77. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210227.012>
- Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., & Rouse, S. V. (2016). The development and validation of the comprehensive intellectual humility scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(2), 209–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1068174>
- Lin, Q., Zhu, Y., Lu, H., Shi, K., & Niu, Z. (2021). Improving University Faculty Evaluations via multi-view Knowledge Graph. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 117, 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2020.11.021>
- Lin, X. F., Hwang, G. J., Wang, J., Zhou, Y., Li, W., Liu, J., & Liang, Z. M. (2022). Effects of a contextualized contextualized reflective mechanism-based augmented reality learning model on students' scientific inquiry learning performances, behavioural patterns, and higher order thinking. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2057546>
- Malik, R. S. (2019). Pathway to rigorous teacher training and effective teaching for better student outcomes. *Journal of Sustainable Development Education and Research*, 3(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jsder.v3i1.17170>
- Mananuwe, B. I., Salamor, L., & Tuharea, J. (2022). Evaluasi kepala sekolah tentang kinerja Guru PKn yang sudah sertifikasi dan yang belum sertifikasi di sekolah SMA Negeri 19 Seram Bagian Barat Kecamatan Taniwei Timur. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 6(2), 10749–10755.

- <https://www.jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/view/4131%0Ahttps://www.jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/view/4131/3465>
- Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 102–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518>
- Retnowati, T. H., Mardapi, D., Kartowagiran, B., & Hamdi, S. (2021). A Model of Lecturer Performance Evaluation: Sustainable Lecturer Performance Mapping. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 83–102. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.1426a>
- Rince, & Sitorus, S. A. (2022). Upaya meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa melalui penerapan metode jigsaw pada pelajaran PKn Siswa Kelas Kelas VIII SMP Swasta Cerdas Mandiri. *Edusaintek: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sains, dan Teknologi*, 9(1), 264–277.
- Schindler, L., Puls-Elvidge, S., Welzant, H., & Crawford, L. (2015). Definitions of Quality in Higher Education: A Synthesis of the Literature. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 5(3), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v5i3.244>
- Shafa. (2014). Karakteristik proses pembelajaran Kurikulum 2013. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 14(32), 99–102. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9410\(1991\)117](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9410(1991)117).
- Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2010). Students' perceptions about evaluation and assessment in higher education: A review. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 325–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500099102>
- Sujudi, N., Gaffar, M. F., Komariah, A., & ... (2022). Strategy of fulfilling the needs of quality college lecturer. *Journal of Positive ...*, 6(8), 483–494. <https://www.journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/9755%0Ahttps://www.journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/download/9755/6368>
- Tapia-Leon, M., Rivera, A. C., Chicaiza, J., & Luján-Mora, S. (2018). Application of ontologies in higher education: A systematic mapping study. *2018 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)*, 1344–1353. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON.2018.8363385>
- Tondeur, J., van Braak, J., Siddiq, F., & Scherer, R. (2016). Time for a new approach to prepare future teachers for educational technology use: Its meaning and measurement. *Computers & Education*, 94, 134-150. *Computers & Education*, 94, 134–150. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131515300816>
- Torlak, N. G., Demir, A., & Budur, T. (2022). Decision-making, leadership and

---

performance links in private education institutes. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 16(1), 63–85. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RAMJ-10-2020-0061>

Rencana Induk Pengembangan UBK 2019-2034, (2019).

Upadhyay, S., & Upadhyay, N. (2016). A multi-criteria decision framework to measure spiritual intelligence of university teachers. *Procedia Computer Science*, 91(Itqm), 591–598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.07.150>

Yang, Z. (2022). An investigation about the challenges of adopting performance management in educational leadership in England. *Journal of Education and Development*, 6(3), 67–71.

Yusaini, Y., Darmawati, D., Mahyiddin, M., & Zainuddin, Z. (2021). Implementation of PTKIN Quality Assurance: Performance improvement efforts through motivation and job satisfaction in Aceh. *Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 10(01), 473–500. <https://doi.org/10.30868/ei.v10i01.1426>