

The Effectiveness of Internal Quality Management Evaluation Model at The Universitas Sumatera Utara

1st Dedi Amrizal

Programe of Education of Management
Universitas Negeri Medan
Public Administration
University of Muhammadiyah
Sumatera Utara
Medan, Indonesia
dediamrizal@umsu.ac.id

2nd Paningkat Siburan

Education of Management Post
Graduate Program
Universitas Negeri Medan
Medan, Indonesia
siburanpaningkat@gmail.com

3rd Abdul Muin Sibuea

Education of Management Post
Graduate Program
Universitas Negeri Medan
Medan, Indonesia
sibuea.muin@gmail.com

Abstract—Building quality awareness at the faculty/study program begins with building a correct evaluation. The low of awareness, commitment, and quality knowledge of the leaders and lectures at the faculty/study programs were due to the lack of evaluation. This study aims to (1) find out the implementation of internal quality management in the faculty/study program; (2) design a better internal quality management evaluation model; (3) apply an internal quality management evaluation model that has been designed; (4) test the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance system evaluation model at the Universitas Sumatera Utara. This study uses research and development methods to determine the effectiveness of the evaluation, to create an evaluation model, and find an effective model related to internal quality management evaluation. The results showed that the evaluation of quality management had not been effective. It is due to the quality evaluation model that has not provided a maximum contribution. Developing aspects of commitment, training and socialization are necessary. The application of this new model provides a fundamental change in the quality follow-up efforts carried out in each evaluation.

Keywords-evaluation, quality evaluation, quality management evaluation, internal quality management and quality cycle

I. INTRODUCTION

The quality assurance process carried out in a quality cycle begins with careful planning and is ready to be run through a complete quality document and resources that have been trained to run it. The implementation of quality assurance often creates friction and irregularities from the planning that has been carried out to the stage of improvement. For this reason, an evaluation effort is needed which is usually scheduled routinely and structurally in a working mechanism which is built using the right research methods. This evaluation activity was carried out within the scope of limited space and objects which were examined or measured. Then a control effort was made regarding the findings obtained from the evaluation results through concrete actions in a place that had problems and deficiencies as indicated by the evaluation report. The results of internal quality management evaluation would be the findings and information needed in preparing the program and making policies for the next stages or quality cycles.

In the implementation cycle of quality management, there are three terms of supervision (monitoring, evaluation and audit). Quality assurance is a process of determining and fulfilling quality management standards for higher education consistently and continuously. In the end, the quality assurance process will make stakeholders (students, lecturers, educators, parents, the world of work, the government, and other interested parties) obtain their satisfaction and desires. However, before arriving at the final process, monitoring, evaluation or audit actions must be carried out so that the hard work that has been done and its weaknesses can be measured and detected.

Internal quality management evaluation was carried out as a form of supervision management that took place at the faculty level (Quality Assurance/GJM) and study program (Quality Control/QCC) University of North Sumatera (USU). The implementation of internal quality management evaluations reported so far to the university (Quality Management Unit/UMM) is carried out by the mechanism applied. However, the quality still has to be questioned because of the level of understanding, commitment, and quality knowledge of the leaders and lecturers in the faculties and study programs are very varied. This makes the quality of implementation, and the results of internal quality management evaluations carried out by faculties and study programs also diverse.

The implementation of internal quality evaluation is still a need to fulfil accreditation forms and the report still looks low quality. This is because the quality assurance evaluation that should contain corrective actions towards the implementation of the SOP at the Faculty and Study Program level is still not running as it should. Quality management evaluation carried out is less successful in detecting basic weaknesses regarding learning and administrative learning which has been outlined in the Quality Standards and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). In one quality cycle carried out by the Faculties and Study Programs, quality management evaluations carried out should be able to describe the current conditions of the implementation of quality planning, then corrective and anticipatory actions can be carried out maximally at each quality cycle.

The internal quality management evaluation model has not yet provided a maximum contribution, and then a more effective model needs to be developed. Understanding of right quality related to quality management evaluation must also be improved. Because in the old quality evaluation model, the evaluation function is a superior function and is limited to the reporting of monitoring actions that are routinely carried out so far.

In applying the new quality management evaluation model, the position of internal quality management evaluation is very important in measuring the implementation of SOP at the faculty and study program level. Also, the quality evaluation carried out is independent by utilizing GJM and GKM in a cross-way among study programs in each faculty. The results of quality management evaluations obtained must be followed up in the form of corrections to existing SOPs and the formation of new SOPs from evaluations conducted.

For this reason, evaluation of quality management requires a thorough analysis of the findings obtained. This analysis is the result of data obtained from the research methods applied in the implementation of the evaluation. At present, USU needs to conduct intensive training and guidance on leaders and implementers of GJM and QCC quality at the faculty and study program level. The model that has been implemented can be a guide even though its implementation does not look effective because it is not yet supported by documents that are well integrated and interrelated with each other such as Vision, Mission, Objectives, Objectives integrated with SOPs, Strategic Plan and Annual Work Program.

II. METHOD

This research used the research and development methods. The focus of data collection was to obtain information on the implementation of internal quality management evaluations in faculties/study programs, to make a better internal quality management evaluation model, to implement a quality management evaluation model that has been formed, and to test the effectiveness of the model.

Data were obtained through participant observation, in-depth interviews, and FGDs on the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance system evaluation model. The validity of observation, interview, and document study was conducted through a test of credibility, triangulation, confirmability, dependability, and transferability.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the research that had been conducted so far were preliminary studies to test whether quality assurance evaluations had been carried out or not at the faculty and study program level. From the results of interviews and observations conducted, the monitoring and evaluation had not been carried out at the faculty and study program level, which means that the evaluation has not yet proceeded.

The implementation of internal quality management evaluations that should have run in faculties and study programs turned out to be less well-implemented and even not implemented at all in several faculties. The old model made by UMM did not work at all. It requires a new quality management evaluation model.

Making the model was seen from the application of quality management that had been implemented so far. This old, less effective model must be repaired and evaluated to provide benefits to UMM USU, the Faculty, and study programs. The benefit for USU's UMM is to expedite their annual audit to faculties and study programs in order to improve USU's quality standards. The benefits for faculty and study programs were to improve their performance and complete their documents. Besides, evaluation was also useful for improving their SOPs. The SOP is a measure indicator at the faculty and study program level.

After the old quality assurance evaluation model was updated, the formation of a new model was carried out in the next section of the explanation. This new model was tested in the field using quantitative methods. So, research with data collection had been carried out. Processing the data would produce:

- a. Effective model
- b. Effective model application

After the instrument was prepared, the next step was to prepare a research and development method with the Borg and Gall approach. In retrieving the data, this method used a Mixed Method including Qualitative and Quantitative. Qualitative data sources were: (1) FGD at UMM: (UMM Employees, Chair of UMM, Secretary, UMM Auditor); (2) FGD in the Faculty: (Deputy Dean 1, Lecturer, GJM, GKM). Whereas to obtain Quantitative data, the methods fulfilled were as follows: (1) the population was among lecturers, employees and students; (2) the sample taken was among lecturers, employees, users, alumni and students; (3) the minimum sample setting was using Slovin techniques.

The object of research was the subject matter to be investigated to obtain data in a directed manner. The object of research in this paper was reflected in the research concepts built into the model presented as follows: (1) planning / procurement of documents; (2) research methods; (3) goals; (4) accountability; (5) leadership decisions/ decision making; (6) academic performance, organizing, commitment of the academic community, and quality culture; (7) communication; (8) work effectiveness; (9) work procedures; (10) work assessment; (11) work coaching; (12) policies and (13) work efficiency.

The quality assurance supervision model can be divided into two, namely (1) the EMI model, is the application of quality assurance supervision that runs within the scope of monitoring and evaluation; (2) the AMI model, is the application of quality assurance supervision at the end of a quality cycle. This model is derived from a clear understanding of the application of the SPMI stages.

However, the implementation of the stages of supervision of SPMI at the faculty and study program level depends on their readiness and abilities. The condition of readiness and ability is reflected in its imperfect implementation. Many factors cause this condition to occur, ranging from a lack of quality socialization, a variety of understandings, to funding and others.

Based on the previous SPMI stages, it couldbe stated that the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation did not take place as ideal as stated by Higher Education. Monitoring and evaluation were carried out by faculties by not involving GJM and GKM elements. This means that the Faculty carried out monitoring and evaluation without the assistance of GJM and GKM or the Study Program. This created a dilemma that the faculty checkeditself so that this situation was not objective.

For this reason, the improvements to the implementation of the SPMI supervision phase were needed. The active role of GJM at the faculty level must be maximized. Because ideally through GJM, the guidance of the GKM as a quality controller at the study program level would be carried out. GKM would help Study Programs to optimize quality assurance at the lowest level. Monitoring and evaluation were designed and implemented by GKM together with GJM for the Faculty and Study Program.

Arikunto reveals that evaluation is an activity of collecting data to measure goals that have been achieved [1].Evaluation as a systematic process of determining the extent to which instructional objectives are achieved by pupils spontaneously and incidentally, but is an activity to assess things in a planned, systematic manner and directed by purpose [2]. Evaluation is the process of understanding, giving meaning, gaining and communicating information and guidance for decision-making parties [3]. Evaluation is a process of understanding, giving meaning, getting a decision, and communicating information fordecision making [4].

If an evaluation was carried out based on a systematic, directed and objective plan, the results obtained had to be submitted and communicated to the leader to revise the document and correct inappropriate policies immediately. The evaluation process carried out on faculties was not yet fully based on the prepared SOP, and the evaluation results obtained had not been used to correct inappropriate documents and policies.

The implementation of the evaluation requires research methods and academic research results that can be accounted. Evaluation as research to collect, analyze, and present useful information about the object of evaluation, evaluate it and compare it with evaluation indicators and then the results are used to make decisions about the object of evaluation [5].

The methods and techniques of analysis in evaluations carried out so far were very simple and had been improved

using academic methods and analysis. It proved that the faculties at USU could account for the results and used them to improve existing documents and policies so that the objectives of evaluation in education management couldbe achieved. The purpose of evaluation consists of (1) measuring the influence of the program on the community; (2) assessing whether the program has been implemented according to plan; (3) measuring whether the program implementation is in accordance with standards; (4) program evaluation can identify and determine which program dimensions work, which ones do not work; (5) program staff development; (6) fulfilling the provisions of the law; (7) program accreditation; (8) measuring cost effectiveness and cost efficiency; (9) making decisions about the program; (10) accountability; (11) providing feedback to leaders and programs; (12) developing evaluation and research theories [5].

Implementation of internal quality evaluation

The monitoring, evaluation and auditing is the application of the supervisory function in quality management [6]. Theoretically, The evaluation function as follows: (1) to find out whether the objectives set have been achieved in the activity; (2) to provide observational objectivity to the behaviour of results; (3) to provide feedback on the activities carried out [4]. The implementation of internal quality evaluations in the faculties at USU had not been able to show the achievement of previously set goals, had not been able to carry out repairs or improvements related to reports of results obtained, and had not been able to provide actionable feedback to form improvement or subsequent policy-making.

Implementation of the New Internal Quality Evaluation Model Test

The new internal quality evaluation was formed through variables obtained from valid, meaningful, comprehensive, continuity, fair, objective, cooperative, practical, open, and accurate principles [7]. All of these principles must make the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) be implemented at the administrative and academic level. By using agreed research methods and assisted by the application of quality evaluation principles, accurate data couldbe obtained. This accurate data wouldbe accounted for in the form of reports on the results of research and follow-up carried out through faculty and study program meetings. Through this meeting, the existence of documents and leadership policies was further improved. Then socialization and communication to stakeholders regarding the findings and choice of actions taken by the leadership elements were carried out. In this study, testing the model with results that couldbe accounted forwas done to ensure that the evaluation in the future is going well.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Initially, the quality management evaluation was made to meet the requirements for faculty and study program accreditation. The making of management evaluation is also adjusted to the value needs that will be obtained from

accreditation and not based on the evaluation needs of the SOP that has been made. The internal quality management evaluation that was carried out was detected not being able to measure the achievement of the objectives set out in the faculty and study program SOPs. So finally, the implementation of quality management evaluations cannot correct or refine significant errors/shortcomings contained in the quality documents that have existed so far. It means that the feedback that should have been obtained in the form of document improvements and new policy-making never be materialized.

This finding resulted in a new quality management evaluation model regarding theory and its application. Making a new model of internal quality management evaluation was carried out based on the functions and indicators of implementing a quality evaluation. The old model of internal quality evaluation that had been carried out so far only considered the availability of physical evidence as supporting elements and indicators without regard to usefulness and activity feedback. After researching, it turned out that the old model was less useful in measuring goals, was unable to detect feedback and was unable to produce document improvements and as a valuable input for policy.

Testing of new models that used a whole quality evaluation principle turned out to be more beneficial for the development of quality and quality culture at FISIP USU. The factor of leadership commitment and understanding of leaders at the faculty and study program levels as well as GKM and GJM also primarily determined the running of an internal quality management evaluation. Although it had not been seen as very useful in implementing this new model, the testing of this new model had provided awareness, understanding, and the need for quality management evaluations in the quality management cycle at the faculty and study program level.

The implementation of internal quality evaluations carried out so far was still not able to measure the achievements of previously set goals. The implementation of quality evaluation had not been able to carry out essential improvements related to the findings obtained so that the expected feedback in the form of improvement of new documents and new policies would never be realized.

Making a new model of internal quality evaluation was carried out based on the indicator function of implementing a quality evaluation. The old model of internal quality evaluation that had been carried out so far only considered the availability of supporting elements and indicators without considering the usefulness of activity feedback. After being examined, it turned out that the old model was less useful in measuring goals, was unable to detect feedback and had not produced document and policy improvements.

The testing of new models that used a perfect quality evaluation principle turned out to be more beneficial for the development of quality and quality culture at USU's

Faculties and Study Programs. This new quality evaluation model, although it has not been very useful in assisting the implementation of internal quality assurance systems in faculties and study programs, has been used by UMM USU as a university-level quality management unit to maximize the implementation of the USU Quality Standards and SOPs. Thus, the implementation of the quality audit every year complained by UMM USU had minimal obstacles and problems. UMM should provide more frequent training to GKM and GJM at the faculty and study program level in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper will not be completed without the help of various parties. I am very grateful to the Directorate General of Higher Education for funding this research, in addition to the leadership of the quality assurance and faculty at USU who helped in implementing the new model and provided a lot of data in this study. Hopefully, this article can be useful to make the quality management evaluation model more effective in the future.

REFERENCES

- [1] Suahsimi Arikunto, *Fundamentals of Educational Evaluation*. Bumi Aksara: Jakarta, 2015.
- [2] Hergenhahn dan Matthew H.Olson, *Theories Of Learning Pearson Education*. Kencana: Jakarta, 2012.
- [3] Slameto, *Educational Evaluation*. Bina Aksara: Jakarta, 2012.
- [4] H.M. Sukardi, *Educational Evaluation*. Bumi Aksara: Yogyakarta, 2011.
- [5] Wirawan, *Social Theories in Three Paradigms*. Kencana: Jakarta, 2012.
- [6] Dedi Amrizal, *The Development Model of Evaluation and Audit Internal Quality in University of Sumatera Utara*, Atlantis Press Volume 104, 2017, pp. 102.
- [7] Anas Sudijono, *Introduction to educational evaluation*. Rajawali Press: Jakarta, 2015.