



# Internal Quality Assurance System Standards Learning Management in D3 Midwife Study Program

Nurhidayah<sup>(✉)</sup>, Suryadi, and Matin

Education Management, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia  
nurhidayah.kila@gmail.com

**Abstract.** The Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI) is one strategy to tackling the concerns and obstacles that higher education in Indonesia faces. Higher education is seen to be of high quality if it can strengthen and achieve its vision via mission execution while also meeting the demands of society, the workplace, and professionals. The purpose of this study is to examine the implementation, restrictions, and variations in the usage of SPMI learning management criteria in D3 midwifery research programs. For the inquiry, a hybrid approach with an exploratory sequential design was used. A qualitative methodology was employed in the first phase of the data gathering and analysis procedure, while a quantitative methodology was used in the second. The findings revealed that the adoption of SPMI learning management standards was not done properly, and that it seems to be a series of actions carried out every semester with little progress. However, the general hurdles are four (four), meaning dedication, various opinions, mental attitude, and organization, and it has been established that there are discrepancies in the application of SPMI learning management standards in the Midwifery D3 Study Program. It is advised that the Study Program Director take the time to discover and develop talents in the execution of SPMI in order to establish a strong team.

**Keywords:** implementation of SPMI · learning management standards · Midwifery D3 Study Program

## 1 Introduction

Education is one of the most significant components of a country's growth, especially when it faces the millennium century, industrial revolution 4.0, or society 5.0, thus quality is something that cannot be separated from everyday life (Sarvitri and Supriyanto 2020). Total Quality Management refers to the implications for improving educational quality (TQM). It is an employee-centered management strategy that strives to constantly increase stakeholder satisfaction. To improve all elements of education and organizational administration, all members must commit. This is consistent with Edward Deming's Kaizen idea (Ismail 2016).

Quality enhancement is one of the issues that is closely tied to the policies, commitments, and goals of the development of Higher Education implementation. According to Edward (in Fitrah 2018), quality is a standard that demonstrates the superior quality of a higher education (Fitrah and Ruslan 2018), so higher education providers are required to carry out quality assurance activities in order to improve and control the implementation of higher education quality (Wicaksono 2016).

Internal quality assurance in higher education has gained a great deal of attention in recent years, both academically and practically. Professional organizations have started to take this issue seriously. Data from a representative poll of academic employees in Norway suggest that existing quality assurance systems serve to improve quality in universities (Per Olaf Aamodt 2018), while in nursing and midwifery education say that internal quality assurance systems are effective in improve the quality of teaching and assessment, especially in monitoring and evaluating laboratories (Essel et al. 2018).

The objective of any excellent education is effective quality assurance. In its quality assurance process, Indonesia acknowledges two systems: internal and external quality assurance. Internal quality assurance is a tool for improving quality, achieving our vision and objective, and obtaining certification. Meanwhile, external quality assurance ensures that the institution has an efficient internal quality assurance mechanism in place (Beerkens 2018).

The Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI) is considered as one means to solve numerous difficulties and challenges in Higher Education in Indonesia, where higher education is considered to be of quality if it is able to develop and achieve its vision via the implementation of its purpose, and is able to satisfy the demands of stakeholders, notably the needs of the community, the work world and the work world professional. As a result, universities must be capable of developing, managing, and overseeing a process that ensures quality achievement in a sustainable manner that is carried out internally by the relevant institution (Apri 2018).

In actuality, most institutions are more focused on accreditation or SPME rather than with SPMI. It is because the accreditation is traditionally considered to improve the quality of study programs or universities. Once the accreditation is removed, the education provider no longer evaluates the quality internally, which has the effect on the teaching and learning activity, for instance, a less updated curriculum and learning materials, lecturers who provides various learning methods, and many infrastructure facilities that are not fit for use, resulting in graduates with competencies that do not meet industry standards the requirements. Expectations of stakeholders (Apri 2018). The low competence of graduates in the Midwifery D3 Study Program is seen from the results of the national competency test, one of which can be caused by the management in the Study Program is still considered lacking, especially in learning management standards. Therefore, the use of learning management standards (SPMI) in the Study Program of Midwifery D3 is really needed, especially how the strategy is implemented.

The use of learning management of SPMI standards in the Midwifery D3 Study Program is a minimal criteria for learning activity design, implementation, control, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting at the Study Program level. Through the 5 (five) stages of the SPMI cycle, D3 midwifery must be based on graduate competency

requirements, standards of learning material, standards of learning activity, standard of lecturers and education staff, and standards of infrastructure.

#### A. *Determination of Learning Management Standards in SPMI*

The setting of learning management standards in SPMI can be done if there is an SPMI policy document which contains the vision and mission of the concerned university, the number of standards to be implemented, and the SPMI manual document consisting of a standard implementation manual, an evaluation manual for the implementation of standards, an implementation control manual. Standards, and standard improvement manuals in SPMI. Activities that must be carried out in setting standards, at least asking: the type of work that must be done, the party who must do the work, how the work must be done, and when the work must be done (Kemenristekdikti 2018) For learning management standards the Study Program must set standards-standards that include learning management standards, that is;

##### 1) *Graduate Competency Standards (SKL)*

Graduate competence standards are minimal requirements for graduates' competencies, which comprise attitudes, knowledge, and skills expressed in the creation of graduate learning outcomes, and are used to build additional standards in the field of Higher Education Tridharma.

##### 2) *Standards of Learning Content*

Standards of learning content are minimum criteria regarding the level of depth and breadth of learning materials that are formulated based on the learning outcomes of graduates, and are formulated in study materials that are realized in the form of courses.

##### 3) *Standards Learning Process*

The learning process standard is the minimal criterion for learning implementation in the study program. It is implemented interactively between lecturers and students through lectures, replies, seminars, studio practice, practicum, workshop practice or field practice. Each course may employ one or more combinations of distinct learning approaches, which may then be accommodated in a learning format.

#### B. *Standards of Lecturers and Educational Personnel*

The lecturers and education staff's standards are the minimal criteria for lecturers' and education staff's credentials and skills to offer education in the context of meeting graduate learning outcomes.

#### C. *Standard of Learning Facilities and Infrastructure*

Standard of learning facilities and infrastructure play main function as standards for facilities and infrastructure. It is in line with the demands of the content and learning process in order to meet graduate learning goals, particularly in midwifery laboratories.

##### 1) *Implementation of Learning Management Standards in SPMI*

Implementation of the Standards in SPMI can be done in stages or all at once. The standard implementation stage is determined according to the culture or

locality as well as the peculiarities of a higher education institution. If the implementation of standards is carried out in stages, it is recommended that learning standards of management to take precedence since they are connected to the quality of graduates and students' satisfaction (internal stakeholders).

- 2) *Evaluation of the Implementation of Learning Management Standards in SPMI*  
Evaluation of the implementation of learning management standards in SPMI aims to control and increase quality, not to find faults, but to find solutions to improve the quality of education in the future in a planned and continuous manner. The evaluation procedure begins with determining who is in charge of conducting the evaluation, forming an evaluation team that will take measurements and record/record findings on the achievement of the content of learning management standards by using an evaluation form or instrument that has been prepared, which is carried out periodically.
- 3) *Controlling the Implementation of Learning Management Standards in SPMI*  
Controlling the implementation of learning management standards in SPMI is an important part of SPMI which can ensure that learning management standards can be achieved or exceeded. There are 4 (four) conclusions obtained from controlling the implementation of learning management standards in SPMI from the evaluation results carried out previously, namely (1) the implementation of standards in SPMI reached the standards in SPMI; (2) exceed the standard in the SPMI; (3) has not reached the standard in the SPMI; and (4) implementation of standards in SPMI deviates from standards in SPMI.
- 4) *Improving Learning Management Standards in SPMI*  
Improving learning management standards in SPMI is an activity to improve or elevate the content of learning management standards according to the vision of the Higher Education, the development of science and technology, as well as the demands of stakeholders who want better education services. This stage is taken after successfully carrying out the previous 4 (four) stages of the SPMI cycle, it can be done simultaneously or partially, in different time periods depending on each Standard.

## 2 Method of the Research

Mixed Method were used in this study by a sequential exploratory design where quantitative is complementary to qualitative. used when researchers want quantitative methods to be used to extensively test the findings resulting from qualitative methods, with the following steps; The first stage of the research employs qualitative methods; the first step is to identify the problem or potential. The authors conduct a perspective theory to guide the researcher in collecting and analyzing data, and finally, the researcher collects data and formulates hypotheses. The researcher employs quantitative tools to test the hypotheses discovered in the first stage of research in the second step. The processes in applying quantitative techniques are determining the population and sample as a site to test hypotheses, developing and testing tools for data collection, analyzing data, drawing findings and making recommendations, and finally writing a report (Aini 2020).

### 3 Result and Discussion

#### *Qualitative Research Results*

According to the National Education System Law's study findings, universities have autonomy in administering education at their institutions. Since then, the national curriculum, diploma program, and the statute model as a form of quality assurance managed by the organizer to have all been gradually forcing universities to establish, implement, evaluate, control, and improve their quality assurance activities on their own. Higher Education Quality Assurance System (SPM Dikti) was defined in a book titled Higher Education Quality Assurance System in 2008. In addition to the book, the Directorate General of Higher Education Internal Quality Assurance System Training Materials were produced in 2010, followed by distribution and training at institutions. Until 2012, SPMI dissemination had been carried out to 1,938 universities (62.04% of 3,216 universities), and SPMI training to 788 universities (24.50% of 3,216 universities (Kemenristekdikti 2016).

The results of the research on the implementation of SPMI learning management standards in 2 (two) Midwifery Academies (Akbid) with different accreditation values, Akbid A with accreditation C and Akbid B with accreditation B as follows. For the organizational model of the SPMI institution, Akbid A integrates the implementation of SPMI into the management of the Academy, while Akbid B uses a combination model, namely forming a special unit for SPMI and integrating the implementation of SPMI into the management of the Academy. The selection of the SPMI organizational model carried out by the two academies was conditioned by the ability of resources, and the number of students. In principle, there are 3 (three) organizational models that can be chosen by universities in implementing SPMI, namely (1) forming a special unit for SPMI; (2) integrate the implementation of SPMI into higher education management; and (3) the combination of forming a special unit for SPMI by mixing the application of SPMI into higher education organization (Kemenristekdikti 2016).

Based on this principle, the model chosen by Akbid A is suitable for small universities such as the Academy, where by attaching the task of implementing SPMI to structural positions ranging from the leadership of the Academy to managers in the Study Program, thus making the implementation of SPMI relatively more efficient and flexible because the structure is relatively simple. The organization of the Academy will remain lean and not lengthen the bureaucratic chain. Lecturers, education staff, students and even structural officials will relatively feel more comfortable, because there is no feeling of being forced and supervised. However, this model can interfere with accountability because it leaves the implementation of SPMI to structural officials whose performance will be measured in the SPMI so that it looks less ethical, for effectiveness it is also doubtful because the success of the implementation of SPMI depends on the initiative and firmness of the structural official.

While the model used by Akbid B according to the researcher is more appropriate for universities such as the Academy because this model can be adopted by universities with limited human resources, where at the time of preparing the SPMI document a SPMI document drafting team was formed after which a special SPMI unit was formed to carry out SPMI systematically, effectively, and does not cause psychological effects for structural officials who run SPMI. So that the existence of this special unit oversees

the work unit at the Higher Education, because under this SPMI unit there is no longer an SPMI unit in the Study Program, but the implementation of SPMI is the task of structural officials, while the task of the Higher Education SPMI unit is only to monitor, evaluate, and audit SPMI. in all work units below it. Looking at the organizational model of the SPMI institution chosen by the two Akbids, it is obtained an overview of the implementation of the SPMI learning management standard as follows:

A. *Determination of Learning Management Standards in SPMI*

In setting standards, the two academies have no difference, where when making the second SPMI standard they already have 2 (two) important documents in standard making, namely policy documents and manual documents, although physically for Akbid A the document is not visible. Both Academies already had standard documents, but unfortunately, those documents existed but seemed to be missing. How come. The document does not depart from the results of field needs and there is no contextualization process with the academic reality that exists in the university, it is only present as a formality to fulfill the administration of the organizers, not for the sake of accreditation alone. So that in its manufacture there are often copies and pastes of documents made by other universities, so that they are unrealistic, grounded and in turn cannot be socialized let alone become a standard for the implementation of quality assurance at the D3 Midwifery Study Program level.

According to research Trianto (2020) says that standard setting must refer to Permendikbud No. 3 of 2020 concerning National Higher Education Standards which have set 24 minimum standards that must be carried out by every tertiary institution, and it is hoped that universities can exceed these standards, especially learning management standards, because the vision of the Higher Education is the benchmark for setting standards, and an absolute requirement to provide a direction in which the Higher Education will be developed, the farther the university's vision is, the more diverse the content and number of standards set. So that all parties in a university can understand how Higher Education standards that are set by the Higher Education themselves, are formulated and determined, it is necessary to have the availability of standard setting manual documents. This manual is equipped with a standard implementation manual, a standard implementation evaluation manual, a standard implementation control manual, and a standard improvement manual, which can be compiled into an SPMI manual.

For setting a standard, 7 important steps are needed, namely; (1) prepare and study various materials in setting Dikti standards, especially legislation in the field of Higher Education; (2) perform benchmarking or comparative studies to other universities; (3) holding discussion by inviting stakeholders both internal and external of the Higher Education; (4) formulating all Dikti standards that will serve as benchmarks, containing ABCD elements, they are Audience (subject), Behavior (predicate), Competence (object), and Degree (description) or Key Performance indicators (KPIs) format, namely indicators, measure, and targets; (5) conduct public testing to internal and external stakeholders; (6) improve the standard formulation of the Higher Education by considering the results of the public test; and (7) stipulate the implementation of all the standards of Higher Education by regulation of the Higher Education leaders based on the mechanism stipulated in the Higher

Education statutes. However, from the 7 (seven) steps above, before setting the standards for higher education, they should periodically and consistently do; (a) SWOT analysis, both in Higher Education and Study Program management units; and (b) graduate tracking studies and/or need assessment of graduate users. These two things must be done first before universities start formulating standards.

**B. *Implementation of Learning Management Standards in SPMI***

Implementation of standards in higher education can be done in stages or all at once, but it is recommended that learning management standards are a priority because they relate to student satisfaction. The implementation of learning management standards is directly managed by the Study Program and the Head of the Study Program is fully responsible for its implementation. Results The implementation of learning management standards at these two academies did not see the existing standard implementation manuals. The activities that take place only look like routine activities that are always carried out every semester. This is constrained by the limited resources available at the two academies where lecturers continue to work not only as lecturers but also as managers of study programs. For the implementation of standards, the two academies have carried out stages in accordance with the implementation of learning management standards, namely planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation as well as reporting. Implementing learning management standards in the Study Program, the most commonly used quality control management model is the PDCA (plan, do, check, action) model. While the SPMI manual for vocational education says that the implementation of learning management standards is carried out in accordance with established policy documents, starting with preparation by the Study Program, namely understanding in advance the standard implementation manual to find out what kind of work is being done, who is responsible, how to do the work, and when the work is done, after that, hold a plenary meeting to determine the person in charge of implementing standards such as determining the lecturer or coordinator of each course, then identifying the infrastructure needed in the learning process, after being identified then coordinating with all related units. With the teaching and learning process. After all the people in charge have been determined, carry out the activities as determined at the plenary meeting. At the end of the activity, all persons in charge record all data and information that occurred during implementation. Routinely each coordinator will hold a plenary meeting as a means for all persons in charge to report all implementation and obstacles to the implementation of the activities for which they are responsible, after which the results of the meeting are agreed to be followed up by the coordinator. The results of the plenary meeting were recorded to be used as best practices in the future and decided as quality improvement. At the end of the implementation, it is necessary to conduct a survey through questionnaires to standard implementers (students, lecturers, supervisors and stakeholders) the survey results are analyzed so that suggestions can be given to improve implementation, at the end of the semester all persons in charge make reports according to the content and format that have been determined, and record important notes to be used as the best practice.

C. *Evaluation of the Implementation of Learning Management Standards in SPMI*

Structural officials at each level of Higher Education, including the quality assurance unit if, should conduct evaluation of the implementation based on standards of the action. Evaluation is conducted to assess whether the contents of the learning management standards have been implemented or have been met. The evaluation of learning management standards conducted by the two academies is coordinated by the head of the Study Program whose evaluation is carried out by each person in charge of standards. The difference is for Akbid B, the evaluation continues to an internal audit conducted by a Special unit, namely the Quality Assurance Unit (UPM). The standards that are often evaluated are almost the same, namely graduate competency standards, learning content standards, learning process standards, and infrastructure standards, while for lecturer standards it has never been carried out, unfortunately when the evaluation was carried out by the head of the Study Programs, the two Academy did not use an assessment form or instrument. So the evaluation results are not measurable.

In evaluating learning management standards, the Head of the Study Program should have determined from the beginning who was doing the evaluation and then prepared the appropriate form or instrument and finally recorded the findings from the evaluation results which would become an accountability report at the plenary meeting. If there is a UPM, the results of the plenary meeting can be given to UPM for an internal audit. Research by Mustafa (2018) states that the evaluation process here is not intended to find someone's fault, but to find room for improvement for continuous quality improvement in the future. Evaluation of the implementation is something that must be carried out properly and continuously, so that the implementation of successful quality assurance is proven to be able to significantly improve the quality and reputation of higher education institutions and increase competitiveness in improving sustainable quality to realize a "quality culture" as a prerequisite for achieving quality higher education. And competitive. However, nowadays, evaluation of learning management standards is only done when facing the process of applying for accreditation or reaccreditation. Whereas the implementation of evaluation needs to be carried out regularly, which aims to evaluate yourself to get better quality.

D. *Control of the Implementation of Learning Management Standards in SPMI*

Control of the implementation of standards in the SPMI is a follow-up to various findings obtained from the evaluation stage of the implementation of standards. The standard control for the learning management of the Study Programs at the two academies is almost the same because they do not use forms or instruments that are in accordance with the standards so that the findings cannot be measured, but for Akbid B there is an added value at the time of evaluation, namely the existence of an internal audit conducted by UPM using the same instrument. The results can be measured, even though the size set is not in accordance with the existing standards,

so that standard control can still be established, whether the implementation of the standard reaches the standard, exceeds the standard, has not reached the standard, and deviates from the standard, because the control measures that need to be carried out depend on the results evaluation of standard implementation.

If the results of the evaluation of the learning management standard reach the standard, the control is that the Study Program maintains achievement and seeks to improve the standard: if it exceeds the standard the Study Program maintains the exceedance and seeks to further improve the standard: if it has not reached the standard the Study Program takes corrective action on the implementation of the learning management standard so that the standard can be met. Achieved; and if it deviates from the standard of the Study Program, take corrective action on the implementation of learning management standards to implement the standards according to the standards set. In the standard statement, one of the elements that needs to be present is the implementer of the standard, thus the party who must control the implementation of the standard is the party who manages the standard.

#### E. *Improving Learning Management Standards in SPMI*

Improving learning management standards is a Study Program activity to improve the content of standards, this activity is often called kaizen or continuous quality increase. To increase learning management standards, the Study Programs at the two academies have carried out 4 (four) stages of the previous SPMI cycle, namely the establishment, implementation, evaluation, and control of learning management standards. It is impossible to improve standards if the Study Program has not gone through the evaluation stage of the implementation of standards even though the Study Program has implemented the standards, on the contrary, after the implementation of the learning management standards is evaluated, but the content and scope are not increased, the quality of the Study Program will not increase, even though the standard content can still be improved. Improved. For the stage of improving the standards of Akbid B, the implementation is somewhat different because Akbid B is at the time of standard control, standards can be measured even though they do not see the standards that have been set, but can be seen from the results of the internal audit instrument carried out by UPM. For the addition of the existing standards, these two academies have not changed, let alone create standards that are the hallmark of the two academies. It should be remembered that what is improved is not only the implementation, evaluation of the implementation and control of the implementation of standards, but the content of the standard of learning management in the Study Program it self.

According to research by Azhar (2003), the improvement of learning management standards is not only driven by the necessity to improve sustainable quality to achieve the vision of the Study Program but is also driven by developments in society, the progress of science and technology and the demands of external stakeholders who want competent graduate competencies. Especially at this time, where the world is in the millennial era, information, decisions, and actions will take place “at the speed of thought”. Causing consumer expectations of the quality of education to increase.

The procedure for improving the standard of learning management in the Study Program must be carried out by implementing standards as in the previous four stages

of PPEPP. It should be noted that there is no sporadic increase in standards with the same implementer, it is better to increase all standards by institutional, namely the academic leadership or UPM or a standard improvement team formed to coordinate standard improvement activities. After that, the implementation of SPMI returns to the next cycle.

### *Qualitative Research Results*

Research results from quantitative methods prove that there are differences in the application of learning management standards in SPMI between Akbid A and Akbid B with a sig value (2-tailed) of  $0.017 < 0.05$ , and the difference between the differences was  $-6.027$  to  $-0.605$ . Even if every university is able to develop SPMI independently or independently, there are some basic things that must be in SPMI in every university.

Every Higher Education in conducting SPMI must go through 5 (five) stages of the SPMI cycle, which consists of determining, implementing, evaluating the implementation, control and improvement which is often called PPEPP. That is, five main steps must be present in the implementation of SPMI and are the core of SPMI in each university. Based on the term “internal” in the SPMI, these five steps must be carried out internally by universities. Therefore, all universities in implementing SPMI are no different. The two academies have implemented SPMI in accordance with the 5 (five) cycle stages in the SPMI, only in the results of the implementation of learning management standards in SPMI there are differences in terms of learning management in the Study Program. This is due to problems at the time of implementation.

According to research by Sulaiman & Wibowo (2016), the obstacles that exist in the implementation of SPMI at the Higher Education level. Among others; awareness of the actors of the education process about the importance of quality assurance as a stakeholder need is still low, and the commitment of the actors of the higher education process to guarantee and improve the quality of education is still lacking. Concern for all parties to continue to improve and increase the quality of learning management standards, with policies from the leadership of education providers to carry out internal quality assurance consistently and seriously. And can compete with other education that is already qualified.

Learning management standards are one of the standards that are always improved and improved on an ongoing basis because of their very strategic role in ensuring the quality of education. In this instance, not only must learning be organized, but also the teaching and learning process must be of high quality. The fulfillment and attainment of learning management criteria expresses the quality of the teaching and learning process. These standards will govern all aspects of the teaching and learning process, including planning, implementation, monitoring/evaluation, and reporting. To assure the attainment of the curricular objectives, a number of systematic actions are carried out to enhance the quality of learning management standards. Where the curricular goals will be accomplished if the graduate competency standards (SKL) or learning outcomes are reached, so that the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process may be assessed by meeting learning quality accomplishment targets (Puspita Sari n.d).

## 4 Conclusion

The strategy for implementing the SPMI Learning Management Standard in the Midwifery D3 Study Program is running 5 (five) stages of the SPMI cycle, namely standard setting, standard implementation, evaluation of standard implementation, controlling the implementation of standards and improving standards correctly according to the stages set out in the implementation manual. SPMI as a systemic activity of quality assurance at Higher Education by Education Institution independently to control and improve the implementation of Higher Education in a prearranged and sustainable program based on the historical background, vision and mission of the Higher Education. However, in the implementation of each tertiary institution there is no difference because in the implementation of SPMI each university must carry out the principles in SPMI, namely; (1) autonomous, SPMI is carried out independently by each Tertiary Education Institution; (2) standardized, SPMI uses Dikti standards consisting of standards approved by the minister and standards passed by each university; (3) accuracy, SPMI uses accurate data and information on PD Dikti; (4) planned and sustainable, SPMI is implemented using 5 (five) quality assurance steps, namely PPEPP; and (5) documented, every step of PPEPP in SPMI must be written in a document and systematically documented. If there is a difference in implementing learning management standards at SPMI in Study Programs, it occurs because of obstacles during the implementation of standards, including commitment and competence, changes in paradigm, mental attitude and organization.

## 5 Recommendation

The implementation of SPMI learning management standards is organize directly by the Study Program under the coordination by the Head of the Study Program. Achieving or not achieving learning management standards depends on the commitment and competence of the Head of the Study Program in managing the teaching and learning process in the Study Program. Therefore, the researcher's recommendation for managers of the Midwifery D3 Study Program in implementing SPMI on learning management standards is to increase commitment, competence and form a solid team.

## References

- Aedi, N. (2010). Research Instruments and Data Collection. Self-study materials Educational research methods.
- Ahmed. (2012). *Strategic quality management in the Arab higher education institutes: a descriptive & analytical study*. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3(24).
- Ahyar. (2020). *Qualitative & quantitative research methods* (Metode Penelitian Kualitatif & Kuantitatif).
- Aini, N. R., Islam, U., Raden, N., & Lampung, I. (2020). Mixed method: research method. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG2.2.1258603524>
- Aini, S. R., et al. (2020). Overview of the implementation of the internal quality assurance system for the pharmacy study program, faculty of medicine. *University of Mataram Jurnal Kedokteran*, 9(4), 274–280.

- Andriansyah, D. (2013). Program Evaluation Industrial Internship program at SMK Negeri 8 Bandung. Repository.Upi.Edu.
- Sarvitri, A., & Achmad Supriyanto, A. T. (2020). Penerapan Manajemen Mutu Terpadu Pada Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan (Internal implementation of integrated quality management in the internal education quality assurance system). *Jurnal Adminitrasi Dan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 3(Nomor 1), 38–51. Retrieved from <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jamp>
- Apri, D. (2018). Management of Total Quality Management Oriented to the Quality of Education Services at SDIT Al Abidin (Pengelolaan Total Quality Management Berorientasi Pada Kualitas Layanan Pendidikan Di SDIT Al Abidin Surakarta).
- Arifudin, O. (2020). Implementation of the internal quality assurance system (SPMI) as an effort to improve the quality of study programs. *Jurnal Al Amar*, 1(3), 1–11.
- Azhar, I. (2003). Conceptualization of higher education quality improvement through total quality management (TQM), pp. 1–25.
- Beerkens, M. (2018). Evidence-based policy and higher education quality assurance: progress, pitfalls and promise. *Jurnal European Journal of Higher Education*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2018.1475248>
- Fajar, C., et al. (2020). Analysis of governance standards for educators and education personnel in maritime vocational higher education in Indonesia. *Jurnal Sains Teknologi Transportasi Maritim*, 2(1), 20–29.
- Kurniady, D. A., Linda Setiawati, S. N. (2018). Education financing management on the quality of vocational high schools. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 263–269.
- Dikti, D. (2006). Guidelines for the implementation of the higher education quality assurance system (SPM-PT), Indonesia
- Dikti, D. (2014). Higher education quality assurance system in Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.32923/edugama.v5i1.963>
- Essel, H. B., Boakye-Yiadom, M., & Kyeremeh, F. A. (2018). Assessing students' experiences of internal quality assurance practices in selected private higher education institutions. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15131.77605>
- Fadlilah, H. (2016). Research instruments and their urgency in quantitative research. *Jurnal IAIN*, 59–75.
- Fitria, R., Serudji, J., & Evareny, L. (2019). Persiapan Uji Kompetensi Bidang sebagai Exit Exam. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 19(1), 195. <https://doi.org/10.33087/jjub.v19i1.590>
- Wicaksono, G. W. (2016). Peningkatan Kualitas Evaluasi Mutu Akademik Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang melalui Sistem Informasi Mutu ( SIMUTU ). *Jurnal Kinetik*, 1(1), 1–8.
- Ismail, F. (2016). Implementasi total quality management (TQM) di Lembaga Pendidikan. *Jurnal Ilmiah IQRA*, 10(2).
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Purwanti, K., Murniari, A. R., & Yusrizal, Y. (2014). Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah dalam Meningkatkan Kompetensi Guru pada SMP negeri 2 Simeulue Timur. *Jurnal Ilmiah DIDAKTIKA*, 14(2), 390–400.
- Kemendikbud. (2020). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Nomor 03 Tahun 2020 Tentang Standar Nasional Perguruan Tinggi.
- Kemendes, R. (2020). Keputusan menteri Kesehatan republik Indonesia Nomor HK.01.07/Menkes/320/2020 tentang Standar Profesi Bidan.
- Kemendikdik. (2016). Pedoman Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Kemendikdik. (2018). Pedoman Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Internal Pendidikan Akademik-Pendidikan Vokasi- Pendidikan Profesi-Pendidikan Jarak Jauh.

- Umar, M., & Ismail, F. (2017). Peningkatan Mutu Lembaga Pendidikan Islam (Tinjauan Konsep Mutu Edward Deming dan Joseph Juran). *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Iqra*, 11(2), 1–24.
- Mekarisce, A. A. (2020). Teknik Pemeriksaan Keabsahan Data pada Penelitian Kualitatif di Bidang Kesehatan Masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 12(33), 145–151.
- Menristekdikti. (2016). Permenristekdikti Nomor 62 tahun 2016 Tentang Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Fitrah, M., & Ruslan, H. (2018). Urgensi Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Internal Terhadap Peningkatan Mutu Perguruan Tinggi. *Jurnal Penjaminan Mutu*, 4(1), 76–86. <https://doi.org/10.25078/jpm.v4i1.400>
- Fitrah, M. (2017). Peran Kepala Sekolah Dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pendidikan. *Jurnal Penjaminan Mutu* 3(1), 31–42.
- Mustafa, D. (2018). *Penerapan Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Internal di Perguruan Tinggi (UPRI) Makassar*; (19). Retrieved from <http://spmi.ristekdikti.go.id/repositori/5a79d6f4a54a05499d1fda82>
- Mustaqim. (2016). Metode Penelitian Gabungan Kuantitatif Kualitatif/Mixed Methods Suatu Pendekatan Alternatif. *Jurnal Intelegensia*, 04(1), 1–9. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.unisnu.ac.id/JI/article/view/1351/135>
- Nurdiansah, N. (2017). Pengelolaan Pembelajaran dan Pengembangan Bahan Ajar. *Jurnal Pedagogi Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 04(01), 59–69.
- Nurmalasari. (2014). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Dan citra terhadap Kepuasan Mahasiswa pada Akademik Kebidanan Aisyiyah pontianak. *Jurnal Khatulistiwa Informatika* 2(2), 184–197.
- Learning outcomes– a useful tool in quality assurance ? Views from academic staff. *Jurnal Studies in Higher Education*, 43(4), 614–624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1185776>
- Arieska, P. K., & Herdiani, N. (2018). Pemilihan Teknik Sampling Berdasarkan Perhitungan Efisiensi Relatif. *Jurnal Statistika*, 6(2).
- Pratama, M. Y. (2011). Penerapan Sistem Penjamin Mutu Internal Di Akper Kesdam I/bukit Barisan Medan.
- Puspitasari, H. (n.d.). Standar Proses Pembelajaran Sebagai Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Internal di Sekolah, pp. 339–368.
- Putra, M. F. (2017). Mixed Methods: Pengantar Dalam Penelitian Olahraga. *Jurnal Sportif*, 3(1), 11–28. [https://doi.org/10.29407/js\\_unpgri.v3i1.682](https://doi.org/10.29407/js_unpgri.v3i1.682)
- Putu-Artaya, I. (2018). Uji independent sample test. ResearchGate, (December). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25160.57604>
- Rahardjo, M. (2018). Metode campuran (Mixed Methods) dalam Penelitian Sosial.
- Siyoto. (2015). Dasar Metodologi Penelitian.
- Sodik, K., & Sodik, A. (2015). Dasar Metodologi Penelitian.
- Sugiyono. (2015). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan Kombinasi (Mixed Methods).
- Sulartopo, Manonga, D., & Nan, A. K. (2019). Sistem Informasi Memori Organisasi Pada Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Internal. In *Seminar Nasional Inovasi Teknologi* (pp. 81–86).
- Sumarmi, S., Sanusi, A., Sumantri, M., & Rostini, D. (2019). Manajemen Pembelajaran Kompetensi lulusan Implementasi Manajemen Pembelajaran Untuk Mempersiapkan Uji Kompetensi Lulusan Pendidikan DIII Kebidanan. *Jurnal NER*, 2.
- Syam, R. Z. A. (2021). Strategi Peningkatan Mutu Lulusan Prodi Paud Melalui Pelaksanaan Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Internal Di Universitas Islam Nusantara. *Al-Fikrah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 8(2), 161. <https://doi.org/10.31958/jaf.v8i2.2415>
- Tang, H. (2019). Practical research on graduates ‘Employment quality monitoring in vocational colleges’. *Jurnal Education and Humanities Research*, 385(Iceemr), 296–300.
- Triyana, I. G. N. (2017). Penjaminan mutu pendidikan melalui teknologi informasi di institut hindu dharma negeri denpasar. *Jurnal Penjaminan Mutu*, 119–126.
- UU No 20, 2003. (2003). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No 20 Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. Retrieved from content/uploads/2013/04/Lamp\_2\_UU20–2003-.

UU No 4, 2019. (2019). Undang - Undang RI Nomor 4 Tahun 2019 Tentang Kebidanan. Retrieved from undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 4 tahun 2019.  
UU No 12. (2012). Undang-Undang RI No 12 tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

