



Model Development Strategy for Improved Quality of Private Higher Education that Manage Diploma Program through the Implementation of Good University Governance

Donni Juni Priansa^{1*}, Teguh Widodo²

1PhD Student of Padjadjaran University; Marketing Management Studies Program, Telkom Applied Science School, Bandung, Indonesia

2 Magister of Management Studies Program, School of Economics and Business, Bandung, Indonesia

**Corresponding author E-mail: donnijunipriansa@tass.telkomuniversity.ac.id*

Abstract

Indonesia's competitiveness ranking based on the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) has not been so encouraging, especially of higher education. This study aims to analyze how the governance and quality of private universities that manage diploma program; and to analyze the influence of good university governance on the quality of private universities, partially and simultaneously. This study is a descriptive-verification with design research is causality and cross-sectional. The population in this study is a Private Higher Education that manages diploma program. Where the unit sample is a lecturer. Data analysis techniques used in this research is path analysis. The results of this study indicate that the governance descriptive colleges included in the classification of a high score. In addition, the quality of higher education are in a high classification. In the verification results show that the good university governance has positive and significant impact on the quality of private higher education, either partially or simultaneously. These findings illustrate that the private higher education needs to improve its governance through the aspects of transparency, accountability, responsibility, independence and fairness.

Keywords: Higher Education Governance, Quality Higher Education

1. Introduction

Higher education is education in the education track at a higher level than secondary education in education track. Instead colleges are educational unit that organizes higher education (Indrajit and Djokopranoto, 2012). According to the Law on National Education System No. 20 of 2003 (Article 20, paragraph 1), which organizes educational unit called colleges of higher education that can be shaped Academy, Polytechnic, College, Institute, or University.

Competitiveness is closely related to the quality of PTS PTS itself. According to Goetsch and Davis (2013) quality is a dynamic state that is associated with the products, services, people, processes, and environments that meet or exceed expectations. Described "dynamic state" refers to the fact that what is considered quality can and often change over time and turn the enactment of environmental conditions. Elements' products, services, people, processes, and the environment ", indicating the quality does not only apply to the products and services provided, but also people and processes that provide products and services as well as the environment in which products and services are provided.

Frensidy (2013) points out, the root causes of the declining quality of higher education in Indonesia is: (1) the absence of ethics education. It's time drafted ethical standards or a code of conduct for the profession of teachers and education providers. Without ethical standards, law teachers and lecturers to be less grounded, (2) the loss of idealism in the university, so the remaining commercialization, (3) do not specifically government through the Directorate General of Higher Education, Department of Education (Directorate General of Higher Education) action against college high-offenders, (4) the cost of higher education is made so low in order to attract more students. On the other hand, there is a phenomenon that occurs in the world of higher education in Indonesia, namely the reduction in the amount of public interest in sending their children to the college. This decrease terjadi because of the low level of public confidence in the universities in Indonesia. The high cost of education if it is associated with per capita income and the absence of job security the driving force people not to send their children to the college.

Quality PTS will increase if the government managed through good university (GUG). According to the Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS) is a GUG is the entire system formed starting from the right (right), the process, as well as the control of either the inside or outside of the company's management. Further OECD (Sutojo, 2014) states that GUG is the implementation of corporate government, namely a system where business firms are directed and controlled. The structure of corporate governance specifically distribute rights and responsibilities of the members of the company, such as commissioners, managers, shareholders, and other stakeholders, and pro-

duce rules and procedures in making decisions in the company. By doing so, it also can create a corporate structure in accordance with company objectives are set, and menatapkan the attainment of these objectives, and performance monitoring.

Based on the various descriptions, so in this study, is good university government is a system where colleges are directed and controlled. College governance structure specifically distribute rights and responsibilities of each member is in college, and produce rules and procedures in making decisions for universities. Thus, it can be created colleges for their intended purpose, and can establish strategies to achieve these objectives, and carry out performance monitoring of the management of the college. The quality of private universities that are examined in the study using the dimensions developed by The National Committee on Governance (NCG 2006) which uses five measurement dimensions that are transparency, accountability, responsibility, independency, and fairness.

Based on the various descriptions, so in this study is the quality of private universities is a dynamic state that is associated with the products, services, people, processes, and environments that meet or exceed expectations. Quality does not only apply to the products and services provided, but also people and processes that provide products and services as well as the environment in which products and services are provided. The quality of private universities that are examined in the study using the dimensions developed by Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA), which uses seven measurement dimensions that are leadership, strategic planning, customer focus; measurement, analysis, and knowledge management; workforce focus; process management, and results.

2. Methods

This study is a descriptive-verification. The study design is causality with its time frame are limited at one point or cross-sectional. The population in this study is a Private Higher Education that manages diploma program. Where the unit sample is a lecturer. Data analysis techniques used in this research is path analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

The total contribution of the effect of openness on the quality of PTS is of 23.0%. The total effect is obtained from the direct effect of openness on the quality of PTS of 5.96%; as well as indirect effect through the accountability of 5.49%; indirect effect through the responsibilities of 4.23%; indirect effect through the independence of 4.12%; and the indirect influence via the reasonableness of 1.23%;

The total contribution of the influence of accountability for the quality of PTS is equal to 18.36%. The total effect is obtained from the direct influence on the quality of PTS accountability of 4.96%; as well as indirect effect through the openness of 5.49%; indirect effect through the responsibility of 3.78%; indirect effect through independence at 2.11%; and the indirect influence via the reasonableness of 2.02%;

Total contributions influence the responsibility for the quality of PTS is equal to 16.33%. The total effect is obtained from the direct influence of the responsibility for the quality of PTS of 4.23%; as well as indirect effect through the openness of 4.23%; indirect effect through the accountability of 3.78%; indirect effect through the independence of 2.01%; and the indirect influence via the reasonableness of 1.98%;

Total contributions influence the independence of the quality of PTS is equal to 13.66%. The total effect is obtained from the direct influence on the quality of PTS independence of 4.13%; as well as indirect effect through the openness of 4.12%; indirect effect through accountability at 2.11%; indirect effect through the responsibilities of 2.01%; and the indirect influence via the reasonableness of 1.23%;

Total contributions influence the fairness of the quality of PTS is equal to 11.51%. The total effect is obtained from the direct influence on the quality of PTS reasonableness of 3.08%; as well as indirect effect through the openness of 3.2%; indirect effect through the accountability of 2.02%; indirect effect through the responsibilities of 1.98%; and the indirect influence through the independence of 1.23%;

4. Conclusions

Governance of universities earned an average score of 4,05 which is included in the classification of a high score. Quality higher education earned an average score of 4,05 which is included in the classification of a high score. Good university governance has positive and significant impact on the quality of private universities partially and simultaneously. Good university governance has positive and significant impact on the quality of private universities amounted to 82.8%, and the remaining 17.2% is influenced by other factors beyond this study, for example, the organization's culture.

References

- [1] Adomssent, Maik; Jasmin Godemann, and Gerd Michelsen (2007). Transferability of Approaches to Sustainable Development at Universities as A Challenge. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*. Vol 8, 2007.
- [2] Albrecht, Patrick; Simon Burandt, and Stefan Schaltegger. (2007). Do Stimulate Organizational Learning Sustainability Projects in Universities? *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*. Vol. 8, 2007.
- [3] Arafat, Wilson. (2011). *How To Implement Good Corporate Governance Effectively*. Jakarta: skyrocketing Publisher.
- [4] Cooper, Donald R and Pamela S Schindler (2001). *Business Research Methods*. 7th. Boston: McGraw Hill International Edition.
- [5] Daniri, Mas Achmad. (2012). *Good Corporate Governance*. Jakarta: Indonesia Ray.
- [6] David, Fred R. (2009). *Strategic Management*. New Jersey: Person International.
- [7] Dawood, Isaam. (2012). Quality Management: An Index For Managers And Perception Actual Practice. *Journal of Business Case Studies*. 3 (4). 125-136.
- [8] Ernst and Young. (2004). *Corporate Governance Toolkit*. Assurance and Advisory Business Services.
- [9] FCGI. (2002). *The Essence of Good Corporate Governance*. Jakarta: Capital Market Education Foundation and Synergy Communication.

- [10] L. Goetsch and Davis D.L D. (2013). Total Quality Management: Quality Management for Production, Management, and Services. Jakarta: PT Prenhalindo.
- [11] Indrajit, Eko and Djokopranoto. (2013). Modern Higher Education Management. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- [12] National Committee for Good Corporate Governance. (2004). Code of Good Corporate Governance Bank Indonesia. Jakarta: National Committee for Good Corporate Governance.
- [13] Kuncoro, Engkos Ahmad. (2008). Leadership as Primary Forces in the Competitive Strength, Competitive Area, Competitive Result for Improving the Competitiveness of Higher Education. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.
- [14] Lederer, Jeff and Mark Seasons (2005). Understanding the University- Community Alliance: The Waterloo Experience. Canadian Journal of Urban Research. Vol. 14, 2003.
- [15] McDevitt, Roselie; Catherine Giapponi and Norman Solomon (2008). Revitalization Strategy in academe: A Balanced Scorecard Approach. International Journal of Education Management. Vol. 22, 2008.
- [16] Porter, Michael E. (1993). Competitive Advantage: Creating and Maintaining Superior Performance. Moulds to 2. Jakarta: Erland.
- [17] Porter, Michael E. (1994). Competitive Strategy Technics Analyzing Industries and Competitors. Jakarta: Erland.
- [18] Purnama, Nursya'bani. (2012). Quality Management Global Perspective. Yogyakarta: Faculty of Economics UII Ekonisia
- [19] Sanusi, Anwar. (2011). Business Research Methods. Jakarta: Four Salemba.
- [20] Sutojo, Siswanto. (2014). Good Corporate Governance Governance Sehat, PT. Damar Noble Reader: Jakarta.
- [21] Swanson, Julie Dingle. (2007) Policy and Practice: A Case Study of the Gifted Education Policy Implementation. College Student Affairs Journal. Vol 25, 2007
- [22] Vaira, Massimiliano (2003). Higher Education Reform in Italy: An Analysis of institutional and a First Appraisal. Journal of Higher Education Policy. Vol. 13, 2003.
- [23] Vaughan, Norman. (2007) Perspectives on Blended Learning in Higher Education. Journal of Nursing Education International Journal on E-Learning. Vol. 6 entitled.
- [24] Wheelen, Thomas L and J. David Hunger. (2010). Strategic Management, Yogyakarta: Andi.