Organisational Capacity in Implementing Quality Assurance: Study at LPMPT Universitas Negeri Manado

Abdul Rahman Dilapanga[a], [a]Public Administration Science Studi Program Faculty of Social Sciences Universitas Negeri Manado, Email: [a]abdulrahmandilapanga@unima.ac.id

Quality assurance is carried out by an institution called the Higher Education Quality Assurance Institute (LPMPT) Universitas Negeri Manado (Unima). The quality assurance system in higher education is intended to maintain and improve the quality of education on an ongoing basis internally. Facing global competition, including competition between universities, which is increasingly stringent and open, quality is the key to success for a tertiary institution to gain public trust on an ongoing basis, therefore quality assurance is one of the main needs of each tertiary institution. This research takes the main focus of organisational capacity, in this case the capacity of LPMPT Unima as a quality assurance policy implementor. Based on the background of the problem and the focus of the problem above, the problem in this study operationally was formulated in the research question: What is the Unima LPMPT Capacity in Higher Education Quality Assurance? This research was conducted with the intention to gather information, analyse, interpret and illustrate the Unima LPMT Capacity in Implementing Higher Education Quality Assurance Policies. The results of the study showed that: 1. Organisationally, the capacity of LPMPT Unima as a quality assurance policy implementor has not yet demonstrated its optimal performance. Not yet optimal capacity of LPMPT Unima as a quality assurance policy implementor is due to the following conditions: one, Communication between organisations, namely between LPMPT Unima, UPM (faculties) and GPM (departments / study programs) has not been well established. This is because UPM and GPM are organisationally spread across various faculties, departments and study programs. Two, based on the results of the data analysis that has been described, it was found that Unima LPMPT still lacks the support of resources. Both human resources are still relatively limited and do not understand quality assurance. Limited facilities to support activities, and weak financial resource support

(financing) are also factors that hamper LPMPT operations as quality assurance do not run effectively. Three, the low commitment and support of leaders from the top to the lowest level towards the existence of LPMPT as a quality assurance agency. Four, the LPMPT bureaucratic structure starting from the Unima, Faculty (UPM) level to the departments and study programs (GPM) is clear, but operationally it has not functioned well. The reason for this is that the mechanism and working relationship are less intertwined, because LPMPT Unima itself does not have standard operating procedures (SOP) that would facilitate a highly functional, cooperative and working relationship between LPMPT, UPM and GPM.

Key words: *Capacity, Organisation, Policy, Quality.*

Introduction

Quality assurance is a series of efforts or actions taken by institutions or work units in realising a culture of quality that is planned, systematic and based on predetermined service quality standards in the hope of guaranteeing and providing satisfaction for people who receive services. Quality improvement is a very urgent and most important task faced by various institutions including tertiary institutions. Quality is a very complex concept, so it is not easy to define and measure. One of the development problems that is often raised and used as a topic of discussion by various groups is the low quality of education. The spotlight on the low quality of education is often directed at certain aspects: learning achievements, educational processes, aspects of educators, books / libraries, learning tools / media, educational facilities and infrastructure, effectiveness and efficiency of education management and the relevance of education to the world of work.

Organisational Capacity: The organisation in implementation is inseparable from the management of the organisation to implement a policy. According to Dr. SP Siagian, MPA is any formal alliance between two or more people who work together and are formally bound in achieving the goals specified in the bond where there is a person / several people called superiors and a person / group of people called subordinates (Siagian, 2003). Building adequate organisational capacity is a common challenge for organisations tasked with implementing complex educational reforms (Cohen, 2007). Capacity is the ability (ability to solve problems) possessed by a person, organisation, institution, and community to individually or collectively carry out functions, solve problems, and set and achieve goals (Miles and Huberman, 1992).

Many researchers say that capacity building refers to infrastructure development, which includes staff, skills, resources, and structures to overcome existing problems (Meissner, 1992). Rohman said public policy was generally taken through a political process. Politically, a policy is usually influenced by who is involved, the situation in which a policy is being discussed, and

how much and from which groups the demands of society are pushed (Rohman, 2012). Policy implementation as a study began to develop since many researchers highlighted case studies to understand why many national policies failed to be implemented by local governments. Purwanto said that the concept of implementation is widely used by political scientists and public policy scientists to explain the various phenomena of public policy (Purwanto, 2004).

Quality assurance of higher education is the process of determining and meeting the quality standards of management of higher education in a consistent and sustainable manner, so that stakeholders get satisfaction (Adisusilo, 2008). In its implementation, higher education quality assurance policies must be able to adjust to changes and developments in science and technology and global dynamics so quickly. Previous research in this study includes: (1) Discussion of previous studies that are relevant to the study to be conducted by the author, (2) and an examination of public administration theory to provide theoretical answers to the problems related to the implementation of policies for quality assurance in higher education in force now.

In accordance with the mandate of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education, in the world of higher education, quality assurance is carried out by an institution called the Higher Education Quality Assurance Institute (LPMPT) (Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number, 2012). The quality assurance system in higher education is intended to maintain and improve the quality of education on an ongoing basis. Facing global competition, including competition between universities, which is getting tougher and more open, quality is the key to the success of tertiary institutions to gain public trust on an ongoing basis, therefore quality assurance is one of the main needs of every tertiary institution.

As an institution of tertiary education, Manado State University has the same commitment as other tertiary institutions in Indonesia to implement and guarantee the quality of education (academic and non-academic quality). As a form of commitment to academic and non-academic quality assurance, there is the Chancellor's Decree Number: 6453 / H41 / HK / 2010 the Higher Education Quality Assurance Institute (LPMPT) of Manado State University. The main tasks and functions of Unima LPMPT are carrying out total quality assurance at Unima at all levels of education (diploma, study program, postgraduate), as well as in all study programs, study program managers (faculties / PPs, departments / sections), research fields, community services, academic administration services, general administration, and resource management. In addition to the LPMPT at the university level, the main quality assurance task force is formed at the Faculty level with the name Quality Assurance Unit (UPM) and at the department / study program level called the Quality Assurance Group (GPM). Institutionally, LPMPT is directly under the Chancellor, while relations with faculties and institutions are coordinative and consultative (Anonymous, 2014).

Unima LPMPT has been around for a long time, but it still often raises question marks from various parties. Frequently asked questions related to the existence of LPMPT Unima include: What has the LPMPT done? How far has LPMPT played a role in Unima's quality assurance? Besides these questions, other questions often arise regarding the relationship and coordination between faculties, departments and study programs, and the ability of LPMPT to carry out its main tasks and functions.

Based on the background of the problems stated above, this research is written in the title: Organisational Capacity in Implementing Quality Assurance Policies (Study at LPMPT Manado State University).

Literature Review

Public policy (policy) is derived from the Greek, "Polis," which means City (city). According to Nicholas, "policy is a decision that is thought through carefully … by the peak taken from the decision and not repetitive and routine activities that are programmed or related to the rules of the decision rule" (Abrecombi, 1984). Anderson defines policy as a party of actors (officials, groups, government institutions) or actors appointed in a particular field. Indeed, policy discussions are inseparable from inter-group interests, both at the government level and the general public. The implementation of policy as an initial study was developed by many case study researchers to evaluate many national policies which failed to be implemented by local governments (Anderson, 2014). Purwanto said the concept of implementation was widely used by political and public policy researchers to explain various phenomena of public policy (Purwanto, 2006). Purwanto's study of the opinions of Jeffrey Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky, who were later considered to be the pioneers of implementation studies and the first generation of researchers, mostly produced case studies to explain what they called the missing links, as well as governments who wanted to turn good intentions into good policies. From the various case studies, the researchers then came up with their own recipes on how to solve the problem of policy implementation. However, they have not been able to produce a general theory of implementation.

Rohman said public policy was generally taken through a political process. Politically, a policy formulated is usually influenced by who is involved, in what situations a policy is being discussed, and how much and from which groups the demands of the community are pushed (Afzal and Rohman, 2006). The science of state administration assumes that public policy is made by the government (management) as a dynamic function of the state (organisation) aimed at creating effectiveness and efficiency in carrying out the tasks of government and the state. The function of public policy (public policy) of the organisational pillar is "the State", while the meaning of the management element is "Government." From this perspective a combination

of state and government elements will produce provisions, regulations, or laws that are commonly called public policies (Subiakto, et al. 2012).

This also applies to the higher education quality assurance policy, because the policy is easily implemented and can be controlled highly depends on the communication built within the institution of each tertiary institution. This communication must be established as a reference, for example, how often regular meetings will be held to discuss quality assurance policies both within the tertiary institution and in the communication conducted by Kopertis as a supervisor of private tertiary institutions and between State Universities with the Directorate General of Higher Education. This is in the form of socialisation, specifically in regard to the provisions of higher education quality assurance before it is implemented. Communication between organisations within tertiary institutions also points to the demands for mutual support between institutions related to quality assurance programs / policies.

Quality in this view is used to convey the superiority of status and position, as well as ownership of goods that have 'quality.' This will make the owner different from others who are unable to have it (Sallis, 2010). In fact, quality in such a sense is more accurately referred to as high quality 'or top quality' (high quality). If related to the educational context, then the concept of quality is elite, because only a few institutions can provide a 'high quality' educational experience to students. Some students cannot reach it, and most institutions do not wish to fulfil it.

Quality assurance of higher education is the process of determining and meeting the quality standards of higher education management consistently and continuously, so that stakeholders get satisfaction (Directorate General of Higher Education, 2010). In its implementation, higher education quality assurance policies must be able to adjust to changes and developments in science and technology and global dynamics quickly. The ability of policy decisions to structure the process of implementing education quality assurance policies well is largely determined by the resources of tertiary institutions. Resources refers to how much support human and financial resources have to implement all standards in the quality assurance policy. The difficult thing is assessing the financial and human resources necessary to produce a good university quality assurance policy implementation.

The actual implementation of the policy does not become a monopoly in the education bureaucracy that is hierarchically carried out from the highest level of higher education (Rector of Higher Education) to lecturers and education staff. In implementing the higher education quality assurance policy, both the Chancellor, Chair of the Quality Assurance, lecturers, employees, and students should ideally work hand in hand and carry out tasks for the successful implementation of the higher education quality assurance policy. The direct influence of various political variables on the balance of support for the goals contained in policy decisions

regarding quality assurance is also strongly influenced by the content and policy context. The process of implementing a quality assurance policy includes the task of forming bonds that allow the direction of the policy to be realised as a result of leadership activities (Minister of National Education Regulation, 2009).

Policy content in implementing higher education quality assurance policies includes affected interests, the level of change desired, and program implementers due to quality assurance policies. The quality assurance policy established by tertiary institutions with reference to the quality assurance system established by the government will not cause harm to tertiary institutions. This is because tertiary institutions will have standards that must be achieved by all academics in tertiary institutions. Standards set by tertiary institutions are strongly influenced by the interests of institutions (tertiary institutions). After a quality assurance policy is implemented by a tertiary institution, it can be evaluated annually to determine whether the standard is raised or not. Quality assurance policies in tertiary institutions will differ between private tertiary institutions. This is because each university has different laws, different goals and different target groups.

In general, people view the bureaucracy as the administrative agency most responsible for implementing public policies. This view holds true in implementation activities both in developed and developing countries. The administrative paradigm known as "the political and administrative dichotomy" is "when the political process is complete, administration begins". This paradigm explains that when rules or regulations (policies) have been completed by the legislative body (political process), then the administration starts to run, because every policy that has been formulated by the legislature is then left to the administration (executive) to implement it.

Although the agencies involved in the implementation of public policies can be very diverse, the bureaucracy still has the most dominant position compared to other organisations. Bureaucracy is still the backbone for achieving various public policy objectives as mentioned. The bureaucracy plays a role and has great authority and fully controls the "area of policy implementation" as part of its main duties and functions because it obtains a mandate from the legislature. Although the agents / implementing units involved in the implementation process can be very diverse, the bureaucracy to this day still plays an important role and occupies the most dominant position compared to other organisations. This view occurs because the bureaucracy is still seen as a determinant and frontline unit for the achievement of public policy goals that have been formulated and predetermined.

Purwanto emphasised that; "Bureaucracy is still the backbone for achieving various public policy objectives" (Purwanto, et al. 2012). As the backbone in implementing policies, the success of the bureaucracy is greatly influenced by the capacity of the organisation. This

argument was made by Armstrong in Erwan and Dyah, as quoted in the following paragraph: "organisational capacity is the capacity of an organisation to function effectively. It is about its ability to guarantee high levels of performance, achieve its goals (sustained competitive advantage in a commercial business), deliver results and, importantly, meet the needs of stakeholders" (Purwanto and Erwan, 2012). Likewise Goggin defines organisational capacity as a unified organisational element that involves: (a) structure; (b) mechanism of work or coordination between units involved in implementation; (c) human resources within the organisation; and (d) financial support and resources needed by the organisation to work (Purwanto and Erwan, 2012).

In connection with the study of organisational capacity, it can be stated that Gogin, et al views organisational capacity as a unitary organisational element that involves: (a) structure; (b) mechanism of work or coordination between units involved in implementation; (c) human resources in the organisation; and (d) financial support and needed resources. Gogin explained that, for policies to be achieved, organisational capacity involving four elements must be in optimal condition or mutually support one another, therefore an appropriate organisational design is needed (Purwanto, et al. 2012). In connection with the explanation of the need for optimal conditions so that policy objectives can be achieved, there is a view that is almost the same as Gogin's view, which is the perceived need for optimal conditions for the effectiveness of policy implementation which includes four factors or variables: (a) communication, (b) resources, (c) disposition, and (d) bureaucratic structure (George, 2003).

The accuracy and adequacy of the elements associated with the formation of organisational capacity will greatly determine the effectiveness of the organisation as a unit / agent in implementing policy. The effectiveness of the organisation will ultimately determine the organisation as an executor who is able to carry out its role well. Crosby identified elements of organisational capacity which included: (a) the ability to bridge various interests, (b) the capacity to mobilise and maintain support, (c) the ability to adapt to new tasks and have a framework for conducting the learning process, (d) the ability to recognise changes in the environment, (e) the ability to lobby and advocate, (f) the ability to monitor and control implementation, (g) a good coordination mechanism, (h) a mechanism to monitor the impact of policies (Crosby, 1996).

Research Methods

The design method used in this research is the descriptive qualitative research method, because in this study the researcher intends to collect and analyse data qualitatively and explain the nature of an object's conditions in situations and conditions naturally, by situating itself at the University's Quality Assurance Institute (LPMPT) Negeri Manado. This type of research uses descriptive qualitative analytical methods. Bogdan and Taylor in Moleong argued that,

qualitative research is "a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written or oral words from people and observable behavior" (Moleong, 2010). Qualitative research relies on a natural background holistically, positioning humans as research tools, conducting data analysis inductively, prioritising the process rather than the results of research agreed upon by researchers and research subjects. The main objective of qualitative research is to understand social phenomena or phenomena by focusing more on a complete picture of the phenomenon being studied rather than dividing it into interrelated variables.

The hope is to obtain a deep understanding of the phenomenon to further produce a theory. Because the objectives are different from quantitative research, the procedures for data acquisition and the types of qualitative research are also different (Adisasmita, 2010). This research is focused on the capacity of organisations in implementing quality assurance policies at LPMPT Unima , include: 1) Communication 2) Organisational resources 4) Disposition, and 5) Bureaucratic structure. The main data sources in qualitative research are informants. Informants are people who are observed and are rich in information and understand the problem being studied, so they can provide the information needed. Determination of the initial or key informant in this study was selected purposively (Stratified Purposive Sampling), i.e. people who really have a lot of data about the object under study. In qualitative research, the main instrument is the researcher itself (Anonymous, 2014).

Data collection techniques are the most important step in research, because the main purpose of research is to get data. Data collection can be done in various settings, with various sources and in various ways. When viewed from its settings, 60 data samples can be collected in natural settings. When viewed from the data source, the data collection can use primary sources and secondary sources. Furthermore, when viewed in terms of the ways or techniques of data collection, the data collection techniques can be done by observation (observation), interview (interview), documentation and a combination of the four (Sugiyono, 2012). In qualitative research, data collection is carried out in natural settings, with primary data sources, using data collection techniques such as triangulation / combination.

Nasution argued that, to facilitate data collection, the researchers used tools such as interview guidelines, field notes, tape recorders, photo cameras and so on (Nasution, 1988). Data collection techniques included: In-depth Interviews, and observations. This technique is used to observe social conditions, especially interactions and collaborations between LPMPT Unima, Faculty Quality Assurance Unit (UPM), and Quality Assurance Group (GPM) in each department and study program. Documentation, this technique is used to gather various written information related to Unima LPMPT activities, UPM and GPM activities. Data analysis used an interactive analysis model from Miles and Huberman (BAPPENAS and UNDP Indonesia, 2004).

Research Result

Based on the data description of the results of the research data analysis, the results of this study are summarised as follows: 1. Organisationally the capacity of LPMPT Unima as a quality assurance policy implementor has not shown its optimal performance. 2. The sub-optimal capacity of LPMPT Unima as a quality assurance policy implementor is caused by the following conditions: One. Communication between organisations, namely between LPMPT Unima, UPM (faculties) and GPM (majors / study programs) has not been well established, because UPM and GPM are organisationally spread across various faculties, departments and study programs.

Two, based on the results of data analysis that has been described, it was found that Unima LPMPT still lacks the support of resources. Human resources are still relatively limited and do not understand quality assurance. Other factors include limited facilities to support activities, and weak financial resource support (financing), which hampers LPMPT operations, as quality assurance do not run effectively.

Three, the low commitment and support of leaders from the top to the lowest level towards the existence of LPMPT as a quality assurance agency. Four, the LPMPT bureaucratic structure starting from the Unima, Faculty (UPM) level to the departments and study programs (GPM) is clear. Operationally, however, it has not functioned well. The mechanism and working relationship are less intertwined, because LPMPT Unima itself does not have standard operating procedures (SOP) that facilitate coordination and allow the working relationship between LPMPT, UPM and GPM to run well.

REFERENCES

Adisusilo, S. (2008). "Nationalism-democracy-civil society, "Yogyakarta : Sanata Dharma University.

Adisasmita, R. (2010). "Rural and urban development," Graha Ilmu: Yogyakarta

Afzal, A. Rohman, A. (2012)."The effect of investment decisions, funding decisions, and dividend policies on company value. Journal of Accounting Volume 1 No. 2 page 09," Diponegoro University:Semarang,.

Anderson, J. (2014). "Public Policy Making, (second ed)," New York : Holt, Renehart and Winson New York,

BAPPENAS and UNDP Indonesia, Indonesian Human Development Report. (2004). Economic Democracy: Financing Human Development in Indonesia. Published jointly by BPS-Statistics Indonesia.

Brecombi, N. A. (1984)."Dictionary of sociology," New York: Penguin Books.

Cohen, (2007)."Research methods in education,"New York. Rutekan. 657 Pg, 2007.

Crosby, P. (1996)."*The absolutes of leadership,"*San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company

Directorate General of Higher Education, (2010). Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI). Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

George, E. (2003). Public policy implementation. YPAPI: Yogyakarta.,

Meissner, H. (1992). Develop cancer control capacity in state and local public health institutions," Public Health Report, 107, 15-23.

Miles M. and Huberman, (1992)."Qualitative data analysis," UI Press: Jakarta,.

Minister of National Education Regulation. (2009). No. 63 concerning the Education Quality Assurance System.

Moleong, L. (2010)."Qualitative research methodology. Youth Rosdakarya: Bandung,

Nasution, S. (1988)."Qualitative naturalistic research methods. Tarsito: Bandung,.

Purwanto, N. (2004). Principles and techniques of teaching evaluation," Bandung: Rosdakarya,

Purwanto, N. (2006)."Theoretical and practical education," Bandung: Youth Rosda Karya,.

Purwanto, E. A. Sulistyastuti, D. (2012).Implementation of public policy: Its concepts and applications in Indonesia," Gava Media: Yogyakarta, ,

Purwanto A. and Erwan. (2012)."Implementation of concept and public policy," Application in Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.

Rohman, A. (2012)."Effects of investment decisions, funding decisions, and dividend policies on company value. Journal of Accounting Volume 1 No. 2, page 09," Diponegoro University, Semarang.

Sallis, E. (2010). "Integrated quality management," Bogor: IRCiSoD Publisher.

Siagian, P. (2003)."Philosophy of administration," Jakarta; Bumi Aksara.

Subiakto, H. Ida and Rachmah, (2012)."Political communication, media, & communication," Jakarta: Kencana,

Sugiyono, (2012)."Understanding qualitative research. Publisher of CV. Alfabeta: Bandung,.