UNESA
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

LECTURER SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT 2022



DATA AND SURVEY CENTER
QUALITY ASSURANCE UNIT
STATE UNIVERSITY OF SURABAYA

Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri,
Kota Surabaya, Provinsi Jawa Timur

simutu.unesa.ac.id
lpm.unesa.ac.id

LECTURER SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT



SURVEY AND DATA CENTER

QUALITY ASSURANCE BOARD

UNIVERSITAS NEGERI SURABAYA

2022

FOREWORD

By praising and giving thanks to Allah SWT, the preparation of the Universitas Negeri Surabaya Lecturer Satisfaction Survey Report has been completed. We would like to thank the various parties who have assisted in carrying out this activity so that it can be compiled as a report for the 2022/2023 Academic Year.

The preparation of this report is inseparable from the parties who have given appreciation and several inputs to the authors. Therefore, in this opportunity, allows us to express our gratitude for the following:

1. The Rector and the staff have provided much moral and material support to the Surabaya State University Quality Assurance Board.
2. The respondents were Lecturer at Universitas Negeri Surabaya who had agreed to take the time to fill out the satisfaction questionnaire instrument and provide input and suggestions.

Implementation and presentation of the results of this measurement, of course, still need improvement. Therefore, we hope for input from the entire academic community of Universitas Negeri Surabaya as a form of feedback that can be used to improve the implementation of measurements and evaluations for the coming period.

Acknowledge by,
Head of Quality Assurance Board

Dr. Widowati Budijastuti, M.Si
NIP. 196804151994022001

Surabaya, 11 March 2023
Head of Data and Survey Center

Wiyli Yustanti, S.Si, M.Kom
NIP. 197702032005012001

LEGITIMATION SHEET

Declare, that the Universitas Negeri Surabaya Lecturer Satisfaction Survey Report was made truthfully

Surabaya, 11 Maret 2023

Acknowledge by,
Head of Quality Assurance Board

Dr. Widowati Budijastuti, M.Si
NIP. 196804151994022001

Head of Data and Survey Center

Wiyli Yustanti, S.Si, M.Kom
NIP. 197702032005012001

LIST OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD **2**
LEGITIMATION SHEET **3**
LIST OF CONTENTS **4**
CHAPTER I **5**
INTRODUCTION **5**
1.1. Background 5
1.2. Legal basis 5
1.3. Problems 6
1.4. Objective 6
1.5. Report Systematics 6
CHAPTER II **8**
SURVEY METHOD **8**
2.1. Type and Design of Survey Implementation 8
2.2. Operational Definition 8
2.3. Survey Instruments 8
2.4. Method 8
2.5. Data processing 9
a. Gap Analysis and Conformity Level (Tki) 9
b. Normality test 10
c. Wilcoxon test 10
d. Cartesian diagram 11
CHAPTER III **12**
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION **12**
3.1 Statistical Analysis 12
3.2 Gap Analysis and Conformance Level 14
3.3 Quadrant Analysis (IPA) 17
CHAPTER IV **21**
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS **21**
BIBLIOGRAPHY **22**
ATTACHMENT **23**

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Data and Survey Center at Quality Assurance Board (LPM) Universitas Negeri Surabaya is one of the boards whose job is to assist the implementation of quality assurance with Quality Planning, Quality Implementation, Quality Evaluation, Quality Control, and Quality Improvement (PPEPP). The main task of the Data and Survey Center is to carry out a Customer Service Satisfaction survey which is currently a requirement as well as a demand for Study Program Accreditation and Higher Education Accreditation. The survey that has been carried out is a satisfaction survey of all activities carried out by LPM so that the quality of the implementation of operational activities at Surabaya State University can be evaluated periodically. This survey was conducted online. In addition, this survey is conducted when the regular semester, both the first and second semesters, have ended in each academic year. The results of this survey will be followed up with an evaluation meeting whose results will be used to improve service activities in the next academic year.

As time passes, the need for service quality improvement at Universitas Negeri Surabaya is increasing yearly, which can be caused by various internal and external factors. That main reason is one of the essential factors that encourage the implementation of satisfaction surveys at Universitas Negeri Surabaya, especially for students, lecturers, and education staff as survey respondents. This survey is truly needed so that LPM can determine which variables need to be improved and maintained in quality so that the community's welfare at Universitas Negeri Surabaya, starting from students, lecturers, and education staff, can continue to increase every year. This satisfaction survey consists of several statements, which respondents need to fill out the survey by placing a tick in the survey table regarding the respondent's expectations for the statements presented in the survey form and the reality that occurs regarding the service perceived at Universitas Negeri Surabaya in 2022.

1.2. Legal basis

1. Law Number 20 of 2003 on National Education System.
2. Law Number 12 of 2012 on Higher Education.

3. Government Regulation Number 4 of 2014 on Implementation of Higher Education and the Management of Higher Education.
4. Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture Number 50 of 2014 on Higher Education Quality Assurance System.
5. Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture Number 87 of 2014 on Accreditation of Study Programs and Higher Education.
6. Regulation of the Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Number 13 of 2015 on the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education 2015-2019.
7. Regulation of the Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Number 44 of 2015 on National Higher Education Standards.
8. Regulation of the Minister of National Education Number 7 of 2007 on Organization and Work Procedure of the Education Quality Assurance Institution.

1.3. Problems

1. Are the results of the 2022 UNESA lecturer satisfaction survey between expectations and reality indicating that there is a statistically significant difference by using statistical testing.
2. What are the results of comparing the expectations and reality of UNESA lecturer satisfaction based on the 2022 UNESA lecturer survey using Gap analysis.
3. What is the comparative analysis between expectations and the reality of UNESA lecturer satisfaction (2022 UNESA lecturer survey) using the Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) method.

1.4. Objective

By discovering the quality of UNESA lecturer satisfaction in 2022 based on a statistical analysis of different tests, gap analysis, and Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) analysis. In addition, this report is expected to be material for consideration and evaluation to improve quality in the next academic year.

1.5. Report Systematics

The systematics of this Universitas Negeri Surabaya lecturer satisfaction survey report consists of four chapters, which are as follows:

1. CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

   The first chapter contains the background to the preparation of the report, the legal basis, the problem raised in the report, the objective of the report, and the report systematics.

2. CHAPTER II: SURVEY METHOD

   The second chapter contains the type and design of survey implementation, operational definition, survey instruments, method, and data processing, consisting of gap analysis and conformity level, normality test, Wilcoxon test, and cartesian diagram.

3. CHAPTER III: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

   The third chapter contains the results and discussion of statistical analysis, Gap analysis, suitability level, and quadrant analysis using the Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) method.

4. CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

   The fourth chapter contains conclusions about the Universitas Negeri Surabaya lecturer satisfaction survey report and suggestions for implementing measurement and evaluation for the coming period.

CHAPTER II
SURVEY METHOD

2.1. Type and Design of Survey Implementation

The type of this research is quantitative descriptive research with a survey method. The survey method was chosen because it can provide a quantitative description or picture of the population's trends, attitudes, and opinions toward variables by studying the sample (Creswell & Creswell, 2018); (Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

This study uses a cross-sectional design to study the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable by taking measurements simultaneously (point time approach). At the same time, it means that each subject is only observed once, and the subject variables are carried out at the time of observation. The method used in data collection is a questionnaire.

2.2. Operational Definition

Some operational definitions are as follows:

1. Consumers are all lecturers who have already used UNESA services in 2022.
2. Consumer expectations are lecturers who will receive UNESA services in 2022.
3. Consumer satisfaction was consumer recognition regarding UNESA services in 2022.
4. The quality of service that will be examined is the expectations and reality of consumers on reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangible.

2.3. Survey Instruments

The instrument used is a questionnaire. Questionnaires are used to collect data by providing written questions about consumer expectations and realities to be answered. The questionnaire instrument consists of 5 aspects: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangible.

2.4. Method

The method which was used in this report is the *Service Quality Servqual Method* (Parasuraman et al., 1985). The dimensions of the service quality characteristics are:

1. *Tangibles*, which include physical appearance, equipment, employees, and means of communication.
2. *Reliability*, ability to provide the promised service promptly, accurately, and satisfactorily.
3. *Responsiveness*, desire of staff to shape customers and provide responsive service.
4. *Assurance*, covers the staff's knowledge, ability, courtesy, and trustworthy nature free from danger, risk, or doubt.
5. *Empathy*, includes ease in making relationships, good communication, personal attention, and understanding customer needs.

The next stage is to use the Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) method, which was first introduced by (Martilla & James, 1977) to measure the relationship between consumer/customer perceptions and priorities for improving the quality of products/services, also known as the Quadrant analysis.

2.5. Data processing

a. Gap Analysis and Conformity Level (Tki)

The level of consumer satisfaction is described using gap analysis (Gap). This analysis compares the mean between expectations and reality received by consumers from the service dimensions, namely reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangible. The highest satisfaction occurs when reality exceeds expectations, namely when the service provided is maximum (4) while the minimum expectation is (1). The formula for calculating the Gap analysis:

Gap = Reality - Expectations

Then, the formula for the level of conformity (Tki) between expectations and reality can use the formulation:

Tki = (Reality/Expectation) x 100%

Gap Score shows the gap between reality and expectations (Parasuraman et al., 1985). This shows that there is a problem of mismatch between customer expectations and the reality they feel. If the gap score is positive (+) indicates that reality can meet customer expectations, conversely if the gap value is negative (-) indicates that customer expectations have not been met (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

According to Wahyuni (2014), there are criteria for assessing the level of conformity of customers:

1. Customer conformity level > 100%, which means that the quality of the services provided has exceeded what is considered necessary by the customer à The service is very satisfactory.
2. Customer suitability level = 100%, which means that the quality of the service provided meets what is considered necessary by the customer à The service has been satisfactory.
3. Conformity level < 100%, which means that the quality of services provided is lacking/does not meet what is considered important by the customer à The service is not satisfactory.

b. Normality test

Data normality test was carried out by statistical analysis. This test was carried out by entering the average reality and expectations of each statement in the questionnaire. This test was conducted to determine whether the data used is normally distributed so that the next statistical test can be determined to be used.

The test used to determine whether the data is usually distributed is using Kolmogorov-Smirnov for large samples (more than 50 respondents) or Shapiro-Wilk for small samples (less than 50 respondents). The basis of decision-making is as follows:

1. If the significance value is > 0.05, the data is normally distributed (parametric data) and can be analyzed by paired t-test.
2. If the significance value is <0.05, then the data is not abnormally distributed (nonparametric data) and can be analyzed using the Wilcoxon test

c. Wilcoxon test

This test is conducted to determine whether there are significant differences between the reality and expectations studied so that it can be determined whether it is H_0rejected or accepted. If the results obtained are significant differences, then H_0it is rejected, but if the differences that occur are not significant, then H_0it is accepted. The Paired T-Test test is carried out if the two data being compared are normally distributed,

or the Wilcoxon test is if at least one of the compared is not normally distributed. It can be from reality and expectations

d. Cartesian diagram

The Cartesian diagram describes the level of statements into four parts. With this diagram, several factors that influence consumer satisfaction can be determined, which can then be prioritized for the company to improve further.

CHAPTER III
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Statistical Analysis

The survey was conducted by taking respondents who were lecturers of Universitas Negeri Surabaya, which was conducted randomly through Single Sign On (SSO). The data obtained amounted to 1026 respondents. This number of samples has fulfilled the sample adequacy requirements by using the Slovin formula. If the total lecturers population at UNESA is 1065 people and it is assumed that a tolerable error of 5%, then the minimum sample that must be fulfilled is:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2} = \frac{1065}{1 + (1065)(0.05^2)} = 290{,}78 \approx 291$$

With a total sample of 1026 respondents, the data adequacy requirements have been fulfilled.

Next, a normality assumption test will be carried out as a prerequisite for testing the mean difference between Expectations and Reality. The hypothesis is defined as follows:

H_0 : The data follows the Normal Distribution

H_1 : The data does not follow the Normal Distribution

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		H	K
N		1026	1026
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	3.6309	3.3867
	Std. Deviation	.46830	.53249
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.226	.125
	Positive	.215	.125
	Negative	-.226	-.110
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		7.255	3.994
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Figure 3.1. Data Normality Test Results

By using a significance value of 5%, from Figure 3.1 it can be seen that the asymptotic or p-value is less than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the results of hypothesis testing are Reject H0, which means the data does not follow the Normal distribution.

The Wilcoxon test is an alternative method of testing two paired samples in addition to testing with the Paired-T Test. If the sample meets the normal distribution assumption, the parametric statistical test approach can be used with the Paired-T Test. In contrast, if the assumption of normality is not met, the Wilcoxon test can be used. From the normality test results, it was concluded that the survey data did not meet the normal distribution assumptions. Therefore a non-parametric approach to the Wilcoxon sign test was used.

Ranks

		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Kenyataan - Harapan	Negative Ranks	457[a]	315.56	144209.00
	Positive Ranks	116[b]	174.50	20242.00
	Ties	453[c]		
	Total	1026		

a. Kenyataan < Harapan

b. Kenyataan > Harapan

c. Kenyataan = Harapan

Test Statistics[a]

	Kenyataan - Harapan
Z	-15.648[b]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

b. Based on positive ranks.

Figure 3.2. Wilcoxon Test Results

Based on the results of the Wilcoxon test using SPSS for windows 26, the results were obtained $Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed) < 0{,}05$. So, it can be stated Reject H $_0$ with the following hypothesis :

H_0 : There is no difference between Expected and Reality values

H_1 : There is a difference between Expected and Reality values

It can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the Expectations and Reality of UNESA lecturer satisfaction.

3.2 Gap Analysis and Conformance Level

The results of calculating Reality, Expectations, Gap Analysis, and Quality of Satisfaction of Unesa Lecturers in 2022 are explained in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Calculation results of Reality, Expectations, Gap Analysis, and Quality of Satisfaction of Unesa Lecturers in 2022

Dimensions	Code	Statement	Reality	Expectation	Gasp	Tki (%)
Tangibles	P1	Ease of obtaining information in supporting the activities of the Tridarma of Higher Education	3.43	3.67	-.24	93.54
	P11	Adequacy of the quantity and quality of facilities and infrastructure that support tri dharma activities (buildings, laboratories, classrooms, libraries, polyclinics, parking, etc.)	3.40	3.65	-.25	93.18
	P18	Accuracy in the disbursement of research and PKM funds	3.44	3.64	-.21	94.29
Means			**3.42**	**3.65**	**-.23**	**93.67**
Assurance	P4	Services of leaders and/or persons in charge who are authorized to support the implementation of the Tridarma of Higher Education	3.46	3.66	-.20	94.62
	P7	The clarity of the lecturer performance evaluation mechanism is in accordance with the SOP	3.38	3.63	-.25	93.01
	P12	Clarity of financial guidelines in all types of salary deductions and	3.55	3.71	-.16	95.68

		remuneration				
	P13	Accurate disbursement of salaries, lecturer certification and 30% remuneration every month	3.48	3.67	-.18	94.98
	P20	The accuracy of the research output and PKM is in accordance with the guidelines and SOP according to the scheme	3.44	3.63	-.19	94.63
Means			**3.46**	**3.66**	**-.20**	**94.58**
Responsiveness	P3	Ease of management services in the implementation of the Tridarma of Higher Education	3.20	3.59	-.39	89.15
	P8	Accuracy in the promotion process, career development, and lecturer rights	3.29	3.61	-.32	91.08
	P16	Readiness of LPPM administrative services in dealing with problems in the field of research and PKM	3.36	3.63	-.27	92.64
Means			**3.28**	**3.61**	**-.33**	**90.96**
Empathy	P5	Excellent management services at PT are carried out in accordance with procedures	3.42	3.63	-.21	94.24
	P9	Providing fair and transparent remuneration	3.15	3.48	-.33	90.38
	P14	Lecturer involvement in the preparation of the Budget Business Plan	3.41	3.61	-.20	94.35
	P17	Disclosure of the results of the evaluation of proposals,	3.30	3.57	-.27	92.44

		implementation, to the final research report and PKM				
Means			**3.32**	**3.57**	**-.25**	**92.85**
Reliability	P2	Availability of services to support Higher Education Tridarma activities, administration and information needs services on-line and offline accurately and satisfactorily	3.32	3.60	-.28	92.19
	P6	Appropriateness of the process of recruitment, selection and dismissal of lecturers in accordance with planning needs and applicable SOPs	3.42	3.67	-.25	93.29
	P10	Accessibility in accessing information systems through SSO	3.45	3.68	-.24	93.62
	P15	Compatibility of proposed proposals with research *roadmap* and PKM (studies, faculties, and universities)	3.43	3.67	-.24	93.46
	P19	Consistency of rules on the implementation and activities of research monev and PKM	3.34	3.61	-.27	92.65
	P21	Compatibility of PKM output with community needs	3.45	3.63	-.18	94.93
Means			**3.40**	**3.64**	**-.24**	**93.36**
Grand Mean			**3.38**	**3.63**	**-.25**	**93.08**

Table 3.1. Calculation results of Reality, Expectations, Gap Analysis, Conformity Level, and Mean UNESA lecturer satisfaction survey in 2022

Based on the results of the Gap Score calculations contained in table 3.1, it shows that of the five dimensions (items) are negative, this shows that the performance of lecturers has not met user expectations. It is known that the largest negative gap value is found in the *Responsiveness aspect* of the P3 variable and the P9 *Empathy* variable. This *responsiveness* aspect which is a service in the Ease of management services in the implementation of the tridarma of higher education and the *empathy aspect* is a service in the provision of fair and transparent remuneration. These two variables respectively have a gap value of -0.39 and -0.33. This shows that the level of respondents' expectations exceeds the level of performance/actual quality of the services provided. According to respondents, the level of conformity with expectations felt in the *responsiveness aspect* of the P3 variable was 89.15% and the value of the level of conformity with expectations in the *empathy aspect* of the P9 variable was 90.38%. Overall, the total correspondence between reality and expectations felt by lecturers from the satisfaction survey was 93.08%.

3.3 Quadrant Analysis (IPA)

Quadrant analysis or Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) is a descriptive analysis technique used to identify what important performance factors an organization must demonstrate in meeting the satisfaction of their service users (consumers). In general, the quadrant diagram model can be shown in Figure 3.3.



Figure 3.3. Cartesian diagram (Supranto, 2001)

The interpretation of each quadrant in Figure 3.3 can be explained as follows:

a. Quadrant I (Top Priority) This quadrant shows the factors that are considered to affect customer satisfaction and includes service elements that are considered very important to consumers. However, service providers have not implemented it in accordance with the wishes of consumers, causing disappointment / dissatisfaction. Variables in this quadrant need serious attention.

b. Quadrant II (Maintain Achievement) This quadrant indicates that the factors considered important by consumers have been implemented properly and can satisfy consumers, it is the obligation of service providers to maintain their performance.
c. Quadrant III (Low Priority) This quadrant shows factors that are considered less important by consumers and the implementation by service providers is mediocre. Variables included in this quadrant do not need to be questioned even though they do not satisfy consumers because consumers do not consider them very important
d. Quadrant IV (Excessive) This quadrant indicates factors that are considered less important by consumers but have been implemented very well by service providers.

Based on the interpretation of each of these quadrants, the results of calculating the average Expectations and Reality in table 3.1 are plotted in a Cartesian diagram as shown in Figure 3.4.



Figure 3.4. Cartesian Diagram of the 2022 Lecturer Satisfaction Survey

Based on the Cartesian diagram in Figure 3.4, the following are the results of the analysis of each quadrant, which are as follows:

a. Quadrant 1

In **quadrant I,** an indicator with code P7 is found, meaning that the clarity of the lecturer performance evaluation mechanism in accordance with the SOP must be a top priority. Higher education management has not implemented it in accordance with consumer wishes, giving rise to dissatisfaction. Thus the variables in this quadrant need to be taken seriously and the service must be improved even better

b. Quadrant II

In **quadrant II,** several variables were found, namely P1, P4, P6, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15, P18, P20, and P21. These variables are considered important by users and have been implemented properly to satisfy consumers. The higher education management's obligation is to maintain the performance that has been running so far. The aspects that include these variables are

- P1: Ease of obtaining information in supporting the activities of the Tridharma of Higher Education
- P4: Services of the leadership and/or persons in charge who are authorized to support the implementation of the Tridarma of Higher Education
- P6: Appropriateness of the process of recruitment, selection and dismissal of lecturers in accordance with planning needs and applicable SOPs
- P10 : Accessibility in accessing information systems through SSO
- P11: Adequacy of quantity and quality of facilities and infrastructure that support tri dharma activities (buildings, laboratories, classrooms, libraries, polyclinics, parking, etc.)
- P12 : Clarity of financial guidelines in all types of salary deductions and remuneration
- P13: Accurate disbursement of salaries, lecturer certification and 30% remuneration every month
- P15: Compatibility of proposed proposals with research *roadmap* and PKM (studies, faculties, and universities)
- P18 : Accuracy in the disbursement of research and PKM funds
- P20: The accuracy of the research output and PKM is in accordance with the guidelines and SOP according to the scheme
- P21: Conformity of PKM output with community needs

c. Quadrant III

In **quadrant III** , variables P2, P3, P8, P9, P16, P17, and P19 were found. These variables do not need to be questioned and are in accordance with consumer expectations so that they are not too much of a focus of attention in subsequent improvements. The aspects that include these variables are

- P2: Availability of services to support Higher Education Tridarma activities, administration and on-line and offline information needs services accurately and satisfactorily
- P3: Ease of management services in the implementation of the Tridarma of Higher Education
- P8 : Accuracy in the promotion process, career development, and lecturer rights
- P9 : Providing fair and transparent remuneration
- P16 : Readiness of LPPM administrative services in dealing with problems in the field of research and PKM
- P17 : Disclosure of the results of the evaluation of proposals, implementation, up to the final research report and PKM
- P19: Consistency of rules on the implementation and activities of research monev and PKM

d. Quadrant IV

In quadrant IV, variables P8 and P10 are found, including accuracy in promotion processes, career development, and lecturer rights and accessibility in accessing information systems through SSO. This variable is a factor that is less important to users because it is not deemed necessary, but the services provided have been carried out very well.

CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of data analysis from the lecturer satisfaction survey, it can be concluded as follows:

a. There is a significant difference between Expectations and Reality based on the results of the Wilcoxon test with a significance value of <5% and concluding that Ho is rejected.
b. A significant difference based on the gap analysis found that there is a fairly large gap in the P3 variable of -0.39, namely the ease of management services in the implementation of the higher education Tridarma has a level of conformity with lecturer expectations of 89.15% so that it is interpreted as unable to fulfill satisfaction based on the lecturer's perspective . However, in general, the level of conformity between expectations and reality is 93.08%.
c. In quadrant I, an indicator with code P7 is found, meaning that the clarity of the lecturer performance evaluation mechanism in accordance with the SOP must be a top priority.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Creswell, JW, & Creswell, JD (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Johnson, RB, & Christensen, R. (2014). Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Martilla, JA, & James, JC (1977). Importance Performance Analysis. Journal of Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 41(1), 77–79.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, VA, & Berry, LL (1985). A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research. Journal of Marketing, 49(4), 41–50.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, VA, & Berry, LL (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. Journal of Retailing, 64(1), 12–40.

Supranto, J. (2001). Measuring the Level of Customer Satisfaction to Increase Market Share. Rineka Cipta.

Wahyuni, N. (2014). Gap Analysis. Binus University.

ATTACHMENT

Code	Statement	Importance Level				Performance Level			
		Very important	Important	Quite important	Not too important	Very Good	Good	Pretty Good	Not Good
I.	**Management Service Satisfaction Instrument (Criterion 2)**								
P1	Ease of obtaining information in supporting the activities of the Tridarma of Higher Education (*tangible*)								
P2	Availability of services to support Higher Education Tridarma activities, administration and on-line and offline information needs services accurately and satisfactorily (*reliability*)								
P3	Ease of management services in the implementation of the Tridarma of Higher Education (*responsiveness*)								

P4	Services for leaders and/or persons in charge who are authorized to support the implementation of the Tridarma of Higher Education (*assurance*)								
P5	Excellent management services at PTs are carried out in accordance with procedures (*empathy*)								
II. HR Development Management Service Satisfaction Instrument (Criterion 4)									
P6	Appropriateness of the process of recruitment, selection and dismissal of lecturers in accordance with planning requirements and applicable SOPs (*reliability*)								
P7	Clarity of lecturer performance evaluation mechanism according to SOP (*assurance*)								
P8	Accuracy in the promotion process, career development, and lecturer rights (*responsiveness*).								

P9	Providing fair and transparent remuneration (*empathy*)								
III. Satisfaction Instrument for Financial Management Services and Infrastructure (Criterion 5)									
P10	Accessibility in accessing information systems through SSO (*reliability*)								
P11	Adequacy of the quantity and quality of facilities and infrastructure that support tri dharma activities (buildings, laboratories, classrooms, libraries, polyclinics, parking, etc.) (*tangibles*)								
P12	Clarity of financial guidelines in all types of salary deductions and remuneration (*assurance*)								
P13	Accurate disbursement of salaries, lecturer certification and 30% remuneration every month (*assurance*)								

P14	Lecturer involvement in the preparation of the Budget Business Plan (*emphaty*)								
IV. Satisfaction Instrument for Research Process Implementation Services and PKM (Criteria 7 and 8)									
P15	Conformity of the proposed proposals with the research *roadmap* and PKM (studies, faculties, and university) (*reliability*)								
P16	Readiness of LPPM administrative services in dealing with problems in the field of research and PKM (*responsiveness*)								
P17	Disclosure of the results of the evaluation of proposals, implementation, to the final research report and PKM (*empathy*)								
P18	Accuracy in the disbursement of research funds and PKM (*tangibles*)								
P19	Consistency of rules on the implementation and activities of research monev and PKM (*reliability*)								

P20	Accuracy of research output and PKM in accordance with the guidelines and SOP in accordance with the scheme (*assurance*)								
P21	Compatibility of PKM output with community needs (*reliability*)								