

# ANALYSIS OF DETERMINING THE APPROPRIATE FORM OF QUALITY EVALUATION IN MEASURING THE STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES OF A HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Dedi Amrizal<sup>1\*</sup>, Yusriati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>\*1,2</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara

<sup>\*1</sup>email: [dediamrizal@umsu.ac.id](mailto:dediamrizal@umsu.ac.id)

**Abstract:** The implementation of SPMI in a university uses evaluation in the PPEPP stage. Evaluation is very important because it serves as evidence of implementation and planning. Therefore, it requires the ability to apply evaluation correctly according to the sop and the field being measured. So far, the types of measurements known and practiced by quality assurance organizations and UPPS are only audits and monev. SOP measurement should be adjusted to the most effective evaluation to get the achievement of indicators from existing quality standards. The purpose of this study was to determine the best type of evaluation as a measuring tool for the implementation of SOPs that have been determined by quality standard indicators. The research method used is R&D with the ADDIE approach. The effectiveness of the implementation of this type of evaluation was used the N-Test of Gain. The results concluded that there is only one type of evaluation that is most suitable and effective for each SOP that has been outlined by quality standard indicators. Each SOP has its own specific indicators and types of evaluation that are not the same as other SOPs. This shows that the form of evaluation given to all existing SOPs should not be the same.

**Keywords:** Quality\_Evaluation, Standard\_Operating\_Procedures, Quality\_Assurance\_System.

## Introduction

Research data in several public and private universities related to the application of evaluation in the PPEPP cycle only focuses on the application of quality audits during one quality cycle. The application of evaluation to the implementation of quality assurance mandated in the main performance indicators and additional performance indicators of quality standards is only carried out through internal quality audits. No other form of evaluation was found to measure the implementation of quality standards except quality audits. This means that the measurement of the implementation of SOPs, which is a derivative of quality standards, is not evaluated. As for some monitoring and evaluation related to student satisfaction, lecturers, staff and cooperation partner satisfaction are not fully related to the main performance indicators and additional performance indicators of the quality standards.

SPMI implemented through the PPEPP stage requires quality standards that are operationalized in the form of SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures). This SOP must be measured using evaluation so that the results can be used in management review meetings. The form of evaluation is adjusted to the form, breadth, depth and usefulness of the SOP being measured. Field facts show that the understanding of the importance of the formulation of SOPs and evaluation tools is very minimal owned by higher education quality assurance organizations

in universities. If a college has a quality standard with a complete SOP in its implementation, unfortunately it has not been equipped with a clear evaluation and even nothing at all.

This study aims (1) to determine the existence of quality standards through SOPs that are measured in a clear form of evaluation; (2) to explain how to determine the right form of evaluation in measuring SOPs that have been owned so far; (3) to determine the effectiveness of the selected type of evaluation for one SOP. The results of this study show that the existing SPMI implementation does not yet have quality standards that have complete SOPs. In addition, it was also found that SOPs that have been decided to exist, it turns out that at the evaluation stage there are still many that do not have clear and effective measuring instruments. There are also SOP measurement tools that have been implemented but are not related to the KPIs and KPIs of existing quality standards. This apparently boils down to the lack of understanding of the quality assurance organization in determining the most appropriate and effective form of evaluation for an SOP. In the end, by using the N-Gain Test on one form of evaluation (student satisfaction monitoring and evaluation) on the level of academic services with the results tested effective.

## Literature Review

The term evaluation according to Arikunto (2015: 25) is a data collection activity to measure the extent to which the objectives have been achieved. This evaluation activity according to Wirawan's description (2015: 7) is a research to collect, analyze, and present useful information about the object of evaluation, assess it and compare it with evaluation indicators and the results are used to make decisions about the object of evaluation. So an evaluation is a long process towards making the right decision as revealed by Sukardi (2011: 22) that actually evaluation is also a process of understanding, giving meaning, getting decisions, and communicating information for decision-making purposes. From the understanding of the experts above, it can be concluded that evaluation itself is the process of analyzing and assessing a condition or program, whether the program has run according to its objectives or not.

In line with that, Wirawan (2015: 22-23) revealed that in accordance with the development of educational management, it was developed that the objectives of the evaluation consisted of: (1) measuring the effect of the program on society; (2) assessing whether the program has been implemented according to plan; (3) measuring whether the implementation of the program is in accordance with the standards; (4) program evaluation can identify and determine which dimensions of the program are working, which are not working; (5) program staff development; (6) fulfilling statutory provisions; (7) program accreditation; (8) measuring cost effectiveness and cost efficiency; (9) making decisions about the program; (10) accountability; (11) providing feedback to leaders and programs; (12) developing evaluation theory and evaluation research..

According to Munthe (2015: 1-14) that program evaluation can be translated as a process of seeking information, finding information and determining information that is presented systematically related to planning, value, purpose, benefits, effectiveness and suitability of something with predetermined criteria and objectives. In line with that, Amrizal (2022: 338-341) states that in existing work programs if they have not been properly evaluated and when the program runs or is completed it is often found that the vision, mission, goals and objectives are not used as a measure of success. In addition, it was also found that each program has not been analyzed for its results and benefits for the community. Musfah (2011: 92) reveals that the information obtained from evaluation activities is very useful for decision-making and further policies for programs that are being or have been implemented. The form of evaluation results is a recommendation from the evaluator to make decisions. Furthermore, Mulyatiningsih (2011:

114-115) explains that program evaluation is carried out with the aim of: a) showing the contribution of the program to the achievement of organizational goals. The results of this evaluation are important for developing the same program elsewhere; b) make decisions about the sustainability of a program, whether the program needs to be continued, improved or stopped.

As we know that SPMI is an important program in fostering quality higher education. The development of SPMI at this time has been carried out using a management process that includes the stages of procurement, implementation, evaluation, control and improvement or abbreviated as PPEPP. The output of procurement is a quality document (including quality policy, quality manual, quality standards and forms) that summarizes all planned activities during one quality cycle. The output of implementation is a list of monitoring and documentation of all activities carried out based on official documents. This activity will be illustrated in the form of SOPs or standard operating procedures, guidelines, and guidelines for work. The output of evaluation is a report on the results of the evaluation of work programs and performance of organizations and institutions as well as faculties and study programs. The output of control is a discussion of the results of evaluations and internal audits that have been carried out in a management review meeting. The resulting follow-up report is given recommendations to be followed up in the next stage. Finally, the output of improvement is an annual performance meeting in the form of a follow-up for improvement or replacement of new standards in order to anticipate future problems and mistakes at the university level.

The definition of Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) according to Tambunan (2013: 86) is a guideline that contains standard operational procedures that exist within an organization that are used to ensure that all decisions and actions, as well as the use of process facilities carried out by people in the organization who are members of the organization to run effectively and efficiently, consistently, standardized and systematic. In line with that, Ekotama (2011: 19) explains that SOP or what translates into PSO (Standard Operating Procedure) is a system that is compiled to facilitate, tidy up, and bring order to our work, this system is a sequential process for doing work from start to finish. Soematmadja (2020: 11) explains that the implementation of standard operating procedures (SOP) is determined so that organizations can adapt to changing times and are ready to accept challenges and become one of the solutions to reduce the occurrence of various problems in the company. Furthermore, Budihardjo (2014: 8) suggests that the impact of implementing SOPs on organizations is as follows, if all work units in a company or organization agree to be disciplined and consistent in implementing SOPs according to the interests and needs of their respective work units, it can be ensured that efficiency will be achieved as a whole in the organization.

Sebuah SOP merupakan program kerja yang harus dievaluasi. Hal ini disebabkan sebuah SOP dijadikan sebagai acuan dalam melakukan evaluasi atau penilaian kinerja para pekerja pelaksana, berikut penjabaran kapan SOP dibuat menurut Fatimah (2021:22-24), yaitu: (a) sebelum suatu pekerjaan dilakukan, SOP harus sudah ada sebelum pekerjaan dilakukan oleh pelaksana, contohnya seorang staf pemasaran, pihak perusahaan harus memberikan SOP dengan jelas kepada staf tersebut sebelum staf tersebut turun lapangan; (b) saat ada posisi baru SOP harus dibuat sebelum posisi ditempati oleh seorang karyawan; (c) saat ada perubahan langkah kerja SOP perlu dibuat agar pelaksana mengetahui bagaimana menggunakan langkah kerja tersebut; (d) saat ada lokasi berbeda, dan perbedaan di semua hal yang mempengaruhi lingkungan kerja Lokasi juga memengaruhi bagaimana seseorang melakukan pekerjaannya, misalnya seorang staf yang lokasi kerjanya lebih luas dari area kerja yang lama, maka perlu dibuatkan SOP yang sangat detail sehingga staf tersebut paham batasan dan target yang harus diperoleh di area kerja yang baru.

Fatimah (2021: 13) further explains that the SOP is one of the main guidelines regarding work procedures related to steps or stages related to work activities in a company and its units. There are various evaluation tools to measure this SOP, including monitoring, observation, monitoring and evaluation, swot analysis, audits and others. So this SOP must have been socialized first before being evaluated as Yusriati's opinion (2024: 1974) that socialization cannot be abandoned and must be routinely carried out through any method / technique and media with the aim of telling something, or changing opinions, attitudes and behavior.

Finally, Pratono (2011: 86-93) proves that evaluation activities make internal control lead to improved work quality. The form of evaluation carried out regarding the implementation of standard operating procedures provides effective input to work units regarding the work activities provided. Furthermore, universities also need quality evaluations as revealed by Becket (2015: 12) that audits (monev) conducted have potential value in improving the quality of higher education provision and identifying actions that universities and their departments can take. The research above reveals that evaluation activities are important because they can improve the quality of a standard operating procedure, while evaluation in the form of an audit is also needed to carry out inspection activities in a broad sense of the implementation of quality standards of an organization, system, process, product, or activity carried out by competent parties. All of this is done objectively and impartially.

## Method

The research method used is Research and Development (R&D) with the ADDIE model approach. To support the applied method, this research uses one example of SOP (academic services) and the selection of its evaluation form (student satisfaction evaluation). At the time of the research, research subjects were used in the form of students. While the Gain Test sample used lecturers and staff in higher education. Data collection techniques were carried out by observation, interviews, and questionnaires. Research instruments at the time of the trial were validated and rehabilitated. Instruments for FGD, Implementation and Gain Test were also validated by the LLDIKTI facilitator with very feasible results. For N-Gain Testing conducted on the form of evaluation used by an SOP tested with the effective category. This shows that the SOP with the developed evaluation form is tested effective. In other words, it can be stated that the improved academic service SOP at the research location can be measured properly and tested effective at the research location.

## Result and Discussion

### a. Existence of quality standards through measurable SOPs in a clear form of evaluation

At the analysis stage of the ADDIE approach used, the ongoing system, the ongoing management structure and the environment that supports the application of the SOP evaluation form used. At this time, an analysis of the current SOP is carried out. The SOP selected in this study continues to be developed through implementation and measurement using the M&E evaluation form. The selection of the evaluation form of the SOP begins with matching the criteria, processes and results obtained from a measurement tool (for example: monitoring and evaluation, monitoring, evaluation, FGD, benchmarking, audit, swot analysis, short survey and others). After the selection of the evaluation form is completed, small-scale and wide-scale field testing is carried out. However, beforehand, the instruments and implementation team are prepared as well as supporting tools such as guidebooks and others that have been validated by experts.

**b. The right form of evaluation in measuring SOPs.**

Analysis. After studying the theories and models applied in academic services, the characteristics and indicators of the SOP of academic services were obtained, which will be measured by one of the selected evaluation forms, namely monitoring and evaluation with consideration of theories and evaluation models combined from various management evaluations in the field of education. Then the characteristics and indicators of the existing SOPs were tested in FGDs before being applied on a limited and wide scale.

Development. The initial development phase tested the feasibility of the SOPs and the measurement tools used. This feasibility is necessary to ensure that the SOPs and evaluations used are reliable and effective for measuring, monitoring and evaluating the SOPs. The feasibility of M&E (as the chosen measurement tool) is a measure or assessment of how well it can be used to effectively measure, monitor and evaluate academic service SOPs. Therefore, the feasibility of the selected form of evaluation (money) can be seen from the supporting documents, the instrument of the evaluation tool (money) and the experts who assess it.

Implementation and Evaluation. The form of evaluation (M&E) that has been selected and assessed for feasibility is then implemented in the field on a limited scale and on a wide scale. At the time of implementation in the field, evaluation is carried out in the form of pretests and posttests. The form of evaluation as a product that is applied gets an evaluation in terms of the instruments and indicators used, then also gets input from the FGDs that are held.

**c. Effectiveness of the selected evaluation type for one SOP.**

This form of evaluation (M&E) as an N-Gin tested product was found to be effective. This can be seen from the results of the N-Gain test calculation which shows that the N-Gain value is in the very effective category. Evident from the average pretest and posttest achievements of the experimental group/class. Then the normality test was carried out on the N-Gain data to determine the effect of the treatment carried out on the distribution of data in each sample group/class. In this study, normality testing was carried out using the Shapiro-Wilk Test. Given that the data is not normally distributed, non-parametric statistical tests are used using the Mann Whitney Test. Based on the Mann-Whitney Test obtained, the sig value is  $0.000 < 0.05$ , this means that:  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. This means: there is a significant difference between the experimental class and the control class.  $H_0$  is the application of monitoring and evaluation (as a form of evaluation) cannot improve the SOP.  $H_a$  is the application of money can improve SOP.

**Conclusion**

The implementation of this research generally shows that (1) the existence of quality standards in SPMI can be realized in the form of SOPs. The number of SOPs that are born must guarantee the quality of their implementation. For this reason, each SOP must have an appropriate and easy-to-run evaluation form; (2) The ADDIE technique is able to determine the right form of evaluation to measure the SOPs that have been owned so far. Starting from detecting SOPs, testing the feasibility of instruments, to implementing evaluation products in order to measure SOPs; (3) The form of student satisfaction M&E evaluation used to measure the implementation of academic service SOPs was tested effective using N-GAIN. This effectiveness test was obtained from the implementation of the student satisfaction M&E model in a limited trial and a broad trial. The N-Gain test shows average results that are in the effective

category. So it can be concluded in general that the academic service SOP as measured by using student satisfaction money is very effective. This means that it can be applied to other SOPs with other forms of measurement.

## References

- Amrizal, D., & Yusriati, Y. (2022). *Pelatihan penerapan evaluasi program kerja organisasi salimah sumatera utara*. Martabe Journal of Pengabdian Masyarakat, 5(1), 338–341.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2015). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara: Jakarta.
- Becket, Nina. (2005). *Analysing Quality Audits in Higher Education*, Brookes eJournal of Learning Vol. One – Issue Two – Jan 2005.
- Budihardjo, M. (2014). *Panduan Praktis Menyusun SOP*. Raih Asa Sukses: Jakarta.
- Ekotama, Suryana. (2011). *Cara Mudah Bikin SOP Agar Bisnis Lebih Praktis*. Media Pressindo: Yogyakarta.
- Fatimah, F. N. (2021). *Panduan Praktis Evaluasi Kinerja Karyawan*. Anak Hebat Indonesia: Yogyakarta.
- Mulyatiningsih, E. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Terapan Bidang Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Alfabeta.
- Munthe, A. P. (2015). *Pentingnya evaluasi program di institusi pendidikan: Sebuah pengantar, pengertian, tujuan dan manfaat*. Scholaria: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 5(2), 1–14.
- Musfah, Jejen. (2011). *Peningkatan Kompetensi Guru Melalui Pelatihan dan Sumber Belajar Teori dan Praktik*. Kencana: Jakarta).
- Pratono, Rudi. (2011). *Evaluasi Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Audit Operasional Aktivitas Pelayanan Jasa Penginapan Pada Hotel Equator Surabaya*, Akruel Jurnal Akuntansi 3 (1), 2011, pp. 86-33.
- Sukardi, H.M. (2011). *Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara: Yogyakarta.
- Soemaatmadja, R. (2020). *Pentingnya Pembuatan SOP (Standar Operasional Prosedur) Sebagai Pendukung Dalam Pelayanan Publik*. Jurnal Lingkar Widyaaiswara, 7(1), 69-74.
- Tambunan, Rudi M. (2013). *Pedoman Penyusunan Standard Operating Prosedur (SOP)*. Maiestas Publishing: Jakarta.
- Wirawan. (2015). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Indonesia*. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada: Jakarta.
- Yusriati, Y., & Amrizal, D. (2024, March). *The Effectiveness Of The Formation Of Halal Production Communities Based On Halal Certified SMES In Tebing Tinggi*. In *Proceeding International Seminar Of Islamic Studies* (No. 1, Pp. 1026-1034).