Panelist Analysis of Higher Education Governance Instruments Based on Good University Governance Principles Using Many Facet Rasch Measurements

Deni Iriyadi[1], Muhajir[2], Cecep Nikmatullah[3], Hevriana hartati

[123]Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten

Address for Correspondence:
deni.iriyadi@uinbanten.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research aims to develop instruments related to measuring higher education governance so that it can fulfill the principles of good governance. This research used 3 panelists to measure the content validity of the instrument developed. The criteria for selecting experts/validators are adjusted to the expertise and needs of the instrument development being carried out. The study on testing the content validity of panelists uses Rasch Model analysis with the Facets application which aims to test subjectively rated statement items by looking at several aspects including unidimensional assumptions, testing model fit (item fit), and rater/expert consistency. The results of the content validity analysis carried out show that the unidimensional criteria (the raw variance explained by measure value is more than 20%), the item fit value (the outfit value is in the range of 0.5-1.5), and the rater consistency assessment show that all raters/experts meet the fitness criteria (outfit and infit value categories are in the range 0.5-1.5). The results of the content validity analysis carried out show that the quality of the instrument developed is suitable for use to measure higher education governance.

Keywords: Good University Governace, Rasch, Facet

INTRODUCTION

The term "Good Corporate Governance" (often abbreviated as "GCG") refers to a structure, a system, and a process that are utilized by business organs in an effort to add value to the firm on an ongoing basis over the long term, while still paying respect to the interests of other stakeholders, and doing so in accordance with morality, ethics, culture, and other applicable standards. It is anticipated that good university governance will improve the public image, which will ultimately contribute to the promotion of legitimacy and public engagement in the role that universities play. In accordance with the Strategic Objective that was put into place for the period 2015–2019, the Strategic Objective Performance Indicator was put into place in order to characterize the level of success that was achieved in relation to this strategic objective indicator university.

In order to raise the overall level of educational excellence, it is necessary to simultaneously carry out either a regulating process or an evaluation of educational management. Earlier study on the topic of good university governance, which was published in 2015, formed the basis for this conclusion (Mariani et al., 2017). That study found that the function of universities as a component of the process of educating people has been of great importance within society. In point of fact, Indonesia is thought to have a bad quality of education, which is proven by the fact that its universities rank lower than other leading universities throughout the world and by the country's high rate of unemployment. One of the numerous initiatives currently underway to raise educational standards is the establishment of more responsible governance at universities. The Good University

Governance (GUG) idea refers to a university and higher education system that creates objectives, puts them into action, and organizes institutions in terms of their achievements, finances, and human resources.

Learning is an important process in human life. Through learning, humans can refine their attitudes to be more civilized and civilized to create a better life (Stojanović et al., 2016). National Education System Law No. 20 of 2003 states that education is a real and planned effort to create an atmosphere of educational practice and process. This is done so that students can actively develop their ability to have inner faith, self-regulation, character, reason, noble character, as well as the skills needed by themselves, citizens, the nation and society. The National Education System is a complete system for the country which is the basis for implementing national learning with Article 31 section (3) in the 1945 Constitution as the basis. The mandate of the Constitution is stated again in more detail in the National Education System Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Learning System.

Higher education is education provided in diploma, bachelor's, master's, specialist and doctoral programs. To advance humanity and solve emerging problems in the modern world, education is an important source of innovation and solutions. This is in line with what is stated in the UNESCO declaration that the mission and main function of higher education is to contribute to sustainable development and improvement of general society throughout the world (Orlovic Lovren et al., 2020). The subject of higher education governance, which is often associated with commercialization and privatization, is the most critical problem facing the higher education system today. In Indonesia, the implementation of higher education is not only carried out by the government, but also by the community in the form of foundations, associations, and so on in accordance with statutory provisions. Regulations are intended to prevent organizers from seeking profits that are detrimental to society (Negara & Purnamasari, 2018). Therefore, national education system regulations are binding on organizations operating in the higher education sector. Higher education organizations are also required to operate in an ethical manner.

To maintain high standards and accountability, especially in managerial matters, a good and appropriate governance structure is needed. In Indonesia there are 3,426 vocational study programs and 25,987 non-vocational study programs (PD-Dikti, 2022). This quite large number can make it difficult for the government in terms of standardization. Higher education institutions in Indonesia are required to improve their quality in order to be able to survive in an academic environment that is increasingly crowded with various new educational institutions (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). There are four aspects that need to be considered in higher education management, namely: governance, quality lecturer resources, research and publishing activities, and student activities. Therefore, universities must continue to adapt to every change and demand made by stakeholders, not only at the system level, but also at the management and technical level, in order to develop in response to advances in globalization. In order for higher education administration to have a strong foothold in realizing its vision, aims and objectives consistently, the reality of the situation needs to be put forward to prepare for unpredictable possibilities. The establishment, growth and maintenance of a financially viable higher education system cannot be based solely on aspirations that only inspire optimism. Facts must be disclosed to foresee potential uncertainties in order to maintain and develop the country's fundamental values and cultural traditions. Essential activities in the form of a Development Master Plan, Strategic Plan, Annual Operational Plan and Activities; each of these plans aims to do something different, can be measured relatively easily, and is targeted.

Higher education governance, which is usually combined with concerns of commercialization, privatization, and other related topics, is often cited as one of the most serious challenges facing the higher education sector (Tilak & Tilak, 2018). Meanwhile, laws

that guarantee and limit the fulfillment of rights and create a government system that is in accordance with the principles of good governance are both still weak. The idea that the regulations in the Higher Education Law are an attempt to abdicate the government's responsibility in administering higher education, etatism and commercialization of higher education is becoming expensive. Other problems are often related to various pros and cons related to autonomy and governance (Pierre & Peters, 2020). This concept is often associated with the theory that the regulations in the Higher Education Law are an attempt to free the government from its obligation to provide higher education.

Governance is the behavior, procedures or strategies carried out by a PT to use all its potential as best as possible in an effort to achieve the vision and goals that have been set (Wasiuzzaman & Gunasegavan, 2013). Technically, governance is expressed as a systematic effort in a process to achieve organizational goals, through the functions of planning, implementing, managing and improving follow-up. In other words, governance is a process to achieve organizational goals. Therefore, governance also has the main objective of improving the quality of PT in order to achieve the stated goals.

Governance will function well as long as it is equipped with a supportive academic environment and a culture of organizational involvement. Both must continue to be developed from time to time. At present, the responsible university governance model is the most credible option for leading an institution. In general, government components such as openness, accountability, leadership and dedication are related to each other. However, when good governance needs require adjustments and innovations of existing systems to achieve the HEI's vision and goals, governance issues become more difficult and present additional challenges.

Higher education institutions use governance as a strategy to maximize the use of all available resources and to work toward the realization of the vision and goals that have been articulated for the institution (Mariani et al., 2017). Technically, government is understood as a systematic effort in the process of achieving expected goals through the functions of planning, implementation, control, monitoring and evaluation. Thus, governance covers the entire governance process and has the main objective of continuously improving the quality of higher education in order to realize the desired vision and goals outlined in the higher education strategic plan.

Topics related to the application of good governance principles in higher education can easily attract the attention of various organizations, including academics (Sam, 2022). When it comes to improving the standards of higher education administration as a whole, many people see good governance as the best idea. The Good University Governance (GUG) model is currently recognized as an option that is believed to be able to help universities achieve their goals (Lieharyani et al., 2019). Strong governance is able to demand changes and new developments from old systems that are outdated. A good organizational governance mechanism is defined as GUG when an institution is able to manage organizational resources effectively, efficiently, economically, or productively while adhering to the principles of openness, accountability, responsibility, independence and fairness in the context of achieve organizational goals . Mutual control efforts carried out by many related parties and a strong government system can provide a harmonious, egalitarian, cohesive and balanced process in governance. Of course, it must also be ensured that there must be complete procedures that are able to guarantee harmony, equality, coherence and a balanced division of tasks.

GUG is an understanding that emerged as a result of the realization that the administration of higher education cannot be equated with the management of a nation or business (Swansson et al., 2005). The difference lies in the noble ideals related to the educational mission. Therefore, it is very important to establish criteria when determining whether a university has implemented the GUG concept or not. This criterion is used to

evaluate the extent to which universities are able to respond to changes as an effect of implementing GUG without having to sacrifice high ideals or responsibilities that must be fulfilled in the name of society, nation and state.

METHOD

This research aims to conduct a panelist test of data from the responses of 3 experts who have different knowledge according to the needs of writing the instrument, starting from experts on higher education content, measurement experts, and grammar experts. Data analysis uses many facet Rasch measurements using facet software. The data analysis focuses on 3 things, namely the unidimensional assumption, testing model fit (item fit), and rater/expert consistency (Chan et al., 2023; Eckes, 2015; Erguvan & Aksu Dunya, 2020). The unidimensional criterion is measured from the raw variance explained by measure value of 20% (Aryadoust et al., 2021). Meanwhile, for the model fit criteria (item fit) uses a different outfit value approach in the range of 0.5-1.5 and for the rater/expert consistency criteria uses an outfit and infit value category approach in the range of 0.5-1.5 (Tavakol & Pinner, 2019). There are 5 indicators regarding this measurement, namely: transparency, accountability, responsibility, independence, and fairness (Hariyanto, 2004; Jukneviciene & Kareivaite, 2012; Larasati et al., 2018; Lieharyani et al., 2019; Muhsin et al., 2020; Sari et al., 2022; Solikhudin & Zainullah, 2022; Waluya & Mulauddin, 2021).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the study presented above indicate that the value of the Variance explained by Rasch measures is 25.65%. This score is higher than the 20% threshold that constitutes the lowest acceptable deviation for unidimensional testing. In this manner, one can acquire results that demonstrate that the higher education governance assessment instrument is unidimensional or, to put it another way, that it satisfies the criteria for unidimensionality.

```
                                          Count    Mean    S.D.
 Responses used for estimation       =      27    2.27    0.93
 Responses in one extreme score      =       3    4.00    0.00
Count of measurable responses        =      18
 Raw-score variance of observations  =   0.240 100.00%
 Variance explained by Rasch measures =  0.068  25.65%
 Variance of residuals               =   0.172  74.35%
```

According to the findings of the investigation presented earlier, the value of the Variance Explained by Rasch is 25.65%. This value is greater than the 20% minimum criterion limit that is required for unidimensional testing. Results can be acquired in this manner which state that the higher education governance assessment instrument satisfies the unidimensional criteria, or, to put it another way, that it is unidimensional.

No	Infit	Outfit	PtMea
12	1.24	1.11	0.34
13	1.21	0.92	0.63
2	1.07	0.97	0.47
20	0.66	1.33	0.55
27	1.19	0.96	0.46
9	1.45	0.89	0.57
24	1.02	0.73	0.48
15	0.72	0.69	0.29
21	0.52	1.50	0.54
8	0.60	1.45	0.31

No	Infit	Outfit	PtMea
22	1.38	0.75	0.43
17	0.69	1.23	0.57
11	0.53	1.14	0.34
16	0.78	1.31	0.43
10	0.69	1.42	0.46
14	0.86	0.75	0.41
25	1.19	0.84	0.44
19	0.61	0.74	0.33
6	0.58	0.73	0.58
23	1.26	0.56	0.30
5	1.37	0.64	0.30
4	1.06	0.84	0.46
26	1.20	0.85	0.53
7	0.52	1.11	0.54
18	1.43	0.55	0.49
1	0.64	0.74	0.56
3	1.18	1.35	0.60

The item with the assessment that is the least difficult to complete is number 3, while the item with the assessment that is the most difficult to complete is number 12. All of the outfit scores fall between 0.5 and 1.5, which means that all of the components from the instrument that was produced satisfy the criteria for the outfit. Even just one of these items does not meet the requirements. Regarding the criteria for unacceptable fit, every component has a value that falls between 0.5 and 1.5. When it comes to the PtMea score, every single item has a positive value, which suggests that the instrument items that were designed do not have double meanings and do not confuse assessors when it comes to measuring higher education governance. The following table provides information regarding the value of rater consistency:

No	Infit	Outfit
2	1.49	0.90
1	0.54	0.72
3	1.48	1.01

The data presented in the table above demonstrates that all of the raters' fitness values fall within the acceptable range, which is defined as 0.5 to 1.5. Nobody who participated in the rating process deviated from these standards in any way.

Discussion

It has been determined, on the basis of the findings of the study, that the instruments for assessing the governance of higher education satisfy the legitimate criteria derived from the findings of the expert evaluations. The results that were stated earlier indicate that the instrument can be utilized; however, it is still necessary to undertake empirical tests on a broad scale to ensure that it is suitable for use. In the context of the administration of universities' own resources, the phrase "Good University Governance" (GUG) refers to a management concept that is utilized by educational institutions. (2017) (DIKTI, 2014) Good institutional governance, often known as GUG, is an organization that was established with the purpose of building accountable institutions. According to the Indonesian Ministry of Education (DIKTI), the eight tenets that make up the GUG are as follows: transparency, accountability, responsibility, independence, fairness, quality assurance and relevance,

effectiveness and efficiency, and not-for-profit status. Having a not-for-profit status is also one of the tenets. According to a report that was published in 2010 by Media Indonesia, universities are expected to manage their resources in a manner that is consistent with the principles of Good University Governance.

The Good University Governance (GUG) model is the single most critical success element in determining whether or not institutions are successful in gaining a competitive advantage. If the principles of Good University Governance (GUG) are put into effect at universities, it is possible for educational and research programs at universities to improve in terms of their overall quality. Good University Governance (GUG) must be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the vision and purpose of the university, and Islamic Private Universities are obligated to adhere to Islamic principles in this process. Good University Governance must be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the vision and objective of the university. The Vision and Mission of Islamic Private University in addition to carrying out the mandate of the creation of the University which is as an institution that operates based on Islamic principles and does not seek to make a profit in addition to carrying out the mandate of the formation of the University as an institution that operates based on Islamic principles and does not seek to make a profit.

The incorporation of Islamic principles into the academic community should not be confined to the intellectual level alone; rather, it should also take place within the organizational framework of the institution. As a natural consequence of monotheism, activities related to university management need to be carried out in a way that is good and proper in accordance with the path that was demonstrated by the Prophet Muhammad. This is required. In addition to the other things that need to be done, it is strongly suggested that this implementation take place inside the organization of the Human Resources. It is essential to have high-quality human resources that model themselves after the attributes exhibited by the Prophet Muhammad in order to create a government that functions efficiently.

When applied to an Islamic private institution, the concept of "Good University Governance," abbreviated as "GUG," provides extra benefits and is dubbed "Islamic University Governance," or "GUG." GUG is an abbreviation for "Good University Governance." Confirmation of this identity is something that holds a great deal of significance, and it is one of the things that sets Islamic Private University unique from other educational institutions. According to the findings of this research, the following ideas were suggested as potential indicators for identifying strong university governance: accountability, responsibility, independence, fairness, quality assurance and relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, non-profit status, and leadership.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the conversation that took place earlier, it is necessary to implement governance measurements for higher education that are based on the principles of good university governance, but Islamic values must be incorporated into these measurements. Measurements that are more accurate will be produced as a result of the combination of general knowledge and Islamic beliefs. The chances for adopting strong higher education governance measurements are significantly impacted by the results of the rater validation that was carried out, which have a substantial impact. Every single thing that was developed is up to the required standard. In this way, the newly developed devices will be able to be put into use right away. This study is solely concerned with the opinions offered by the panelists. It is vital to conduct empirical trials utilizing samples on a wider scale in order to ensure that the instrument that is currently being created is of the highest quality. In order to maintain consistency with the rater analysis that is being covered in this article, it is advised that you make use of Rasch model analysis.

REFERENCE

Aryadoust, V., Ng, L. Y., & Sayama, H. (2021). A Comprehensive Review ff Rasch Measurement in Language Assessment: Recommendations and Guidelines for Research. *Language Testing, 38*(1), 6–40. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/02655322209274

Chan, K. K. Y., Bond, T., & Yan, Z. (2023). Application of an automated essay scoring engine to English writing assessment using many-facet rasch measurement. *Language Testing, 40*(1), 61–85.

Eckes, T. (2015). Introduction to many-facet rasch measurement: Analyzing and evaluating rater-mediated assessments: Second edition. In *Introduction to Many-Facet Rasch Measurement: Analyzing and Evaluating Rater-Mediated Assessments: Second Edition* (Vol. 22). https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-04844-5

Erguvan, I. D., & Aksu Dunya, B. (2020). Analyzing rater severity in a freshman composition course using many facet Rasch measurement. *Language Testing in Asia, 10*(1), 1–20.

Hariyanto, S. (2004). Good Governance dalam Persprektif Perguruan Tinggi Swasta untuk Menghadapai Persaingan. *Jurnal Widya Manajemen Dan Akuntansi, 4*(2), 205–217.

Jukneviciene, V., & Kareivaite, R. (2012). Good Governance as the Instrument for the Implementation of the Sustainable Development's Conception. *Social Research, 28*(3), 28–42.

Larasati, R., Asnawi, M., & Hafizrianda, Y. (2018). Analisis Penerapan Good University Governance Pada Perguruan Tinggi Di Kota Jayapura. *Jurnal of Applied Managerial Accounting, 2*(2), 304–323.

Lieharyani, D. C. U., Hari Ginardi, R. V., Ambarwati, R., & Multazam, M. T. (2019). Assessment for good university governance in higher education focus on align strategy business with it at big data era. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1175*(1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1175/1/012204

Mariani, Pituringsih, E., & Hermanto. (2017). Good University Governance and Its Implication to Quality of Financial Reporting in the Public Service Agency. *International Conference and Call For Paper*, 395–417. http://jurnal.stie-mandala.ac.id/index.php/eproceeding/article/view/143

Muhsin, Martono, S., Nurkhin, A., Pramusinto, H., Afsari, N., & Arham, A. F. (2020). The relationship of good university governance and student satisfaction. *International Journal of Higher Education, 19*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p1

Negara, H. K. S., & Purnamasari, D. I. (2018). Implementation of good university governance principles in managing new universities assets. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network, 7*(5), 304–310.

Orlovic Lovren, V., Maruna, M., & Stanarevic, S. (2020). Reflections on the learning objectives for sustainable development in the higher education curricula–three cases from the University of Belgrade. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 21*(2), 315–335.

Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2020). *Governance, politics and the state*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Sam, I. (2022). Analisis Pelaksanaan Good University Governance, Sistem Pengendalian Intern Dan Hubungannya Dengan Kualitas Layanan. *Jambi Accounting Review (JAR)*. https://online-journal.unja.ac.id/JAR/article/view/19291

Sari, D. N., Previdayana, K. S., & Djasuli, M. (2022). Implementasi Prinsip Transparansi Dalam Kaidah Islam. *Jurnal Ekonomika Dan Bisnis (JEBS), 2*(3), 911–915.

Solikhudin, M., & Zainullah, M. (2022). The Formulation of Good Governance Fiqh for Indonesia as a Welfare State. *Al-Qisthu: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu-Ilmu Hukum, 20*(2), 166–181. https://doi.org/10.32694/qst.v20i2.1718

Stojanović, I., Ateljević, J., & Stević, R. S. (2016). Good Governance As a Tool of Sustainable Development. *European Journal of Sustainable Development, 5*(4), 558–573.

https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2016.v5n4p558

Swansson, J. A., Mow, K. E., & Bartos, S. (2005). Good university governance in Australia. *Proceedings Forum Of The Australian Association For Institutional Research*, *Dest 2004*, 98–109.

Tavakol, M., & Pinner, G. (2019). Using the Many-Facet Rasch Model to analyse and evaluate the quality of objective structured clinical examination: a non-experimental cross-sectional design. *BMJ Open*, *9*(9), e029208.

Tilak, J. B. G., & Tilak, J. B. G. (2018). Private higher education in India. *Education and Development in India: Critical Issues in Public Policy and Development*, 535–551.

Waluya, A. H., & Mulauddin, A. (2021). Akuntansi: Akuntabilitas Dan Transparansi Dalam Qs. Al Baqarah (2): 282-284. *Muamalatuna*, *12*(2), 15–35. https://doi.org/10.37035/mua.v12i2.3708

Wasiuzzaman, S., & Gunasegavan, U. N. (2013). Comparative study of the performance of Islamic and conventional banks: The case of Malaysia. *Humanomics*. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/08288661311299312/full/html?fullSc=1

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education–where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 1–27.