



UIN SUNAN AMPEL
SURABAYA

Integrated Twin Towers

Building Character Qualities:
for the Smart, Pious, and
Honorable Nations

Lecturer Satisfaction Survey Report

UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

2021



Quality Assurance Agency
UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya
2022

Acknowledgment

Assalamu'alaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh,

First and foremost, let us express our gratitude to the presence of Allah *Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala*, for His mercy and guidance, allowing us to compile the Lecturer Satisfaction Survey Report on UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya services in 2021.

I, as the chairperson of the Quality Assurance Agency (LPM) UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, extend sincere thanks to the entire academic community, especially to the lecturers who are at the forefront of carrying out the main roles and functions of the campus core business. This survey reflects our commitment to maintaining and improving the quality of services provided by UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Every response and input provided is highly valued.

Through the cooperation and collaboration among students, lecturers, educational staff, partners of *tridharma*, graduates, and users of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya graduates, we strive to continuously develop and enhance the quality of services provided by the campus. The service satisfaction survey serves as a means for us to evaluate our collective performance, identify areas for improvement, and respond to the needs and expectations of stakeholders.

Therefore, we want to emphasize that every input provided through this survey will be the basis for continuous improvement. We will make every effort to follow up on every constructive suggestion and criticism to create a better and conducive academic environment for the development of knowledge, morals, and character, as reflected in UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya's motto: Building Character Qualities: for the Smart, Pious, and Honorable Nation.

Thank you for the active participation of all stakeholders in conveying views and evaluations of the services we have provided. Through this synergy, may we continue to advance and improve the quality of education in the UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya environment.

In conclusion, let us remain committed to being part of positive change and providing our best contribution to the progress of our beloved UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. May Allah SWT always guide and bless our steps in the future.

Wassalamu'alaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh.

Surabaya, January 2022

Chairperson of LPM

Dr. Ali Mustofa, M.Pd.I.

Table of Content

- Acknowledgment 1
- Table of Content 1
- A. Background 1
- B. Respondent 2
- C. Instrument..... 2
- D. Scoring 3
- E. Satisfaction Category 3
- F. Results of the Survey 4
 - a) Management 4
 - b) Quality Improvement 4
 - c) Facilities and Infrastructure Management..... 6
 - d) Financial Management 6
 - e) Research 7
- G. Analysis 8
- H. Conclusion and Follow-up..... 9
- I. Closing 9

A. Background

Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Sunan Ampel Surabaya, as a higher education institution, places service to lecturers as a crucial aspect in achieving quality education goals. The success of the teaching and learning process is not only determined by the quality of teaching materials but also by how well the lecturers feel supported and served in carrying out their academic duties. Therefore, the satisfaction service survey report by lecturers at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya is initiated with the aim of understanding the perspectives, needs, and satisfaction levels of lecturers regarding the services provided by the university.

Various fundamental factors underlie the initiative of the lecturer satisfaction at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Firstly, the recognition of the importance of the well-being of lecturers as an integral component of the academic ecosystem. Lecturers' well-being includes not only financial aspects but also support in professional development, a conducive working environment, and the fulfilment of other basic needs. Lecturers who feel supported and have their needs met tend to be more motivated, dedicated, and able to contribute optimally to the education process.

Secondly, the dynamics of change in the increasingly complex world of higher education are an important factor behind this survey. Technological advancements, the demand for innovative research, and the evolution of learning paradigms require fast responses and adjustments to services to ensure that the university remains relevant and effective. The lecturer satisfaction survey becomes an essential tool to evaluate the extent to which the service system can meet the needs and expectations of lecturers in the face of dynamic change challenges.

Thirdly, UIN Sunan Ampel's commitment to providing excellent service is the primary driver behind the implementation of this survey. In an effort to support the achievement of the university's vision and mission, quality service to all academic elements, including lecturers, is a strategic foundation. This service satisfaction survey is expected to provide concrete insights for continuous improvement, ensuring that the services provided align with the goals and commitments of UIN Sunan Ampel.

With a profound understanding of lecturers' satisfaction with the services received, UIN Sunan Ampel is expected to make continuous improvements in specific areas that require further attention, as well as to build an academic environment conducive to the development of knowledge and quality learning.

B. Respondent

This service satisfaction survey was conducted in December 2021 and targeted the lecturers of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. From the distribution of service satisfaction questionnaires, a total of 356 lecturers participated in the survey. The survey was conducted through the website <https://survey.uinsa.ac.id/>.

C. Instrument

The survey instrument consists of 17 items divided into four aspects, as follows:

a) Management

- (1) Administrative and correspondence management services meet needs and are optimal.
- (2) Administrative services adhere to clean and service-oriented principles.
- (3) Administrative services utilize IT for user convenience.
- (4) Personnel provide services with excellent work culture, politeness, friendliness, and are perceived as excellent by users.

b) Quality Improvement

- (1) The appointment and placement of new personnel are confirmed by the Rector's decree upon the request of faculty and/or unit leaders.
- (2) Distribution of tasks and workloads (job descriptions and authorities) is adjusted according to capacity and planned with basic principles of fairness.
- (3) Opportunities for participating in career development programs (advanced studies, seminars, conferences, workshops, symposiums, etc.) have been provided based on principles of fairness and effective planning.
- (4) Clarity, transparency, and ease of information and services for promotion and position advancement.
- (5) Schemes for rewards and/or punishments, recognition, mentoring to support the implementation of Tridharma, as well as retirement and pension schemes, have been implemented effectively.

c) Facilities and Infrastructure

- (1) Ease of access to the internet and speed of access on campus.
- (2) Ease of use and fulfilment of needs in Single Sign-On (SSO).
- (3) Adequate working/study spaces.
- (4) Supporting facilities in carrying out core duties and functions.
- (5) Completeness of Laboratory facilities and infrastructure.

- d) Financial Management
 - (1) Clarity of guidelines and regulations related to established finances.
 - (2) Transparency in all types of salary deductions and remuneration.
 - (3) Accuracy of salary and remuneration disbursements.
- e) Research

D. Scoring

The survey questionnaire requires respondents to choose one of the following options:

- 1 = Very Dissatisfied
- 2 = Dissatisfied
- 3 = Satisfied
- 4 = Very Satisfied

E. Categories of Satisfaction

The service satisfaction categories are based on the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Decision Number 14 of 2017, which involves first calculating the weighted average by the following formula:

$$IK = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(N_j x \frac{1}{n} \right)$$

IK= *Indeks Kepuasan* (Satisfaction Index)

N=Average value for each questionnaire question

n=Total number of questionnaire questions

j= Questionnaire question number, where j =1...n

j=Questionnaire question number, where j=1...n

The satisfaction index (IK) is likely calculated by taking the average (N) of the values for each questionnaire question (j), where there are 'n' total questions.

The subsequent categorization is based on the following table:

Perception Value	Interval Value	Conversion Interval Value	Quality	Category
1	1,00 – 2,59	25,00 – 64,99	D	Not Good
2	2,60 – 3,06	65,00 – 76,60	C	Poor
3	3,06 – 3,53	76,61 – 88,30	B	Good
4	3,53 – 4,00	88,31 – 100,00	A	Very Good

F. Results of the Survey

The following are the results of the service satisfaction survey in three service aspects: management service, facilities and infrastructure management service, and student affairs service.

a) Management

Statement	Satisfaction Level								IK*	Category
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Not Satisfied		Very Unsatisfied			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Administrative and correspondence management services meet needs and are optimal.	168	47.19%	188	52.81%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.47	Good
Administrative services adhere to clean and service-oriented principles.	157	44.10%	199	55.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.44	Good
Administrative services utilize IT for user convenience.	170	47.75%	186	52.25%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.48	Good
Personnel provide services with excellent work culture, politeness, friendliness, and are perceived as excellent by users.	175	49.16%	181	50.84%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.49	Good
Average									3,47	Good

b) Quality Improvement

Statement	Satisfaction Level								IK*	Category
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Not Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
	f	%	f	f	%	f	f	%		
The appointment and placement of new personnel are confirmed by the Rector's decree upon the request of faculty and/or unit leaders.	160	44.94%	196	55.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.45	Good
Distribution of tasks and workloads (job descriptions and	189	53.09%	167	46.91%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.53	Very Good

authorities) is adjusted according to capacity and planned with basic principles of fairness.										
Opportunities for participating in career development programs (advanced studies, seminars, conferences, workshops, symposiums, etc.) have been provided based on principles of fairness and effective planning.	172	48.31%	184	51.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.48	Good
Clarity, transparency, and ease of information and services for promotion and position advancement.	128	35.96%	193	54.21%	35	9.83%	0	0.00%	3.26	Good
Schemes for rewards and/or punishments, recognition, mentoring to support the implementation of Tridharma, as well as retirement and pension schemes, have been implemented effectively.	183	51.40%	173	48.60%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.51	Good
Average									3,44	Good

c) Facilities and Infrastructure Management

Statement	Satisfaction Level								IK*	Category
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Not Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
	f	%	f	f	%	f	f	%		
Ease of access to the internet and speed of access on campus.	180	50.56%	176	49.44%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.51	Good
Ease of use and fulfillment of needs in Single Sign-On (SSO).	178	50.00%	178	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.50	Good
Adequate working/study spaces.	185	51.97%	171	48.03%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.52	Good
Supporting facilities in carrying out core duties and functions.	173	48.60%	183	51.40%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.49	Good
Completeness of Laboratory facilities and infrastructure.	171	48.03%	185	51.97%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.48	Good
Average									3,50	Good

d) Financial Management

Statement	Satisfaction Level								IK*	Category
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Not Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
	f	%	f	f	%	f	f	%		
Clarity of guidelines and regulations related to established finances.	170	47.75%	186	52.25%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.48	Good
Transparency in all types of salary deductions and remuneration.	110	30.90%	171	48.03%	75	21.07%	0	0.00%	3.10	Good
Accuracy of salary and remuneration disbursements.	192	53.93%	164	46.07%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.54	Very Good
Average									3,37	Good

e) Research

Statement	Satisfaction Level								IK*	Category
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Not Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
	f	%	f	f	%	f	f	%		
The university has developed and disseminated a research roadmap that guides the research themes of both lecturers and students.	178	50.00%	178	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.50	Good
Ease in obtaining information, procedures, and submitting research proposals.	173	48.60%	183	51.40%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.49	Good
Lecturers and students conduct research in accordance with the department's research roadmap.	169	47.47%	187	52.53%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.47	Good
The university evaluates the alignment of lecturer and student research with the roadmap for the purpose of improving research relevance and the academic development of study programs.	168	47.19%	188	52.81%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.47	Good
Periodic training for the development of lecturer research skills is conducted.	183	51.40%	173	48.60%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.51	Good
Research facilities and infrastructure for lecturers and students (adequacy, quality, and accessibility).	183	51.40%	173	48.60%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.51	Good
Recognition and incentives for lecturer	172	48.31%	184	51.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.48	Good

who excel in research and the publication of research results.										
Average									3,49	Good

G. ANALYSIS

- 1) In the aspect of management services, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya lecturers give positive assessments to administrative and correspondence services, which are considered optimal. The implementation of clean principles and good service, the use of facilitating information technology, and the excellent work culture of the staff, who are polite and friendly, are appreciated. Overall, the management services aspect is rated as good with an average score of 3.47.
- 2) Lecturers provide positive assessments of the quality improvement aspect. The appointment of new personnel, task distribution, and opportunities for career development programs are considered good. Although there are some criticisms regarding information on promotions, the overall score for this aspect remains good with a score of 3.44. This reflects lecturer satisfaction with the institution's efforts to enhance quality and human resource development.
- 3) Lecturers give positive assessments of the facilities and infrastructure management service. Ease of internet access, supporting facilities, and the completeness of infrastructure are rated as good with an average of 3.50. This reflects lecturer perceptions of the availability and quality of facilities that support academic and research activities.
- 4) In this aspect, clarity in financial guidelines receives positive feedback, although information on salaries and remuneration obtains some criticism. It should be noted that there are areas that could be improved, such as transparency in salary deductions and remuneration, as well as information on promotions. The average score for this aspect is 3.37, reflecting lecturer satisfaction with the institution's financial management.
- 5) Lecturers provide positive assessments of research services. The research roadmap, ease of information, and research facilities are considered good with an average score of 3.49. This reflects lecturer satisfaction with the institution's efforts to provide support and facilities for research activities.

H. CONCLUSION AND FOLLOW-UP

1) Conclusion

Based on the results of the lecturer satisfaction survey, it can be concluded that the majority of lecturers are satisfied with various service aspects provided by the institution. Aspects such as administrative services, quality improvement, facilities and infrastructure management, financial management, and research services received positive evaluations. However, there are some areas that require more attention, especially regarding salary and remuneration information.

2) Follow-up

- a) Evaluate and improve the salary and remuneration information system to ensure the availability of clear and accurate information to lecturers. Improvement measures may include providing an easily accessible information system.
- b) Enhance openness and availability of information related to promotions. Effective communication measures, both through online platforms and face-to-face meetings, should be taken to ensure that lecturers have a good understanding of promotion procedures and criteria. Additionally, the institution could provide a promotion and position information system to facilitate lecturers in applying for promotions.

I. CLOSING

In conclusion, the survey results indicate significant satisfaction among lecturers regarding various service aspects, reflecting the dedication and efforts of the institution to meet the needs and expectations of lecturers.

Although a good level of satisfaction has been achieved, this report also identifies some areas that require further attention. Therefore, the recommendations and follow-up actions outlined earlier are expected to guide the institution in continually improving and enhancing services, in line with the developments and demands of lecturer needs in this dynamic era of education.

We believe that with the synergy between lecturers, institutional leaders, and all stakeholders, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya will continue to develop as an excellent educational center that provides the best services to produce quality future generations. May this report provide valuable insights and serve as a foundation for improvement measures in the future. Thank you for the cooperation and participation of all parties in creating a better and competitive academic environment.