

Synchronization of Strategic Plan and Implementation in Legal Entity State University through Good University Governance

EkaPrihatin¹, Danny Meirawan², Asep Suryana³, RatuDintha IZFS⁴, Aan Komariah⁵

Abstract--This article aimed to evaluate the health of institutions through the analysis of good university governance principles on legal entity state universities in Indonesia, which are granted their own autonomy in determining the management of their institutions to respond to the changes and challenges they face. The problem that occurs is how the analysis of GUG implementation which has several characteristics namely (1) openness; (2) participation; (3) legitimacy; (4) transparency; (5) effectiveness and efficiency; (6) accountability and availability; (7) predictability; (8) coherence; (9) services excellence in synchronizing the planning and implementation of the three principles of higher education (education, research, and community service) program namely Education, Research and Community Service effectively and efficiently. The methodology used was mixed methods, namely quantitative, qualitative and normative legal approaches, from 65 respondents, of 121 educational programs in planning stated 64.7% of respondents implemented, 22.94% of respondents stated they did not implement and the rest did not answer. 4 respondents answered 27 research programs showed that 89% were implemented and 11% stated they were not implemented. 4 respondents answered 20 community service programs showed that 72.5% were implemented and 27.5% were not implemented. Thus the synchronization between the strategic plan and the implementation of the three principles of higher education (education, research, and community service) in the category was quite good, it must be improved by (1) building appropriate policy communication; (2) building a model for selecting and establishing professional-based leaders; (3) discipline.

Keywords---University Governance, Strategic Plan, Higher Education

I. INTRODUCTION

All universities in the world agree that health is an important aspect of the growth and development of higher education, especially legal entity state universities so that the health of this higher education is an absolute requirement to maintain and manage the autonomy granted. There are many tools to measure that higher education is healthy, one of which is the synchronization between strategic plans and implementation (Bryson, Crosby, & Bryson, 2009), the simplest way is by checking the activities of the strategic plan and the implementation (Cervone, 2014; de Haan, 2014). The results will show the level of organizational health, especially for the legal entity state university will have an impact on the growth of higher education in various aspects (Mikkelsen, Saksvik, &

^{1,2,3,5} Educational Administration Department of Indonesian University of Education, ⁴ Sekolah Tinggi TeknologiKedirgantaraan, Indonesia
¹ekaprihatin@upi.edu, ²dmeirawan@gmail.com, ³doef@upi.edu, ⁴ratudinthaizfs@gmail.com, ⁵aan_komariah@upi.edu

Landsbergis, 2000; Özer, Uğurluoğlu, Saygılı, & Songur, 2019). Thus, synchronization of the strategic plan is very appropriate to show the health of legal entity state university.

The legal entity state university has independent autonomy in the academic and non-academic fields (Utama, 2018). In Indonesia, there are 11 legal entity state universities that are trusted to manage independently which are regulated by Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education, where legal entity state university can have rules that are more in line with their characteristics and allow them to develop better (Susanto, 2013). Issues on commercialism and liberalism in education (Menashy, 2016; Norris, 2010; Sukarieh & Tannock, 2009) become a challenge to prove and clarify each of these issues because the legal entity state university has the principles of democracy, decentralization, as well as check and balance (Tamim, 2016). Autonomy gives participation to the community, including students, to participate in oversight of the management of higher education through the Board of Trustees, thus breaking the issue that the legal entity state university will castrate the role of students, alumni, and the community as stakeholders.

The ability of legal entity state university to implement independent autonomy (academic and non-academic) requires healthy conditions with appropriate regulations so that in practice, good university governance (Baird, 2006) is a favorable political framework for developing institution(Li, 2014) with social, ecological and market orientation, and responsible use of political power and public resources with a guarantee of freedom from abuse and corruption (Zheng, 2016) based on the rule of law as a form of institutional guarantee for all stakeholders. Quality assurance in various aspects of both academic and non-academic institutions will lead to optimal institutional growth and development(Cheung, 2015; Mengquan, Kai, & Le, 2016; Yingqiang & Yongjian, 2016).

three principles of higher education (education, research, and community service) which is a product of higher education always experiences dynamic changes following economic development (Blackwell & Weinberg, 2002; Cobert, 2013; Julia Garcia, Devita Gunawan, 2013; Lee, 2012; Macerinskiene & Vaiksnoraite, 2006; Marijan Cingula, Miroslaw, 2017; Oketch et al., 2014; States, States, & States, 2003), it means that the quality of graduates will influence and will be influenced by economic development (Aghion, Boustan, Hoxby, & Vandenbussche, 2009; Campbell, 2016; Cobert, 2013; Eric A. Hanushek, 2007; Gardner, n.d.; E. Summary, n.d.). So that the management of higher education must be performed professionally (Benner et al., 2017; Jørgensen & Surssock, 2014; Keczer, 2014; Round, Hei, & Programme, n.d.). The level of higher education competition both nationally and globally encourages management levels to adopt Good Corporate Governance so that it becomes Good University Governance by applying the following principles:(1) *openness*; (2) *participation*; (3) *legitimacy*; (4) *transparency*; (5) *effectiveness and efficiency*; (6) *accountability and availability*; (7) *predictability*; (8) *coherence*;(Bundschuh- & Bundschuh-rieseneder, 2008) (9) *services excellence* (Of, Arrangements, & Guidelines, 2011; Ruben, Ph, & Brent, 2007)

The focus of research carried out is the analysis of GUG implementation in legal entity state university as follows
1) How is the implementation illustration of each GUG principle in three principles of higher education (education,

research, and community service); 2) How is the relevance of the regulations and programs implemented; 3) How is the illustration of policy communication implemented by the institution. The results of this study were expected to be the result of institutional self-evaluation based on the GUG principle, so it would be a conceptual and informative contribution to further planning. Practically, the results of this study indicated that the positioning of institutions related to the 9 principles of GUG, minimum regulation, and the success of policy communication in institutions as materials for developing models in the management of higher education, and the most appropriate, effective and efficient policy communication models.

The urgency of the research carried was the health of the institution, if the institution is in good health then every development plan will produce high quality. The development of health and the quality of higher education was focused on answering the challenges of (1) the competition of higher education in the world is very high, so higher education in developing countries must survive the wave of expansion of foreign higher education; (2) the quality of management of higher education in developing countries must be improved by referring to the rank of higher education globally so that it can penetrate and attract educational customers from other countries; (3) regulation as a formal legal implementation and management of higher education becomes the foundation of higher education to advance and develop through various collaborative systems.

Professional management of the Triadarma of Higher Education by applying the GUG principle will prepare institutions to have high flexibility to change, obstacles, challenges, and opportunities. With the 4.0 revolution, higher education is a non-profit industry that can survive, has uniqueness, innovate, produce quality so that it can break through any obstacles and seize every opportunity that exists.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted in all Indonesian University of Education (UPI) campuses, namely (1) UPI Bandung Campus (BumiSiliwangi); (2) UPI Cibiru Campus; (3) UPI Tasikmalaya Campus; (4) UPI Sumedang Campus; (5) UPI Purwakarta Campus; and (6) UPI Serang Campus. Subjects as a source of data were the university leaders, namely (1) Rector; (2) Vice-Rector; (3) Director; (4) Dean; (5) Chairperson; (6) Head of Department or Study Program and (7) Head of Subdivision.

The research used a mixed-method which is a quantitative research method and normative law. Qualitative approach was intended to describe the existing conditions of regulations/policies in Indonesian University of Education (UPI) as a legal entity state university, by looking for generalizations that have predictive value in a wide and diverse population, so as to obtain the data, we used an exclusive questionnaire where the questionnaire for each sample was different, random sampling used purposive sampling.

Normative law is a method of legal research conducted by examining literature or secondary data with deductive thinking methods and coherent truth criteria. The working principle of the normative legal research method in research was by conducting a deductive - argumentative test of the framework used in research, where the results of the data collection and information through library research, was not tested (verified) inductively - (verification of the facts).

The procedure of this research aimed to analyze the application of the GUG principle, with the following stages: (1) questionnaire on implementation of program planned in the UPI Annual Work Plan and Budget; (2) questionnaire on the presence or absence of regulations which are the support and foundation of each UPI Work Plan and Budget program; (3) conduct documentation studies by deductive-argumentative test; (4) perform evaluative study of the application of the GUG principle

The study's accomplishments were (1) analysis of synchronization between program planning and implementation; (2) analysis of the legalization of program implementation; (3) minimum regulatory analysis; (4) analysis of the application of the GUG principle in UPI as a legal entity state university.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Synchronization of Educational Program Planning and Implementation

65 respondents gave answers to 121 educational program implementation. Data showed that 64.7% of respondents implemented the programs, 22.94% of respondents did not implement the programs and 12.36% did not state whether the program was implemented or not. While the results of interview respondents who stated the program was not implemented, they stated that the program was not relevant to their fields. While respondents who did not answer, they were confused on whether the program should be implemented or not because there was no relevance with their fields.

Table 1: Percentage of 121 educational programs implementation

Indicator	Implement	Not Implement	No Answer
Program Implementation	64.70	22.94	12.36
Sub-Indicator			
Clarity of Purpose	100	-	-
organizing	65	-	-
Standard operating procedures	87	-	-
Monitoring and evaluation	42	-	-
Budgeting	100	100	-
Accomplishment product	73	-	-
Reporting	100	-	-

1. Clarity of purpose

In the clarity of purpose sub-indicator, 64.70% of respondents who implemented the program showed that all of them (100%) stated clearly knowing the purpose. However, 22.94% of respondents who did not implement, stated that respondents did not clearly know the objectives of the program, while 12.36% of respondents who did not answer, it was unknown whether the respondents knew clearly the purposes of the program.

2. Organizing

In this sub-indicator, 64.70% of respondents who implemented the program, only 65% did the organizing and the remaining 35% did not organize in program implementation. While 22.94% of respondents who did

not implement the program, stated that 100% of respondents did not organize, while 12.36% of respondents who did not answer, it was unknown whether the respondents did organize or not.

3. Standard operating procedures

In this sub-indicator, 64.70% of respondents who implemented the program, there were 87% who implemented the program in accordance with the SOP and the remaining 13% of respondents did not understand and carry out the program according to the SOP. While 22.94% of respondents who did not implement the program, stated that 100% of respondents did not carry out the program, while 12.36% of respondents who did not answer, it was unknown whether the respondents knew and understood the SOP of the program.

4. Monitoring and evaluation

In this sub-indicator, 64.70% of respondents who implemented the program, only 42% stated that monitoring and evaluation were carried out and the remaining 68% were not aware of any monitoring and evaluation in the program implementation. While 22.94% of respondents who did not implement the program, stated that 100% of respondents did not monitor and evaluate the program, while 12.36% of respondents who did not answer, it was unknown whether the respondents, respondents did monitor and evaluation or not.

5. Budgeting

In this sub-indicator, 64.70% of respondents who implemented the program, 100% of respondents stated there was a budget for the program implementation. While 22.94% of respondents who did not implement the program, stated that 100% of respondents stated that there was a budget allocated for the program, while 12.36% of respondents who did not answer, it was unknown whether the respondents, knew or not about a budget allocated for program implementation.

6. Accomplishment product

In this sub-indicator, 64.70% of respondents who implemented the program, only 73% of respondents stated that accomplishment product was in line with the purposes and the remaining 27% of respondents stated the program was unfinished so the accomplishment product was not perfect. While 22.94% of respondents who did not implement the program showed that 100% of respondents did not have an accomplishment product program, while 12.36% of respondents who did not answer, it was unknown whether the respondents had accomplishment product or not.

7. Reporting

In this sub-indicator, 64.70% of respondents who implemented the program, 100% of respondents performed a reporting. While 22.94% of respondents who did not implement the program showed 100% of respondents did not perform reporting, while 12.36% of respondents who did not answer, it was unknown whether the respondents performed a reporting or not.

Synchronization of Research Program Planning and Implementation

There were 4 respondents on the synchronization of program planning and implementation, namely the Rector, Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Business, Chair and Secretary of the Institute for Research and Community Service. The Rector and Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Businesses only check each program implemented, while the data from 27 research programs showed that 89% implemented the program and 11% did not implement the program while the results of interviews conducted with the rector state that the program is 100% must have been carried out, as well as an interview with the Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships, and Business stated that all planned programs were implemented.

Table 2: Percentage of research program implementation

Indicator	Implement	Not Implement	No Answer
program implementation	89	11	-
Sub-indicator			
Clarity of purpose	100	0	-
organizing	100	0	-
Standard operating procedures	100	0	-
Monitoring and evaluation	100	0	-
Budgeting	100	0	-
Accomplishment	100	0	-
product reporting	100	0	-

1. Clarity of purpose

In this sub-indicator, 89% of respondents who implemented the research program, 100% of respondents stated the clarity of purpose of the research program, while 11% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents said they did not clearly know the purpose of the research program.

2. Organizing

In this sub-indicator, 89% of respondents who implemented the research program, 100% of respondents organized the research program, while 11% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not organize the research program.

3. Standard operating procedures

In this sub-indicator, 89% of respondents who implemented the research program, 100% of respondents understood, knew and carried out in accordance with standard operating procedures in this research program, while 11% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents state that they did not know clearly about the standard operating procedures of research program.

4. Monitoring and evaluation

In this sub-indicator, 89% of respondents who implemented the research program, 100% of respondents knew and carried out monitoring and evaluation activities in the research program, while 11% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not know and did not carry out monitoring and evaluation in the research program.

5. Budgeting

In this sub-indicator, 89% of respondents who implemented the research program, 100% of respondents understood, knew and used the budget allocated for the research program, while 11% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated did not know clearly about the budget allocated for the research program.

6. Accomplishment product

In this sub-indicator, 89% of respondents who implemented the research program, 100% of respondents produced an accomplishment product from the research program, while 11% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not have an accomplishment product from the research program.

7. Reporting

In this sub-indicator, 89% of respondents who implemented the research program, 100% of respondents made activity reports of all research program activities, while 11% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not make reports of research program activities.

Synchronization of Community Service Program Planning and Implementation

There were 4 respondents on the synchronization of community service planning and implementation, namely the Rector, Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Business, Chair and Secretary of the Institute for Research and Community Service. The Rector and Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Businesses only check each program implemented, while the data from 20 community service programs showed that 72.5% implemented the program and 27.5% did not implement the program while the results of interviews conducted with the rector state that the program is 100% must have been carried out, as well as an interview with the Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Business stated that all planned programs were implemented.

Table 3: Percentage of Community Service Program Implementation

Indicator	Implement	Not Implement	No Answer
program implementation	72,5	27,5	-
Sub-indicator			
Clarity of purpose	100	0	-
organizing	100	0	-
Standard operating procedures	100	0	-

Monitoring and evaluation	100	0	-
Budgeting	100	0	-
Accomplishment product reporting	100	0	-

1. Clarity of purpose

In this sub-indicator, 72.5% of respondents who implemented the community service program, 100% of respondents understood and clearly knew the purpose of the community service program, while 27.5% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not know clearly the purpose of the community service program.

2. Organizing

In this sub-indicator, 72.5% of respondents who implemented the community service program, 100% of respondents understood and knew and carried out organizing in the community service implementation program, while 27.5% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not organize community service program.

3. Standard operating procedures

In this sub-indicator, 72.5% of respondents who implemented the community service program, 100% of respondents understood, knew, and carried out in accordance with standard operating procedures in the community service program, while 27.5% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% respondents stated they did not know of any standard operating procedures as a guide to community service program activities.

4. Monitoring and evaluation

In this sub-indicator, 72.5% of respondents who implemented the community service program, 100% of respondents monitored and evaluated the program for each community service program activity, while 27.5% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not perform monitoring and evaluation in community service program activities.

5. Budgeting

In this sub-indicator, 72.5% of respondents who implemented the community service program, 100% of respondents understood, knew and used the budget allocated to the community service program, while 27.5% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents state that they did not know clearly about the budget allocated for community service program activities.

6. Accomplishment product

In this sub-indicator, 72.5% of respondents who implemented the community service program, 100% of respondents had an accomplishment product from the community service program, while 27.5% of

respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not have an accomplishment product from the community service program activities.

7. Reporting

In this sub-indicator, 72.5% of respondents who implemented the community service program, 100% of respondents made a report of the community service program, while 27.5% of respondents who did not implement the program, 100% of respondents stated they did not make a report of community service program activities.

IV. Discussion on Educational Program Implementation

65 respondents gave answers to 121 educational program implementation. Data showed that 64.7% of respondents implemented the programs, 22.94% of respondents did not implement the programs and 12.36% did not state whether the program was implemented or not.

Every higher education will have a strategic plan as the execution of a predetermined vision, mission, and purposes that must be achieved at a certain time span through a program.(AO, 2018; Brown, 2020; Hinton, 2012; Hynd, 2016; Island, 2016; Padilla, 2014; University, 2018). The purpose accomplishment can be seen from the success of the program implemented and the compatibility between planning and implementation (For & Projects, 2010; Hummelbrunner & Jones, 2013; Statewide & Data, 2009; UNESCO, 1990; Wkhlu, Lq, Phwkrv, Ri, & Dffhswdelolw, 2008), planning is a guideline for managers (Alexander, 2010; Australia, n.d.; Branch, 1996; David V. Day, n.d.; John's, 2008; Planning, 2001; Process, 2008; Thomas, 2013).

The education program as the core business of higher education is a product offered to prospective education customers. So that the quality of the product and its relevance to the needs of the business world and the industrial world become a benchmark in strategic planning. The level of purpose accomplishment was measured by the suitability of planning with effective and efficient implementation with a high level of implementation quality. Likewise in educational programs implemented at UPI as legal entity state university must be analyzed through synchronization of plans and programs implemented within the scope of education.

The success of 64.7% of respondents who implemented the education program was considered too low because the respondents were leaders of all divisions and units of the education program. There are several aspects that influence the successful implementation of the program namely (1) clarity of purpose; (2) organizing performed; (3) standard operating procedures; (4) monitoring and evaluation performed; (5) a budget allocation for program implementation; (6) has product accomplishment; and (7) reporting. In this aspect it is also very diverse, the lowest percentage is monitoring and evaluation, so it is assumed that there were some leaders who did not conduct monitoring and evaluation programs. Of course, conceptually it was stated that monitoring and evaluation were carried out to ensure the suitability of the process with the planned outcomes (Bank, 2016; E. P. Group, Africa, & Africa, n.d.; James Ballard, 2015; Territory, 2013; Wetzstein, n.d.; WHO, 2016).

Another interesting finding was 22.94% of respondents from leaders who did not implement the program, and after an interview, they stated that the program was not part of the division. This is very interesting because in the Annual Work Plan and Budget the budget allocation and which division will implement the program have been determined if there is budget in division but they do not do the task, it implies several factors namely (1) lack of competence of respondents; (2) unclear purposes of the program; (3) undisciplined. Thus, institutions must find solutions to the three possible factors. The solution to lack of competency of the leader is a training program, in addition, it must also be re-examined the criteria model to become a leader so as to eliminate the paradigm that the leader is a political position, this indicated that the competencies that must be held did not become the main benchmark in the election, simply if the leader does not have the competence to lead in a particular field then it will be difficult to achieve the word quality. The solution to unclear purposes is the planning of institutional division must establish each program with clear purposes and not use ambiguous sentences, whereas the solution to undisciplined is, the presence of every right and obligation with the sanction that is set so that it will eliminate the lack of discipline because the respondent is a leader, then the firm action of the institution must be carried out quickly because it will become an obstacle in the growth and development of the institution, as well as reviewing the model of leader election, by avoiding elections with politics.

Another interesting finding showed that respondents who did not answer, on the knowledge of the program indicated that the leaders of this category must be questioned about their loyalty to the institution, and respondents in this category indicated the failure of institutions in electing leaders.

V. Research Program Planning and Implementation

There were 4 respondents on the synchronization of program planning and implementation, namely the Rector, Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Business, Chair and Secretary of the Institute for Research and Community Service. The Rector and Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Businesses only check each program implemented, while the data from 27 research programs showed that 89% implemented the program and 11% did not implement the program while the results of interviews conducted with the rector state that the program is 100% must have been carried out, as well as an interview with the Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships, and Business stated that all planned programs were implemented.

27 research programs were implemented, but the Chair and Secretary respondents from the same institution showed 89% were implemented and 11% were not implemented. Disagreements between the Chairperson and the secretary of opinion exist in several programs (1) Development of science and technology parks; (2) Collaborative research with foreign partner institutions; (3) Collaborative article writing with researchers from universities or domestic professional institutions; (4) Collaborative article writing with researchers from universities or overseas professional institutions; (5) Strengthening collaborative research networks. The crosscheck by the Chairperson, Secretary and internal customer showed that programs were implemented and strengthened by the customer's opinion that the program has been implemented for a long time. One of the tasks of the chairperson is to carry out

the work program according to the institutional strategic plan, and one of the tasks of the secretary is to assist the chairperson in carrying out the program so that it can be concluded that the chairperson and secretary must carry out the specified program. Secretary is administrative and executive assistant (Ark, 2002; Cambridge, 2014; College, 2010; Findlay, 2016; Force, 2008; Onifade, 2010)

If examined, based on the results of interviews with respondents showed that the elected leaders had low insight and competence on the main tasks and functions in the institutions, it shows that the model to elect the leaders is incorrect or maybe because the leader is a political position, it will be correlated with the political contribution. So the slogan of human resource management namely the right man in the right place, the right man in the right job is a professional reality that guarantees the success of the program.

Community Service Program Planning and Implementation

There were 4 respondents on the synchronization of community service planning and implementation, namely the Rector, Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Business, Chair and Secretary of the Institute for Research and Community Service. The Rector and Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Businesses only check each program implemented, while the data from 20 community service programs showed that 72.5% implemented the program and 27.5% did not implement the program while the results of interviews conducted with the rector state that the program is 100% must have been carried out, as well as an interview with the Vice-Rector for Research, Partnerships and Business stated that all planned programs were implemented.

The cross-checked program implemented between respondents, namely the Chair and Secretary was carried out, 72.5% programs were implemented and 27.5% programs were not implemented because there was a mismatch of answers to the same question between the Chair and Secretary in 11 programs out of 20 programs that had to be implemented. This triggers the inaccuracy of institutions in choosing leaders, it may be further questioned what criteria and competencies are used as benchmarks in the selection of leaders, leaders are political positions or which are resulted from the political process, the success rate was very low based on the above data.

Analysis of Good University Governance Principles

Based on the data and information above, overall, the implementation of this principle was only 75.4%, this showed that the institution still had a 24.6% failure in implementing the GUG principle. The problem is, that the respondents were heads of the division who are the three principles of higher education (education, research, and community service) implementer. It can be said that if the respondents are the heads of a division and unit, then the success rate should be 100% because the leader becomes a role model for the implementation of the following principles:

- (1) *Openness*, Only 75.4% understood every decision that is communicated and able to be communicated back to subordinates so that they have the same perception. The remaining 24.6% of leaders did not understand

the decision of the institution so it can be failed to communicate back to the subordinates which resulted in the failure of the program implementation. Leaders failed to understand and know the decisions of the institution compared to their subordinates. This becomes a separate study as an evaluation material for institutions to choose and elect leaders, so it must be added with competency standards.

- (2) **Participation** refers to the involvement of various parties in developing institutions so that the amount of participation will increase the level of trust of the community by accommodating various parties, one aspect that can foster participation is the ability of communication (Dauda, Bahtiar, & Suhaini, 2017; Emmers-sommer, 2004; Husain, 2009; Kuntz, 2013; Lunenburg, 2010). The material to be communicated will be related to the understanding of institutional decisions and competencies in the field as its main task. Thus the participation rate based on research findings was 75.4%. Likewise, the interesting finding of respondents who did not have the same participation in one division creates obstacles in the planned program.
- (3) **Legitimacy**, The institutional strategy plan is a guideline for all division leaders in the institution to be implemented and will be followed by policies/regulations to guide the program implementation. One of them is that each activity has a standard operating procedure/SOP that must be implemented. Based on the data above that 65.60% of respondents understood, knew and implemented the program in accordance with the SOP, and the remaining 9.8% of respondents who implemented the program without understanding and implementing the program in accordance with the SOP, 24.6% of respondents did not know and understand the SOP so that they did not implement the planned program. Authority is formal power, in other words, authority is the power that has legitimacy (Coleman, 1947; Importance, Legitimacy, The, & Of, 2015; Uphoff & Winter, 2015)
- (4) **Transparency** is a principle of good governance and refers to the availability of information to the general public and clarity about rules, regulations and decisions relating to management activities, decision making, policy implementation where stakeholders must be responsible for communicating policies. The data above showed that only 65.60% of respondents consisting of all leaders in institutions that were authorized to implement three principles of higher education (education, research, and community service), had not been studied for the entire academic community, nor studied in a very broad scope from stakeholders, users and other global communities. Transparency is a control tool for the institution (Advisor & International, 2006; Gaventa, 2010; Grimes & Haring, 2010; M. Group & Science, 2010; Moreno & Gemo, 2014; Slagana Taseva, 2012; R. Summary, 2012)
- (5) **Effectiveness and efficiency**, from a technical dimension, efficiency concerns the ability to use resources to a minimum so that services and infrastructure become of quality according to specified priorities, while effective is the achievement of purposes precisely according to the objectives set. The research findings showed that only 55.04% of respondents implemented the principle of effective and efficient, and 44.96% of respondents wasted institutional resources. Thus it can be concluded that institutional productivity was in the medium category because the manifestation of efficiency and effectiveness is reflected in productivity

(Bartuševičienė & Šakalytė, 2013; Commission, 2013; E. Stathakis¹, K. Brachos^{2,*}, Ch. Abatzianis², 2017)

- (6) **Accountability and availability** are the responsibility in the form of clarity and certainty about the role; task, regulation; obedience, the relationship with the authority and the basis for judging, controlling and evaluating each program carried out. The findings showed 75.4% of respondents who met the principles of accountability and availability related to the availability of resources needed to implement the program (Barringer & Hotel, 1997; Kearney, 2017)
- (7) Predictability; It must be predictable, simply if the respondents understood the purpose of the program, organized, was carried out program according to the SOP, there was a budget allocated, organizing was carried out then monitoring was carried out and there was an accomplishment product and reporting was carried out. It can be predicted that the program will succeed, but if the respondents who did all that was only 75.4% then it could be predicted that the success of the program was only 75.4% while 24.6% was a failure as a waste of resources owned by the institution so that it could be predicted how much the institution would suffer from the failure.
- (8) **Coherence**; there is a systemic, orderly and easily understood relationship within the institution so that the authority is a driving force for quality program implementation. The findings showed that the level of coherence in institutions based on data and information of respondents was 75.4% while the rest was still confused whether this program should be carried out or not, but the results of the study documentation of the institutional annual work plan and budget clearly established who is responsible for implementing and carrying out these activities.
- (9) Service excellence shows the best service and meets the expectations and needs of customers. In other words, it is a service that meets the quality standards of a service in accordance with the expectations and satisfaction of the customer/community (Adegbola, 2010; Bolton, 2014; Kin, Yim, Tse, & Chan, 2008; Qadeer, 2013), so based on the results of research showed that 75.4% of respondents who provided service excellence through the program implementation of the three principles of higher education (education, research, and community service).

VI. CONCLUSION

Synchronization between planning and implementation of three principles of higher education (education, research, and community service) at the Indonesian University of Education as a legal entity state university had been quite well, but there were still units that did not implement the program due to unclear program purposes, stagnant communication so that they did not understand and follow the SOP of program. This causes the implementation phase to be missed, including monitoring and evaluation which will influence the success of the planned program.

Likewise, the analysis of good university governance principles namely (1) openness; (2) participation; (3) legitimacy; (4) transparency; (5) effectiveness and efficiency; (6) accountability and availability; (7) predictability; (8) coherence; and (9) Service excellence were in the quite good category, although there were still a number of issues related to the similarity of perceptions between leaders in an institution relating to the main tasks and functions.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

The improvements that must be performed to create a healthy institution by implementing the GUG principles are as follows: (1) establish appropriate policy communication to build the same perception in all academicians; (2) build a model for selecting and establishing professional-based leaders; (3) discipline.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The greatest gratitude to the Research Institute (LPPM, Research and Community Service Institute) Indonesian University of Education to facilitate the research assignment of the Vice-Rector for Planning, Development and Information Systems and the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia, which has funded research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adegbola, O. A. (2010). CUSTOMER SATISFACTION IN BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS A CASE STUDY OF PRISMA, A SUBSIDIARY OF KPO Bachelor ' s Thesis Degree Programme in Business Management, (September).
- [2] Advisor, S., & International, T. (2006). The Role of Transparency International in Fighting Corruption in Infrastructure by ANNUAL BANK CONFERENCE ON DEVELOPMENT, 1–27.
- [3] Aghion, P., Boustan, L., Hoxby, C., & Vandenbussche, J. (2009). Causal Impact of Education on Economic Growth : Evidence from U . S . 1 Introduction, (March).
- [4] Alexander, M. (2010). *A guide to management planning*.
- [5] AO, P. T. C. (2018). Strategic plan 2018-2022.
- [6] Ark, A. (2002). Job Description : Executive Assistant to the Country Director Job Description : Executive Assistant to the Country Director.
- [7] Australia, U. (n.d.). Workforce Planning Guide For Managers.
- [8] Baird, J. (2006). Beyond professionalisation: Enhancing the governance culture for Australian university governing boards. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 12(4), 297–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2006.9967175>
- [9] Bank, W. (2016). Planning , Monitoring , and Evaluation :
- [10] Barringer, H. P., & Hotel, H. (1997). Availability , Reliability , Maintainability , and Capability.
- [11] Bartuševičienė, I., & Šakalytė, E. (2013). ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT : EFFECTIVENESS VS . EFFICIENCY, 2013(1), 45–53.
- [12] Benner, M., Burkert, G., Dräger, J., Fallon, D., Felt, U., Fochler, M., ... Gufler, A. (2017). Prospects and Future Tasks of Universities.
- [13] Blackwell, M., & Weinberg, D. (2002). The Economic Impact of Educational Institutions : Issues and Methodology, 16(1), 88–95.

- [14] Bolton, R. N. (2014). SERVICE EXCELLENCE : CREATING CUSTOMER EXPERIENCES THAT BUILD RELATIONSHIPS.
- [15] Branch, C. S. (1996). Guide on Developing a HRM Plan, (June).
- [16] Brown, P. P. (2020). STRATEGIC PLAN UM 2020 : BUILDING A UNIVERSITY.
- [17] Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. K. (2009). Understanding strategic planning and the formulation and implementation of strategic plans as a way of knowing: The contributions of actor-network theory. *International Public Management Journal*, 12(2), 172–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967490902873473>
- [18] Bundschuh-, F., & Bundschuh-rieseneder, F. (2008). GOOD GOVERNANCE : CHARACTERISTICS , METHODS AND THE AUSTRIAN EXAMPLES, 26–52.
- [19] Cambridge. (2014). Personal Assistant to the Director.
- [20] Campbell, A. C. (2016). International Scholarship Graduates Influencing Social and Economic Development at Home : The Role of Alumni Networks in Georgia and Moldova, 19(1), 76–91.
- [21] Cervone, H. F. (2014). Improving Strategic Planning by Adapting Agile Methods to the Planning Process. *Journal of Library Administration*, 54(2), 155–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2014.903371>
- [22] Cheung, J. C. M. (2015). Professionalism, profession and quality assurance practitioners in external quality assurance agencies in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(2), 151–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2015.1051795>
- [23] Cobert, C. (2013). The Impact of Local Public Education on Economic Development.
- [24] Coleman, J. A. (1947). Authority , Power , Leadership ;, 1, 31–44.
- [25] College, S. R. J. (2010). ADMINISTRATIVE & EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT.
- [26] Commission, P. A. G. (2013). On efficiency and effectiveness : some definitions, (May).
- [27] Dauda, A. S., Bahtiar, M., & Suhaini, M. (2017). Youth Online Political Participation : The Role of Facebook Use , Interactivity , Quality Information and Political Interest, (February). <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20173300080>
- [28] David V. Day, P. D. (n.d.). Developing Leadership Talent: A Guide to Succession Planning and Leadership Development.
- [29] de Haan, H. H. (2014). Where is the gap between internationalisation strategic planning and its implementation? A study of 16 Dutch universities’ internationalisation plans. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20(2), 135–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2014.896407>
- [30] E. Stathakis1, K. Brachos2,* , Ch. Abatzianis2, D. V. B. and S. G. M. (2017). A Smart Approach to Measuring the Performance-Efficiency, Effectiveness and Productivity - of the General University Hospital of Alexandroupolis-G.U.H.A. using Special Indicators, 10(2), 141–149.
- [31] Emmers-sommer, T. M. (2004). The effect of communication quality and quantity indicators on intimacy and relational satisfaction, 21(3), 399–411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407504042839>
- [32] Eric A. Hanushek, L. W. (2007). QUALITY GROWTH.
- [33] Findlay, P. (2016). Reflections on Secretarial Work and Issues for Further Studies : A Conceptual Contribution, (May 2013). <https://doi.org/10.7769/gesec.v5i3.331>
- [34] For, G., & Projects, M. (2010). How to organise , plan and control projects, (November).
- [35] Force, W. (2008). Executive Secretaries and Administrative Assistants What do they do ?
- [36] Gardner, J. (n.d.). Contribution of Tertiary Education to, 23–44.
- [37] Gaventa, R. M. & J. (2010). Synthesis Synthesis report report.
- [38] Grimes, M. B. M., & Haring, N. (2010). Seeing the State : The Implications of Transparency for Societal Accountability, (June 2010).
- [39] Group, E. P., Africa, T. S., & Africa, S. (n.d.). The Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation in Projects.
- [40] Group, M., & Science, C. (2010). Transparent Government , Not Transparent Citizens : A Report on Privacy and Transparency for the Cabinet Office Kieron O ’ Hara.
- [41] Hinton, K. E. (2012). *A Practical Guide to Strategic Planning in Higher Education*.
- [42] Hummelbrunner, B. R., & Jones, H. (2013). A guide for planning and strategy development in the face of complexity, (March).
- [43] Husain, Z. (2009). Effective communication brings successful organizational change.
- [44] Hynd, G. W. (2016). Oakland university strategic plan 2025.
- [45] Importance, T. H. E., Legitimacy, O. F., The, I. N., & Of, I. (2015). The importance of legitimacy in the implementation of development, 7(4), 45–47.
- [46] Island, T. U. of R. (2016). ACADEMIC ATRATEGIC PLAN.
- [47] James Ballard, E. W. (2015). CMS Webinar Series Transplant Centers.
- [48] John’s, S. (2008). Succession planning and management guide.

- [49] Jørgensen, T. E., & Sursock, A. (2014). Evaluations of ten higher education institutions in Montenegro Cross-cutting summary report, (August).
- [50] Julia Garcia, Devita Gunawan, V. J. (2013). The Influence Of Education on Economi Development, (May).
- [51] Kearney, A. T. (2017). Technology and Innovation for the Future of Production : Accelerating Value Creation, (March).
- [52] Keczer, G. (2014). Management and Organizational Characteristics of Educational Institutions, *1*(2), 106–112.
- [53] Kin, C., Yim, B., Tse, D. K., & Chan, K. W. (2008). Strengthening Customer Loyalty through Intimacy and Passion: Roles of Customer–Firm Affection and Customer–Staff Relations in Services, (852).
- [54] Kuntz, J. R. C. (2013). The Effect of Affective Commitment , Communication and Participation on Resistance to Change : The Role of Change Readiness, *42*(1).
- [55] Lee, E. K. (2012). Higher Education Expansion and Economi Growth in Japan and South Korea.
- [56] Li, L. C. (2014). Multiple Trajectories and “Good Governance” in Asia: An Introduction. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *44*(2), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2013.871836>
- [57] Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). Communication : The Process , Barriers , And Improving Effectiveness, *1*, 1–11.
- [58] Macerinskiene, I., & Vaiksnoraite, B. (2006). The role of higher education to economic development, *2*(2), 82–90.
- [59] Marijan Cingula, Mirosław, K. D. (2017). Economic and Social Development 23, (September), 15–16.
- [60] Menashy, F. (2016). Global Education Inc.: new policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary/Consuming schools: commercialism and the end of politics/Follow the money: how foundation dollars change public school politics. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *14*(1), 145–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2014.982077>
- [61] Mengquan, L., Kai, C., & Le, G. (2016). The Operation Mechanisms of External Quality Assurance Frameworks of Foreign Higher Education and Implications for Graduate Education. *Chinese Education and Society*, *49*(1–2), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2016.1192397>
- [62] Mikkelsen, A., Saksvik, P. Ø., & Landsbergis, P. (2000). The impact of a participatory organizational intervention on job stress in community health care institutions. *Work and Stress*, *14*(2), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026783700750051667>
- [63] Moreno, E. A., & Gemo, M. (2014). *Institutional trust : beyond transparency*. <https://doi.org/10.2788/291053>
- [64] Norris, T. (2010). Consuming schools: Commercialism and the end of politics. *Consuming Schools: Commercialism and the End of Politics*, (November 2014), 1–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2013.846968>
- [65] Of, A. R., Arrangements, G., & Guidelines, Q. A. (2011). Governance and quality guidelines in Higher Education.
- [66] Oketch, M., Bangpan, W. M., Terano, M., Marston, A., Rawal, S., McMahon, W., ... Temple, P. (2014). The Impact of Tertiary Education on Development, (April).
- [67] Onifade, A. (2010). The Indispensable Secretary, *22*(1), 47–51.
- [68] Özer, Ö., Uğurluoğlu, Ö., Saygılı, M., & Songur, C. (2019). The impact of work alienation on organizational health: A field study in health sector. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, *12*(1), 18–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20479700.2017.1312804>
- [69] Padilla, I. T. B. (2014). S t r a t e g i c p l a n 2014 - 2030.
- [70] Planning, I. I. O. F. (2001). STRATEGIC PLANNING : A TEN-STEP GUIDE *, (May 1994).
- [71] Process, P. M. (2008). State of Kansas, (May).
- [72] Qadeer, S. (2013). Service Quality & Customer Satisfaction, (November).
- [73] Round, F., Hei, F., & Programme, I. C. I. (n.d.). *Higher Education Institutions Partnering for Development and Change Reflections of the First Round*.
- [74] Ruben, B. D., Ph, D., & Brent, D. (2007). *Higher Education Guide*.
- [75] Slagana Taseva, P. . (2012). *Promoting transparency and accountability in public institutions*.
- [76] States, U., States, U., & States, U. (2003). The impact of education quality established that A more educated society may rates of innovation , productivity and, 40–78.
- [77] Statewide, A., & Data, S. (2009). Business Plan Guidelines, (May).
- [78] Sukarieh, M., & Tannock, S. (2009). Putting school commercialism in context: A global history of Junior Achievement Worldwide. *Journal of Education Policy*, *24*(6), 769–786. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930903294636>
- [79] Summary, E. (n.d.). Education and Economic Growth : From the 19th to the 21st Century.
- [80] Summary, R. (2012). TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY Transparency and Accountability.

- [81] Susanto, S. (2013). PERTIMBANGAN DALAM MENYUSUN STATUTA PERGURUAN TINGGI NEGERI BADAN HUKUM (PTN-BH), 53(9), 1689–1699. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- [82] Tamim, R. (2016). Tata kelola perguruan tinggi yang baik, transparan, dan akuntabel, (April).
- [83] Territory, A. C. (2013). Organisational Performance Measurement and Reporting Guide.
- [84] Thomas, L. and J. M. (2013). Guidelines for management planning of protected areas. IUCN Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. ix + 79pp., (June), 1–5.
- [85] UNESCO. (1990). Planning and Management Of Educational Development.
- [86] University, L. (2018). Strategic Plan.
- [87] Uphoff, N., & Winter, N. (2015). Distinguishing Power , Authority & Legitimacy : Taking Max Weber at His Word by Using Resources-Exchange Analysis Distinguishing Power , Authority & Legitimacy : Taking Max Weber at His Word by Using Resources-Exchange Analysis, (January 1989). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3234836>
- [88] Utama, K. W. (2018). Otonomi Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Manusia Ptn-Bh. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 46(1), 92. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.46.1.2017.92-99>
- [89] Wetzstein, B. et. . (n.d.). Monitoring and Analyzing Influential Factors of Business Process Performance.
- [90] WHO. (2016). *Monitoring and Evaluating Digital Health Interventions*.
- [91] Wkhlh, H. D. Q. G., Lq, P., Phwkrqv, S., Ri, V., & Dffhswdelolw, W. (2008). 6wudwhjlf 3odqqlqj 'hflvlrqv dqq wkhlu ,psohphqwdwlrq lq 3xeolf ,qvwlwxlrv, 2(2), 194–204.
- [92] Yingqiang, Z., & Yongjian, S. (2016). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Reflection, Criticism, and Change. *Chinese Education and Society*, 49(1–2), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2016.1192382>
- [93] Zheng, Y. (2016). The impact of E-participation on corruption: a cross-country analysis. *International Review of Public Administration*, 21(2), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2016.1186457>
- [94] Shah hirva, pateljenisha (2016) bicelle: a lipid nanostructure for transdermal delivery. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 3 (2), 17-22.
- [95] Ramya, D., & Hemalatha, R. (2015). Analysis of Biological and Clinical data using Effective Data Mining SVM Technology with ERCOF Filtering Gene Selection Method. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Emerging Technology*, 7(8), 571-585.
- [96] Deepa,K.,Sindhupriya,P., &Arunanand,M. (2017). Design of Non Isolated Multi-Input Multi-Output Bidirectional DC-DC Boost Converter Using a Seamless Sliding Mode Control for Electric Vehicle Applications. *Excel International Journal of Technology, Engineering and Management*, 4(1), 38-45.
- [97] Wang, X., Zhao, X. Impact of strong sound of starting guns on the hearing loss of track and field athletes based on brainstem auditory evoked potential (2018) *NeuroQuantology*, 16 (6), pp. 806-810.
- [98] Chen, T. Effects of martial arts on recovery of motor function and nerve excitability of stroke patients (2018) *NeuroQuantology*, 16 (6), pp. 894-898.