

# Quality and University Governance in Indonesia

Nur Sayidah<sup>1</sup>, Sri Utami Ady<sup>1</sup>, Jajuk Supriyati<sup>1</sup>, Sutarmin<sup>1</sup>,  
Mustika Winedar<sup>1</sup>, Alvy Mulyaningtyas<sup>1</sup> & Aminullah Assagaf<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Bussiness and Economic, University of Dr. Soetomo Surabaya, Indonesia

Correspondence: Nur Sayidah, Faculty of Bussiness and Economic, University of Dr. Soetomo Surabaya, Jl.Semolowaru 84 Surabaya, Indonesia. E-mail: nur.sayidah@unitomo.ac.id

Received: March 9, 2019

Accepted: June 24, 2019

Online Published: June 28, 2019

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v8n4p10

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n4p10>

## Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the importance of quality in university governance in Indonesia. The researcher designed this study with an approach of qualitative research approach with Focus Group Discussion (FGD) method. Participants come from 25 universities throughout Indonesia. Participants are leaders of higher education ranging from the head of the study program to the rector. The result of the focus group discussion shows that the quality of higher education will decrease if there is the scarcity of qualified lecturers. Declining quality of higher education will affect the number of students. Finally, if the student decline happens continuously, then higher education can close. So quality is a top priority in university governance.

**Keywords:** quality, university, governance, higher education

## 1. Introduction

Economic pressures due to environmental changes such as industry and information technology and globalization have had an impact on the pattern of university governance in Indonesia. Almost all universities are making changes in how they operate. There is a process of internationalization into a world-class university in terms of education, teaching, and research, and some are on the way to university entrepreneurs to create young entrepreneurs. There are global university models that adopt research universities in Indonesia and Malaysia. The results of the analysis show that there are differences in implementation to achieve them, even with the same globalization discourse (Beerrens, 2010).

These changes must necessarily keep the university accountable for the main function of education. Law no. 20 of 2003 on National Education System states that education serves to develop the ability and form the character and civilization of a dignified nation in order to educate the nation's life and aims to develop learners into human beings who believe and piety to God Almighty, noble, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, and become a democratic and responsible citizen. To achieve a balance between following the flow of globalization and maintaining the functions and goals of education within the university requires good governance.

Good governance of private higher education is a set of mechanisms to direct and control a university to run in line with the expectations of all interested parties, by applying the principles of transparency, accountability, responsibility, fairness, independence, equality and fairness (Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry no. 16 of 2018). Currently, although in Law no. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education and Law no. 66 on the Implementation and Management of Higher Education has been set on governance principles but only for state/public universities. Private universities are left to each institution. This delegation of authority certainly results in varying governance practices on higher education.

Good governance of private higher education is set in the statutes which are the basic rules of university governance that will be used as the basis for the preparation of regulations and operational procedures in each private higher education (Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry no 16 of 2018). One of the important things that must be considered in university governance is quality. The university's goal of producing high-quality education is different from generating profits (Trakman, 2008). The university is not a sort of factory that produces scholars who are ready to work without being responsible for their morality. The main role of higher education according to Plato is to free human beings from the shackles of ignorance and unrighteousness so that the whole human being has the

idea of virtue, goodness, and justice (Jalaluddin and Idi, 2011). Quality is one of the important issues in university governance (higher education).

In Europe, higher education institutions have established quality assurance systems according to national standards and adapted to the needs of each institution (Alzafari and Ursin, 2019). Member countries of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) have tried to establish a similar quality assurance system that includes regulations related to quality assurance agencies, accreditation systems and the development of institutional quality assurance (Komotar, 2018). Quality assurance systems built on the foundation of quality culture will improve the quality of teaching and learning and encourage the achievement of academic success (Kadhila and Lipumbu, 2019).

## **2. Literature Review**

### *2.1 The Concept of University Governance*

Governance can be viewed from three different perspectives as a discipline, checks and balances, and decision making (Iqbal and Lewis, 2009). From the perspective of governance, discipline is a theoretical model of the ideal state and how to execute it appropriately. From this perspective, all governance models are viewed as rooted in the same conceptual framework. Furthermore, in the perspective of checks and balances, governance is the process of delegation of authority for decision-making. The delegation process requires checks and balances against authorized authorities to make decisions. In the perspective of decision making, governance is related to the effectiveness of decisions made (Iqbal and Lewis, 2009). When it comes to the effectiveness of government decision making it is the structure of relationships that bring about organizational coherence, authorize policies, plans, and decisions, and accounts for their probity, responsiveness, and cost-effectiveness (Gallagher, 2001, 1).

Governance has various terminologies such as monetary governance, economic governance, public governance, corporate governance (Iqbal and Lewis, 2009). In the university governance context as used in this study, governance is related to decision making from a university (Mackey, 2011). The three dimensions of general-purpose decision making in organizational management include: for whom, by whom, and by what resources (to whom) decisions are made (Iqbal and Lewis, 2009).

University governance that includes a system, organizational structure, and mechanisms that ensure transparent and accountable management of institutions and are developed based on moral values, ethics, integrity and academic norms (BAN PT, 2011) will answer the question for who and by whom university decisions are made. University governance as a behavior, method or method used by a university (university) to utilize all potency and elements possessed optimally, to reach the vision and mission which have been determined (Directorate of Higher Education, 2005) determine to whom accountability must be intended for the use of such resources. The governance model (system) includes governance structures, mechanisms, and principles (Syakhroza, 2005). All three are also called governance tools will run as a whole. Structure in organizational theory can be interpreted as a pattern of coordination and control, workflow, authority, and communication that connect the activities of members of the organization (Bedeian and Zammuto, 1991). The structure is a framework within the organization how the principles of governance can be shared, executed, and controlled. The governance structure is designed to support responsible and controlled organizational activity. Emphasis on control is crucial because governance deals with answers to who controls who arise from the importance of separation between the decision-making party and the controlling interests (Syakhroza, 2008).

The governance structure describes in detail the level or layers of the committee and describes its main role. In the United States, the structure of university governance as referred to by Balderston (1995) consists of trustees, administrative executives, lecturers, and groups as well as other units such as students, government and alumni (Ricci, 1999). In Indonesia, based on Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No.66 of 2010 concerning changes to Government Regulation No.17 of 2010 concerning Management and Governance of Education, governance structure of higher education organized by the government includes (1) rectors, presidents, or directors (2) university senates (3) the supervisory unit, and (4) consideration council. Rectors, presidents, or directors conduct university autonomy for and on behalf of ministers. University senates, give consideration and oversight of the rector, president, or director. The supervisory unit shall supervise the implementation of non-academic university autonomy for and on behalf of the rector, president, or director. (4) Consideration council considers the autonomy of higher education non-academic and other functions according to the statutes to the rector, president, or director. While the organs and management of higher education units organized by the community, higher education governance uses statutory provisions stipulated by non-profit legal entities.

Meanwhile, governance mechanisms are clear rules, procedures, and relationships between decision-makers and those who control the decisions. The governance mechanism is directed to ensure and oversee the running of governance systems within the organization (Syakhroza, 2008). The internal and external relations mechanism at a private university focuses on how trustees, presidents, and other actors carry out their institutional responsibilities. In the case of a public university or multicampus university system, accounts should be established to show the relationship between the executive and the local legislature with the central government, especially with the higher education coordinator (Ricci, 1999). Good governance should be able to create mutual respect between institutions and government institutions, community groups, and other institutions (BAN-PT, 2007).

## *2.2 Quality in University Governance*

The challenge faced by higher education in Indonesia is the increasing number of prospective students who are not balanced with the availability of state higher education, thus encouraging the emergence of many private universities that raise problems especially related to quality control and governance (Welch, 2012). Research on university governance in Indonesia has not been done. One of the studies that have been done by Idrus (1999) is related to university autonomy. The results show that before the reform of government, the autonomy granted to universities is relatively small, especially for state universities. After the reform of a new paradigm in education management that includes autonomy, accountability, accreditation, self-evaluation, and continuous quality improvement are implemented (Idrus, 1999). Quality in the view of students based on the results of Noha Classy's research (2015) related to the performance of lecturers as well as the teaching and learning process. While some educators see students as partners, lecturers as facilitators in the learning process, education is a transformative process. Quality in a university cannot be separated from the quality of human resources, especially lecturers.

Assessment of ranking of universities in Indonesia is conducted by the Research and Higher Education Ministry. Ranking indicators that include human resources, accreditation ratings, student affairs, research, and community service are determined by the institutional section in Research and Higher Education Ministry. These indicators show that the proportion of higher education quality is associated with the quality of lecturers is 60%. Among the 60 %, 30% is an assessment for research and dedication of lecturers; the remaining 30% is the value for the quality of lecturers. Assessment of lecturer quality includes the number of lecturers who have a doctoral degree and number of lecturers who have the academic position of professor and associate professor. A lecturer with lecturer academic level under associate professor does not have any weight in the assessment (Indarjo, 2018). Therefore, every university should strive continuously to motivate and send lecturers to continue their doctoral studies and take care of academic promotion. This effort needs to be done intensively, especially in universities that are still short of lecturers who have doctoral education and low academic level.

Quality improvement in universities should be made by improving the quality of lecturers. Lecturers become the main actors in the teaching and learning process. Therefore the quality of the lecturer becomes the guarantee of the acquisition and transfer of knowledge to the students (Brewer & Brewer, 2010). Students as customers become the driving force for universities to reach their function and goals effectively (Sunder M., 2016). Providing quality services is a key factor in attracting and retaining students. Failure to attract or satisfy students will negatively impact the number of new students, funding, and university survival (Devinder & Datta, 2003). Quality and service become one unity that affects customer value (Collins & Philippa, 1994).

## **3. Research Methodology**

The researcher designed this study with a qualitative approach. This research method used Focus Group Discussion (FGD) method. At the time this study was conducted, the researcher was accepted as one of the Deans' Course Indonesia participants. This activity has the same theme as the research being conducted by researchers that is higher education and governance. Therefore the results of this training serve as research data. Training methods include 70% participant engagement and 30% lecture / facilitation. This method indicates that the participants discussed more topics that fit the theme so that they meet the criteria as a Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Participants come from 25 universities throughout Indonesia. Participants are leaders of private higher education ranging from Head of Department to Rector. This research takes place in Surabaya and Jakarta, where Indonesia Deans' Course is held. Data collection will be conducted with focus group discussion, which is to conduct group discussions to explore the importance of quality in university governance.

### *3.1 Data Analysis*

Data analysis was done by qualitative analysis technique of Miles and Huberman (1992). The components of the data analysis include (1) data collection (2) data reduction (3) data presentation (4) conclusion. Data reduction is done by

selecting, focusing attention, and simplification of rough data derived from written notes during the interview process. The data is unnecessary to be removed, and the selected data is organized so that it can be collected into a theme. The theme is presented in the narrative form as a set of organized information, making it possible to conclude.

#### 4. Data Analysis And Discussion

##### 4.1 Participant Description

Participants are all members who are elected to participate in Indonesia Deans' Course with the following description:

Table 1. Description of Participants

Nu.	Initial	Position	Nu.	Initial	Position
1.	AT	Vice Rector for Student & Alumnus Affairs of Private Higher Education -Malang	13.	JL	Vice Rector for Academic of Private Higher Education - Surabaya
2.	AM	Rector of Private Higher Education -Malang	14.	LL	Dean of Private Higher Education – Surabaya
3.	AC	Vice Rector for Academic and Student Affairs of Polytechnic	15.	LK	Director of Private Higher Education - Yogyakarta
4.	BI	Rector of Private Higher Education - Yogyakarta.	16.	MA	Head of Department, Private Higher Education - Bali
5.	DR	Dean, of Private Higher Education - Banjarmasin.	17.	MI	Vice Director of Finance, Private Higher Education - Riau
6.	DD	Dean of Private Higher Education - Jakarta	18.	NS	Director of Private Higher Education - Tangerang
7.	DH	Rector of Private Higher Education - Surabaya,	19.	NSU	Vice Dean, Private Higher Education – Yogyakarta
8.	ER	Vice Rector for Cooperation and Research of Private Higher Education – Jakarta	20.	NSA	Dean of Private Higher Education – Surabaya
9.	HM	Vice Rector for Academic Affairs, Private Higher Education - Jakarta.	21.	PS	Rector of Private Higher Education – Malang
10.	IP	Dean of Private Higher Education - Yogyakarta	22.	Re	Dean of Private Higher Education – Jakarta
11.	IM	Director of Polytechnic - Jakarta	23.	TT	Dean of Private Higher Education – Jakarta
12.	JS	Vice Rector for Development and Cooperation of Private Higher Education - Purwokerto	24.	TH	Head of Department, Private Higher Education - Tangerang
			25.	TY	Vice Director, Private Higher Education - Malang

Participants consist of four rectors, three directors, six vice rectors, two vice directors, seven deans, one vice dean, and two Head of Department. These participants come from various private higher education in Indonesia.

##### 4.2 Quality Becomes the Foundation in University Governance

Quality or quality is described in Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 50 of 2014 on Quality Assurance System of Higher Education article 1 paragraph 1. Higher education quality is the level of conformity between the implementation of Higher Education with Higher Education Standards consisting of National Standards of Higher Education and Standards of Higher Education that defined by the institution. Furthermore, in Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry no. 44 the year 2015 on Higher Education National Standard is a higher education level after the secondary education that includes diploma programs, undergraduate programs, master

programs, doctoral programs, professional programs, specialist programs organized by universities based on the culture of the Indonesian nation. Universities are educational units that hold higher education and have obligations in implementing three duties of higher education. The implementation of three duties of higher education is set to meet the minimum standards set by certain qualifications. Qualifications include qualifications of graduate competence, qualifications, and competence of lecturers and education personnel. This qualification shows that quality is the most important part of the governance of universities.

#### *4.3 Regulations of the Higher Education Quality in Indonesia*

The importance of quality in the management of higher education in Indonesia is indicated by the number of regulations set by the government. There are 17 regulations related to the quality of universities have been published since 2012 (Sailah, 2018). The rules are as follows:

1. Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education
2. Law No. 20 of 2013 on Medical Education
3. Act No. 11 of 2014 on Engineering
4. Presidential Regulation No. 8 of 2012 on KKN
5. Regulation of Education and Culture Ministry No. 109 of 2013 on Distance Education
6. Regulation of Education and Culture Ministry No. 14 of 2014 on Higher Education Cooperation
7. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 50 of 2014 on Quality Assurance System of Higher Education
8. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 44 of 2015 on National Standards of Higher Education
9. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 26 of 2016 on RPL
10. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 32 the year 2016 on Accreditation of Study Program and Higher Education
11. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 61 of 2016 on Higher Education Database
12. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 100 of 2016 concerning Establishment, Amendment, Dissolution of State Universities, and Self-Establishment, Amendment, Revocation of PTS's Permit.
13. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 1 of 2017 concerning Opening, Amendment, Closure of Study Program Off Main Campus
14. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 51 the year 2017 on Educator Certification for Lecturer
15. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 9 of 2018 on Accreditation of Scientific Journals
16. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 3 the year 2018 on Merger and Unification of PTS.
17. Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 16 of 2018 on the Preparation of the PTS Statute

These regulations are made by the government to encourage universities to meet national standards both in learning, research, and community service to become a qualified college. Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education regulates the principles, objectives, and implementation of higher education, quality assurance system, and the implementation of universities and financing.

Quality assurance system is regulated in Regulation of Minister of Ristekdikti No. 50 the year 2014 on the Quality Assurance System of Higher Education. Each higher education must have an Internal and External Quality Assurance System. This regulation is supported by Presidential Regulation No. 8 of 2012 on KKN which regulates the framework of competency qualification by the structure of work in various sectors and is reinforced by Minister of Ristekdikti Regulation No. 44 of 2015 on National Standards of Higher Education.

The most recent regulation is the Regulation of the Minister of Ristekdikti No. 16 of 2018 on the Preparation of the Statutes of private universities governing the procedures for the preparation of private university statutes. The Statutes are the basic rules of private university management that are used as the basis for the preparation of rules and operational procedures in private universities. The background of the emergence of this regulation is that private universities can play a role in producing qualified human resources, scientific and technological innovation, and able

to play an active role, both in national development activities and in improving national competitiveness. Therefore, private higher education must be managed well (good university governance) to produce high-quality graduates.

#### 4.4 Quality of Lecturer as a Determinant Factor of University Quality

One of the qualities of higher education is shown by the quality of the graduates. While the quality of graduates is determined by the quality of human resources, especially the quality of the lecturer. If a college experiences a scarcity of qualified lecturers, then the quality will also fall. The following is the result of discussion related to the scarcity of qualified lecturers in a university.

The result of the discussion from the participants of the course, when asked to convey the negative impact that arises concerning the scarcity of qualified human capital for higher education institutions, proves the importance of quality. All participants are required to write down keywords using capital letters, three negative impacts for private universities without qualified human resources (lecturers and educational staff) on available meta cards. Writings are numbered priorities (1, 2 and 3) on three selected challenges and then pasted on boards available at their priority. The results of the priorities are discussed in large groups.

The result of keyword groupings on the negative impacts arising from the scarcity of qualified human capital for higher education institutions is based on their priorities — priority one which is the greatest challenge to the impact of the scarcity of quality human capital. The greatest opinion is that the quality of the college is decreasing (there are 13 people), the second is the college closed (there are seven people) and the third is the existence, the weak competence, the declining trust, and morale. Opinion on the 2nd priority shows the most opinion is the decrease of the number of students (there are ten people), the second is related to the performance of the lower colleges (there are four people) and the decreasing quality of alumnus (there are three people). From now on is opinion relating to low of recognition from society and decreasing of financial ability. Priority 3 indicates that there are interesting because it covers various aspects of remuneration, students as the main source of income from universities. The most opinion is the decreasing quality, the two are related to the students, the students' understanding, the number is decreased, the demand is down there is no new change, the student is not satisfied. Next is the accreditation becomes ugly; the performance in the college declines; the alumni's confidence decreases.

The result of priority grouping on the impact of the scarcity of qualified human capital is heterogeneous. Some place the same impact on different priorities. But the most important of these results, are all agreed that the quality of human resources is very important in maintaining the continuity of a college. The main issues are quality down and closing, then accreditation ranks down, the number of students a little, and decreased income. Decreased quality is a reminder of the number of students and acceptance. Based on the opinions of all the participants above we can grasp the idea that all collectively aware that if quality human capital is scarce poses challenges to academic quality (lower academic quality of college), the number of students and finances decreases. Quality becomes the foundation in university governance. Quality needs to be internationalized in college life and becomes a habit as Aristoteles philosopher states that: *quality is not an act, it is a habit*

([https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/aristotle\\_379604](https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/aristotle_379604))

## 5. Conclusion

Universities are an institution that has an important role in developing science and producing quality human beings. Quality is a major concern in university management to gain public recognition and trust. In Indonesia, the quality of universities is regulated by the government through the ministries of research and higher education. The importance of university quality is demonstrated by the many regulations. Since 2012 until early 2018 there have been 17 regulations issued by the government to regulate the quality of universities. The regulations govern various university activities starting with the establishment of universities and courses, curriculum, learning process, management to the preparation of statutes.

One of the qualities of higher education is shown by the quality of the graduates. While the quality of graduates is determined by the quality of human resources, especially the quality of the lecturer. The result of the focus group discussion shows that the quality of college will decrease if there is the scarcity of qualified lecturers. Declining quality of college will affect the number of students. Finally, if the student decline happens continuously, then the college can close. So quality is a top priority in university governance.

## References

- Alzafari, Khaled & Jani Ursin. (2019). Implementation of quality assurance standards in European higher education: does context matter? *Quality in Higher Education*, 25(1), 58-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2019.1578069>
- BAN-PT. (2011). Buku II: Standar dan Prosedur.
- Bedeian, Arthur dan Raymond F. Zammuto. (1991). *Organization: Theory and Design*. The Dryden Press, Chicago.
- Berkens, Eric. (2010). Global models for the national research university: adoption and adaptation in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 8(3), 369-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2010.505099>
- Brewer P, Brewer K. (2010). Knowledge Management, Human Resource Management, and Higher Education: A Theoretical. *Journal Of Education For Business*, 85, 330–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832321003604938>
- Collins, P. (1994). Approaches to Quality. *The TQM Magazine*, 6(3), 39–43. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09544789410057881>
- Devinder, K., & Datta, B. (2003). A study of the effect of perceived lecture quality on post - lecture intentions. *Work Study*, 52(5), 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00438020310485967>
- Directorate of Higher Education. (2005). Buku – X Tata Kelola.
- Gallagher, Michael. (2001). Modern university governance – a national perspective. Conference organized by The Australia Institute and Manning Clark House. 26 July.
- Elassy, Noha. (2015). The concepts of quality, quality assurance and quality enhancement. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 23(3), 250-261. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-11-2012-0046>
- Idrus, Nirwan. (1999). Towards quality of higher education in Indonesia. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 7(3), 130-140. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684889910281566>
- Indargo A. (2018). Strategi Meningkatkan Peringkat Perguruan Tinggi Menuju Kampus Unggul. Dalam: Workshop di Universitas Dr. Soetomo Surabaya, 21 April.
- Iqbal, Zafar dan Lewis, Mervyn K. (2009). *An Islamic Perspective on Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, UK. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781848449220>
- Jalaluddin dan Idi Abdullah. (2011). *Filsafat Pendidikan: Manusia, Filsafat dan Pendidikan*. RajaGrafindo, Jakarta.
- Komotar, Maruša Hauptman. (2018). The evolutionary dynamics of quality assurance systems in European higher education: the view from Slovenia. *Quality in Higher Education*, 24(3), 203-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2018.1553274>
- Law no. 20 of 2003 on National Education System.
- Law no. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education.
- Law no. 66 on the Implementation and Management of Higher Education.
- McCawley, Peter. (2005). Governance in Indonesia: Some Comments, *Discussion Paper*, No: 38, Published 26 September.
- Miles, Matthew B dan A. Michael Huberman. (1992). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Tjetjep Rohendi Rohidi (translator), Analisis Data Kualitatif, UI-Press, Jakarta.
- Presidential Regulation No. 8 of 2012 on KKNi.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 50 of 2014 on Quality Assurance System of Higher Education.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 44 of 2015 on National Standards of Higher Education.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 32 the year 2016 on Accreditation of Study Program and Higher Education.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 61 of 2016 on Higher Education Database.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 100 of 2016 concerning Establishment, Amendment, Dissolution of State Universities, and Self-Establishment, Amendment, Revocation of PTS's Permit.

- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 1 of 2017 concerning Opening, Amendment, Closure of Study Program Off Main Campus.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 51 the year 2017 on Educator Certification for Lecturer.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 9 of 2018 on Accreditation of Scientific Journals
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 3 the year 2018 on Merger and Unification of Private Higher Education.
- Regulation of Research and Higher Education Ministry No. 16 of 2018 on the Preparation of the Statute of Private Higher Education.
- Ricci, Emil A. (1999). College and University Governance in the United States: An Historical Survey, Working Paper.
- Sunder V. (2016). Constructs of quality in higher education services. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(8), 1091-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2015-0079>
- Syakhroza, Akhmad. (2005). *Corporate Governance: Sejarah dan Perkembangan, Teori, Model dan Sistem Governance serta Aplikasinya pada Perusahaan BUMN*. Lembaga Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Trakman, Leon. (2008). Modelling University Governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(1/2), January/April, 63-83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00384.x>
- Welch, Anthony. (2012). The limits of regionalism in Indonesian higher education. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 1(1), 24-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20463161211194441>