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Abstract: Purpose of this study was to find out and understand the profile of Higher Education Human Resources (PT), the quality of Human Resources for Higher Education, and determine the quality of Higher Education in Kopertis III in the Jakarta Region by using data from 2015 to 2017. The method used in this analysis is a study of documentation and surveys. In addition, key performance indicators (IKU) were used from the Kopertis III Education Strategy Plan for the Jakarta Region in 2015-2019 to assess the quality of Higher Education. The results show that there are 332 Higher Education under the auspices of Kopertis III in the Jakarta Region, which consists of PT Private institutions in the form of Universities of 57 Universities (17.17%), in the form of 15 Institute institutes (4.52%), in the form of Colleges 125 (37.65%), in the form of academies, 121 (36.45%) and 11 polytechnics (3.31%). but the students are only 58.39% and the lecturers are 71.83%. Based on 7 indicators, the feasibility of teaching lecturers was only 37.65%, permanent lecturers were 67.82%, professorship professors were 3.59%, senior lecturers were 19.84%, and most teaching staff of SM graduates were 34.82%. Based on 5 composite indicators selected, the quality of PT is only 49.85, meaning less than half. Based on the results of the analysis of the authors, it is recommended that further research be carried out regarding PT data collection, especially lecturers with all the details and whether the composite indicators used are appropriate to measure the quality of PT.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Government of the Republic of Indonesia every five years is always subject to change, but in each year the government of the Republic of Indonesia has the same ideals for its people, namely to educate the lives of the nation. The government has an education program to educate the lives of the nation as stated in Law Number 20, 2003 concerning the National Education System (Ministry of National Education, 2003) and Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education (RistekDikti, 2012). The education program is expected to ensure equal opportunities for education, quality improvement and relevance and efficiency of education management, especially higher education to face challenges in accordance with the demands of changes in local, national and global life. For this reason, it is necessary to reform the higher education (PT) in a planned, directed and continuous manner.

Renewal of higher education is carried out, among others, to improve the quality of higher education in the present to the long term. The quantity and quality sector is still an important sector in the assessment of improving the quality of higher education. The academic community in particular have qualified lecturers are expected to carry out the three responsibilities of education especially in the field of teaching in accordance with applicable rules so as to generate outputs (graduates / ti) qualified in each year. When able to produce high-quality graduates, it can automatically improve the quality of education in each year.
Every year is always a scourge of problems and constraints in improving the quality of higher education in Indonesia, namely the problem of procurement, placement, appointment and coaching of educators. In addition to these four problems, not only the problem of the ratio of lecturers to students, but also there are problems in the form of level of guidance, the level of quality of professional expertise, and the level of welfare of educators in each year.

The Government of the Republic of Indonesia in this case the Ministry of Research and Technology is always thinking and tasked to improve the quality of higher education in Indonesia. The quality of higher education is strongly influenced by the degree to which the quality level of educators in the PT in addition to the quantity and quality of teaching, qualified educators can be seen from several assessment indicators, including the number of educators sufficient, career and professional coaching as educators, the welfare of educators, and distribution in the placement of educators according with educator needs planning.

Educators in this case lecturers are needed in the indicators of quality of national education, including at the level of higher education in charge of developing quality human resources in accordance with industrial development needs. Past experience shows that the quantity and quality of teaching educators with a diploma that is owned is inadequate. Education efforts towards productivity must always emphasize people as subjects. Systemic education and training programs can improve understanding and productivity awareness and the need to improve it (I Ketut Sudarsana, 2016). Based on the results of the evaluation of Ilah Sailah (2017) concerning PTS in Kopertis III in the Jakarta area, in 2016/2017 there were lecturers in Private Higher Education (PTS) in Kopertis Region III Jakarta amounting to 21,381 people. From a number of permanent lecturers, it is known that there are still 2561 lecturers (11.98%) who are only graduates of Bachelor or S1 level (Ilah Sailah, 2017). Under these conditions, Private Higher Education (PTS) always gets the spotlight from the public because the results of education are less in line with development needs, one example of which is due to the inability of qualified teaching educators who do not qualify as educators at PT. The problem affected the public to be doubtful about the existence of Kopertis III in the Jakarta Region and several higher education institutions located in the Kopertis III region in the Jakarta area.

Educators have an obligation to improve the quality of themselves, the government in this case through the Ministry of Research and Technology and Kopertis III in the Jakarta Region continues to improve the management of higher education (PT), especially educators and other education personnel who are expected to be able to prepare innovative programs that can improve the professionalism of educators in the future. This is in accordance with Law No. 20/2003 articles 39 and 40, namely improving the ability to plan and implement the learning process by creating a learning atmosphere that is meaningful, fun, creative, dynamic, and dialogical, evaluates learning outcomes, conducts coaching and training and is professionally committed in order to improve the quality of education especially PT in the Kopertis III Jakarta area.

The implications of the lecturer declaration as a professional profession, all academic community members in the PT to synergize through standardization, competency testing, certification and professional registration mechanisms that have consequences on improving decent welfare, reward systems and protection of professions that are able to guarantee their future. In order to support these efforts, the authors carry out HR analysis of higher education in the PTS Kopertis III Jakarta area which can be utilized by decision makers and policy formulation in the framework of various policy planning in the field of education, especially educators and education personnel in higher education. Based on this background, the problems that need to be explored further are the extent to which the availability of educational human resources in PT is one of the sources of information that is closest to the data object so that it can be used in decision making and the formulation of educational policies.
that are close to reality in the field. There are several assumptions that need to be considered in relation to these various problems, namely 1) a description of educators and higher education education personnel and 2) analysis of data on educators and education personnel based on the Jakarta Kopertis III Education Strategic Plan, 2015-2019 (Kopertis3.or.id, 2015). In accordance with the problems, the purpose of the PT HR analysis is to understand the profile of PT HR, the quality of PT HR, and the quality of PT by using education indicators based on the Kopertis III Education Strategic Plan in Jakarta, 2015-2019 (Kopertis3.or.id, 2015). HR Analysis uses 2015/2017 data so that it is known HR Profile of PT. PT HR quality analysis uses seven indicators, namely 1) percentage of lecturers’ teaching feasibility according to institutional status, 2) percentage of permanent lecturers according to institution status, 3) percentage of functional positions according to institution status, 4) percentage of lecturer pensions according to institution status, gender, differences gender, and gender parity index, 5) percentage of lecturer seniority according to status 6) percentage of pension staff education according to institution status, gender, gender differences, and gender parity index, and 7) highest percentage of education personnel according to institution status. Of the seven indicators, five indicators or composite indicators are used to determine the quality of PT, especially PTS in the scope of Kopertis III in the Jakarta area.

**The Theory Of Study**

**Human Resources**

According to Hullah, et al. (2012), Human resources are people who are ready, willing and able to contribute to efforts to achieve organizational goals, human resources cover three aspects, namely education, experience and training. Human resources must be good because good human resources will show good resource capacity as well. According to Hullah, et al. in Warih Komarasari (2016), humans are responsible for managing the organization, therefore human resources are an important element and are always present in the organization. The right amount of human resources and with good competence will influence the reliability of regional financial reporting, therefore, the capacity and competence of human resources are interconnected. The capacity of human resources is the ability of a person or individual, an organization (institutional), or a system that is used to carry out its functions or authorities to achieve its objectives effectively and efficiently. Capacity must be seen as the ability to achieve performance, to produce outputs and outcomes (Indriasari and Nahartyo in Warih Komarasari, 2016).

**Quality**

According to Nurul Qomariyah (2012), Quality is an important construct in the business world, including in the service business. According to Kotler (2000), service quality is the overall nature of a product or service that affects its ability to satisfy expressed or implied needs. *Total Quality Service* is a concept of how to embed the principle of service quality in each phase of service delivery involving all personnel within the organization (Handriana, 1998).

There are several dimensions of service quality that have been analyzed by experts. According to the results of research on the quality of services and the factors that influence them that have been done by Parasuraman, et al. (1985), there are 5 dimensions of service quality, including:

- **Tangibles**, or physical evidence, namely the ability of a company to show its existence to external parties. The appearance and capability of the company's physical facilities and infrastructure and the conditions in the surrounding environment are concrete evidence of the services provided by service providers including physical facilities (buildings, shops and warehouses), equipment and equipment used (technology) and the appearance of its employees.
Reliability, or physical reliability is the company’s ability to provide services in accordance with the promised accurately and reliably. Performance must be in accordance with must be in accordance with customer expectations which means timeliness, same service for all customers without errors, a sympathetic attitude and with a high degree of accuracy.

Responsiveness, or responsiveness, is a willingness to help and provide fast (responsive) and appropriate services to its customers by delivering clear information. Allowing consumers to wait without a reason that clearly causes negative perception in the quality of service.

Assurance, or guarantee and certainty, is the politeness, knowledge, and ability of company employees to foster a sense of customer trust in the company. Consists of several components including communication, credibility, security, manners, and competence.

Empathy, or give sincere and individual or personal attention given to customers by trying to understand consumer desires. The company is expected to have understanding and knowledge about customers, understand customer needs specifically, and have a comfortable operating time for customers.

Higher Education
According to RI Law No. 20 of 2003 Article 1 concerning the National Education System, Education is a conscious and planned effort to realize a learning atmosphere and learning process so that students actively develop their potential to have religious spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and skills needed himself, society, nation and state. Basic Education is a solid foundation or foundation for every community to be able to change attitudes and behavior by practicing and learning and not limited to the environment of educational institutions. The basis or foundation of education is seen from various aspects, including:

a. Religious
Is the basic element or basis of education that is embedded in the values of Islamic religion (faith, faith, and morals) as a solid foundation in education

b. Ideology
That is the basis that refers to the nation’s ideology, namely the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution. And the point is to educate the life of the nation.

c. Economics
Education can be used as a step to get a decent life and get out of all forms of ignorance and poverty

d. More politics refers to ongoing conditions

e. Technology
World has experienced explosives in science and technology. And it can be said that technology has a role in the advancement of the education world

f. Psychological and Pedagogical
The task of education is to teach how to learn, educate psychologically, instill strong motivation in students / teach to learn continuously throughout their lives and provide skills to students, developing a great adaptability in students.

According to Soekidjo Notoatmodjo (2003: 16), elements of education consist of:

1) Input Educational targets, namely: individuals, groups, communities

2) Educators, namely education actors

3) Process, which is an effort planned to influence others

4) The output, which is doing what is expected / behavior

According to the RI Law No. 20 of 2003, the education pathway is divided into:

1. Formal Pathways to

a. Basic Education
Basic education in the form of elementary schools (SD) and Islamic elementary schools or other equivalent forms as well as junior high schools (SMP) and Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs) or other equivalent forms.
b. Secondary Education Secondary education consists of general secondary education and secondary education majors, such as: high school, MA, SMK, MAK, or other equivalent forms.

c. Higher Education Higher education can take the form colleges, polytechnics, colleges, institutes, and universities

2. Paths of Non-Formal Education is a process that takes place informally throughout the ages so that every person gain values, attitudes, skills and knowledge that comes from the experience of everyday life, environmental influences include the influence of family life, relationships with neighbors, work and game environment, markets, libraries, and mass media.

3. Informal Path Informal education is a process that lasts for all ages so that everyone gains values, attitudes, skills, and knowledge that come from the experience of daily life, environmental influences including the influence of family life, relationships with neighbors, work environment and games, markets, libraries, and mass media.

In supporting the research background, the author uses several relevant studies as a guide for the author in compiling and discussing from the author’s research, including:

1. Ambar Sri Lestari (2013)
   Ambar Sri Lestari is a lecturer at the Kendari State Islamic Institute who is an expert in the field of Educational Management Science. Ambar Sri Lestari has conducted a research entitled Analysis of the Performance Assessment of Higher Education Institutions with the Method Balanced Scorecard: Its Application in Strategic Management Systems (Case Study at Brawijaya University Malang) which has been published on the 2nd International Seminar on Quality and Affordable Education (ISQAE 2013).

   From his research, it can be seen that in order to improve organizational performance, alignment of organizational and individual goals in the organization is important. The Balanced Scorecard is an alternative performance measure that aims to combine financial and non-financial performance measures. Inspired by Kaplan and Norton, this concept was developed in four perspectives: finance, customers, internal processes and learning and growth. This paper discusses how to build a balanced scorecard, including determining strategic objectives, size, targets, initiatives, and implementing balanced scorecards in public organizations. Performance assessment analysis of UB has: a) two strategic perspectives of financial perspective, namely the ability to obtain funds and cost efficiency, b) two strategic objectives of stakeholder perspectives, namely satisfaction and pride for UB students, c) six strategic objectives, internal perspective processes, namely a portal internal business, process and policy procedures, financial and reporting systems, internal control & performance measurement, quality research and community service, quality PBM, d) three strategic objectives of learning & growth perspectives improve human resource professionalism, improve infrastructure quality and facilities. UB has 18 strategic targets in four perspectives of the Balanced Scorecard and 40 KPIs that will be used as a measure in the scorecard.

   The results of her research can also be seen that UB’s performance appraisal system (Universitas Brawijaya) Malang has strategic objectives in improving the quality of higher education including: a) strategic objectives of financial perspective, namely the ability to obtain funds and cost efficiency; b) strategic objectives of stakeholder perspectives, namely the trust of stakeholders to UB, satisfaction & pride of students towards UB; c) strategic objectives from perspectives internal process, namely UB business portal, process & policy processes, financial and reporting systems, internal control & performance measurement, quality of research & community service, quality of PBM; d) Strategic learning & growth objectives, namely the development of SIM (Management Information System), improvement of HR professionalism, improvement of the quality of facilities and infrastructure. Translation of the UB strategy results in 18 strategic objectives on all four perspectives of the Balanced
Scorecard and 40 KPIs that will be used as a measure in the scorecard. The amount of size given to the customer perspective is balanced with the size of the financial perspective which is equal to 15%, where UB focuses on the internal process size of 58% to satisfy customers and the growth & learning perspective of 12%. The design and measurement results obtained by various formulations of UB balanced scorecard which cover the objectives, size, objectives and strategic initiatives illustrated in the Strategy and Key Performance Indicator Map.

In improving the quality of higher education, he concluded and suggested that managing finances independently and flexibly must be done with prioritizing productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. Financial management through the pattern of the Public Service Agency (BLU) can provide the freedom to explore and use financial resources sourced from the results of services. Collaboration between institutions and the community and other institutions at home and abroad must be continuously improved so as to enhance the image of UB. Many research results must be used to enrich teaching materials and community development. So that the results of research that have been published and patented can contribute to building images and revenue generation for UB. Evaluation and handling specifically for this matter is needed in the future. UB's organizations related to the development of a Business Incubator Center are the answers to solving this problem. The adequacy of the hardware infrastructure and network system is still not optimally utilized, so there is still remaining capacity that should be utilized immediately. The steps of consolidation, socialization and training seem to need to be improved and sought a breakthrough in order to accelerate. Management development in terms of availability of resources for technical support needs to be improved so as to be able to provide services in terms of development and operations optimally by utilizing existing infrastructure.

Moses L. Singgih and Rahmayanti are lecturers from the Department of Industrial Engineering at the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology (ITS) Surabaya. They conduct research on the factors that affect the quality of education in universities that have been published in the 2008 Proceedings of the National Teknoin Seminar in Industrial Engineering.

According to the results of the study, universities with their products in the form of educational services are institutions that function as a place to conduct education or teaching, research and community service. This research was conducted at a college in Surabaya where to improve the quality or quality of education, the factors (indicators) that determine the quality of education are the learning process, curriculum of study programs, human resources, student affairs, infrastructure and facilities, academic atmosphere, financial, research and publications, community service and governance. This research is intended to look for factors (indicators) that affect the quality of education. Variables used to be indicators that affect the quality of education are the quality standards of education according to DIKTI which consists of 10 indicators including learning process, curriculum of study programs, human resources, student affairs, infrastructure and facilities, academic atmosphere, finance, research and publication, dedication in the community and governance. The steps in the research are as follows: first, the researcher identifies the problems that will be discussed in this study then formulates the research objectives, conducts field observations to determine the state of the research object. Furthermore, the literature study in which researchers look for literature related to research and the last is to determine variables that serve as indicators of the quality of education. Second: data collection is done by distributing questionnaires to respondents who have been determined. Beginning with a preliminary survey of 50 respondents, then conducting a real survey of 115 respondents with a total of 85 questions for all indicators.
Third: the data processing begins with the validity and reliability of the results of a preliminary survey, then calculate the adequacy of the data that is then performed statistical tests descriptive and test cross tabulation (crosstab) using SPSS software, this test is performed to determine the characteristics of respondents and determine the ratio between characteristics of data. Based on the purpose of this study, to find out the indicators that affect the quality of education, data processing is done by using confirmatory factor analysis, one of the stages in the SEM (method Structural Equation Modeling) using LISREL 8.8 software. Fourth: Analysis and Data Interpretation Phase, at this stage is carried out to discuss the results of the validity and reliability test in the preliminary survey, how to read the results of descriptive statistical tests and cross tabulation test and analyze the results of confirmatory factor analysis where the indicator results will be obtained. anything that affects the quality of education and can know the size of the weight for each indicator. As well as the fifth stage: Stage of Conclusions and Suggestions. It is expected that after getting indicators that affect the quality of education, the institution can increase its target so that the quality of education can be improved and can compete at national and international levels. From the results of this study, it was found that out of the 10 quality standard indicators that were determined it turned out that all of these indicators had a significant effect on the quality of education.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research method used in Higher Education HR analysis is the study of documentation and surveys. Documentation study uses two types, namely 1) study of database Higher Education available in PDSP and 2) study of literature about Higher Education such as Higher Education Statistics 2009/2010 (Kemdiknas 2010b), Higher Education Profile (PSP, 2009), and Educational Development High (PSP, 2010) while the survey was carried out by visiting representatives of PTS in Kopertis III and Kopertis III Jakarta Region. Educational Indicators Based on the 2015-2019 Strategic Plan. Based on the 2015-2019 Strategic Plan (Ministry of National Education, 2010a), the indicators used in conducting HR HR analysis are also based on the five K mission, namely service availability, service affordability, service quality and relevance, service equality, and service certainty. From the five K mission, only one mission was taken, namely the third mission of quality and relevance of educational services. However, in this analysis only the quality of educational services is generated from the data available in the data base as well as from PT Statistics, 2015/2018 (Kemdiknas, 2010a). The PT data base is called because the data has never been published while the PT statistics are data published annually by PDSP. Indicators of the quality of education services produced are seven types of indicators, namely 1) Lecturer teaching feasibility, 2) Percentage of permanent lecturers, 3) Percentage of lecturer functional positions, 4) Percentage of lecturer pensions, 5) Percentage of seniority of lecturers, 6) Percentage of retired education personnel, and 7) Percentage of educational staff diploma. (Center for Educational Statistics, 2009). How to Calculate Indicators To understand how to calculate indicators related to PT HR analysis, the indicator of education services uses seven types of explanations, data variables, formulas and the meaning of the value of each indicator. Percentage of Lecturer Teaching Feasibility The percentage of lecturers' teaching feasibility is the comparison between lecturers who are eligible to teach and the number of lecturers in each type or status of the institution. Eligible to teach lecturers referred to in this writing are lecturers who have a master's degree and above. Eligible to teach lecturers should be broken down into two, namely according to diploma and bachelor programs with postgraduate programs. Lecturers to teach in diploma and bachelor programs are those who have a master's degree and above while the postgraduate program lecturers are those who have a S3 certificate. However, in this analysis only S2 diplomas were used. Data variables of this
indicator type are lecturers according to the type of highest diploma they possess such as S1, S2, S3, and Profession. The formula used is:

\[
\% \text{ Lecturer of Feasibility} = \frac{\text{Number of Masters-level above}}{\text{All Of The Number of Lecturers}} \times 100\%
\]

Amount shows the amount of lecturers who are eligible to teach in each institution. The greater the value in an institution means that lecturers who are worthy of teaching are also getting bigger. On the contrary, the smaller the value means the lecturer who is worthy of teaching will be smaller. Ideally, lecturers who are eligible to teach are 100%, meaning that all lecturers have a diploma that is in accordance with the provisions under Law No. 14/2005 (Ministry of National Education, 2005). Percentage of Permanent Lecturers The percentage of permanent lecturers is the ratio between permanent lecturers and the number of lecturers in each type or status of the institution. What is meant by permanent lecturers is a lecturer who has a decree (SK) to become a permanent lecturer in an institution. Variables of this type of indicator data are lecturers according to employment status such as permanent and non-permanent lecturers. The formulas used are:

\[
\% \text{ Permanent of Lectures} = \frac{\text{All Of Permanent Lectures}}{\text{Total Lecturers}} \times 100\%
\]

The amount of value indicates the size of the lecturer remain in each institution. The greater the value in an institution means that the permanent lecturers are getting bigger too. Conversely, the smaller the value means the smaller the permanent lecturer. Ideally, lecturers who remain are 100% so that lecturers can teach better because they only teach in one place. Percentage of Lecturer Functional Position Percentage of lecturer functional position is a comparison between one type of functional position in accordance with the SK in the number of lecturers in each type or status of the institution. Data variables of this indicator type are lecturers according to functional types such as assistants, lecturers, head lecturers, and professors. The formula used is:

\[
\% \text{ Lecturers JF} = \frac{\text{Number of Lecturers JF}}{\text{Total Lectures}} \times 100\%
\]

Indeks:
JF = Functional positions such as assistants, lecturers, head lecturers, and professors.

The amount of value indicates the size of the portion of the functional position of the lecturer in each institution. The greater the value of professorship in an institution means that certain types of functional positions for lecturers in the institution will be greater. Conversely, the smaller the value of an assistant's position means the better. This shows that lecturers are getting better quality so that their functional positions are increasing. There is no provision what is the ideal value.

**Persentase Retirement Lecturer**

Pension lecturer percentage is the ratio between the lecturers who will retire by the total number of lecturers who are still active in the year. Lecturer pension is calculated from the age of lecturers above 59 years. Data variables of this indicator type are lecturers according to age groups such as under 59 years and over 59 years of age. The formula used is:
Number of Pension Lectures
\[
\% \text{ Pensioners} = \frac{\text{Number of Pension Lectures}}{\text{Total Lecturers}} \times 100
\]

The amount of value indicates the amount of lecturers who will retire in each institution. The greater the value in an institution means that the lecturers who will retire the institution are also getting bigger. There is no provision what is the ideal value. However, by knowing the lecturers who will retire can be planned to replace the lecturer so that there is no gap in the existing lecturers. Percentage of Seniority Lecturers The percentage of seniority of lecturers is the comparison between lecturers who are senior with the number of lecturers in each type or status of the institution. Senior lecturers are lecturers who have taught more than 20 years. Variables of this type of indicator data are lecturers according to working period groups such as 20 years or less and more than 20 years. The formulas used are:

\[
\% \text{ Seniority} = \frac{\text{Number of Senior Lecturers}}{\text{Total Lecturers}} \times 100\%
\]

Amount values indicate the size of senior lecturers in each institution. The greater the value in an institution means that the senior lecturer is also bigger. The number of senior lecturers can show the quality of the lecturer because he has experience teaching.

Data Analysis Test Data

Analysis techniques used in analyzing the quality of Higher Education Human Resources, especially PTS in Kopertis III, 2015/2016 to 2016/2017 are descriptive analysis with the presentation of data in the form of simple tables making it easier for readers to understand the presentation. PT HR analysis includes PT HR profiles and education indicators based on the 2010-2014 Education Strategy Plan on the 3rd mission on the quality of education services that use seven types of indicators. Of the seven indicators, the author uses 5 composite indicators to determine the quality of tertiary education, namely the level of lecturer education, lecturer functional position, lecturer age, lecturer seniority, and lecturer gender. Of the five indicators, to find out the level of the Human Development Index (HDI) in Kopertis III DKI Jakarta in a period using the Gender Development Index (IPG) calculation method. IPG is an index of achievement of basic human development capabilities that are the same as the HDI with regard to gender inequality. IPG is used to measure achievement in the same dimension and use the same indicators as the HDI, but it is more directed to reveal the inequality between men and women. So that the GPA can be known by calculation:

\[
IPG = \frac{1}{3} \left[ (X_{ede}(1) + X_{ede}(2) + I_{inc-dis}) \right]
\]

Description:

\(X_{ede}(1)\) = X for Retirement Lecturer \(X_{ede}(2)\) = Xede forLecturer SeniorCertification \(I_{inc-dis}\) = index of distribution of gender differences

Results from these calculations, if the value of IPG ranges from 0-100 percent. If the IPG value is higher, the higher the development gap between men and women.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Growth Number of PTS in Kopertis III
Year 2016
Table 1. Number of PTS per Region in DKI Jakarta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SHAPE PTS</th>
<th>TOTAL PTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Jakarta East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Institut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academy Community</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LAKIP Kopertis III (2016)

In 2016, the form of private tertiary institutions under the auspices of Kopertis III was in the form of Academic and High Schools totaling 120 and 118 respectively. PTS consisted of 42 Academies and 41 Colleges based in East Jakarta, 32 Academies and 41 Colleges in South Jakarta.

This shows that the emerging PTS is in the DKI Jakarta region which has a high potential for student growth and the level of public interest, especially DKI Jakarta, to continue their education to Private Universities in East Jakarta and South Jakarta.

Year 2017

Table 2. Number of PTS per Region in DKI Jakarta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SHAPE PTS</th>
<th>TOTAL PTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Jakarta East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Institut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academy Community</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dr. Ir. Illah Sailah MS (2017)

In 2017, the form of private tertiary institutions under the auspices of Kopertis III majority still consisted of Academic and High Schools totaling 122 and 128 respectively. The Private Colleges still consisted of 42 Academies and 43 Colleges residing in East Jakarta, 33 Academies and 43 Colleges in South Jakarta.

This shows that Private Universities that have sprung up in the DKI Jakarta region have experienced a number of new PTSs established both in the form of Academies, Colleges, Institutes and universities and PTS which have changed their status from Polytechnic to University.

Higher Education Quality Trend

Indicators of quality of service for universities are of seven types, namely teaching lecturers' feasibility, percentage of permanent lecturers, percentage of lecturers' functional positions, percentage of lecturers' retirement, percentage of seniority of lecturers, percentage of education staff retirement, and percentage of education staff diplomas.
Table 3. Number Lecturer PTS According diploma And Functional Academic Year 2015/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diplom a</th>
<th>Expert Assistant</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor (Professor)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP- 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>4478</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dr. Ir. Illah Sailah MS (2017) and LAKIP Kopertis III (2016)

From a number of PTS lecturers in Kopertis III in 2016 amounting to 20,686 people in Table 3, the smallest specialist lecturers (SP-1 and SP-2) were 168 people. For the biggest lecturers, they have a S2 degree (15,684 people) and an S1 certificate (2561 people). Based on these data it can be seen that the level of feasibility of lecturers (≥ S2) who teach in various Private Higher Education (PTS) in Kopertis III Region is 18,307 people (87.73%).

Thus, it can be stated that the good conditions of the seven indicators show an improvement in the quality of education. The teaching feasibility indicator contained in Table 3, in 2016 shows that the lecturers in Kopertis III who are eligible for teaching are only 87.73%. Ideally lecturers who are worthy of teaching are 100%, therefore there is still a need to increase the qualifications of lecturers to become S2 by 12.27%.

Based on table 2, it can be seen that the level of feasibility of the lecturer (having a functional lecturer position ≥ Expert Assistant) is 52.06%. In 2016, there were 10,770 lecturers at Kopertis III who had functional lecturer positions consisting of lecturers who had the greatest functional as lecturers (4478 people) and the smallest professors (379 people). For PTS lecturers in Kopertis III, there are 1,788 Head Chancellors and 4,125 Expert Assistants.

This shows that Kopertis 3’s performance in fostering all colleges under its guidance has not been maximized in the 2015/2016 school year because Kopertis 3 through all universities under Kopertis 3 guidance has 48.40% or as many as 10,098 lecturers who are categorized as not worth teaching. This is because there are still lecturers with the status of teaching staff or do not have lecturer functional positions and 12.27% or as many as 2561 lecturers are still educated under S-2 level.
Table 4. Number of Lecturers PTS According diploma And Functional Academic Year 2016/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Expert Assistant</th>
<th>Associte Profess</th>
<th>Associte Profess</th>
<th>Professor (Profess)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>2462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>15886</td>
<td>4468</td>
<td>2501</td>
<td></td>
<td>15886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>16395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-1</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profess</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5131</td>
<td>4468</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>5131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LAKIP Kopertis III (2017)

From a number of PTS lecturers in Kopertis III in 2017 amounting to 21,283 people found in Table 4 specialist lecturers (SP-1 and SP-2) the smallest is 317 and 5 people. For the biggest lecturers, they are S2 (15,886) and have S1 degrees (2462 people). Based on these data it can be seen that the level of feasibility of lecturers (≥ S2) who teach in various Private Colleges (PTS) in Kopertis III Region is 18,387 people (86.39%).

Thus, it can be stated that the good conditions of the seven indicators show an improvement in the quality of education. The teaching feasibility indicator contained in Table 4, in 2017 shows that lecturers in Kopertis III who are eligible for teaching are only 86.39%. Ideally, lecturers who are worthy of teaching are 100%, therefore there is still a need to improve lecturers' qualifications to ≥ S2 by 13.61%.

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that in 2017, there were 11,248 lecturers in Kopertis III who already had functional lecturer positions consisting of lecturers who had the highest functional as Expert Assistants (5131 people) and the smallest professors (254 people). For PTS lecturers in Kopertis III, there are 1,395 Head Lectors and 4,468 Lectors.

This indicates that the performance Kopertis 3 in fostering the entire university under the surrogate is not maximized in the academic year 2016/2017 due Kopertis 3 through the entire college under the guidance Kopertis 3 has 47.10% or by 10 035 in the category of lecturers who do not worth teaching. This is because there are still lecturers with the
status of teaching staff or do not have a functional lecturer position and as many as 2462 lecturers (11.57%) are still educated under S-2 level.

Table 5. Percentage of Retirement and Seniority of PTS 2016/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Types of Indicators</th>
<th>Education Variable</th>
<th>Gender Differences</th>
<th>IPG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>%Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 2015/2016 (Overall Lecturer Total 20,868 People)</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (%)</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 2016/2017 (Lecturer Overall Total 21,283 persons)</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>2432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (%)</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>% Seniority Lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Academic Year 2015/2016 (Overall Lecturer Total 20,868 People)</td>
<td>4189</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>6272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (%)</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>30.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017 Academic Year (Total Lecturer Total 21,283 People)</td>
<td>4652</td>
<td>2951</td>
<td>7603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (%)</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>35.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed by the Author (2018)

Based on Table 5 it is known that the number of lecturers who will retire and lecturers with a period work long enough. Retired lecturers are lecturers who are more than 59 years old, senior lecturers are lecturers who have a work period of more than 20 years. In 2015/2016, the number of male lecturers, the number of male lecturers' pensions at Private Universities amounted to 30.05%. This condition causes an almost balanced gender difference of 2.43% and has approached the value of gender balance in human development (lecturers) with a value of 0.24 far from the balanced number 1.

2016/2017 Academic Year, in table 5 it is known that the number of senior lecturers is 11.43% with the details of men as 7.42% and women at 4.01%. This is in line with the number of male lecturers compared to female lecturers. This condition causes 3.41% of the gender that will or has entered retirement age so that there is a relative balance of senior lecturers between men and women with a value of 0.30 which is close to number 1 (balanced). Based on Table 5, it can also be seen the number of PT Private lecturers in Kopertis III, senior lecturers by 35.73% with the details of senior men at 21.86% and women at 13.87%. Gender differences occur at 7.99% so that they are not balanced between men and women with a value of 0.55, which is still far from the 1.

Table 6. College Service Quality in Kopertis III 2015 - 2017 Period Based on Five Types of Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Conclusions And Suggestions

It can be concluded that during the last 2 years (2015/2016 and 2016 academic year / 2017) it can be seen that there has been an increase in the number of lecturers by 415 lecturers, a decrease in the number of head lecturers by 429 people, lecturers with lecturer's lectures decreased by 10 people, the number of expert assistants experienced a significant increase of 1006 lecturers. This indicates that the performance Kopertis 3 in fostering the entire university under the surrogate is not maximized in the academic year 2015/2016 due to Kopertis 3 through the entire college under the guidance Kopertis 3 has 48.40% or by 10 098 in the category of lecturers who do not worth teaching. This is because there are still lecturers with the status of teaching staff or do not have lecturer functional positions and 12.27% or as many as 2561 lecturers are still educated under S-2 level. However, there was an increase in performance in 2016/2017 which was shown by all universities under Kopertis 3's guidance having 47.10% or as many as 10,035 lecturers who were categorized as not worthy of teaching. This is because there are still lecturers with the status of teaching staff or do not have a functional lecturer position and as many as 2462 lecturers (11.57%) are still educated under S-2 level.

Based on tables 3 through 5, can be a threat that in the future, DKI Jakarta has the potential to experience a shortage of teaching-worthy lecturers for the advancement of Human Development (lecturers) in Kopertis III because there are 2082 lecturers annually (2015/2016 academic year) and 2432 lecturers (2016/2017 academic year) who have retired or will retire. However, this is an opportunity due to the large number of lecturers who have functional positions under the lector and have a bachelor's degree to pursue their careers even more and work opportunities to become lecturers are increasingly open in large numbers in the future.

There are some suggestions from this research on the next research, namely 1) Looking at the existing University HR data, further research is needed on the existing data between PT Negeri and PT Private, the difference is both in terms of students and lecturers, 2) Research needs to be done more about the existing teaching staff such as librarians and laboratory assistants who are lacking, 3) The need for an increase in the equalization of teaching lecturers in PT because the lecturers' feasibility teaches a S2 certificate in accordance with the provisions of Law No.14 / 2005 is very small and the condition of PT Private is very smaller than PT The country so that quality improvement will be difficult to achieve, 4) The need to increase the functional position of lecturers is very small, only the biggest assistants and lecturers, especially at PT in Kopertis II. This condition must be improved whether because the lecturer is lazy to take care of his functional position or other problems, 5) Further research is needed because the senior lecturers at Kopertis III are very small at only 7-10%, and 6) Further research is needed on retired lecturers because the value is very high at 11.48% at Private Universities in Kopertis III.
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| % Growth in Number of Private Universities | 8.86 | 10.04 |
| % Seniority Lecturers (% SD) | 32.89 | 65.78 |
| % Head of Lecturer and above (% LK +) | 9.09 | 18.18 |
| % Permanent Lecturers (% DT) | 87.73 | 87.73 |
| %Feasibility to Teach (% KMD) | 52.58 | 47.42 |
| Average (%) | 38.32 | 45.83 |


