LECTURER SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT

Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program

Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (FMIPA),

Universitas Negeri Surabaya (Unesa)

2025

PREFACE

All praise is due to Almighty God for the completion of this *Lecturer Satisfaction Survey Report* for the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (FMIPA), Universitas Negeri Surabaya (Unesa). This report was prepared as part of our continuous commitment to improving the quality of academic services within the study program, the faculty, and the university as a whole.

The preparation of this report would not have been possible without the appreciation, contribution, and valuable input of various parties. Therefore, we would like to extend our sincere gratitude to:

1. The Rector of Universitas Negeri Surabaya and all leadership members for their support and guidance during the implementation of this survey.
2. The Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences for providing the opportunity and necessary facilities that enabled the smooth execution of this survey.
3. The respondents - the lecturers of the Biology Education Study Program – who willingly devoted their time and attention to completing the questionnaire.

This survey serves as an essential instrument in Unesa's academic quality assurance process. Through this survey, we obtained valuable feedback regarding lecturers' experiences and perceptions of the university's services across the *Tri Dharma* domains – teaching, research, and community service – as well as supporting facilities and administrative systems. The results of this survey are expected to form the foundation for evidence-based evaluation and continuous improvement efforts,

aimed at establishing an academic service system that is more effective, efficient, and satisfactory for all members of the academic community.

Finally, it is our hope that this report will serve as a useful reference for enhancing the quality of services at Unesa, particularly within FMIPA and the Biology Education Study Program. We sincerely aspire that this effort contributes to the ongoing improvement of academic service quality in alignment with the aspirations and needs of lecturers.

Surabaya, October 19, 2025

Quality Assurance Unit, Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program

Dr. Ulfi Faizah, S.Pd., M.Si.

NIP. 197809212005012002

CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Enhancing the quality of academic services in higher education institutions is one of the key factors in achieving the strategic goals of education. As a university committed to continuous improvement in educational quality, Universitas Negeri Surabaya (Unesa), through the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (FMIPA), consistently strives to deliver the best academic services to all members of its academic community, including lecturers. To realize this objective, a systematic and objective evaluation mechanism is essential to ensure that the services provided meet the expectations and needs of lecturers as primary stakeholders.

The Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program of FMIPA Unesa recognizes the importance of implementing a *Lecturer Satisfaction Survey* on the services related to the *Three Pillars of Higher Education* (Tri Dharma Perguruan Tinggi) as an effective evaluation instrument. This survey aims to identify the performance of institutional services across multiple dimensions, including the teaching process, research, community service, academic infrastructure, and administrative support systems provided by the university. Consequently, the results of the survey provide a clearer picture of lecturers' perceptions regarding the overall quality of academic services.

The implementation of this survey benefits not only lecturers but also other internal stakeholders, such as students and educational staff. As primary users of academic services, lecturers play a vital role in providing accurate and relevant feedback. Such feedback serves as a valuable reference for the study program and faculty management to evaluate their performance and to formulate better strategies for quality improvement.

Furthermore, the survey helps identify service variables that are already functioning effectively and those that require further enhancement. These variables encompass several dimensions of service quality, such as the quality of teaching, availability of facilities, administrative efficiency, and accessibility of academic services. By understanding which aspects have met or exceeded expectations, the university can

maintain those strengths while formulating targeted actions for areas that still require improvement.

Through the implementation of this survey, it is expected that the study program, faculty, and university can continuously pursue data-driven and needs-based improvement. Consequently, the academic quality and service performance of Unesa can evolve sustainably to meet the expectations of its internal stakeholders.

1.2 Legal Framework

1. Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System.
2. Law No. 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education.
3. Government Regulation No. 4 of 2014 concerning the Administration and Management of Higher Education Institutions.
4. Ministerial Regulation of Education and Culture No. 50 concerning the Quality Assurance System in Higher Education.
5. Ministerial Regulation of Education and Culture No. 87 of 2014 concerning the Accreditation of Study Programs and Higher Education Institutions.
6. Ministerial Regulation of Research, Technology, and Higher Education No. 13 of 2015 concerning the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education for 2015–2019.
7. Ministerial Regulation of Research, Technology, and Higher Education No. 44 of 2015 concerning the National Standards for Higher Education.
8. Ministerial Regulation of National Education No. 7 of 2007 concerning the Organization and Operational Procedures of the Educational Quality Assurance Agency.

1.3 Problems

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the *expectations* and *perceptions* of lecturers in the 2025 Lecturer Satisfaction Survey of the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program, FMIPA Unesa?
2. How does the comparison between lecturers' expectations and perceptions reflect satisfaction levels, as analyzed through the Gap Analysis approach?

3. How does the comparison between lecturers' expectations and perceptions indicate satisfaction levels when analyzed using the *Importance–Performance Analysis* (IPA) method?

1.4 Objectives

This survey aims to assess the quality of lecturer satisfaction within the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program, FMIPA Unesa, for the year 2025 through statistical difference testing, Gap Analysis, and Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA). Additionally, the report is intended to serve as a reference for evaluation and improvement in subsequent academic years.

1.5 Report Structure

The structure of this Lecturer Satisfaction Survey Report of Universitas Negeri Surabaya consists of four main chapters:

1. **Chapter I – Introduction**
   Provides the background, legal framework, research problems, objectives, and report structure.
2. **Chapter II – Survey Methods**
   Describes the type and design of the survey, operational definitions, survey instruments, implementation methods, and data processing techniques — including *Gap Analysis*, *Suitability Index (Tki)*, *Normality Testing*, *Wilcoxon Test*, and *Cartesian Diagram*.
3. **Chapter III – Results and Discussion**
   Presents statistical findings and discussions on *Gap Analysis*, *Suitability Index*, and *Quadrant Analysis* using the *Importance–Performance Analysis* (IPA) method.
4. **Chapter IV – Conclusions and Recommendation**
   Summarizes the findings and provides recommendations for future evaluation and quality improvement efforts.

CHAPTER II – SURVEY METHODS

2.1 Type and Design of the Survey

This study employed a quantitative descriptive approach using a survey method. The survey method was chosen because it provides a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, and opinions within a population by studying a representative sample (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

The research utilized a cross-sectional design, aimed at examining the relationship between independent and dependent variables by collecting data at a single point in time (*point-time approach*). In this design, each subject is observed once, and all variables are measured during that observation period. The data collection instrument consisted of a Likert-scale questionnaire (ranging from 1 to 5).

2.2 Operational Definitions

To ensure conceptual clarity, the following operational definitions were adopted in this study:

1. **Respondents** – All lecturers of the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program, FMIPA Unesa, who utilized institutional services during the year 2025.
2. **Respondents' Expectations** – The perceived level of service quality that lecturers hoped to receive from FMIPA Unesa in 2025.
3. **Respondents' Satisfaction** – The lecturers' actual perception of the quality of services provided by the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program, FMIPA Unesa, in 2025.
4. **Service Quality** – The measured difference between lecturers' expectations and perceptions regarding five dimensions of service quality:
    - *Reliability* – dependability and consistency in providing promised services;
    - *Responsiveness* – promptness and willingness to assist;
    - *Assurance* – knowledge, courtesy, and trustworthiness of staff;
    - *Empathy* – personal care and understanding of user needs;

- *Tangibles* – physical facilities, equipment, and appearance of personnel.

2.3 Survey Instrument

The instrument used in this survey was a lecturer satisfaction questionnaire, distributed through Google Forms. The questionnaire contained written statements measuring both *expectations* and *perceptions* toward academic and administrative services, using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The instrument covered five main dimensions adapted from the SERVQUAL model:

1. *Reliability*,
2. *Responsiveness*,
3. *Assurance*,
4. *Empathy*, and
5. *Tangibles.*

2.4 Method

This study employed the Service Quality (SERVQUAL) method proposed by *Parasuraman et al.* (1985). The dimensions of service quality are explained as follows:

1. Tangibles (Physical Evidence) – Covering the physical appearance of facilities, equipment, staff, and communication media.
2. Reliability – The ability to perform the promised service dependably, accurately, and satisfactorily.
3. Responsiveness – The willingness and readiness of staff to provide prompt assistance and service.
4. Assurance – Encompassing knowledge, competence, courtesy, and trustworthiness of staff, ensuring users feel safe from risks or uncertainty.
5. Empathy – The ability to communicate effectively, offer personalized attention, and understand users' specific needs.

Following SERVQUAL analysis, data were further examined using the Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA) method, originally introduced by *Martilla and James (1977)*. The IPA method evaluates the relationship between user perception and the

priority level of service attributes, helping identify which areas require quality improvement through a quadrant analysis approach.

2.5 Data Processing and Analysis

The data processing phase consisted of several analytical steps:

a. Gap Analysis and Suitability Index (Tki)

Customer satisfaction was explained through Gap Analysis, which compares the mean scores between *expectations* and *perceptions* across the five SERVQUAL dimensions.

The Gap Score was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Gap} = \text{Perception} - \text{Expectation}$$

Meanwhile, the Suitability Index (Tki) was calculated as:

$$Tki = (\frac{\text{Perception}}{\text{Expectation}}) \times 100\%$$

According to *Parasuraman et al.* (1985, 1988), a positive Gap Score (+) indicates that actual performance exceeds expectations, while a negative Gap Score (–) implies that performance falls short of user expectations.

Based on *Wahyuni (2014)*, the interpretation criteria for the suitability level are:

- Tki > 100% → The provided service exceeds user expectations (*very satisfactory*).
- Tki = 100% → The provided service meets user expectations (*satisfactory*).
- Tki < 100% → The provided service does not meet user expectations (*unsatisfactory*).

b. Normality Test

A data normality test was performed to determine whether the dataset followed a normal distribution. The average values of *expectations* and *perceptions* from each questionnaire item were tested using either the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test (for large samples, $n > 50$) or the Shapiro–Wilk test (for small samples, $n < 50$).

Decision criteria:

- If *p-value* > 0.05 → Data are normally distributed (*parametric*).
- If *p-value* < 0.05 → Data are not normally distributed (*non-parametric*).

Accordingly, *Paired t-test* was used for normally distributed data, whereas the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was employed for non-parametric data.

c. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test

The Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was applied to identify whether there were significant differences between *expectation* and *perception* scores.

- H_0 (Null Hypothesis): No significant difference between expectations and perceptions of lecturers' satisfaction.
- H_1 (Alternative Hypothesis): A significant difference exists between expectations and perceptions.

If the *p-value* < 0.05, H_0 is rejected, indicating a statistically significant difference between expectation and perception values.

d. Cartesian Diagram

A Cartesian Diagram (also known as the *Importance–Performance Matrix*) was used to visualize the relationship between importance (expectation) and performance (perception). The diagram divides service attributes into four quadrants:

1. Quadrant I – Concentrate Here (High Importance, Low Performance) → Attributes that are important but underperformed and require immediate improvement.
2. Quadrant II – Keep Up the Good Work (High Importance, High Performance) → Attributes that are important and well-executed; should be maintained.
3. Quadrant III – Low Priority (Low Importance, Low Performance) → Attributes with low importance and low performance; limited attention needed.
4. Quadrant IV – Possible Overkill (Low Importance, High Performance) → Attributes with low importance but excessive performance; potential resource inefficiency.

This quadrant analysis assists the program and faculty management in identifying service priorities for continuous quality improvement.

CHAPTER III – RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Statistical Analysis

The survey was administered to lecturers of the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program, FMIPA Unesa, using the institutional Single Sign-On (SSO) system. The total population of lecturers in the program was 15, and the number of valid survey responses obtained was also 15, thereby meeting the minimum sample size requirement as calculated by the Slovin formula with a 5% margin of error ($n = 14.46 \approx 15$).

The normality test was conducted as a prerequisite for the difference-of-means analysis between *expectation* and *perception* data.

Hypotheses:

- H_0 : The data follow a normal distribution.
- H_1 : The data do not follow a normal distribution.

Variable	K–S Value	p-Value	Interpretation
Expectation	0.433	0.001	Not Normal
Perception	0.251	0.012	Not Normal

Because both p-values (0.001 and 0.012) were < 0.05, H_0 was rejected, indicating that the dataset did not follow a normal distribution. Consequently, a non-parametric Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was applied instead of the parametric Paired t-test.

The Wilcoxon test results are summarized below:

Variable	N	Median	Mode	Z Statistic	p-Value
Expectation	28	4.00	4	–	–
Perception	–	3.91	4	–2.043	0.041

Because $p < 0.05$, H_0 was rejected and H_1 accepted, demonstrating a significant difference between lecturers' expectations and perceptions. The median for expectations (4.00) was slightly higher than for perceptions (3.91), yielding a gap of

0.09 - suggesting that overall service performance still lags behind lecturers' expectations.

3.2 Gap and Suitability (Conformity) Analysis

The Gap and Suitability Index (Tki) were computed for each service dimension using the SERVQUAL framework. Results indicated that all five dimensions (*Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance,* and *Empathy*) had negative Gap values, meaning that the actual service performance did not fully meet lecturers' expectations.

The largest negative Gap (–0.33) occurred in item P10 (Reliability) — "Accessibility of the information system through SSO." This item also had the lowest Suitability Index (91.60%), implying that system accessibility remains a critical issue.

Overall, the Grand Mean Suitability Index was 94.23%, showing that while service quality is generally high, certain aspects still require improvement to align with lecturers' expectations.

3.3 Quadrant Analysis (Importance–Performance Analysis, IPA)

The Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA) was employed to visualize service performance priorities through a Cartesian quadrant diagram (*Martilla & James, 1977*). The axes represent:

- X-axis = average perception (performance), and
- Y-axis = average expectation (importance).

Each survey item was plotted into one of four quadrants as follows:

Quadrant I – High Importance, Low Performance ("Concentrate Here")

Attributes that are crucial to lecturers but underperformed; they require immediate attention.

- P6 (Reliability) – Compliance of recruitment, selection, and dismissal processes with needs and SOPs.
- P10 (Reliability) – Accessibility of the SSO information system.

→ These should be treated as top priority areas for improvement in the next academic year.

Quadrant II – High Importance, High Performance ("Keep Up the Good Work")
Attributes considered important and already performed well. Examples include:

- P1 (Tangibles) – Ease of obtaining information for Tri Dharma activities.
- P2 (Reliability) – Availability of online/offline services for academic and administrative support.
- P3 (Responsiveness) – Ease of management services in Tri Dharma implementation.
- P4 (Assurance) – Leadership and accountability in supporting Tri Dharma.
- P7 (Assurance) – Clarity of performance evaluation mechanisms according to SOPs.
- P11, P14, P15, P16, P18, P20, P21 – Covering adequate facilities, research funding, proposal alignment, and community service outputs.

→ These dimensions should be maintained to sustain lecturer satisfaction levels.

Quadrant III – Low Importance, Low Performance ("Low Priority")
Attributes perceived as less important and moderately executed.

- P5 (Empathy) – Quality management services delivered according to procedures.
- P12 (Assurance) – Clarity of financial guidelines and salary deductions.
- P13 (Assurance) – Punctuality of salary and remuneration disbursement.
- P17 (Empathy) – Transparency of proposal and final report evaluations.

→ While these may not require urgent action, monitoring should continue to avoid further decline.

Quadrant IV – Low Importance, High Performance ("Possible Overkill")
Attributes considered less important by lecturers but already performed very well.

- P8 (Responsiveness) – Timeliness of promotion and career development processes.
- P9 (Empathy) – Fairness and transparency in remuneration.

- P19 (Reliability) – Consistency in research and community service monitoring and evaluation procedures.

→ Resources devoted here may be reallocated toward Quadrant I priorities.

3.4 Discussion

The results reveal that lecturers perceive overall academic service quality as good (94.23% conformity), but certain operational and administrative aspects require attention — particularly digital accessibility and HR process alignment.

The Gap and IPA analyses jointly indicate that future quality assurance efforts should focus on:

1. Improving SSO system performance and user accessibility.
2. Ensuring that recruitment and career management processes are transparent and SOP-compliant.
3. Maintaining high-performing attributes to safeguard lecturers' trust in institutional services.

The findings also highlight the importance of data-driven evaluation in supporting continuous improvement of service quality within FMIPA and Unesa at large.

CHAPTER IV – CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the 2025 Lecturer Satisfaction Survey data, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Significant Difference Between Expectation and Perception

   Statistical testing using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test indicated a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between lecturers' expectations and actual experiences. The median gap of 0.09 suggests that overall service performance has not yet fully met lecturers' expectations.

2. Key Service Gap Identified (P10)

   The largest negative Gap Score (–0.33) was observed in indicator P10 (Reliability), related to "*Accessibility of the information system through SSO.*" This indicator also exhibited the lowest Suitability Index (91.60%), reflecting a pressing need for improvement in the digital accessibility and efficiency of the SSO platform.

3. Overall Service Quality Remains High

   Despite the identified gap, the overall Suitability Index across all dimensions reached 94.23%, demonstrating that the majority of lecturers were satisfied with the university's academic and administrative services, albeit with room for refinement.

4. Priority Areas for Improvement

   Based on the Importance–Performance Analysis (IPA), two indicators were classified within Quadrant I (High Importance–Low Performance), thus designated as top priorities for corrective action:

   - P6 (Reliability): Compliance of recruitment, selection, and termination processes with the established SOP and staffing plan.
   - P10 (Reliability): Accessibility and usability of the SSO information system.

These findings underscore the importance of strengthening both human resource management mechanisms and digital infrastructure to enhance lecturer satisfaction and institutional quality assurance.

4.2 Recommendations

In light of the above conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed for the Undergraduate Biology Education Study Program and FMIPA Unesa:

1. Targeted Improvement Measures
   Implement strategic actions to enhance performance in P6 and P10, focusing on transparent and SOP-aligned HR procedures as well as optimizing the responsiveness and stability of the SSO platform.
2. Sustaining High-Quality Services
   Maintain the performance of other indicators that have achieved high satisfaction levels, ensuring consistent service excellence across all academic and administrative domains.
3. Continuous Monitoring and Feedback Integration
   Conduct periodic follow-up surveys and integrate lecturer feedback into the Quality Assurance (QA) cycle, ensuring that improvements are evidence-based and responsive to evolving needs.
4. Institutional Learning and Benchmarking
   Encourage FMIPA to benchmark best practices from comparable higher education institutions, promoting innovation in academic service management and the development of a proactive quality culture.

In summary, the 2025 Lecturer Satisfaction Survey provides an evidence-based foundation for continuous quality enhancement within FMIPA Unesa. By addressing identified service gaps and reinforcing institutional strengths, the Biology Education Study Program can further advance its commitment to academic excellence and lecturer well-being.