1. Introduction

Regarding to the comprehension on how important of public services for the existence of public organizations, the demand for reliable organizational capacity in providing public services is inevitable. The big challenge is how to deliver truly high-quality public services. The main core of each study and practical effort to implement public service management is quality services (Dwiyanto, 2010). In other words, every theoretical and practical effort by public service providers will be judged by the quality of services provided. In the end, regardless of the type of goods and services, whoever the service provider actor playing the role, no matter what method or model of service is chosen, public service is always demanded for the creation of quality services.

The quality of public services has become a strategic issue so that the government strictly regulates its implementation. Good public service delivery is also an obligation for public sector institutions. Public services organized shall fulfill the rules and procedures that have been regulated as in Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services. Public services cover various fields of life such as education, health, hygiene, social welfare, and various other types of administrative services. In line with the development of community life, there are also increasing demands for the quality and quantity of public services needed.
The improvement of the public services quality must be based on real conditions of community capacity and needs. Improving the quality of public services must be carried out sustainably, thus, a periodic evaluation of public service delivery is needed. The government in the last decade has attempted to formulate an evaluation framework for public services delivery (Thangeda, et al, 2016). This is proven from changes in regulations that dynamically follow the development needs. The latest regulation is the Regulation of the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reforms of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2017 concerning Guidelines for the Preparation of a Public Satisfaction Survey Unit for Public Service Providers.

The mandate of the Regulation of the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reforms of the Republic of Indonesia No. 14 of 2017 in Article 1 Paragraph (1) that public service providers are required to carry out a Citizen Satisfaction Survey at least once a year by using the indicators and survey methods that have been determined. The Citizen Satisfaction Survey is a comprehensive measurement of activities on the level of citizen satisfaction obtained from the measurement of community's perceptions of the quality of public services perceived. The Educational Administration Study Program, as a service administration organizer for students, considers it necessary to know in real about the service performance that has been carried out by conducting Satisfaction Survey on the Educational Administration Students in 2019. Study Program of Educational Administration is an undergraduate education program in the field of educational administration under the Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administrative Sciences, University of Brawijaya. The Educational Administration Study Program is carried out based on an operational permit from the Ministry of Education and Culture with the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Decree No. 595/E/0/2014 concerning Permit for Implementing Study Programs at University of Brawijaya dated October 17, 2014.

As the effort to meet the interests and satisfaction of students of the Educational Administration Study Program in improving services, it is necessary to evaluate the service performance through feedback from service users, specifically students. This evaluation is done as the part of measuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the work unit (Educational Administration Study Program) in providing services. The research problem in this study is 'How are the students' satisfaction on the services provided by the Educational Administration Study Program working unit. The research objectives include:

a) Measuring students' satisfaction on the services provided by the working unit of the Educational Administration Study Program; and
b) Analyzing and determining the value of the Citizen Satisfaction Index (CSI).

2. Theory

2.1 Evaluation

According to Suchman, cited by Islamy, M. Irfan (1997), evaluation is seen as a process of determining the results achieved in several activities planned to support the achievement of objectives. According to Keban, Y. T. (2004), the definition of evaluation is emphasized again as the process of assigning or determining values to certain objects based on certain criteria. According to Lupiyoadi (2001), evaluation is a process, not an outcome (product). The results obtained from the evaluation activity is the quality of something, whether it concerns about the value or meaning, meanwhile, the activity to provide meaning and value is called evaluation. The same thing is expressed by Moenir (2001). Based on the above definition, it can be concluded that evaluation activity is a systematic process. Evaluation is a planned activity and is carried out on an ongoing basis. Evaluation is not only an end or closing activity of a particular program, but is an activity carried out at the beginning, during the program, and at the end of the program after the program is completed.

2.2 Public Service

Good public service delivery requires a standardized service and is a shared understanding between service providers and service users. Service quality standards shall be adhered to by both service providers and service users. According to Rowland, cited by Azwar (1996), service standard is a specification of the function or purpose that must be fulfilled by a service facility so that service users can get the maximum benefit from the services provided. The service standards imposed are as follows:

a) Minimum Requirement Standard: referring to the minimum conditions that must be met in order to guarantee the implementation of quality medical services. It comprises of: input standards: implementing staffs both in quality and quantity; facilities, types, quantities, specifications of facilities available, both medical and non-medical; and funds, the amount and the use allocation;

b) Environmental Standard: an outline of the policies used as guidelines by service facilities in performing their activities, namely: organizational structure and patterns applied by service facilities; and the management system adopted by service facilities;

c) Process Standard (Action Standard): Medical procedure carried out by service facilities; Non-medical procedure; and
d) Minimum Performance Standard: referring to the appearance of medical services that are still acceptable. This standard refers to the element of output (standard of output) or appearance standard consisting of: Appearance of medical aspects, namely those concerning patient satisfaction with medical services; Appearance of non-medical aspects.

Based on the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reforms of the Republic of Indonesia No. 14 of 2017, public services shall have the following 9 elements:

a) Requirements: requirements that must be met in the arrangement of a type of service, both technical and administrative requirements;
b) System, Mechanism, and Procedure: standardized procedure for service providers and users, including complaints;
c) Completion Time: the period of time required to complete the entire service process for each type of service;
d) Cost/Tariff: the fee charged to the service recipients in managing and/or obtaining services from the organizer whose amount is determined based on an agreement between the provider and the community;
e) Product Specifications Type of Service: result of service provided and received in accordance with established conditions. This service product is the result of every type of service specification;
f) Implementer Competency: capabilities that must be possessed by the implementer include knowledge, expertise, skill, and experience;
g) Implementer Behavior: the attitude of officers in providing services;
h) Complaint, Suggestion, and Feedback Handling: procedures for handling complaints and its follow-up; dan
i) Facilities and Infrastructure: everything that can be used as equipment in achieving goals and objectives. Infrastructure is everything considered as the main support for the implementation of a process (business, development, and project). Facilities are used for moving objects (computers, machines) and infrastructure for immovable objects (buildings).

3. Research Method

This study used a quantitative method by taking all existing populations. This is because the population is not many, so that the researcher took the entire population. The total population was 167, with details from highest to lowest:
a) Batch 2019 with 66 respondents;
b) Batch 2016 with 38 respondents;
c) Batch 2017 with 35 respondents; and
d) Batch 2018 with 29 respondents.

The variable determination in this citizen satisfaction survey refers to the Regulation of the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reforms of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2017 concerning Guidelines for the Preparation of a Citizen Satisfaction Survey Public Service Provider Unit which stipulates that there are nine elements that must be used in a citizen satisfaction survey. The nine elements are:
a) Requirements;
b) System, Mechanism, and Procedures;
c) Completion Time;
d) Cost/Tariff;
e) Product Specification Type of Service;
f) Implementer Competency;
g) Implementer Behavior;
h) Complaint, Suggestion, & Feedback Handling; and
i) Facilities and Infrastructure.

4. Results and Discussion

The measurement of the Citizen Satisfaction Index (CSI) is based on survey data using nine elements as regulated by the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reforms of the Republic of Indonesia No. 14 of 2017. The Citizen Satisfaction Survey in 2019 was conducted on all types of services in the Educational Administration Study Program with consideration that number of respondents that is different on each type of service. The following types of services are used for measurement:
a) Academic Services;
b) Financial Services;
c) Student Affairs Services;
d) Research Permit Management Services;
e) Academic Advisor Guidance Services;
f) Internship and Thesis Guidance Services; and
g) Application for Advising Lecturer on Internship and Thesis Services.

The determination of the seven samples is based on the consideration that services received by the community with consideration of the batch admission in the Educational Administration Study Program. Thus, these considerations cause differences in the number of respondents on each service received.

The priority for improving service quality must pay attention on the average value of elements in the respective regional organizations (Haseena V.A & Ajims P. Mohammed; 2015). Priority ranking for each service element is tabulated and added up. The sum will show the priority ranking.

The tabulation for ranking all service provider units is presented in Table 1:
Through the summation process as in Table 1, it obtains the results of priority improvement of the public service elements quality in the Educational Administration Study Program presented in Table 2. The list of priority recommendations can be used as input for the formulation of Study Program policies in an effort to improve the quality of public services in the Educational Administration Study Program next year.

Table 2 Priority Quality Improvement of Public Service Elements in the Educational Administration Study Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Service Elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speed Of Service Completion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ease Of Service Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conformity Between Standards And Service Results</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quality Of Service Facilities And Infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conformity Of Service Requirements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Behavior Of Service Officers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Competency Of Service Officers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reasonableness Of Service Cost/ Tariff</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Handling Of Service Complaint</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analytical result, 2019

Table 1 Tabulation of Priority Ranking for Improving Service Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Service Elements</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Academic Adviser Guidance</th>
<th>Internship And Thesis</th>
<th>Counseling Lecturer On Internship &amp; Thesis</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conformity of Requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ease of Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reasonableness of Cost/Tariff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conformity of Standards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Competency of Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Behavior of Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quality of Facilities and Infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Handling of Service Complaint</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analytical result, 2019

5. Conclusion

The Citizen Satisfaction Index on Public Service in the Educational Administration Study Program is 76.64 with a quality rating of "B" and a performance value of "Good". The Educational Administration Study Program has professional, independent and creative abilities and is
innovative towards the development of science and technology. Various attempts were made to improve services to students. Providing services quickly and friendly, providing financial assistance, and providing facilities and infrastructure. However, the reality shows that there are some students who are not satisfied with the service.

The success of the Study Program as a work unit in Higher Education is largely determined by the quality of the services provided. Aspects conducted by the Study Program such as aspects of academic services, service and performance of lecturers and academic staff become one of the key indicators in fulfilling the concept of student satisfaction as a service user.
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