

# **CONSTRUCT A MODEL OF EFFICIENCY LEVEL MEASUREMENT OF THE PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES AS A LEARNING ORGANIZATION**

**Hasyim**

University Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia

**Rina Anindita** 

University Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia

[anindita.rina@gmail.com](mailto:anindita.rina@gmail.com)

## **Abstract**

*The study aims to develop a conceptual model to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the Private Universities as a Learning Organization in improving the performance of Design Lecturers. Research design adopted is causality-explanatory. The primary data type is in the form of perceptions, opinions, and attitudes of Lecturers who have already passed the Lecturer and the management certification of Private Universities in the environment of Kopertis III. Time dimension is one shot study. The respondents of the research were a Lecturer who already passed the Lecturer certification which is noted as a permanent lecturer at the private Universities in the neighborhood of Kopertis III. Descriptive analysis and Data Envelopment Analysis are used to describe a characteristic which is the representation of the theory, and DEA that measures effectiveness level. The research results obtained from the universities that are grouped into two, main and middle universities, and assisted universities that ranked highest in terms of implementation efficiency of the University as a Learning Organization in improving the performance of lecturers is Trisakti University, Trisakti University is efficient on People Level and Structure Level, as well as efficient on Learning Organization as an integrated system on people and Structure level. In the second place as University that is efficient as a Learning Organization in improving the performance of lecturers is Gunadarma University, on People Level and Structure Level, where the efficiency level reaches 100%. It's just in terms of efficiency, in running the learning organization as a whole the efficiency level has not reached*

*100%, but only 99.6%. Trisakti University and Gunadarma University both are universities which are in the Main University group. In Assisted University group, the most efficient University as a Learning Organization is STMIK &K and STIE Ahmad Dahlan. Both Universities have a campus that is not too large, but the entire study program and supporting units are located only in one place.*

*Keywords: Learning Organization, Private University, Data Envelopment Analysis, Efficiency Measurement*

## **INTRODUCTION**

University in Indonesia is one of the instruments of national education which organizes and develops higher education where in it there is the development of science. With the task of developing the science, then University faces heavy challenges. In addition to preparing graduates who have good competence, a University is expected to show a positive image as a quality educational institution which is adaptive to changes and developments. This is in line with what is said by Watkins (2005:414) and Ali (2012:61) that a University should already pay attention to quality improvement efforts, both individually and in structural organization in order to adapt and compete in facing the challenges.

Besides having a good performance, Private Universities must be able to adapt, develop and perform continuous learning or in other words, a University must be a learning organization (Ali, 2012:59; Watkins, 2005:414 and Al-Qhatani, 2013:515). By becoming an organization learner, Private Universities will have positive influence on performance, according to the research results of Thomas and Allen (2006:124-6), Watkins and Marsick (1993, 1994, 2003, 2004, 2005) and Weldy and Gillis (2009:456), Kotoghiorges (2005:189), Kumar (2005; 28) show the existence of Organization Learners influence on performance of universities viewed from the knowledge performance reflected from the Lecturers' ability to create scientific works, either published or unpublished. According to Veisi, et.al (2010:22), University is a unique organization, where individuals or members in organization determine a higher education institution can walk into a learning organization or not. So it is necessary to distinguish how the learning organization at the level of individual and management, although the individuals, teams, and organizations must be a system that 'embedded' (Rose and Kumar, 2006:70). Being a learning organization, not only related to the performance of the Lecturer and the University. Learning organizations conducted by the Universities will be able to create a

competency of all its members, that can enhance the success (Malik, Qiser and Munir, 2012:117), Wang and Lo (2004; 172), Singh and Garg (2008:310).

The condition of the Private Universities in Kopertis III, related to Private Universities as learning organizations, that several times it has been found allegations of plagiarism on the results of lecturer's research report, at the time of filing rank stratification or workload report of lecturers; it is found that the results of lecturer's research at the time of rank stratification and workload report of lecturers is not accompanied by feedback and review from the management of Private Universities related to the results of research report (Reports of Kopertis III Coordinator, December 2012). In addition, according to Rakhmani (Kompas, 3 December 2012), Private University is less empowering the Lecturers to conduct research, but most of the lecturers are empowered to teach six courses (18 credits) per semester (equivalent to 30-35 hours per week) out of the structural position and guiding the student at Private Universities of Kopertis III. In addition to the above facts, there are few Universities in several countries who have infrastructure that allows the entire knowledge and information which can be accessed by all Lecturers as HR in it (Smith, 2003; Pollack, et.al, 2009).

Thus every study program requires a draft of performance measurement methods that are effective and efficient, are comprehensive as well as being able to see the condition of the organization from a variety of viewpoints. With the performance measurement results, every study program can establish management strategies for the improvement and development of organization in the future. To measure the efficiency is the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) method which is trying to maximize efficiency by taking consideration of input and output. This is the mathematical programming technique which calculates the relative efficiency of some Decision Making Units (DMUs) on the basis of input and output observed which could be expressed with different types of metrics. A basic concept in the DEA is to measure the efficiency of a certain DMU against point that is projected on an 'efficiency border'. The usefulness of DEA in evaluating the system of multi-criteria and provides a target of system repair. So both productivity factors (effectiveness and efficiency) can be measured by combining two models simultaneously (SeyyedAsghar, et al. 2009).

Thus the aim to be achieved in this research is the creation of a conceptual model to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the Private Universities as a Learning Organization in improving the lecturer performance through the approach of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), through the construction of conceptual model of the dimensions on the Learning Organization model of Watkins and Marsick by calculating the Factor Score and calculate Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Learning Organization

Based on the results of the literature study of Lyle (2011:216) Learning organization is one of the concepts of organizational development that first put forth in the 1980s, which refers to the process of learning in organizations that aim for company growth, the term was only recently popularized by Peter Senge (1990) in his book *Fifth Disciplines*. Learning organization according to Peter Senge (1990) and Ali (2012:55-7), is an organization which members are continuously developing its capacity to meet the desires, developing mindset, being able to give the aspirations freely and its members always do continuous learning together. Later, Yang, et.al(2004:32) says that the Learning organization is process that not only adjusts the capacity owned but also adding the ability of the company to create a change in the future.

Some of the definitions below associate learning at the level of individual which is integrated with learning on the level of management or organization. The first came from Watkins and Marsick (1992) and Grieves (2006:466), that for the learning organizations, to transform themselves continuously reflected in the totality of the employees involved in the process that collectively controlled by the leaders of the organization. That means there is learning from the individual which is integrated with learning on the level of the organization. Second, revealed by Garvin (1993) as quoted by Yen (2011:2), that the Learning organization is a skill in organizing that create, need and share knowledge and further modifying the behavior after getting new knowledge and insight that is conducted from the side of the employees individually and the management that represents organization structure. Third, definition from Murray (2002) which results of the discovery was the same as that expressed by Braham (1996), the Learning organization is a process in which there is sharing and giving or gaining knowledge by way of transfer of science through the organization that aims to achieve a strategic goal both individually and in groups (Yeo: 2005:371).

By concluding from various definitions of Learning organization above, then it can be taken a few conclusions that are described as the 'new perspective', expressed by Watkins and Marsick (2004:32-35), Ji et.al (2009:42045), and Weldyet.al (2010:456), that the definition of Learning organizations from various studies, grouped into 4 main groups, namely:

1. System Thinking Perspective is a perspective from Senge (1990) that defines it as an organization that has not only the ability to adapt, but also the ability to develop, namely the ability to create various alternatives for the future.
2. Learning Perspective. Pedler, Burgonye and Biydell (1991), define it as an organization that facilitates the learning for all its members continuously in achieving the objectives of the organization.

3. Strategic Perspective. Garvin (1993) defines the Learning organizations as the ability of the Organization to create and transfer knowledge as well as modifying knowledge in accordance with the new knowledge gained. In this strategic perspective, the managerial ability is required for an organization to be a learning organization.
4. Integrative Perspective. Marsick and Watkins (1993, 2003, and 2004) divide the Organization into a principle that in it there are three key components, namely: (1) system level, continuous learning (2) create and manage knowledge outcomes (3) lead to improvements in the Organization's performance. This principle of Marsick and Watkins, is integrating two important things namely people and structure, which is seen as an interactive component in the change and development of organization. Next Marsick and Watkins develop seven dimensions in the Learning organization, namely: Continuous Learning represents the efforts of the Organization to create a continuous learning and opportunities for all its members to do the learning. The second is the inquiry and dialogue, reflecting the efforts of the Organization to create a culture in asking, giving feedback and doing experiment. The third dimension is team learning, reflecting the spirit of working together and the ability to cooperate so as to become an effective team work. The fourth dimension, empowerment, exposing the process of Organization to create a variety of shared vision and get feedback from all members of the organization about the gap between the current vision with a new vision that will be developed. The fifth dimension, embedded systems, indicates an effort to build a system that covers the whole process of learning and sharing. The sixth dimension, system connection, reflects global thinking and action that connects between the internal organizations with the external environment. And the last dimension is strategic leadership, showing the leaders who can think strategically and are able to use learning to create change and turns into the organization with a new direction.

### **The Learning organization in Universities**

Watkins (2005:515), Ali (2012:61) and Veisi (2010:28) have the same opinion that an educational institution particularly Universities naturally is a Learning organization. But the existing characters of Learning organization in Universities are different from what existed in other organizations, where in Universities there are characters: determined, teaching and sponsoring leadership, participatory strategy, team based structure, rigorous strategy, administrative staff empowerment, access to information (Hawamdeh, et al; 2011:690). Still in line with the previous definition and view, the character of Learning organization in educational institutions is related to what is said by Watkins, Marsick, and Garvin, namely there is a learning

from the level of individuals, teams and organizations (Alkhatani and Ghoneim; 2012:515). This is proved empirically by Chang and Lee (2007:156), according to their research results in higher education institutions; he said that "Learning Organizations means that the organizations that covers individual, grouping and organizational learning with the simultaneous proceedings effort for organizational and individual learning." Where Learning organizations include of individuals, groups and learning organizations which are simultaneously performs ongoing efforts both individually and organizationally.

But that doesn't mean that the university institution has no high barriers as a Learning organization. What is frequently encountered is the academic staff or educators who have structural position in the University no longer do the learning process (Watkins 2005:415). In addition, White and Wheatersby (2005:292-3) said that University as learning organization will meet obstacles in learning from individual level because of the characteristics of the Organization members who are educators, often think that they already know so they stop doing the learning.

### **Education Performance and Lecturer Performance**

Watkins and Marsick (2004:71) state that performance for the company consists of financial and non-financial performance, which shows achievement indicator whether the results achieved in accordance with the objectives desired by the company. Educational performance in the article written by Trisnaningsih (2009:86), quoted from Blazey, et.al (2001:31) aims to improve the performance, capability and output of education; facilitate communication and information exchange about the best educational practices for several types of educational institutions and as a tool to understand and improve the performance of educational institutions as well as guidelines in the strategic planning.

According to Sudiro (2009:2) Lecturer Performance is the work result in quality and quantity that is done by a lecturer in performing the Tri Darma of University. Lecturer's work achievement which is associated with the Tri Darma of University is measured from Teaching, Research and scientific works as well as public services.

Furthermore, Sri Trisnaningsih (2009:85-87) in her article said that the lecturer performance has been set forth in Law No. 14 of 2005 about Teachers and Lecturers, and Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 37 of 2009 about Lecturers. Whereas based on the definition of Ministry of National Education (formerly: Department of National Education) stated lecturer performance is the ability to perform a job or task as a lecturer in completing a job.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Research Design**

This research uses a type of descriptive research to find out the value of an independent variable that is the level of Learning Organization implementation based on the distribution of data from respondent answers. Then, followed by a descriptive analytical by using operational research techniques, linear programming, Data Envelopment Analysis, seeing the relative efficiency of Private University as learning organization towards lecturer performance. The methods used in this research is survey, where data is taken from the sample that are members of the population, done by using questionnaire tools to see and to measure variable through the answers of respondents.

### **Population and Sample**

The population in this research is a lecturer who has a Home Base in the Private University located on the environment of Kopertis III and actively follow research activities since 2010, and has got or passed in the Lecturer Certification (until 2014). We used convenience sampling methde. The lecturer who will be chosen is a lecturer who comes from some Private Universities which current research is financed by the Ditlitabmas of DIKTI through Kopertis III. Members of the population are known of 1866 lecturers and Chairmen of the Universities which are spread as permanent lecturer at some Private Universities.

### **Data Source**

The data source is the primary data in the form of opinions, attitudes, justifications, and the perception of respondent consists of permanent lecturers of the Foundation that has already passed the lecturer certification and representatives of University Management, which is the answer of the respondent against the questioner that was formed from the indicator of respective research variables and given the weights based on interval scale. Primary data obtained by using a structured questionnaire. Before the questionnaires distributed to respondents, then the quality test of questionnaires will be carried out in advance through pre-test.

## **ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Private Universities as Learning organization at the People Level**

After the descriptive analysis is done towards index number on each dimension and each indicator, then the recapitulation is done towards Learning Organization variable on the People

Level that is calculated from the average index number on each dimension in the previous calculation above.

The research results for Private Universities in the main category is in contrast to what is delivered by Watkins and Marsick (2008) themselves, who said that in Learning Organization People Level, Continuous Learning is necessary but not sufficient. However, the characteristics of Lecturer in Indonesia particularly Kopertis region III are different than teaching staff in some research locations that also use the size and dimension of Watkins and Marsick (2008). Characteristics of Lecturer in research is often learning informally, including open discussion by gathering between fellow lecturer, which mutually exchanging thoughts, sharing information and learning from each other. This is the one that causes high dimensions of the Continuous Learning and Inquiry Dialogue, and in contrast to the results of previous research. In the perception of lecturers in Private Universities of main category who are the respondents in this research, it turns out that the level of Continuous Learning thus deemed the best in Learning Organization People Level.

These results show that currently if we see from learning organization on People level, the Private Universities of main category are already learning organizations, there is communication and dialogue among all members of the Organization and management, in tune with the research of Alipour and Karimi (2011:144) in higher education. While Private Universities of Middle and Assisted category are currently trying to become a learning organization seen from the value of the index numbers that are still in the middle category.

### **Private Universities as Learning Organization at Structure Level**

The results of the index number calculation correspond to what is meant by Peddler (2011), Dale (2003) in Sharifirad (2011:665) that higher education is difficult to become a Learning Organization at management level, but if they continue to do continuous transformation it will potentially become a Learning Organization, that is able to continue to grow and develop. And also in line with the opinion of Lyle (2012) who said it does not matter that an organization has yet to become a Learning Organization, provided that the leader may encourage organizations to change, remove individual obstacles in learning and facilitate the learning for each member of organization.

### **The influence of Learning Organization against the performance of a lecturer**

The results showed that when the average perception results of the Learning Organization is 0, then the average performance of lecturer is 1,442 ( $p < 0.05$ ), on the other hand the role of Perception against the Learning Organization that is also visible from its significant estimation



value (1,020,  $p < 0.05$ ). From the significance values can be concluded that the role of Learning Organization of Private Universities variable as a subject researched turned out to be equally significant.

Parameter value of covariant estimation that represents random aspects on this research design shows variation inside (within) Private Universities. The residue value obtained was 1,436, where the differences quite a bit with the first analysis design that obtains residue value of 1,597. The intersep Value 0,07 shows the magnitude of lecturer performance variances between Private Universities described by the Learning Organization at Structure Level by observing the variables between Private Universities. Compare with the design 1 that has intersep value 0.33, the intersep value on the 2nd design is much smaller. This means that the Learning Organization is able to absorb variations of lecturer performance between Private Universities, or in other words Learning Organization explains most of the variation of lecturer performance of one Private University with another Private University.

## **Efficiency Level of Private Universities as a Learning Organization**

### ***Analysis of Efficiency Value***

The main result obtained from integration of model LO-DEA is relative efficiency value for each Private Universities (DMU) based on the perspective of the Learning Organization. The efficiency value describes the efficiency level of each DMU whose value ranges between 0%-100%. DMU with 100% efficiency level can be interpreted from two points of view representing the two orientations used i.e. input orientation and output orientation. Viewed from the input orientation, DMU with 100% efficiency contains the notion that none of the DMU or any combination of DMU is capable of producing more output level using the same input level. Similarly, when viewed from the output orientation, then the DMU with 100% efficiency means that no DMU or any combination of DMU are capable of using less input level to produce the same output level.

### **Analysis of Efficiency Value of the Learning Organization Implementation at Main and Middle Universities**

In this section, DMU was Private Universities that are in the Main and Middle category, which consists of 13 (thirteen) Private Universities. The output in the calculation is the Lecturer performance value of permanent Lecturer at DMU in terms of research, public service and scientific publications. Input is divided into three; the first Input is Learning Organization, Learning Organization People Level and Learning Organization Structure Level. The efficiency

value describes the efficiency level of each DMU whose value ranges between 0%-100%. The results of the calculations are seen in the table below:

Table 1. Efficiency Value of LO-DEA Model of Main and Middle Private Universities

No.	DMU (Private Universities)	Efficiency on the implementation of the Learning organization	Efficiency of LO People Level	Efficiency of LO Structure Level
1	Binus University	95,93%	99,58%	93,14%
2	GunadarmaUniversity	99,60%	100,00%	100,00%
3	TrisaktiUniversity	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%
4	Al AzharUniversity	67,44%	77,47%	68,96%
5	EsaUnggulUniversity	92,23%	93,10%	93,80%
6	MercuBuanaUniversity	78,12%	86,05%	73,40%
7	TarumanegaraUniversity	92,90%	95,26%	93,91%
8	UHAMKA	56,98%	60,47%	57,20%
9	UNIKA Atma Jaya	100,00%	100,00%	95,51%
10	PancasilaUniversity	77,75%	80,88%	77,17%
11	YAI	94,90%	100,00%	99,07%
12	Indraprasta PGRIUniversity	80,00%	80,27%	79,16%
13	UNSADA	87,98%	89,34%	94,03%

Source: Recapitulation Result of Software EMS.3.1

On table 1 illustrates the relative efficiency level of Universities on the main and middle categories in improving lecturer performance. From the table above, it is seen that the highest ratings in terms of implementation efficiency of the Private Universities as a Learning Organization in improving lecturer performance is Trisakti University, Trisakti University is efficient on People Level and Structure Level, as well as efficient Learning Organization as an integrated system on people and Structure level. In the second place as Private University that is efficient as a Learning Organization in improving the lecturer performance is Gunadarma University, on the People Level and Structure Level, where the efficiency level achieved 100%. It's just in terms of the efficiency in running the learning organization as a whole, the efficiency level has not reached 100%, but 99.6%. Trisakti University and Gunadarma University both are Private Universities that are in the main group of Private Universities.

## The Efficiency Value of Private Universities as a Learning Organization at Assisted Universities

Furthermore, after the analysis efficiency level of Main and Middle Private Universities is done as a Learning organization, continued with the analysis of efficiency level of the Private Universities in the assisted category as a Learning organization, as seen in the following table:

Table 2. Efficiency Value of LO-DEA Assisted Private Universities Model

No.	DMU (Private Universities)	Efficiency on the implementation of the Learning organization	Efficiency of LO People Level	Efficiency of LO Structure Level
1	BundaMulia University	67,93%	73,67%	62,68%
2	PelitaHarapan University	92,34%	96,11%	85,66%
3	Budi Luhur University	100,00%	100,00%	90,02%
4	Bakrie University	87,21%	82,97%	90,33%
5	Muhammadiyah Jakarta University	67,52%	73,90%	69,42%
6	STIE AHMAD Dahlan	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%
7	UNTAG	91,28%	92,60%	89,62%
8	STMIK & K	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%
9	Jayabaya University Academy of Media	82,93%	85,90%	84,25%
10	Communication Radio and TV	67,56%	72,84%	67,21%
11	Nusantara Institute of Business Business and Informatics Campus of Kwik Kian Gie	39,69%	41,96%	39,81%
12	School of Business	79,44%	80,57%	79,55%
13	STEI	62,04%	75,07%	61,27%
14	STIE Tazkia	67,15%	78,75%	63,61%
15	STIE Maiji	67,53%	65,27%	69,41%
16	STIE JIC	41,32%	42,15%	40,75%
17	Other Private Universities	90,24%	94,20%	88,24%
18	UPN Veteran	99,24%	83,97%	100,00%

Source: Recap Results of Software EMS.3.1

In the group of Assisted Private Universities, the most efficient Private Universities as a Learning Organization is STMIK &K and STIE Ahmad Dahlan. Both are Private Universities which have campuses that are not too large, but the entire course and supporting units are located only in one place. Besides these Private Universities, even though both are small scale organizations, but they have supporting unit of Research and Public Service Institutions that encourage and monitor the activities of lecturer performance in conducting Research, Public Service and Scientific Writing. After that, the Efficiency Level was followed by Budi Luhur University, although classified in the Assisted Private University, but Budi Luhur University is a University with a large scale which its development is quite rapidly and has solid supporting units in assisting research activities, public service and scientific writing by their permanent lecturers.

### **Learning Organization as a strategy to improve the lecturer performance**

To make the Learning Organization as a strategy in improving the lecturer performance, the DEA analysis can help in a way that DMU or Private Universities which are lacking or inefficient conduct benchmark against the most efficient DMU. The full analysis will be discussed in the section below.

### ***Benchmark analysis on Main and Middle Private Universities***

In the group of Middle Private Universities, DMU or Private Universities which become benchmark are the Private Universities that have a 100% efficient level, i.e. DMU No.3, no. 2 and DMU no. 9. Other Private Universities or DMU must refer to these three Private Universities in improving the performance seen from the efficiency as a Learning Organization. Not only refer to Private Universities, which become the benchmark, but in detail it can be recognized which input or output that should be modified in order to become as efficient as Private Universities that became the benchmark. For other values and DMU can be seen in the table below:

Table 3. Benchmark of Main and Middle Private Universities Group

No.	DMU (Private Universities)	Benchmark on the Implementation of Learning Organization	Benchmark LO People Level	Benchmark Structure Level
1	Binus University	3 (0,43) ; 9 (0,68)	3 (0,89) ; 9 (0,22)	3 (1,09)
2	Gunadarma University	3 (0,91) ; 9 (0,05)	5	5

3	Trisakti University	11	8	9
4	Al Azhar University	3 (0,71) ; 9 (0,07)	3 (0,21) 11 (0,66)	3 (0,77)
5	EsaUnggul University	3 (0,91)	3 (0,67) 11 (0,27)	2 (0,95)
6	MercuBuana University	3 (0,02) 9 (0,89)	3 (0,88) 11 (0,01)	2 (0,19) 3 (0,71)
7	Tarumanegara University	3 (0,91)	2 (0,53) 3 (0,40)	3 (0,91)
8	UHAMKA	3 (0,35) 9 (0,29)	2 (0,06) 3 (0,58)	2 (0,67)
9	UNIKA Atma Jaya	7	3	2 (0,75) 3 (0,26)
			2 (0,36) 3 (0,42)	
10	Pancasila University	3 (0,66) 9 (0,21)	9 (0,09)	3 (0,86)
11	YAI	3 (0,86)	3	3 (0,86)
			2 (0,09) 3 (0,37) 9	
12	Indraprasta PGRI University	3 (0,45) 9 (0,34)	(0,33)	3 (0,78)
13	UNSADA	3 (0,83)	2 (0,87)	2 (0,06) 3 (0,78)

Source: Recap Results of Software EMS.3.1

On the method of calculation technique if there is a difference between the left and right sections on input variable, then the difference can be interpreted as how large the input variable must be raised in order for the inefficient DMU or Private Universities can be efficient as DMU that became benchmark. The same thing in case of a difference between the left and right sections in the output variable, then the difference is interpreted as how large output variable value should be increased in order for an inefficient DMU or Private University can be efficient as DMU which became benchmark.

### ***Benchmark Analysis on the Assisted Private Universities***

As well as on Main and Middle Private Universities, Benchmark analysis is determining the DMU used as benchmark for measuring the efficiency level of DMU which efficiency level has not been maximum on group of Assisted Private Universities. DMU of Assisted Private University group which became benchmark is DMU that has an efficiency value of 100%. This DMU will be the guideline values that must be followed by inefficient DMU in order to be classified as efficient DMU as DMU that became benchmark.

In the group of Assisted Private Universities, DMU or Private Universities which became benchmark are the Private Universities that have 100% efficient level, i.e. DMU No. 6, no. 8 and DMU no. 18 or STIE Ahmad Dahlan, STMIK & K and UPN Veteran University. Other Private Universities or DMU must refer to these three Private Universities in improving the performance

seen from the efficiency as a Learning Organization. Not only refer to Private Universities, which became the benchmark, but in detail it can be recognized which input or output that should be modified in order to become as efficient as Private Universities that became the benchmark. The calculation method is simulated below. For example in the table above, DMU No. 1, is BundaMulia University. On the implementation of the efficiency of BundaMulia University as a learning organization integrated, BundaMulia University is an inefficient DMU, so we need to look to the DMU No.6 i.e. STIE Ahmad Dahlan and DMU No.8 i.e. STMIK &K as its benchmark, with the intensity value respectively 0,43 and 0,68. For other value and DMU can be seen on the table below:

Table 4. Benchmark of Assisted Private University Group

No.	DMU (Private Universities)	Benchmark on the Implementation of Learning organization	Benchmark LO People Level	Benchmark Structure Level
1	BundaMuliaUniversity	3 (0,62) 8 (0,35)	6 (0,51) 8 (0,33) 18 (0,07)	6 (0,51) 8 (0,33) 18 (0,07)
2	PelitaHarapanUniversity	3 (0,80) 8 (0,47)	6 (0,59) 8 (0,58) 18 (0,01)	6 (0,59) 8 (0,58) 18 (0,01)
3	Budi LuhurUniversity	5	6 (0,31) 8 (0,55) 18 (0,05)	6 (0,31) 8 (0,55) 18 (0,05)
4	BakrieUniversity	6 (0,53) 8 (0,21)	6 (0,54) 8 (0,20)	6 (0,54) 8 (0,20)
5	Muhammadiyah JakartaUniversity	6 (0,27) 8 (0,52)	6 (0,37) 8 (0,42)	6 (0,37) 8 (0,42)
6	STIE AHMAD Dahlan	10	15	15
7	UNTAG	6 (0,38) 8 (0,47)	6 (0,84) 18 (0,00)	6 (0,84) 18 (0,00)
8	STMIK & K	13	10	10
9	JayabayaUniversity	6 (0,40) 8 (0,44)	6 (0,82)	6 (0,82)
10	Academy of Media Communication Radio and TV	6 (0,24) 8 (0,55)	6 (0,46) 8 (0,32)	6 (0,46) 8 (0,32)
11	Nusantara Institute of Business	6 (0,29) 8 (0,20)	6 (0,29) 8 (0,20)	6 (0,29) 8 (0,20)
12	Business and Informatics Campus of Kwik Kian Gie School of Business	6 (0,78)	6 (0,76) 18 (0,03)	6 (0,76) 18 (0,03)

13	STEI	3 (0,35)	8 (0,61)	6 (0,12)	8 (0,80)	6 (0,12)	8 (0,80)
14	STIE Tazkia	3 (0,57)	8 (0,43)	6 (0,41)	8 (0,52)	6 (0,41)	8 (0,52)
15	STIE Maiji	6 (0,43)	8 (0,29)	6 (0,71)		6 (0,71)	
16	STIE JIC	6 (0,03)	8 (0,50)	6 (0,48)	18 (0,04)	6 (0,48)	18 (0,04)
17	Other Private Universities	3 (0,48)	8 (0,71)	6 (0,40)	8 (0,74)	6 (0,40)	8 (0,74)
18	UPN Veteran	6 (0,75)		6		6	

Source: Recap Results of Software EMS.3.1

On the method of calculation technique if there is a difference between the left and right sections on input variable, then the difference can be interpreted as how large the input variable must be raised in order for the inefficient DMU or Private Universities can be efficient as DMU that became benchmark. The same thing in case of a difference between the left and right sections in the output variable, then the difference is interpreted as how large output variable value should be increased in order for an inefficient DMU or Private University can be efficient as DMU which became benchmark.

## IMPLICATIONS

The whole Private Universities in the environment of Kopertis III is not Learning organization from the side of the Structure Level, but they were trying to become a Learning Organization. For that the management of Private Universities need to improve some policies and activities so that Private Universities to become a Learning Organization at Structure Level. What can be done by the management of Private Universities is by creating an integrated system for information dissemination and the learning that is easy and can be accessed anywhere by any Lecturers (Embedded systems), then management of Private Universities establish cooperation with a third party or the community around the Private Universities that support research activities, and public service (System Connection) and the last is the management of Private Universities must have a strategic leadership which can divide the vision and mission and goal of Private Universities to each level in Private Universities include lecturers so that research activities, public service and scientific publications conducted by the lecturers are in line with the vision and mission of the Private Universities.

In improving the lecturer performance in the field of research, public service and scientific publications then there are some things that can be done by the management and the manager of the Private Universities in the neighborhood of Kopertis III, namely: making the Private Universities as a Learning Organization both on the people level or structure level. To

become a Learning Organization on the People level, lecturer empowerment needs to be enhanced through the involvement of lecturers, provide opportunities for Lecturers to do the initiative, giving authority to lecturers in selecting the resources that will be used to support research activities, public service and their scientific publications. In addition to the lecturer empowerment, what can be done by the management of Private Universities is by way of providing ease of access to information and the infrastructure that supports the lecturer learning, namely by having a good information system devices, having an integrated system in providing information and communicate with Lecturers related to the things that support the lecturer learning. In addition to that, the management of Private Universities must continue to maintain Strategic leadership, by always sharing the vision, mission and goals to be achieved by Private Universities, always giving the referral that related to research, public service and their scientific publications, and the leaders continue to strive in looking at various opportunities that exist in the learning.

Seen from the efficiency level in performing Learning Organization activities that can improve the lecturer performance in the field of research, public service and scientific publications there are several Private Universities that have 100% efficiency level. From the Main group, Trisakti University is a University that can be used as a benchmark by other Private Universities that are in the same level. While in the Middle group, UnikaAtma Jaya is the most efficient Private University in carrying out activities of Learning Organization, so that it becomes a benchmark for other Private Universities that are in the Middle group. And in the Assisted group, STIE Ahmad Dahlan and STMIK&K the most efficient Private Universities in carrying out the activities of the Learning organization, so that they can become benchmark Private Universities or to perform comparative study for other Private Universities assisted group.

## REFERENCES

- Abbot, M and Doucouliagos. 2003. "the Efficiency of Australian Universities: a data envelopment analysis". *Economics of Education Review*. Vol.22. p.89-98.
- Ali, Khamis Ali. 2012. "Academic staff's perceptions of characteristics of Learning Organization in a higher learning institution" *International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol.26, .No.1. p.55-82
- Alipour, Farhad dan Karimi, Roohangiz. 2011 "Mediation Role of Innovation and Knowledge Transfer in the Relationship Learning Organization and Organizational Commitment". *International of Business and Social Science*. Vo.2 No. 19.
- Al-Qahtani, Fatimah Moh. Sabed and Ghoneim, Salah El Din Abd El Aziz. 2013. "Organizational Learning: as an Approach for Transforming to the Learning Organization Concept in Saudi Universities". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol.4 No.2.. P. 513-527.
- Al-Qutop. M.Y and Futa, Sahar. 2011. "The relationship between Learning Facilitators and transforming into a Learning Organization: An empirical Study of the Insurance Sector in Jordan". *International Busniess Research*, Vol 4, No.3 July 2011.



- Billett, Stephen. 2001. "Learning through Work: Workplace Affordance and Individual Engagement". *Journal of Workplace Learning*. Vol.13. No.6. p.209-216.
- Blackman, Deborah and Handersin, Steven. 2005." Why Learning ORganizations do not transform". *The Organisasi pembelajar*. Vol.12 No. 1
- Bryan, Philips. 2003. "A Four Level Organisasi pembelajar Benchmark Implementation Model". *The Learning Organization*. Vol. 10. No. 02.
- Bryson, Jane. 2006. 'Learning at work: Organizational Affordances and Individual Engagement". *Journal of Workplace Learning*. Vol.18. No.5. p.279-297.
- Bui and Barich. 2010. "Creating Learning Organization in Higher Education: applying a system perspective". *The Organisasi pembelajar* Vol 17. No. 3.
- Chang and Lee. 2007. "A study on relationship among leadership, organisational culture, the operation of Learning Organization and employee's job satisfaction". *The Organisasi pembelajar* Vol. 14 No. 2 p.155-186
- Chien-Chi Tseng. 2010. "The effects of Learning Organization on Organization Commitment and Effectiveness for Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises in Taiwan." Graduate School University of Minnesota
- Cho, Jason, et.al. Examining the Relationship between Dimensions of Organizational Learning and Firms' Financial and Knowledge Performance in the Korean Business Context. 2009.
- Collie, Sarah dan Taylor, Alton. *Improving Teaching Quality and The Learning Organization*. Tertiary Education and Management. Vol.10. No.2. June 2004.
- Cullen, John.et.al. 2003. "Quality in Higher Education from Monitoring to management. ". *Quality Assurance in Education*. Vol. 11. No.1. p.5-14.
- Davis, James Lee and Davis, Harley. 2009. *The Learning Organization Implemented in Education through Advisory Committees*". *Education*. Vol. 13. No.1. P.114-120
- De Clerq, Dirk, et. Al. 2013. "Unpacking the Goal Congruance-Organizational Deviance Relationship: the Roles of Work Engagement and Emotional Intelligence". *Journal of Business Ethics*,
- Diez, Miriem, et.al. 2005. *Exploring the Learning Organization Model in Multinational Companies*. *Journal of European Industrial Training*.Vol.29. No.04.
- Friedman, Hershey. Et.al. 2006 "transforming a University from a Teaching Organization to a Learning Organization". *Review of Business*. Vol.26. No.3.
- Greenberg, Jerald dan Baron, Robert. *Behaviors in Organizations*. Pearson Education-Prentice Hall. 2008
- Griffin. Ricky, Management. Houghton Mifflin Company. Texas. 2006
- Hair, Joe, Ringle, Christian and Sarstedt, Marko. 2011. "PLS-SEM" Indeed a Silver Bullet". *Journal of marketing Theory and Practice*. Vol. 19. No.2. p.139-151.
- Hall, Richard. *Organizations. Structure, Process and Outocmes*. Pearson Education. Sydney. 2002.
- Hanrin, Chanwitt. Et Al. 2009. "The Construction and development of indicators of Learning Organization at higher educational institutions emphasizing graduate production and social development". *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 2009.
- Hernaus, Tom Islav. *Relationship between Organizational Learning and Orgniazational Performance : the case of Croatia*. 2004
- Hair, Josepph. , et.al. 2008. *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*. Prentice Hall International. New Jersey, USA.
- Howell, Deborah. 2012. "A relational Study of the Knowledge Sharing Behavior and Organizational Commitment of Engineers". *The University of Alabama in Hunstville*.

- Hoffman, David and Griffin, Mark. 2008. "the Application of Hierarchical Linear Modelling to Organizational Research". *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organization*. P.467-509
- Ivancevich, Konipaske, Matterson. *Organizational Behavioral and management*. McGraw Hill International Edition. 2008
- Ji-hoon Song, Baek-Kyoo, Chermack., 2009 "The Dimensions of Learning Organization Questionnaire: a Validation Study in a Korean Context"., *Human resources Development Quarterly*, Vol. 20. No.1, P.43-65
- Kohli, Ajay and Shervani, Tassaduq. "Learning and Performance orientation of sales people : the Role of Supervisor's". *Journal of Marketing Research*. Vol 35 No. 2. May 1998.
- Konidari, Victoria dan Abernot, Yvan. 2006. "From TQM to Learning Organization: Another way for Quality management in Educational Institutions". *The International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. Vol.23 No.1. p.8-16.
- Kontoghiorges, Constantine.et.al. 2005. "Examining the Relationship between Learning Organization Characteristics and Change Adaption, Innovation and Organizational Performance". *Human Resources Development Quarterly*. Vol.16. No.2. p.185-203
- Kongar, Elif. Et.al 2010. "Approach for Evaluating the Performance of engineering Schools". *International Journal of Education*. Vol.26. No.5. p.1210-1219.
- Koyuncu, Mustafa, et.al. 2006. "Work Engagement among Women Managers and Professionals in a Turkish Bank". *Equal Opportunities International*. Vol.25. No.4. p.299-310.
- Kumar, Naresh. 2005. "Assesing the Learning Culture and Performance of Educational Institution". *Performance Improvement*. Vol. 44 No.9. p.27-35
- Lee, Deokro. 2004. " Competing Models of Effectiveness in Research Centes and Institiute in the Florida State University System : a Data Envelopment Analysis. *The Florida State University*
- Lurullard, Diana. 1999. "a Conversational Framework for Individual Learning Applied to the Learning Organization and the Learning Society". *Systems research and Behavioral Science*. Vol.16. p.113-122
- Lyle, Ellyn. 2012. "Learning Organization". *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. Vol.3 No.6.
- Malik, Muhammad Ehsan, et.al. 2012. Determinants of Learning Organization in Higher Education Institutes of Pakistan; a Correlational Study". *International Journal of Innovation Management and Technology*. Vol.3. No.2. p.117-123
- Marsick, Victoria and Watkins, Karen. "Demonstrating the value of an Organmiztion's Learning Culture : The dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire". *Developing Human Resources* . Vo;. 5. No. 2 May 2003. P. 132-151
- Moilanen, Raili. 2005. Diagnosing and measuring Learning Organizations. *The Learning Organizations* Vol. 12 No. 1. p.71-89
- Mone, Edward, et.al. 2011. "Performace management at the Wheel : Drving Employee engaement in Organizations". *Journal of Business Psychology*. Vol.26. p. 205-212
- Murray, Peter. "Organizational Learning, Competencies, and Firm Performance". *The Learning Organization*. Vol.10 no.5. 2003
- Neefe., DO. 2001. Comparing Level of organizational Learning Maturity of Colleges and Universities Participating in traditional and Non-traditional (Acaemic Quality Improvement Project) Accreditation Process. *American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual 4th edition*. [http : www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis.pdf](http://www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis.pdf).
- Ngarap IM Manik. "Perancangan Model Peta Profil Dosen Perguruan Tinggi di Indonesia". *Universitas Bina Nusantara*. 2010.
- Ortenbald, Anders. 2007. "Senge's many faces: Problem or Opportunity?". *The Learning Organization*. Vol.14 No.2. p.108-122.

- Osborne, Jason. 2011. 'Advantages of Hierarchical Linear Modeling'. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation. Vol.7 No.1. p.1-4.
- Pollack, Simcha dan Fireworker, Robert. "Transforming a University from a Teaching Organization to a Learning Organization.
- Prugsamat, Raphaella. 2010. Factor that influence organization learning sustainability in non-profit organizations. The Learning Organization Vol. 17. No. 3.
- Purwantor dan Siswadi. 2009. "Pengolahan data skala terbatas dengan Metode DEA". Lembaga Manajemen Universitas Indonesia
- Rebelo, Teresa and Gomes, Adelino. 2008. Organizational Learning and the Learning Organization. Reviewing Evolution for Prospecting the Future. The Learning Organization, Vol.15 No. 4
- Revilla, Elena dan Sarkis Joseph. 2003. "Performance Evaluation of Public and Private R&D Partnerships: a Learning and Knowledge Management Perspective".
- Robertson, Ivan, Birch, Alex Jansen, Cooper, Cary. 2012. "Job and work Attitudes, engagement, and Employee Performance". Leadership and Organization Development Journal . Vol. 33, No.2. 2012. P.224-237
- Rose, Raduan Che dan Kumar, Naresh. The effect of Organisational Learning on Organization Commitment, job Satisfaction, and Work Performance. The Journal of Applied Business Research.. Vol.25 No.6. Desember 2009
- Rowley, Jennifer and Gibbs, Paul. 2005. From Learning Organization to practically Wise Organization. The Learning Organization.
- Saleh, Chairul. "Pengukuran Pemindahan Teknologi di Industri Manufaktur Otomotif melalui Pendekatan DEA". International Program Department Industrial Engineering Faculty of Industrial technology Universitas Islam Indonesia.
- Senge, P.M., 1990. The fifth Discipline : The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization, New York : Doubleday
- Serrat, Oliver. 2009. Building a Learning Organization. Knowledge Solution. Asian Development Bank.
- Sharifirad, Mohammad Sadegh. 2011. "The Dimensions of Learning Organization Questionnaire (DLOQ) : a Cross-cultural Validation in Iranian Context". International Journal Manpower. Vol.32 No.6. p.661-676
- Sicillia, Miguel-Angel and Lytras, Miltiadis. 2005. The Semantic Learning Organization. The Learning Organization. Vol 12 No.05
- Snyder, William M. Organization Learning and Performance. Exploring of the Linkage between Organization Learning, Knowledge and Performance. Faculty of the Graduate School University of Southern California. August 2002
- Sri Trisnansih. "Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Dosen Akuntansi". UPN Veteran Jawa Timur. 2009.
- Thomas, Keith and Allen, Stephen. 2006. "The Learning Organization : a Meta Analysis- of themes in Literature". The Learning Organization. Vo. 13. No. 2
- Tsang, Eric. "Organizational Learning and the Learning Organization: a Dichotomy between Descriptive and Prescriptive Research". Human Relation. Vol.50 No.1. P.73-90
- Ulrich, Dave. 1998. Human resources Champion. The Next Agenda for Adding Value and Delivering Results. Harvard Business Press. Boston. Massachusetts
- Umi Narimawati. 2010. "Peranan Modal Intelektual Dosen dalam Menciptakan Kualitas Lulusan". Majalah Ilmiah UNIKOM. Vol. 6. No.2. p.143 – 158
- Vatankhah, Reza., Pakdel, Abdollah., Naruzi, Loftallah., Mahmudi, Abazar., dan Vatankhah, Gholam. "Surveying of Learning Organization Indices and Academic Quality Improvement in Islamic Azad Universities". Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business. Vol.3 No. 5. September 2011. P.861-881

- Veisi, Hadi. 2010. "Organizational Learning in the Higher Education Institutions (a case study of Agricultural and Natural Resources Campus of University Teheran)". *International Journal of Education Science*. Vol.2. No.1. p. 21-36
- Watkins, Karen. "What would be Different if Higher Educational Institutions were Learning Organizations?" *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. Vol.7. No.3 Agustus 2005. P. 414-420
- Weldy, Teresa and Gillis, William. "The Learning Organization: Variations at different Organizational Levels". *The Learning Organization*. Vol.17. No.5. 2010. P.455-472
- White and Wheathursby. 2005. Can universities be a true Learning Organization? *The Learning Organization* Vol. 12 No. 05.
- Ya-Hui Lien, Bella. "Is the Learning Organization a valid Concept in the taiwanese Context?" *International Journal of manpower*. Vol.27. No.2. 2006. P. 189-203
- Yang, Watkins and Marsick "The Construct of the Learning Organizations: Dimensions, Measurement, and validation". *Human Resources Development Quarterly*, Vol. 15. No.1, 2004. P. 31-55.
- Yen, Poh Ng, 2011. *Learning Organization Dimensions on Knowledge Sharing: A study of Faculty Members in the Private Universities in Malaysia*.
- Yeni Absah. 2007. "Pengaruh Kemampuan Pembelajaran terhadap Kompetensi, Tingkat Diversifikasi, dan Kinerja Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Sumatra Utara"
- Yeo, Roland. 2002. "From Individual to Team Learning; Practical Perspective on the Learning Organization". *Team Performance Management*. Vol.8 No.7. p.157-170
- Yeo, Roland. 2005. "Revisiting the Roots of Learning Organization: a synthesis of the Learning Organization literature". *The Learning Organization* Vol. 12 No.4