

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## QUALITY ASSURANCE IN OPEN UNIVERSITY

	Page
CAPACITY BUILDING FOR DISTANCE TEACHERS THROUGH VIRTUAL TRAINING LOUNGE: A CASE OF IGNOU	1
Moumita Das, Prabir K Biswas	
QUALITY CONTROL ON FINAL EXAMS PROCESSING AT  EXAMINATION CENTRE OF UNIVERSITAS TERBUKA – INDONESIA	8
Eko Yuliastuti Endah Sulistyawati, Adhi Susilo  THE EVALUATION OF THESIS DEFENCE IMPLEMENTATION AT  GRADUATE PROGRAM OF UNIVERSITAS TERBUKA	13
Tita Rosita, Sri Lestari Pujiastuti, Fauzy Rahman Kosasih NURTURING CREATIVITY FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY IN OPEN	20
DISTANCE LEARNING SYSTEM: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY	20
Moumita Das, Prabir K Biswas  ROLE OF TEACHERS IN TECHNOLOGY-MEDIATED DISTANCE  EDUCATION	30
Deeksha Dave	
QUALITY IN THE ODL SYSTEM IN INDIA: NEED FOR ADOPTING INNOVATIVE MEASURES	39
Leena Singh, Moumita Das	
INTEGRATING OER INTO AN ONLINE TUTORIAL IN ODL SETTING: AN EXPLANATORY STUDY	50
Maximus Gorky Sembiring	
UT WEBSITE USER SATISFACTION IMPROVEMENT MODEL BASED ON PERCEIVED USEFULNESS, PERCEIVED EASE OF USE, PERCEIVED INFORMATION QUALITY AND PERCEIVED SYSTEM QUALITY (CASE STUDY ON PAGE WWW.MAKASSAR.UT.AC.ID)	60
Nina Utami Yanuarvah, I Made Gunawan Sanjaya, Andi Sylvana	
QUALITY OF LEARNER SUPPORT SERVICE AND DISTANCE LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS: A CASE STUDY	67
Sutapa Bose	
FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENTS' RE-ENROLLMENT: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY IN THREE REGIONAL OFFICES OF UNIVERSITAS TERBUKA	75
Sugilar	
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BENEFIT MODEL (USABILITY) IN IMPROVING USER SATISFACTION WITH ACADEMIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SERVICE AT UNIVERSITAS TERBUKA	82

# QUALITY CONTROL ON FINAL EXAMS PROCESSING AT EXAMINATION CENTRE OF UNIVERSITAS TERBUKA – INDONESIA

Eko Yuliastuti E.S.<sup>1)</sup> & Adhi Susilo<sup>2)</sup>

182) Universitas Terbuka (INDONESIA)

#### **ABSTRACT**

One indicator to measure competency of learning out comes from student of Universitas Terbuka (UT) is the final exams(FE). As part of the student learning system, the FE is the only process that can be fully controlled by the UT. Therefore, UT performs quality control to maintain the credibility and validity of the results of FE. One attempt to maintain the validity of the results of FE is controlling the processing of examination results in UT Examination Centre. There are three types of exam results at UT, the exam answer sheet (EAS), exam answers book(EAB), and exam assessment sheet. This article will discuss quality control on EAS processing. Quality control on EAS processing consists on many steps: EAS admission, examination and determination of the validity of rules and sanction violations of test administration, scanning, matching examinees student data and personal data, giving sanction violations of rules and administration, scoring, and grading. During the semester exam 2016. 2, EAS which were process data UT Examination Centre were amounted to 1.505.220 pieces. With the number of permanent employees 15 people, each semester, the Examination Center recruits temporary labors to process the exam results from 739 test points. To get qualified temporary labor, then Examination Center must do the selection. For selected temporary labors, trainings were conducted in order to work according the required qualifications from UT. Providing quality control of test results processing and temporary labor recruitment process, have be enable to improve the performance of the Examination Center, It can be seen by the exam results available in earlier stage and the decreasing of problems related to the processing of exam results each semester.

Keywords: Quality control of processing exam results, exam answer sheet, Examination Center, temporary labors.

#### 1 INTRODUCTION

Universitas (UT) is a university that uses open and distance learning systems. Teaching materials for students are delivered through various media, ranging from printed materials to digital teaching materials. The learning process for students is done freely with the help of learning through face-to-face tutorials, online tutorials, and practice / practicum whose implementation is controlled by academic staff at the UT. At the end of each semester, students' learning achievement is measured through the final exam of the semester (FE) for each course. Each UT semester holds 2 FEs, namely FE for Faculty of Economics (FEc), Faculty of Law, Social and Political Sciences (FLSPS), Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (FMNS), and Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FOE) and FE for FOE Program Primary School Teacher Education (PSTE) and Teacher Education Early Childhood Education (TEECE).

FE are implemented throughout the Regional Offices (RO). UT has 39 ROs serving across Indonesia and one Overseas Service Unit. Materials for FE in the form of supporting materials and manuscripts sent from the Central UT to all RO and test places abroad. The test script is destroyed at the local exam/test location / RO site. The results of FE in the form of test answer sheets (EAS) and the assessment format along with the supporting test result files are sent directly to the Test Center at the Central UT. While the test results in the form of test answers (EAB) sent to RO Sentra to be corrected by the examiner. EAB scores obtained from inspectors at RO Sentra are sent to Central Testing Center at UT Center for grading process.

The FE process is done in the Field of Exam Resulting Processing, Testing Center, UT Center. The processing time of the FE results to yield the grade in the Testing Center is determined for 7 weeks for FE results from FEc, FLSPS, FMNS, and FOE and FOE Program PSTE and TEECE. While the process

time of FE FOE Program PSTE and TEECE is determined for 9 weeks. The total score processed in each semester of 2015- 2016 are listed in Table 1. The FE results process must produce valid, reliable, and in accordance with the standards specified by UT. Bearing in mind that value process should be done correctly according to the standards specified in UT. Quality dick is done at every stage of the process of examination result since RO and in Processing Field of Exam Result, Test Center, UT Center. In this paper will be discussed about quality control performed on the processing of exam results in the Field of Exam Resulting Processing, Testing Center, UT Center in an attempt to generate valid and standardized value.

Table 1. Number of FE Score Value Processed in 2015-2016

		*		
Short Number	FE Period	FEC, FLSPS, FMNS, FOE	FOE Program PSTE and TEEC	Amount
		(score)	(score)	(score)
1.	2015.1	466.550	1.077.467	1.544.017
2.	2015.2	472.134	1.043.171	1.515.305
3.	2016.1	497.609	976.340	1.473.949
4.	2016.2	562.914	942.306	1.505.220

Distance education is teaching and planned learning in which teaching normally occurs in a different place from learning, requiring communication through technologies as well as special institutional organization (Moore and Kearsley, 2012). The existence of distance between student and learning source hence need media and technology to assist the learning process.

According Moore and Kearsley (2012), there are 4 kinds of media that can be used to assist student learning process, that is:

- A. Print media
- B. The image media (silent and moving)
- C. Voice media
- D. Media artifacts.

Instructional design should consider all aspect of instructional environment, following a well-organized procedure that provides guidance to even the novice distance instructor. The learner (Simonson etc., 2012) is the learner of the distant learner.

## 1.1 Final Exam of the Semester at UT

To measure the level of achievement of student learning outcomes in the courses followed, UT conducts final exam (FE) in each semester. FE results in the form of value is symbolize the success rate of students mastering a teaching material. Simonson et al (2012), states that assessment is define as a process of measuring, documentating, and intrepreting behaviors that demonstrate learning. Assessment is the means of measuring learning gains and can be used to improve the teaching-learning process in distance education setting as well as more traditional environments.

## 1.2 Processing of FE Results at UT

Processing of FE results in Processing Field of Testing Result, Testing Center, UT Center begins with acceptance of FE results from RO. For test answer sheets (EAS) and test scoring formats are sent directly from RO, while for exam book (EAB) sent from RO Sentra.

The FE results are sent to the Field of Exam Resulting Processing through Post Office and Giro, delivered directly by RO staff or delivered by courier. Upon receipt of FE results, the number of packs (sacks) is matched with mailing letters from the Post Office and Giro / RO / courier staff. If the number of sacks is in accordance with the delivery letter then the exam results will be checked the number of boxes, the number of envelopes in the acceptance of FE results.

The next stage is bacthing numbering on FE results based on test location per exam spot per RO on a number of FE envelope results. After the batching process, the next step is to check the validity of FE results. In this process, the EAS / assessment format is matched with the student's personal data (name, student identification number, date of birth, course code, signature graduation on Student Presentation Checklist with EAS / EAB signature). If EAS is in accordance with the student's personal data, then the EAS is scann. EAS scann results will be matched with personal data on student registration data base, if there is discrepancy and after examined correctly then editing and updating personal data of students.

The execution of the punishment shall be conducted if in the Minutes of Examination Execution there is a record of violation of the disciplinary examination or on the monitoring officer's report on the execution of the examination there is a record of violation of the discipline of examination. In addition, also applied punishment pattern answers for students who have the same pattern of answers on the answer about the wrong. Scoring is done based on the key answer questions from the Field of Test Examination and Testing Technology Development at the Testing Center. After the supporting value is declared complete by the Administrative and Academic Bureau of Students, then grading the value of FE. In UT there are 5 grade values, namely A, B, C, D, and E. These sequential processes affect each other. There is a potential for significant errors during the production process consisting of sequential stages, each of which is heavily dependent on the previous stage. Such processes can be affected critically by material variations, weight, time, temperature, or other parameters, regardless of the task. Choice between alternatives can be crucial to the success of the entire process (Allalouf, 2007). Therefore the process of examination results should be controlled so that the results are vaid and standardized.

### 1.3 Announcement of FE Results to UT Students

The result of FE is the result of the assessment of student learning process in certain subject. The FE results are submitted to students in grade form on the exam list (EL) format per semester. Student grades are sent to RO through student records system (SRS) application to RO and UT website. Students will get EL from RO. In addition, students can access the UT website to see its grade.

## 1.4 Research Questions / Objectives

The purpose of this study was to know the suitability of quality control on the processing of FE results into grades in the Field of Examination of Test Results, Testing Center with UT standard. It also studies the compatibility of recording with quality controls performed.

#### 2 METHOD

The method in this research is observation study. The objective of this observational study is to determine the level of conformity of practice with the quality control standards determined by UT, especially during the final exam period 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1 and 2016.2.

Variables of conformity of quality control standard on FE result process, subject to quality control standard on process of FE grade, and achievement of target quality of processing result of FE seen from scope as follows.

- 1. This research is conducted for FE results in:
- A. Faculty of Economic
- C. Faculty of Law, Social and Political Sciences.
- D. Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (FMNS),
- E. Faculty of Teacher Training and Education and

F. Faculty of Education (FOE) for Program Primary School Teacher Education (PSTE) and Teacher Education Early Childhood Education (TEECE).

The exam results are combined for FEc, FLSPS, FMNS, FOE at each observed FE period. While for FE results FOE for Program Primary School Teacher Education (PSTE) and Teacher Education Early Childhood Education (TEECE) are incorporated separately in each FE period observed based on separate test times with FEc, FLSPS, FMNS, FOE.

- 2. Time of sampling during final exam period
- A. 2015.1
- B. 2015.2
- C. 2016.1
- D. 2016.2
- 3. Quality objectives achieved during the FE period
- A. 2015.1
- B. 2015.2
- C 2016.1
- D. 2016.2

#### 3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1. Amount of Value Processed

The number of exam results processed in the Field of Examination of Test Results, Testing Centers from the FE period 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1 and 2016.2 are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Number of FE Value Processed in 2015-2016

Short number	FE period	FEc, FLSPS, FMNS, FOE		FOE Program F	FOE Program PSTE and TEEC	
		(score)	(grade)	(score)	(grade)	(score)
1.	2015.1	466.550	460.740	1.077.467	965 371	1.544.017
2.	2015.2	472.134	469.842	1.043.171	913.716	1.515.305
3.	2016.1	498.095	486.602	976.340	871.148	1.473.949
4.	2016.2	562.914	556.701	942.306	900.770	1.505.220

# 3.2 Tools Used for Quality Control

Testing Center has been certified ISO 9001: 2015. Guidelines for Quality Assurance System used are JKOP UJ04 dated June 25, 2013. In Guidelines of Quality Assurance System contains Testing Procedure of Test Result, 22 work instructions, and 19 recordings used as quality control on FE result process in Processing Field of Test Result during FE period 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1 and 2016.2.

## 3.3 The Quality of Exam Results to be Achieved under UT Conditions

The quality objective of processing the exam results to achieve ISO 9001: 2015 certification is 95% of the value processed correctly. This value is determined based on the number of scores that can be made grade. Not all processed scores can be made grade because of incomplete administrative

requirements, incomplete final score components, and unregistered course registration data. The achievement of the quality objectives in each semester is shown in Table 3.

## 3.4 Achievement of Processing Quality of FE Results

The processing of FE results in the semester 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1 and 2016.2 are listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Achievements of Quality Goals for Processing of FE Results in the Semester 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1 and 2016.2

Short FE number Pe		FEc, FLSPS,FMNS, FOE	FOE Program PSTE and TEEC
	Period	(%)	(%)
1.	2015.1	98,8	89,6
2.	2015.2	99,5	87,6
3.	2016.1	97,7	89,2
4.	2016.2	98,7	95,6

#### 4 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on observations on the process of FE results semester 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1, and 2016.2 in the Field of Processing Results Exam, Testing Center concluded that:

- 1. The process of FE results in the semester 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1, and 2016.2 has followed the Guidelines of Quality Assurance System in ISO 9001: 2015
- 2. Quality targets achieved in accordance with the set of 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1 for FE FE, FHISIP, FMIPA and FKIP and FE 2016.2 for FE FKIP PGSD and PGPAUD results.
- 3. Less than achieved Quality Goals set for semester 2015.1, 2015.2, 2016.1 for results for FE results FKIP PGSD and PGPAUD
- 4. Factors outside the process of examination results affect the results of grading the value of FE results.

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that UT to do:

- Providing trainings for the execution committee for FE exams to be more orderly so that the exam administration case can be avoided.
- 2. The entry process of supporting value scores is more accurate and timely.
- 3. The process of validation of the registration of subjects from students on time.

#### REFERENCES

- Allalouf, A. (2007). Quality control procedures in the scoring, equating, and Reporting of test scores. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice Volume 26, Issue 1Spring 2007 Pages 36-46.
- Moore, M.G. & Kearsley, G. (2012). Distance education: a system view of online learning, third edition. Davis Drive. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., Albright, M., & Zvacek, S., (2012). Teaching and learning at a distance, fifth edition.Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.