

REPORT

**STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY
ON THE LEARNING PROCESS
Academic Year 2021/2022**



**UNIVERSITAS SUMATERA UTARA
INDONESIAN LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM
FACULTY OF CULTURAL SCIENCES
MEDAN
2025**

FOREWORD

Praise and gratitude of the author to the presence of Allah SWT because for His grace and grace the report "Student Satisfaction Survey on the Learning Process of the Indonesian Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sumatra Utara, Academic Year 2021/2022" can be completed properly.

This report was prepared as part of the efforts to evaluate and improve the quality of education in the Indonesian Literature Study Program. The student satisfaction survey is an important instrument to assess the quality of academic services, learning processes, and final project guidance provided by lecturers. The results of this survey are expected to be an evaluation material as well as a reference for the study program in formulating policies and strategies for continuous improvement.

The author would like to thank all students who have participated in this survey, as well as the lecturers and faculty who have supported the implementation and preparation of the report. Hopefully this report will be useful for improving the quality of education and services in the Indonesian Literature Study Program.

Medan, August 22, 2025

Compilation Team

Indonesian Literature Study Program

SUMMARY

This report contains the results of the student satisfaction survey of the Indonesian Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sumatra Utara for the 2021/2022 academic year. The survey was conducted in odd and even semesters, covering four main aspects: evaluation of teaching lecturers, student satisfaction with the educational process, evaluation of student learning load, and evaluation of lecturers guiding the final project.

The survey results show that in general the quality of lecturer teaching is in the very good category with an average score of 3.66 - 3.68. The evaluation of student learning load also obtained a high score (3.47 - 3.50), indicating that the course load is considered appropriate. The survey of student satisfaction with the educational process showed good results, although there was a decrease from 3.47 in the odd semester to 3.09 in the even semester, which requires further attention. Meanwhile, the evaluation of lecturers in guiding the final project also obtained very good grades (average 3.59) and some lecturers even achieved perfect scores.

Overall, the results of this survey indicate that the Indonesian Literature Study Program has provided satisfactory educational services, but still needs improvement in certain aspects so that the quality of learning is more consistent and sustainable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	i
Summary.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Background.....	1
B. Problem Formulation.....	1
C. Objective.....	1
D. Scope.....	2
CHAPTER II SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION.....	3
A. Implementation.....	3
B. Data Type and Source.....	3
C. Form of Answer.....	3
D. Data Analysis.....	3
CHAPTER III ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.....	5
A. Evaluation Survey of Lecturers Teaching Odd and Even Semester 2021/2022.....	5
B. Student Satisfaction Survey on the Education Process Odd and Even Semester 2021/2022.....	7
C. Student Learning Load Evaluation Survey Odd and Even Semester 2021/2022.....	9
D. Evaluation Survey of Lecturers Guiding the Final Project Odd and Even Semester 2021/2022.....	11
CHAPTER IV CLOSING.....	14
A. Conclusion.....	14
B. Suggestions.....	14

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background.

Student satisfaction is one of the important indicators in evaluating the quality of educational services in higher education. A high level of satisfaction reflects that the institution has succeeded in meeting student expectations in various aspects, such as the learning process, supporting facilities, administrative services, and the relationship between lecturers and students.

As part of efforts to improve the quality of education and services, it is necessary to conduct periodic student satisfaction surveys. The results of this survey are not only the basis for internal evaluation, but also serve as strategic planning material for future institutional development.

This survey was conducted to determine the extent to which students are satisfied with the services provided by the Indonesian Literature Study Program, as well as to identify aspects that need to be improved. By involving students as the main respondents, the survey results are expected to reflect the actual conditions and can be used as a reference in the process of continuous quality improvement.

B. Problem Formulation

1. To what extent is the level of student satisfaction with academic and lecturer services provided by the Indonesian Literature Study Program?
2. What aspects of service are considered most appropriate and least appropriate by students?
3. What factors influence student satisfaction in following the educational process in the Indonesian Literature Study Program?
4. What are the suggestions and input from students that can be used for future service improvements?

C. Objective

1. Measuring the level of student satisfaction with various aspects of academic and non-academic services provided by the Indonesian Literature Study Program.
2. Identify strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of educational services, both in terms of teaching and learning processes, facilities and infrastructure, and administrative services.
3. Providing objective data and information as a basis for decision making and formulating strategies for improving the quality of educational services.
4. Accommodate student aspirations and feedback as part of continuous evaluation to create a learning environment that is conducive and responsive to student needs.
5. Support the accreditation process and internal quality assurance by providing

relevant evidence related to student satisfaction.

D. Scope

The scope of the student satisfaction survey includes:

1. Teaching Lecturer Evaluation Survey
2. Student Satisfaction Survey of the Education Process
3. Student Learning Load Evaluation Survey
4. Evaluation Survey of Lecturers Guiding Final Project

CHAPTER II

SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION

A. Implementation

This student satisfaction survey was carried out with the aim of collecting relevant data and information related to student learning experiences in the Indonesian Literature Study Program. The survey process is online through the one student page. The implementation of the student satisfaction survey is carried out through the stages of planning, implementation, processing, and presentation of survey results.

The survey took place at the end of the semester. Prior to filling out the questionnaire on the student page, students are given an explanation of the purpose of the survey, the method of filling it out, and the importance of their contribution in providing accurate input. The results of this survey will be analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively to provide a clear picture of the student learning load, so that it can be the basis for decision making in curriculum development and learning methods in the future.

This survey was carried out over a period of two semesters, namely odd and even semesters of the 2021/2022 academic year.

B Type and Source of Data

This survey uses primary data obtained directly from students of the Indonesian Literature Study Program through an online questionnaire. The data collected includes information regarding student perceptions of teaching lecturer evaluations, student satisfaction with the educational process, evaluation of student learning loads and evaluation of lecturers guiding final assignments. These data will be analyzed to get a comprehensive picture of the learning load experienced by students during the course.

C Form of Answer

The design of the answer form in each service element question in the questionnaire, in the form of multiple choice question answers. The form of questionnaire question answer choices is qualitative to reflect the level of service quality. The level of service quality starts from Very Suitable / Very Satisfied to Very Unsuitable / Very Unsatisfied. The division of answers is divided into 4 (four) categories, namely:

- 1) Very unsuitable / very dissatisfied, given a perception value of 1;
- 2) Not Suitable / Not Satisfied, given a perception value of 2;
- 3) Suitable / Satisfied, given a perception value of 3;
- 4) Very Suitable / Very Satisfied, given a perception value of 4.

D Data Analysis

The data collected from the questionnaire will be analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative analysis is carried out by calculating the frequency and percentage of each respondent's answer to get an overview of student perceptions of the learning load. In addition, descriptive statistical methods will be used to measure

perceptions of how lecturers teach and lecturers guide final assignments, student satisfaction with the educational process and student learning load.

Meanwhile, a qualitative analysis will be conducted on the open-ended responses given by the students, to better understand the factors that influence their experience. The results of this analysis will be used as a basis for developing recommendations to improve services and learning methods in the Indonesian Literature Study Program.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains the results of the answers obtained from the academic.usu.ac.id survey page which are then analyzed and discussed. The analysis and discussion are complemented by tables or images downloaded from usu.ac.id.

A. Teaching Lecturer Evaluation Survey

Odd Semester 2021/2022

Table of Lecturer Evaluation Survey Teaching Odd Semester 2021/2022

No	Lecturer	Total Class	Total credits	Evaluation Value
1	Haris Sutan Lubis	5	10	3.65
2	Amhar Kudadiri	8	16	3.67
3	Dwi Widayati	5	10	3.76
4	Dardanila	7	14	3.72
5	Gustianingsih	4	11	3.63
6	Parlaungan Ritonga	7	15	3.58
7	Roslina Lubis	6	12	3.74
8	Ida Basaria	2	4	3.35
9	Nurhayati Harahap	7	14	3.70
10	Mulyadi	3	6	3.70
11	Bambang Riyanto	6	12	3.59
12	Sugihana Sembiring	3	6	3.69
13	Ikhwanuddin Nasution	3	6	3.43
14	Emma Marsella	7	14	3.62
15	Hariadi Susilo	8	16	3.74
16	Salliyanti	7	14	3.66
17	Pribadi Bangun	2	4	3.83
18	Asrul Siregar	5	10	3.68

Based on the 2023/2024 odd semester Teaching Lecturer Evaluation Survey table above, it can be explained that the average value of lecturer performance is 3.66 on a scale of 1-4. This shows that the quality of lecturer teaching is generally very good. Lecturer Performance with the Highest Evaluation Score is Pribadi Bangun (3.83) despite teaching few classes (2 classes, 4 credits). Teaching performance is rated as excellent, despite the relatively small teaching load. The lecturer with the lowest score is Ida Basaria (3.35), with a load of only 2 classes (4 credits). Lecturers with the highest load are Amhar Kudadiri and Hariadi Susilo with a total of 8 classes or 16 credits each. Their scores remain high, at 3.67 and 3.74. This shows that

despite the large load, the quality remains good. Furthermore, the distribution of Evaluation Grades is in the range: 3.35 - 3.83. This indicates that there are no lecturers with low scores. all of them are above 3.3 on a scale of 4. Almost all lecturers are in the range of 3.6 - 3.7. This means that the consistency of teaching quality is relatively even.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this description is that in general, the teaching quality of lecturers is very good (average 3.66). There are some excellent lecturers with almost perfect scores (≥ 3.75), for example Dwi Widayati, Rosliana Lubis, Hariadi Susilo, and Pribadi Bangun. Some lecturers need coaching because their scores are relatively lower, around 3.35-3.45. The teaching load is not always directly proportional to the evaluation score because there are lecturers with high loads but their scores are still good.

Even Semester 2021/2022

Teaching Lecturer Evaluation Survey Table for Even Semester 2021/2022

No	Lecturer	Total Class	Total credits	Evaluation Value
1	Maulida Yanti	1	3	3.72
2	Dwi Widayati	5	10	3.80
3	Gustianingsih	5	10	3.66
4	Amhar Kudadiri	5	10	3.60
5	Dardanila	3	6	3.59
6	Parlaungan Ritonga	5	10	3.81
7	Haris Sutan Lubis	7	16	3.72
8	Putri Khairiah Nasution	1	3	3.62
9	Ida Basaria	2	4	3.45
10	Sallyanti	2	4	3.54
11	Rosliana Lubis	4	8	3.68
12	Nurhayati Harahap	7	14	3.76
13	Mulyadi	5	10	3.62
14	Sugihana Sembiring	3	6	3.64
15	Asrul Siregar	3	6	3.73
16	Pribadi Bangun	2	4	3.80
17	Ikhwanuddin Nasution	3	6	3.53
18	Emma Marsella	4	8	3.70
19	Hariadi Susilo	5	10	3.70
20	Bambang Riyanto	7	14	3.75

Based on the 2023/2024 odd semester Teaching Lecturer Evaluation Survey table above, it can be explained that the average value of lecturer performance is 3.68 (from a scale of 1-4).

In general, teaching quality is in the very good category. Lecturers with the highest scores with a load of 5 classes (10 credits) are Parlaungan Ritonga (3.81) and also Dwi Widayati (3.80). Also, Pribadi Bangun with an evaluation score of 3.80. This shows the consistency of excellent teaching quality. Lecturers with the lowest scores are Ida Basaria (3.45) and Ikhwanuddin Nasution (3.53). These scores are relatively low compared to other lecturers. This means that efforts need to be made to improve the quality of learning. Furthermore, Lecturers with High Teaching Load are Haris Sutan Lubis (7 classes, 16 credits, score 3.72) and Bambang Riyanto (7 classes, 14 credits, score 3.75). Despite the high load, these lecturers still have good grades. This shows that the high teaching load does not reduce the quality of teaching. The distribution of evaluation scores that can be described is in the range: 3.45 - 3.81. Almost all lecturers are in the range of 3.6 - 3.8, meaning that the quality of teaching is quite evenly distributed. There are no lecturers with scores below 3.4. All lecturers are classified as good.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the above description is that the average score of 3.68 confirms that the quality of lecturer teaching in the even semester 2021/2022 is very good. Some lecturers stand out with near-perfect scores (≥ 3.8), such as Parlaungan Ritonga, Dwi Widayati, and Pribadi Bangun. There are some lecturers with relatively low scores, namely ≤ 3.5 , which require attention for improvement. High teaching loads do not always negatively affect teaching quality (e.g. Haris Sutan Lubis and Bambang Riyanto still received high scores).

B. Student Satisfaction Survey of the Education Process

Odd Semester 202/2022

No	Study Program	Semester	Evaluation Score
1	S-1 Indonesian Literature	Odd Semester T.A. 2021/2022	3.47

Table of Student Satisfaction Survey on the Education Process
Odd Semester 2021/2022

Value	Number of Answers	Total Questions	Percentage
1	200	5.820	3,43%
2	250	5.820	4,29%
3	1950	5.820	33,50%
4	3420	5.820	58,76%

Based on the Student Satisfaction Survey on the Education Process in the odd semester 2021/2022, the Indonesian Literature Study Program received an evaluation score of 3.47.

This value is obtained from the answers to the questions collected as many as 5,820, namely value 1 (Very Dissatisfied) as many as 200 (3.43%); value 2 (Dissatisfied) as many as 250 (4.29%), value 3 (Satisfied) as many as 1950 (33.50%) and value 4 (Very Satisfied) as many as 3420 (58.76%). The total number of responses was 5,820.

These figures show that the majority of students are very satisfied with the education process in the Indonesian Literature Study Program. The majority of answers were at a score of 4 (58.76%), which shows that respondents' perceptions or assessments tend to be very positive. About a third of respondents gave a score of 3 (33.50%), which is also in the quite good/positive category. Only a small number of respondents gave scores of 1 and 2 (7.72% in total), indicating some criticism or dissatisfaction. The average of 3.47 is close to the maximum score (4), meaning that respondents were generally very satisfied/positive about the aspects measured. This is a small group, but important to note as it could indicate areas for improvement (e.g. learning methods, facilities, or academic services).

The conclusion that can be drawn is that the score of 3.47 indicates that the quality of the educational process is at a good level, with dominant support from students who feel satisfied to very satisfied. The high percentage of score 4 (58.76%) reinforces that the majority of students rate educational services as very satisfying. However, there are still around 7-8% of students who are not satisfied, so the study program can make it an input for improving the quality of educational services so that the average score can increase.

Even Semester 2021/2022

No.	Study Program	Semester	Evaluation Score
1	S-1 Indonesian Literature	Even Semester T.A. 2021/2022	3.09

Table of Student Satisfaction Survey on the Education Process
Even Semester 2021/2022

Value	Number of Answers	Total Questions	Percentage
1	102	1.124	9,07%
2	161	1.124	14,32%
3	390	1.124	34,70%
4	471	1.124	41,90%

Based on the Student Satisfaction Survey on the Educational Process in the even semester 2021/2022, the Indonesian Literature Study Program received an evaluation score of 3.09. This value is obtained from the answers to the questions collected as many as 1,124, namely value 1 (Very Dissatisfied) as many as 102 (9.07%); value 2 (Dissatisfied) as many as 161 (14.32%), value 3 (Satisfied) as many as 390 (34.70%) and value 4 (Very Satisfied) as many as 471 (41.90%). The total number of responses was 1,124.

These figures show that the majority of students are quite satisfied with the education process in the Indonesian Literature Study Program. The majority of answers are at a value of 4 (42.90%) and a value of 3 (34.70%) which indicates a fairly good to very good perception or assessment. Only about 23.39% of respondents gave low scores (1-2), indicating relatively little dissatisfaction. The average score of 3.09 indicates that it is in the good category, but decreased compared to the score obtained in the odd semester of the same academic year. This indicates a slight decrease in the quality or satisfaction of respondents. This means that needs to be improved, for example learning methods, facilities, or academic services.

Based on the balance of answers, it is known that value 4 is the most dominant (41.90%), indicating that many respondents are very satisfied. The value of 1 is relatively small (9.07%), meaning that the number of extreme dissatisfaction is not too large.

Based on the above descriptions, it can be concluded that Quality is generally good (average 3.09 out of 4). Most respondents (76.6%) gave scores of 3 and 4. This indicates strong satisfaction. Only 1 out of 4 respondents still gave low scores (1-2), so there are still aspects that need improvement, but they are not dominant. When compared to the previous results (average 2.85), this table shows the need for quality/satisfaction improvement.

C. Student Learning Load Evaluation Survey

Odd Semester 2021/2022

No	Study Program	Average
1	S-1 Indonesian Literature	3.50

Student Learning Load Evaluation Survey Table Odd Semester 2021/2022

Value	Number of Answers	Total Questions	Percentage
1	125	3.150	3,97%
2	106	3.150	3,36%
3	1000	3.150	31,75%
4	1919	3.150	60,92%

Based on the table above, it can be explained that the most answers are at a value of 4 (60.92%), indicating that the majority of respondents are very satisfied. The value of 3 (31.75%) is also quite high, indicating that many respondents rated it as quite good. Only 7.33% (scores 1 and 2) indicate dissatisfaction. The average of 3.50 is in the very good category, indicating a significant improvement in quality or respondent satisfaction.

Based on the balance of answers, respondents who gave low scores were very small (less than 10%). In contrast, more than 92% of respondents gave a score of 3 or 4, meaning that the majority rated it positively.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the above description is that in general, the evaluated

quality is in the very good category (3.50 out of 4). The majority of respondents (92.67%) gave positive assessments (scores of 3 and 4). Only a small proportion (7.33%) gave a negative assessment, so it needs attention but is not dominant. Compared to the previous tables (2.85 → 3.09 → 3.50), there is a clear trend of improvement, indicating a significant increase in satisfaction/quality.

Even Semester 2021/2022

No	Study Program	Average
1	S-1 Indonesian Literature	3.47

Student Learning Load Evaluation Survey Table Even Semester 2021/2022

Value	Number of Answers	Total Questions	Percentage
1	90	2.645	3,40%
2	102	2.645	3,86%
3	930	2.645	35,16%
4	1523	2.645	57,58%

Based on the Student Learning Load Evaluation Survey in the even semester 2021/2022, the Indonesian Literature Study Program obtained an evaluation score of 3.47 with details of the assessment per category: The Question category received an average score of 3.47. This score was obtained from the answers to 2645 questions, namely with details of score 1 (Very Dissatisfied) as many as 90 (3.407%); score 2 (Dissatisfied) as many as 102 (3.86%), score 3 (Satisfied) as many as 930 (35.16%) and score 4 (Very Satisfied) as many as 1523 (57.58%). From the description above, it can be explained that the majority of respondents gave a score of 4 (57.58%), meaning that more than half of the respondents were very satisfied. A score of 3 (35.16%) is also significant, indicating that many respondents rated it as good/satisfied. Only 7.26% (score 1-2) of respondents rated it negatively. The average score obtained was 3.47. This value is in the very good category, close to the maximum score and indicates that respondents' perceptions are predominantly positive.

Based on the balance of responses, it can be explained that almost 93% of respondents gave a score of 3 or 4. This confirms that the quality is very satisfactory. The number of low scores (1 and 2) is relatively small, so the problems are minor.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the above is that in general, the survey results show very good quality, with an average of 3.47. The majority of respondents (92.74%) rated it positively (3 and 4). Only a small proportion (7.26%) were less satisfied, which can be used as input for further improvement.

**D. Evaluation Survey of Lecturers Guiding Final Project
Odd Semester 2021/2022**

Table Evaluation of Lecturers Guiding the Final Project Odd Semester 2021/2022

No	Lecturer	Total Students Mentored	Lecturer Evaluation Score
1	Dr. Dardanila, M.Hum.	3	4,00
2	Drs. Amhar Kudadiri, M.Hum.	8	4,00
3	Dr. Gustianingsih, M.Hum.	1	4,00
4	Dr. Dwi Widayati, M.Hum.	6	3,99
5	Dr. Drs. Mulyadi, M.Hum.	4	3,95
6	Dra. Rosliana Lubis, M.Si.	2	3,93
7	Drs. Asrul Siregar, M.Hum.	1	3,93
8	Dr. Ida Basaria, M.Hum.	2	3,89
9	Emma Marsella, S.S., M.Si.	16	3,88
10	Drs. Haris Sutan Lubis, M.SP	14	3,71
11	Prof. Dr. Ikhwanuddin Nasution, M.Si.	9	3,70
12	Drs. Parlaungan Ritonga, M.Hum.	2	3,69
13	Bambang Riyanto, S.S., M.Si.	9	3,66
14	Dra. Sugihana Sembiring, M.Hum.	6	3,62
15	Dra. Nurhayati Harahap, M.Hum.	13	3,60

Based on the table above, it can be interpreted that there are three lecturers who obtained the highest score (4.00 - perfect), namely Prof. Dr. Dardanila (3 students), Amhar Kudadiri (8 students), and Gustianingsih (1 student). This data shows that the quality of guidance is very good, consistent despite the different number of students (1, 3, to 8). Excellent scores were obtained by six lecturers with an evaluation score range of 3.88 - 3.99, namely Emma Marsella (16 students) with a score of 3.88; Dwi Widayati (6 students) with a score of 3.99; Mulyadi (4 students) with a score of 3.95; Rosliana Lubis (2 students) with a score of 3.93; Ida Basaria (2 students) with a score of 3.89; Asrul Siregar (1 student) with a score of 3.93. These scores show that the mentoring ability remains high even though the number of students mentored varies.

Furthermore, five lecturers with an evaluation score range of 3.62 - 3.71 received good scores, namely Haris Sutan Lubis (14 students) with a score of 3.71; Ikhwanuddin Nasution (9 students) with a score of 3.70; Bambang Riyanto (9 students) with a score of 3.66; Sugihana Sembiring (6 students) with a score of 3.62; and Parlaungan Ritonga (2 students) with a score of 3.69. This means that the evaluation scores obtained by the five lecturers are still good, but lower than the previous group. These lecturers need to pay attention to guidance strategies so

that satisfaction increases. While the relatively low score on the list is Nurhayati Harahap (13 students) with an evaluation score of 3.60). However, this number falls into the good category as it is still above the 3.50 score. This indicates that the heavy mentorship load could be a factor in the decrease of satisfaction.

The conclusion that can be formulated is that the majority of lecturers have scores above 3.7, which means that student guidance in this study program is generally good to very good. Three lecturers (Dardanila, Amhar Kudadiri, and Gustianingsih) stood out with perfect scores (4.00). Emma Marsella deserves appreciation for being able to maintain the quality of her guidance despite guiding the most students (16) with a score of 3.88. Nurhayati Harahap had the lowest score (3.60) despite the high number of students she mentored (13), so she may need attention to improve the quality of her mentorship. Overall, the data shows that the number of students mentored is not always directly proportional to the evaluation score. The quality of mentorship is more decisive than the quantity.

Even Semester 2021/2022

Evaluation Table of Lecturers Guiding the Final Project Even Semester 2021/2022

No	Lecturer	Total Students Mentored	Evaluation Value
1	Dra. Nurhayati Harahap, M.Hum.	6	3.85
2	Drs. Amhar Kudadiri, M.Hum.	6	3.46
3	Prof. Dr. Ikhwanuddin Nasution, M.Si.	4	3.25
4	Emma Marsella, S.S., M.Si.	9	3.11
5	Bambang Riyanto, S.S., M.Si.	4	4.00
6	Drs. Parlaungan Ritonga, M.Hum.	4	3.91
7	Dr. Dwi Widayati, M.Hum.	1	3.64
8	Drs. Haris Sutan Lubis, M.SP	1	3.00
9	Dr. Gustianingsih, M.Hum.	3	3.77
10	Dra. Rosliana Lubis, M.Si.	1	3.93
11	Dr. Drs. Mulyadi, M.Hum.	1	3.95
12	Dr. Dardanila, M.Hum.	2	3.21

Based on the table above, the average evaluation value of Lecturers Guiding Final Project is 3.59. This figure shows a good evaluation value. From these figures, it is known that the lecturer with the highest score is Bambang Riyanto (4.00), which is a perfect score even though he only guides 4 students. Then Mulyadi (3.95) and Rosliana Lubis (3.93). Both have excellent evaluation scores. In contrast, the lecturer with the lowest score was Haris Sutan Lubis (3.00) despite only mentoring 1 student. Likewise, Emma Marsella (3.11) and Dardanila (3.21) received relatively low evaluation scores. This is a record of the need for

attention and evaluation to improve the quality of guidance. Meanwhile, the Lecturer with High Guidance Load is Emma Marsella (9 students, score 3.11). Emma Marsella has a high load, but relatively low evaluation scores. Nurhayati Harahap although guiding 6 students, the evaluation score obtained is quite high, namely 3.85. Likewise, Amhar Kudadiri with a total of 6 students was able to get a good evaluation score of 3.46). This means that the varied evaluation scores show variations in quality despite the same load. There are indications that a higher student load may affect the quality of mentorship, but not always (depending on the individual lecturer).

The distribution of Evaluation Scores with a range of scores between 3.00 - 4.00 shows that almost all lecturers are in the good to very good category. No lecturer scored below 3, meaning that in general the quality of guidance is good.

The conclusion that can be drawn is that the average evaluation score of 3.59 indicates that the overall quality of lecturer guidance is in the excellent category. There are several excellent lecturers with almost perfect scores (≥ 3.9), namely Bambang Riyanto, Mulyadi, Rosliana Lubis, and Parlaungan Ritonga. There are some lecturers who need coaching because their scores are relatively lower (around 3.0-3.2), such as Haris Sutan Lubis, Emma Marsella, and Dardanila. The student load could potentially affect the evaluation scores, but the personal quality of the lecturers is also crucial.

CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION

A. Conclusion

Based on the results of the evaluation survey that has been conducted, it can be concluded that the quality of lecturer teaching is generally in the **very good** category, with an average score between **3.66 - 3.68**. Some lecturers obtained high scores close to perfect (≥ 3.8), while a small number of others were still in the range of **3.0-3.3**, requiring further attention. The level of student satisfaction with the educational process also showed positive results, although there was a decrease from **3.47 in the odd semester** to **3.09 in the even semester**, which indicates the need for improvement in several aspects. Evaluation of student learning load shows satisfactory results with an average of **3.47 - 3.50**, which means that the course load is considered appropriate by most students. Meanwhile, the evaluation of final project guidance also showed very good quality (**average 3.59**), with some lecturers even receiving perfect scores. These findings indicate that teaching load or the number of students supervised does not always determine quality, but is more influenced by the competence and commitment of individual lecturers.

The results of this survey provide a fairly clear picture of student perceptions and expectations of the services they receive. Therefore, follow-up is needed in the form of:

1. A plan to improve the quality of lecturers based on the survey results regarding aspects of teaching quality, guidance, service.
2. Providing a reward & punishment system to improve lecturer performance and educational services.

B. Suggestion

To maintain and improve quality, it is necessary to conduct **training and mentoring** for lecturers who receive relatively low scores, as well as **student-lecturer discussion forums** to accommodate direct input from students. It is also important to improve academic services, improve facilities, and develop **minimum standards for final project guidance services** to maintain consistent quality. On the other hand, lecturers with excellent performance need to be given **appreciation** as a form of motivation. The results of this evaluation should be used as the basis for the preparation of a **continuous improvement** program by the study program so that the quality of learning, academic services, and student satisfaction continues to improve from time to time.