

**ACADEMIC YEAR  
2024/2025**



# **INTERNAL QUALITY AUDIT REPORT EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHER EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAMME**



**LEMBAGA PENJAMINAN MUTU  
UNIVERSITAS PGRI SEMARANG**

*Melaju dengan Mutu*

INTERNAL QUALITY AUDIT REPORT (AMI)  
ACADEMIC YEAR 2024/2025 EARLY  
CHILDHOOD TEACHER EDUCATION  
STUDY PROGRAMME



Auditor:

1. Dr Siimarno, M.Pd.
2. Dr. Moliammad Debbj Rizani, ST, MT.

QUALITY ASSURANCE  
INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITAS  
PERSATUAN GURU REPUBLIK  
INDONESIA SEMARANG  
2025

## FOREWORD

In accordance with Law No. 12 of 12<sup>th</sup> October 2012 on Quality Assurance, SPM management includes the Establishment of Standards (P). Implementation of Standards (P). Evaluation of standard implementation (F.), monitoring of standard implementation (P), and improvement of educational standards (P). The stages in SMI management are known as the PPEPP cycle. In accordance with Perrmenristekdikti No. 2 of 2016, Article 5, the evaluation referred to in the PPEPP cycle is carried out through an Internal Quality Audit.

Internal Quality Audit (AMI) is a systematic, independent and documented process of assessment to ensure that activities at Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang are carried out in accordance with procedures and that the results meet the standards required to achieve the institution's objectives. As such, the Internal Quality Audit (AMI) is a highly strategic measure for the quality development of Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang, particularly for the continuous improvement of quality.

Semarang, 2025  
Ketua LPM,  
  
Drs. Ary Susatyo Nugroho, M.Si



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE .....	1
FOREWORD .....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	3
PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING INTERNAL QUALITY AUDITS .....	4
SUMMARY .....	5
I. INTRODUCTION.....	6
II. AUDIT OBJECTIVES .....	6
III. SCOPE OF THE AUDIT .....	7
IV. AUDIT FINDINGS.....	12
1. AMI Score .....	12
2. Conclusion .....	22
V. APPENDIX .....	22

## PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING AN INTERNAL QUALITY AUDIT




- i. The LPM draws up the AMI implementation programme
2. The LPM submits the AMI schedule to the auditee and the auditor no later than 2 days after the programme has been finalised
3. The auditee downloads the Standard Achievement Form from SIJITU (Form 1)
4. The auditee must complete and upload the Standard Achievement Evaluation Results Form, together with supporting documents, to SIJITU and report to the LPM no later than two weeks after receiving the AMI schedule
5. The LPM assigns a validator to validate the completed Standard Achievement Evaluation Form and report back to the LPM (Form 2)
6. The LPM assigns an auditor to assess the Standard Achievement Evaluation Results Form no later than 2 days after the auditee has completed and uploaded the form.
7. The auditor downloads the Standard Achievement Evaluation Results Form via SIJITU and carries out the assessment independently within one week of receiving the assignment from the LPM
8. Auditors 1 and 2 confirm (if there is a split score) (Form 3)
9. The LPM draws up a field audit schedule for all auditors
- {0. The LPM assigns auditors to carry out the field audit.
11. Conduct of the on-site audit. The auditor prepares the Minutes and Audit Findings and submits them to the auditee. (Forms 4, 5, and 6)
12. Grace period for re-verification with the auditee online (maximum 5 working days)
13. The auditor prepares the audit report and findings if re-verification takes place (Forms 7 and 8)
14. Auditors must upload the results of the on-site audit to SIJITU no later than one week after the audit has been carried out.
15. Auditors prepare a report on the field audit findings and submit it to the LPM.
16. Validation of AMI forms and reports by the LPM
17. The LPM uploads the AMI results to the LPM website so that the auditee can view them.
18. The LPM reports the AMI results to the Vice-Chancellor

## SUMMARY

The Internal Quality Audit (AMI) for the 2024/2025 academic year was an evaluation of the performance of the Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme at Universitas Persatuan Gurur Republik Indonesia Semarang, conducted on 16 October 2025 by a team of auditors from the LPM. This report presents the IQA scores, IQA findings and recommendations for improvement, requests for corrective action (PTK), conclusions, and supporting appendices containing scans of physical documents resulting from the IQA. Based on the AMI results within the Study Programme, several findings and recommendations for improvement were identified, including: Analysis of the fulfilment of graduate learning outcomes (CPL) measured using valid and relevant methods, covering the aspects of: 1) comprehensiveness, 2) depth, and 3) the usefulness of the analysis, as demonstrated by an increase in CPL over time in the last 3 years. The conclusions from the AMI activities in the Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme are as follows: 1) A complete and structured documentation system 'and structured' to support the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI); 2) The department **has been/keke** implementing the internal SPMI consistently and sustainably, and this is well documented; 3) Corrective Action Requests (PTK) from the previous year have been/ i+elure'\* followed up; 4) Findings during this audit period are of a minor/e+ayer\*\* nature.

•) Cross out what is not needed

## I. INTRODUCTION

<b>Work Unit</b>	<b>Early Childhood Teacher Education</b>	
<b>Address</b>	Jl Lontar No 1 Dr Cipto Semarang	
<b>Head of Programme</b>	Dr Anita Candra S, M.Pd	Signed 
<b>Audit Date</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> October 2025	
<b>Chair of the Auditors</b>	Dr Sumarno, M.Pd.	Signed 
<b>Auditor</b>	Dr. Mohammad Debby Rizani, ST., MT	Signed 

## II. AUDIT OBJECTIVES

Tick (✓) as applicable

	Yes	No
a. Ensure that findings/corrective action plans in The previous year's audit cycle has been followed up.	✓	
b. Ensuring the alignment of the direction and implementation of the Study Programme's quality assurance with academic documents and Quality	✓	
c. Mapping the readiness of the Study Programme to implement the accreditation programme		
d. Ensuring the smooth implementation of the management of the Study Programme	✓	
e. Identifying opportunities for improving the quality of the Study Programme	✓	
f. Other objectives, please specify:		

### III. SCOPE OF THE EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AUDIT ( )

1. Educational Standards
  - a. Graduate Competency Standards
  - b. Curriculum Content Standards
  - c. Learning Process Standards
  - d. Learning Assessment Standards
  - e. Standards for Lecturers and Educational Staff
  - f. Learning Facilities and Infrastructure Standards
  - g. Learning Management Standards
  - h. Standards for Education Funding
2. Research Standards
  - a. Research Outcomes Standards
  - b. Research Content Standards
  - c. Research Process Standards
  - d. Research Assessment Standards
  - e. Researcher Standards
  - f. Research Facilities and Infrastructure Standards
  - g. Research Management Standards
  - h. Research Funding and Financing Standards
3. Community Service Standards
  - a. Community Service Output Standards
  - b. Standards for the Content of Community Service
  - c. Community Service Process Standards
  - d. Standards for the Assessment of Community Service
  - e. Implementation Standards for Community Service
  - f. Standards for Facilities and Infrastructure in Community Service
  - g. Management Standards for Community Service
  - h. Standards for Funding and Financing Community Service
4. Additional Standards
  - a. Standards for the vision, mission, objectives and targets of faculties and study programmes
  - b. Governance and Administration Standards
  - c. Admissions Standards
  - d. Student Services Standards
  - f. Institutional collaboration standards

- g. Laboratory standards
- h. Standards for academic affairs and student affairs
- i. Programme Outcomes Standards
- j. MBKM Standards
- k. Service standards
- l. Welfare standards

**AUDIT FINDINGS FORM**  
**INTERNAL QUALITY AUDIT OF PUNIVERSITAS PERSATUAN**  
**GURU REPUBLIK INDONESIA SEMARANG**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR 2024/2025**

**I. Non-conformity**

No Indicator	Indicator	Finding
14	C.3. Students C.3.4. Key Performance Indicators C.3.4.a) Quality of Student Intake A. Recruitment methods and selection criteria.	The selection ratio for student admissions has not yet reached 1:5
21	Assignment of DTSP as the main supervisor for students' final projects.	DTSP are not yet involved in research that relevant

**II. Suggestions for improvement**

No Indicator	Indicator	Findings
14	C.3. Students C.3.4. Key Performance Indicators C.3.4.a) Quality of Student Intake A. Recruitment methods and selection rigour.	Promotion of the dual-major programme is conducted in two languages
21	Assignment of DTSP as the main supervisor for students' final projects.	DTSP staff need to be involved in relevant research

**III. Audit Conclusions**

The audit team concluded:

1. The documentation system is sufficiently comprehensive and structured to support the Internal Quality Assurance System. \*(Yes/No/Other )
2. The study programme has implemented the Internal Quality Assurance System consistently and continuously. \*(Yes/No/Other .....) )
3. The requests for corrective action (RCA) relating to previous audit findings have been effectively addressed. \*(Yes/No)-If not, state the audit team's recommendations:.....
4. Findings for this audit period are: ~~Non-conformities~~

\*(KTS)/Observations/No findings



(Dr. Anita Chandra Dewi S., M.Pd.)

*Auditee*

Semarang, 16 Oktober 2025



(Dr. Sumarno, M.Pd.)

*Chair of the Audit*

\*) Delete as appropriate

*\*coret yg tidak perlu*

**FORM FOR REQUEST OF CORRECTIVE ACTION (PTK) FOR  
THE INTERNAL QUALITY AUDIT OF UNIVERSITAS  
PERSATUAN GURU REPUBLIK INDONESIA SEMARANG  
ACADEMIC YEAR 2024/2025**

Faculty	: Faculty of Education		
Study Programme	: Early Childhood Teacher Education		
Head of Study Programme	: Dr Anita Chandra, M.Pd.		
Chair of the Auditors	: Dr Sumarno, M.Pd	Audit Date	:
Description of PTK 1: promotion was carried out and RPL was received			
Indicator No.: 14	Category:	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-conformity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation
Description of PTK 2: Integrating DTSP into the programme's curriculum			
Indicator No.: 21	Category:	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-conformity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation

Semarang, October 2025



(Dr Sumarno, M.Pd.)  
Chair of the Auditors

#### IV. AUDIT RESULTS

##### 1. Audit Score

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor's Score	Weight	Score x Weight
1	A. External Conditions Consistency with the results of the SWOT analysis and/or other analyses, as well as future development plans.	4	1.00	4.00
2	B. Profile of the Programme Management Unit The comprehensiveness of the information in the profile and the consistency between the profile and the data and information provided for each criterion, as well as demonstrating a climate conducive to development and a reputation as a leading authority in its field of expertise.	4	1.00	4.00
3	C. Criteria C.1. Vision, Mission, Objectives and Strategy C.1.4. Key Performance Indicators Alignment of the Vision, Mission, Objectives and Strategy (VMTS) of the Programme Study Management Unit (UPPS) with the VMTS of the Higher Education Institution (PT) and the academic vision of the Programme Study (PS) it manages.	4	0.51	2.04
4	Mechanisms and stakeholder involvement in the development of the UPPS VMTS.	4	1.02	<b>4.09</b>
5	Strategies for achieving objectives are formulated based on systematic analysis, and monitoring and evaluation are carried out during implementation, with appropriate follow-up.	4	1,53	6.13
6	C.2. Governance, Management and Cooperation C.2.4. Key Performance Indicators C.2.4.a) Governance System A. The completeness of the organisational structure and the effectiveness of organisational management. B. The realisation of good governance and the fulfilment of the five pillars of the governance system, which include: 1) Credibility, 2) Transparency, 3) Accountability, 4) Responsibility, 5) Fairness.	4	0.34	1.36

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor's Score	Weight	Score x Weight
7	<p>C.2.4.b) Leadership and Managerial Capabilities</p> <p>A. Commitment of UPPS leadership.</p> <p>B. Capabilities of UPPS leadership, covering the following aspects:  1) planning, 2) organising, 3) staff deployment, 4) implementation, 5) control and supervision, and 6) reporting, which forms the basis for follow-up action.</p>	4	0.34	1.36
8	<p>C.2.4.c) Cooperation</p> <p>Quality, benefits, satisfaction and sustainability of educational, research and community engagement partnerships relevant to the study programme. UPPS has valid evidence that existing collaborations have fulfilled the following three aspects: 1) providing benefits to the study programme in fulfilling the learning, research and community engagement processes; 2) enhancing the performance of the three pillars of higher education and the supporting facilities of the study programme; 3) ensuring the satisfaction of industry partners and other collaborative partners, as well as guaranteeing the sustainability of the collaboration and its outcomes.</p>	4	0.68	2.73
9	<p>A. Educational, research and community engagement collaborations relevant to the study programme and managed by the UPPS over the last three years.</p> <p>B. International, national, regional/local collaborations relevant to the study programme and managed by the UPPS over the past three years. Table 1 LKPS</p>	4	0.34	1.36

10	C.2.5 Additional Performance Indicators for Exceeding SN-D1KTI (additional performance ) set by the UPPS for each criterion.	4	0.68	2.73
11	C.2.6 Evaluation of Performance Achievement An analysis of the success and/or failure of the UPPS in achieving the performance targets set for each criterion covers the following two aspects: 1) performance achievements are measured using appropriate methods, and the results are analysed and evaluated, and 2) the analysis of performance achievements includes the identification of root causes, factors supporting success and factors hindering the achievement of standards, and a brief description of the follow-up actions to be taken.	4	<b>1.02</b>	4.09

No.	Criteria/Element/Indicator	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
12	C.2.7. Quality Assurance Implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (academic and non-academic) as evidenced by the presence of 5 aspects: 1) legal documents establishing the quality assurance implementation units, 2) availability of quality documents: SPMI policies, SPMI manuals, SPMI standards, and SPMI forms, 3) the implementation of the quality assurance cycle (PPEPP cycle), 4) valid evidence of the effectiveness of quality assurance implementation, and 5) the use of external benchmarking for quality improvement.	4	1,36	5.45
13	C.2.8. Stakeholder Satisfaction Measurement of management service satisfaction among stakeholders: students, lecturers, educational staff, graduates, users and partners, covering the following aspects: 1) use of valid, reliable and user-friendly satisfaction instruments, 2) conducted periodically, with data recorded comprehensively, 3) analysed using appropriate methods that are useful for decision-making, 4) satisfaction levels and feedback are followed up to ensure regular and systematic improvement and enhancement of the quality of outcomes, 5) a review is conducted of the implementation of lecturer and student satisfaction surveys, and 6) the results are published and easily accessible to lecturers and students.	3.5	1.36	4.77
14	C.3. Students C.3.4. Key Performance Indicators C.3.4.a) Quality of Student Intake A. Recruitment methods and selection rigour. Table 2.a LKPS	2.07	4.60	9.52
15	C.3.4.b) Programme Appeal A. Increased interest among prospective students. Table 2.a LKPS B. International students Table 2.b LKPS	3.48	3.07	10.67
16	C.3.4.c) Student Services A. Availability of student services in the areas of: 1) reasoning, interests and talents, 2) welfare (guidance and counselling, scholarship services, and health services), and 3) career guidance and entrepreneurship. B. Access to and quality of student services.	4.	1.53	6.13

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
17	C.4. Human Resources C.4.4. Key Performance Indicators C.4.4.a) Lecturer Profile Adequacy of the number of DTPS. Table 3.a.1) LKPS	4	0.74	2.97
18	Academic qualifications of DTPS. Table 3.a.1) LKPS	4	0.99	3.96
19	Academic position DTPS. Table 3.a.1) LKPS	4	0.50	1.98
20	The ratio of the number of students in the study programme to number of DTPS. Table 2.a LKPS Table 3.a.1) LKPS	4	0.50	1.98
21	Assignment of DTPS as primary supervisor student final projects. Table 3.a.2) LKPS	2.48	0.99	2.4
22	Full-time teaching equivalence (DTPS). Table 3.a.3) LKPS	4	0.25	0.99
23	Non-permanent lecturers. Table 3.a.4) LKPS	4	0.50	1.98
24	C.4.4.b) Lecturer Performance Recognition of expertise/achievements/performance of DTPS. Table 3.b.1) LKPS	4	0.81	3.24
25	DTPS research activities relevant to the field of study in the last 3 years. Table 3.b.2) LKPS	3.72	0.81	3.02
26	DTPS Community Engagement Activities relevant to the field of the study programme over the last 3 years. Table 3.b.3) LKPS	3.64	0.41	1.48
27	Scientific publications on topics relevant to the field of study produced by DTPS over the last 3 years. Table 3.b.4) LKPS	4	0.81	3.24
28	DTPS scientific articles cited in the last 3 the last year. Table 3.b.5) LKPS	4	0.81	3.24
29	Research and Community Engagement outputs produced by DTPS over the last 3 years. Table 3.b.7) LKPS	4	0,81	3.24

30	C.4.4.c) Lecturer Development Lecturer development initiatives.	4	2.23	8.92
----	--	---	------	------

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
31	C.4.4.d) Educational Support Staff A. Qualifications and adequacy of support staff based on their job type (administration, librarians, technicians, etc.) B. Qualifications and adequacy of laboratory assistants to support the learning process in accordance with the needs of the study programme.	4	1.12	4.46
32	C.S. Finance, Facilities and Infrastructure C.5.4. Key Performance Indicators C.5.4.a) Finance Operational costs of education. Table 4 LKPS	4	0.77	3.07
33	DTPS research funds. Table 4 LKPS	4	0.77	3.07
34	Community service funds DTPS. Table 4 LKPS	4	0.38	1.53
35	Realisation of investment (human resources, facilities and infrastructure) supporting the implementation of the three pillars of higher education.	4	0.38	1.53
36	Sufficient funding to ensure the achievement of learning outcomes.	3.8	0.77	2.91
37	C.5.4.b) Facilities and Infrastructure The adequacy, accessibility and quality of facilities and infrastructure ensure the achievement of learning outcomes and enhance the academic atmosphere.	4	3.07	12.27
38	C.6. Education C.6.4. Key Performance Indicators C.6.4.a) Curriculum A. Stakeholder involvement in the curriculum evaluation and updating process. B. Alignment of learning outcomes with graduate profiles and KKNI/SKKNI levels. C. Appropriateness of the curriculum structure in the formulation of learning outcomes.	4	2.51	10.04
39	C.6.4.b) Characteristics of the Learning Process Fulfilment of the characteristics of the learning process, comprising the following features: i) interactive, 2) holistic, 3) integrative, 4) scientific, 5) contextual, 6) thematic, 7) effective, 8) collaborative, and 9) student-centred.	4	0.84	3.35

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
40	C.6.4.c) Learning Process Plan A. Availability and completeness of the semester learning plan (RPS) documents. B. The depth and breadth of the RPS are in line with graduate learning outcomes.	4	1.67	6.69
41	C.6.4.d) Implementation of the Learning Process A. Forms of interaction between lecturers, students and learning resources. B. Monitoring the alignment of the process with the learning plan. C. The learning process associated with research must comply with the Higher Education Research Standards (SN Dikti Penelitian): 1) research outcomes: must contribute to the development of science, technology, and innovation; improve public welfare; and enhance national competitiveness. 2) research content: must demonstrate the depth and breadth of the research material in line with the learning outcomes. 3) research process: must encompass planning, implementation, and reporting. 4) Research assessment must fulfil the elements of being educational, objective, accountable, and transparent. D. Learning processes related to Community Engagement (PkM) must comply with the Higher Education Standards for Community Engagement (SN Dikti PkM): 1) Community Engagement outcomes: must contribute to the development of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (IPTEKS), improve community welfare, and enhance national competitiveness. 2) PkM content: meets the depth and breadth of PkM material in line with the learning outcomes. 3) PkM process: covers planning, implementation and reporting. 4) PkM assessment	4	1.12	4.46
42	meets the criteria of being educational, objective, accountable, and transparent. E. Alignment of teaching methods with learning outcomes. Examples: RBE (research-based education), IBE (industry-based education), <u>teaching factors/teaching industry</u> etc. <u>Learning</u> conducted in the form of practical sessions, studio practice, workshop practice, or field practice. Table 5.a LKPS	4	0.56	2.23

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
43	C.6.4.e) Monitoring and Evaluation of the Learning Process Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the learning process covers the characteristics, planning, implementation, learning process and student workload required to achieve the graduate learning outcomes.	4	2.51	10.04
44	C.6.4.f) Learning Assessment A. The quality of the implementation of learning assessment (the process and outcomes of student learning) to measure the achievement of learning outcomes based on assessment principles that include: 1) educational, 2) authentic, 3) objective, 4) accountable, and 5) transparency, carried out in an integrated manner. B. The implementation of assessment consists of assessment techniques and instruments. Assessment techniques consist of: 1) observation, 2) participation, 3) practical demonstration, 4) written test, 5) oral test, and 6) questionnaire. Assessment instruments consist of: 1) process assessment in the form of a rubric, and/or, 2) outcome assessment in the form of a portfolio, or 3) design work. C. The implementation of assessment includes the following elements: 1) having an assessment plan agreement, 2) carrying out assessment in accordance with the agreement, 3) providing feedback and giving students <b>the opportunity to question the results</b> , 4) having documentation of the assessment of the process and learning outcomes of students, 5) having procedures which includes the planning stage, the assignment of tasks or questions, performance observation, the feedback of observation results, and the awarding of final marks; 6) assessment reporting in the form of a letter and numerical grade indicating the student's success in completing a course; 7) having evidence of plans and having implemented improvement processes based on the results of assessment monitoring and evaluation.	4	DTPS over the last 3 years. Table 5.b   1.67  6.69	
45	C.6.4.g) Integration of research and community engagement activities in learning Integration of research and PkM activities into learning by	4		

1.67      6.69

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
46	C.6.4.h) Academic Atmosphere The implementation and regularity of programmes and activities outside of structured learning activities to enhance the academic atmosphere. Examples: student association activities, public lectures/studium generale, academic seminars, book reviews.	4	2.51	10.04
47	C.6.4.i) Student Satisfaction A. Level of student satisfaction with the educational process. Table 5.c LKPS B. Analysis and follow-up of student satisfaction survey results.	4	3.35	13.38
48	C.7. Research C.7.4. Key Performance Indicators C.7.4.a) Research Relevance The relevance of research at UPPS encompasses the following elements: 1) having a roadmap that encompasses the research themes of lecturers and students, 2) lecturers and students carry out research in accordance with the lecturers' research agenda, which refers to the research roadmap; 3) evaluate the alignment of lecturers' and students' research with the roadmap; and 4) use the results of the evaluation to improve the relevance of the research and the academic development of the study programme.	4	1.53	6.13
49	C.7.4.b) Faculty and Student Research DTPS research involving students from the study programme over the last 3 years.	4	3.07	12.27

Table 6.a LKPS

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
50	C.8. Community Service C.8.4. Key Performance Indicators C.8.4.a) Relevance of Community Service The relevance of Community Engagement (PkM) at UPPS encompasses the following elements: 1) having a roadmap that encompasses the PkM themes of lecturers and students as well as the commercialisation/application of the academic discipline of the study programme, 2) lecturers and students carrying out PkM in accordance with the PkM roadmap, 3) evaluating the alignment of lecturers' and students' PkM with the roadmap, and 4) using the evaluation results to improve the relevance of PkM and the academic development of the study programme.	4	0.51	2.04
51	C.8.4.b) PkM for Lecturers and Students: DTSP PkM which, in its implementation, involved students from the study programme over the last 3 years.	4	1.02	4.09
52	Table 7 LKPS C.9. Outputs and Achievements of the Tridharma C.9.4. Key Performance Indicators C.9.4.a) Outputs of the Dharma of Education An analysis of the achievement of graduate learning outcomes (GLOs), measured using valid and relevant methods, covers the following aspects: 1) comprehensiveness, 2) depth, and 3) the usefulness of the analysis, as demonstrated by the improvement in CPL over time in the last 3 years.	4	1.92	7.67
53	Graduates' GPA. Table 8.a LKPS	4	1.92	7.67
54	Student academic performance over the last three years. Table 8.b.i) LKPS	4	2.88	11.50
55	Student achievements in non-academic fields over the last three years. Table 8.b.2) LKPS	3.58	0.96	3.43
56	Duration of study. Table 8.c LKPS	4	1.92	7.67
57	On-time graduation. Table 8.c LKPS	4	1.92	7.67
58	Academic success. Table 8.c LKPS	3.71	1.92	7.11

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
59	The implementation of the tracer study covers the following 5 aspects: 1) the tracer study is coordinated at university level, 2) tracer study activities are carried out regularly every year and are documented, 3) the questionnaire covers all core questions of the DIKTI tracer study, 4) it targets the entire population (graduates from TS-4 to TS-2), and 5) the results are disseminated and used for curriculum and teaching.	4	2.88	11.50
60	Waiting time. _____ Table 8.d.1) LKPS	4	2.88	11.50
61	Relevance of field of work. Table 8.d.2) LKPS	4	1.92	7.67
62	Level and size of graduates' workplaces. Table 8.e.1) LKPS	3	1.92	5.75
63	Graduate user satisfaction levels. _____ Table 8.e.2) LKPS	3.44	3.83	13.19
64	C.9.4.b) External Research and Community Engagement Scientific publications by students, produced independently or in collaboration with the DTSPS, with titles relevant to the field of study within the last three years. Table 8.f.1) LKPS	3.86	2.88	11.10
65	Research and Community Engagement (PkM) outputs produced by students, either independently or in collaboration with the DTSPS, within the last 3 years. Table 8.f.4) LKPS	4	0.96	3.83
66	D Analysis and Determination of Development Programmes D.1 Analysis and Performance Achievements The comprehensiveness (completeness, breadth, and depth), accuracy, precision, and appropriateness of the analysis of performance achievements, as well as consistency with each criterion.	4	1.50	6.00
67	D.2 SWOT Analysis or Other Relevant Analyses The accuracy of the SWOT analysis or relevant analysis in developing strategies.	4	2.00	8.00
68	D.3 Development Programme Accuracy in setting priorities for development programmes.	4	1.50	6.00

No.	Criteria/Elements/Indicators	Auditor Score	Weight	Score x Weight
69	D.4 Sustainability Programme L PI's has a policy, the availability of resources, the capability to implement, and programme implementation.	4	1.00	4.00
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>100.00</b>	<b>381.39</b>

The score obtained is 381.7 out of a total score of 400.

## 2. Conclusion

The conclusions drawn from the AMI activities in the Early Childhood Education Study Programme are: 1) A comprehensive documentation system. ' and 'structured/less structured' \*' to support SPM1;

2) Work units are able to implement the internal SPM consistently and continuously, and this is well documented; 3) Requests for corrective action (PTK) from the previous year have been followed up; 4) Findings in this audit period are of a minor nature '.

## V. APPENDIX

1. AM1 Attendance List
3. Minutes of the Implementation of AM1
4. Documentation of AM1 Implementation
5. Assignment Letter for the Implementation of AMI

*\*coret yg tidak perlu*



QUALITY ASSURANCE INSTITUTE (LPM)  
**UNIVERSITAS PERSATUAN GURU  
REPUBLIK INDONESIA SEMARANG**

Jl. Sidodødi Timur No. 24, Semarang

Telp/Fax: (024) 8444967 <http://lpm.upgris.ac.id> email: [lpm@upgris.ac.id](mailto:lpm@upgris.ac.id)

**MINUTES OF THE INTERNAL QUALITY AUDIT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME**

Number:...../LPM/UPGRIS/X/2025

On, Thursday, 16<sup>th</sup> October 2025 at 08.00 WIB,  
held in Laboratory Room 407, the Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme  
conducted an Internal Quality Audit (AMI) by the AMI Auditors from Universitas Persatuan  
Guru Republik Indonesia Semarang on:

Study Programme : Early Childhood Teacher Education

Academic Year : 2024/2025

The Internal Quality Audit was attended by the Head of the Study Programme and his staff.

The audit results were recorded on the following form:

1. AMI Assessment Results
2. Audit Findings Form
3. Corrective Action Request Form

This report has been drawn up truthfully for information and use as appropriate.

Semarang, 16<sup>th</sup> October 2025

Chair of the Auditors,

Auditee  
Head of the Studies Programme,

Dr. Anita Chandra Dewi S, M.Pd.








Dr. Sumarno, M.Pd.

In the presence of

Dekan  
  
Dr. Arri Handayani, S.Psi, M.Si

ATTENDANCE LIST FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF AMI AT  
UNIVERSITAS PERSATUAN GURU  
REPUBLIK INDONESIA SEMARANG

Name of Study Programme/ Auditee                      Early Childhood Teacher Education  
Name of Chair of the Auditors                              Dr. Sumarno, M.Pd.  
Date of Audit    16<sup>th</sup> October 2025  
Place of Audit    Early Childhood Education Teacher Study  
Programme Lab

No.	Name	Position	Signature
1	Dr Sumano, M.Ed	Chair of the Auditors	
2.	Dr M. Debby Rizani, BSc, MSc	Auditee	
3.	Sr. Siti Fitriana, M.Ed. (Cons.)	Vice Dean 1 Faculty of Education	
4.	Dr. Anita Chandra Dcwi S, M.Ed.	Head of the Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme	
5	Dr Ratna Wahyu Pusari, M.Ed.	Lecturer in Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme	
6.	Oktavia Indah Permuta Sary, BEd, MEd	Lecturer in Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme	
7.	Carissa Rissiasal Sabilla, BEd	Laboratory Assistant, Early Childhood Education Programme	

Semarang, 16 October 2025

  
Dr Anita Chandra Dcwi S, M.Ed.  
At/;fee

  
Dr Sumarno, MEd  
Family

Documentation of AMI Implementation





QUALITY ASSURANCE INSTITUTE (LPM)  
**UNIVERSITAS PERSATUAN GURU  
REPUBLIK INDONESIA SEMARANG**

at Sidodadi Timur No. 24, Semarang

Tel/Fax: (024) 8444967 <http://lpm.upgris.ac.id> email: [lpm@upgris.ac.id](mailto:lpm@upgris.ac.id)

ASSIGNMENT LETTER

Number: 033/LPM/UPGRIS/X/2025

The Quality Assurance Agency of UPGRIS hereby assigns  
to the person named below:

Name - Dr Mohammad Debby Rizani, ST, MT.  
NIDN . 0602077402

Jabatan Lektor  
Position : Lecturer in Civil Engineering  
On Day, Date : Tuesday, 14 October 2025  
Purpose : To conduct an Internal Quality Audit (AMI) for the  
Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme  
Venue : Smdi Programme Office

This letter of assignment is hereby issued to be carried out to the best of one's ability  
and with full responsibility.

Telah melaksanakan tugas:

Dr. Arri Handayani, S.Psi., M.Si

Semarang, 13 Oktober 2025  
Ketua LPM,



Ary Susatyo Nugroho, M.Si  
DIP 196908261994031003



QUALITY ASSURANCE INSTITUTE (LPM)  
**UNIVERSITAS PERSATUAN GURU  
REPUBLIK INDONESIA SEMARANG**

at Sidodadi Timur No. 24, Semarang

Tel/Fax: (024) 8444967 <http://lpm.upgris.ac.id> email: [lpm@upgris.ac.id](mailto:lpm@upgris.ac.id)

**SURAT TUGAS**

No. 333/LPM/U PCiR IS/X/2025

The Quality Assurance Institute of UPGRIS hereby assigns the following duties to the person named below

Name : Dr Mohammad Debby R izani, ST, M 1 .  
NIDN : 0602077402  
Position : Lecturer  
Occupation : Lecturer in Civil Engineering  
On the day, the date : Tuesday, 14 October 2025  
Purpose : Conducting an Internal Quality Audit (AMI) in the  
Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Programme  
Tempat : Study Programme Office

This letter of assignment is hereby issued to be carried out to the best of one's ability and with full responsibility.

Telah melaksanakan tugas:

  
Dr. Arri Handayani, S.Psi., M.Si

Semarang, 13 Oktober 2025

K



Dr. Ary Susanto Nugroho, M.Si  
NIP 19690826 1'79403 1 103