International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Is Transparency Still Valuable When Budget Details Are Wrong?

Tri Diana Sari[1], Nuri Susilawati[2], Teguh Wahyudi[3], Masita Nur Hayati[4]

[1,2,3,4] Budget Analyst, Planning and Budgeting Directorate, Universitas Negeri SurabayaIndonesia

Abstract

This research aims to explore how universities use budgets to achieve their goals. Using a qualitative approach, we interviewed the deputy dean responsible for managing the university budget and the head of planning and budgeting to explain how they interpreted the 2023 budget to achieve the university's goals. Based on theirstatements, this research found that there were inconsistencies, meaningless words,and ambiguous descriptions but the aim remained the same. So our findings suggestthat objectives become unimportant when the budget is irrelevant, transparency becomes useless due to incorrect budget details.

Keywords: university budget, budget transparency, budget irrelevance, incorrect budget detail

INTRODUCTION

Universities, to ensure the achievement of their goals, need to develop university budgets. The budget development mechanism functions as a tool to measure and provide incentives for achieving performance indicators at universities, encouraging accountability and continuous improvement (Cotelnic, 2022; Parasiy- Vergunenko, 2019). This research aims to find out how university budget development

mechanism can be used to measure the achievement of its performance indicators. There are many previous studies discuss the effect of performance measurement on budget execution and how performance indicators are used to monitor and evaluate budget implementation (Laili & Sari, 2022). This research is important because performance measurement is very important for successful budget management (Eduardo, 2017).

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Key performance indicators (KPI) are metrics used to measure the performance and progress of an organization or a specific activity (Zhang et al., 2020). Key performance indicators need to be linier with university's strategic goals, as it help university assessing the progress towards achieving strategic goals and objectives (Safonov et al., 2022). When developing university KPIs, applying SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achieveable, Relevant, and Time-bound) principles is important to ensure metrics are well-defined and aligned with strategic goals (Bjerke & Renger, 2017; Sagara, 2022). Measuring key performance indicators must include measuring budget effectiveness which consists of indicators related to transparency of the budget process, achievement of public policy objectives, efficiency of public financial management, and evaluation of the effectiveness of budget programs. These indicators can provide information regarding the use of budget funds, spending structure, economic characteristics of public spending, and the level of achievement of public policy objectives. They can also help monitor and evaluate the quality of financial execution, measure the success of planned programs and activities, and assess the budgetary performance of an organization (Laili & Sari, 2022; Zapico-Goni, 1997). Transparency allows external actors to monitor and asses organization's internal workings and performance (Grimmelikhuijsen et al., 2017). The university's KPI system should be regularly evaluated, monitored, and challenged to ensure its effectiveness in measuring performance indicators, as this ongoing process helps identify any drawbacks and challenges faced during the performance measurement of universities (Antipova, 2021)

Unfortunately, all of the research above does not explore how budget details are presented. This presentation is important because as mentioned above, the budget will be used to monitor and evaluate performance. If the details are not correct, can the budget be used to measure? Is transparency of value? We agree that transparency is important in public sector organizations, such as public universities (Bernhard, 2012; Castro, 2012; Grimmelikhuijsen et al., 2017; Vaccaro & Madsen, 2009), but the number of studies on public sector transparency is small (Grimmelikhuijsen et al., 2017), especially on higher education institute. Start from this point, this research provides a good example of how the details of a university's budget are relevant to its measurement of university performance. The transparency will meaningless without detail and correct budget description.

(Sukmono, 2016) conducted research at BPPK and found that the implementation of key budget performance indicators showed differences in budget expenditure from

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

2011 to 2014, which shows that priority indicators have an impact on improving business processes. These findings imply how important budget indicators are to help monitor performance. This study also illustrates how the budget amount increases from year to year, but budget absorption at the end of the year is still small. These findings indicate that budget planning has not been carried out properly. Once again, studying the details of the budget will save the organization from ineffective use of funds. Another finding is that commitment from all departments involved is very important to improve employee performance, and continuous monitoring and evaluation by top managers can strengthen the commitment of middle and operational managers. This means that the budget needs to be implemented by the right personnel, the right people according to their responsibilities.

Other research in Indonesia conducted by (Ihwan & Rahman, 2016) explains why the implementation of performance-based budgeting in the Malang city government was not optimal until 2015. This is because the determination of performance indicators in local governments must be adjusted and aligned with regional and national programs. However, outcome indicators, benefits and impacts

are still difficult to determine, thus hampering the maximization of performance measurement

Objectives

This article intends

To describe the sufficiency of program or activities in university budget

To describe the relevancies between program or activities towards its university performance indicators

To analyze the impact of budget detail towards university performance indicators

DISCUSSION

This research uses qualitative and quantitative data in the form of annual plans and budgets for 2023 taken from the university's e-planning program. After the data was collected, we used a qualitative approach to describe and interpret the data by interviewing 7 informants from the general and assets department of the faculty as well as the head of planning and development at UNESA. Interviews were recorded and transcribed using a speechnotes application and then coded and categorized to obtain interpretations and conclusions.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Data on from speechnotes are presented in table 1 and table 2 below. The data is grouping based on its relevance to the indicator, for example the focus of table 1a is the indicator of being self-employed, all data group based on each sub-indicator.

Table 1a: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #1: Percentage of S1 and D4/D3/D2 graduates who succeeded in become self-employed

N0	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with indicator			
			amount	getting a job	continuing studies	self- employed
1	Student Entrepreneurship	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Enterpreneurship is quite				Y
		small PD: However, the problem is not only the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to students becoming self-employed criteria. Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse due to misinterpretation				
18	Carrying out student entrepreneurship training	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Enterpreneurship training is quite small PD: However, the problem is not only the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to students becoming self-employed criteria. Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid bias target				
25	Student Entrepreneurship	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Enterpreneurship is quite small PD: However, the problem is not only the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to students becoming self-employed criteria. Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse misuse due to misinterpretation				

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

19	Carrying out Student Digital Entrepreneurship Innovation Training	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Enterpreneurship training is quite small PD: However, the problem is not only the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to students becoming self-employed criteria. Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid bias target				
20	Carry out selection for entrepreneurial student programs	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Enterpreneurship training is quite small PD: However, the problem is not only the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to students becoming self-employed criteria. Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid bias target				
21	Providing entrepreneurial working capital	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Enterpreneurship training is quite small PD: However, the problem is not only the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to students becoming self-employed criteria. Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid bias target, for example laboratory optimalization activity (is there direct relationship?)				
22	Carrying out monitoring and evaluation of entrepreneurial student programs	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Enterpreneurship training is quite small PD: However, the problem is not only the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to students becoming self-employed criteria. Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid bias target				

Table 1b: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #1: Percentage of S1 and D4/D3/D2 graduates who succeeded in getting a job

No	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with indicator			
			Amount	getting a job	continuing studies	self-employed

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

	Student Career Development	BO: The proportion of the budget for student career development is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are aligned, but more detailed and definite output measurements need to be carried out to avoid misuse of the budget or misinterpretation of targets.				

7	Implementing a Job Fair	BO: The proportion of the budget for job fair is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are aligned, but more detailed and definite output measurements need to be carried out to avoid misuse of the budget or misinterpretation of targets. For instances international accreditation and entrepreneur expo.		Y	X	X
8	Organizing Career Seminars/Workshops	BO: The proportion of the budget for student career workshop is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are aligned, but more detailed and definite output measurements need to be carried out to avoid,misuse of the budget or misinterpretation of targets.	X	Y	X	X
10	Carrying out Certified Internships	BO: The proportion of the budget for student career development is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are aligned. But this program is also better suited for performance indicator #2. Therefore, the budget owner must provide a rational explanation regarding which indicators are better met	X	X	X	X
5	Carrying out Student Soft Skills Training	BO: The proportion of the budget for student career development is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are aligned, but more detailed and definite output measurements need to be carried out to avoid budget misuse or misinterpretation of targets, for example student competition activities are not suitable for this program and also outclass learning is more suitable for performance indicator #2.	X	Y	X	X
6	Carrying out Student Competency Tests	BO: The proportion of the student competency test budget is not proportional to the number of students PD: Aligned program and performance indicators. This competency certification is actually needed by companies to guarantee the quality of prospective employees	X	Y	X	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

13	Conduct User Surveys	BO: The proportion of the student survey budget is proportional to the number of students PD: There is alignment of programs and performance indicators. This is a routine program so it is necessary to follow up and monitor the input rather than just conducting a survey.	X	Y	X	X
24	Carrying out Student Soft Skills Training	BO: The proportion of the budget for student career development is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are aligned, but more detailed and definite output measurements need to be carried out to avoid budget misuse or misinterpretation of targets, for example student competition activities are not suitable for this program and also outclass learning is more suitable for performance indicator #2.	X	Y	X	X
11	Carry out Tracer Study Activities	BO: The proportion of the tracer survey budget is proportional to the number of students PD: There is alignment of programs and performance indicators. This is a routine program so it is necessary to follow up and monitor the feedback results rather than just conducting a survey	Y	Y	X	X
4	Tracking Studies and User Surveys	BO: The proportion of the tracer survey budget is proportional to the number of students PD: There is alignment of programs and performance indicators. This is a routine program so it is necessary to follow up and monitor the feedback results rather than just conducting a survey	Y	Y	X	X
12	Developing tracer study applications/information systems	BO: The proportion of the tracer program development budget is appropriate and important to maintain its function PD: There is alignment of programs and performance indicators, but the budget is too large for routine maintenance.		Y	X	X
23	Judicial and Graduation	University mandatory				

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 1c: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #1: Percentage of S1 and D4/D3/D2 graduates who succeeded in continuing studies

No	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with indicator			
			amount	getting a job	continuing studies	self-employed
14	Carrying out student scholarship socialization	BO: The budget is appropriate and need to increase the number of prospective graduate students PD: There is alignment of programs and performance indicators. However, because this program is routine and there is misuse of the budget, for example the outreach of the Student Creativity Program should be included in performance indicator #2, namely meeting student achievements at the national level. And there is also a mismatch in activities, namely surveys of scholarship recipient students.	X	Y	X	X
15	Carrying out the selection of scholarship recipient students	BO: The budget is appropriate and need to increase the number of prospective graduate students PD: There is alignment of programs and performance indicators. However, because this program is routine and there is misuse of the budget, for example the outreach of the Student Creativity Program should be included in performance indicator #2, namely meeting student achievements at the national level. And there is also a mismatch in activities, namely surveys of scholarship recipient students.	X	Y	X	X
9	Organizing Advanced Study Seminars	BO: The proportion of seminars is sufficient. Because, this seminar is only to promote postgraduate programs and motivate undergraduate students to continue their studies. PD: There is alignment of programs and performance indicators. However, there is one program that is not yet aligned, namely student	Y	X	Y	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

		exchange which is more in line with performance indicator #2				
2	Awarding Scholarships	BO: The proportion of the budget for students is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are not aligned because this target is not for undergraduates but for undergraduates to continue their studies. However, if universities want to distribute to undergraduate students, they should consider it in proportion to the main target, namely postgraduate students.	X	X	X	X
17	Carry out management of scholarship funds	BO: The proportion of the budget for students is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are not aligned because this target is not for undergraduates but for undergraduates to continue their studies. However, if universities want to distribute to undergraduate students, they should consider it in proportion to the main target, namely postgraduate students.	X	X	X	X
16	Providing/distributing scholarships to scholarship recipients	BO: The proportion of the budget for students is quite small PD: Program and performance indicators are not aligned because this target is not for undergraduates but for undergraduates to continue their studies. However, if universities want to distribute to undergraduate students, they should consider it in proportion to the main target, namely postgraduate students.	X	X	X	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 2a: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #2: Percentage of undergraduate and D4/D3/D2 students who earned at least 20 (twenty) credits outside campus; or achieved the lowest achievement at national level

No	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with indicator		
			Amount	External	National achievemen
1	Student activities	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small (2%) PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	X	X
42	Student Activity Unit and Student Organizations	BO: The budget proportion for the activities of Student Activity Units and Student Organizations is appropriate because the activities of Student Activity Units and Student Organizations are very high even though difficult to measure its relevance to student academic performance. PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	Y	X	X
4	Students who carry out Student Organization activities	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	X	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

5	Students who carry out Student Leader Election activities	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	X	X
6	Carrying out Student Leader Election activities	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	X	X
7	Students who carry out student activities	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	X	X

20	Carry out Student Council activities	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition?	X	X	X
21	Carrying out student organization activities	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: However, the problem is not the	X	X	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

		numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition?			
24	Carry out student Council coaching activities		X	X	X
28	Carrying out Student Management Leadership Training	BO: The proportion of the budget is small because there are no clear and measurable targets. PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	X	X
22	Carrying out Student Assistance Guide Training activities	BO: The proportion of the budget is small because there are no clear and measurable targets. PD: This needs to be done in detail to avoid misinterpretation and misuse of the budget	X	X	X

Table 2b: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #2: Percentage of undergraduate and D4/D3/D2 students who earned at least 20 (twenty) credits outside campus; or achieved the lowest achievement at national level

No	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with indicator		
			Amount	External	Program/ activities
2	Student Competitions/Contest ation	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: This program is very closed to university performance, the question is why are there so few? The vice dean for student affairs is of the opinion that the strategy used is to use the budget to prioritize capable students, not to train students.	X	X	Y
8	Students who take part in competitions in 8 (eight) fields	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: This program is very closed to university performance; the question is why are there so few? The vice dean for student affairs is of the	X	X	Y

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

		opinion that the strategy used is to use the budget to prioritize capable students, not to train students.			
9	Students who take part in competitions in the field of entrepreneurship	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: This program is very closed to university performance; the question is why are there so few? The vice dean for student affairs is of the opinion that the strategy used is to use the budget to prioritize capable students, not to train students.	X	X	Y
10	Students who take part in the Indonesian Student Debate Competition	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: This program is very closed to university performance; the question is why are there so few? The vice dean for student affairs is of the opinion that the strategy used is to use the budget to prioritize capable students, not to train students.	X	X	Y
11	Students who take part in competitions in sports	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: This program is very closed to university performance; the question is why are there so few? The vice dean for student affairs is	X	X	Y

		of the opinion that the strategy used is to use the budget to prioritize capable students, not to train students.			
12	Students who take part in competitions in the field of arts	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: This program is very closed to university performance; the question is why are there so few? The vice dean for student affairs is of the opinion that the strategy used is to use the budget to prioritize capable students, not to train students.	X	X	Y
13	Students who take part in the Student Digital Entrepreneurship Innovation Competition		X	X	Y

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

14	Students who take part in university level competitions	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: The proportion of the budget for student activities that take part in university level competitions is quite small because the budget is prioritized for students who pass the competition, not the supporting Activities	X	X	Y
15	Students who take part in the National University Debating Competition (NUDC)	BO: The proportion of the budget for student activities taking part in the National University Debating Competition (NUDC) is relatively small because the budget is prioritized for students who already have English language talent. PD: This program is very closed to university performance; the question is why are there so few? The vice dean for student affairs is of the opinion that the strategy used is to use the budget to prioritize capable students, not to train students.	X	X	Y
17	Students who take part in the Selection of Outstanding Students	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: There are no clear and measurable targets. The activities carried out are only limited to holding competitions without thinking about the continuation of the activities, for example at a higher level.	X	X	Y
18	Carrying out Student Performance and Achievement	BO: The proportion of the budget for Student Activities is quite small. PD: The proportion is small, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition?	X	X	Y
19	Carrying out competition/contest activities	BO: The budget proportion is small so universities must combine it with partnership participation PD: The proportion is small, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria and student achievement in competition?	X	X	Y
23	Carrying out student scientific writing development activities	BO: The proportion of student activities is small, even though this program is a national priority. PD: The budget is used to prioritize capable students, not to train students. This program is very close to university performance	X	X	Y

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

34	Carrying out training in preparing scientific papers	BO: The proportion of the budget for the activity of Carrying out training in preparing scientific papers is quite small PD: The budget is used to prioritize capable students, not to train students. This program is very close to university performance	X	X	Y
35	Carrying out Student Research/Research	BO: The proportion of the budget for the activity of Carrying out training in preparing scientific papers is quite small PD: The budget is used to prioritize capable students, not to train students. This program is very close to university performance	X	X	Y

Table 2c: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #2: Percentage of undergraduate and D4/D3/D2 students who earned at least 20 (twenty) credits outside campus; or achieved the lowest achievement at national level

No	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with Indicator		
			Amount	External	Program/ activities
16	Students who take part in the village community empowerment (vocational) program competition	BO: The proportion of the budget for the activity of Carrying out training in preparing scientific papers is quite small PD: The proportion of student activity budgets that take part in village community empowerment (vocational) program competitions is small, even though this program is a national priority	X	Y	X
25					
26	Carry out small business development activities	BO: The proportion of the budget is small because there are no clear and measurable targets PD: The budget is used to prioritize capable students, not to train students. This program is very close to university performance	X	Y	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

27	Carry out small business activities	BO: The proportion of the budget is small because there are no clear and measurable targets PD: The budget is used to prioritize capable students, not to train students. This program is very close to university performance	X	Y	X

Table 2d: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #2: Percentage of undergraduate and D4/D3/D2 students who earned at least 20 (twenty) credits outside campus; or achieved the lowest achievement at national level

No	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with indicator		
			Amount	External	Program/ activities
29	Carry out PKKMB activities	BO: The proportion of the budget is appropriate. This is a regular program since many years ago but there are no clear and measurable targets PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	Y	X	X
30	Carrying out social Work Lectures	BO: The proportion of the budget for Implementing Real Work Lectures (also called KKN) activities is small because they broke down KKN funding into some programs. Thus, the amount seems smaller PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	Y	X
31	Carrying out Internships/Work Practices	BO: The proportion of the budget for Implementing internship activities is small because they broke down internship funding into some programs. Thus, the amount seems smaller PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external"	X	Y	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

		criteria? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse			
32	Carry out New Student insurance payments	BO: The proportion of the budget for the activity of implementing insurance payments for new students is small because the budget is prioritized to support other IKUs PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	Y	X	X

Table 2e: Budget Detail and Relevance of Indicator #2: Percentage of undergraduate and D4/D3/D2 students who earned at least 20 (twenty) credits outside campus; or achieved the lowest achievement at national level

No	Program/activities	Budget owners (BO) and planning division (PD) comments	Alignment with indicator		
			Amount	External	Program/activities
36	Carrying out Student Exchanges	BO: The proportion of the budget is quite small PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	Y	X
37	Implementing Projects in Villages	BO: The proportion of the budget is quite small PD: However, the problem is not the numbers, but rather how does this program contribute to "external" criteria? Program and performance indicator is aligned, but need more specific to avoid budget misuse	X	Y	X

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

38	Implementing Social and Humanitarian Projects	BO: The proportion of the budget for the activity of Implementing Humanitarian Projects is small PD: The details of activities that should be combined into 1 (one) must be broken down into several details of activities so that they read smaller and the budget is prioritized to support other IKUs	X	Y	X
39	Carrying out Independent Studies/Projects	BO: The proportion of the budget for the activity of Carrying out Independent Studies/Projects is small PD: The details of activities that should be combined into 1 (one) must be broken down into several details of activities so that they read smaller and the budget is prioritized to support other IKUs	X	Y	X
40	Teaching in schools	BO: The proportion of the budget for teaching activities in schools is quite small PD: The details of activities that should be combined into 1 (one) must be broken down into several detailed activities so that they read smaller and the budget is prioritized to support other IKU	X	Y	X
41	Off-Campus Learning	BO: The proportion of the budget for entrepreneurial activities is small PD: The off-campus learning activities are also budgeted for other student activities.	X	Y	X

Based on the entire table above, this research interprets the budget details as follows.

The presented table unequivocally underscores the prevailing concern among informants regarding budget adequacy across various programs and activities aimed at supporting performance indicators #1 and #2. A majority of respondents have identified this insufficiency as a pervasive challenge within the university. However, the Head of Planning and Budget has provided valuable context, emphasizing the need for a holistic perspective in evaluating budget allocations. Rather than scrutinizing each program within individual faculties in isolation, the emphasis is placed on assessing the cumulative impact of programs with similar substance or function. This broader approach recognizes that numerous programs or activities may bear different names but essentially contribute

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

to the same overarching goals. By aggregating these efforts, the total resource allocation might indeed be sufficient to effectively support the specified performance indicators. This nuanced understanding highlights the importance of considering the collective impact of programs, promoting a more comprehensive evaluation that goes beyond surface-level disparities in nomenclature. It encourages a holistic approach to budget analysis that captures the true magnitude of support for university objectives.

Based on performance indicator number 1: Percentage of S1 and D4/D3/D2 graduates who successfully found work; continuing studies; or becoming a self- employed person, there are 3 things whose relevance is measured, namely whether the program or activity is aimed at supporting students to graduate and get their first job in a shorter time, or support them when continuing their studies or support their decision to become entrepreneurs. by running their own business. All faculty informants stated that all programs support university performance indicators as evidenced by their activities. However, again the head of the planning and budget section disagreed because when compared, not all faculties explained the programs and activities that supported indicator number 1 and indicator number 2. Look at the name of the program, it seems to support or link to performance indicators. However, if we look in detail, from the interviews we conducted, we found that not all activities carried out were running in harmony. Apart from that, we also found many inconsistencies in program names making it difficult to measure and link to performance indicators. As a result, university leaders will find it difficult to measure their performance achievements.

The Head of Planning and Budget has identified a critical concern regarding the potential misplacement of programs or activities between performance indicators one or two. Such misalignment poses a risk of inaccurate measurements, introducing bias into the assessment process. Additionally, when detailed program specifics are not adequately represented within the indicators, the results only portray achievements at a general level. This lack of granularity may lead to misinterpretation and misuse of budgetary allocations. To address these challenges and ensure a more precise and effective performance measurement system, it is strongly recommended that the university adopts the SMART measurement approach in crafting key performance indicators (KPIs). This entails setting Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound criteria for each KPI, fostering clarity, objectivity, and alignment with overarching strategic goals. By implementing SMART measurement in the development of performance indicators, the university can enhance accuracy, mitigate the risk of bias,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

and facilitate a more nuanced understanding of program achievements, ultimately fostering a more informed and strategic budgetary decision- making process

Ensuring transparency and accountability in the use of public funds is of paramount importance, as it allows public representatives and officials to be held accountable for the effectiveness and efficiency of their actions. A crucial aspect of achieving this transparency is through the detailed inclusion of budgetary information as a key performance indicator for the university. By meticulously outlining how funds are allocated and expended, the university provides a clear and comprehensive account of its financial activities. This transparency not only safeguards against potential waste and misuse of public funds but also serves as a deterrent to fraudulent activities. A detailed budget, functioning as a performance indicator, acts as a safeguard, assuring

stakeholders and the public that financial resources are utilized judiciously and in line with the institution's objectives. This commitment to openness not only fosters trust but also strengthens the university's reputation as a responsible steward of public resources, contributing to a culture of integrity and accountability within the institution.

CONCLUSION

From this research, we have shed light on crucial aspects of university budgeting and its direct influence on institutional performance. Firstly, we've examined the sufficiency of programs or activities within the university budget, recognizing the pivotal role financial allocations play in supporting the breadth and depth of academic, research, and administrative initiatives. Ensuring adequate resources are earmarked for each facet is essential for sustained growth and excellence.

Secondly, our discussion delved into the significance of establishing clear relevancies between programs or activities and university performance indicators. This connection is indispensable for meaningful assessment and strategic decision- making. By aligning budgetary allocations with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound indicators, the university can effectively gauge progress and ensure that resources are directed toward endeavors that directly contribute to overarching goals.

Lastly, we addressed the critical need to analyze the impact of budgetary details on university performance indicators. A transparent and detailed budget not only serves as a roadmap for financial stewardship but also acts as a performance indicator in itself.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Understanding how each financial decision resonates with institutional objectives enables the university to not only measure success but also adapt and refine strategies for continuous improvement.

REFERENCES

Antipova, T. (2021). Public Universities' Performance Evaluation. Advances in Intelligent System and Computing (ICADS 2021) , 1352, 126–137. http://www.springer.com/series/11156

Bernhard, A. (2012). Quality Assurance in an International Higher Education Area: A summary of a case-study approach and comparative analysis. Tertiary Education and Management, 18(2), 153–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2012.654504

Bjerke, M. B., & Renger, R. (2017). Being smart about writing SMART objectives. Evaluation and Program Planning, 61, 125–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2016.12.009

Castro, E. B. (2012). La reforma de la gobernanza de la educación superior en la práctica. Puesta en práctica de los objetivos políticos en la gestión universitaria. RUSC Universities and Knowledge Society Journal, 9(2), 268–278. https://doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v9i2.1415

Cotelnic, A. (2022). University Performance: How We Define It and How We Measure It. EASTERN EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF REGIONAL STUDIES, 8(1), 21–29. https://doi.org/10.53486/2537- 6179.8-1.02

Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Weske, U., Bouwman, R., & Tummers, L. (2017). Public sector transparency. In

Experiments in Public Management Research: Challenges and Contributions (pp. 291–312). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316676912.014

Ihwan, R. N. R., & Rahman, A. F. (2016). Analisis Proses Penetapan Indikator Kinerja Pada Anggaran Berbasis Kinerja Di Pemerintah Kota Malang. Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB, 4(2).

Sagara, A. I. (2022). Analysis of application of key performance indicator with SMART-C. International Journal on Social Science, Economics and Art, 12(3), 113–121.

Laili, N. R., & Sari, C. M. (2022). The Effect of Performance Measurement on Budget Execution with the Formulation of Performance Indicators on Budget

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Implementation of KPPN Blitar Service Scope. Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences, 5(4), 765–774. https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijss.v5i4.120

Parasiy-Vergunenko, I. (2019). Organizational mechanism of the budgeting implementation in the universities. Fìnansi Ukraïni, 2019(3), 92–102. https://doi.org/10.33763/finukr2019.03.092

Safonov, Y. M., Marichereda, V. G., Borshch, V. I., Khrapatyi, M., & Goncharenko, M. (2022). Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as a Part of the Staff Performance Management at the University: A Case of Medical University. Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 22(18), 151–161.

Sukmono, R. (2016). ANALISIS DAMPAK IMPLEMENTASI INDIKATOR KINERJA UTAMA TERHADAP SERAPAN ANGGARAN BPPK. Info Artha, 61–72.

Vaccaro, A., & Madsen, P. (2009). Transparency in business and society: Introduction to the special issue. In Ethics and Information Technology (Vol. 11, Issue 2, pp. 101–103). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-009-9197-7

Zapico-Goni, E. (1997). Monitoring Performance in the Public Sector (1st ed.).

Zhang, Q. Z., Jiang, S., Liu, R., & Liu, H. C. (2020). An integrated decision-making model for analyzing key performance indicators in university performance management. Mathematics, 8(10), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/math8101729

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.