



Evaluation of Student Affairs Services in Higher Education in East Java

Mochammad Rozikin¹✉
Andhyka Muttaqin²
Bayu Indra Pratama³
Endry Putra⁴
Kartika Putri Kumalasari⁵
Reika Happy Sugiastuti⁶
Devi Nur Cahaya Ningsih⁷



(✉ Corresponding author)

^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7} Faculty of Administrative Science, Universitas Brwajaya, Malang, Indonesia.

¹ Email: mochrozikin@ub.ac.id

Abstract

Academia is not the only sector or service that should be focused on and provided to students within higher education institutions. Student affairs services must also be adequately provided to recipients of higher education institution services, namely students. Student affairs services contribute significantly to the overall ranking of higher education institutions. The present study aims to evaluate and obtain information about the quality of student affairs services in higher education institutions in East Java, Indonesia. The present research conducts an evaluation using reference to the *Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2017 Concerning Guidelines for the Preparation of a Public Satisfaction Survey Unit for Public Service Providers*. The method used is a survey method, leveraging a questionnaire with a positivistic paradigm. The results of this research have shown that student services are ranked 'good', but an evaluation is required in terms of their implementation, because the services are not yet reaching a status of 'excellent'. Another finding is that student affairs services are widely known to include scholarships, whereas services of interest include awarding talents, logic or reasoning competence. Moving forward, it is hoped that student affairs services will become more efficient in terms of bureaucracy in order to achieve the effectiveness of all parties involved.

Keywords: Academic sector, Public service, Student affairs, Student services, Higher education institution, Evaluation.

Citation | Mochammad Rozikin; Andhyka Muttaqin; Bayu Indra Pratama; Endry Putra; Kartika Putri Kumalasari; Reika Happy Sugiastuti; Devi Nur Cahaya Ningsih (2020). Evaluation of Student Affairs Services in Higher Education in East Java. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 7(1): 49-55.

History:

Received: 14 November 2019

Revised: 18 December 2019

Accepted: 27 January 2020

Published: 5 March 2020

Licensed: This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

[Attribution 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Publisher: Asian Online Journal Publishing Group

Acknowledgement: All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study was reported; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

Ethical: This study follows all ethical practices during writing.

Contents

1. Introduction	50
2. Literature Review	50
3. Method	52
4. Results and Discussion	52
5. Conclusion	55
References	55

Contribution of this paper to the literature

The present study aims to examine the rule of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia (KEMENPAN-RB, in Indonesian) Number 14 of 2017 Concerning Guidelines for the Compilation of Public Satisfaction Unit Public Service Provider Survey as the indicator to measure the quality of service of higher education in Indonesia.

1. Introduction

The primary service offering of higher education institutions is academia, or education (Indrajit & Djokopranoto, 2006). This causes the majority of studies on higher education institution services to focus on academic services. Nonetheless, in the management of higher education institutions in Indonesia, offerings are commonly divided into three fields – academic, resources, and student affairs (Welch, 2007). Student affairs and resources should be evaluated just as often as academic services, because they relate to the public service of higher education institutions.

The scope of resources includes the management of human resources, finance, and educational and supporting infrastructure. Evaluation of the resource field has become a multilevel and structured examination through internal and external auditors of tertiary institutions (Puspitarini, 2012; Sukirman & Sari, 2012; Zamzami & Faiz, 2015). Performance targets and achievements are traditionally formulated in order to be done objectively (Nurchahyo & Sumaedi, 2011). The measurement or quantification of budget achievements and expenditures has become a general framework in this field (Nurchahyo & Sumaedi, 2011; Sukirman & Sari, 2012).

The student affairs sector needs attention. Evaluations of higher education institutions tend to neglect it, even though the student affairs sector is directly related to student success. The student affairs sector is also quite complicated because it is related to the interests of talent, reasoning or logic competence, and student welfare. The complexity of the student affairs sector means it requires excellent care in order to achieve expected performance.

Student affairs services do not only relate to student activities. Student affairs is also a benchmark that can be used to rank higher education institutions. Based on the ranking assessment framework, student affairs contributes significantly to the overall ranking of an institution, and shows the significance of the contribution of student assessments to these rankings.

Previous research has shown there is a strong relationship between academic services and student achievement (Dewi, 2015; Dirwan, 2014; Muntamah, Pietojo, & Widagdo, 2012). The better the academic assistance, the higher the student achievement (Dewi, 2015; Dirwan, 2014), which shows there is a direct influence between service and success (Dewi, 2015; Dirwan, 2014; Muchoyar et al., 2013; Muntamah et al., 2012). The understanding of the influence of student affairs on student success can be used to assess a series of other services that impact student achievement.

An example of varying student achievement in higher education institutions can be seen in the case of Universitas Brawijaya (UB). For three consecutive years, from 2015 to 2017, UB was the General Champion of the National Scientific Week, but failed to maintain this status in 2018 and 2019. This is due to a decrease in UB's ranking by the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education (Kemenristekdikti, in Indonesian). Universitas Brawijaya was ranked 6th according to the Ministry of Research and Technology's assessment in 2017. The achievement then dropped to 12th place the following year. The position of Universitas Brawijaya again rose in 2019 to 9th position.

This dramatic decrease requires an outside evaluation that includes a look at the level of student services offered at specific points in time. It is possible that a decrease in the quality of student services offered could have led to a decrease in student achievement. The findings of such a study would be expected to help provide recommendations for improving student services.

The present study aims to obtain information about the quality of student services offered in higher education institutions in East Java. There are two large cities in East Java that have the highest number of universities – Surabaya and Malang. Surabaya has around 90 universities, while Malang city has approximately 60 universities. Therefore, these two cities are choice targets for this research, evaluates student services at universities in East Java, referencing the *Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2017 Concerning Guidelines for Preparation of Community Satisfaction Survey for Public Service Providers*.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Public Services

Public services are required in all aspects of life in a society whose purpose is to support its various needs. According to Kotler (Sinambela, 2011), service refers to "all forms of profitable activities and offers satisfaction in a set, which results are not physically bound." The term public, in English, means general, community, or state (Sinambela, 2011). Based on the understanding of the terms 'service' and 'public', it can be concluded that public service is a profitable activity in society that offers satisfaction, the results of which may not always be physically visible.

According to Sinambela (Pasolong, 2010), public services are "every activity carried out by the government to several people, and these activities offer satisfaction even though the results obtained are not tied to a product physically." Another definition of public services, according to *KEPMENPAN (Ministerial decree in Indonesia) Number 63 of 2004 concerning General Guidelines for Public Service Operations*, is "all forms of activities carried out by public service providers as a form of effort in meeting the needs of service recipients as well as implementation based on the provisions of the service law. The essence of public service is the provision of excellent service to the community, which is a manifestation of the obligation of the state apparatus as a civil servant."

Another definition of public services, according to Article 5 of Law Number 25 of 2009 states, "The scope of public services includes public goods and public service services as well as administrative services that are regulated in legislation." This scope includes education, teaching, work and business, housing, communication and information, the environment, health, social security, energy, banking, transportation, natural resources, tourism, and other strategic sectors.

Based on several explanations related to the definition of public services, it can be concluded that public services refers to all forms of service activities provided by the government to the public both in the form of public goods and public services.

KEPMENPAN Number 63 of 2004 concerning General Guidelines for the Implementation of Public Services classifies three types of services from government agencies as well as BUMN (State-Owned Enterprises) and BUMD (Regional-Owned Enterprises). The grouping of these services is based on the characteristics and nature of the activities and items produced, namely:

1. Administrative Services are the types of services provided by service units in the form of recording, research, decision making, documentation, and other administrative activities that, as a whole, produce the final product in the form of documents, such as certificates, permits, recommendations, and so forth.
2. Goods Services are services provided by service units in the form of activities of supplying and/or processing physical, tangible goods, including distribution and delivery to direct consumers (as units or individuals) in a system. These activities produce real physical products, such as electricity, clean water, and telephone services.
3. Services are the types of services provided by service units in the form of facilities and infrastructure, as well as their support. The final product is a service that benefits the recipient directly and is used up over a period of time — for example, banking services, postal services, and fire-fighting services.

Based on the three types of services listed above – administrative services, goods services and services – services provided to students within higher education institutions are placed in the categories of administrative services and services.

2.2. Student Affairs in Higher Education Institutions

Student affairs are one type of service provided to students, in addition to academic services and resources. This sector deals with reasoning or logic competence, specialization in talent, and the welfare of students. The reasoning or logic competence component relates to channeling student activities in the area of academic applications such as scientific writing competitions, student debates, business plan competitions, or other events related to intellectual abilities. The specialization in talent component relates to channeling activities related to students' hobbies and talents. It refers to student activities institutionalized in student activity units.

These student organizations have become a space for channeling student talents in the arts, sports, and politics. The student welfare area relates to efforts made to provide social security in student activities. It can be applied in the provision of scholarships, compensation to students, or initiatives surrounding the mentoring of student psychology (Kirom, Abdul Kadier, & Bilfaqih, 2012).

The student affairs sector facilitates students in obtaining soft skills that can support their various needs within their community or industry. Students are expected to have the ability to adapt to their environment and have a strong character after graduation. The student affairs sector provides support by organizing competitions or allowing students to compete in developing their interests, talents, logic and reasoning.

The student affairs sector is managed at two levels – at the university level and the faculty level. Each follows the same management structure, but the difference is in the scope of student interaction. The management of student affairs at the university level involves student interaction between faculties. In contrast, at the faculty level, student affairs tend to be handled at the level of each individual study program/department.

2.3. Community Satisfaction Index

Community services need to be continuously improved, and these efforts need to be preceded by evaluating the services. Evaluation measurements can be carried out using the *Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia (KEMENPAN-RB, in Indonesian) Number 14 of 2017 Concerning Guidelines for the Compilation of Public Satisfaction Unit Public Service Provider Survey*.

The decree, or rule, of KEMENPAN-RB defines the community satisfaction index as data obtained from scientific measurements regarding public opinion of services received from public service providers. The evaluation is carried out by comparing the expectations and needs of service recipients. The target of the community satisfaction index is the performance of the service units obtained based on community perception of the services received. The Community Satisfaction Index (CSI or IKM, in Indonesian) aims to ensure systems, mechanisms, and procedures are of higher quality. The existing CSI/IKM also becomes feedback from the public on the services that have been provided.

Based on KEMENPAN-RB, the Community Satisfaction Index has several advantages, including:

- a. The institution will know the weaknesses or shortcomings of each of the elements in the administration of public services.
- b. The institution will know that service delivery performance has been carried out periodically by public service units.
- c. The community satisfaction index is known, as a whole, to be a result of the implementation of public services in the scope of central and regional governments.
- d. The community satisfaction index is encouraging positive competition among service providers in the scope of central and regional governments, to improve service performance.
- e. The results of the evaluation will determine policies that need to be taken and efforts that need to be done.
- f. For the community, the performance of service units will be transparent and easily known.

The community satisfaction index includes nine components that need to be measured. These nine areas of measurement include service prerequisites, service procedure, speed of service, fairness of service costs, appropriateness of service products, the ability of service officers, and the behavior of service officers, quality of facilities and infrastructure, and handling of complaints from service users.

Each component is explained as follows:

- a. The service prerequisite refers to technical and administrative requirements that must be available in order to obtain appropriate services.

- b. The service procedure is the ease of service procedures provided by institutional units.
- c. The speed of service is related to the ability of officers to complete services, suitable for the specified time.
- d. The fairness of service costs is the ability of the community to reach a set service fee.
- e. The appropriateness of service products is the suitability of service standards with the results provided.
- f. The ability of service officers refers to the skills or expertise of service providers according to their duties.
- g. The behavior of service officers is related to the ability of officers to provide services in a friendly and mutually respectful manner, to the service recipient community.
- h. The quality of facilities and infrastructure refers to regularity, neatness, cleanliness, and facilities that provide comfort during service.
- i. Handling complaints of service users is the readiness of officers in handling complaints and providing solutions to service users when complaints arise.

3. Method

The evaluation of public services is research that seeks to measure the performance that has been carried out by the service provider. The present research also evaluates the student services of universities in East Java. Performance measurement was carried out using the *Community Satisfaction Index determined by the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2017 Concerning Guidelines for the Preparation of Public Satisfaction Unit Survey of Public Service Providers*. This has implications for the method used in the present research and the survey method, based on the ministerial regulation reference frame. It also has implications for the research paradigm of this research, which is a positivistic paradigm.

The present study sought to measure student services at state universities in East Java. The primary method in this study was the use of a questionnaire distributed to a predetermined sample. The questionnaire was compiled based on a conceptual and operational framework developed by researchers from the required literature review. There are approximately 808,542 students in East Java, of which roughly 384,032 are male and 424,510 are female. Based on population calculations, the number of samples used in this study was 399, which have been rounded up to 400 student samples.

Out of the respondents who filled out the questionnaire in this study, gender can be broken out into 143 men (66.1% of sample) and 279 women (33.9% of sample). Looking at geography, all respondents came from the East Java region. The majority of respondents came from the city of Surabaya, totaling 202 people (47.9% of sample), and 55 people (13% of sample) came from the city of Malang. Most of the respondents, 215 people (50.9% of sample) came from state universities, with 207 people (49.1% of sample) coming from private universities. Various types of colleges were represented in the questionnaire – universities, polytechnics, colleges, institutes, and academies. The highest percentage of higher education institutions came from the university category, with 338 people (80.1% of sample). The education level of respondents was included on the questionnaire, starting from D1 student (College Diploma) to S3 student (Postgraduate). The majority of respondents came from the S1 education level, with 385 people (91.9% of sample), and most respondents were from the fifth semester, at 114 people (27% of sample).

Data processing referred to the *Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2017 Regarding Guidelines for the Preparation of Public Satisfaction Survey Units of Public Service Providers* used as indicators. Each aspect measured has the following weighing values:

$$\text{The average weighted value} = \frac{\text{Weight Amount}}{\text{Number of Elements}} = \frac{1}{14} = 0,071$$

And with regard to the weighted average value, the following formula is used:

$$\text{CSI or IKM} = \frac{\text{Total of Perception Value Per Element}}{\text{Total of Filled Items}} \times \text{Weighing Value}$$

The value was converted between a value of 25-100 with a base value of 25 to obtain the interpretation of community satisfaction index, so the formula used is as follows:

$$\text{CSI or IKM Service Unit} \times 25$$

The results of the measurement values were then converted to the service quality standards presented in [Table 1](#):

Table-1. Perception Value, CSI or IKM interval, CSI or IKM conversion interval, service quality, and service performance of the service unit.

Perception Value	CSI or IKM Interval	CSI or IKM Conversion Interval	Service Quality	Service Performance of the Service Unit
1	1,00-1,75	25-43,75	D	Not Good
2	1,76-2,50	43,76-62,50	C	Less Good
3	2,51-3,25	62,51-81,25	B	Good
4	3,25-4,00	81,26-100,00	A	Excellence

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Services of Student Affairs

Table-2. Student affairs service assessment.

No	Question or Statement	Logic &			Total
		Talent Interest	Reasoning	Scholarship	
1.	What student affairs services do you know of?	38,4%	22%	88,9%	149,3%
2.	What are student affairs services most frequently accessed?	19,2%	7,3%	73,5%	100%
3.	What are student affairs services the least accessed?	22%	66,4%	11,6%	100%

Based on Table 2, the student affairs service that was the most known by students was scholarships. Out of 422 respondents, there were 88.9%, or as many as 375 students, who knew of its existence. The next most recognized student affairs service was talent interest. There were 38.4%, or 162 students, who knew about it. Finally, the student affairs service that was the third most known was logic/reasoning competence. There were 22%, or as many as 93 people, who knew about this service. The conclusion here is that the student affairs service that was the most widely known was scholarships, because so many students try to receive scholarships themselves, in order to reduce the cost burden of lectures. The second most well-known service was talent interest, because many students strive to achieve various hard skills and soft skills required to succeed. The least known student service of the three was logic/reasoning competence, which is used to fulfill a student's scientific ability or self-reasoning.

The student affairs service that was most frequently accessed was scholarships. There were 310 students, or 73.5% of respondents, accessing this service. The next accessible student service was talent interest. There were 81 students (19.2% of the sample) accessing this service. The next most frequent student affairs service that was accessed was reasoning or logic competence. There were 31 students (7.3% of the sample) accessing this. The scholarship service is the student affairs service that was most often accessed, and caused critical factors related to the economy. The next service that was accessed the most was the talent interest service. It was favored by students according to their individual passions. The least accessed service was the reasoning service. Many students were not interested in logic or reasoning competence.

From 422 respondents, there were 280 students, or 66.4%, infrequently accessing logic/reasoning competence services. There were 93 students, or 22%, who rarely accessed the talent interest service. In terms of scholarships, the questionnaire showed there were 49 students, or 11.6%, infrequently accessing the service. In general, most students had not requested logic or reasoning services which are related to scientific knowledge, because the students thought that college itself was the first step in developing science. Only a few students had been interested in the logic or reasoning service.

4.2. Evaluation of Student Affairs Services

Table-3. Student affairs information service requirements assessment.

Question or Statement	The Result of Respondent				Total
	1 (Unclear)	2 (Less clear)	3 (Clear)	4 (Very Clear)	
Information about student affairs service requirements is clear?	2,1%	20,1%	58,1%	19,7%	100%

Based on Table 3, out of 422 respondents, there were nine students, or 2.1% of respondents, who stated that information on student affairs service requirements was unclear. There were 85 students, or 20.1% of respondents, who stated that the information was less clear. 245, or 58.1% of respondents, stated that the information was clear. There were 83, or 19.7% of respondents, who stated that the information is very clear. Almost all respondents stated that the information was clear. These results inferred that information about student service requirements had been conveyed clearly.

Table-4. Assessment of student affairs service.

No.	Question or Statement	The Result of Respondent				Total
		1 (Bad)	2 (Less Good)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	
1.	Requirements for obtaining student services are easy to fulfill	1,2%	26,3%	56,6%	15,9%	100%
2.	The behavior of student service providers	2,8%	19,2%	60%	18%	100%
3.	Handling complaints, suggestions, and input student services	5,9%	27,5%	50,2%	16,4%	100%
4.	Student service facilities and infrastructure	1,9%	19,9%	58,1%	20,1%	100%

Based on Table 4, there were five students, or 1.2% of respondents, who stated that the ease of meeting the requirements for obtaining student affairs services was bad. There were 111 students, or 26.3% of respondents, who stated that it was less good. There were 239 students, or 56.6% of respondents, who stated that the ease of meeting requirements was good. 67 students, or 15.9% of respondents, stated that it was excellent. The average respondent stated that the ease of meeting the requirements for obtaining student affairs services was good. These results implied that the requirements for obtaining student services were easy to fulfill.

For the behavior of student affairs service providers, out of 422 respondents, there were 12 students, or 2.8% of respondents, who stated that the behavior was not good. 81 students, or 9.2% of respondents, stated that the behavior was less good. There were 253 students, or 60% of respondents, who stated that the behavior was good, and 76 students, or 18% of respondents, stated that the behavior was very good. The average respondent stated that the behavior of student affairs service providers was good. The conclusion is that the behavior of student service providers had been implemented well.

For the handling of complaints, suggestions, and input about student affairs services, out of 422 respondents, there were 25 students, or 5.9% of respondents, who stated that the handling was not good. There were 116 students, or 27.5% of respondents, who stated that the handling was less good. 212 students, or 50.2% of respondents, stated that the handling was good, and 69 students, or 16.4% of respondents, stated that the handling was excellent. Most respondents stated that the handling was good. These results implied that the handling of complaints, suggestions, and input relating to student services had been done well but still requires an evaluation in order to be carried out to its maximum potential.

For student affairs service facilities and infrastructure, out of 422 respondents, there were eight students, or 1.9% of respondents, who stated that facilities and infrastructure were not good. 84 students, or 19.9% of respondents, stated that facilities and infrastructure were less good. There were 245 students, or 58.1% of respondents who stated that facilities and infrastructure were good, and 85 students, or 20.1% of respondents, who stated they were very good. Almost all respondents stated that student affairs service facilities and infrastructure were good. These results inferred that the facilities and infrastructure of student services are good.

Table-5. Assessment of student affairs service.

No.	Question or Statement	The Result of Respondents				Total
		1 (Not Exist)	2 (Lack)	3 (Sufficient)	4 (Exist)	
1.	Is there a student affairs service system, mechanism, and procedure?	1,7%	15,2%	51,7%	31,5%	100%
2.	Is there a certainty in the time of completion of student affairs services?	5,7%	23,9%	43,6%	26,8%	100%

Based on Table 5, out of 422 respondents, there were seven students, or 1.7% of respondents, who stated that the system, mechanism, and procedures of student services did not exist. There were 64 students, or 15.2% of respondents, who stated that the system was lacking, and 218 students, or 51.7% of respondents, who stated that the system was enough. There were 133 students, or 31.5% of respondents, who stated that the system existed. The average respondent stated that the system was enough. The conclusion is that there are enough systems, mechanisms, and procedures relating to student services, but that they need to be improved in order to better improve student services.

There were 24 students out of 422 respondents, or 5.7%, who stated that there was no certain time in completing student affairs services. There were 101 students, or 23.9% of respondents, who stated that the certainty was lacking, and 184 students, or 43.6% of respondents, who stated that the certainty was sufficient. There were also 113 students, or 26.8% of respondents, who stated that the certainty existed. The average respondent stated that the certainty was enough. These results show that the certainty of time in the completion of student affairs services is sufficient. However, this can be improved.

Table-6. Assessment of student affairs service.

Question or Statement	The Result of Respondents				Total
	1 (Uncertain)	2 (Less Certain)	3 (Certain)	4 (Very Certain)	
Is there certainty in fees/tariffs in managing and obtaining student affairs services?	12,1%	28,7%	39,8%	19,4%	100%

Based on Table 6, out of 422 respondents, there were 168 students, or 39.8% of respondents, who stated there was a certainty in the cost of handling and/or obtaining student affairs services. There are 121 students, or 28.7% of respondents, who stated that the cost was less certain. There were 82 students, or 19.4% of respondents, who stated that the cost was very certain, and there were 51 students, or 12.1% of respondents, who stated that the cost was uncertain. This concluded that the certainty of cost in the handling of and/or obtaining student affairs services was certain.

Table-7. Assessment of student affairs service.

Question or Statement	The Result of Respondents				Total
	1 (Inappropriate)	2 (Less appropriate)	3 (appropriate)	4 (very appropriate)	
Results of student affairs services are received following the provisions applied?	2,1%	19,9%	60,4%	17,5%	100%

Based on the above Table 7, out of 422 respondents, there were 255 students, or 60.4%, who stated that the results of student affairs services received were following the provisions. Respondents who stated that the results of services were less appropriate were 84 people, or 19.9% of respondents. There were 74 students, or 17.5% of respondents, who stated that the results of services were very suitable. There was one student, or 2.1% of respondents, who stated that the results of services were very inappropriate. Most of the student affairs services provided were following the applicable conditions.

Table-8. Assessment of student affairs service.

Question or Statement	The Result of Respondents				Total
	1 (not competent)	2 (less competent)	3 (competent)	4 (very competent)	
Student service affairs providers have the competency to provide services?	1,7%	19,4%	60,4%	18,5%	100%

Based on Table 8, out of 422 respondents, as many as 255 students, or 60.4% of respondents, stated that student service providers had the competency to provide services. There were 82 students, or 19.4% of respondents, who expressed that the providers were less competent. As many as 78 students, or 18.5% of respondents, stated that the providers were very competent to provide services, and there were seven students, or

1.7% respondents, who stated that the providers did not have the competence to provide services. Student affairs service providers are largely seen as competent.

5. Conclusion

The research evaluation of student affairs services by higher education institutions in East Java Province proved to be positive. In this case, however, it seems there is improvement needed in order to achieve student satisfaction in receiving student affairs services. The scholarship was widely recognized as a student affairs service, whereas services relating to the interests of talents and logic or reasoning competence were less known. It can be concluded that information about the requirements of student affairs services has been conveyed clearly. Requirements for obtaining student services, student service providers' behavior, handling complaints, suggestions, and input, and student affairs service facilities and infrastructure, were all proven to be handled properly. The systems, mechanisms, and procedures, as well as the certainty of the completion of student affairs services, were found to be sufficient in facilitating students to receive student affairs services.

Student affairs services related to the certainty of fees/tariffs in managing and/or obtaining student services were certain, as were clear rules for students in managing and/or obtaining student services. Student affairs services had been received in accordance with the provisions applied. Student affairs service providers had competency in providing services. The evaluation of student affairs services was good, but its implementation requires additional evaluation, because it has not yet reached the level of 'very good'. Evaluation of student services must pay attention to student recipients of said services. It is hoped that student services will become more efficient in terms of bureaucracy in order to be effective for all parties involved.

References

- Dewi, M. (2015). The effect of quality of library services and facilities on university students ocean learning achievement. *Journal of Management and Finance, 4*(1), 203-213.
- Dirwan, A. (2014). The effect of service quality and student commitment on achievement motivation of private tertiary students. *Educational Horizons: Scientific Journal of Education, 33*(3), 379-391.
- Indrajit, R. E., & Djokopranoto, R. (2006). *Modern college management*. Jakarta: Andi.
- Kirom, D. N., Abdul Kadier, R. E., & Bilfaqih, Y. (2012). ITS scholarship management information system based on decision support systems using the analytical hierarchy process method. *ITS Engineering Journal, 1*(1), A154-A159.
- Muchoyar, I., Basrowi, B., Wijanarka, B. S., Sudiyanto, S., Nugroho, A. C., Soeprapto, S., & Cahyati, I. (2013). Evaluation of student learning achievement in the faculty of engineering, Yogyakarta State University. *Journal of Technology and Vocational Education, 21*(4), 325-334.
- Muntamah, U., Pietojo, H., & Widagdo, L. (2012). Students' perceptions about the quality of education services and motivation to follow the teaching and learning process. *Indonesian Health Promotion Journal, 7*(2), 109-115.
- Nurcahyo, R., & Sumaedi, S. (2011). Study of the application of ISO 9001 on administrative services at XYZ colleges. *Journal of Standardization, 13*(3), 155-162. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.31153/js.v13i3.40>.
- Pasolong, H. (2010). *Bureaucratic leadership*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- Puspitarini, N. D. (2012). The role of internal control unit in achieving good university governance in higher education with PK-BLU status. *Accounting Analysis Journal, 1*(2), 1-8.
- Sinambela, L. J. (2011). *Public service reform*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sukirman, E., & Sari, M. P. (2012). The role of internal audit in efforts to realize good university governance at UNNES. *Journal of Accounting Dynamics, 4*(1), 64-71.
- Welch, A. R. (2007). Blurred vision? Public and private higher education in Indonesia. *Higher Education, 54*(5), 665-687.
- Zamzami, F., & Faiz, I. A. (2015). Evaluation of the implementation of internal control systems: Case study at a state university. *Journal of Multiparadigm Accounting, 6*(1), 20-27.