

ICU auditors' understanding of achieving good university governance

Arisona Ahmad¹, Ali Djamhuri², Ari Kamayanti³

^{1, 2, 3} Brawijaya University, MT Haryono Street 165, Malang, 65145, East Java, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29 April 2016

Revised 10 October 2016

Accepted 14 December 2016

JEL Classification:

G34

Key words:

Internal Control Unit (ICU),
Good University Governance (GUG),
and Phenomenology.

DOI:

10.14414/tiar.v6i1.605

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the Internal Control Unit (ICU) auditors' understanding in achieving Good University Governance (GUG) at Jember University (UNEJ). This study uses interpretive phenomenology. Method of data collection is conducted by interviewing the ICU auditors of UNEJ. The research findings indicate that the ICU auditors' understanding in carrying out their function is compliant with the ICU charter. Through in-depth interview with informants, it is found noesis, in which the informants' understanding is not only through the knowledge and implementation of the existing rules, but also through cultural practices of "mutual support". For Jember University, the ICU plays a critical role in achieving GUG by fixing the governance of the work unit related to non-academic fields that include finance, human resources, goods and services procurement, and public asset management.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pemahaman auditor di Internal Control Unit (ICU) dalam mencapai Good University Governance (GUG) di Universitas Jember (UNEJ). Penelitian ini menggunakan fenomenologi interpretative yaitu dengan metode pengumpulan data melalui wawancara auditor ICU di UNEJ. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pemahaman auditor ICU dalam melaksanakan fungsi mereka sesuai dengan ICU charter. Melalui wawancara mendalam dengan informan, ditemukan noesis, di mana pemahaman informan 'tidak hanya melalui pengetahuan dan pelaksanaan aturan yang ada saja, melainkan juga melalui praktik-praktik budaya "saling mendukung". Untuk Universitas Jember, ICU berperan penting untuk mencapai GUG dengan memperbaiki tata kelola unit kerja yang terkait dengan bidang non-akademik yang meliputi keuangan, sumber daya manusia, pengadaan barang dan jasa, dan manajemen aset publik.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this globalization era, public services, including educational service at higher education, have become one of the most crucial public concerns. The increasingly complex demands, as an impact of globalization, have led the institutions of higher education, such as university, to conduct internal restructuring by developing a system of governance and a new paradigm in management.

The National Accreditation Agency for Higher Education (known in Indonesia as BAN-PT (2011: 5) defines governance as a system that ensures the institutional management in fulfilling the principles

of transparency, accountability, credibility, responsibility, and fairness. Governance in organizing institutions of higher education should reflect the implementation of Good University Governance (GUG) and accommodate the values, rules, structures, functions, roles and aspirations of all stakeholders.

In contrast to Indonesia, the Global Trend In University Governance by Fielden (2008) of the World Bank revealed that GUG, in the United States, is implemented by giving full autonomy, in terms of academic, managerial, and funding, to universities as long as they can be accounted for.

* Corresponding author, email address: ¹ ahmad.arisona@gmail.com.

However, most countries in Europe implement full autonomy in term of academic but not full in terms of managerial and financing that leads to the large influence of the state in terms of managerial and financing. In Austria, the government even bears the full cost of higher education so that students do not have to pay. Swansson et al. (2005), who studied GUG in Australia, concluded that the implementation of GUG at universities in Australia varies in accordance with the law of each territory that controls the autonomous right of universities in the region.

In the implementation, the academic community sometimes deviates from the noble values regarding professionalism. State Finance Accountability Committee (BAKN) based on the annual report of the Indonesia Supreme Audit Board (BPK) 2008-2012 discovered irregularities and deviations in budgeting and asset management at 16 universities and three Directorates of the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud). The role of GUG, which has the objective to achieve a good university management, is very necessary to create good behavior of all components of the academic society. In an effort to reform the bureaucracy, to strengthen governance, and to achieve accountability in the Ministry of Education and Culture, it was established Internal Control Unit (ICU).

Jember University (UNEJ), as an organizing institution of higher education in the Ministry of Education and Culture, determined to realize good governance. It is marked with the establishment of Internal Control Unit (ICU) by the Chancellor of Jember University on May 1, 2012. The existence of ICU in achieving GUG, laid out in the ICU Charter of Jember University, is a need to improve transparency, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness in the management of finance, human resources, and assets of the university.

The successful implementation of GUG cannot be separated from the role of ICU. Aisyah et al. (2013) revealed that, in fact, the establishment of ICU is merely an administrative complement to the organization and not based on the needs of the role of ICU in public universities. Many public universities have not optimized the existence of ICU due to inadequate number of human resources and qualifications that must be met, as well as funding programs. ICU has to change the mindset and conduct a larger increase in the enforcement of GUG, so that ICU will be more appreciated positively as a problem solver, as well as to accelerate the implementation of GUG practices which in turn will increase the stakeholders' confidence to the university man-

agement.

The research which connects the ICU to GUG has been done by Priastuti (2011). In her research, which examined the performance of ICU at Sebelas Maret University Surakarta (UNS), she concluded that the effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of ICU performance is good enough to monitor the fields of academic, financial, and asset and in realizing Good University Governance (GUG) in UNS. While Asy'ari et al. (2013) who examined the role and function of internal control units (ICU) in the prevention of fraud at higher education "x" using case study, concluded that the role of ICU has not reached the stage of fraud prevention because of the lack of awareness of the management toward the roles and functions of the ICU.

In this study, the researchers will discuss the ICU auditors' understanding in realizing Good University Governance at Jember University. The present study differs from the previous one because the researchers try to use a different perspective called phenomenology. The phenomenon of the ICU auditors' understanding at Jember University is very interesting to study because the ICU was just established in May 2012. However, in October 2013 the ICU of Jember University was declared as the best work unit of the ICU work units in Indonesia, which was announced during the coordination meeting of internal monitoring in the field of higher education. As a newly formed unit, rationally, it should take long time for the ICU of UNEJ in carrying out its duties and responsibilities to realize the transparency, efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of the management of human resources, assets and finance in Jember University environment. In addition, the researchers are interested in choosing ICU of UNEJ for it is filled by the members who have different educational backgrounds and some of them still do not have experience as internal auditor. Therefore, of course it is also related to their understanding of their duties as ICU auditors.

Based on the above background, the question presented in this study is "How is the UNEJ ICU auditors' understanding of their role in realizing GUG?" The aim of this study is to assess the ICU auditors' understanding in realizing GUG in UNEJ environment.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Good University Governance (GUG)

Wijatno (2009: 126) defines GUG as the implementation of good governance principles in a system and governance process at higher education institutions (universities) by making adjustments based

on the values that must be upheld in organizing higher education. According to Aristo (2005), the demand for the implementation of GUG today is not just as an obligation, but rather than as a necessity. Along with the tight competition, university must strive continuously to realize good governance as a system that is attached to the dynamics occurring in the university. The purpose of GUG policy is to make the parties involved in running the management of the university understand and perform their functions and roles according to their powers and responsibilities.

Each country has different GUG concept depending on the conditions and the culture of the country. The concept of higher education in realizing GUG in Indonesia is based on Law No. 20 of 2003 on National Education System and Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education. The management of higher education (universities) in Indonesia has the characteristic that the government is responsible for organizing the universities, giving autonomy to universities, increasing widespread public participation, as well as non-profitting.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study is a qualitative study employing interpretive paradigm. Creswell (2008: 7) reveals that by using a qualitative approach, researchers can learn in detail about the issues examined, can empower informants to get answers to the problems from the data analysis to the interpretation, can learn in what context the informants provide their information, and can capture the complexity of the problems examined.

The method used in this study is using phenomenology. As quoted by Moleong (2012), Edmund Husserl (1859) on understanding the transcendental phenomenology as a descriptive and introspective analysis of the depth of all forms of consciousness and direct experiences related to religion, morality, aesthetic, conceptual, and sensory. Patton (2002: 104) reveals that the use of phenomenology as a research approach requires the phenomenologist to capture and describe the human experience of the phenomenon. Creswell (2010: 20) states that phenomenology aims to understand the world from the perspective of those who experience directly or the real nature of human experience and the meaning attached to it. The informants involved in the study should have experiences related to the phenomenon. In line with the statement of Creswell (2010), phenomenology is used because this research would like to learn the ICU auditors' understanding of their role in achiev-

ing GUG at Jember University.

The main data sources of this study are derived from informants. The Informants in this study are the most influential people and directly involved in the ICU. Every informant selected is always related to the purpose of the research being investigated. In this study, the informants are ICU chairman, ICU secretary, HR manager, finance manager, and pool of auditors who assist the ICU in performing the duties. At first, the researchers actually would like to get information from the entire board of ICU currently consisting of five people, but until the deadline specified, the researchers only managed to interview four of them (except the head of state property) plus one of the pool of auditors.

The ICU auditors' understanding of their role was directly obtained by the researchers from the informants based on interviews. Before being allowed to conduct interview with informants, the researchers had to wait for a research approval letter from university. When the approval letter was completed, the researchers still could not directly interview the informants because the schedule of interviews had to be adjusted to the schedule of activities of the informants. The schedule of interview determined was sometimes not on time because of certain reasons, such as having emergency meeting with the rector (chancellor), sickness, or in conjunction with their obligation to lecture.

The stages of data analysis in this study are using phenomenological method, which refers to Sanders (1982). Sanders divided the phenomenological method into four stages of data analysis. The first stage is to conduct a description of the phenomenon of the interviews that have been recorded by identifying the transcript of the interview and explain the quality of the experience and awareness of the informants. The second stage is to identify themes emerging from the description of the first stage. The third stage is to develop *noema* and *noesis*. The final stage is to abstract the essence of the relationship between *noema* and *noesis* commonly called *eidetic reductio*.

In this study, the meanings of statements obtained through interviews with informants are grouped in the analysis table of ICU auditor's understanding. According to the table, the researchers will portray ICU as a working unit, the ICU auditors' understanding of their duties, responsibilities and authority in carrying out their role as internal auditors in the environment Jember University so that GUG can be achieved, as well as the barriers

Table 1
Format of Analysis Table of Jember University ICU Auditors' Understanding

No.	Informant	Theme of ICU Auditors' Understanding	Intentional Analysis		Eidetic Reduction
			Noema	Noesis	
1	Chairman of ICU				
2	ICU Secretary				
3	ICU Managers				
4	Pool Of Auditors				

and efforts to increase the ICU auditors' understanding. The statements, in the form of the informants' understanding, are grouped based on the informants. The format of the analysis table of ICU auditors' understanding is as shown in Table 1.

The statements which are initially considered having equal value are grouped into themes based on the viewpoint of informants. Then they are specified in detail using intentional analysis and eidetic reduction. Intentional analysis has two derivatives, namely *noema* and *noesis*. *Noema* is obtained from the first expression revealed by the informant, while *noesis* is obtained from the experience of the informants toward the *noema*. The next stage is the *epoche*, a termination of relationship with the experience and knowledge owned or previously believed by the researchers. *Epoche* is related to the behavior of researchers in conducting field data extraction (bracketing) and attitude.

After that, the researchers conclude the phenomenon that has been obtained on what eidetic reduction means, based on the subjective understanding of the researchers themselves. The statements that are not in accordance with the topics and questions and considered overlap will be eliminated, so that the remaining is the textural meaning and the forming elements of the phenomenon that does not experience irregularities (horizons). The statements are then collected into a unit, and then it is written an overview of how these experiences occur. The researchers develop an overall description of the phenomenon so as to find the units of meaning of the phenomenon and leading to the stage of variation of imagination consisting of making explanation or textural description. Developing a textural description is the description stage of the phenomenon occurring to the informants. The next stage is to make structural description that explains how the phenomenon occurs. The researchers give narrative explanations related to the essence of the phenomenon studied and get the meaning of experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge of the informants related to the phenomenon. The last is the stage of reflection and deduction by the researchers in the form of research findings.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Jember University ICU was established on May 1, 2012 through the Rector/Chancellor's Decree number 4924/UN25/TU.2/2012. The vision of Jember University ICU contained in the ICU Charter is to become an institution of internal control unit which has high dedication and professionalism, to contribute to the leadership in decision-making, and to assist the university to realize good university governance. Prior formed into a separate working unit, ICU is a sub-section of the Jember University Quality Assurance Agency (BPM) formerly known as M & E (Monitoring and Evaluation). The establishment of the Jember University ICU is focused on monitoring the aspects of non-academic covering finance, human resources, state property, as well as the procurement of goods and services, while the Quality Assurance Agency (BPM) is focused on the academic aspects.

ICU, as a professional work unit at Jember University, has an organizational structure in which ICU is positioned directly under the rector/chancellor and is independent of all working units at Jember University. At the beginning of the establishment, the ICU consisted of seven people, Dr. Tri Candra Setiawati, M.Si as the ICU Chairman, Taufik Kurrohman, MSA., Ak., CA., QIA, as the ICU Secretary, Dr. Yosefa Sayekti, M.Com, AK, as the Finance Manager, Dr. Purnamie Titisari, SE., M.Si, as the Human Resources Manager, Moh. Ali, SH., MH, as the Assets Manager, Dr. Akhmad Toha, M.Si, as State Owned Property Manager, and Agustina Pradjaningsih, S.Si., M.Si., as the Manager of Procurement of Goods and Services (PBJ). Over the time, there has been changing of ICU personnel as explained by Mr. Taufik:

"There has been a change. Initially, there were seven, Mrs. Chandra, I, Mrs. Yosefa, Mrs. Purnami, Mr. Toha, Mrs. Agustina, Mr. Ali. But not until one year, Mr. Toha was appointed to assistant to pro-vice-chancellor, so his position was eventually replaced by Mr. Ketut. The next year Mr. Ali continued his study and there left only six people. We wanted the new one, but we couldn't find yet. The next year Mrs. Agustina continued her study again. Finally there have been five people up to now."

From the above statement, it appears that the current number of ICU key personnel is five people, including the chairman and the secretary who supervise the non-academic aspects, namely finance, state owned property/assets/procurement of goods and services, and human resources. For the procurement of goods and service is coordinated by the chairman or secretary of ICU. The *noesis* "We wanted the new one, but we couldn't find yet" was obtained by the researchers during an interview with Mr. Taufik while he was waiting for the schedule to test the thesis of his undergraduate students. The statement indicates that ICU continues to search for the right replacement to fill the position that has been abandoned by the previous personnel. The *eidetic reduction* that can be abstracted by the researchers is the turnover of personnel composition of Jember University ICU auditor that is not an absolute requirement that must be done before the ICU can find truly professional personnel in accordance with the requirements.

The researchers then asked a question related to whether the selected ICU members have been in accordance with their academic background and their respective sectors. Here is Mr. Taufik's answer:

"Yes... We're from finance consisting of two people, me and Mrs. Yossefa, because our background is accounting. In HR, there is Mrs. Purnami because her background is HR management. Then, asset, which was at that time still in general, and the procurement of goods and services were at first handled by Mr. Ali, because he was the only one who had certificate of procurement of goods and services. So in the first year we all were schooled and sent to courses so that each member of ICU has been a certified expert in procurement of goods and services. Therefore, the area of procurement of goods and services is safe. Then, for the state property management, we sent them to take courses. And finally we all are able to handle it. In conclusion, we all are competent in our respective fields. "

From the statement (*noema*) above shows that the selection of ICU personnel has been in conformity with their educational background. Mr. Taufik showed *noesis* by saying "we all were schooled and sent to courses". The *eidetic reduction* that can be abstracted by the researchers from Mr. Taufik's statements is despite the conformity between the selection of ICU personnel and their educational background, the ICU personnel are also encouraged to improve their competence, in which they are sent to get certification, training, and the development of ICU auditor such as following certifica-

tion of the Quality of Internal Audit (QIA) and certification of procurement expert. Until recently, of the UNEJ ICU members, there is still only who has obtained the title of QIA. He is Mr. Taufik, while others are still in the process of obtaining the title.

Jember University ICU, in carrying out its surveillance function is assisted by a group or a pool of auditors, the auditors who are in charge in the field of internal control of organization incorporated under the control of the Chairman of ICU. The pool of auditors consists of the auditors coming from the work units existing at Jember University and is assigned to assist the ICU core members to supervise the work units. Pool of auditors is divided into two, namely pool of financial auditors and pool of general auditor.

The first program conducted by Jember University ICU was a socialization program performed by the resource persons such as the Jember University Rector/Chancellor and Officials of Ministry of Education and Culture with participants of the heads of work units in Jember University environment. Jember University ICU mapped the problems and conditions existing in the work units sourced from the output of the socialization through *focus group discussion* (FGD). Of these FGD activities were obtained the necessary instruments to conduct the audit. The researchers asked about the first activities undertaken by Jember University ICU. Here is Mr. Taufik's answer:

"Well. At the beginning we concentrated on ICU governance. The capacity of the building needed to be improved. We built the instruments and so on. After that, we focused on the head quarter at the office of university head, and we just then mapped the units."

In connection with the theme of the first activities undertaken by ICU, "the capacity of building" is bracketed by the researchers as the *noema* of Mr. Taufik. This is the intentional analysis or reasons why *noesis* of Mr. Taufik stating "We built the instruments and so on. After that, we focused on the head quarter at the office of university head, and we just then mapped the units" can be obtained. The researchers tried to dig more information to obtain other information related to the field of ICU audit by asking the other informant. Here is the answer of the ICU HRD manager, Mrs. Purnamie:

"The first step we conducted in ICU audit process was mapping, because there had been no HRD audit activities before. So what we needed to do was digging. On the first digging process, Mrs. Purnamie and her friends invited all unit managers and searched for what was becoming the subject

matter because when we performed audit, not all performed the same thing. From the discussions, we eventually could make risk mapping. So, at first we performed audit on those that had high risks."

The researchers found the *noema* "work unit mapping" from Mrs. Purnami and specified so as to be found *noesis* in the form of "digging process by searching for the subject matter of the work unit so that it appeared the risk mapping". From the above statement, the eidetic reduction that can be abstracted by the researchers related to the theme in the area of auditing is that the ICU, at the beginning of its establishment, focused on strengthening the ICU governance by increasing the capacity building of ICU members. The capacity building was done to overcome the gap between the standard of competence required to be an internal auditor of Jember University ICU and the competence of ICU personnel today.

Regularly, Jember University ICU has work programs related to activities on monitoring and evaluating the work units at Jember University. This was disclosed by Mr. Taufik that:

"There is a mandatory plan. For each field, we conduct mandatory monitoring once but possibly it can be more or if there is special request like special audit or preparatory audit, as well as the follow-up audit. So, for each field, at least we conduct once, but on average it is usually more."

Researchers bracket *noema* [there is compulsory plan] which shows that Jember University ICU always draws up a work program every year to perform monitoring function in the work unit. Mr. Taufik's *noesis* "So, for each field, at least we conduct once, but on average it is usually more" indicates that the work system of Jember University ICU in monitoring the work units within the environment of Jember University depends on the urgency and complexity of the problems existing in the work units. So ICU can be down to each unit more than once outside the follow-up audit.

The first audit conducted by Jember University ICU is the performance assessment which is measured based on the conformity of competence, discipline, and duties. Here is Mrs. Candra's statement:

"Initially, we just carried out sampling while giving experiences to our friends so that they were not nervous when they were on duty. So in the beginning, it was in 2012, we just took sampling in three work units whereas we had a lot of work units. And they were the small ones, in Technical Implementation Unit (UPT). In faculty, it was really complex."

Well, sampling in Technical Implementation Unit (UPT) of library, then we continued to LP3 and Technical Implementation Unit (UPT) of language if I'm not mistaken. They were not complex while they were learning."

The *noema* "Initially, we just carried out sampling" shows a intentionality analysis. The Informant consciously makes the audit work program in the work unit by performing sampling in the work units that are not complex. The *noesis* of Mrs. Candra which spontaneously comes out "while giving experiences to our friends so that they are not nervous when they are on duty" makes the researchers understand so as to be able to abstract the information which eventually produces eidetic reduction that in the first year, Jember University ICU conducted performance audits limited to the work units that had no complex problems while providing experiences to their internal auditors.

At the beginning of its establishment, ICU got refusal from various parties. Yet, as time went on, after three years, the existence of Jember University ICU has been recognized and required by all personnel in the environment of Jember University. At present, all work units find that ICU is a partner in advancing Jember University as stated by Mrs. Candra:

"Yes it is easier because we've got a pattern. In the past, at the beginning it seemed that we would like to oversee all. It is not right, there is still some weaknesses, and the resistance was quite strong at the beginning. So we didn't want to be audited, we didn't provide data. Then we told that if there was a work unit that refused, it was no problem. Anyway we conveyed to the employer because it was the employer who assign had assigned us. So if they didn't want to be audited internally, no problem. I never imposed, it was at the beginning. But now they even ask for it. Miss, when will you perform audit before the external audit comes? And some work units do the same."

The researchers bracket [we've got a pattern], which is the *noema* of Mrs. Candra, and shows that the informant realizes at the beginning that when monitoring the work unit, she wanted all the problems to be solved. Additional question from auditee related to "when will the ICU last?" Here is Mrs. Candra's answer:

"I said that I actually preferred to no supervision if everything had been running according to the rules. But when it happens according to the rules, nobody knows. If there has been no finding, it means that everything has been run and my job would be easier"

when there were no findings. But the problem, there are still many things that are not in accordance with the rules, and still violate the standard. So, inevitably if the Head of University cannot undertake an obligation to supervise, the ICU will still be there. Quality assurance should be there too. That's the first. Then the second, in the organization's management system, there must be evaluation and there must be checking. Why? Because if they both did not exist, there would be no continuous improvement. So, there must be planning, execution, evaluation, and improvement. That is the cycle so that monitoring is a major organ in a university. If there's no one to evaluate, it seems everything is okay, but in fact it is not. "

Mrs. Chandra's statement above makes researchers find *noesis* "I said that I actually preferred to no supervision if everything had been running according to the rules". There is a strong desire from the work units existing at Jember University can function properly in accordance with applicable regulations. But, it is probably still far from what is desired because there are still many problems found by ICU auditors. The eidetic reduction that can be abstracted by the researchers related to this theme with the informant is that ICU should be there because there are still many discrepancies or findings obtained by internal and external auditors during the audit in the work units. The ICU can also make an evaluation because as an organization, Jember University certainly needs evaluation for sustainable improvement.

In carrying out supervision in the work units, the core personnel of ICU are required to be able carry out supervision on all areas that become the responsibility of ICU. Here is Mrs. Purnami's statement:

"Well, we all are trained as auditors. We are five people, Mrs. Candra, Mr. Taufik, I, Mrs. Yosefa, and Mr. Ketut, are all trained to audit all non-academic activities. And the one who becomes the coordinator is the person who is expertise in the field."

The similar statement was also expressed by Mrs. Chandra as follows:

"Yes, it can be because we used to. We all must understand eventhough everything is under responsibility. So the function of Mrs. Yosefa and Mrs. Purnami is to organize when we perform audit based on their responsibilities. But who will work? Of course we all."

The researchers bracket the preliminary state-

ment (*noeme*) [*we all are trained as auditors*]. It shows that all members in the work system of Jember University ICU are required to be able to work on all areas that become the responsibility of ICU in its monitoring activities in the work units. Under these conditions, the ICU personnel should be aware of all aspects in the field of audit that becomes the responsibility of Jember University ICU and of course in the beginning it took learning for auditor. When the first time of performing audit, ICU personnel supported each other so that what has been done is in accordance with the objectives of the audit. The following is statement from Mrs Purnami:

"Mrs. Purnami is as the coordinator. There are five people in the ICU. And in HRD, Mrs Purnamie is the coordinator. When we work on the fields, we are grouped into small teams. So, under the small teams, there are some members called pool of auditors. We support each other, means that those who do not understand in this field will be supported by those who understand. Here is the mechanism of learning process."

The similar statement was also expressed by Mrs. Chandra:

"...yes, they must be supported. Suppose that Mrs. Purnami and Mrs. Tina are together with me. Later anyone will be with Mr. Taufik. Anyway we reinforce each other and we don't want to let them go."

The process of extracting the *noema* from the informants above makes the researchers find *noesis* that among the ICU members support each other to build cooperation and communication so that they understand their respective duties. The statement certainly constitutes a finding for the researchers that, in fact, there is a culture of "mutual support" among the personnel of ICU that is not contained in the quality manual made by ICU in the form of ICU Charter. The existence of coordinator who is truly expertise in his field who is responsible and supportive makes the cooperation among the members of ICU better. The eidetic reduction that can be abstracted by the researchers through interviews with several informants above shows that all activities that have been coordinated well by the coordinator can prevent ambiguity of the duties and responsibilities of each member in an assignment, so that all members of ICU can act in unity to achieve the goals that have been predetermined before.

In performing their duties, ICU auditors should be independent on each activity being audited. To meet the proficiency standards of professionalism, Jember University ICU always considers

the assignment of internal auditors who are qualified in terms of task demands such as independence, education, technical ability, and the complexity of the audit task. In monitoring the work units, UNEJ ICU uses cross system to avoid conflict of interest so that the auditors assigned are not part of the work unit. Here is Mrs. Purnamie's statement:

"From the beginning we have been minimizing the conflict of interest. I am from the economic department, so I am not allowed to perform audit in economic department."

The similar statement was also expressed by Mrs. Nining:

"I do not perform audit in Economic Department. We are plotted outside because we are afraid we will not be independent. Facing our own friends is uneasy, that is why we are usually assigned outside."

From the above statement, the *noema* arises from the informants related to the independence referring to the ICU Charter, in which auditors are prohibited from conducting audits in their work unit work. Although there have been clear rules, the extraction of information from informants makes the researchers find *noesis* from Mrs. Nining's statement *"Facing our own friends is uneasy, that is why we are usually assigned outside."* This statement shows that within the informant there has been embedded the sense of reluctance or uneasy when performing audit to the auditee who has been known. In terms of professionalism, ICU auditors should be able to maintain their independence despite the need to conduct an audit on their work unit. So it should not become an obstacle if they have to monitor the auditees known.

The ICU auditors are obliged to deliver any audit findings and provide recommendations for improvement to the work units to follow up. Here is Mrs. Yosefa's statement in response to the audit findings:

"We usually tell and deliver our findings. Then we convey the shortcomings to the employer. If, for example, they can explain why so, it will be okay. But if they cannot explain, and cannot show adequate evidence, they sometimes make certain report, in which, in fact, there is condition that they forgot to attach... It is okay."

In more detail, Mrs. Candra explained:

"We have two mechanisms. If there are urgent findings, we will tell directly during the wrap up meeting in order to get immediate follow up related to the matters. For example, it is the asset audit that

can follow up the work unit, so we will tell it there. But there are times when they cannot, because it is associated with the university policy. Well... we have two times of wrap-up meeting. If the process is such, on the first wrap-up meeting at the work unit we tell things that they will likely handle immediately. And the second is the wrap-up meeting with the employer. Definitely Mr. Rector called for the existing leaders wrap up meeting. Well wrap up with the leadership it depends on the object of the audit scope of the audit."

From the informal argument above (*noema*), the *noesis* found by the researchers is that the wrap-up meeting is used for confirming the findings and the clarification of the completion ability as the follow-up by the heads of work units according to the recommendations provided. Wrap-up meeting is becoming intentionality that is consciously and deliberately done by the auditors of Jember University ICU. The results of wrap-up meeting will be used as a corrective action for audit reporting.

Sometimes in dealing with various recommendations for improvement provided by the auditors, the auditees reject the recommendation or partially accept the recommendations of the auditors. It does not matter if the work unit has a sufficient data. As expressed by Mr. Taufik below:

"If they reject it, though supported with sufficient data, it is no problem. For us, the board functions as a reviewer. So, when the pool of auditors gets findings, they will wrap up their findings. Before wrapping up, they consult us. If the evidence is sufficient, they may wrap up. But if the evidence is not sufficient, it should be dropped. If the evidence is strong, it is no problem."

The similar argument was also stated by Mrs. Chandra:

"It's ok. In the data of audit findings/audit official report, there is a statement that they accept entirely, accept partly, or reject. Therefore, we have a mechanism, ie follow-up audit. If he does not follow up, we have got a note on which section that has not been followed up. We report that a certain percentage of the work unit follows up, a certain percentage does not follow up, a certain percentage follows up partly and so on, so we can convey it. Then, the party that will follow up those who make rejection is university. The most important thing is that we have shown the real condition and this is what they are supposed to do. When they reject it, this is no longer the ICU business. We only recommend that this one needs to be improved in accordance with the rules, the laws, and so on."

Based on the statement above related to the exploration of the theme on the auditee's rejection to the auditor's findings, the researchers conduct bracketing [If they reject it, but supported with sufficient data, it is no problem] as *noema* arising from the informant. The statement coming out of the informant shows that the informant is not rigid in dealing with answers of the head of work unit related to the recommendations provided, whether to accept, to reject, or to accept partly. The extraction of information from the informant makes the researchers find *noesis* on Mrs. Candra's statement "When they reject it, this is no longer the ICU business. We only recommend that this one needs to be improved in accordance with the rules, the laws, and so on ". This indicates that the Jember University ICU has no authority to force the work units to do all recommendations related to the findings in the work units. ICU is just limited to providing recommendations to the work units. And the party that has the right to follow up the work unit which is persistent not to follow the recommendations of a working unit without strong evidence is the head of the university.

ICU, as the work unit assigned by the Chancellor/Rector of Jember University, was established not only to perform administrative activities but also to focus on the achievement of good university governance (GUG), risk management, and control at Jember University. To find out more about the definition of GUG according to the Jember University ICU, the researchers asked some questions. Here is an answer from Mrs. Nining:

"When the university has been good, it means that the university stakeholders can access, view, and enjoy all university programs, in which ranging from planning to the accountability are all clear."

A more specific answer was conveyed by Mrs. Candra:

"Good University Governance is how everything in the organization runs well, not only in the aspect of academic but also in all aspects including the supporting aspects. Actually, our court is in academic but we get support from various fields: finance, student affairs, and so on. If all of them are good and have been arranged well, it is called good university governance. So, we have to make all organizations in this university run according to the rules and the standards we have created and there is no rule violation even though it will take a long time to achieve it. So, from those there will be vision, mission, goals, and objectives, and don't forget that there are also strategic plans. To achieve the targets, we must create strategic plans to get certain indica-

tors leading to to the vision. Good university in what terms? For example in terms of academic, what will be done in the day-to-day implementation? What are the indicators? Then we will include them in the strategic plan. So, there must be strategic plan."

Based on the statement above, the *noema* [how everything in the organization runs well] shows that the informant sees GUG as a university governance that guarantees transparency, accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness to all stakeholders so that the university goes well in accordance with the existing rules and standards. Then Mrs. Candra explained her statement (*noesis*) more deeply related to GUG:

"Well... we are not in the field of academics. We are in the field of supporting, but that does not mean that we cannot oversee it, because we do have the funds, we must have plans, so we must audit in its planning. We need to know whether or not the planning is used to achieve the goals existing in the vision. It must be related to academics. Academic not only consists of learning, but also research and devotion. We need to know whether or not the supporting leads to the objective. It is described that we have goal, and there must be academics in the goal. Here, we must supervise the way/its supporting. How is the supervision? For the academic achievement, the supervision is on how the learning process is done by our friends in BPM and Research Institution, how the research is conducted by our friends in Research Institution, how the curriculum is designed by our friends in LP3, how the supporting funds are planned, how the human resources support that this, and this is our part. So, there must be divisions. How to implement it depending on the faculty and that is called the division."

From the above statement, the eidetic reduction can be abstracted by the researchers from the informant related to the theme of GUG. The work implementation of each field in the work units has their respective roles in the achievement of GUG in the university. There should be a strategic plan undertaken by each work units using measurable indicators so that the goals set can be achieved.

Next, the researchers attempt to dig out from the informants associated with the central role of Jember University ICU in achieving GUG at Jember University. Here is Pak Taufik's answer:

"GUG is achieved from all stakeholders. So ICU considers that when ICU is fixing the management of resources, assets, and financial to become transparent, automatically the ICU is taking part in the

achievement of GUG in the University."

The researchers conducted bracketing the *noema* [GUG is achieved from all stakeholders] indicating that the ICU is one of several stakeholders at Jember University that play a role in achieving GUG Jember University. There are many stakeholders involved in the effort to achieve GUG at Jember University. Furthermore, Mr. Taufik's statement is deepened so the researchers find the *noesis* that when Jember University ICU has run its monitoring functions to the work units existing at Jember University in accordance with its duties, the ICU surely also plays a role in achieving GUG at Jember University.

GUG implementation requires transparency and accountability at the university. Associated with the presence of ICU at Jember University, transparency and accountability are important measure to determine the extent of Jember University ICU responsible for their duties to the Chancellor/Rector of UNEJ that include supervision of the work units at Jember University, the use the funds from the university, the performance of ICU personnel related to the ICU Charter, as well as the role of ICU in achieving accountability of work units at Jember University.

Jember University ICU is responsible for its performance vertically to the Chancellor of Jember University. Any activity undertaken by ICU requires a decree (SK) from the Chancellor of Jember University and the accountability is reported to the Chancellor of Jember University. The following is the initial statement (*noema*) disclosed by Mrs. Candra:

"We send the report only to the head of university and not to the work units. So, if they have the report, it means that they get it from the university. I never want to send the report. So, we also send the report to the Inspector General."

From this statement, the researchers find *noesis* from Mrs. Candra "I never want to send the report", indicating that indeed Jember University ICU was established as the "right hand" and "eye" of the Chancellor. So, the accountability must be reported to the Head of UNEJ as a fiduciary. ICU always reports what has been done related to its functions to supervise the work units in the form of audit report (LHA) which contains the results of the examination, the conclusion of the internal auditor's opinion, as well as the recommendations made in writing and timely delivered to the authorities.

In connection with the funds used by Jember

University ICU, The ICU is responsible for making accountability report of the funds used in carrying out the work program. The following is the initial statement (*noema*) of Mrs. Candra:

"We are also the same. The financial report will be monitored by the financial auditor through the accountability report and financial book keeping. Mrs. Chandra will monitor the finances managed ICU. We also have the funds. It is one of the financial liabilities. Then our activities are audited by BPM. So, BPM personnel focus more on the aspect of activities, and not the finance. The ICU activities which include proposing something, how could there be hundreds of millions of fund in ICU, what activities it performs, and so on are audited by quality assurance. Just like when get BOPTN funds, we have got the report and it must be asked. The next is the audit from of external. When the Inspector General comes, the ICU will then be called. We are the same as other the other work units and we are treated the same. For example, ICU manages the fund of several hundred million. And then we will be questioned about its accountability, how to implement the activities using the fund."

Based on the statement above, the researchers find *noesis* from Mrs. Candra's statement "We are the same as other work units and we are treated the same". The statement indicates that although ICU, in one of its functions, monitors the financial management in the work units, but Jember University ICU also responsible for reporting the funds used to execute any work program. Associated with the activities that have been carried out, Jember University ICU is also open to be supervised by the Quality Assurance Agency of Jember University in order to see whether the work program has been in accordance with the rules and procedures applicable at Jember University. And, of course, as a working unit at Jember University, ICU also cannot be separated from the supervision of the Inspector General of the Ministry of Education and Culture that conducts internal control in the Ministry of Education and Culture.

Related to the role of ICU in creating transparency and accountability in the work units, Jember University ICU contributes to achieve good governance by supervising and monitoring the governance of the work units at Jember University. ICU searches for the root of the internal problem of the work units and resolves the problem based on the recommendations given by ICU. So, the presence of ICU has a positive impact and provides benefits for the work units in realizing the accountability of the work unit.

In carrying out supervision, Jember University ICU auditors encounter some resistance from internal ICU. The resistance from the internal includes some of the ICU personnel initially still has no experience in the field of monitoring, the limited number of HR internal auditors mainly the financial internal auditor finance, all ICU auditors are lecturers so they get difficulty in managing time between carrying out *tri dharma of education* and carrying out their duties as internal auditors, and ICU personnel who still understand the concept only but not the technical aspects related to the field being audited. Meanwhile, the external factors are related to the rejection of the auditee when the ICU starts working. This makes ICU get difficulty in obtaining the data.

Various barriers being experienced make the UNEJ ICU auditors work hard to find solutions to overcome the barriers. The recruited auditors to expedite the site visit in the work units, providing education and training regularly to increase the competence and qualifications of ICU auditors, and performing persuasive approach to the auditee that ICU is a partner that helps the auditee to know the problems faced by the work units and provide recommendations as to remedial solutions to minimize the findings by external auditors.

5. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, SUGGESTION, AND LIMITATIONS

Jember University ICU was established to strengthen the governance in order they implement the tasks and functions of the work unit. Jember University ICU supervises non-academic fields by conducting an audit program in the fields of finance, human resources, state owned property, and procurement of goods and services. The ICU auditors' understanding of carrying out their functions has been in accordance with the ICU Charter. After learning the informants deeply, it is found noeses in which the informants' understanding is not only through knowledge and the implementation of the rules, but it is also strengthened through cultural practice with mutual support.

ICU, as a work unit at Jember University, is not the only one that contributes to achieving GUG at Jember University. ICU is a small part of all stakeholders associated with achieving GUG at Jember University. Although ICU has already been running well and the results of the audit are available, the recommendations are not followed up properly by the head of each unit, the role of ICU will merely function as administrative only. So, there should be a support and synergy from all parties, such as the

Head of University, faculty, ICU, Quality Assurance Agency (BPM), and other stakeholders so that the efforts to realize GUG at Jember University can be easily achieved.

The limitation of this study is that the researchers failed to interview the chairman of state owned property (BMN) relating to the goods purchased or acquired using the state budget funds or come from other legitimate acquisition such as grants or contracts. In conducting interviews, the researchers were also constrained by the state of the informants who are always in a hurry due to many activities. So, during the interviews, the researchers were not able to dig and explore the experience and understanding of the informants deeply.

The suggestion for Jember University ICU is that since all ICU internal auditors, both the board of ICU and poll of auditors, are the lecturers who were given additional task to become internal auditors. Besides that, Jember University ICU should recruit professional auditors in order to be able to facilitate and improve the performance of the ICU in running its duties and responsibilities.

REFERENCES

- Aisyah, S, Husaini, Halimatusyadiah and Abdullah, 2013, 'Peran Satuan Pengawasan Internal (SPI) di Perguruan Tinggi Negeri Indonesia', *Project Report*, Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu.
- Aristo, DA 2005, 'Good University Governance', <<http://aristodiga.blogspot.com>>, viewed January 2014.
- Asy'ari, MA, Prasetyono and Haryadi, B 2013, 'Peran dan Fungsi Satuan Pengawasan Intern dalam Pencegahan Fraud pada Perguruan Tinggi X', *JAFFA*, 1(2) : 99-112.
- BAN-PT, 2011, *Standar dan Prosedur Akreditasi Institusi Perguruan Tinggi*, Jakarta.
- Creswell, JW 2008, *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*, New Jersey: Practice Hall.
- Creswell, JW 2010, *Research Design : Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed*, Yogyakarta: PT Pustaka Pelajar.
- Fielden, J 2008, 'Global Trends in University Governance', *Education Working Paper Series*, (9): 1-70.
- Moleong, LJ 2012, *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi)*, Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Patton, MQ 2002, *Qualitative Research Evaluation Methods*, Third Edition, California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Priastuti, E 2011, 'Kinerja Satuan Pengawas Internal

- (SPI) dalam Pengawasan Bidang Akademik, Keuangan dan Asset di Lingkungan Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta', *Abstracts*, Digilib Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.
- Sanders, P 1982, 'Phenomenology: A New of Viewing Organizational Research, *Academy of Management*', *Review*, 7 (3): 353-360.
- SPI Universitas Jember, 2013, *SPI Charter Universitas Jember*, Jember.
- Swansson, JA, Mow, KE & Bartos, S 2005, 'Good university governance in Australia', *Proceedings Forum of the Australian Association for Institutional Research*: 98-109.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi 2013, *SPI Charter Universitas Jember*, Jember.
- Wijatno, S 2009, *Pengelolaan Perguruan Tinggi Secara Efisien, Efektif, dan Ekonomis untuk Meningkatkan Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan dan Mutu Lulusan*, Jakarta: Salemba Empat.