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**Abstract.** This study aims to describe the understanding of records managers and archivists in universities as managers of student records that will be a source of data in *Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi ( Forlap Dikti)*. Survey was conducted to obtain their understanding of the forlap dikti and student records that would be the main data in the forlap of dikti. The results of the study will provide an overview of understanding, attitudes and activities that have been carried out by archivists and records managers at the university in order to support Forlap Dikti as a center of data collection of high education providers throughout Indonesia.

The research results are expected to provide input to universities to ensure student record management programs can support data in the Dikti forlap system. Besides that the results of this study will also provide input to the Kemenristek Dikti to strengthen the role of Forlap Dikti as a reference for scholarships, research, and student level competitions in Indonesia
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**1 Introduction**

The rise of issues concerning false diplomas conducted by public officials and public, plagiarism of scientific papers, the loss of archives of research results caused by various factors originated from the quality of university records and archive management. Quoted from detikNews 1 January 2015, Kemenristek Dikti continues to work to identify problematic campuses which allegedly carry out the practice of buying and selling diplomas, as of September 29, 2015 there were 243 campuses which were deactivated due to problems. Information related to the non-active campus was announced by Kopertis XII in the Maluku and North Maluku regions and was confirmed by the Minister of Research and Technology Dikti Muhammad Nasir. (https://news.detik.com.)

The emergence of cases of rejection of new admissions or loss of opportunity to participate in national-level Mapres due to the name of the student not registered in Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi or called Forlap Dikti also raises questions about how the management of student records has been done (Puspita, 2018). In many universities, the management of this archives institution still encounters various obstacles both regarding policy and management system according to studies conducted by Pusat Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Sistem Kearsipan (2013). In fact, the archives created from the activities of public administration, teaching and learning process, research, community service, and academic activities are also used as a university accountability performance and national responsibility that needs to be saved for the benefit of the nation and state, in term of keeping the rights of students who have completed their studies

Efforts to ensure the protection of graduate rights can be made by ensuring the existence of student records since the beginning of its creation. University must apply the principles of good record management. Record management principles are focused on managing records from creation to retention. University must also ensure the main purpose of record management is to help the university organize their records and archives for retrieval and storage and to protect them from misuse.

Implementation of ICT in the management of student archives at the higher institution and ministry levels is an opportunity to simplify the process..All the extrinsic and intrinsic elements of records are incorporated to form the records profile. A key requirement for a record profile is to ensure that records are authentic, trustworthy and reliable. Without these criteria, records may not be valid as evidence to protect organisations from risks that may damage its business function, mission or reputation.( Mokhtar, Yusof, Kamsuriah, & Jambari, 2016)

**2 Literature Review**

Considering the importance of the role of the record as evidence of activities there are several studies made to ensure all extrinsic and intrinsic components of the record are maintained so that they can be used to create a reliable recording profile of activities. Several electronic record studies to ascertain the main requirements records as business evidences. A study proposes an electronic archive management model that applies a methodical method to determine the classification and other metadata terms in the recording profile. Then the record is stored in a folder-based structure that is in accordance with the organization's classification scheme. The model in this study illustrates how this process works with most digital recording systems, where metadata can be equipped with a user before the record is entered into the system (Mokhtar, Yusof, Kamsuriah, & Jambari, 2016). The application of this model requires that the record creation stage requires a disposition schedule, retrieval methods, metadata elements, shapes and structures, and technological solutions. Records are controlled through processes such as registration, classification, selection, access rules, authorization for the use, disposition, transfer, deletion, destruction and administration of the recording system (Mokhtar, Yusof, Kamsuriah, & Jambari, 2016)

A study in Turkey shows that ERMS will be useful for users if the system can facilitate the creation of documents, access to records and document tracking and the recording system must function properly. By improving the system, according to a questionnaire distributed to Ministry personnel, the level of satisfaction from in-house IT services has increased from the previous year with a value range of 71% to 77%. (Demirtel & Bayran, 2014)

Other researchers also found that most of the data in higher education institutions was not structured even though most of the data used every day for academic management was structured data. This fact is the reason for building a better access control policy. (Khalil, Khair & Nassif,2015). A study conducted by ANRI also showed In many universities, the management of this archives institution still encounters various obstacles both regarding policy and management system. (2013)

**3 Research Method**

This paper is the result of qualitative descriptive research on the understanding of records managers and archivists about *Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi ( Forlap Dikti)*. This study provide an overview of understanding, attitudes and activities that have been carried out by archivists and records managers at the university in order to support Forlap Dikti as a center of data collection of high education providers throughout Indonesia.

The survey was conducted on 255 archivists in the Higher Education Archives Forum group from various universities in Indonesia. From 255 archivists, there were 48 respondents from around 20 different universities in Indonesia Data collection methods were conducted through on line survey. This study also use data from PPID ANRI from the Central Sub Directorate III.

**4 Result and Discussion**

As is known, all data of higher education in PDDikti are all data provided by higher educational institutions themselves, so that all data quality and strength are the full responsibility of the institution. Whereas the source of the data on the educational activity organizing process is the entire record or archive created by the activity in the institution. Under Permenristek Dikti Permeristek Dikti No. 78 of 2017 article 27 organizing archival activities in higher institutions is the responsibility of structural officials in the field of Archives, Archivists, Archives organizers and staffs in the Archives field. Therefore the quality and quantity of PDDikti data are also determined by the role of archivists in higher institutions in managing their records and records. To find out how the relationship between the role of archivists in managing PDDikti, the following will be explained about PDDikti, University Archives and Records Center (LKPT) and understanding of archivists about PDDikti based on the results of a survey conducted.

**5 Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi**

Based on the Ministry of Higher Education Regulation No. 61 of 2016 concerning Pangkalan Data Perguruan Tinggi, article 1, Pangkalan Data Perguruan Tinggi, starting now referred to as PDDikti is a system that collects higher education data from all nationally integrated higher institutions. PDDikti or better known as the Forlap Dikti (Higher Education Report Forum) is a center of data collection of high education providers throughout Indonesia. PDDIKTI was born from the mandate of Law no. 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education as a reference Higher Education data. (https://pddikti.wordpress.com.)

PDDikti is an activity of collecting, processing, and storage of data and information about Higher Education by Government, which is useful to control the fulfillment of a high-quality education guarantee system. Starting from Universities, Study Program Profiles, Lecturer Profiles, Profile of Teachers, Student Profiles, and Research both PTN, PTS, and PTK. These data sets are managed by the Directorate General of Higher Education Addressed at http://forlap.dikti.go.id/ which is a synchronized data PDDIKTI application managed by each national college, and Kemenristekdikti is not authorized to change, add, and reduce the reported data. To collect data from higher institutions, PDDikti Feeder is used, which is software that is placed in higher institutions and has a replica database structure from the PDDikti database which is used as an official reporting tool for higher education throughout the higher institutions. Regulation of the Ministry of Research and Technology No. 61 of 2016, article 2, states the purpose of the PDDikti which includes for accreditation institutions, to accredit the Study Program and Higher Education; for government, to regulate, plan, supervise, monitor, and evaluate and guidance and coordination of Study Programs and Universities and for the community, to find out the performance of the Study Program and Higher Education.

**5 University Archives and Records Center**

The existence of higher institution archive institutions is regulated in the Directorate of Higher Education No. 78 of 2017 Article 6 Paragraph (2). According to the Directorate of Higher Education No. 78 of 2017 Article 6 Paragraph (2) universities must have a Filing Organization consisting of Processing Units (Unit of Work), Filing Unit II (Faculty Archive Unit) and Filing Unit I or Higher institution Archives Institution (Archive Office) ). As the ultimate responsibility of the archive management in universities, the task of the Filing Unit I as outlined in article 13, paragraph 3, Units I have the duty to Prepare Policy in Archive fields: Arranging a filing system at PTN; Do collection maintenance . ; Acquisition of Static Archives at PTN; Eradicate Archives by the provisions of the Act; Conducting Evaluation of Filing Performance at PTN

The existence of archival institutions as an instrument in the organization of national archives is first regulated in Article 16 paragraph 3 of Law No. 43 of 2009 concerning Archives that consist of ANRI archives, provincial archives, county/city archives, and higher institution archives. Higher institution archive institutions are regulated in Article 1 number 17 of Law No. 43 of 2009 concerning Archives, that the Archives of Higher Education is an archive of institutions in the form of a unit of organization of the university, both public and private that carry out functions and tasks of organizing files in a higher institution environment.

Given the important role of archival management in higher institutions under Law No. 43 of 2009 concerning the Archives and Permeristek Dikti No. 78 of 2017, ANRI has a Central Sub Directorate III that specializes in guiding for organizing archives in universities in Indonesia. Based on data obtained from PPDikti higher institutions in Indonesia amounted to 4709 with 436 state higher institutions consisting of various types of higher institutions. While based on data collected from ANRI PPID regarding the number of higher institutions that have been under the guidance of the Central Sub Directorate III is 188. Of the total higher institutions, there are only 24 higher institutions that have archival institutions mandated in Law No. 43 of 2009 article 27 (2). With the existence of autonomy of higher education and higher institution position as organizer of archives, there is an adjustment of authority, existence, and nomenclature of the archival institution in a higher institution environment with the title of Archival of Higher Education.

The figure 1 shows a comparison between the number of higher institutions in Indonesia, the number of higher institutions in the formation of ANRI and the archiving institutions of existing higher institutions (LKPT).

**Fig. 1.** Perguruan Tinggi vs LKPT

From the graph above, it can be seen that only 43% of universities have coordinated with ANRI as a guiding institution for all national archiving activities, and only 5.5% of universities have LKPT. With these conditions seen even though the existence of LKPT which plays a role in fostering the organization of archives in higher institutions mandated by strict legal rules cannot yet encourage higher institutions to implement them.

**6 Archivist and PDDikti**

Given the role of higher archivists in managing the educational process documents in their institutions, it is necessary to know the understanding of higher archivists about PDDikti. The role of archivists specifically in higher institutions is regulated in the Ministry of Research and Technology Regulation No. 78 of 2017 concerning the Administration of Archives in the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, article 27. In this article, it is explained that the Archiving human resources consist of structural officials in the field of Archives, Archivists, Archive stylist, and staff in the area of Archives.

This study tries to see the extent to which university archivists know and are involved in the process of providing data for PDDikti through online surveys. The survey was conducted on 255 archivists in the Higher Education Archives Forum group from various universities in Indonesia. From 255 archivists, there were 48 respondents from around 20 different universities in Indonesia, including the University of Indonesia, Padjadjaran University, Gajah Mada University, Pattimura University, University, and the State of Malang.

The first three questions contain a basic introduction to the archives regarding the existence of PDDikti including the experience of interacting with PDDikti, that is, having heard, had accessed and or been involved in managing data. Respondents' answers showed that although 83% of archivists had heard/knew the existence of PDDikti, only 31% had been involved in managing the data.(see Figure 2)

**Fig. 2.** Archivist vs PDDikti in %

The next three questions relate to the data in PDDikti, including ease of access, data sources, and data transmission through direct synchronization. Archivists know that PDDikti data is easily accessible, 70% of respondents also understand that the data comes from reported higher institutions, but only half of the respondents see the method of entering PDDikti data by higher institutions. The level of understanding of respondents can be seen in the following figure (Figure 3).

**Fig. 3.** Archivist vs Data PDDikti in %

To find out more about the respondents' understanding, the next three questions about the PDDikti function can be used by all stakeholders, including students and the community as university users. The purpose of the PDDikti as a monitoring instrument, a source of reference for people in general and the risks that might occur by stakeholders, especially graduates of a higher institution if the data is not in the PDDikti is illustrated in the graph below.(see Figure 3)

**Fig. 4.** Functions and Risk in %

Respondents generally understand that PDDikti can be used as a source of reference for all stakeholders (91%), but for the monitoring function there are still respondents who do not know it, and this is likely related to the ignorance of respondents about risk factors that occur if there are college graduates who are not found in PDDikti.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fuction** | **Percentance** |
| Accreditation institution, to accredit the Study Program and Higher Education; | 70,2 |
| Government, to regulate, plan, supervise, monitor, and evaluation and guidance and coordination of Study Programs and Universities | 74,5 |
| The community, to find out the performance of the Study Program and Higher Education | 36,2 |
| Others | 8,5 |

**Table 1.** Percentage of Function

To find more information about respondents' understanding of the PDDikti function, the survey measures how much the respondent's knowledge of each function. The results show that archivists understand most of these functions. The Table 1 provides the level of understanding of respondents for each PDDikti function for all higher education stakeholders

The table 2 shows that respondents, as members of the community, are not yet accustomed to using PDDikti as a reference for finding out the performance of the Study Program and Higher Education. The results of the above questions are also strengthened by the table whose contents explore archival knowledge about the information presented by PDDikti. Some respondents (74.5%) know that PDDikti can be a reference to find out the status of higher institutions, while for other information such as to find out the authenticity of diplomas and other aspects of higher institutions the value is only around 50%.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Important information in PDDIKTI** | **Percentance** |
| Higher Education Status | 74,5 |
| Ratio of student lecturers | 55,3 |
| Institutional engagement with other institutions | 44,7 |
| The authenticity of the graduate diploma (student) under PDDIKTI | 53,2 |
| Others | 8,5 |

**Table 2.** Percentage of Important Information in PDDIKTI

Based on the discussion above, it is obtained an overview of the understanding and involvement of higher archivists in PDDikti, which still needs to be improved considering the data sent by higher institutions comes from the records and records management that they do. The existence of the University Archives and Records Center (LKPT) in state universities is less than 6%, whereas LKPT is a work unit responsible for fostering the administration of archives in higher institutions.

**7 Conclusion**

The implementation of PDDikti to regulate graduate legality is an effort that needs to be supported by all higher education stakeholders in Indonesia. The readiness of higher education institutions to support this system needs to be considered so that the final result will be as planned. The implementation of records management and university archives needs to be strengthened. With the support of university archivists as implementing records and records management in all units within the higher institution, the quality and quantity of data to be stored by PDDikti will be stronger and more credible.

With only a small percentage of university archival institutions occurs, the government needs to ensure that all higher institutions obey the rule of law to establish records management and university archives soon. Higher education also needs to strengthen the role of archivists in higher institutions in managing and providing data for PDDikti by involving and building awareness that all records and records that they maintain will also determine the quality and progress of higher education in Indonesia.
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