



UNIVERSITAS
MUHAMMADIYAH
SIDENRENG RAPPANG



SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT
GOALS

SDG 16

Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions

Progress Report 2025

Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang

Reporting period 1 January to 31 December 2025

Prepared 29 October 2026

16 PEACE, JUSTICE
AND STRONG
INSTITUTIONS



*Mewujudkan Masyarakat
yang Damai, Berkeadilan,
dan Kelembagaan yang
Kuat untuk Pembangunan
Berkelanjutan*

UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH
SIDENRENG RAPPANG



SDG 16 Peace Justice and Strong Institutions Progress Report 2025

Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang

Reporting period 1 January to 31 December 2025

Prepared 29 October 2026

Executive overview

UMS Rappang's documented 2025 contribution to SDG 16 includes campus violence-prevention review, learning with the Ombudsman, public-service internships, community consultation and research on transparent digital governance. Internal quality assurance provides an additional institutional accountability process. A public satisfaction survey conducted with FISIP offers evidence of university engagement in gathering citizen perspectives on local governance.

Contribution	Evidence covered
Campus safety	PPKPT prevention evaluation meeting
Public accountability education	Ombudsman study visit involving 50 students
Citizen perspectives	FSI and FISIP public satisfaction survey involving 680 respondents
Public-service capacity	FISIP internship launch covering 38 placement locations
Institutional review and participation	Health Administration audit and Carawali consultation
Governance knowledge	Master's thesis results seminar on inclusive digital public services

Main finding

The evidence establishes educational activities, review processes and opportunities for participation. It does not establish a measured reduction in violence or corruption, improved access to justice, or demonstrated improvements in public-service performance attributable to the university. Each evidence area is therefore presented with its documented output and the additional records needed to assess results.

Reporting status

This report includes seven original source photographs and clickable evidence links. It is a 2026 synthesis of the 2025 activity period, subject to institutional factual review and approval before release. It does not establish that this report was published in 2025.

Scope and evidence method

This selective report draws on official university news and accounts published by the Ombudsman, district government and a village government. It covers seven evidence areas rather than a complete audit of institutional policy, finances or legal services. Sources were reviewed on 29 October 2026.

Relationship to SDG 16

The most relevant UN target directions are reducing violence under 16.1, effective and accountable institutions under 16.6, inclusive and responsive decision-making under 16.7, and public access to information under 16.10. Learning about complaint mechanisms also supports understanding of rights and institutional remedies. These are thematic links rather than measurements of UN indicators or a determination of ranking eligibility.

[\[8\]](#)

Type of evidence	Interpretation
Meeting and review	Demonstrates a reported process; subsequent implementation requires its own record.
Study visit and internship launch	Demonstrates a learning opportunity; completion and competency are separate results.
Citizen survey	Reports respondents' perceptions; does not prove objective service quality or causal effects.
Research seminar	Demonstrates academic examination; policy adoption and service changes are not assumed.
Village consultation	Shows a forum for input; proposed projects are not treated as completed.
Internal academic audit	Supports quality accountability; it is not a financial or anti-corruption audit.

Numbers and dates

The 50 students, 680 respondents and 38 placement locations describe different units and cannot be added into a beneficiary total. Activity dates are separated from publication dates. The survey's data-collection period is distinct from the presentation and news dates. Undated current web features are not used to establish that a policy or service operated throughout 2025.

Campus violence prevention and oversight

PPKPT evaluation / Activity 22 October 2025 / News 31 October 2025

UMS Rappang's violence prevention and handling task force, PPKPT, met with the Vice Rector for Student Affairs on 22 October 2025. The account describes evaluation of prevention policies and programmes, including oversight of student activities. It identifies planned strengthening through programme and faculty recommendations, activity suitability review and schedules naming responsible persons. [\[1\]](#)



Figure 1. Photograph published with the university account of the PPKPT evaluation meeting. Source [\[1\]](#).

Contribution and documented output

The meeting is evidence of an institutional prevention review relevant to target 16.1. Attention to responsibilities and oversight also relates to accountable institutional processes. The source establishes a review and stated follow-up direction; it does not establish that every proposed mechanism was implemented or that violence declined.

Assessment and follow up

Retain the task-force appointment, meeting minutes, agreed actions and dated evidence of implementation. A stronger assessment would examine awareness of reporting routes, timely support and compliance with the activity-review process. Any aggregate reporting on cases should protect identities and explain definitions and reporting periods. A low number of reports alone cannot demonstrate safety because awareness and willingness to report may vary. No case total or reduction rate is inferred here.

Learning about public service oversight with the Ombudsman

Public Administration and HIMAP | Makassar | 12 June 2025

The South Sulawesi Ombudsman office reports receiving 50 UMS Rappang Public Administration students on 12 June 2025. Programme head Hardianti and lecturers Yayuk Astuti and Hariyanti Hamid accompanied them. The learning session covered complaint reporting, verification and follow-up concerning maladministration, followed by discussion of the Ombudsman's role and cases. [\[2\]](#)



Figure 2. Photograph published by the Ombudsman with its account of the HIMAP study visit. Source [\[2\]](#).

Contribution to SDG 16

The visit connects public-administration education with an external oversight institution. Understanding how complaints are handled is relevant to accountability under target 16.6 and to informed participation in institutional processes. It is an educational contribution; it does not establish that students provided legal representation or resolved public complaints.

Learning assessment and evidence needs

Retain the visit agenda, attendance and associated course assignment. Learning could be assessed through an anonymised case exercise requiring students to identify the responsible institution, explain a reporting pathway and distinguish an allegation from a verified finding. Programme reporting should document demonstrated understanding separately from attendance. Any later public-service or complaint-support activity requires its own authorisation, delivery record and outcome evidence.

Collecting citizen perspectives on local governance

FSI and FISIP | Survey 20 November to 5 December 2025 | Presentation 30 December 2025

A district government article dated 31 December 2025 reports a survey by Formasi Survei Indonesia with FISIP UMS Rappang. It involved 680 registered voters and used interviews and questionnaires. Findings were presented at the university on 30 December. The account reports an aggregate satisfaction figure of 75.42% across its main dimensions. [\[3\]](#)



Figure 3. Image accompanying the district government report on the survey presentation. Source [\[3\]](#).

Contribution and interpretation

Collecting and discussing citizen perceptions is relevant to targets 16.6 and 16.7. It can inform questions for further public-service review. The 75.42% value is the source's cross-dimension aggregate, rather than a university performance score or a verified SDG indicator. The report is not evidence that the university caused satisfaction levels to rise.

Methodological follow up

The source states an approximately 3.75% margin of error at 95% confidence. Independent assessment would require the sampling design, response rate, questionnaire, weighting and calculation method. Preserve the complete survey report and anonymised analytical records. Some published response-category totals do not sum to 100%; clarify missing responses and rounding before reusing detailed percentages. The survey's general public-service item is not automatically equivalent to indicator 16.6.2, which concerns the last service experience.

Preparing students for accountable public service

FISIP internship programme / Launch 3 February 2025 / News 4 February 2025

The university reports the launch of internships for Public Administration and Government Science students at 38 locations across Sidrap, Pinrang and Parepare. The programme theme concerned public-service excellence through digital governance innovation. Placements included government institutions and community organisations, with university leadership outlining the intended practical learning role. [\[4\]](#)



Figure 4. Photograph published with the university account of the FISIP internship launch. Source [\[4\]](#).

Contribution and evidence status

The launch establishes an opportunity to develop skills relevant to institutional effectiveness under target 16.6. Exposure to service delivery may also help students understand responsiveness and inclusion. Thirty-eight refers to placement locations, not students or completed service innovations. The launch report does not establish completion, satisfaction gains or reduced processing times.

Assessment and follow up

Retain placement agreements, student rosters, placement dates, supervision records and final assignments. Assessment should identify actual tasks and demonstrated competencies. If a student project changes a service process, document the initial problem, implemented change, responsible host and subsequent measurement. Beneficiary experience and accessibility should be assessed directly where relevant. Internship attendance alone should remain separate from evidence of public-sector performance improvement.

Research on inclusive and transparent digital services

Master of Public Administration | Seminar 30 October 2025 | News 1 November 2025

A master's thesis results seminar at UMS Rappang examined Hardinda's research on evaluating a digital governance model for inclusive and transparent public services in Sidenreng Rappang. The event took place in the FISIP hall on 30 October 2025 as an academic review before the final thesis examination. The account describes discussion of transparency, participation and service-oriented reform. [\[5\]](#)



Figure 5. Photograph accompanying the university report on the digital governance thesis results seminar. Source [\[5\]](#).

Contribution to governance knowledge

The seminar demonstrates academic examination of a topic relevant to targets 16.6 and 16.7. Its contribution is the development and review of governance knowledge. It does not establish final thesis approval, publication, implementation by local government or measurable improvements in inclusive services.

Records needed for further assessment

Retain the thesis, seminar record, research methods and revision outcomes. A later policy brief should distinguish findings from recommendations and identify the evidence behind each proposed change. If a public institution adopts a recommendation, document the decision, implementation scope and subsequent service assessment. Digital availability alone is insufficient to establish inclusion; evidence should address whether intended users can access and use the service.

Internal accountability through academic quality audit

Health Administration programme / Audit 11 August 2025 / News 12 August 2025

The Health Administration programme underwent an internal quality audit led by the university Quality Assurance Board and its auditors. The account describes review of semester learning plans, teaching records, learning evaluations, meeting evidence and student-activity documents. It also records examination of the PPEPP cycle of setting, implementing, evaluating, controlling and improving standards. [\[6\]](#)



Figure 6. Photograph published with the account of the Health Administration internal quality audit. Source [\[6\]](#).

Contribution and scope

Documented review against standards is relevant to the institutional accountability direction of target 16.6. The source supports a programme-level academic audit, rather than an institution-wide financial audit, proof of absence of corruption or an independent assurance opinion.

Closing the improvement cycle

Retain the audit plan, criteria, findings, response and evidence that agreed corrective actions were completed. Distinguish the number of findings from their significance and track follow-up against responsible units and dates. A public summary could communicate the process and verified improvements without exposing confidential records. The news item indicates intended follow-up but does not provide finding totals, closure rates or evidence that every action was completed during 2025.

Participatory planning with Carawali residents

KKN cohort 7 | Carawali village | 15 July 2025

The Carawali village website reports a KKN work-programme seminar involving UMS Rappang, IAIN Parepare and Universitas Hasanuddin. Village officials, community figures, supervisors and residents attended. UMS Rappang students presented eight proposed programmes, including SIBERAS for village information and public services, and residents provided input. [\[7\]](#)



Figure 7. Photograph accompanying the village government report on the joint KKN planning seminar. Source [\[7\]](#).

Contribution to participation and transparency

Presenting proposed work and receiving community input provides evidence of a participatory planning forum relevant to target 16.7. The information-sharing function also supports institutional openness. The report does not establish that all resident groups were represented or that each suggestion affected the final plan.

Distinguishing consultation from delivery

The eight programmes are proposals at the seminar stage. In particular, a SIBERAS proposal is not evidence of a functioning village information service. Retain attendance, minutes, comments received and the revised work plan to show how input was considered. Subsequent reports should identify which actions were delivered and how residents evaluated them. Representation and accessibility should be assessed using actual participation records rather than inferred from an event photograph.

Assessment of progress against SDG 16

The reviewed evidence shows several ways a university can support stronger institutions: educating future public servants, engaging oversight bodies, reviewing its own processes and providing spaces for community input. These are credible activity-level contributions, with outcome evidence still needed in several areas.

Target direction	Evidence in this report	Supported conclusion
16.1 Reduced violence	PPKPT evaluation	Prevention oversight process; no incidence trend established.
16.6 Accountable institutions	Ombudsman visit, internships, survey, research and academic audit	Learning, knowledge and review opportunities; no causal service improvement established.
16.7 Inclusive decisions	Citizen perspectives and village consultation	Opportunities for input; representativeness and subsequent influence require records.
16.10 Information access	Public reporting and village information proposal	Information sharing is visible; no comprehensive access-to-information policy assessment.
16.3 Justice and remedies	Complaint-mechanism education	Understanding of oversight; no legal aid caseload or justice outcome established.
16.5 and other areas	No direct outcome evidence in the selected sources	No claim of reduced bribery, corruption, trafficking or improved legal identity coverage.

Results that remain unmeasured

The sources do not establish institution-wide violence prevalence, corruption incidence, complaint resolution rates or quantified changes in service quality attributable to university activity. These missing measures should not be recorded as zero. They define the evidence needed for a stronger future report.

Consistency across goals

Activities may also contribute to education, gender equality or partnerships. Maintain one activity identifier across SDG reports, while describing each relevant contribution. This prevents duplication of participation counts and preserves a consistent institutional evidence trail.

Monitoring and improvement priorities

The measures below are recommendations for institutional review rather than approved commitments or achieved 2025 results. Select a manageable set of measures aligned with the activities and records the university actually maintains.

Area	Proposed measure	Supporting record
Safety governance	Prevention actions completed and awareness of reporting routes	Minutes, action logs and appropriately designed awareness assessments
Oversight education	Participation and demonstrated understanding	Attendance, assignments and assessed case exercises
Public-service placements	Completion and competencies demonstrated	Placement records, supervision and final outputs
Citizen research	Method disclosure and documented use of findings	Survey protocol, full report and follow-up decisions
Academic accountability	Corrective actions completed against agreed dates	Audit findings, response plan and closure evidence
Participation	Input received and changes made to plans	Consultation record, revised plans and feedback to participants

Recommended sequence

First, validate event dates and institutional roles with the responsible units. Second, attach underlying records to each evidence entry. Third, identify whether an activity produced a decision or change beyond the event itself. Finally, measure the relevant result with an appropriate method and retain enough detail for verification. Report limitations alongside findings.

Publication and accountability

Before release, review factual accuracy, image attribution and the completeness of evidence links. Publish the report using its actual approval and release dates. Protect identifiable complaint or case information, and use appropriately aggregated results for public reporting. Later corrections should preserve the report's version history and distinguish new information from the original 2025 record.

Evidence register for institutional and public engagement

All sources were reviewed on 29 October 2026. Photographs are reproduced from the cited news accounts. Images document their reported context and do not establish participation totals or institutional outcomes independently.

Source 1 UMS Rappang

UMS Rappang Perkuat Komitmen Cegah Kekerasan di Lingkungan Kampus. 31 October 2025; meeting held 22 October 2025.

[Open evidence source](#)

Source 2 Ombudsman RI South Sulawesi

Ombudsman Sulsel Terima Kunjungan HIMAP UMS Rappang Pendalaman Peran dan Fungsi Lembaga Pengawas Pelayanan Publik. 12 June 2025. Host-institution account of the study visit.

[Open evidence source](#)

Source 3 Sidenreng Rappang district government

Apa Kata Warga Sidrap soal Kinerja Pemda Simak Survei FSI FISIP UMS Rappang. 31 December 2025; presentation 30 December; survey 20 November–5 December 2025.

[Open evidence source](#)

Source 4 UMS Rappang

UMS Rappang Magangkan Mahasiswa FISIP ke 38 Lokasi di Sidrap. 4 February 2025; launch held 3 February 2025. The body describes locations in Sidrap, Pinrang and Parepare.

[Open evidence source](#)

Source interpretation

The Ombudsman account corroborates the learning visit from the host institution's perspective. The district government article is a public account of survey results, not the full technical survey report. Institutional review should obtain the underlying methods before making wider statistical or policy claims.

Additional evidence and verification notes

Source 5 UMS Rappang

Pascasarjana UMS Rappang Gelar Seminar Hasil Tesis Bahas Digital Governance. 1 November 2025; seminar held 30 October 2025.

[Open evidence source](#)

Source 6 UMS Rappang

Prodi Adminkes UMS Rappang Laksanakan AMI. 12 August 2025; internal quality audit held 11 August 2025.

[Open evidence source](#)

Source 7 Carawali village government

Seminar Program Kerja KKN UMS Rappang Angkatan 7 Tahun 2025 di Desa Carawali. 15 July 2025. Records a planning and consultation event; listed programmes remain proposals at this stage.

[Open evidence source](#)

Source 8 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

Goal 16 targets and indicators. Framework for thematic interpretation. No UN indicator attainment is asserted.

[Open evidence source](#)

Records for institutional validation

The responsible units should confirm event records, attendance and follow-up actions before institutional approval. The survey needs its full methodological report; the audit needs findings and closure records; the thesis seminar needs the underlying research; and the village forum needs a record of how public input affected decisions. These records would extend the evidence beyond public news.