

# *Implementation Of Empowerment Programs Community in Kelurahan Palmerah Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta*

Novida Yenny, Muchlis R. Luddin, Billy Tunas  
*Human Resources Management Doctoral Program*  
*Universitas Negeri Jakarta*  
Jakarta, Indonesia  
novidayennygeo@gmail.com

**Abstract**—The specific objective of the study is to evaluate the implementation of the program starting from the context, input, process, and products which include the objectives of program implementation, availability of program support tools, program implementation processes, and output of program implementation manifested in the form of Environmental and Community Development Social. The method used is the survey method, with program evaluation orientation. The evaluation research model used is the CIPP model. Overall, the results of the evaluation show that the implementation of program activities has been going well, but has not fully provided results in accordance with the objectives stated in the Governor Regulation No. 81 of 2011 which is the basis or reference for implementing the program, especially in relation to the procedures for implementing the program.

**Keywords**—Program Evaluation, poverty, empowerment and CIPP Model

## I. INTRODUCTION

Poverty alleviation is a policy of the National Government Program and the Regional Government which is carried out systematically, planned and synergized with the business world and the community whose purpose is to reduce the poor population in order to improve the welfare of the people. This Empowerment Program (PPMK) was established as an effort to accelerate the process of improving the welfare of urban communities in Daerah Khusus Ibukota (DKI) Jakarta. PPMK is designed as a government program that "supports the poor" (pro-poor) and uses the principles of economic democracy with a strong emphasis on caring for those who are weak. The design of this program is expected to foster the nation's potential and provide opportunities, protection and rights for the poor to improve living standards, participation and self-empowerment in economic development.

## II. LITERATURE

### *A. Conceptual description of public policy and programs*

#### *1. Definition of Public Policy*

Good policies are generated from a proper democratic process whose realization can be in the form of public services based on the principles of good governance or good governance. Furthermore, Nugroho added that the product of good democracy is a superior public policy developed in democratic contexts and processes, and the external forms of

democracy and public policy are public services based on good governance principles [1].

#### *2. Definition program*

Programs, in general, can be interpreted as plans involving activities to be carried out, and specifically if the program is associated with program evaluation, the program is defined as a unit or unit of activity which is the realization of a policy, takes place in a continuous process, and occurs within an organization which involves a group of people. A program that is running or already underway needs to be evaluated to find out whether the program is quite useful in overcoming the problem that is the goal of a program. For this reason, a program evaluation study that contains data and information is needed to make decisions about the program that results in recommendations for policy.

### *B. Conceptual Description of Program Evaluation*

#### *1. Evaluation concept*

Evaluation comes from evaluation words in English that are absorbed into Indonesian into the evaluation. According to the Oxford Dictionary, evaluation means an attempt to determine the value or amount [2]. This definition is a generally accepted definition that is understood simply in everyday life, so it is not appropriate to use it for special understanding.

#### *2. Evaluation concept program*

Given that evaluation plays an important role in assessing the success rate of a program that is usually related to government policy towards public interest, evaluation can be carried out as long as the program is still running (formative evaluation) or after the program is completed (summative evaluation). Formative evaluation is done to diagnose obstacles and immediately overcome them so that the implementation of the program becomes more successful, while summative evaluation is done to evaluate the level of achievement of results by the program objectives in all components of the program evaluation.

The evaluation model is a design made by experts or evaluation experts, usually based on the interests or objectives of the evaluation. According to Wirawan, the evaluation model is an elaboration of evaluation theory in the practice of carrying out evaluations. Therefore, determining the evaluation model is a series of activities in making an evaluation design that simultaneously determines the method of research to be conducted.

### 3. *Goal-free evaluation model*

The goal-free evaluation model was put forward by Michael Scriven [3]. This evaluation model is an evaluation of the actual influence that the program wants to achieve. Furthermore, the evaluator said that it does not need to know the program's objectives before evaluating. The evaluator evaluates to find out the real effect of the program; maybe the actual influence is more than what is described in the program objectives so that the objectives outside the program can be known.

### 4. *Formative and summative evaluation model*

Michael Scriven also developed this formative and summative evaluation model; this model was carried out when the program began to be implemented (formative evaluation) and until the end of the program implementation (summative evaluation) [3]. In this model, the evaluator cannot escape from the goal. Therefore this model refers to "what, when, and goals" the evaluation is carried out. Formative evaluation in principle is an evaluation carried out when the program is still ongoing or when the program is still close to the beginning of activities. The purpose of the formative evaluation is to know the extent to which the program designed can take place while identifying obstacles. While the summative evaluation function in the evaluation of learning programs is intended as a means to find out the position or position of individuals in the group.

### 5. *Stake's Countenance Model*

This model was developed by Stake [4]. This model emphasizes the implementation of two main things, namely: (1) description related to intense goal and observation effect, and (2) judgments related to standards (benchmark/criteria) and judgment. This model distinguishes three phases in program evaluation, namely: preparation or introduction (antecedents), transaction-processes, and outputs or outcomes (outcomes, output).

### 6. *Evaluation CIRO Model*

CIRO stands for Context evaluation, Input evaluation, Reaction evaluation, dan Outcome evaluation. CIRO is a program evaluation model of Human Resources Development (HRD) stated by Ward, M. Bird, dan N. Rackman [5].

### 7. *CIPP evaluation (context, input, process, and product) model*

CIPP Model, a decision-oriented evaluation approach structured, evaluators widely use this model. The aim is to help administrators (principals and teachers) in making decisions [6].

### 8. *Evaluation Model Used*

By paying attention to the concepts of program evaluation in the above theoretical framework and comparing one and the other, and connecting with the research objectives, the evaluation model chosen in this study was the CIPP model proposed by Stufflebeam. This CIPP evaluation model is considered the most relevant to use [6]. The evaluation of the Urban Community Empowerment Program in the DKI Jakarta area, wants to know the implementation of a structured program starting from the context aspects related to the establishment of

program implementation, inputs related to the resources used in implementing the program, the processes carried out in implementing the program, and products or results expected from the implementation of the program, all of which are regulated in Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011.

## III. RESEARCH METHOD

The place of research was carried out in Kelurahan Palmerah, Kecamatan Palmerah, Kota Administrasi Jakarta Barat, Daerah Khusus Ibukota (DKI) Jakarta. This research approach uses a qualitative descriptive approach. In this study, evaluative research methods were used, with the CIPP evaluation model developed by Stufflebeam [6], which consisted of four components: Context, Input, Process, and Product. This study uses data analysis techniques Miles and Huberman [7]. In the analysis, activity consists of three lines of activities or processes that occur simultaneously, namely: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion/verification. Data reduction is defined as the selection process, focusing on simplification, abstracting, and transformation of "rough" data that emerges from written records in the field.

## IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

At the beginning of its establishment, PPMK had three main pillars called Tri Bina which consisted of Economic Development, Environmental Physical Development and Social Development [8]. Bina Ekonomi provides revolving loan funds to residents in need, while Environmental Physical Development is a grant that is channeled to residents to improve facilities in their RW, with mutual assistance and mutual assistance. Whereas Social Development is also a grant given to increase community capacity through skills training for residents who do not have permanent employment or those who need skills to improve their economy and life.

This program is a manifestation of the policy of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government to continue to alleviate poverty in the capital through empowering weak economic citizens, by building independence so that citizens can improve their welfare. The Urban Community Empowerment Program (PPMK) is a program that involves the community from the planning stage, implementation and supervision, needs to be directed in order to create optimal community empowerment. The existence of this program is expected to be able to educate the public, to discuss and agree to determine their mutual interests and then implement the joint decision. One assessment of the success of PPMK is its ability to facilitate the community at the sub-district level to develop dynamic activities, both economic, social and physical through infrastructure development. From the results of the research in Kelurahan Palmerah, the findings of the evaluation results were obtained as follows:

### 1. The result of Context Evaluation

In the context evaluation phase, evaluation of the background of the program (PPMK) is carried out which includes: program objectives, the foundation of the program implementation, and needs analysis of the program.

a. Purpose of Implementation Program

The context evaluation of the program objectives is intended to see whether the program objectives in the sub-district are by the expected program objectives in the Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011 [8]. The program objectives are applied in the activities of the Environmental Physical Development Program. From the results of the research, the sub-district has program objectives that are listed in writing in the program plan proposal. The sub-district has listed the objectives of each program and is written.

b. Legal Platform for Program Implementation

The context evaluation of the program implementation foundation is intended to assess whether the program is made by taking into account the applicable legal basis so that the program can be carried out continuously as intended. The existence of a legal foundation that is apparently by the hierarchy of laws and regulations makes this program have the power to be carried out sustainably both regarding planning, funding and providing other program facilities.

c. Analyst of Program Needs

Context evaluation of needs analysis in the preparation of program and activity plans, intended to assess whether the program was made by taking into account the needs of the sub-district so that the results of the program could be right on target.

2. Evaluation Results of Input Phase

In the evaluation of inputs an evaluation of the availability of program support devices is carried out, including the organizational structure, program design, work procedures, and funds/budget, as follows:

a. Organizational structure

Evaluation of inputs on the organizational structure of PPMK in the sub-district is intended to assess whether there are program managers and implementers available as required by the Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011 [8] so that the program can be implemented as intended. Governor Regulation No. 81 of 2011 explains that the organization that manages the environmental binoculars and social development program consists of Director, Trustee, Implementer, and Controller. Based on the results of the evaluation of inputs related to the organizational structure that plays a role in the implementation of PPMK in the Sub-district, which is carried out by the Kelurahan Palmerah, PPMK has an organizational structure as stipulated in the Governor Regulation.

b. Program Design

Evaluation of inputs on program design is intended to assess whether the program design has been well designed, clearly written, can be understood well as required by the Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011 [8], so that the program can be implemented as intended.

Even so, not all activities can be carried out as stated in the program reference; this is due to limited funds and priority scale which are the main needs and urging every RW that will carry out PPMK activities.

c. Procedure for Program Implementation Work Procedures

The input evaluation of the procedures for working on the implementation of PPMK in the sub-district is intended to assess how the procedures for working procedures for the PPMK are conducted which are regulated in Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011 [8]. This procedure is intended so that the program can be carried out according to the objectives to be achieved.

3. Results of the Process Stage Evaluation

In the evaluation of the process stage, it is carried out on the implementation of the environmental and social development program (PPMK). Process evaluation is used to detect or predict the design of a procedure or design implementation during the implementation phase, providing information for program decisions and as a record or archive of procedures that have occurred. Process evaluation includes a collection of assessment data that has been determined and applied in the practice of implementing the program. The evaluation of the process in this study is to determine the extent to which the program's work plans and procedures have been implemented and what components need to be improved in the Environmental and Social Development Program. Criteria for evaluating the process of environmental physical and social development programs that will be seen are (1) program socialization, (2) program implementation, (3) work procedures, (4) Funding and secrecy of funds.

a. Program Socialization

The program socialization process is an effort to introduce and understand the program to all parties involved in the implementation of PPMK and to beneficiaries, in this case, the sub-district community at the RT/RW level. The socialization also included the program implementers themselves who had to understand all the rules and follow the Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011 [8] which was used as a reference for program implementers. All parties must understand the purpose of the program and what activities will be carried out as well as program funding.

b. Program Implementation

The process evaluation in the implementation of the program is intended to see whether the program has been implemented by the written program design and by the Pergub.pasal 6 which details the activities of the environmental, physical development program, and article 7 concerning social development activities. From the findings, it appears that all programs designed have been carried out by the proposals in the activity proposal submitted and approved by the BPMPKB. One thing that needs to be noted here is that the programs designed and implemented all refer to the program design guidelines that contain various activities that may be carried out but not all programs can be accommodated due to limited funds and the provision of priority scales that must take precedence.

c. Implementation of work procedures

The results of the study on work procedures in realizing the program objectives in 2014 in Kelurahan Palmerah, showed that the majority of work procedures followed the provisions in the Governor Regulation, but in

the determination of activities did not carry out the priority scale, checking the completeness of the documents and checking the field feasibility by the TPKK and also not discussed in the development plan deliberation where the headman only knows. Evaluation results are classified as moderate (50% -90% criteria met). From the results of research in Palmerah, it can be seen that program implementers in the Sub-district do not make or organize their work procedures separately. Each Sub-district follows the applicable provisions and makes the regulation of Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011 especially Article 27 dd 42 as a guideline in the procedures for implementing the PPMK [8].

d. Funding and Allocation of Funds

Funding and allocation of program funds are arranged in the Governor Regulation Number 81 of 2011, Articles 35, 44, 45, 46 and 47 [8]. In the Governor Regulation, it is stipulated about the procedures for using, funding sources and its confidentiality.

## V. CONCLUSION

This program is a manifestation of the policy of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government to overcome poverty in the capital through empowering program, by building independence so that they can be independent and improve their welfare. The Urban Community Empowerment Program (PPMK) in its implementation is a program that involves the community from the planning, implementation, and supervision stage so that it needs to be directed towards creating optimal community empowerment.

Implementation of Environmental Physical and social Development Program. From the results of the research, the program objectives are listed in writing in the program plan proposal and refer to the determined program reference.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Nugroho, "Public Policy: Dinamika Kebijakan, Analisis Kebijakan, Manajemen Kebijakan," *Jakarta Elex Media Komputindo*, 2011.
- [2] Oxford English Dictionary, "Oxford English Dictionary Online," *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2014. .
- [3] M. Scriven, "Prose and Cons about Goal-Free Evaluation," *Am. J. Eval.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 55–62, Feb. 1991.
- [4] B. B. Wood, "Stake's countenance model: evaluating an environmental education professional development course," *J. Environ. Educ.*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 18–27, 2001.
- [5] D. Gilibert and I. Gillet, "Revue des modèles en évaluation de formation: approches conceptuelles individuelles et sociales," *Prat. Psychol.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 217–238, 2010.
- [6] D. L. Stufflebeam, "CIPP evaluation model checklist," *Retrieved January*, vol. 8, p. 2012, 2007.
- [7] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, M. A. Huberman, and M. Huberman, *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. sage, 1994.
- [8] "Peraturan Gubernur Provinsi Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta Nomor 81 Tahun 2018 Tentang Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Kegiatan Bina Fisik Lingkungan dan Bina Sosial Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Kelurahan," no. 11, pp. 1–23, 2011.