

Analysis of the Employee Performance Evaluation Related to Bureaucratic Reform at The Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province

Anwar Abbas^{1,a}, Djayani Nurdin², Harnida Wahyuni Adda²

¹*A Student of Master of Management Study Program, Postgraduate, Tadulako University, Palu Indonesia*

²*The Lecturers of Master of Management Study Program, Postgraduate, Tadulako University, Palu Indonesia*

^aanwar_utd@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze performance evaluation after bureaucratic reform at the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province. The sample in this research was employees of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province. The research method used is descriptive qualitative to determine the facts and phenomena of implementing performance evaluation after bureaucratic reform at the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province. The results show that there is a change in the performance evaluation system before and after bureaucratic reform. The performance evaluation system after bureaucratic reform is considered better than before. In implementing the performance evaluation system after bureaucratic reform, there are several problems such as resistance of some employees, the absence of an assessment standard, and the perception of employees that performance evaluation does not affect employee careers.

Keywords— *Performance, Performance Evaluation, Bureaucracy, and Bureaucratic Reform*

1. INTRODUCTION

In 2010, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declared a significant change in running the government bureaucracy called Bureaucratic Reform. The purpose of implementing Bureaucratic Reform is to create a government bureaucracy that is professional, with integrity, trustworthiness, and upholds the fundamental values and code of ethics of the state apparatus. Prasjo states that bureaucratic reform includes changes in the structure and repositioning of the bureaucracy, changes in the political and legal system as a whole, changes in the mental attitude and culture of bureaucrats and society, and changes in the mindset and commitment of the government and political parties [1].

The declaration of bureaucratic reform is accompanied by the issuance of the legal basis for the implementation of bureaucratic reform, namely:

PERPRES No. 81 of 2010 concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010-2025.

PERMENPAN RB No. 20 of 2010 concerning the Road Map for Bureaucratic Reform 2010-2014.

Bureaucratic reform contains policy directions for implementing national bureaucratic reform from 2010 to 2025. This Grand Design is described in the Bureaucratic Reform Road Map from 2010 to 2014 as a guideline for implementing bureaucratic reform in all ministries, state institutions, and local governments.

Grand Design for bureaucratic reform is the master plan for implementing bureaucratic reform for 2010 to 2025 to realize a professional and high-integrity government bureaucracy, providing excellent service and democratic government management to realize good governance in 2025. The Grand Design is described into the mission of bureaucratic reform as follows:

- 1) Forming and refining laws and regulations in the context of realizing good governance.
- 2) Organizing and strengthening the organization, management, human resource management, remuneration system, pension system, budgeting and financial system, mindset, and culture.
- 3) Supervision and accountability of the quality of public services.

Develop effective control mechanisms.

The Bureaucratic Reform Road Map is a form of operationalization of the Grand Design of bureaucratic reform which outlines three main strategies for implementing bureaucratic reform, namely:

1. Decentralized: Each ministry or institution and local government carry out bureaucratic reform steps by referring to the Grand Design of bureaucratic reform, according to the characteristics of each institution.
2. Multispeed: Dissemination of understanding about Grand Design of bureaucratic reform simultaneously to all ministries or institutions and local governments in the context of the effectiveness of achieving the targets for implementing bureaucratic reform.
3. Centrally Coordinated Actions: Bureaucratic reform is carried out with nationally coordinated steps by the National Bureaucratic Reform Steering Committee while still referring to the Grand Design of bureaucratic reform.

To carry out the mandate of bureaucratic reform, the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS), as one of the non-ministerial state institutions, also plans to implement bureaucratic reform within the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS). The formal legality of the draft is stated in the Regulation of the Head of the Central Bureau of Statistics Number 19 of 2010 concerning the Strategic Plan of the Central Bureau of Statistics for 2010-2014, by adopting 8 (eight) areas of change that have been set out in the National Bureaucratic Reform Road Map.

One of the 8 (eight) divisions of change that is the goal of Bureaucratic reform at the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) is Human Resource Management (HR). Changes in Human Resource Management (HR) are considered very important because HR greatly determines the life and death of the organization. If the human resources in the company are of good moral character, disciplined, loyal and productive, the organization can develop well. On the other hand, if HR is static, has low morals, corruption, it will destroy it. One of the focuses of Human Resource Management (HR) is performance issues. States that performance is the output produced by the functions or indicators of a job or a profession within a particular time. Of course, every organization expects good performance from every individual in the organization. Therefore, every organization needs to conduct an evaluation or performance evaluation for every individual in the organization [2].

Before the Bureaucratic Reform, performance evaluations at the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) were carried out by direct superiors. In the implementation of field tasks, performance evaluation is only based on monitoring and reports from supervisors. Therefore, it is feared that there will be subjectivity in terms of assessment. Besides that, the assessment with such a model is not well documented, so accountability is very low. The absence of a performance reporting system from employees causes the assessment to focus

more on employee discipline. More emphasis is on employee absenteeism. Assessment of the quality of employees' work, only relying on monitoring during the execution of work.

For periodic performance evaluation, the Work Implementation Assessment List (DP3) format is used by assessing several elements, namely: loyalty, work performance, responsibility, obedience, honesty, cooperation, initiative, and leadership. These elements are assessed by the leadership without a clear basis, not transparent, and subjective. There is a tendency that the DP3 assessment format is only a formality.

Explains that there are at least 6 elements in assessing performance: achievement, discipline, creativity, cooperation, skills, and responsibility. All of these elements must be assessed proportionally. Emphasizing one element and ignoring other elements will result in unfair performance evaluation [3].

Of course, such an assessment is hazardous because, from the assessment results, the percentage of an employee's performance wage is determined. Performance wages are remuneration received by an employee based on their performance in carrying out their duties. As a result of such non-transparent assessments, it is not uncommon to differentiate between the evaluator and the assessed employee.

Rani (2015) states that employees' performance evaluation will impact employee performance in the next period because employees feel that what they are doing is assessed and given feedback by their superiors so that employees are motivated to work better. It is feared that performance evaluations are not accountable and transparent will affect employee career advancement and employee welfare. Because, in addition to determining the number of performance wages that employees will receive, performance evaluation is also very closely related to employee career advancement. The placement of an employee to occupy a particular position cannot be separated from the results of his performance evaluation. It is one of the ingredients to assess a person's competence to occupy certain positions.

Another thing that is also considered is that it is complicated to assess fairness in workload among employees with such an assessment system. Employees whose workloads are small can get a better performance evaluation percentage than employees who have more workloads. As a result, there is jealousy and gaps between employees. Mutual suspicion arises between employees, thereby damaging the harmonization of the organization and, in the end, affecting the work atmosphere and environment.

Along with implementing bureaucratic reform and changes in HR management carried out by BPS in the context of bureaucratic reform, there have also been changes in the performance evaluation system of the State Civil Apparatus (ASN) in the scope of work at BPS, Central Sulawesi Province. The changes are

socialized in holding various knowledge sharing, various training, and workshops.

In addition, the leadership also issued various policies for the policy to run smoothly. For example, rules regarding attendance that have started using technology in fingerprint attendance (fingerprint), functional position rules, and rules regarding the time limit for evaluating Employee Performance Achievements (CKP). Changes that occur do not always get a positive response, like the bureaucratic reform at Central Bureau of Statistics. Some employees find it difficult to follow the flow of change, while others are resistant to the change.

In 2013, every employee had to report performance in Annual Employee Performance Targets (SKP) and Employee Performance Achievements (CKP), which included assessing the quality and quality of work. The direct supervisor carried out the CKP assessment, who previously coordinated with the work subject matter. The results of this CKP assessment will become a benchmark for the amount of compensation in performance allowances received by employees.

In its application, it cannot be separated from obstacles. The absence of standardization of assessment causes the absence of the same perception between raters. The same case often gets different assessments and treatment in different places and times. There is also no official distribution for employees who are not satisfied with the performance value given by the evaluator. So the assessment is still very subjective.

The expectation in implementing the performance evaluation system in the form of the Employee Performance Report is to solve all the performance evaluation accountability, transparency, and fairness in evaluations based on an employee's workload. With this system, it is also expected that performance evaluation for employee career advancement can also be better.

The change of the performance evaluation system is also expected to have a good impact on employee performance. In addition to eliminating subjectivity in employee performance evaluation, it is also expected to eliminate the occurrence of moral hazards in the implementation of each job. Therefore, all activities can be carried out properly by the agreed Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). This system is also expected to make it easier for leaders to control and supervise every employee's task implementation.

Improvements in the performance evaluation system, which lead to the better performance of each employee, can have a better impact on the organization of the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS), Central Sulawesi Province. In order to realize the big vision of the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) as a trusted provider of statistical, and instill the core values. They are professional, integrity, and trust in all employees within the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) of Central Sulawesi Province.

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.1 Performance

A performance, also known as job performance or actual performance or level performance, is the level of success of employees in completing their work. It is not an individual characteristic, such as talent or ability, but the embodiment of talent or ability itself, but it is a manifestation of ability in actual work or the result of work achieved by employees in developing the tasks and work assigned to them.

Explains that performance results from work in quality and quantity that an employee can achieve in carrying out tasks by the responsibilities [4]. "Performance is basically what employees do or do not do. It influences how much to contribute to the organization [5], which includes:

Output quantity
Output quality
Output period
Attendance at work
Cooperative attitude"

"Performance is a person's achievement about the tasks assigned to him. Performance can also be seen as a combination of work results (what a person must be achieved) and competence (how a person achieves it)[6].

2.2 Performance Evaluation

"Performance evaluation is the process of evaluating how well employees do their jobs when compared to a set of standards, and then communicating it with employees" [5]. "Performance evaluation is one way to measure the contribution of someone who works in an institution or agency in an organization. Performance evaluation is critical because it can determine how much a person's contribution or performance level is given in completing a job or responsibility given to him [7].

Performance evaluation can be interpreted as an effort to measure the performance of each employee. This is related to the employee's productivity and work effectiveness in producing specific works by the company's job description to the employee concerned [8].

Define that "Performance Assessment is a formal system to check or review and evaluate a person's performance periodically [9]. Performance can also be viewed as a combination of:

Work results (what a person must achieve).
Competence (how one achieves it)."

Levinson defines performance evaluation as a systematic description of a person or group's strengths or strengths and weaknesses (related to work) [6].

The primary purpose of the performance evaluation system is to produce accurate and authentic information about the behavior and performance of organizational

members. The more accurate and authentic the information produced, the greater its potential value to the organization [10].

2.3 Bureaucracy

That "Bureaucracy is an organization that has levels, each level is occupied by an official who is appointed, and accompanied by rules regarding authorities and responsibilities, and every policy made must be known by the leaders" [17].

In terms of meaning, bureaucracy means positive, negative, and neutral. Martini (2012) explains that bureaucracy has three meanings, namely:

Positive, It is defined as a rational-legal bureaucracy that works efficiently and effectively. Bureaucracy was created because of the need for a liaison between the state and society to implement state policies.

Negative, It is defined as bureaucracy full of pathology (unhealthy), consisting of several layers of management, wasteful, inefficient and ineffective, corruption, and others. Bureaucracy is a tool of oppression (exploit) for the weak (poor) and only defends the rich.

Neutral, It is defined as all state officials in the executive branch or can also be interpreted as any large-scale organization.

2.4 Bureaucratic Reform

The emergence of the impetus for bureaucratic reform in Indonesia was triggered by the unsatisfactory professionalism of the average bureaucracy. One of the reasons is due to improper human resource management practices. Bureaucrats, as one of the nation's competitive power elements, even as the primary determinant, must have high competence and performance to achieve goals, professionalism, and image development of public services, and as a unifying for the nation.

Mention 5 backgrounds for the need for bureaucratic reform in Indonesia [11], as follows:

The practice of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism is still ongoing today.

The level of quality of public services that have not been able to meet public expectations.

The level of efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity has not been optimal for the government bureaucracy.

The level of transparency and accountability of the government bureaucracy is still low.

The level of discipline and work ethic of employees is still low.

Bureaucratic reform is not only a change in the structure and repositioning of the bureaucracy, but also it must include changes in the political and legal systems, changes in the mental attitude and culture of bureaucrats

and society, and changes in the mindset and commitment of the government and political parties [12]. There must be clear boundaries between career officials and political officials, both central and regional bureaucracies. It is also intended to limit political officials in the bureaucracy.

Mentions several definitions of bureaucratic reform, as follows [13]:

1) Changes in mindset, way of thinking (thinking patterns, attitude patterns, and action patterns);

Change from ruler to servant;

Prioritizing the role of authority;

Changes in performance management;

Monitoring (best practices) in realizing good governance, clean government, transparent, accountability, professional, and free of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism).

3. METHOD

3.1 Type of research

This research was descriptive qualitative to provide an overview of employee performance evaluation at the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, after implementing bureaucratic reform.

Define qualitative research as a research procedure that produces descriptive data in written or spoken words and observed phenomena [14]. Descriptive research emphasizes data in words, pictures, and not numbers due to qualitative methods [14].

3.2 Research Informants

This research was conducted by selecting informants purposively, namely, people directly involved and related to the performance assessment and implementation of bureaucratic reform at the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province. The people who will be informants in this research include:

Head of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province/Change Leader

Head of General Section of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province

Coordinators and Sub-Coordinators of Statistics Functions within the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province

Head of the Assessment Team for the List of Proposed Credit Score Determination functional officials within the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province.

3.3 Data collection technique

To obtain data and information obtained in the preparation of this proposal, the authors use several methods of collecting relevant data to solve and analyze the previously stated problems, as follows:

Observasi

Kaelan in [15] explains that observation is careful observation or review. According to him, observation is the most critical data collection technique in research. Therefore, many theories and sciences in history were discovered through observation.

In this research, the researcher observes the preparation of performance reports and the existing performance evaluation system in the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province.

In-depth Interview

An in-depth interview is a conversation with a specific purpose, which involves two parties: the interviewer and the interviewee. An interview is a meeting between two people to exchange information and opinions through question and answer, resulting in constructing meaning about a particular topic.

The researcher conduct interviews with people who conduct direct performance evaluations and several employees about their opinions on the performance evaluation system before and after bureaucratic reform.

Documentation

Documents are records of events that have passed. Documents can be in the form of writing, pictures, or monumental works of a person. Documents in writing such as diaries, life histories, stories, biographies, regulations, policies. Documents in the form of images such as photos, live images, sketches, and others. Documents in the form of works such as works of art, which can be in the form of pictures, sculptures, films, and others) [18].

4. FINDINGS

After the declaration of bureaucratic reform at the Central Bureau of Statistics, since 2012, employee performance evaluation in the Central Bureau of Statistics have used the annual Employee Performance Target (SKP) format, which is described in the Employee Performance Achievement (CKP) format, which is compiled monthly by each employee. CKP consists of two parts: CKP-Realization (CKP-R) and CKP-Target (CKPT), which are assessed and approved by the direct supervisor.

CKP-Realization (CKP-R) contains a description of employee performance that has been realized in the previous month in quantity. For the quality, it will be assessed by the direct supervisor on a percentage basis. Meanwhile, the CKP-Target (CKP-T) describes the employee's performance targets for the next month and is mutually agreed upon with the direct supervisor. This CKP-T then becomes the basis for making CKP-R in the coming months.

Changes in the performance evaluation into the CKP format, following the application of performance allowances (remuneration) to every employee within the Central Bureau of Statistics scope. Apart from being

used as a performance measurement tool, the results of CKP assessment are also used to determine the amount of performance allowance received by each employee. In other words, the amount of performance allowance will not be the same every month, or uniform for all employees. The amount of the performance allowance received depends on the assessment of each employee's performance.

Head of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, Drs. Dumangar Hutauruk, M.Si, in an interview, explained:

"SKP is made at the beginning of the year; then the implementation is made monthly through CKP to see an assessment of its performance later.

"In CKP, there are two things assessed, the work quantity and the work quality that has been realized. A comparison is made between the number of jobs realized, and work targets agreed at the beginning of the month to assess the quantity. While the quality of work is assessed by looking at various aspects, starting from the work results to conformity with the order and implementation standards that have been set, the quality value is assessed in percent units.

Before implementing bureaucratic reform, the only tool used to assess employee performance is the Job Implementation Assessment List (DP3) which is assessed annually. In DP3, several elements are assessed, loyalty, work performance, responsibility, obedience, honesty, cooperation, initiative, and leadership.

Head of General Section of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, Ir. Jefrie Wahido, M.Si, in the interview further explained:

"In the past, the standard we used is DP3 to see annual performance, in contrast to CKP which assessed monthly performance. In the past, the standard for looking at employee DP3 was only one aspect, namely absenteeism did not look at other aspects, because there is no measuring instrument at that time."

Due to the many weaknesses of the DP3-based assessment, the government issued Government Regulation Number 46 of 2011 concerning the Performance Assessment of Civil Servants, which replaced the DP3-based performance evaluation format with a performance evaluation using the SKP format. Then, the SKP assessment format with an assessment period of one year is described into the CKP format with a monthly assessment period. This step is taken in line with the provision of employee performance allowances. In this case, CKP is a tool to measure employee performance and material to determine the performance allowance received by an employee.

At the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, the change in the performance evaluation format was also inseparable from resistance from several employees. This is revealed in an interview with the Head of the General Section of the Central Bureau of

Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, Ir. Jefrie Wahido, M.Si:

"Resistance occurs because previously the behavioral element is not an assessment, while in SKP it is 60 compared to 40. 60 percent of performance and 40 percent of behavior. The element of behavior associated with changes in bureaucratic reform."

Another problem related to the CKP-based performance evaluation system is the perception that CKP values are not used to make decisions to improve employee careers. In other words, an employee's performance evaluation does not affect the employee's career. It affects a decrease in employee motivation to show optimal performance.

Agus Santoso, S.ST, M.Si, Middle Statistician and Head of the Functional Position Assessment Team at Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, revealed in an interview:

"CKP is more of a monthly performance evaluation, so it does not guarantee that CKP will have an impact on future careers. Moreover, the career is now determined by the employee for the functional. Even though the performance description is contained in the CKP, it gets a credit score. However, an assessment from a direct supervisor regarding quality does not determine a career."

"The opinion that the performance value in CKP does not affect a person's career is not justified by the Head of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, Drs. Dumangar Hutauruk, M.Sc. In the interview, he revealed:

"It must affect because the final score in the Work Performance Assessment, 60 percent, comes from performance evaluation sourced from CKP and SKP. In contrast, one of the considerations in appointing someone to occupy a particular position is the value of the work performed."

Based on the existing rules, one of the requirements for promotion or class promotion, for example, is that the results of the work performance assessment must be in the "GOOD" category, and 60 percent of the work performance assessment comes from the performance evaluation element. In comparison, the remaining 40 percent is an assessment of employee behavior. So, the element of performance evaluation is more dominant in determining employee careers than the element of behavior.

Another problem regarding SKP and CKP-based performance evaluation in Central Sulawesi Province are that there is no standard for evaluating the quality of employee performance. As a result of the absence of such performance evaluation standards, evaluators have different ways of evaluating. Thus, employees often question the objectivity and fairness of the SKP and CKP-based assessment systems.

Muhammad Zein, S.ST, a functional archivist at Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, in an interview, revealed:

"Until now I have not found a standard by which to judge the quality of a person's work. When can the quality of a person's work be rated above 90? When can it be rated above 80? Etc."

The same thing is also expressed by Lustiawaty Achmad, S, ST, MPWP, Sub-Coordinator of Finance Function of Central Bureau of Central Sulawesi Province:

"There should be a national standard, so there is no difference. If necessary, make an application that is used nationally. Currently, each satker has its own method and application."

Ir. Jefrie Wahido, M.Si, Head of the General Section of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, confirmed that there are no standards in assessing the quality of an employee's performance:

"There is no standard of assessment. Because it does not have a standard format, CKP is only considered to be limited to determining the value of the performance allowance. And most employees think that the performance allowance is like a salary, even though the allowance is not a take home pay, the value could be zero or 100."

Mr. Jefrie Wahido, also added:

"Our weakness is that there are no individual performance indicators, so we don't have a standard for assessing someone's performance yet."

In the absence of standards in measuring the quality of a person's performance, it will be difficult to evaluate that person's performance. The consequence of the absence of this standard is that the values of the performance evaluation that are carried out cannot accurately describe the quality of employee performance. Wirawan (2009) explains that in performance evaluation, there are standards called performance standards. Performance evaluation cannot be carried out properly without performance standards. The essence of performance evaluation is to compare the assessed performance with its performance standards. If the performance evaluation is carried out without performance standards, the results have no value.

Priansa (2017) also explains that performance evaluation requires clear standards used as benchmarks or benchmarks against measured performance. The standards made must, of course, relate to the type of work to be measured and the expected results to be seen with the performance evaluation. Four things must be considered in preparing good and correct performance evaluation standards, namely as follows:

1) Validity relates to the validity of the performance standards used with the type of work being assessed.

The validity referred to here is that the standard is appropriate or relevant to the type of work to be assessed.

Agreement in the form of approval or acceptance by all employees who will receive an assessment.

Realism means that the assessment standard is realistic, achievable by employees, and according to employees' capabilities.

Objectivity means that the standard is objective, i.e., fair, reflecting the actual situation without adding to or subtracting from reality, and challenging to influence the evaluators.

Head of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, Drs. Dumangar Hutauruk, M.Si, in an interview, expressed different views on this issue:

"Indeed, standardization cannot be done as a whole, because the output produced by each section is different. Therefore, the one who knows exactly is the evaluator (function coordinator) who is the employee's direct supervisor."

Therefore, what can be done is to develop individual performance indicators that will be the basis for performance evaluation. These individual performance indicators, of course, will not be the same as a whole but are adjusted to the level of position, business processes, and main tasks of each function in the organization. The Central Bureau of Central Sulawesi Province has planned to prepare individual performance indicators, which will then be used as a standard for evaluating employee performance. The results, in the form of individual performance indicators and performance determination.

Head of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, Drs. Dumangar Hutauruk, M.Si, in an interview, revealed:

"In the next few months, evaluation and improvement will be carried out with a new SKP that is more output-based."

Ir. Jefrie Wahido, M.Si, Head of the General Section of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, also said the same thing:

"In the future, improvements will be made to this performance assessment system, especially the preparation of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) and Individual Performance Indicators (IKI)."

The SKP and CKP-based assessment systems are also considered to be able to improve the performance of employees. It happens because each employee has determined the performance targets for the next month at the beginning of each month. These targets will then be agreed upon with the direct supervisor and become the basis for future assessments. Thus, employees are more motivated to work to pursue the agreed targets.

Explain that one of the goals of evaluating employee performance is performance improvement, enabling

leaders and employees to improve employee performance [16].

Explains that one of the performance evaluation goals is to improve employee performance by helping them realize and use their full potential in realizing organizational goals [17].

Head of General Section of Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, Ir. Jefrie Wahido, M.Si, in an interview, revealed:

"Although not significant, but there is an increase. If there is improvement, it will increase more significantly."

In general, there is an apparent improvement in performance after the use of the SKP and CKP formats for employee performance evaluation as part of changes in bureaucratic reform at the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province. Performance improvement occurs because, with CKP, employees have agreed on their performance targets in advance with their respective direct supervisors. Thus, employees already know what they have to do over the next month to meet their performance targets.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussions that have been carried out previously, the researcher draws the following conclusions:

1. In implementing bureaucratic reform at the Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, there is resistance from several employees, especially employees who no longer had the opportunity to improve their careers.
2. The Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, has carried out various internalization and socialization activities on bureaucratic reform, but all employees have not understood it well.
3. Implementation of performance evaluation using SKP and CKP also experienced resistance from several employees.
4. Employees do not fully understand the relationship between CKP-based performance evaluation and employee career advancement.
5. There is no clear standard for assessing the quality of employee work in CKP-based performance evaluation.
6. The CKP-based performance evaluation implemented after the bureaucratic reform is more fair, transparent, and objective than the DP3-based performance evaluation implemented before the bureaucratic reform.
7. Performance evaluation with CKP affects improving employee performance.

5.2 Suggestion

Based on the results of the discussion and conclusions in this research, the researcher recommends the following suggestions:

1. Needed strategic planning and socialization materials regarding bureaucratic reform and CKP-based performance evaluation to make it attractive and more accessible for employees to understand.
2. It is necessary to develop quality assessment standards for CKP-based performance evaluation according to the position, business processes, duties, and functions of each employee. Therefore, the assessment is more fair and objective.

- [17] Sedarmayanti. 2017. Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja. Bandung: CV Mandar Maju.
- [18] Sugiyono. 2004. Metode Penelitian. Bandung: Alfabeta.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ria, Mai Damai., Siregar, Hermanto., dan Bratakusumah, Deddy S., 2016, Analisis Pengaruh Reformasi Birokrasi Terhadap Kinerja Pemerintah (Studi Kasus di Pemerintah Provinsi Jawa Barat), *Jurnal Civil Service*, 10, 51-67
- [2] Wirawan, 2009, *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia, Teori, Aplikasi, dan Penelitian*, Salemba Empat, Jakarta.
- [3] Hasibuan, Malayu, 2009, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- [4] Sulaksono, Hari, 2015, *Budaya Organisasi dan Kinerja*, Deepublish, Jakarta
- [5] Mathis, Robert L dan John H Jackson, 2002, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Salemba Empat, Jakarta
- [6] Marwansyah, 2019, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Alfabeta, Bandung.
- [7] Riniwati, Harsuko, 2016, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Aktivitas Utama dan Pengembangan SDM)*, UB Press, Malang
- [8] Budihardjo, M, 2015, *Panduan Praktis Penilaian Kinerja Karyawan, Raih Asa Sukses*, Jakarta.
- [9] Sedarmayanti, 2017, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*, Refika Aditama, Bandung
- [10] Sinambela, Poltak Lijan, 2016, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Membangun Tim Kerja Yang Solid Untuk Meningkatkan Kinerja*, Bumi Aksara, Lampung
- [11] Ginting, Rosalina., dan Haryati, Titik, 2011, *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia*, *Jurnal Ilmiah CIVIS*, 2, 27-41
- [12] Damanhuri, dan Jawandi, Roni, 2017, *Reaktualisasi Reformasi Birokrasi Menuju Good Governance*, *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pendidikan FKIP UNTIRTA*, 297-304
- [13] Iqrom, Pahrizal, 2013, *Reformasi Birokrasi Di Nusantara*, Universitas Brawijaya Press, Malang.
- [14] Moleong, Lexi J. 2006, *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*, Edisi Revisi. Bandung PT Remaja Rostakarya.
- [15] Ibrahim, 2018, *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*, Alfabeta, Bandung.
- [16] Priansa, Donni Juni, 2017, *Manajemen Kinerja Kepegawaian Dalam Pengelolaan SDM Perusahaan*, Pustaka Setia, Bandung.