Policy Evaluation of Livable Houses Programs in Gorontalo City

Karim Lasulika¹, Muh. Firyal Akbar², Ramlah Alkatiri³
¹²Public Administration Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences
³ Development Economics Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences
Muhammadiyah University of Gorontalo, Indonesia

Abstract. *This study aims to obtain an overview of the Policy Evaluation of Livable Houses Programs in Gorontalo City (Period 2016-2018). The research method uses a qualitative approach with descriptive research type. Data collection techniques are done through interviews with a number of informants and observations and recording secondary data related to research problems. The results of the study concluded that the evaluation of suitable program programs for habitation has not been effective, this is seen from the obstacles encountered in the distribution / construction of livable houses that must be in accordance with the stated objectives. Seen from the indicator of the equal distribution of programs that have been conducted unevenly. Accuracy in implementing policies has been done well but not yet optimal, this is because the accuracy in terms of policies is still lacking on the desired target, in this case the recipients of inappropriate housing programs are not appropriate.*

Keywords: *Evaluation; Public Policy; Program*

INTRODUCTION

Housing and settlements can be said to be one of the basic human needs. In addition, housing and settlements have a very strategic function and play a role as a center for family education, cultural nurseries, and improving the quality of future generations who require a good quality housing and residential environment.

However, in reality there are still housing and settlement problems in Indonesia that are inseparable from the dynamics that occur in people's lives and government policies in managing well-ordered housing and settlements which are supported through the formulation of policies and programs for housing and settlement management in Indonesia which have been carried out comprehensively during the period. the New Order government and reforms in the form of a Policy in the National Housing Strategy, however, the emphasis was still limited to the housing aspect.

Observing the implementation of this strategy there are still shortcomings with various problems that are increasingly complex in the current era, so that a more integrated housing and settlement management and management is needed. Therefore, it is necessary to formulate a new policy and strategy whose scope can include the housing and settlement sector as an inseparable unit in a housing and settlement development plan.

Current conditions indicate the need for housing is urgently needed in quantity and will increase along with the addition of new households. The construction of houses for the underprivileged has not fulfilled this need. This actually looks lame when compared to private developers who prioritize real estate and apartments that are difficult to reach by poor people. Therefore, this condition encourages the life of the underprivileged in urban areas to build settlements and housing that are not suitable for habitation or slum housing. The government

still needs a strategy for dealing with slum areas as an effort to create a healthy housing and settlement environment, the government needs to do (Hariyanto, 2010).

The policy of providing housing in urban areas should be carried out in stages and adjusted to the capacity of residents. For example, for residents whose income is low and who do not yet have sufficient financial capacity to pay installments for the purchase of a house, these residents can temporarily become tenants. The problem encountered by people who yearn for housing is that assistance to obtain housing microcredit requires collateral (in the form of goods or securities) while the poor do not have assets that can be used as collateral. Acceptance of credit application or not is always based on the level of income and job stability. The poor, who have very low incomes and work irregularly, have doubts about their ability to pay credit installments so that applications are often rejected. Therefore, government policies related to efforts to improve slum settlements have not fully resolved the problems that cause the emergence of slum settlements which can come from the physical and non-physical conditions of the population concerned (Lestari & Sugiri, 2013).

A problem that also needs to be addressed nationally is that slum housing is found in almost all urban areas in Indonesia. There is no accurate data found on the number of slum neighborhoods throughout Indonesia. however, almost all urban areas in Indonesia have very many pockets of slum areas. Housing provision has become a development priority by the central government. This commitment has been demonstrated through a series of policies so that adequate and affordable housing is available to all people, including those who are less fortunate or have low income. Therefore, the biggest challenge in providing housing for low-income people is the availability of land, especially in big cities where prices are out of control. Low income communities (MBR) are still low in reach, whether they buy from developers, build independently or improve the quality of houses that are unfit for habitation. For the availability of funds, housing financing patterns or schemes for low-income families are limited, MBR's access to housing finance sources or financial institutions to obtain housing loans (KPR) is still limited (Ridwan, et al, 2019).

The availability of funds for housing finance schemes / schemes for low-income people is limited and access to housing finance sources (financial institutions) to obtain housing loans (KPR) is still limited and finally the sources of housing finance funds are still short-term so that they cannot be sustainable for housing loans. long term. It must be admitted that housing demand in Indonesia is still high, however, it cannot be fulfilled only through APBN funds alone. For this reason, his party also collaborates with banks, developers and local governments in realizing the launch of the One Million Houses Program. Moreover, the central government has provided the Housing Financing Liquidity Facility (FLPP) for low-income people (MBR), both urban and rural.

This was done by the government by placing a number of APBN funds in the bank and returned at a low rate. This strategy is intended for MBR to have the ability to pay FLPP home ownership credit (KPR) installments (Mangeswuri, 2016). This program has been running and is quite helpful in relieving MBR in paying installments. The government, in this case the Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing (KementerianPUPR), has made efforts to maintain the growth of the property sector, especially the construction of housing for low-income people (MBR).

The government's efforts are embodied in the strategy taken to face the challenges of housing development. The first strategy includes tax reform, regional permit fees, land and spatial planning. Meanwhile, the second strategy, namely improving the housing subsidy pattern, encourages tax incentives to the business world, providing housing micro credit facilities and community empowerment through technical assistance from community groups and finally providing housing that does not only consider the purchasing power of the community.

The government's follow-up contained in the One Million Houses Program is a joint movement in the housing development sector for the community. The government cooperates with all stakeholders to focus on building houses for the community. The coverage of the 1 Million Houses Program is wider, not only for low-income groups. This program also includes residential

development for the part of non-MBR groups or commercial houses that are not subsidized. For the MBR group who are entitled to subsidies, they can enjoy various facilities from the government, namely only the obligation to make a 1 percent mortgage down payment. The one million houses program is a joint movement by all housing stakeholders, both the Central Government, Local Government, Housing Developers, Banking, Private companies and society.

This was done by the government by placing a number of APBN funds in the bank and returned at a low rate. This strategy is intended for MBR to have the ability to pay FLPP home ownership credit (KPR) installments (Mangeswuri, 2016). This program has been running and is quite helpful in relieving MBR in paying installments. The government, in this case the Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing (KementerianPUPR), has made efforts to maintain the growth of the property sector, especially the construction of housing for low-income people (MBR).

The government's efforts are embodied in the strategy taken to face the challenges of housing development. The first strategy includes tax reform, regional permit fees, land and spatial planning. Meanwhile, the second strategy, namely improving the housing subsidy pattern, encourages tax incentives to the business world, providing housing micro credit facilities and community empowerment through technical assistance from community groups and finally providing housing that does not only consider the purchasing power of the community.

In addition, there is the Livable Home (RLH) program which is a government policy by encouraging the participation of Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) and various elements of society. This program provides assistance in the form of construction of livable houses that are built or located on land owned by underprivileged communities. The livable housing program is funded by the APBD. The implementation of the development program for the provision of livable houses is carried out at the Ministry of Public Housing of the Republic of Indonesia, and at the district level. Each area is made a community group organization that handles and is responsible for the implementation of the Livable Housing Program in each village / sub-district. The target group for the livable housing program is the poor who own houses that are unfit for habitation or do not own houses and own land that is their own or grants.

Gorontalo City Government has allocated a budget of Rp. 23.5 billion to handle a number of houses unfit for habitation. Such large funds come from the Gorontalo City APBD of Rp 10 billion, the APBN Rp 7.5 billion, foreign assistance of Rp 3 billion, and the Provincial APBD 3 billion. The program for handling unfit for habitation consists of housing construction with assistance given of Rp. 25 million and house maintenance and rehabilitation of Rp. 15 million. The aim of this program is to eliminate uninhabitable houses which according to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS, 2017) are 7,681 units.

The settlements proclaimed by the Gorontalo provincial government will be built in more complete sub-districts in unsupportive districts. The Livable Housing Program (RLH), is a form of housing subsidies in the form of money intended for low-income households as a government effort to increase housing resilience and provide social protection to target households.

The realization of the livable housing (RLH) development program built by the Gorontalo Provincial Government through the Public Housing and Settlement Service (PRKP) in 2018 was 610 units with a budget of up to 18 billion rupiah. Based on data from the Gorontalo Province PRKP Office, in the period 2012 to 2017, the Gorontalo Provincial Government has built 4,617 RLHs and 19,864 RLHs remain to be built in all areas of Gorontalo Province. Based on this data, it means that it still takes another 20 years to complete the construction of a livable house (Humas Provinsi Gorontalo, 2018).

Related to the concept used in this article, it talks more about implementation because it talks about the implementation of the livable housing program in Gorontalo City. Wirawan (2012) describes evaluation as research to collect, analyze, and present useful information about the object of evaluation, assess it by comparing it with indicators and the results are used to make decisions about the object of evaluation. Evaluation itself is collecting,

analyzing, and presenting useful information about the object of evaluation, evaluating it by comparing it with indicators and the results are used to make decisions about the object of evaluation (Akbar, MF, 2016). In terms of the objective of the evaluation study, the objective of the evaluation is to collect information to determine the value and benefits of the evaluation object, control, improve, and make decisions about the object (Akbar, MF, Mohi, WK, 2018).

In evaluation, program evaluation is also known, as expressed by Ralp Tyler in Farida (2008), defining that program evaluation is a process to determine whether program objectives have been realized.

Based on the author's preliminary observations, it was found that many participants (program beneficiaries) did not meet the requirements for the program, and on the other hand, many deserved the program but did not receive this program assistance. Another problem is that the land used for the housing program is relatively small because some people do not allow the land to be used for this program. In addition, the operational costs for housing construction are given while the purchase of materials and delivery of materials for housing is different for each region.

Several previous studies related to the themes in this article have been carried out by several previous researchers, such as that of Wahyuni Pamelasari, (2014), with the title Implementation of the Liveable House Program in Bagan Sinembah District, Rokan Hilir Regency. Based on the research that has been carried out based on the data source of this study, it can be said that the implementation of the Livable Home Program has gone quite well in accordance with the established regulations, which are guided by Law No. 01 of 2011 concerning housing and residential areas.

Furthermore, the research was conducted by Samosir & Sadad (2016), with the title Implementation of the Livable House Program in Kampar Regency. Based on the results of the research, the implementation of the Livable Houses Program in Kampar Regency has been going well, but there are still obstacles in its implementation and still need to be fixed. In the implementation of the livable housing program, there are still deviations in the process of building a livable house, which is not in accordance with the Standard Operational Procedure (POB). In addition, the implementation of the Livable Housing Program in Kampar District is still not open about matters in the development process between Community Organizations (CSOs) and the community receiving assistance. For community empowerment in the form of community involvement / participation as the main actors of development in livable houses in Kampar Regency, it is still very low

The novelty with this research clearly has differences in terms of focus and locus as well as the theoretical approach used. The purpose of this research article is to determine the evaluation of the livable housing program in Gorontalo City.

METHODS

This research uses a qualitative approach with descriptive research type. According to Sugiono (2012), qualitative research methods are research methods based on the philosophy of postpositivism, used to examine the conditions of natural objects that can be interpreted as being opposed to experiments. This research describes in depth the problems regarding the evaluation of the Livable Houses program in Gorontalo City.

The data sources in this study were primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained from informants / key informants, which in this study were as many as 7 people, including: Head of Public Housing, Public Housing and Settlement Areas (PRKP) Gorontalo Province; Head of Settlement, Gorontalo City Public Housing and Settlement Services Office; Head of the Data Collection and Settlement Area Planning Section, Gorontalo City Public Housing and Settlement Services Office and 4 Community Beneficiaries of Livable Houses (RLH) in Gorontalo City. Furthermore, secondary data is obtained from searching documents

related to research needs such as journal articles, proceeding articles, books, documents of applicable laws and regulations.

The data collection techniques carried out were interviews, observation and documentation in the field. Data analysis was carried out by qualitative descriptive analysis with several stages, namely data reduction, data display and data verification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Evaluation is a planned and systematic activity that is often carried out by every human being in everyday life regarding a certain activity which aims to determine the extent of the success or effectiveness of the activities that have been carried out, so that the final result can become a decision or evaluation can be information in taking decisions on objects that have been measured based on a certain size.

Research related to evaluation discussed is policy evaluation. Policy evaluation basically explains how activities that have been carried out or the implementation of an activity can achieve the expected goals. A public policy cannot be separated without an evaluation. Policy evaluation is conducted to assess the effectiveness of public policies to be accountable to the public in order to achieve the objectives that have been implemented. Evaluation is carried out to see the gap between expectations and reality. If evaluation is seen as a functional activity, then policy evaluation is seen as an activity that is as important as the policy itself.

The program is the basis for activities that will be carried out in the future. A well-prepared program will provide direction and guidelines for the activities to be carried out. With program planning, anyone who functions as an executor will avoid mistakes made in the past and will not make the same mistakes on tasks that will be carried out later. Regarding the welfare of the community and to meet the demands of the community, there are many steps or programs taken by the government, such as developing several programs, one of which is the provision of livable houses (Mahyani) for poor families.

In analyzing scientific studies, regarding the Evaluation of the Livable House Program Policy in Gorontalo City (2016-2018 Period), a theoretical approach is needed, for that the theory used by researchers comes from William N Dunn, to see the implementation of a policy, it can be seen through 5 indicators, namely: Effectiveness; Efficiency and Adequacy; Equity; Responsiveness; and Accuracy, which are described based on the research results and concluded in the following discussion:

1. Effectiveness

The definition of effectiveness has many different meanings, depending on each individual giving meaning also depending on the theory used. The diversity of opinions regarding the nature and theory used, it is not surprising that there are many disagreements regarding how to interpret it, how to organize it, even how to determine evaluation indicators. Researchers take the concept of this effectiveness is how the results received are related to the results issued.

Based on the opinion previously explained, that if the achievement of the goals of the organization is greater, the greater its effectiveness. If after the implementation of the program it turns out that the impact is not able to solve the problems currently facing the community, it can be said that a program has failed, but sometimes a public policy is not immediately effective in the short term, but after going through a certain process.

Seeing conditions in the field, according to the findings of researchers, this decent housing program still needs to be re-evaluated in relation to poor communities who have not been touched by this program. There are still family interests in this case, so this program cannot be said to be effective even though it has been implemented but has not met the expectations of the community even though there are still shortcomings. The same is the case with the conclusion of the interview results on the research results that the Livable House Program is not fully based on the stated objectives, because it needs improvements in the distribution / construction of livable

houses which must be in accordance with the stated objectives because there are still people who are entitled but do not get the help.

To respond to this, it is hoped that the Government, especially the related agencies, can take effective and efficient steps in proposing a program so that the program created can run as expected.

2. Efficiency and Adequacy

Efficiency or sufficiency in policy can be said that the goals that have been achieved have been felt to be sufficient in various ways. William N. Dunn Adequacy refers to how far a level of effectiveness satisfies the needs, values, or opportunities that give rise to problems (Dunn, 2003). From the above understanding it can be concluded that adequacy still has a relationship with effectiveness by measuring how far the results that have been achieved can satisfy the need, value or opportunity in solving a problem.

To see the adequacy of this program, it is seen from the impact or benefits as well as the effort required to achieve the desired results in accordance with the facts that are still not optimal. In accordance with the fact that there is no good coordination between policy makers and managers as well as the community.

Based on the observations of researchers during their stay in the field, the funding in the livable housing program is not in accordance with the needs of the people who need it and have not been able to serve the needs of the region due to budget constraints. The budget is the most important thing in terms of the efficiency of a program. According to the conclusion of the results of previous interviews, the funds provided by the Government in dealing with the needs of livable houses in each region are not yet in accordance with the needs of the community, especially livable housing assistance, it is necessary to increase the budget.

The previous statement emphasized that the government needs to take a firm stance so that whatever is done for regional progress in terms of community welfare, it is hoped that it can take the most effective policies to be implemented so that all parties involved can implement the policy or program.

3. Equity

Equity in public policy can be said to have meaning with the justice that is given and obtained by the target of public policy. The criterion of equity (equity) is closely related to legal and social rationality and refers to the distribution of consequences and effort between different groups in society.

A program will run well if all coverage needs are met so that the desired targets can be achieved as desired. The equalization that is carried out in the livable housing program is whether the policies made are applied equally across groups and according to the findings of the researchers it has been evenly felt by all groups but has not yet affected all existing aspects. The statement which states that it is evenly distributed is only because the assistance given to the community is felt the same but is inversely proportional to the lack of participation provided by the community.

In accordance with the conclusion of the interview results, this program has not been maximized because it has not fixed the desired target. Constraints on funding in the livable housing program are not in accordance with the needs of the people in the existing areas due to a lack of budget. In response to this, it is hoped that the government will review the policies or those that have been made, so that a policy can be taken which can be used as a measure of success in developing a development.

4. Responsiveness

Responsiveness in alternative policies can be interpreted as a response to an activity. A policy success can be seen through the response of the community who responds to

implementation after predicting the effect that will occur if a policy is to be implemented, as well as community responses after the impact of the policy can be felt in a positive form in the form of support or an alternative form of rejection. Therefore, responsiveness clearly reflects the needs, preferences, and values of certain groups to the process of effectiveness, adequacy, and equity. One of the determinants of policy is how to respond after the policy is made.

From the findings of researchers, government programs in terms of the development of a prosperous community, namely the livable program, received a good response because the Livable House Program has provided satisfaction to the beneficiaries. Although, it is necessary to improve the physical quality of the building by increasing the budget for better construction quality.

According to the results of the interview conclusions on the research results, some people have felt real satisfaction with the Livable House Program even though it is not entirely adequate because it is constrained by budget, but basically the physical quality of livable houses provided by the government has been quite satisfying. Seeing this condition, it means that there is feedback between program makers and recipients, so it needs to be improved again so that this program is more useful and can be felt by people who really need it.

5. Accuracy

Accuracy This means that accuracy can be filled by the success of other policies (if any). For example, other impacts that cannot be predicted are either positive unexpected impacts or it is possible that other alternatives are felt to be better from a policy implementation so that policies can move more dynamically.

Based on the description of the results of the interview above, it can be concluded that the community feels helped by the livable housing program but there is a negative impact because the government program drops simultaneously every Budget year resulting in delays in development and limited manpower and budget.

According to the findings of the researchers, determining the accuracy in terms of evaluating livable programs is still not optimal. Judging from the fact that there are still those who have not been touched by the program, it is not right on target. People who are entitled to get are not even needed at all, so that the government program at this stage needs to be reviewed again, even though it has received a good response from the community but it needs a review.

Based on this theory, it can be concluded that the government program policies are good where all aspects of the policy can be assessed based on the policy evaluation indicator theory, but not all have run optimally because there are still obstacles to be encountered.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the focus of the problem, it was stated that the Livable House Program Policy Evaluation (Period 2016-2018), has not fully run optimally, this is shown by policy evaluation according to William N. Dunn using 5 indicators, namely, effectiveness, efficiency and adequacy, equity, responsiveness and accuracy.

The effectiveness indicator shows that the policy evaluation of the shelter service program has not been effective, seen from the obstacles encountered in the improvement in the distribution / construction of livable houses which must be in accordance with the stated objectives because there are still people who are entitled but do not receive this assistance. Efficiency and Adequacy If it is seen that it is already effective and gives a good impact from the indicators of effectiveness and adequacy, although it is not maximized.

Judging from the indicators of program distribution, it is not evenly distributed because a policy will run as expected if the related parties support and implement the policy properly and all parties are involved and responsible. The responsiveness indicator shows that policies in development get a positive response, but there are a number of things that must be completed by policy makers, namely paying attention to any advantages and disadvantages of the policies

issued. Accuracy in implementing policies has been carried out well but has not been optimal, this is due to the lack of accuracy in terms of policies regarding the desired targets, in this case the recipients of the livable housing program are not right.

REFERENCES

Akbar, M. F. (2016). Evaluasi Kebijakan Program Pemberian Dana Bantuan Operasional Sekolah (Studi Kasus pada Sekolah Dasar di Kabupaten Mamuju Utara). *JAKPP (Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan & Pelayanan Publik), 2(*1), 47-64.

Akbar, M. F., & Mohi, W. K. (2018). Studi Evaluasi Kebijakan (Evaluasi Beberapa Kebijakan di Indonesia). Gorontalo: Ideas Publishing.

Dunn, William N. (2003). *Pengantar Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press

Hariyanto, A. (2010). Strategi penanganan kawasan kumuh sebagai upaya menciptakan lingkungan perumahan dan permukiman yang sehat (Contoh Kasus: Kota Pangkalpinang). *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah dan Kota UNISBA, 7*(2), 11-37.

Lestari, I. D., & Sugiri, A. (2013). Peran Badan Keswadayaan Masyarakat dalam Penanganan Permukiman Kumuh di Podosugih, Kota Pekalongan*. Jurnal Teknik PWK (Perencanaan Wilayah Kota), 2*(1), 30-41.

Mangeswuri, D. R. (2016). Implementasi Kebijakan Fasilitas Likuiditas Pembiayaan Perumahan (FLPP) Terhadap Angka Backlog. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Publik, 7*(1), 83-95.

Ridwan, R., Rusli, B., Saefullah, A. D., & Nurasa, H. (2019). Penanganan Kawasan Permukiman Kumuh di Kota Cilegon. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik, 10*(2).

Samosir, S. I., & Sadad, A. (2017). *Impementasi Program Rumah Layak Huni di Kabupaten Kampar* (Doctoral dissertation, Riau University).

Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D.* Bandung: Afabeta.Wahyuni Pamelasari, (2014) *Implementasi Program Rumah Layak Huni Di Kecamatan Bagan Sinembah Kabupaten Rokan Hilir.* Thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Riau Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Wirawan.(2012).*Evaluasi,Teori,Model,Standar,Aplikasi dan Profesi.* Jakarta: Rajawali Prses.

Yusuf Farida. (2008). *Evaluasi Program Dan Instrumen Evaluasi Untuk Program Pendidikan dan Penelitian*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.