

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF VILLAGE GRANT PROGRAM ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER 6 OF 2014 CONCERNING VILLAGE

**(Study in the Landungsari Village, Dau District, Malang
Regency, East Java)**

MUHAMMAD OKTO ADHITAMA

Public Administration, Department of Social and Politic, Tribhuwana Tungadewi University

Jalan Telaga Warna Malang

e-mail: moktoa@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms conducted by the local government against the Village grant program. This study uses a qualitative method. Taking data using interviews that hold on the interview guide favorable (positive). Determination of informants using purposive sampling. Data analysis is done by multilevel method, with validity test of data triangulation and peer debriefing. The results showed that monitoring and evaluation were carried out with supervision from planning, implementation, report after program implemented and annual report, both physical and non physical program. Supervision is done by Local Government through BPD. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are seen from the availability and appearance of Village grant files, clarity of Village grant files, regulations used in Village grant management, accountability reports and see the impacts. So based on that, accountability of Village grant management has been considered good. It is also based on four principles of Village grant management that have been fulfilled, especially in relation to openness to the general public both in the preparation of the plan, implementation and in accountability.

Keywords: *Monitoring, evaluation ,grant, village.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The progress of a country is basically determined by the village, because there are no developed countries without developed provinces, there are no developed provinces without developed regencies and cities, and no developed regencies and cities without developed villages and villages. This means that the basis of the progress of a country is determined by the progress of the village, this is in line with the change in the position of the village in Law Number 6 Year 2014 concerning Villages. When compared with Law Number 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Government, which explains that the village is a government organization that is in the Regency / City government system. So in Law No. 6 years 2014 Regarding Villages, explains that the Village is the smallest, lowest, leading and closest government organization. The vision and mission carried out by Law No. 6 of 2014 is the State's commitment to protecting and empowering villages in order to be strong, advanced, independent and democratic so as to create a strong foundation in implementing governance and development towards a just, prosperous, and prosperous society, (Soleh and Rochmansjah, 2014: 54). Furthermore, through Law Number 6 of 2014, it is expected that an independent village will be realized where the village is not just an object of beneficiary but as a subject of benefit to the local community.

Facing the implementation of the Village Law, the district government also it is demanded to be more prepared to provide more space for the village to determine the direction of development

policies to be carried out in the village. So that it is hoped that the village government can be truly qualified and not interrupt to a higher level of government. Basic use of Allocation of village grant for Malang Regency, contained in Regional Regulation 18/2006 concerning Allocation of village grant, which is reinforced by the Regional Regulation 5/2013 as a guide for implementation. Based on the applicable provisions Allocation of village grant is used for community empowerment and strengthening the capacity of village government. While the basis for the use of Village grants for Malang Regency, contained in the Regent's Regulation No. 37 of 2017 concerning Village grants Amounts and Priority Objectives.

Based on the description above, it is interesting to know how far the village government is prepared to face the implementation of Law Number 6 concerning the village. Starting from planning, implementation to supervision of village government programs, it is necessary to study more deeply. Therefore this study is entitled "Monitoring and evaluation of the Village grant program in accordance with Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages".

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation of village grant

2.1.1 Government

According to Osborne and Plaatrik in Mustafa (2013: 76) that the government is a large, complex and complicated institution. According to Sayre in Syafiie (2013: 21-22) explained "Government is best as the organized agency of the state, expressing and exercising its authority". The purpose of the government in its best definition is as an organization of the State, which shows and exercises its power. Whereas according to Wilson in Syafiie (2013: 23) explained that the government in the end of the program, is the organization of strength, not always related to the organization of the armed forces, but two or a group of people from many groups of people who are prepared by an organization to realize the goals and objectives with them, with matters that provide information for general public affairs

2.1.2. Village

According to Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages and Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 Regarding the Implementation Regulation of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, Villages are traditional villages and villages or referred to as other names, hereinafter referred to as Villages, are legal community units that have territorial boundaries that are authorized to regulate and administer government affairs, the interests of the local community based on community initiatives, rights of origin, and / or traditional rights recognized and respected in the government system of the Republic of Indonesia.

2.1.3. Evaluation

Evaluating the impact of a program or public policy requires a criterion to measure the success of the program or public policy. Regarding the performance of policies in producing information, there are public policy impact evaluation criteria, namely as follows:

1. Effectiveness; Widodo (2013), the objectivity comes from the effective word which implies the achievement of success in achieving the stated goals. Effectiveness is also called usability. Effectiveness is always related to the relationship between expected results and actual results achieved.
2. Efficiency; according to Widodo (2013): Efficiency (efficiency) with regard to the amount of effort needed to produce a certain level of effectiveness. Efficiency which is a synonym of economic rationality, is the relationship between effectiveness and last effort which is generally measured by monetary costs. Efficiency is usually determined by calculating the cost per unit of product or service. Policies that achieve the highest effectiveness with the smallest costs are called efficient.
3. Adequacy; Widodo (2013), Adequacy in public policy can be said that the goals that have been achieved have been felt sufficient in various ways. Adequacy with regard to how far a level of effectiveness satisfies needs, values, or opportunities that foster a problem. Sufficiency is still related to effectiveness by measuring or predicting how far the alternatives can satisfy needs, values or opportunities in solving problems that occur. These various problems are a problem that occurs from a policy so it can be concluded that the problem is included in one type of problem. This means that before a policy product is ratified and implemented there must be a suitability analysis of the method to be implemented with the target to be achieved, whether the method is correct or violates the rules or the correct technical implementation.
4. According to Widodo (2013), smoothing in public policy can be said to have meaning with justice given and obtained by public policy objectives. The criteria for equality are closely related to legal and

social rationality and refer to the distribution of consequences and effort between different groups in society. Grading-oriented policies are policies whose consequences or business are fairly distributed. A particular program may be effective efficiently, and sufficient if the cost-benefit is evenly distributed.

5. Responsivity, Widodo (2013): Responsiveness in public policy can be interpreted as a response to an activity. Which means the response of public policy objectives to the application of a policy. Responsiveness relates to how far policies can satisfy the needs, preferences or values of certain community groups. The success of the policy can be seen through the response of the community that responds to the implementation after first predicting the influence that occurs if the policy will be implemented, also the response of the community after the impact of the policy has begun to be felt in the form of support / form of rejection.

2.1.4. Evaluation of village grant

Village funds disbursed to villages to build people's welfare must also be evaluated so that there are no deviations. In Article 26 paragraph

1 confirmed that the Government is monitoring and evaluating the allocation, distribution, use and reporting of village grant. The monitoring is carried out with several steps, including:

1. issuance of regent / mayor regulations concerning;
2. procedures for the distribution and determination of the amount of the Village Fund;
3. Village Fund distribution from RKUD to RKD;
4. submission of reports on the realization of distribution and consolidation of Village Fund use;

and

5. Remaining Village Funds.

Meanwhile, to evaluate the use of village grant, the central government also confirmed in Government Regulation Number 60 of 2014, that the steps that must be carried out in the VILLAGE GRANT evaluation are as follows:

1. Calculation of the amount of village grant amount per Village by district / city; and
2. Realization of village grant usage.

3. RESULTS

The Village grant basically aims to carry out rural development as a government effort to alleviate poverty. This is in line with changes in the village's position in Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. When compared with Law Number 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Government, which explains that the village is a government organization that is in the Regency / City government system. So in Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, explains that the Village is the smallest, lowest, leading and closest government organization. Thus, the realization of an independent village where the village is not just as the object of the beneficiary but as the subject of the benefit of the local community is a necessity that must be sought together. village grant management will also never be separated from regulations or legal umbrella that is used as the basis for village grant management. Based on the data obtained, the regulation issued by the Landungsari Village Government is a form of transparency applied in managing the budget. The regulations that are used as the basis for village grant management for 2015 incorporated in the APBDesa are Village Regulation Number 2 of 2014 concerning APBDesa to be able to run the 2015 budget and Village Regulation Number 5 of 2015 concerning the Accountability Report for the Realization of APBDesa 2015 Implementation. DESA PTPKD AND BARAARA DESA) issued by the Decree of the Village Chief of Landungsari Number: 140/06 / 421,633,003 / 2015. Openness of the Government of the Landungsari Village in issue regulations relevant to the principle of order and obedience to the law invitation that the village financial management must be guided by the prevailing laws and regulations. Budget management will also not be well realized if it does not follow the procedures in Disbursement of village grant. The Landungsari Village Government has demonstrated transparency by following the village grant disbursement procedure for 2015. Transparency does not only talk about information, access, participation, but if the budget realization is not in accordance with the procedure, there will be legal defects later. Therefore, the 2015 VILLAGE GRANT disbursement procedure applied by the Landungsari Village Government is relevant to the Regent's Regulation Number 21 of 2015 concerning Village Fund Budget Implementation Guidelines (VILLAGE GRANT). This is also relevant as Astri Furqani's research in previous research said that the procedure for budget disbursement was also a priority in realizing transparency. Budget reporting is carried out for one year budget is a form of transparency of the Landungsari Village Government in opening information especially village grant to the community. This report is commonly called the Accountability Letter (SPJ) village grant year 2015

becomes an annual final report which is evidence of the implementation of the Village Government for one budget year. This report is usually given at the end of the year submitted by the Village Head. Transparency is here in accordance with the principle of openness that requires the principle of opening up to the rights of the community to obtain correct, honest and non-discriminatory information about village financial management while still taking into account the rights of individuals and groups and responsible principles that require recipients to be responsible for managing and controlling resources and the policy entrusted to him in the management of village finance, (Soleh and Rochmansjah 2014: 7) that opens village financial reports to the general public. From the explanation above, in general the mechanism of monitoring and evaluation is actually village grant management has been good. done when the program is run, after the program is implemented, and then the report is accumulated at the end of the year. however, things that need to be considered that the impact of village grant management has not been seen maximally, especially related to non-physical programs such as empowerment and poverty alleviation, for example. the village government does not yet have a method to measure whether the program can have an impact on welfare, alleviate poverty, reduce unemployment and so on. another thing to note is that the presence of village grant is also feared to undermine the sense of community mutual cooperation and culture, because people assume that what is done by the village has funds from the regional and central government.

4. CONCLUSION

Monitoring and evaluation are carried out in a number of ways, namely by monitoring starting from planning, implementing and reporting after the program is implemented and annual reports, both physical and non-physical programs. Supervision is carried out by the BPD and the Regional Government which in this case is represented by the inspectorate. Monitoring and evaluation mechanism is based on the availability and appearance (openness) of village grant files, clarity of village grant files, regulations used in village grant management, accountability reports and seeing the impact.

accountability of village grant management has been considered good by looking at four the principle of village grant management that has been fulfilled, specifically related to openness to the general public both in the preparation of plans, implementation and in accountability. openness in the management of village grant can be proven by exposure both orally and in print by using banners placed in the village office. thus, all elements of society can access directly, can supervise and can evaluate if there is a discrepancy with the plan.

this study also revealed that the constraints faced by villages in the management of village grant are limited human resources that are capable in the field of technology, by looking at the reporting of village grant management must go online. aside from these constraints, what also needs attention is the measurement of the impact of village grant management on the community, especially non-physical, such as improving welfare, reducing the amount of poverty, and so on, because there are no criteria and methods. so that it cannot see for certain whether village grant has a significant impact on the welfare of the community. another thing that also needs to be considered is the negative impact of the existence of village grant, namely the erosion of the community's sense of mutual cooperation in building villages. this is because the community considers that what is done by the village government in building the village already has village grant. so that community participation in this matter has begun to diminish and solutions must be sought immediately.

REFERENCES

- [4] Mardyanto, M.A. (2004), *A Solution to an Inverse Problem of Groundwater Flow Using Stochastic Finite Element Method*, Tesis Ph.D., University of Ottawa, Ottawa.
- [1] Kartasasmita, Ginanjar, et all. (2005), *Pembaharuan dan pemberdayaan*. Jakarta: Ikatan Alumni.
- [2] Moleong, Lexy. (2012), *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya
- [3] Mustafa, Delly. (2013), *Birokrasi Pemerintahan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [4] Soleh, Chabib dan Heru Rochmansjah. (2014), *Pengelolaan Keuangan Desa*. Fokusmedia. Bandung.
- [5] Syafiie, Inu Kencana. 2009. *Kepemimpinan Pemerintahan Indonesia*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- [6] Syafiie, Inu Kencana. 2013. *Pengantar ilmu pemerintahan*. Bandung: Refika Aditama

Undang-Undang

Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 113 Tahun 2014 Tentang
Pengelolaan Keuangan Desa.

Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 43 Tahun 2014 Tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang
Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 Tentang Desa.

Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 60 Tahun 2014 Tentang Dana Desa yang bersumber
dari Anggaran Pendapatan Dan Belanja Negara.

Surat Keputusan Kepala Desa Landungsari Nomor: 140/3/421.633.003/2013 tentang
Penunjukan Tim pelaksanaan ADD (PTPKD dan Bendahara desa) tahun 2013.

Surat Keputusan Kepala Desa Landungsari Nomor: 140/002/421.633.003/2014 tentang
Penunjukan Tim pelaksanaan ADD (PTPKD dan Bendahara desa) tahun 2013.

Undang-Undang RI Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 Tentang Desa.