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Abstract: Decentralization era makes change the design of development strategic management at local government. Local autonomy assert that planning authority is on local government's hand. The local election makes the political campaign at the city mayor/regent as the reference point of RPJMD. The design change demands strict, effective and efficient evaluation process. The study designs the general evaluation of strategic management implementation at regencies and cities level. The study used ex post and ex ante models simulations. The study observes various law regulations about evaluations and refide former evaluation models weaknesses. As the results, the study recommends that the strategic management evaluation should be done in evaluation types, that is SKPD local government task force evaluation on its capacity in implementing the middle term development plan and SKPD capacity evaluation in implementation. Evaluation realization is conformed by measuring the consistence and achievement the target indicator from: (i) activities (output), (ii) program (outcome), and (iii) objectives (impacts): While, the SKPD capacity evaluation is done by (i) using 24 key indicators (ii) based on AHP method to determine indicator weight (iii) evaluators consist of superiors, SKPD partner, subordinate UPT and themselves, and (iv) FGD utilization aims to determine each evaluator weight. To reach high efficiency, evaluation process should be done since the beginning when city mayor/regent starts their official position.
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Abstrak: Era desentralasi membuat adanya perubahan desain manajemen strategik pembangunan di daerah. Otonomi daerah menegaskan bahwa wewenang perencanaan kini ada di daerah. Pemilukada menjadikan janji kampanye Kepala Daerah sebagai titik tolak penyusunan RPJMD. Perubahan desain ini menuntut adanya proses evaluasi yang ketat, efektif dan sekaligus efisien. Studi ini merancang desain umum evaluasi implementasi manajemen strategik pada pembangunan di tingkat kabupaten dan kota. Studi ini menggunakan model ex ante. Studi ini menggunakan model ex post dan sekaligus ex ante. Studi ini meninjau berbagai aturan hukum tentang evaluasi dan memperbaiki kelemahan model evaluasi sudah pernah dilakukan. Sebagai hasilnya, studi ini merekomendasikan bahwa manajemen strategik dilakukan dalam dua jenis evaluasi, yaitu evaluasi kapasitas SKPD dalam mengimplementasikan rencana pembangunan jangka menengah dan evaluasi kapasitas SKPD dalam melakukan implementasi. Evaluasi realisasi dilakukan dengan mengukur konsistensi dan realisasi target indikator keberhasilan dari: (i) kegiatan (output); (ii) Program (outcome); dan (iii) Sasaran/tujuan (impact). Sedangkan evaluasi kapasitas pada metode AHP untuk menentukan bobot indikator; (iii) Para evaluator terdiri dari pejabat atasan, SKPD partner/sekerja, UPT bawahan dan diri sendiri; serta (iv) Penggunaan FGD untuk menentukan bobot masing-masing evaluator. Agar berdaya guna tinggi, proses evaluasi harus mulai dilakukan sejak awal ketika Kepala Daerah memulai masa jabatannya.
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Post local autonomy implementation and local government head election, there are some changes in the developmental strategic management in Indonesia. Local autonomy make regencies and cities become more powerful. Local governments were given great authorities in determining the local development. The authority also followerd with the financial transfers. The local election has placed regents and mayors as important person in arranging local strategic management. Local government visions and mission become the spirit in arranging local middle term plan document or RPJMD.

The increasing local power and local government heads in general did not followed with sufficient developmental strategic management. The local government heads tend to be reactive in doing development. The visions and mission explanations were not done integrally and comprehensively, either at local level or at local apparatus work unit level (SKPD). As the consequences, planning become the initial weaknesses point in the developmental management. The weaknesses continued to implementation and evaluation level. The implementation is not in control. The evaluation unable to detect the fundamental problems and unable to formulate sufficient follow up. The consequences, many campaign promises were not realized.

To detect the developmental failure threats as early as possible, the study will consider the model design of strategic management evaluation in the regencies/cities development today. The study also give picture about how the ideal evaluation design, that able to trigger SKPDs to improve their performance.

**Developmental Strategic Management of Regencies and Cities**

Management basically is series activities to do change that consist of four steps, that is PDCA or plan-do-control-action. In the developmental management context, plan means making development planning. Do means implementation, means implementing the developmental planning, check or evaluations means look at how war the implementation suitable with the planning. Action or follow up means doing the needed corrective steps as the response of evaluation or feedbacks.

Developmental strategic management is PDCA process for middle or long term development. In the local development management context, the middle term means 5 years suitable with the local government head tenure, while the long term is 20 years or 4 times tenure of the local government head, the discussion is limited only at the middle term only.\(^1\)

Strategic management try to ensure the realization of the local government campaign.\(^2\) To make the local government head visions and missions are realized, then the planning should be implemented carefully. If it is not realized, then the people will punish him from not elected again. How to know the implementation success of the plan? One of the ways by evaluation.

A good strategic management evaluation should not be trapped to measure the success ex post, but also predict the success probability in the future (ex ante). So, the produced recommendation will be more useful.

The study design the general evaluation of strategic management implementation to development at regencies and cities level. The study using ex post and ex ante model. The study will improve the ever used evaluative models and adapt the model with the new regulations.

Today, the regulation for strategic management implementation evaluation at Act No 32/2004 about local government at Chapter VII about ”Local Government Planning” at section 150 to 154.\(^3\) The Act then be followed with PP (Governmental Regulation) No 8/2005 about ”Stages, Arrangement Procedures, Control and Evaluation of Local Development Plan Implementation”, and Internal Affairs Regulation NO 54/2010 about ”Implementation of PP No 8/2008 about Stages, Arrangement Procedures, Control and Evaluation of Local Development Plan Implementation”

Suitable with section 150 sub section (3) letter (e) Act No 32/2004, RPJMD was determined with the local regulation.\(^4\) The RPJMD arrangement should refer to RPJPD (Local Long Term Development Plan) and RPJMN (National Middle Term Development Plan). So, there will be consistency, either at national level, or with the previous local government head.
Basic Framework of Evaluation

Basically, the done evaluation in this study is the performance evaluation. It is part of important processes in the public policy (Wahab: 197, Nugroho: 543). Performance evaluation aimed at ensuring the accountability in the good governance era (Nurgroho: 556). The done evaluation not only aimed for retrospetcion, look from the past or ex post, but also prospective, in effort to give recommendation or ex ante (Dunn: 609, Dye in Abidin: 170). In the system approach, performance evaluation at least should include either process (capacity), output (direct results of capacity) and outcome/impact (value added or impact of the activities (look at Mahmudi: 6–7).

Evaluation aimed at evaluating how far the success of RPJMD implementation and also looking at how the success of occurred process in it. So, there are two desired things, output and process. The two things are important because able to describe the success in the different time.

Output evaluation means look at the production results or how far the realization of RPJMD implementation realization. It can be seen from the success to reach the determined target. It also showed how the success in present time.

Process evaluation means look at the ability to produce. The implementation success of RPJMD in the present only continuous in the future if supported by ability to produce well. The ability to produce can be seen from the process aspect. The process aspect called as production capacity. If the capacity is bad, then slowly the quality and quantity of the product realization will decrease. In the contrary, although the product realization presently is low, but if the capacity is good, slowly the product will be better (look at table 1).

The analysis unit in the both evaluation is same, SKPD. The unit is chosen because will describe the condition in the local area. The capacity gap and performance between SKPD can be reflected so the follow up can be done easier.

At analysis unit, there are differences between the focus of both evaluations. Capacity evaluation focus to strategic actors, organization and system. The three are important component that determine the SKPD success as a system in realizing their performance. While realization evaluation will focus to activities aspect (output), program (outcome), and the goals and objectives (impact). The aspects are measuring rod that required in the present regulation, that become the feedback for SKPD capacity improvement. The both evaluation schema can bee seen in the figure 1 below.

Table 1. Results possibility of realization and capacity evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realization evaluation results (ex post)</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity evaluation results (ex ante)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Today the SKPD performance is good and in the future will still good or improve</td>
<td>Today the SKPD performance is bad but in the future will improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Today the SKPD performance is good but will decrease in the future</td>
<td>Today the SKPD performance is bad but in the future will even decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.  Two SKPD Evaluation Form in the System Perspective
Realization evaluation

Realization evaluation is comparing between the plan and the realization. How far the realization suitable with the expectation. How far the gap and what the gap occurred. The good plan is by listing the success indicators. So, the realization evaluation actually measuring the achievement level of the success indicators. To understand the realization evaluation deeply, then it will be explained (a) evaluative indicators (b) evaluation mechanism, and (c) evaluation results interpretation.

Realization evaluative indicators

To make the realization evaluation able to measure what should be measured, then it should use good indicators. The indicators should be reliable. Good indicators at least fulfill the SMART norm, that is specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time related. Specific means focus to certain thing. Measurable means can be measured. Attainable means can be attained. Realistic means the needed factors to fulfill the goals are realistic. Time related means there is time period to attain.

In the local development strategic plan, it is known three indicators that suitable with the level. For goals and objective level, the measured thing is the impact so the indicator called as impact. At program level, the measured is outcome, so the indicator called as outcome indicator. While at activities level, the measured is output so the indicator called output indicator. Look at figure 2

At local level, strategic management was begun by arranging the goals and objective of local development

![Figure 2: Strategic management and evaluative indicators](Source: Figure G-III.C.6. Appendix VII Permendagri 54/2012)
that contained at the RPJMD. RPJMD is the five yearly plan as derivation from the RPJD. RPJD contains local visions and missions. While RPJMD contains harmony between local vision and mission (campaign promise) of the local head. Beside that, RPJMD also should care the RPJMP (Central Middle Term Development Plan), RTRWD (Local Spatial and Regional Plan), and RPJMD/RTRW of around area. The harmony and consideration results in RPJMD were formulated in the form of goals and objectives.

To make it can be evaluated, the goals and objectives of RPJMD were measured in a group of performance indicators that called as impact indicators. Goals, objectives and impact indicators are across SKPD. They are only can be reached through collaboration and cooperation among SKPD. Some performance indicators such as the poverty number, unemployment level, and social gap, disparity among region and human resources index. All of these can be reached by cooperation among SKPD.

To make goals, objectives and impact indicator can be fulfilled, then the strategy and general policy for achievement were arranged, that was what should be priority in the first, second, and up to the fifth year. The strategy and general policy then be derived to be priority program, that is program that related with the strategy achievement and general policy. The priority program were followed by outcome indicator and SKPD caretaker. Because the program was specific, then the indicator should be suitable. The suitability including (i) control level or responsibility for achievement at the SKPD, not the SKPD in group (ii) along with target and goals so the outcome indicator fulfillment will have high impacts to the success of the impact indicator achievement.

At SKPD level, the strategic management was done by arranging Renstra SKPD. Renstra SKPD was produced by investigating (1) the task and functions (2) RPJMD (3) provincial Renstra SKPD, related ministry and institutions (4) related strategic issues. From the investigation, then the vision and mission of SKPD were made. The SKPD vision and mission then explained in the form of goals and objectives and derived again in the form of SKPD program.

Because RPJMD is part of the part that investigated by SKPD, then there are some goals and objectives of SKPD that is the direct explanation of RPJMD. For the goals and objectives like this, the impact indicators should suitable with the RPJMD. And also with the program derivation and the outcome indicator. The direct related program called by local development program. While for SKPD goals and objectives that are indirect related with RPJMD but still important for the running of the government, then the impact indicators, program and outcome indicators were arranged separately but still considering its harmony with the RPJMD target.

All SKPD programs, either local development program or the others should be explained in the activities. The explanation is contained in the Renja (work plan) of SKPD, the yearly activities plan that were arranged before the APBD discussion. For composite plan of all SKPD, the activities were contained in the RKPD (Work Plan of Local Development). Each activity in all SKPD should contain success indicators, that is output indicator.

In general, output indicator in the form of goods, human amount, groups amount, and money or activities amount. While for impact and outcome indicators, Permendagri 54/2010 has provided 247 indicators examples. As the first aspect (community welfare) and third (local competitiveness), that were presented mostly impact indicators. While at the second aspect (public services), the explained in general the outcome indicators suitable with each field. The examples can be seen in table 2.

**Mechanism of Realization Evaluation**

Realization evaluation was done after budget year ended. At that time, all indicators were measured, either output of SKPD activities indicators, outcome indicators of SKPD program up to impact indicators. The output indicator measurement were done by the SKPD. While the outcome indicators were measured by the SKPD or by Bappeda/BPS if across SKPD. For impact indicators, in general the measurement done by BPS. The measurement unit of realization evaluation is in the percentage form. That compare between target and evaluation. At Permendagri 54/2010, realization evaluation of RPJMD results have been measured so rigid by government. The procedures were contained in the appendix VII with title Stages and Procedures of...
Control and Evaluation of Local Development Plan, at letter G, H, and I of the appendix.

**Interpretation of Realization Evaluation Results**

The output and outcome indicators reflected the success of each SKPD. To get SKPD average value, only by averaging all output and outcome indicator evaluation results at the SKPD. While the impact indicators reflected the success at local level. To obtain the local average value, enough by averaging all impact indicator evaluation results. In general, the 100% achievement will show that target was achieved.

At most cases, output indicator evaluation of activities in SKPD level has approached 100% or sometimes lesser. But, it is often the case where the achievement success of the output indicator that not followed with the outcome indicator success, even the impact indicator. If the output indicator has been good, but the outcome indicator and impact still bad, but there is possibility of the mistake occur in the planning. The possibilities:

- No logical relationship between program and activities. The implemented activities not the program explanation
- The outcome indicator invalidity. Indicators do not figure what is meant. Indicator internal validity

### Table 2. Examples of impact and outcome indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Impact and outcome indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community welfare</td>
<td>Welfare and economic</td>
<td>Local autonomy, general</td>
<td>PDRB growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>even distribution</td>
<td>government, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public services</td>
<td>Mandatory services</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>School participation number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School availability ratio/ schooling age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School participation number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School availability ratio/ schooling age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>School participation number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School availability ratio/ schooling age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional services</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Pusyandu ratio per balita unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Puskemas, polyclinic, pus-tu ratio per population unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Forest and critical land rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local</td>
<td>Economic capability</td>
<td>Local autonomy, general</td>
<td>Household expense per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>government, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area facility /</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Total local productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange rate of farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road length ratio per vehicle amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persons/goods amount that are carried by public transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were questioned. If should be checked again, whether the indicator validity is exact (truly representative), proxy (approach), or only activity (measuring the activities/product, not the run of the function). The good indicator is the exact one.

- Irrelevant outcome indicator. The indicator target achievement not in the control of SKPD. So the determinant of the indicator success not the SKPD, but other SKPD.

- The weak other SKPD performance. It is occurred if the impact indicator is not reached, even the outcome has been valid, relevant ant the target was fulfilled. Because the impact indicator is the collaboration results of many SKPD, then it should be checked the other SKPD performance.

To avoid the occurred inconsistence between the three indicators, before the RPJMD to APBD is legalized, so it should be done consistent evaluation. Whether Renstra SKPD truly the explanation of RPJMD. Whether the RKPD truly the explanation of RPJMD. Whether the Renja SKPD truly explanation of Renstra SKPD and RKPD. The stages are important to avoid trapped in the pseudo success. Success at activities output level, but fail at the outcome and impact level.

The evaluation realization coverage not reach the internal process in SKPD. Suitable with the Permendagri 54/2010, if there is gap between plan and realization, then only general analysis done. There is no deep analysis about the things that influenced the SKPD abilities in the future years. Because of that, strategic management evaluation should not be stopped at realization evaluation only, but also touch the evaluation aspect of bureaucracy capacity.

**Capacity Evaluation**

Capacity evaluation should be done to predict how the bureaucracy capabilities in the future. If the capacity evaluation results shoed good value, it means in the future, the performance realization value will increase. On the contrary, if the capacity evaluation results was bad, then in the future, the realization evaluation results tend to decrease.

The research unit of the capacity evaluation is SKPD. The evaluation value will become the reflection, how the SKPD success in the future. Beside that, the evaluation will showed what side of the weak bureaucracy that should be corrected soon.7

To understand the capacity evaluation deeply, then it will be explained some matters (a) evaluative indicators (b) indicators weight (c) evaluator (d) evaluation form (e) SKPD capacity value, and (f) interpretation of evaluation results.

**Capacity Evaluative indicators**

Bureaucracy capacity can be seen from the three components, that is strategic actors, organization and system. Actor give emphasis on the capabilities and smart of SKPD head. Organization refer to the presence of SKPD as unit that should be coordinated consciously in certain limit to reach certain goals. While the system refer to the influencing things outside SKPD. The system component involvement follow the modern organizational theory that look at organization as open system and become part of larger system.

The arrangement of 24 indicators was the correction of the ever used indicator in the development evaluation study of Blitar city in 2007 (PLOD, 2007). At the research used 36 evaluative indicators. After weighing, only some indicators that gat low value or not significant. The indicator amount were valued by evaluator as too many so the filling need much time. From analysis results, it is done simplification and unification of the insignificant indicators. Beside that, it is also done correction of indicator formulation. There were also indicators that should be replaced with the new more suitable indicators. The results were 24 indicators that come from 3 main component. Each component was derived become 2 or 4 sub component. Each sub component was derived again become 2-3 indicators. The details can be seen in table 3.

**Indicator Weight of Capacity Evaluation**

The 24 key indicators in bureaucracy capacity do not have similar weight. To get each weight by sing AHP (Analytic Hierarchy Process). AHP is method to solve complex problem with series (1) break the problem into components (2) regulate the numeric
value as the substitute of human perception to make comparison, and (4) produce synthesis the determine the weight of the component. The method was developed in 1970s by Thomas L. Saaty.

The weight giver is persons that considered as expert. In this case the SKPD head or other expert person. The local government head, vice local government head can be entered in this case. Local academic also can be considered. The indicator weight calculation with AHP can be done by expert in Focus Group Discussion or alone. If done alone, then the final results done by averaging.

AHP done in stage, that is in the component level (once), then sub component level (three times), and then indicator level (nine times). The total will be 13 times AHP calculation. The results of each level then be multiplied to get the weight per indicator.

**Capacity Evaluator**

To produce the objective capacity analysis evaluation, then evaluator should understand the SKPD performance. So far, the valuation done by superior only. But to improve the objectivity, then the study used evaluation model of 360 degree. It means the evaluator not only the SKPD superiors, but also SKPD external and internal.

In the 360 degree evaluation, the internal evaluation is the SKPD officials. To make it more objective, evaluator not only the SKPD head. The other reasons, because on foe component that valued is strategic actor or SKPD head himself. Beside SKPD head, the chosen is one level under him. Such as, for agency, the involved is the administration head or section head.

External evaluator is superior, peers and subordinates. The superior is the official above SKPD. If it is valued by agency, then the superior is the Local Secretary or directly the Local Government Head. The peers is the related SKPD. Including (i) SKPD in similar field with close goals (ii) user SKPD that use the output and (iii) input SKPD, that is whose the output used by this SKPD.8

At this model, the matters that should be considered is the comparison of internal and external evaluator. It should be balance. It should be considered also the internal and external valuation differences. If there is high difference then there is unsuitability in perception. It can be in the form of self valuation that is too high (if the external average too high) or self valuation that is too low (if the external average too high)

**Form of Capacity Evaluation**

In arranging the capacity evaluation form, it should be considered the valuation scale and value description.
The valuation scale for each indicators was determined by Likert scale. The scale amount that is used can be odd or even. If odd, it can be 5 or 7 stages. If even, it an be 4 or 6 stages. The benefit of even scale usage able to avoid the tendency bias, that is to give average value.

Value description to facilitate the evaluation understanding. Because of that, the usage should be adjusted with the question description. Such as, if the question is "how competent" with 4 scale, then the choices are "very competent", "competent", "competent enough", and "less competent"

**Value of SKPD Capacity**

The SKPD capacity value is the average results of all evaluator values, either internal or external of the SKPD. There are some choices in making the average, depend on the evaluator weight determination.

If it is decided that each evaluator has similar weight, then it should be average directly from all evaluator. But if it is decided that the internal and external group evaluator is similar, then it is calculated first each group, then both of them. If it is decided the superior average and other evaluator group have similar weight, then it is calculated first the average of all evaluator of non superiors, then calculated the average of superior and group of non superiors.

In previous research, the weighing was done, that is internal evaluator group has similar weight with external evaluator group. The way showed that internal group average was 2.7% higher than external. So, there was tendency for internal group to value themselves higher than external. It showed the black spot, the internal weaknesses that were not realized, but can be seen by external.

**Interpretation of The Capacity Evaluation Results**

SKPD values reflected the SKPD capacity. SKPD that should be given attention is the SKPD that has under average values. If their capacity lower than other others. The correction priority at the high weight but low valuation. The correction at the indicator will bring the most significant results to the SKPD capacity.

If the there is SKPD with low capacity evaluation and realization value also low, then it needs more drastic action. The SKPD structural change is one of the alternatives.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Strategic management evaluation at cities/regencies development is evaluation form to long term and middle term development plan implementation. The study focus to middle term. Strategic management evaluation was done in two evaluations, SKPD realization evaluation in implementing the middle term development plan and SKPD capacity evaluation in implementation. Both evaluation are complementary. Realization evaluation look at the present success, while capacity evaluation predict at the next years. To give more objective picture, then both evaluation done qualitatively by using secondary or primary data.

Realization evaluation done by measuring the target realization of the success indicator (output), program (outcome) and goals/objective (impact). The evaluation only can run well if there is consistence between RPJMD, RKPD, Renstra SKPD, Renja SKPD, SKPD Program and SKPD activities. Without consistence, then realization evaluation will give wrong picture. The SKPD success to fulfill the activities indicator target (output) not in harmony with the target achievement success at the program (outcome) and goals/objectives of RPJMD (impact).

SKPD capacity evaluation can be done by using 24 key indicators. Indicators weighing done by AHP. The evaluators were determined by 360 degree evaluation method, that were, superior officials, partner SKP, superior UPT, and themselves. While the weight of each evaluator was determined by expert FGD.

The strategic management evaluation design was recommended to be implemented in regencies/cities. The evaluation process should be begun since beginning when the local government head begun his administration. Because it is correction of previous evaluation and adapted with the prevailing acts, then the success level of the implementation is high.

**Literatures**


