Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

Community Evaluation Of Action Plan (CAP) In Slum Settlement Arrangement In Villageskedaung Kaliangke West Jakarta

Riya Irawati*[1]; Mustika Berliantoro[2]; Imam Mujahid A[1]; Neneng Sri Rahayu[3]

[1]Ministry of Home Affairs, Indonesia
[2]Provincial Government of Special Capital Territory of Jakarta (DKI Jakarta), Indonesia
[3]Politeknik STIA LAN Jakarta, Indonesia

INFO ARTICLE

* Corresponding author; : riyairawati@gmail.com

Keywords:
community action plan (cap); countenance stake model; program evaluation.

ABSTRACT

According to the Spatial and Regional Plan of DKI Jakarta Province, Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict is one of the targeted areas for urban redevelopment through a slum area revitalization program. The Community Action Plan (CAP) program in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict began implementation at the end of 2018 and served as a pilot project area for this program, alongside several other subdistricts in the West Jakarta Administrative City region. This research aims to evaluate the CAP program using Stake's Analysis, followed bythe formulation of conclusions and recommendations for improving the implementation of CAP in addressing slum settlements in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict. The research findings, based on Stake's analysis of readiness, processes, and outcomes, indicate that the CAP program in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict has not been optimaland effective in improving the quality of housing. There is also a lack of collaboration from sectors outside the housing and settlement department, leading to neglect in maintaining and caring for infrastructure through the CAP and CIP programs. Recommendations for improvement include the need for community awareness campaigns about the CAP program before activities commence, enforcing transparency in the administrative process, extending the duration of CAP implementation, and selecting priority programs tailored to the community's needs as a solution to address the issues faced by the population.

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

INTRODUCTION

The organization of slum settlements poses a distinctive challenge for the government, especially in regions experiencing rapid population growth. Slum settlements are defined as residential environments of extremely inadequate habitation quality. Characteristics of slum settlements include being situated on land not designated for housing/urban planning, extremely high building density within very limited areas, susceptibility to social and environmental diseases, very low-quality buildings, inadequate environmental infrastructure services, and posing risks to the sustainability of life and the livelihoods of its inhabitants (Eko 1997). Kuswartojo (2005) asserts that many residential areas lack minimum urban service standards or housing development without accompanying facilities and infrastructure development. Additionally, residential structures in illegal land ultimately lead to the creation of slums.

As a central hub for business, government, and economic and social activities, DKI Jakarta is an attractive destination for people to reside and seek livelihoods. The phenomenon of urbanization towards DKI Jakarta, occurring for decades, has resulted in a very large population and high population density. This serves as a driving factor for the emergence of slum settlements in the province of DKI Jakarta.

Based on data released by the Department of Population and Civil Registration of DKI Jakarta Province, the population of DKI Jakarta in 2023 has reached 11,317,271 people (source: https://kependudukancapil.jakarta.go.id/ - Update March 6, 2023 - accessed June 11, 2023). According to the population projection for DKI Jakarta based on the Regional Regulation of the Special Capital Region of Jakarta Province Number 1 of 2014 concerning Spatial Planning, the population is projected to reach 12,500,000 people by 2030. In 2030, the West Jakarta Administrative City is projected to accommodate 25.3% of the total projected population of DKI Jakarta, making it the area with the largest projected population distribution in the province by 2030.

Currently, West Jakarta Administrative City itself has a population of 2,609,564 people, making it the second most populous area after East Jakarta Administrative City in DKI Jakarta. West Jakarta Administrative City has a population density of 20,863 people per km^2, making it the second-highest population density in DKI Jakarta after Central Jakarta Administrative City, which serves as the epicenter for all economic, governmental, and social activities in DKI Jakarta. (Source: https://kependudukancapil.jakarta.go.id/statistik_2022_2/ - Data for the second semester of 2022 - accessed June 11, 2023).

Cengkareng District is the second-largest district in West Jakarta Administrative City with a total area of 26.54 km^2. It currently has the largest population in West Jakarta Administrative City, totaling 590,335 people, with a population density of 22,234 people per km^2, above the average population density in West Jakarta Administrative City.

The Cengkareng District is projected in the Spatial Planning and Regional Plan of DKI Jakarta Province 2030 as a center for the trade of goods and services, as well as a relocation site for industrial activities in the western part of DKI Jakarta Province. Cengkareng District is positioned as an industrial and warehousing center along the Mookervart River corridor on Daan Mogot Street, starting from Kedaung Kaliangke Village to Duri Kosambi Village, bordering Kalideres District in West Jakarta Administrative City. Along this corridor, several residential areas (RW) with high population density are located around warehousing and industrial zones, especially in Kedaung Kaliangke Village.

According to the Spatial Planning and Regional Plan of DKI Jakarta Province, Kedaung Kaliangke Village is a target for area development through a rejuvenation program in the slum area. As an implementation of this program, the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government, through Governor Regulation No. 90 of 2018 on the Improvement of Settlement Quality in the Framework of Integrated Settlement Area Planning, has designated 5 priority RWs in Kedaung Kaliangke Village with the categories of moderate and light slums, namely RW 01, RW 02, RW 03, RW 06, and RW 08.

The regulation also outlines policies aimed at enhancing the quality of settlements comprehensively through the Community Action Plan (CAP) and Collaborative Implementation Program (CIP). The goals include ensuring adequate housing and living security for village residents, fulfilling the principle of residency certainty

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

that guarantees the rights of every citizen to occupy, enjoy, and/or own a residence in accordance with regulations; improving housing facilities and infrastructure services, and ensuring accessibility to public facilities. The Community Action Plan (CAP) is an action plan for community-based settlement quality improvement, while the Collaborative Implementation Program (CIP) is a program for community-based settlement quality improvement through multi-stakeholder collaboration. Both activities are ongoing and cover aspects of physical environmental planning, social and cultural empowerment, as well as economic empowerment of the community.

This research will focus on evaluating community collaboration in the slum settlement arrangement program through the Community Action Plan (CAP). The community is directly involved in the CAP program at each stage through various community institutions such as neighborhood units (*Rukun Tetangga*), community units (*Rukun Warga*), youth organizations (*Karang Taruna*), FWE (Family Welfare Empowerment) mobilization teams, and other community organizations. The Community Action Plan (CAP) is a method to build the capacity of community members to take appropriate actions based on community problems, needs, and resource potentials (Nations 2006). Another definition of the Community Action Plan (CAP) is an invitation to take action, create a document containing descriptions, and publish it as a form of community commitment with the aim of improving and organizing the environment (TCCO 1995).

The CAP program in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict began its implementation at the end of 2018 and became a pilot project area for the program, along with several other subdistricts in the West Jakarta Administrative City. The author chose Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict as the locus for the CAP program evaluation due to the specificity of the slum settlement area in Kedaung Kaliangke, located along the Mookervart River corridor on the Daan Mogot national road. In the projection of the Spatial Planning and Regional Plan of DKI Jakarta Province for the year 2030, this area is designated as a central zone for warehousing and industry, where the relocation of industries and warehouses from DKI Jakarta Province to the western region is planned. This relocation plan can trigger increased population density in the residential areas of Kedaung Kaliangke, with the potential addition of residents working in the industrial and warehouse sectors.

In this research, the evaluation of the CAP program will be conducted using Stake's Analysis, followed by the formulation of recommendations to design strategies for improving the implementation of the CAP in handling slum settlements in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict. Previous research related to CAP has been conducted by several researchers, including Ayuni Murtiana Riadin et al. (2020), who concluded that the concept of village arrangement with the Community Action Plan (CAP) program was not successfully implemented in Bukit Duri Village, and there was a lack of maximal collaboration between the government, residents, and supporting institutions, such as Ciliwung Merdeka, resulting in the failure to create more habitable settlements.

Another study by Muhtadi and Alvin (Muhtadi and Anggara 2020) provided different results, where the evaluation of CAP in Kampung Akuarium had been fairly successful, indicating collaboration between the government and the community in Kampung Akuarium. Additionally, research by Marlina et al. (2020) highlighted the success of collaborative models in the implementation of CAP in the arrangement of the Akuarium village in DKI Jakarta, involving joint planning through discussions and negotiations. Considering the dynamic conditions of CAP implementation, the author is interested in researching "*Community Evaluation Of Action Plan (CAP) In Slum Settlement Arrangement In Villageskedaung Kaliangke West Jakarta*."

LITERATURE REVIEW

Evaluation Concepts, Programs, Program Evaluation and Program Evaluation Models

a. Evaluation

Evaluation refers to a study that is planned and conducted to aid diverse audiences in appraising the value and benefits of a specific object. The term "evaluation" is sometimes specifically employed to address decision-making aspects. The utilization of evaluation in policy and program development is influenced by factors such as relevance, communication, translation, credibility, and commitment

(Leviton and Hughes 1981). The increasing popularity of evaluation research has led to a greater diversity of methods and practices (Newburn 2001). The utilization of evaluation results is influenced by the evaluator's role, the evaluation process, and the evaluation context (Contandriopoulos and Brousselle 2012). Evaluations are commonly organized within the framework of the monitoring, evaluation, and review cycle.

According to UCLA (National Study Committee on Education), evaluation is defined as a process or activity involving the selection, gathering, analysis, and presentation of information that can be used in decision-making. Evaluation is also employed to assess and compare the degree to which an activity is accomplished. From the explanations provided above regarding the definition of evaluation, it can be inferred that evaluation involves a series of activities aimed at collecting information. This information is then used to assess and compare the achievement and suitability of a task, and the results of this assessment and comparison can be considered as alternatives in decision-making and policy formulation.

b. Understanding Programs

The concept of a program has many facets, encompassing a series of activities and strategies to achieve objectives (Middleman 1981). A program is a series of activities as a form of implementation of a policy. In a general sense, a program is defined as a "plan" that will be carried out by an individual or an organization to achieve goals. However, when the program is associated with program evaluation, it is defined as a unit or a set of activities that represent the realization or implementation of a policy, occurring in a continuous process, and taking place within an organization involving a group of people. Program evaluation, in particular, is a crucial aspect in this context, serving as a tool to enhance and sustain the program (Libbee and Wilbanks 1982). It involves examining the conditions of program implementation and the mechanisms that mediate between the process and outcomes (Weiss 1997).

c. Program Evaluation

Program evaluation is an activity to gather information about the functioning of a program, and this information is subsequently used to determine appropriate alternatives in making decisions related to the program. Furthermore, Wirawan (2011) states that evaluation is research to collect, analyze, and present useful information about the evaluation object, assess it by comparing it with evaluation indicators, and the results are used to make decisions regarding the evaluation object. With this understanding, when associated with program evaluation, it can be said that the program is the evaluation object whose assessment is compared with evaluation indicators or standards.

Program evaluation is an activity or effort to obtain information about a program that has been implemented to assess the extent to which the activities have been carried out according to the established plan. Subsequently, it aims to determine the decisions that can be made related to the conducted assessment. Program evaluation is conducted to understand how far a program that has been designed and planned is progressing towards achieving program objectives. By conducting program evaluation, decision-makers have the strength to provide recommendations on program implementation. Ideally, a program being implemented should be directed towards the set objectives, both short-term and long-term goals. Program evaluation, when conducted during the program, can be used to identify barriers that need to be eliminated, strengths that need to be enhanced, and efforts to overcome conflicts that may hinder program achievement. On the other hand, program evaluation, when conducted after the program has ended, can provide direction in determining recommendations on whether the program should be stopped, continued, or improved based on an assessment of how effectively the program has been implemented.

d. The Countenance Evaluation Model, also known as the Stake Model.

The Countenance Stake Model is a comprehensive program evaluation model also known as the consideration evaluation model. This means that the evaluator considers the program by comparing the conditions of program evaluation results with those occurring in other programs, targeting the same

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

objectives, and comparing the conditions of program implementation results with standards set by the program (Arikunto and Jabar 2014).

The purpose of the Stake Model is to provide a framework for the development of an assessment plan. Stake's main focus is on the relationship between assessment objectives and subsequent decisions based on the nature of the collected data. In this regard, Stake emphasizes the evaluator's role in developing objectives into specific and measurable goals. The Stake Model consists of two matrices: description and judgment. The judgment matrix can only be worked on by the evaluator after the description matrix is completed.

Stake puts forward an analysis of the evaluation process, stating that it has a significant impact and lays the groundwork for a simple yet powerful concept for further development in the field of evaluation. Stake emphasizes the presence of two basic activities in evaluation, namely Descriptions and judgments, and distinguishes three stages: Antecedents (Context), Transaction (Process), and Outcomes (Output) (Tayibnapis 2008). The description matrix consists of plan (intensity) and observation categories. The judgment matrix consists of standard and consideration categories. In each category, there are three focuses:

a) Antecedents, which are conditions that exist before the instruction that may be related to outcomes, such as background, potential, priorities for slum management.
b) Transaction, which is a dynamic meeting that represents the instructional process (activities, processes, etc.), for example, the interaction of the housing department with the program recipients.
c) Outcomes, which are the effects of the learning experience (observation and workforce results), for example, the condition of settlements, the progress of a program to be achieved.

METHOD

The research conducted involves evaluating the CAP program using Stake analysis through a qualitative descriptive approach, utilizing primary data from interviews with officials from the West Jakarta Housing and Settlement Department, the Head of Kedaung Kaliangke Sub-district, RW Chairperson, and local residents. Additionally, it involves reviewing secondary data such as the executive summary of CAP implementation in Kedaung Kaliangke Sub-district and relevant regulations.

This research adopts an evaluative research design using the Stake Model (countenance) developed by Robert E. Stake (Arikunto and Jabar 2014). The Stake evaluation model emphasizes two types of operations: descriptions and judgments, distinguishing three phases in program evaluation: antecedents, transactions, and outcomes. 1) Antecedent stage (context), which occurs before the program is implemented, 2) Transaction stage (Process) during program implementation, and 3) Outcome stage (Output) to assess the consequences after the program is implemented. In this context, readiness (context), implementation (process), and utilization (outcome) will be evaluated according to Governor Regulation Number 90 of 2018 on the Improvement of Settlement Quality in the Framework of Integrated Settlement Area Arrangement, which provides guidelines for the implementation of the CAP program and prioritizes the designation of RW for improvement.

Stake analysis is generally used to analyze programs, as seen in Bachtiar's research (2016), which examines the Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) skills that can provide recommendations for further studies related to students' reasoning and decision-making skills. Another study by Lukum (Lukum 2015) evaluates the Junior High School Science Learning Program using the Countenance Stake Model based on the Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 65 of 2013 concerning the Basic and Secondary Education Process Standards. Meanwhile, the Countenance Stake analysis conducted in this research is compared based on Governor Regulation Number 90 of 2018.

The description matrix establishes a connection between the intensity of the CAP program and the observed outcomes in Kedaung Kaliangke Village, comparing it to the successful CAP implementation in Sukapura Village, North Jakarta. Sukapura Subdistrict serves as a benchmark, examining the achievements of

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

CAP activities through collaboration with UPH and involving community members in the CAP stages. The judgment matrix pertains to standards or criteria, specifically Governor's Regulation Number 90 of 2018 regarding the Enhancement of Settlement Quality in the Framework of Structuring Integrated Settlement Areas, along with the evaluator's judgment. The primary focus in this model is on the evaluator's decision-making regarding the evaluated program. The research design adopts the countenance evaluation model developed by Stake, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Research Design with Countenance Stake Evaluation

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Collaborative governance and community-involved program evaluation are intricately linked to enhancing the quality of public decision-making and implementing more effective programs that cater to community needs. Inclusion of the community in program evaluation serves as a means to foster a more inclusive, transparent, and accountable governance process, aligning with the observations of Kiswoyo (2023). The methods for executing the Community Action Plan (CAP) can vary, ranging from direct community engagement to a hybrid approach. The hybrid method was employed in the implementation of CAP in four slum areas in North Jakarta, a collaborative effort between the DKI North Jakarta City Government and the School of Design at Universitas Pelita Harapan (SoD UPH). The Design As Generator (DAG) Hybrid Methodology consists of three stages: the Discovery Stage, focusing on active listening; the Ideate Stage, transforming data into meaningful concepts and formulating problem-solving focus; and the Prototype Stage, translating ideas into reality through proposing and prototyping solutions. According to Stake, when evaluators assess a program, such as the CAP slum management program, they inevitably engage in two comparisons:

a) Comparing the conditions of the evaluation results of a particular program with those occurring in other programs, with the same target object, in this case the implementation of CAP in Sukapura Village, North Jakarta.
b) Comparing the conditions of program implementation results with the standards intended for the program concerned, based on the objectives to be achieved, in this case Governor Regulation Number 90 of 2018.

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

Table 1. CAP Evaluation Results Based on Stake Count Evaluation

No	Descriptions Matrix		Judgment Matrix	
	Intense	Observation	Standard	Judgment
	Sukapura Subdistrict	Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict	Governor Regulation No. 90	CAP Analysis of Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict
1	Antecedents Readiness for the implementation of the CAP Program includes: 1. Administration of CAP Auction Implementation Administrative work is carried out from March to November or for a period of 9 (nine) months. 2. Readiness of CAP Beneficiary Residents Residents are highly prepared and actively involved in the CAP program. 3. External and Internal Elements in Collaborative CAP Involvement of UPH as an external element and neighborhood apparatus and the community as internal elements in the collaborative CAP.	Antecedents Readiness for the implementation of the CAP Program includes: 1. Administration of CAP Auction Implementation Administrative work is conducted from (September to December), spanning a period of 4 months. 2. Readiness of CAP Beneficiary Residents Residents are highly prepared but are not actively involved in the CAP program. 3. External and Internal Elements in Collaborative CAP Lack of external elements supporting CAP activities or the absence of consultants directly involved in the implementation of the CIP by the contractor.	Antecedents Readiness for the implementation of CAP: 1. Location Determination Identification of the location: Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict, characterized by a low level of slum conditions. 2. Priority Location Determination Selection of 5 prioritized neighborhoods (RW) within Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict, categorized as neighborhoods with moderate and light slum conditions, namely RW 01, RW 02, RW 03, RW 06, and RW 08.	Implementation of CAP 1. Regarding the location determination, it is appropriate where Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict is situated close to the Mookervart River and is prone to flooding. Therefore, physical arrangement and flood mitigation efforts are necessary. 2. The determination of the priority locations for 5 RWs is appropriate, as these neighborhoods require environmental planning and improvement.
2	Transactions Implementation of CAP: 1. Socialization of Implementation Methods 2. "Village Discussion" to identify issues and potentials 3. "Design Collaboration"	Transactions Implementation of CAP: Implementation Process The CAP program does not involve community discussions ("rembug warga") and receiving proposals for needs from the community. Instead, it only visits the neighborhood (RW) once to present the Detailed Engineering	Transactions Determination of CAP is carried out in the following stages: 1. Preparation 2. Identification 3. Compilation of data and facts 4. Analysis 5. Formulation of handling concepts 6. Preparation of action plans	Transactions The stages conducted are as follows: 1. Socialization 2. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Community Discussion 3. Survey The CAP consultant emphasizes more on socializing planned

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

	Determination of design proposals based on CAP needs 4. "Let's Create Samples" Community representatives provide sample design proposals for CAP needs 5. "Harmony of Community Presentation" Community representatives present selected design examples 6. "Feedback and Design" UPH (external entity) provides refined designs based on feedback	Design (DED) drawings for implementation.	7. Preparation of Detailed Engineering Design (DED) The level of involvement is documented through a Minutes of Meeting.	activities, particularly physical work. However, they have not been able to generate activities that address specific needs, such as tackling flood issues or empowering the community to create economic value.
3	Outcomes In this activity, community self-reliance is realized through CAP activities such as painting, mural creation, convection (clothing manufacturing), pond construction, catfish farming, and the creation of home industry crafts. These activities contribute to the economic, social, and cultural development of the community.	Outcomes While there have been physical activities, social-cultural and economic empowerment initiatives for the community have not been implemented yet.	Outcomes Action Plan for improving the quality of community-based settlements.	Outcomes The community feels that the benefits of the CAP-CIP program are limited due to the lack of maintenance of physical infrastructure by relevant authorities and the absence of program continuity.

Source: Analysis Results, 2023

In-depth, Stake's Analysis Model for the evaluation of the CAP in Kedaung Kaliangke Village encompasses three key aspects, namely:

a. Aspect of CAP Implementation Readiness (Antecedents).

Based on the readiness of CAP job administration, which only lasted for 4 (four) months and the absence of a supporting consultant who coordinates intensively with the community, the administrative readiness aspect in Kedaung Kaliangke Village is considered unprepared. The lack of information to the residents during village meetings or technical proposals from the residents and consultants is also a factor that makes the CAP program unsuccessful in Kedaung Kaliangke Village. In terms of the readiness

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

of the residents to accept the CAP program, the residents are actually very enthusiastic. This is evidenced by the interview results with the Head of RW 6, who stated that the awareness of the residents is significant to take care of and be concerned about the built infrastructure. This is demonstrated by the communal work conducted every 2 months, and the active participation of RW 6 residents in maintaining the provided public facilities (fasum) and social facilities (fasos).

b. Aspect of CAP Implementation (Transactions).

Some activities have been carried out, including (Source: Executive Summary of CAP-CIP Activity Implementation in Kedaung Kaliangke Village in 2018):

a) Socialization

The socialization event took place at the Kedaung Kali Angke Subdistrict Office, and it was attended by members of the Subdistrict Party, LKM, RW Chair, community figures, and consultants responsible for implementing the activity. The primary objective of this socialization initiative is to impart knowledge to sub-district officials and RW leaders about CAP activities in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict. Additionally, it aims to establish a consensus on the schedule and venue for socialization activities at the RW level.

Figure 2. Implementation of CAP Socialization, 2018

b) Focus Group Discussion

Community Meeting is the initial process of realizing participatory development, as the community has the right to determine whether they will undertake efforts to address social, economic, and environmental issues.

Figure 3. Implementation of CAP FGD/Resident Consultation, 2018

Volume 5 Nomor 2 Agustus 2023

Journal of Public Administration and Government

journal homepage : : https://jurnal.fisip.untad.ac.id/index.php/JPAG

c) Survey

In essence, surveys are conducted to gather data and information related to existing conditions, trends, potentials, problems, and predetermined development directions. The identified issues include damaged road constructions, inadequate drainage for water runoff, poor settlement visualization, and the absence of public street lights. The proposed activity program involves repairing environmental roads, enhancing environmental drainage, installing box culvert openings, adding green plant pots, painting road markings, painting drain covers, establishing vertical gardens, providing public street lighting, and supplying waste carts tailored to the needs analysis for each RW. Additionally, there is an action plan for economic activities, encompassing business development training and the establishment of a savings and loan cooperative institution. Moreover, a social activities action plan includes training for attitudinal and behavioral changes and the socialization of the 3 R concept. The estimated cost for physical work in RW 1 is IDR 1,764,903,049.00 (Source: CAP's self-estimated price for RW 1 Kedaung Kaliangke), and the values for other RWs are approximately in the same range.

Based on interviews with the settlement and housing office, it was informed that the CAP program in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict, implemented in 2018, resulted in physical activities, while social-cultural activities and community economic empowerment were not carried out due to the very limited implementation time at the end of 2018. Interviews were also conducted with Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict officials, specifically with staff in charge of economy and development, who participated in the CAP program in 2018. The conclusion drawn from these interviews is that the CAP-CIP program in 2018 provided limited space for community input regarding the implemented program.

This was because the CAP consultants mostly emphasized the pre-planned activities, namely physical work such as road construction, canal construction, tactile tile installation for the visually impaired, convex mirror installation at bends, park bench installation, procurement of waste bins and pots, mural creation on settlement boundary walls, and vertical garden construction. Field observations revealed that the physical work from the CAP-CIP results in 2023 lacked maintenance. Examples include many empty spaces in the vertical garden, unreplaced broken convex mirrors, park benches relocated from their original locations, and faded murals not renewed. Meanwhile, the condition of tactile tiles and concrete roads remains good.

The subsequent interview involved discussions with representatives from the Residents' Welfare (RW), PKK Trustees, and the Kelurahan Deliberative Institution. The findings of this interview echoed those of the previous session, highlighting the apparent lack of community engagement in both the Community Action Plan (CAP) and Community Infrastructure Program (CIP). Notably, there has been a discontinuation of these programs, with no follow-up evident in 2023. The community perceives a deficiency in the benefits derived from the CAP program, attributing this shortfall to the absence of maintenance of physical infrastructure by the relevant authorities and the absence of program continuity.

It is worth noting that once the CAP program is initiated, it precludes the entry of other programs, such as village fund allocations or aid from relevant Ministries/Institutions. Consequently, when the targeting of the CAP program goes awry, the community stands to incur losses. This aligns with the viewpoint that the comprehensive implementation of the CAP should align with four critical domains in evaluating good urban governance: responsibility, accountability, representation, and access. Additionally, considerations of power, legitimacy, and effectiveness are essential. Ultimately, this lack of adherence results in governance for slum settlements that lacks responsiveness, effectiveness, resilience, reliability, and balance. The consequence is governance that fails to be truly responsive and impactful on society, as highlighted by Muslim and Kurniawan (2020).

The evaluation outcomes presented above indicate that the Stake model's assessment in the 2018 implementation of the CAP Program in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict did not align with the technical guidelines outlined in accordance with the established Governor's Regulations.

a) In terms of the initial stages of the CAP, encompassing factors such as administrative readiness and community outreach—both of which are currently suboptimal—insufficient community engagement and the lack of coordination in handling technical proposals and consultant feedback have resulted in a collaborative process that falls short in structuring settlements within the CAP program in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict.
b) Examining the procedural dimension of the CAP, spanning from the identification phase to the preparation of data, analysis, conceptualization, action plans, and the Detailed Engineering Design (DED), it can be deduced that its effectiveness is yet to be realized. This is attributed to the incomplete fulfillment of the seven requisite stages and the relatively short timeframe allocated for implementing the CAP.
c) Evaluating the outcomes of the CAP in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict based on benefit indicators, it is evident that the program has yielded limited advantages in enhancing the quality of settlements according to community needs.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion from the evaluation of the CAP is as follows: Firstly, through Stake's analysis of readiness, process, and outputs, the CAP program in Kedaung Kaliangke Subdistrict has not reached an optimal and effective level in improving the quality of settlements. Secondly, social and community activities have not successfully transformed into sustainable social movements, and their impact has not been felt significantly by the community. Community participation in the CAP program remains normative, failing to make them feel that the program is part of proposals aligned with their needs. Thirdly, sectors outside the Housing and Settlement Department have not fully recognized cross-sector responsibilities for the outcomes of the CAP and CIP programs. Consequently, maintenance and care for the infrastructure built through the CAP and CIP programs have been neglected.

Recommendations resulting from the monitoring and evaluation of the CAP program based on Stake's analysis are as follows: Firstly, there is a need for socialization of the CAP program to residents so that they can provide input on the enhancement of settlements in their area from the outset of the CAP program implementation. Secondly, transparent administration is required in the selection of consultants and contractors involved in the CAP, involving independent entities such as universities to ensure a fair selection process. Additionally, extending the duration of the CAP is necessary to fulfill the 7 stages, including preparation, identification, data and facts compilation, analysis, conceptualization, action plan preparation, and Detailed Engineering Design (DED). Lastly, the selection of priority programs in the CAP should be based on tangible benefits and concrete solutions to the housing issues faced by the community.

Furthermore, there are several suggestions for further improvement: Firstly, the Jakarta Provincial Government is expected to revise the Governor's Regulation on the Improvement of Housing Quality in the Framework of Integrated Settlement Area Arrangement by providing more detailed technical guidelines regarding the CAP implementation timeline. Secondly, the Housing Department is encouraged to exercise stricter supervision over the CAP program and collaborate with independent consultants, such as universities and other reputable consultants, to ensure program sustainability. Lastly, the community is urged to play an active role in overseeing the CAP implementation by proposing technical drawings, expressing the need for housing improvements in their area, thereby ensuring that the program aligns more precisely with the community's needs.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, Suharsimi, and Cepi Safuruddin Abdul Jabar. 2014. “Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Pedoman Teoritis Praktisi Pendidikan.”

Bachtiar, Rayendra Wahyu. 2016. “Model Evaluasi Countenance Stake Menggunakan Pendekatan Analisis Rasch Terhadap Keterampilan Pemecahan Masalah Kolaboratif.” *Saintifika* 19(2):1–10.

Contandriopoulos, Damien, and Astrid Brousselle. 2012. “Evaluation Models and Evaluation Use.” *Evaluation*

18(1):61–77. doi: 10.1177/1356389011430371.

Eko, Budiharjo. 1997. "Arsitektur Dan Kota Di Indonesia." *Alumni, Bandung*.

Kiswoyo, Gandisa Pangestuti, Herbasuki Nurcahyanto, and Aufarul Marom. 2023. "Proses Collaborative Governance Dalam Penanganan Permukiman Kumuh Di Kelurahan Banjardowo, Kecamatan Genuk, Kota Semarang." *Journal of Public Policy and Management Review* 12(2):60–73.

Kuswartojo, Tjuk. 2005. "Dkk: Perumahan Dan Permukiman Di Indonesia." *Penerbit ITB, Bandung*.

Leviton, Laura C., and Edward F. X. Hughes. 1981. "Research on the Utilization of Evaluations: A Review and Synthesis." *Evaluation Review* 5(4):525–48.

Libbee, Michael, and Thomas J. Wilbanks. 1982. "Program Evaluation as a Strategy for Program Enhancement." *The Professional Geographer* 34(4):381–86.

Lukum, Astin. 2015. "Evaluasi Program Pembelajaran IPA SMP Menggunakan Model Countenance Stake." *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Evaluasi Pendidikan* 19(1):25–37.

Marlina, Sinta Eka, Yusuf Fadli, and Arif Ginanjar. 2020. "Model Kolaborasi Pembangunan Kawasan Perkotaan: Implementasi Cap Dalam Penataan Kampung Akuarium Di Dki Jakarta." *Prosiding Simposium Nasional''Tantangan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Di Era Revolusi Indusri 4. O"* 169–96.

Middleman, Ruth R. 1981. "The Use of Program: Review and Update." *Social Work with Groups* 3(3):5–23.

Muhtadi, Muhtadi, and Alvin Anggara. 2020. "Evaluasi Proses Program Community Action Plan Dalam Upaya Meningkatkan Kualitas Lingkungan Di Kampung Akuarium Jakarta Utara." *Jurnal Al-Ijtimaiyyah* 6(1):31–52.

Muslim, Ardila, and Teguh Kurniawan. 2020. "Community Action Plan (CAP) Dalam Penataan Kawasan Kumuh Dari Perspektif Good Urban Governance: Sebuah Tinjauan Literatur." *J-3P (Jurnal Pembangunan Pemberdayaan Pemerintahan)* 33–50.

Nations, Human Settlements Programme United. 2006. *The Millennium Development Goals and Urban Sustainability: 30 Years of Shaping the Habitat Agenda*. Earthscan.

Newburn, Tim. 2001. "What Do We Mean by Evaluation?" *Children & Society* 15(1):5–13.

Riadin, Ayuni Murtiana, Toddy Aditya, and N. Nurhakim. 2020. "Evaluasi Program Community Action Plan (CAP) Dalam Penataan Kampung Kumuh DKI Jakarta (Studi Kasus Kampung Bukit Duri Jakarta Selatan)." *Prosiding Simposium Nasional''Tantangan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Di Era Revolusi Indusri 4. O"* 635–53.

Tayibnapis, Farida Yusuf. 2008. "Evaluasi Program Dan Instrumen Evaluasi Untuk Program Pendidikan Dan Penelitian."

TCCO. 1995. *Community Action for the Environment: A Guide to Helping Your Community Go Green*. Ontario: The Conservation Council of Ontario.

Weiss, Carol H. 1997. "Theory-Based Evaluation: Past, Present, and Future." *New Directions for Evaluation* 76:41–55.

Wirawan, W. 2011. "Evaluasi Teori, Model, Standar, Aplikasi Dan Profesi." *PT. RajaGrafindo Persada*.