
The Evaluation of the State University Operational Assistance Policy: The Case of the Two State Universities

ACHMAD HADIANSYAH^{1*}, HIMSAR SILABAN², HARRY NENOBAIS³, AND YOGA DWI ARIANDA⁴

Abstract

To maintain the continuity of the teaching and learning process at State Universities by minimum services, in 2021, the government has launched the state universities operational assistance (*BOPTN*) policy by providing operational funding assistance to state universities. The education budget allocated by the government does not seem to be the operational needs of a state university, especially those in the *DKI Jakarta* region. Therefore, evaluation of this policy is necessary. The qualitative research method was carried out by using the Dunn's six evaluation criteria, consisting of effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and accuracy. This research was conducted at the *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*. It indicated that the *BOPTN* policy was effective, efficient, and appropriate in assisting operations at PTNs in the *DKI Jakarta* region. However, the amount of assistance provided was still not enough to cover all operational costs, and the amount among PTNs was also not fair, and complaints were still found from students.

Keywords

Evaluation, operations, policy, state universities

Article History

Received 01 Jan 2024

Accepted 30 May 2024

How to Cite

Hadiansyah, A., Silaban, H., Nenobais, H., & Arianda, Y. D. (2024). The evaluation of the state university operational assistance policy: The case of the state universities in Jakarta. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education | IRJE |*, 8(1), 107 – 119. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v8i1.35203>

^{1*}Graduate student at Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia; Corresponding email: hadicacab81@gmail.com

^{2,3}Faculty member at Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia

⁴Coordinator Publication and Research at the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, Indonesia

Introduction

As explained by the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) regarding the HDI (Human Development Index), the basis of a nation's progress is the level of education itself (Radovanović, 2011). HDI has three things in measuring the level of progress or development of a nation, namely the level of education, health, and diversity of purchasing power (economy) (Jacobs & Šlaus, 2010). The role of education then becomes crucial in efforts to prepare and produce good human resources. Education is one of the keys to the progress of the nation and state. Education is the spearhead in improving the quality of human resources so that they can compete in the increasingly advanced and modern competition of national life (Rahmi et al., 2020).

One level of education is higher education. Higher education prepares students to become members of society with high academic or professional abilities so they can apply, develop, and create science, technology, and art in the context of national development and improving human welfare (Austin, 2002). Higher education is education at a higher level than secondary education in the school education pathway. It is also known that higher education is a public sector organization that operates in the field of education. Universities as higher education example are public entities in the field of education. To carry out sustainable operations, universities need material support covering various aspects, including support from the government as one of the main stakeholders (Alshuwaikhat & Abubakar, 2008).

In carrying out the sustainability of the wheels of a college or university as higher education, material support is needed to accommodate the needs and of course (Gusti et al., 2023), there needs to be support from various parties, one of which is the government as the driver of the wheel and in this the government's role is included. In addition, it can be seen with financial assistance in the form of BOPTN. BOPTN funds are higher education operational assistance issued from the DIPA budget by the government for both state and private universities to carry out existing higher education goals (Jupriadi et al., 2019). Additionally, to maintain the continuity of the teaching and learning process at state universities by services and to solve funding problems by providing financial assistance to state universities once a year.

One of the government's efforts to expand access to higher education is to anticipate the high costs of higher education by stipulating that there will be no increase in tuition fees (SPP) and using a Single Tuition Fee (UKT) at state universities, which will take effect from the 2012/2013 academic year. To overcome this problem and to maintain the continuity of the teaching and learning process at state universities by minimum services, the government launched a State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) policy by providing operational financial assistance to State Universities (Sakapurnama et al., 2019). The BOPTN program aims to cover shortfalls in operational costs at universities. Providing BOPTN not only helps ease the operational burden of State Universities (PTN) but also increases the research budget. Providing BOPTN also aims to make a majority of higher education operational costs not become a burden on students whose purchasing power is not sufficient to pay standard operational costs according to the Minimum Service Standards (SPM) (Jupriadi et al., 2019).

In implementing the BOPTN policy, several problems are still found, including the implementation of the use of BOPTN has not been truly effective in opening access to higher education, especially for the poor (Rakhmani & Siregar, 2016). There are still PTNs that have not made optimal use of BOPTN to support the operational tri dharma of higher education and transparency in budget provision. BOPTN is still not visible among PTNs. The BOPTN is still considered unable to reduce tuition fees, which are quite expensive at PTNs, and many people still do not know the benefits of BOPTN for students (Purnastuti & Izzaty, 2016).

Based on the problem above, government policy and reality may result in differences. The education budget allocated by the government does not seem to be by the operational needs of state universities, which increase year by year, especially those in the DKI Jakarta. The large number of private universities also erodes and reduces the budgets of other state universities because, in principle, the budget distributed is relatively the same in a year while the number of PTNs tends to increase. Therefore, evaluating the State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) policy at State Universities, especially those in the DKI Jakarta, is essential. This research aims to evaluate the provision of BOPTN policies to conduct a deeper evaluation of the policy for providing State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) in the DKI Jakarta region. It can be done by capturing a picture through public policy evaluation criteria with six aspects, namely effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and accuracy. Therefore, in the future, the problems faced by PTNs related to this policy can be good and in line with the objectives of providing this policy as well as conducting research on what aspects influence the evaluation of State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) policy in the DKI Jakarta region so that the focus for improvement in this policy can be found immediately.

According to Dunn (2015), the evaluation produces policy-relevant knowledge about the discrepancy between expected policy performance and what is produced. In general, the term evaluation can be equated with appraisal, rating, and assessment, words that express an effort to analyze policy results in terms of value units. Ralph Tyler, who is known as the first to develop modern evaluation theory, stated that evaluation is a process to determine the extent to which educational goals can be realized (Madaus & Stufflebeam, 2012). Rossi et al. (2018) stated that evaluation is a systematic application of social research procedures in assessing the conceptualization design, implementation, and unity of social intervention programs. Evaluation Criteria Theory describes the criteria for evaluating public policy, namely effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, alignment, responsiveness, and accuracy (Dunn, 2015). Professor Budi Winarno, in the book *Public Policy: Theory, Process, and Case Studies* states that policy is the behavior of an actor (for example, an official, a group, or a government institution) or several actors in a definite field of activity (Winarno, 2012). According to Nugroho (2020), policy is a decision made by a government institution or organization that is binding on the parties related to that institution. The word policy is a direct translation of the word "policy" itself, which etymologically comes from the word *Polis* (Greek), which means city-state. In Latin, this word then became "*Politia*" which means a state, and in old English, the word became *Policie*, which relates to government affairs or government administration.

Literature Review

Evaluation

Vedung (2017) explained that evaluation aims to see some failures of a policy and find whether it has been formulated and implemented can produce the desired impact. Chen (2005) stated evaluation is a process of determining the results that have been achieved by several planned activities to support the achievement of goals. Meanwhile, Stufflebeam (2001) stated that evaluation is a process of describing, searching for, and providing beneficial information for decision-makers to determine decision alternatives. Fernandez et al. (2011) explained evaluation as research to collect, analyze, and present essential information about the evaluation object and assess it by comparing it with indicators, and the results are used to make decisions regarding the evaluation object.

Policy evaluation concerns the information about the values or benefits of policy results (Dunn, 1981). Subarsono (2011) further explained three approaches to evaluation, such as pseudo evaluation; an evaluation approach with descriptive methods to produce reliable and valid information about policy results without asking about the benefits or value of the policy results to individuals, groups, or society. A formal evaluation; is an evaluation approach with descriptive methods to produce reliable and valid information regarding policy results based on policy program targets that have been formally determined by policymakers. Furthermore, evaluate the theoretical decision process; an evaluation approach that uses descriptive methods to produce reliable and valid information about policy results that are explicitly desired by various stakeholders. As a comparison, Schofield (2001) classified the policy implementation evaluation into process evaluation, namely evaluation relating to the implementation process; impact evaluation, namely evaluation regarding the results and effects of policy implementation; policy evaluation, namely whether the results achieved truly reflect the desired goals; and meta-evaluation which is concerned with evaluating various existing policy implementations to find certain similarities. Meanwhile, Anderson et al. (2022) divided public policy evaluation into three types. They are first, public policy evaluation is understood as a functional activity. Second, evaluation that focuses on the working of policy. Third, systematic policy evaluation looks objectively at policy programs to measure their impact on society and the extent to which existing goals have been stated to have been achieved. In general, Dunn (2015) explained the indicators in evaluating a policy are effectiveness; have the desired results been achieved? efficiency; how much effort is required to achieve the desired results? sufficiency; to what extent does achieving the desired result solve the problem? alignment; are the costs of benefits distributed equally among different groups? responsiveness; do policy outcomes satisfy the needs, preferences, or values of particular groups?, accuracy; is the desired outcome (goal) truly useful or valuable? The several definitions above indicate that policy evaluation is an activity carried out to see implementation and then assess the progress of a policy, whether the policy has been implemented well or not, while the purpose of the evaluation is to find out whether the policy is suitable to be continued or not.

In general, Dunn (2015) stated the indicators used in evaluating a policy, which: are effectiveness: Have the expected results been achieved? efficiency: how much effort is

required to achieve the desired results, adequacy: to what extent does achieving the desired outcome solve the problem? equity: are the benefits of the policy distributed equally among various groups? responsiveness: does the policy meet the needs, preferences, or values of specific groups? appropriateness: does the desired outcome or goal provide meaningful benefit or value? The definitions above show that policy evaluation is an activity that aims to see policy implementation and assess the extent to which the policy has been well realized. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine whether the policy is worth continuing or not.

Program evaluation

Hill and Hupe (2002) revealed that a program is a unit or unit of activity, which is the realization or implementation of a policy, takes place directly in a continuous process, and occurs in an organization involving a group of people. Thus, what needs to be emphasized is that the program has three paramount elements, including a program is the realization or implementation of a policy, occurs over a long period, and is not a single activity but multiple continuous activities that occur in organizations involving a group of people. Marten and Wilson (2018) defined program evaluation as a process to know whether the program objectives have been realized. Additionally, according to Brown (1989), program evaluation is a process to assess whether the objectives of the program have been achieved. Brikerhoff et al. (2012) explained that program evaluation is an effort to provide information to decision-makers. Newcomer et al. (2015) stated that program evaluation is the process of systematically determining the value, objectives, effectiveness, or suitability of something by previously established criteria and objectives. The decision-making process is based on the observed data comparison with definite standardized standards. Various definitions above show that what is meant by program evaluation is an activity to collect information about the workings of a government program, which is then used to determine the precise alternative or choice in making a decision.

In implementing the program, there are several interrelated activities. These activities are measurement, assessment, and evaluation. According to Socha (2013), measurement, assessment, and evaluation constitute a hierarchy. Measurement compares the observation results with a criterion that is considered more standard. Assessment is an effort to explain measurement results, while evaluation determines the values or implications of behavior. This hierarchical nature indicates that evaluation activities involve measurement and assessment. Every planned activity program needs to end with an evaluation. This evaluation is intended to review whether the program was implemented according to plan and by its objectives. Based on information from the evaluation results, it can be compared whether a program meets the criteria that have been previously determined. Based on the evaluation results, a decision is then made whether the program will be continued, revised, stopped because it causes many problems, or reformulated to suit new goals, targets, and alternatives that are different from the previous one.

In addition, according to Hjern and Porter (2014), a program can be interpreted as a unit of activity, which is the implementation of a policy. This program takes place in a sustainable process and involves a group of people in an organization. There are three paramount elements in a program: a) the program is the policy implementation. b) the

program takes place over a long period and is not just a single activity but continuous. c) the program takes place in an organizational context involving several people.

Evaluation has two roles: formative and summative. Evaluation is categorized as formative if the evaluation results are to be used to improve the program, while a summative evaluation approach is often used to assist in making decisions about the continuation or adoption of a program. Evaluation needs to be carried out starting from the initial steps to ensure that deficiencies and mistakes do not continue and have negative and detrimental consequences. From these various definitions, it can be concluded that program evaluation is an activity to collect information about the performance of a government program. This information is then used to evaluate alternatives or appropriate choices in the decision-making process.

State university operational assistance policy-BOPTN

BOPTN (*Bantuan Operasional Perguruan Tinggi Negeri* abbreviated as BOPTN) is financial assistance from the government given to state universities to cover the shortfall in operational costs as a result of the absence of an increase in educational contributions (SPP) at state universities. BOPTN is also used to pay fees for lecturers who are not civil servants. BOPTN is also used to pay students' single tuition fees (UKT), which are allocated so that single tuition fees remain the same as the tuition fees set by the government. The government has made it easier for students to reach their future by providing various kinds of scholarships and operational financial assistance provided through universities or directly to students, one of which is operational assistance for state universities (Rakhmani & Siregar, 2016).

It is stated in Article 1 of Permendikbud Number 58 of 2012. According to Minister of Education and Culture Regulation no. 58 of 2012, BOPTN funds are used for 1) Carrying out research and community service, 2) procurement maintenance costs such as maintainance of buildings and other facilities in higher education, and 3) addition of practical/lecture materials, 4) library materials, such as procurement of textbooks, national and international journals, CD ROMs of scientific articles, CD ROMs of research data, subscriptions to digital journals, and must be carried out regularly and continuously to ensure the maintenance and development of current insights into the knowledge studied by the academic community, 5) quality assurance aims to achieve A (national) accreditation and international accreditation, 6) implementation of student activities, 7) power and service subscription financing; namely, internet access services to allow the students to find direct information and electricity, 8) implementation of supporting activities; various activities in higher education, such as curriculum development, human resource development, learning method development, seminars, and workshops, which play a very important role in the success of higher education in providing satisfactory higher education services, 9) development of information and communication technology (ICT) in learning, which is used for hardware maintenance, software, and network system development, learning materials (handouts, modules, animations, audiovisuals), and evaluation tools (quizzes, exam questions, independent assignments, teleconferences), 10). Honorarium for lecturers and non-civil servant education staff, 11). Procurement of guest lecturers to improve the quality of departments/study programs, especially related to guest lecture activities for lecturers and

students, financial assistance allocation can be provided. This activity is essential because it is directly related to updating knowledge, which is very beneficial for lecturers and students in deepening their understanding of the knowledge available in higher education, 12). Other activities are priorities in each university's strategic plan. However, BOPTN funds are not used for capital expenditure in the form of physical investment (buildings and equipment), additional teaching incentives for civil servants, and operational needs for management (Surtiati et al., 2017).

In addition, the Internal Supervisory Unit's BOPTN budget can be used to finance the operations of the Internal Supervisory Unit in supervising the implementation of tasks within the work unit as well as carrying out supervisory functions in non-academic fields, which include: (1) the financial sector, (2) the asset sector, and (3) personnel sector (Naufal et al., 2023). The target of the BOPTN program is higher education/ universities. National standards for higher education are standard units that include national education standards, plus research standards and community service standards.

The Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Regulation Number 60 of 2016 regulates Operational Assistance for State Universities (BOPTN). The BOPTN program is designed to overcome operational cost deficits in higher education. BOPTN research funds are managed by the Ministry of Education and Culture through the Directorate General of Higher Education. In addition, BOPTN research funds can be allocated directly to State Universities and the Coordination of Private Universities. Allocation of BOPTN research funds is based on the level of higher education research performance.

Providing BOPTN not only helps reduce the operational burden on PTNs but also increases research budget allocations for both PTNs and PTSs. By Law Number 12 of 2012, at least 30% of BOPTN must be allocated for research costs. Based on the POAC theory (Planning, Organizing, Actuating, Controlling) in financial management, each stage in the POAC process, including planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling, is paramount to pay attention to because they complement each other to achieve optimal fund management.

In the planning stage, the management of BOPTN funds to support work programs requires careful planning, and the government will also evaluate the allocation of State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) every year. Financial assistance from BOPTN is vital as a support for limited research and service activities. The BOPTN budget can be used to finance the operations of the Internal Supervision Unit in supervising the implementation of tasks within the work unit as well as carrying out supervisory functions in non-academic fields, which include (1) the financial sector, (2) the asset sector, and (3) the personnel sector.

BOPTN funds are not used for a) capital expenditure in the form of physical investment (new buildings and official vehicles) b) additional teaching incentives for civil servants, c) Additional incentives and honorariums for administrative officials, functional officials, and high-ranking officials who have civil servant status, and d) operational needs for management.

The benefits of BOPTN are necessary for universities, namely covering operational costs in universities and supporting improving the quality of services in universities, besides facilitating the learning process in universities and increasing research budgets. Operational costs in universities can be covered and improve the higher education graduates' quality.

Meanwhile, the benefits for the community/parents of students are to ease the burden of financing higher education operations for students, ensure continuity of higher education services for students, increase the quality of facilities and infrastructure increase comfort while studying.

The procedure for granting BOPTN is as follows: (1) The Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education receives an allocation of BOPTN funds from the *APBN*. (2) The Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education determines the allocation of BOPTN funds for each Working Unit based on predetermined criteria. (3) Higher education institutions receive allocations of BOPTN funds from the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education. (4) Higher education institutions arrange activities by the scope of use of BOPTN funds described in the Technical Instructions in the RKA-K/L. (5) Universities prepare supporting documents such as *TOR* (Term of Reference) and *RAB* (*Budget Plan*) for activities to be carried out. (6) Universities review the RKA-K/L together with the Inspectorate General team and the Planning Bureau of the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education. (7) The Planning Bureau of the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education carries out an evaluation together with the Directorate General of Budget. (8) If the RKA-K/L is approved, it will be designated as DIPA. If it is not approved, the university must revise the RKA-K/L according to the recommendations of the Directorate General of Budget and then review it again. (9) Higher education institutions use BOPTN funds by the activity plans that have been prepared. (10) Universities report the use of BOPTN funds per output.

Methodology

Based on the qualitative data analysis techniques above, this research predominantly uses qualitative research data analysis techniques using a combination method between the Miles and Huberman model of qualitative research methods and the Creswell model referring to the Grounded Theory research methodology and case studies. Qualitative research is a type of research that explores and provides more detailed information and insights into a problem. Additionally, qualitative research helps the researcher to generate the hypothesis by collecting the participants' experiences, perceptions, and behavior (Tenny et al. 2017).

The reason for using a qualitative research methodology using the Miles and Huberman model is because this research was carried out by starting with data collection, then presenting the data, if necessary reducing the data, and finally drawing conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The grounded theory approach was used because the data collection technique used interviews as primary data containing the informants' views about the BOPTN evaluation and other things that influence the policy. The grounded theory approach is one of the approaches that is mostly used in qualitative research that tries to uncover the meaning of community interactions, social actions, and experiences (Charmaz, 2005).

Results and Discussion

Dunn's first evaluation criterion is the effectiveness criterion. Effectiveness comes from the word 'effective', which means achieving success in achieving predetermined goals.

William N. Dunn, in his book entitled, *Introduction to Public Policy Analysis*, Second Edition, states that effectiveness is concerned with whether an alternative achieves the expected results (consequences) or the goal of the action. Which is closely related to technical rationality, always measured in terms of product or service units or monetary value (Dunn, 2015). In connection with the effectiveness evaluation criteria, the results of interviews with informants indicate that the provision of BOPTN to PTNs in the DKI Jakarta region, namely at *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)* is by the BOPTN policy objectives, effectively helping The operations of these State Universities are also effective in providing access to underprivileged communities to enjoy higher education.

Dunn's second evaluation criterion is efficiency. Efficiency will occur if resources are used optimally so that a goal can be achieved. William N. Dunn believes that efficiency relates to the effort required to produce a certain level of effectiveness. In this research, regarding the efficiency evaluation criteria, the provision of BOPTN has been efficient and beneficial in helping run operations at *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*. Additionally, this BOPTN policy is appropriate because it can open access for students from underprivileged families to enter *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*.

The third evaluation criterion according to Dunn is the adequacy criterion. Adequacy in public policy can be said to mean that the objectives that have been achieved are felt to be sufficient in various respects. William N. Dunn suggests that adequacy concerns the extent to which a level of effectiveness satisfies the needs, values, or opportunities that give rise to problems (Dunn, 1981). In this research, the policy of providing BOPTN was not sufficient to cover the shortfall in operational costs due to tuition restrictions, and 20% of new students at *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*, came from underprivileged families.

The fourth evaluation criterion according to Dunn is the equity criterion. Equity in public policy can be said to have the same meaning as justice provided and obtained by public policy targets. Dunn stated that equity criteria are closely related to legal and social rationality and refer to the distribution of consequences and efforts between different groups in society (Dunn, 1981). In this research, all academic components, from the rectorate to student activities, could run optimally with this BOPTN policy, but from the size of the BOPTN between PTNs, it was not fair even in the same region.

The fifth evaluation criterion is responsiveness. Responsiveness in public policy means the response of public policy targets to the implementation of a policy. According to William N. Dunn, responsiveness concerns the extent to which a policy can satisfy the needs, preferences, or values of certain groups of society (Dunn, 1981). Based on the results of research related to responsiveness criteria, the provision of BOPTN to *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*, (PTN for the DKI Jakarta region) was not sufficient to cover additional operational costs for universities, and there were still complaints from students to the *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*, campuses in particular regarding facilities on campus.

The sixth evaluation criterion according to Dunn is accuracy. Appropriateness refers to the value or worth of the program objectives and the strength of the assumptions

underlying those objectives. Dunn (2015) stated that appropriateness is a criterion used to select several alternatives as recommendations by assessing whether the results of the recommended alternatives are a worthy choice of objectives. Feasibility criteria are connected with substantive rationality because these criteria concern the substance of the goal, not the means or instruments for realizing that goal (Winarno, 2002). In this research, the policy of providing BOPTN to *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)* was appropriate and truly useful to help with operations at the two universities. However, the policy of providing BOPTN cannot cover the shortfall in operational costs due to reduced income due to the Single Tuition Fee (UKT).

To answer the research question of whether any aspects influence the evaluation of the policy for providing State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) to PTNs in the DKI Jakarta region, the results of the research conducted show that the aspect of the time for reducing the BOPTN budget which is considered quite tight with the preparation deadline influences the BOPTN policy because, at *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*, sufficient time is needed so that the use of BOPTN is more targeted and efficient in its use. Gollwitzer and Sheeran (2006) revealed that the time factor influences goal achievement. Goal achievement is the overall effort to achieve goals that must be viewed as a process. Therefore, to ensure the achievement of the final goal, phasing is needed, both in the sense of phasing in the achievement of its parts and periodization.

The State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) Policy at State Universities in the DKI Jakarta region has been effective, efficient, and appropriate in assisting operations at PTNs in the DKI Jakarta region. However, the assistance provided is still not enough to cover all operational costs. The BOPTN allocation given between PTNs is also not fair, and regarding its use, there are still complaints from students on campus. The relatively short time factor for reducing the BOPTN allocation also influences the effectiveness of BOPTN use. In addition, there are still points that are weaknesses or deficiencies in supporting the running of this program.

Aspects that influence the policy of providing State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) to PTNs in the DKI Jakarta region are effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, accuracy, and other aspects related to the relatively short time for the BOPTN budget to be reduced, which is considered to influence implementation and effectiveness of the use of BOPTN.

Efforts that need to be made by the government, in this case, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, to improve the provision of BOPTN policies in the future are to try to improve the amount of allocation so that it can cover the entire operational cost shortfall at PTNs and reformulate the BOPTN distribution calculation so that each PTN receives by the assistance allocation needed.

Conclusions

By looking at the results of the evaluation using evaluation criteria in the program providing operational assistance funds for state universities (BOPTN) at state universities in the DKI Jakarta region, the researcher suggests that the government should continue this program, but there needs to be improvements. From the results of the efficiency evaluation

criteria, the provision of BOPTN is efficient and beneficial in helping run operations at *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*. In addition, this BOPTN policy is appropriate because it can open access for students from underprivileged families to enter *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*. The relatively short time factor for reducing BOPTN allocations also influences the effectiveness of using BOPTN. In addition, there are still points that are weaknesses or deficiencies in supporting the running of this program.

Based on the results presented, although the provision of State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN) to *Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta (UPNVJ)* and *Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ)*, (PTN for the DKI Jakarta region) is not sufficient to cover additional operational costs for universities, and there are still complaints from students regarding the facilities on campus, the granting policy BOPTN for the two universities is considered appropriate and very useful for supporting their operations. However, this policy was unable to overcome the shortfall in operational costs arising from reduced Single Tuition Fee (UKT) income.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest.

References

- Alshuwaikhat, H. M., & Abubakar, I. (2008). An integrated approach to achieving campus sustainability: Assessment of the current campus environmental management practices. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(16), 1777-1785.
- Anderson, J. E., Moyer, J., & Chichirau, G. (2022). *Public policymaking*. Cengage Learning.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
- Brinkerhoff, R. O., Brethower, D. M., Nowakowski, J., & Hluchyj, T. (2012). *Program evaluation: A practitioner's guide for trainers and educators*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Brown, J. D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. *The Second Language Curriculum*, 222-241.
- Charmaz, K. (2005). Grounded theory in the 21st Century: A qualitative method for advancing social justice research. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3(7), 507-535.
- Chen, H. T. (2005). *Practical program evaluation: Assessing and improving planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Sage Publication.
- Dunn, W. N. (1981). *Introduction to public policy analysis*. Englewood Cliffs.
- Dunn, W. N. (2015). *Public policy analysis*. Routledge.
- Fernandez, A., Insfran, E., & Abrahão, S. (2011). Usability evaluation methods for the web: A systematic mapping study. *Information and software Technology*, 53(8), 789-817.
- Gollwitzer, P. M., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 69-119.

- Gusty, S., Tumpu, M., Yunus, A. Y., Chaerul, M., Harun, A. M. Y., Rangan, P. R., ... & Asri, Y. N. (2023). *Perguruan tinggi menuju era society 5, 0 "Peran dan strategi"* (Higher education towards the era of society 5, 0 "Roles and strategies"). Tohar Media.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2002). *Implementing public policy: Governance in theory and in practice*. Sage.
- Hjern, B., & Porter, D. O. (2014). *Implementation structures: A new unit of administrative analysis*. Routledge.
- Jacobs, G., & Slaus, I. (2010). Indicators of economic progress: The power of measurement and human welfare. *Cadmus J*, 1, 53-113.
- Jupriadi, J., Aslamiah, A., & Suriansyah, S. (2019). The analysis optimization analysis of budget absorption of State University Operational Assistance Funds (BOPTN). *Journal of K6 Education and Management*, 2(1), 36-41.
- Madaus, G. F., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.). (2012). *Educational evaluation: Classic works of Ralph W. Tyler*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2018). *Program evaluation theory and practice*. Guilford Publications.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage Publication.
- Naufal, P. P., Aisyah, S., & Budiati, A. (2023). Information technology-based budget accountability at the University of Borneo Tarakan. *The International Journal of Politics and Sociology Research*, 11(3), 289-299.
- Newcomer, K. E., Hatry, H. P., & Wholey, J. S. (2015). Planning and designing useful evaluations. *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 7-35.
- Nugroho, S. A. (2014). *Hukum persaingan usaha di Indonesia (Business competition law in Indonesia)*. Prenada Media.
- Nugroho, S. H. N. H. (2020). The assessment of management effectiveness program on organizational performance. *Assessment*, 29(4), 4730-4741.
- Purnastuti, L., & Izzaty, R. E. (2016). Access and equity in higher education in Indonesia: A review from the periphery. *Widening Higher Education Participation*, 119-134.
- Radovanović, B. (2011). Human development index as a measure of human development. *Filozofija i Društvo*, 22(3), 193-208.
- Rahmi, E., Patoni, A., & Sulistyorini, S. (2020). The management of human resources development in increasing the quality of Islamic education institutions. *Al-Ta Lim Journal*, 27(2), 166-178.
- Rakhmani, I., & Siregar, M. F. (2016). *Reforming research in Indonesia: Policies and practices*. New Delhi: Global Development Network.
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Henry, G. T. (2018). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. Sage Publications.
- Sakapurnama, E., Huseini, M., & Soeling, P. D. (2019). The challenges in higher education institutions in Indonesia: Are we entrepreneurial university yet?. *Hasanuddin Economics and Business Review*, 2(3), 153-171.
- Schofield, J. (2001). Time for a revival? Public policy implementation: A review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(3), 245-263.
- Socha, A. (2013). A hierarchical approach to students' assessments of instruction. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 94-113.

- Stufflebeam, D. (2001). Evaluation models. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2001(89), 7-98.
- Subarsono, A. G. (2005). *Analisis kebijakan publik (Public policy analysis)*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Surtiati, S., Siregar, H., & Andati, T. (2017). Analisis arus kas terkait kebijakan uang kuliah tunggal di perguruan tinggi negeri badan hukum (Cash flow analysis related to single tuition policy at state universities as legal entities). *Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis dan Manajemen (JABM)*, 3(2), 222-222.
- Tenny, S., Brannan, J. M., & Brannan, G. D. (2017). *Qualitative study*. Statpearls.
- Vedung, E. (2017). *Public policy and program evaluation*. Routledge.
- Winarno, B. (2012). *Public policy (Theory, process, and case studies)*. Yogyakarta: Caps.
-

Biographical Notes

ACHMAD HADIANSYAH was a graduate student at Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia

HIMSAR SILABAN is a faculty member at Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia

HARRY NENOBAIS is a faculty member at Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia

YOGA DWI ARIANDA is a coordinator Publication and Research at the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, Indonesia.