

EVALUATION OF THE REHABILITATION PROGRAM OF UNINHABITABLE HOUSES FOR LOW-INCOME PEOPLE IN SITUMEANG HABINSARAN URBAN VILLAGE

Septiani Solagrasia Lumban Gaol^{1*}, R. Sally Marisa Sihombing²

¹ Ilmu Administrasi Publik, Universitas Sumatera Utara

² Ilmu Administrasi Publik, Universitas Sumatera Utara

Corresponding Author Email: septianilumbangaol123@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Received: 16-02-2025

Accepted: 18-06-2025

Keywords:

Evaluation, Program Evaluation, Uninhabitable Homes, Low-Income Communities, Situmeang Habinsaran Urban Village

Tapanuli Regency has been running the Uninhabitable House Rehabilitation Program since 2015 and in 2019 Situmeang Habinsaran Village received assistance from the uninhabitable house rehabilitation program. However, in its implementation, the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses that has been running for 8 years has not been able to answer the problem of uninhabitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village. This research uses descriptive research methods with a qualitative approach. Data collection techniques were carried out by means of interviews, observation and documentation conducted at the Office of the Housing and Settlement Areas Office of North Tapanuli Regency. The data obtained was then analyzed qualitatively by reviewing all the data collected, which was supported by the results of interviews with the theoretical approach put forward by William N. Dunn (2003), namely: effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, accuracy and responsiveness. The results of this study show that the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Subdistrict from the aspect of effectiveness is not good enough, marked by the repair of houses that are carried out only focused on repairing roofs, floors and walls while other components of house repairs are not repaired. The efficiency and adequacy aspects are not good enough with insufficient human resources and waste of aid funds. Aspects of equity that are not good enough due to the uneven socialization provided. The responsiveness aspect is not responsive to the recipient community and the accuracy aspect, the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses is not right on target. The implementation of the Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village has not gone well and has not achieved its goals.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian government has placed housing as one of the basic needs such as education and health, the fulfillment of which is guaranteed in Article 28(h) of the 1945 Constitution. The fulfillment of these basic needs is also in line with the Global Agenda of the 2030 Development Goals (Sustainable Development Goals).

The high number of uninhabitable houses in Indonesia is also followed by the results of the implementation of the components of uninhabitable houses that are still low. In the achievement of livable housing in 2015-2019 there are still 51 million Indonesians living in houses with inadequate building resilience, 22 million Indonesians living in houses with inadequate building area adequacy and 28.6 million Indonesians with inadequate drinking water sources (National Water and Sanitation Information, 2022).

The Non-Habitable House Rehabilitation Program itself is a product in the form of cash given to Low-Income Communities. Data from the National Affordable Housing Program (<http://nahp.pu.go.id/>) notes that.

North Sumatra Province experienced an increase in the number of habitable houses from 2020 to 2022 which can be seen from table 1.2 followed by a decrease in the percentage of access to adequate housing in 2022 by 2.22%. Tapanuli Regency is one of the regions in North Sumatra that runs the Uninhabitable House Rehabilitation Program which also experienced an increase in the number of uninhabitable houses and became the 6th district that contributed to the number of uninhabitable houses (e-RTLH PUPR, 2023).

Tabel 1. Number of Uninhabitable Houses in North Tapanuli Regency 2018-2022

| No. | Date | Number of Uninhabitable Homes |
|-----|------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2018 | 10.876 |
| 2 | 2019 | 11.277 |
| 3 | 2020 | 11.673 |
| 4 | 2021 | 11.962 |

The Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses in North Tapanuli Regency from 2017 to 2022 has a total of 3,280 housing units with the least number received in 2020

due to Covid-19 conditions. The number of uninhabitable houses when compared to 2020 in table 1 with the number of RTLH program quotas in 2020 that have been done in the number of uninhabitable houses should have decreased.

Situmeang Habinsaran Village is one of the areas in North Tapanuli that received the Uninhabitable House Rehabilitation Program, which at that time the number of quotas received by Situmeang Habinsaran Village was 40 housing units with a ceiling amount of Rp.700,000,000. The implementation of the Uninhabitable House Rehabilitation Program is carried out through North Tapanuli Regent Regulation No. 28 of 2021 concerning the Rehabilitation of Uninhabitable Houses for Low-Income Communities (MBR) as a guideline in the implementation of the program.

The damage to the house will worsen if there is no action from the beneficiary community because repair assistance can be given again after fulfilling a predetermined period of time. In the housing program, the time of usefulness of the house is intended for a long period of time, but because of the rapid damage of the houses resulting from the Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses and the lack of initiative of the beneficiary community to repair their own houses, it causes the inefficiency of the Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village.

The Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses in Situmeang Village is clearly visible and very important to be resolved because it is not only to be used as an object of research but how these phenomena and problems are researched for solutions to problems so as to provide solutions for people's lives, especially people in Situmeang Habinsaran Village for livable homes. Researchers need a number of criteria or standards as a basis for consideration to determine whether the evaluation results are good or bad. According to Stufflebeam & Coryn (2014: 77) and Yrbrough, et al (2011) these standards are Utility Standard, Feasibility Standard, Propriety Standard, and Accuracy Standard. The results of the meta-evaluation that researchers have done are in the form of the following table.

Tabel 2. Meta Evaluation Results

| No. | Standart | Presentation | Category |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------|----------|
| 1 | Utility Standard | 50% | Good |
| 2 | Feasibilitas Standart | 50% | Good |
| 3 | Proprietary Standard | 50% | Good |
| 4 | Accuracy Standard | 50% | Good |

Source: Processed by Researcher, 2023

The results of the meta-evaluation that researchers have conducted on the Rehabilitation of Non-Habitable Houses program with four good results. The explanation is that the Utility Standard obtained a score of 14 or 50% (good) where the other 50% still did not meet the standard, namely in the absence of evaluators and the lack of written reports and the lack of communication carried out by the Housing and Settlement Area Office with prospective beneficiaries and beneficiaries of the Uninhabitable House Rehabilitation program. Proprietas standard obtained a score of 17 or 50% (good) where the other 50% have not met the standard is informing the program in the form of positive and negative outputs and program weaknesses.

Feasibility Standards obtained a score of 6 or 50% (good), where 50% have not met the standards, namely the absence of minimizing data loads, minimizing program disruptions,

especially implementation procedures and no development in program improvement if there is an obstacle carried out by the North Tapanuli Housing and Settlement Area Office related to the implementation of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses and for Accuracy Standards obtained a score of 27 or 50% (good).

The author chooses the theme of evaluation because there are programs that have been implemented that have problems in their implementation, which causes the program to not be able to meet its own objectives optimally. As evaluation is an objective, systematic and empirical examination in terms of the objectives to be achieved (Dye, 1987: 351), which in this case is the Rehabilitation Program for Non-Habitable Houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, Senagaiman. Therefore, researchers are interested in conducting research with the title "Evaluation of the Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses for Low-Income Communities in Situmeang Habinsaran Village".

2. METHODS

This research uses a qualitative research approach. According to Wijaya (2018) qualitative research is a research method used to research on natural object conditions, and the researcher himself as a key instrument, the data collection technique used is triangulation, the data obtained tends to be qualitative data,

This research is located in the North Tapanuli Residential Area located on Jl. Raja Marhusa, Hutatoruan I, Siatas Barita District, North Tapanuli Regency, North Sumatra 22412, The technique of determining informants carried out by researchers in this study is purposive sampling technique, Researchers reasoned using purposive sampling, namely to find and collect valid data by interviewing an informant who is considered capable and knows or masters an expertise in his field. The data analysis technique used in this research is the Miles and Huberman model. Miles and Huberman model. According to Miles and Huberman in Sugiyono's book (2018: 246) qualitative research data analysis is carried out during direct data collection and after data collection is completed within a certain period.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Effectiveness

The effectiveness of a policy or program can be seen in terms of the extent to which a policy or program achieves the objectives that have been set. One of the beneficiaries who had an inadequate toilet, Mr. Jusrifal Situmeang, stated that:

"The government provided assistance to repair the house but only the roof, walls and floor were repaired, the toilet was not repaired, nor was the water. Our water was not repaired, yes we do use water from PAM but it is not clean, we also use it for drinking water, and even then the bathroom was not repaired, there were still less funds to build the house, so we bathe in the river." (Interview with Mr. Jusrifal Situmeang, beneficiary of the Rehabilitation Program for Non-Habitable Houses, 02 October 2023).

House repairs that have been carried out by the Housing and Settlement Areas Agency of North Tapanuli Regency in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, through the construction of components that have been repaired are only the roof, walls and floors of the house which are included in the building durability component. No improvements were made to the latrine, even though the latrine was in an unfit condition.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------|------------|------------|-----------|--|--|
| V | Upah Kerja | | | | | | |
| | - Tukang | Oh | | | | | |
| | - Pembantu Tukang | Oh | | | | | |
| | - Makan siang dan minum | Kali | | | | | |
| VI | MCK dan lain-lain | | | | | | |
| | - Closet Jongkok | 1 Unit | 150.000 | 150.000 | 150.000 | | |
| | - Pipa paralon | 4 Btg | 45.000 | 180.000 | 180.000 | | |
| | - Paku, engsel, slot pintu, kunci, kawat ikat | Ls | | 34.000 | 34.000 | | |
| | - Papan Bekisting | Ls | | | | | |
| | JUMLAH | | 22.710.000 | 20.000.000 | 2.710.000 | | |



BRS Dana Alokasi Khusus Tahun 2020 -36

Figure 1. Format of Budget Plan - Calculation of Purchase of Building Materials

In the picture of the cost budget plan above owned by one of the beneficiaries of the Rehabilitation Program for Non-Habitable Houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Subdistrict, the amount of funds for the repair of bathing, washing and latrines has been included. However, in its implementation in Situmeang Habinsaran, the entire repair budget was intended to repair the building's durability component only.

In its implementation in Kelurahan Situmeang Habinsaran, the products provided by the Field Facilitators were only building resilience and the other products that were not provided were bathing, washing, latrines. Because the Field Facilitators thought that building resilience was more important than bathing, washing and toilet products, the entire grant was used only to improve building resilience products.

The Field Facilitators' lack of understanding of the objectives of the Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses is due to a lack of understanding of the optimization of the objectives of a program (Steers, 1997) so that the expected results of the Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses have not been achieved in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, namely the improvement of the building durability component, the bathing, washing, and toilet component and the minimum movement space component.

B. Efficiency

The optimum use of resources to achieve a certain goal. This means that efficiency will occur if the use of resources is optimally empowered so that goals will be achieved. William N. Dunn argues that efficiency is related to the amount of effort required to produce a certain level of effectiveness.

1. Human Resources (Technical Efficiency)

The implementation of the Rehabilitation Program for Non-Habitable Houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Subdistrict has one role that is directly related to the implementation, which has an important task and is the spearhead of the Non-Habitable House Rehabilitation Program. When viewed from the tasks attached to Regent Regulation No. 28 of 2021, namely Field Facilitators (TFL).

In its implementation in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, there were no empowerment facilitators during the program until its completion. As based on an interview with Mr. Rintope Situmeang, that:

Yesterday, there were actually two people who supervised us but they were specialized in engineering and for the empowerment, they also did the empowerment, I don't know because they were the only two who helped us (Interview Mr. Rintope Sinaga, community beneficiary of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Sub-district, September 28, 2023).

The lack of field facilitators has resulted in minimal empowerment in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, which can be seen indirectly from the repaired houses from the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses that are not in accordance with the construction of the house. Some beneficiaries cannot maximize the value of their self-help and can only provide self-help value in the form of social capital. Human resources in efficiency to produce a high level of effectiveness in the rehabilitation program of habitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village have not been sufficient due to the lack of facilitators, the lack of ability of field facilitators in understanding the objectives of the rehabilitation program of uninhabitable houses themselves.

2. Financial Sources-Optimized Use of Assistance Funds

The implementation of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses by facilitators uses a cost budget plan (RAB) and a list of building material purchase plans (DRPB2) to control the purchase of building materials and control beneficiaries in withdrawing savings funds so as to achieve the appropriate use of funds to build or improve the quality of the house to be livable or according to the cost budget plan. Making a list of plans for purchasing building materials is made by the beneficiaries together in the beneficiary group.

The cost budget plan that has been budgeted is Rp.22,710,000 with self-help assistance provided of Rp.2,710,000. The handyman's wage in the cost budget plan is not included because the one who is the handyman in repairing the house is the beneficiary community itself. This is done to maximize the amount of aid funds so that the results are in accordance with the expectations of the beneficiary community, namely improving the quality of the house into a livable house.



Figure 2. Floor condition of a house that received RTLH program assistance in Situmeang Habinsaran Village

Building materials delivered in a low-quality condition are what causes premature deterioration of the houses. An interview with Mr. Boy Situmeang mentioned that there was a decline in the quality of the building materials provided by the building stores to the beneficiaries, as Mr. Boy stated that:

"There is a decline in the quality of building materials used in house repairs. For example, the bricks given are brittle and have many voids in the bricks, they are not solid. Yes, the bricks that were given were cheap but the quality was not good. There were also some building materials that were

damaged on the way, so when the building materials arrived they were already defective and could not be used so there were double purchases.” (Interview with one of the community members who received assistance from the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses, Mr. Boy Situmeang, 27 September 2023)

In the implementation of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses, this has not been done, so that a rational maximizer of the amount of assistance funds is needed in order to increase the effectiveness of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses. The efficiency of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village is not enough to encourage program effectiveness because both efforts (funds and human resources) in the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses have not been maximized.

C. Adequacy

Adequacy is concerned with how far the level of effectiveness satisfies the needs, values, or opportunities that give rise to the problem. The adequacy criterion emphasizes the strength of the relationship between policy alternatives and expected outcomes.

1. Adequacy of the Grant Amount

The rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in the Situmeang Habinsaran sub-district has been able to provide sufficiency in repairing the houses of beneficiary communities, based on the results of interviews, because without the assistance of this uninhabitable house rehabilitation program, beneficiary communities have difficulty in repairing their homes. One of the impacts of the uninhabitable house rehabilitation program assistance in the Situmeang sub-district is that the beneficiary community has experienced an increase in comfort and health in the house, as revealed by Mr. Boy Situmeang to researchers, that:

“There is an increase in ventilation and lighting. The house that has been repaired is no longer cold. The old house had no windows and it was dark inside. There was no light coming in. From this house repair, I can get benefits that I might not be able to get on my own.” (Interview with one of the beneficiaries of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses, Mr. Boy Situmeang, 28 September 2023).

The amount of assistance from the Rehabilitation of Inadequate Housing program in Situmeang Habinsaran Village is not enough to provide livable houses for beneficiaries. The beneficiaries who were able to provide self-help in the form of additional money during the implementation of the rehabilitation program were still able to improve their houses into livable houses. The beneficiary community feels that the amount of assistance is not enough because they provide a lot of additional capital (money), but if the amount of assistance is increased, it can alleviate the beneficiary community in the process of repairing the house.

The beneficiaries who can only provide their self-help in the form of social capital have not been able to feel the change of the house into a livable house, because they cannot make additions so that maximum management is needed but because as discussed in the efficiency section, cost maximization is not done, the amount of aid funds is not enough to provide livable houses for beneficiaries in Situmeang Habinsaran Village.

The amount of funds is a problem in the implementation of the rehabilitation program in the situmeang habinsaran

village through this Dunn (2003: 430) that the choice of its adequacy in the situmeang habinsaran village is in a type III problem. Type III problems need to make optimal budget choices to maximize the achievement of program objectives by increasing the amount of program assistance (changing costs and changing effectiveness). In this case, it is necessary to increase the cost of budgeted handyman wages and the amount of assistance in purchasing building materials so that both beneficiaries who can be self-sufficient and less, can minimize the budget burden that beneficiaries bear.

D. Equity

The key to equity is justice or fairness. In the process of implementing house construction activities in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, the government can provide assistance without any difference in discrimination so that the process of building uninhabitable house programs can be enjoyed and benefited by the beneficiaries as it should.

1. Socialization Alignment

Facilitators have provided socialization to the beneficiary community in Situmeang Habinsaran Village both after and before the assistance was provided, according to the results of the interview. Socialization is a form of service that should be received equally.

Observations and the results of interviews with beneficiaries in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, the socialization provided by field facilitators is uneven as based on the results of interviews with beneficiaries who live in various different neighborhoods in Situmeang Habinsaran Village. One of the neighborhoods or areas that did not receive assistance for the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in the Situmeang Habinsaran Urban Village was the beneficiary community in the Pansinaran neighborhood, as expressed by Mrs. Lepina Simanjuntak, that:

“No socialization was given, just yesterday the assistance was given to me and then the process of repairing the house was carried out. The field facilitator only came during the construction process to check the progress of the construction and provide receipts for the purchase of building materials.” (Interview with community beneficiary Mrs. Lepina Simanjuntak, October 02, 2023).

The uneven socialization provided in situmeang habinsaran kelurahan where the beneficiary community in the ria-ria I neighborhood received socialization while in the pancinaran neighborhood the community did not receive socialization according to the results of interviews with beneficiary communities. According to the results of an interview with a field facilitator in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, Mr. Jonis Lubis, socialization has been provided thoroughly to the beneficiary community in Situmeang Habinsaran Village.

The field findings that researchers obtained regarding this socialization were that it was clear that the beneficiaries who received socialization and those who did not received socialization. When viewed from the Situmeang Habinsaran urban village area, those who tend to get socialization are the Ria-Ria I and Pangambatan areas because of their good road access and proximity to the crossing road. Meanwhile, the area that did not receive socialization was Pansinaran, which was caused by the results of the interview above that the difficulty of access to the place was an obstacle to socialization. Researchers found a tendency that beneficiaries who did not receive socialization did not know

the description of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses and its objectives, so they did not know the importance of livable houses for them. In contrast to the beneficiaries who received socialization, they knew the purpose of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses so that a different pattern of behavior emerged where beneficiaries who received socialization would be more inclined to maintain or care for their homes so that they remained habitable homes. Maintenance of the house building is carried out so that the lifetime of the building can be longer and can even exceed the calculated eligibility value.

E. Responsiveness

The responsiveness criterion is important because an analyst who can satisfy all the other criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity) still fails if it does not respond to the actual needs of the groups that are supposed to benefit from a policy.

1. Self-help in the Rehabilitation Program of Non-Habitable Houses

The rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village in its implementation, there are types of self-help that can be provided by the beneficiary community, mostly as one of the requirements in receiving program assistance, namely self-help-collaboration and self-help-labor obtained through family or relatives.

Tabel 3. Forms of Self-help of Community Recipients of the Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village

| No. | Name of Beneficiary | Form of Self-help |
|-----|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | Boy N. Situmeang | Self-employed labor |
| 2. | Maslan Situmeang | Self-employed labor |
| 3. | Rintope Situmeang | Self-help funding |
| 4. | Roni Hutabarat | Self-help collaboration |
| 5. | Nelli Hutauruk | Self-employed labor |
| 6. | Ria Siregar | Self-employed labor |
| 7. | Dumanis Hutauruk | Self-help funding |
| 8. | Lepina Simanjuntak | Self-employed labor |
| 9. | Paulina Simatupang | Self-help collaboration |
| 10. | Ratima Simamora | Self-help collaboration |
| 11. | Jusrifal Situmeang | Self-employed labor |
| 12. | Rolan Silitonga | Self-help collaboration |

The function of self-help is not only to help the recipient community but by applying the principle of self-help, this program allows the community to actively participate in the planning, implementation, supervision, accountability, and reporting processes. In addition, this program develops and increases awareness of the potential or strength of the community. Each form of self-help provided by the recipient community will affect the results of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses. This is due to the differences in quantity and value of each form of community self-help.

Self-reliance is the key to the success of the uninhabitable house rehabilitation program, but its implementation to support or maximize the self-reliance value of the beneficiary community in Situmeang Habinsaran Village is non-existent. One of which is the absence of direct

and active involvement of empowerment facilitators in Situmeang Habinsaran Village.

The facilitators also do not activate the beneficiary group as a forum formed to assist beneficiary members in carrying out home repairs, so that beneficiary communities who can only provide their self-reliance in the form of mutual cooperation, the construction process is only carried out by field facilitators which causes the results of home repairs to be haphazard and unworthy. Interview with the head of the beneficiary group in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, Mr. Rintope Situmeang, that:

"Actually we also want to help one of our groups by working together in home repairs, but because our house is far away and we are not mobilized to help and do mutual cooperation in building houses, yes we also don't know who needs it. " (Interview with the Head of Aid Recipients, Mr. Rintope Situmeang, September 28, 2023).

Mutual assistance is not enough to change the house to be habitable because there is no empowerment facilitator and the role of the aid recipient group and the self-help value that is not empowered properly. These factors cause the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses to not meet the needs (responsiveness) of several groups in the Situmeang Habinsaran sub-district, where the implementation of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses is not responsive and answers the problems of aid recipient communities who have low self-help values.

F. Appropriateness

Appropriateness questions whether the goals are appropriate for a society. Appropriateness refers to the value or worth of the program's goals and to the strength of the assumptions underlying those goals.

1. Target Accuracy

The suitability of the target group for the implementation of the uninhabitable house rehabilitation program is carried out by identifying community groups that receive assistance for the uninhabitable house rehabilitation program. The accuracy in this point is the relationship between the recipient of assistance and the qualifications or requirements that have been set.

The most basic requirement for recipients of the uninhabitable housing rehabilitation program is that the community is a low-income community group. Based on the results of interviews with community recipients, they are in this case low-income communities according to their monthly income not exceeding the district minimum wage. The minimum wage for North Tapanuli Regency is Rp. 2,739,640.

The facilitator said that the requirements had been met in Situmeang Habinsaran Village, based on the interview results above. The researcher's observations in the field found that there were community recipients who received program assistance who did not meet one of the assistance requirements, namely "having and occupying the only house in an uninhabitable condition. In this case, the community recipients of assistance have two houses, one of which is habitable and the other is uninhabitable.



Figure 3. Program Result Houses Are Not Right on Target

The impact of the inaccuracy of the target of this assistance is the abandonment of the results of the program assistance where on the one hand there are still many people who are more deserving of receiving assistance for the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses. In Situmeang Habinsaran sub-district, the implementation of the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses was not on target because the facilitators did not consider all the criteria together in one period of time and only looked at one criterion such as "can the community be said to be a low-income community?" without looking at other criteria, namely the number of houses owned and the situation of the house.

The implementation of the housing program by the government, the administrative approach is so obvious, ignoring the essence of the uninhabitable housing rehabilitation program itself. This does not only happen during the target group data collection process, but also during the data verification process and distribution of the uninhabitable housing rehabilitation program. The government uses the government structure from the central level to the bureaucracy at the village level to collect administrative documents. The program target documents are prepared in stages and include proposals from the bottom up. In the Situmeang Habinsaran village itself, the proposal document was carried out by the Head of Situmeang Habinsaran Village, Mrs. Desma Purba. Based on the results of the interview, that:

"Program proposals or anything related to assistance are submitted to the village head as someone who knows the conditions of his community better, after which the agency comes for verification." (Interview with the Head of Situmeang Habinsaran Village, Mrs. Desma Purba, October 11, 2023)

The limited number of uninhabitable housing rehabilitation programs available allows data filtering at each level of bureaucracy to be unknown to the community and fraud is very possible during this process especially because of the conflict of interest that wants to prioritize a community. The next factor is bureaucracy, namely the Housing and Settlement Service of North Tapanuli Regency does not try to adjust the data produced to the current situation in society. Its implementation in Situmeang Habinsaran Village is the absence of data on uninhabitable houses which causes a discrepancy with the actual situation.

4. CONCLUSION

Researchers evaluated the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village using the William N. Dunn evaluation model. The findings showed that the effectiveness of the program had not been achieved, especially in the Bathing, Washing, and Toilet components,

because funds were more focused on repairing roofs, floors, and walls. In terms of efficiency, there was a lack of human resources, especially facilitators, which hampered community empowerment. As a result, community self-help support was not enough to repair their houses. The use of funds was also not optimal, with waste in purchasing building materials. Although this program helped repair houses, the funds provided were still lacking, especially for pre-prosperous communities who could only do mutual cooperation. Socialization of the program also did not go well because it was not structured and there were obstacles to access to the community, especially farmers. The community appreciated the program, but those with low self-help felt they had received less benefits to repair their houses. The accuracy of the program was also a problem, with recipients of assistance not always meeting the requirements due to outdated data between the Housing Agency and the Ministry of Public Works. Overall, the rehabilitation program for uninhabitable houses in Situmeang Habinsaran Village faced various challenges that hindered the achievement of its goals.

REFERENCES

- Abioro, Tunde., & Hammed A. Adefeso. (2016). The Menace of Poverty and The Challenges of Public Policy Making in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 9(1). 180-181.
- Aditama, P. B., & Widowati, N. (2017). Analisis Kinerja Organisasi Pada Kantor Kecamatan Blora. *Journal of Public Policy and Management Review*, 6(2), 283-295.
- Akibu, R. S. (2014). Evaluasi kebijakan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan di sma negeri 1 ampibabo kecamatan ampibabo kabupaten parigi moutong. *Katalogis*, 2(1).
- Anggraini, L. B, Kurniawan, B. (2021). Evaluasi Program Rehabilitasi Rumah Tidak Layak huni (RTLH) di Kabupaten Tuban. *Publika*, 9(2). 209-322.
- Lassance, Antonio. (2020). What is a policy and what is a government program? A Simple Question with No Clear Answer, Until Now. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 10-11.
- Christie, C. A., & Alkin, M. C. (2008). Evaluation theory tree re-examined. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 34(3), 131-135.
- Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Clark Plano, V. L., & Morales, A. (2012). Qualitative research designs: Selection and implementation. *The counseling psychologist*, 35(2), 236-264.
- Dworak, M., Prskawetz, A., & Feichtinger, G. (2001). From Vicious Circles to Cycles of Poverty. Mimeo. Vienna: Institute for Demography, Austrian Academy of Sciences.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public administration*, 69(1), 3-19.
- Huraerah, A. (2013). Strategi Kebijakan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Kesejahteraan Sosial*, 12(1), 3-13. *Jurnal Teknologi*, 1(2), 75-76.
- Koehuan, J & Messha, Y. (2014). Estimasi Backlog (Kekurangan Rumah) dan Jumlah Tidak Layak Huni Provinsi NTT Tahun 2010.

- Putra, Roby Hadi., Afriva Khaidir. (2019). Concept of George C. Edwards III on Implementation of Regional Regulations No.12 of 2017 Concerning Youth in Granting Youth Service in West Sumatera. *International Journal of Progressive Science and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, 15(1), 236-237.
- Putra, W, A, Syahrini, Prakoso, C, T. (2020). Evaluasi program Rehabilitasi Rumah Tidak Layak Huni di Kecamatan Loa Kulu Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara (Peraturan Bupati Kutai Kartanegara Nomor 46 Tahun 2011. *eJournal Administrasi Negara*, 8(1), 8817-88122.
- Ramdhani, Abdullah., & Muhammad Ali Ramdhani. (2017). Konsep Umum Pelaksanaan Kebijakan Publik. *Jurnal Publik*, 11(01). 2-3.
- Ram, P. & Neddham B. (2016). The Provision of Affordable Housing in India: Are Commercial Developers Interested? *Habitat International Journal*, 197(3795), 2-3.
- Rounavaara, Hannu. (2018). *Theory of Housing, From Housing, About Housing*. Routledge, 35(2), 182-183.
- Sekarsari, Retno Wulan., Suteno. (2018). Evaluasi Kebijakan Penyelenggaraan Hari Bebas Kendaraan Bermotor (Car Free Day) Di Kota Malang. *JU-Ke*, 2(2). 166.
- Sudipa, N., & Nurjani, P. S. (2021). Strategy for Accelerating Poverty Reduction in Klungkung Regency, Bali. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 13(1), 41-51.
- Sujarwani, R, Suhandri. (2021). Evaluasi program Rehabilitasi Sosial Rumah Tidak Layak huni di Desa Tanjung Lipat Kabupaten Lingga. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Raja Haji*, 3(1), 635-643.
- Yoshino, N., & Helble, M. (2016). The housing challenge in emerging Asia: Options and solutions. *Asian Development Bank Institute*, 3(2), 45-46.
- Regulasi
- Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Kesejahteraan Republik Indonesia 1945 Pasal 34 Ayat 1 Tentang Kesejahteraan Sosial.
- Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia 1945 Pasal 28H Ayat 1 Tentang Hak Asasi Manusia.
- Peraturan Menteri Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Republik Indonesia No.7/PRT/M.2018 Tentang Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya.
- Peraturan Bupati Tapanuli Utara Nomor 28 Tahun 2021 Tentang Rehabilitasi Rumah Tidak Layak Huni Bagi Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah.
- Dirjen Penyediaan Perumahan. (2019). *Pedoman Umum National Affordable Housing Program*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Republik Indonesia.
- Pokja PPS Nasional. (2019). *Pedoman Pengukuran Capaian Pembangunan Perumahan dan Permukiman Berbasis Hasil (Outcome)*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat. Studi Pada Corporate Social Responsibility Pertamina Di Kota Batam. *Student Online Journal (Soj) Umrah-Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 2(1), 430-438.
- Silaban, W., & Silalahi, M. V. (2021). Analisis Kualitas Air Di Perairan Danau Toba Kecamatan Pangururan, Kabupaten Samosir. *Jst (Jurnal Sains Dan Teknologi)*, 10(2), 299-307.
- Soejarwo, P. A., Koeshendrajana, S., Apriliani, T., Yuliaty, C., Deswati, R. H., Sari, Y. D., ... & Sirait, J. (2022). Pengelolaan Perikanan Budidaya Keramba Jaring Apung (Kja) Dalam Upaya Penyelamatan Danau Maninjau. *Jurnal Kebijakan Sosial Ekonomi Kelautan Dan Perikanan*, 12(1), 79-87.