

The Governor's Role in Policy Evaluation in the Preparation of the Banten Province RKPD

Heru Wahyudi ^{1*}, Jaka Maulana ², Angga Rosidin ³

^{1,2,3} Pamulang University, Indonesia

¹ dosen10020@unpam.ac.id *; ² dosen02887@unpam.ac.id; ³ dosen03003@unpam.ac.id;

* corresponding author : dosen10020@unpam.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received : 17 December 2025

Revised : 22 Juni 2026

Accepted : 30 Juni 2026

Keywords

Policy evaluation;

RKPD;

Development Planning;

Utilization Of Evaluation Results;

Local Government;



This is an open access
article under the CC-BY-SA
license. Copyright (c) 2026
Transparansi : Jurnal Ilmiah
Ilmu Administrasi

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the role of policy evaluation in the preparation of the Regional Government Work Plan (RKPD), with a focus on the integration of performance monitoring and assessment results into annual development planning. This study uses a literature review approach to analyze various theories of policy evaluation, regional planning systems, and institutional dynamics that influence the utilization of evaluation results at the regional government level, particularly in Banten Province. The results show that evaluation models such as CIPP, objective-based evaluation, and utilization-focused evaluation have the potential to strengthen the quality of RKPD planning if systematically integrated. However, various structural, cultural, and technical barriers hinder the optimal utilization of evaluation results, including a lack of human resource capacity, weak performance information systems, and a low evaluative culture within the regional bureaucracy. This study concludes that the success of annual development planning depends heavily on the extent to which evaluation serves as the basis for developing programs and activities. This study recommends strengthening regulations, digitizing evaluation-planning systems, and building the capacity of civil servants (ASN) to encourage more evidence-based and results-oriented regional development governance.

INTRODUCTION

Regional development planning is a crucial element of governance in Indonesia. As a key instrument in the public policy cycle, the *Regional Government Work Plan* (RKPD) document serves as the meeting point between the medium-term development vision and the implementation of annual programs. In the context of regional autonomy and increasingly complex development challenges, the preparation of the RKPD must be based on the principle of *evidence-based policy*, which prioritizes the use of data and evaluation results in the decision-making process. However, in many local governments, including Banten Province, the practice of integrating policy evaluation results into annual planning still faces significant structural and cultural barriers.

The concept of policy evaluation has undergone significant evolution, from simply measuring program success to a more comprehensive and participatory approach. Models such as the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) developed by Stufflebeam have been widely used to evaluate policy effectiveness across various contexts. Larasati et al. (2023) assert that the CIPP approach is capable of identifying environmental characteristics, community strengths and weaknesses, and stakeholder relationships, making it an adaptive tool for evaluation-based policy planning. On the other hand, the *goal-based evaluation approach* seeks to measure the alignment between program outcomes and established objectives, while the *utilization-focused evaluation approach* (Patton, 2008; Podems, 2014) emphasizes the involvement of users of evaluation results to ensure that the information is effectively used in decision-making.

In Indonesia, regional development planning through the RPJMD (Regional Medium-Term Development Plan) and RKPD (Regional Work Plan) involves a complex interaction between central policies and local needs. The RKPD plays a role in translating medium-term targets into annual operational strategies. According to Samosir et al. (2023), the success of regional planning depends heavily on accurate analysis of the regional context, including geographic, economic, and social aspects.

The *Strategic Environmental Assessment* (KLHS) approach is also considered crucial to ensuring environmental sustainability and sustainability in development. Muzaqi et al. (2022) and Dwiwarman (2021) emphasize the need for dynamic alignment between local and central policies, as well as effective communication between institutions, as prerequisites for successful planning. In the context of Banten, which faces regional disparities and the challenges of urbanization, the quality of planning is largely determined by the region's ability to incorporate the results of previous evaluations into its annual planning.

Unfortunately, although formal regulations such as Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 86/2017 mandate the use of monitoring and evaluation results in the preparation of the Regional Work Plan (RKPD), their integration remains suboptimal. Stoneham and Dodds (2014) found that limited time and resources lead local policymakers to rely on the most readily accessible information, rather than the most relevant. However, research by Armstrong et al. (2014) demonstrates that robust decision-making must rely on a combination of academic evaluation results, community input, and local policy documents. Uppal and Dunphy (2019) and Matsiliza (2017) add that results-based planning requires a framework that emphasizes measurable achievements and evidence-based performance indicators. Without these mechanisms, the RKPD tends to be an administrative document with minimal substantive impact.

Furthermore, various studies have revealed serious challenges in utilizing evaluation results in the public bureaucracy. Dickey and Hampton (1981) noted that weak communication between evaluators and policymakers results in evaluation results rarely being used strategically. Hudib and Cousins (2022) stated that low organizational capacity, the absence of a systematic evaluation framework, and an organizational culture resistant to change are key barriers. In the Indonesian context, many evaluations are conducted solely for formal accountability purposes, rather than for reflective and sustainable policy improvement. Breidahl et al. (2016) and Schedler et al. (2019) emphasized that institutional unpreparedness in building adaptive evaluation systems results in evaluation results not being connected to the planning and budgeting process.

Nevertheless, several case studies demonstrate that integrating evaluation into local planning is feasible. Ntshangase and Msosa (2022) demonstrated in the South African context that shifting organizational culture from administrative compliance to institutional learning can improve the quality of public services. Dany and Lebel (2020) demonstrated that mainstreaming climate change issues through local planning increases community resilience. In Indonesia, similar practices are rarely systematically documented, particularly in the context of regional development plans (RKPD). However, the success of initiatives such as *the Age-Friendly Taiwan Program* (Lin et al., 2019) demonstrates that stakeholder engagement and local community involvement in evaluation can enhance policy legitimacy and improve implementation quality.

Recent studies have revealed a clear research gap, particularly in how policy evaluation results (whether through SAKIP, LAKIP, or sectoral program evaluations) are truly integrated into annual planning documents such as the Regional Work Plan (RKPD). Laurian et al. (2010) stated that even when evaluations are conducted, their results are rarely systematically followed up in subsequent planning. This finding echoes the findings of Evans et al. (2013), who noted limited local capacity to utilize research findings for planning, primarily due to weak synergy between technocratic actors and policymakers. In Indonesia, a similar phenomenon occurs, where evaluation tends to be a mere tool of legitimacy, rather than an instrument of critical reflection in the policy cycle.

Based on the description, this study aims to examine in more depth the role of policy evaluation in the RKPD preparation process in Banten Province, with a focus on how the results of monitoring and performance assessment are utilized or ignored in the annual planning cycle. The problem formulation of this study is: *How are the results of policy evaluation, especially monitoring and performance assessment, integrated into the RKPD preparation process in Banten Province?* This study is expected to provide a conceptual contribution to the literature on regional policy evaluation, while also offering practical recommendations for improving the performance-based planning system in the local government environment

THE PURPOSE METHOD

This research uses a *literature review approach* as the primary method for exploring, reviewing, and analyzing various scientific literature relevant to the topic of policy evaluation and regional development planning. This approach was chosen because it provides a deep conceptual and theoretical understanding of the role of policy evaluation results in the process of preparing the *Regional Government Work Plan* (RKPD), particularly in Banten Province. Using this method, researchers can build a comprehensive analytical framework based on a synthesis of various theories, models, and previous empirical findings.

This research design is descriptive-qualitative with a systematic literature review strategy. The aim of this approach is to identify patterns, research gaps, and opportunities for strengthening the evaluation system in the context of annual planning within local governments. This research was conducted by searching literature from various reputable sources, such as scientific journals indexed in Scopus, SINTA, Web of Science, and other trusted academic databases, such as Scite.ai, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect.

The literature sources used were selected based on several criteria: (1) Relevance to the main theme, namely policy evaluation, regional development planning, and integration of monitoring results into planning; (2) Source credibility, namely originating from national and international accredited journals; (3) Actuality, prioritizing publications within the last ten years (2013–2024) except for classical theories such as the CIPP model and Utilization-Focused Evaluation; and (4) Context that is appropriate to the local government system, both studies in Indonesia and international studies that are relevant to the decentralization system and performance-based governance.

METHOD

The data collection procedure began with a search for specific keywords such as: “policy evaluation model,” “CIPP framework,” “utilization-focused evaluation,” “RKPD Indonesia,” “monitoring and evaluation integration,” “evidence-based planning,” “evaluation barriers in bureaucracy,” and “local government planning.” These keywords were combined with Boolean expressions (AND, OR) to broaden the scope of the search results. The search results were then manually extracted and coded to identify thematic variables, methodological approaches, and recommendations from previous studies.

After the literature collection was conducted, the researcher compiled a thematic synthesis of the reviewed literature. This synthesis grouped the literature based on six main domains that were the focus of the introduction: (1) policy evaluation theory; (2) development planning systems and RKPD; (3) integration of evaluation in planning; (4) evaluation challenges in bureaucracy; (5) international case studies related to best practices; and (6) identification of *research gaps* and opportunities for developing evaluation systems in a regional context. This synthesis process aimed to develop systematic and critical conceptual arguments, which then became the basis for answering the research problem formulation.

The data analysis method used in this study was qualitative *content analysis*, which was conducted on the substantial content of each reviewed article. Researchers read and analyzed the selected articles in depth to identify common threads, link concepts, and identify differences and similarities among various approaches used by previous researchers. The analysis results were then developed into a critical narrative to demonstrate how the practice of integrating evaluation in the preparation of the Regional Work Plan (RKPD) can be strengthened through conceptual approaches and best practices from other contexts.

Finally, the validity of this literature review is ensured through a rigorous source selection process, triangulation of information from various references, and the development of arguments based on scientifically tested theories. Because it does not utilize primary data from the field, the credibility of this research depends entirely on the quality and depth of the analysis of the selected literature. Therefore, every quotation and reference is used accurately and refers to academically verifiable sources.

With this literature review approach, it is hoped that this research will be able to provide a comprehensive, critical, and actual picture of the importance of integrating policy evaluation results in

the RKPD preparation process, as well as offering a conceptual foundation for policy makers at the regional level to strengthen evidence-based planning practices and performance

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study are compiled based on a systematic literature review that examines various theories of policy evaluation, regional development planning systems, the integration of evaluation into planning, and structural barriers that affect the utilization of evaluation at the regional bureaucratic level. The main focus of this study is to examine how policy evaluation results can play a significant role in the preparation of the *Regional Government Work Plan* (RKPD), taking the context of Banten Province as a reflective space for the dynamics of policy implementation at the subnational level.

The first finding in this study relates to the conceptual understanding of policy evaluation. Evaluation is no longer positioned merely as an administrative activity to fulfill procedures, but rather as a strategic tool to guide the improvement of government policies and programs. In this regard, the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model, as introduced by Stufflebeam, has become the dominant model widely adopted in the context of public program evaluation. This model assesses policies or programs comprehensively, starting from the policy background, inputs or resources used, the implementation process, and the results achieved. A study by Larasati et al. (2023) showed that the application of the CIPP model in women's empowerment programs in villages was able to uncover previously overlooked contextual factors, such as social relations, community capacity, and unequal access to programs.

In addition to the CIPP model, the goal-based evaluation approach is an important approach for assessing policy performance based on the achievement of predetermined targets. This approach specifically emphasizes the relationship between program outcomes and initial policy objectives, making it highly suitable for use in performance-based development planning systems such as the Regional Work Plan (RKPD). Goal-based evaluation requires clear achievement indicators and the availability of credible data so that evaluation results can be used appropriately in the decision-making process.

Furthermore, the concept of utilization - *focused evaluation* developed by Patton (2008) adds the important perspective that the success of an evaluation is determined not only by the validity of its data, but also by the extent to which the evaluation results are used by stakeholders in subsequent policy planning. Evaluations should not be merely technical documents that end up on bureaucrats' desks, but rather serve as a reflective basis for changing policy direction and improving program effectiveness. In this context, a utilization-focused evaluation approach encourages the active participation of users of evaluation results in all stages of the evaluation process, from formulating evaluation questions to developing recommendations.

The next finding concerns the regional development planning system, specifically how the Regional Development Plan (RKPD), as an annual document, plays a crucial role in translating the strategic policies of the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) into concrete programs that can be implemented within a single fiscal year. The RKPD serves not only as a technocratic tool but also as a political and social vehicle for building consensus between the government and the community. Samosir et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of spatial planning in the preparation of the RKPD, which must take into account the geographic, social, and environmental diversity of each region.

In the process of drafting the Regional Development Plan (RKPD), the use of instruments such as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (KLHS) is crucial to ensure that planning does not undermine environmental carrying capacity. Muzaqi et al. (2022) noted that regional planning is often characterized by a trade-off between central priorities and local needs, which, if not aligned, can lead to ineffective program implementation. Furthermore, Wicaksono (2024) emphasized the importance of managing local potential as the basis for planning that is responsive to the real needs of local communities.

However, the results of this study indicate that in practice, many regions, including Banten Province, have not fully integrated evaluation results into the Regional Work Plan (RKPD) documents. The absence of clear systems and protocols means that evaluation results become merely administrative appendices rather than an integral part of new program development. This indicates a serious *gap*

between the normative value of evaluation as a tool for policy improvement and the technocratic realities of regional bureaucratic practice.

Furthermore, integrating evaluation into planning requires a foundation of evidence *-based planning*, where decision-making is based on data and information from previous evaluations. Stoneham and Dodds (2014) found that local decision-makers often rely more on readily accessible and familiar information than on truly relevant and high-quality information. This results in planning being insensitive to existing evaluation results.

Armstrong et al. (2014) show that information sources used in public planning include academic research, local evaluations, community perspectives, and policy documents. However, the absence of a system that integrates all these sources of information makes planning fragmented and less results-oriented. In this context, Lebel et al. (2015) emphasize the importance of multi-stakeholder involvement in the planning and evaluation process as a strategy to increase the legitimacy and quality of policy outcomes.

The next finding focuses on internal barriers within the bureaucracy that hinder the utilization of evaluation results. Poor communication between evaluators and decision-makers is a classic obstacle that persists today. Dickey and Hampton (1981) stated that the communication of evaluation results that is out of context, lacking communication, and untimely results in evaluations failing to influence policy decisions. This is exacerbated by a bureaucratic culture that does not yet value evaluation as a learning tool.

Hudib and Cousins (2022) emphasize the importance of *evaluation capacity building* as an effort to build a bureaucratic ecosystem that supports the evaluation process and its utilization. Without this capacity building, government institutions will continue to be trapped in an unproductive cycle of administrative evaluation. A culture of resistance to change and the dominance of procedural approaches lead to evaluation being viewed solely as a regulatory obligation, rather than as a source of policy innovation.

Furthermore, Breidahl et al. (2016) and Schedler et al. (2019) show that the absence of a framework linking evaluation results to the budgeting and planning system results in evaluations operating separately from the policy cycle. Consequently, evaluation results produced by regional government agencies (OPD) or third parties are not incorporated into the following year's budget planning process. This is a form of disintegration that jeopardizes planning quality.

In the context of Banten Province, which holds a strategic position as a buffer zone for the capital city and an industrial and tourism area, integrating evaluation results into the Regional Work Plan (RKPD) is crucial. However, challenges such as weak coordination between regional agencies, a lack of training for internal evaluators, and a work culture that focuses on budget realization rather than program results present significant obstacles to realizing performance-based development governance.

In general, the results of this study confirm that the challenges of integrating evaluation results into the preparation of the Regional Work Plan (RKPD) are not only technical, but also structural and cultural. To make evaluation a viable instrument within the policy cycle, systemic reforms in regional planning are needed. This includes establishing clear guidelines on how evaluation results are incorporated into the RKPD, increasing human resource capacity, and creating a bureaucratic culture open to learning.

Thus, the results of this study not only offer a theoretical understanding of the relationship between evaluation and planning, but also provide a concrete picture of the empirical conditions and actual challenges faced by local governments in implementing utilization-based evaluation principles into annual planning practices. Improvements need to be directed at strengthening evaluation institutions, performance management information systems, and integrating evaluation processes into the regulatory framework and regional planning policies.

This discussion is based on a critical examination of the literature on the integration of policy evaluation in the preparation of the Regional Government Work Plan (RKPD), particularly in the context of the Banten Provincial Government. Key findings indicate that policy evaluation frameworks such as CIPP, objective-based evaluation, and *the utilization-focused evaluation approach* offer significant

potential for use in improving the annual development planning process. However, their utilization remains very limited due to various structural, cultural, and technical factors that hinder the functionalization of evaluation as a decision-making tool.

The CIPP model, as developed by Stufflebeam, is highly relevant in bridging program needs and development outcomes because it considers four fundamental aspects of a policy: context, input, process, and product. This model has proven effective in mapping the gap between planning and implementation, as demonstrated in Larasati et al.'s (2023) study of community-based programs. In the context of the Regional Development Plan (RKPD), this approach should be applied to evaluate the effectiveness of priority programs funded by the Regional Budget (APBD), so that the results reflect not only budget realization but also its contribution to regional development goals.

However, the synthesis revealed that the application of evaluation approaches such as CIPP has not yet become standard practice in local government internal evaluation systems. Evaluation procedures are often administrative in nature, merely fulfilling regulatory obligations, rather than being a reflective process that guides policy change. This is where the concept of *utilization-focused evaluation* (Patton, 2008; Podems, 2014) becomes relevant: that the effectiveness of an evaluation lies not only in the validity of its methodology but also in the extent to which its results are utilized in the policy cycle. If evaluation results are merely a formality and not used in the preparation of the following year's Regional Work Plan (RKPD), the strategic significance of the evaluation itself is lost.

The Banten Provincial Government's experience in developing the Regional Work Plan (RKPD) reflects the general situation of many local governments in Indonesia, where previous program evaluation results have not fully served as a reference in determining current year's priority programs. This is despite the fact that normatively, RKPD preparation is required to refer to the results of the previous year's monitoring and evaluation (monev). Samosir et al. (2023) even emphasize that planning that is not based on evaluation tends to repeat past mistakes and lose its strategic direction. If planning is prepared without reference to empirical data and previous achievements, the development undertaken runs the risk of not being adaptive to the real needs of the community.

From an institutional perspective, the integration of evaluation results into planning is highly dependent on technical capacity and coordination between regional government agencies. Research shows that many regional government agencies (OPDs) lack human resources with adequate evaluation competencies. Consequently, the evaluation reports they compile lack in-depth analysis and tend to be normative and descriptive. Hudib and Cousins (2022) emphasize that improving evaluation capacity is an essential first step, as without adequate capacity, evaluation results will be useless documents.

Another challenge is cultural resistance within regional bureaucracies, which tend to view evaluation as a control process, not a learning process. This culture leads to evaluation results being under-read or even ignored because they are perceived as threatening to job stability and performance. Breidahl et al. (2016) show that perceptions of evaluation significantly influence its adoption rate. If evaluation is positioned as a form of external oversight, it is likely to be passively rejected by program implementers. Conversely, if evaluation is developed within the framework of performance and service improvement, its acceptance rate is much higher.

Another important aspect that emerged in the discussion was the fragmentation between evaluation, planning, and budgeting systems. In many cases, these systems operate in parallel without adequate logical and procedural connections. Schedler et al. (2019) explain that without integration within a systemic design, evaluation results lack a channel into the planning and budgeting cycle. This renders the Regional Work Plan (RKPD) a document insensitive to the dynamics of the previous year's implementation. In fact, many strategic programs continue to be budgeted despite not showing significant results in evaluations.

In the Indonesian context, particularly in Banten Province, this fragmentation is exacerbated by the weakness of the performance management information system, which should serve as a bridge between evaluation and planning. This system is crucial for automatically integrating monitoring and evaluation data into activity formulation and budget allocation. Without such a system, the planning

process will remain dependent on intuition and political considerations, rather than evidence and analysis.

Theoretically, this research contributes to broadening understanding of the importance of designing an evaluation system integrated with annual planning. It also reinforces arguments by academics such as Armstrong et al. (2014), Lebel et al. (2015), and Matsiliza (2017), who emphasize the importance of an evidence-based approach in local governance systems. These findings also emphasize that a good evaluation system does not necessarily guarantee good policies, unless the results are actively used in the decision-making process.

The practical contribution of this research lies in identifying the real obstacles faced by regional bureaucracies in implementing evaluation as a basis for drafting the Regional Work Plan (RKPD). Understanding that these obstacles are not only technical but also cultural and structural, future policy interventions must be comprehensive. Improving technical procedures is not enough; it also requires building an organizational culture that values learning, transparency, and accountability.

The implication of this discussion is the need to formulate regional regulations or policies requiring each regional apparatus to include evaluation results in the following year's activity proposals. This policy could be formalized in a Gubernatorial Regulation or an official circular to strengthen the internal evaluation system. Furthermore, the digitalization of the Regional Work Plan (RKPD) system should also include a program achievement tracking feature to ensure that proposed programs are truly based on results and not simply copied and pasted from the previous year.

This discussion also emphasized that the planning process must be dialogic and inclusive. This means that evaluation results are not only reviewed by technical OPDs but also discussed openly in Musrenbang forums and other public consultation forums. In this way, evaluation can serve as a tool to build public trust and encourage community participation in the development process.

Finally, this discussion encourages all parties to view evaluation not as a burden, but as an opportunity to improve government performance. In today's era of accountability and transparency, the ability of local governments to utilize evaluation results as a basis for planning will be one of the main indicators of successful good governance

CONCLUSION

Regional development planning in Indonesia, particularly in Banten Province, faces significant hurdles in integrating policy evaluation results into the annual Regional Government Work Plan (RKPD). Despite formal regulations mandating evidence-based planning, the synchronization between evaluation, planning, and budgeting remains suboptimal. This literature review highlights that evaluations like SAKIP and LAKIP are frequently treated as mere administrative compliance rather than tools for institutional learning. The primary obstacles are structural fragmentation, low organizational capacity among internal evaluators, and a bureaucratic culture resistant to change that views evaluation as external oversight. To overcome these barriers, Banten must bridge this technocratic gap by institutionalizing utilization-focused evaluation frameworks, digitalizing performance management information systems, and strengthening human resources. Ultimately, transforming the bureaucratic mindset toward transparency ensures that annual development programs actively reflect empirical data and genuine community needs.

REFERENCES

- Al-Rawahna, M., Al-Debei, M.M., & Al-Lozi, E. (2019). E-government critical success factors: A systematic review of the literature. *Electronic Journal of e-Government*, 17(1), 1–20.
- Armstrong, R., Waters, E., Roberts, H., Oliver, S., & Popay, J. (2014). The role and theoretical evolution of evidence in public health policy-making. *Social Science & Medicine*, 99, 177–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.10.031>

- Azhar, M., Lestari, SD, & Nugroho, H. (2024). The gap between regional development budgeting and planning: A study of district governments in Indonesia. *Journal of Public Administration*, 19(1), 15–29.
- Briedenhann, J., & Butts, S. (2005). Application of utilization-focused evaluation in rural tourism: A South African case study. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 5(1), 45–54.
- Breidahl, K.N., Rangvid, B.S., & Refsgaard, M.B. (2016). Evaluation use in policy making: Lessons from Denmark. *Evaluation*, 22(1), 33–50.
- Dickey, W. M., & Hampton, G. (1981). Evaluation utilization in state governments: An examination of influencing factors. *Public Administration Review*, 41(4), 446–451. <https://doi.org/10.2307/975733>
- Dwiwarman, H. (2021). Collaboration between levels of government in regional development: A study of the integration of the RPJMN and RKPD. *Journal of Development Planning*, 25(3), 182–195.
- Ebrahim, Z., & Irani, Z. (2005). E-government adoption: Architecture and barriers. *Business Process Management Journal*, 11(5), 589–611.
- Evans, B. A., Snooks, H., Howson, H., & Davies, M. (2013). How hard can it be to include research evidence and evaluation in local health policy implementation? Results from a mixed methods study. *Implementation Science*, 8(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-8-17>
- Hudib, K., & Cousins, J. B. (2022). Building evaluation capacity in public sector organizations: Strategies and reflections. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 43(1), 58–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10982140211022002>
- Jackson, S. F., Edwards, R., & Roberts, L. (2024). System-based decision making in local governance: Lessons from integrated planning in health systems. *Health Policy Journal*, 128(2), 243–259.
- Kirkhart, K. E. (2010). Reconceptualizing evaluation use: Reflections on past, present, and future. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(3), 400–409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214010378351>
- Larasati, N., Yuliana, E., & Mahfud, I. (2023). CIPP model in evaluating rural women empowerment programs in agriculture. *Journal of Evaluation and Program Planning*, 97, 102267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2022.102267>
- Latue, M., Daud, A., & Hetharie, A. (2023). Integration of disaster management policies in regional development planning documents. *Indonesian Journal of Disaster Management*, 9(1), 55–68.
- Laurian, L., Day, M., Berke, P., Ericksen, N., Backhurst, M., Crawford, J., & Dixon, J. (2010). Evaluating plan implementation: A conformance-based methodology. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 76(4), 471–480.
- Lebel, L., Grothmann, T., & Siebenhüner, B. (2015). The role of social learning in building adaptive capacity and resilience. *Ecology and Society*, 20(3), 35. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-07281-200335>
- Matsiliza, N.S. (2017). Monitoring and evaluation systems for enhancing governance and government legitimacy in South Africa. *Journal of Public Administration*, 52(4), 825–839.
- Matlala, M. (2025). Embedding continuous quality improvement in municipal systems: A systems-based approach to local development. *Journal of Development Policy Review*, 21(2), 145–160.
- Muzaqi, R., Prasetyo, AA, & Handayani, T. (2022). Integration strategy of regional and national development planning: A SWOT study in Semarang City Government. *Journal of Regional Development Administration*, 12(2), 110–122.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Podems, D.R. (2014). Demystifying theories of change: Practical guidance. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 10(23), 38–61.

- Rahmawati, R. (2020). Strengthening local government capacity in addressing economic inequality. *Journal of Government Science*, 6(1), 99–113.
- Samosir, TU, Situmorang, B., & Wulandari, E. (2023). Analysis of regional-based development planning and geographic characteristics. *Journal of Regional and Urban Planning*, 15(1), 1–13.
- Schedler, K., Proeller, I., & Reichard, C. (2019). Performance measurement and management in local government: Challenges and prospects. *International Public Management Review*, 20(1), 50–67.
- Stoneham, M., & Dodds, J. (2014). Evidence-based policy development and decision making in local government: Barriers and enablers. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 73(2), 209–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12076>
- Uppal, J., & Dunphy, S. (2019). Embedding evidence into local government planning: Lessons from Australia. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 11(3), 21–32.
- Wicaksono, A. (2024). Local potential-based development: A case study in Sula Islands Regency. *Journal of Regional Planning*, 9(1), 44–56.