ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Village Fund Program and to see to what extent the achievement of the program and to know the response and the obstacles and obstacles in the implementation of the policy regarding the holding of the program. Researchers used the evaluation model of the SSE-UCLA Evaluation Model, providing a comprehensive evaluation format at each stage of program implementation. Evaluation of village fund program in coastal community of bintan regency in Kepulauan Riau Province has an issue that is, the need for improvement of distribution system according to the assessment of the researcher needs a good distribution system. The next issue that is, the need for Monitoring and Evaluation, researchers assess the need for monitoring and evaluation for the Village Fund program so that the program can be controlled and can run smoothly. In the last issue, the need for socialization system of the research program also assessed the need for socialization system which was facilitated by the government regarding the Village Fund aid program because there are still people who do not know the information about the program. Based on the results of the above research, researchers recommend the following matters; (1) That the Village Fund program is good and can be continued because there is optimism in the running of the program with long-term impact on improving coastal community welfare; (2) It is necessary to improve the distribution system where it is necessary to specialize in supervising and managing the distribution of village fund grants to the community so that it is not misdirected and smooth; (3) There needs to be monitoring and evaluation for the Village Fund program so that the program can be controlled and can run smoothly. Need for socialization.
INTRODUCTION

Before the government system changes from centralization to decentralization all programs in each region including in the village are designed by the central government or in other words the program is determined from above. As a result, it often happens that programs made from the center do not suit local needs. Therefore, with the decentralization system is expected to empower the village community is expected to succeed.

In order to empower villagers in accordance with the needs of the villagers themselves (in the Village Minister's Regulation, Development of Underdeveloped Regions and Transmigration No.19 of 2017), among others, stated that other village community empowerment activities are in accordance with the needs analysis of Villages and defined in Village Deliberations.

According to Chapter I General Provisions in article 1, paragraph 12 of the Village Law (2014) "that Village Community Empowerment is an effort to develop the independence and welfare of the community by increasing knowledge, attitude, skills, behavior, ability, awareness, and utilizing resources through the determination of policies, programs, activities, and assistance in accordance with the essence of the problems and priorities needs of villagers ".

This empowerment efforts will not succeed if it does not have the full support of the central government. Because of that community empowerment is a necessity for the State of Indonesia especially Indonesia include the largest archipelagic country in the world, which has a coastline of 95,000 kilometers and a number of islands more than 17,000 islands.

In this coastal village is approximately 1340 types of tribes domiciled. For Indonesia Coastal areas and oceans have a strategic meaning because the coastal and ocean areas are transitional areas between terrestrial and marine ecosystems.

This region has the potential of very rich natural resources. In addition there are different things between the people in the land area with coastal communities, they have uniqueness in social life, culture and economy.

Riau Islands Province is a province whose territory consists of islands of large island as well as large and small, of the total area of approximately 8.202 km only about 4% is the
land area while as much as 96% is the ocean region. Thus the vastness of marine areas in the province of Riau Islands is certainly very influential on their social, cultural and economic life.

The breadth of the territorial sea in the province of Riau Islands, it is certainly affect the pattern of community life around the sea area. They are very dependent on marine resources and use them as the foundation of their lives.

The coastal community's dependence on the marine sector gives its own identity as a coastal community with its own life pattern and characteristics. Rural communities in coastal areas as a unique community that is different from rural communities in the land area.

In the coastal villages, communities are formed that have a pattern of life and behavior and certain characteristics. They are a host community in coastal areas, coastal communities are the main actors in development in their village areas.

The development carried out by coastal communities is certainly utilize all marine and fishery resources that exist, but unfortunately the coastal community groups that live scattered in the coast of Bintan regency Riau Islands their economic and educational conditions are still far behind when compared with the community from the village in the area of the mainland or even can be said they are isolated in their life.

The condition of residential environment in coastal communities, especially the fishermen is not well organized so that their settlements seem slum. Coupled with their socio-economic conditions of the rate relatively under average or in the low welfare level, then in the long term pressure on coastal resources will be even greater in order to meet their needs.

Viewed from the internal factors of coastal communities are very slow in following the development even they tend to be less open to technology, this is because in addition they are difficult to use technology in the management of marine resources also due to lack of appropriate resource management with local community culture. So it is still a long time to make the prosperous coastal communities.

Besides many other factors that cause people in coastal areas have become a backward and isolated communities. As a result of these backwardness and isolation, their level of welfare and education are generally low.
Coastal communities, as communities living in coastal areas have distinctive characteristics. This characteristic is formed from business characteristic in the field of fishery itself. Because the characteristics of the fishery business are strongly influenced by the factors: environment, season and market, so these factors form the coastal community. In terms of socio-economic aspects and the control gear according to Yudi Wahyudin (in the Socio-Economic and Cultural System of Coastal Communities: 2003) on the coastal communities of fishermen in this case there are three strata.

More Yudi Wahyudin said that the other characters in the coastal communities are primarily dependent they are on the small fishing season. In the fishing season the fishermen are very busy fishing. In contrast, in the season where peceklik which does not allow them to go to sea as a result of which is that many fishermen were forced to idle.

Such conditions have a great impact on the socio-economic conditions of coastal communities in general and more specifically for the fishermen. In difficult seasons and cann’t go to sea their income dropped dramatically, so their purchasing power decreased which resulted in their lives is getting worse.

In general, the income of fishermen is unstable and very fluctuating every day. One day there is the possibility that they get a very large catch but on a certain day downhill may not even be at all. Such conditions lead to the emergence of a particular pattern of relationships that are very common among fishermen, namely patron-client relationship pattern.

As a result of the decline in income the small fishermen or fishermen are forced to borrow money and goods of daily necessities from the skipper or the collecting traders (tauke). The pattern of relationship between tauke with the fishermen or fisherman workers is causing the nature of dependence of the fishermen or fisherman workers against the tauke or traders.

Pattern of the relationship resulted in an attachment that is in the form of obligations of fishermen or fisherman workers to sell their products to traders collector (tauke) them. In this relationship pattern the tauke dominates and exploits the fishermen, they are only used as a means of collecting fish by the tauke.

So in this relationship pattern arises the unequal relationship between tauke with fishermen, although the fishermen who produce fish catch (producer) they remain poor and
marginalized. Their level of life is still far from prosperous and the pattern of this relationship takes place continuously and continuously for generations.

Based on the condition of the fishermen community as a coastal community like this, it is the obligation of the government either central or local level to protect the lives of these fishermen by designing an economic empowerment program for coastal villages in the Riau archipelago. Thus there is need for strengthening of coastal communities.

Economic empowerment for people in the coastal areas of Riau Islands is actually a necessity or an absolute thing done as a form of state protection in this case the government against its people. In accordance with Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution, the economy is structured as a joint effort based on the principle of kinship. In connection with article 33 of the 1945 Constitution Sri-Edi Swasono (2007) said that: the economy is composed of normative-imperative intention, not left alone, otherwise there is a real action to form an economic structure.

Then according to Sri-Edi Swasono (2010), the joint effort is based on the principle of kinship is a form of togetherness, a mutualism and brotherhood or ukhuwah (wathonia), not individualism, but mutual respect and care for each other and help each other, a sense of togetherness with the spirit of hablum minannas.

Further more in Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution is the basis of Economic Democracy, democracy here is a social democracy based on togetherness rather than liberal democracy on the basis of individualism. The prosperity of society is the main goal not the prosperity of individuals or persons.

In an economic democracy there is no prohibition or occurrence of economic autocracy that is the concentration of power or economic power on a certain group of people, economic sovereignty is in the hands of the people together, but not ignore the rights of individuals.

By running this mandate then Indonesia can displace poverty instead of displacing or neglecting the poor. Because if you do not run this mandate will result in the economy is only run by a handful or a group of people called a conglomerate.

The destruction of our economy as a result of the neglect of the economic principle of democracy because so far only the entrepreneurs who enjoy the prosperity, they are more direct economic to develop capitalistic industries that are domesticated by debts from within and outside the country by compounded using and relying on imported raw materials.

This clearly does not touch the economic sector which is cultivated by the people mostly small and medium enterprises (SMEs), whereas if the government supports more
SMEs then the effort to improve the welfare of society can be realized so that will reduce the level of poverty and no marginalized society.

With the allocation of village funds from the central government to the regions could not have designed a community empowerment program especially economic empowerment in coastal areas, especially for the village in the district of Riau Islands Bintan.

One model of economic empowerment of coastal communities that can be applied in Bintan Regency Riau Islands Province is to form a cooperative or Village Owned Enterprises. The type of business through cooperatives or Village Owned Enterprises can be implemented by business model: savings and loans, fishery cultivation, catching the catch and marketing the catch and others.

The cultivation of fishery can be made with the model of the core business and plasma, where the core is a big cultivation business (in this case it would be better if the cooperative / Village Owned Enterprises involve the banking or private companies as well as government). Furthermore, the core business pattern that will help and guide the cultivation business belongs to the surrounding community as plasma in a system of mutually beneficial and sustainable cooperation.

Cooperatives or Enterprises Owned Village fishermen established must be managed in a professional and transparent, so that later cooperatives / village-owned enterprises that will accommodate fishery products as well as help to market it. In addition, the Village Owned Enterprises/Cooperatives must prepare their daily necessities for fishermen or coastal communities.

Besides, the effort of economic empowerment of coastal community can also be done by doing socialization, technical guidance of product quality improvement, assisting procurement of product packing machine, preparing storage warehouse of fish storage, helping marketing processed products such as fish crackers, marine cultivation products, processed fish, fish processed snack, processed seaweed, etc.

It's just to increase the quality and quantity of each product is needed government help, so that these products can compete with similar products from other regions. Therefore all the efforts that will be done this would need funds that are not small.

It is expected that with the policy of the Village Fund Program, the need for such funds can be overcome by utilizing the existing village funds, the question is whether the village funds have been socialized and known by coastal communities? Has it been utilized and channeled well? Is it right on target? And so forth.
This is what causes researchers interested and want to research and review and analyze more about “Evaluation Of Effectiveness Of The Village Fund Program In The Coastal District Of Bintan Regency In Riau Islands Province”.

RESEARCH PURPOSES

Specifically, the purpose of this study is to:

1. Evaluate the Village Fund Program and to see to what extent the success of the program is achievable.
2. Knowing the response and the obstacles and obstacles / impediments in the implementation of the policy the holding of the program.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Description of Public Policy

The policy made by the government of a State is a public policy because it will affect the lives of citizens of the State within the State. Therefore a policy created by a government should not harm the citizens of its State, meaning that any defined policy should be pro-citizen.

But it can’t be denied that any policy made by the government is a result of a response to something that is influenced by things such as the pressure of a society that has influence among the government, whether or not it is desirable of the ruling group within a government itself.

Public policy is a familiar term for society because this term is often heard in everyday life. Even among community college, public policy into a special assessment in research and writing so that today many experts write and publish books that discuss the theories of public policy with an emphasis different because each expert review them based on rumors, symptoms and problems that develop in the community.

So the concept of understanding put forward by experts is very diverse each of the experts have views and perspectives that differ from each other in defining public policy. Even Parsons (2006) in his book says that the growth of public policy as a study in the academic world is expected to begin in the late 1960s.

Based on the opinion of Parsons, it seems that the interest of academics to study this field has been long enough nowadays various studies and public policy research are trending in Indonesian universities especially after the reform in 1998 where the demand for good governance on the government is getting stronger so the process of public policy since began
to be formulated until it was evaluated jointly between the government and the community. In accordance with the opinion of Gambhir Bhatta in Riant Nugroho (2009) "governance is the relationship between government and citizens that enable public policies and programs to be formulated, implemented and evaluated". Or with other understandings, government is the relationship between the government and society that allows public policies and programs to be formulated, implemented and evaluated.

Then Steven A. Peterson (2003) says that what is meant by public policy is: "Government action to address some problem". The meaning is: Various government actions to solve various problems.

Furthermore, according to James Lester and Robert Steward (2000) defines public policy is: "a process or a series or pattern of governmental activities or decisions that are design to remedy some public problem, either real or imagined", meaning "one process or one series or patterns of government activities or decisions designed to correct some common, real or unreal issues.

Furthermore, according to Anderson (1978) in Islamy (2003) the definition of public policy is: "Public policies are those developed by governmental bodies and officials". The point is that public policy is the policies developed by government agencies and officials.

Meanwhile, according to Dye (1972) in Wahab (1990), that public policy is "whatever the government choose to do or not to do". Or in another sense, public policy is whatever the government chooses to do and does not do. A similar opinion is expressed by Dunn (1994), he defines public policy as "a complex pattern of interdependent collective choice, including decisions not act, made by governmental bodies and official".

Understanding Dunn can be understood that public policy put forward various things based on collective, complex, and interdependent patterns, done not only by government officials, but also by government agencies as a whole. Similarly, Easten (1953) which states that public policy as: the authoritative allocation of Values for the whole society ". Which means public policy is the allocation of values legally / forced to the public.

In contrast to Dunn and Easten, Gerston (1995), reveals that public policy is "an attempt to resolve public issues, which should be at the appropriate level of national, state or local government". Gerston's opinion on public policy emphasizes the efforts decided by government officials at every level of government. A similar opinion is expressed by Parker (1975), that public policy is "a specific goal or set of principles or actions undertaken by the government in a given period in relation to a subject or response to a crisis".
While Lasswell and Kaflan (1970) define policy as: "a projected program of goals, values, and practices," and according to Friedrich (1963) that "it is essential for the policy concept that there be a goal, . A more complete definition is put forward by William Jenkins in his Policy Analysis: A Political and Organization Perspective cited by Howlett and Ramesh (1995) that public policy as a set of interrelated judgments taken by a political actor or group of actors concerning the selection of goals and the means of achieving them within a specified situation where they should act, in principal, be within the power of those actors to achieve ". (Howlett, Michael and Ramesh, M., 1995; 5).

Jones (1984), citing Eula and Prewitt, argues almost similarly to Gerston by arguing that public policy as a permanent decision characterized by consistency and repetition of the behavior of those who make and from those who abide by the decision.

If Eula and Prewitt understood the policy of emphasis on the decisions themselves, Edward III and Sharkansky (1978) differed, he argued that policy is what the government does and does not have clear goals and intentions and is the government program that will held. Nakamura and Smallowood (1980), similarly to Eula and Prewitt, argued that public policy was "a series of instructions to policymakers explaining the goals and ways of achieving that goal."

Likewise Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) argue that policy as: "a hypothetical containing initial conditions and predicted consequences". In other words, policy is a hypothesis containing preliminary conditions and predictable effects.

In general, of the several definitions put forward above, it can be concluded that the views on public policy are divided into two groups. First, the group that views public policy as an action or what is actually done; second, the group that emphasizes that public policy is a set of decisions.

The first opinion gives emphasis the meaning of the policy as an action of an official or entrepreneur, group, agency or government in a particular environment for a particular purpose in public affairs.

The experts in this group include Anderson, Parker, Gerston. While the second group that views public policy as a series or formulation of decisions made by the actor policy formulator. Public policy experts who are in the second group include Easton, Dunn, Dye, Sharkansky, and Pressman and Wildavsky. This second view focuses more attention on the formulation of decisions that have certain goals and specific purposes and have predictable consequences (Predictable impacts). Thus, from some of the opinions of public policy experts mentioned above can be concluded that public policy is a series of decisions made by
individuals, institutions or government on public affairs that direct actions that have certain goals, objectives, and intentions in an effort to overcome public problems in order to be better and as expected.

In the context of this research is a public policy is a series of laws and decisions concerning the Village Fund program.

**Program Evaluation**

The term evaluation is a term that has been frequently heard everyday, and evaluation activities carried out in various sectors of life as in the evaluation company conducted both for product evaluation as well as for employee performance evaluation, if government agencies for the evaluation of government programs such as in the field of education, health, social economy, various public services etc, especially in the world of education this term is not foreign anymore.

According to Wirawan (2011), evaluation by object is grouped into: policy evaluation, program evaluation, project evaluation, material evaluation and human resource evaluation.

In discussing evaluation we often find words that are related to the word evaluation, according to Suharsimi Arikunto (2012), "a word that is always associated with the word of the evaluation are: evaluation (evaluation), measurement (measurement), and assessment (assessment)." Added also by Arikunto that, "Evaluation is an activity to gather information about the work of something, which then the information is used to determine the right alternative in making decisions.

According to Stufflebeam et al. (1971) in Suharsimi (2007) defines evaluation as "the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judgment decision alternatives," meaning evaluation is the process of describing, obtaining, and presenting useful information to formulate an alternative decision.

According to Anne Anastasi (1978) defines evaluation as "a systematic process of determining the extent to which instructional objectives are achieved by pupils". Evaluation is not merely a spontaneous and incidental assessment of an activity, but an activity to assess something in a planned, systematic, and directed direction based on clear objectives.

Also presented by Tyler, Fernandes (1984) that, evaluation is a process to determine how far the goal of education can be achieved. Meanwhile, Kaufman & Thomas (1980) "evaluation is a process of helping to make things better than they are, of improving the situation", evaluation is a process to help and improve things for the better of the previous state
Then, according to Wirawan (2011), "In early 1930 Ralph Winfred Tyler who came to be known as the father of evaluation he put forward his definition and his theory of evaluation that focuses on assessing whether a program's objectives are achieved or not later known as the Goal based evaluation model."

While the program according to Arikunto (2009), "Program is a carefully planned activity", still according to Arikunto (2012) is the latest "program is a plan involving various units that contain policies and series of activities to be done in a certain period ".

Meanwhile, according to Tayibnasis (2000), "the program is everything that someone tried to do in the hope of bringing results or influence".

Followed by Suharsimi Arikunto (2012) that, "Program evaluation is a unit or unit of activity aimed at collecting information about the realization or implementation of a policy, takes place in a continuous process, and occurs within an organization involving a group of people for decision making.

Program Evaluation as a study, in accordance with the views of Wirawan (2011) is a tool from various branches of science to analyze and assess the phenomenon of science phenomena and application of science. Furthermore, according to Wirawan (2011) Science evaluation is in various branches of science, both as a tool of social sciences, economics, education, business, management, sociology and others.

As a branch of science in Wirawan (2011), the science of evaluation is supported by the theories of Daniel L. Stufflebeam and Anthony J. Shinkfield that the theory of program evaluation has the following six characteristics: total coherence; core concepts; tested hypotheses about how the evaluation procedure produces the expected output; applicable procedures; ethical requirements; and a general framework to guide the practice of program evaluation.

So it can be concluded that the evaluation program is a series of activities conducted deliberately and carefully to determine the level of implementation or success of a program by knowing the effectiveness of each component, both on the program being run as well as programs that have been passed.

In this evaluation study, what is meant by the village fund program is the policy of the central government in the context of community empowerment in the village. The village fund is a budget received by the village government sourced from the State Expenditure Budget for the purpose of development is the funds disbursed for the village from the center for village development in order to realize a more advanced and better village, especially in order to improve the economy of the village community own.
With the village funds expected poverty and economic limitations of village communities can be eliminated. Due to the construction of facilities and infrastructure of the village budget funds is expected to be realized villages that have creative and innovative works.

To see if the program is effective or not, the appropriate research model for this research is model CSE-UCLA Evaluation Model (developed by Alkin). CSE-UCLA consists of two abbreviations, namely CSE and UCLA. The first, the CSE, stands for the Center for the Study of Evaluation, while UCLA stands for University of California in Los Angeles. The hallmark of the CSE-UCLA model is the five stages performed in the evaluation, ie planning, development, implementation, outcome, and impact. Fernandes (1984, in Arikunto 2004) provides an overview of the CSE-UCLA model into four stages: (1) needs assessment, (2) program planning, (3) formative evaluation, and (4) summative evaluation.

**Coastal Communities**

Category communities living in coastal areas and the lifeblood of the economy depends directly on the utilization of marine and coastal resources. They consist of fisherman owner, fisherman laborer, fish farmer and other marine organism, fish trader, fish processor, supplier factor of fishery production facility. In the field of non-fisheries, coastal communities could be made up of sellers of transportation services and others related to the sea.

Characteristics of coastal communities is different from the characteristics of agrarian or farmers. In terms of income, farmers have a controllable income because of a controlled harvest pattern so that the food or livestock they have can be determined to achieve the income they want. Unlike the case with coastal communities whose livelihoods are dominated by servants. fishermen struggle with the sea to earn income, then the income they want can not be controlled. Fishermen face open access and high risk resources. This causes coastal communities such as fishermen to have a strong character, hard, and open.

**Coastal Community Welfare**

Indonesia is a maritime country, most of which is oceans and Indonesia is famous for Natural Resources (SDA) especially in fishery and marine field. Indonesia's marine and coastal regions contain abundant marine resources. The maritime development policy has tended to lead to productivity policy, maximizing the exploitation of marine resources
without adequate policies that control it and the lack of interest of investors to invest their capital in producing and processing seafood maximally.

Coastal locations that seem distant and isolated, making the market difficult to penetrate. Of course, the high cost of transportation is the main reason, in addition to the bad weather that often becomes a barrier to the smoothness of the delivery vessels.

Economic activity in coastal, marine and ocean as ocean economy consist of 7 (seven) sectors namely fishery, marine tourism, marine mining, marine industry / maritime, marine transportation, marine building and marine services. The spatial boundary of the marine economy is to land is the coastal district / municipality and to the sea is the sea area to ZEE Indonesia and Continental Shelf of Indonesia. (Kusumastanto, 2006)

Decree of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries No.18 of 2004 on general guidance of the implementation of Coastal Economy Community Empowerment (CECE), tried to re-establish the basics of coastal development with community empowerment based.

Strategy for eradicating poverty alleviation in coastal communities is by establishing community activity units such as educating GJV (Group of Joint Ventures), especially for fishermen to help people who can not afford to buy fishing gear such as simple boat provision, net provision or fishing gear, while resource result natural marine processed into durable poduk in the form of packaging. The processing of marine products requires investors to invest in a number of production costs and productions made throughout the year (independent of seasons), so that marine or marine resources are the main products distributed to the wider community, including for exports.

According to Purwanto (2009), the determinants of the optimal management of development resources are: (1) limited economic facilities and infrastructures, such as roads, fishery economic facilities and public-social facilities, (2) low quality of human resources, have the maximum capacity to manage them in order to improve their social welfare, (3) limited capture technology capacity, (4) limited access to capital and local economic product markets, (5) the absence of socio-economic institutions that can be instruments of community development, 6) the absence of an integrated coastal development commitment.

According to Arieta (2013), the impact of market-based patronage economic order in the present era of changing economic situation changes, among others: (1) Commercialization of fishery products (increasing economic value of almost all fishery products, (2) Access to market becomes easier (3) Existence of out migration and inward migration, (4) Increasingly new investors who also act as new patrons (in fact not native people) actually encourage more client bargaining power (5) There is a supply of fund /
capital for fisheries from other sectors (capital cross-cutting) mainly from the tourism sector, while the impact of modernization of fisheries that bring changes to fish penagkapan is (1) Introdusi fishing with using the technology chart, (2) ) The use of motor boats that have a larger capacity.

EVALUATION RESEARCH METHOD

This model divides the evaluation into four stages: (a) Aspects of the Needs assessment, from the background and objectives of the program which include determining the issues that need to be considered in the program, the need for money required by the program, and achievable goals. (b) Aspects of Program planning, which is viewed from the planning of the program is prepared according to planning and needs analysis or not, infrastructure, and distribution. (c) Aspects of Formative Evaluation, evaluated from formative evaluation, ie monitoring and evaluations and constraints / constraints in the current program and (d) Summative aspect of the program, evaluated from program outcomes, the outcomes and impacts of the program and on achieving program achievement.

The researcher used evaluation model of SSE-UCLA Evaluation Model, because based on the research question, it is needed comprehensive information about the implementation of Village Fund Program. Given the SSE-UCLA Evaluation Model provides a comprehensive evaluation format at each stage of the program implementation, this study is set to use evaluation of the SSE-UCLA Evaluation Model.

The data collection techniques conducted The data used in this study consists of two types of data required are primary data and secondary data.

1) Primary Data; data obtained directly from through surveys of observation, interviews or structured interviews including data from the results of filling questionnaires respondents from parties who are considered to be informant sources, namely: Coastal communities domiciled in the Riau Islands Province, especially Bintan regency and the resource persons associated with the Village Fund program in the Riau Islands Province region, especially Bintan Regency.

2) Secondary Data; data taken from various institutions in the form of data - data stastistik, maps and images - images relevant and associated with this research in the form of data archives, data reports and data through library study ie data from documents, planning, program, project, study results, research, books and regulations that are relevant and related to the research.
The purpose of collecting techniques conducted in this study is to complete the information and data sources required during processing the study results, both the main data and supporting data ie data that is primary and secondary.

To obtain data in accordance with the problem formulation and the purpose of this study, the researchers used three data collection techniques, among others:

1. **Questionnaire**: questionnaire is a data collection technique that is done by giving a set of questions or statements to others who made the respondents to be answered, the purpose of questions given to the respondents to dig the data in accordance with the formulation of the problem and research objectives.

2. **Observation**: Observation is one data collection technique that not only measures the attitudes of respondents (interviews and questionnaires) but also can be used to record various phenomena that occur (situation, condition). In this observation, researchers are directly involved in the daily activities of the person or situation observed as a source of data.

3. **Interviews**: Interview is a technique of data collection conducted through face-to-face and direct questions between data collectors and researchers to sources or data sources.

4. **Documents**: The collection of documents as data in the study was obtained from local government agencies in Bintan that related to the formulation and research objectives such as samples of information data on the general condition of coastal communities, photos and statistical materials.

The population of this study consists of stakeholders either directly or indirectly related to the village fund program that is in improving the welfare of coastal communities located Bintan Province Riau Islands Province, the population set include:

1. Coastal communities domiciled in Riau Islands Province in particular Bintan Regency.

2. Resource persons associated with the Village Fund program in the province Riau Islands especially Bintan Regency.

Data analysis was done by using to process the data into result of study among others:

1. **Quantitative Analysis**: Quantitative method of analysis is done on a particular object either into the population or sample form, after the data collected, then the next then the analysis is analyzed to answer the problem of the deviation that should or indeed.
2. Qualitative Analysis; This qualitative analysis is conducted to find out evaluation of village fund program in the area.

The presentation of data (displays) is made in the form of tables and pie charts in order to easily obtain an overview on each part or all of the sub focus being evaluated. Next draw the conclusions expressed in terms of rank, i.e., low, moderate, and high. Based on the rankings are made decision evaluation results. The descriptor and rating ratings used in the study are presented in the following table:

**Evaluation Findings Table Assessment Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring scale</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Evaluation Evaluation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The evaluation criteria are not fulfilled completely or partially fulfilled, under fifty percent of the number of criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria are partially met, fifty percent or more of the number of criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria are met all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Planning Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects / Indicators</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Stage Evaluation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Arrangement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Related parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Key informant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The results of the Village Fund program</td>
<td>a. Village Funds</td>
<td>a. Document Analysis</td>
<td>Summative program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned in the second and third chapters of this study, we use the CSE-UCLA model to evaluate the Village Fund Program, by exposing questionnaires and interviews from key informants on the components studied, the background and objectives of the program, program planning, formative evaluation and program outcomes.

By studying questionnaires and interviews with key informants, the researcher concludes that there is a suitability between the plan or procedure established in the Village Fund Program with its implementation in the field, but still sees errors or major obstacles because most of the procedures have been implemented with good. This can be seen from the following Table of Achievement Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Evaluation Component</th>
<th>Aspects Evaluated</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Background and Program Objectives</td>
<td>a. Problem Determination</td>
<td>There is a problem</td>
<td>68% of respondents stated that the village fund policy has focused on problem determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Fund Requirement</td>
<td>There is a Need for a Village Fund Program</td>
<td>77% of respondents stated that there is a need for a Village Fund Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Program Objectives</td>
<td>The welfare of society increases</td>
<td>55% of respondents stated that some of the program objectives have been achieved but need improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Planning</td>
<td>a. Planning</td>
<td>Implementation of the program according to planning</td>
<td>68% of respondents stated that the implementation of the program is in accordance with the planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Arrangement</td>
<td>Programs prepared according to needs analysis or not</td>
<td>64% of respondents said the program was prepared according to needs analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Infrastructure</td>
<td>Availability of infrastructure supporting</td>
<td>64% of respondents stated that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the results of the interviews in the Table of Achievement of the Evaluation of Fund Village Program Effectiveness mentioned above that most of the respondents are as much as 68% stated that the village fund policy has been directed to solving problems faced by villagers, especially in helping the community to improve the economy or welfare of villagers in the form of loan assistance for fishermen such as fishing gear, while the remaining 32% of respondents stated that the village fund program policy has not been directed to solve the economic problems of the villagers because the Village Head and Village Devices have not fully understood the utilization of village funds for the economic empowerment of the communication. While the remaining 32% of respondents stated that the Village Fund program does not focus on determining the problem of reasoning because in the determination of village funding policy, the village heads have not understood the overall use of village funds so that the need for training and rules are clear and simple, then other reasons not village apparatus have conducted surveys so that they do not know the priority of the problems that occur, even the village fund program has not been implemented because the recommendations of the community are not necessarily accepted. The next reason is because not all have been implemented and not exactly targeted in running the program, and not according to what is given. The point is not right on target and the help is not in accordance with the existing community work.
Aspects of needs, based on the results of questionnaires and interviews with key informants as much as 77% of respondents said yes if the funds distributed village is in accordance with the needs of the village community while the remaining 23% of respondents said not on the grounds that the central government should be able to distinguish the needs of archipelagic and inland areas, because the archipelago area is in need of greater operational costs to get good results. Then from the government only came the survey only once, the government only compiled the program but did not implement it, whereas the people really need this program because so far the fishermen have not received any help at all.

The evaluation aspect of the program objectives, based on questionnaires and interviews with key informants as much as 55% of respondents stated that some of the program objectives have been achieved but the need for further guidance should be program policies to be explained in simple way so that it is easy to understand well considering the SDM (Kepala Desa) need to be briefed as a guide in managing the village fund program. For other respondents also stated that the program objectives have been in accordance with what has been done so far and the program from the village has been running well, but from the distribution of aid distribution has not been maximal, then it is hoped that in the future the provision of aid will be targeted.

The remaining 45% of respondents said no, with many reasons that many respondents stated that the process is so complicated that lazy to take care of it, then the program does not run with the expected, the program conducted the village does not provide sufficient funds to the community, even from the village there has never given funds because the program is done not in accordance with the expectations of the community. Then the realization in the field of the government has not been optimal because it is only at the level of the plan but the implementation is not correct or not exactly as planned, so far only people who know close who can help.
In Program Planning evaluation, the components evaluated are program planning, with aspects of planning, preparation, infrastructure and program distribution. Aspects that can be evaluated from the Planning of the Village Fund Program are:

Aspects of planning evaluation, based on questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, 68% of respondents said yes the reason is that before village funds can be disbursed, the village must complete the Village RPJM, Perdes and Bupati Regulation so planning is already under way. People feel that there is a match between planning and implementation because people feel directly the impact of the village fund program for example the fishermen obtain assistance in the form of pompong or motor boat. It’s just that there are still a few obstacles such as village plans not all can be implemented so that only some people who feel, although the plan already exists but not yet equally felt by society or not maximally implemented due to funding factors that become obstacles. Because it must be addressed again so that people can feel evenly and the community can know the Village Fund program from the socialization provided. While the remaining 32% of respondents said it is not appropriate, the reason is not all village planning is done, the plan is made pretty good but the government on the implementation is less good or less precise, besides the village plan is arranged quite a lot but only part of that goes, to be planning only but the people do not feel the impact, the community assumes that the village government only do the plan only but the implementation is not correct or not exactly as planned.

In the aspect of planning evaluation, based on the results of questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, as many as 55% of individuals who propose individual funding needs stated that there is indeed a match between the planning prepared with the implementation. According to individuals who propose funds individually to support their programs such as: opening a shop, buying fishing gear, or financing a hydroponic vegetable garden, must go through a convoluted process and repeatedly applying for new
funds. But some individuals claim that in the distribution of funding support has not been evenly distributed and not yet maximal even not right on target.

While the remaining 45% of respondents said that the implementation of the group is still experiencing many obstacles, because in the preparation of programs and activities should involve the community or institutions in the village such as IPM, DPP, in addition because the process for the disbursement of funds filed berbelit belit and even if the funds are liquid but not in accordance with the needs so that many members of the group that disbanded.

The government only came to survey and interview without disbursing the program funds, especially for the group internally weakness there are groups that are less compact and even frequent disputes so that these groups must be fixed and there should be people who are good at taking care of group business.

**Aspects of evaluation of the compilation**, based on the results of questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, as many as 64% of respondents stated that between the preparation of programs in accordance with the needs analysis of village funds program, the reason is appropriate because in addition to the village and community tools there has been good coordination has also placed to assist the Village Head in preparing the program, so that some people can feel the funds provided. While the rest as much as 36% of respondents said it is not appropriate, the reason is because the needs analysis done does not accommodate their needs, the existing planning according to them is not appropriate with the required, the village apparatus does not do the analysis evenly, the needs analysis is not all feel, the government has never conducted a survey all over the place so that there are people who do not feel it and assume that the planned program is not in accordance with the required analysis, because it is almost 3/4 years the plan continues to be done but not as needed.
The evaluation aspect of infrastructure facilities, based on questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, as many as 64% of respondents stated yes if infrastructure facilities are available to support the running of the program, the reason is because according to the assessment of these respondents that the facilities and infrastructure available are good and very supportive of programs and their activities, although there are some inputs need for the rejuvenation of infrastructure facilities.

While 36% of respondents said not support the program, the reason is because the facilities and infrastructure are not fully available and can not be operated other than that there are still people who have never felt the help and benefits of infrastructure. In fact, according to respondents from farmers' groups that all farm equipment owned today is equipment purchased from their own pockets.

Aspects of distribution evaluation, that the distribution process went well, based on the results of questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, as many as 9% of respondents said yes the reason until now the village fund distribution process goes well because the Village Head has begun to understand and added the supervision of District of Sub-District and Village, but 91% of respondents stated that the distribution process did not work well, for various reasons and the majority of respondents thought that the distribution process was not good because there were sometimes delays in disbursing funds, programs, there is still no help because no one helps / gives guidance to take care of because they do not know who to ask for help, still uneven distribution and unclear how to get help because of misunderstanding of information to take care of aid.

Formative Evaluation Evaluation of Village Funds Programs, at the stage of formative evaluation, the components being evaluated are program monitoring and evaluation, with monitoring and evaluation aspects of the program as well as obstacles or
program constraints. Aspects that can be evaluated from this formative evaluation of the Village Fund Program are: **The evaluation aspect of program monitoring and evaluation**, regarding the implementation of program monitoring and evaluation based on questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, 36% of respondents stated that it has been implemented with various reasons among others monitoring of the evaluation has been carried out by involving elements of the legislature, police, KPPN and Dintas Sector DPP that exist, in the hope that the future can be better and if there are problems can be handled so the problem is not widespread, while 64% of respondents stated that the implementation of monitoring and evaluation less maximal in the village fund program so far, the reason the government only do one monitoring and evaluation of the program so there is no monitoring and evaluation again so often still the case or the same problem that the government has not provided assistance or assistance that channeled me rang evenly.

Furthermore, **Aspects of evaluation of obstacles or constraints** related to the program of village funds there is time village empowerment program implemented, based on the results of questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, 82% of respondents said yes there are still obstacles or constraints in village fund programs such as lack of understanding stakeholders so more socialization of the central government is needed to clarify both the terms and procedures of submission, the distribution process when approved, the allocation / use of village funds to accountability for the use of village funds.

This is to avoid complicated requirements, difficult and complicated processes both in the filing and in the disbursement of funds, resulting in frequent delays in receiving funds. Another obstacle from the distribution of village funds for capital is not the right target and equity is not maximized, and the remaining 18% of respondents stated that there are no
significant obstacles or constraints because they already feel or enjoy the help although with the note that the process is long or convoluted.

Aspects of **evaluation of obstacles or program constraints** in the distribution, based on the results of questionnaires and interviews with key informants and respondents, 82% of respondents said yes there are obstacles in the distribution with the reasons: lack of socialization, lack of understanding of the village financial system, the need for measurable training, came not in accordance with the planned time, the distribution of funds is very slow. There are even respondents who argue that how the government is willing to distribute the funds while the government rarely conduct direct survey of spaciousness, in the distribution process is not clear because often misdirected because that should not get even given / get the distribution of village funds, which filed from the community of fishermen but who get aid is a society whose work is not a fisherman. While the remaining 18% of respondents said there are no significant obstacles or barriers in the distribution of village funds because they already have received.

At the stage of **program summative evaluation**, the components evaluated are program outcomes / products, with aspects of program outcomes / products and program impacts. Aspects that can be evaluated from the products of the Village Fund Program are:

**The evaluation aspect of the program result**, about the results of the previous village fund program is good and beneficial for the community, based on the questionnaire and interview with key informants and respondents, as much as 73% of respondents said yes agree with the reason that the village fund program is very beneficial to the community and need the rules which is simple in managing village funds. For community groups whose profession farmers already feel the benefits of village funds that serve to ease their burden, can help the development of farming economies that need to or connect life especially if the right target, can help community groups who do not have a pompong
fisherman to continue his work and the remaining 27% of respondents said it is not useful because the reason is not evenly distributed, the requirements are many / too complicated, there are still people who do not know about the existence of village funds, most respondents expressed the opinion that the government came for the survey alone but the distribution of funds never exist.

The impact evaluation aspect of the program, on whether the impact of the village fund program is very good and beneficial for the coastal community of Bintan Island, then based on the questionnaire and interview with key informants and respondents, 95% of respondents said yes very good and useful, because it can be utilized by communities and provide learning for the community for the development of economic enterprises, can ease the burden of farmers, especially on the needs of funds, the community can better manage and know how to be independent. In addition there are many people who get help so as to reduce the burden of family and community life in general and it will be very good if fit in helping the appropriate work, so far beneficial to coastal communities in the smooth work as a fisherman, especially for people who less able to improve the economy / income and can connect the work. The remaining 5% of respondents said that it is not useful because they do not fit with what is expected by the community, in addition to the requirements that make it difficult and tortuous, also until now the funds never come out, not in accordance with the plan, the activity is only good at the beginning of planning but nothing follow-up of the plan so that the plan is not useful.

There are several strategic things that researchers can ask about the achievement of the Village Fund program in the framework of improvement, based on the results of interviews and data distributed questionnaires, namely:
Issue 1: Need for improvement of distribution system

Based on the results of interview researchers with key informants, according to Mr. Fisherman A, distribution is not as easy as imagined, certainly any help is uneven. Similarly, according to Mr. Fisherman B, he added that because there is still no help because no one helps manage in the affairs to get the help of the village government agree with it, Mr. Fisherman F according to him lies the problem is at the time of distribution or grant money sometimes not some are responsible in terms of care-taking care. Similarly, according to Mr. Fisherman G, there are still who have not been able to help because no one helped take care of it, and according to Mr. Fisherman H, during this obstacle can not be overcome is difficult in the care because do not know who to ask for help. Assistance is still not evenly distributed, according to Mr. Fisherman J because there are many conflicts in taking care of the village aid.

Another opinion by Mr. Fisherman D and Mr. Farmer B, more particularly view of uneven distribution because of wrong target Mr. Fisherman H and Mr. Farmer D also convey the same thing that the distribution of funds is not right on target. Added also by Mr. Fisherman I that clear obstacles are less appropriate target in providing assistance because that is not in accordance with the work can be help. Even Mr. Farmer F and Mr. Farmer G said that all this time there has never felt a sense of getting village funding aid when in dire need.

Another case with Mr. Farmer J, he said that how the government would distribute the funds while they rarely conduct direct survey spaciousness.

The conclusion concurred with some of the above opinion, the researchers assessed the need for a good distribution system, where required people who specifically supervise and manage the distribution of village funds to help the community run smoothly so that no one target.
**Issue 2: The Need for Monitoring and Evaluation**

Based on evaluations and indicators of success at each stage, what can be reviewed is the need for monitoring and assessment for the implementation of the Village Fund. According to Mr. Fisherman A and Mr. Fisherman C, monitoring and evaluation activities are necessary for the future so that problems in the field are not enlarged. According to Mr. Fisherman B, he saw no monitoring and evaluation activities in the field, even if there is still why the same case or problem occurs. Added by Mr. Fisherman E and Mr. Fisherman F that every run of the program, monitoring and evaluation activities is necessary for the smooth future of the program and however the money activities are necessary for the program to be better.

Another case with Mr. Fisherman D, according to him monitoring and evaluation activities already exist but still not good. Similarly, according to Mr. Fisherman G that monitoring and evaluation activities already exist but not maximal in the implementation.

Besides there were assessing the need for monitoring and evaluation and has been a judge that the M & E is already running although not maximum, no one argues that monitoring and evaluation can not be dialksanakan because the program was not running, as submitted by Mr. Farmer J, he argues how willing monitoring and evaluation while the government just do the plan alone without running the program.

The conclusion concurred with some of the above opinion, the researchers assess the required monitoring and evaluation for the Village Fund program so that the program can be controlled and can run smoothly.

**Issue 3: The need for a program socialization system**

Based on the interviews of the researchers with Mr. Fisherman I and Mr. Fisherman F, he believes that there is already a grant but they do not know exactly or lack the knowledge about the village fund assistance program. According to Mr. Farmer G, so far no
socialization, the authorities only come survey and Mr. Farmer F also said that the village apparatus never conduct surveys let alone socialization so they do not know the priority problems that occurred in the village.

Agreeing with some of the above opinion, the researchers also considered the need for a socialization system facilitated by the government regarding the Village Fund assistance program because there are still people who do not know the information about the program.

**Recommendation**

**Sustainability of Village Fund Program with improvement**

Based on three strategic issues in the Program mentioned earlier, we recommend some things in the Village Fund Program activities in Coastal Communities of Bintan Regency in Kepulauan Riau Province, namely:

1. That the Village Fund program is good and can be continued because there is optimism in the running of the program with long-term impact on the improvement of coastal community welfare.

2. Need to improve the distribution system where necessary people who specifically oversee and manage the distribution of village funding to the community so that it is not wrong target and smoothly.

3. There needs to be monitoring and evaluation for the Village Fund program so that the program can be controlled and can run smoothly. Need for socialization.

4. There needs to be a socialization system facilitated by the government regarding the Village Fund assistance program because there are still people who do not know the information about the program.
CONCLUSION

1. This research was conducted to evaluate the Fund Program for the coastal community of Bintan Regency in Riau Islands Province and to know the extent of success of the Program, and to formulate the recommendation of government policy to improve this program in the future.

3. Referring to the evaluation undertaken on the aspect of the Need Assessment program of the Village Fund, it can be concluded that the results are moderate, based on the percentage of achievement from 3 aspects.

4. Referring to the evaluation done on aspects of the Program Planning stage of the Village Fund program, it can be concluded that the results are moderate based on the percentage achievement of 4 aspects, but there are still obstacles in the distribution aspect which the percentage is very small.

5. Referring to the evaluation done on the aspect of the Formative Evaluation stage of the Village Fund program, it can be concluded that the result is low, since the percentage of the 2 aspects evaluated is still low it is seen that 64% of respondents considered still need monitoring and evaluation program and 91% respondents said there are still obstacles in the implementation of the program.

6. Referring to the evaluation done on the aspect of the Summative Program Program of Village Fund, it can be concluded that the result is high, based on the percentage of achievement from 2 aspects.
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