Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Administrasi Publik
Volume 11 Number 2, July –December 2021. Page 556-566
p-ISSN: 2086-6364, e-ISSN: 2549-7499
Homepage: http://ojs.unm.ac.id/iap

Policy Evaluation of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) in Indonesia's Education Outcomes

Abd. Rohim Asnawi[1], Bambang Budi Wiyono[2], Asep Sunandar[3]
[1,2,3] Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
Jl. Semarang No.5, Sumbersari, Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Malang City, East Java 65145
Email: asnawialbasyir@mail.com

(**Received**: October 21-2021; **revised**: November 20-2021; **published**: December 30-2021)

ABSTRACT

The Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) has been running for 6 years since it was first implemented. This policy aims to help the poor to get proper education from Primary school until their children graduate from Senior Secondary School as well as non-formal education. This study aims to evaluate the policy of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) by comparing educational outcomes before and after this policy was implemented. The method used in this research is explanatory research with a quantitative approach. The data analyzed in the period before the implementation of the policy, namely in 2009-2014 and after the policy, namely in 2015-2020. The results showed that this policy was only effective at the junior high and senior high school levels. This policy is not able to cope with students who drop out and do not go to school, especially at the basic education level. The failure may be due to the lengthy requirements, the small amount of aid funds at the primary school level. The policy of the Program Indonesia Pintar is to increase student enrollment or education participation.

Keywords: Education; Policy; Education Policy; Scholarship; Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP)

INTRODUCTION

Investing in education means investing in human capital, but economic returns are not as fast as economic returns. However, it is believed that the quality of human resources produced by education will increase the rate of economic growth (Rusdiana, 2015). Investment in education as an important channel for building human capital and achieving long-term development goals (Adejumo et al., 2021). However, the development of education is still constrained by equitable distribution of education.

The low quality and equity of education in Indonesia is caused by several things, including: First, inequality in access to education between the rich and the poor. Second, the gap in educational development outcomes between regions. Third, the condition of education infrastructure is still low and uneven. Fourth, the quality of education is still low (DPR RI, 2020). Of these problems that are closely related to the development of education is access to education.

The 1945 constitution stipulates that every citizen has the right to education and the state prioritizes the education budget at least 20% of the state revenue and expenditure budget and the regional revenue and expenditure budget for education. The use of the education budget is used in various educational activities, including the provision of scholarships. One of the educational

scholarship policies issued by the government to help children from poor families attend school is the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP).

The Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) is regulated in Presidential Instruction Number 7 of 2014 which was later revealed to be Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2016 concerning the Program Indonesia Pintar which was then updated to Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 10 of 2020 concerning the Program Indonesia Pintar. This PIP-targeted program is designed to help school-age children from poor/vulnerable/poor families continue to receive education services until they graduate from high school, through formal education as well as non-formal education. Through this program, the government seeks to prevent children from dropping out of school and hopes to attract dropouts to continue their education (Kemendikbud, 2021).

The Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) has been running for 8 years since it was first implemented in 2014. During this program, there will still be many children who are not in school and drop out of school, as shown in the following table:

Table 1
Percentage of Children Not in School

Education Level	Year	Percentage
Primary School	2020	0.62
Junior Secondary School	2020	7.29
Senior Secondary School	2020	22.31

Source: BPS, 2021

Based on these data, it can be seen that the percentage of children who are not in school is quite high. The percentage of children not attending elementary school is 0.62 percent. The percentage of children not attending junior high school or equivalent is 7.29 percent. The percentage of children not attending high school or equivalent is 22.31 percent. Based on these data, it can also be seen that the higher the level of education, the higher the percentage of children who are not in school.

Table 2
Number of Out of School Children

Education Level	Academic Year	Total
Primary School	2020/2021	2.790
Junior Secondary School	2020/2021	976
Senior Secondary School	2020/2021	541
State High School	2020/2021	609

Source: Kemendikbud, 2020

In contrast to the data on children who are not in school, the data on the number of dropouts shows the opposite. The higher the education level, the lower the dropout rate. The number of children dropping out of school at the elementary level or equivalent is 2,790 children. The number of children dropping out of school at the junior high school level is 976

children. The number of out of school children at the high school level or equivalent is 5.41 children. The number of out-of-school children at the vocational high school level is 609 children. With PIP aimed at the community and students, but there are still many who cannot afford to go to school. Therefore, an evaluation of the educational scholarship policy needs to be carried out.

Not all programs of public policy can be achieved, therefore a policy evaluation needs to be carried out. Often public policies fail to achieve the goals that have been set (Situmorang, 2016). Policy evaluation or assessment involves the re-discussion of policy implementation. This stage focuses on identifying the results and consequences of policy implementation (Meutia, 2013). Policy evaluation to find out the causes of failure and to find out the impact resulting from policy implementation (Maulana & Nugroho, 2019). Policy evaluation in the perspective of the process flow/public policy cycle, occupies the last position after policy implementation, so it is only natural that public policies that have been made and implemented are then evaluated (Mustari, 2015).

Policy evaluation methods can be carried out with 4 methods, namely *single program after only, single program before-after, comperative after only* dan *comperative before-after* (Maulana & Nugroho, 2019). Impact evaluation can only be carried out satisfactorily if the program has been implemented completely and has been running for a relatively long time (Rusdiana, 2015). Policy evaluation steps are carried out by identifying program objectives, analyzing problems, describing activities, measuring changes in results, determining the causes of changes in results and determining indicators for the existence of impacts (Situmorang, 2016). The data and information needed for policy evaluation can be in the form of documentation, surveys, interviews, observations and Focus Group Discussions (Meutia, 2013).

The evaluation of the Smart Indonesia Program Policy uses the single program before-after method, namely evaluation activities by looking at changes before and after the target group. Policy evaluation requires data to evaluate in a relatively long time, therefore the Smart Indonesia Program uses the variables used in this study are education completed by level, Gross Enrollment Rate, School Participation Rate and Net Enrollment Rate. The data that is compared to assess educational outcomes is before the implementation of the PIP policy in 2009-2014 and after the PIP policy in 2015-2020.

Policy on scholarship results can be done by comparing the goals of the scholarship and the results of the scholarships that have been carried out (Mawer, 2017). Countries that wish to increase educational attainment and increase incomes should promote policies that reduce the cost of education and provide financial assistance to the poor (Villareal, 2018). This article aims to evaluate the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy by comparing educational outcomes before and after this policy was implemented. Educational achievements measured are Education Participation and the level of education completed because this program aims for students to be able to participate in education until they graduate from school.

METHOD

The type of explanatory research is analysis with a quantitative approach. Location This research was conducted throughout Indonesia with secondary data. The variables used in this study were education completed by level, Gross Enrollment Rate, School Participation Rate and Net Enrollment Rate. This population and sample use the full sample because the entire population is the sample. The type of data used is secondary data obtained from the Publication of the Central Statistics Agency in 2009-2020. The data analysis of this research used comparative analysis. The data that is compared to assess educational outcomes is before the implementation of the policy, namely in 2009-2014 and after the policy, namely in 2015-2020. Data analysis using *Software Statistical Package for Social Sciences* (SPSS) version 21.0.

Measuring the Impact of the Smart Indonesia Program Policy

A summary of the results of descriptive statistics from the two samples studied, namely the value of the Education Indicators before the implementation of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy and after the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy. The data used uses a period of 6 years between 2009-2014 before the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy was implemented and 6 years between 2015-2020 after the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy was implemented. The purpose of measuring the two ranges of years is to assess and evaluate the policies of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP). The summary of the results of data analysis is as follows:

Table 3
Results of Data Analysis

Indicator	Description	Paired Samples Statistics	Paired Samples Test			
		Mean	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Not in School Yet	Before PIP	6.48	2.09	7.816	5	0.001
	After PIP	4.39				
Not Graduated from Elementary School	Before PIP	14.13	1.655	4.323	5	0.008
	After PIP	12.48				
Graduated from Elementary School	Before PIP	28.53	1.122	1.152	5	0.301
	After PIP	27.41				
Graduated from Middle School	Before PIP	20.43	-0.403	-0.442	5	0.677
	After PIP	20.83				
Graduated from High School	Before PIP	30.44	-4.463	-13.45	5	0
	After PIP	34.9				
School Enrollment Rate 7-12 years old	Before PIP	98.16	-1.015	-6.21	5	0.002
	After PIP	99.17				
School Enrollment Rate 13-15 years old	Before PIP	89.12	-6.097	-5.116	5	0.004
	After PIP	95.22				
School Enrollment Rate 16-18 years old	Before PIP	60.79	-10.86	-5.418	5	0.003
	After PIP	71.66				
School Enrollment Rate 19-24	Before PIP	16.72	-8.337	-5.708	5	0.002

Indicator	Description	Paired Samples Statistics	Paired Samples Test			
		Mean	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
years old	After PIP	25.06				
Gross Enrollment Ratio Primary School	Before PIP After PIP	107.6 108.45	-0.853	-0.597	5	0.577
Gross Enrollment Ratio Junior Secondary School	Before PIP After PIP	85.96 90.95	-4.987	-3.106	5	0.027
Gross Enrollment Ratio Senior Secondary School	Before PIP After PIP	66.66 81.82	-15.16	-11.13	5	0
Primary School Net Enrolment Rate	Before PIP After PIP	94.13 97.27	-3.14	-3.934	5	0.011
Junior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate	Before PIP After PIP	70.98 78.76	-7.78	-6.037	5	0.002
Senior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate	Before PIP After PIP	50.71 60.47	-9.757	-4.803	5	0.005

Source: Processed by the Author, 2021

1. Not in School Yet
   The average value of Not in School Yet before the PIP policy is 6.48 and is greater than After the PIP policy, which is 4.39, so it means that there is no difference in the average before and after the PIP policy with a difference of 2.09. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.001 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.
2. Not Graduated from Elementary School
   The average value of Not Graduated from Elementary School before the PIP policy was 14.13 and greater than After the PIP policy 12.48, it means that there is no difference in the average before and after the PIP policy with a difference of 1,655. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.008 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.
3. Graduated from Elementary School
   The average value of Graduates from Elementary School before the PIP policy is 28.53 and is greater than after the PIP policy 27.41, so that means there is no difference in the average before and after the PIP policy with a difference of 1,122. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.301 > 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no difference in the mean between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.
4. Graduated from Middle School

The average value of Graduates from Middle School before the PIP policy was 20.43 and smaller than After the PIP policy was 20.83, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -0.403. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.667 > 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no difference in the mean between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

5. Graduated from High School
   The average value of Graduates from High School before the PIP policy was 30.44 and smaller than After the PIP policy 34.9, it means that there is a difference in the average before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -4.463. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.
6. School Enrollment Rate 7-12 years old
   The average value of the School Enrollment Rate 7-12 years old before the PIP policy was 98.16 and less than after the PIP policy was 99.17, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -1,015. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.002 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.
7. School Enrollment Rate 13-15 years old
   The average value of the School Enrollment Rate 13-15 years old before the PIP policy was 89.12 and less than after the PIP policy was 95.22, so it means that there is a difference in the average before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -6.097. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.004 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.
8. School Enrollment Rate 16-18 years old
   The average value of the School Enrollment Rate 16-18 years old before the PIP policy was 60.79 and less than after the PIP policy was 71.66, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -10.86. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.003 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.
9. School Enrollment Rate 19-24 years old
   The average value of the School Enrollment Rate 19-24 years old before the PIP policy was 16.72 and smaller than after the PIP policy was 25.06, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -8.337. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.002 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after

the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

10. Gross Enrollment Ratio Primary School

The average Gross Enrollment Ratio Primary School before the PIP policy was 107.6 and less than after the PIP policy was 108.45, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -0.853. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.577 > 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no difference in the mean between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

11. Gross Enrollment Ratio Junior Secondary School

The average Gross Enrollment Ratio of Junior Secondary School before the PIP policy was 85.96 and smaller than After the PIP policy was 90.95, it means that there was an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -4.987. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.027 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

12. Gross Enrollment Ratio Senior Secondary School

The average Gross Enrollment Ratio for Senior Secondary School before the PIP policy was 66.66 and smaller than After the PIP policy was 81.82, it means that there was an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -15.16. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

13. Primary School Net Enrolment Rate

The average value of the Primary School Net Enrollment Rate before the PIP policy was 94.13 and smaller than After the PIP policy was 97.27, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -3.14. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.011 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

14. Junior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate

The average value of the Junior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate before the PIP policy was 70.98 and less than after the PIP policy was 78.76, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -7.78. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.002 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

15. Senior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate

The average value of the Senior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate before the PIP policy was 50.71 and less than after the PIP policy was 60.47, so it means that there is an average difference before and after the PIP policy with a difference of -9.757. From the table of paired sample test results, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.005 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an average difference between before the PIP policy and after the PIP policy, namely that there is an influence of the PIP policy on the development of education.

Policy Evaluation of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP)

The PIP program is aimed at the community and students, but there are still many who cannot afford to go to school. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the educational scholarship policy. Policy evaluation is a factual question in the form of measuring and evaluating both the policy implementation stage and the results or impact of the actions of a particular policy or program to determine which actions can be taken in the future (Meutia, 2013).

The policy evaluation of the Smart Indonesia program focuses on assessing the impact of the policy. Impact assessment can only be carried out satisfactorily if the program is fully implemented and has been carried out over a relatively long period of time (Rusdiana, 2015). Policy evaluation steps can only be carried out when data and information are received from several previous activities so that an accurate, measurable and traceable assessment can be carried out (Meutia, 2013). Policy evaluation of the results of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy uses some educational data as a result of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) scholarship policy.

The data used in evaluating the impact of the Smart Indonesia Program policy include Not in School Yet, Not Graduated from Elementary School, Graduated from Elementary School, Graduated from Middle School, Graduated from High School, School Enrollment Rate 7-12 years old, School Enrollment Rate 13-15 years old, School Enrollment Rate 16-18 years old, School Enrollment Rate 19-24 years old, Gross Enrollment Ratio Primary School, Gross Enrollment Ratio Junior Secondary School, Gross Enrollment Ratio Senior Secondary School, Primary School Net Enrolment Rate, Junior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate dan Senior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate.

Based on data analysis, for indicators Graduated from Elementary School and Graduated from Middle School and Gross Enrollment Ratio Primary School are not affected by the existence of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy although on average there is a difference between before the policy and after the policy. For indicators Not in School Yet, Not Graduated from Elementary School, School Enrollment Rate 7-12 years old, School Enrollment Rate 19-24 years old, Gross Enrollment Ratio Junior Secondary School, Gross Enrollment Ratio Senior Secondary School, dan Primary School Net Enrolment Rate in a different test, but not correlated. While the indicators that show that there are differences and correlates of influential values are Graduated from High School, School Enrollment Rate 13-15 years old, School Enrollment Rate 16-18 years old, Junior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate dan Senior Secondary School Net Enrolment Rate. Therefore, in general, the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) policy is successful for junior and senior high school education levels.

The PIP program aims to ensure that school-age children in poor/vulnerable/poor families get educational services through formal education (starting from elementary school to high school graduation) up to secondary education and non-formal education (Package A to Package C, and standardized courses). However, this policy is only effective at the junior and senior high school levels. The registration requirement is likely to be the cause of the ineffectiveness of this policy at the elementary level equivalent. Students can register by bringing Kartu Keluarga Sejahtera (KKS) to the nearest educational institution. If students do not have KKS, their parents can apply for a Surat Keterangan Tidak Mampu (SKTM) from the Neighborhood or Hamlet and Urban village/Village first to fulfill the registration requirements. Padahal perubahan persyaratan pendaftaran yang lebih mudah akan meningkatkan partisipasi dalam program ini (Cierniak, K., Billick, R., & Ruddy, 2015).

In addition, this policy is not able to cope with students who drop out and do not go to school, especially at the basic education level. This can be seen from the Not in School Yet, Not Graduated from Elementary School, Graduated from Elementary School indicators which do not show an increase in the Mean value after the change. This means that the PIP policy is not able to protect poor students from the threat of dropping out of school. This is because students from low-income or poor families often drop out of school (Ware, M., & Patel, 2012) and scholarships are proven to be effective in improving student achievement (Damon et al., 2019). On the other hand, scholarships do not guarantee the level of completion of education (Němečková & Krylova, 2014).

The low success of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) at the education level may also be due to the additional money given to students. The amount of education funds for elementary school students gets Rp. 450,000,-/year, Middle school students get Rp. 750,000,-/year, High school students get Rp. 1,000,000,-/year. The amount of money shows different values at the level of education. The small amount of funding for education for elementary school students or equivalent may be the cause of this failure. This evidence also shows that students are more motivated by incentives and additional money (Barrow & Rouse, 2018).

The positive effect of this Smart Indonesia Program Policy is that it can increase student enrollment or education participation. This is evident from the indicators for the School Enrollment Rate, Net Participation Rate and Gross Enrollment Rate which have been shown to increase from the existence of this Smart Indonesia Program Policy. This proves that the scholarship policy can increase enrollment or educational participation (Patel & Rudd, 2012).

CONCLUSION

This PIP-targeted program is designed to help school-age children from poor/vulnerable/poor families continue to receive educational services until they graduate from high school, through formal education (from elementary school to high school graduation) as well as non-formal education (Package A to Package C and standardized courses). However, this policy is only effective at the junior and senior high school levels. This policy is not able to cope with students who drop out and do not go to school, especially at the basic education level. The failure may be due to the lengthy requirements, the small amount of aid funds at the

primary school level. The policy of the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) is to increase student enrollment or education participation. Based on these results, it can be recommended to improve the Program Indonesia Pintar (PIP) Policy, which is related to the requirements to get it to make it easier because to get the scholarship, there are many documents and requirements that need to be prepared.

REFERENCES

Adejumo, O. O., Asongu, S. A., & Adejumo, A. V. (2021). Education enrolment rate vs employment rate: Implications for sustainable human capital development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *83*(March), 102385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102385

Barrow, L., & Rouse, C. E. (2018). Financial Incentives And Educational Investment : The Impact Of Performance-Based Scholarships. *Education Finance and Policy*, *13*(4), 419–448. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00228

BPS. (2021). *Indikator Pendidikan, 1994-2020*. Badan Pusat Statistik. https://www.bps.go.id/statictable/2010/03/19/1525/indikator-pendidikan-1994-2019.html

Cierniak, K., Billick, R., & Ruddy, A. (2015). *The Indiana Choice Scholarship Program: Legal Challenges, Program Expansion, and Participation. Informing Policy and Improving Practice* (pp. 1–12). Center for Evaluation and Education Policy, Indiana University.

Damon, A., Glewwe, P., Wisniewski, S., & Sun, B. (2019). What education policies and programmes affect learning and time in school in developing countries? A review of evaluations from 1990 to 2014. *Review of Education*, *7*(2), 295–387. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3123

Kemendikbud. (2020). *Statistik Pendidikan*. Siswa, Jumlah Sekolah, Putus Jenis, Menurut Dan, Kelamin Tiap,Tingkat.http://statistik.data.kemdikbud.go.id/%0Ahttp://statistik.data.kemdikbud.go.id/index.php/page/smp

Kemendikbud. (2021). *Program Indonesia Pintar*. Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan. https://indonesiapintar.kemdikbud.go.id/

Maulana, D., & Nugroho, A. (2019). *Kebijakan Publik Cara Mudah Memahami Kebijakan Publik*. CV. AA. RIZKY.

Mawer, M. (2017). Approaches to Analyzing the Outcomes of International Scholarship Programs for Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *21*(3), 230–245. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315316687009

Meutia, I. F. (2013). *Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. AURA.

Mustari, N. (2015). *Pemahaman Kebijakan Publik: formulasi, implementasi & evaluasi kebijakan publik*. LeutikaPrio.

Němečková, T., & Krylova, P. (2014). The Czech government scholarship programme for students from developing countries - Evaluation findings and policy reflections. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *43*, 83–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2013.12.002

Patel, R., & Rudd, T. (2012). Can Scholarships Alone Help Students Succeed? *SSRN Electronic Journal*, *November*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2188758

RI, D. (2020). *Pembangunan Bidang Pendidikan: Perencanaan Yang Lebih Fokus Dan Berorientasi Ke Timur Indonesia Merupakan Solusi Atasi Kesenjangan Dan Percepatan Pencapaian Target Nasional*. https://www.dpr.go.id/doksetjen/dokumen/biro-apbn-apbn-Pembangunan-Bidang-Pendidikan-Perencanaan-Yang-Lebih-Fokus-dan-Berorientasi-Ke-Timur-Indonesia-Merupakan-Solusi-Atasi-Kesenjangan-dan-Percepat-Pencapaian-Target-Nasional-1434364286.pdf.

Rusdiana, H. A. (2015). *Kebijakan Pendidikan dari Filosofi Ke Implementasi*. CV.Pustaka Setia.

Situmorang, C. H. (2016). *KEBIJAKAN PUBLIK (Teori Analisis, Implementasi dan Evaluasi Kebijakan)*. Social Secururity Development Institute (SSDI).

Villareal, M. (2018). *The Effects of Need & Merit Grant Aid on Graduation Rates : A Regression Discontinuity Analysis*.

Ware, M., & Patel, R. (2012). *Does more money matter? An introduction to the performance-based scholarship demonstration in California* (pp. 1–12). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2030337