Reform on Integrated Public Service Management in the Regions Based on New Public Service

Erlita Cahyasari ^a*

^a Universitas Brawijaya, East Java, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:

Date submission: 03 October 2017

First revision: 24 October 2017

Accepted: 15 November 2017

Available online: 28 November 2017

Keywords: NPS, Public Service Management, Reform

ABSTRACT

The more developed a country is, the more complex the public service management it requires. Thus, increasing public service provision has been a huge challenge for big countries around the world, especially for a country like Indonesia that adopts decentralized system of governance. Hence, for Indonesia, it is important to formulate and reinforce the service standards (Minimal Service Standards, Public Service Standards, and Operational Procedures Standards). This writing emphasizes on the Standards that are meant to be the reference for around 590 regencies/cities across Indonesia in terms of the establishment of Public Service. Public service standards need to focus on the citizens' basic needs and civil rights for goods, services, and administrative services. Basic public services, especially in education, health, and infrastructure sectors, are determinant or key factors for a better quality life in a society.

INTISARI

Semakin maju suatu negara, maka semakin kompleks pengelolaan pelayanan publiknya. Salah satu tantangan terbesar di berbagai negara di dunia adalah peningkatan penyediaan layanan publik. Terlebih untuk sistem pemerintahan desentralisasi seperti di Indonesia, penting adanya perumusan dan penegakan standar pelayanan (NSPK – Standar Pelayanan Minimal, Standar Pelayanan Publik, Standar Prosedur Operasional). Tulisan ini menitikberatkan pada rujukan bagi 590-an kabupaten/kota di Indonesia dalam menyelenggarakan pelayanan publik. Kebutuhan dasar dan hak-hak sipil setiap warga negara atas barang, jasa, dan pelayanan administrasi harus menjadi fokus utama dalam standar pelayanan publik. Pelayanan publik dasar terutama di sektor pendidikan, kesehatan dan infrastruktur merupakan salah satu determinan/faktor penentu kunci untuk kualitas hidup yang lebih baik bagi masyarakat.

2016 FIA UB. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

A good management is one of the keys in the establishment of a quality public service. The management mentioned in this context refers to the mechanisms for economic and social resources management which involve the influence of the state sector and the non-government sector in its collective efforts (UNDP, 2001). The concept proposed by UNDP suggests that there are many actors involved in the governance and that there is no dominant party that can determine the others' movement. The decision and

policy making processes consider inputs and directions from the other actors involved.

The public service management which is based on standards includes many actors that have to play their own part in order that public service provision can work effectively, efficiently, and responsively to society's needs. Two major components that need actively work hand in hand are service providers and service recipients. Nevertheless, the presence of regional government as regional policy maker is highly important. Good management principals, such as active

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +62-856-4959-3000; e-mail: erlita@ub.ac.id

participation of the society, accountability, transparency, and responsiveness, are the pre-conditions which are necessary to develop.

Society as service recipients has significant role in expressing their needs for a quality, effective, and efficient public service to the decision maker. They can also give technical inputs to service providers and monitor the existing public service. It is also possible to mobilize society to help public service (for instance in the contexts of health, education, an infrastructure) in order to ensure the equality of access to public service. Service providers are obliged to provide public services which are in accordance with the needs of the society using the available service standards as reference. In addition to this, service providers also have to present information and reports and lobby the policy makers to guarantee the availability of resources needed. Besides presenting vertical accountability to policy maker, which is made in the form of reports, they also need to present social accountability to society as the main recipient of public service. If there is a situation where public service is delegated to a private or non- government entities because of some limitations, supervision and technical assistance for public service will be absolutely needed.

Regional government as the major policy maker has to be responsive towards society's needs that are expressed through various public mechanisms. They also need to guarantee the sufficiency of resources for the establishment of public service, and give directions and supervisions to service providers. In addition to the local government, members of the regional house of representatives who represent society in general also play important role to ensure a policy which is responsive to people's voices and ensure the availability of resources needed in public service.

2. Discussion

Today, public service management is required to cover the following characteristics: minimal state, collaborative, and partnership. For this reason, *New Public Service* (NPS) approach is considered to be appropriate, especially since we refer to the premise that the focus of public management should be the community, and civil society. This basic concept stresses that the role of public servants (service providers) is to help citizens articulate and meet their shared interests rather than to control or steer society (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000). This vis-à-vis the conception of NPM approach that emphasizes transactions between service providers and consumers, reflecting individual interests based on the working principles of the market. It is also distinct from the old public administration approach where citizens were treated as clients or constituents of a bureaucracy who were treated as passive recipients of top-down policy making and service delivery mechanisms (Bourgon, 2007). In this traditional concept, control and

hierarchy are more dominant in comparison to social relation approach and the needs of the people.

The NPS approach also reasserts the importance of a public service ethos, emphasizing the values and motivations of public servants dedicated to the wider public good (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000, pp. 556-57). In line with the concept of citizenship, Bourgon (2007) proposes "democratic citizenship" concept to raise a new perspective in which the role of public administrator is not only confined to responding or fulfilling the demands of service users, but more to building collaborative relationships with the society and groups of society. For this reason, Bourgon offers four important elements, they are: (a) building collaborative relationships with citizens and groups of citizens, (b) encouraging shared responsibilities, (c) disseminating information to elevate public discourse and to foster a shared understanding of public issues, and (d) seeking opportunities to involve citizens in government activities.

NPS provides the proper model for public management to realize the orientation of public interests and citizenship in public service. However, it is not yet capable of providing comprehensive solutions for fundamental changes in public sector (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2011; Christensen and Lægreid, 2011). At least NPS is able to present high norms and values by giving emphasis on citizenship as its main focus in public management. Furthermore, it is also necessary to integrate organizational dimensions of NPS to accommodate the plurality of service requirements. This concept is also called as "*Post-New Public Management*" perspective, stressing on the comprehensive approach which includes the entire government activities, digital governance, and motivations to solve organizational coherence and responsiveness issues. It places society's needs and interests as the main attention or the center of public management in an effort to realize public sector ethos.

The key concept for *Post-New Public Management* is the *digital governance*. *Digital Governance* focuses on efficiency by employing modern technology to improve the quality of service provision (Heeks and Bailur, 2007; Yildiz, 2007). It is believed that the use of digital technology can build a good relationship between the government and the society, and ease the transformation of service process to society (Dunleavy, et al, 2006). Another advantage of *digital governance* is to really encourage public engagement in public service delivery processes (Osborne, Radnor, and Nasi, 2013). Other advantages are: it supports the government transparency on information, supports transparency process with high accessibility, and increases public satisfaction. Technological innovations designed to increase transparency and accountability offer the potential to bring citizens closer to the policymaking process through new and improved channels of

participation as well as citizen monitoring of government (Avila et al, 2011).

The concept of *governance* and *networking* has become dominant in the development of 21st century public management literature. Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) explain that the role of government should be directed more towards encouraging and directing for negotiations and intermediaries of interest among citizens and community groups, and creating the spread of values. This change is based on the relationship established between the network of public services and the citizens. Efforts to build this humanitarian relationship must revolutionize the role of the state (Cooke and Muir, 2012).

Public service is a service that covers public interests in general. Public value is the total value of a society that cannot be monopolized by individuals but must be disseminated by all actors in society and this is the result of the allocation of decision-making resources. The government today must reduce and minimize its role as the citizens are empowered to channel their aspirations and get the attention of the government. It is now the era of partnership and *many hands*, and it is no longer the era of *the visible hand*, nor *the invisible hand* (Millard and Wimmer, 2012). The citizens and private sectors must be connected and that will enable them to work together.

This new format gives birth to third actor through mass production and collaboration (Linders, 2012). It is known as 'co-production', which is the ability of citizens and users to innovate in providing public goods and public services (OECD Public Governance Reviews, 2011). This can be achieved with a quality (democratic) and effective decision making, building trust in public institution, and strengthening public value.

Another service innovation is the regionalization system of public service provision which involves local communities in decision making through the '*bottom-up*' initiation (Foley and Martin, 2000), and the development of '*public-private partnership*' to produce innovative solutions. The end results of these innovations are service mechanisms that are expeditious, effective and efficient, and put forward public values more than simply minimizing service costs (Chun, et.al, 2012).

Currently, public service is a kind of service which is dynamic and based on citizenship. According to Nedham and Mangan (2007), in the Millennium era, public service has the following characteristics:

1. The entrepreneur role of the government as the embodiment of its wide roles and responsibilities.
2. Engage with citizens
3. Service provision with generic skill, professionalism, good and well mannered towards the society
4. A Combination of values and *ethos of publicness*

5. Struggle to balance short-term cost-cutting

In this decentralization era, public service management must be colored with 21st century public service values, which is based on the NPS approach and driven by the passion of democratization and put forward the spirit of citizenship. The following are the values that characterize the 21st century public service: democratic, professional, ethical, and humanist. First is the *democratic* value. Here, service servants must be honest and impartial in providing services. In addition to this, there should be enough room for society to participate and deliver their aspirations in order to improve service quality. Next is *professional* value. This signifies that service servants must be competent, work excellently, efficiently, and objectively. Next is the *ethical* value, which means that every service activity must be conducted in a courteous way in order to build trust within society. The last is the *humanist* value. This indicates that service servants must be respectful, fair, and polite in serving the society.

The establishment of public service in regions must adhere to the principles that control the achievement of its objectives. Denhardt and Denhardt (2003: 42-43) suggest that the principals in the *New Public Services* cover some of these aspects:

1. Serve citizens, not consumers. The public interest is the result of a shared dialogue about shared values rather than the aggregation of individual self-interest.
2. Seek the Public Interest. Public administrators must contribute to building a collective, shared notion of the public interest.
3. Value citizenship over entrepreneurship. The public interest is better advanced by public servants and citizens committed to making meaningful contributions to society than by entrepreneurial managers acting as if public money is their own.
4. Think strategically, act democratically. Policies and programs meeting public needs can be most effectively and responsibly achieved through collective efforts and collaborative processes.
5. Recognize that accountability isn't simple: Public servants should be attentive to more than the market; they should also attend to statutory and constitutional law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizen interests.
6. Serve rather than steer. It is increasingly important for public servants to understand and help the society meet their interests.
7. Value people. Public organizations create a room for society to participate in the decision making of public service.

Besides taking *citizenship* values into account,

regional permits management have to be based on service sector to improve service quality. Below are some situations describing a good sector management, in which service provider side (supply) and service recipient side (demand) and decision maker play their roles to improve public service in the sector:

1. Government officials formulate policies, plans, regulations, procedures, and standards based on evidences for sector intervention effectiveness, resources allocations, expenditure patterns, etc.
2. Government officials draw decisions on resources allocations for service based on evidences on service needs and its effectiveness, and its conformity to policies.
3. Policy/regulation maker regularly seeks inputs from technical experts in government organizations, civilians, and public service users as recommendations for related sector regulations, including the roles of society, civilians and private sectors.
4. Service providers regularly review and renew their service based on evidences on service effectiveness, clients' needs, and sector problems.
5. The protocols, standards, and ethical codes, including certification procedures for training centers, public service facility, and service provider, have been developed for all actors involved in the widespread service provision.
6. Monitoring procedures and structures (such as policy institutions that employ competent people) enable service providers, clients, and related stakeholders to get justice when the regulations, protocols, standards, and/or ethical codes are not meet.
7. Funds, supports and monitoring regulations are available to allow/offer incentives for the government, NGOs, and private service providers to improve its public service performance.
8. There are structures and procedures to allow/motivate public service technical experts and local community to review and give inputs on sector priorities, decisions on resources allocations, and service quality while the process of government strategic planning is taking place.
9. Resources allocations and utilizations can be regularly traced down and information on it should be available for public review and related stakeholders.
10. Monitoring system to facilitate reports, investigations, and trials on the mal-allocations and manipulation of resources is prepared.
11. The government and public health organizations regularly hold a forum to dig up inputs/opinions/ideas from stakeholders and related service recipients (high-risk group, special case group, etc) in terms of priorities, services, and resources.
12. Civil organizations (including specific professional organizations connected to the sector, NGOs, and the media) act as observers, while NGOs and private service providers can help the existing public service by providing or funding the service.
13. The actors and stakeholders have regular opportunity to meet with the management of public service organizations to discuss issues in relation to service efficiency and quality.
14. The actors and related stakeholders own financial means/instruments/capacity to support and effectively participate in the formulation of public service policies, plan and budget together with the government officials.
15. Information on public service quality and cost is accessible to public to help them choose where they need to get the service they need.
16. There is a procedure/system to reduce/eliminate/control bias and injustice in service access.
17. There is a structure which enables civilians and private sectors to equally participate in planning and budgeting processes for basic public service programs both in national and regional levels.

2.1. Encouraging multi-actors to play their roles

To encourage these multi-actors (supply, demand) to take part, it is necessary to make planned and systematic efforts so that those actors can involve and play their parts maximally. Viewing from the *supply* side, whether it is in the *SKPD* (Regional Government Instruments) or in the service unit, it is important to promote and push openness and/or increase access on information, participative management, and strengthen accountability. Meanwhile, from the *demand* side, the reinforcement of advocacy capacity of civil organizations and the media has become important in order to let them take part in improving public service.

Below are some things that can be done as an attempt to reach the objectives above, they are:

1. Targeting a reform on Local policy related to sector issues to ensure the fulfillment of the basic rights of citizens, for example: in the health sector, there should be a regulation that prohibits the promotion of formulated milk in the delivery service unit.
2. Improving the capacity of public service providers and its unit in participatory planning and budgeting by referring to the fulfillment of minimum sector service standards. Certainly, participatory planning involves not only SKPD and related technical implementation units, but also the community to listen to their inputs on sector planning.
3. Technical assistance for Information Communication and Education strategy development (KIE).

4. Technical assistance for calculating the gap and a policy to Minimum Service Standards (SPM) and Public Service Standards (PSS) that involve civilians and other public service observers.
5. Establishing and strengthening mechanisms to manage complaints.
6. Developing incentive and disincentive systems.
7. Strengthening partnership among service units/supply with the society and the mass/social media.
8. Increasing the civil rights awareness (including reproduction, consumers, and education rights), so that society can demand a better service.
9. Supporting society's involvement in public service planning and monitoring – in which includes monitoring on service standards fulfillment in public service provision - through multi-stake forum.
10. Advocating policies (policies, resources sufficiency and situation analysis as inputs for policy makers).
11. Revitalizing local institution/ partner in organizing people, monitoring mediation and advocacy.
12. Initiation and advocacy for service notice/appointment.
13. Support on media campaign for a better public service.
14. Establishing or strengthening people's forum.
15. Developing a network with a higher institution (regency/DPRD [Regional House of Representatives], province and national such as Ombudsman and KIP) in solving public service dispute.

2.2 Mapping the type of public service standards in the region

Within the last decade of decentralization, many policies that support regions in improving services to the society have born. One of the attempts the government has done is reformation in determining basic/public service standards. Some of the standards intended here are: (1) Norms, Standards, Procedures, and Criteria (NSPK); (2) Minimal Service Standard (SPM); (3) Public Service Standard (SPP); (4) Standard Operating Procedures (SOP); (5) International Organization for Standardization (ISO). However, this “richness on standards” tends to be regarded as a burden instead of an aid to establish public service in the regions because all of those standards are simultaneously introduced by various government agencies.

The diversity of nature, legal basis, and standards lead to the complexity and heavy workload. The essence of standards and their inter-relations have not been adequately explained in all regions. There are many complaints from actors in the regions because the overall

standards cause confusion and exceed regions' capacity to apply them. This situation is unfortunate, because all kinds of standards, if well known and applied by nature, can actually improve access to public services and become the measures for the quality and satisfaction level of service users. Taking into account the objective which is improving the quality of public services in the regions, support is required to enhance the capacity of local actors to maximize the richness of standards that have been made or required on the regions.

In relation to the difference on types of standard, the superiority of each type of standard, and correlation among them, it is highly important to gain comprehensive understanding on the regions. A good understanding will help actors to reach decisions with clear mind on how to apply a set of standards in order to achieve maximum results according to the region's needs, capacity, and other factors. Local actors are given space to different application depends on the types of standard. The development or application of some of the *SPP*, *SOP* and standards related to ISO accreditation depends on the institution/implementation unit without any obligation from the government. Standard achievement/application entirely relies upon the capacity of local actors and the type of standard applied. There are standards that require high capacity (some *SPMs* as examples), and there are those that are easier to apply (for instance, many kinds of *SOP* which are thoroughly developed internally). The capacity mentioned here is including financial aspect. *SPM* has big implications on funding because it focuses on service access, quality, and management.

Success on standards application is extremely influenced by a clear support from the regulations. Nevertheless, there are still a lot of types of standards to clarify. For example, in UU 25/2009, society has the rights to file a complaint to Ombudsman. It is yet unclear whether regional Ombudsman can also handle complaints from regional government service unit or only the Ombudsman formed by central government which is allowed to do so. Moreover, it is not clear whether the society that is unhappy with *SPM* achievement may use the Ombudsman line (whether regional or central) to denounce its complaints. There are still other questions that are waiting for clarifications besides the ones mentioned above. In this respect, attempts to clarify should be done by national agents that sponsor all types of standards.

2.3 Simplifying public service management in the regions

The quality of public services in the regions should be continuously improved. Despite the fact that there are issues related to the capacity of local agencies, legislative umbrella, and standard ambiguities from various ministries that are still faced, quality improvement cannot be ignored. The community continues to move

dynamically. The expectation of the satisfaction level of the service received is also dynamic over time, thus the local government must move as quickly as possible to realize the best service for its people. Reform of the service system in the regions can be done with the following strategies:

- (1) *Strengthening the institution by increasing its authority.* To realize services effectively, local institutions in charge of public service must establish “tangible integrated services” in which service recipients do not have to go to other institutions to complete the related service needed.
- (2) *Improving service quality.* First, standard operating procedures (SOPs) and service standards (SPs) for each type of service should be developed and established so that national service standards (time, cost and requirements for licensing arrangements) are met. SOPs should also separate front office and back office services to ensure clear separation of powers and develop checks and balances. Secondly, if the service provider does not have a complete technical capacity, then representatives from other agencies are selected to assist as members of the “technical team”. Therefore, the overall process can still be done without reducing the quality of service. Third, capacity building for staff and technical team members.
- (3) *Improving service management.* The activities included here are: (i) providing clear and transparent information about the time, cost, terms and procedures for taking care of any type of service; (ii) establishing complaints management mechanisms to ensure that dissatisfied people can easily address their concerns for immediate action; and (iii) conducting periodical community satisfaction surveys to provide a basis for improving overall service quality.
- (4) *Integrating Services.* Integration of services will help the community to take care all types of services needed in one place.
- (5) *Cooperating with non-government organizations (NGOs) and private sectors in implementing the four strategies above.* The process of improving service delivery will be more effective if NGOs, and especially private sectors, are involved in the process. Therefore, NGOs and private sectors collaborate intensively in identifying problems and formulating alternatives of solutions.

3. Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, some conclusions can be drawn as follows:

1. The establishment of Public service by the government in the regions today must put forward entrepreneurship principals, engage with the society, be professionally established and well mannered in

attending the people, combine ethos and values, and apply *survive* strategy to save the costs.

2. Public service must be managed by involving multi- actors, encouraging private sectors and society to be actively involved and collaborate in the establishment of public service to get a more optimal result.
3. The tactical steps in simplifying public service management in the regions are understanding every type of service standard set by the legislations, mapping all the available standards, and simplifying public service management through the following strategies: improving the capacity of service provision institutions, improving the quality of civil servants, integrating services, and improving the service management dynamically and continuously.

References

- Avila, R., H. Feigenblatt, R. Heacock and N. Heller (2011). *Global Mapping of Technology for Transparency and Accountability*. Mimeo. London: Transparency and Accountability Initiative.
- Bourgon, Jocelyne. (2007). Responsive, Responsible, and Respected Government: Towards a New Public Administration Theory. *International Review of Administrative Science*. Vol 73(1):7- 26.
- Chun, Soon Ae, Luis F. Luna-Reyes, Rodrigo Sandoval-Almazan, (2012). *Collaborative e-government, Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*.
- Cooke, G., dan Muir R., (2012). *The Relational State*. London: IPPR.
- Denhardt, Janet, V., dan R. B. Denhardt, (2011). *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*. 3rd Edition. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- _____, (2003). *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*. Armonk, N. Y: M. E. Sharpe.
- _____, (2000). The New Public Service: Serving Rather Than Steering. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 60, No. 6, pp. 549-559.
- Dunleavy, P., H. Margetts, S. Bastow dan J. Tinkler, (2006). New Public Management Is Dead— Long Live Digital-Era Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 467-494.
- Foley, Paul, dan Steve Martin, (2000). *A new deal for the community? Public participation in regeneration and local service delivery*, The Policy Press.
- Heeks, R., dan S. Bailur, (2007). Analyzing E-government Research: Perspectives, Philosophies, Theories, Methods, and Practice. *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 243–265.
- Linders, Dennis, (2012). *From e-government to we-government: Defining a typology for citizen coproduction in the age of social media*. Brussel: Government Information Quarterly.

- Millard, J., dan M. Wimmer, (2012). *Analysis of current FP7 projects and future research challenges*.
- Nedham, Chaterine, dan Chaterine Mangan, (2007). *A declining Public Service Ethos. In: Dibben P, Wood G, Roper I, James P, editors. Modernising Work in Public Services: Redefining Roles and Relationships in Britain's Changing Workplace*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- OECD, (2011). Together for better public services – partnering with citizens and civil society, OECD Public Governance Reviews.
- Osborne, S. P., Z. Radnor, dan G. Nasi (2013). A New Theory for Public Service Management? Towards a (Public) Service-Dominant Approach. *The American Review of Public Administration*, vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 135-158.
- UNDP, (2001). *Transparancy and Accountability*.