Jurnal Ombudsman Daerah

pelayanan berkualitas hak warga negara

ISSN 2085-224X

Edisi: 8 /Tahun V/ Juli - Desember 2010

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICE THROUGH
THE DISTRICT OMBUDSMAN OF YOGYAKARTA
PARTICIPATION**

Didik Rinan Sumekto

**MENYOAL SENTRALISASI PENGAWASAN
PELAYANAN PUBLIK**

Bagus Sarwono

**MEWUJUDKAN PEMERINTAHAN YANG BERSIH
DENGAN OMBUDSMAN**

Moh. Hasyim

**PENUNDAAN BERLARUT
DALAM PENERBITAN SERTIFIKAT TANAH**

TUKAR GULING PROYEK IRIGASI

**LAPORAN PELAKSANAAN TUGAS TRIWULAN IV
TAHUN 2010 LEMBAGA OMBUDSMAN DAERAH
PROVINSI DIY**

(1 Oktober – 31 Desember 2010)

Lembaga Ombudsman Daerah
Propinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta

Daftar Isi

Edisi: 8 / Tahun V/ Juli - Desember 2010

Fokus I

Strengthening Public Service Through
The District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta Participation

Didik Rinan Sumekto..... 01

Fokus II

Menyoal Sentralisasi Pengawasan Pelayanan Publik

Bagus Sarwono..... 20

Fokus III

Mewujudkan Pemerintahan Yang Bersih
Dengan Ombudsman

Moh. Hasyim..... 25

Laporan I

Penundaan Berlarut Dalam Penerbitan Sertifikat Tanah..... 33

Laporan II

Tukar Guling Proyek Irigasi..... 38

Pernak-pernik

Laporan Pelaksanaan Tugas Triwulan IV Tahun 2010

Lembaga Ombudsman Daerah Provinsi DIY

(1 Oktober – 31 Desember 2010)..... 44

Fokus I

Strengthening Public Service Through The District Ombudsman Of Yogyakarta Participation

Didik Rinan Sumekto¹

Abstrak

Kajian dalam tulisan ini mengedepankan bagaimana tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik (good government governance) dijalankan dan peran dari Lembaga Ombudsman daerah melakukan pengawasan terhadap kinerja pemerintah daerah. Masalah utama dalam tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik memiliki delapan karakteristik, yaitu: (1) partisipasi; (2) aturan hukum; (3) transparansi; (4) responsif; (5) orientasi terhadap konsensus; (6) kesetaraan dan inklusif; (7) efektifitas dan efisiensi; dan (8) akuntabilitas.

Secara umum Lembaga Ombudsman Daerah Propinsi (LOD) DIY memiliki empat tugas utama, yaitu: (1) mengedukasi masyarakat terhadap posisi, tugas pokok dan kewenangan; (2) melakukan kerjasama dengan organisasi non pemerintah (LSM) dan institusi terkait lainnya dalam mendukung pelaksanaan tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik di wilayah Propinsi DIY, seperti: Kabupaten Sleman, Kulonprogo, Gunungkidul, Bantul, dan kota Yogyakarta dengan memberikan penekanan hukum terkait

¹ Anggota LOD DIY & Dosen Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Widya Dharma Klaten; e-mail: didi.rinan@lod-diy.or.id, didikrinan@unwidha.ac.id

dengan korupsi, penyalahgunaan wewenang, dan kegiatan-kegiatan di luar kewenangan lainnya; (3) merespon laporan dari masyarakat terkait dengan pelayanan publik yang tidak memuaskan, seperti: ketidakadilan, diskriminasi, dan melawan hukum; dan (4) menindaklanjuti laporan-laporan masyarakat terkait dengan penyimpangan dalam pelayanan publik yang ada di wilayah pemerintahan DIY dengan memberikan rekomendasi, pendapat hukum, dan kesimpulan.

Pembahasan dalam kajian ini mengenai kasus-kasus pendidikan yang pernah dilaporkan oleh masyarakat di tahun 2009 sampai dengan 2010. Laporan yang berkenaan dengan Pendidikan menempati urutan tertinggi dari total laporan terkait dengan pelayanan publik lainnya, yaitu pada tahun 2009, laporan yang masuk di LOD DIY berjumlah 29 atau 20,86% dan tahun 2010 berjumlah 24 atau 18,60%.

Kata Kunci: *Pelayanan publik, Good governance, Ombudsman, Pendidikan.*

Introduction

Generally, there are still few governments have attempted to push the idea of performance reporting even further. The concrete result that is aimed for is a government wide performance plan that identifies specific measures of societal well-being that are regarded as important, and assesses the effectiveness of government as a whole in improving those measures. Public sector orientation plays an important role in public sector performance. If the public service is oriented toward serving its citizens, bureaucratic red tape and corruption will be minimal and the judiciary will further enforce accountability through timely and fair decisions in the administration of justice (World Bank, 2005). The quality of a good government governance is thus determined by the impact of this exercise of power on the quality of life enjoyed by its citizens. There is growing awareness in the development community that a comprehensive look at the enabling environment of institutions,

therefore, interests and policies are needed in determining the net impact of the state on the well-being of its citizens (World Bank, 1994; Picciotto, 1995; Hansen, 1996; Huther, Roberts, and Shah, 1997; Shah, 1998b; World Bank, 2005). The orientation of governments toward the provision of public goods and services is assessed through three indexes, namely: judicial efficiency, bureaucratic efficiency, and lack of corruption (World Bank, 2005). Therefore, the *public policy* refers to those public issues defined as problems and the courses of action (or inaction) that arise to address these problems (Davies, Nutley, and Smith, 2009).

Since twenty-first-century governance requires effective local government, and the foundation of local government is empowered citizenship. The empowered the citizenship involves face-to-face relationships in which the duties of living together are to the democratic political community or polity and are broader than voting or attending meetings. It depends on the use of executive power by administrators who act 'as' citizens and 'with' citizens whom they regard as equals in governance processes (Stivers, 2001). An active citizenship also rests on the foundation of facilitative governance. Facilitative governance includes normative public administration, such as political neutrality, the management of collaborative networks, and 'a robust facilitation of the public good' (Newland, 2003).

At the most fundamental level, citizenship must mean something for citizens. To make citizenship meaningful, citizens must be actively involved in governance aspects. The connection between meaningful citizenship and active governance stems from the idea of community as a polity organized to handle the public matters of collective life. A democracy emphasizes the decision-making authority of citizens. The purpose of a political system is to 'allocate values authoritatively' (Easton, 1965; Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Kaku, 2009). The authority to allocate values requires a political system to have legitimacy. Political legitimacy rests on the system's legality and on the perceptions of citizens who

believe in that system. Both forms of legitimacy are rooted in the concept of a constitution. A constitution delineates the structure of a polity based on shared political values that both citizens and office holders respect. This respect requires an ethical system of governance to guide the interaction of citizens with key critical office holders, such as legislators, executives, and public administrators (Cooper, 1998; Stivers 1994; Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Kaku, 2009).

Although spaces for citizen participation have expanded in the country and mechanisms for continuous revision, such as monitoring and evaluation systems, have been gaining support, Indonesian government, so far has still few mechanisms for redressing unequal provision of entitlements. This lack of legal and effective means for citizens to claim their rights is one of the greatest challenges to establishing an accountable government. The state's responsibility in the matter is diluted into so many levels of institutional power that it is hard to define the responsible institution that should respond to claims of education rights violations or negligence. For instance, there is no record of sanctions applied to educational authorities who failed to guarantee minimums of coverage and quality. Without coherent supportive executives establishing in detail the division of responsibilities for social services provision, citizens are unable to seek accountability from the appropriate institution when they think their rights are not being respected. Moreover, this executive gap also prevents the different stakeholders, e.g.: public, private, and civil and community institutions from being aware of and prepared to deal with their own responsibilities.

Thus, continuous revision, which can be enabled by monitoring and evaluation systems, is also important for strengthening good government governance and improving public service delivery. It has the potential to increase transparency, strengthen accountability relationships, and build a performance culture within governments that contributes to better policy making. Apart from its help with the design of new social policies, a

monitoring system based on the guarantees can be used to evaluate and strengthen existing programs and regulations in social, education, legal, and political domains (World Bank, 2009).

Good Government Governance Position

There are rival perspectives on the knowability of the public interest and on the state's governance capacity (i.e.: the state's capacity to acquire adequate and reliable knowledge of the 'adverse' consequences of the private sphere's actions in a timely enough manner to be able to 'correct' them—to resolve the conflicting public and private sphere claims—while maintaining an 'acceptable' balance between individual autonomy and societal control). What, then, is in the public interest and how it is promoted and protected is a matter of societal governance. This essentially involves the polity balancing the interests of the state, and voluntary communities of interest (civil society), thereby settling on the set of priority citizenship attributes that sanction its particular collection of concomitant citizenship rights and obligations (Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Kaku, 2009). Figure 1. below concerns with the characteristics of good government governance services.

Strong; Figure 1. Charateristics of Good Government Governance (Unescap, 2001)

1. Participation

Participation by both men and women is a key cornerstone of good government governance. Participation could be either direct or through legitimate intermediate institutions or representatives. The representative democracy does not necessarily mean that the concerns of the most vulnerable in society would be taken into consideration in decision making. Participation needs to be well-informed and well-organized. This means that the freedom of association and expression on the one hand and an organized civil society on the vice a versa.

2. Rule of Law

Good government governance requires fair legal frameworks that are enforced impartially. It also requires full protection of human rights, particularly those of minorities. The impartial enforcement of laws requires an independent judiciary and an impartial and incorruptible police and any other related task forces.

3. Transparency

Transparency means that decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions, enforcement, and enough information as well that is provided in easily understandable forms and media.

4. Responsiveness

Good government governance requires that institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe determined responsibly.

5. Consensus oriented

Good government governance requires mediation of the different interests in society to reach a broad consensus in society on what is in the best interest of the community level and how this can be achieved. Consensus oriented also requires a broad

and long-term perspective on what is needed for sustainable human development and how to achieve the goals of such development. This condition can only result from an understanding of the historical, cultural and social contexts of a given society or community.

6. Equity and Inclusiveness

A society's well being depends on ensuring that all its members feel that they have a stake in it and do not feel excluded from the mainstream of society. This position requires all group levels, but particularly the most vulnerable, have opportunities to improve or maintain their well being.

7. Effectiveness and Efficiency

A Good government governance means that processes and institutions produce results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources at their disposal. The concept of efficiency in the context of good governance also covers the sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment.

8. Accountability

The word *accountability* is most often used in relation to governance processes as it refers to political accountability to citizens. The local-level representatives are meant to be more accountable to their constituents. The theory assumes that local constituents have the ability to call such representatives to account for their actions and for their performance, and to discipline or reward representatives accordingly. This is only possible where political representation is highly localized, however, and citizens have information about government performance and voice and exit channels that can effectively be used to ensure the accountability of their representatives. This is not the case in many governments, where citizens typically lack information about performance and the mechanisms necessary for voicing a response. Governments commonly internalize

information and elevate the knowledge of technical, managerial, and political elites over the local "time-place" knowledge of grassroots actors and constituents. Such transparency-reducing approaches (and the devices associated with them) underscore an official and unofficial limit on citizen information access—information is not provided to social groups because their input is not valued or required in the governance process—and legitimizes the exclusion of citizens (especially poor citizens) from decision making. It reinforces an inward, managerial model of governance and prohibits local-level accountability (World Bank, 2005). Accountability means a key requirement of good government governance which also covers the private sectors and civil society organizations that must be accountable to the public and to their institutional stakeholders. Who is accountable to whom varies depending on whether decisions or actions taken are internal or external to an organization or institution. In general, an organization or an institution is accountable to those who will be affected by its decisions or actions. It cannot be enforced without transparency and the rule of law (UNESCAP, 2001).

Because the performance measurement in government is related to accountability, it is important to provide a democratic means to monitor and control government conduct, for preventing the development of concentrations of power, and to enhance the learning capacity and effectiveness of public administration (Aucoin and Heintzman, 2000). Bovens (2006) divided the accountability assessments into two groups: the internal or procedure assessment affording a framework for a normative analysis of accountability procedures; the external assessment from democratic perspective (meeting the needs of relevant stakeholders), constitutional perspective (prevention of corruption and abuse of power) and cybernetic perspective (enhancing the learning capacity). Meanwhile, Chai (2009) emphasizes that the existing performance evaluation involves only the internal assessment

stressing on regularity compliance and managerial performance, but pays little attention to democratic perspective and citizen satisfaction.

District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta

The District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta, familiarly called *Lembaga Ombudsman Daerah/LOD DIY* initially was created through a partnership between two main organizations initiation. The first is Partnership Institution and the second one is Centre for Basic Human Rights at the Indonesian Islamic University "*Pusham UII*". As a result of Partnership Institution and *Pusham UII* working together with the Yogyakarta Government, the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta then received the support from the Governor of Yogyakarta, and was formalized by the Decree of Governor, number 134/2004 and now established by the Governor Regulation, number 21/2008. This is the current legal basis for the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta.

Specifically, the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta has four main tasks. First, to educate the community on the position, main tasks, function and authority of the District Ombudsman. This has occurred through the dissemination of publications, media awareness, and running workshops or seminars to educate government officials and wider community as well. Second, the District Ombudsman must work together with non-government organisations and other institutions in supporting the implementation of local government, namely: Sleman, Bantul, Gunungkidul, and Kulonprogo district and Yogyakarta city and law enforcement that is free from corruption, abuse of power, and unauthorized activities. Third, the District Ombudsman must respond to complaints, reports or information from the community, or to action by officials, local governments, and law enforcers which is felt to be unfair, discriminatory, or against the law. Finally, the District Ombudsman must follow up on complaints or reports from the community concerning maladministration in local government

governance or law enforcement. The complaint must relate to matters such as fraud, misuse of authority, discrimination, corruption, institutional incompetence, unreasonable delay of service, and so forth. In carrying out the above functions, the District Ombudsman only has jurisdiction throughout Yogyakarta Province and is restricted to local government services.

The District Ombudsman's mandate includes coordinating and working together with local authorities to support good government governance and prevent the misuse of power. It has actively engaged with local authorities ranging from professional bodies to the media, to community organisation and non-government organisations (NGOs), independent institutions and the Private Ombudsman as stated on the article 7; Governor Regulation, number 21/2008 as well. This has significantly enhanced its effectiveness. In spite of its existence and role, the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta has fostered a constructive relationship with the local media for three reasons. First, it has maximised the District Ombudsman's efforts at socialization and informing government officials and the wider community about the District Ombudsman existence and role. It has begun the process of educating people about what the Ombudsman is and complies with. This function has been very important due to the fact that *ombudsman* is largely used as a foreign word before its implementation in Indonesia. Second, local media coverage has provided momentum to investigations, placing pressure on government bodies to respond where it is necessary. Finally, the media has attributed respect and credibility to the District Ombudsman by positively covering the progress of investigations. This has helped to promote a sense of trust and confidence in the Ombudsman's roles within the community at larger domain (Crouch, 2007).

Ombudsman's Jurisdiction, Role and Responsibility

The Ombudsman institution or District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta has an important role in educating the public about its

own role (what falls within its mandate and, importantly, what does not) but it should also be pro-active, ensuring that minority rights standards and multiethnic cooperation are promoted. This has the twin advantage that minorities will be protected and that the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta is less likely to be called upon to respond to problems. Models of good practice can be a useful learning tool and the District Ombudsman should ensure that where the office has achieved some success these are well known to potential future clients. This is not being immodest, rather it is a way of building up confidence that members of minorities may usefully refer issues to the District Ombudsman in the hope of achieving a successful outcome. Similarly it is very important that potential beneficiaries throughout the state know of or may be able to find out about the work of the District Ombudsman, which issues are within the office's competences, how to make contact with the District Ombudsman, and what service to expect and, importantly, which issues are outside their competences. In a number of countries an Ombudsman institution plays a facilitating role, bringing together civil society and government to enter into discussion on areas of mutual concern in a neutral and trusted environment. These may be through conferences, seminars, workshops or on occasion private discrete discussions on sometimes controversial policy issues that need resolution. This may also involve joint training sessions or separate training programmes (Lloyd, 2005).

Lloyd (2005) points out again that in order to be effective, an Ombudsman institution must be, and be perceived by the public it serves to be, honest and reliable; in order to hold the government, civil service and other public bodies to account, it must be independent of those bodies. However, to be able to effectively resolve disputes relating to minorities, it must also be perceived by both the government, civil service and other public bodies, on the one hand, and the wider public on the other, of not being beholden to any special interests.

The acts of the *Ombudsman* institution as an independent and impartial third party to examine and, where appropriate, to investigate complaints. The District Ombudsman decides which complaints to investigate, how to investigate them and what recommendations to make to the authorities against which the complaints have been made. Most Ombudsman institutions try to find resolutions to problems and ways to restore rights rather than conduct the full investigation process described below. That process takes time and resources that could better be devoted to solving problems. There are occasions, however, when solutions may not be possible or may not be possible without a full investigation that determines what actually took place and has recommendations based on fact-finding. In serious, difficult and complex cases, the investigative process described below will help determine what happened and what to recommend.

This type of full investigation process should be considered and used only when necessary, particularly in offices that do not have sufficient resources. In handling and investigating complaints, most offices use some form of these steps: (1) *receiving and focussing the complaint*. It is about communicating with the complainant(s) to determine what is being alleged and which person or authority is the subject of the complaint; (2) *determining whether the Ombudsman institution has authority or power or jurisdiction to investigate*. Examining the Ombudsman institution's legal basis to determine whether the complaint is within the Ombudsman's authority to consider and investigate; (3) *deciding whether to investigate*—after a preliminary examination of the complaint, determining whether it can be resolved without an investigation and if not whether it will be investigated; (4) *investigating through fact-finding*. Using the Ombudsman institution's powers to interview persons with information about the events that are the subject of the complaint, and obtaining records about the events to determine the facts surrounding the complaint; (5) *testing the facts*. Examining the facts to resolve conflicts and determine which are most important to

making a finding on the complaint; (6) *analyzing the facts*. Finding laws or other legal instruments that govern the facts and then analyzing the facts in light of the laws; (7) *consulting with the subject of the investigation in an attempt to settle the complaint*. Interviewing the subject to determine whether it is possible to settle the complaint or to restore rights that have been violated. Resolving complaints where and when possible; (8) *preliminary report to the authority/institution*. Writing a report that summarizes the investigation—the facts found, the law that governs them, analysis of the facts in light of the law, the Ombudsman institution's finding on the complaint and recommendations. A preliminary report is sent to any person or authority that is being criticized for any comments or responses; (9) *final report with findings and recommendations*. Any responses are included or summarized, any changes made as a result of the responses are indicated and the findings and recommendations are made final. Confidential material is removed before the report is issued to anyone not entitled to read the confidential material; and (10) *keeping the complainant appropriately informed*. The complainant is appropriately informed of the investigation's progress throughout the process (UNDP, 2006).

Another perspective on Ombudsman functions are pointed out by McMillan (2004: 1-9) that there are admittedly distinct limitations on the role, meaning that the Ombudsman can only ever complement and not supplant the judicial role. As is well-known, the Ombudsman cannot make a declaration of invalidity, and must rely on recommendation, persuasion and publicity to effect change. Nor can the Ombudsman injunct an agency, command action, or award compensation for defective administration. Turning more specifically to the Ombudsman's role in ensuring legal compliance, it is undoubtedly that complaints to the Ombudsman are more about matters of administrative style and fact-finding than about legal errors.

Nevertheless, the law is never far from the sphere of investigation. A common cause of the complaints that people have

against government is that legislative schemes of entitlement and regulation are nowadays detailed, complex, specific and sometimes rigid and harsh. The rule of law is as much concerned with explaining to a person why an adverse decision was made and is unimpeachable as it is with examining whether a decision was legally proper. Ombudsman institution is often well-placed to resolve legal issues affecting a large number of people, in circumstances where cost, complexity or lack of information inhibit the commencement of legal proceedings. A different facet of the legal compliance role the Ombudsman institution can play is in drawing attention to gaps and anomalies in the legal framework. The traditional and still the core function of Ombudsman is to investigate, on complaint or of the Ombudsman's own motion, whether there has been defective administrative action.

Over the years a number of other functions have been conferred on the office that are significant from a rule of law perspective. The thrust of both legislative schemes is to ensure transparency and accountability in government: whistleblower protection does so by providing legal protection to a person who discloses information about unlawful or improper official action; and freedom of information does so by providing a right of public access to government documents. A perpetual challenge for all administrative law bodies is to adapt their function to cope with changes in the structure of government and the delivery of public services. The statutory jurisdiction of administrative law bodies was mostly devised in an earlier age when there was a sharper distinction between the public and private sectors. The jurisdictional concepts embodied in legislation have not kept pace with changes in government, and in varying degrees constrain administrative law review bodies from reviewing administrative conduct that was formerly within jurisdiction.

The *Ombudsman* institution model is that everyone receives the same service and has the same, equal access to the office. The process of receiving complaints is the same for everyone. The model

emphasizing equal service in the form of equal treatment, however, sometimes disadvantages some people. An equal treatment model of service treats everyone the same. A service equity model treats people differently according to their diversity, needs and circumstances to achieve equitable service for everyone. The Ombudsman must provide timely, relevant and fair service. In addition to providing high quality service, a service equity model recognizes the public's diversity and honours fairness and relevance. Designing appropriate models of service delivery that consider changing demographics requires flexibility and creative adjustments to traditional administrative procedures. The Ombudsman can and must provide equitable and efficient services.

Fundamental to achieving service equity is the commitment to equal consideration and respect for all complainants in providing services. Equal consideration and respect do not necessarily mean identical treatment, since respecting the differences between people and groups of people (including different circumstances, needs and wants) often require different treatment. Equal respect for all complainants means both being sensitive to the possible implications of the complainant's apparent or stated social location, and not stereotyping or being inflexible based on that awareness. It is based on factors including: gender, religion, ability, sexual identity, race, age, colour, marital status, physical appearance, family status, ethnicity, class, culture, geographic location, citizenship, criminal record, residency status, education, occupation, language, aboriginal status, political, trade union and community group affiliations.

The equitable service must take into account the social location of the Ombudsman and staff, and the impact that may have on others. They must therefore foster critical self-awareness, because their social location, lived experience, and the degree to which they are knowledgeable about issues of importance to complainants, affect the *Ombudsman* institution's ability to provide services effectively and equitably. These standards relate directly to an

Ombudsman's mandate, vision, mission and to all the office's work. They focus on internal practice and external service delivery (UNDP, 2006).

Empirically Educational Findings

During the span of two years, District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta had received 29 cases or 20,86% in 2009 and 24 cases or 18,60% in 2010 from the total cases in various fields of public services. These educational cases posted the highest rank of reported cases done by the community members living around the Yogyakarta province. From the total reports in 2009 above, they might be classified into several detailed items.

Report finishing on cases-based involved seven items; legal opinion involved seven items; legal opinion and recommendation involved three items; conclusion on cases-based involved three items; and recommendation involved nine items as well. All educational cases reported to the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta had been completely conducted 100%. Meanwhile, the category of cases reported might be quantitatively viewed through the table 1 below:

Table 1. Cases Reported during the year of 2009

Category	Case sum
1. Tuition fee	8
2. Students pragnancy	1
3. Financial assisstance	7
4. Cost transparency	7
5. Incompetence service	4
6. National examination fraud	1
7. Age fraud	1
Total report	29

Then, from the total reports in 2010 above, they might be classified into several detailed items. Legal opinion-based involved seven items; legal opinion and recommendation involved nine items; conclusion on cases-based involved two items; and recommendation involved six items as well. All educational cases reported to the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta had been completely conducted 100%. Meanwhile, the category of cases reported might be quantitatively viewed through the table 2 below:

Table 2. Cases Reported during the year of 2010

Category	Case sum
1. Tuition fee	5
2. Academic fraud	1
3. Financial assistance	5
4. Cost transparency	3
5. Incompetence service	3
6. Abuse of power	3
7. Teacher certification	2
8. Students quota	1
9. Others	1
Total report	24

For all cases that had been academically and juristically examined, the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta then mutually decided the next steps to do concerning with the suitable cases resolution. Particularly, for instance, in providing one recommendation letter for one case, the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta would shortly supervise its recommendation to ensure whether it was applicable or on going process or not yet done by monitoring continuously. The recommendation execution done by the government institutions sometimes took one till seven months, depending on the complex and substantial cases faced. Once, the government institution intentionally and/ or honestly neglected to

the recommendation, then the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta would reschedule the second monitoring scheme by visiting and/or inviting the government institution to discuss some matters concerning with the recommendation issues. The District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta certainly kept bridging up and accommodating to its recommendation in order to implement completely by the related parties.

Conclusion

There was a fact that a good public service quality should be certainly supported through the multiple aspects, namely: a proper budget, facility, regulation, human resources, etc. Recently, being a classical reason that government nearly grumbled in touching with the public service increase problems above. When the reformation era firstly revealed in 1998, obviously the central and local government must truly attempt in running some reformation agenda at the multiple sectors. One of them is concerning with the public service quality increase. Increasing internally at the government multiple sectors were currently very popular—what mostly people recognized it as bureaucracy reformation. At least, there were eight characteristics of being good government governance model in the near future, namely: (1) participation; (2) rule of law; (3) transparency; (4) responsiveness; (5) consensus oriented; (6) equity and inclusiveness; (7) effectiveness and efficiency; and (8) accountability. Due to a good government governance issue at the educational sector, some regulations and agenda tried to meet the trends in its reformation agenda initiating from the minimum service standard to the excellent service standard, even the parameters of the later were applicable in different ways among the public service providers.

Thus, as one of the independent observer on public services, the District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta consistently played its participation in all over domains. One sector that nowadays has attracted many community members in Yogyakarta province relates

to educational issues, in which during the span of two years has posted the highest rank. The District Ombudsman of Yogyakarta had officially received 29 complaints or 20,86% in 2009 and 24 complaints or 18,60% in 2010. Relating to these educational issues, it is very important that the government of Yogyakarta province in the near future shall put these issues into an urgent priority as a part of reformation bureaucracy agenda.

References

- Aucoin, P., & Heintzman, R. (2000). The Dialectics of Accountability for Performance in Public Management Reform. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 66, 45-55.
- Bovens, M. (2006). Analysing and Assessing Public Accountability—A Conceptual Framework. European Governance Paper (EUROGOV), No. C-06-01. Downloaded on 7th August 2011, from <http://www.connex-network.org/eurogov/pdf/egp-connex-C-06-01.pdf>.
- Chai, N. (2009). *Sustainability Performance Evaluation System in Government: A Balanced Scorecard Approach towards Sustainable Development*. Beijing: Springer Science & Business Media B.V.
- Crouch, M.A. (2007). The Yogyakarta Local Ombudsman: Promoting Good Governance through Local Support. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, Vol. 2, 232-243.
- Davies, H.T.O., Nutley, S.M., & Smith, P.C. (2009). *What Works? Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Public Services*. Southampton: Hobbs the Printers Ltd.
- Kakabadse, A, Kakabadse, N & Kaku, K.N. (2009). *Citizenship: A Reality Far From Ideal*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lenonard, P. (2003). *Promoting Welfare? Government Reformation Policy and Social Citizenship*. United Kingdom: The Policy Press.

M. (2006). *Ombudsman Institutions and Minority Issues: A Guide to Good Practice*. Flensburg: The European Centre for Minority Issues.

McMillan, J. (5-6 November 2004). *The Ombudsman and the Rule of Law*. Downloaded on August 6th, 2011, from <http://www.ombudsman.gov.au/pages/publications-and-media/speeches-and-presentations/>

Newland, C.A. (2003). The Facilitative State, Political-Executive Aggrandizement, and Public Services Challenges. *Administration & Society* No.34, Vol. 4, 379-407.

Stivers, C. (2001). Citizenship Ethics in Public Administration. In T. L. Cooper (Ed.), *the Handbook of Administrative Ethics*. New York: Marcel Dekker, pp. 583-602.

UNDP. (2006). *Guide for Ombudsman Institutions: How To Handle Complaints*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme.

_____. *Guide for Ombudsman Institutions: How To Handle Investigations*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme.

UNESCAP. (2011). What is Good Governance. Downloaded on August 4th, 2011, from <http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp>.

World Bank. (2009). *Building Equality and Opportunity through Social Guarantees: New Approaches to Public Policy and the Realization of Rights*. Washington DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

_____. (2009). *Public Services Delivery: Public Sector Governance and Accountability Series*. Washington DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.