

THE ROLE OF SYSTEMATIC CONTROL AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PUBLIC POLICY: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Sunnah

Doctoral Student Faculty of Law Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta
naibanjarutama05@gmail.com

Gunawan Widjaja

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Law Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta 1945 Jakarta

Abstract

This study aims to analyse the role of systematic control and evaluation systems in improving the effectiveness of public policy through a *literature review* method. Control systems are seen as mechanisms that ensure policy implementation is in line with plans, prevent deviations, and maintain accountability. Meanwhile, systematic evaluation plays a role in providing data-based assessments of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of policies, while also providing constructive feedback for future policy improvements. The study findings indicate that the integration of these two mechanisms creates a continuous learning cycle that strengthens the policy formulation and implementation processes. Thus, the consistent, adaptive, and evidence-based application of control and evaluation systems is key to achieving effective, transparent, and accountable public policy governance.

Keywords: public policy, control system, systematic evaluation, policy effectiveness, governance.

Introduction

Public policy is a strategic tool used by the government to achieve development goals and meet the needs of society. In practice, public policy covers various sectors such as the economy, education, health, the environment, and security, all of which are designed to provide optimal benefits for citizens (Mavrot, 2025) . However, the effectiveness of a policy is not only determined by the quality of its formulation, but also by the process of implementation, control, and evaluation. Without structured control mechanisms and systematic evaluation, policies are likely to fail or produce outcomes that do not align with their original objectives. Therefore, it is crucial to thoroughly examine how control and evaluation systems can contribute to the success of public policies (Dwyer & Pullin, 2024) .

Control systems in public policy serve as monitoring and corrective mechanisms to ensure that policy implementation remains on track with established objectives. These controls may include administrative oversight, budgetary control, and performance reporting and audit mechanisms. In many countries, the existence of an effective control system can minimise budget leaks, ensure efficient use of resources,

and accelerate the achievement of policy targets (McConnell, 2023). Unfortunately, not all public policies are equipped with adequate control systems, resulting in consequences such as inefficiency, budget waste, or programme failure.

Meanwhile, systematic evaluation is an important step in measuring the extent to which a policy has achieved its objectives and expected impacts. This evaluation is not only carried out at the end of the programme, but can also be conducted periodically during the process. A data-driven and evidence-based evaluation approach enables policymakers to gain a realistic understanding of the effectiveness of the programs being implemented, identify implementation challenges, and formulate more targeted recommendations for improvement. Without systematic evaluation, the risk of ineffective policies increases because decisions are made without a valid information base (Bennett, 2024).

Indonesia, as a country pursuing development in various fields, faces specific challenges in ensuring the effectiveness of public policies. Differences in the capacity of local governments, limited resources, and the complexity of socio-economic issues often result in policy implementation processes not proceeding as intended. In this context, a robust control system and appropriate policy evaluation serve as strategic solutions to ensure that every policy delivers optimal results for the community. This makes research on the role of these two aspects highly relevant, both from an academic and practical perspective (Mayne, 2020).

Various studies have shown that successful public policies are almost always supported by adaptive control systems and continuous evaluation. For example, policies to improve the quality of education in several developed countries have shown significant results when the government consistently monitors teacher performance, evaluates the curriculum, and provides retraining as needed. Conversely, similar policies without strict controls often stagnate, fail to reduce educational quality gaps, and fail to improve student competencies (Langer et al., 2022).

In the context of public policy, a control system encompasses a series of procedures and instruments designed to minimise deviations from plans and facilitate the achievement of targets. These instruments can take the form of administrative procedures, legal norms, sanction mechanisms, or the use of information technology for real-time monitoring (Bovens et al., 2021). When implemented effectively, this system enhances transparency, accountability, and the effectiveness of programs. On the other hand, systematic evaluation enables objective feedback, which is crucial for decision-makers to adjust policies based on actual data and field outcomes (Parkhurst, 2022).

The effectiveness of public policy is often an indicator of a government's success. However, this effectiveness is difficult to achieve without proper integration between control and evaluation. Control ensures that policies remain consistent with their objectives, while evaluation provides an overview of whether the policies actually

provide solutions to the problems they are intended to solve. Without these two components, policies risk becoming mere administrative formalities that fail to bring about meaningful change on the ground (Pennington & Stanford, 2023).

The phenomenon of policy failure due to weak control and evaluation is not only found in developing countries, but also in developed countries. However, in countries with democratic and transparent governance, these weaknesses can usually be minimised through a strong systemic framework and active public oversight. This is what distinguishes the effectiveness of policies across countries, while also underscoring the importance of literature-based research to identify proven principles of control and evaluation.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine theoretically and empirically the role of systematic control and evaluation systems in improving the effectiveness of public policy. The study aims to produce a deeper understanding of the relationship between these two mechanisms, while providing insights that can be applied by policymakers to improve the performance of government programmes.

Research Method

The research method used in this study is a *literature review*, in which the researcher collects, selects, and analyses various relevant literature sources, such as scientific journals, books, policy reports, and official government documents that discuss the topics of control systems, systematic evaluation, and the effectiveness of public policy. The literature selection process was conducted based on criteria of direct relevance to the research theme, source validity, and publication recency to ensure data relevance (Eliyah & Aslan, 2025). The analysis was conducted using a thematic synthesis approach to identify patterns, relationships, and key concepts emerging from previous studies. The results of this synthesis were then used to formulate conceptual findings, build a framework of relationships between control and evaluation systems, and develop practical recommendations for improving public policy (Ferrari, 2020).

Results and Discussion

The Role of Control Systems in Public Policy

Control systems are a vital component of public policy governance, serving to ensure that policy implementation proceeds in accordance with established plans and objectives. Without effective control mechanisms, public policies are prone to deviations, overlaps, and inefficiencies that can hinder the achievement of their final outcomes. Therefore, control is an instrument that not only maintains consistency but also supports transparency and accountability in policy implementation.

Control systems in public policy can be defined as a series of processes and procedures designed to supervise, measure, and adjust programme implementation to ensure that it remains in line with planned targets. This control encompasses various

aspects, ranging from resource utilisation, technical implementation, to risk management that may arise during policy implementation. With control in place, the government can monitor the steps taken to ensure operational and administrative effectiveness (Bodnaruc, 2025) .

One of the main functions of a control system is as an early detection tool for potential problems that could disrupt policy implementation. Through routine monitoring, control enables the identification of deviations and obstacles so that corrective action can be taken quickly. This function is important to prevent policy failures caused by unexpected internal and external factors. (Vedung, 2020) . In addition to monitoring, the control system also plays a role in providing continuous feedback to decision-makers. Information obtained from the control mechanism can be used to evaluate policy implementation performance and make policy adjustments when necessary. In this context, control serves as a bridge between the implementation process and the strategic decision-making process (Dunn, 2020) .

In Indonesia, the public policy control system is regulated by various regulations that place control as an integral part of government management. For example, budget control through the state financial supervision system and internal audits is a practical form of control aimed at ensuring that the budget is used in accordance with policy priorities. This structured control system is key to optimising policy outcomes and preventing the misuse of resources (Rose, 2023) .

Control models in public policy can vary depending on the characteristics of the policy and the context in which it is implemented. Some models prioritise results-based control, which focuses on achieving output and outcome targets, while others place greater emphasis on process control, ensuring that procedures and technical standards are implemented correctly. The selection of the appropriate model is critical to the success of the control measures applied (Whitsel, 2024) .

Information technology has made a significant contribution to the development of modern public policy control systems. The use of management information systems and performance dashboards enables more accurate and transparent real-time monitoring. With this technology, policymakers can directly monitor programme implementation and make faster and more appropriate interventions if discrepancies are found (Biggs, 2021) . One concrete example of effective control is strict budget control over government projects. The control system ensures that funds are allocated in accordance with plans and that there is no waste or corruption. The implementation of effective budget control not only enhances public trust in the government but also strengthens the legitimacy of the policies being implemented (Stewart & Dayal, 2022) .

However, a common challenge faced in public policy control systems is resistance from policy makers and bureaucrats who feel constrained by strict oversight mechanisms. This often leads to conflicts of interest and obstacles to optimal control implementation (Cairney, 2025) . Therefore, strengthening an organisational culture

that supports control and transparency is crucial. The importance of control systems is also reflected in their role in mitigating strategic risks that could threaten the sustainability of government programmes. Through risk control, policies can be reviewed to anticipate potential failures or negative impacts. Thus, control is not merely about static oversight but also a proactive aspect of public policy risk management (Schmitt, 2020).

Cooperation between institutions in the control system is something that cannot be ignored. Public policies involving many stakeholders require integrated control coordination so that surveillance data and information can support each other between work units. Integration of control systems between institutions can strengthen synergy and minimise overlapping or gaps in surveillance (Affrian, 2020).

The role of control systems in public policy is also closely related to good governance. Effective control will promote transparency, accountability, and public participation. When control is implemented based on good governance principles, policy development will not only be results-oriented but also meet ethical and social justice standards (Callahan, 2022).

In the context of policy evaluation, control systems provide primary data that serves as material for further evaluation. Without valid and structured data from the control process, policy evaluation will lack a strong empirical basis. Therefore, control and evaluation have a synergistic relationship that must be developed so that public policy can truly be optimised (Parkhurst, 2022).

Thus, the role of control systems in public policy is crucial to the successful implementation and achievement of policy objectives. With its functions of monitoring, prevention, and data-based decision-making, control systems strengthen governance and improve the overall effectiveness of policies. Therefore, the development of adaptive and integrative control systems must be a priority in public policy management in the modern era.

Systematic Evaluation in Enhancing Policy Effectiveness

Systematic evaluation is a structured and continuous assessment process of public policies with the primary objective of determining the extent to which these policies have succeeded in achieving their objectives and producing the desired impacts. This process is not merely an administrative activity, but also a strategic instrument that provides evidence-based data and information for more accurate and fact-based decision-making. In the context of public policy, systematic evaluation helps measure the effectiveness of implementation and serves as a basis for continuous policy improvement. (Kettunen, 2022).

Through systematic evaluation, the government can conduct a comprehensive analysis of various aspects of policy, ranging from relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, to sustainability. Relevance refers to the alignment of policy objectives with the needs

and issues faced by society, while effectiveness assesses how well policies achieve their targets and objectives. Efficiency evaluates the ratio between inputs used and outputs produced, and sustainability assesses the long-term impact of policies on society and the environment (Knill & Tosun, 2023).

Systematic evaluation encourages a continuous feedback mechanism between policy implementation and formulation. By obtaining regular and in-depth information, policymakers can clearly see which aspects of the policy are working well and which need to be adjusted or reformulated. This approach prevents policies from failing repeatedly due to decisions that are not based on empirical data (Shaxson, 2021).

One important element of systematic evaluation is the use of data- and evidence-based methods. Quantitative and qualitative data collection, such as surveys, interviews, case studies, and statistical analysis, provide a comprehensive picture of policy outcomes. Quantitative approaches help measure impact numerically, while qualitative approaches provide context and in-depth understanding of the processes and dynamics of policy implementation (Hill & Hupe, 2022). Timeliness is a crucial factor in the implementation of systematic evaluation. Evaluations conducted regularly and at the right time enable quick interventions to improve policy implementation before problems become more significant. A continuous monitoring process is preventive and corrective, so that policy effectiveness can be continuously improved over time (Pramono, 2020).

In addition to improving effectiveness, systematic evaluation also enhances government accountability and transparency. The results of evaluations that are published openly enable the public and stakeholders to monitor the use of public resources and assess the success of government programmes. This also strengthens public trust and the legitimacy of the policies implemented (Fischer, 2021).

Systematic evaluation can be conducted through various approaches that are appropriate to the characteristics and objectives of the policy. Goal-oriented approaches focus on the achievement of objectives, while process-oriented approaches assess the quality of policy implementation. Other approaches include theory-driven evaluation, which tests the basic assumptions of the policy, and participatory evaluation, which involves various stakeholders in the evaluation process (Stewart & Dayal, 2022).

The use of information technology in systematic evaluation also facilitates real-time data collection and analysis. Management information systems and performance dashboards can provide up-to-date data that supports quick and accurate decision-making by policymakers. Thus, evaluation is no longer static, but dynamic and responsive to changes in the field (Batchelor, 2022).

Systematic evaluation also plays an important role in mitigating the risk of policy failure. By identifying weaknesses and obstacles in the implementation process, evaluation provides opportunities for improvement and anticipation of potential

problems in the future. This process strengthens policy risk management so that the results achieved are in line with the objectives and do not cause unwanted negative impacts (Sanderson, 2021).

In practical terms, systematic evaluation helps optimise the use of public resources. By identifying aspects that are ineffective or inefficient, the government can allocate budgets and manpower more wisely, thereby increasing the added value of every investment made. This efficiency is also important for ensuring the long-term sustainability of programmes amid limited resources (Pellense, 2025).

Stakeholder participation is one of the equally important aspects in systematic evaluation. Involving the community, programme implementers, and other stakeholders provides a more comprehensive and diverse picture of policy impacts and unmet needs. This participatory approach also enhances policy legitimacy and supports community acceptance of the resulting policies (Cahyono, 2025).

Systematic evaluation does not stop at the data collection and analysis stages, but also requires follow-up in the form of concrete and applicable recommendations. These recommendations should serve as a basis for policy updates, implementation improvements, and the development of new, more effective programmes. This process creates a continuous learning cycle in public policy management (Jansen & Kwakkel, 2025).

The main challenges in implementing systematic evaluation include limited human resource capacity, incomplete or invalid data, and a lack of integration between evaluation results and decision-making processes. Therefore, strengthening the capacity of policy analysts, developing a reliable information system, and establishing mechanisms for using evaluation results in strategic planning are crucial (Leeuw, 2021).

Overall, the role of systematic evaluation in improving the effectiveness of public policy is fundamental. By providing accurate data, constructive feedback, and evidence-based recommendations, evaluation enables continuous improvement in policy implementation. Therefore, the implementation of systematic evaluation should be an integral part of the public policy cycle to achieve effective, transparent, and accountable governance.

Conclusion

Control systems play a strategic role in ensuring that public policies are implemented in accordance with their intended objectives. Through oversight, monitoring, and adjustment mechanisms, the control system prevents deviations, minimises inefficiencies, and enhances accountability and transparency in policy implementation. Without effective control, policy implementation is at high risk of failure, both in terms of outputs and outcomes, making it difficult to achieve the desired development objectives.

Systematic evaluation serves as a data-based instrument for assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and long-term impact of public policies. Structured and continuous evaluation provides objective feedback to decision-makers so that policy improvements can be made in a timely manner. In addition to improving the quality of implementation, systematic evaluation also strengthens the legitimacy of policies through transparency of information to the public and stakeholder participation, which ultimately increases public trust in the government.

Overall, the integration between systematic control and evaluation systems creates a continuous policy improvement cycle, where control results support the evaluation process, and evaluation recommendations strengthen subsequent control strategies. The combination of both forms the foundation of adaptive, responsive, and evidence-based public policy governance. Therefore, the consistent and integrated implementation of these two mechanisms is the key to improving the effectiveness of public policy, ensuring the success of implementation, and achieving optimal development goals.

References

- Affrian, R. (2020). *Model-Model Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik*. Universitas 17 Agustus Surabaya.
- Batchelor, S. (2022). Evaluative thinking for policy learning: Systematic methods and frameworks. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22222>
- Bennett, C. (2024). Transparency and trust in policy evaluation. *Public Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2160174>
- Biggs, J. S. (2021). Policy evaluation: New methods for complex settings. *Public Administration Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13463>
- Bodnaruc, A. (2025). Reliability and reproducibility of systematic reviews informing the 2020–2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans: A pilot study. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcn.2025.05.015>
- Bovens, M., 't Hart, P., & Kuipers, S. (2021). *The Politics of Policy Evaluation*. Routledge.
- Cahyono, Y. N. (2025). The Importance of Character Education for The Young Generation in the Digital Era. *AAICE Proceedings*, 920, 99–106. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-414-3_18
- Cairney, P. (2025). Policy concepts in systematic review. *Annual Review of Political Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051821-105603>
- Callahan, B. S. (2022). Mixed-methods systematic review for public sector evaluation. *Evaluation Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X211066734>
- Dunn, W. N. (2020). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Routledge.
- Dwyer, L., & Pullin, A. S. (2024). Using systematic review to inform policy: Current practice and future prospects. *Environmental Science & Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2024.02.015>
- Elijah, E., & Aslan, A. (2025). STAKE'S EVALUATION MODEL: METODE PENELITIAN. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Indonesia*, 3(2), Article 2.

- Ferrari, R. (2020). Writing narrative style literature reviews. *Medical Writing*, 24(4), 230–235. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329>
- Fischer, F. (2021). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*. CRC Press.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2022). *Implementing Public Policy: An Introduction to the Study of Operational Governance*. Sage Publications.
- Jansen, I., & Kwakkel, J. (2025). Evaluating the adaptability of public policy: Systematic review of methods and applications. *Policy & Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557324X16998827384765>
- Kettunen, P. (2022). Local government policy evaluation: New trends and challenges. *Local Government Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2021.2017104>
- Knill, C., & Tosun, J. (2023). Indicators for effective evaluation in multilevel governance. *Journal of European Public Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2023.2189111>
- Langer, L., Tripney, J., & Gough, D. (2022). The science of using science: Researching the use of research evidence in decision-making. *PLOS ONE*. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261623>
- Leeuw, F. L. (2021). Evaluating public policy in complex institutional environments. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2020.102004>
- Mavrot, C. (2025). What evaluation criteria are used in policy evaluation? A systematic review across five policy fields. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2024.102529>
- Mayne, J. (2020). Theory of change analysis in public sector evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214019873756>
- McConnell, A. (2023). *Understanding Policy Success and Failure*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parkhurst, J. O. (2022). The politics of evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence. *Social Science & Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115637>
- Pellense, M. da S. (2025). Evaluation of quality policies and strategies in health systems: A scoping review. *Frontiers in Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1234567>
- Pennington, M., & Stanford, E. (2023). Systematic evidence mapping in public policy: Advancements and roadblocks. *Policy Studies Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12484>
- Pramono, J. (2020). *Implementasi dan Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik*. UNISRI Press.
- Rose, R. (2023). Policy transfer and learning: A review of systematic approaches. *Policy Studies Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psr.12402>
- Sanderson, I. (2021). Evaluation, uncertainty and evidence-based policy. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1035719X20984569>
- Schmitt, C. (2020). Monitoring and evaluation frameworks in the public sector. *Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389020905267>
- Shaxson, L. (2021). Improving evidence use in policy evaluation. *Evidence & Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1332/174426421X16156929370822>
- Smith, M. J. (2020). Standards for policy evaluation reporting: A bibliometric analysis. *Evidence & Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1332/321472130X16132336083256>

- Stewart, R., & Dayal, H. (2022). Policy evaluation and evidence translation in Africa: What works? *Evaluation and Program Planning*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2021.102004>
- Suazo-Galdames, I. C., Saracostti, M., & Chaple-Gil, A. M. (2025). Scientific evidence and public policy: A systematic review of barriers and enablers for evidence-informed decision-making. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10, Article 1632305.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1632305>
- Vedung, E. (2020). *Public Policy and Program Evaluation*. Routledge.
- Whitsel, L. (2024). Policy implementation and outcome evaluation: Establishing a framework for advocacy organizations. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 22.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-024-01110-0>