

Monitoring and Evaluation in Strategic Public Management as tools of Sustainable Development: Case for ARC (Ukraine)

Valeriy Tertychka,

the National Academy of Public Administration,
office of the President of Ukraine,
20, Ezhena Pottier St., Kyiv,
03057, Ukraine
E-mail: vtertychka@yahoo.com

Abstract

M & E examined in the context of strategic public management at the local self-government level as regarded as an essential and integral component. Short characteristic of legislative field of local self-government for M & E.

In article describe the system, objects, types and approaches of evaluation of M & E. Evaluation criteria and indicators: specific for level of local self-government. Make the characteristic of stakeholders analysis – how it support for M & E. Classification of program implementation indicators, programs for community development and coordination issues between state (public-goal) programs and local self-government programs. Singled out some barriers, obstacles and strengths, weaknesses of M & E.

Keywords: monitoring, evaluation, strategic public management, types of evaluation, indicators

Introduction

M & E is regarded as an essential and integral component of strategic public management. M & E procedures are used during assessment and evaluation of certain programs and projects - especially at the local level. Monitoring, which is regarded as a constituent element of evaluation, also plays an important role.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) as necessary components for policy cycle [6] and strategic public management [8], and special procedure for programs or projects in local self-government. In article analyzed peculiarities of using strategic public management for Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC).

The aim of the article is to identify the potential and issues of M & E in strategic public management as tools of sustainable development in local self-government level.

The author directly participated in the development of guidelines to M & E of local self-government [4]. There have been a series of workshops on the practical application of M & E. Problematic issue is the harmonization objectives state programs and local development programs that are developed in accordance with the strategy ARC.

It is reasonable to use “Practical Handbook on the Basics of Programme / Project Monitoring & Evaluation” [1] and other practical materials developed for Evaluation.

Theoretical framework of the research is concepts of strategic public management, public policy and M&E. Briefly describes methods for classification programs, SMART-goals approach for M & E of programs, Performance Auditing of programs. Classification of program implementation indicators

M&E considered as:

- the stage of the public policy cycle - a course of action (or unction), selected governments in dealing with a social problem or a set of interrelated problems;
- a necessary component of strategic public management- a systematic process by which the authority (or private sector), organization, industry sector, the community expects and plans for future operations;
- a separate program;
- a separate project, the services provided by this project.

We consider M & E in the context of strategic public management at the local self-government level.

Strategic public management as tools of sustainable development has specific on local self-government level. Peculiarities of using strategic public management for Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC).

Environment of M & E.

Evaluation environment. Policy is formulated in a particular environment. In Ukraine, there is a large number of standardized regulations for program development, analysis of regulations, monitoring and evaluation. Among the latest related legislative acts it is worth mentioning the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers

of Ukraine on “The adoption of the procedure of development, implementation and monitoring of sector budget support programs of the European Union in Ukraine” (2011) and the Order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine “The issue of optimization of the budget programs quantity” (2011), which adopts the Optimization strategy of budget programs quantity.

Questions about the quality of implementation – program development, analysis of regulatory impacts, monitoring and evaluation – are quite complicated.

Considering Evaluation environment, it should be noted that the most important components include:

Social environment: cultural, ethnic, religious and other traditions, social structure of society, expectations, behavioral patterns and ways of interaction and relationship between them that are established in any society;

Physical environment incorporates:

- geographical characteristics: climate, natural resources, topography, architecture, etc.;

- demographic characteristics: size and dynamics of population, population settlement pattern, urban conditions, population age structure and other physical characteristics that define the lifestyle adopted in society;

Economic environment: economic system, content and activity of the economic life of society, including the nature of industry and trade, the relative wealth or poverty of the region covered by policy, the unemployment rate, the rate of economic growth, etc.;

Political environment: the political system, political institutions, power structures, legislation, political parties, civic organizations, special interest groups, lobby, dominating ideology, political culture, the current topical political problems.

Legislative field of local self-government for M&E.

In Ukraine is normalized a number of documents related to strategic public management. So we can speak of a framework of strategic management system in Ukraine. (It is advisable to inspect the "System of strategic planning of socio-economic development in Ukraine: current state and trends of improvement. - Kyiv: UNDP in Ukraine" [3])

Normative legal acts (in force as of 2012) on strategic management can be divided into several blocks of content:

- Block documents to formulate strategies to Ukraine at the national level

- Block legislation aimed at development of regional strategies

- Block documents – development strategies at the local community

- Block certain documents – development of sectoral strategies

We consider the normative legal acts concerning strategic public management, local self-government, and M & E. Specifically it:

The strategy of economic and social development of ARC for 2011-2020: developed by the Council of Ministers of Crimea and approved by the Supreme Council of Crimea [2];

Laws of Ukraine :

"On Local Self-Government in Ukraine";

"On Local State Administrations" ;

"On accelerated revision of regulations adopted by authorities and officials of local self-government";

"On Status of Deputies of Local Councils";

Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada

"On the concept of sustainable human settlements development ";

CMU Resolution :

"On approval of the National Regional Development Strategy until 2015";

"On the Establishment of the Council for Regional Development and Local Government";

"On approval of the monitoring indicators of regions, districts, cities of republican in ARC and regional significance for the recognition of depressed areas";

"On the implementation of the performance evaluation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, Kyiv and Sevastopol city state administrations";

" On approval of the design, monitoring and evaluation of regional development strategies";

"On the formal promulgation of regulations adopted by local authorities, regional bodies of central executive bodies and their officials, and amending the Order of the publication on the Internet of information about the activities of the executive branch";

" On approval of the design, monitoring and evaluation of implementation of the National Strategy for Regional Development";

"On some issues of public participation in the formulation and implementation of public policy";

"On the Procedure for the publication on the Internet of information about the activities of the executive power";

" The work of central and local authorities to ensure transparency in its operations , public relations and interaction with the media";

There are a number of regulations not directly related to strategic management, but those that affect the development of their potential. We note that the legislation requires substantial adjustments and reconciliations to improve strategic management system .

Current opportunities and issues problems to address in programs monitoring and evaluation.

The basic Law on the state target programs adopted in 2004 presupposes monitoring the implementation of programs, the purpose of which, apart from the timely implementation of measures and purpose use of funds, is to achieve the target characteristics. However, in practice the main emphasis is often laid only on the control over the application of measures and the purpose spending of budgetary resources. The methodology of development and implementation of monitoring target characteristics is not officially defined. These problems are the basis for the development of a new version of the law.

For the purposes of monitoring and evaluation it is possible to use the passports of budget programs, which were first introduced in 2002 and the format of which has changed several times. However, again, the task of the budget program evaluation is primarily the purpose use of budgetary funds.

Methods of the estimation of program performance indicators – quantitative and qualitative parameters, which determine whether planned objectives have been achieved, – are used for program-based approach to budgeting, which is particularly prevalent on the level of cities. However, according to the Budget Code of Ukraine, this practice is not yet obligatory, and therefore, it is rarely used at regional level.

Detailed methods of monitoring and / or evaluation of programs implementation are used since the early 2000's in some areas of public administration – the fight against HIV / AIDS, management of education, refresher training of civil servants, and promotion the development of technology parks. Specifically, at the end of 2004, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine adopted an integrated monitoring system in the sphere of environment. In particular, it determined: the task of monitoring (data collection, the formation of data banks, analysis of information, ensuring regulatory, methodological and technical support for data collection and analysis, ensuring the accuracy of the information and its public availability) and the subjects of monitoring, including the coordinating organization (interdepartmental Commission, approved by the CMU).

In the field of regional policy methods of monitoring the performance of certain types of areas were introduced in recent years. In particular, this concerns the introduction of monitoring of the functioning of special (free) economic zones and priority development territories. The Order of the Ministry of Economy and European Integration from 19.01.2005 includes the method of determining the evaluation criteria, the basic parameters of development and performance of these zones and territories.

Ukraine also has experience in implementation of the evaluation of authorities activists (central and local) in some areas, for example, to attract investments and create favorable investment climate. The Ministry of Economy offered a new method of evaluation of authorities activists in July 2006. According to this method, the evaluation was performed on the basis of clearly defined list of indicators; besides, a new report form was introduced. The structure of the form was as follows: "Indicator – evaluation period – deviation index (%)".

The Government of Ukraine has made several attempts to develop a holistic approach to the evaluation of central and local authorities regarding their impact on the regional development trends. A separate method of complex evaluation of socio-economic development was approved in February 2004. According to this method, the aim of the evaluation process was to determine the impact of the government on regional development trends and compliance of these trends with the objectives of Government program.

In terms of the methodological technique, there were 23 indicators that were supposed to show trends in various areas of regional development based on the information submitted by the State Statistics Committee and also some specialized authorities.

This technique was modified by new cabinets in 2005-2006, including the determination of socio-economic development indicators, which provide data as the basis for the government evaluation. It should be noted that for the first time it was proposed to use such a complex index, as **gross regional product**.

Monitoring of budget programs

For programs, especially budget programs (BP) [7] are used indicators: output indicators - indicators on which assess the efficiency of budgetary funds meant for BP to achieve its objectives and implementation tasks.

Output indicators are subdivided into the following groups:

indicators to determine – the scope and cost structure of resources to ensure that the BP and characterize the structure of fiscal expenditure programs;

product indicators – used to assess achievement. Indicators of the product, in particular, the volume of production, services rendered or work performed on the budget program, the number of users of goods (works, services):

- performance depending on the tasks to realize the BP;
- resource consumption rate per unit of product (economy);
- the ratio of the maximum number of manufactured goods (works, services) for a specified amount of financial resources (performance);
- achieve a certain outcome (effectiveness);

quality Score is a set of properties that characterize the quality of results generated products that meet consumers according to their purpose and reflect the weakening of negative or strengthening positive trends in service delivery (output of goods, works) to consumers at the expense of BP.

Performance monitoring BP provides a systematic and periodic analysis and control of the implementation of BP, the evaluation of economic benefit from the use of budget funds for the BP and achieving the planned goals, identify problems in the course of BP and suggest improve budget allocation.

Analysis of BP conducted on the basis of planned and actually achieved performance indicators, as well as costs in terms of the tasks to realize the BP.

Trends analysis of the BP:

- compliance with the objectives intended;
- the level of achievement of goals and objectives of BP;
- the level of actual compliance performance indicators planned spending levels to achieve these indicators;
- deviation of performance indicators in the period of the plan and justify the reasons for such deviation;
- match results to the interests of stakeholders

Groups of indicators

Indicators	Description
Contributions	determine the type , amount and proportion allocated in accordance with the intended budget, resources (financial, logistical, information, personnel) that are used by the authorities to carry out tasks (eg., the amount of assets spent to implement the project , the number of accepted and thematically oriented regulations). In the domestic regulatory environment and management practices under the definition of "performance fees" refer to the financial performance of services
Products	characterize the quantity and type of works and services developed in the project and its immediate customers (ie, the number of workshops and their participants, the number of consultations youth , the unemployed, etc., the number of businesses that have access to credit and their volume, the number of unemployed who received a lump sum to start their own business)
Results	reflect an indirect impact on the beneficiaries of the project and the region as a whole from their implementation. These changes are perceived as having occurred not only because of the project, but also influenced by social, economic and political change (after whether as a result of that?). Performance results are classified into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicators of effects: usually medium changes in scope of project related behavioral change beneficiaries or the policy of the authorities, the project environment as a whole (for example, increasing the share of small businesses, creating jobs, increasing the number of tourists, increasing the number of users of decentralized services) - Impact indicators: as a rule, long-term changes in the scope of the project, demonstrating the strategic objectives of the project (eg., changes in environmental performance, reduce emissions, reduce unemployment among women and men)

Evaluation of costs, products, effects and results of programs (policies)

Efficiency and effectiveness of programs

Costs are the resources needed to implement certain policy.

The implementation of policy, i.e., application of policy measures to address the problem taking into consideration the known objectives and tasks, provides results – *policy products (output)*.

Environment affects the process of decision-making, the costs and the output. In addition to the natural environment, it is necessary to consider the economic environment, social environment, and political environment. All together they form a set of factors (economic, social, and political) that may to some extent distort the process and its results.

Policy effects (consequences) appear in course of time and under the influence of environmental factors. They can be classified according to the *time of occurrence* – short-term, medium-term, and long-term. Consequences may also be *desirable* (those, which increase the benefits of policies) and *undesirable* (that generate costs and losses for particular groups or society as a whole and reduce the benefits of the policy). The consequences can be predictable – then they can be taking into consideration during decision-making, and unpredictable – those that were not taken into account in the course of decision-making process (this does not mean that they were impossible to be taken into account: perhaps the preliminary analysis of possible consequences was poorly conducted).

Direct policy product and all its significant effects form the final outcomes of the policy as a process, although the term “final” is rather relative, because the consequences of policy implementation often cause new problems that also need resolution.

Final results should reflect policy objectives, while policy products are associated with the tasks of policy.

The policy evaluation should be based on several aspects – effectiveness, efficiency and economy.

Effectiveness of program (policy) is a measure of achievement of the declared policy goals. Effectiveness show how close the results are to the declared goals. For example, a program of HIV/AIDS prevention is based on the social values and is aimed at reduction of the cases of the disease incidence. The program could include a task – to reduce the number of cases, say, by 50%. If a year after the program achieved a 45% reduction, it can be considered effective, but if only 10% – then probably not. Still, it is also necessary to prove that the reduction of HIV/AIDS cases was a result of this particular program, rather than influence of any other factors. To determine the policy effectiveness it is necessary to take into account the direct results of the policy (products) or policy final outcomes (consequences).

Efficiency of program (policy) is the ratio between the cost of the policy and its achievements (sometimes – policy products, and sometimes – policy consequences). Efficiency can be measured both in physical terms (as productivity) and in value – if it is possible to give pecuniary valuation to all costs and benefits.

Sometimes during the analysis *policy economy* is allocated as a separate aspect of policy effectiveness.

Policies (programs) economy means that some fixed results are tried to be achieved with the least resources cost (or in the cheapest way).

Stakeholders analysis – how important it is in strategic public management M&E? Strategic public management should be aimed at identifying stakeholders - all those individuals (or groups of individuals) that are relevant to the *strategy process* (as in government and outside government). So, stakeholders include every individual who is affected by the existence of the given problem and possible ways to solve it (the related costs, policy production and impact of policy implementation). These individuals are stakeholders of the *strategy process* because they have a stake in it – and they must be taken into account in the *strategy process*.

While conducting strategic public management it is necessary to consult with the two groups of stakeholders – the representatives of interest groups and interested authority bodies.

Interest groups are institutionalized groups of members (it is possible to take into account both formal and informal bonds that unite the participants into the group), who have a common interest in the strategy. A good example is a group of business interests, business lobby groups, political parties and movements. It is necessary to conduct appropriate consultations with the representatives of interest groups during strategy process, especially before making any decisions.

Another group of stakeholders, representatives of which must be consulted, are interested authority bodies – bodies that have the authority to address and coordinate the questions relating to the given strategy process. The circle of such authority bodies is outlined in the legislative acts or is determined by experts on the basis of reasonability.

Stakeholder analysis includes determination of the following:

- the views and attitudes of stakeholders, leaders, media, etc. to the problem (regarding who is affected by the problem and who can leverage the possible solutions / deepening of the problem);
- institutions: institutions that support / not support decision.

Stakeholder analysis should be carried out on standardized templates. This analysis aims to determine the level of influence of stakeholders on the strategic public management and implementation of the strategic plan. Template for analyzing stakeholders see table.

Name stakeholder (1)	Assessment measures stakeholder interest (2)	Assessment stakeholder influence (3)	Significance of stakeholder for the implementation (4)	The role that can be played by stakeholder in the implementation of the strategic plan
Stakeholder 1				
Stakeholder 2				
Stakeholder 3				
...				

The Ukrainian legislation refers to the concept of stakeholder as “the interested party”. In order to identify the interested parties the following questions should be considered:

- Who can benefit from the program?
- Whom it may affect adversely?
- Who are the advocates of the program?
- Who are the opponents of the program?

Interest measures should be assessed by means of the scale from 0 to 4, where:

- 4 is very interested
- 3 is more interested than not
- 2 is not interested
- 1 is opponents
- 0 is not known.

The assessment of influence of an interested party should take into consideration:

- Authority and status (political, social and economic) of each party
- The degree of organization
- Resources that can be mobilized by the interested party
- Unofficial influence
- Relations with other stakeholders

The assessment of influence of an interested party should be performed by means of the scale from 0 to 4, where:

- 4 is very influential
- 3 is quite influential
- 2 is rather not influential
- 1 is not influential at all
- 0 is unknown

The assessment of the level of significance should be performed by means of the scale from 0 to 4, where:

- 4 is very significant
- 3 is quite significant

- 2 is rather insignificant
- 1 is insignificant
- 0 is unknown

Stakeholders are the actors of the strategy process, where the central figures are the strategy producers, particularly the individuals that make decisions.

Strategy producers – individuals who “make” strategy, i.e. who are responsible for its development and decision-making in authority bodies.

Experts strategy - is analysts who actually carry out a preliminary analysis (ex-ante analysis) prepare recommendations for strategic customer management and preparation of the strategic plan and perform the final analysis (ex-post analysis).

Public monitoring and its level in Ukraine. The draft concept of the program is published by the program initiator in the official media and is posted on his Web site.

The initiator conducts public discussion of the concept of the program (board meetings, conferences, meetings), which result in preparing proposals that are taken into consideration during the finalization of the project.

Strategic customer management of the program organizes the publication of the final report on the results of the program implementation, excluding the report on the program implementation that contains information that constitutes state secrets, in the official media and places it on their website.

The institutions conduct public control over activities of executive bodies to solve problems that have social significance in the form of public monitoring of development and implementation of decisions, examination of their effectiveness, and provision of expert bodies of executive power with appropriate recommendations (According to the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine number 1035 “On the approval of the Concept of the executive bodies’ promotion of civil society development”, November 21, 2007.)

Carrying out Evaluation it is important to compare “what really happened to that would have happened if the program had never been fulfilled.” That is, what happened after programs or policies were implemented and whether the result was or was not due to them. Evaluation of policy or program is conducted in two areas:

- Negative impact of program on the planned objectives;
- Actual (real) impact of program.

As it has been already mentioned, Evaluation is considered as a stage of the strategy cycle and its procedures are de facto applied at all stages of the cycle. That is, determining needs and resources, identifying problems, developing alternatives, consultation, stakeholder analysis, assessment of effectiveness, efficiency, impacts and others.

During Evaluation procedures the logical framework (objectives, products, measures, and resources) contains the following assumption: the external factors are unmanageable, but have an impact on objectives, results or activities, and consequently, are necessary to be taken into account.

Goals and objectives of programs evaluation.

1. Content of strategic public management: problems, goals and tools.

Content of the strategic public management covers definition of the problem and goals and tools of its solution.

Strategy objectives are what the strategy seeks to achieve, its goals and direction.

Formulating the goals it is necessary to proceed from the values declared in the society (sometimes strategic priorities can act as values). Strategy analysis is conducted from the point of view of values.

Strategy objectives should be of external nature in relation to the problem: it would be a mistake to choose as a strategy objective the problem that causes this strategy. Strategy objectives are specified in the tasks / problems of the strategy.

Taking into consideration the policy objectives, alternative ways to achieve goals are developed. They include a set of measures – certain clearly defined steps to be taken to resolve the problem.

Therefore, there is such a logical chain:

Social *values* → *goals and objectives* of strategy → alternative *strategies* to achieve goals → *measures* to implement strategies.

In general, goals are classified into two groups:

- The main (independent) goals – values that the society maintains and guarantees per se. These include: human dignity, justice, effectiveness of self-consciousness and self-realization, morality, etc.;

- Instrumental goals – conditions that facilitate the achievement of the main (independent) goals. They are often called constraints (limitations).

Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI). Describe the objectives in measurable terms, providing the basis for evaluating performance results.

Thus, it would be evident whether a certain condition/result has been achieved or not.

Definition of indicators:

- define quality
- define target group
- define location
- determine the number
- define time

SMART (autonomous analytical reporting procedure)

- Specific
- Measurable
- Available
- Realistic
- Time-bound

Another method of analyzing strategy effectiveness – *is cost-effectiveness analysis*. It is a method of quantitative comparison of the results of public programs (projects) with the social costs associated with the implementation of the program (project).

Performance auditing of programs

Performance auditing is a preparation of an independent evaluation of the efficiency, effectiveness and economy of government measures, programs and activities of government structures in processes of social transformation and is carried out to determine:

- Whether methods of public structures in social transformations are efficient and effective, and if not, why;
- Whether government programs are efficient and effective, and if not, why;
- Whether it is possible to improve efficiency and effectiveness of programs and practices of the structures in social transformations and, if possible, how to do it.

Types of evaluation

Evaluation is based on different approaches and generally the following general types should be distinguished:

- Formative – gathering of information that provides feedback during the development of strategy direction, which improving assessment;
- Final - after the formation of strategy directions is complete.

Depending on the task facing experts the following *types of evaluation* can be enumerated:

1. Evaluation of a series of actions / measures:

- provides the conceptual answer to the question of the consistency of the program (logical relationship between cause and effect);
- provides the conceptual answer to the questions about the operating logic and sequence of actions within the program.

Evaluation of a series of actions / measures enables the experts to evaluate the sequence of stages of work accuracy and identify the level and nature of the impact of such a sequence on the efficiency and effectiveness of the program.

2. Preliminary evaluation of the operating strategy – is implemented before the start of the program. It helps to understand how individual parts of the program interact both with each other and with the resources necessary to implement the program. Such evaluation helps to answer the following questions: are there enough appropriately trained human resources, necessary to implement the components of the program? Will financial, technical and other facilities for the program be provided timely and according to the schedule, etc. In addition, this evaluation helps to determine whether the goals of the program correspond to the current situation (which may change over time), whether the resources, required to implement the program, are correctly identified, etc. In general, this type of assessment helps to minimize risks.

3. Evaluation of implementation process – provides the detailed information on whether there is a

realization of the program according to the plan, and whether beneficiaries feel and perceive short-term results of the program. This assessment complements the feedback and therefore helps the management.

4. Evaluation by means of individual situations studies (case study) - helps the management of the program to learn from examples of successful and unsuccessful experiences in similar situations in order to repeat the decision or, conversely, just look for others. In this case, the force of decisions is crucial.

5. Evaluation of long-term effects of program, or evaluation of impact - conducted usually 3-7 years after the completion of program (or set of programs) in order to determine its real influence on society. This evaluation reveals the true cause-effect relationships between the established aims and results.

6. Mega-evaluation is intended to combine the results of multiple assessments (short-, medium-, and long-term), the known research, etc. on the same issue. Thus, using common criteria and aggregating diverse data, conclude about the reliability and validity of the results.

Evaluation Forms

- Appraisal: a critical inspection of potential value (utility) of a program, made before the decision to start its implementation.

- Monitoring: continuous monitoring of progress of the program to determine compliance with the plan and take the necessary decisions to improve operations.

- Review: periodic or special, often quick assessment in order to determine the status of the program, which is not evaluated by usual methods. Critical reviews are usually applied to operational issues.

- Inspection: general test, designed to identify weaknesses and malfunctions and to propose ways to fix them.

- Investigation: a special investigation of a statement on the violation and providing evidence for possible prosecution or disciplinary proceedings.

- Audit: determining of the adequacy of management controls to ensure: the effective use of resources; preservation of funds; reliability of financial and other information; its compliance with effective legislation, policies, and applicable rules; the effectiveness of risk management; adequacy of organizational structure, systems and processes.

- Research: systematic study designed to create or develop knowledge.

- Internal management consulting: consulting services, designed to help management implement changes caused by organizational and managerial problems, and improve internal work processes.

Classification and definition of program indicators

Indicators are the foundation of any monitoring. Indicators are the means by which monitoring is carried out. They serve to determine the level of progress concerning program specific tasks or expected results (short and medium term) and others.

Indicators describe the program in operationally measured values, such as quantity, quality, type of beneficiaries, time, location, etc. For the purposes of monitoring different types of indicators can be applied.

Direct and indirect indicators

Direct indicators are those which are applied in cases when changes in the object of observation can be directly observed by the subject. This usually concerns short-term results. Direct indicators are more accurate, more complete and more appropriate for the immediate use.

Indirect indicators are used instead of direct indicators or in addition to them. They are used in cases when the achievement of results (or failure) (i.e. changes in the observed object):

- cannot be fixed and measured directly, but only indirectly, such as quality of life, organizational development, etc;

- Can be directly measured, but the cost of such measurement would be unreasonably high;

- Can be measured only after a considerable lapse of time when the event / program is finished.

Quantitative and qualitative indicators

Quantitative (statistical) indicators – are indicators that are quantified and indicated by such formulations as the number, frequency, percentage, proportion, etc. Quantitative indicators can describe, for example, the following: the frequency of meetings and number of participants, the rate of economic growth, indicators of climate, productivity, price, etc.

Qualitative indicators (opinions, evaluation, perception and attitude) – are indicators that do not have quantitative expression and may be expressed by the following formulations: availability, compliance, quality, level, satisfaction, awareness and so on. Depending on the needs of the program, quality indicators can describe,

for example, the attitude of stakeholders and consumers to a given fact, the level of their satisfaction, capacity for decision making and self-esteem, behavior change, and so on.

In practice it is desirable to maintain a balance between quantitative and qualitative indicators. It is important that stakeholders defined the indicators jointly at the stage of the program planning.

Indicators of process and outcomes of the program implementation

With the help of the indicators of program implementation outcomes it is possible to determine and estimate such issues as the introduced technology, printed and distributed training materials or growth of the household incomes, etc.

Indicators of program implementation process are usually qualitative and are designed to determine how technology was developed and implemented, how increase in income was achieved and who contributed to this.

Some of these indicators may be subjective and therefore end-users or participants of the event (project) may be asked to confirm or disprove the existence of a result. The source of information in such cases is also subjective.

Intermediate and final indicators. Inter-sectoral indicators

Intermediate indicators are established in order to determine the outcome in certain periods or stages of the program. So they actually serve as benchmarks or milestones for achieving the expected final results.

Indicators of final results of the program are inherently summarizing indicators.

Indicators that reflect the specific features of a particular industry or sector (e.g., indicators of agricultural development), and purely technical indicators must be balanced by means of the addition of other indicators, which are inter-sectoral in nature and designed to reflect, for example, issues of social development, gender equality, environmental security, development of civil society, etc.

Identification and selection of indicators. Criteria for selection of indicators

A wide range of different criteria is used in order to select indicators. They are as follows:

Relevance: Does the indicator provide a possibility to measure progress of certain stages of the program and the achievement of its objectives?

Sensitivity: If changes occur, will the indicator be sensitive to them?

Simplicity and accessibility: Is the information available for the collection and will it be easy to collect?

Reliability: Will the data needed for the indicators be reliable and comparable over time?

Simplicity: Is it difficult to calculate the value of the indicator?

Usability: Will the received information be used for decision-making and experience sharing?

Objectivity: Can everyone familiar with the data reach a general conclusion?

Cost-efficiency: Will the cost of obtaining information be comparable with the benefit from monitoring?

Representation: Will the indicator provide a possibility to estimate representation of different of age groups, gender, beneficiary, etc.?

Evaluation: obstacles in determining the success / failure of a program

- Uncertainty about the policy goals. If the policy goals are vague and poorly defined, it certainly complicates the process of determining the level of their implementation. That is why it is necessary to obtain the support of the majority coalition, sharing different values, interests, etc.

- The difficulty of establishing causality. As long as policy evaluation requires determinization of social changes, there appears difficulty of establishing their cause-effect relationships.

- Dispersion of policy impact. Given that the policy has an impact both on the groups which it targets, and on other groups and individuals, it is necessary to take this additional impact into account because it can be both symbolic and material, and in consensus conjunction.

- Difficulty in obtaining data. This is a very serious obstacle in the practice of evaluation. Analysts and experts from their own experience are aware of the lack of adequate and accurate data and impartial information to identify the real impact or consequences of a policy.

- The official resistance. Publication of data and information on effectiveness and efficiency of policy implementation can trigger official resistance to the disclosure of negative effects of activities of administrative bodies or individuals. Official resistance shows itself in attempts to de-emphasize evaluation, denial of access to information, media, prevention, structural pressures or personal impacts. It is also necessary to take into account the organizational inertia - resistance to any changes of the organization as a structure.

- Time limits. This issue has already been repeatedly emphasized. Time constraints are the major obstacle in conducting assessment, as politicians expect rapid social change, as opposed to structural ones, while

managers try to slow down this rate. Time factor is an essential element of evaluation, because it allows taking into account long term effects of policy.

- Ignoring the consequences of evaluation. "Inappropriate" evaluation results can be criticized, ignored or recognized as mistaken. Arguments for the recognition of evaluation mistaken are:

- Imperfect structure of the program
- The use of inadequate data
- Erroneous conclusions

Potential and problems M & E for community development programs.

Concern for local self-governments ARC is to coordinate the goals and objectives of state programs with the goals and objectives of the Strategy ARC [2]. To optimize the number of local development programs in the ARC has developed a matrix matching. It has been developed guidelines for the practical application of matrix matching [5]. The essence of this matrix is to optimize the objectives of local development programs with the objectives of the Strategy ARC. Applying the matrix was reduced from 52 to 21 programs available programs.

The next step was to develop an M & E system with the relevant guidelines [4]. However, the most acute problem of the M & E strategic management in Ukraine today is the low quality of the procedures provided by law. This can be illustrated examples analyzing impacts of regulations and develop passports of budget programs, especially in the part concerning the analysis of the expected and actual performance and efficiency of policies. Thus, the analysis of efficiency is limited mainly descriptive the expected benefits and costs without quantitative calculations, the risk of significant losses for some groups and business and the need for significant (costly) administrative and anti-corruption efforts of government are ignored.

Poor performance - it is rather only a symptom of the problem and the main causes of this phenomenon, we see two: 1) lack of adequate professional training of actors; 2) indiscriminateness customers that accepts the draft decisions on the basis of superficial analysis, and sometimes orders preparation of recommendations, which carries the risk and threat making opportunistic or lobbied specific interest groups making.

The first problem can be solved by rationing requirements for professional training of actors in the M&E. As to the second problem we main hope – the development of civil society institutes, which should provide adequate pressure on the strategy makers. Legislative opportunities for such pressure are created. To improve the validity and transparency of strategy-making processes, we hope, will also positively affect increased political competition between the major stakeholders, increasing external pressure on the government for which it had to respond through European integration.

References

- 1 Project Monitoring & Evaluation (2011). *Practical Handbook on the Basics of Programme*. Available online at <http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-ME-Guide-8-2011.pdf>
- 2 The Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (2010). *The strategy of economic and social development of ARC for 2011-2020*. Available online at <http://www.ark.gov.ua/images/strategiya2011-2020new-5.pdf>
- 3 UNDP in Ukraine (2009) *System of strategic planning of socio-economic development in Ukraine: current state and trends of improvement*. Київ
- 4 IPAS (2012). *Методические рекомендации по мониторингу и оцениванию Стратегии и программ АРК*. Available online at <http://www.ipas.org.ua/images/doc/Library/EducationalMaterials/metodicheskie-rekomendatsyi-monitoring-arc-2011-2020.pdf>
- 5 IPAS (2012). *Методические рекомендации по согласованию имеющихся и будущих государственных и республиканских программ со стратегическими целями и приоритетами АРК*. Available online at <http://www.ipas.org.ua/images/doc/Library/EducationalMaterials/metodicheskie-rekomendatsyi-arc-2011.pdf>
- 6 IPAS (2012). *Вироблення і реалізація державної політики*
Available online at http://www.ipas.org.ua/images/doc/Library/Short-termSeminars/DevAndImplStatePolicy/ipk_ppmaking_09-10_04_2012%20conspect.pdf
- 7 IPAS (2011). *Управління державними програмами. Моніторинг та оцінювання*. Available online at http://www.ipas.org.ua/images/doc/Library/Short-termSeminars/PublicProgramsManagement/ipk_evaluat_monit_conspect_14-15_11_2011.pdf
- 8 IPAS (2013). *Стратегічне управління*. Available online at <http://www.ipas.org.ua/index.php/uk/library/dc/207-strategic-public-administration>

Summary

Мониторинг и оценивание в стратегическом управлении как инструмент устойчивого развития: кейс для АРК (Украина)

Мониторинг и оценивание (М и О) рассматривается как важная и неотъемлемая составляющая стратегического управления. Процедуры М и О используются в процессе анализа и оценивания определенных программ и проектов - особенно на уровне местного самоуправления. Мониторинг, который рассматривается как составная часть оценивания, также играет важную роль.

М и О рассматриваются как необходимые компоненты цикла политики и стратегического управления, а также специальные процедуры для программ и проектов на уровне местного самоуправления. В статье проанализированы особенности использования стратегического управления для Автономной Республики Крым.

Целью статьи является выявление потенциала и проблемных вопросов М и О в стратегическом управлении как инструмента устойчивого развития на уровне местного самоуправления.

В статье использованы наработки проектов, в которых автор принимал непосредственное участие. Это прежде всего разработка методических рекомендаций по М и О для местного самоуправления. Также обобщен опыт проведения серии тренингов по практическому применению М и О. Выделены проблемные вопросы по согласованию целей государственных программ и программ местного развития, которые разрабатываются в соответствии со стратегией АРК.

Анализ нормативно-правового обеспечения (выделены соответствующие блоки) для применения М и О в местном самоуправлении выявил наличие системы стратегического управления и пробелы, требующие урегулирования на законодательном уровне. Выделено, что теоретической основой исследования является концепция стратегического управления, государственной политики и М & О. Охарактеризована среда для М и О, выделены ее составные.

Рассмотрены возможности и проблемные вопросы применения в программах М и О. Детализированы методы М и О программ, отдельно описан мониторинг бюджетных программ. Выделены группы индикаторов для мониторинга бюджетных программ.

Сделана характеристика оценивания затрат, продуктов, эффектов и результатов выполнения программ. Выделены такие составные М и О как эффективность и результативность программ. Кратко описан анализ стейкхолдеров в процессе разработки стратегии и значения его для М и О. Предложен стандартизированный шаблон для проведения анализа стейкхолдеров. Также описан общественный мониторинг в соответствии с законодательными требованиями.

Выделены цели и задачи для оценивания программ в контексте стратегического управления: проблемы, цели, инструменты. Описаны объективно измеримые индикаторы и составные SMART-анализа. Также сделана краткая характеристика значения аудита исполнения (Performance auditing) для М и О программ.

Кратко описаны способы классификации программ, классификационные типы и формы оценивания. Сделана характеристика классификации индикаторов (показателей) для М и О и их значение для качественного М и О. Также описаны параметры для идентификации и выбора показателей, критерии отбора показателей (индикаторов).

Описаны ограничения в определении успеха / неуспеха программы и как это оценивать. Проблемным вопросом является согласование целей и задач программ, разрабатываемых местным самоуправлением и общегосударственных программ со своими целями и задачами. Именно порой несогласованность Стратегии АРК (ориентированной для развития местного самоуправления, программ местного развития) с целями и задачами ранее разработанных общегосударственных программ приводит к невозможности проведения полноценного М и О программ, разработанных в соответствии со Стратегией АРК. Еще одним из проблемных вопросов является низкий уровень исполнения М и О. Хотя его можно решить с помощью проведения соответствующих тренингов. Проблемный вопрос неостребованность полноценного М и О со стороны заказчиков приводит к поверхностному исполнению М и О и, соответственно, принятию проектов решений на основе такого поверхностного анализа, а иногда и целенаправленного заказа подготовки рекомендаций, которые таят в себе опасность и угрозу лоббирования интересов конкретных групп влияния. Но эти сложности можно преодолеть благодаря открытости и прозрачности процесса стратегического управления через евроинтеграцию.

Ключевые слова: мониторинг, оценивание, стратегическое управление, типы оценивания, показатели (индикаторы)