Muhtarova K.S.,
Ashirbekova L.Zh.,
Myltykbayeva A.T.

Evaluation of government programs and policies: foreign experience and Kazakhstan

Comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of regional governance should be multilateral and present a system of indicators characterizing the regional administration in various aspects. The method of evaluating the effectiveness of strategic management was used in this article, which is for evaluation of socio-economic development of regions by the methodology of Piven I.G. The method allows evaluating the effectiveness of the strategic regional management through the indicating of separate groups of the balanced scorecard based on the calculation of integrated indicators using the correction coefficients for each group.

Key words: region, efficiency, management, indicator approach, strategic management, socio-economicdevelopment, methodology, efficiency evaluation.

Мұхтарова Қ.С.,
Аширбекова Л.Ж.,
Мылтықбаева А.Т.

ҚР аймақтары бойынша аймақтық басқару тиімділігі

Аймақтық басқарудың тиімділігін кешенді бағалау жан-жақты болып, аймақтық басқарудың түрлі аспектілерін сипаттайтын көрсеткіштер жүйесінен тұруы қажет. Мақалада И.Г. Пивень әзірлеген аймақтардың әлеуметтік-экономикалық дамуын стратегиялық басқару жүйесін бағалау әдістемесі қолданылған. Бұл әдістеме теңдестірілген көрсеткіштер жүйесінен түзетуші коэффициенттерді қолдана отырып есептелген интегралдық көрсеткіштер негізінде жеке топтарды бөлу арқылы аймақты стратегиялық басқару жүйесінің тиімділігін бағалауға мүмкіндік береді.

Түйін сөздер: аймақ, басқару, индикативтік тәсілдеме, стратегиялық басқару, әлеуметтік-экономикалық даму, әдістеме, тиімділік, бағалау.

Мухтарова К.С.,
Аширбекова Л.Ж.,
Мылтыкбаева А.Т.

Эффективность регионального управления по регионам РК

Комплексная оценка эффективности регионального управления должна быть многосторонней и представлять собой систему показателей, характеризующих региональное управление в различных аспектах. В статье использована методика оценки эффективности системы стратегического управления социально-экономическим развитием регионов по методике И.Г. Пивень. Методика позволяет провести оценку эффективности системы стратегического регионального управления путем выделения отдельных групп сбалансированной системы показателей на основе расчета интегральных показателей с использованием корректирующих коэффициентов для каждой группы.

Ключевые слова: регион, эффективность, управление, индикативный подход, стратегическое управление, социально-экономический регион, развитие, методика, эффективность, оценка.

© 2016 Al-Farabi Kazakh National University

UDC 352(574)

***Muhtarova K.S., Ashirbekova L.Zh., Myltykbayeva A.T.**

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Kazakhstan, Almaty
*E-mail: mukhtarova@inbox.ru

EVALUATION OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND POLICIES: FOREIGN EXPERIENCE AND KAZAKHSTAN

The effectiveness of regional governance can be viewed in different ways. Currently, at the regional level are most commonly used and the indicative criteria approach to the assessment of the effectiveness of the regional government, based mainly on an assessment of the managed subsystem management. Comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of regional governance should be multilateral and consist of a system of indicators characterizing regional management in different aspects. Over the last decade we have developed various systems and methods for assessing management effectiveness. Evaluation question management at the regional level is still relevant. For example, Volkov AM [1] offers the efficiency of regional management present as a generalized category in the following series of concepts:

1. Productivity, as the ratio of the results achieved and used by regional authorities of resources (financial, property, personnel, information);

2. Cost-effective, the ratio between the input of resources and the minimum possible taking into account that the quality of public services to the accepted standards (administrative regulations) and, ultimately, the needs of the business community of the region;

3. efficiency, as the ratio achieved over a certain period of changes in the socio-economic situation in the region with planned or predicted.

According to Volkova MA, all of these components are interconnected and interchangeable. The effectiveness of regional governance can be viewed in different ways: from a position of control and manageable sub-systems from the perspective of subsystems management subsystem, from the perspective of the individual functions of the regional administration. Comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of regional governance should be multilateral and to provide a system of indicators characterizing the regional administration in various aspects.

The most currently used is an indicative approach to assessing the effectiveness of the regional government, which is based on a comparison of actual indicators of development of the region with target indicators that are set initially at the time of planning in accordance with the main purpose of development of the territories.

Another currently used approach to assessing the effectiveness of the system of regional government is the criteria approach. The main indicators for assessing the effectiveness of the mechanism of state administration regions AM Volkov's group recommends the following criteria: the outcome measures, intermediate indicators of effect parameters of the intermediate results, performance workflows, wasted resources indicators (see. Table. 1).

Table 1 – Criteria of efficiency of public administration regions (regional economies) by the method A.M.Volkovoy [1]

Name of criteria	The content of the criterion
Outcome measures	1. The level of socio-economic development of the regional economy: the number of small businesses; the share of employment in small business in the total number of people employed in the region's economy; the average salary of employees in small enterprises; the proportion of products / services of small businesses in gross regional product; the share of small high-tech enterprises in the total number of small businesses. 2. Status of the revenue base of the regional budget: the percentage of growth in tax revenues due to the growth of small businesses and increase the salary of employees in a small business. 3. Evaluation of the regional authorities, representatives of the business community of the region: the percentage of respondents who gave a positive assessment of the activities of regional authorities.
The interim result	1. The degree of implementation of measures to support small businesses: the percentage of implementation in relation to the plan. 2. Funding for the support of small businesses at the expense of the regional budget: the amount and proportion of the regional budget. 3. The degree of participation of small businesses in support programs implemented by regional authorities: the share of small businesses benefiting from state support.
Performance workflows	Compliance with the terms and procedures for activities carried out in the framework of the regional programs.
Indicators of resources expended	The time spent on regional budget execution of public functions and procedures (the complexity and efficiency)

According to other authors, in particular, Zueva SE, Vasetskaya AA, when assessing the effectiveness of regional management [2] should provide the position and role of each individual ministry (department) in the context of the implementation of all areas of regional responsibility and further specific indicators that capture these activities. This criterion is the level of implementation of all areas of regional responsibility (to be understood as - the politician), and the most common integrated indicators are quality of life index («internal» regional environment) and the index capitalization of the territory (the «external» integration into the national and global development processes) each key policies characterized by its own parameters, and accordingly may be detailed in the following figures (see. Table. 2):

Table 2 – Basic parameters of key policies.

The level of strategic and political decisions	Quality of life	The capitalization of the territory
The level of the establishment of joint programs and inter-agency commission at ministries and departments	Integral indices of the effectiveness of the executive authorities on the key regional policy (budget, space, innovation, human capital, security, cultural)	
The level of administrative control and monitoring	Quantitative and qualitative indicators of the effectiveness of simplified	Quantitative and qualitative indicators of the effectiveness of simplified

In assessing the level of implementation of the regional areas of responsibility, the authors propose the new conditions the transition to new indicators to measure and argued that the new performance indicators like «absorb» the traditional sectoral indicators – without denying them, but, at the same time, introducing a framework of strategic expediency.

The author of the following techniques Dubrovin NA [3] offers as the criterion of assessing the effectiveness of the control region of the level of effective utilization of the resource potential of the region when a certain condition of social and economic development of the region, which can be calculated using an index of socio-economic development and resource potential region.

We believe that it is necessary for the further development of the sweep of the new model of regional management performance criteria, ie, in the context of an innovative economy is necessary to make innovation in the evaluation of the effectiveness of regional management. For this purpose, the most appropriate method of assessing the effectiveness of the strategic management of socio-economic development of the region, authored by IG Piven [4]. According to the proposed method assessment is carried out in three stages:

1. The calculation of the integral index of pre - made selection and ranking of indicators, their weights are determined and calculated integral preliminary index of evaluation. Indicators should be formulated so as to ensure the simultaneous evaluation of social, economic, financial and budgetary. For this analysis are four blocks: the social and environmental performance, investment performance, economic performance indicators of the financial sector and budget. (see Table 3);

2. Determination of correction factors - due to the influence of internal and external factors should be applied special adjustment coefficients to assess the impact of significant factors in the context of each of the analytical group of indicators. It is expedient to use the tempo indicators that correlate with each other parameters that can not be compared to the absolute values;

3. The calculation of the total integral index - is determined on the basis of the calculation of the total consolidated integral index, as the product of a preliminary summary of the integral index, and total correction factor for each group of indicators.

Table 3 – Blocks of indicators to measure the effectiveness of the method Piven [4].

Social indicators	Economic indicators
1.1 average per capita income per month; 1.2 proportion of the economically active population in the total population,%; 1.3 The number of people with den. incomes below the subsistence minimum,% of the total population; 1.4 The rate of natural population increase, per 1000 population; 1.5 food consumption per year per capita, kg; 1.6 unemployment rate in%; 1.7 The number of hospital beds per 10,000 people of the population; Incidence of 1.8 per 1000 people; The number of registered 1.9 per 100,000 population crimes; 1.10 Emissions zagryazn.veschestv in atm.vozduha tons; 1.11 zagryaznen.stochnyh water discharge into surface water per capita cubic meters; 1.12 The use of fresh water per capita cubic meters; 1.13 housing, total area per person., M; 1.14 share issue experts universities in the total working-age population,%; 1.15 share issuance post-graduate students, the total number of the working age population,%.	2.1 GDP per capita; 2.2 The actual final consumption of households per capita; 2.3 Retail trade turnover per capita; 2.4 The volume of paid services per capita .; 2.5 net financial result of organizations in the DN .; 2.6 The number of companies registered in the state agencies DN .; 2.7 proportion of companies with foreign capital; 2.8 The share of unprofitable organizations,% 2.9 The ratio of the trade deficit,%; 2.10 The share of CIS countries in foreign trade,%; 2.11 The share of CIS countries in foreign trade,%; 2.12 The density of the railway tracks public km of track on the territory of 10,000 km; 2.13 The density of public roads paved kilometers of roads in the territory of 10,000 km.
Investment and Innovation	Finance region
3.1 Investments in fixed capital per capita actually deystv.tsenah; 3.2 degree of depreciation of fixed assets,%; 3.3 The share of the budget of the region in the amount of budgetary funds invested in fixed assets,%; 3.4 The number of created and used advanced manufacturing technologies chel.naseleniya 10000; 3.5 costs of technological innovation per capita; 3.6 The volume of innovative goods, works and services per capita; 3.7 foreign investment in the country's economy, per capita.	4.1 consolidated revenues on d.nas .; 4.2 The costs of subjects of the country's social support of citizens, d.nas .; 4.3 The share of expenditures of consolidated byudzh.sredstv on social sphere in the total budget expenditures,%; 4.4 The share of tax revenues in total revenues of the consolidated budget,%; 4.5 share of consolidated budget expenditures on housing and communal services in the total expenditures,%; 4.6 The share of consolidated budget expenditures on education and health in the total budget expenditures,%; 4.7 The number of credit institutions with branches per 100,000 people.

After that, within each group according to the priority indicators are assigned weighting coefficients, in descending order, that is, the indicator having the highest priority is assigned to the maximum value of the coefficient [4]:

$$Xi=\frac{1}{n}+\frac{2uVn}{n(\text{âêâàäðàòå})n} \quad (1)$$

where Xi - weighting factor of a single indicator,

n - serial number of the coefficient of weight,

u - t - t-test (stored in the table, depending on the likelihood ratio y and the degree of freedom (n-1)

n - the number of coefficients,

V - coefficient of variation is determined depending on its level = 0.2.

The resulting numerical series of weighting coefficients is distributed in descending order, the maximum value assigned to the first member of the series. The total sum of the weighting coefficients of each row equals unity.

Further, the integral index is determined by the effectiveness of strategic management (P Preview.) [4]:

$$\text{P Preview} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} XiQi\,, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{where Qi}=\frac{Q1}{Q\max} \quad (3)$$

Assuming that the growth rate increases efficiency control value [4]:

$$\text{Qi}=\frac{Q\min}{Q1} \quad (4)$$

Comparing the analyzed values of integral indices produced with the value of the integral indicator of the effectiveness of strategic management in the region, taken as a benchmark, which is defined by the formula [4]:

$$\text{P standard} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} XiQi\max \quad (5)$$

where Qi max - the maximum value of reference calculated by the formula

$$\text{Q I max} = \frac{Q\max}{Q\max} \quad (6).$$

Thus, the standard P calculated by formula (5) is equal to 1. The reference region is determined by the index of the largest value among the regions examined.

Table 4 shows the results of evaluation of the effectiveness of the strategic management of socio-economic development of the regions of Kazakhstan, according to preliminary figures for 2003-2015, ranked by assessing the level of control in Table 5.

Table 4 – Results of the effectiveness of the strategic management of socio-economic development of the regions of Kazakhstan, according to preliminary figures for 2003-2015

№	Regions	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2015	2013	2014	2015
1	Akmola	1,02	1,22	1,31	1,35	1,49	1,44	1,59	1,68	1,53	1,46	1,70	1,75	1,80
2	Aktobe	1,3	1,5	1,6	1,6	1,7	1,8	1,7	1,7	1,8	1,7	1,86	1,90	1,94
3	Almaty	1,7	1,1	1,1	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,4	1,4	1,6	1,3	1,41	1,42	1,43
4	Atyrau	2,3	2,3	2,5	2,5	2,7	2,5	2,6	2,5	2,6	2,6	2,67	2,70	2,73
5	West Kazakhstan	1,3	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,7	1,6	1,7	1,6	1,8	1,7	1,82	1,86	1,90
6	Zhambyl	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,3	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,47	1,51	1,55
7	Karaganda	1,5	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,7	1,6	1,7	1,5	1,62	1,63	1,64
8	Kostanay	1	1,2	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,5	1,4	1,55	1,59	1,63
9	Kyzylorda	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,5	1,5	1,55	1,59	1,63
10	Mangistau	1,9	2	2	2	2,1	2,2	2	1,8	1,9	1,8	1,89	1,87	1,86
11	South Kazakhstan	1	1,5	1,1	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,3	1,43	1,45	1,47

12	Pavlodar	1,3	1,4	1,3	1,3	1,6	1,6	1,7	1,6	1,7	1,6	1,76	1,81	1,85
13	North Kazakhstan	1,2	1,3	1,2	1,4	1,3	1,3	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,45	1,47	1,49
14	East Kazakhstan	1,2	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,5	1,5	1,6	1,6	1,67	1,71	1,76
15	Astana	2,3	2,6	2,7	2,6	2,6	2,5	2,5	2,6	2,8	2,6	2,69	2,71	2,73
16	Almaty city	2,3	2,5	2,5	2,6	2,9	2,7	2,8	2,4	2,7	2,4	2,65	2,67	2,68

Table 5 – Comparative results of the second stage of the methodology for assessing the effectiveness of the strategic management of regions of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2003-2015

Years	Regions Evaluating the effectiveness of management The characteristics of innovation and socio-economic development of the region					
	Maximum		average		Low	
	Optimal	stable	stable	unstable	**unstable**	critical
	3,2 – 4	2,8 – 3,2	2,4 – 2,8	2 – 2,4	1,2 – 2	0 – 1,2
	Preliminary figures integral Prev					
2003				R4, A1, A2	R2, R3, R5, R7, R9, R10, R11, R12,	R1, R6, R8, R13, R14,
2004			A1, A2	R4, R10	R1, R2, R3, R5, R7, R8, R9, R11, R12, R13, R14,	R3, R6,
2005			R4, A1, A2	R10	R1, R2, R5, R7, R8, R9, R12, R13, R14,	R3, R6, R11
2006			R4, A1, A2	R10	R1, R2, R3, R5, R7, R8, R9, R11, R12, R13, R14,	R6
2007		A2	R4, A1	R10	R1, R2, R3, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R11, R12, R13, R14,	
2008			R4, A1, A2	R10	R1, R2, R3, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R11, R12, R13, R14,	
2009		A2	R4, A1	R10	R1, R2, R3, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R11, R12, R13, R14,	
2010			R4, A1, A2		R1, R2, R3, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, R11, R12, R13, R14	
2011		A1	R4, A2		R1, R2, R3, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, R11, R12, R13, R14	
2015			R4, A1, A2		R1, R2, R3, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, R11, R12, R13, R14	

Evaluate the effectiveness of regional governance for the period from 2003 to 2015 in the regional context in Kazakhstan, we reached the following conclusions:

According to this technique the regions of Kazakhstan should be subdivided as follows:

1) The maximum level control (stability control), Almaty (2007, 2009), Astana in 2011.

2) The average level of control (stability control): Atyrau region (2005-2015), Astana (2004-2010, 2015) and Almaty (2004-2006, 2008, 2010-2015).

3) The average level of control (not stable management): Atyrau (2003), Astana (2003), Almaty (2003) and Makngistauskaya region (2004-2009).

4) The low level of control (not sustainable management): Akmola, Aktobe, Almaty, East Kazakhstan.

4) The low level of control (not sustainable management): Aktobe (2003-2015), Almaty (2003-2004, 2005-2015), Akmola (2004-2015), Karaganda (2003-2015), Kostanay (2004-2015) Kyzylorda (2003-2015), Mangistau (2003, 2010-2015), South Kazakhstan (2004-2015), Pavlodar (2003-2015), North Kazakhstan (2004-2015), East Kazakhstan (2004-2015) Zhambyl (2007-2015), West Kazakhstan (2003-2015).

5) The low level of management (critical control): Akmola (2003), Zhambyl (2003-2006), North Kazakhstan (2003), East Kazakhstan (2003), South Kazakhstan (2003), Kostanay (2003).

Thus, for 2003-2015, the regions have shown consistent results. Leading regions with a high evaluation of the effectiveness of management are Astana, Almaty, Atyrau and Mangistau oblasts. 12 regions of Kazakhstan for the period illustrated the low evaluation of the effectiveness of management.

References

1 Volkov, MA Evaluating the effectiveness of the mechanism of state management of the economy in the region in support of small business // Bulletin of the Siberian State Aerospace University. Academician MF Reshetnev. 2009. № 2. pp 438-442.

2 Zuev SE, Vasetsky AA State Regional Policy: approaches to evaluating the effectiveness // Management Consulting. – 2009. – № 4. – S. 52-70.

3 Dubrovin N. Evaluating the effectiveness of regional management // Vestnik of Samara State University. – 2006. – № 8. – S. 54-59.

4 Piven IG Methods of assessing the effectiveness of the strategic management of socio-economic development of the region [electronic resource] // Access: http://www.teoria-practica.ru/-3-2015/economics/piven.pdf