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How to Improve the Evaluation of Municipal Management Effectiveness: The Moscow and Moscow Region Experience

Alexey Barabashev, Sergey Semenov

Abstract

The authors analyze present trends in the evaluation of management effectiveness in municipal districts of Moscow and the Moscow Region. Our analysis consists of four parts. First, we describe the approaches to public management effectiveness. Secondly, we provide a case analysis of the Moscow Government's current attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of the regular day-to-day management of the Moscow districts (uprava) according to selected criteria and suggest a number of weaknesses of the current effectiveness evaluation strategy. Thirdly, an additional case analysis of the development strategies of selected Moscow Region small towns is provided. Finally, we offer proposals on how to improve the evaluation of Moscow districts' management effectiveness using program-evaluating criteria obtained from selected strategies of municipal development of several small cities of the Moscow Region which are compatible in terms of size and budget with other Moscow districts. This paper argues that some indicators of effectiveness, elaborated for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of municipal development strategies, can be incorporated into the system of effectiveness evaluation for municipal district management. The usage of quantificators for evaluation can help to produce a better quality of municipal district management, as well as help discover strategic and sustainable changes for the social and economic systems of the districts.

Keywords: municipal management; effectiveness evaluation; strategy of municipal development; Moscow municipal districts; quantificator.

1. Approaches to Public-Management Effectiveness

Currently, mainstream research in the field of Public Management is changing. Most theories of Public Management, including NPM, Good Governance, Antici-
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involved into the evaluation practice and processes. There are many national government accountability evaluation, including (as exam Government Accountability Office (GAO), the US Executive Office of the President - the Employment and Training Administration Agency within the Chamber (RACH), the Russian Apparatus of the Ministry of Labor and Social Development

Accordingly, one of the main problems is how to evaluate the quality of public governance and the appropriate tools for evaluating programs and servants' activity. Without a doubt, there are some methods of decision which are quite clear. The evaluation model starts, as well as the problem of the theoretical standpoint, which should be elaborated and discussed by the evaluators.

The general outline of our article is the need for the municipal level to naturally start on the municipal level, but the division of responsibilities for decision-making is different in different districts. The strategic development of districts is an important issue that should be transformed independently from the districts. The establishment of a special requirement for the quality of the indicators of municipal districts and the problem of the elaboration of the so-called strategies of municipal development.

We will describe the case of the Moscow region as an example of how to apply the so-called strategies of municipal development.
involved into the evaluation practice and methodic elaboration of the evaluation processes. There are many national government structures now affiliated with effectiveness evaluation, including (as examples, just for the USA and Russia) the US Government Accountability Office (GAO), the US Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the US Executive Office of the President (EOP), the US Ministry of Labor - ML (the Employment and Training Administration Agency and the Employment Standards Administration Agency within the Ministry), the Russian Accountability Chamber (RACH), the Russian Apparatus of the Government (RAG) and the Russian Ministry of Labor and Social Development (RML).

Accordingly, one of the main problems for Public Management improvement is how to evaluate the quality of public governance in practice, not just to construct the appropriate theoretical tools for an effectiveness evaluation of public bodies, programs and servants’ activity. Without practical-effectiveness evaluation it is impossible to select which decision is worse and which is better. In our article, we would like to show how the practical evaluation of municipal districts in the Moscow region starts, as well as the problems, which were initially “invisible” from a theoretical standpoint, which should be solved for the successful implementation of elaborated evaluation tools.

The general outline of our article is to show that the effectiveness evaluation on the municipal level naturally starts (first stage) from the evaluation of the current managerial activity of municipal districts, and that some indicators of such activity can be elaborated and implemented. The restrictions for the elaboration of the indicators has not been based on a theoretical background, but is based on a clear division of responsibilities for decision-making and on existing data, collected independently from the districts. In the second stage, the effectiveness evaluation of municipal districts should be transformed toward an effectiveness evaluation of the strategic development of districts. This is a much more complicated issue, and the problem of the elaboration of appropriate indicators can be solved only by establishing a special requirement for the life cycle (or conditions) of indicators, namely their qualitative essence, repetitive duration of their measurement, clear understanding of the risks of their measuring and of their influence on each other. Such indicators are named by us as *quantificators*. The principles for the elaboration of quantificators can be founded on the program-planning method instruments, the so-called strategies of municipal development.

We will describe the case of the Moscow Region municipal districts in terms of the effectiveness of their evaluation history and its present condition. Our goal is to provide an example of how to apply this instrument to the evaluation of other Public Management entities’ effectiveness.
2. Effectiveness evaluation of the management of Moscow municipal districts: present situation

The discussions and documents about the effectiveness evaluation of municipal management in Russia can be selected according to some key topics or problems. The first is the problem of how to evaluate effectiveness, and what kind of tools it is possible to use (Leksin 2012; Minchenko 2012; Decree of the President of RF “On Performance Assessment…”, 2012; Instruction on Drafting a Report by a Head of Local Government of the Urban Area (Municipal District) of a RF Subject on the Achieved Indicator Values, 2013). Secondly there is the question of how to define the strategy of the development of the municipal entity and to shape better the management of strategy implementation (Zhikharevitch et al. 2013; Makovkina 2010; Makovkina 2009; Kuznetsova 2007; Seliverstov 2011; Turgel et al. 2012; Report “Developing the Territorial Planning System in the RF”, 2012; Analytical report “On the Realization of the RF Presidential Decree” of 28 April 2008. № 607 “On assessing the performance of local government bodies of the urban areas and municipal districts” in the RF subjects). Finally, the last group of documents and discussions is dedicated to the problem of how to shape investments on the municipal level and to make the municipal investment climate better (Abramov 2012; Chernova 2011; Standard of the Activity of the RF State Executive Body, 2013; Activity Standard of Local Self-Government Bodies, 2014).

Despite this broad picture of research on municipal effectiveness in Russia, one of the remarkable points is that a lot of authors use Moscow and Moscow region municipal districts (upravas) as cases that illustrate their ideas. This is because the last and important movement toward an evaluation of the quality of the municipalities’ management in Russia exists in Moscow and the Moscow Region. There are two reasons for this stance toward effectiveness evaluation at this particular metropolitan area: firstly, there is the extension of Moscow into the Moscow Region so that the size of Moscow was enlarged by a third from 1 July 2012 by transferring some Moscow region areas into Moscow (see: Map of “New Moscow”, which shows the newly added territories). The problem is how to compare the quality of governance of the newly added Moscow districts with the “old Moscow” districts, given their different governance styles, the incompatibility of the city territories and of suburban small cities and village management, as well as the differences in Moscow and in former Moscow Region municipalities’ finances and human resources. These differences produce the problem of how to find appropriate mechanisms for the quality of municipal management evaluation for the municipal communities which differ in their origin.

Secondly, the attempts to transfer authority from the level of the central authority, namely the capacity of the district, according to the wishes of the inhabitants for the power and resources only for local autonomy.

To solve the problem of district Order of the Moscow Government municipal districts (upravas) in Moscow issued by the Mayor of Moscow (Or subject for evaluation was specified newly attached districts of the Moscow area for them and of the incompati-
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The list of principles for effectiveness evaluation (Application to the Order) includes 22 (later 21) indicators that can be measured on the basis of data collected by city departments, but not by the Moscow municipal districts themselves. Ideas about what kind of criteria to use for the evaluation of Moscow districts was clear:

(1) data in a proper area of district responsibility should be collected at least in a previous period (one year) by Moscow government, but not by Moscow districts themselves (independent audit from Moscow government is required);

(2) the responsibility for the area of responsibility should be concentrated on the level of districts, but not on the level of the Moscow government;

(3) the evaluated districts should have the resources for management in the selected areas.

The mechanism of how the principles are used is founded on a broad application of information technologies. All the data during the reported period of time (every 3 months and finally a period of one year) is collected by districts and transmitted to the informational system located on the site of the Moscow Government (http://gp.mos.ru/). Inside the informational system, the data is processed, using special software produced by the Department of Computer Service of the Moscow Government and by the Department of Audit of the Moscow Government (kontrol'-no-schetnoye upravleniye Moskovskogo pravitel'stva) and checked by the Department of the Territories of the Moscow Government. The final evaluation of collected and processed data is produced by a committee consisting of independent experts (Order of the Moscow Government, 2014). The committee has the right to check the data and to correct some clearly irrelevant positions (not more than 10% of the given single criterion).

As just one example in this ongoing process, every district in Moscow consists of some number of the territories which include apartment buildings located nearby (so-called “yard territories”). Money for the reconstruction of the yard territories according to the City Plan of reconstruction is transferred to the districts, and districts takes the responsibility for contracting organizations to produce the works. Every district reports to the informational system how many yards of the territories are reconstructed in time and whether the work was properly done. Then the Department of the Territories of the Moscow Government checks the data selectively and produces the ranking of all Moscow districts according to their percentage of properly (quality + in-time) produced works. Finally, the Expert committee provides the districts’ ranking according to this indicator.

---

3. Strategies of municipal development in Moscow Region as the soul principles of municipal districts

How to extend the effectiveness of management from Moscow to the Moscow Region, 11 districts? Additionally, how can the evaluation of the districts be improved? To answer the questions, we would like to introduce the strategies of municipal development elaborated in the Moscow Region as a strategic program.
In June 2014 the results of the effectiveness evaluation of the Moscow municipal districts management was approved and published. It has a great impact on the municipal offices of the districts and on the heads of districts personally. As the straight result of the evaluation, one can see the visual changes in the areas of evaluation: district territories became cleaner, special constructions for disabled persons appear in the lobbies of apartment buildings (which is now a standard element of new lobbies), the local roads at the territories near apartment buildings (yards) are renovated, the areas for children near the municipal houses are renovated, etc. Additionally, some of the heads of districts from the "bottom" part of the evaluation list became the subject of possible replacement. This evaluation process is a serious stimulus for the improvement of the quality of day-to-day management of Moscow’s municipal districts (see http://gp.mos.ru/effoiv/index.php?show=rating).

Despite the success of the district evaluation, there are at least two weak points at present. Firstly, there is the absence of evaluation of district management as a strategy-targeted activity. Last year, a first step for the evaluation of the quality of the municipalities’ activity outcomes was produced, but these do not yet incorporate an evaluation of the strategies of municipal development, as the indicators are concentrated on current activity process, not on strategic goal achievement. The new generation of the evaluation criteria should be elaborated, and it should be concentrated on some evaluation of the progress in achieving the strategic goals announced by the districts themselves. Secondly, the effectiveness evaluation was produced this year just for the districts of “old” Moscow, without the new territories. Finally, the evaluation of the current managerial activity of municipal districts does not take into account differences in their starting positions and, perhaps, of the different regulatory mechanisms used by districts (for example, administrative pressure vs. administrative support of contractors). The possibility of contradictions between the strategic development goals of municipal districts and their current activity goals also can produce a potential danger for the districts, for instance in making successful small steps in the wrong strategic direction.

3. Strategies of municipal development of small cities of the Moscow Region as the source for new strategy-oriented principles of municipal district evaluation

How to extend the effectiveness of management evaluation to new districts, passed from Moscow to the Moscow Region, using data which already exists for the new districts? Additionally, how can the evaluation of district management be reshaped toward the evaluation of the district effectiveness in pursuing their strategic goals? To answer the questions, we would like to concentrate on the outcome evaluation of the strategies of municipal development (or, municipal strategy). This instrument is elaborated in the Moscow Region as a Subject of the Russian Federation.
Municipal strategy is a kind of public program, and its difference from business-oriented programs is to add public value rather than profit. Public programs can be classified hierarchically as national-level programs (coming from the president and the national government); joint projects of several government-body programs; single government-body programs; unit programs and municipal programs. Nowadays, international programs, which have become a frequent tool for the UN, EU, NIS, BRICS, etc. are related to international organizations and states’ unions.

Public-program effectiveness can be measured by targeted variable indexes, reflecting program evaluation. In the last few years, public-program evaluation has shifted from the effects (outcomes) of the programs toward the evaluation of operational aspects of each program’s management.

The complexity and divergence of the evaluation procedures goes far beyond the subject of our research. But, to concentrate on municipal strategy as the municipal district development programs, any municipal strategy is a complex that consists of goals, tasks, predicted results, organizational factors and mechanisms, and road maps of strategy implementation (Barrett et al. 2002). As a rule, strategies are executed in the different subject fields of governance. The mentioned elements contribute to the levels of performance-management success and can be evaluated by results, measuring activities, measuring outputs and outcomes (Ammons 2013). In any municipal strategy one can find the leading subject fields of development: the development of the social sphere, economic development, personnel for governance and strategy development, organizational structure for governance of strategy development and legislative acts for strategy implementation elaboration (Netzebaum 2006).

The core for municipal development strategy are the specific indexes and indicators for every subject field of the strategy. Indicators should be measured, and quantified data should be collected, as otherwise it will be impossible to evaluate the progress in the strategy implementation. For any strategy, indexes and indicators should not only be measured, but the history of their recording should be kept and evaluated itself, at least for one or two years. For municipal strategy preparation, the government must utilize the collection of various quantified statistical data (Makarova 2009; Vahromervention 2006).

One of the significant specifics of the Russian case is that the federal budget is constructed on the basis of principles of centralization and a re-distribution of the local incomes. It is influenced by the municipal strategies elaboration and implementation, because the financial sources for strategies are supplied not just from the municipal budget, but from transfers from the federal center. The crucial question is, therefore, how to combine the centralization and need to introduce and to implement municipal strategies, how to establish the budgets for Strategies, and how to secure municipal responsibility for strategy results. Is it possible to use (given our domestic circumstances) the experiences for elaboration and municipal strategy implementa-
program, and its difference from business rather than profit. Public programs (coming from the projects of several government-body profit programs and municipal programs) have become a frequent tool for the UN, national organizations and states’ unions.

assured by targeted variable indexes, years, public-program evaluation has turned toward the evaluation of operational procedures goes far beyond the traditional municipal strategy as the municipal strategy is a complex that includes the following factors and mechanisms: Ammon, the leading subject fields of development, personnel for rational structure for governance of strategies, implementation evaluation of strategy are the specific indexes and indicators that should be measured, and it will be impossible to evaluate the strategy indexes and indicators if their recording should be kept and municipal strategy preparation, the quantified statistical data (Man).

ian case is that the federal budgetization and a re-distribution of the strategies elaboration and implementation are supplied not just from the federal center. The crucial question is how to introduce and to implement these strategies, and how to secure possible to use (given our domestic and municipal strategy implementation).
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on that exist in other countries, for example, in the USA, especially the North Carolina Charlotte city experience (Marstall 2010), or produced by PROON (Guide Planning, 2009)?

The elaboration and implementation of strategies for municipal development present is the main instrument for the development of municipal communities in Russia. Among the normative legislative acts for municipal strategies can be identified the Methodology of the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia and the normative acts prepared by the administrations of the Subjects of the Russian Federation on the basis of the MED Methodology (Methodic Recommendations, 2004). Attempts in Russia to develop the municipalities using such a tool as strategies, in their essence can be recognized as a dissemination of the program-planning method (Osborne and Gaebler 1992). For Russia this has its roots in the Soviet time, from the National program of the development of electric power plants in the 1920s, the so-called GOELRO Plan, and now it is disseminated from the federal level (federal programs) and from the level of Subjects of Russia (regional programs) toward the local level, and the program-planning method now covers different areas of state and municipal activity (Basnak 2009). Additionally, recently in Russia the new Federal Law “About Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation” was adopted (Federal Law “About Strategic Planning”, 2014). This Federal Law establishes the framework for coordination of state and municipal strategic management and budget policy and describes the competencies of government bodies and municipal bodies, as well as their foundation on interaction with other organizations in the area of strategic planning.

The field analysis was produced for the group of small cities in the Moscow Region that stood out, based on their willingness to provide the data about their strategies during the period of September 2012 through June 2013, including Mytishchi, Shchelkovo, Lyubertsy and Vidyuwe. A group of master-degree students at Moscow Government City University of Governance, working under advisor S. Semenov, conducted interviews about the elaboration and implementation of the municipal strategies with the municipal authorities responsible for the strategies, with citizens of cities and with representatives of local non-profit organizations. The aim of field studies was to understand the key goals of the municipal strategies and to understand which types of data were collected in the process of strategy implementation (see also Pankruhin 2006; Grabovoj and Chernyshov 2004), which bodies were responsible for data collection and the extent to which it is possible to use existing data for the effectiveness evaluation of municipal districts of “new” Moscow.
As a result, a matrix of possible new evaluation criteria (quantifiers)\(^2\) that are similar for corporative decision effectiveness (matrix of strategic analysis and positioning) was constructed\(^3\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptions of quantifiers</th>
<th>Quantificare data</th>
<th>Life cycle of quantifier (similar to SWOT)(^4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantifiers of the social sphere of municipalities</strong></td>
<td>5 sub-groups (quantifiers of health, education, culture, ecology, physical culture), totally 30 quantifiers, available from municipal statistics</td>
<td>Current conditions of quantifiers — measures — risks — outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantifiers of the governance sphere (including personnel) of municipalities</strong></td>
<td>3 sub-groups (quantifiers of quality of municipal executive servants — human capital, their education, quality of managerial level of municipal governance), totally 14 quantifiers, available from municipal statistics</td>
<td>Current conditions of quantifiers — measures — risks — outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantifiers of municipal economics</strong></td>
<td>5 sub-groups (quantifiers: general economic indexes of municipal entity, budget of the region, size of local business, infrastructure, labor resources), totally 34 quantifiers, available from municipal statistics</td>
<td>Current conditions of quantifiers — measures — risks — outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantifiers of the organizational-structural supplement in municipalities</strong></td>
<td>2 sub-groups (quantifiers: organizational structure of municipal governance — municipal bodies, functional structure of municipal governance), totally 6 quantifiers, available from municipal statistics</td>
<td>Current conditions of quantifiers — measures — risks — outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantifiers of municipal strategy components</strong></td>
<td>1 sub-group (quantifier: level of the implementation of the strategy), totally 4 quantifiers, available from municipal statistics: budget of the strategy, frequency of the reports about its implementation, indicators of the outcomes for strategy implementation, duration of the strategy.</td>
<td>Current conditions of quantifiers — measures — risks — outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the next step of Moscow districts’ effectiveness evaluation it will be necessary to include into the list of criteria the new quantifiers described in the table above and to incorporate the data about the quantifiers into the list of evaluation criteria. At the present time, proposals about the extension of the criteria are discussed by an independent Expert Committee of departments.

We believe that the new evaluation tool is an extension and incorporation of the model (transferred from the Moscow region to the Moscow districts’ management effective) each district’s level of social, governance, and trends. To compare how the quantifier time (3-months, half-year and one-year period) trends and sources of the change, and as a more effective and analytically grounded.

### References

**About the Effectiveness Evaluation of Municipal Entities**

Order of the Government of Moscow [Постановление от 26 марта 2013 г]

**About the Expert Committee for Expertisation of the Moscow Districts Activity**


---

\(^2\) The notion of a quantifier has some special meaning. Namely, a quantifier is a quantitative parameter that can be measured (or already measured).

\(^3\) A next step for municipal management development could be to establish the multi-factor matrix of quantifiers, where for every quantifier its weight will be introduced and its significance of quantifier for the strategic goals’ achievement).

\(^4\) Once again, life the cycle of the quantifier is its characteristics, or conditions, including its qualitative essence, repetitive duration of its measurement, clear understanding of the risks of measuring and of the influence of the quantifier on other quantifiers.
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discussed by an independent Expert committee and by Moscow government departments.

We believe that the new effectiveness criteria implementation will lead to the extension and incorporation of the new districts’ management effectiveness transferred from the Moscow region to Moscow), resulting in a general “picture” of Moscow districts’ management effectiveness. It will allow managers to evaluate each district’s level of social, governance, organizational and economic capacities and trends. To compare how the quantifiers change during the fixed period of time (3-months, half-year and one-year periods) can help us better understand the trends and sources of the change, and as a result, to make municipal management more effective and analytically grounded.
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