

Umidullaev Qahramon Usmanovich,

*Received on December 28, 2017,
Recommended for publish on May 29, 2018.*

PhD student at the Academy Public
administration under the President of the
Republic of Uzbekistan.



<http://dx.doi.org/10.26739/2181-9130-2018-2-5>

THEORITICAL AND LEGAL BASIS OF THE RATING SYSTEM IN ASSESSING EFFICEINT PERFORMANCE OF LOCAL ADMINISTRATIONS

Annotation: *the article focuses on evaluation of the effectiveness of over public administration authorities. Moreover, the article covers transparency, openness and evaluation of effectiveness of functions public administration authorities. Moreover, the article covers the issues of evaluation effectiveness assessment and developing methods of evaluation and its transparency.*

Key words: public administration authorities, evaluation of effectiveness, local government, governor, region, district, city.

Аннотация: *в этой статье основное внимание уделяется критерию и методам на исполнительные органы государственной власти Республики Узбекистан. Статья охватывает методический инструментарий оценки эффективности деятельности органов исполнительной власти и эффективность оценочных процедур. Кроме того, открытость и прозрачности органов государственного управления, их оценки эффективности на основе критериев.*

Ключевые слова: *исполнительные органы государственной власти, методический инструментарий оценки эффективности, критерии оценки эффективности, хаким, область, район, город.*

Аннотация: *ушбу мақола Ўзбекистон Республикаси давлат ҳокимиятининг ижро органларининг мезонлари ва усулларига қаратилган. Мақолада ижро этувчи органларнинг самарадорлигини баҳолаш ва баҳолашнинг тартиб-таомилларининг методологик воситаларини ўз ичига олади. Бундан ташқари, ҳукуматнинг очиқлиги ва шаффофлиги, уларнинг мезонлари асосида самарадорлигини баҳолаш тўғрисида баён қилинади.*

Калит сўзлар: *давлат ҳокимиятининг ижро этувчи органлари, самарадорлигини баҳолаш методик воситалари, самарадорлигини баҳолаш мезони, ҳоким, вилоят, туман, шаҳар.*

Time is requiring us to use existing potentials fully and to use material and natural resources economically and rationally. Correct management can lead to the effectiveness of the work.

In many countries of the world, a rating system has been introduced to assess the effectiveness of public administration bodies on a clear basis.

In particular, in countries such as Russia, USA, Canada, Great Britain, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand, a unique system of rating assessment based on the state structure and management is introduced.

Estimation of effectiveness on defined criteria of the rating system creates healthy competition in the regions. Regular

information can be formed on each area which is ahead or behind in certain field. In the future, it will be possible to plan business according to this information and to develop a sector that is behind. It encourages leaders of regions to have a creative approach to their daily work, to use existing potentials fully and to develop sectors of new socio-economical development.

The rating system for performance evaluation does not let leaders to be dependent, indifferent. They can't ignore any of the areas listed in the evaluation criteria. In the regions, all areas are guaranteed to develop at the same time, without being behind one another. This, in turn, creates a basis for the comprehensive development and prosperity of the state.

The system based on criteria broadens the capabilities in analyzing each sector separately. Criteria of efficiency identification not only enhance the efficient performance of the staff but also create environment of healthy competition between the regions and contributes to the development of the country. Evaluation criteria should be developed and improved annually by taking into account the interests of the state and the entire stratum of population.

Over the last decades of the XX century the administrative systems of a significant number of countries have undergone significant qualitative changes, manifested in a departure from the practices of the welfare state that prevailed in the post-war world [1]. Consequences of the energy crisis, rising prices for oil products have revealed "the obvious need for economic efficiency and budget cuts" [2].

Since the early 1970s, an objective request for reforms in the field under investigation arose in a group of qualitatively different countries characterized by the highest indicators in

the sphere of economic and democratic political development. The ideological basis of the revolution in management practices is the "spirit of entrepreneurship", in terms of D. Osborne and T. Gebler [3]. Built on the principles of commercialization of public management, New Public Management was the basis for the transformation of neo-conservative governments that came to power in the Anglo-Saxon countries in the 1970s [4], first of all New Zealand, the United Kingdom, the United States, and others [5]. In general, despite the varying intensity of the reforms, tendencies in improving the quality and efficiency of public administration have affected most of the countries of the developed world.

The new state administration is a complex of qualitative changes in the system of public finance management, organization of the civil service, provision of services to the population built on a single ideological component. It is based on the establishment of service principles of state activity, presupposing the priority of the state's satisfaction of the requirements of the clients of the citizens, quality and competitive provision of services to consumers at their request. The client-citizen, thus, acts as a principal who determines the political course through electoral mechanisms, while politicians take the subordinate role of agents [6]. In this case, the bureaucracy, conceivable as an agent of elected politicians and dependent on the procedure for appointments, indirectly perceives the requests of consumers through instructions and instructions and directly implements them. The new state administration as a strategy of state management presupposes the introduction of management methods from the corporate sphere to the state one [7]. Emphasizing its business nature, J. Olsen suggests calling the end product of building

such a management system a "super market state"

In addition, it is important to note that with the departure from "market ideology" to the ideology of "good governance", the public administration of the developed countries of the world has only consolidated the values of openness, efficiency, effectiveness and responsibility of state institutions [8].

Despite the diversity of emerging holistic or instrumental concepts in public administration, they are all characterized by a qualitative difference from the former administration of the 9th model of M. Weber [9]. Priority of effective development remains an urgent task of public administration.

Central meaning of the term "effectiveness" for the purposes of this study is to some extent polysemous. Traditionally it was used within the framework of economic analysis, the cost-benefit ratio. The aggressive expansion of the tools of economic science and its explanatory basis has reached the sphere of state administration at the end of the last century. At the same time, a qualitative understanding of the effectiveness inherent in the philosophical interpretation of the term is no less significant for the sphere of state administration and political science.

Classical theory of public administration focused on understanding efficiency in the context of a clear division of goals, objectives, methods and practices of public administration and the sphere of political alignment of rational governance structure, scientific justification of the principles of state bureaucracy. As L. Gulik noted with reference to F.J. Goodnau, the combination of "management" and "politics" "within the framework of one structure will inevitably lead to inefficiency" [10]. In fact, efficiency was understood as the effectiveness of formal institutions (within the framework

of the "old" formal institutionalism dominant in the early twentieth century). The transformation of the understanding of efficiency led to the penetration of an economically-centered approach to the theory of public administration.

The satisfaction of the client, therefore, is determined not only by directly received costs in obtaining public services (temporary, psychological), but also by larger, socially significant effects: the lack of corruption [11], poverty reduction, normalization migration situation, increasing prestige of the state in the international arena, etc.

Currently, in countries of Western Europe, the Anglo-Saxon world, Scandinavia, the institution for evaluating the effectiveness of government agencies and related practices is an entrenched mechanism of managerial and analytical activity.

Thus, the most ambitious project to collect objective statistical information on the work of state regional structures is implemented in the USA (the portal data.gov aggregates a full array of statistical information available for public use). The prevalence of evaluation practices at the regional (local) level is provided by financial or reputational incentives in Italy, France, Sweden, and Norway. Non-governmental organizations that calculate the performance indices of government institutions of the executive (or legislative) authorities, as a rule, take into account not only objective statistical indicators, but also formalized expert knowledge about qualitative unquantifiable phenomena (corruption, weakness of the state apparatus, the role of violence, etc.).

Evaluation of programs and policies, like other elements of the new model of public management, emerged and strengthened in the field of public administration in the last third of the 20th century, due to the

unsatisfactory state of the public finance sector, the loss of most social programs of the welfare state. As the domestic researcher D.B. Tsygankov, "the introduction of an institution for evaluating policies and programs occurred after the implementation of public administration reforms, and the significance of this institution for the success of reforms has become universally accepted" [12].

The fundamental work on the evaluation is Schumann's work "Evaluation Study" of 1967, which regarded the assessment as an area requiring study. Despite the fact that since that time the assessment has become an absolutely integral part of the political and managerial cycle, today "an evaluation of the effectiveness of the public administration system is an independent and complex problem of the theory of administrative and political management" [13].

According to H. Wolmann, the development of the evaluation practice was characterized by three qualitative changes, three waves: on the first wave "introduction of evaluation was aimed at improving the results of policy implementation and maximizing the effectiveness of the impact of certain programs," on the second wave, efforts were concentrated on the economic effectiveness, on the third - the evaluation became "an integral part of a full-fledged public administration" [14].

Researchers note the key role of evaluation as a difference between the new management and the former "Weberian" management model and the source of new knowledge [15]. In general terms, a "policy evaluation" is a "systematic collection of information about activities within the program, its characteristics and results that is conducted in order to make judgments about the program, increase the effectiveness of the program and / or develop plans for the future". In public administration, a user-oriented assessment

is usually applied, carried out "for predefined users, with a clear understanding of how they will use the results of the assessment" [16].

This approach to the use of data obtained during the evaluation has passed to the practice of state structures also from the business sector and is connected with the practice of management based on the total quality management, which includes, besides purely economic, also other qualitative socio-professional, psychological components.

In the system theory, on the basis of which the theory of political decision-making was formed, the evaluation of results is an important element of the analysis [17]. Relevance of performance assessment practice and the efficiency of the policy as a necessary final stage is noted by foreign and national experts [18, 19]. In this case, it is the stage of the evaluation of the results that determines the cyclicity of the indicated process. Understanding the process of making political decisions as a dynamic, consisting of functionally defined and sequentially located stages, assumes the key role of the phase of evaluating the results.

Within the framework of this work, the efficiency of state structures is understood primarily as social efficiency, resulting in the level of population satisfaction and improvement of the well-being of citizens, rather than achieving material and economic results. The main objective of the system of local executive bodies is a new quality of life of the population, disclosed as "creating conditions for improving the standard of living of citizens, including for improving material well-being, ensuring access to quality education and medical care, access to national and world cultural values, ensuring security and law and order, favorable conditions for the

implementation of economic and social initiatives." Thus, the strategic goal of developing state institutions is social efficiency.

Assuming that the quality of the institution being examined for assessing the effectiveness of the activities of the regional executive authorities does not meet the stated principles and the efficiency assessment mechanism in its modern architecture does not reflect the social effectiveness of the regional authorities, that is why statistical analysis are urgently required.

In addition, the practice of assessing the effectiveness of regional executive bodies relies, first of all, on an economically-centered approach, with a high share of the importance of the counting financial indicators in the final assessment (both in the block of inefficient expenditures and in efficiency). An attempt to evaluate social effectiveness is indirectly taken into account the sociological component - the opinion of the population - and partly in the examination oriented to a qualitative analysis of the success of management and development.

Understanding of social efficiency as a degree of achieving a socially significant effect is given significantly less attention. So, for example, it is not the effect of improving the nation's well-being, the quality of life or health, but the processes of reform (the proportion of certain institutions applying new standards

transferred to a new sectoral wage system); not the level of literacy and the increase of cultural potential, but the completeness of classes in rural and urban areas and indicators of the relative wages of workers.

As the first President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A.Karimov noted, "... the hakim is the leader and he must be aware of all about everything regarding the people how the people are living, what are their dreams and concerns." This new system entrusts the hakims with additional responsibilities [20].

So as our President noted, "Strong discipline and personal responsibility should be the daily rule of every individual leader - whether it be Prime Minister or his deputies, a government official, or a regional governor"[21]. Only then we can achieve the goal from this new system.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the system must explicitly state the actual position in the regions. We think that the Rating system will be effective for the prosperity of all regions of the state. The most important thing is that the system should be free from the abuse of official statistical information in the interests of any particular region, such as deliberate correction, corruption otherwise the system's goal could not be achieved. This requires intolerance. The system must serve for the accurate and practical results. Working with fraudulent numbers in order to get good marks should be forbidden.

References:

1. Manning N. Reform of public administration. M.: All the World, 2003.
2. Wolmann H. Evaluation of public administration reforms: "the third wave" // Sociological research. 2010. № 10. P. 93-99.
3. Osborne D. Gaebler T. Reinventing government. Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1992.
4. Dunleavy P., Margetts H, Bastow S., Tinkler J. New Public Management Is Dead-Long Live Digital-Era Governance // Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. 2006. Vol. 16. No. 3. P. 467-494.
5. Considine M., Lewis J.M. Bureaucracy, Network or Enterprise? Comparing Models of Governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand. Public Administration Review. 2003 (Mar.-Apr.). Vol. 63. No. 2. P. 131-140. 52
6. Moe T.M. The New Economics of Organization. American Journal of Political Science. 1984. Vol. 28. No. 4. P. 739-777.
7. Drechsler W. The Rise and Demise of the New Public Management // Post-autistic economics review. 2005. Issue 33. 14.09. 2005. P. 17-28.
8. UNESCAP. What is good governance? // UNESCAP / 2011 / [Electronic document]: ([http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/Project Activities / Ongoing / gg / governance.asp # top](http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/Project%20Activities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp#top)). Checked May 10, 2012.
9. Christensen T. Smart Policy? // The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy. Oxford Press, 2008. – P. 448-468.
10. Gulik L. Notes on the theory of organization // Classics of the theory of public administration: American school / ed. J. Shafritsa, A. Hyde. Moscow: Izd-vo MGU, 2003. P. 105-117.
11. Gaman-Golutvina OV, Smorgunov LV, Soloviev AI, Turovsky RF Efficiency of public administration, state competence: the 1st annual report of the Institute for the Analysis of the Status and Prospects of the Political System of the Russian Federation in 2008 - the Beginning of 2009. Moscow: INOP, 2009.
12. Tsygankov D.B. Integration of evaluation in the public administration of the Russian Federation / / Evaluation of programs: methodology and practice / Ed. A.I. Kuzmina, R. O'Sullivan, N.A. Koshelevoy. M.: Presto-RK, 2009. S. 170-192.
13. Gaman-Golutvina OV, Smorgunov LV, Soloviev AI, Turovsky RF Efficiency of public administration, state competence: the 1st annual report of the Institute for the Analysis of the Status and Prospects of the Political System of the Russian Federation in 2008 - the Beginning of 2009. Moscow: INOP, 2009.
14. Wolmann H. Evaluation of public administration reforms: "the third wave" // Sociological research. 2010. № 10. P. 93-99.
15. Hatton M.J., Schroeder K. Results-based management: friend or foe? // Development in Practice. 2007 (Jun.). Vol. 17. No. 3. P. 426-432.
16. Patton M.Q. Utilization-focused evaluation (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2008.
17. Hogwood B., Gunn L. Policy Analysis for the Real World. Oxford, 1984.
18. Anderson J. Public Policymaking: An Introduction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006.
19. Dunn W. Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction. Upper Saddle River, 2004.
20. I.A.Karimov The way we chose is the way of cooperation with the democratic development and enlightenment world. TITLE 11: "Uzbekistan", 2003. 157-p
21. Mirziyoev Sh.M. We will continue our path of national development with determination and bring it to the new stage. T.I. -T.: Uzbekistan, 2017. - B. 235.