Natal'ya Vladimirovna Eshenko – chief specialist of the Administration of economic development of the administration of Khabarovsk (Khabarovsk).
E-mail: eshenkonv@khabarovskadm.ru

To the question about evaluation of the result of design activity of the nonprofit organizations

In this article the questions of evaluation of the result of design activity of the nonprofit organizations are examined.

Keywords: nonprofit organizations, the evaluation of design activity.

In the countries of developed democracy the significant role play the nonprofit organizations, which come out as the component part of civic community, although in the legislation of many states there is no not legally specific concepts "non-government nonprofit organization" (NNO). The more concrete specific definitions are used instead of this: "noncommercial association", "fund", "voluntary organization", "charitable institution", determined either by the specific laws or by the kept balance practice and by the internal documents (regulations) of such organizations.

The basic sources of the incomes of NNO are the payments, donations and gratuitous investments, which are directed to the realization of the socially significant projects in different spheres of society. However, the main directions of activity of NNO are: education and science, culture and sport, and also public health and the work of professional organizations.

In recent years the tendency to focusing of attention to NNO from the side of federal and local authorities was outlined. In connection with the realization of the positions of 131-FL [1], the first priority role of NNO is seen in the information, the education of citizens about the possibilities of their participation in the local self-government and their active involvement in this process. From the other side, NNO can play the role of mediator between the organs of local self-government (LSG) and the citizens, being of interests of the local communities before the municipal authorities.

Naturally, the question about the forming of steady local communities with the help of not only the organs of authority and LSG, but also by means of the work of those acting prolonged time NNO, which have the experience of control of different kind of projects and collaboration with different philanthropists, and also professional associations arises.

In the Russian Far East by an example of this association can serve KTCPO "Green house", which realizes at present 2 multi-projects ("Associations and Alliances at the municipal level", "The development of collective (association) owner's activity") and 2 projects ("The development of the village: the owner's passiveness of population and the methods of its overcoming", "The development of municipal formations") of social and economic directivity in the focal

(purposeful) regions in Khabarovsk and Primorsk territories with the total budget about 2,1 million dollars of the USA.

The questions regularly arise: “What are the results of realizable projects? How do they influence the social and economic development of the territory (and so forth)? ”.

There are many approaches, made in the economically developed countries. Most known of them are 3 waves of approaches to the estimation of programs, developed, beginning from the 60th of the XX century (against the background the development of administrative reforms in the EU countries, the USA, etc) [2]:

• 1960th – 1970th (normative approach: the accent on the planning of state programs);

• the middle of 1970th – 1980th (the control over the expenditures);

• the end of 1980th – 1990th (the new state management).

The main disadvantage in all three approaches is an excessive attachment to the quantitative measurements [3].

More extended in the 90th of the XX century was the model of successful control (performance management), which is directly connected with the philosophy of “the new model of control” (“New Steering Model”) and includes the collection of following procedural principles [4]:

1) Determination of the result in the reviewer concepts (direct results (outputs), eventual results – social effects (outcomes), other effects and influence);

2) Setting the measured level of desirable achievements (the purposes of result, the standards of services);

3) Determination of the degree, in which the results can be considered the achievements with the use of indices of the result (result measurement, the monitoring result);

4) Giving accounts according to the results with the used resources (reports about the results, about the social results);

5) Solutions, relevant to the distribution of resources (for example, budget fund), are based on that obtained as a result of result measurement of information (budgeting, oriented to the effectiveness; budgeting, oriented to the result).

The main failure in this method is in the superfluous degree of orientation to the financial result.

In Canada more frequently is used the system’s approach to the evaluation of programs (politician) (program (policy) evaluation). In accordance with the frame agreement, the territorial organ of the state administration (agency) establishes the detailed criteria of correspondence for the programs, being based on the priorities and measures; it separates funds in accordance with the priorities, and then selects the projects. With an increase of regional and local potentials and the right of property the decentralization of management occurs [5]. The major problem of using of this method is the expense on time and resources since it can include different combinations of, at least, 35 methods of evaluation, among which: the evaluation of results, the budget outlays, the results.

However the most comprehensible approach received the greatest distribution in economically developed countries and used, in particular by the

World Bank, is the complex approach including following principles and the criteria of evaluation:

1. The comparability of estimations of various scenarios.

2. The orientation on steady development (the project should be ecologically, socially and economically steady).

3. The openness of the project, information support, participation in its development and realization of all interested.

4. The degree of an acuteness of the solved problem, promptness of actions.

Thus, in the world practice various methods of evaluation of productivity of social and economic projects are used. Thus, the tendency of transition from the use of mono-methods to the use of their complex (program evaluation) recently is observed. In Russia the given approach just starts to be used.

According to the international standards, the mortgage of successful evaluation is: "…the interest in spent researches, their importance for the citizens, and also small quantity of data about the object of research" [6]. The parameters of productivity should be verified, i.e. to enter the statistical reporting or to be defined on the basis of others legislatively or regular established procedures. The working plans of sold projects should be oriented on the achievement of results established for them, and the development of budgets – to the maintenance of concrete functions, services and kinds of activity, instead of to the developed organizational structure.

According to the English tradition of evaluation, there are some levels of it: at the territorial level, at the level of the program/project as a whole, and also at the level of components of this program/project [7].

The purpose of evaluation of productivity of the realized programs/projects should depend on how the results of carried out research will be used by the customer. Besides, proceeding from the limitation of finances, it is better "… to focus attention and resources to the limited quantity of the important questions and aspects of the project, than to try to estimate the efficiency of all" [8].

Thus, we come to the point that in the basis of evaluated researches the methods borrowed from various fields of the socially-scientific knowledge should be, first of all – from sociology, economy, the political analysis and the right. This aggravating the methodological party of the question circumstance becomes complicated also by the constant and ineffectual discussion about an opportunity of domination of qualitative or quantitative methods in the program evaluation.

As an example we can dwell on the projects of the already mentioned above the Khabarovsk territorial charitable public organization “Green house” (KTCPO “Green house”) and, in particular, on the system of indices, developed by the implementation of the Program “Associations and alliances at the municipal level” (AAM).

The program began its work from the search of rural activists in 42 villages of 7 purposeful regions of Khabarovsk and Primorsk territories, through conducting of the round of small grants (“blind” grant- round). The work was made with the help of the Resource centers (RC), created in each of the purposeful regions. In the selected 19 focal villages for 2 years (since October 2007 until July

2009) by the prepared by the program masters was carried out the system work, the result of which became the formation and development in each of the villages of the acting rural active memberships.

The initial evaluation of projects occurred in the Expert councils by the means of application of the matrix of SMART-analysis. These are international criteria, the essence of which consists in the following: specific (concreteness – the project will actually give at the output the product, necessary to the association and designated in the concept of development); measurable (calculation; this product can be calculated); area-specific (territoriality; the project acts on this territory, village); realistic (reality; the project is feasible with this group of development by the appropriate support of the administration of the village, region, local owners, under the condition of attraction of the population); time-bound (the project is possible to carry out in the time indicated).

In this case, the active membership or the group of concrete project could independently develop the criteria of success of the project. “Green house”, in particular, manufactured the following: the need of project for the creator; the need of project for the association; the need of project for the authority/for large business, interested in successful realization of the project and consonant for this success to give into the project budgetary/their own means and administrative resource; the project is implanted into the system, which feeds the association, the product of the project enjoys demand.

The evaluation of the influence of the Program on the social and economic situation through the number of indices, which include the still appropriate statistical indicators has taken place at the end of realization of the projects: professional growth, the quarry of people, new working places, special-purpose local programs (for the cooperators – credits of the national project on AIC); partner investments from business; the decrease of criminality; the stabilization of the decrease in the population or its increase; the formation of young families; demographic increase; an increase of children, who attend the paid kindergartens, circles, courses; an increase in the stores and in the markets of a quantity of local production; an increase of the taxable base, an increase in the welfare of inhabitants, who work in the cooperative constantly or seasonal; the precedents of information support; meetings in the support of development projects and so forth.

The district organs of the local self-government (LSG) highly evaluated the contribution of resource centers to the development of civic community and economy of their regions, the part was taken by RC as the experts to the elaborating of development programs of the civic community.

The best results were achieved at the level of focal settlements. Its own contribution on the projects of 2007 – 2008 made 581801 dollars by the contribution of the Program of 282219 dollars. Those who got grant drew means more 3,5 times, than they planned. In the whole, on the projects there was exceeding of its own contribution above the means of Grants – to 30 – 50%.

Their own contribution in the projects of 2008 – 2009 was 220421 dollars by the contribution of the Program of 202085 dollars. Those who got grant drew

means more 2 times, than they planned (108925 dollars). As a whole on the projects their own contribution is equal to grant's sums.

Much was done, also, in the course of the implementation of such programs, as:

1. The multi-project "Developing of more active collective (association) owner's activity". It is financed by the Ford Found, the USA. The period of realization: since the 1st of September, 2006 till present. Invested to the present period resources make 450000 of US dollars. In 2006 – 2008 the project was realized in the villages the Vyazemsk region, at present is planned the widening of activity to the other regions of Khabarovsk territory with the condition of co-financing from the budget of Khabarovsk territory.

2. The project "Development of the village: the owner's passiveness of population and the methods of its overcoming". It is financed by ANO "The institute of public design" in the correspondence and the order, established by the President of RF "About the guarantee in 2007 of the state support of the noncommercial nongovernmental organizations, which participate in the development of the institutes of civic society". The period of realization: December 2007 – October 2008. Budget – 179384 rubles.

3. The program "Development of municipal formations" (DMF). It is fulfilled by the Fund "Steady development" (FSD, Moscow) by the financial support of USAID. KTCPO "Green house" is the Regional center of the program in the Far East. The period of realization: since October 2006 till the present time. Total budget – 5,6 million dollars. DMF is realized throughout the entire territory of Russia.

Furthermore, the successful implementation of programs impelled the government of the territory to strengthen the work on creation of the infrastructural support NNO of the territory.

However, in spite of the number of reached successes in the design activity of NNO, the further refinement of criteria, characterizing the results of projects (programs), realized by the assistance of NNO and, correspondingly, the evaluation of their activity is still required. The production of these criteria and evaluations by the parallel search of active citizens and the support of their public initiatives continue.

Literature and the sources:

1. About the general principles of organization of local self-government in the Russian Federation: Federal law dated October 6, 2003. № of 131-FL // Russian newspaper. – 2003. – № 202.

2. Wollmann, H. Evaluation in public-sector reform: Towards a ` third of wave' of evaluation? – Pp. 1-11. [Electronic resource] – Electron. data. – The regime of access: http://www.politanaliz.ru, free. – Titles from the screen.

3. Anderson, Andrea. An introduction to Theory of Change. The Evaluation Exchange. Volume XI, No. 2, Summer 2005. – [Electronic resource] – Electron. data. – The regime of access:

http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/issue30/expert3.htm, free. – Titles from the screen.

4. V. Marshakov. Evaluating of policies and the result measurement: world experience and the Russian prospects of evaluating of effectiveness in the state administration. – [Electronic resource]. – Electron. data. – The regime of access: http://www.politanaliz.ru/articleprint_505.html, free. – Titles from the screen.

5. Institutional measures of the realization of strategy of the regional development: the survey of international experience // The region: economy and sociology. – 2007. – № 3. – P. 259 – 277.

6. The Program Evaluation Standards. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. – [Electronic resource]. – Electron. data. – The regime of access: http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc/, free. – Titles from the screen.

7. McNamara, Carter, Basic Guide to Program Evaluation. – [Electronic resource].– Electron. data. – The regime of access: http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm, free. – Titles from the screen.

8. Dowell, A. Guidelines for Legislative Language for State Program Evaluation / California State University Long Beach. 18.12.1998. – [Electronic resource] – Electron. data. – The regime of access: http:// www.csulb.edu/~ddowell/goldbook.htm, free. – Titles from the screen