

Aim and scope

<u>Editors, Advisory Board</u>

- Ethical Standards
- For authors
- Archive
- Open Access Policy
- Contact

European Financial and Accounting Journal 2011/2

M&E and Budget Program Performance Measurement in Ukraine: Current State and Needs for Improvement

[full text (PDF)]

Sergii Slukhai

The key elements of a performance-based budgeting methodology have already become a part of the mechanism for public expenditure management in Ukraine. At the same time, there still remains the issue of linking budget expenditures to specific results achieved by specific budget programs which defines the necessity of applying modern approaches to carrying out M&E. This study presents an analysis of the current state of M&E in Ukrainian public expenditure program management and offers some solutions which could improve its functioning. The analysis has revealed the absence of rigorous selection of performance indicators to evaluate budget program implementation, a need to better institutionalize the monitoring and evaluation activities through functional differentiation of budget programs and changes in approaches to their assessment.

Keywords: Budget program, Evaluation, Major spending unit, Monitoring, Performance-based budgeting

JEL Classification: H50

References:

[1] Heyets, V. M. (ed.) (2008): State Purpose-Oriented Programs and

Regulation of Programming Process in the Budget Sphere. Kyiv,

Naukova Dumka, 2008.

[2] Jackson, P. M. (1995): Measures for Success in the Public Sector.

London, Public Finance Foundation, 1995.

[3] Kusek, J. Z. - Rist, R. C. (2001): Building a Performance-Based

Monitoring and Evaluation System. The Challenges Facing

Developing Countries. Evaluation Journal of Australasia, December

2001, Vol. 1 (new series), No. 2, pp. 14-23.

[4] Kuzmin, A. I. – O' Sallivan, R. – Kosheleva, N. A. (eds.) (2009):

Program Evaluation: Methodology and Practice. Moscow, Presto-

RK, 2009.

[5] Mackay, K. (2007): How to Build M& E Systems to Support Better

Government. Washington, D.C., World Bank, 2007.

[6] OECD (1998): Best Practice Guidelines for Evaluation. PUMA

Policy Brief, May 1998, No. 5.

[7] OECD (2008): Performance Budgeting: A User's Guide. OECD

Policy Brief, March 2008.

[8] Reed, E. – Morariu, J. (2010): State of Evaluation 2010. Evaluation

Practice and Capacity in the Non-Profit Sector. Washington, D.C.,

Innovation Network, 2010.

[9] Robinson, M. - Last, D. (2009): A Basic Model of Performance-

Based Budgeting. Washington, D.C., IMF, 2009.

[10] Sanzharovskyi, I. – Polianski, Yu. (eds.) (2007): Handbook on

Monitoring and Evaluation of Programs for Regional Development.

Kyiv, KISS, 2007.

[11] Tertychka, V. (2002a): Governmental Policy: Analysis and

Implementation in Ukraine. Kyiv, Osnovy, 2002.

[12] Tertychka, V. (2002b): Issues in Effectiveness and Efficiency

Evaluation within Public Policy Analysis. Bulletin of Ukrainian

Academy of Public Administration, 2002, No. 1.

[13] World Bank (2004): Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools,

Methods & D.C., World Bank, 2004.

Current issue

2/2018

Articles

Zdeněk Rybák

Analysis of the Individual Travel Insurance in the Czech Republic

Michal Novák

The Quality of Disclosure under IAS 38 in Financial Statements of Entities Listed on PSE

Lucie Kábelová, Ondřej BAYER

Labour Taxation and its Effect on Employment Growth: Latest Estimations with Focus on the Czech Republic

ATM Adnan

Home vs. Cross-Border Takeovers: Is There Any Difference in Investor Perception?

Copyright © 2018 <u>Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze</u> webmaster