THE EMERGING FIELD OF EVALUATION AND THE GROWTH OF THE EVALUATION PROFESSION: THE RUSSIAN EXPERIENCE

Alexey Kuzmin
Process Consulting Company

Daniel Tsygankov
Higher School of Economics

Abstract: Evaluation is an emerging field in Russia, and the authors have been intensively involved in it for over a decade. This article explores the evolution of evaluation capacity and describes the growth of evaluator competencies in Russia. It focuses on areas with extensive development: (a) the institutionalization of regulatory impact assessment in the public sector, (b) evaluation's development in nongovernmental organizations, (c) the growth of monitoring and evaluation capacity in private foundations, and (d) the emergence of local independent evaluation consulting. Although no common definition of evaluator competencies exists in Russia, the role may be included in a professional registry currently under development.

Résumé :   L'évaluation est un domaine émergent en Russie, et les auteurs ont participé intensivement depuis plus d'une décennie. Cet article explore l'évolution de la capacité d'évaluation et décrit la croissance des compétences de l'évaluateur en Russie. Il se concentre sur les domaines qui subissent un développement étendu : (a) l'institutionnalisation de l'évaluation de l'impact réglementaire dans le secteur public, (b) le développement de l'évaluation dans les organisations non gouvernementales, (c) la croissance de la capacité de suivi et d'évaluation dans les fondations privées, et (d) l'émergence de conseil indépendant local en évaluation. Bien qu'aucune définition commune des compétences des évaluateurs n'existe en Russie, le rôle peut être inclus dans un registre professionnel actuellement en cours de développement.

▆▆▆▆▆▆   The demand for evaluation services in Russia is real and increasing slowly. Evaluation was "imported" into Russia along with international technical assistance during the early 1990s (Kuzmin, 2006). Throughout the mid 1990s, primarily foreign evaluators met

Corresponding author: Alexey Kuzmin, Process Consulting Company, Stromynka St.19, bld.2, TARP VAO, Moscow, Russia, 107076; <alexey@processconsulting.ru>

foreign donors' needs for program and project evaluation services in Russia. By the end of the 1990s, however, local specialists and organizations capable of conducting evaluations at a very high professional level were available in Russia. Foreign donors invited these practitioners to participate in evaluations under the supervision of foreign experts and, for the first time, on their own. Although this practical work gave many Russian specialists valuable experience, the confidence of foreign donors is still developing. No matter how experienced or how much effort local specialists invest in establishing their *bona fides*, many foreign donors still maintain a cautious attitude (Kuzmin et al., 2007).

By the end of the 1990s, following the adoption of laws and regulations governing competitive bidding for government contracts for social programs and municipal grants, Russian governmental structures began to show an interest in program evaluation. Administrative reforms in Russia now emphasize management by results, and governmental entities are increasingly interested in evaluation as an important new management tool. Large corporations have also begun to include charitable programs in their long-term strategies for social responsibility. These corporate charities have identified the need for evaluation, creating a demand for another new use of local evaluation practitioners.

The number of evaluation practitioners and people using evaluation in their everyday work was increasing and by the late 1990s had reached a critical mass for the creation of the first regional professional evaluation association in the Newly Independent States: the International Program Evaluation Network (IPEN).[1] IPEN was created in 2000 as an informal community of people working in the field of evaluation or interested in the subject of evaluation (Kosheleva, 2012). IPEN now includes 600 individual members from about 20 countries. Over 60% of IPEN members are from Russia. Together with its partners in the Newly Independent States, IPEN has conducted 11 annual international conferences, 4 of which were held in Russia.

There is a growing need in Russia to establish a national evaluation association to support nationwide development of the evaluation profession and to create new opportunities for local evaluators to increase their evaluation competency. We hope that by the time this article is published, a Russian Society for Program and Policy Evaluation will be formally established and active.

REGULATORY IMPACT ASSESSMENT COMPETENCIES IN THE
PUBLIC SECTOR

At present, all levels of government recognize only one type of evaluation as legitimate: regulatory impact assessment (RIA) within the government sector. RIA is a method of ex-ante or ex-post evaluation that measures the potential effects of a new regulation or regulation package. In the West two key approaches have determined the formation of RIA competencies: (a) *ideal* (normative) models developed within disciplines competing for leadership in RIA such as law, economics, sociology, and public administration, and (b) *Realpolitik*, a system of politics or principles based on practical rather than ideological considerations, one that adjusts ideal models to local political, legislative, cultural, and other contexts (Kirkpatrick & Parker, 2007).

Several factors affected the development of regulatory impact assessment during Russia's transition into the 21st century. In the late 1990s, the so-called "Liberal Economic Project" included use of RIA as an approach for evaluating the quality of governance during the first term of Vladimir Putin's presidency. The Center for Strategic Research,[2] one of the leading Russian economic think tanks, was the driving force behind that project.

The scope of RIA evolved rapidly. RIAs in Russia were initially limited to identifying administrative barriers and understanding how to reduce them. The Moscow-based economists who drove this initial implementation of RIAs during 2000–03 had built their RIA evaluation capacity by attending Western universities (e.g., through exchange programs), working with bilateral or multilateral organizations such as TACIS (Technical Assistance to Commonwealth of Independent States, a European aid program for the countries of the former Soviet Union) or the World Bank, and training themselves through online resources in the West.

Although influenced by the West, the approach developed a uniquely Russian character that defined and applied RIA differently. For example, although RIA in Russia started with Western concepts such as *simplification*, *reducing administrative burdens*, and *less regulation*—concepts that had also emerged in the OECD countries in the 1980s and early 1990s—these concepts had become outdated by the late 1990s (Radaelli & de Francesco, 2010). RIA in Russia shifted from *less regulation to better regulation* and eventually to *smart regulation* (Belyaev, Derman, & Tsygankov, 2011).

Regulatory impact assessment also became a multidisciplinary arena requiring competencies related to economics, law, political science, and sociology. This shift was influenced by two factors. First, political scientists, lawyers, and sociologists began to conduct RIAs and brought the paradigms and approaches to research and analysis of their fields to RIA. Second, international collaborations expanded, particularly with European and North American RIA specialists. Through these collaborations, the Russians who had been implementing RIAs with limited access to learning and few opportunities for sharing experiences gained access to the most recent evaluation journals and books, became involved in international discussions at professional conferences, and were able to attend training and capacity-building workshops.

The global financial crisis of 2008 created incentives for reconsidering the criteria for *good governance* and for formally installing RIA within governmental structures. In the summer of 2010, the federal Ministry of Economic Development created a Department for Regulatory Impact Assessment, and the RIA system has been developing rapidly ever since. RIA units must be established at the regional level by 2014 and at local levels by 2015. The establishment of RIA throughout the Russian government has created a growing need to hire RIA specialists and to develop systematic descriptions of the core competencies of an RIA specialist and the responsibilities of this new position. Table 1 presents a brief description used by the recruiting agency to find suitable candidates for the position of Deputy Director of the RIA Center at the Higher School of Economics. While the Deputy Director job description provided enough information for candidates to apply (e.g., they understood the basic qualifications for the position), the core competencies were not clearly defined.

In the fall of 2010, the Higher School of Economics (HSE) in Moscow[3] established its RIA Center to provide methodological support to the Department for Regulatory Impact Assessment and regional administrations. At the time, there were no competency definitions for Russian RIA specialists. By 2012, however, some definitions had been developed, and training for civil servants conducted by the Higher School of Economics currently includes competencies in data collection, assessment with limited quantitative data, assessment of resources needed for developing RIA systems in the regions, implementation of pilot studies, selection of normative acts for analysis, and development of expert centres.

Table 1
RIA Center Deputy Director (HSE) Position Description

Functions	• Manage implementation of research projects • Develop documentation for tenders, contract drafts, etc. • Provide consultations and methodological support to the government entities (including the RIA Department of the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia) • Negotiate contract terms and conditions, delivery of research reports, etc. with government agencies • Participate in meetings with various stakeholders
Necessary experience	• 3+ years managing government-funded research projects (maintaining relationships with government clients, developing terms of reference, negotiating contracts) • Developing regulatory acts and guides • Skills in economic analysis of the effects of regulations • Knowledge of principles of and approaches to performance evaluation • Understanding of how the Russian budgeting system functions • Understanding of office systems in federal-level government entities
Competencies	• Acquaintance with anti-corruption analysis, monitoring application of laws, public assessment, environmental impact assessment • Good working knowledge of English

The professionalization of this very specialized field has been supported in several ways. Evaluators and others who identified themselves as RIA professionals developed an informal community of practice with several online forums. Its members actively participate in regional and national evaluation conferences. Since 2007, the International Program Evaluation Network[4] (IPEN), a professional association operating throughout the Newly Independent States, has included an RIA strand in its regional conferences. Also in 2007, a conference hosted by the HSE focused on "Reforms and Evaluation of Programs and Policies."[5] Since 2011, the annual international academic conferences on economic and social development organized by the HSE have had an RIA strand.[6]

In summary, while an individual who wanted to conduct an RIA when it was originally introduced in the late 1990s was constrained by lack of guidance, formal training, and professional journals, the situation quickly shifted when the government institutionalized RIA. Educational and civil society organizations stepped in to provide support that resulted in the development of core competencies for

this emerging profession. The professionalization of the RIA field in Russia is still in its early stages, however, and it is too early to make judgements regarding the effects of its institutionalization.

EVALUATION COMPETENCIES IN NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Nongovernmental Context

The oldest Russian nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are not much more than 20 years old. NGOs first appeared in Russia along with Gorbachev's *perestroika* (restructuring) and *glasnost* (openness) in the late 1980s. These terms were the watchwords for the renovation of Soviet society that Mikhail Gorbachev pursued as general secretary of the Communist Party from 1985 until 1991. The number of NGOs increased dramatically in the early 1990s when international development agencies such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and others provided direct grants and technical assistance to many civil society development programs in Russia (Sundstrom, 2006). NGOs have become an important element of contemporary Russian society and address issues ranging from human rights and legislation, public participation, and environmental protection to healthcare, education, media, and research (Abrosimova, Kazakov, Kovalevskaya, & Mokienko, 2006).

During the 1990s, several regional NGO resource centres were established that supported other NGOs. These centres, most of which evolved from existing NGOs with the strongest overall capacity, offered training and technical assistance to NGOs in their respective regions (GRANI Center, 2010).

In the last several years there has been a significant decrease in the amount of money received from international donors and an increase in the amount of money received from Russian citizens, corporate and government sources, and newly established private Russian foundations (Chikov, 2013; Public Chamber of Russian Federation, 2011). Today, while Russian NGOs vary by size, mission, and budget, most have highly trained staff. Most NGO workers, for example, have university degrees. The NGO sector is now recognized by government and business alike as an important partner and a valuable professional resource (Chirikova, 2012).

Evaluation and the NGO Sector

Until the mid 1990s, foreign evaluators—often from the country of the donor agency funding the NGO—conducted all program evaluations in Russia. The numerous donor-funded training programs for NGOs contained either no information on evaluation or, at most, very short, basic modules explaining how to develop indicators (Kuzmin, 2004a). NGOs applying for donor-funded grants often filled in the monitoring and evaluation sections of their applications with formal one-paragraph statements that said very little about how they were actually going to conduct their monitoring and evaluation.

In the mid 1990s, this practice began to change as international development agencies began to add local evaluation capacity development to their agenda (Kuzmin et al., 2007). Four significant changes took place. First, as local NGOs matured, they realized that they needed to further develop their ability to measure the results of their efforts. Second, local grant-managing organizations faced the challenge of evaluating the projects and programs they funded. Third, as the amount of foreign assistance decreased, greater responsibility was delegated to the local partners of international organizations, which naturally resulted in their need to develop greater internal skill in evaluation, research, and analysis. Fourth, there was a growing demand for local evaluators; local organizations with modest project budgets found it impossible to hire foreign external evaluators (who often were more expensive than local evaluators), and international agencies began hiring local professionals to evaluate programs in the region.

The Siberian Civic Initiatives Support Center (SCISC) is a good example of a Russian NGO with strong evaluation competencies. SCISC is an NGO resource centre located in Novosibirsk with a network of affiliates throughout Siberia. Its mission is to promote the development of civic initiatives and citizen responsibility for addressing community issues through strengthening partnerships among civil society institutions, government, and business. The leadership of SCICS is involved in promoting effective evaluation throughout their organization and developing evaluation capacity in the civil society and public sector.

Management involvement and support played an important role in its own evaluation capacity development. SCISC became involved in evaluation because of its own internal need to conduct effective

grant programs and inform strategic decisions. SCISC had effectively trained NGO representatives and government officials in evaluation because of its own focus on utilization; the intended use and intended users of evaluation have always been clearly identified. External demand has played an important role in sustaining SCISC's present evaluation capacity, which is not restricted to its headquarters. Evaluation capacity is dispersed among various organizations and people throughout the SCISC network, making the evaluation capacity development process more sustainable and far-reaching.

One of SCISC's strategic priorities is to continuously develop and maintain the evaluation competencies of its staff. The SCISC strategy for professional staff development is opportunity-driven. Although they do not yet have a comprehensive list of evaluation competencies for their own use, their lead evaluators use every opportunity to learn more about the discipline through online courses and national and international conferences. Interestingly, one of the SCISC specialists received the American Evaluation Association's (AEA) International Travel Award in 2011 and attended the Evaluation 2011 conference in Anaheim, California.

The SCISC evaluation training program is organized around meeting evaluators' practical needs. The training covers all stages of the evaluation process, from identifying intended users and their information needs to implementing the evaluation's results. It teaches people how to develop an evaluation scope of work, design an evaluation, collect and analyze data, write an evaluation report, provide feedback on evaluation findings, and implement evaluation results. The training also covers evaluation ethics and guiding principles for evaluators based on the AEA principles.[7]

It is important to note that SCISC faces serious practical challenges in developing and promoting evaluation skills within the organization and its network:

- Keeping evaluation competency inside the organization in spite of high staff turnover
- Finding the right balance between "empirical" (i.e., practical) and theoretical learning
- Keeping the network's most capable evaluators motivated through creating opportunities for their professional development (i.e., training and conferences) and regular involvement in evaluation work; all of them are doing evaluation

on a part-time basis and need to have regular evaluation practice. (Kuzmin, 2009)

Evaluation Competencies in Private Foundations

The newly established private foundations in Russia rapidly developed internal evaluation capacity. Their financial resources gave them the ability to hire highly competent staff with business backgrounds or solid experience in the NGO sector and experience with evaluation. This ability to "buy" evaluators with strong evaluation skills has allowed private foundations to become leaders in evaluation capacity development in Russia. The Victoria Foundation (Moscow) is a good example of such an organization.

URALSIB Financial Corporation is one of the pioneers and active users of the Balanced Scorecard strategic planning and management system. In 2008, URALSIB became the first Russian company to be inducted into the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) Hall of Fame, which honours "organizations that have achieved an *execution premium*—extraordinary performance results—through the use of the Kaplan-Norton Balanced Scorecard" (http://www.thepalladiumgroup.com/Results/hof/Pages/HofViewer.aspx?MID=112).

Nikolay Tsvetkov, the President of the URALSIB Financial Corporation, established the foundation in 2004 to support orphans. The foundation focuses on placing orphans in families and helping the families provide consistent support that assists these children to realize their goals in life, live a happy childhood filled with positive emotions, receive a good education, become spiritually mature, and ultimately become successful members of society.

The Victoria Foundation inherited the BSC approach and became the first Russian Foundation to systematically implement the BSC in a non-business environment. The foundation has a full-time evaluation specialist who is responsible for (a) helping develop and implement monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, (b) consulting the foundation's management and staff on M&E issues and updating them on current trends and developments in the M&E field, and (c) helping program officers develop evaluation terms of reference (ToRs) and select external evaluators. The evaluation specialist is also responsible for developing ongoing evaluation skills training programs for the foundation's program staff and management. The foundation con-

ducts external evaluations of its programs and projects on a regular basis and is well known among Russian evaluators.

Currently, the Victoria Foundation is implementing internal evaluation standards developed by Evolution and Philanthropy (E&P), another not-for-profit group established by Tsvetkov. The development of evaluation standards was based on the assumption that implementation and systematic use of evaluation by URALSIB not-for-profit entities would improve the effectiveness, quality, and transparency of their programs and that the newly developed evaluation standards would help improve accountability and increase the key stakeholders' confidence in a program's performance. URALSIB evaluation standards are based on the results of a thorough study conducted by a team of leading Russian evaluation specialists. They also reflect the URALSIB leaders' views on evaluation and existing company practices. URALSIB evaluation standards cover the following areas:

- general purpose of evaluation and evaluation categories
- institutionalization of evaluation
- planning requirements and evaluation
- conducting an evaluation
- developing and using indicators
- accountability and reporting
- funding and capacity building

Each standard includes (a) a brief statement; (b) several bullet points explaining the statement; (c) the rationale and importance of the standard; (d) comments on practical use of the standard, including its limitations; and (e) references to special literature in Russian and/or English.

Three out of 15 evaluation standards are related to evaluation capacity development, and one of the standards explicitly refers to evaluator competencies. The URALSIB evaluation standards are currently contained only in an internal document and have not been published. All of the not-for-profit and charitable entities established by URALSIB or its owner, however, including the Victoria Foundation, are supposed to use these evaluation standards.

GROWTH OF INDEPENDENT EVALUATION CONSULTING

As a result of slowly but steadily growing demands for evaluation services, independent evaluation consulting as an area of profes-

sional activities is growing slowly but steadily in Russia. Evaluation companies and freelance evaluation consultants develop their competencies mostly by self-education and learning by doing, gain experience, and become active in the Russian evaluation market. Few Russian companies specialize in evaluation, as most groups and independent consultants include evaluation among their services. Discussion about the difference between research (particularly applied sociological research) and evaluation is at an early stage. Many people believe that evaluation is similar to research and that researcher competencies can guarantee high quality evaluation.

English-speaking Russian evaluation consultants are better connected with international professional communities and acquainted with special literature on evaluation and evaluator competencies. They are already playing an important role as knowledge brokers, especially when working through the professional associations.

EVALUATOR COMPETENCIES: INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE AND THE RUSSIAN CONTEXT

Russian evaluators have been connected with the international evaluation community since the late 1990s. They have regularly participated in conferences held by leading professional associations such as the American Evaluation Association, the Canadian Evaluation Society, the European Evaluation Society, and the German Evaluation Society (DeGEval - Gesellschaft für Evaluation). International networking has allowed many English-speaking Russian specialists to become knowledge brokers and to communicate information on new directions and developments in evaluation to their colleagues in Russia. Russian RIA specialists have benefited greatly from participation in the training conducted by universities and Western consulting companies outside Russia and, since 2010, from visits by leading RIA practitioners to Russia.

Research results on evaluator competencies were first introduced to a Russian-speaking audience and discussed in a systematic manner at the international IPEN conference in Kiev, Ukraine, in 2004 (Kuzmin, 2004b). That paper (in Russian) included a taxonomy of evaluator competencies developed by King, Stevahn, Ghere, and Minnema (2001), evaluator competencies presented by the Canadian Evaluation Society (McGuire, 2002), and the core evaluator competencies identified by the Australasian Evaluation Society (English, 2002). Russian evaluators have been following publications on evalu-

ator competencies in various countries and contexts for the better part of a decade now and have used this information to

- help people new to the field understand what they need to learn to become evaluation professionals
- develop evaluation-related university curricula and short-term evaluation training
- develop ToRs for evaluations
- create job descriptions for evaluation and evaluation management positions
- develop evaluation policies at the organizational level.

There is no common definition in Russia of what constitutes a competent evaluator. Some academic sociologists believe that evaluation is similar to applied sociological research and that any properly trained sociologist can conduct quality evaluations. Evidence from evaluation practice in Russia contradicts this belief and demonstrates that evaluation requires unique competencies that are not, by default, included in most sociologists' training (e.g., negotiation skills). The debate about the contrast between evaluation competencies and sociological competencies may intensify in the near future, along with the growing government demand for evaluation and the increasing availability of funds for evaluation. International experience in defining evaluation competencies will definitely be used to provide arguments in the course of this debate.

The Government of Russia, which is currently preparing a new registry of professions, will also have a role in this debate. The profession of program evaluator—with a set of relevant competencies based on local and international experience—could be included in this new professional registry. A working group formed by an informal committee of Russian evaluators drafted a description of the program evaluation profession that will be submitted to the Russian Ministry of Labour in 2014. The description document includes the following areas of competency:

1. Program and project planning
2. Design and implementation of expert evaluation of project and program proposals
3. Design, implementation, and maintenance of project and program monitoring systems
4. Design and implementation of empirical evaluations of projects and programs

    5. Project management
    6. Consulting
    7. Interpersonal communication
    8. Evaluation ethics and guiding principles

Competency areas 1, 5, 7, and 8 are based on international experience and are in line with the work of international authors mentioned above. The remaining four competency areas included in the document need some clarification. They are based on an evaluation typology comprising three broad categories of evaluation (Kuzmin, 2011, 2012):

    a. "Expert evaluation" or evaluation based on expertise (that knowledge subject experts already have)
    b. "Indicator evaluation" or evaluation based on indicators (that are measured in the course of an evaluation)
    c. "Empirical evaluation" or evaluation based on empirical study

Three examples will help clarify this typology. A project proposal assessment conducted by a group of preselected subject experts is an example of expert evaluation. Monitoring is an example of indicator evaluation. *Program evaluation*, as the term is normally used in the professional literature—systematic collection of data about a program using the methods of the social sciences—is an example of empirical evaluation. This evaluation typology reflects the reality that Russian evaluators face. They are often invited to participate in or organize proposal assessment processes (competency area 2 above); they are heavily involved with design, implementation, and maintenance of monitoring systems (competency area 3); and they regularly conduct traditional empirical evaluations (competency area 4).

Consulting (competency area 6) was included in the description document because the working group strongly believes that evaluation is a consulting profession and that an evaluator fits Peter Block's classic definition of a consultant: "a person in a position to have some influence over an individual, a group, or an organization, but who has no direct power to make changes or implement programs" (Block, 2011). According to Block, consulting skills need to be developed to meet the specific requirements of each stage of consulting: contracting, diagnosis, feedback, and decision. Hence, strong consulting skills are essential for evaluators.

There are two important concluding notes. First, at this time there is no general consensus on evaluation competencies in Russia; the competency areas mentioned above were proposed by a relatively small working group and are subject to change. Second, the newly established Russian Society for Program and Policy Evaluation will continue to advocate for including the profession in the new registry.

NOTES

1   http://ioce.net/download/regional/RussiaCIS_IPEN_survey.pdf

2   http://new.csr.ru/index.php/ru/

3   http://www.hse.ru/en/

4   http://www.eval-net.org/

5   http://www.eval-net.org/view_konf.php?id=2007

6   http://conf.hse.ru/en/2013/history

7   http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51

REFERENCES

Abrosimova, E., Kazakov, O., Kovalevskaya, E., & Mokienko, R. (Eds.) (2006). *Contribution of non-governmental non-commercial organizations to coping with social problems in Russia: Development of social services*. Moscow, Russia: International Research and Exchange Board (IREX), Open Society Institute / Soros Foundation – Russia.

Belyaev, A., Derman, D., & Tsygankov, D. (2011). Methodological approaches to meta-evaluation of the regulatory impact assessments. *Journal of Project Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, 1*(1), 23–51.

Block, P. (2011). *Flawless consulting: A guide to getting your expertise used* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Chikov, P. (2013). *Russian NGOs: The funding realities*. Retrieved from http://www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/pavel-chikov/russian-ngos-funding-realities

Chirikova, A. (2012). *NGOs: Will a new player appear in the area of social policy in Russia?* Retrieved from http://www.socpolitika.ru/rus/ngo/research/document93.shtml

English, B. (2002). Competencies for evaluation practitioners: Where to from here? *Journal of the Australasian Evaluation Society, 2*(2), 13–15.

GRANI Center. (2010). *Study of Russian NGO resource centers: Review of the key results*. Moscow, Russia: Center for Civil Society and NGO Sector Studies, Higher School of Economics.

King, J. A., Stevahn, L., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2001). Toward a taxonomy of essential evaluator competencies. *American Journal of Evaluation, 22*, 229–247.

Kirkpatrick, C., & Parker, D. (Eds.) (2007). *Regulatory impact assessment: Towards better regulation?* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781847208774

Kosheleva, N. (2012, October). *Networked management model: Sustaining operation of an evaluation network without an executive office.* Paper presented at the 10th EES biennial conference, "Evaluation in the Networked Society," Helsinki, Finland.

Kuzmin, A. (2004a). *Exploration of factors that affect the use of evaluation training in evaluation capacity development* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Union Institute and University, Cincinnati, OH.

Kuzmin, A. (2004b, September). *Professional competencies in the areas of program evaluation and organization development*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Program Evaluation Network (IPEN), Kiev, Ukraine.

Kuzmin, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Program evaluation development in the Newly Independent States: Subjective views on an objective process*. Moscow, Russia: International Program Evaluation Network and UNICEF Regional Office for CEE and CIS.

Kuzmin, A. (2009). Development of evaluation capacity in the Siberian Center for Civic Initiatives Support. In A. Kuzmin, R. O'Sullivan, & N. Kosheleva (Eds.), *Program evaluation: Methodology and practice* (pp. 305–325). Moscow, Russia: Presto-RK.

Kuzmin, A. (2011, October). *Making evaluations useful*. Paper presented at the Grantmakers East Forum, Riga, Latvia. https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B8mxmw_YsWnpOTVkMWU5NjMtMWUwZi00ZWM5L-WJjM2EtM2IwNzA0NjE4YTE3/edit?pli=1

Kuzmin, A. (2012). *Types of evaluation*. Retrieved from http://evaluationconsulting.blogspot.ru/2012/08/blog-post.html

Kuzmin, A., Karimov, A., Borovykh, A., Abdykadyrova, A., Efendiev, D., Greshnova, E., . . ., & Balakirev, V. (2007). Program evaluation development in the Newly Independent States. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation, 4*(7), 84–91.

McGuire, M. (2002). *Canadian Evaluation Society project in support of advocacy and professional development*. Retrieved from http://consultation.evaluationcanada.ca/pdf/ZorziCESLitReview.pdf

Public Chamber of Russian Federation. (2011). *Corporate charity in Russia: Assessment of effectiveness of the existing institutional environment*. Retrieved from http://www.oprf.ru/ru/about/structure/structurenews/newsitem/13594?PHPSESSID=lhvmrv8lpks9q0kpqb0p5ig4n4

Radaelli, C. M., & de Francesco, F. (2010). Regulatory impact assessment. In M. Lodge, M. Cave, & R. Baldwin (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of regulation* (pp. 279–301). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199560219.003.0013

Sundstrom, L.M. (2006). *Funding civil society: Foreign assistance and NGO development in Russia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Alexey Kuzmin is the Director of the Process Consulting Company in Moscow, Russia. He also teaches program evaluation at the Moscow Higher School for Social and Economic Sciences. He is an experienced evaluation consultant and specializes in evaluating various development programs and projects in Russia and internationally.

Daniel Tsygankov is the Director of the Center for Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia. He teaches program and policy evaluation in the Masters of Public Administration Program. He has an interest in advancing and implementing RIA methodology in Russia.