

## EVALUATION OF PUBLIC POLICIES: CONTENT AND MODELS OF IMPLEMENTATION

### Mariana IAȚCO

Doctor of Political Sciences, university lecturer  
State University of Moldova, Faculty of International Relations, Political and Administrative Sciences,  
Department of Political and Administrative Sciences-Republic of Moldova  
e-mail: [iatsco44@hotmail.com](mailto:iatsco44@hotmail.com)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2864-2331>

---

*The evaluation is not only a verification of the conformity of public action, but also expresses a valuable appreciation of the success of the results and the impact - desired or not - of public policies and that this value judgment must be performed with the utmost rigor based on sound methodologies of evaluation. In recent years, public policy evaluation has been a huge concern for the governments of industrialized countries. Compared to other management improvement techniques focused primarily on economic control and regulatory compliance, the evaluation addresses social issues and democratic transparency, which are closely linked to the public visibility of reports and the diverse participation of public and private actors.*

**Keywords:** evaluation, cooperation programs, public policies, government, public administration, methodological guides, evaluation objectives.

### EVALUAREA POLITICILOR PUBLICE: CONȚINUT ȘI MODELE DE APLICARE

*Evaluarea politicilor nu este doar o verificare a conformității acțiunii publice, ci exprimă, de asemenea, o apreciere de valoare asupra succesului rezultatelor și a impactului - dorit sau nu - al politicilor publice și că această judecată valorică trebuie realizată cu maximă rigoare în baza unor metodologii solide de evaluare. Într-o lume în continuă schimbare, autoritățile statului trebuie să înțeleagă problemele complexe, difuze și contradictorii pe care politicile publice încearcă să le rezolve. Această întrebare necesită abordări cuprinzătoare în comparație cu analizele atomizate și decontextualizate ale controalelor administrative tradiționale. În ultimii ani, evaluarea politicilor publice reprezintă o preocupare enormă pentru guvernele țărilor industrializate, deoarece ea abordează aspecte sociale și de transparență democratică, care sunt strâns legate de vizibilitatea publică a rapoartelor și de participarea diversă a actorilor publici și privați.*

**Cuvinte-cheie:** evaluare, programe de cooperare, politici publice, guvernare, administrație publică, ghiduri metodologice, obiective de evaluare.

### EVALUATION DES POLITIQUES PUBLIQUES: CONTENU ET MODÈLES DE MISE EN ŒUVRE

*L'évaluation n'est pas seulement une vérification de la conformité de l'action publique, mais exprime également une appréciation précieuse du succès des résultats et de l'impact - souhaité ou non - des politiques publiques et que ce jugement de valeur doit être effectué avec la plus grande rigueur sur la base de méthodologies d'évaluation. Ces dernières années, l'évaluation des politiques publiques a été une préoccupation majeure pour les gouvernements des pays industrialisés. Par rapport à d'autres techniques d'amélioration de la gestion, axées principalement sur le contrôle économique et la*

*conformité réglementaire, l'évaluation aborde les questions sociales et la transparence démocratique, qui sont étroitement liées à la visibilité publique des rapports et à la participation diversifiée des acteurs publics et privés.*

**Mots-clés:** *évaluation, programmes de coopération, politiques publiques, Gouvernement, administration publique, guides méthodologiques, objectifs d'évaluation.*

## **ОЦЕНКА ПУБЛИЧНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ: СОДЕРЖАНИЕ И МОДЕЛИ РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ**

*Оценка политики является не только проверкой соответствия публичных действий, но выражает также и важную оценку успешности и воздействия - желаемого или нет - государственной политики и того, что это оценочное суждение должно быть выполнено с максимальной тщательностью на основе использованных методологий. В постоянно меняющемся мире, органам власти необходимо понимать сложные, разрозненные и противоречивые проблемы, на решение которых направлена государственная политика. Этот вопрос требует комплексных подходов по сравнению с раздробленным и деконтекстуализированным анализом традиционного административного контроля. В последние годы оценка государственной политики вызывает огромную обеспокоенность у правительств промышленно развитых стран. Это связано с тем, что оценка затрагивает социальные вопросы и демократическую прозрачность, которые тесно связаны с публичностью и доступностью отчетов и разнообразным участием государственных и частных субъектов.*

**Ключевые слова:** *оценка, программы сотрудничества, государственная политика, правительство, государственное управление, методические руководства, цели оценки.*

In recent years, public policy evaluation has been a huge concern for the governments of industrialized countries. Compared to other management improvement techniques focused primarily on economic control and regulatory compliance, the evaluation addresses social issues and democratic transparency, which are closely linked to the public visibility of reports and the diverse participation of public actors and private.

In a constantly changing world, public authorities need to understand the complex, diffuse and contradictory problems that public policies seek to address. This question requires comprehensive approaches compared to atomized and decontextualized analyzes of traditional administrative controls. The search for a broader holistic meaning, translated into a more comprehensive context, is the aspiration of evaluating public policies and programs.

The evaluation is not only a verification of the conformity of public action, but also expresses a valuable appreciation of the success of results and the impact - desired or not - of public policies and that

this value judgment must be extracted with the utmost rigor based on sound methodologies. evaluation.

For years, public administrations have developed numerous evaluation guides, referring to different sectoral policies. However, each institution has its own approaches depending on its tasks, this contributing to the customization of its instruments, all having a common core. In addition, major changes have taken place in the field of evaluation that require new tools and approaches, with an increasing demand for the need for strategic policy evaluation tools at public level.

Currently, policy evaluation reveals a complex area, with countless and very heterogeneous practices, with different approaches and goals. Thus, in different countries policy evaluation has an uneven development and continues to have certain tensions between the weight of its academic components and the logic of public interventions. In any case, both states and scientific communities are increasingly recognizing the need to assess the functioning and results of their institutions and policies in order to substantially

increase productivity and modernize specific public sector processes. In fact, three major sectors dominate the evaluation industry and establish many of its rules: the development assistance sector of international organizations, the European funds sector and the internal evaluation sector of each country, creating a myriad of evaluation practices [4, p.35].

States and their policies are increasingly involved in transnational interactions, promoted by very different actors, state and non-state, which force debate in increasingly open and complex spaces, which require a balance at regional and global level. However, the risks are not only determined by mismanagement or mismanagement, but rather by the public that develops mismanagement, with their backs to social and collective interests, protected by the democratic system itself [6, p.80].

As a result, there has been talk for many years of addressing all these risks with the establishment of a series of principles, known as New Governance, which naturally have an impact on public policy. The culmination of this process is good governance. And here we are talking not only about strengthening national institutions, but also about the democratic system, which is not without conflicts and various interpretations, because New Governance does not imply the same thing for everyone. It is a process under construction, which involves a new reflection on the role of the state and society in public decisions and their interaction in situations where resources are dispersed.

In Europe, this impetus has found its application in the White Paper on Governance, whose principles are based on “openness, participation, accountability, efficiency and coherence, while proposing democratic legitimacy and subsidiarity” [10, p.147]. These principles are not the sole responsibility of the European institutions, or only of the European Commission, but affect all levels of responsibility for public administration, private companies and civil society. If

this context of good governance and its principles are not taken into account, then the approach to public policy evaluation would compromise any research or study.

The analysis and evaluation of public policies requires a connection to the geopolitical contexts in which they develop, such as regions, economic sectors, nation states, corporations, taking into account other contexts such as culture, principles, criteria and goals pursued by public policies in various fields. action.

The quality of the political system is not an independent variable of the quality of public administration, but is in a direct dependence between these two elements. Public administration is a key political actor. In addition to being responsible for the implementation of public policies, the public administration is also responsible for their management, which is perceived after the good or poor functioning of public institutions, but also of the services they provide. However, the political-administrative relationship is not exempt from the tensions that have oscillated, over time, between approaches that give more or less discretion and responsibility to administrative functions.

It is impossible to gather here the infinite number of evaluation practices that try to improve the quality of public policies and contribute to their accountability. However, in a summary effort, we could highlight at least three well-defined evaluation pillars:

- 1) the enormous and varied block of national assessments, with a very diverse development and practice in each country and in each sector;

- 2) the evaluation carried out in the EU determined, in particular, by the control over European funds;

- 3) evaluation of development aid, which influences the transfer of knowledge and practices of international organizations [2, p.325].

The landscape of policy evaluation in different countries presents a very complex field of inhomoge-

neous practices, with overlapping control layers, with large differences between the spheres of government that interact and the sectors to which the evaluation is applied, with very different approaches and purposes. All this looks like a complicated labyrinth of coexisting paradigms, some emerging and others dominant, difficult to reveal, because they enrich the evaluation exercise, on the one hand, but also contain contradictions, on the other hand. In any case, they show the error of standardized solutions in the evaluation process.

Thus, states are increasingly recognizing the need for continuous evaluation of the performance and results of institutions and their policies in order to substantially increase productivity and modernize public sector-specific processes. Evaluation is practiced today in almost all European countries, but its development is very different. It can be measured by two types of criteria: i) the degree of institutionalization and its role in the preparation of the budget and its use by the public management; ii) the importance of structuring a specialized professional and academic environment [8, pp.51-65].

Based on these criteria, the American school of evaluation has made substantial progress, despite recent progress in policy evaluation in Europe. Some countries (Canada, UK, Australia, New Zealand) approach and apply the Anglo-Saxon school assessment methodology, with the exception of the Netherlands and Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark and Finland). Germany and France are in an intermediate situation, while in Italy and Spain policy evaluation has begun to develop at a faster pace in recent decades.

Evaluation in the Anglo-Saxon countries is closely linked to its relationship with the budget (the example of the United States and the United Kingdom Treasury). The results of the evaluations are explicitly mentioned in the budget documents, which provide a justification for certain public policy proposals. For

example, in the Netherlands, “budget assessment” is part of a systematic procedure for reviewing expenditure.

### **Models for evaluating public policies in the European space**

**United Kingdom (UK).** During the 1990s, the development of valuation in the United Kingdom was strongly marked by New Public Management (NPM). The strengths of this approach have been focused on privatization, the development of “market mechanisms”, the strengthening of regulatory bodies responsible for overseeing the proper functioning of markets, the outsourcing of administrative functions to non-governmental or semi-public actors.

In the new public management, the evaluation was endowed with strong political support and was invoked for the benefit of administrative reforms, with the risk of being reduced to an objective management technique. One of the reasons was the limitation of budgets and the need to set policy outcomes. All this promoted, in the ‘80s-90s, the use of managerial evaluation, focused on reducing costs and improving management.

The UK Strategy Unit, created in 2002, is a central body that brings together the work of the Performance and Innovation Unit (IPU) and other organizations to study and define strategies, which are subordinate to the Prime Minister. Its main task is to provide ideas for key topics of government policy and prospective studies. It also conducts studies in collaboration with sectoral ministries, which include evaluations and impact analyzes related to specific projects. It also highlights the opportunity cost of public interventions with a greater search for effectiveness and efficiency in management, as well as market share considerations. It is also worth mentioning that the share of ex ante evaluation is highlighted by the activity of the Regulatory Impact Analysis Units in promoting and supporting the

performance of the impact analysis by the sectoral departments of the British administration.

**Sweden.** The Swedish Public Management Agency (Statskontoret) operates on behalf of various ministries or parliamentary committees, which in turn have several evaluation bodies. The Swedish administrative system is based on the creation of commissions to carry out various tasks and involves a large number of evaluations of very different character and quality. The evaluation preferably focuses on social programs to determine their impact on social well-being and cohesion. The most common areas are the environment, taxes, social security, education and immigration assistance. It is part of public management models and budget programs and is supported by networks of external evaluators.

In **France** the development of the evaluation practice is inseparable from the political vision of the evaluation towards the manager and has been translated, since the '70s, in a series of extremely diversified institutional evaluation initiatives. Its history was marked by two attempts to implement evaluation in the functioning of the administration: the rationalization of budgetary decisions (RCB, 1970) and the creation of a governmental device for evaluating inter-ministerial policies in 1990.

Since the 1980s, under the impetus of Michel Rocard, evaluation has been part of an ambitious policy of administrative reform called "public service renovation". There are two special aspects to the evaluation in France: its contribution to the development of the responsibility of public officials and its role in the public debate.

The aim is to make evaluation a central element in government decision-making and democratic debate (hence the obligation to publish evaluation reports) and to advance evaluation methodology and ethics. In 1988, the Interministerial Council and the Scientific Council were abolished and replaced by the National

Evaluation Council, whose powers are both political and methodological.

The National Evaluation Council (CNE) in France was created in 1999 and, in theory, has the power of real initiative to propose evaluation issues to the Prime Minister. In practice, this power is limited by the reluctance of ministries involved in evaluations. It consists of professionals from the control bodies (Economic and Social Council, State Council and Court of Accounts), university professors, representatives of the socio-professional media and elected representatives from regions, provinces and municipalities.

The evaluation concept is multidisciplinary and interministerial, with a cross-cutting approach and as an economic and social tool. It is a model that has raised some criticism for its excessive bureaucratic burden and ongoing revision. In parallel with this institutionalization process, other forms of evaluation are being developed by the French administrations [5, p.1-32].

In the **Republic of Moldova** the process of analyzing and evaluating public policies includes three consecutive stages - ex-ante analysis (AEA), mid-term evaluation (EI) and ex-post evaluation (EEP). The public policy cycle is operational and efficient only if all these types of analysis and evaluation are closely integrated into a single coherent system, and if it comes to support public policy making and budgeting in a sustainable manner. Ex-ante analysis is the first step in the cycle of public policies that assesses the potential impact of a public policy on target groups or other groups, the budget, certain sectors, etc. The ex-ante analysis examines alternative options for solving problems and achieving the set objectives, analyzing the fiscal, administrative, economic, social and environmental impact of each option. The basic objective of the AEA is to support the Government's decision-making process by recommending that public policy approach, which we anticipate to be the most efficient or the most



positive impact and which avoids, as far as possible, inappropriate side effects.

Until now, in the Republic of Moldova the ex-ante analysis was the institutionalized part by introducing in 2008 the regulatory impact analysis (RIA). In 2010, the State Chancellery developed a more comprehensive guide for the AEA (entitled Methodological Guide for Ex-ante Analysis of the Impact of Public Policies), which is already being implemented for the elaboration of several Public Policy Proposals in all branch ministries. The regulatory framework and methodology regarding the evaluation of policy documents developed by the Government of the Republic of Moldova will be updated, and the further strengthening of the analysis capacities, expertise in the field of evaluation of civil servants.

#### **Evaluation of European funds from the methodological perspective of the MEANS guidelines**

In recent years in Europe, in addition to the United Kingdom and the Nordic countries pioneering policy evaluation, the greatest impetus in the field of evaluation has come from the European Union, which has stressed the importance of evaluating its policies and the need for Member States to develop them.

Since its creation in 1996, the evaluation system of the European Commission has developed both in the internal units of the institution itself and in the European Member States. Its objective was to promote and ensure the use of information obtained in evaluation activities at all levels of decision-making, from strategic to operational, although the latter were the most privileged.

The development of EU-promoted regional policies has put in place the Structural Funds Mechanism (ERDF, ESF), which, with the 1998 reform, obliges Member States to carry out systematic and mandatory evaluation activities to justify EU aid programs. This was corroborated by the reform carried out in

1999, based on the agenda planned for 2000. It is not only important to correctly define the problems and needs of the regions and to design programs to correct them, but also to set up an evaluation system that allows regular knowledge, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (not in terms of the environment, but in terms of the possibility of maintaining the program) of public interventions. To these criteria set by the European Commission for Development (DAC), the EU adds those with common complementarity and added value.

Community evaluation regulations have undergone significant changes since 1999, which are in line with:

- a) greater precision and consolidation of the references regarding the necessity and the obligatory execution of three types of evaluation (previous, intermediate and final);
- b) determining who should take responsibility for monitoring each of the evaluations;
- c) increasing the degree of achievement of monitoring and evaluation objectives;
- d) increasing the involvement of Member States' responsibilities [1, p.5-23].

In the field of evaluation, the European Union is particularly concerned with the political support of interventions and the acceptance of programs by governments and interest groups. In terms of its purpose, it contributes to the design of interventions and the setting of social priorities, seeking the efficiency and effectiveness of results, the impact of programs and the responsibility of interventions.

The EU has also maintained a very active role in the field of evaluation methodologies through the MEANS (Evaluation Methods for Structural Action) Program, which aims to achieve greater coherence and efficiency in procedures, helping to create a cultures of evaluation in several professional organizations.

The Structural Funds have created an environment, a language and an evaluation market with important

advantages for its promotion, although in some cases there have been contradictions. From a structural point of view and following the mandatory regulations of 2000, the evaluation units were created and strengthened in general in all the services of the European Commission, which allowed the consolidation of the evaluation culture within the institution.

The role of evaluation has been strengthened from an institutional point of view, with the inclusion in the 2003 Financial Regulation of the obligation to evaluate the activities carried out and to use the information obtained in the decision-making process [4, pp.35-67].

However, the momentum of policy evaluations in the EU is not without some paradoxes. On the one hand, it is positive that Member States have begun to think about the effectiveness of the results of programs and projects, and administrations have had to develop independent evaluations, although initially the evaluation work was more based on monitoring. economic (good use of funds), rather than the effects of policies and their formulation. But, on the other hand, the fact that the EU requested these controls conditioned the evaluation itself on the most ambitious claims (at political level), favoring its usefulness at managerial and technocratic level, even at the risk of bureaucracy.

The evaluation requests are not based on the specific problems presented by the programs, but rather on the budgets that must be met in order to obtain the funds. In turn, evaluation offers are transformed into requirements that try to comply with the Commission's calls, without much creativity, for fear of not meeting the specifications and losing competitions. The general conclusions regarding the evaluations performed are: feasible and financial studies well described in detail; the methodological bases of the evaluation and its processes have been strengthened, especially at managerial and operational level. The conclusions are often too general and of little use to decision-makers. It is difficult to separate the effects

of programs from other private, regional or national actions to determine the extent to which the results are attributed to EU regional policies.

All the above shows that the major concern of the European Community is the quality of evaluation. Despite the contradictions, it must be acknowledged the merits of the European Commission, in the period 1994-1999, a long way has been made, trying to individualize the evaluation methods to examine the effects of programs receiving European funds. This was due both to the debates organized within the international community of evaluators, discussing different approaches to evaluation and how to integrate them, and to the work carried out within the European MEANS program. The latter contrasted with the most significant evaluation experiences, the work being completed with the publication of a series of guides that offer a wide range of tools from which to draw conclusions, indicating the value and limit of each and inviting evaluators to develop more methodologies.

Since then, concern for evaluation quality has addressed not only well-done studies based on traditional statistical and macroeconomic methodologies, but also the entire collection of information that provides knowledge about program theory, context and, in particular, the use of evaluations by receiving administrations.

MEANS guides are indispensable for anyone who wants to know the methodological rules governing evaluation in the EU, although their use is not as general as it should be. The given guidelines do not seek to establish a "bible" in the assessment, but rather a guide for countries to adapt their requirements with versatility, also promoting methodological questioning and critical analysis. Along with the MEANS guides, the European Commission has published numerous collections and documents, such as the 2003 Evaluation Methodology for External Aid and the Guide to Socio-Economic Development, continuing the contribution started by the MEANS guides.

### **Evaluation of cooperation and development aid programs of international organizations**

Development aid policies are one of the areas in which evaluation has been imposed for many years as a tool of responsibility. It is true that in the beginning it was more related to monitoring and control than to the strategic vision of the evaluation requested lately.

Multilateral organizations dedicated to development cooperation and aid, such as the United Nations, the World Bank or the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, have been the driving force behind program evaluations by recipient countries' public administrations and have promoted a culture of evaluation with the publication of numerous theoretical studies, guides and practical manuals.

The framework for international cooperation of 7 July 1998 states in Article 19 (4) that SECIPI 'shall evaluate development cooperation policies, programs and projects financed by State funds in progress and completed, from its conception and definition to its results. STI. The evaluation will take into account the relevance of the objectives and their degree of achievement, as well as the efficiency, effectiveness, impact achieved and proven viability of the programs and projects already completed'[2, p.325].

A similar interest in evaluation is evident in the reports of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), in which governments work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of interdependence and globalization. This organization was created after World War II in order to coordinate the Marshall Plan, and in 1961 became the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development with a transatlantic and later global vocation. It currently has 30 member countries working through Cooperation Agencies and almost 70 countries or economies in development and transition are associated with its work. Its mission is to promote policies aimed at sustainable economic

growth, as well as financial stability and opportunities for progress in the living standards of member countries, in order to contribute to global economic development.

The approach to OECD evaluations is characterized by a technocratic approach, with an emphasis on efficiency and modernization of the public sector and support for the private and entrepreneurial sectors. Its main goals are to improve regulation, streamline decision-making and resource allocation, and promote "accountability" and learning policies from beneficiary organizations.

The OECD encourages joint evaluations with other donors, in line with current trends from the European Union, the World Bank, the International Labor Organization, NGOs. Evaluation is a tool that aims to answer specific questions about a specific program, project, set of actions or public policy. The questions may come from the beneficiary community, project or program managers or political authorities and are usually reflected in five standard criteria approved by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC): relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and durability. These criteria are included in the Terms of Reference (ToR), which is the contractual agreement with which the evaluation is formalized.

The characteristics of development aid evaluation focus on programs, projects and tools of different types, but fundamental are:

- Emergency humanitarian aid;
- Development Aid Funds (ADF);
- Funds for the granting of microcredits (FCM);

All aim to extend the same methodological line to all evaluations based on the intervention logic of the logical framework approach (EML), the research methodology of the intervention actions is also applied [7, pp.56-98].

External evaluations are usually used, hiring independent consultants by tender, in accordance with the established scale and tender specifications. It seeks to



promote the principles of impartiality and independence, as well as credibility based on the technical experience of the members of the teams. But we must also pay attention to some limitations of the evaluations of policies and programs characterized by:

- the fact that in most cases, ongoing projects and programs are evaluated, largely highlighting training features from recommendations and conclusions;
- lack of synthesis, sectoral or thematic studies for the systematization of the lessons learned;
- the need to stimulate the conduct of strategic evaluations, as the techniques and tools for operational evaluations differ in some respects from the methodologies propagated in the DAC manuals;
- they tend towards a very technical specialization.

Public policy evaluation indicates a new type of political-democratic control in accordance with the principles of the New Government: accountability, transparency and participation. This new mode of governance is based on public management models, which aim at greater effectiveness and efficiency of the public sector at different levels of governance, strategic and operational. These levels complement each other, but the logic of their evaluation is not exactly the same [13, p.35].

From this perspective, a public policy could have good results in terms of its objectives, but it does not always respect the principle of openness to citizens or may have a low social position. Civic participation is necessary in assessing the quality, relevance and effectiveness of public policies. On the other hand, beyond economic accounting, there is still little culture of responsibility in public organizations. Efficiency is a more common criterion, but may risk being limited to managerial effectiveness that does not include social effectiveness.

The logic of each level of governance must be taken into account in order to resolve the tensions that may arise when applying the criteria by which public

policies will be assessed. Finally, in the complexity of governmental spheres, the coherence of public policies seems to be an elementary principle of good governance and public monitoring.

Evaluation is the appreciation of the public to turn what does not work, but not only into purely technical premises, but also social dialogue that promotes a culture of responsibility and continuous improvement of public management. From this perspective, evaluation contributes to administrative improvement, which is not only compatible with efficiency, but can strengthen it, promoting the relational logic between the different administrative spheres and taking advantage of their capacities, resources and synergies.

Public policy evaluation seeks to connect democracy, control and efficiency, understanding that this, in the public sector, cannot be limited to exclusive market criteria or the interests of administrative oligarchies. The rules of good governance must balance efficiency with other criteria of public value: equity, social cohesion, co-responsibility, institutional cooperation, understanding and explaining the tensions inherent in the various interests that intersect in public action [15, p.135].

The added value of evaluation, in the end, is to help improve the quality of democracy and only in this way achieve its full legitimacy, because if it were limited to the tasks typical of traditional control, it would have no reason to exist. In order to improve the capacity to formulate public policies at a higher level and to value them, it is necessary to go beyond the conventional notions of “efficiency” and “effectiveness” (despite their importance) and to value the “capacity to influence the future in the desired direction” (“enlightenment”) and to deepen the quality of democracy. This is the essence of public policy evaluation.

Evaluation also contributes to the training and mobilization of agents and actors involved in public interventions. It helps them to understand the processes in which they participate and to assume their responsi-

bilities more responsibly on the objectives pursued by the policies and to improve the results [11, p.42].

Often, time produces changes that affect the objectives set in the planning of public interventions and it is possible that a dynamic process, such as evaluation, can better clarify them, producing improvements in the organization of work and in the effectiveness of the whole public policy process. Modern public management tools must allow each agent and each service to better define their tasks, assess their role in a general strategy and develop civic participation [3, p.135].

Another important aspect of the evaluation is that it favors the convergence of points of view and the cooperation between the political and administrative actors engaged in an intervention. All this allows not only to improve efficiency, but also to strengthen the legitimacy of public policies. Initially, evaluation can be experienced as annoying because it consumes time and energy. It may generate mistrust when interpreted as another type of administrative control, but when its culture is pervasive, it causes the actors involved to confront their daily action with external effects and take greater responsibility for results.

All these, in conclusion, make the evaluation, in addition to a cognitive process, to become a process of dynamization that promotes a relational culture and will have to coexist with other administrative cultures: legal-normative, managerial, economic. This dynamic capacity of evaluation has several types of effects: the motivation of the agents / actors involved, the more concrete delegation of responsibilities, the evolution of decision-making methods and the greater concern for public profitability. This capacity also becomes the biggest promoter and disseminator of the "evaluation culture" both for those who decide or propose evaluations and for those who lead and carry them out. Experience shows that the most successful evaluations are those that meet various purposes and uses in the public sector.

## References

1. ALVIRA, F. Metodología de la evaluación de programas. In: Revista "Cuadernos Metodológicos" nr. 2, CIS. Madrid, 2002, pp. 5-23.
2. BALLART, X. Modelos teóricos para la práctica de la evaluación de programas. Madrid, Lecturas de Gestión Pública. 1996, pp. 323-349.
3. BRIGGS, S., RIMKUTE, E. Manual de monitorizare și evaluare a politicilor publice. Secretariatul General al Guvernului României. București, 2009, pp.2-150.
4. BAÑÓN MARTINEZ, R. La evaluación de la acción y de las políticas públicas. Madrid, Ed. Díaz de Santos, 2003, pp.34-67.
5. CHANU, V. L'évaluation: affaire d'état ou question d'organisation. In: Politiques et Management Public, Paris, 2002, pp. 1-32.
6. CHELIMSKY, E., SHADIS, W. Evaluation for the 21 century. Thousand Oaks. SAGE Publications, 1997, pp.79-144.
7. FETTERMAN, D.M. Empowerment evaluation. California, SAGE Publications, 1996, pp.56-98.
8. HOWLETT, M.R. Studiul politicilor publice. Chișinău, Ed. Cartier, 2004.
9. HOGWOOD, W.B., GUNN, A. Lewis Introducere în politicile publice. București, 2000.
10. HESPEL, V. L'avenir institutionnel de l'évaluation des politiques publiques. In: Politiques et Management Public. Paris, 2002, pp.51-65.
11. IAȚCO, M. Unele aspecte privind evaluarea politicilor publice în practica guvernării democratice. In: MOLDOSCOPIE (Probleme de analiză politică) nr.3 (LXX), 2015, pp.41-46.
12. JOURDAIN, L. L'évaluation des politiques communautaires: légitimation et apprentissages nationaux. Cultures et Conflits, n° 28, 1997, pp.147-169.
13. LINDLOMB, Ch. Elaborarea politicilor. București, Ed. Cartier, 2003.
14. POPESCU, L. Politici publice. București, 2002.
15. WEIMER, D., VINIG, A. Analiza politicilor. Ediția III. Chișinău, 2004.