

UDC: 351.7

Terentieva Anna Valerivna,

Doctor of Public Administration, Full Professor, Senior Researcher, Head of the Department of public service, administration and training on the international projects, Institute of Public Administration in the Sphere of Civil Protection, 04074, Kyiv, Str. Vyshhorodska, 21, tel.: (044) 468 91 84, e-mail: teren_a@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-3881-5865

Терент'єва Анна Валеріївна,

доктор наук з державного управління, професор, старший науковий співробітник, завідувач кафедри державної служби управління та навчання за міжнародними проектами, Інститут державного управління у сфері цивільного захисту, 04074, м. Київ, вул. Вишгородська, 21, тел.: (044) 468 91 84, e-mail: teren_a@ukr.net



ORCID: 0000-0003-3881-5865

Терентьева Анна Валериевна,

доктор наук по государственному управлению, профессор, старший научный сотрудник, заведующий кафедрой государственной службы управления и обучения по международным проектам, Институт государственного управления в сфере гражданской защиты, 04074, г. Киев, ул. Вышгородская, 21, тел.: (044) 468 91 84, e-mail: teren_a@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-3881-5865

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i12.92>

ADMINISTRATION DECISION-MAKING UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF EMERGENCY

Abstract. The author has analyzed the problem aspects of public administration of educational change in modern Ukraine. Special frameworks of public administration of educational change in an information society have been determined. The author has analyzed the categories of the implementation process of educational change. The author has explored the key features of external environment of such activity, formed by regulatory acts for settling relations in a particular area. The author has highlighted a set of contradictions of public management of educational change and recommendations for state agencies regarding the organization of an effective process of implementation of educational change as a social and political process with an emphasis on peculiar properties of the educational change.

It is determined that the updated legal and regulatory framework of the educational sector, at the same time, extends the scope of professional freedom of teaching and, hence, sets high requirements for the professionalism of teachers. The change in the focus of educational activity by innovations is declared in terms of practice, interactivity and functionality. The teacher will now create educational and training programs tailored to the needs of students and local communities, will create an open learning environment, taking into account the potential of the school and involving the partners in the educational process.

However, it has been proved that the methods of active and problem-searching approach defined in the updated normative provision of education in Ukraine require appropriate conditions for the educational process. An active student becomes an active citizen; school, school environment and class become a micro-society. Like the society itself, the school environment is not devoid of conflicts or problem situations. It is in these conditions that students have the opportunity to learn to consciously identify their own interests and gain experience in civic activity.

Keywords: public administration, administration, civil protection, emergency, administration decision.

ПРИЙНЯТТЯ УПРАВЛІНСЬКИХ РІШЕНЬ В УМОВАХ НАДЗВИЧАЙНИХ СИТУАЦІЙ

Анотація. Сучасна система державного управління, яка наділена адміністративно-правовими повноваженнями, не може повністю виконати покладені на неї завдання щодо забезпечення захисту населення і територій від надзвичайних ситуацій, тому актуальним є її удосконалення у сфері запобігання та ліквідації надзвичайних ситуацій (НС).

Державні службовці та особи, які приймають політичні рішення, змушені визнати той факт, що конфлікти та кризи потенційно можуть мати місце в будь-якій сфері їх відповідальності. Кризові ситуації вимагають з їх боку послідовних дій, спрямованих на відновлення суспільної довіри та цілісності управлінських механізмів, в той час як надзвичайні ситуації можуть також потребувати зусиль, що мають обмежити масштаби збитків для людей, їх власності та навколишнього середовища. Історичний досвід показує, що НС легко перетворюються у політичні кризи та, в свою чергу, в політичні конфлікти там, де влада втрачає контроль над розвитком подій.

Ризики виникнення надзвичайних ситуацій природного і техногенного характеру є фактором, що визначає якість життя у регіонах будь-якої країни. На жаль, для України ці ризики є достатньо високими, що зумовлює нагальну потребу докладного опрацювання організаційно-управлінських підходів до вирішення цієї комплексної проблеми. Викладене зумовлює визнання того, що традиційні підходи до управління подоланням комплексних наслідків надзвичайних ситуацій, як доводить досвід їх застосування, часто призводять до незадовільних результатів. Також серйозною проблемою організації ефективного управління за умов надзвичайних ситуацій є реальне

ускладнення або відсутність координації дій офіційних урядових, відомчих і неурядових органів. Традиційні підходи до управління НС, як доводить досвід їх застосування, часто призводять до незадовільних результатів.

Зменшення часу на розроблення, прийняття та реалізацію управлінських рішень, зростання невизначеності та ризику, необхідність залучення з резервів додаткових ресурсів, наявність різних режимів функціонування системи державного управління в умовах надзвичайних ситуацій свідчать про те, що державне управління у цій сфері має певні особливості. Їх урахування в діяльності органів державного управління в умовах надзвичайних ситуацій дасть можливість зменшити вірогідність прийняття неадекватних управлінських рішень, сприятиме економії ресурсів та часу на ліквідацію наслідків надзвичайних ситуацій, зменшенню збитків.

Системний підхід до управлінської діяльності припускає, що вона може бути досліджена як із точки зору змісту, так і з точки зору форми її прояву. Цілі, функції і методи управління в комплексі характеризують зміст діяльності і можуть мати різні аспекти. Визначальним аспектом може бути названий методологічний, що відображає сукупність принципів, закономірностей і законів, реалізованих у процесі управління і які дозволяють визначити, з якою метою, на що і як варто впливати для одержання бажаного результату, у тому числі у виробленні управлінських рішень в умовах надзвичайних ситуацій.

Ключові слова: державне управління, управління, цивільний захист, надзвичайна ситуація, управлінське рішення.

ПРИНЯТИЕ УПРАВЛЕНЧЕСКИХ РЕШЕНИЙ В УСЛОВИЯХ ЧРЕЗВЫЧАЙНЫХ СИТУАЦИЙ

Аннотация. Современная система государственного управления, которая наделена административно-правовыми полномочиями, не может полностью выполнить возложенные на нее задачи по обеспечению защиты населения и территорий от чрезвычайных ситуаций, поэтому актуальным является ее совершенствование в сфере предупреждения и ликвидации чрезвычайных ситуаций (ЧС).

Государственные служащие и лица, принимающие политические решения, вынуждены признать тот факт, что конфликты и кризисы могут иметь место в любой сфере их ответственности. Кризисные ситуации требуют с их стороны последовательных действий, направленных на восстановление общественного доверия и целостности управленческих механизмов, в то время как чрезвычайные ситуации могут также потребовать усилий, должны ограничить масштабы убытков для людей, их собственности и окружающей среды. Исторический опыт показывает, что ЧС легко превращаются в политические кризисы и, в свою очередь, в политические конфликты там, где власть теряет контроль над развитием событий.

Риски возникновения чрезвычайных ситуаций природного и техногенного характера являются фактором, определяющим качество жизни в регионах любой страны. К сожалению, для Украины эти риски достаточно

высокие, что приводит к насущной необходимости детальной проработки организационно-управленческих подходов к решению этой комплексной проблемы. Все вышеизложенное обуславливает признание того, что традиционные подходы к управлению преодолением комплексных последствий чрезвычайных ситуаций, как показывает опыт их применения, часто приводят к неудовлетворительным результатам. Также серьезной проблемой организации эффективного управления в условиях чрезвычайных ситуаций является реальное осложнение или отсутствие координации действий официальных правительственных, ведомственных и неправительственных органов. Традиционные подходы к управлению ЧС, как показывает опыт их применения, часто приводят к неудовлетворительным результатам.

Уменьшение времени на разработку, принятие и реализацию управленческих решений, рост неопределенности и риска, необходимость привлечения из резервов дополнительных ресурсов, наличие различных режимов функционирования системы государственного управления в условиях чрезвычайных ситуаций свидетельствуют о том, что государственное управление в этой сфере имеет определенные особенности. Их учет в деятельности органов государственного управления в условиях чрезвычайных ситуаций позволит уменьшить вероятность принятия неадекватных управленческих решений, способствовать экономии ресурсов и времени на ликвидацию последствий чрезвычайных ситуаций, уменьшению убытков.

Системный подход к управленческой деятельности предполагает, что она может быть исследована как с точки зрения содержания, так и с точки зрения форм ее проявления. Цели, функции и методы управления в комплексе характеризуют содержание деятельности и могут иметь различные аспекты. Определяющим аспектом может быть назван методологический, отражающий совокупность принципов, закономерностей и законов, реализованных в процессе управления и позволяющие определить, с какой целью, на что и как следует воздействовать для получения желаемого результата, в том числе в выработке управленческих решений в условиях чрезвычайных ситуаций.

Ключевые слова: государственное управление, управление, гражданская защита, чрезвычайная ситуация, управленческое решение.

Statement of the problem. At present time, in the field of civil protection which is one of the components of the national security of Ukraine, there is an urgent need to develop methodological approaches to justifying administration decision-making under complex emergency factors which are uncertain.

The current system of public administration which has administrative and legal power cannot fully fulfill its mandated tasks on ensuring the protection of population and territories from emergencies, thus improvement of this system in the field of emergency prevention and liquidation is regarded as a critical issue.

Administration decision-making in emergency is considered a vital process, for example, in the events of fires, catastrophes, natural disasters where it is not just a matter of optimal use of material and financial resources but first of all, of people's lives, children's lives in particular, and every second counts for them.

It is emergency that compels to mobilize significant material, financial and human resources for elimination of consequences. Moreover, the thorniest question is optimal, prompt and adequate use of resources. For the above reasons, there is no doubt about the importance of effective administration during liquidation of consequences of any emergency.

Civil servants and political decision-makers are obliged to recognize the fact that emergencies, conflicts and crises can potentially occur in any area of their responsibility. Crisis situations require consistent actions to restore public confidence and integrity of administration mechanisms, while the emergency may also need efforts to limit the extent of damage to people, their property and the environment. Historical experience shows that the emergency is easily transformed into political crises and, in turn, into political conflicts during which authorities lose control of the development of events.

It is traditionally believed that actions under the conditions of crises and emergency are the prerogative of executive bodies. However, in recent times, experts tend to acknowledge the fact that the task of ensuring readiness to operate in challenging environment extends to all public authorities with-

out exception, as well as non-governmental organizations and institutions. Adequate understanding of this idea refers to clear knowledge of the nature of crisis situations and emergency in terms of the functions and tasks of public administration.

Operation in crisis situations and emergencies is significantly different from routine behaviour as new and unfamiliar tasks are assigned to managers and their subordinates, routine procedures change, as well as priorities and responsibilities. As a rule, the situations involve close cooperation with various institutions and structures that are not part of the usual circle of communication. There are tight time limitations that interfere with clarifying who is responsible for sorting the problem out. In that regard, the key importance is given to the degree of readiness to act under similar circumstances, determining the scope of responsibilities in advance and division of tasks. A high degree of readiness involves the ability to face a larger range of challenges and potential threats in comparison with people's own experience.

The reputation of any institutions and their leadership may depend on the degree of readiness to operate effectively under severe conditions. In this regard, the crisis poses not only new threats to managers but also gives them new opportunities (effective actions at crisis time and during emergency can help the career development and strengthen profile of leadership).

Analysis of recent studies and publications. The issue of making management decisions in any emergency were studied by the scientists: S. Andreiev, O. Barylo, P. Volianskyi, V. Mykhailov,

S. Poteriaiko, V. Tyshchenko, H. Sytnyk, B. Khalmuradov.

The purpose of this article. The purpose is to investigate the issue of making administration decisions in the emergency by studying technology, mechanisms and principles of administration decision-making under the rapid changes of limitations and boundary conditions.

Statement of the main material.

At the present time in Ukraine, on the one hand, the industrial and agricultural infrastructure is sufficiently developed, on the other hand, technological equipment in industry and transport has become worn and obsolete, there are also certain climatic and geographical features of our country. This creates a potential threat of large-scale catastrophes with significant human casualties that could cause the state known as an emergency. The potential danger is man-made disasters, the number of which has increased not only in Ukraine but also in the world with a constant tendency on average 5–7 % per year followed by harsh consequences.

The issue of administration has become especially important due to fundamental changes that have taken place in recent years in the field of protection of the population and territories from emergency both in Ukraine and throughout the world. The main task of administration is to ensure the effective use of potential of the involved forces and successful tasks fulfillment within a specific time frame under any conditions.

During 2017, in Ukraine there were registered 166 emergencies (www.dsns.gov.ua) which according to the Nation-

al Classifier “Emergency Classifier” SC 019:2010 were divided into: anthropogenic – 50; natural – 107; social – 9.

As a result of these emergencies, 172 people (including 29 children) were killed, and 892 people (including 417 children) were injured.

All the emergencies in 2017 were different in scale and subdivided into: state level – 2; regional level – 8; local level – 69; site level – 87.

Compared to 2016, the total number of emergencies in 2017 increased by 11,4 %, while the number of man-made emergencies decreased by 10,7 % but the number of natural and social disasters increased by 20,2 % and 125 % respectively. Also, in 2017 there is a reduction in the number of deaths and injuries during emergencies – by 6 % and 50,6 % respectively.

Administration process is one of the most important component of the emergency response, and its influence increases in proportion to the scope of the emergency, complexity of the situation, increase in the number of forces and need for material resources.

The larger the scope of emergency, the higher requirements to administration, and the more final outcomes of the consequences elimination depend on the effective administration.

In the research literature there are both extended and narrow understanding of decision-making in administration [1, p. 16–17; 2, p. 94]. In a broad sense, decision-making is identified with the whole process of administration. Broad understanding encompasses not only the decision-making process but also its implementation and control of the results. However, this view does not correspond to the conception that

the ultimate result of a decision is the decision itself.

In the narrow sense, decision-making is considered only as a choice of the best solution for numeral alternatives. Analyzing the narrow view, it is important to realize that alternatives do not arise spontaneously [1, p. 88–89; 2, p. 16–20]. The decision-making process involves not only the choice of the best option but also finding alternatives, establishing criteria for evaluation, a method for evaluating alternatives, etc.

Taking that into account, we can propose the definition of the category “decision-making”: decision-making is a process that starts with the statement of the challenging situation and ends up with the choice of solution, that is the steps towards eliminating the problem situation [3, p. 67–69].

Key factors influencing emergency liquidation are the following: political, economic, institutional, social and humanitarian, psychological, technological, informational, organizational, spatial and temporal [4, p. 102].

Political factors reflect the distribution of the main tasks among central and local government bodies, they are: The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, ministries and territorial authorities.

Economic factors include financing of measures on emergency elimination, compensation of losses to the victims, logistical support for measures in civil protection which are considered as a complex of organizational, engineering, technical, legal and other arrangements aimed at the continuous maintenance of government and civil protection forces, as well as the support of the population suffering from emergency.

By the institutional factors we mean a set of rules, organizations and institutional conditions, namely: laying the foundation for safe living in Ukraine, balanced economic and environmental policy, well-considered use of nature, recreational restoration of territories, creation of efficient bodies to administrate emergency prevention. The basic principles of safety are the ways of practical application of achievements on life safety for the sustainable harmonious development of people and society.

The social and humanitarian factor reveals the volunteer movement, that is informational and educational performance, training on pre-hospital skills, professional development of rescuers-volunteers, encouraging the population to disseminate some knowledge on safe behavior and survival in a variety of different circumstances.

The psychological factor is prevention of panic among victims, psychological support for search and rescue teams’ professional activity, and as a mandatory task is carrying out medical and psychological rehabilitation of rescuers and the personnel of mobile medical teams.

Information factor is seen as application of modern information and telecommunication technologies to support the administration decision-making, to receive timely and adequate information on the consequences of emergency and the situation in the emergency zone, the technology of OLAP analysis and spatial analysis by means of GIS technologies in determining the emergency zone, automatized monitoring systems of the hydropower structures and nuclear power plants.

Organizational factor reveals the goals and tasks of the Unified State

Civil Protection System (USCPS) as a set of governing bodies, forces and means of central and local executive authorities, the Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, executive bodies of councils, enterprises, institutions and organizations that ensure state policy implementation in the field of civil protection.

The spatial and temporal factor shows that the USCPS operates constantly throughout Ukraine. Depending on the emergency scope and peculiarities which is arisen or anticipated, one or another regime of the USCPS operation is established in Ukraine: day-to-day functioning; high readiness; emergency situation; emergency state.

To sum up, it should be noted that the combination of economic and psychological factors influencing the process of liquidation of consequences of emergency can be expressed in a negative sense. At the same time, the combination of informational and social and humanitarian factors helps to optimize administration decisions and bring assistance closer to the victims. Rejection of the importance of the political and economic factors, neglecting the problem of adequate financial support of civil protection measures both during the emergency elimination and emergency prevention may lead to a decrease in the level of natural and technological safety of Ukraine.

Emergency or crisis scenarios can be divided into phases [5, p. 3].

The risk minimization phase consists of measures aimed at reducing the probable negative consequences of a crisis situation or emergency. Their purpose is to identify vulnerable ad-

ministration units and take preventive measures to reduce their vulnerability. The list of the actions includes:

- carrying out research into identification of risks and possible crisis states;
- risk assessment (ranking according to the importance and relevance);
- scenarios and predictive models analysis (including identification of the “worst” scenarios);
- retrospective analysis of experience in such circumstances;
- identification of experts and specialists to be involved in situations of possible crisis or emergencies;
- creation and implementation of permanent monitoring systems.

Readiness phase. The steps aimed at providing readiness include planning of operational and communication measures, the main parameters of the relevant actions, organizational behavioral patterns, required resources, and trainings on actions as planned. There should not be too voluminous and complicated plans which are impossible to study in the real state of emergency due to lack of time.

The plan of operational measures for emergency liquidation is a framework document which includes all the critical information for managers to effectively identify crisis situations and emergencies in accordance with the plan:

- administrative structure (list of people responsible for actions in the situations, distribution of power, type of interaction with other institutions (organizations) and their operational headquarters);
- administrative procedures for the plan implementation in the event of crisis situation or emergency;

- organizational and technical support (premises and equipment allocated to the crisis operational headquarters);
- crisis management and emergency administration.

The plan of communication measures includes guidelines for actions before, during and after the crisis or emergency. The plan is intended to help all participants involved in joint actions to maintain a single assessment system in their comments and reactions to the events that are happening. The plan also determines people authorized to communicate with the media and public, target audiences, organizational and technical needs.

The operational headquarters usually consist of key individuals of the organization (institution) considering their specialty and experience. Members' roles and responsibilities in the operational headquarters, as well as the authority of the headquarters themselves should be outlined in the plans of operational arrangements.

Identification of partners involves establishing preliminary contacts between the main institution and external structures that provide support in the process of eliminating the consequences of any emergency or crisis. The main agency should coordinate its emergency (operational) plan with these institutions (organizations). Relationships and agreements that partners had before the beginning of crisis situations or emergencies can significantly facilitate effective coordination of actions at the time of their occurrence.

Setting up the systems involves ensuring the uninterrupted functioning of all organizational and technical resources listed in the emergency

plan (the lack of critical components can paralyze activities under the conditions of emergency or crisis situation). This list includes: buildings and premises; communication equipment (telephones, fax machines, computers and network equipment, video systems, etc.); available and backup equipment with consumables, and technical staff.

Any plans may be useless and ineffective if they have not been verified in practice. Moreover, the very existence of these plans can give managers a false sense of security and readiness. In order to avoid that, plans should be periodically tested, the operational team, along with additional technical staff, must undergo appropriate trainings. Trainings can help:

- support an adequate level of participants' expertise regarding their duties and powers;
- familiarize the staff with the specific content of the plans of operational measures and communications;
- acquire by the staff the skills of handling the equipment and procedures to implement the plans;
- transform the abstract points of a plan into the specific actions of the experts;
- clarify the discussion points and unclear details.

Each training exercise in any discussion should be ended by summarizing the results and identifying strengths and weaknesses in the staff's operation. It allows to adjust the plans and make changes to distribution of responsibilities and fields of activity.

The response phase includes measures taken in a particular crisis situation or emergency which are designed to keep the situation under control and

minimize its negative consequences. It should be borne in mind that responses can be iterative and non-stop in nature due to the high degree of uncertainty that characterizes crisis situations and emergencies.

An assessment of the situation involves collecting information about a particular crisis situation or emergency and verifying the reliability of sources. This step allows to assess the scale of the problem and establish the structure of decision-making, if this problem belongs to the scope of this responsibility. The corresponding body, for its part, decides on the implementation of operational plans and communications if considers it essential.

Decision-making is the most important function of management as its successful implementation ensures achievement of goals by the organization. Due to inability to carry out this process efficiently and rationally, due to the lack of a mechanism for its implementation and technology most state institutions are affected in Ukraine. The success of any institution or administration body of all areas of operation largely depends on this fact, especially in Ukraine, where most organizations and governance bodies have the first stage of their development, and their choice of technology to solve the problems is rather important.

Decision-making along with coordination and communication is one of the most important internal organizational processes, and the feature of this process is that it is directly aimed at achieving the goals by the institution or administration body.

In the narrow sense, decision-making is a process that begins with the

statement of the problem and culminates with the choice of ways dealing with it. In this case decision-making is considered only as a choice of the best solution from a variety of alternatives. However, the decision-making process is not made up only of choosing the best options but also of finding alternatives, establishing criteria for evaluation, choosing a method for assessing alternatives, etc.

The process of making managerial decisions is influenced by a multitude of factors [3, p. 70–97; 6, p.153–154; 7, p. 113–118]. The most important among them are the following:

- risk factor: there is always the possibility of making wrong decisions that may unfavorably affect the organization. Managers take a risk factor into account consciously or subconsciously when making decisions because it relates to growing responsibilities;

- time which is given to the manager to make a decision. In practice, most executives are not able to analyze all possible alternatives owing to time constraints;

- extent of support from the leader for the team. This factor takes into account the fact that new managers are not perceived immediately. If there is not enough understanding and support from other managers and subordinates, the problem has to be dealt with at the expense of the personal traits which should contribute to the implementation of the decisions.

Regardless of how managers make decisions and are responsible for them they must have relevant skills to make the right decisions.

- the policy of the organization (institution). In this case the subject-

tive factor is taken into account during decision-making. Status, power, prestige, ease of implementation — all these things can affect decision-making.

Three basic decision-making models are distinguished in the theory of management: classical, behavioral, and irrational.

The classical model is based on the concept of “rationality” in decision-making. It is assumed that the person making decisions must be absolutely objective and logical, have a clear goal, and all their actions are aimed at selecting the best alternative.

According to the classical model, the person making decisions should have:

- clear purpose of the decision;
- complete information on the decision-making situation;
- full information on possible alternatives and their consequences;
- a rational system of organizing benefits according to their importance;
- always aim at maximizing the results of the organization’s performance.

Consequently, the classical model implies that the conditions for the decisions should be sufficiently defined.

However, in practice many restrictive and subjective factors influence the decision-making process. The behavioral model takes into account this combination of the factors in the decision-making process.

According to the behavioral model, a person who makes decisions:

- does not have complete information on the decision-making situation and all possible alternatives;
- is not able (is not inclined) to predict the consequences of possible alternatives.

Decision-making in any organization is a conscious choice of existing options or alternatives of actions that reduces the gap between the present and the future desirable state of the organization [6, p. 154; 8, p. 121–122]. The decision-making process consists of different elements, and it is always bound to contain such elements as problems, goals, alternatives, and solutions. This process is the basis for planning activities, because planning is a set of solutions for allocating resources and their use to achieve goals. Decision making is the core for life to spin around. Any decision can be regarded as a product of administration work, and its adoption is considered as a process that generates this product.

Decision-making is ensured by managers at different levels and has rather formalized nature since the decision concerns not only one person but more often it relates to the unit or organization as a whole.

The most important issue of the successful operation of any organizations (institution, department, unit) is how the organization can recognize problems and deal with them. Each solution is aimed at some kind of problems, and the right decision as much as possible meets the goals of the organization. Goals to be achieved are sometimes not sufficiently understood. Setting inaccurate goals means that wrong solutions are possible which can lead to much greater dissipation of resource than if there are inefficient solutions to well-defined problems. In this regard, the role of the leader is critical because decision-making is not only a process but a type of mental activity and manifestation of the person’s will.

Taking into consideration the statements above, the task of emergency administration is constant managing and control by the governing bodies and the authorized head of emergency of the forces and means, and tasks fulfillment on emergency liquidation or disaster consequences.

The main tasks of administration during the emergency event are: maintaining a high level of personnel moral and psychological state and constant readiness to act; timely planning of actions for forces; constant data collection and examination of the information on emergency situation; decision-making and communication to subordinates; providing continuous interaction; gathering and evacuation of the population from the emergency zone; training the forces and preparing means to carry out emergency search and rescue and other urgent works on emergency liquidation; forces and facilities arrangements; control over the timely implementation of activities and tasks by subordinates and relevant assistance to them [3, p. 94–100; 5, p. 5–8; 7, p. 24–30].

The basis of administration is the decision made by the person in charge of emergency liquidation who is fully responsible for the subordinated forces and successful accomplishment of tasks on elimination of the aftermath of emergency.

In the field of administration psychology, the concept “problem” is used to indicate the gap between the desired state (primarily goals) of the organization and its actual state. Thus, the solution to the problem is considered as a means to overcome the gap, a choice of one of many objectively existing cour-

ses of action (alternatives) allowing you to move from the observed state to the desired one.

Responsibility for making important decisions is a heavy moral burden which becomes particularly apparent at higher levels of administration. However, managers of any rank deal with property owned by other people, and affect their lives. If the manager decides to dismiss a subordinate, a person can be badly hit. If a bad employee is not stopped, the organization can suffer which will negatively affect all the employees. Therefore, the head, as a rule, can not take unconsidered decisions [7, p. 71–76; 9, p. 181–200].

The variety of solutions represents a certain system understanding of which is facilitated on the basis of a systematic approach. In such a system, solutions should indicate both general and specific features of any decisions. Consequently, the main differences between administration decisions are goals, consequences, division of labor, expertise.

The agent of administration (an individual or a group) makes decisions taking into consideration problems of an organization but not own interests or needs.

The leaders, especially at the high level, do not only adhere to their own course of actions but to an organization as a whole and its employees, and their decisions can significantly affect the lives of many people. If the organization is large and influential, leaders' decisions can seriously affect the social and economic situation of entire regions.

There is a definite work-sharing in the organization: some employees (managers) are busy with emerging is-

sues and decision-making while others (executors) deal with the implementation of the decisions.

In the administration field decision-making is a complicated, responsible and formalized process requiring professional training. Not every employee of the organization but only one who has certain professional knowledge and skills is empowered to make decisions on his own.

Considering these distinctive features of decision-making, the following definition of the concept "administration decision" can be given: administration decision is the choice of an alternative executed by the manager within the limits of his official authority and competence, and is aimed at achieving the goals of the organization (institution, unit).

During the administration process, a huge variety of different decisions are made. However, there are some common features that make it possible to categorize these decisions in a certain way.

According to the frequency of the problem to be addressed, all administration decisions can be subdivided into traditional ones that are rather frequent in administration practices, and it is only necessary to make choices from already existing alternatives; and non-standard, innovative decisions related to the generation of new alternatives.

Any administration decision is aimed at achieving a specific result so the purpose of administration is to find such forms, methods and decision-making tools that could contribute to achieving optimum results under specific circumstances.

Development, adoption and implementation technology for decisions and

procedures as well as logical, analytical, information retrieval, computing and other operations should involve clear consistency. When working out administrative arrangements, it is necessary to establish the procedure to implement certain operations related to the collection, flow, storage, processing, analysis of information, its delivery to structural units and individual workstations, as well as to determine other activities resulting from the need for dealing with economic matters.

Rational technology for making and implementing administration decisions should include the following stages: preparation of the decisions; decision-making; implementation of the decisions.

At the stage of preparing to decision-making it is necessary to follow the procedure which usually consists of five stages. We suggest considering these stages in detail.

At the first stage the problem that needs to be solved is cleared up, as well as cause-and-effect relations of this problem, the result of this work is analyzed and the ability of the institution to sort this problem out is established.

At the second stage a deep systematic study of the problem itself is conducted, and objectives and intermediate goals are formulated.

The third stage indicates the potential of the administration system to address the emerging problems. Processing of various options to solve this problem is carried out.

At the fourth stage a choice is made for the solution to the emerging problem, and at the fifth stage some arrangements on the implementation of the ad-

ministration decisions and monitoring the process with strict time constraints are conducted.

As a rule, commonly accepted methodological approaches to the process of making administration decisions do not fully reflect indicators that characterize the effectiveness of the administration decision or a number of decisions.

This study tends to improve the process of making administration decisions by the administration bodies of the State Emergency Service of Ukraine which is an integral part of the Unified state system of civil protection aimed at enhancing the efficiency of operation to save lives and health of people suffering from disasters.

It is argued that the process of justification, adoption and implementation of administration decisions has both objective and subjective components, is clearly formalized and requires intuition, skills and knowledge of the person who makes the decisions.

To streamline the process of making administration decisions as a set of formal and informal procedures, it is reasonable to use the technology of decision-making that will allow to analyze the decisions made earlier and to make optimal ones.

We find the technology of making administration decisions with several iterative stages interesting.

On the whole, stages are as follows: 1) problem setting; 2) preparation for administration decisions; 3) administration decision-making, and 4) implementation of the administration decisions.

The first stage is for decision formulation when the processing of informa-

tion on the current operational situation in the emergency zone takes place. The determination of the urgent problems and monitoring of available resources for the emergency elimination are carried out.

At the second stage of preparation of administration decisions special attention is paid to determining the criteria for choosing sound administration decisions. For this purpose, several scale options can be used, such as qualitative, quantitative, and ranking.

The type of uncertainty (stochastic, natural, behavioral, etc.) depends on the number of indicators used to process an administration decision.

At the stage of administration decision-making possible alternative solutions along with the “best” and “worst” options should be considered. At this stage, experts are invited to consider thoroughly the proposed solution.

At the fourth stage of the implementation of administration decisions there is a need to have a system to monitor the operation of the civil protection administration bodies, forces and facilities of the operational and rescue units on tasks fulfillment, and also it is essential to have an appropriate regulated procedure for assessment of decisions according to the parameters of effectiveness, quality and efficiency. The assessment should be carried out with the assistance of specialists who have their own experience in eliminating the consequences of emergency.

The important point in administration decision-making to overcome the emergency consequences, especially medical and sanitary ones, is the assessment of effectiveness of the administration decisions.

Conclusions. Administration decision-making during any emergency is considered vital, for instance, in the event of fires, catastrophes, natural disasters, and it is not just about the optimal use of material and financial resources but primarily about people's lives.

Time reduction for the development, adoption and implementation of administration decisions, the growth of uncertainty and risk, the need to attract additional resources from the reserves, and the availability of different modes of operation of the public administration system under the emergency conditions indicate that public administration in this area has certain features. Taking them into consideration by the state administration bodies under the emergency will make it possible to reduce the likelihood of inadequate administration decisions, contribute to saving resources and time to eliminate the consequences of the emergency and reducing losses.

It should be noted that the assessment of the quality of administration decisions should be based on information and analytical support that involves the collection and processing of operational data from the emergency zone, and the previous development of options for administration decisions applying mathematical modeling.

There is no doubt that achieving the best results when dealing with administration decisions on the elimination of the consequences of emergencies is only possible due to the combination of methods which are determined by the level and nature of the problems to be addressed.

To conclude, it should be noted that administration decision-making during elimination of consequences of any emergency, in particular medical and sanitary ones which are the most difficult and important, needs to be improved, not only due to the application of modern information technologies and powerful mathematical apparatus but due to the analysis of domestic experience in emergency liquidation and development of emergency response plans at all levels of the public administration system.

REFERENCES

1. *Larichev O. I.* (2000), *Teoriya y metodi prynyatyia resheny* [Theory and methods of decision-making: Textbook], Moscow: Logos, Russia.
2. *Soroka K. O.* (2004) *Osnovy teoriiy system i systemnoho analizu*, [Fundamentals of the Theory of Systems: Training. Guidances], Kharkiv: KSAME, Ukraine.
3. *Volianskyi P. B.* and others (2014) *Reahuvannia na nadzvychaini sytuatsii* [Emergency response], Kyiv: Blank-Pres, Ukraine.
4. *Terentieva A. V.* (2015), "Analysis of the factors influencing the adequacy of administration measures for the elimination of the consequences of emergencies, *Investytsii: praktyka ta dosvid*, vol. 4, p. 100–103.
5. *Terentieva A. V.* (2015), "Emergency administration with elements of crisis management", *Derzhavne upravlinnia: udoskonalennia ta rozvytok*, vol. 9, <http://www.dy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=881>
6. *Terentieva A. V.* (2014), "System analysis as a method for approving and substantiating decisions in the field of civil protection", *Investytsii: praktyka ta dosvid*, vol. 12, p. 152–155.

7. *Guriev S. O., Terentieva A. V. and Volianskyi P. B.* (2008), Kryzovyi menedzhment ta pryntsyphu upravlinnia ryzykamy v protsesi likvidatsii nadzvychnaynykh sytuatsii [Crisis management and the principles of risk management in the process of eliminating of emergencies], Kyiv, Ukraine.
8. *Terentieva A. V.* (2015), "Administration decision-making in the event of emergency: the possibilities of SWOT-analysis", *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu zakonodavstva Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy*, vol. 2, p. 119–124.
9. *Bakumenko V. D.* (2000), *Formuvannya derzhavno-upravlins'kykh rishen': problemy teorii, metodolohiyi* [Formation of administration decisions: problems of theory and methodology. Practice], Kyiv, UAPA Publishing, Ukraine.
4. *Terent'eva A. B.* Аналіз факторів впливу на адекватність управлінських заходів з ліквідації наслідків надзвичайних ситуацій // *Інвестиції: практика та досвід.* — 2015. — № 4. — С. 100–103.
5. *Terent'eva A. B.* Управління надзвичайними ситуаціями з елементами кризового менеджменту // *Електронне наукове фахове видання "Державне управління: удосконалення та розвиток"*. — 2015. — № 9. — <http://www.dy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=881>
6. *Terent'eva A. B.* Системний аналіз як метод ухвалення та обґрунтування рішень у сфері цивільного захисту // *Інвестиції: практика та досвід.* — 2014. — № 12. — С. 152–155.
7. *Кризовий менеджмент та принципи управління ризиками в процесі ліквідації надзвичайних ситуацій* : монографія / С. О. Гур'єв, А. В. Терент'єва, П. Б. Волянський. — К. : [б. в.], 2008. — 148 с.
8. *Terent'eva A. B.* Прийняття управлінських рішень за умов надзвичайних ситуацій: можливості SWOT-аналізу // *Наукові записки Ін-ту законодавства Верховної Ради України.* — 2015. — № 2. — С. 119–124.
9. *Бакуменко В. Д.* *Формування державно-управлінських рішень: проблеми теорії, методології. Практики*: монографія. — К.: Вид-во УАДУ, 2000. — 328 с.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Ларичев О. И.* Теория и методы принятия решений: учебник. — М.: Логос, 2000. — 296 с.
2. *Сорока К. О.* Основы теории систем і системного аналізу: навч. посіб. — Харків: ХНАМГ, 2004. — 291 с.
3. *Реагування на надзвичайні ситуації*: навч. посіб. — К.: Бланк-Прес, 2014. — 206 с.