

COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR PUBLIC SERVICES' TRAINING CENTRES

Athanasios Vasilakis

Training coordinator, Greek Ministry of Economy and Finance, Training Centre
1 Chandri & Thessalonikis, P.C. 183 46, Moschato
email: thanosba@otenet.gr

Abstract

Rapid changes in life-long training and Performance Measurement (PM) in public services literature are posing serious questions from both theory and practice. A proposed synthesis of the most Common Performance Indicators (CPIs) aim to promote and support the PM into the public sector training programs provides the benchmarking of the selected frameworks and creates two proposed set of tables. These set of tables include:

*-The first set describes, through the tables 1 to 5, each source of reference (theoretical or practical) the number of selected frameworks that supports CPIs in this paper and,
-The second set describes, through the tables 6 to 9, the CPIs selected by each referred framework. Both sets reveal the lack of PM into the public sector training programs.
The CPIs offers practical help to increase the value of taxpayers' money and provide accountability of public services decision makers' contribution.*

Keywords – Common Performance Indicators (CPIs), Performance Measurement (PM), public sector life-long training programs

JEL Classification: M53

Introduction

The rational of this review is to reduce the knowledge gap if performance dips below target, the Common Performance Indicators (CPIs) control system will register an expanded “performance gap”, which is then acted upon to produce a reduction in resource allocation of training programmes. Getting a better insight into the appropriateness of this paper's objectives, life-long training is one of the central elements of performance improvement, into public organizations in general and public training organizations more specifically (Mwita, 2000, Kettunen J., 2005). CPIs could create flexibility in order to re-allocate resources within training programs (especially concerning staff). Furthermore, CPIs could create new reporting terms of public service employment in order to enable better internal management, including the ability to move staff from low value areas and to recruit and promote capable staff (Johanson, 1999; Vasilakis, A., 2008). Each public organization needs flexibility to redeploy expenditure within these budgets so as to maximize performance of each Public Services Unit (Holzer, M. and Kloby, K., 2005; Papadeas, P. 2006). CPIs could also contribute to another dimension of public accountability to the taxpayers and stakeholders in general and to the public sector more specifically (Johanson, 1999; Chang, 2004). The Performance Measurement (PM) can be used as a report card from which taxpayers and stakeholders can gauge operational efficiency (inputs-outputs) of each state training center and measure the ‘value for these spending funding’ (Johnes, N., and Connolly, M., 2001; Cutler, T. and Waine, B., 2003; Boyne, G. and Enticott, G., 2004).

Performance Measurement Frameworks and Initiatives Applied in Education and Training

To start with the literature review reveals four-performance measurement's theoretical frameworks that could be applied in life long training of public services. These frameworks are presented in the following table 1.

Table 1: Theoretical Frameworks

Theoretical Frameworks	Country	Year
Balanced Scorecard (B.S.C.),	U.S.A.	1992
The Model of European Foundation of Quality Management (E.F.Q.M.),	Europe	1996
New Public Management (N.P.M.)	U.K.	1984
Data Envelopment Analysis (D.E.A.)	Europe	1978

Secondly, the general review of international practice reveals assessment frameworks that could be applied in life long training of public services. The sum of methods and processes used to evaluate the attainments (knowledge, know-how, skills and competences) of an individual, and typically leading to certification is called an “Assessment” (European Commission, 2005b). The selected assessment frameworks are illustrated in the following Table 2.

Table 2: Assessment Frameworks

Assessment Framework	Country	Year
Center European Pour Le Developpement De La Formation Professionnelle (CEDEFOP)	Europe	1975
European Training Foundation (ETF)	Europe	1995
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA), Educational Criteria	U.S.A.	1999
European Universities Association (EUA)	Europe	2001
U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO)	U.S.A.	1980
Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) of Audit Committee	U.K.	2002
Higher Education Funding Council For England (HEFCE)	U.K.	1992
U.S. Government Accounting Standards Board (G.A.S.B.)	U.S.A.	1987
Common Assessment Framework (C.A.F.)	Europe	2000
The Danish Evaluation Institute (DEI)	Denmark	1999
Office For Standards in Education (OFSTED)	U.K.	2001
The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)	U.K.	1997
Internal Revenue Service's (IRS's)	U.S.A.	1913
European Social Fund (ESF)	Europe	1957
U.S. The Nation's Report Card	U.S.A.	1988

Thirdly, the general review of international practice has indicated different accreditation frameworks concerning of programmes and institutions. These frameworks have adapted processes and procedures for performance measurement of training programmes. Some of them are selected and illustrated in table 3. Furthermore, the process of accrediting an institution of education or training, a programme of study, or a service, shows that it has been approved by the relevant legislative and professional authorities by having met predetermined standards (European Commission, 2005b).

Table 3: Accreditation Frameworks

Accreditation Framework	Country	Year
Investors in People (IiP)	U.K.	1990
Association of Masters of Business Administration (A.M.B.As).	U.K.	1967
European Quality Improvement System (E.Q.U.I.S).	Europe	1998
Council for Higher Education Accreditation (C.H.E.A), including: Association to Advance Collegiate Business Schools of Business (A.A.C.S.B), and Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (A.C.B.S.P).	U.S.A.	1996
The Teacher Training Agency (T.T.A)	U.K.	1994

Fourthly, the general review of international practice has revealed legislation frameworks that encourage the performance measurement in life long training. Some of them are illustrated in table 4.

Table 4: Legislation Frameworks

Legislation Framework	Country	Year
The National Center For Vocational Educational Research (NCVER)	Australia	2002
The Australian Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST)	Australia	2001
National Forum on Educational Statistics (NFES)	U.S.A.	2001
Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA)	U.K.	1985
Sector Skills Development Agency (SSDA)	U.K.	2002
The Canadian Education Statistics Council (CESC)	Canada	1989
Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA)	U.K.	1997
Department of Education & Employment	U.K.	1999

Department of Labor (DOL)	U.S.A.	2003
National Performance Review	U.S.A.	1993
Governing with Accountability	U.S.A.	1993
The Government Performance and Results Act	U.S.A.	1993
Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA)	U.K.	1993
National Skills Framework (NSF)	Australia	2002
National Governance and Accountability Framework (NGAF)	Australia	2005

Lastly, the general review of international practice has indicated general initiatives of European Union and International Organisations for the development performance measurement systems and the application of CPIs. Some initiatives are referred as following in Table 5.

Table 5: Initiatives of European Union and International Organizations for performance measurement metrics in Education and Training

Initiatives for performance measurement metrics in Education and Training	Country	Year
Eurostat (Education and Training)	Europe	1952
European Union initiatives for life long learning	Europe	1976
European Employment Strategy (EES)	Europe	2002
EQUAL Initiative of European Union	Europe	2001
The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)	International	1996
International Federation of Training & Development Organisations (IFTDO)	International	1972
European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Europe	2000
International Labour Organisation (ILO)	International	1944
Ministerial Council for Vocational and Technical Education (MCVTE)	Australia	2005

Overall, the above initiatives and frameworks have been tested empirically and applied practically as a performance measurement process and procedure in education and training. Some of the above empirical papers or practical applications have been tested or applied for different purposes. All of them use different performance indicators in order to measure the performance of a training programme or an organization. The benchmarking of them leads to summarization of most CPIs that could be appropriate for performance measurement of life long training into public services.

The Proposed Common Performance Indicators (CPIs)

This study selects CPIs in four sets. These sets are grouped into input, output, results and outcome indicators (see: the following tables 6, 7, 8, 9) and are identified during the synthesis of usability approach for the International and European reality (see: the above tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). Data on these indicators could be quantified and collected among the consideration of parity in the public services units that participate in life long training and the PM of the variable could ensure uniqueness in the representation. The final choice except the benchmarking of the highest referred indicators from different frameworks was based on adaptability to the European public life-long training centers. These tables illustrate a PM system, where each target consists of a relevant group of indicators on the right (CEDEFOP, 1997; European Commission, 2002a, 2002b; Forrier A. and Sels L., 2003).

1. In fact, the consumption of some inputs such as financial, human capital, technical material etc. is necessary for the training system (Smith et al., 2002; Vasilakis, A., 2008). The selected input indicators refer to some resources that need to be consumed in order to cover all needs that are necessary for target accomplishment (GASB, 1990, 1997; Hood, 1991; GAO, 1998, 2003; Petridou E. and Chatzipanagiotou, P., 2004). The most common of them are selected and presented in the following table 6.

Table 6: Set of Input Indicators

Objective	Measure
1.1 Valid training budget	The valid budget illustrates the training cost of Civil Servants.
1.2 Training programme conditions for trainees	-Lecture rooms -Timetable
1.3 Teaching methods for trainees.	Instructor efficiency or inefficiency
1.4 Instructors' sufficiency in training programmes for trainees' opinion.	-Sufficiency in instruction -Sufficiency in answering questions.
1.5 Homogeneity of trainees (as knowledge level of the subject) in the group of participants.	Level of knowledge of the subject
1.6 Estimation of instructors for homogeneity of trainees (as knowledge level of the subject).	Level of knowledge of the subject (for instructors' opinion)
1.7 Average cost per trainee.	1. Expenditures divided by the number of trained civil servants. 2. Comparison between the costs of different training programmes. 3. Different time period and different instructors and trainees
1.8 Sufficient absorption costs (expenditures) as part of the budget.	Available resources
1.9 Trainees estimation for teaching materials quality.	Coverage needs of trained civil servants.

The consumption of the inputs produces outputs in order to fulfill the training progress (GASB, 1990, 1997; GAO, 1998, 2003). These outputs could be referred to as actual training programmes, number of participants, training timeframe, etc. (Behrman, J.N. and Levin, R.I., 1984; Agocs C., 2002; Eurostat 2002e, 2002f; Tablib, A., 2001; Baruch, Y. and Leeming, A., 2001). The most common of them are selected and presented in the following table 7.

Table 7: Set of Output Indicators

Objective	Measure
2.1 Average training cost per human hour	Total expenditures divided by time period of training programme.
2.2 Number of civil servants that take advantage of the training action	Number of completed training programmes related to trained target group each year.
2.3 Percentage of trainees who abandon the training programme per the total number of trainees	Percentage of trainee failure or abundance in total trained civil servants each year.
2.4 Timeframe adequacy of training programmes	Difference between planned and applied time trained hours each year.
2.5 Absorption cost - Difference of actual and budgeted cost	Difference between actual and budgeted cost.
2.6 Average timeframe suitability per number of trained civil servants	Number of trained civil servants divided by training time each year.
2.7 Sufficient percentage of trained civil servants per total number of public services	Percentage of trained civil servants per total number of civil servants in public organization.
2.8 Satisfactory absorption of costs (expenditures) as part of the budget	Expenditures per outputs of a project.
2.9 Number of materialism's training programmes	Completed training programmes per planned training programmes.

The following result indicators pay attention to trainee civil servants and they measure the direct impact of training to civil servant skills, employment behaviour into the public services. The simplification of working activities could increase outputs in order to improve the results that concern direct benefits. For instance, the

value added of learning in the trainee civil servant unit, the trainees civil servant performance in their units, the efficiency and effectiveness of training programme and the target accomplishment of training programmes (Terry, F., et al, 1992; CEDEFOP, 1997; Taylor, J. and Parkinson, S.T., 1998; Bell, E. et al, 2001, 2002; Smith, A. et al, 2002; Smith, A. and Collins, L., 2004). In most cases the results are illustrated immediately after the completion of training programmes period. The most common of them are selected and presented in the following table 8.

Table 8: Set of Results Indicators

Objective	Measure
3.1 Learning Utilization (Value added of life-long learning).	Average of trainees and trainees' managers' opinion that trainees could utilization the learning knowledge into their administration unit.
3.2 Applicability and utilization of knowledge	Percentage of received knowledge applicability into administrative unit. This measure is calculated by the average of trainees and their manager's opinion.
3.3 Training Programmes Effectiveness	Outputs divided by the targets in general. In this case training outputs divided by annual planning targets.
3.4 Training Programmes Efficiency	Relationship of Inputs – Outputs of training programmes
3.5 Training programmes targets accomplishment	Complete rate of annual Training programme targets.
3.6 Trainee rate of success	Percentage of trainees that received the degree of successful attendance.
3.7 Civil servant's performance	Percentage that recognizes the performance improvement of civil servant is a result of training. This measure is calculated by the average of trainees and their managers' opinion.
3.8 Relevance training programme curriculum and job tasks	This measure is calculated by the average of trainees and their managers' opinion.
3.9 Recognition of Training programme's practical utilization	Link between Trainees targets and leadership could be calculated by the percentage of expression of interest in the duration of training course.

The selected outcome indicators concern the public services in general and the indirect results of training programmes. In fact, it paid extra attention to the external relationship of the public services with citizens-customers. Furthermore, the results and outputs could lead to outcomes when they accomplish the annual targets. This is an essential issue for the success or failure of training programmes (Reddy, P.S., et al., 2000; Cutler, T. and Waine, B., 2003; HM Treasury, 2005). Outcomes could appear late or with different results for public services after long time (Hood 1991; GAO 1998, 2003; Agocs C., 2002; Freer, S., 2002; Broadbent, J., 2003; EU Directors general for Public administration, 2002). The most common of them are selected and presented in following table 9.

Table 9: Set of Outcomes Indicators

Objective	Measure
4.1 Cost Reduction	This measure is calculated by the average of trainees and their managers' opinion that the training programme led to cost reduction.
4.2. Public service effectiveness	The training programmes leads to effectiveness improvement of trainee's public service. This measure is calculated by the percentage of trainees' managers opinion that the training programme leads to effectiveness improvement to public service.
4.3 Public Service targets' accomplishment	The planning and the implementation of training programme should satisfy the targets of public services. This measure counts the percentage of public service manager who estimates that the training programme elaborate public service accomplishments.
4.4 Diffusion of Learning	The diffusion of learning add value in life long learning. This measure is estimated by the percentage of trainees and their managers who believe that the attended training programme elaborate to the diffusion of learning. This measure is calculated by the average of trainees and their managers' opinion.

4.5 Modernization of public services	The contribution level of training programme to modernization of public services. This measure is calculated by the average of trainees and their managers' opinion that the training programme contributes to public service modernization.
4.6 Better management of tasks in public services	This measure is the percentage calculated by the average of trainees and their managers' opinion that training programme contributes to management of public services tasks.
4.7 Servicing customer-citizens	This indicator assures the service improvement to citizens and measures by the percentage of managers who estimates that the training programme contributes to better service of citizens.
4.8 Time- saving methods in public services	The training programme could save working hours for civil servants. This percentage is calculated by the average of trainees and their managers' opinion that training programme contributes to saving working hours by improving civil servants' working methods.
4.9 Assimilation of legislation changes for servicing the citizens	Public services' managers who believe that the training programme contributes in assimilation of legislation changes calculate this indicator.

The synthesis of the above CPIs is constructed in a more simplistic way in order to be convenient to the Public Services' Decision Makers. The proposed metrics are quantifiable, complete and controllable. If we look at the use of CPIs, and at their integration in more elaborate systems of monitoring, evaluation or benchmarking, we will often observe that the practice at the different levels is not integrated (Kouzman A. et al, 1999). Moreover, there may be conflicts or contradictions between the actors at different levels concerning the use of CPIs or concerning the aforesaid systems.

Conclusions

This literature review paper has hopefully made a convincing argument that PM's priority on CPIs mechanisms and studies is substantial in relation to the size of the public training institutes or organisations. The purpose of PM's system is to guarantee that in terms of credibility and consistency PM meets the high expectations and demands of the government, stakeholders, educational institutions, and other users of PM's reports (Kouzman A. et al, 1999). The PM system is a mean to better services and products and to a higher uniform quality standard (Mwita, J., 2000). Thus, the PM system is not an end in itself, but one mean to achieve the end of a quality standard second to none. Therefore, the public training organizations could set priorities through the proposed CPIs in order to keep the costs down and improve performance for public services. The benchmarking of CPIs according to referred frameworks offers credibility of CPIs selection. Therefore, these proposed sets of CPIs could force the public training organizations to cover the public services needs through their training programmes in a more efficient way. Consequently, these proposed sets could increase the value of stakeholders' money and provide accountability to the public services decision makers' contribution.

The proposed CPIs were constructed in a short version that consists of inputs, outputs, results and outcome sets. This version has illustrated the minimum necessary indicators for PM in order to keep the monitoring in control (Mwita, J., 2000), thus includes 36 indicators (see tables 6-9). These indicators that refer to the most frameworks are the only criterion of credibility and selection in this presented short version. The selected CPIs are synthesized, renamed or modified properly in order to be able to compare to each other. The majority of indicators are referred differently in different theoretical and institutional practical frameworks. Finally, the proposed CPIs aim to close the knowledge gap of performance measurement between public services and public life-long training centers.

References

1. Agocs C. (2002). Canada's employment equity legislation and policy, 1987-2000 –The gap between policy and practice.// International Journal of Manpower. Vol. 23, No 3, pp. 256-276
2. Baruch, Y. and Leeming, A. (2001). The added Value of MBA studies – graduates' perceptions.// Personnel Review. Vol. 30, No 5, pp. 589-601,
3. Behrman, J.N. and Levin, R.I. (1984). Are business schools doing their job? .// Harvard Business Review. January-February. Vol. 62, pp. 140-7.

4. Bell, E. et al (2001). Investors in people and the standardization of professional knowledge in personnel management.// *Management Learning*. Jun. Vol. 32, No 2, pp. 201
5. Bell, E., et al, (2002). A Step in the Right Direction? Investors in People and the Learning Organization.// *British Journal of Management*. Vol. 13, pp. 161–171
6. Broadbent, J. (2003). Comprehensive Performance Assessment: The crock of gold at the end of the performance rainbow?// *Public Money & Management*. Vol. 23, No 1, pp. 5–7.
7. Boyne, G. and Enticott, G. (2004). Are the ‘Poor’ Different? The Internal Characteristics of Local Authorities in the Five Comprehensive Performance Assessment Groups.// *Public Money and Management*, January
8. CEDEFOP, Document, (1997). Indicators in Perspective – The use of quality indicators in vocational education and training, European Centre for the Development of vocational Training
9. Chan, L. (2004). Performance measurement and adoption of balanced scorecard: A survey of municipal governments in the USA and Canada.// *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*. Vol. 17, No 3, pp. 204-221
10. Cutler, T. and Waine, B. (2003). Advancing public accountability? The social services ‘star’ ratings.// *Public Money & Management*. Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 125–128.
11. European Commission, (2002a). European Report on quality indicators of Lifelong Learning: Fifteen quality indicators, Report, Brussels, June.
12. European Commission, (2002b). The Lisbon Strategy — Making Change Happen, Brussels, COM, 14 final
13. European Commission, Employment and Social Affairs DG, (2005). Indicators for monitoring the Employment Guidelines, Employment and European Social Fund policy development and coordination, Employment Strategy, Second Version, 2004-2005 compendium
14. Forrier A. and Sels L. (2003). Flexibility, turnover and training.// *International Journal of Manpower*. Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 148-168
15. Freer, S. (2002). Comprehensive Performance Assessment in local government.// *Public Money & Management*. Vol.22, No.2, pp. 5-6.
16. General Accounting Office, (1998). Managing for Results: The Statutory Framework for Performance-based Management and Accountability, Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. General Accounting Office
17. Governmental Accounting Standards Board, (1990). Service Efforts and Accomplishments Reporting: Its Time Has Come, An Overview, Research Report
18. Governmental Accounting Standards Board and National Academy of Public Administration, (1997). Report on Survey of State and Local Government Use and Reporting of Performance Measures – First Questionnaire Results (September 30).
19. Holzer, M. and Kloby, K. (2005). Public performance measurement: An assessment of the state-of-the-art and models for citizen participation Public performance measurement.// *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. Vol. 54, No. 7, pp. 517-532
20. Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons?// *Public Administration*. Vol. 69, pp.3-19.
21. Johanson, U. (1999). Why the concept of human resource costing and accounting does not work: a lesson seven Swedish cases. *Personnel Review*. Vol.28, No. ½, pp. 91-107
22. Johnes, N., and Connolly, M. (2001). The Competent Primary Head teacher: Broadening the management competence approach or abandoning it?, *Public Money & Management*, April- June, Vol. 21, No. 2, p.53
23. Kouzmin A. et al (1999). Benchmarking and performance measurement in public sectors: Towards learning for agency effectiveness. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*. Vol. 12, No 2, pp. 121-144
24. Mwita, J. (2000). Performance management model: A systems-based approach to public service quality.// *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*. Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.19-37,
25. Papadeas, P. (2006). Comparable Financial Information and Decision Making for the Public Sector.// *The South European Review of Business Finance & Accounting*. Vol. 4, No.2, pp. 99-118
26. Petridou E. and Chatzipanagiotou P. (2004). The planning process in managing organizations of continuing education: the case of Greek vocational training institutions.// *International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol.18, No. 4, pp. 215-223
27. Reddy, P.S., et al. (2000). Human Resources capacity- building the local government.// *Public Personnel Management*. Vol. 29, No.2, Summer.
28. Smith, A. et al (2002). IIP and SMEs: Awareness, benefits and barriers.// *Personnel Review*. Vol. 31, No.1-2, pp. 62
29. Smith, A. and Collins, L. (2004). Understanding the new Investors in People standard - Lessons from experience.// *Personnel Review*. Vol.33, No. 5-6.
30. Tablib, A. (2001). Formula based Allocation of Public Funds: The Case of Higher Education Research Funding.// *Public Money & Management*, January – March
31. Taylor, J. and Parkinson, S.T. (1998). An assessment and analysis of Investors in People in Northern Ireland organizations.// *Total Quality Management*. Vol. 9, No. 2-3, pp. 347-55.
32. Terry, F., et al (1992). National Vocational Qualifications.// *Public Money & Management*. April – June
33. Vasilakis, A. (2008). Relative Balanced Measurement of Trainees’ Civil Servants.// *Benchmarking an International Journal*. Vol. 15, No. 6