

## **Convergence of the Policies for Promoting Total Quality Management in the Public Administrations of Balkan States – European Union Member States\***

**Ani MATEI**

National School of Political Studies and Public Administration, Bucharest  
amatei@snsps.ro

**Carmen SĂVULESCU**

National School of Political Studies and Public Administration, Bucharest  
csavulescu@snsps.ro

**Abstract.** *In the past three decades, total quality management (TQM) has been appreciated as “fundamental modality in view to improve the activity in the public and private sectors” (Boyne and Walker, 2002, p. 1). For the time being, in public administrations, we witness an extension of the policies for promoting TQM, although the experiences have not always been positive.*

*The European Administrative Space (EAS) incorporates TQM, in different manners at national level, taking into consideration its recognised impact on the efficiency of public administration, one of EAS fundamental principles (Zurga, 2008, pp. 39-49). In the context of analysing EAS evolution, the administrative convergence will also comprise the convergence of TQM policies. In fact, the field literature (Hackman, Wageman, 1995) reveals, in the context of national TQM policy-making, the concepts of “Convergent validity” and “Discriminant validity”, reflecting “the degree to which the version of TQM promulgated by the founders and observed in organizational practice share a common set of assumptions and prescriptions” (Hackman, Wageman, 1995, pp. 318-319).*

---

\* Paper achieved with the support of the project “Restructuring doctoral research in the fields of political sciences, public administration, sociology and communication”, co-funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund, Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013

*By a comparative analysis on TQM policies in the national public administrations of Balkan states, EU Member States: Greece, Cyprus, Slovenia, Bulgaria and Romania, the current paper aims to reveal the level of their convergence as well as the theoretical consistency of the conceptual and practical framework for TQM assertion.*

*The comparative analysis will be based on a comprehensive vision on TQM, provided by Dean and Bowen (1994), Boyne and Walker (2002), namely its approach should be characterised on own principles, practices and techniques, grouped on customer focus, continuous improvement and team work (Boyne and Walker, 2002, pp. 4-5).*

*The tradition on promoting TQM in public administration in the above-mentioned states is relatively recent: since 1990s – Cyprus, since 1995 – Greece and Slovenia, since 2000 – Bulgaria and Romania. However, in the context of the EU membership and EAS enlargement to the Balkans, their efforts for promoting TQM in public administration are marked by concrete actions, reflecting differentiated degrees of convergence.*

*The current study will refer briefly to global convergence – assessed in relation to the founders' conception on TQM and comprehensively to the relative convergence – assessed by comparing the activities concerning TQM in the states under review.*

**Keywords:** Total Quality Management Policies, Public Administration, Convergence.

**JEL Code:** H83.

**REL Codes:** 13G, 13J.

## Introduction

The preoccupations for promoting total quality management (TQM) in public administrations or generally in the public sector are moreover visible, especially in the past three decades.

In the above context, TQM is appreciated as “fundamental modality in view to improve the activity in the public and private sectors” (Boyne, Walker, 2002, p. 1).

The specialists’ approaches are definitely complex and the analyses are using modern tools based on benchmarking as well as on integration and interpretation of the outcomes in the context of the processes of convergence and administrative dynamics.

For the Balkan states – EU Member States: Greece, Cyprus, Slovenia, Bulgaria and Romania – the different histories of the European integration will determine different approaches of the policies for promoting quality in national public administrations. In this view, we find significant issues since 1990s, when strategies and policies for promoting quality in the public sector, in general and in public administrations, in particular, have started to be shaped on the working agenda of public authorities.

A TQM temporal ranking reveals that those preoccupations have started in Cyprus in 1990s, in Greece and Slovenia since 1995, and in Bulgaria and Romania after 2000.

### **1. General analysis context of the policies and strategies for promoting quality**

In general, the strategies for promoting quality in the public sector in the above-mentioned states have coincided or succeeded the strategies of public sector reform. The latter strategies have aimed “to introduce the ‘managerial’ culture and the market-based mechanisms in the public sector, to re-orient the public administration from production focus to “customer’ or citizen focus” (Borzelay, 1992), to improve “performance” of public administration and deliver better quality services to “customers” (Engel, 2003, p. 18).

Deepening the analysis, Engel (2003) refers to the fact that the actual impetus towards quality promotion, using quality management initiatives and tools has been often associated to the “paradigm of New Public Management, rooted in private sector managerialism and theory of public choice” (Hood, 1991). In fact even some governmental programmes, such as that of Clinton administration in US promoted strongly quality management in federal administration (Gore, 1996). In United Kingdom, the introduction of New

Public Management in some fields, i.e. in health, has triggered the quality policies to become “an element of public management reforms” at the end of 1980s, through the so called model “New Public Management in search of excellence” (Ferlie, et al., 1996, p. 13).

At the same time, Engel (2003) asserts that this “new” search of quality and the promotion of excellence models in businesses emphasise the development of organisational culture, staff involvement and human resource management, investment in human resources, organisational values of “learning” (Broekmate et al., 2001, p. 319).

Referring to Herbert Simon’s old school of administration and management, the above mentioned authors highlight the topic on modernisation of public administration through promotion of the new culture of quality, which “seems to be appropriate in «traditional» bureaucracies, focusing on the needs and values of public service providers and organisations” (Engel, 2003, p. 18).

At the end of last century, quality was considered a universal trend of administrative modernisation or reform, trend that, comprised both OECD countries and EU Member States. Even in the first half of 2002, a research conducted by the Spanish EU Presidency revealed that theoretically, initiatives on quality and use of quality management tools had emerged in all EU Member States. Also, the comparative research highlighted the asymmetry of the processes for externalisation and internalisation of good practices in public organisations as well as significant similarities and differences. A similar research on quality in public administrations of the EU Member States was achieved in 2005 by Slovenian EU Presidency. After 2005, relevant analyses on quality management in public administrations were accomplished by the Innovative Public Services Group (IPSG), focusing on three priority issues:

- Common Assessment Framework (CAF);
- Quality conferences;
- Studies and analyses on quality management.

In 2007, IPSG presents information on quality management in public administrations of the EU Member States, achieving a comparative analysis published in the European Public Administration Network (EUPAN).

In February 2008, Slovenia developed a wide project, analysing comparatively quality management in public administrations of the EU Member States. The study aimed at understanding the progress and actual situation of quality management in the EU Member States (Zurga, 2008, pp. 5-6).

The above research focused on two main directions:

1) comparative analysis of quality management in public administrations inside the EU, analysis that represented one of the main contributions to the 5<sup>th</sup> Quality Conference in Paris in October 2008;

2) strengthening the transparency and visibility of the current comparative analyses (improving the general analysis – first level, greater access to complementary information and/or more details – second level).

The analyses and field literature (Pollitt, Bouckaert, 1995; EIPA, 1996, Löffler, 1996, Engel, 2003, Zurga, 2008) highlight a series of differences present for the time being in the general context of quality management in public administrations. Briefly, they can be described as follows (Engel, 2003, pp. 18-19):

- in spite of a European vocabulary on quality, the directions for change and the values emphasizing quality improvement are different as regards every country and initiative;
- the attention towards quality in public administration in the framework of programmes and strategies of administrative modernization varies powerfully in every country and the quality management policies, strategies or instruments are different in the public authorities' options holding responsibilities at state level.
- the notion of quality in public administration and the objectives associated to quality promotion in the public sector have endemic characteristics and features of instability in time;
- a wide variety of quality management initiatives and tools aim either the improvement of quality of internal operations in the public organizations or the quality of services provided to citizens or customers or (often) both of them;
- although the quality "tools" promoted and used and various quality initiatives bear similar names or are identical, they do not trigger the same impact or even aim different objectives;
- significant variation of the degree of using quality management tools and techniques in various states and various governance levels in a country;
- understanding quality in public administration is powerfully influenced by several independent contextual factors referring to "administrative culture", the role of administration and state in society etc.

Therefore, in spite of the progress in promoting quality management in public administration, similar to other European processes, we are far away from a common "European" understanding and a common approach on quality in public administration and "the research on quality is and it will remain significant for long time, differentiated mainly by its ways of accomplishment" (Engel, 2003). At the same time, the research on quality is moreover characterized by a "broad" international vocabulary of management reform (Pollitt, Bouckaert, 2000, p. 180), promoted by organizations such as OECD, World Bank or United Nations.

## **2. A specific issue on promoting quality policies in national public administrations of the Balkan states**

Although such analysis in view to reveal the specificity of promoting quality policies in the Balkan states is not very visible, some conclusions, valid for a broad area of Central and Eastern Europe may provide valuable information for the Balkan states, integrating in the current study the five states under review.

At the same time, it is worth to emphasise the fact that the Western EU Member States have represented for the European Union and particularly for the Balkan states a catalyst for quality promotion policies. The specific method focused on externalization of policies and good practices, including the theoretical and practical substantiation of quality management.

“The low quality of public administration” as core feature of the Balkan states, associated with “uncertainty and unpredictability of the institutional context” (Brunetti et al., 1997) represented “explanatory and important factors of economic collapse and crises” (Verheijen, 2000, p. 25).

Caddy and Vintar (2002) highlight a slow and afterwards fast growth of the interest for the quality policies, fact based on three main reasons in the authors’ opinion:

- The reform processes of the state, in general, and public administration, in particular, have undergone three development stages: transformation, consolidation and modernization (Hesse, 1998). Therefore, only after the finalization of the two stages, “a differentiation of quality” (Poschl, 1996) could be perceived. At the same time, it is worth to remark the powerful influences of Western experts, international organizations and assistance programmes that have been often based on “optimum situations”, specific to other states, usually Western European states.
- The processes of negotiation for accession to the European Union have been delayed a few years, even if Copenhagen criteria had been adopted in 1993. Except Greece, the other states since 1998 have awarded attention to the development of the administrative capacity and consequently initiation and implementation of quality policies.
- Increase of the pressure exercised by citizens for improving the public services and rebuilding the trust in public administration.

To those assertions we may add the lack of empirical evidence concerning the use of management and quality assurance systems in the private sector in the states under review as well as the lack of trust in the capacity of public organizations to obtain outcomes after using quality management tools.

Also, Talbot (1999) and Gooden and McCreary (2001) have raised the issue if “the old philosophy of efficiency”, or in other words, “the improvement of quality in public organizations by tools specific for quality management derived from the private sector represents the best way for organizations in view of approaching the real citizens’ needs (not only the customers’ needs) and those of society as a whole” (Engel, 2003, p. 22).

### **3. Total quality management (TQM) in the context of quality policies in public administration**

According to Engel (2003), TQM was used in the beginning in the private sector in view to monitor and evaluate all the activities in an organization, relevant for reaching excellent results in businesses. Addressing to all activities in an organization, TQM represents a “holistic” tool which does not especially focus only on specific activities or production processes. As above shown, in the late 1980s/beginning of 1990s, TQM was also used in the public sector. In Europe, the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) promoted and developed the most spread TQM “model”.

#### **3.1. TQM in public organizations**

Boyne and Walker (2002) achieve an interesting study on evaluating the impact of TQM in public organizations. Accepted relatively recent as management tool, once with the increase of its popularity, a series of questions persist on TQM concerning the concept, components or even similarity with the theory of management (Boyne, Walker, 2002, p. 2). Making the adequate differentiation between quality and TQM, famous authors, quoted by Boyne and Walker (2002, p. 2), remark that there is no consensus on the content of TQM concept starting from the main characteristics of TQM, as promoted by Deming, Juran or Crosby.

However, Boyne and Walker (2002) assert that “it is possible to identify the key components of TQM”. Referring to TQM components, it is worth to reveal a diversity of approaches under the heading “hard techniques”, related to production and operation management and “soft techniques” which include qualitative approaches of customer focus, team work, employee’s training and involvement (Boyne, Walker, 2002, p. 4).

The above authors reveal the studies of Dean and Bowen (1994) which “provide a comprehensive vision of literature and argument that TQM approach should be characterized by its own principles, practices and techniques”. In this context, the principles identified by Dean and Bowen (1994) refer to *customer focus, continuous improvement and team work*. In the opinion of the above

authors, each principle is implemented through a set of practices (collecting information about customer, analysis of organizational processes, etc.) supported by a variety of techniques (examining the customer, events such as team building etc.) (Boyne, Walker, 2002, pp. 4-5).

Table 1 reveals a synthetic presentation of TQM components.

Table 1

<b>TQM principles, practices and techniques</b>			
	<b>Customer focus</b>	<b>Continuous improvement</b>	<b>Team work</b>
Principles	Paramount importance of providing products and services that fulfil customer needs; requires organisation-wide focus on customers.	Consistent customer satisfaction can be attained only through relentless improvement of processes that create products and services.	Customer focus and continuous improvement are best achieved by collaboration throughout an organisation as well as with customers and suppliers.
Practices	Direct customer contact. Collecting information about customer needs. Using information to design and deliver products and services.	Process analysis, re-engineering, problem solving, plan/do/check/act.	Searching measures for the benefit of all units involved in a process; setting various types of teams; Group skill training.
Techniques	Customer surveys and focus groups. Quality function deployment (translates customer information into product specifications).	Flow diagrams; Pareto analyses, statistical process control; structural diagrams.	Organisational development methods such as the nominal group techniques. Team-building methods (e.g. role clarification and group feedback).

**Source:** Boyne and Walker, 2002, pp. 4-5.

The above references as well as the experience on TQM use in governmental public organizations determine us, similar to Boyne and Walker (2002) to turn into account TQM definition of Dean and Bowen (1999), as pillar of our analysis.

In view to understand better the connection of TQM with public management and its reforms in the context of the enlargement of the European Administrative Space (EAS), we should reveal the fact that TQM “is obvious linked and created on the management theory”. Boyne and Walker (2002, p. 5), Spencer (1994), Dean and Bowen (1994), Grant, Shan and Krishan (1994) support also the above assertion.

In theoretical perspective it is important the demonstration of Hackman and Wageman (1995) on the “convergent and discriminant validity” of TQM.



Their arguments presented also by Boyne and Walker (2002, 5-6) reveal rather the proxy type and specific difference of TQM concept.

### **3.2. Convergence of the policies for promoting TQM**

Referring to the convergence of the policies for promoting and implementing TQM in public administrations, this will encompass aspects of compatibility, complementarity or similarity that could be remarked in the national policies concerning the use of TQM in the reforms of national public administrations.

Their comparison with a series of general standards derived from concepts, practice and experiences at EU level will provide elements in view to determine “the global convergence” and the comparison of initiatives, mechanisms and tools promoted in the states under review will determine “the relative convergence”.

As above briefly defined, the two concepts – global convergence and relative convergence – inscribe in the general approaches of the administrative convergence as fundamental process for strengthening the European administration and enlarging the European Administrative Space.

Another perspective on the convergence of TQM policies is based on performance assessment induced by TQM in public administration. This approach, explained coherently and thoroughly by Boyne and Walker (2002), refers rather to TQM result.

The approach proposed by us will be a process assessment referring to the design, structure and content of the policies for promoting TQM.

Both approaches need empirical studies, comparative studies of TQM policies, specifically an assessment on how TQM has been made operational.

The same authors, Boyne and Walker (2002, pp. 7-9), provide a suggestive and beneficial overview for our study, identifying 19 studies concerning TQM structure and content, according to the theoretical option on TQM provided by Dean and Bowen’s (1994).

Table 2 provides a synthetic image on TQM content and structure and its correlation with performance.

Table 2

<b>TQM content and structure</b>			
<b>Studies</b>	<b>Customer focus</b>	<b>Continuous improvement</b>	<b>Team work</b>
Anderson, Rungtusanatham, Schroeder & Devaraj (1995), Flynn, Schroeder & Sakakibara (1995b)	Internal and external cooperation; customer satisfaction. Relations with customer; relations with provider.	Visionary leadership; process management; continuous improvement. Process management, designing the product, control, statistic feedback, support of top management.	Employee involvement. Personnel management, work attitude.
Powell (1995)	A closer relation with customer; a closer relation with provider.	Leadership and commitment; adopting and communicating TQM; open organization; mentality of zero defects; flexible manufacturing; process improvement; measurement.	Intensive training; middle management teams; problem-solving.
Youssef, Boyd & Williams (1996)	Customer focus.	Top management commitment, organizational learning; process improvement; learning.	Role of top management models; Problem-solving.
Forker, Mendez & Hershauer (1997)	Provider's quality management.	Leadership and quality policy; designing the product/service; process management; information about quality and reporting; role of Quality Department.	Relations with employer; training.
Hendricks & Singhal (1997) Easton & Jarrell (1998)	Quality Awards, Customer focus, Provider performance, relations with provider.	Process focus; systematic improvement; recognizing TQM as critical competition strategy.	Quality Awards Employee involvement and development Inter-functional management.
Forza and Filippini (1998)	TQM connection with customers, TQM connection with providers.	Quality oriented; control of the process.	Human resources.
Rungtusanatham,, Forza, Filippini & Anderson (1998)	Internal and external cooperation; customer satisfaction.	Visionary leadership; learning, process management, continuous improvement.	Employee development.
Samson & Terziovski (1999)	Customer focus.	Leadership; strategic planning, information and analysis, process management.	Personnel management.
Tan, Kannan, Handfield & Ghosh (1999)	Customer focus.	Information and analysis, role of Quality Department, leadership of top management; processes for product design.	Functional teams, learning.
Brah Woug & Rao (2000)	Customer focus.	Leadership, provider's quality management; process improvement; service design; rewards for quality improvement; order and organization.	Employee's involvement, training, empowerment.

<b>Studies</b>	<b>Customer focus</b>	<b>Continuous improvement</b>	<b>Team work</b>
Chandler & Mc Evoy (2000)	Customer friendly.	Waste, quality tools, cleaning.	Management involvement.
Kunst & Lemink (2000)	Customers.	Leadership, strategy, staff, resources, process management, social effects.	Management involvement employees.
Martinez-Lorente Dewhurst & Gallegor – Rodriguez (2000)	Relations with providers.	Organisation, designing the product; information about quality; process tools; design tools.	Relations with employees.
Douglas and Judge (2001)	Customer focus.	Management by facts; continuous improvement of the process; adopting the philosophy of quality; using TQM methods.	Involvement of top management team; Focus on TQM training.
Ho, Duffy & Shih (2001)	Provider's quality management.	Role of top management; role of Quality Department; product design; process management; reporting information about quality; provider's quality management.	Relations with employees; training.
Rahman (2001)	Customer focus.	Leadership, information and analysis; strategy and planning; processes, products and services.	People.
Sim (2001)	Customer satisfaction.	Quality at provider; statistic control of quality, methodologies for quality improvement.	Quality and team work, training.

Source: Boyne and Walker, 2002, pp. 7-9.

Table 2 will represent the pillar for understanding and organizing the comparative information in view to determine the levels of convergence for TQM policies.

#### **4. An empirical study on the convergence of the policies for promoting TQM in Balkan states - EU Member States**

##### **4.1. Framework of analysis**

The current study is based on the comparative analysis achieved and published by Zurga (2008). The information from that study has been reorganized according to the conceptual framework above described in our study.

For the Balkan states mentioned, TQM approaches will fit in the general context of quality management in public administration and, according to Zurga (2008, p. 16), they incorporate a combination of centralised and decentralised approach with top-down and bottom-up approach.

The mentioned study, achieved for the EU Member States, accomplishes a matrix containing 18 categories of information for the comparative analysis (Zurga, 2008, pp. 25-148).

From the categories of information mentioned we retained 11 categories, relevant in our opinion, for TQM in public organizations (Table 3).

Table 3

Structure of TQM policies in Balkan states

TQM principles	Customer focus	Continuous improvement	Team work
TQM elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ QM Policies (q11)</li> <li>▪ Quality Awards (q12)</li> <li>▪ Excellence Models (q13)</li> <li>▪ Citizens Charters (q14)</li> <li>▪ Testing Customer Satisfaction (q15)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality Management Development (q21)</li> <li>▪ Measuring the Quality in PA (q22)</li> <li>▪ Sharing good practices (q23)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Organizational structure for promoting quality (q31)</li> <li>▪ Training for QM (q32)</li> <li>▪ Quality Tools in PA Organizations (q33)</li> </ul>

Source: The authors (processing information from Zurga, 2008).

#### 4.2. Methodology

Related to the classification in Table 3, the comparative information provided by Zurga (2008) was processed; we introduced the codification for the issues as nominal variables, thus emphasizing a set of standards of reference for each variable, based on the general conclusions at EU level.

Related to the standards of reference, a value from the interval [1,5] is assigned to each state, representing the appreciation on the hierarchic position concerning the accomplishment of the standards of reference.

The levels of global convergence will be obtained by data statistic processing and they will be provided by Pearson correlation coefficients.

For the relative convergence, values from the interval [-1,1] will be assigned for each state and each variable, expressing the level of compatibility and similarity in TQM approaches and tools. Value 1 will express similarity in the approach specific for a variable; value 0 will express the lack of common elements, while value -1 will express incompatible activities and tools. The score obtained for each variable will represent the mean of its values through inter-states comparisons for the respective variable.

The level of relative convergence will be also provided by Pearson correlation coefficients.

### 4.3. Empirical analysis

#### 4.3.1 Global convergence

Using the information from Annex 1, for every item out of the 11 items of TQM mentioned in Table 3, quantitative evaluations were formulated on the level of compatibility for the activities and tools in every state related to the general conclusions/trend at European level drawn up by Zurga (2008).

Those conclusions were considered standards of reference and accordingly the rankings in Table 4 have been achieved.

Table 4

Rankings estimated on conceiving and implementing TQM elements												
Element State	q11	q12	q13	q14	q15	q21	q22	q23	q31	q32	q33	Total
GREECE	1	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	3	3	5	28
CYPRUS	3	1	1	4	2	5	2	1	1	1	2	23
SLOVENIA	4	5	5	1	5	2	4	3	5	5	3	42
BULGARIA	5	3	3	5	4	3	5	5	4	2	1	40
ROMANIA	2	4	4	3	3	1	1	4	2	4	4	32

The evaluations in Table 4 were achieved on the basis of the information provided by Zurga (2008). Unfortunately those data were incomplete and it was necessary to use other sources, usually websites of public institutions, syntheses of EIPA, EUPAN, etc.

As shown by the final scores, the highest convergence of quality and TQM policies is present in Slovenia, followed by Bulgaria, Romania, Greece and Cyprus.

The system proposed can be improved and updated on the basis of more complete data and more rigorous criteria and standards.

#### 4.3.2. Relative convergence

On the basis of data from Annex 2, six variables were defined, describing quantitative quantifications on the levels of compatibility of the policies for promoting TQM with the policies of the other states under review. MEAN variable evaluates the mean of the other five variables.

Table 5 presents the Pearson correlations for the variables mentioned.

Table 5

**Pearson correlations for TQM policies in the Balkan states – EU Member States**

		GR	CY	SI	BG	RO	MEAN
GR	Pearson Correlation	1	-.090	-.315(*)	-.138	.019	.210
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.511	.019	.314	.892	.124
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55
CY	Pearson Correlation	-.090	1	.304(*)	.188	.221	.715(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.511		.024	.169	.105	.000
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55
SI	Pearson Correlation	-.315(*)	.304(*)	1	-.163	-.190	.267(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.024		.234	.164	.049
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55
BG	Pearson Correlation	-.138	.188	-.163	1	.298(*)	.519(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.314	.169	.234		.027	.000
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55
RO	Pearson Correlation	.019	.221	-.190	.298(*)	1	.583(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.892	.105	.164	.027		.000
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55
MEAN	Pearson Correlation	.210	.715(**)	.267(*)	.519(**)	.583(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.124	.000	.049	.000	.000	
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Excepting the MEAN variable, all the other correlations are low (0.019 – 0.304) and the other correlations are negative. The general conclusion is that the policies for promoting TQM are based on various activities and tools that do not trigger the conclusion of high convergence. The most powerful correlations are between Cyprus and Slovenia (0.304), as well as between Bulgaria and Romania (0.298), both coefficients being significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). We explain such situation as follows: membership of the two groups of states to the same wave of EU enlargement (2004, respectively 2007) as well as the European context which enables the promotion of quality and TQM policies in those four states. The case of Greece is singular, holding negative correlations [(-0.315) – (-0.090)], except the correlation with Romania, which rather signifies the lack of correlation (0.019).

If we discuss about a mean of the variables expressed through MEAN variable, we remark, as it is natural, the following order of the correlations: Cyprus (0.715), Romania (0.583), Bulgaria (0.519), Slovenia (0.267) and Greece (0.210).

## 5. Conclusions

The policies for promoting quality and TQM in public administrations of the Balkan states – EU Member States are quite different. The explanation for such a situation consists, on the one hand, in the different stage of accession to the EU and, on the other hand, in the late set up of a coherent, conceptual framework and good practices on promotion of quality and TQM in public administration in the end of 1990s.

In fact, the model of the European Administrative Space that provided after 2000 the standards in view to assess and monitor the progress in national public administration reforms does not contain explicit approaches on the necessity to introduce and implement quality and TQM policies in public administrations.

The initiatives on evaluating the quality and TQM policies have been expressed after 2000, as also shown in the first part of the paper, and our analysis is achieved on the basis of an initiative carried out in 2007-2008. Therefore, the period necessary for implementation and compatibility of the quality and TQM policies was insufficient.

However, the preoccupations on promoting quality and TQM policies are more visible and the efforts of the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA) and European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) are more important. The instruments promoted -CAF and EFQM model- benefit in many states of distinct policies and the conferences on quality already exceeded five editions.

---

## References

- Barzelay, M. (1992). *Breaking through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government*, Berkeley, University of California Press
- Boyne, G., Walker, R., „Total Quality Management and Performance. An Evaluation of the Evidence and Lessons for Research on Public Organizations”, *Public Performance & Management Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2, December 2002, pp. 111-131
- Broekmate, L., Dahrendorf, K., Dunker, K. (2001). *Qualitätsmanagement in der öffentlichen Verwaltung*, Berlin, Jehle
- Brunetti, A., Weder, B., Kisunko, G., “Institutions in Transition: Reliability of Rules and Economic Performance in former Socialist Countries”, *World Bank Working Papers on Governance, Corruption and Legal Reform*, No. 103, 1997, Washington, D.C.
- Caddy, J., Vintar, M. (eds.) (2002). *Building Better Quality Administration for the Public: Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe*, Bratislava, NISPAcee

- Dean, J.W., Jr., Bowen, D.E., "Management Theory and Total Quality: Improving Research and Practice through Theory Development", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1994, pp. 392-418
- EIPA, 1996, "National Programmes for the Improvement of the Quality of Public Services", Report drawn up by the EIPA for the 27<sup>th</sup> Informal Conference of the Directors-General of the Public Service, Maastricht
- Engel, Ch. (2003). *Quality Management Tools in CEE Candidate Countries*, Maastricht, EIPA
- Ferlie, E. et al. (1996). *The New Public Management in Action*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Gooden, S.T., McCreary, S.M., "That Old Time Religion: Efficiency, Benchmarking, and Productivity", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 61, No. 1, 2001, pp. 116-120
- Gore, Al., "The best kept secrets in government: a report to President Bill Clinton", Washington DC, US Government Printing Office, *National Performance Review*, 1996
- Grant, R.M., Shani, R., Krishan, R., "TQM's challenge to management theory and practice", *Sloan Management Review*, 35(2), 1994, pp. 25-35
- Hackman, R.J., Wageman, R., "Total Quality Management: empirical, conceptual, and practical issues", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 1995, pp. 309-42
- Hesse, J.J., "Rebuilding the State: Administrative Reform in Central and Eastern Europe", in Preparing Public Administration for the European Administrative Space, *Sigma Paper*, No. 23, OECD, Paris, 1998, pp. 168-179
- Hood, Ch., "A Public Management for all Seasons?" *Public Administration*, Vol. 69, No. 1, 1991, pp. 3-19
- Löffler, E., "The Modernization of the Public Sector in an International Perspective: Concepts and Methodologies of Awarding and Assessing Quality in the Public Sector in OECD Countries", Speyer, *Speyerer Forschungsberichte*, 151, 1996
- Pollitt, Ch., Bouckaert, G. (1995). *Quality Improvement in European Public Services. Concepts, Cases and Commentary*, London, Sage Publications.
- Poschl, J., "Are CEECs Stuck in a Quality Gap?", *Trends in World Economy*, No. 78, 1996, pp. 183-188
- Spencer, B.A., "Models of organization and total quality management: A comparison and critical evaluation", *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 1994, pp. 446-471
- Talbot, C., "Public Performance – towards a new model?", *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1999, pp. 15-34
- Verheijen, A.J.G., "Administrative Capacity Development: A race against time?" *WRR Working Document*, No. 107, 2001, The Hague.
- Zurga, G. (ed.), "Quality Management in Public Administrations of the EU Member States. Comparative Analysis", 2008, Ljubljana: Ministry of Public Administration, <http://www.eupan.eu>



**Annex 1****Comparative information on promoting quality policies  
in the Balkan states – EU Member States**  
(processed after Zurga, 2008, pp. 25-146)**q11 QM Policies**

Several policies in the Quality Management are presented.

**BULGARIA**

The Strategy for Modernisation of the State Administration – from accession to integration 2003–2006 – aimed at increased efficiency, effectiveness and quality in the public sector in general – approved by the CoM in 2002.

Concept and Generic Model for Improving Administrative Services through the One-Stop Shop – pointing out the main principles and organisation of the service delivery process.

Guide for developing a Client Charter – document supporting administrations in the development of their own standards and elaboration of Client Charters.

System for Self-Assessment – an Internet-based system, developed according to the EFQM Excellence Model in 2003, which guides all administrations through the process of self-assessment (active since 2003). All administrations perform self-assessments every year and publish the results.

Methodology for Measuring Customer Satisfaction – presented in 2007 by the MSAAR under the requirements of the Ordinance for the general rules for organisation of administrative service delivery.

Ordinance on the general rules for the organisation of administrative service delivery (approved by the CoM in September 2006) – establishes the main principles of service delivery.

Law on E-Governance – adopted in May 2007 (will enter into force in June 2008). It regulates the electronic delivery of administrative services to citizens and the business sector, the processing of electronic documents within individual administrations, as well as the exchange of electronic documents between state authorities.

The Law on Access to Public Information was adopted in 2000.

The Law on Limiting Administrative Regulation and Administrative Control Over Economic Activity – adopted in 2003 and entered into force in 2004.

The Code of Conduct of Employees in State Administration was adopted in 2004 and sets the rules of conduct of employees in state administration.

The MSAAR and the Ministry of Justice jointly developed the Code of Ethics for High-level Officials. The Code was adopted with a Decision of the CoM on 23 December 2005. It aims at recognition of the principles of transparency, accountability and integrity in state administration.

In June 2006, the MSAAR elaborated the Standards of Administrative Ethics, which represent the major rules that every employee must comply with.

The Operational Programme Administrative Capacity (2007–2013) is a strategic document for the modernisation of Bulgarian state administration during the period 2007–2013. The Programme is financed by the European Social Fund (ESF) and the national budget. Its main priorities are related to good governance, human resource management, quality administrative service delivery and e-Governance development.

## CYPRUS

- Employee performance management system aimed at enhancing meritocracy and transparency
- Code of Conduct
- Other policies for improving the quality of service provided to the public (e.g. One-stop-shops)

## ROMANIA

Starting in 2005, all public policies/strategies issued by ministries must include quality management aspects in order to make public institutions more accountable, responsible, effective and citizen-oriented (Government Decision No. 775/2005 on public policies). The first report regarding the stage of the implementation of public policy rules is available, only in the Romanian language so far, at:

[http://www.sgg.ro/docs/File/UPP/doc/raport\\_ian\\_dec2007.pdf](http://www.sgg.ro/docs/File/UPP/doc/raport_ian_dec2007.pdf)

The package law adopted in 2006 provides the framework for developing cost and quality standards (Law No. 215/2001, revised in 2006, on local public administration; Law No. 273/2006 Law on local public finance; Framework Law No. 195/2006 on decentralisation; and Law No. 188/1999 for civil servants, amended in 2006).

## SLOVENIA

### **Quality Policy of State Administration – “Politika kakovosti državne uprave”, 1996 (Adopted by the Slovenian Government in October 1996)**

Its major components concern:

- ethical conduct of all the employees;
- partnership with citizens, national economy, friendly states and coworkers;
- establishing the conditions for social and economic development,
- harmonisation with modern European standards, norms and legislation;
- striving for implementation of the European Business Excellence model and for timely education and training;
- transparent, efficient and effective functioning within and among ministries and with administrative units;
- awareness of entrepreneurial opportunities of state administration for developing the society;

- effective and efficient use of budget resources;
- establishing the conditions for quality of life and work for all citizens of the Republic of Slovenia.

Quality Policy of Public Administration – “Politika kakovosti slovenske javne uprave”, 2003 (Adopted by the Slovenian Government in December 2003)

This document broadens the Quality Policy from the scope of state administration to the scope of public administration.

## **q12 Quality Awards**

In the majority of cases, Member States join conferences on quality with rewarding achievements in the field of quality. In the selection procedures, countries use various models or approaches to assess applicant organisations. As the basis for assessing the State, the CAF model is used in some places (e.g. in the Czech Republic, Greece and in some countries only indirectly); elsewhere, their own quality or excellence models are used, and, in some countries, a range of several criteria is used.

### **BULGARIA**

In June (on the occasion of State Administration Employee’s Day), the Minister of State Administration and Administrative Reform awards public institutions for their contribution to the process of modernisation of the administration.

The awards have been given since 2006. Awards have been granted in the following categories:

- “Accessible and quality administrative service delivery”
- “Best on-line services”
- “Effective human resources management”
- “Best PR practice in state administration”.

In 2003, 2004 and 2005, the Institute for Public Administration and European Integration organised several competitions and awarded good practices in the areas of administrative service delivery, e-government, transparency, etc.

### **GREECE**

In a wider effort to promote quality, the Ministry of Interior has launched, for the first time in 2007, the “National Quality Award for Greek Public Organisations”, which aims at identifying and awarding top performers on CAF use. A number of central, regional and local government organisations have implemented the CAF and applied for the award. The three winners were:

- The Validation of Applications & Marketing Authorisation Division (*DDYEP*) of the National Organization for Medicines of Greece
- The Byzantine and Christian Museum

- The Directorate of the Organisation and Operation of Citizens' Service Centers of the Ministry of Interior.

## **ROMANIA**

Excellence Award in Public Administration, since 2005 Romania has had several initiatives for awarding good practices within the public sector, for instance: excellence awards organised by the Romanian Leaders (7th edition in 2007), the Award for Excellence in Public Administration (3rd edition) and the awards offered by National Institute for Administration (1st edition in 2007).

The Award for Excellence in Public Administration is meant to emphasise efforts for developing the Romanian public administration system, to reward the positive initiatives of public administration specialists and important projects implemented by representatives of the local and central administration. The ceremony takes place early and is organised by the portal [www.administratie.ro](http://www.administratie.ro) and by the OSC Agency (specialised in communication). <http://www.osc.ro/index.php?lang=en>

## **SLOVENIA**

The "Good Practice" Award, since 2002; awarded at the conference: Good Practices in Slovenian Public Administration

The Business Excellence Prize of the Republic of Slovenia (PRSP0), since 2005, also for public administration organizations

### **q13 Excellence models**

Among excellence models in public administrations in the EU, CAF and EFQM are used most. In use are also models that countries have adapted or designed themselves (for example: the Swedish Quality Model, used since 1992, INK developed by the Netherlands and also used by Belgium, and KVIK in Denmark).

## **BULGARIA**

The use of excellence models is not widespread in the country. In the last two years, certain administrations started applying the CAF model (one regional administration, one municipal administration, the National Revenue Agency). The MSAAR organised several events and published materials in order to stimulate more administrations to apply such tools. Further activities are foreseen for 2008. A PHARE project (Twinning Light) was carried out in 2007 aimed at strengthening the capacity of the MSAAR for QM in PA (mainly in CAF) in order to provide better support to other administrations in the process of CAF implementation and validation.

## ROMANIA

The Common Assessment Framework (CAF) was launched at national level in Romanian public administration in 2005 in order to increase the quality of public services. The Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform is responsible for coordinating the use of the CAF model.

The approach to CAF implementation is as follows:

Phase 1: Training sessions on quality management – CAF for top management in targeted public institutions.

Phase 2: Training sessions on quality management – CAF for civil servants in all county councils and prefecture institutions.

Phase 3: CUPAR received and planned the requests for technical support from interested public authorities, which were sent on a *voluntary basis*

Phase 4: CUPAR's CAF team assisted the public authorities in running the exercise *on site*.

Results of CAF 2008:

CUPAR received 47 technical support requests from public administration institutions on a voluntary basis:

- 31 prefecture institutions
- 7 county councils
- 3 deconcentrated public services
- 2 municipalities
- Ministry of Economy and Finance (1 General Directorate)
- Ministry of Education, Research and Youth (3 Directorates)
- National Institute for Administration
- Central Unit for Public Administration Reform.

386 civil servants were trained in CAF and were able to disseminate the information related to it 84 high civil servants, representatives of prefectures and county councils from all 42 counties in Romania were trained on the self-assessment instrument Action plans were elaborated in the institutions based on CAF implementation.

*Conclusions*

The principal domains proposed for improvement are:

- Internal communication (drafting internal strategy communications, creating an intranet network, introducing integrated document management).
- Strategic planning (reviewing the multi-annual modernisation strategy).
- Employee motivation (their involvement in drafting the action plan for the institution, in drafting internal communications and the multi-annual modernization plan through working groups).
- Results measurement for both personnel and beneficiaries (established a set of indicators).
- Customer/citizen satisfaction (questionnaires were drafted in order to have a clear view on their satisfaction).

## **SLOVENIA**

CAF was extensively introduced in Slovenia in 2002; in the beginning of 2003, the Slovene translation of the CAF was published. Since then, usage of the CAF has been increasing continuously as the CAF was defined as a strategic direction in Slovenian public administration modernisation. CAF is incorporated in different strategic documents and/or initiatives. In the *Further Development Strategy of the Slovenian Public Sector 2003–2005*, the CAF was included in the first of seven priority tasks in the area *Quality management within administration and orientation of public administration towards users*. In *Slovenia's Development Strategy (2005)*, in the action plan for 2005 and 2006 under the third development priority *An efficient and less costly state*, the CAF was proposed along with the EFQM model as a tool for systematically raising the quality of public administration services.

Furthermore, the *Reform Programme for Achieving the Lisbon Strategy Goals (2005)* states:

“Slovenia wants to achieve growth in institutional competitiveness by introducing business excellence in public administration. The objectives we wish to achieve are the introduction of a strategic planning system as a basic management tool in public administration, the introduction of management tools and the application of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and inclusion in the European Excellence Model (EFQM). The measures for the achievement of these objectives are: (i) adoption of regulations for quality assessment and strategic planning (2006/2007); (ii) building support (methodological support and information support) for the strategic planning system (2006/2008); (iii) management education and training.”

### **q14 Quality/Citizen's charters**

Quality/citizen charters are widespread in the EU, being used in the majority of Member States.

## **BULGARIA**

The development and publication of a CC has been obligatory since the end 2006, beginning of 2007. The guidelines were developed in 2002.

## **CYPRUS**

Yes.

## **GREECE**

Not in use.

**ROMANIA**

Different authorities acting at the local level (prefecture institutions) are using the Citizen's Charter concept (e.g. Bihor prefecture, <http://www.prefecturabihor.ro/>). The Romanian Government adopted a memorandum regarding "Necessary measures for improving the quality of public services", (<http://www.sgg.ro/docs/File/SGG/memo.pdf>, available in Romanian). This memorandum contains a plan for the period 2007–2008 for improving the quality of a number of specific public services: issuing passports, driving licenses, criminal records, etc. Additionally, the memorandum sets certain guidelines for general policy regarding the behaviour of public service providers towards citizens.

**SLOVENIA**

In Slovenia we do not have citizen charters, yet we do have defined standards for operation, communication and relations with public administration customers. These standards are part of the regulations.

**q15 Testing customer satisfaction**

Testing of customer satisfaction is being performed in almost all EU Member States. All these countries perform customer surveys, and some also use other tools for gaining insight into their customers' needs.

**BULGARIA**

In 2002, 2004, 2005 and 2006, surveys were conducted throughout the whole country (centralised). Each administration conducts (more specific) surveys itself, which has been obligatory since the end of 2006.

**CYPRUS**

Since the establishment of one-stop shops in 2005. Surveys are carried out to measure the level of satisfaction of the public in relation to the services provided at the one-stop-shops.

**ROMANIA**

We do not have standards for all public services; therefore, we test and evaluate customer satisfaction at the national level only on specific issues and projects, such as:

- MATRA 2005 Timisoara – Employment Agency

- two opinion polls in order to measure citizens' satisfaction with public services offered by civil servants and to analyse the level of depolitisation of Romanian civil servants organised by the NACS during 2005 and 2006.

## SLOVENIA

Since 2001.

### *Yearly*

The methodology for testing administrative units' customer satisfaction was developed in 2000, first as a methodological tool for those administrative units which decided to implement a quality management system according to the ISO 9000 standards. After the Government adopted the Decree on the Manner of Public Administration Bodies' Transactions with Customers in which, among other things, the obligation for testing customer satisfaction was set, this methodology has been in use in all administrative units. After the testing period in 2001, the methodology is being used on a regular yearly basis since 2002.

According to the methodology, results of the customer survey is a thorough report which is basically oriented to identification of the gap between how customers see the services they have just used in relation to their expectations; several characteristics of quality are tested in the sample and then used with a 95% likelihood for the whole population (possible customers) of the administrative unit. Results of the survey are mainly used as a basis for each administrative unit to identify areas for improvement and develop its action plan.

In 2006, the questionnaire was redesigned and simplified, yet it still based on detecting the gap between expectations and perceived quality. Comparison between administrative units for 2007:

[http://www.mju.gov.si/fileadmin/mju.gov.si/pageuploads/Kakovost/Analiza\\_primerjav\\_a\\_med\\_UE\\_2007.xls](http://www.mju.gov.si/fileadmin/mju.gov.si/pageuploads/Kakovost/Analiza_primerjav_a_med_UE_2007.xls)

The following items are being compared: overall score (up to 5); difference in scores between years 2007 and 2006; 15 quality dimensions (10 for services and 5 for employees) are presented according to the traffic-light principle: green = perceived quality was better than expected, yellow = perceived and expected quality were at the same level, red = expectations of customers were higher than the perceived quality; waiting time to be served by a public employee: % of customers who did not wait to be served, % of customers who had to wait up to five minutes, the sum of both percentages and finally, the % of customers who had to wait more than five minutes to be served.

### *Monthly – quality barometer*

In 2006, monthly customer satisfaction testing was also introduced (in May), based on a short questionnaire for customers. It aims to provide quick and short feedback information from customers and to assure responsiveness from administrative bodies.

Results (in Slovene) are published at the state portal:

<http://e-uprava.gov.si/e-uprava/javniStran.euprava?pageid=130>.



## **q22 Quality management development**

For the present report, the Member States provided comprehensive information on national QM development, confirming that the EU Member States have different traditions for addressing quality in their public administrations.

Important lessons were learned in this respect, among others:

- A sustainable approach requires comprehensive cooperation.
- Imposing a formal model or even establishing it as a legal obligation cannot work long-term.
- Launching quality policy requires adequate support.
- Quality principles should be integrated into all government programmes.
- A national QM approach is required to contribute to the competitiveness of the national economy.

### **BULGARIA**

The main goals pursued by quality management policy in the public sector in Bulgaria are:

- to increase efficiency and effectiveness in the public sector;
- to ensure transparency, accessibility and openness and build trust in public institutions;
- to improve the image of the public sector as employer;
- to involve all stakeholders in the improvement process and ensure the sustainability of reforms;
- to increase the satisfaction of both customers and employees.

The following strategic principles for public service delivery have been established in Bulgaria, namely to:

- treat all users fairly, honestly and courteously;
- communicate openly and provide full information;
- consult widely and promote continuous improvement;
- incorporate feedback and learn from complaints;
- encourage access to services via different channels;
- work with others to provide an improved, integrated service;
- set and publicise service standards and publish results against those standards;
- measure and publish measurements of customer satisfaction

### **CYPRUS**

The starting year for targeted efforts in the area of quality management in public administration in Cyprus was 1993, when the decision on development and implementation of specific reform measures was taken. The main objective of this

initiative was to increase productivity and reduce operating costs in the Cyprus Public Service.

It should be mentioned that a milestone in quality management was the establishment of the Office of the Commissioner for Administration (Ombudsman) in 1991, an independent officer of the Republic who exercises control over the action or inaction of public administrative authorities.

In addition, another important milestone was the establishment of the Cyprus Academy of Public Administration (CAPA), again in 1991, which has the responsibility of contributing through training activities to the management development and modernisation of the Cyprus Public Service and, as a result, to the enhancement of quality in the Public Service. In the first five years of its operation, CAPA provided training on European Union issues in order to assist public officers in understanding EU functions, policies and practices, as well as to develop awareness of the effects of participation in the EU. In addition, the CAPA designed and developed induction courses for newly recruited public officers, as well as training programmes in skills development. Furthermore, in 1993, a decision was taken to enhance the employee performance management system in order to make it more transparent, fair and objective.

Since then several reform measures towards quality management have been introduced.

The most important goals regarding quality management in PA in our country are the following:

- to create a performance and results-oriented culture in order to enhance effectiveness and productivity (budgets are currently constructed on a pilot basis, based on performance targets; the employee performance management system is based on competencies with a view to incorporating targets in it, etc.);
- to measure customer and employee satisfaction;
- to promote strategic management and goal-setting in public service;
- to focus on initiatives that directly lead to better quality service provided to the public.

## **GREECE**

The effort to introduce quality management in public administration started in the late 1990s through the establishment of a special Unit on Efficiency and Quality in the General Secretariat of Public Administration in the Ministry of Interior. This effort continued in the following years, and in 2004 a law was voted by the Greek Parliament (Law No. 3230/2004 providing for the establishment of a Directorate on Efficiency and Quality in the General Secretariat of Public Administration). This law provides for the establishment of a network of similar directorates in all ministries and peripheral administrations (regional government) in the country. The law also provides for the establishment of an integrated system of performance management, the introduction of quality tools (mainly CAF) and policies and a quality award for top-performing public organisations.

The details regarding the Quality Award were further elaborated by a ministerial decision in 2005, which set as an evaluation criterion the implementation of CAF by public organisations.

The main goals regarding QM in PA are: to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and quality of public organisations, to adopt a customer-citizen orientation approach in public organisations; to simplify and ease access to public administration by citizens and enterprises; to create a results-oriented administrative culture; to minimise “red tape”.

## **ROMANIA**

Concerning civil service, we consider that 2004 was the year when certain coherent measures were undertaken by Romanian central public institutions in order to ensure and strengthen quality management.

Certain strategic documents were issued in this regard, including:

- introducing quality standards for monitoring and assessing public service and the professional activity of civil servants
- setting up a fixed number of civil servants according to the quality standards established for each public service
- establishing a strategic planning system for each public authority according to the public services offered
- establishing certain motivational schemes in order to increase the quality of public services and to stimulate innovation
- elaborating and implementing the Citizens' Charter in order to introduce and assess quality standards for public services
- implementing an assessment guide for institutional self-assessment according to CAF.

Main goals:

- reducing the bureaucracy
- citizen orientation
- professionalising civil service for increasing the quality of public services.

## **SLOVENIA**

Intensive development in the area of quality in Slovenian public administration has been going on since 1999, when in the Ministry of the Interior, then responsible for public administration, the Quality Committee began its activity, defined as effective, citizen friendly, recognisable and responsible public administration.

In 2002, quality became one of the main pillars of Slovenian public administration reform, the main focus being on customer-friendly service, accountability of public administration bodies to the public for their results and efficient functioning, and on awareness of the role of management in it.

An additional impulse toward further development of quality was due to the formation of the Ministry of Public Administration, which occurred in December of 2004. The Ministry of Public Administration has been incorporating the demands and quality performance standards of Slovenian public administration in legislation and in all strategic documents which it prepares and/or cooperates in preparing.

The main characteristics include:

- a shift from public administration towards public management;
- quality standards and/or models as appropriate starting points for managing PA and its performance – quality standards and models have played an important role in organisation;
- the leading principles of PA: customer orientation, lower costs, efficiency etc. as incorporated in new strategies and initiatives in all areas (e.g. e-Gov strategy, RAB programme) – quality is now perceived as the other side of the same coin of PA.

Main goals: to put the customer at the centre, to improve efficiency, to reduce costs, to simplify administrative processes and to make contacts between customers and the state easier and less frequent.

### **q23 Measuring the quality of PA**

Measuring quality in public administrations has been shown to be the least developed quality management aspect at EU level. Several Member States indicated that they do not directly measure quality in their public administrations: Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Portugal, Romania and Slovak Republic.

#### **BULGARIA**

Yes, since 2003.

The quality in the PA is measured on the basis of Self-Assessment performed by all administrations according to the EFQM model. There are four stages of development – basic, developing, operational and excellent.

#### **SLOVENIA**

Since 2003.

Results published at:

#### **CAF:**

Version CAF 2002

Customer satisfaction (yearly):

Quality barometer (monthly):

Administrative unit performance:

Several reports available at:

[http://www.mju.gov.si/si/zakonodaja\\_in\\_dokumenti/pomembni\\_dokumenti/upravne\\_e\\_note/porocila\\_2006/](http://www.mju.gov.si/si/zakonodaja_in_dokumenti/pomembni_dokumenti/upravne_e_note/porocila_2006/).

### **q23 Sharing good practices**

Different channels are used for sharing good practices: quality conferences and/or awarding good practices, publications and networking. Networking, for example, is being more widely used and can be performed in different ways:

- organised by institutions or organisational units that promote quality;
- within the community of quality specialists, project leaders, administrative unit managers (France) and meetings of relevant officials (Malta);
- the inter-administrative network for quality of public services activities in Spain, and others.

### **BULGARIA**

Sharing good practices is considered an effective tool for improvement in the public sector and is underlined in the main strategic documents of the government. The MSAAR stimulates the process by organising different events, publishing good practices on its own website and the website of the IPAEI.

### **ROMANIA**

Seminars and roundtables on different subjects related to public administration reform (e.g. the 2007 Conference on Good Governance and Public Administration Reform). The NACS drafted a handbook of good practices with different topics related to the public administration system such as ethics of civil servants, deconcentrated public services under the subordination of the prefectures, and the transparency of public institutions in relation to citizens.

### **SLOVENIA**

Constantly expanding. Besides the yearly Good Practices in Slovene Public Administration conferences, other ways are: networking, seminars, publications, etc.

### **q31 Organisational structure for promoting quality**

All EU Member States have developed an organisational structure for promoting quality:

Coordination and the main responsibility for promoting quality is situated at central level, usually at the ministry in charge of public administration (interior, finance) or the prime minister's office.

In Member States where promotion of quality in public administration goes together with organisational support of national quality awards (based on the EFQM model), organisational units/councils/committees are established at government level and/or in most cases at the ministry in charge of the economy.

All Member States have established cooperation between different levels of government and institutions dealing with quality at universities, public administration institutes and private organisations.

Despite all the common characteristics of established an organisational structure for promoting quality, there are significant differences in countries' actual organisational units and the ways they cooperate with other players in the quality management area.

## **BULGARIA**

Ministry of State Administration and Administrative Reform – leading role Council of Ministers – approves the main policy documents (legislative and strategic).

National Association of Municipalities in the Republic of Bulgaria – supports reform at the local level QM units or experts within some administrations.

Institute for Public Administration and European Integration – provides training in different areas, including quality management.

The “Club 9000” Association is a non-profit non-governmental organization (NGO) established in 1991. The Association was created in response to the necessity to speed up the harmonisation of activities related to quality management in Bulgarian organisations with internationally accepted practices embedded in the International Standards.

More info:

[www.government.bg](http://www.government.bg)

[www.mdaar.government.bg](http://www.mdaar.government.bg)

[www.namrb.org](http://www.namrb.org)

[www.ipaei.government.bg](http://www.ipaei.government.bg)

[www.club9000.org](http://www.club9000.org).

## **CYPRUS**

The Public Administration and Personnel Department and the Cyprus Academy of Public Administration are responsible for promoting QM in PA. They both fall under the competence of the Ministry of Finance.

## **ROMANIA**

Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform: Central Unit for Public Administration Reform – CUPAR, and the National Agency for Civil Servants – NACS. Ministry of

Interior and Administrative Reform: Central Unit for Public Administration Reform – CUPAR (<http://modernizare.mira.gov.ro>) and the National Agency for Civil Servants – NACS (<http://www.anfp-map.ro/>)

#### CUPAR

The Central Unit for Public Administration Reform (CUPAR) is a structure within the Romanian Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform, established in 2002 and aimed at coordinating public administration reform in Romania.

#### NACS

The National Agency of Civil Servants (NACS) is a central institution under the coordination of the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform, established in 2000 in order to ensure the management of civil service and of civil service bodies, being the main institution in charge of the Romanian Civil Service Reform.

The professionalisation of the Romanian civil service and the improvement of the quality of public services offered by civil servants is a shared responsibility between the NACS and CUPAR, as well as other central institutions.

## SLOVENIA

Ministry responsible for PA: Ministry of Public Administration, since December 2004; prior to December 2004: Ministry of the Interior Quality Committee at the Ministry of Public Administration National Metrology Institution – MIRS (for EFQM)

#### ***Ministry of Public Administration***

Since December 2004, Ministry of Public Administration has been in charge of the system of Public Administration, which includes QM in PA. The main reason for establishing the Ministry of Public Administration originates in the intention of the Government to join different organisational units (already operating under certain ministries or as government offices) with the common goal of improving the functioning and quality of public administration.

The mission of the Ministry is friendly and efficient public administration, and additionally: to provide public administration which will be comparable with public administrations of other EU Member States and will be – in the sense of advanced organisation, customer satisfaction and impact on public finance among the best in the EU.

Main strategic goals and directions of the Ministry of Public Administration through 2008:

- customer orientation, including customer-oriented administrative processes;
- further development of e-government and other modern mechanisms for supporting relations with external and internal customers, and for providing efficient and competitive services to individuals, civil society and the economy;
- an efficient system of public employees and a fair, transparent and holistic salary system, including all aspects of modern human resource management;

- quality and efficiency of public administration, including quality management at all decision-making levels; efficient and rational operations, with lower costs and fewer public employees in the civilian part of state administration;
- openness and transparency in the public administration system, including simple, holistic and free-of-charge access to public information, accessibility of all information on public expenditure and participation of the public in decision making.

#### ***Quality Committee***

In March 1999, the Quality Committee was established at the Ministry of the Interior in order to pursue efficient, citizen-friendly, transparent and responsible state administration. The Quality Committee set the following goals:

- to improve efficiency and effectiveness
- to increase client satisfaction
- to increase employee satisfaction
- to control and manage costs
- to improve transparency
- to raise its reputation and visibility
- to gain a quality certificate for individual administrative units.

Activities of the Quality Committee are planned with a strategic view to the whole administration and have basically been oriented to administrative units, where the majority of citizens deal directly with the administration.

#### ***National Metrology Institution***

The Metrology Institute of the Republic of Slovenia (MIRS) acts under the Ministry of High Education, Science and Technology, and was established in June 1991.

The Metrology Institute established and now manages the Business Excellence Prize and performs all necessary professional and administrative assignments for this programme. MIRS is an EFQM National Partner Organisation (NPO).

Permanent co-operation between the Ministry of Public Administration and MIRS:

2002/2003: Translation of the EFQM model/brochures into Slovene

2004/2005: Pilot Project of the National Quality Award for Public Administration

2006: Translation of CAF 2006 into Slovene

2007: Pilot project SOOJU.

### **q32 Training for QM**

In almost all the Member States (25/27), training for quality management is considered not only very important but crucial for successful quality implementation. It is organised and provided in different ways.



## **BULGARIA**

Trainings are organised by the Institute for Public Administration and European Integration of the MSAAR.

Additional training sessions were organised under different projects.

Experts from the Bulgarian PA participate in the training organised by the EIPA.

As for 2006:

Training by the IPAEI on administrative activities aimed at improvement of administrative service delivery – 1,744 employees.

Training under the Phare project on quality management systems – 150 employees trained.

## **CYPRUS**

The CAPA organises a 4-day training programme on the CAF. Self-assessment teams are trained on the model.

Training programmes on skills development are organised by the CAPA, but not on quality management as such. However, they do have an indirect impact on quality management.

## **GREECE**

In order to train potential or current CAF users, as well as disseminate the CAF among public servants and public organisations, the Ministry of Interior is co-organising two 5-day training programmes with the National Centre of Public Administration (training institute for public servants): in the first, the CAF is integrated into a training programme for civil servants on performance management, which includes a section on the CAF, while the second is a CAF specific seminar called “Evaluation Procedures & Efficiency”. Both programmes have as a target group employees working in central, regional and local government organisations. In 2007, 44 courses were organised as part of the two programmes, training about 1,100 public servants. In 2008, a roughly similar number of seminars will be organised.

A third training programme was run in 2007 targeted specifically for officials from the 2nd level (prefectural) of local government. This was a one-day seminar on the CAF, goal-setting and results measurement aimed at increasing awareness and boosting the use of the CAF, and goal-setting and results measurement in local government organisations. This programme is organized by the Hellenic Agency for Local Development and Local Government. As part of the programme, 9 seminars were organised, attended by 200 local government officials. In 2008, a new targeted training programme will be initiated aimed at promoting the use of CAF in a number of municipalities.

## ROMANIA

In our country, several institutions provide training programmes in the field of quality in public administration: Central Unit for Public Administration Reform (Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform), National Agency for Civil Servants, National Institute for Administration, Academy of Economic Studies, and the National School for Political and Administrative Sciences.

For example, from 10–20 March 2008, the National Civil Service Agency and SIGMA organised a joint initiative of the OECD and the European Commission, principally funded by the EC ([www.sigmaweb.org](http://www.sigmaweb.org)), having the general objectives:

- to make participants familiar with the key elements of quality management in the public sector
- to present different instruments and frameworks to promote quality in public services and implement quality-oriented policies in the public sector.

General Topics: quality as a policy issue in the public sector performance instruments, techniques and frameworks to enhance the quality of public services, including ISO 9001, Service Charters and Balanced Scorecards assessment of the quality of governance in public service organizations.

Target Groups

- top managers and politicians at local and regional levels
- quality managers in other public agencies at local and regional levels.

## SLOVENIA

Training for QM is organised by the Administration Academy of the Ministry of Public Administration, as a special PA training unit. The catalogue of the Administration Academy for 2007 listed as many as 13 different programmes on the subject of quality in administrative work:

Common Assessment Framework (CAF) for assessment of quality for public sector,

Self-assessment workshop for internal auditors based on the CAF model,

Basic course on self-assessment based on the EFQM model,

Workshop for self-assessment based on the CAF model for internal auditors (public sector),

The road to excellence with a help of the modified model CAF 2006,

A consultation meeting by internal auditors in public administration,

Managing quality – motivational lecture,

Introduction of quality ISO 9000 system – workshop on the preparation of quality manual

Training for internal Auditors,

Managing processes for the implementation of quality,

Methods and techniques for management of quality,

Quality of administrative work - mission, visions and goals,

Achievement of efficiency and effectiveness with help of measures and indicators,

It is fitting to mention that in 2002 the Quality Committee defined the content for training for quality, which is based on the necessary competences for quality, and with this in mind the Administration Academy offered a set of seminars, which are constantly updated and supplemented, with a possibility to organize tailor-made seminars on demand.

### **q33 Quality tools in PA organisations**

Different quality tools are being used in public administrations in the EU. Among the most widely used are improvement groups/quality circles, Balanced Scorecard (BSC), Customer Relationship Management (CRM), Customer Satisfaction Management (CSM) and suggestions and complaint boxes for customers and employees. Comprehensive information is provided in the comparative review matrix on the EUPAN website [www.eupan.eu](http://www.eupan.eu).

#### **GREECE**

The Directorate of Quality and Efficiency (Ministry of Interior) has published a document providing guidelines on strategic management. Within this framework the use of BSCs by public organisations as a tool for goal-setting and performance measurement is strongly recommended and supported by the Directorate of Quality and Efficiency.

#### **ROMANIA**

##### **CLEAR**

Under a public private partnership, the NACS is implementing the CLEAR tool, which exists to help local governments and other organisations or groups at the local level to better understand public participation in their localities. It is a diagnostic tool, one which helps public bodies identify particular strengths and problems with participation in their localities and, subsequently, to consider more comprehensive strategies for enhancing public participation.

The CLEAR tool develops from a framework for understanding public participation which argues that participation is most successful where citizens:

*Can do* – that is, have the resources and knowledge to participate;

*Like to* – that is, have a sense of attachment that reinforces participation;

*Enabled to* – that is, are provided with the opportunity for participation;

*Asked to* – that is, are mobilised by official bodies or voluntary groups;

*Responded to* – that is, see evidence that their views have been considered.

The tool is organised around these five headings and provides a focus for individuals to explore participation in their area. This tool was developed through the Council of Europe's intergovernmental cooperation supported by a team of experts.

