

ENGLISH VERSION

UNIVERSITA' DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE GIURIDICHE

SCUOLA DI GIURISPRUDENZA



TESI DI DOTTORATO DI RICERCA

IN

*Diritto Pubblico, Teoria delle Istituzioni Nazionali ed Europee e Filosofia Giuridica*

*Curriculum: Teoria delle Istituzioni dello Stato tra Federalismo e Decentramento*

XIII CICLO

*Strumenti e tecniche nel sistema di valutazione della  
performance nell'amministrazione pubblica*

*Le materie della sanità e dell'istruzione*

Abstract

Coordinatore:  
Ch.mo Prof.  
Enzo Maria Marenghi

Dottorando:  
Dott. Antonello Crisci  
Matr. 8886800020

ANNO ACCADEMICO 2013-2014

*Tools and techniques in the public administration's performance evaluation system*

*Matters of health and education*

*Abstract*

The public administration performance evaluation and measurement system has developed slowly, with the first legislative actions being taken only starting from the nineties.

More specifically, the Legislative Decree n. 29 of 1993, in order to increase the efficiency of the government, made a clear separation between the functions of political-administrative, attributed to the organs of political leadership, which: (i) identify the goals and programs to be implemented; (ii) allocate resources and verify the compliance of the results of the administrative management with the general guidelines, and management functions more properly attributed to managers (who provide the financial, technical and administrative, including the adoption of acts of the administration in relation to outside parties).

This first regulatory intervention is followed by Legislative Decree. n. 286 of 30 July 1999 "Reform and strengthening of the mechanisms and tools for monitoring and evaluation of the costs,

## ENGLISH VERSION

returns and results of operations carried out by public authorities, in accordance with art. 11, dated 15 March 1997, n. 59: a comprehensive review of the system of internal controls, stating the framework and identifying the types, as well as separating, some functions which were previously attributed to core internal controls.

The rulemaking continued with the aim reaching an optimal evaluation system for the public administration, up to the enactment of enabling Law n. 15 of 2009, implemented by Legislative Decree n. 150 of 2009, which intended to stop the process of deregulation started in the nineties.

More specifically, the innovations introduced by Legislative Decree n. 150 of 2009 have affected, in particular, the organization of work of public administration, the assessment of facilities and staff, as well as the promotion of merit and the equal opportunities.

Furthermore, the transfer of staff assessment responsibility onto managers, led to innovation and to the introduction of new evaluation criteria, aimed at increasing the productivity and efficiency of the public administration.

As a result, the objectives set out in article 3 of the Legislative Decree n. 150 of 2009, which expressly provides that the measurement

## ENGLISH VERSION

and evaluation are aimed both at improving the quality of services offered by public administrations and to the growth of professional competence are finally applicable.

This must be achieved by a “general cycle of performance management”, which includes:

- Goal setting - relevant, specific, measurable, challenging, shared and achievable;
- Measurement and evaluation - measurement of individual and organizational performance by assessing the degree of achievement of objectives;
- Reporting in order to control internal and external - including citizens.

In particular, it was decided to deepen the scope on the measurement and evaluation of performance.

In fact, there are now many tools for measuring and assessing the quality of public services, such as: card services; documents containing standard of quality of services provided by art. 28 of Legislative Decree n. 150 of 2009; service contracts; service level agreements and similar instruments of definition of service levels; various experimental systems for measuring quality assessment.

## ENGLISH VERSION

Generally, the complexity that characterizes the selection and application of instruments for measuring and assessing the quality of services by government is on the one hand -due to the many different instruments and, on the other, direct consequence of the complete lack of coordination between them.

With regards to the system of controls on the adoption and implementation of these tools, we do not see, at present, a complete and efficient structure.

In fact the system is riddled with problems.

Healthcare and education are two fields in which the forecasting, implementation, use and control of these instruments is most complicated.

The regulations on health care quality has its preeminent source in Legislative Decree n. 502 of 1992, otherwise known as the “health care reform BIS” on card services and on the mechanism, covered in the constitution, of insurance Lea health.

Clearly this legislation must always be read in conjunction with the more general provisions contained in the previously mentioned Legislative Decree n. 150 of 2009.

## ENGLISH VERSION

Paradoxically, however, the specific legislation and the general do not always appear to be in complete harmony.

Meanwhile, rules on the measurement of education services have definitely increased in the late nineties.

In fact, the first legislative action in this direction can be discerned in the Law n. 59 of 1997, with which we have tried to introduce the measurement and evaluation of education services.

Unfortunately, also in this case we are in the presence of deficient and contradictory rules, symptomatic of a yet again confused and inconsistent measurement at the national level.

Notwithstanding the allocation of many resources from the State, the regions and the local authorities to the management of these functions, the quality of the services has seldom been good.

These aspects explain, at least in part, the reason why measuring quality in the fields of healthcare and education a greater importance compared to areas, where the services provided are not addressed directly at end users (defense), do not affect the protection of fundamental rights (transport), or do not benefit from special State investments (social welfare), to name but a few.

## ENGLISH VERSION

Unfortunately, it is not possible to deviate from the authoritative thought of those who have argued that there is still very long to go before reaching a certain quality standard of services.

Some of the solutions explored by the most authoritative doctrine are only the beginning of a steady development of the system of performance evaluation in the public administration.

In fact, we should not be limited by the above identified factors, such as the choice of instruments, the legal incoherence, poor implementation and the lack or inadequacy of controls at execution.

The leitmotiv of the system should be the ability to ensure effective and high level performance for citizens.