



PES to PES Dialogue programme

**The European Commission Mutual Learning Programme
for Public Employment Services**

DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

Review of Performance Management in Public Employment Services

Peer Review Comparative Paper

This publication is commissioned by the European Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity (2007-2013).

This programme is implemented by the European Commission. It was established to financially support the implementation of the objectives of the European Union in the employment, social affairs and equal opportunities area, and thereby contribute to the achievement of the EU2020 goals in these fields.

The seven-year programme targets all stakeholders who can help shape the development of appropriate and effective employment and social legislation and policies, across the EU-27, EFTA-EEA and EU candidate and pre-candidate countries.

For more information see:

<http://ec.europa.eu/progress>

For more information on the PES to PES Dialogue programme, please refer to:

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/pes-to-pes>

Editor: Susanne Kraatz, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, Unit C3 - Skills, Mobility and Employment Services, European Commission

Author: Dr Alex Nunn, Centre for Applied Social Research, Leeds Metropolitan University.

In collaboration with ICF GHK and the Budapest Institute

*Please cite this publication as: European Commission (2013), **Review of Performance Management in Public Employment Services**, Brussels, Author: Alex Nunn*

The information contained in this publication does not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the European Commission

Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Performance management	6
3	Performance management, continuous improvement and learning	21
4	Overall conclusions and recommendations	27
5	ANNEX: Tables	30
6	References	59

Tables

Table 1: Use of Quality Management Models.....	7
Table 2: Comparison of numbers of goals and indicators in PES	17
Table 3: Comparison of PES Approaches to Performance Management.....	30
Table 4: Targeting of Specific groups of Jobseekers	32
Table 5: Comparison of Goal and Target Setting Across PES	33
Table 6: PES Objectives and Indicators.....	38
Table 7: Data collection tools and practices.....	49
Table 8: Comparison of Performance Information Sharing and Use.....	53

Boxes

Box 1: Key Findings from European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn).....	4
Box 2: Local Autonomy and Performance Management	12
Box 3: General versus very specific goals and targets	14
Box 4: Benchmarking for the comparison of regions and localities	19
Box 5: Double Loop Learning in Belgium (Flanders region)	25

1 Introduction

The objective of this comparative paper was to inform the Peer Review on "Performance management in PES" which took place on 21 and 22 March 2013. The host PES will be AMS, Denmark, with the other participating PES being Austria, Belgium (Flanders region), Bulgaria,; Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK. The guiding questions for this Peer Review are:

1. How can the appropriate balance be struck between national and regional-level coordination and local-level autonomy for performance management?
2. How can continuous improvement and learning be effectively built into performance management systems, including bottom-up approaches?
3. How can PES use information from performance management in order to make the 'business case' for PES vis-à-vis their ministries, social partners and other stakeholders?

The comparative paper summarises and compares the evidence collected in submissions from each of the PES following a standard comparative structure. It also builds on two previous studies: the first is a study on the use of performance management by PES in support of mobility (Ecorys 2012) and the second is a study on *Performance Management in Public Employment Services* (European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn)). In particular, this report improves upon the previous studies in that it compares evidence on a deeper/broader basis on the use of performance management in a range of PES and uses PES' experience of performance management to share good practice in support of the use of performance management for continuous improvement. The emphasis is not on the technical aspects of performance systems but on how PES can use performance management at a strategic and political level.

Box 1: Key Findings from European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn)

- EU-level activity can help to strengthen the evidence base concerning what works in performance management;
- There are some drawbacks associated with performance management but these can be offset by careful design and management;
- Integrated data systems might improve the quality and effectiveness of PES performance data;
- PES practitioners require training to fully understand how to respond to performance signals;
- Understanding of the linkages between activity and outcomes can be strengthened by the use of Performance Management Frameworks and Analytical Measures;
- Performance management might be improved by integrating performance management with evaluation, decentralised management structures and inclusive governance and accountability.

Additionally, two further peer reviews are relevant for the current peer review on Performance Management. In November 2012, a [peer review](#) was held on the use of administrative data for evaluation data (European Commission 2012b). The latter

review concluded that the use of administrative data to understand the effectiveness of different Active Labour Market Policies (ALMPs) is increasing because of the development of Datawarehouses and integration of administrative datasets. Transnational comparison was thought to be beneficial for understanding the operation of ALMPs, but this is made more difficult in practice by inconsistencies of the data available and varying regimes in terms of data availability and confidentiality. A second [peer review](#) in September 2011 looked at the key success factors in the use of evaluation; the review concluded that political commitment to evaluation and the sharing and use of the findings was critically important (European Commission 2012c).

The purpose of this paper is to compare practice across PES, noting the main similarities and differences and identifying areas where good practice might be shared between PES. It also considers this in light of the recent publication of *Public Employment Services' Contribution to EU 2020: PES 2020 Strategy Output Paper* (European Commission 2012d). This paper suggests that the role of PES is changing as national governments embed their 'flexicurity' strategies and continue to work towards recovery from the economic crisis and achievement of the Europe 2020 objectives. In particular, it is envisaged that PES will increasingly play a 'conducting' role (governance, management and coordination of services, sometimes through partnerships; and the direct provision of services to support individual career management) working with other partners in a Public Employment System, including creating transitional labour markets, facilitating employment security through encouraging job-to-job transitions and promoting lifelong learning. As a result, the use of performance data may become even more important to coordinate and differentiate between the quality and effectiveness of different services and programmes and to build the evidence base for policy makers. While all of this will of course be undertaken within national priorities, policies and institutional structures, the report is clear that the role of PES in the future will be less focussed just on services to the unemployed or most disadvantaged and more focussed on labour market governance more broadly.

2 Performance management

2.1 Overall Approach

There were a range of overall approaches to performance management reported by the participating PES. Common themes are highlighted below.

Most use a recognised Quality Management Model

Most PES (11 of the 15 reported here) report using some form of recognised Quality Management Model to some extent and some use several in combination (see Table 3). The approaches cited include ISO9000 (5 PES), the quality model of the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) (3 PES), the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) (3 PES) and a Balanced Scorecard (6 PES).

*ISO9000 and Balanced Scorecards were the most prominent models in use. However, the type and nature of practice linked to their use differs, particularly in the latter example. In some cases, PES use a very formalised scorecard which explicitly balances the needs of different stakeholders in a weighted and formulaic approach (e.g. Switzerland). In other cases, some PES often call their own method of representing performance information 'a Balanced Scorecard' even if it does not fully fit the original model developed by Kaplan and Norton (1992). For example, in the UK the 'scorecards' used to present performance information across the 'customer journey' are designed in-house and while they cover much of the relevant information, they are not fully designed around the Balanced Scorecard template. Indeed, this term has recently been dropped in favour of 'Scorecard' in the UK (Nunn *et al.* 2012, forthcoming).*

Austria, Belgium (Flanders region), Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland reported the use of multiple Quality Management Models. The use of Quality Management Models is often partial – relating to a particular area of service delivery or by some units (e.g. ISO9000 is used in Germany in relation to customer service and in Switzerland by some but not all cantons) – thereby explaining this multiple approach.

Table 1: Use of Quality Management Models

<i>Does the PES use a quality management model?</i>	
Austria	Balanced Scoreboard, EFQM, partially ISO9000 and specific labour market goals
Belgium (Flanders region)	Balanced Scoreboard, EFQM
Bulgaria	ISO9000
Denmark	PES does not use a general quality management model. This concept was abandoned when the municipalities took over the job centres. It cannot be ruled out, however, that some municipalities may still be using the concept.
Estonia	CAF
Germany	ISO9000, CAF at local agency level – pilot project
Hungary	CAF
Lithuania	None
Netherlands	ISO 9000, Balanced Scoreboard, INK (Instituut Nederlandse Kwaliteit) Quality Mode
Poland	None
Slovenia	ISO9000
Spain	EFQM
Sweden	Balanced Scorecard
Switzerland	Balanced Scoreboard (ISO9000 and EFQM used only by some cantons)
United Kingdom	Balanced Scoreboard

Generally across the participating PES, the extent to which recognised Quality Management Models are used to structure performance management is unclear. Previous research suggests that while the use of standard tools for presenting performance information (such as Balanced Scorecards) are widely used, the use of analytical frameworks for understanding the relationships between inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes is less developed (though analytical measures and frameworks have been reported in Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Poland and Spain (European Commission 2012a; Author: Nunn: 24). Among those PES reviewed, BA, the German PES, was characteristic of having a well developed structure and system

for developing, monitoring and presenting performance information based around the CAF model of incorporating data on employees, service users and wider social outcomes.

Responsibility for performance management varies across PES but is usually the responsibility of the national PES in negotiation with the national labour ministry. PES differ in the extent to which they utilise a governance board structure with oversight of performance management, sometimes having regional representation and sometimes including social partners (see below). Several PES (e.g. Belgium (Flanders region), Estonia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden) all report having distinct teams that have responsibility for analysis of performance management, but it is likely that many more PES that do not explicitly report this also have this capacity.

The purpose and aim of performance management ranges from public accountability to continuous improvement and staff reward

The recent analytical paper on performance management in PES suggested both that performance management needed to be aligned with political goals and that performance information (e.g. in the form of performance indicators) should be viewed as part of a holistic analysis which incorporates evaluation and other research evidence in a full analysis of policy and programme impact (European Commission 2012a; Author: Nunn: 32-5).

Several PES (e.g. Belgium Flanders region and Spain) mentioned the use of performance management for public and political accountability or continuous improvement as the purpose of their performance management system:

- In Denmark, AMS reported that they were in the process of augmenting performance management for political accountability and towards the use of evidence-based service delivery and continuous improvement. This involved bringing performance information together with research and evaluation evidence about 'what works' in the process of policy and programme development.
- In Belgium (Flanders region), VDAB reported that they are increasingly reviewing a range of evidence as part of the performance management process including performance information as well as labour market analysis and research and survey data to study both long- and short-term policy impacts.

Several PES are using Performance Management to support multi-annual policy cycles

Previous research has reported the use of multi-annual cycles in performance management in the three Belgian PES, Estonia and Holland (Nunn *et al.* 2010: 116; European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn)). *Data submitted by PES for the peer review suggests that these are used in Switzerland, Poland and Bulgaria also.* Multi-annual policy and performance cycles can maintain a sense of perspective about short-term labour market trends and allow policies to have time to work. Setting multi-annual policy and performance review cycles can also help to promote the use of longer-term indicators of performance that more accurately capture the desired

outcomes of employment services such as sustained employment, impacts on social inclusion and productivity/competitiveness as advocated by Grubb (Grubb 2004).

A wider than previously reported range of PES reported the use of Performance Management as part of a system of 'inclusive governance' and stakeholder involvement at all levels

Again, the PES Performance Management analytical paper suggested that 'inclusive governance', or the process of including a range of social partners and other stakeholders in the setting, monitoring and interpretation of performance management at a variety of organisational levels (e.g. national, regional, local etc), can help to overcome some of the shortcomings of performance management and strengthen the focus on policy, programme and organisational learning and, through this, continuous improvement (European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn: 33)).

The findings from the PES submissions to the peer review suggest that *inclusive governance is a feature of performance management in Germany, Denmark, Poland and Switzerland*. The role played by stakeholders and social partners in Germany was reviewed in the analytical paper as an example of good practice (see also Weishaupt, 2010). In Poland, the peer review response suggests that social partners and other stakeholders (e.g. interested NGOs) are included in Regional and Local Employment Councils, which are involved in the governance of regional and local service provision, including monitoring and evaluation. In Bulgaria, the PES reports to the National Council for Promoting Employment which has tripartite representation of the social partners.

2.2 Goals and Target Setting

Performance target setting is usually done annually, but is sometimes combined with multi-year budgeting and planning cycles

All PES in this sample worked toward annual performance cycles with performance targets set and measured annually, in conjunction with ongoing monitoring (see Table 5). However, several PES suggest that they combine this with multi-year budgeting and performance planning, such as BA in Germany and Jobcentre Plus in the UK. In Belgium (Flanders region) by contrast, VDAB is subject to annual monitoring but also a five-year contract in which strategic goals are embedded and reviewed in the final year of the cycle. However, within the cycle there is the potential to adjust the targets to reflect changes in the nature of the labour market. In Switzerland, a four-year performance agreement is negotiated between the government and the PES. In Estonia, several performance and planning cycles operate with annual, two-yearly and three yearly cycles, as well as the option to review targets and performance indicators/expectations on a more frequent basis if necessary. Several other PES also reported that in the event of significant shocks to the labour market, there is scope to make revisions to the targets within the performance cycle (e.g. Austria (in 2009), Germany (in 2009), Netherlands, Switzerland (in 2000), Hungary).

Some countries specifically mention the use of the National Employment Planning cycle as being important in their own national performance/planning cycle (e.g.

Bulgaria, Poland) but this seems to be more prevalent in more recent EU Member States.

Target setting is always a negotiation between the PES and the relevant ministry, but in some countries social partners and other stakeholders are also involved at various levels

In all countries target setting is a process of negotiation between the relevant government ministry and the PES. However, *in some countries there is scope for input from the social partners and other stakeholders (e.g. disability or ethnic minority representative/advocate groups), either directly or indirectly* (see Table 4 in Annex). For example, in Austria and Belgium (Flanders region) the social partners are able to do this through representation on the board of PES. In Denmark the social partners, via the local Employment Councils, have a role in the setting of local targets that implement the national level employment goals. The social partners also have a role in Estonia, Poland and Slovenia, for example, through representation on the PES national/supervisory 'board' or 'council'. In the Netherlands the social partners are consulted regularly but do not take part in the discussion and agreement of targets. In Lithuania, social partners can make recommendations. In Denmark, social partners and disability groups are represented on the national, regional and local works councils.

The inclusion of social partners in the target setting and monitoring as well as the interpretation of performance information is reflective of the 'inclusive governance' advocated in the analytical paper (European Commission 2012 (Author: Nunn: 35-6)). In some PES (e.g. Switzerland), PES regional officers are also involved in the dialogue about the establishment of performance targets.

In some PES target setting is informed by a range of analyses of the labour market

For example, in Belgium (Flanders region) VDAB use a variety of qualitative and quantitative data to inform the target setting process. In Estonia, detailed qualitative and quantitative analysis is used to underpin the construction of labour market goals and targets. In Sweden information provided by the analysis department influences the target levels set. In some PES this involves the use of detailed econometric analysis to model the economic prospects of particular social groups and therefore inform the design of specific indicators. So for 2013 the expectations for VDAB in Belgium (Flanders region) in relation to young people have been reduced to reflect the increased employment difficulties for this group of staff.

Most PES encourage a two way process of goal and target-setting and this is crucial to generate 'ownership'

In all PES goals and targets ultimately flow from political priorities and involve some process by which these are translated to the 'frontline' by the national PES. The extent to which lower level organisational units (regions, localities, offices, individuals) are involved in the process differs according to the following practice:

- National-level goals and high-level targets are translated into localised 'measurables' and indicators (e.g. in Denmark – see Box 2), though this sometimes appears to be related to the inclusion of additional measures at the local level.
- Regional/local officers can negotiate target levels and even provide input into the design of targets themselves (e.g. Germany).

Negotiation appears to be limited to the negotiation of target levels and in other PES this even seems to be limited to a mainly top-down and technical exercise (e.g. Spain, Sweden, UK).

Submissions from the PES suggested that securing ownership and commitment to goals and targets is vital to the success of performance management. They also suggested that widespread consultation and input into the process of target setting was a good way of generating this commitment. Procedures that match top-down and bottom-up inputs are widely adopted, at least partly for this reason. That said, there is also scope to suggest that capturing knowledge from the frontline is also useful to inform strategy and planning assumptions. The evidence presented strongly suggested that this is a success factor but was less clear on how this is best achieved. It would therefore be a useful issue to pick up in discussions at the peer review meeting.

Box 2: Local Autonomy and Performance Management

In Denmark, following a structural reform of public administration, there are four employment regions and 98 municipalities. The reform included the devolution of responsibility for increased areas of public services to the municipalities, involving the transfer of 2 000 national employees to the municipalities. The Danish institutional structure for employment services has three distinct levels - National, Regional and Local Employment Councils, each with an advisory body with representation from the Social Partners.

Nationally, the Minister for Employment has responsibility for employment policy and for its implementation by the sub-regional units. AMS (the PES) is responsible for the implementation of this policy. The Minister for Employment sets national employment goals. For 2013 these were:

- ensure that more young people without an education start on a vocational education;
- reduce the number of people on disability pension; and
- ensure that the numbers of unemployed are reduced as much as possible
- the job centres shall strengthen their cooperation with local enterprises on the employment effort

Regionally, the Employment Councils coordinate services among the municipalities within them and have representation from social partners and some service user representatives (e.g. Disabled People's Organisation). The employment regions also provide the function of facilitating benchmarking and information sharing between municipalities and, between the municipalities and the national level.

At the local level municipalities deliver employment services through Jobcentres (each municipality has one, but several have established shared Jobcentres). Municipalities must convert the national employment goals (n=4 in 2013) into 'local, specific, quantified targets' in an employment plan i.e. they translate, but have the autonomy to set, the targets themselves. Municipalities can also set additional targets to reflect local priorities and currently most (84 %) municipalities do this. These targets can specify particular groups or services.

At the end of the annual cycle municipalities must produce a performance audit. This is then used as the basis for dialogue within the region and includes local and regional social partners and stakeholders. This helps to improve the interpretation of performance information and is also used to set targets for the following year. The reports are also used for benchmarking and interpretation of performance variation between municipalities.

Data provided by AMS suggest that most managers (85 %+) at the local level feel that they have moderate or high levels of flexibility. A recent survey suggested that the highest performing municipalities are characterised by strong local political leadership which works well with a strong local management and who sets ambitious goals and targets for the local labour market.

There are some common PES goals but some PES have additional responsibilities

Among the common goals that all PES have are focussing on employment outcomes for unemployed service users and ensuring satisfaction among service users (see Table 6). Ensuring employee satisfaction is also widely shared. However, some PES have goals that go beyond this:

- **Duration of unemployment:** Several PES are now placing greater emphasis on the duration of unemployment (e.g. Austria, Germany, Netherlands, Estonia, Hungary, UK).
- **Ratio measures of effectiveness:** Some PES also try to measure employment outcomes as a ratio of all service users or benefit claimants to look at the effectiveness of the PES relative to their workload (e.g. Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Poland, UK).
- **Outcomes for particular interventions:** Only a small number of PES track these using formal indicators which measure employment outcomes after referral to training or some other programme of activation (e.g. Estonia, Lithuania and Poland).
- **Targeting of particular social groups:** These include the recipients of all or just some (e.g. ill-health or time-limited unemployment insurance) welfare benefits. They also include specific demographic groups such as young (often defined as up to 25) or older workers (often defined as over 50) (e.g. Austria, Belgium (Flanders region), Hungary, Lithuania, Slovenia and Spain). Sweden has specific indicators for different groups of migrants. However, only eight PES currently have targets for young people despite the problems of youth unemployment that are currently present in many member states.

Box 3: General versus specific goals and targets

There is a difference in practice across PES on the extent to which they set general or very specific goals and targets. For example, in Switzerland the PES is measured via four goals and indicators:

Goal		Indicator	Weight
1	Rapid reintegration	Average number of benefit days drawn by former beneficiaries	50 %
2	Prevent/reduce long-term unemployment	Entrants to long-term unemployment divided by the number of persons who potentially could have become long-term unemployed (those who entered a new framework period 13 months ago)	20 %
3	Prevent/reduce benefit exhaustions	Number of persons with exhausted benefits divided by the number of persons who potentially could have exhausted benefits (those who entered a new framework period two years ago)	20 %
4	Prevent/reduce re-registrations	Proportion of benefit recipients who re-register within 4 months	10 %

In the UK, following a change in 2010/11, there is also a system of a very general and small number of national headline objectives and targets. The headline objectives include:

- achieving a specific off-flow rate from benefits into employment; and
- reducing the amount lost through fraud and error.

However, in practice (Nunn and Devins 2012) staff in all parts of the organisation are managed via a larger number of scorecard indicators and in some cases 'proxy' indicators at an individual level. In some instances staff don't realise that there was a process to reduce targets and indicators in the 2010/11 reform. Many of these additional operational and sometimes informal targets are very specific, setting particular deadlines by which processes are to be undertaken, outcomes are to be achieved or for the volumes of particular activities being undertaken (e.g. referrals, sanctions).

There is no clear evidence about the successes of either of these approaches, though it is clear from the UK evidence that measurement structures with a strong emphasis on activity targets can be distracting and lead to gaming and perverse incentives.

Whether the targeting of specific groups of jobseekers is desirable or not is a moot point. On the one hand, it is certainly arguable that the scale of youth unemployment and previous evidence of scarring may suggest that PES should be encouraged to

focus particularly on this group. However, targeting of specific groups also has problems associated with it. For instance, previous research on performance management in the UK PES has suggested (counter-intuitively) that such targets can be both ineffective and introduce perverse incentives *at the same time*. Intuitively, this is contradictory, but the UK experience suggested that even when particular groups were more heavily 'weighted' in the performance management system, those that were easier to place were still likely to receive attention, even when the management message was that they should be encouraged to take independent action to find work (Johnson and Nunn 2006). However, at the same time, the additional weight in the measurement system for some groups meant that disproportionate effort was put into ensuring appropriate classification had taken place. Indeed, in the evidence submissions to this review several responses suggested that a core challenge is ensuring that frontline data capture is accurate and it may well be that this is driven, at least in part, by the desire to meet these sorts of objective. There are currently concerns that the payment by results system and wage incentives offered for young people in the UK employment services may lead to deadweight and displacement effects (Newton *et al.* 2012; Rees *et al.* 2013). Similar concerns have been raised, if not proven, in the past.

Ultimately the targeting of particular social groups reflects a political preference for prioritising services to one social group or another. These preferences should be transparent and open to democratic debate. *Within* the constraints set by the outcomes of such political decisions, what is important is that the approach to performance management does not induce deadweight and displacement effects or other perverse outcomes. This is as much to do with the management process and culture around the use of targets and indicators as it is a technical exercise of what should and shouldn't be included in the target framework. In turn, this implies that a reflective and flexible approach is necessary to ensure that perverse incentives and effects are recognised, moderated and removed.

Six PES also have different types and additional goals that go beyond just reintegration in the labour market. These include the prevention of unemployment in the first place (e.g. Germany, Switzerland) or the stipulation of particular types of (e.g. 'sustainable') employment (e.g. Austria), the upskilling of the workforce (e.g. Denmark concerning younger people without qualifications, and Bulgaria) or even social dialogue (Bulgaria).

The debate on measures such as sustainability/prevention of unemployment is connected to the nature of ALMPs themselves. For instance, there is an active debate about whether 'work first' or more career focussed ALMPs are more successful. At its crudest this comes down to the distinction between whether ALMPs should be simply activation focussed or more oriented toward providing substantive training interventions. Intuitively, substantive training interventions might be thought to be more effective. However, a range of studies appear to have shown that activation and a 'work-first' approach are in fact more effective. That said, there is concern that methodological issues in the relevant evaluations have discounted the longer-term benefits of training in terms of skills development and career progression (for a review of the debate see Nunn *et al.* 2011). Echoing concerns to ensure that ALMPs are

delivered in such a way as to keep longer-term concerns with employment quality and sustainability in focus, Grubb advocates for very long-term measures of wage returns to ALMPs to differentiate shorter-term from longer-term gains (Grubb 2004).

However, the new role envisaged for PES by the PES 2020 strategy suggests that prevention of unemployment and career planning may become more central in the future. Leaving aside the debate above, this presents substantial pragmatic and technical concerns. For example, only a few PES collect data that enable a meaningful prevention indicator to be developed (it requires prior notification of an impending redundancy which in turn requires associated employer regulations). Similarly, tracking the quality or sustainability of employment outcomes requires measures which can track individual ALMP recipients over a long time period (e.g. several years) or construction of skill measures of particular occupations. Both could be resource-inefficient uses of PES time and could also potentially have questionable operational utility (e.g. what would PES do with performance data concerning their activities several years ago?) and introduce distorting effects (e.g. misalignment of PES quality measures with labour market demand). Perhaps in both cases these are more appropriate policy rather than operational indicators, which could be incorporated into an integrated and reflective cycle of double and triple-loop consideration of both policy and practice (see below).

A further area of interest relates to duration measures. Duration measures are intended to reflect the reality that all jobseekers at some point leave the unemployment register. In time-limited benefit systems this might relate simply to the exhaustion of entitlements. Or it may relate to the reality that most jobseekers eventually find work with or without a PES intervention and if they don't, they will ultimately die or reach the end of their qualifying age period. As such, the role of PES can be conceptualised as being to (1) increase the proportion of jobseekers that leave unemployment because they have found paid employment and (2) speed up such a transition where it would have happened without intervention in any case. The business case of PES provision (or put another way, the cost effectiveness of PES services) is predicated on this role. Duration measures reflect this by placing scrutiny on how fast jobseekers flow into work. The problem with duration measures is that depending on their design they may tighten incentives for what has been termed 'creaming and parking'. A recent evaluation of the duration measure system introduced in the UK in 2011 suggests that some degree of prioritisation of jobseekers may result from the effect of the measure on frontline staffs' behaviour. It questions the extent to which this is inappropriate behaviour (e.g. 'creaming and parking') or indeed the rational and appropriate response to political signals and labour market realities (Nunn *et al.* 2012, forthcoming).

PES set a relatively small number of objectives but these are operationalised in a larger number of measurable indicators and targets

All PES in the sample have fewer goals and objectives than operational targets/indicators which is to be expected (see Table 2 and Table 6). By way of illustration, many PES have fewer than 5 overall objectives but very few have 5 or less indicators set against these. In some countries, the number of operational indicators is

very large indeed (e.g. around 200 in Hungary). It was much more difficult to discern the numbers of targets applied to PES and their regions/localities. Furthermore, this refers to the headline information only rather than the more detailed use of indicators and targets at a local and informal level. Little is known on a comparative basis about the latter. This is important as what matters is not so much *how many* indicators and targets are used but *how* they are used. For example, a large number of indicators may simply indicate a large amount of analytical data available for the purpose of interpreting PES performance and linkages to other organisations and stakeholders if they are only used for analytical purposes. If a large number are used to manage frontline staff it could lead to confusion. This echoes the findings of the recent PES dialogue conference that “it is not necessarily the indicators that count, but the way in which they are used” (European Commission 2012e: p.24).

Table 2: Comparison of numbers of goals and indicators in PES

	Goals	Indicators
5 or less	Belgium (Flanders region) Denmark Estonia Germany Lithuania Slovenia Sweden Switzerland UK	Estonia (there are many more than 5 indicators used in a calculation to arrive at a single score) Slovenia Switzerland
6-15	Poland Spain Netherlands	Belgium (Flanders region) Germany Poland
15+		Austria Hungary Lithuania Netherlands Sweden UK

2.3 Performance Measurement

Most PES use some form of Datawarehouse and some are able to support sophisticated analysis of programme effectiveness

Only four PES in the sample do not have a Datawarehouse (Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania and Poland) (see Table 7). However, several of these reported automatic collection of data and the integration of administrative, benefits data and jobseekers activity records with data collected by PES counsellors at the frontline, all of which are characteristics of a Datawarehouse. Where Datawarehouses are in place many PES reported the development of easy to use portals to provide access to performance data against important targets and goals to staff at all levels of the organisation on a regular or ad-hoc basis. Details of whether such portals provide access to 'live' or just historical data though was less clear.

While Datawarehouses are common, their degree of sophistication appears to be variable. Only a few PES reported the use of integrated data systems to develop reliable indicators of programme/intervention effectiveness or cost effectiveness, both of which may be essential in developing the business case around employment service provision in the future. The PES that appear to have the most sophisticated capacity for deriving analytical measures from their Datawarehouse appear to be Germany, Denmark, Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium (Flanders region) and Sweden.

Benchmarking between organisational units is common but the degree of sophistication differs

Some PES develop complex systems to benchmark the performance of local offices/regions, including the use of cluster models in order to mitigate for exogenous, resource or labour market differences. Germany and Switzerland are among those where this practice is the most complex and indeed the German model is being copied in Hungary. However, there is some debate about the effectiveness of this in the technical literature on performance management in PES with some suggesting that such efforts can never fully account for such differences (Kaltenborn *et al.* 2011). Whether they do or not is less important for operational practice than the confidence (or not) among staff and managers that comparison is fair.

Other PES (e.g. Estonia, Slovenia) do compare performance of sub-national units, but do not use clustering to compare between 'like' regions or offices. Rather, they attempt to account for differences by adjusting expectations ex-ante and then compare performance between units on the basis of whether they have met previously set expectations or not.

Beyond the technicalities of benchmarking and comparison of sub-national units, there are important questions of the effect and behaviours that such comparison causes, by intention or accident:

- on the positive side, such comparison might drive healthy competition and provide incentives for continuous improvement or the basis for learning from experience (see below), as has been suggested in both Germany and Austria previously (European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn)).

- on the more negative side, there have been concerns that such comparison can drive gaming, perverse incentives or demotivation as has been debated at times in the UK PES.

It is difficult to judge where the majority of countries sit in relation to this on the basis of the type of data collected for these cross-national comparisons. Firm judgement would need to be based on more in-depth and in-country research including frontline and local/regional office managers to collect evidence about the organisational culture and particularly the relationship between central and regional/local levels and how this influences horizontal relationships between regions/localities. Where benchmarking and cluster-analysis are useful it will be because they facilitate healthy competition in an organisational culture of trust in the accuracy, fairness and effectiveness of the comparison (hence the importance of accurate clustering) and support for information sharing, risk taking/innovation and improvement.

Box 4: Benchmarking for the comparison of regions and localities

PES use a variety of different mechanisms to benchmark the performance of different regions and localities:

- in Switzerland the Cantons are relatively free to decide how they will achieve the centrally set employment goals. "The performance of the Cantons and the localities is measured with a global indicator that is the weighted sum of four performance indicators (see Box 3)". To reflect the different prevailing economic and labour market conditions in the different regions and localities, performance between them is interpreted using a econometric model which takes into account the level of inflow to unemployment, seasonality, the demographic make-up of the local workforce, the extent of 'frontier' workers who travel to work into the area for work and also population density in the local labour market
- in Germany a different system is used to compare the performance of 'like regions in clusters' that are regarded as facing similar labour market challenges. The regions then set individual contribution expectations with the local level through a process of negotiation. Performance variation between and within regions is then used to identify good practice for sharing between regions and localities
- in Slovenia the labour market context of each region is taken into account in setting performance expectations in the first instance through a 'bottom-up' process. The regions are then compared on the extent to which they meet prior expectations. Where performance variation on this basis is not easy to explain, regional and national level staff coordinate more detailed statistical enquiry to identify the causes of performance variation
- in Estonia the regions are evaluated against the four groups of national indicators on a ten-point scale. Again, the results of this process are used to identify areas of good practice and to target improvement support
- In 2014, Spain will benchmark the ALMP performance of its 17 Autonomous Regions, by means of a system with 22 indicators. Their outcomes will determine the sharing out of funds.

Few PES report the comparison of performance data down to individual level

These PES include Holland, Bulgaria and Estonia where there is also an individual incentive scheme. In some other PES (e.g. Austria and Germany) the official indicator and performance management framework enables individual performance management but this is not used. In Germany performance is measured down to team level but is not permitted at individual level. In Austria performance is measured via targets to local level and data can be retrieved from the Datawarehouse on individual counsellor performance but is not routinely used for performance management purposes and there are strict protocols governing its use (European Commission 2012a, Author: Nunn: p28). This is even where there is a performance related pay scheme for aggregate performance. In still other countries, performance is not officially measured to individual level but informal data collection and individual management is in place (e.g. the UK).

Several challenges are present such as balancing qualitative and quantitative information and ensuring accurate data collection

A number of challenges were reported associated with performance measurement. These included:

- balancing qualitative and quantitative data collection e.g. Belgium (Flanders region);
- the integration of data systems (e.g. Germany, Poland);
- the comparison between like-units for benchmarking purposes (e.g. Denmark, Slovenia);
- sharing information between partners (e.g. Spain);
- the development of cost effectiveness measures for Labour Market Programmes (e.g. Poland);
- prevention of information gaming and accurate and timely data capture (Austria, Holland, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Sweden).

Even where PES have a sophisticated and integrated Datawarehouse there was widespread reporting that the weak link in such systems is the administrative collection and updating of jobseeker records in a consistent, accurate and timely manner by frontline staff; this activity is particularly important where performance indicators are tracking activity, specific customer groups or relationships between specific activities and outputs/outcomes.

3 Performance management, continuous improvement and learning

Performance against indicators and targets is typically reported to PES staff on an on-going basis, usually monthly or quarterly and annually

A variety of internal reporting cycles are used, often using annual reporting alongside more frequent reporting. For example, in Belgium (Flanders region) performance is reported annually in the Annual Business Plan and Quarterly Reports. In Germany, annual, quarterly and monthly reporting is used. In the Netherlands this is also done on an annual and monthly basis. In Sweden an annual system of performance dialogues is used to better understand performance and performance variation. Some PES also make use of emails and newsletters to communicate performance information. In Estonia the PES reported that managers are expected to discuss performance results directly with staff rather than communicating via email. In Hungary monthly team meetings consider performance information. Many PES also have systems in place for staff to gain access to this information on an on-going basis through specialist portals or intranets (e.g. Belgium (Flanders region), Denmark, Austria, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Slovenia, Poland).

In some PES (e.g. Denmark, Switzerland) though, there is more of an autonomous approach that is based on local flexibility to report performance over the time cycle that is felt to be important at the local level.

Learning dialogues and meetings contribute to improvement through information sharing

Estonia is a good example of the use of face-to-face transfer of practice between organisational units. In the Estonian PES, monthly meetings between office managers include a presentation and discussion on performance improvement and sharing good practice. In addition, regional offices regularly visit one another and there are twice yearly central information days for the sharing of good practice. Finally, there is a regular schedule of meetings between the PES management board and frontline teams. All these mechanisms are designed to promote dialogue and information sharing across and between levels. While this system is to be praised for the potential it creates for information and communication flow, it may only be possible in a relatively small organisation. In the Netherlands, 'Learning Circles' and Quality Audits are also used to facilitate face-to-face contact, identification of problems and transfer of good practice. Both Austria and Denmark have meetings and workshops at regional level to facilitate information flow.

Knowledge banks and good practice databases can help with information sharing

Several PES collect and share good practice through the use of databases. In Belgium (Flanders region), VDAB operate an evaluation calendar which encourages the sharing and take-up of evidence on successful and less successful practice. In Austria a database archives good practice and the results of evaluation and research studies making them available to all staff.

In Denmark good practice is documented, archived and made available through a 'Knowledge Bank'. These good practice messages are then also promoted through a newsletter that is disseminated to PES employees and external stakeholders. Both the Knowledge Bank and the AMS website host information on good practice for PES employees. This is linked to the evaluation approach (see below) and evidence against the success or otherwise of employment policies/programmes is graded against a structured evidence framework with the following levels:

- strong evidence – three or more high quality studies show effectiveness than show ineffectiveness;
- moderate evidence – two high quality studies show effectiveness than show ineffectiveness;
- indication – one high quality or more limited quality studies show effectiveness than ineffectiveness;
- no, contradictory or uncertain knowledge – studies suggest contradictory findings or there are no high quality studies available.

It will be interesting and important to monitor how these new initiatives in Denmark develop. At the moment, it is assumed that these practices will lead to improvements in information sharing, learning and as a result improved performance. As the new systems become embedded it will be important to continue to reflect on their contribution to identify hard evidence that they contribute to desirable outcomes.

Experimental improvements with thorough evaluation can help to demonstrate performance improvement within the PES and to a wider audience

Several PES (e.g. the Netherlands, UK, Germany) reported that a sound means of developing performance improvement is to experiment or 'pilot' new services or innovations and combine this with rigorous evaluation. For example, in the Netherlands, several 'natural' and 'net effectiveness' experiments are currently being run in order to test the efficacy of 'lighter' touch and more intensive service delivery and might help to shape services in the future. These are generally held to be superior to more informal and qualitative identification of strong or weak performance because of the rigour employed in identifying the effects related to an intervention as opposed to other contextual factors.

AMS in Denmark probably went furthest in this suggesting that they undertake Randomised Control Trials to test performance improvements, though again it is early in the use of these methods and careful monitoring will be needed to fully establish their effects. Experimental evaluation methods can give strong evidence of whether a policy or project works. However, while RCTs are the 'gold standard' in developing new policies and interventions, they can also be difficult, expensive and occasionally problematic. Even without going to these lengths other PES (such as Estonia and Lithuania) also reported pilots/evaluations to be the most effective means of identifying and then sharing evidence about good practice. These are also widely used in the UK context with a variety of degrees of methodological sophistication. Evaluation results are frequently published on an annual basis. In some cases, the results of evaluation reports are summarised in an annual report which evaluates

performance information alongside these findings (e.g. Belgium (Flanders region), Germany).

However, one PES did report that *evaluation needs to be undertaken carefully*. Their experience suggested that pilot scheme evaluations can suffer from a positivity bias. Indeed, this has may have been the case in evaluations of pilot new performance management systems where staff view the change positively to begin with, but over time more negative aspects and behavioural incentives come to the fore. These findings may also be partly influenced by staff in pilot projects simply wanting the project they are working on to be successful. This might not mean that a good system is undermined, just that the balance between positive and negative factors changes. Other reasons why pilot projects may have different degrees of success from the time they are rolled out include differences in the implementation process, targeting of the beneficiary group, differential resourcing, or the possibility that some services are successful when run on a small scale and targeted fashion than when they are rolled out as a general service. Evaluation findings suggest that this is the case in relation to training interventions (Nunn *et al.* 2011:57-61).

Benchmarking, competition and information sharing can help to improve performance

Several PES (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland) note the scope for benchmarking the performance of sub-national units is an effective way of engendering healthy competition between regions, localities and offices. In the Swiss PES, the effects of competition between the Cantons are thought to be key in securing commitment to performance improvement. *In all these PES, there is also a strong emphasis on using quantitative and qualitative explanations of differential performance to identify successful and problematic practice to improve performance*, using a structured benchmarking cycle as the mechanism to drive this process. These cycles are mostly two-fold combining either monthly or quarterly performance analysis with an annual cycle of comparison. In Bulgaria, the annual cycle is accompanied by an award for and celebration of good performance designed to both share practice and incentivise commitment.

This latter point about commitment to performance is important and benchmarking needs to be carefully implemented to ensure that it generates this result rather than causing demotivation and mistrust. This can be the case where managers don't trust performance data, feel that it does not fit with the purpose and objectives of the organisation (i.e. what is measured is not what matters for performance) or that they cannot influence measured performance (European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn); Nunn and Devins 2012). As such, widespread ownership of goals and targets combined with trust in performance information is crucial for driving commitment to performance improvement and that competition is helpful rather than unhealthy.

Some PES extend competition to individuals

In both Estonia and Lithuania it was reported that the performance management system extends sub-national benchmarking and competition to individuals through evaluation and performance-related pay. Even where individual financial incentives are

not in place many other systems establish individual expectations or competition, whether formally or informally (e.g. in the UK). While it might be expected that this will drive individual motivation and commitment to performance improvement, there are also some drawbacks and the balance of evidence on this is as yet unclear (European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn: 16)).

HR and management practices need to support a culture of performance management

Several PES noted that HR practices need to support performance management in three distinct ways:

- Recruitment and selection practices need to ensure that counsellors are able to provide high quality coaching and support to jobseekers and that managers are able to understand the context in which they are working and support counsellors to improve performance on a continuous basis.
- Coaching and training needs to support counsellors and managers to improve the services that they offer. In Spain a system of coaching teams in each province, all working to EFQM standards and processes, has helped to support performance improvement alongside a heavy emphasis on coaching.
- Evaluation, reward and promotion processes need to support and incentivise good performance and prevent disincentives or perverse incentives. Like performance data, evaluation processes for individual staff need to be widely accepted and trusted as both fair and accurate.

In this way HR practices can help to contribute toward the creation of a culture of best practice and continuous improvement throughout the organisation something that was felt to be important by the PES in the Netherlands. This culture though is complex and difficult to engender. BA, the German PES, comment that such a culture needs to be one of “open communication and tolerance of mistakes”.

Double and even triple-loop learning is necessary to support continuous improvement

Several PES (e.g. Belgium (Flanders region), Switzerland) suggested that evaluation and systematic learning from experience is crucial to their efforts at continuous performance improvement. They suggested that a cycle of double-loop learning is necessary to both ensure that activities are done well and that the organisation is ‘doing the right thing’. In Sweden an annual report produced by the analytical department attempts to explain performance information by producing a narrative explanation.

Box 5: Double Loop Learning in Belgium (Flanders region)

In Belgium (Flanders region) the PES report that they are “constantly evaluating whether we are doing things right (tactics), but also evaluating on a long-term basis whether we are doing the right things”. In addition, VDAB combines structured and systematic analysis of performance data with regular programmatic evaluations. These are then brought together in an annual explanatory narrative that is published by the Ministry of Work. The purpose of such an exercise is to place attention on the way that services are delivered and what is delivered to ensure that evidence continues to inform policy throughout the implementation and design cycle.

Organisational structures which allow stakeholders and social partners to be represented within the PES facilitate broader information sharing and support for successful initiatives

Several PES use their organisational structure with national and local Employment Councils or other such structures to share information about successful employment policies and programmes with wider stakeholders and social partners, helping to build support for policies and interventions that are proven to be effective. In Denmark the PES also suggests that localised representation of social partners and local level autonomy combined with evidence based approaches allows policies and programmes to be flexible to meet local needs. In some cases social partners or other stakeholders take the lead in developing interventions. For example, on an annual basis most local level politicians host ‘strategy seminars’ in which a range of interests, including the PES, come together to discuss labour market challenges and solutions in a collaborative way. In Hungary too the PES reports positively on the role of local level engagement with partners, stakeholders and social partners and that this has had a successful impact on modifying employment programmes. In Bulgaria, there are also structures to enable the PES to report to the social partners on performance on an annual and monthly basis. In Spain a looser set of organisational linkages allows the PES to share performance information with stakeholders such as universities, consultancy firms and professional associations who are able to analyse the data. This has led to several service innovations that were initially suggested by external organisations.

Annual reporting provides an opportunity for an open explanation of performance information and linking this to evaluation findings

Performance information alone can be misleading and complicated to interpret. In the context of a challenging labour market with high unemployment and specifically youth unemployment across many EU Member States, employment policy and its implementation is likely to be a high profile issue and attract media and public attention. It is therefore even more important than usual to provide an explanation and contextualisation of performance information. Several PES do this, such as in Belgium (Flanders region), where a narrative explanation of performance is used which draws also on evaluation findings. In Switzerland, Denmark, Germany and Sweden, annual performance is also explained in a public way. In Bulgaria annual

reporting to the labour ministry reflects on learning from the analysis of performance and evaluation data to put forward an explanation of performance and to identify potential improvements.

PES report a range of challenges in performance management both internally and externally

These include:

- providing a clear public explanation for performance information;
- securing motivation;
- ensuring that staff are adequately qualified;
- ensuring that appropriate effort is put into changes following evaluations;
- understanding that evaluations of pilots can be more positive than they later appear;
- taking account of institutional change and recession challenges; and
- understanding that the inconsistency of performance indicators can hamper long-term planning, understanding performance signals and responding to these.

4 Overall conclusions and recommendations

More evidence is still needed about the effect of different performance management systems

Over recent years much has been done to strengthen the evidence base around PES performance management especially on a comparative basis. The current peer review exercise has added much to this in descriptive terms. However, more needs to be done to strengthen the evidence base about the relationship between the performance management process itself, the achievement of positive outcomes and the avoidance of the potential negative implications of performance management. In particular, while there are good reasons to expect that outcome-based approaches at the national level, local operational autonomy, benchmarking, inclusive governance and integrated performance management and evaluation would support good practice and performance improvement, there needs to be more evidence to conclusively demonstrate this. More information is also needed to link outcome performance levels to measures of cost-effectiveness of inputs and reduced benefit levels to demonstrate the net benefits of employment services (European Commission 2012d (Author: Nunn)).

More evidence is still needed about how detailed and informal performance management practices affect frontline delivery

The current peer review has enabled the collection of good descriptive comparative data on headline performance management approaches across EU PES but there is also evidence that national level performance management practices mask differential and informal practices at a local level (Nunn and Devins 2012). As such, headline comparison alone is not enough to fully understand the detailed workings of performance management at a local and informal level. Greater knowledge is needed of these cultural practices and their connection with performance improvement in order to be able to make firmer conclusions and recommendations about what performance management approaches are associated with the type of outcomes envisaged in Public Employment Services' Contribution to EU 2020.

Inclusive governance appears to work and is fully in line with the 'conducting' role envisaged by PES 2020

PES with 'inclusive governance mechanisms' (European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn)) appear to have an inbuilt mechanism to share performance results with stakeholders and social partners and to engage them in a shared process of labour market governance. This is close to the 'conducting' role envisaged for PES by the European Commission (European Commission 2012d). The PES Europe 2020 strategy suggests that 'integration' with a range of partners and 'inter-operability' is crucial to the success of the conducting role. Sharing information and dialogue over the interpretation of performance results and setting operational and strategic objectives is an essential part of such a role.

Inclusive governance can also help to embed employment services in a supportive social and institutional infrastructure helping to improve the relationship of PES to employers on the demand side of the labour market which will be essential to the

development of the PES role in relation to transitional labour markets. This is also helpful in building a broad-based coalition of support for employment services, helping to make the business case for PES (and keep it relevant in changing circumstances) in a difficult labour market and public finance context.

Integrated performance management and evaluation are crucial to an evidence-based approach for the PES and across wider partners

The analytical paper on performance management in PES suggested the integration of performance management and evaluation in cycles of performance management, policy development and reflection on objectives and practice (European Commission 2012a (Author: Nunn)). The peer review suggests that several PES have already developed these practices. As these processes develop the evidence base on 'what works, for who and in what circumstances' will strengthen the business case for PES. Where this is done openly, and the learning is disseminated, it may also help to share good practice across a wider range of partners, again using performance management as part of a conducting approach to the local labour market. Integrating PES performance management and learning from evaluation may be able to influence the actions of other labour market stakeholders, as well as integrating the performance management and payment by results systems extended to contracted-out employment services. Without such integration a fragmented system of data recording and analysis can leave gaps in our understanding of what is working and why.

In the context of current labour market challenges, more needs to be done to create cost effectiveness measures related to employment service influenced outcomes to support the business case for PES

Performance management has the potential to support the business case for PES. Several PES mention the importance of developing cost effectiveness measures or analytical measures which provide comparative information on the costs and effectiveness of different types of labour market programmes and interventions. In the context of tight budgets this is part of the process of 'doing more with less' and will be crucial to the development of successful employment services contributing to sustainable recovery.

Benchmarking, information sharing and targeted support are crucial to continuous improvement

The peer review has supported the argument that benchmarking is crucial to ensuring continuous improvement. However, it suggests that to be fully effective, benchmarking between regions and localities needs to be done in a way that facilitates trust and a culture of continuous improvement. It is important to recognise that benchmarking can have both positive and negative aspects and that developing a supporting infrastructure is essential. First, there needs to be trust that performance comparison is accurate and fair. Second, performance comparison needs to be augmented by interpretation and explanation of variation and the sharing of good practice and lessons learned, as well as support for improvement where necessary. An open and trust-based system with information sharing and support is essential to

ensuring that benchmarking facilitates healthy competition and continuous improvement.

Performance management linked to high quality internal HR practices

Performance management should not be just a technical and analytical exercise but linked to high quality HR practices that support individual and team evaluation, ongoing coaching, targeted training and recognition. Again, high quality HR practices need to help to identify and transfer good practice within the organisation. The changing role of PES will put increased emphasis on these services. As PES develop a role in relation to transitional labour markets and promoting job-to-job transitions (European Commission 2012a), PES will need to adapt and strengthen their skills base from one that focussed more tightly on just those furthest from labour market activity. As PES are expected to work with different types of employers, their credibility in promoting high quality HR practices in the wider labour market will in part depend on their own credibility. Further, high quality internal HR practices in PES may have an important demonstration effect across the labour market.

High quality HR practices are also associated with avoiding some of the downsides of performance management. These might include stress for frontline staff and managers and the potential for performance information to be misused or interpreted for negative reasons (such as bullying etc).

Performance management needs to support a culture of innovation

Important to the future challenge for PES is the ability to work closely with a range of labour market stakeholders in order to innovate so that solutions can be found to local labour market problems. This is partly connected to the challenge of social innovation at a local level and will require a degree of functional, operational, and potentially strategic autonomy at the local level. Central to this is ensuring that performance management supports local autonomy rather than acting as a strait jacket, driving frontline managers to achieve centrally set targets whether or not they meet local needs. Such practices will directly prevent the PES from meeting local needs, will be a barrier to working with other actors and will militate against the recruitment of innovative and entrepreneurial PES staff.

5 ANNEXES: Tables

Table 3: Comparison of PES Approaches to Performance Management

Responsibility for Performance Management (PM) in the PES	
Austria	<p>The management itself is primarily responsible for PM. This comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ two general directors of AMS Austria ▪ 9 provincial managing directors ▪ 100 regional branch managers <p>The management receives operative support from the controllers at the federal, provincial and regional level.</p>
Belgium (Flanders region)	<p>Several units within the PES ensure PM of different aspects and levels. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steering Committee on Effectiveness ▪ Planning and Customer Management-department ▪ Strategic Policy Support ▪ Research Department ▪ Internal Auditing Department
Bulgaria	Senior management at local level, Head Office – national level
Denmark	PM is an integrated part of the general and overall business model in the PES.
Estonia	<p>The PM system is integrated within different functions and staff members. Though the PMS is one of the responsibilities of the Management Board¹, on a daily basis, the work concerning matters of the PMS is coordinated by the advisor of the board in cooperation with the Analysis Department. Other managers are involved in this work regarding the issues that concern specifically their field of work.</p>
Germany	<p>The main platform for PM are performance dialogues which take place quarterly over all hierarchy levels, that is,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) between the board of directors of the head office and the ten regional directors 2) between the ten regional directors and respectively the local directors of the 156 local agencies.
Hungary	The Department of Research and Analysis of the PES is responsible for leading performance management.

Responsibility for Performance Management (PM) in the PES

	A special working group has been established to support the development of PMS.
Lithuania	Managers and the employees share responsibility for the implementation and success of performance management. Ministry of Social Security and Labour sets up together with the PES the annual national plan, social partners can make recommendations Heads of departments allocate targets according to annual national plans, local PES directors monitor PM
Netherlands	The Ministry defines a set of goals. The PES translates these goals to indicators, targets to get to one set of performance indicators / balanced score card in a transparent system. Line management is responsible for the performance itself. The staff facilitates; PES Netherlands has a unit 'business control and quality'.
Poland	Ministry of Labour sets targets for all levels; social partners have advisory function. Regional PES senior managers oversee county PES implementation
Slovenia	PM is integrated into the organisation levels and structures. The overall responsibility for PM lies with the Director General and senior management staff and Central and Regional Offices. Technical support and data maintenance is ensured by the analytical department and ICT department in the Central Office.
Spain	Responsibility for performance management lies with the Directorate General of the PES, which delegates compliance to the General Sub Directorates in each area. A team in the Resources and Organisation sub-directorate is responsible for implementing and developing the Quality and Continuous Improvement Plan. The National PES quality bodies are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Public Employment Service Quality Committee ▪ The Central Services Quality Committee ▪ The Provincial Quality Committees ▪ The Improvement Groups which are created in each province to deal with a specific service or measure ▪ The Quality and Coordination Division ▪ The Quality Coordinators in the provincial offices.
Sweden	The Director General defines the overall goals for the PES. In June, preliminary performance indicators are produced. Information about the current performance indicators of the Balanced Scorecard and the Government Bill is used to do this. A performance dialogue then begins with analytical staff and other managers involved in agreeing target levels which are then signed off by the Director General.
Switzerland	The federal government has overall responsibility for performance management in the PES. Execution is the responsibility of the cantons.
United Kingdom	There is a structured approach to performance management which spans the whole organisation. Each staff member has accountability for their own performance; this contributes to Team, District, Regional,

Responsibility for Performance Management (PM) in the PES

and National PES wide performance recording.

Table 4: Targeting of Specific groups of Jobseekers

	Women	YP	Older People	Disabled People	Ethnic Minorities	LTU	Other (Specify)
Austria	X	X	X			X	Unemployed women re-entering the labour market after parental leave
Belgium (Flanders region)		X	X	X	X	X	
Bulgaria		X					
Denmark		X		X			
Estonia							
Germany						X	
Hungary		X					
Lithuania		X				X	
Netherlands		X	X	X			
Poland							
Slovenia			X			X	
Spain		X	X			X	
Sweden		X		X			Migrants
Switzerland							
United Kingdom							

Table 5: Comparison of Goal and Target Setting Across PES

Country	Frequency of setting the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets	Frequency of reviewing the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in reviewing the goals and targets
Austria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual. ▪ If there is a massive economic slump, the targets are adapted during the year (only ever happened once to date, in 2009). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management. ▪ Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Finance and Social Partners (represented on administrative board of the AMS). ▪ Other PES staff: experts for labour market policy controlling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Goals are not adjusted during the year. The quantitative targets are reviewed quarterly on the central level and monthly to quarterly on the regional level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets
Belgium (Flanders region)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour ▪ Cabinet of the Minister of Work ▪ Social partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour ▪ Social partners ▪ Other PES staff: Research Service
Bulgaria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual for the goals. ▪ Monitoring of the implementation of the qualitative indicators in the action plan is performed monthly and if it is needed reallocation of resources for active policy is undertaken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management. ▪ Ministry of Labour endorse the Action Plan. ▪ Social partners: participate in discussions on employment policies and results. ▪ Other Ministries including Ministry of Education, Youth and Science and Ministry of Economy, Energy and Tourism and Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works. ▪ Directors of the Regional and Local Labour Offices of the Employment Agency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual for the Action Plan Goals ▪ The qualitative implementation of the indicators is monitored monthly and, if it is needed reallocation of funds is undertaken in different periods in line with the current implementation of the goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour approves the reallocation ▪ Other PES staff: Directorates from the Head Office of the EA, Planning Department, Directors of the Regional and Local Labour Offices
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Minister of Employment ▪ Other PES staff within municipalities and regions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets

Country	Frequency of setting the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets	Frequency of reviewing the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in reviewing the goals and targets
Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual ▪ The employment programme is set for 2 years and the development plan for 3 years (adjusted when necessary) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management: the Management Board, advisors, heads of departments in central and regional offices ▪ The Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Finance and social partners participating through the Supervisory Board ▪ Other PES staff: Department of labour market services, department of analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual ▪ Output indicators are reviewed also more than once a year, if necessary. In case the demand turns out to be higher than expected for some measure, it is possible to make adjustments in the budget, as well in the targets also during the year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual for key performance indicators ▪ Multi-annual for input planning ▪ Under the circumstance of an economic crisis, targets may be readjusted. This happened in 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour (on basic social security, financed by taxes but not in unemployment insurance financed by insurance contributions) ▪ Unemployment insurance: board of governors ▪ Other PES staff: Department of controlling, department of programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual for the key performance indicators ▪ Multi-annual for the input planning ▪ Under the circumstance of an economic crisis, targets may be readjusted. This happened in 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets
Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific points that trigger a review/adjustment include when a new programme is launched, planned programme is not launched (in time), or the labour market changes substantially 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management
Lithuania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour ▪ Social partners can make recommendations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets

Country	Frequency of setting the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets	Frequency of reviewing the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in reviewing the goals and targets
Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual ▪ When the estimation of unemployment numbers deviates severely during the year, adjustments can be made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management. ▪ Ministry of Labour for the most important targets and performance indicators. ▪ Social partners are consulted regularly (but do not define and agree targets) ▪ Other PES staff: policymakers, business controllers, financial experts. ▪ Other stakeholders: municipalities (tuning of targets). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual ▪ When the estimation of unemployment numbers deviates severely during the year, adjustments can be made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets
Poland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual for performance budget. ▪ Multi-annual for the National Action Plan for Employment (every two years). ▪ For Operational Programme Human Resources Development it is done under specific points in time/circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management: Regional Labour Office ▪ Ministry of Labour in cooperation with other Ministries. the Minister for the Economy, the Minister for Education, the Minister for higher education, the Minister for rural development and the Minister for regional development. ▪ Social partners: the Chief Employment Council (at all levels). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual for National Action Plan for Employment and for performance budget. ▪ Multiannual for Financial Plan for Employment, Financial Plan of State and National Action Plan for Employment. ▪ Specific points in time/circumstances that trigger review for Operational Programme Human Resources Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management are involved in the Operational Programme Human Resources Development. ▪ Ministry of Labour. ▪ Ministry of Regional Development. ▪ Social partners: The Chief Employment Council.

Country	Frequency of setting the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets	Frequency of reviewing the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in reviewing the goals and targets
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES senior management from Central Office and Regional office. Ministry of Labour. Social partners (partly, through the ESS Council). Other PES staff from Regional Offices and Local Offices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 months; the ESS reports on its annual Business plan twice a year; if there are significant labour market changes, the ESS Management could propose changes of the annual targets. Multi-annual; internally, within the ESS: on annual basis. Changes in the National Budget during the year also leads to adjustments of the ESS annual Business plan; changes are defined by the Ministry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES senior management. Ministry of Labour. Social partners, partly through the ESS Council.
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES senior management. Ministry of Labour. Other PES staff: The sub-directorates of the general services in Madrid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES senior management. Ministry of Labour. Other PES staff: The sub-directors of the general services in Madrid.

Country	Frequency of setting the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in setting the goals and targets	Frequency of reviewing the goals and targets	Types of individuals/organisations involved in reviewing the goals and targets
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES Director General ▪ Senior Managers ▪ Analytical Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual ▪ Within cycle if there are changes in the tasks allocated to the PES or business cycle issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES Senior Management. ▪ Analytical staff.
Switzerland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual for the benchmarking on the results, indicators are calculated ex post (i.e. there are no target values set in advance) ▪ Service agreement revised every four years; it can be adjusted if there is a fundamental need for revision (last happened in year 2000). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour ▪ Other policymakers: ▪ Cantonal directors of each of the four regions which constitute the Swiss labour organizations (AOST) as members of the steering committee. ▪ Cantonal government leaders when it comes to sign a new service agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific points in time/circumstances that trigger a review/adjustment are amendments of relevant laws, new scientific insights, cantonal request, revision of service level agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour ▪ Cantonal directors of four regions of the Association of Swiss Employment Offices are members of the steering committee, which surveys the results-oriented agreement between cantonal governments and federal ministry. ▪ Cantonal specialists in quality management members of the working group on measurement of results.
United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administration budget for PES is set for 3 year period, annual performance requirements are set to deliver required outputs within agreed budget. ▪ The overall performance expectation of the PES are set by the Ministry annually. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour: UK Department for Work and Pensions ▪ Other policymakers: Analysts advise senior PES officials on the practicability of delivering outputs, and the cost and outputs necessary to meet performance expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual, PES, Regional, and local Jobcentre. Targets are set nationally. ▪ Every six months for the targets at Jobcentre level. However, exceptionally can be reviewed more frequently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES senior management ▪ Ministry of Labour ▪ Other PES staff: Analysts, Financial (accountancy) staff, HR experts.

Table 6: PES Objectives and Indicators

PES	National Goals and Objectives		National Targets and Indicators		Relationship to regional/local level
	No	Description	No	Description (targets in bold)	
Austria	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outflow of older unemployed persons into jobs within 6 months ▪ Minimising of the number of young unemployed persons who remain unemployed for longer than 6 months ▪ Sustainable job entries of unemployed persons outside of the labour market ▪ Job entries or entry into training programmes of unemployed women re-entering the market ▪ Rate of job entries of trained unemployed persons ▪ Job entries after special training programmes ▪ Number of vacancies acquired and filled by the AMS ▪ The quantitative targets for the personal annual labour market policy objectives are always fixed separately for men and women 	1 / 20	Balanced Scorecard including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Achievement of the annual labour market policy targets ▪ Duration of unemployment ▪ Outflow of unemployed persons into jobs within 6 months ▪ Success of the measures of active labour market policy ▪ Satisfaction of job-seekers with the measures of active labour market policy ▪ Proportion of expenditure for active labour market policy for women ▪ Satisfaction of the job-seeking clients with AMS ▪ Process quality in the service for job-seekers ▪ Duration and quality of the processing of applications for unemployment benefits ▪ Utilisation of the AMS e-service ▪ Penetration rate of vacancies and apprenticeship training places ▪ Duration of vacancies ▪ Satisfaction of enterprises with AMS ▪ Exact matching by AMS of job-seekers and vacancies ▪ Job satisfaction of AMS employees ▪ Achievement of the internal AMS plan for the advancement of women ▪ Development of selected material costs ▪ Performance of the AMS call centres ▪ Satisfaction with the AMS call centres <p>Total score of the AMS balanced scorecard</p>	
Belgium (Flanders region)	5	A balanced Scorecard of five objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jobseeker Satisfaction ▪ Employee Satisfaction ▪ Employer Satisfaction ▪ Student Satisfaction ▪ Partner Satisfaction 	17	T1 Jobseeker satisfaction OG1 T2 (Re-)employment of young people < 25 years OG2 T3 (Re-)employment of people aged 25-50 years OG3 T4 (Re-)employment of people aged > 50 years OG4 T5 Re-employment of jobseekers > 1 year of UE	

				<p>OG5 T6 (Re-)employment of target groups OG7 T7 Re-employment of employees in outplacement</p> <p>Target for Strategic Goal 2 Global T1 Employee satisfaction</p> <p>Targets for Strategic Goal 3 OG11 T10.1 Employer satisfaction (provided information) 75% OG12 T10.2 Employer satisfaction (vacancy services) T10.3 SME satisfaction (vacancy services)</p> <p>Targets for Strategic Goal 4 Global T11 Student satisfaction OG13 T12 Employment after vocational training T13.1 Offered hours of vocational training T13.2 Number of students enrolled in vocational training OG16 T14 Number of 'workplace-learning' actions T15 Number of online web-courses offered</p> <p>Target for Strategic Goal 5 global T16 Partner satisfaction on collaboration with VDAB</p>	
Bulgaria	6	<p>Encapsulated in its vision: "Support for sustainability and increase of employment through provision of quality workforce and compensating part of the employers' expenses for hiring of unemployed from disadvantaged groups in the labour market, with priority for regions recovering less successfully from the crisis".</p> <p>1. Employment promotion and limiting unemployment through fast and effective work placement of unemployed both in the primary labour market and through programmes and measures under the Promotion Employment Act and through the Human Resource Development Operational Programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support to employment in SMEs. ▪ Active provision of mediation services ▪ Implementation of active programmes and measures 	6	<p>level of unemployment,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ announced vacancies in the primary labour market, ▪ placement of unemployed into jobs in the primary labour market, ▪ organized job fairs including EURES job fairs, ▪ unemployed included into programmes and measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ enrolled in training, ▪ in different projects and schemes 	

		<p>pursuant to the Employment Promotion Act and Human Resource Development Operational Programme for subsidized employment from disadvantaged groups in the labour market, with priority for regions recovering less successfully from the crisis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limiting the youth unemployment and inactivity ▪ Activating discouraged and inactive people ▪ Improving the mobility of workforce ▪ Promoting entrepreneurship ▪ Support for increasing the "green" and "white" jobs in SMEs <p>2. Improvement of the quality of the workforce through acquisition of new qualifications and skills of employed and unemployed to address the demands of the labour market due to the restructuring and technological changes to the economy and better job matching.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promoting participation in life long learning – for employed and unemployed ▪ Improving vacancy matching through improving the quality of education / training <p>3. Development of the regional labour markets and improving the provision of employment services for limiting the unemployment in regions with high levels of unemployment</p> <p>4. Development of the social dialogue at all levels.</p> <p>5. Protection and regulation of the labour market. Effective integration into the European labour market.</p> <p>6. Strengthening of the institutional capacity of EA.</p>			
Denmark	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ensure that more young people without an education start on a vocational education; ▪ reduce the number of people on disability pension; ▪ ensure that the numbers of unemployed are reduced as much as possible. ▪ the jobcentres shall strengthen their cooperation with local enterprises on the employment effort 	Vari abl e	Municipalities and regions set their own targets and indicators to fulfil the national goals and objectives.	
Estonia	3 / 2	<p>Employment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Helping job seekers back to employment as fast as possible (decreasing unemployment duration) 2) Decreasing long-term unemployment 3) Preventing unemployment and decreasing inactivity <p>The PES itself has two strategic objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Improving the effectiveness, efficiency, access and quality of 	4/ 20 +	<p>Target framework in which they are set under the following headings/weightings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Impact indicators (labour market integration) (40%) 2) Output indicators (access of employment services) (25%) 3) Quality indicators (25%) 4) Activity indicators (10%) 	Additional Regional Indicators/Targets

	<p>employment services 2) Developing a competent and efficient organisation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 12 months for newly registered unemployed (excl. recipients of unemployment insurance benefit), % ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 6 months for newly registered unemployed (excl. recipients of unemployment insurance benefit), % ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 4 months for newly registered unemployed (excl. recipients of unemployment insurance benefit), % ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 12 months for new recipients of unemployment insurance benefit, % ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 6 months for new recipients of unemployment insurance benefit, % ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 4 months for new recipients of unemployment insurance benefit, % ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 6 months after work practice, % ▪ Rate of entrances to employment within 6 months after training, % ▪ Participation rate on active measures of long-term unemployed (period of registered unemployment at least 12 months) within past 12 months ▪ Participation rate on active measures (monthly average), % ▪ Inflow to active measures (monthly average number of entrances) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Labour market training ▪ Work practice ▪ Coaching for working life ▪ Business start-up subsidy ▪ Wage subsidy ▪ Career counselling ▪ Job search counselling ▪ Counselling for eliminating obstacles of entering employment ▪ Other services ▪ Satisfaction index of job seekers ▪ Satisfaction index of employers ▪ Satisfaction index of employees of the EUIF ▪ No remarks in the financial audit ▪ Rate of documents and activities in deadline ▪ 26 activities with outputs 	
--	--	---	--

Germany	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prevent unemployment ▪ Reduce the duration of unemployment 	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ratio of job-to-job integrations to job-to-job customers. ▪ Ratio of integrations to customers ▪ Duration of unemployment customers receiving benefits ▪ Duration of unemployment customers not receiving benefits ▪ Number of job vacancies filled ▪ Number of long-term integrations ▪ Customer satisfaction index employers ▪ Customer satisfaction index jobseekers 	
Hungary			10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are around 200 indicators under the following headings: ▪ The number and ratio of those who entered into employment from the total number of registered jobseekers ▪ The number and ratio of persons entering labour market training programmes from the total number of registered jobseekers ▪ The number of reported vacancies in the given period and the changes compared to the previous year ▪ The lifetime of vacancies (in days) ▪ Activation ratio ▪ The number and ratio of ALMP participants who are not registered as jobseekers three months after the end of the programmes. ▪ The indicators of prevention for persons aged less than 25 who entered the register 6 months earlier and for those 25+ who entered the register 12 months earlier ▪ The indicators of new start (a) for those under 25 who entered the register 6 months earlier and for those 25+ who entered the register 12 months earlier ▪ The combined indicators of new start (b) for those under 25 who entered the register 6 months earlier and for those 25+ who entered the register 12 months earlier who have received either services or ALMP 	

Lithuania	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure the provision of quality and easy-to-access labour market services; ▪ Reduce unemployment by stimulating jobseekers' employment; ▪ Strengthen employment mediation activity directed to the matching of labour supply and demand and thus actively promote social cohesion; ▪ Ensure the increase of youth employment by implementing the plan of measures directed to reduce youth unemployment. 	12	<p>Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduce a new jobseekers' profiling-based service model; ▪ Execute active labour market policy measures, including new vocational training system – issuing of training vouchers; ▪ Develop the provision of easy to access and clear information about the labour market services using information and telecommunication technologies and organizing the transfer of electronic public services provision into the internet (Lithuanian Labour Exchange's website www.ldb.lt) and "EdBirža" database; ▪ Contribute to preparation of the quality model of local office employees activities, including the linking of salary to activity results. Introduce this model to the local labour exchange offices, after the agreement with the Ministry of Social Security and Labour; ▪ Implement means and a measure plan, directed to reduce youth unemployment, endorsed in the local offices action plans for 2012. <p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the number of jobseekers ▪ Offer „New start“ measures over 12 months of unemployment for grown-up jobseekers ▪ Fill registered job vacancies ▪ Offer „New start“ measures over 4 months of unemployment for young jobseekers (up to 25 years of age) ▪ Employ and send to the active labour market measures young jobseekers (up to 25 years of age) ▪ Average number of jobseekers who monthly receive unemployment benefits ▪ Increase the availability of labour exchange services to jobseekers ▪ Reduce the average time period needed to fill job vacancies ▪ Increase the number of electronic services' users ▪ Retain established work places over 3 years ▪ Employ over 6 months after public works ▪ Employ and include the recipients of unemployment 	
-----------	---	---	----	--	--

				benefits and social allowances to the active labour market measures	
Netherlands	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The main goals set by the ministry are: ▪ Outflow to work ▪ Transparency of labor market ▪ Vacancy fulfilment for disabled people ▪ Application responses on time for disabled people ▪ Realisation within budget for a) exploitation budget b) external re-integration of disabled people c) facilities for disabled people 	35 +	<p>The most important ones are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outflow to work 0-3 months and > 3 months ▪ Usage of the E-channel ▪ Customer satisfaction (jobseekers and employers) ▪ Transparency of vacancies – vacancies on our website and in our systems as a percentage of total vacancies available in The Netherlands. To provide transparency in the labor market is a public statutory duty. ▪ Services for (young) disabled jobseekers ▪ Services for employers (placements of various target groups) ▪ Services juridical department – to grant dismissal permits, work permits ▪ Target related to enforcement (suitable job offer after 12 months) 	
Poland	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reducing unemployment ▪ Improving operation of Public Employment Services and labour market institutions ▪ Strengthening the capacity of employees of PES and labour market institutions in order to improve customer service by labour offices ▪ Improving the functioning of PES in the services and instruments of the labour market ▪ Improving PES activities for the unemployed and job seekers ▪ Improving information exchange between public authorities ▪ Increase in the number of employees after completing active labour market programmes ▪ Improving the employment efficiency of activities conducted by PES ▪ Preventing social exclusion of the unemployed ▪ Increased effectiveness of actions 	10?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Registered unemployment rate (%) ▪ Growth rate in the number of activated people as compared to the previous year ▪ Number of information and training meetings for PES and labour market institutions ▪ Number of unemployed per one key employee of the local labour office ▪ Number of papers published and distributed in PES ▪ Number of public administration units that exchange electronic data ▪ Employment rate after participation in active programmes ▪ The number of unemployed in active labour market programmes ▪ Average monthly number of paid benefits for the unemployed ▪ Number of people participating in the basic forms of 	There are a large no of additional indicators in other plans and strategies

				professional activation	
Slovenia	4	<p>Objective 1: More efficient job mediation</p> <p>Objective 2: Timely activation of unemployed in order to stimulate their transitions into employment</p> <p>Objective 3: To increase the efficiency of active labour market programmes</p> <p>Objective 4 (longer-term): To promote the ESS as central institution of life-long career guidance</p>	5	<p>Objective 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Target: Transition of 62 000 unemployed persons into employment. ▪ Objective 2: - ▪ Target: All newly registered unemployed will be offered at least one activity (supporting their job-search or participation in ALM programme) in the first 4 months of unemployment spell. ▪ Objective 3: To increase the efficiency of active labour market programmes ▪ Target: The number of participants in all ALMPs: 29 860 unemployed (9 136 subsidised employment) ▪ Target: the number of exits into regular employment among on-the-job training participants: 1 200 unemployed ▪ Target: the share of specific groups among participants in all active employment programmes should be at least: aged 50+, 22 %, aged below 30,35 %, long-term unemployed 50 %, unemployment benefits recipients 24 %; unemployed recipients of social assistance 30 % ▪ Objective 4 (longer-term): To promote the ESS as central institution of life-long career guidance 	
Spain	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognising entitlement to benefits. Ensuring customer support, promoting remote channels and quick, adequate recognition of entitlement to unemployment benefits. ▪ Verification of benefit requirements: Check that beneficiaries meet the requirements for accessing and receiving benefits and identifying and penalising situations of fraud in entitlement to and receipt of benefits. ▪ Overseeing benefit management: Overseeing correct management of files to determine entitlement to benefits. Defence and economic claims: Strengthen jurisdictional defence and optimisation of public resources by securing decisions in favour of the National Public Employment Service in the courts, and recovering amounts owed to the National Public Employment Service deriving from payments unduly made. ▪ Following up vocational training courses for employment in bonuses and agreements: verifying correct application of public resources allocated to employment for workers, through actions 	?	<p>The provincial offices have to set targets and indicators according to these objectives.</p>	

		<p>to follow up and monitor courses in the on-site training initiative in companies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Optimise the performance of prospective provincial activities included in the state programme, which are common to the entire Observatory network. ▪ Encourage staff participation in working groups and development of project methodologies, thus transcending the provincial area. ▪ Reduce the average payment period for suppliers of the National Public Employment Service to a shorter term than that established by law. ▪ Disseminate occupational risk prevention actions and make these generally known. ▪ Improve internal communication. ▪ Introduce the continuous improvement system in the National Public Employment Service. 			
Sweden	3/4	<p>Outcome goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectively bring together jobseekers and employers searching for employees, ▪ Prioritise jobseekers that are far from the labour market; and ▪ Contribute to a steady, long-term increase of employment. <p>Process goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Satisfied customers and external confidence ▪ In time delivery of services provided ▪ Required qualifications and resources for fulfilling defined tasks ▪ Efficient resource management 	20	<p>Effective matching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turnover to employment ▪ Employer contacts <p>Priority to unemployed with a weak position in the labour market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turnover to employment and education for participants in the Job and Development Programme ▪ Turnover to employment and education for participants in the Youth Job Programme ▪ Turnover to employment and education for newly arrived immigrants ▪ Turnover to employment and education for persons with disabilities ▪ Turnover to employment and education for persons born outside Europe <p>Focus on customers and professional manners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percent of employers that are satisfied with the service they received from the PES ▪ Employers that have had an adequate number of applicants in order to fill a vacancy ▪ Job referrals and proposals that jobseekers received when contacting the PES <p>Planning based on customer needs and the PES's</p>	

				<p>assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The employers' market share of the PES ▪ The share of participants in the JOB programme participating in workplace activities ▪ The share of participants in the UGA programme participating in workplace activities <p>Controlling unemployed receiving unemployment benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Follow up of job proposals ▪ Jobseekers' search area and obstacles <p>Good work environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health numbers <p>Commitment and common responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Developing operational reviews <p>Operate with given resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The budget outcome for the Appropriation Direction 1:1 ▪ The budget outcome for the Appropriation Directions 1:3, 1:4 and the Act on Establishment <p>Operate in a cost efficient manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The emission of carbon dioxide from business trips per full time equivalents 	
Switzerland	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rapid reintegration ▪ Prevent/reduce long-term unemployment ▪ Prevent/reduce benefit exhaustions ▪ Prevent/reduce re-registrations 	4	<p>The objectives are translated into a global indicator with the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average number of benefit days drawn by former beneficiaries (50%) ▪ Entrants to long-term unemployment divided by the number of persons who potentially could have become long-term unemployed (those who entered a new framework period 13 months ago) (20%) ▪ Number of persons with exhausted benefits divided by the number of persons who potentially could have been exhausted on benefits (those who entered a new framework period two years ago) (20%) ▪ Proportion of benefit recipients who re-register within 	

				4 months (10%)	
United Kingdom		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To reduce the duration of unemployment ▪ To reduce the amount of money lost through error and fraud <p>Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reducing the number of people on out of work benefits ▪ Reducing the proportion of children living in workless households ▪ Reducing the rate of disability poverty ▪ The gap between the employment rates for disabled people and the overall population ▪ Public opinion of DWP service levels ▪ DWP Productivity measure 	4 / 40 +	<p>The two primary operational objectives are turned into a series of quantifiable indicators for off-flows from benefits as a proportion of inflows at different milestones (e.g. 13, 26, 52 weeks etc). There is also a single measure of the value of money lost to fraud and error derived from a series of qualitative checks on a sample of benefit claims.</p> <p>In addition there is a very large number of quantitative operational indicators included in a 'scorecard' used to measure the performance of regions and districts.</p>	<p>In addition, evaluation research suggests that individual managers set quantitative proxy targets for frontline staff.</p>

Table 7: Data collection tools and practices

Systems and tools used to collect data		Use of data warehouse	Types of data collected
Austria	Data warehouse	Yes, centrally available	a) Balanced Scorecard: not more than 25 indicators (impact indicators, quality indicators; output indicators) b) Annual Labour Market Policy Objectives: not more than 8 (mainly impact indicators) c) data from the financial and human resources management systems, specific data from social security that are entered automatically plus the survey data of AMS customers and employees
Belgium (Flanders region)	Combine information about employment status of customers from different (third-party) databases with own registrations; use of database of national social security, customer database registering actions proposed by counsellor	Yes, this is currently being further developed	Quality indicators – satisfaction level of job seekers, employers, students, training participants, partners
Bulgaria	Internal data and sources are communicated to a central unit collecting data and establishing registers	No	Level of unemployment, announced vacancies in the primary labour market, placement of unemployed into jobs in the primary labour market, organized job fairs, including EURES job fairs, ALMPs, controlling activities, staff training, Roma inclusion
Denmark	The data is based on registrations from the municipalities' own registration systems, like WorkBase, Opera og Fasit, Ministry of Education and Immigration, National Statistics Office. Some of the data is then presented on Jobindsats.dk – which municipalities use to make their planning.	Yes	The Ministry of Employment sets annual goals for which each municipality will determine a broad set of indicators, the National Labour Market Authority (AMS) follows up
Estonia	Collected through different channels, no single IT system, Different software is used to make the queries to the databases (Discoverer Business	No	a) Impact indicators (labour market integration) b) Output indicators (access of employment services, participation active employment measures)

Systems and tools used to collect data		Use of data warehouse	Types of data collected
	Intelligence) and to analyse the data (STATA); evaluations via Snugit Software		c) Quality indicators (satisfaction index of job seekers and employees, quality of documents registered) d) Activity indicators
France			
Germany	A software called TN-Planning collects the data during the top down / bottom up planning process; management information software providing more graphic tools	Yes	8 indicators: ratio job-to-job integration to job-to-job customer; ratio of integrations to customer; duration of unemployment for customers with and without benefits, number of job vacancies filled, number of long-term integrations, satisfaction employers and job seekers
Hungary	Unemployment register and the vacancy database, graphic programme, Excel	Yes	Jobs, placements, services, number of persons entering into employment, ALMP's – indicators are broken down in more detailed indicators, customer satisfaction surveys
Lithuania	Activity managing system - reporting of each department, monitoring system - based on the official statistics data and the calculation of additional indicators from jobseekers' and job vacancies' database	No	Lithuanian Labour Exchange set goals and targets on an annual basis – the type of indicators varies depending on the goals.
Netherlands	Performance management data is available on national, regional, sub regional ('office') and individual employee level; 'Online Analytical Processing' (OLAP) is used to provide user determined tables.	Yes	A number of indicators are collected regarding different aspects: placements, use of services provided to job-seekers, transparency of vacancies, use of specific ALMP tools, services provided to young disabled jobseekers, services provided to employers, services of judicial department, efficiency indicators
Poland	Study published by Ministry of Labour on unemployment rates, its central registers containing data pertaining to the labour market, labour market institutions, projects, provided assistance and benefits, as well as data regarding job seekers, the	No	Indicators relate strongly to Europe 2020 targets: Auxiliary indicators recommended for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of specific courses of action, employment rates, educational attainment rates,

Systems and tools used to collect data		Use of data warehouse	Types of data collected
	unemployed, employers and job offers collected by PES; Software used: Syriusz Std application software; VLO Viator computer software for regional labour offices		
Slovenia	Management information software, data collected at local level is entered directly into the data warehouse	Yes – available in intranet	ALMP participation, placements, new registrations, long-term unemployed characteristics, vacancy monitor
Spain	Common Information System (SISPE), collecting in real time data from the 17 PES in each Autonomous Region. All of them jointly manage and update SISPE requirements, coordinated by the State Public Employment Service of Spain (SEPE).	Yes	Jobseekers, registered unemployment, benefits, subsidies and allowances, contracts, ALMP participation, ALMP services, vacancies, training programmes.
Sweden	The PES uses a data warehouse and a separate electronic system for collecting information (AIS). Satisfaction data is collected through regular qualitative interviews with randomly selected jobseekers and employers.	Yes	Basic demographic information about jobseekers, benefit record, participation in different ALMPs.
Switzerland	Unemployment insurance and REC have each one data collection system	Yes, available online for staff of supervisory bodies	4 main indicators: Average number of benefit days drawn by former beneficiaries; Entrants to long-term unemployment divided by the number of persons who potentially could have become long-term unemployed (those who entered a new framework period 13 months ago); Number of persons with exhausted benefits divided by the number of persons who potentially could have been exhausted on benefits (those who entered a new framework period two years ago); Proportion of benefit recipients who re-register within 4 months
United	Data warehouse; individual advisor system user input	Yes	Number of interviews that have taken place with submission to a vacancy, referral to a programme, or better off in work

Systems and tools used to collect data		Use of data warehouse	Types of data collected
Kingdom	on actions taken, client specific records		calculation (assessment by advisor of labour market financial incentive for client taking up a vacancy); Number of interviews arranged, proportion of scheduled appointments that took place, outcomes of interview; Number of appointments taking place within three days of first registration

Table 8: Comparison of Performance Information Sharing and Use

	Methods to communicate goals, indicators and targets to PES staff	Methods to communicate goals, targets, indicators to others	Methods used to share results of PES PM with others	Systems used to feed results into continuous improvement and learning of the PES
Austria	Intranet, newsletters, staff meetings, regular controlling of targets, performance related pay	PES Administrative Board – Ministries and Social Partners – dispose of tools to monitor targets, ‘long-term’ performance plan	Results are shared directly within the Administrative Board	Results of PM are subject to systematic controlling, exchange of best practice between offices, Management Assessment tool of central office to control regional performance
Belgium (Flanders region)	Annual business plan, quarterly report through Balanced Scoreboard	The PES Board of Management, consisting of social partners and independent experts, and the Minister of Work have to agree with the proposed targets.	Evaluation Report published by Ministry of Work; Quarterly reports by the PES Board of Management, specific evaluations can be ordered by the PES Board of Management	Quarterly reports on progress towards quantitative targets; network of experts from each service domain consisting of experts from local offices and head office advise on future activities in business plan; Steering Committee on Effectiveness formulate and communicate policy advice based on evaluations
Bulgaria	Each staff member has an annual action plan linked to the agencies and units goals	Monthly meetings with social partners at regional and local meetings, at the Head	Annual reports by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, the National	Good practice examples are shared at national and regional meetings, study

	Methods to communicate goals, indicators and targets to PES staff	Methods to communicate goals, targets, indicators to others	Methods used to share results of PES PM with others	Systems used to feed results into continuous improvement and learning of the PES
		Office there are meetings with the National Council for Promotion of Employment.	Council for Promotion of Employment and Commission for Labour and Social Policy – communicated to Parliament and social partners, reports are gathered on PES website	visits are organised, analysis of action plans to identify what worked well and why.
Denmark	Staff is involved in formulating targets and indicators, different ways at each individual PES, monthly national newsletter	Required by legislation, municipalities must engage with the local employment council and the employment region in the development of an employment plan and their performance audit	Collaboration is relatively institutionalised. Municipalities must engage with the local employment council and the employment region in their performance audit. Municipalities hold strategy seminars on challenges facing employment policy.	Web-based data base to share best practices with all the public, need to involve and engage all staff in design and management of PM system so that they will accept the findings and act on these, new evidence is disseminated through newsletter and knowledge site on PES website.
Estonia	Staff meetings, meeting with Management Board of PES, performance related interview	Social Partners and Ministries are involved in the Supervisory Board	Shared through the tripartite Supervisory Board	CAF self-evaluation model, monthly managers meeting to share best practices or discuss problematic issues, on site visit to other PES, central information days, heads of fields/service visit local and regional offices

	Methods to communicate goals, indicators and targets to PES staff	Methods to communicate goals, targets, indicators to others	Methods used to share results of PES PM with others	Systems used to feed results into continuous improvement and learning of the PES
Germany	Publication of the Board of Director's annual report – letter to employee	Central office publishes an annual report	Central office publishes an annual report	Benchmarking within clusters, identification of best practices
Hungary	Staff meeting on annual national plans, regional branch offices evaluate monthly their targets and benchmarks	Goals and performance indicator setting is done together with the ministry. There are no other stakeholders involved in this process, neither the social partners nor members of the civil society.	Indicators are set by in co-operation by several ministries and performance is shared in expert meetings and website	Expert meetings, regular consultation with senior managers, and presentations on international best practices; following CAF self-evaluation – quality development groups work on areas for improvement; creative work groups where members of PES can share ideas
Lithuania	Result based model – show staff directly their achievements and results, discussed with line manager and staff meetings	Minister approves Annual Action Plan. PES publishes action plans and results on website, replies to individual inquiries	Policymakers from the ministry organise analysis on specific topics via events which involve the PES.	Data and best practices of policy is discussed in work groups at central PES office, outcomes are widely disseminated; collective training sessions, meetings and regional coaches with relevant experience in the field help to improve performance
Netherlands	Intranet, warehouse	Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment is involved in	Conferences, stakeholder meetings, brochures	Quality programmes in which a selection of

	Methods to communicate goals, indicators and targets to PES staff	Methods to communicate goals, targets, indicators to others	Methods used to share results of PES PM with others	Systems used to feed results into continuous improvement and learning of the PES
		setting most important goals and targets. Other stakeholders are informed through yearly report	published on website	operational managers and employees have participated and audits
Poland	Conferences, meetings of staff of county and regional labour offices with an informal advisory body to the Minister for Labour, to discuss performance under annual national action plan; intranet and website, research publications are at disposal for staff	Ministry and social partners are involved in setting goals and targets.	Websites, conferences and thematic seminars, research publications	Best practice of ALMP measures are presented and widely discussed at the meetings of the county and regional labour office directors; development of pilot projects to find out new methods and tools for ALMPs; Ministry of Labour and Social Policy supports labour offices by providing specialist knowledge, developing methods and tools which support work with customers and the provision of labour market services – such as IT tools, research and training
Slovenia	Progress on targets is communicated via intranet, data is discussed on a monthly basis	PES prepares reports for Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs	All the information and data are shared with MoLFSA (quarterly) and presented at meetings of the ESS Council, where the social	Head office has regular meetings with middle managers where best practices in specific areas are discussed; regular

	Methods to communicate goals, indicators and targets to PES staff	Methods to communicate goals, targets, indicators to others	Methods used to share results of PES PM with others	Systems used to feed results into continuous improvement and learning of the PES
			partners are present.	regional staff meetings; specific training to improve performance
Spain	Staff are notified of the goals, indicators and targets in meetings in which targets are set and management is planned.	The objectives, goals and indicators are communicated through the institutional participation bodies: General Council of the National Employment System, Executive Central Committee, Management Committee of the Directorate of the Public Employment Service and the Coordination and Monitoring Committee of the Information System of the Public Employment Services.	The information is shared through the National Employment System tools and is available to other public and private entities and bodies or employment market studies.	Involvement of all levels of staff in PM, use of coaching teams in the provincial offices, training for staff.
Sweden	They are 'cascaded' from national level to the 'marketing areas' or localities and then to individual offices.	Some stakeholders take part in meetings where presentations are given.	The analysis division prepares a Labour Market Report, and other reports on an ad hoc basis.	Publication of reports, good practice examples shared on the intranet and performance dialogues.

	Methods to communicate goals, indicators and targets to PES staff	Methods to communicate goals, targets, indicators to others	Methods used to share results of PES PM with others	Systems used to feed results into continuous improvement and learning of the PES
Switzerland	Cantonal authorities share goal achievement via press release or online tool, regional PES benchmarking results are shared via intranet	Annual benchmark is published each year as a press release – widely discussed in newspapers		Best practices are shared through one day conferences, other models of senior manager exchange are currently being tested: managers of employment centres with similar labour market contexts are invited to discuss relevant topics in an on-going process.
United Kingdom	Website, intranet, weekly meetings	Business plans are publicly available on PES website	PES does not tend to consult external stakeholders on process changes; jobseekers/employers are however always involved in trials and pilots as part of substantial changes to process, all data is available on PES website	LEAN management techniques to encourage all staff to consider process and systems and suggest enhancements; Front-line staff user input is therefore considered at weekly meetings to assess where wasteful and non-value added activities can be reformed/removed, this contributes to greater PES cost/efficiency and productivity.

6 References

- Ecorys (2012). *PES performance measurement systems and geographical labour mobility: Final Report*. London and Rotterdam, Ecorys.
- European Commission (2012a). *Performance Management in Public Employment Services. PES-2-PES Mutual Learning Programme*. Brussels, European Commission. Author: Alex Nunn
- European Commission (2012b). *Summary of the Peer Review on "Evaluation of Labour Market Policies and Programmes: the use of data-driven analysis"*. Mutual Learning Programme Peer Review. Brussels, European Commission.
- European Commission (2012c). *Summary of the Peer Review on Evaluation of Labour Market Policies and Programmes: Methodology and Practice*. Brussels, European Commission.
- European Commission (2012d). *Public Employment Services' Contribution to EU 2020: PES 2020 Strategy Output Paper*. Brussels, European Commission DG Employment.
- European Commission (2012e). *PES to PES Dialogue Report 2012 Dissemination Conference: Results from the second year of the PES to PES Dialogue programme*. Brussels, European Commission. Authors: H.Tubb and E.Murray
- Grubb, D. (2004). "Principles for the Performance Management of Public Employment Services." *Public Finance & Management* **4**(3): 352-398.
- Johnson, S. and A. Nunn (2006). *Evaluation of the Job Outcome Target Pilots: synthesis report*. Leeds, Corporate Document Services.
- Kaltenborn, B., N. Wielage, et al. (2011). *Zielsteuerung in der Arbeitsverwaltung - ein europäischer Vergleich*. Berlin, Ramboll Management.
- Kaplan, R. S. and D. P. Norton (1992). "The Balanced Scorecard--Measures That Drive Performance." *Harvard Business Review* **70**(1): 71-79.
- Newton, B., N. Meager, et al. (2012). *Work Programme evaluation: Findings from the first phase of qualitative research on programme delivery*. Norwich, DWP.
- Nunn, A., T. Bickerstaffe, et al. (2010). *International Review of Performance Management Systems in Public Employment Services*. Norwich, HMSO.
- Nunn, A. and D. Devins (2012). *Process Evaluation of the Jobcentre Plus Performance Management Framework* Norwich, HMSO.
- Nunn, A., D. Devins, et al. (2011). *The Role of Skills from Worklessness to Sustainable Employment with Progression*. Wath-upon-Deerne, UK Commission for Employment and Skills.
- Nunn, A., D. Devins, et al. (2012, Forthcoming). *Evaluation of the Performance Management Framework for Jobcentre Plus*. Norwich, HMSO.
- Rees, J., R. Taylor, et al. (2013). *Does sector matter? Understanding the experiences of providers in the Work Programme*. Birmingham, Third Sector Research Centre.
- Weishaupt, J. T. (2010). *Governing Public Employment Services: Recent Trends in Social Partnership and Privatization*, University of Mannheim.