

Scuola Superiore della Pubblica Amministrazione
Graduate School of Public Administration

**International Symposium
on the theme:**

"Performance-based Management
in Public Administration
and its Training Implications"

Caserta, Palazzo Reale, 24-26 September 1997

Background paper

by
Franco Archibugi
Graduate School of Public Administration

***Performance-based Management
in Public Administration and its Training
Implications***

- 1. Problems and Motivations**
- 2. The New Needs for Performance-based Manageriality**
- 3. The New Professional Figure of the PA Manager**
- 4. What are the Principles and the Main Learning Fields for the New Professionalism?**
- 5. Learning the Functionality of the Public System**
 - 5.1 An Educational Programme on the Institutional Functionality of the Public System*
 - 5.2 An Educational Programme on the Economic Functionality of the Public System*
 - 5.3 An Educational Programme on the Socio-cultural Functionality of the Public System*
- 6. The Learning of the Performance-oriented Management Capacity**
 - 6.1 On the Capacity of Decision-taking Management*
 - 6.2 On the Capacity of Human Resources Management*
 - 6.3 On the Capacity of Management and Reform of Regulation*
 - 6.4 On the Capacity of Budget Management and Financial Management*
 - 6.5 On the Capacity of Evaluation and Management of Performance and Results*
- 7. New Supporting Knowledge**
 - 7.1 The Knowledge of the Main Public Policies*
 - 7.2 Some Technical and Notional Support for Management Learning*
- 8. The Institutional and Operational Modifications for the New Performance-based Manageriality**
- 9. Conclusions**

Performance-based Management in Public Administration and its Training Implications

1. Problems and Motivations

In recent times, throughout the world, and in particular the Western world, new interest has arisen in creating a new concept of performance-based management and, consequently, in new managerial skills in the figure of the public administration manager.

Starting perhaps from what has occurred in the case of the manager of private economic activities and businesses, for which a new specific professionalism has been conceived that is independent from the various technological activity sectors¹, in the world of public administration as well, which has been until now linked to the tight jurisdiction of administrative and public law, and, in the technological sectors (e.g. public works, health, finances, education, etc.), to specific technical competence, there has developed more and more the need for a "*manageriality*" that is specific, but at the same time unitary and multi-disciplinary, and independent from the various sectors engaged in public administration itself².

Thus schools of public administration are proliferating which provide new contents and abilities, although in this specific field many uncertainties and a pluralism of ideas and experiences are current.

All this is stimulating and demanding an innovative process in the practice and design of training activities destined for future managers of public administration, which nobody yet considers to be satisfactorily acquired.

This need is accompanied moreover by an even vaster one for innovative processes in many other training activities, which are under discussion internationally with regard to their scope and contents, for the purpose of adapting their traditional training structures to the new professionalism which social and technical development require³.

¹ With the development of specific training activities, and with the proliferation of university or post-university business schools and diplomas, or masters, which have been very successful both in the business and education world.

² The literature on the theme of professionalisation in public management is abundant; we can mention among the more recent works: Stever (1988), Salamon (1989), Cigler (1990), Pollit (1990), Osborne & Gaebler (1992), King & Roberts (1992), Mascarenhas (1993), Levin M.A. (1994).

³ An example of this are the numerous programmes promoted by the European Union in the training sector, which are intended in fact to facilitate, on the scale of the Union countries, a transnational exchange of experience and common reflection.

Transnational collaboration in the field of public administration training is still very limited⁴. The fact that public administration in any country depends on highly diversified administrative orders, as any comparative conventional analysis makes clear, has discouraged and rendered the comparison difficult. Nevertheless, the ascertainment of the obvious differences has had an unjustified prevailing effect on the underlying existence of problems, and consequent methods of approach, which are more and more common and tending towards actual homologation, in spite of different juridical-administrative orders. The persistent mentality aimed at underlining the formal specificity and diversity has meant that the pressing substantial problems of efficiency, performance-based organisation, actual and operational coherence between means and ends, saving of real resources etc., have been neglected; i.e. those requirements which characterize as a priority the operability of the private sector and have led to the success of private manageriality in comparison to public manageriality.

Obviously it would not be wise to limit oneself to a comparison of efficiency between the two worlds. It seems that between public and private manageriality there are such important differences in role, aims, organisation, and methods, that a mere comparison would be somewhat lacking in common sense. But the idea itself of manageriality in the public sector is having difficulty in getting through. And this in fact represents a serious negative factor which no difference could justify.

2. The New Needs for Performance-based Manageriality

One of the main reasons, and thus one of the specific tasks of reflection, research, and experimentation on the part of experts in public administration seems to have become the delineation of a *new and different type of manageriality in public administration* which could assume what is possible and useful to assume from the private sector; and could translate in autonomous and different ways what is not possible - given the substantial differences - to assume from the private sector⁵.

There is no doubt that particular impulse has been given to this movement in thinking, research, and study, by the work (concluded in

⁴ Not even the OECD (Public Management Service - PUMA) - which nevertheless represents an interesting clearing house of experience and debate on new methods of public management - has faced adequately the subject of the training of the public operator. Neither does the European Union contemplate in its agenda the training of the public manager.

⁵ There is a vast amount of literature on this subject which it is not possible to list here. Among the more recent works are: Wilson J.Q. (1980 and 1987), Barzelay (1992), Bennis (1993), Hunt (1994) and many others. See also a specific intervention on this subject by the American Vice-President Al Gore (1994).

1993) of the American Government Commission, presided over by Vice-President Al Gore, for a reform of administrative methods. This work was called the "National Performance Review" (NPR)⁶. But we should also mention that some precise signals towards these reforms had developed throughout the 1980s (if not before), in connection with the debated crisis of public budget, welfare state overload, and the worrying increase in the public debt in all Western countries⁷. Also worthy of note were the more marked signals of reform in the whole system of public affairs economic management had in the 1960s and '70s with attempts to introduce rational methods of political decision-taking adopting planning processes and evaluation of results techniques⁸.

Signals have arisen from the universities that these concerns are spreading. Numerous university institutions are arising with the purpose of developing ad hoc research in public management⁹. And perhaps, beyond

⁶ Previously in a report by the Brookings Institute (Kettl, 1994) it was said that "the National Performance Review has taken on three different meanings: the six-months survey of federal management, conducted by hundreds of federal managers during the middle of 1993; the report that survey produced, *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less* (Report of the NPR, see Al Gore, 1993); and the effort that followed to put the report's recommendation into effect". It can now be said that for the "NPR" the third meaning has prevailed, in part because it has become the name of permanent federal activity and a special office of the White House.

⁷ We should mention the report, again produced in the United States, of the National Commission on the Public Service (Volcker, 1989); a document on the "revitalisation" of federal management of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA, 1983), and the report which is now considered a "classic" by Charles H. Levine and Rosslyn S. Kleman (1986) also for the National Academy of Public Administration. For the older among us, a large part of these "modern" revivals for the introduction of rationalisation and efficiency measurement methods in public administration give a pathetic sensation of "deja vu". It is probable that the same (amongst whom the writer is included) often hold back from saying what they think in order not to seem pessimistic, or to discourage younger and more hopeful impulses, and in order to express an incurable desire for improvement. However we must not underestimate the harm that could be caused by any mistification brought about by a lack of memory of the facts. What we should perhaps recall is that "in the first year, the NPR has proven one of the most lively management reforms in American history"; that "public support has been overwhelming" and "the NPR has unquestionably generated an enormous amount of activity, enthusiasm, and positive effort" (quotations from the afore-mentioned report by the Brookings Institute, p. 1 and 2. This Institute is external to the NPR and normally objective and prudent).

⁸ For an overall evaluation of these by now old experiences, we could recommend reading some historical works representative of the same, such as those by Novick (1965, 1973) and Wildavski (1964, reprinted up to 1979a). For the latter, see also the same author's critical revisitation in a work on the art and craft of policy analysis (1979). Another case of old but continuous attention to the problems of results evaluation of public policies is that of "The Urban Institute" of Washington, created in 1968, in the full flourishing of these studies on planning, by the prestigious figure of William Gorham, and which throughout the decline of the 1980s persisted successfully in dealing with these matters in particular on the state and local scale. See, for example, the numerous works by Hatry and associates (see the Bibliographical References).

⁹ The Planning Studies Centre in Rome manages an "Information System for Planning Science" (with a contribution from the Italian National Research Council). The Centre has collected and analysed (directly and via Internet) a wide range of academic programmes and courses of European and American Graduate schools on: "public policies", "public management", "public affairs", "policy

the enthusiasm which particular "reforms" may provoke for limited periods, the way of ensuring stable change in the mind and culture of public administration management is that of preparing its operators, and in particular the managers, with a personal capacity (knowledge and methods) in operating and introducing innovations; in other words the improvement of the managerial quality of its operators¹⁰.

In the world of official Government¹¹ training institutions (where these exist) as well, which are normally aimed at responding in a somewhat passive way to the training needs expressed by current public administration (and which are always a bit behind with respect to the real training needs which are emerging outside these), there are signals of a relative ferment and a certain attention to research in new contents and new training curricula¹².

Before discussing the questions about the new contents for training programmes for the public manager, it would be a good idea to critically pose some general questions, on the actual needs for performance-based management, and its motivations.

sciences" etc. (PSC, 1997a and b). This information will be made available on a PSC Web page. For the moment, information can be requested at psc@iol.it.

¹⁰ We should recall that the introduction of methods of analysis and evaluation for operational programmes in public administration (which were widely promoted from the 1960s onwards: the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System) failed mainly because of the limited formative support given by the universities or the public institutions for training activities for such methods. Relating to these methods and period we can refer at random to a few works such as Quade (1976) or Novick, already mentioned (1965 and 1973). Attempts were made with little success to apply these methods not only in the USA but also in several European countries.

¹¹ We are obviously referring to some European schools that are directly dependent on public administration such as: the French ENA, the British Civil Service College, the Spanish INAP, the Dutch ROI, the Greek NCPA, the Danish DSPA, the Austrian VAB, the Italian SSPA and others. See for more information a comparative analysis carried out by the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA, 1994).

¹² The Italian Graduate School of Public Administration (SSPA) intends to bring itself into line with these new novelties and profitably join the network of contacts and scientific cooperation which are developing in this direction. On the one hand it has intended to get into line with the new administration needs as expressed through the documentation gathered on an international scale for instance by the OECD Public Management Service (PUMA). On the other hand, it has realized that some programmes of research and development of the European Union, aimed at collecting proposals for information and training exchanges in the field of innovation in training, may be used also for adaptation to the needs of new professionalism in the sector of public administration.

To do this the Graduate School of Public Administration has promoted contacts with a selected number of institutions of research and training operating in the field, and with a selected number of experts operating in this direction.

In order to make such contacts as rapid and efficient as possible, it has promoted this Symposium to which it has invited a number of international institutions and personalities who are well-known in this field and asked them to exemplify their experience and points of view on the subject of the Symposium: innovation in public administration professionalism and its implications for training.

In the meantime the School has developed new teaching outlines for the inauguration of a new Master for Upper Management for which it has received a mandate from the Italian Government. This background paper is largely inspired by the approach to this Master.

It cannot be denied that Public Administration (and consequently its civil service officers) has been passing through a crisis without precedent for some time now, in almost all advanced industrial countries. It would be opportune to take into consideration initially this fact in itself, which is albeit controversial.

The opinion has become widespread - whether justly motivated or otherwise - that in relation to the productive world which surrounds it and in which it operates, which is subject to rapid industrial economic transformation, PA has remained bound and caught up in old ways of operating and managing.

Why are the effects of these transformations on PA not apparently visible, in the obvious form of the employment crisis, as has taken place in the industrial sector. We can discuss two explanations:

1. because the mechanisms of the market economy which are dominant in the industry do not translate immediately the effect of innovations, and the notable increases in productivity in the productive sectors, into employment terms, and thus the need to readapt the work force is not so explicitly felt in this sector as in other sectors of the economy;
2. because among the transformations in course there is the relatively more important growth, in the overall demand, on the part of the citizens, for goods and services, until now defined as "public", which has provoked an employment expansion without precedent in PA. This has, so to speak, cushioned, and therefore masked, the needs for employment adaptation in PA, in comparison to what has happened in other productive sectors of society.

The first reason could be explained considering the influence of many factors: first of all, the transformations underway in the industrial world are linked substantially to the evolution of physical and quantitative productivity, and thus are not the same as those of the PA world, which are linked instead to an operational efficiency not measurable in quantitative terms but rather in "qualitative" ones, which are assessed in completely different ways from those used to measure quantitative productivity in industry. As is known, the measurement of output in PA has been until now difficult to conceptualize, and the progress obtained in methods used for measurement has not yet been transposed into PA in practical data collection such as in industry.

Apart from the common capacity (on the part of industry and PA) to absorb innovation in information technology and telematics, which undoubtedly bring to PA noteworthy increases in "quantitative" productivity, the majority of the PA services (likewise for many private, educational, cultural and health services) are not susceptible to rapid and

important changes in physical-quantitative productivity (service or output per man-hour), with the introduction of new machines, but only with improvements in quality. Neither in PA is there (unlike in the greater part of the industrial "private" world) the interest of the entrepreneur (who is urged on by competition) to translate technological innovation into an improvement in the combination of productive factors by eliminating obsolete and superfluous factors, such as a not adequately requalified workforce. The demand for requalification therefore is much less felt in PA than in industry both for structural reasons and for labour market ones; but it would be wrong to deduce from this that the *needs for requalification* are less important or felt.

The second reason, that of the absolute increase in society's need and demand for public services could be connected to the fact that, in contemporary industrial society, we are living with a certain saturation of the demand for tangible goods, and that the demand is expanding for "intangible" or cultural goods, which have been so far guaranteed by PA. This aspect, which has increased greatly society's needs for PA services, and which has led to an unbearable *overload* (exacerbated moreover by the existence of a "democratic" regime, i.e. by a "vote market"), has placed the PA system (both from the financing and organisational point of view) in a crisis situation in which there is an objective need for transformation and transition. Rather than increase its role of provider of services, it must increase its role in the "management", regulation, programming and encouragement of the substitution of the public sector with the private one, wherever possible:

- both in the commercial sector (to the extent that conditions for profitability exist for private entrepreneurs);
- and in the non-commercial, and nevertheless independent sector (non-profit voluntary cooperation) to the extent that there is the initial or permanent need for public support, but always in less burdensome terms than direct production.

We may wonder whether these different effects of societal transformation underway may determine that the needs for transformation within PA with regard to the "workforce" justify (much more than in industry) a requalification of the *management*, and *upper management*. And whether it is correct to claim as a consequence that it is necessary to introduce, rather than mere technological innovations (always to be hoped for and always possible, and which replace a *medium-low workforce*), *new criteria and new managerial and policy-oriented capacities*.

Therefore we can ask whether there has matured today in PA - as previously in industry - the need for a new specific *managerial*

professionalism, independent from the specific competence of this or that branch of administration; a professionalism which is to a large extent (as in industry) inter-changeable, but which (much more than in industry) is capable of dealing with the plurality and complexity of criteria (or objective-functions) by which any PA programme is governed.

3. The New Professional Figure of the PA Manager

As is known, industry today is benefitted by a vast range of training initiatives of a managerial type (management "masters" are rife today). And yet, faced with these developments it is still correct to ask whether the training of managers ad hoc for PA is not somewhat lacking.

And we can ask furthermore; should not the PA manager - whilst adopting the common spirit of manageriality - bring specific capacities that are able to face the characteristic civil service problems which are very different from those of industry? and should they not be able to face the typical needs for transformation of the role of this service in the "post-industrial" society of today? In other words does not the new situation create a new demand for qualified labour in the complex sphere of the management of government agencies and organizations at any level and sector?

And if this is the case, to what extent do current training activities respond with a suitable supply to this new demand?

The impression is had that up until now, managerial roles in this direction were carried out in a rather traditional way, or by means of the acquisition of *sectorial technical abilities*, or by means also of an *administrative conception of a prevalently juridical type*, and that a typically performance-based managerial training has been lacking. Can these limitations and/or deficiencies be removed?

A possible conclusion to a positive response to these questions could be that the reality of the breadth of activity assumed by operational public activities is pushing towards a more accentuated "*professionalisation*" in the field of *performance-based management*, with the creation of a new "*professional figure*" that is *sectorially workable*, as in the large private sectors.

This educational activity that is oriented towards the preparation of this kind of new professionalism in public management¹³, deserves, however, a period of reflection, study and experimentation for numerous reasons.

¹³ Some indications for a wider analysis of professionalisation to be developed in the public organisation sector are in a work by Benveniste (1987).

In the first place, these new needs are the result of developments that are *homogeneous in part*, on the scale of the various public management typologies in various countries, and *in part dissimilar*, according to legal, administrative and cultural systems, etc., that remain strong in various countries even among the European Union states. These diversities also concern the differing stages of economic development both in the world and in the European regions.¹⁴ A programme of educational activities, that is capable of forming new human energies in each country or of readapting old qualifications or work experiences that have become obsolete, needs a trial or confrontation period on a trans-national scale, to progress towards a useful and efficient "minimum common denominator".

Moreover, a formative activity of such an innovative character, deserves to be begun with an eye to the higher and more qualified levels of these managers, who could subsequently be made promoters of further initiatives on more particular scales, of more defined typologies, and for more specific "national" and regional managements.

4. What are the Principles and the Main Learning Fields for the New Professionalism?

The first matter for discussion could be some of the informing principles of an educational planning of the new PA managers. A proposed taxonomy of these principles could be the following:

a. Peculiarity

The principle of *peculiarity* concerns the fact that this training must be *exclusively* aimed at the training of the new professional figure of public administration manager, and nothing else. Should this principle be considered?

b. Flexibility

The principle of *flexibility* concerns the fact that this training must be aimed at forming a manager who can be used in *any* operational sector of PA, without distinction. Should this principle as well be considered?

c. Post-scholasticism

The principle of *post-scholasticism* concerns the fact that this formation is assumed at the end of an ordinary advanced curriculum of

¹⁴ In the European Union, for example, all this hinders the reinforcement of a major social and economic cohesion, that the Union Treaty declares to pursue.

studies, whether of a university sort or other. Is this principle to be assumed?

d. *Homogeneity*

The principle of *homogeneity* concerns the fact that in comparison to its purpose (the capacity of the PA manager), such formation provides a *compact corpus of know-how without internal diversity*, apart from that which refers to the various academic bases of the participants.

From the said principles, some operational deductions could be drawn, which should be borne in mind in the teaching programme of schools aimed at the training of new PA managers.

From the principle of *peculiarity*, it could be deduced that we must place ourselves in a position of indifference in comparison to the training origin of the participants, and to any professional direction alternative to that of PA manager. From this it follows also that the study programme should not be able to count on any basic propedeutic training in a specific way to the one imparted, unless that which is common to all accesses to higher education.

At the most, as will be better explained later, in parallel with the main and unitary training anticipated in the programme, complementary courses of a university type could be imagined (already circumscribed, as will be seen, as instrumental to the main course) which the participants would be able to choose *ad libitum* in relation to their personal study background and the gaps felt to exist concerning unstudied subjects. These complementary courses as well should be constructed on the basis of conventional disciplines, but also in the essential form that could be useful as a background that is common to all participants without distinction.

From the principle of *flexibility* it is deduced that the School Programmes would have substantially to leave aside the operational destinations in which the participants may find themselves operating. And thus it becomes indifferent whether the programme is built on the basis of consultations about needs that single administrations may express or manifest.

From the principle of *post-scholasticism* it can be deduced that the educational programme will leave aside the various professionalisms that may be exercised within the various public administrations, and adds - perhaps to these professions, that are more or less well represented - an absolutely new and inexistent *quid* in these professions: *manageriality*.

From the principle of *homogeneity*, we can deduce that a programme must be judged by its internal coherence and consequentiality, in relation to the peculiar manageriality sought, and not by the presence of

this or that discipline which may be considered necessary and/or opportune in the training of the new manager.

Such principles are strongly "interconnected". Far from manifesting the minimum logical contradictoriness, between themselves, they manifest a strong character of interdependency: respect for one serves also for that of the other.

These principles could represent a first set of subjects to be discussed. They would obviously condition strongly the concrete choices which may be made in the planning of a specific curriculum for the future PA manager.

Discussion on fields of specific educational programming for the public manager could be oriented along two guidelines, which may be considered the two faces of the same need:

1. the professional destination of the new manager, thus his "*professional figure*";
2. the general and unique function to which he must respond: *decision undertaking or undermaking or simply management* (from the technical point of view).

With regard to the latter, it would be opportune to point out that by "decision management", reference is not only made to "decision-taking", with the relative techniques, but also to the capacity to "manage" or implement them, with relative techniques; and, furthermore, reference is made to the fact that the final decision is that of the political decision-taker.

Here discussion could involve another field of training: to what extent should such training concern political staff as well, that are normally responsible for public management.

The fact that, in democratic regimes at least, access to political representative life cannot be the subject of a "specific professionalism" makes it difficult to organise training activity that is explicitly aimed at political personnel. At the most political personnel could be the subject of interest of a specific "on the job" training that aims to update, during the exercise (contingent in nature) of the political-representative role¹⁵.

Consequently, the professionalism to be discussed concerns the sphere of public administration, i.e. a professional and technical activity, which occasionally, but not necessarily, may coincide also with roles of

¹⁵ On the training of the decision-taker, of a purely political origin (corresponding in democratic systems to the elected political personnel) there has developed an important discussion in policy sciences. One of the most influential authors in this field has been Yehezkel Dror, by whom we will quote some recent works, such as one of 1987, in a collection of works on "advising the rulers" (Dror, 1987a), or a paper "school for rulers" (Dror, s.d).

political representation, but which is anchored to a career: i.e. that of the public manager. The possibility of coincidence of political roles with administrative ones and thus also of a coincidence of the training and didactic contents under discussion is irrelevant for the purposes of the latter, since such contents (whatever they consist of) are the same, and will be utilized by the manager or as a support for political decision-taking (for such support it is technically responsible), or for those decisions which it could assume as a manager delegated (explicitly or implicitly) by the political decision-taker, or in the case in which he or she carries out a function which is also political¹⁶.

Coming back to the fields (or contents) of the didactic training of the public manager, and in the limits of the pre-selected fields - the *managerial capacity* of the participant - the discussion could examine these from two main *viewpoints*, which could give rise also to two groups of teaching material:

1. the first viewpoint would concern the *environment* in which the public manager is destined to work and which fundamentally conditions his or her decisions and actions;
2. the second would concern the *operationality* which the public manager should be able to ensure working in this environment, in the taking of decisions and actions.

Following this bipartition, two wide fields of learning (and relative teaching) could be selected that are necessary and specific for the public manager:

1. the first concerns the learning - for the public manager - *how the "public system" functions*, from all points of view, which represents the *operational environment* of the public manager;
2. the second concerns the learning - for the public manager - of "*know-how*" in the various main aspects in which any decision and action is presented in most cases.

In the *first* viewpoint and in the *first* field of learning, public information should be imparted to the aspiring public manager relative to the *functionality of the public system*, in such a way as to frame the

¹⁶ The limitations on our Symposium, due to the nature itself of the School and its mission, do not diminish the importance of the question of how the future manager could act as an Advisor of political personnel. The exercise of a function as advisor of the decision taker gives the public manager the capacity to perceive fully the functional limits of the policy (where these exist). For a vaster idea of the problem which is outside the limits of the scope of this Background Paper, it would be useful to consult a series of contributions by Yehezkel Dror which would deserve greater diffusion and discussion (Dror, 1987b, 1988, 1990, 1991).

management problems of the second part in a suitable cognitive and informative general framework.

The *second* viewpoint, and the *second* field of learning which is of an essentially technical nature, should develop the decision-making and managerial capacities proper of the participants, dealing directly with a) in a first set of teaching, the problems and objectives of management of the public system in its general characteristics, and b) in a second group, the most important methods and techniques connected to managerial capacity.

5. Learning the Functionality of the Public System

The first learning field, which concerns the functionality of the public system, will have to make known this functionality from various aspects and points of view.

These points of view have something to do with the conventional separation of knowledge, which are often assumed as the basis of a mix of educational programmes of an interdisciplinary type. However, we can collect all these points of view in three main approximate categories, which could be called: *institutional*, *economic* and *socio-cultural*.

This does not mean that in this proposed taxonomy, the three groups remain separate and totally independent. On the contrary, it is highly probable that they will strongly intertwine, and integration is greatly advisable when dealing with these subjects. We will nevertheless outline in three different programmes the set of teaching fields for the three viewpoints¹⁷.

5.1 *An Educational Programme on the Institutional Functionality of the Public System*

The first type of functionality of the public system, in which the public manager must become expert is - as we have said - its *institutional* functionality. He or she must in other words know the public system well, in its various bodies, jurisdictional processes, history, rules and operational organisation, as well as, obviously, its current disfunctioning¹⁸.

¹⁷ These three programmes could be inserted in various study programmes in a separate way, in relation to the study backgrounds of the participants. This will have to be evaluated case by case, and programme by programme.

¹⁸ Would it not therefore be a good idea to integrate the conventional descriptions of modern constitutional and administrative orders, with some critical material on institutional disfunctioning? (For example, with the ideas given in works such as those by Poulantzas (1976), Ripley & Franklin (1984), Suleiman (1984), Crozier (1987), etc. ?)

Therefore, what can the contents of a learning (and relative teaching) programme be, for the public manager, in the functioning of the public system from the institutional viewpoint? And how much does policy count in its functioning?

And what innovations, in this teaching, may be proposed on the basis of a renewed reflection in the light of the demands of a new emerging professionalism, and the principles for the formation of the same (which have been listed above)?

The question may be presented in a different way. Since the institutional system is that which assumes above all the outlines of a juridical competence, how should, for the typical training of the new public manager, the traditional teaching of public law, the history of law, constitutional law, environmental law, and the administrative law, in force in each country, be imparted? And what should the role be of a vision of internationally "comparative" law? and that of a vision in which national law is placed in a functional relationship with the emerging "international" law (commercial, environmental, "civil rights" laws etc.)? and that which is emerging on a world scale with UN law, past and *in fieri*, or at the European Union scale? And how should knowledge of law be proposed to the new public manager in the operational terms of the difference between *condito* law and *condendo* law?

On this latter point, we can ask whether the future public manager's learning of the functioning of institutions should not be extended to include critical analyses not only of what today is the prevalent public constitutional and administrative order, albeit in its multiple various manifestations (provided by comparative law), but also a discussion on the possible radical reforms of the same in order to bring it into line with new governance needs, that have not yet emerged in the historical development of our democratic societies. For example, we can refer to the modalities in which the citizens could participate in political (economic and social) choice in ways that are more direct than those permitted by current parliamentary representation, by methods of telematic consultation. And we could refer to the forms on the basis of which parliament, and through it, the citizens, may be "informed" much more intensely and "globally" about the systemic interdependencies (or overall scenarios) linked to their choices. There is in fact a "technological" component in (socioeconomic and environmental) planning science which has its both constitutional and procedural effects. The public manager should be aware of these and be able to manage them. Should not this be a subject (completely innovative *per se*) included in the new manager's training programme.

Finally, all this should be known and seen, as part of a general system with which it is functionally interdependent, even from the merely

institutional point of view (interrelated obviously with the other viewpoints which we will discuss).

From the institutional viewpoint (the first viewpoint posed), knowledge of this system cannot be separated from that of its relationship with the private system (private organisations and law) and with all the intermediate and mixed institutions which lie somewhere between the public and private system.

But to what extent must the learning of such relations be developed in a programme for the public manager?

5.2 *An Educational Programme on the Economic Functionality of the Public System*

The functionality of the public system from the economic profile is the second set of learning which should be obtained by an educational programme for the public manager.

The economic functionality of the public system as well (and even more than the institutional functionality) may be understood when related to the economic and general social system. In fact, the public economic system is more easily understood if firstly the public economy is inserted in the circuit of the general economic process. This relationship should be seen in its historical dynamic as well, in each country, in relation to the great stages of economic development of each.

The economic circuit is represented by the economic-financial flows which develop between the great acting sectors (aggregates) of the general economic system: households, firms, non-commercial and non-profit organisations (today increasingly important) and, in fact, the state and the government, which constitute the "public sector".

Naturally, particular attention should be given to the typical working of the public economic system, its income, outgoings, its "products" and costs, and in general the annual and pluriennial budget of its programmes. Particular attention should be placed in this case:

- both on the problems of *community income* (with particular regard for the effects of taxation policies on the private sector)
- and on the problems of *outgoings* (the problems of the constant increase in public spending, the rigidity of costs, the evaluation of results, etc.)
- and on the general problems of expenditure choices, which have never been systematically introduced even in the advanced and democratic countries, and which are a general projection of the problems of choice and selection of the programmes at the operational scale which interests

the public manager, and the most advanced methods and techniques of management which should be learnt (see Para. 6).

Since these subjects are those which are normally dealt with in conventional courses in economic policy, we should discuss how and to what extent the specificity of an educational programme for the public manager should revisit and reconstruct the subject or utilize the schemes commonly proposed to date.

In this part of the learning programme for the public manager, there should also be defined the field and study of the increasing relationship of the problems of economic policy and public sector economics with the European (community) dimension and the international one (globalisation) of the functioning of a national public system.

Finally we should not neglect understanding to what extent it is opportune that, in the training of the public manager, analysis of a large part of the theorems of public economics should be included. These have developed greatly in modern economic theory, with very debatable cognitive results. This means reflection on the efficiency of policies:

- for the *allocation* of public means (in the various intervention sectors: school, home, environment, culture, etc.),
- *stabilisation* (the possible effects of the structure variation of some interventions both in economic policy, and external events - for example, prices - which require the use of economic policy instruments),
- *redistribution* (efficiency relative to measures aimed at mitigating or eliminating the phenomena of poverty, the effects of welfare state overloading costs, possible alternatives to public spending, etc.),
- and, finally, *regulation* (reasons and risks of regulation; expensive and non-expensive regulation; direct and indirect effects both of regulation and deregulation; effect of "privatisation", etc.)¹⁹.

We can ask to what extent we should delve into these theoretical reflections in the training of the public manager. In fact they:

- create positive familiarity with the interdependence of economic phenomena, on the one hand

¹⁹ Among a vast conventional literature available on the analysis of economic policy problems, I would indicate two texts which are particularly close to the teaching options discussed here for PA managers: one in French by Xavier Greffe (1994), and one in Italian by Nicola Acocella (1994), but which is currently being translated for the Cambridge Univ. Press. (1997).

- whilst, on the other, do so a) with a limited operational generality, b) with a debatable level of abstract axiomaticness; and c) without a "decision-oriented" approach, and which is thus far from the practical operationalness of public operators.

Therefore if the functioning of the public system (in its relations with the private system as well) seems to constitute an indispensable cognitive condition for the public manager, it is probable that its learning should not get confused in theoretical matters (that are subordinate to various hypotheses and simplifying assumptions), but would more profitably concentrate on single sectorial policies (which we will discuss in the Para. 7). Also the manager could be better assisted (in his or her decision-taking processes) by the more concrete analyses and evaluations of programmes for which he will have to learn techniques and procedures (see Para. 6). It is through and relating to those techniques and procedures that that he or she could verify (case by case, and taking into consideration the incumbent particulars) the relations that the theory thinks of "theorising", i.e. of generalising.

In other words, if economic theories - learnt as knowledge of the environment in which the managerial decisions are made - risk being defective both per se, and as the background for operational decisions - programme analyses as well carried out in the ignorance of many possible correlations of possible economic "environmental" effects run the risk of being defective through lack of awareness. (All this from the point of view of the training of the public manager.)

What could in fact be more in line with the curriculum of the public manager is the learning about how *choice scenarios* could be constructed, that are not only useful on a national and international scale by type and scale, but also valid on other scales, as the context of sectorial and local choices, which are today discussed and made without any framework of reference, or with frameworks and scenarios that are very vague, aggregate and aleatory.

The construction and utilisation of these *choice scenarios* is not dealt with adequately either in the conventional treatises on economic policy, even though they have constituted the most advanced point of reflection of the most authoritative economists,²⁰ which had perceived the

²⁰ Here we are referring precisely to the work of some economists (almost all - incidentally - Nobel prize winners for economics) who, in one way or another, have dealt with a new methodology for the construction of preference scenarios for economic planning. They are:

a) first of all, Ragnar Frisch (the founder of econometric analysis, which he himself accused in his final years, as being playometrics) whose posthumous work (1976), which passed almost unnoticed among conventional economists, collects his last works such as that on "cooperation between politicians and econometricians on the formalization of political preferences" (1970) or on "an implementation system for optimal national economic planning without detailed quantity fixation

limits of the conventional analysis of economic policy, to the extent that they declared the crisis of economic analysis itself (as a discipline), if not oriented toward a scientific approach including adequate instrumentation of a decisional or managerial type at all levels.

We must wonder if this approach in economic analysis (defined by some as "planological" or "decision-oriented")²¹, could not be an essential and integrative part of the learning of the public manager about the (decisional) public system and its functionality. And this is the case even if this part of economic analysis, i.e. the decision-oriented type, is located at the avantgarde or frontier of a scientific development that is very questioned and at the same time poorly known and practised at the present stage. This learning direction would provide the future public manager with the capacity not only to be a builder of the above mentioned choice scenarios, but certainly to be a user of them (even if today insufficiently known and practised).

from a central authority" (1963); or on "a survey of types of economic forecasting and programming"(1965); and many others.

b) Jan Tinbergen, who - after the previous models for the quantitative analysis of economic policy (1953) that are well-known - has developed methods and procedures, much less well-known, and much more critical toward the "positivist" approaches of the aggregated econometrics and economic policy based on it. There are works on the "centralization and decentralization of the economic policy" (1954); on "central planning" (1964); and on the role of econometrics itself (1961), and others papers on planning methodology (1966); on "incomes distribution" (1975); on "an interdisciplinary approach to the measurement of utility or welfare" (1972); and - last but not least - the lectures on economic policy, published posthumously by Knoester and Wellink (1993).

c) Wassili Leontief, the founder of "input-output" analysis in economics, who devoted himself in the 1970s to proposing operative implementations of the economic systems governance, on the occasion of a "Committee on National Growth Policy Processes" (Us Advisory Committee on Nat. Growth Policy Processes, 1976) created by Carter. See different papers on: "Modeling Approach of Policy Decisions" (1976); on the methods and problems of "national economic planning"(republished in 1985); all this revised and revisited in the book (with H.Steiner) on "the economic system in an age of discontinuity: long-range planning or market reliance?" (1976). See also by Leontief a methodological work on "modern techniques for economic planning and projections" (1966).

d) Leif Johansen, (colleague and successor of Frisch at the University of Oslo), who - after a well-known and influential book of "Public economics" (1965), (on which has been formed an entire generation of economists), and a equally popular "multisectoral study of economic growth" (1960, enlarged 1974), had devoted the last years of his life on "the methodology of economic planning"(1977-78), a work conceived in three vols. but only published in the first two and that has been totally ignored in the official literature. See also the last papers of Johansen edited posthumously by F.R. Forsund (1987), and the collection of essays in memory of him edited by Forsund, Hoel and Longva (1985).

²¹ Among the most significant works in this field, we must highlight that by Andreas Faludi (1986), which reconstructs the epistemology of planning, after codifying it in another work (1973). Some works on "planology" are those developed critically in the field of urban, regional or environmental planning approaches: thus in a limited scope; but it would be valuable to transfer them to the plane of public choices at different scales. See in general Alexander (1986) For methods concerning generally the application to planning of Cost-Benefit Analysis at Communitarian level, see Lichfield (1996). For the application of Multi-Criteria analysis and Evaluation, see Rietveld (1980), Voogd (1983), Nijkamp and Voogd (1985), Fandel and Spronk (1985), etc.. For a survey of all approaches leading to "Planology", and that could lead to the consolidation of a new "meta-discipline" in this field, see a still unfinished paper by the writer (Archibugi, 1992).

We are dealing in fact with the instrumentation (which is surely part of the competence of the future public manager) for learning a managerial capacity, in particular the primary capacity in decision-taking²² (with which we will deal in Par. 6.1).

5.3 An Educational Programme on the Socio-cultural Functionality of the Public System

However, the public system has its functionality, which is independent, albeit interconnected, from the institutional and economic one. This functionality attains to the behavioural aspects both of the citizen/user of the system, and of the operator/manager of the system itself. This can be called its "socio-cultural" functionality, which is made up of a large quantity of disciplinary aspects, that are often little connected, but which nevertheless deserve to be the object of learning in the framework of an educational programme for the public manager.

The most relevant aspects, which could be studied to great benefit in such a programme are the behaviour of the citizen in their various roles as a) user-consumer; b) elector; c) tax payer; d) member of non-public intermediate associative groups (trade unions, lobbies, churches, etc.) etc. It would be opportune to learn the modality of stimulation for participation in each of these roles; as well as that for cooperation, co-management, and the awareness of legitimacy and public interest.

At the same time, another relevant aspect for study would be the behaviour of the operators of the public system, whether "politicians" or functionaries. It would be useful to gain knowledge of the perception of the collective and personal interest; as well as questions relating to the awareness of legitimacy, the public interest and the public.

Finally, specific programmes of learning the principles and philosophy of a public ethics should be configured, as well as the conditions for the development of deontology of the public service²³. In forms common both to the relationship with the public system with its citizens and users and with its operators-employees, the psycho-social problems of control, regulation, obligations, etc. should be studied, for the various categories of citizens as for the various categories of functionaries of public power²⁴.

²² Thus defined by the OECD-PUMA Service, which has devoted to this capacity the first section of its organisational scheme, for the improvement methods of public administration management.

²³ The OECD-PUMA has produced an interesting document on this subject (OECD-PUMA, 1996g).

²⁴ Naturally an "historical" knowledge - in each (national or regional) environment - of the relations between citizen and State, and of the historic evolution of the bureaucracy, would be useful themes to

Nevertheless, for this group of teaching and learning as well, we might wonder - as we did previously for the other two groups, the institutional one and the economic one - whether this knowledge of the behaviour of citizens and politicians should be studied with a "positivistic" approach, on the basis, i.e. on that of theoretical reasoning (more or less supported by empirical enquiry), or whether the public manager should be taught to face those problems of behaviour with direct enquiries aimed at pointing out, in concrete, what behaviour could result in particular decisions which it would be necessary to take, case by case, through the analysis and evaluation of the programme in question. In such a case the analysis (and any eventual generalisation, or theorisation) would follow, and not precede, the analysis of the programme. This in the case of a field, that of "social" behaviour, which is strongly subject to various conditioning and very contingent factors, and above all to a great variability in time.

In this case the operationality of the public manager, if well oriented from the start of the learning and training stage, could constitute a very important occasion for aimed enquiry, such as to advance sociological research in new and effective directions.

6. The Learning of the Performance-oriented Management Capacity

The second of what we have called "learning fields" for the educational programme for the public manager, concerns as said, his *operational capacities*, his *know-how* (and connected methods), obviously in the light of the new performance-based management which we have postulated as emerging (Paras. 2 and 3) and the general principles of the educational programme itself (Para. 4).

What can be the sectors in which all, without distinction, public managers must show their capacity, in order to respond to the needs of a the new postulated result-oriented activities?

This has become the most delicate part of the new programme. In fact it is the part which - apart from corresponding to what the manager should "know" - has more direct pertinence to what the public manager should "know how to do": the part therefore that is most intimately linked to "professionalism" and to the new needs for the performance-based approach which may be considered to be emerging²⁵.

explore in any educational programme for the public manager. But this would clearly be a "local" question.

²⁵ The replies to give therefore are intimately bound up with the replies which we may wish to give to the problems discussed in Paras. 3 and 4.

Since the entire approach of our reasoning²⁶ is to derive the formative implications of the public manager from the needs of the new performance-oriented professionalism, and since the needs of the new professionalism in turn are emerging from the vast debate (referred to at the beginning) on a reinvention of managing public administration²⁷, it is perhaps to this debate and to the new tasks of PA and the emerging results that it is opportune to link up the configuration of the new didactic themes.

As already indicated in Para. 2, the reforms hoped for in a new "entrepreneurial" way of managing PA have classified the fields of reform which would characterize this new business spirit.

We should then ask ourselves: could these fields be directly assumed as the specific "teaching materials" of new training activities, or do they only concern innovative operations but not teaching? If the answer were to be yes for the first part of this question, they how should the new teaching matters be part of the typical training process of the new manager?

And, furthermore, do these new teaching matters concern both the fields in which we have approximately divided the training activities; that of "study" and that of "updating", or only the latter?

In other words, should we or not look for the didactic implications of the needs of the new performance-oriented professionalism (which is the theme of this Symposium) in the reform guidelines which are emerging into new methods of operating in public administration.

It is a fact however that, from the "NPR reform" in the USA and from other "reforming" attempts in other countries, we can draw therefore the best inspiration to fire the debate on the new training programmes concerning the operational capacities of the public manager²⁸.

²⁶ And of the Symposium promoted by the School.

²⁷ "Reinvention" has become the reiterated slogan of the American government NPR. Born originally - as a slogan - with the title of a well-known best seller by Osborne and Gaebler of 1992, it has become the title of the entire movement that is pervading the American federal administration at all levels, involving also wide sectors of the state and local administrations. See Kettl (1994) and Kettl and DiIulio Jr (1995).

²⁸ As a general inspiration we can recall a "decatalogue" proposed by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, which have been recognised as inspiring principles for the NPR; a decatalogue of "entrepreneurial" requirements for the new public management, addressed to the reinventing of public administration:

1. the promotion of competition between services
2. putting the citizens in the position to take control away from bureaucracy and bring it into the community
3. measuring the effectiveness of their agents, with a concentration of attention not on inputs but rather on outcomes
4. being guided by goals - or missions - and not by rules and regulations
5. redefining the users as customers and offering them alternative choices (between schools, training programmes, housing options)
6. anticipating problems before they emerge, instead of simply providing services after the fact
7. using one's energy to make money, rather than to spend it
8. decentralising authority, by introduction participatory management

The activity of the "Public Management" service of the OECD (PUMA) has for some years provided the most vast observatory, although very heterogeneous, of information and evaluation of the "reforming" attempts of Public Administration. The Service has organised both the collection of information and the discussion of its study and working groups according to some fundamental fields of operational management²⁹.

The new managerial subject is divided into the following five fields:

1. Decision-taking management
2. Human resources management
3. Management and reform of the regulatory system
4. Management of the budget and financial management
5. Management of performance and results.

From the reform emerging in the USA other classifications may be extracted which are even more aimed. For example, that already seen in the *Alliance for Redesigning Government* is articulated in the following ways:

- a) Introduction of elements of competitiveness
- b) Capacity for prevention and anticipation with respect to emergencies
- c) Introduction to elements of entrepreneurialship
- d) Market-oriented government
- e) Decentralisation
- f) Involvement of the private parties

Each of these directions could be the subject of methods and techniques to discuss and learn³⁰.

However, the debate on the new teaching relative to the managerial capacities of the new public manager could start from these classifications?

Assuming as a reference, for example, the OECD-PUMA system, which is less finalised, but which seems also less repetitive and more organic than the American one, some further observations could be developed in this background paper on the theme of teaching implications.

9. preferring market mechanisms to bureaucracy mechanisms

10. concentrating not only and simply on the supply of public services, but catalyzing all sectors - public, private, and voluntary - in action to resolve the problems of the community (see Osborne and Gaebler, p. 19, 1992).

²⁹ On the basis of which it has also articulated its internal offices.

³⁰ Other approaches are not lacking. See however the analyses carried out by the Brookings Institution: DiIulio, Garvey and Kettl, 1993, DiIulio ed. 1994; and a contribution by the Comptroller General (GAO) of the USA, (Bowsher, 1993).

6.1 *On the Capacity of Decision-taking Management*

Decision-taking management is certainly the most complex and delicate field in the entire *managerial capacity* (the fundamental and unitary object of the entire Programme). It is applied at various levels and contents, to the point that it is difficult to see it in an overall whole, also from the mere point of view of the decision-taking techniques. Nevertheless it is good that its peculiarity is well marked transversally, because it is also the field that has been most neglected in the training of the public operator, perhaps exactly because of this variety.

Despite this variety, decision-taking management may be dealt with from some essential angles:

1. *the pragmatic analysis of "decision-taking theory"*, with information suitable for the elementary techniques of "systems engineering" applied to complex organisations;
2. *the theory of coordination and planning of public action*; the capacity to know, understand and practice forms of pre-decisional coordination based on the system interdependencies connected to its activity;
3. *the analysis and evaluation of programmes*; the predisposition of "structures" or schemes of operational planning, and evaluation of achievement indicators and realisation of the same decisions;
4. *the use of information systems*, for the coordination and planning of public programmes.

The overall learning of the management of decision taking is based on the acquisition of the problem of coherence and compatibility as fundamental aspects for decisions of a general character, which are often poorly coordinated in public administrations.

The absence of coordination often arises from the absence of planning and the incapacity of the decision-maker and operator to think, even before acting, in terms of planning and programming activities.

This field of the educational programme for the public manager concerns substantially the role of the organs at the "centre of Government" (Prime Ministers' Cabinets, General Secretariats, Federal Chancelleries) and their capacity (with an opportune technical structuring of research and planning: planning offices and institutes) "to ensure coordination, coherence and strategic direction, as well as to manage the flow of

information before and after taking decisions (with regard also to the relationship with the public)"³¹.

It is a question of the management of general decisions, with eventual consultation, concertation, co-decision, implementation procedures by means of organisms in and outside the institutional system itself (Parliament on the one hand, and trade unions and social forces on the other).

The educational programme should, in this sense, prepare the public manager or operator (whether they are seen as an aid to policy decision-taking, or the actual decision-maker for programmes under their jurisdiction) to know and manage (with participation) such *operations of general planning*, even they imply - as said - by their nature decisions "at the maximum level" of public operators (Parliament, Government overall, etc). For such operations, the articulation could be:

1. *techniques for the management of information flows relative to the construction of scenarios and balance sheets for socio-economic development overall* (and construction of the relative models);
2. *techniques for the evaluation of alternative decision-making scenarios relative to the priority use of national resources*;
3. *techniques for the evaluation of the public use of national resources* (on a nationwide scale).

The coherence and compatibility, which as said, are particularly important aspects at the "centre" of the public decisional system³², are also important at other decisional levels which are more familiar and current for public managers. For this reason the techniques mentioned above (flow management, modelling, alternative scenarios, etc.) may be taught in versions suitable also for the afore-mentioned sub-programmes (with due

³¹ We are giving the same expression used by the PUMA programme for its operational sector.

³² That which would imply systems of management of social and economic policy and of the community public choice which are still far from being present and practiced even in economically and socially advanced countries. The introduction of these systems, although very bound up with the modern techniques of administration, cannot be only expected from the public manager's ability in management, but require also a general political will that is still immature with respect to these. To give an example of what we mean, we will refer not only to some forms of macro-economic programming introduced in some European countries in the 1960s and 70s (in the Netherlands, France, Great Britain, Italy), but also to the ideas and recommendations of the American mixed Executive-Congress (US Commission on Supply and Shortages/ Advisory Committee on National Growth and Policy Processes, 1976). The Commission provided towards the end of the Carter presidency a programme of actions which, if it had been adopted at the time, would have saved around twenty years. All these initiatives, rather than perfecting themselves (since they were very defective and operated at aggregation levels that were unable to fuse with public management operability) collapsed definitively with the economic-political reflux of the 1970s and 80s. And they would deserve being relaunched now that American strategic planning (with the 1993 GPRA Law) has reopened the process of public administration rationalisation of choice and downsizing for direct government management.

attention to the risks of sub-optimization inherent in the lack of systemic coordination between decision-making levels).

However, in the United States with the GPRA Law of 1993, great diffusion was given to the "strategic planning" practices at all levels of public administration. It is not yet the time for a summing up, but the impression is that an authentic revolution is underway in American public management. However it is certain that this law has given rise to a great activity of reflection and identification in methods, which can be the contents of a central part of the training activity³³.

6.2 *On the Capacity of Human Resources Management*

The second operational field of a programme aimed at studying the modalities for installing, in the sector of public function, more flexible and dynamic management systems of human resources, as a determining factor for the realisation of reforms in public management³⁴. The theme which will be developed in this field are:

1. *methods of personnel management* (recruiting; on the job training; updating; job analysis and evaluation; merit rating; remuneration techniques).
2. *methods of labour organisation* (staffing; group working; transmission of responsibility, etc.)

An even wider debate on the training aspects of human resource management, with which to prepare suitable educational programmes is seen to be of great interest and topicality³⁵.

6.3 *On the Capacity of Management and Reform of Regulation*

Excessive regulation has become an endemic ill for all public management systems in the advanced (OECD) countries of the West. The

³³ The bibliography is growing in an exponential way. We can recall by way of exemplification: some Memoranda and guides produced by the OMB (1995a) and GAO (1994, 1995a, and b), and the production of manuals and guides such as the video set of Performance Studies Inc. (s.d). For the USA a review has been made of the experience of many American State Agencies with strategic planning (see Berry & Wechsler, 1995). See also the works by Bloom (1994), Canary (1992) and Du Pont-Morales & Harris (1994). Good comment on the Law are by those Metzger (s.d.) and Mihm (1995).

³⁴ Which is a need felt in common by all OECD countries and taken on by the PUMA service which has produced some interesting documentation on the subject.

³⁵ On this see some works by OECD-PUMA (1993g, 1996f) and reports of the US OPM (1993) which has planned a complete redefinition of its roles with regard to the NPR. Witness the attention given to the problem of human resources by one of the reports by the NPR (NPR, 1993).

field of training in ways and techniques to reform the regulation systems of the OECD countries has become a priority field. It is a case of studying and applying:

1. *techniques of evaluation of regulation* (the relationship between the objectives which it intends to achieve and the costs that it produces, techniques for the improvement of the transparency and flexibility of regulation systems, and their capacity to respond to needs;
2. *techniques for procedural management of regulation* (recourse to other instruments) as alternative solutions to traditional regulation. Forms of management of the interaction administration/enterprise in the regulatory field. Forms of consultation of the public with regard to regulation.

The results and implications in the training field with respect to needs for the widening of control and management of regulation are a theme of discussion which is topical and pressing³⁶.

6.4 *On the Capacity of Budget Management and Financial Management*

This is a field of the new professionalism of the public manager which imposes a particular attention and a particular examination of design in the educational programmes for the new public managers. The learning of new techniques and new procedures of management and control of public spending is of fundamental importance both in general terms and in the specific terms of the various spending sectors³⁷.

A particular attention in this field should be given to the structural modifications of public spending. In particular to:

1. *the economic management of plans*, aiming at the introduction, in the operational processes of realisation of plans, of contractual delegation in the exercise of services and the production of public infrastructures and works³⁸, and the introduction of "Market-type Mechanisms" (MTM) (as

³⁶ The OECD has worked much on this point and reached a Recommendation in March 1995, which includes a checklist for the control and evaluation of the effects of regulatory management OECD-PUMA, 1995d, prepared by documents of 1993 and 1994 (OECD, 1993m, 1994e). One of the most important "executive orders" of the White House in the NPR was that concerning regulatory management (US-Whitehouse, 1993). Ten or so sectorial reports have followed this by Federal Agencies, which constitute an interesting collection of practical initiatives in deregulation.

³⁷ Two OECD-PUMA reports provide interesting points on the subject (1993d and 1994c). One on accrual accounting in the public sector, and the second on forecasting and controlling transfer programme costs.

³⁸ See an OECD-PUMA report (1994d).

they are called in the OECD³⁹). The most important mechanisms which should be studied in the programme - with the assistance of interesting multi-national documentation - are: tariffs for users; sub-contracts; the emission of shares or equivalent; the creation or modification of property rights; attribution of internal prices to the PA; contracts between branches of the State; contracts within one branch and forms of competition different from the price, etc. It would be worthwhile discussing how all this material may find suitable space in the training programmes for public management.

2. *Plan budgeting techniques*, where particular attention should be given to the construction of "budgeting for results"⁴⁰. By linking budgeting to the plans, the new manager will have to maximise the execution of the objectives with the maximum of contribution. Not only those of public origin which have given rise to the plans, but also those of private origin which may be interested in the realisation of the actual plans. The forms and techniques of Project financing, applied to public plans, will be taught (where possible).

6.5 On the Capacity of Evaluation and Management of Performance and Results

This latter field is that which should absorb the highest quantity of energy in an educational programme for public managers. In part because this should characterize it more than any other. It represents the most extensive application of a reformed operationality in the public sector⁴¹.

The field includes the study of systems of decentralisation in the management of the PA, with special attention for the elaboration of any type of activity and programmes of result indicators, in particular for

³⁹ See some OECD-PUMA documentation (1993e, 1993f).

⁴⁰ An OECD-PUMA publication analyses the budget practices and innovations in 22 OECD countries (OECD-PUMA, 1995a). Other works by OECD-PUMA on cost forecasting (1994c) and on the definition of public sector accrual accounting (1993d) should be considered. In the USA more advanced operations have been developed to bring budget procedures into line with strategic planning. See Canary (1992), Du Pont-Morales & Harris (1994), already quoted, and an interesting manual by the Finance Project (1996a).

⁴¹ It is no coincidence, therefore, that it has already obtained very great attention in the movement of genetic "transformation" of public administration. A vast review on the applications underway in various countries can be found in the OECD-PUMA works (1994b, 1996d, 1996e). The American OMB, which has inherited the old attempts to introduce PPBS methods, has recently produced a "primer" for the use of various agencies on Performance Measurement (US-OMB, 1995b). See also furthermore among the more recent products, and which are more connected to the "NPR" operation, a very recent Manual from the L. B. Johnson School of Public Affairs (1996), a manual by the Australian Public Service (1996), manuals of the "The Finance Project" (1996b), Raum & Soniat (1993), Bouckaert (1993), Duquette & Stowe (1992), Kerr (1994), Keelhey et al (1996), Fischer (1994), Spendolini (1992), Williams et al (1993).

"objective contracts" and "strategic planning" on the scale of any body or operational agency. The points which should be the object of teaching are⁴²:

1. *the planning of actions and regulations and measurement of results*: plan analysis, target-groups; multiple-goal plans; plan indicators and measurers; the measurement of evaluation of regulatory systems⁴³;
2. *the economic-quantitative evaluation of plans*: types of procedures; types of methods; evaluation as a process; cost-benefit analysis in its many applications and forms and the estimation of "total utility";
3. *the qualitative evaluation of plans*: various typologies of multi-criteria and multi-objective analysis. (For example, cost effectiveness analysis; risk-benefit analysis; decisional analysis; environmental impact analysis; techniques of evaluation linked to the evaluation of territory and plans: (PBS-Planning Balance Sheet); (GAM-Goals-Achievement Analysis); (EA-Energy Analysis); (LSA-Land Suitability Analysis); (LA-Land Assessment); (EES-Environmental Evaluation System); (JIM-Judgemental Impact Matrix). The methods of evaluation will be the main subject of permanent exercise.

7. New Supporting Knowledge

7.1 The Knowledge of the Main Public Policies

The specific fields of the training programme indicated above certainly do not exhaust all the learning needs of a programme for public management, even if they constitute the *specific part* (see above, Para. 4),

⁴² Any reference to the conventional literature on cost-benefit analysis, cost effectiveness, multi-criteria analysis applied to public programmes, etc. and single evaluation procedures has been avoided, because it would go beyond the range of this background paper. I would mention only that the literature specifically aimed at the evaluation of public programmes, should be borne in mind, with regard to teaching public managers. Among this latter two works should be mentioned (which are perhaps not adequately known), that by Sinden & Worrel (1974) on "unpriced values in the decisions without market prices"; and a work by Selma Mushkin (1972) on "public prices for public products". On programme indicators (and on the methodology of programming and evaluation for which they are a tool) I would indicate a recent work (Archibugi, 1997).

⁴³ It is worth recalling that a vast know-how has been accumulated in this area at various research institutions (e.g. the Urban Institute of Washington in the USA, the Planning Studies Centre, of Rome, Italy) which have been ignored in the cultural, technical and political reflux had between the beginning of the 1970s and 1990s. With regard to the Urban Institute of Washington, we can recall various manuals, already mentioned, by Hatry and others (republished several times, the most recent are 1974, 1983, 1986², 1988², 1992), which are still highly useable for the new needs. (Similar works by the Planning Studies Centre can be overlooked for now because they are limited to that period and are only in Italian.)

the "core tracks" (as are often called in American University educational programmes).

It would be opportune then that the future public manager, in fact - even if centrally prepared for knowing the *environment* in which he works (the operational capacities of the public manager, Para. 5), and *the ways in which he should work* (the operational capacity of the public manager, Para. 6) - knew also public policies in their length and breadth and the most delicate problems involved in their management. He must be able to know and evaluate these, whatever his formative university background, and whatever his or her future position in the public system. At the same time they should know - *panoramically* (with stress on this adverb) - the problems intrinsic in the main *public policies*, in the technical formation which are given on an international scale for these.

These public policies (which we will indicatively list below rather than exhaustively in note form⁴⁴), should be known probably not in single detail - since there would be a danger of too much specialisation and a lack of the "flexibility" strictly recommended earlier - but rather in their meaning for possible case learning in the systemic decisional process.

These public policies therefore should be learnt and taught with particular attention to their reciprocal interdependence with other specific sectors of the training of public managers. In particular, they should be learnt and taught in the learning stage of the modalities of public system *functioning* in its integrated aspects (institutional, socio-economic and behavioural), and in the stage of decision-taking learning (based on the coordination of the same policies).

At the same time, it would be opportune to join the learning of the various public sector policies, with a course devoted exclusively to the "theory of public choice", on the condition that it is coherently linked with the logic recommended here of the study of the general framework of the compatibility of the choices themselves (both from the point of view of the various objectives in themselves, and for the expected effects, and the amount of resources and means available)⁴⁵.

⁴⁴ 1. Fiscal policy; 2. Monetary policy; 3. Industrial policy and policy for technology innovation; 4. Land-use, environmental and urban policy; 5. Education policy; 6. Research policy; 7. Policy for nature conservation and promotion; 8. Policy for labour and professional training; 9. Policy for social welfare, immigration and housing; 10. Policy for public safety and social defence; 11. Defence policy; 12. Health protection policy; 13. Policy for international cooperation.

⁴⁵ "Public policies" have been the subject of a large amount of academic work which seems nevertheless to have perplexed its followers with regard to the relative usefulness of a purely scientific approach not linked to the operational science of planning. Jan-Erik Lane (1993) claims very appropriately at the end of an in-depth study of the discipline:

" 'Public policy', like some other words such as 'politics', 'public administration' and 'public management' has a double meaning standing for both the science of something and the object studied. It could either mean the public sector as it appears in various phenomena - public resource allocation, income redistribution and public regulation - or it could stand for some framework for or approach to the interpretation of these appearances. As a matter of fact, public policy as an academic discipline

7.2 *Some Technical and Notional Support for Management Learning*

Finally, to what extent should this educational programme for new public management include, to complement the "specific core" of the programme, a part on the support for the managerial functions in question?

The informing principles (see Para. 5) of the new educational programme - which it is supposed should guide the planning of any new educational programme - postulate the radical abandonment of any form of instruction which is repetitive in some way of university disciplines and grouping in disciplinary "areas".

But in the same logic, the possibility should be anticipated (see Para. 5 again) of "complementary" or "integrative" courses that are parallel to the "institutional" ones indicated above, aimed at satisfying two converging but different needs:

that of "bringing into line" the basic knowledge and information common to all participants. These courses which could be called, in fact, "alignment" courses should take place in the initial parts of the curricula of the educational Course or Programme⁴⁶;

that of giving the foundations of some specific technical notions necessary for the further application of decisional methods of planning.

was launched in the form of new courses, departments, institutes or school where policy analysis would be practised, replacing the outdated public administration framework.

"However, two difficult problems arise in relation to the ambition to identify a distinct social science enterprise, the policy analysis orientation:

"1. Does such a distinct approach to the understanding of the public sector exist that we may comfortably speak about policy analysis as an art and craft in its own right?

"2. Could policy analysis in the future deliver a new general framework for the study of the public sector?"

"I would be inclined to answer 'no' to both these question... (p.227-228)".

There is a strong feeling that the training problems for a new managerial capacity and mentality in public administration would suggest sharing the above opinion. Some have discussed at length whether there is or not a distinction between "analysis of policy" and "analysis for policy" (see, for example, some works by Wildavsky, 1979b, and Ham and Hill, 1984). Whether there is or not, what should be clear is that it is the second aspect of that analysis, i.e. an applied activity that attempts above all to contribute to problem solving, which should engage the teaching of public managers. On these points see also the concepts reiterated by Ray C. Rist (1989, 1990, 1995); and for further considerations, see "The Presidential Address" by Beryl A. Radin to the 18th Annual Conference of APPAM (Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Nov. 1996, Pittsburgh) (Radin, 1996). For an even clearer conception of how policy analysis is becoming substantially emerged in single public policies, see the work by Radin on experience at the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation at the Dept. of Health and Human Services, HHS, (Radin, 1992). In this same tenor are almost all the writings in the volume in which the aforementioned work by Radin is included (Carol H. Weiss, ed., 1992). Policy analysis, in fact, is seen here essentially as a problem of organisation, on the one hand, and, on the other, as a problem of evaluation technique; and everything is solidified operationally into planning and decision-taking.

⁴⁶ Such courses should aim at covering the gaps, considered unacceptable for any participant, which the various university origins may create.

For the learning not only of the "alignment", but also of "support"⁴⁷ for the themes of the teaching programme illustrated, what importance is it correct to give to specific ad hoc training in:

1. *Information technology*: with courses aimed at informing and training the utilisation of computer systems; management of electronic archives and their utilisation for management and decision-making purposes; notions of geographical and thematical cartography; software programmes for the graphical and cartographical representation of territorial and environmental phenomena (geophysical, geochemical, geomorphological) etc.⁴⁸?
2. *Systems analysis and engineering*; with teaching aimed at providing modelling schemes of the systems of relations between the various phenomena that may be the subject of public policies, in order to develop knowledge of interdependencies; systems analysis should be as much as possible be exemplified on "systems" with many decisional variables?
3. *Operational research*; with teaching aimed at providing the tools of operational analysis (linear, multi-linear and dynamic programming, optimisation, etc.) and calculation (elementary illustration of mathematical modelling of economic, social and environmental phenomena; matrix analysis; calculations algorithms, game theory; etc.)?

8. The Institutional and Operational Modifications for the New Performance-based Manageriality

The final theme in which the Symposium is articulated, should be interpreted from two points of view:

1. in the first place, in general, we can ask whether the new performance-based professionalism implies some reforms in the legal "statute" of public management. We might wonder, in other words, whether the new way of conceiving both the function and the modality of exercise of this, must change something in the modality - already widely differing from country to country - in which the contractual position of the public

⁴⁷ It goes without saying that a good knowledge of the international language of exchange (English) is now a *sine qua non* in public management.

⁴⁸ The use of information technology both for the improvement of the cognitive framework of decisions, and decision-taking techniques is so great that it could be conceived as not merely a supporting subject but one of central importance for the new teaching. On this point there is some work by the OECD-PUMA (1993c, 1994e).

manager with regard to the public body for which he or she is responsible or manager is established.

2. in the second place, more specifically, we might wonder if the implications of the new performance-based professionalism for training and educational programmes of the public manager, imply in turn something institutionally necessary in the field of the specific planning for the public manager. In other words, whether some kind of interface must be conceived between the general training of public managers, for which a vast more or less specialised educational apparatus provides, and their concrete evaluation and assumption in functions in the various public bodies in which they operate. It would be an interface aimed at ensuring a certain quality control in the operational capacity.

But the institutional problem is not limited to these two aspects. Other aspects - transversal to these - must be discussed as well.

One of the most evident and diffuse dichotomies in the educational planning of the public manager (which is common moreover to any profession) is that which distinguishes:

- a) the educational pre-professional training, which although post-university, is carried out before assuming work engagements and responsibilities;
- b) training - more or less "on the job" - which is carried out during working activities.

The first could (very imperfectly) be called *study* activities, in comparison to which the second could be called *updating* activities.

In studying the new needs of a performance-based professionalism and any implications for the contents and needs of the public manager, it would be a mistake to limit ourselves only to one of the above-mentioned aspects (for example, that of study, to which universities are mainly devoted). Because it seems evident that the impact of those implications must be measured in both the educational forms: study and updating.

But it would be legitimate to ask: on which of the two can the impact be considered greatest? And, as a consequence: may the impact be different on one or the other? If so, in what way? And furthermore: on which of the two forms is it considered most opportune to concentrate efforts for maximising the results of an efficient response of the training activity to the new requirements of professionalisation⁴⁹?

Other aspects are more directly pertinent to the type of career which may be produced with the needs of the professionalism. Do these latter

⁴⁹ These aspects have been debated by the OECD-PUMA (1996d).

tend to increase or reduce the mobility of public managers? Will the principle of flexibility which we discussed (see Para. 4), and which we have postulated as an innovative factor in the new professionalism, tend to have, as its inevitable corollary, greater mobility or not?

If this is the case, will this increased mobility produce consequently some modification of the relationship between the form of "study" and form of "updating" of the training activity?

Other aspects are pertinent to the type of application and body in which the public manager works. There is widespread distinction of these public bodies based on the territorial level in which they operate: international, national, regional, municipal bodies, etc.

Are the new professional needs distributed uniformly throughout these bodies, or can the impact be different according to the type of body? And if diversity of impact occurs, does this imply something for the type of training activity dealt with here?

The debate on the institutional and operational modifications connected to the new performance-based management takes us a long way. In part because the situation is large and complex; and very bound up (much more so than the first two themes of the Symposium) with the various political-juridical orders, as well as the socio-economic and cultural ones, of the various countries. However, going too far in the international comparison could lead us astray from the purpose of the Symposium itself, which is to debate substantial problems, of possible general utility, and for which the exchange of ideas and opinions may in effect have positive results for the single starting positions.

When we dwell on institutional differences for too long, we run the risk of dealing with the problems from the wrong side (at least on the international scale) because we stop at the listing of the ex post diversities and obstacles which these constitute, rather than on the analysis of the ex ante goals, with which such obstacles or means could even be overcome. In a certain sense, we deny in this peculiar aspect, the principle itself of an objective or result-based system of actions. They could at least be faced case by case, i.e. country by country, operational level by operational level, without bringing into play the general feasibility of the performance-based goal-oriented approach.

9. Conclusions

There are many postulates which a consequential reasoning, which we have laid down in this background paper, has had necessarily to assume. We have had to deduce in fact from the first options, the successive options, and so forth in a chain reaction. This has given the

document a more assertive rather than dubitative character, in contrast, with what a background paper should require. But independently from the form and tone of the exposition, this document remains fundamentally a background paper, i.e. a document which has wished solely to constitute an instrument for opening a debate and the organisation of the same. We have only attempted to propose a classification, a taxonomy of subjects, according to a certain logic, and nothing more. And a dubitative and interrogative spirit pervades all the themes raised.

Bibliographical References

- Acocella, Nicola,(1994), *Fondamenti di politica economica [Fundamentals of Economic Policy]*, La Nuova Italia, Roma.
- Alexander E.R. (1986), *Approaches to Planning: Introducing Current Planning Theories, Concepts and Issues*, Gordon and Breach, New York.
- Archibugi, Franco (1970), *Rapporto sulla introduzione di un sistema di programmazione di bilancio in Italia*, [Report on the Introduction of a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System in Italy] (Ricerca svolta per conto dell'Istituto di studi per la programmazione economica), Ispe, Roma.
- Archibugi, Franco (1992), "The Resetting of Planning Studies", in: A.Kuklinski, ed., *Society, Science, Government*, KBN, Warsaw.
- Archibugi, Franco (1992), *Introduction to Planology: toward a Metadisciplinary Convergence of the Planning Sciences*, (first draft), Planning Studies Centre, Rome.
- Archibugi, Franco (1994), "The Disciplinary Implications of Environmental Planning and Evaluation", in: H.Voogd, *Issues in Environmental Planning*; Pion, London.
- Archibugi, Franco (1995), (with Mathias Koenig-Archibugi), *Industrial Relations and the Social Economy: Forms and Methods of Negotiated Destatalization of the Social Welfare Systems in the European Union* (Report prepared for the European Commission, Novembre 1995). Brussels.
- Archibugi, Franco (1996) "Beyond the Welfare State: Planning for a Welfare Society", in: B.Greve, ed. *Comparative Welfare Systems*, Macmillan, London.
- Archibugi, Franco (1996), "Program Indicators: Their Role and Use in the Integrated Social or Community Programming", *Social Indicators Research*, 1996.
- Archibugi, Franco (1996), "Towards a New Discipline of Planning", *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, Vol.30, N.2 pp.81-102.
- Australian Public Service (1996), *Raising the Standard: Benchmarking for Better Government*, (Report from the Management Advisory Board, Management Improvement Committee) June 1996, (available in Internet: <http://www.innovations.gov.au/benchmark.htm>)
- Barzelay, Michael, (1992), *Breaking Through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government*, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley.

- Bennis, Warren, (1993), *Beyond Bureaucracy: Essay on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Benveniste, Guy, (1987), *Professionalizing the Organization: Reducing Bureacracy to Enhance Effectiveness*, Jossey-Bass, S.Francisco.
- Berry, Frances S. & Barton Wechsler, (1995), "State Agencies' Experience with Strategic Planning: Findings From a National Survey", *Public Administration Review*, v.55, n.2, March-April 1995, pp159-68
- Bloom, Michael J. & Mary K. Menefee, (1994), "Scenario Planning and Contingency Planning", *Public Productivity and Management Review*, v.17, n.3, Spring 1994, p.223-30.
- Boukaert, Geert, et al. (1993), "Featured Topic: Performance Measurement and Public Management", *Public Productivity and Management Review*, v.17, n.1, Fall 1993, p.29-68.
- Bowsher, Charles A. (1993), *Reinventing Government: Do It Now, Do It Right* (An Address by the Comptroller General of the US Government).
- Bowsher, Charles A. (1995), *Government Reform: GAO's Comments on the National Peformance Review* (Testimony before the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, House of Representatives (May 2 1995)).
- Canary, Hal W.Jr. (1992), "Linking Strategic Plans With Budgets", *Government Finance Review*, April 1992, p.21-24.
- Cigler, Beverly A. (1990), "Public Administration and the Paradox of Professionalization", *Public Administration Review*, November-December 1990, pp.637-653.
- Cohen, Steven & Ronald Brand (1993), *Total Quality Management in Government: A Practical Guide for the Real World*, Jossey-Brass, San Francisco.
- Crozier, Michel (1987), *Etat moderne, Etat modeste*, Grasset, Paris.
- DiIulio, John J.Jr.(ed.) (1994) *Deregulating the Public Sector. Can Government Be improved?*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC..
- DiIulio, John J.Jr., Garvey G., Kettl, D.F. (1993), *Improving Government Performance. An Owner's Manual*, The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.
- Downs, George W. & Patrick I. Larkey (1986). *The Search for Government Efficiency: From Hubris to Helplessness*, Random House, New York.
- Dror, Yezezel (1987a), "Conclusions", in William Plowden, ed. *Advising the Rulers*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1987.
- Dror, Yezezel (1987b), "Planning as a Mode of Policy-Reasoning", in *Abstract Thoughts: Concrete Solutions. Essays in Honour of Peter*

- Nash*. University of Waterloo, Dept. of Geography Publications Series, Waterloo, Canada, 1987.
- Dror, Yezezel (1988), "Notes Towards a Philosophy of Policy-Reasoning", in *Between Rationality and Cognition: Policy-making Under Conditions of Uncertainty, Complexity and Unbalance*, Miriam Campanella, ed. Albert Meynier, Torino, 1988
- Dror, Yezezel (1990), *A Training Module for Senior Government Executives*, European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht, 1990.
- Dror Yezezel (1991), *Grand Policy Analysis*, Presidential Address Paper, Policy Study Association Annual Meeting, Washington DC, August 1991.
- Dror Yezezel (s.d.) "School for Rulers", in: *The Systemic Basis of Policymaking in the 1990s*, Kenyon B. De Greene, ed.
- Drucker, Peter F.,(1995), "Really Reinventing Government", *The Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1995 pp.41-61.
- Duquette, Dennis J. & Alexis M. Stowe (1992), "Enter the Era of Performance Measurement Reporting", *Government Accountants Journal*, Summer 1992, p.19-28.
- DuPont-Morales, M.A. & Jean E.Harris (1994), "Strengthening Accountability: Incorporating Strategic Planning and Performance into Budgeting", *Public Productivity and Management Review*, v.17, n.3, Spring 1994, p.231-39.
- European Institute of Public Administration, EIPA, (1994), *Comparative Analysis of Civil Service Training Schools*, Ed. by Claudio Zanghi, EIPA, Maastricht.
- Faludi, Andreas (1973) *Planning Theory*, Pergamon, Oxford.
- Faludi Andreas, (1986), *Critical Rationalism and Planning Methodology*, Pion, London.
- Fandel G. & J.Spronk, eds., (1985), *Multiple Criteria Decision Methods and Applications*, Springer, Berlin.
- Finance Project (The) (1996a), *A Strategy Map for Result-Based Budgeting: Moving From Theory to Practice*, Washington DC, October 1996.
- Finance Project (The) (1996b), *A Guide to Developing and Using Performance Measure*, Washington DC, December 1996.
- Finance Project (The) (1996c), *A Guide to Results and Indicators*, Washington DC, December 1996
- Fischer, Richard J. et al. (1994), "Benchmarks of Performance: Special Section", *Public Management*, vol.76 n.9, Sept. 1994, S1-s23.
- Forsund F.R., M. Hoel and S.Longva, eds.,(1985), *Production, Multisectoral Growth and Planning: Essays in memory of Leif Johansen*, North-Holland, New York.

- Frisch, Ragnar (1976), *Economic Planning Studies: a Collections of Essays*, selected and introduced by F.Long, Reidel , Dordrecht, Holland.
- Frisch, Ragnar (1970), *Cooperation between politicians and econometricians on the formalization of political preferences*, (rep. in: Frisch, 1976).
- Frisch, Ragnar (1963), *An Implementation System for Optimal National Planning without detailed quantity fixation from a Central Authority*, rep. in: Frisch, 1976)
- Frisch, Ragnar (1965) *Preface to the Oslo Channel Model: A Survey of types of Economic Forecasting and Programming*, (rep. in: Frisch, 1976).
- Gorham William & Nathan Glazer (1976), *The Urban Predicament*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Gore, Al, (1993), *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less; Report of the National Performance Review*, New York, Plume (Sept.1993).
- Gore, Al, (1994), "The New Job of the Federal Executive", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 54 n.4, July-August 1994.
- Greffe, Xavier (1994), *Economie des politiques publiques*, Dalloz, Paris.
- Ham, C. & M.Hill, (1984), *The Policy Process in the Modern Capitalist State*, Wheatsheaf, Brighton.
- Hatry, Harry, P. et al. (1974), *Measuring the Effectiveness of Basic Municipal Services*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Hatry Harry, P. (1983), *A Review of Private Approaches for Delivery of Public Services*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Hatry, Harry, P. et al., (1986²), *Practical Program Evaluation for State and Local Governments*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Hatry Harry, et al. (1988²), *Program Analysis for State and Local Governments*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Hatry Harry, P. et al. (1989), *Building Innovation into Program Reviews: Analysis of Service Delivery Alternatives*, The Urban Institute, Washington..
- Hatry Harry P. et al. (1991), *Excellence in Managing: Practical Experiences from Community Development Agencies*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Hatry, Harry, P. et al., (1992²), *How Effective Are Your Community Services? Procedures for Measuring Their Quality*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Holzer, Marc, ed. (1992), *Public productivity handbook*, M.Dekker, New York.
- Henke, Steve H. (ed.), *Prospects for Privatization*, Academy of Political Science,1987.

- Hunt, David (1994), *Next Steps Agencies in Government Review 1994*, (A Report of the Minister of Public Service and Science), HMSO, London.
- Hunt, V. Daniel (1993), *Quality Management for Government: A Guide to Federal, State & Local Implementation*. ASQC Quality Press, Milwaukee.
- Johansen, Leif, (1965,), *Public Economics*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Johansen, Leif, (1960, 2nd ed. enl. 1974) *A multisectoral study of economic growth*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Johansen, Leif (1977-1978), *Lectures on macroeconomic planning*, 2 vols., North-Holland, Amsterdam
- Johansen, Leif (1987), *Collected vorks of Leif Johansen*, edited by F.R.Forsund, Elsevier-North Holland, New York.
- Keelhey, Patricia, et al. (1996), *Benchmarking for Best Practices in the Public Sector: Achieving Performance Breaktroughs in Federal, State and Local Agencies*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kerr, Deborah L., (1994), "Managing Rosie the Riveter: The Work Between Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement", *Public Productivity and Management Review*, v.17, n.3, Spring 1994, p.215-22.
- Kettl, Donald F. (1994), *Reinventing Government? Appraising The National Performances Review*, Center for Public Management, The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.
- Kettl, Donald F. and John J.DiIulio, eds. (1995), *Inside the Reinvention Machine: Appraising Governmental Reform*, Brookings Institution, Washington DC.
- King, Paula J. and Nancy C.Roberts, (1992), "An Investigation into the Personality Profile of Policy Entrepreneurs", *Public Productivity and Management Review*, V.16, n.2 (Winter 1992).
- Lane, Jan-Erik (1993), *The Public Sector, Concepts, Models and Approaches*, Sage, London.
- Leontief, Wassili, (1966), "Modern Techniques for Economic Planning and Projections", in *Essays in Economics* [vol 1], Blackwell, Oxford.
- Leontief, Wassili, (1976a), "An Information System for Policy Decision in a Modern Economy", in: Us Committee on National Growth Policy Processes, *Forging America's Future, Strategies for National Growth and Development*, (Appendix, vol 1), December 1976.
- Leontief, Wassili, (1976b), "Modeling Approach of Policy Decisions in the US Economy", Hearing to the US Congress, Joint Economic Committee (10 November 1976).
- Leontief, Wassili and Herbert Steiner, (1976), *The Economic System in a Age of Discontinuity: Long-range Planning or Market Reliance?*, New York University Press, New York.

- Leontief, Wassili, (1977), "National Economics Planning: Methods and Problems", in: *Essays in Economics. Theories, Facts and Policies*. [Vol.2], Blackwell, Oxford.
- Levin, Martin A. (1994), *A Making Government Work: How Entrepreneurial Executives Turn Bright Ideas Into Real Results*, Jossey-Bass, Sn Francisco.
- Levine, Charles H., B.Guy Peters & Frank J.Thompson, (1990), *Public Administration: challenges, choices, consequences*, Scott, Foresman/Little, Glenview, Ill. Usa.
- Linden, Russel M., (1994), *Seamless Government: A Practical Guide to Reengineering in the Public Sector*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- L.B.Johnson School of Public Affairs (Harvard University), (1996), *Managing for Results: Advancing the Art of Perfomance Measurement*, (Conference Proceedings, June 1996).
- Mascarhenas R.C., (1993) "Building an Enteprise Culture in the Public Sector: Reform of the Public Sector in Australia, Britain and New Zealand", *Public Administration Review*, July-August 1993, vol.53, N.4, pp.319-329.
- Metzger, Carl J. (s.d.), *GPRA-Related Meetings and Conferences for Government*, Management System International, Washington, DC.
- Mihm, J. Christopher, (1995), "GPRA and the New Dialogue", *The Public Manager*, v.24, n.4, Winter 1995-96, p.15-18.
- Mushkin, Selma, (1972), *Public Price for Public Products*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- National Academy for Public Administration, (1983), *Revitalizing Federal Management: Managers and their Overburdened Systems*.
- National Association of State Budget Officers (s.d.) *Restructuring and Innovations in State Management*. Washington DC.
- National Performance Review (NPR), (1993), *Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less: Reinventing Human Resources Management*, Washington DC.
- Nijkamp, P. and H.Voogd, (1985), "An Informal Introduction to Multicriteria Evaluation", in: G,Fandel & J.Spronk, *Multiple Criteria Decision Methods and Applications*, Springer, Berlin.
- Novick, D. (ed.), (1965) *Program Budgeting*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Novick, D. (1973), *Current Practice in Program Budgeting (PPBS)*, Heinemann, London.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993a), *Public Management: Oecd Country Profiles*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993b), *Public Management Developments: Survey 1993*, Oecd, Paris.

- Oecd-Puma, (1993c), *Information Technology in Government: Management Challenges*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993d), *Accounting for What? The Value of Accrual Accounting to the Public Sector*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993e), *Managing with Market-Type Mechanism*. Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993f), *Internal Markets*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993g), *Performance Appraisal: Practice, Problems, Issues*, Oecd, Paris
- Oecd-Puma, (1993h), *Value and Vision: Management Development in a Climate of Civil Service Change*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993i), *Pay Flexibility in Public Sector*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993l), *Private Pay for Public Work: Performance Related Pay Schemes for Public Sector Managers*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1993m), *The Design and Use of Regulatory Checklist in Oecd Countries*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1994a), *Public Management Developments: Update 1994*, Oecd, Paris
- Oecd-Puma, (1994b), *Performance Measurement in Government: Performance Measurement and Result-Oriented Management*, Oecd, Paris
- Oecd-Puma, (1994c) *Forecasting and Controlling Transfer Programme Costs: Definition and Methods*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1994d), *New Ways of Managing Infrastructure Provision*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1994e), *Regulatory Management and Information Systems*. Oecd, Paris
- Oecd-Puma, (1995a), *Budgeting for Results: Perspectives on Public Expenditure*, 337 pages, Oecd, Paris
- Oecd-Puma, (1995b), *Governance in transition: Public Management Reforms in Oecd Countries*, 247 pages, Oecd, Paris
- Oecd-Puma, (1995c), *Public Management Developments: Update 1995*, Oecd, Paris
- Oecd-Puma, (1995d), *Recommendation of the Council of the Oecd on Improving the Quality of Government Regulation* (Adopted on March, 9, 1995) including *The Oecd Reference Checklist*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma, (1996a), *Ministerial Symposium on the Future of Public Services* (Paris, March 1996a), Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma (1996b), *Managing Structural Deficit Reduction*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma (1996c), *Building Policy Coherence: Tools and Tensions*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma (1996d), *Performance Auditing and the Modernization of Government*, Oecd, Paris.

- Oecd-Puma (1996e), *Performance Auditing in Government: Contemporary Illustration*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma (1996f), *Integrating People Management into Public Service Reform*, Oecd, Paris.
- Oecd-Puma (1996g), *Ethics in the Public Service: Current Issues and Practice*. Oecd, Paris.
- Osborne, David (1988), *Laboratories of Democracy*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler (1992), *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Performance Strategies, Inc.(s.d.) *Strategic Planning for the Public Sector*. (Video set: \$ 995).
- PSC- Planning Studies Centre [Centro di studi e piani economici], (1997a), *I centri di ricerca e promozione sulla gestione pubblica - Esplorazione (diretta ed internet) delle attività presso le principali istituzioni di ricerca sul "public management"*, [Centres of Research and Promotion for Public Management - Exploration (direct and via Internet) of Activities in the Main Public Management Research Institutions], Various tracks, Roma.
- PSC- Planning Studies Centre [Centro di studi e piani economici], (1997b), *I nuovi programmi didattici nella formazione del manager pubblico - Esplorazione (diretta ed internet) dei principali programmi di "public management"* [The New Teaching Programmes for Training Public Managers - Exploration (direct and via Internet) of the Main Learning Programs in Public Management], Various tracks, Roma.
- Pollitt, Christopher (1990), *Managerialism and the Public Services: The Anglo-American Experience*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford
- Poulantzas, N., (ed.) (1976), *La crise de l'Etat*, Puf, Paris.
- Quade, E.S., (1976), *Analysis for Public Decisions*, Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Radin, Beryl A. (1992), "Policy Analysis in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation in HEW/HHS: Institutionalization and the Second Generation", in Carol H. Weiss, *Organizations for Policy Analysis: Helping Government Think*, Sage, Newbury Park, Calif.
- Radin, Beryl A. (1996), *The Evolution of the Policy Analysis Field: From Conversation to Conversations*, Presidential Address to 18th Annual Research Conference, Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Pittsburgh.
- Raum, Ronell B. & Edwin Soniat, (1993), "Measurement Based Performance Audits: A Tool for Downsizing Government", *Government Accountants Journal*, vol 42, N.2, Summer 1993, p.61-69.

- Rietveld, P. (1980), *Multiple Objective Decision Methods and Regional Planning*, North Holland, Amsterdam.
- Ripley, R. & G. Franklin, (1986), *Policy Implementation and Bureaucracy*, The Dorsey Press, Chicago.
- Rist, Ray C., (ed.) (1989), *Policy and Program Evaluation: Perspectives on Design and Utilization*, IIAS (Intern.Inst.of Administrat.Sciences), Brussels.
- Rist, Ray C. (ed.) (1990), *Program Evaluation and the Management of Government: Patterns and Prospects across Eighth Nations*. Transaction Publ., New Brunswick.
- Rist, Ray C. (ed.) (1995), *Policy Evaluation: Linking Theory to practice*. Elgar, Aldershot. UK.
- Rivlin, Alice M.,(1971), *Making Federal Programs Work Better; Nighlights of Systematic Thinking for Social Action*, Brookings Institution, Washington
- Rivlin, Alice M. (1972), *New Approach to Public-Decision-Making*, (Prepared for the Economic Council of Canada), Information Canada, Ottawa.
- Salamon, Lester M. (ed.) (1989), *Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Government Action*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Sinden, J.A. & Worrel A.C. (1979), *Unpriced Values: Decisions without Market Proces*, Wiley, New York.
- Spendolini, Michael J. (1992), *The Benchmarking Book*, AMACOM, New York.
- Stever, James A. (1988), "The Fragmented Philosophy and Ideology of Post-Progressive Public Administration", in: (ed.), *The End of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post-progressive Era*, Transnational Publishers, Dobbs Ferry, NY.
- Stillman R.J. II. (ed.) (1992), *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*, 5th ed., Houghton Mifflin.
- Suleiman, E.N,ed. (1984), *Bureaucrats and the Policy-Making, A Comparative Overview*, Holmes and Meier, New York-London.
- Sundquist, James L. (1995), "The Concept of Governmental Management: Or, What's Missing in the Gore Report", *Public Administration Review*, July/August 1995, Vol.55, N.4, pp.16-23.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1952), *On the Theory of Economic Policy*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1954), *Centralization and decentralization in economic policy*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1961), *Econometrics*, Allen and Unwin, London.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1964), *Central Planning*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Usa.

- Tinbergen, Jan (1966), *Essays in regional and world planning*, National Council of Applied Economic Research, New Delhi.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1972), *An interdisciplinary approach to measurement of utility or welfare*, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1975), *Income distribution: analysis and policies*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1985), *Production, Income and Welfare: the Search for an Optimal Social Order*, Wheatsheaf Books, Brighton (Sussex),UK.
- Tinbergen, Jan (1993), *Tinbergen lectures on economic policy*, edited by A.Knoester and A.H.E.M. Wellik, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- United Way of America, (1996), *Measuring Program Outcome: A Practical Approach*.
- Urban Institute (The), (1980), *Performance Measurement: A Guide for Local Elected Officials*, The Urban Institute, Washington.
- US Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, (1996) *Intergovernmental Accountability: The Potential for Outcome-Oriented Performance Management to Improve Intergovernmental Delivery of Public Works Programs*. Washington, DC, May 1996.
- US-GAO, General Accounting Office,(1994), *Managing for Results: State Experiences Provide Insights for Federal Management Reforms* (GAO/GGD-95-22, Dec.21, 1994), Washington DC.
- US-GAO, General Accounting Office (1995a), *Civil Service Reform: Changing Times Demand: New Approach* (GAO/T-GGD-96-31),October 12, 1995.
- US-GAO, General Accounting Office, (1995b), *Managing for Results: Experiences Abroad Suggest Insights for Federal Management Reforms* (GAO/GGD-95-120, May 2, 1995), Washington DC.
- US-GAO, General Accounting Office, (1996), *Effectively Implementing the Government Performance and Results Act* (Executive Guide), Washington, DC. (Available in Internet: <http://www.npr.gov/library/>)
- US-OPM, Office of Personnel Management, (1993), *Redefine the Mission and Role of the Office of Personnel Management*. (Available in Internet: <http://www.npr.gov.library/>)
- US-OMB, Office of Management and Budget, (1995a), *Submission of FY 1996 Performance Plans for Pilot Projects under PL 103-62, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993(GPRA)* (Memo from: Alice M.Rivlin), (Available in Internet: <http://www.npr.gov/library/>)
- US-OMB, Office of Management and Budget, (1995b), *Primer on Performance Measurement*, Washington DC. (Available in Internet: <http://www.npr.gov/library/>).

- US-Commission on Supply and Shortages/Advisory Committee on National Growth Policy Processes, (1976), *Forging America's Future: Strategies for National Growth and Development*, (Report, 4 vols.), Us-Gpo, Washington.
- US-White House (1993), *Executive Order N.12866: Regulatory Planning and Review*, Washington DC.
- Volcker Paul A. (1989), *Leadership for America: Rebuilding the Public Service*. (The Report of the "National Commission on the Public Service"). NCPS, 1989.
- Voogd, Henke, (1983), *Multicriteria Evaluation for Urban and Regional Planning*, Pion, London.
- Webb, K.& H.P.Hatry, (1973), *Obtaining Citizen Feedback: The Application of Citizen Surveys to Local Governments*,The Urban Institute, Washington.
- Weiss, Carol H. (1992), *Organizations for Policy Analysis: Helping Government Think*, Sage, Newbury Park, Calif.
- Wildavsky, A. (1964 e 1979a), *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*, Little Brown, Boston.
- Wildavsky, A. (1979b) *Speaking Truth to Power. The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. Little Brown, Boston 1979.
- Wildavsky, A. (1985), "The once and future school of public policy", *The Public Interest*.
- Williams Harold S. et al. (1993), *Outcome Funding: A New Approach to Targeted Grantmaking*. The Rensselaerville Institute Innovation Group.
- Wilson, James Q. (1989), *Bureaucracy: What Governments Agencies do and Why they do it*. Basic Books, New York.
- Wilson James Q., (1994a), "Can the Bureacracy be Deregulated? Lessons from Government Agencies", in: J.J.DiIulio, Jr. ed., *Deregulating the Public Service*, The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.
- Wilson James Q. (1994b) *Reinventing Public Administration*, (John Gaus Lecture delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Sept. 2, 1994).
- Wye, Christofer G. et al. (1992) "Forum: Improving Government Performance" *The Public Manager*, vol.21, n.4, Winter, 1992, p.4-27.