

Area 3: Public Service and Human Resource Management

Principle 3	The recruitment of public servants is based on merit and equal treatment in all its phases; the criteria for demotion and termination of public servants are explicit		
Principle approach	WeBER focuses particularly on the openness and transparency of the recruitment process, as a particularly critical aspect of HRM in the public administration, due to its public facing character.		
INDICATOR 1	<i>Openness, transparency and fairness of recruitment into the civil service</i>		
Indicator focus and general methodological remarks	<p>The focus of this indicator is on the recruitment into the civil service, more specifically through the analysis of the characteristics of the public competitions, as an open and transparent recruitment method which should ensure that the best candidates get civil service jobs.</p> <p>The methodology is based on the combination of analysis of administrative data pertaining to public competitions for public (civil) service positions and the perceptions of the public, and the civil servants themselves.</p> <p>The main sample for analysis are five most recent, completed public competitions for civil service jobs in each country for the year preceding the monitoring, from five different state administration authorities, i.e. one large ministry, one medium ministry, one small ministry and two central state administration agencies (special organizations, offices, government services, etc.). Only institutions to which civil service law applies are taken into account. Before filing requests, researchers check if the administrative bodies have had public job announcements in the previous year. In countries with decentralised systems (where requests have to be filed to individual institutions), researchers double the number of FOI requests. All elements based on the sample below refer to the same sample.</p> <p>To better inform the research and particularly the narrative reports, a focus group will be held with 5-10 former candidates for civil service jobs who applied to various levels of job positions as external candidates (i.e. candidates who were not already civil servants or hired via contracts in the public administration). An interview with a representative of the central, HRM responsible institution is held, to further inform the findings.</p>		
INDICATOR ELEMENTS			
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source

E.1	Information about public competitions is made broadly publicly available	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information available on webpage of central responsible institution • Information on announcements of 5 public competitions obtained online or through FOI • Interview with representative of a central HRM institution • Focus group with former candidates for civil service jobs (for narrative report)
Element methodology		Point allocation	
<p>Broad public availability is understood as requiring publication through at least 3 different means of advertising that are available nation-wide, including a single point portal/website for all recruitments in the public administration and social media.</p> <p>Researchers perform a review of the website of the central responsible institution for civil service competitions in the last calendar year. Additionally, websites of the five different central administration bodies included in the sample are analysed.</p> <p>FOI requests are sent to the central, HRM responsible institution to obtain information on the ways of advertising for the public competitions more generally, but the fact checking is done by analysing the ways in which the five sampled public announcements were published.</p>		<p>0 if information about public competitions is not made broadly publicly available (not published though at least 3 different, nation-wide means of advertising, as stipulated in the methodology); also, if some open competitions are published more widely, but not all, 0 points are awarded.</p> <p>1 if information about all public competitions is made available online through a single point portal/website for all recruitments in public administration.</p> <p>2 if the information about public competitions is made available online through a single point, and at least 2 other different means of advertising available nation-wide, including social media.</p> <p>Maximum points: 4</p>	
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.2	Public competition announcements are written in a simple, clear and understandable language	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text of 5 public competitions obtained online or through FOI • Interview with representative of a central HRM institution • Focus group with former candidates for civil service jobs (for narrative report)

Element methodology		Point allocation	
<p>This element seeks to establish if open competitions are written so as to incentivise external candidates to apply and ensure that they understand the job description and all requirements for submitting an application.</p> <p>Researchers analyse the text of 5 public competition announcements within a year preceding the measurement. The announcements need to pertain to vacancies in five different institutions of the central administration. Depending on the recruitment procedure (centralised or decentralised), researchers first review the websites of the central HRM institution or of individual central administration bodies, to identify where announcements have been made. If announcements are not available online, they request them from the responsible authority/authorities, using FOI requests.</p> <p>Next, they analyse the information obtained for the five sampled public job announcements.</p> <p>Simplicity, clarity and understandability are taken to mean that the information is translated into less bureaucratic language, that the requirements and the procedure are explained in a manner which provides all the necessary information and is clear regarding the types of documents and information which needs to be submitted, the procedure for application and the procedure for selection. If the primary announcement for a vacancy is shortened (e.g. for the sake of clarity or cutting the costs of advertising) but makes a clear reference to the web address and physical address where detailed information can be obtained, points will be allocated. Also, if additional efforts are present to make the announcements more attractive and easy to understand to external candidates (i.e. infographics, messaging, etc.), and other criteria described above is also met, points will be allocated.</p>		<p>0 if the text of public competitions is not assessed as simple, clear and understandable</p> <p>1 if the text of public competitions clearly contains all elements and is clear, but is not translated into less bureaucratic language.</p> <p>2 if all requirements of simplicity clarity and understandability are met, as described in the methodology, including use of less bureaucratic language.</p> <p>Maximum points: 4</p>	
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.3	During the public competition procedure, interested candidates can request and obtain clarifications, which are made publicly available	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation regulating external recruitment • Information received through FOI requests (same sample as in E.2) • Websites of central responsible institutions and other relevant portals/websites • Interview with representative of a central HRM institution Focus group with former candidates for civil service jobs (for narrative report)

Element methodology		Point allocation	
<p>This element measures if candidates can request additional information and clarifications from the hiring authority, and if the replies to such requests are made publicly available at a clearly designated online location (the website of central responsible institution or the hiring authority).</p> <p>Researchers first perform a review of external recruitment procedures based on legislation (primary and secondary), to establish if it is possible to request additional information and clarifications.</p> <p>Next, they perform analysis of the online availability of requests for clarifications and replies, for the same sample of announcements used in E.2 above. If they are not available online, researchers send FOI requests to the central HRM-responsible institution or to the recruiting central administration bodies (depending on the system), to obtain examples of requests for clarifications and replies provided. Online research and/or FOI requests are done regardless of the result of the legislative analysis, unless the legally prescribed procedure explicitly prohibits requesting and issuing clarifications to candidates. This is done in order to ensure that the actual practice is identified.</p> <p>In case that requests for clarifications are legally allowed, but are not found in the sample, researchers first rely on information collected through focus group and interview. Also, if in the sample announcements it is made clear that requests for clarifications can be made, researchers can allocate points (candidates were informed and chose not to request clarifications). If the information about possibility to send requests for clarifications was nowhere published in the call, researchers do not allocate points.</p>		<p>0 if there is no possibility for clarifications and replies; also, if clarifications are allowed, but replies are not provided in practice</p> <p>1 if clarifications are possible and provided in practice, but replies are not made publicly available at a clearly designated online location</p> <p>2 if clarifications are possible and provided and they are made publicly available at a clearly designated online location</p> <p>Maximum points: 4</p>	
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.4	There are no unreasonable barriers for external candidates which make public competitions more easily accessible to internal candidates	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public competitions announcements Information received through FOI requests Interview with representative of a central HRM institution Focus group with former candidates for civil service jobs (for narrative report)
Element methodology		Point allocation	
Researchers first perform expert review of the requirements established in the relevant legislation (primary and secondary).		0 if public competitions contain unreasonable barriers for external candidates	

	<p>Next, they perform expert review of supporting documents requested from candidates, through a sample of 5 public competition announcements in the year preceding the measurement (sample as in E.2). Through FOI requests, researchers obtain information on what is required from candidates to submit in all stages of recruitment process.</p> <p>They search for requirements that are a special burden to external candidates (e.g. passing a state exam or proof of attendance of specific courses/trainings available only to civil servants or costly to take) or those that could only reasonably be expected from an existing civil servant (e.g. very specific information on the tasks and duties of the job position to which they are being recruited).</p>		<p>1 if public competitions contain no barriers for external candidates</p> <p>Maximum points: 2</p>
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.5	The application procedure imposes minimum administrative and paperwork burden on candidates	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texts of public competition announcements • Information received based on FOI requests • Interview with representative of a central HRM institution • Focus group with former candidates for civil service jobs (for narrative report)
Element methodology			Point allocation
<p>This element measures how burdensome the application procedure is, especially in the first phase. Less administrative burden in the first stage can increase the interest of external candidates.</p> <p>Researchers perform a review of the legislation regulating the recruitment procedure, first to establish if it is organised in phases or as a single procedure. Subsequently, they analyse the list of documents requested in the first phase of application for civil service competitions (5 sampled public competitions). Finally, they analyse the list of documents required in the second phase (and other subsequent phases, if applicable).</p> <p>Easily obtained documents for the first phase include: curriculum vitae, statement of interest, copy of ID, ordinary copy of the relevant diploma, copies of up to 2 reference (recommendation) letters. A maximum of 5 documents are considered as reasonable to allocate maximum points.</p> <p>If in the recruitment procedure the administration collects all data and information from the registries and databases it keeps/collects (e.g. birth certificates, citizenship certificates, state examination certificates, etc.), this gives grounds for awarding points.</p>			<p>0 if the application process is organised in one phase, with all documents to be obtained and submitted by the candidate upfront (including documents which are kept in civil and other registers, e.g. birth certificates); also, if the sample shows diverging practices</p> <p>1 if the application process is organised in two phases, but more than 5 documents are requested in phase 1; or if particularly burdensome requirements are made in the subsequent phase(s); also, if the procedure is organised in one phase, but up to 5 different documents are requested from the candidate and all data/information kept by the government authorities is</p>

			<p>obtained ex officio for the candidate</p> <p>2 if the application process is organised in two phases, with up to 5 easily obtained documents requested in the first stage and a reasonable list of documents requested in subsequent phase(s) and all data/information kept by the government authorities is obtained ex officio for the candidate</p> <p>Maximum points: 4</p>
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.6	Candidates are allowed and invited to supplement missing documentation within a reasonable timeframe	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation regulating recruitment of civil servants • Information received through FOI requests • Interview with the central HRM responsible institution • Focus group with former candidates for civil service jobs
Element methodology		Point allocation	
<p>This element determines if failure to submit all requested documents in the first stage means automatic disqualification from the procedure, which is particularly important for the procedures where a greater number of documents is requested to apply initially. A reasonable timeframe is understood to mean at least 5 working days.</p> <p>Researchers first perform a review of legislation (laws and bylaws) regulating recruitment of civil servants to determine if the formal procedure allows for this. Subsequently, FOI requests are sent to the central, HRM responsible institution (and, where needed due to the nature of the procedure, to five different central administration bodies, using the same sample as in E.2), to obtain information and evidence regarding possibility of supplementing documents.</p>		<p>0 if no option to supplement documents is provided</p> <p>1 if supplementing documents is allowed, but required within less than 5 working days; or if evidence is found that this possibility is not used properly and evenly across the sample</p> <p>2 if the application procedure allows candidates to supplement missing documentation within a reasonable timeframe (at least 5 working days) and evidence shows that it is practiced properly and evenly across the sample</p> <p>Maximum points: 4</p>	
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source

E.7	Responsible government bodies publicly provide feedback on the treatment of received comments	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups with CSOs; • Interviews with relevant government institutions; • Official reports from consultations; • Websites of responsible government bodies;
Element methodology		Point allocation	
<p>This element analyses the transparency of the outcome of the selection process, i.e. if the decisions are made publicly available. The caveat related to the protection of personal information of candidates is included (it is not used for indicator value calculation but will be notified in the narrative report).</p> <p>Researchers first review the legislation pertaining to the selection procedure, to determine the legal requirements. They further perform a review of the website of the central, HRM-responsible institution and five central administration bodies (sample as in E.2) with regards to the decisions (outcomes) of selection processes in the year preceding the measurement.</p>		<p>0 if no information on decisions is made publicly available</p> <p>1 if not all decisions from the sample were made publicly available or if only partial information is provided (e.g. names, but no ranking)</p> <p>2 if all selection decisions are made publicly available with rankings of candidates provided</p> <p>Maximum points: 4</p>	
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.8	Information about annulled announcements is made publicly available, with reasoning provided	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation regulating recruitment of civil servants • Website of central responsible institution • Websites of ministries and central administration bodies • Information received through FOI requests • Interview with the central HRM responsible institution • Focus group with former candidates for civil service jobs
Element methodology		Point allocation	
<p>For this element, researchers will analyse if there have been follow-up discussions and exchange of opinions (open dialogue) between the responsible government bodies and civil society regarding any contested issues arising from the consultation process. Points will be awarded if there has been dialogue, regardless of whether it was initiated by the government or CSO side.</p> <p>To determine if such dialogue has taken place, expert assessment of any meeting minutes and/or other reports will be done. In addition, qualitative semi-structured interviews (up to three) with representatives of relevant government institutions and</p>		<p>0 points: There is no dialogue on contested questions for any of the key strategic PAR documents (or there is dialogue for some but not for the overall PAR strategy);</p> <p>1 point: There is a dialogue on contested questions in the case of one key strategic document – overall PAR strategy;</p>	

	focus groups with representatives of CSOs who participated in consultation will be used, to determine whether there is a practice of sufficient and active dialogue on contested issues (e.g. comments that were not accepted, issues that CSOs pushed for, but the responsible government bodies have rejected, or issues that were initially accepted, but later deleted in the inter-ministerial procedures, etc.) in consultation process. In order to award points, all three data sources need to corroborate the finding.		2 points: There is a dialogue on contested questions in the case of all key strategic PAR documents; Maximum points: 2
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.9	Civil servants perceive the recruitments into the civil service as based on merit	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey of civil servants
	Element methodology		Point allocation
	<p>This element measures perception of the meritocratic character of the recruitments by the civil servants themselves.</p> <p>As part of the survey of civil servants, respondents are asked two questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Civil servants in my institution are recruited on the basis of qualifications and skills.</i> <i>To get a civil service job in my institution, one needs to have connections.</i> <p>Scale is: 1 – Strongly disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Neither disagree nor agree; 4 – Agree; 5 – Strongly agree, with possibility to opt for “Don’t know/ No opinion/ Don’t want to answer”.</p> <p>For the first statement, researchers measure the percentage of respondents who reply with “strongly agree” and “agree”.</p> <p>For the second statement, researchers measure the percentage of respondents who reply with “disagree” and “strongly disagree”.</p> <p>The average for the two statements is calculated for the indicator point allocation.</p>		<p>0 point = below 29.9%</p> <p>1 point = 30.00 – 59.9%</p> <p>2 points = 60%-100%</p> <p>Maximum points: 2</p>
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source
E.10	Civil servants perceive the recruitment procedure to ensure equal opportunity	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey of civil servants
	Element methodology		Point allocation
	<p>This element measures the civil servants’ perception of the equal opportunity character of the recruitment procedure.</p> <p>As part of the survey of civil servants, respondents are asked the following question:</p> <p><i>In the recruitment procedure for civil servants in my institution all candidates are treated equally (regardless of gender, ethnicity, or</i></p>		<p>0 point = below 29.9%</p> <p>1 point = 30.00 – 59.9%</p> <p>2 points = 60%-100%</p> <p>Maximum points: 2</p>

	<p><i>another personal trait which could be basis for unfair discrimination).</i></p> <p>Scale is: 1 – Strongly disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Neither disagree nor agree; 4 – Agree; 5 – Strongly agree, with possibility to opt for “Don’t know/ No opinion/ Don’t want to answer”.</p> <p>Researchers measure the percentage of respondents who reply with “agree” and “strongly agree”.</p>					
Element #	Element formulation	Weight	Element data source			
E.11	The public perceives the recruitments done through the public competition process as based on merit	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public perception survey 			
Element methodology		Point allocation				
	The public perceives the recruitments done through the public competition process as based on merit		1			
TOTAL POINTS	0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36
FINAL INDICATOR VALUE	0	1	2	3	4	5