



Professional performance evaluation within the Romanian administrative system

*Evaluarea performanțelor profesionale
în sistemul administrativ românesc*

Lecturer Cristina MANOLE, Ph.D.

The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania

e-mail: man_cor_1969@yahoo.com

Abstract

The current economic crisis, manifested in the entire world, highlights the need for sustained involvement of the local and regional authorities in each country, in conceiving and implementing Community policies (which already exist at European level) having an essential role in implementing the economic plans achievement. This view was shared by all European Union Member States, of which Romania is part, since 2007. Therefore, the economic crisis which is reflected in the Romanian society today, requires prompt and sustained intervention by the authorities in the execution of the economic recovery plan, implying the community strategies, due to sharply budgetary expenses cut, which is found in all European countries. In order to achieve this major objective, the Romanian authorities should have qualified and properly motivated personnel through an adequate remuneration, according to the training, skills, responsibilities and especially individual performance obtained at each position, as it happens in most developed countries of the European Union. In this context, this study approaches the issues related to the performance evaluation of the public sector's employees. Considering the fact that strengthening and developing the human resources segment is a strategic goal of the Romanian administration for the period 2008 - 2013, which will lead to modernizing it and making it more efficient (at both central and local level), the personnel performance evaluation, at the organizational level represents a fundamental activity from the human resources' management perspective.

Keywords: *performance evaluation; performance indicators' system; human resources management; Romanian administration.*

Rezumat

Criza economică actuală, manifestată la nivel mondial, scoate în evidență necesitatea unei implicări susținute a autorităților locale și regionale din fiecare țară, în conceperea și execuția strategiilor comunitare (existente la nivel european) acestea având un rol esențial în execuția planurilor de realizare economică. Această opinie a fost împărtășită de către toate statele membre ale Uniunii Europene, din care și România face parte, începând cu anul 2007. Astfel, criza economică în care se regăsește societatea românească astăzi, impune intervenția promptă și susținută a autorităților în execuția planului de relansare economică și implicit a strategiilor comunitare, pe fondul reducerii

drastice a cheltuielilor bugetare, aspect regăsit în toate țările europene. Pentru îndeplinirea acestui obiectiv major, autoritățile românești trebuie să dispună de personal calificat și motivat corespunzător printr-o recompensare adecvată, în funcție de pregătirea, aptitudinile, responsabilitățile și mai ales performanțele individuale, obținute la nivelul fiecărui post, așa cum se întâmplă în majoritatea țărilor dezvoltate ale Uniunii Europene. În acest context, lucrarea de față abordează problematica referitoare la evaluarea performanțelor angajaților din sectorul public. Având în vedere faptul că, întărirea și dezvoltarea segmentului resurse umane reprezintă un obiectiv strategic al administrației românești, pentru perioada 2008 – 2013, obiectiv ce va conduce la modernizarea și eficientizarea acesteia (atât la nivel central, cât și local), evaluarea performanțelor personalului, la nivel organizațional, reprezintă o activitate fundamentală, din perspectiva managementului resurselor umane.

Cuvinte-cheie: *evaluarea performanțelor; sistemul indicatorilor de performanță; managementul resurselor umane; administrația românească.*

JEL Classification: , H83, J3J31, K23.

General considerations

The dignity of the public service all around the world, is based on civic responsibility and loyalty towards the citizens. The experience of many countries confirms the fact that one of the objectives of implementing performance evaluation systems is to improve responsibility (Androniceanu & Burcea, 2005). According to specialists, the dignity specific to the mission of this organization is based not only on the hierarchical responsibility and loyalty to superiors, but also social responsibility and loyalty to citizens. In this situation, the lack of real information regarding the achieved performance significantly limits the managers' ability to efficiently manage the public organization, but also the external control organisms (the Parliamentary Committees, the Court of Auditors etc.) in order to evaluate the performance level and making it public (Androniceanu & Burcea, 2005).

Knowing the performance level of the employees in public institutions and their overall performance, is an essential part of confidence which people give to public organisms.

Considering the fact that strengthening and developing the human resources segment is a strategic objective of the Romanian administration for the period 2008 - 2013 (objective sustained and determined by the crisis which is reflected in today's Romania, like other European countries), will determine, inevitably, the modernizing and efficient zing the administrative structures, both at central, but especially at a local level. From this perspective, the professional performance evaluation represents a fundamental activity of human resources management. It is necessary, on one hand to establish the annual performance criteria, in each public institution (activity in which the role of the public managers

is crucial), and on the other hand, the evaluation will be accomplished reported to the set objectives, in each position, existing in the organizational institution (Manole, 2006; Emilian, Tigu & Tuclea, 2003; Lefter, Marinaş & Nica, 2007; Stanciu, 2003).

Before starting the actual performance evaluation, the evaluator must be provided with the job description. Every public worker has a current job description that under the law (Law Romania, 1999; Law Romania, 2001), comes together with the administrative appointing document in a public position. If the job description does not exist, it must be put together by the head of the department in which the public worker operates and endorsed by the supervisor of the head of department. The approval of job description is performed by the manager of the institution or public authority concerned.

The job description related to a public position defines and mainly delimits the following:

- The contribution to achieving the goals, functions, tasks and objectives of the institutions;
- Content and forecasted results of the work to be done;
- Authority limits related to performing within the public position;
- Requirements and conditions to be met by a person to fill in the position.

In preparing the job description the aptitudes and professional competences of a certain person are not considered (public worker), but the most optimal activity organization in order to fulfill the public institution's attribution. This is, in fact, the reason why the job description is initially not individualized. A public worker may not be required to undertake any activity, and the department's manager does not have the possibility to include in the job description expressions such as 'any other activities that will be assigned' and cannot expect for this formulation to cover any unimaginable activities.

The individual objectives derive from the objectives of the organizational structure in which the public worker performs his activity, set objectives, depending on the strategy of the public institution. These objectives may change (within the limits imposed by the job description) if the public authority or institution modifies its own objectives.

The individual professional performance evaluation methodology of the public workers requires that the objectives can be reviewed quarterly or whenever a change in organizational structure of the public authority or institution occurs. In this case, the revised objectives will be stated in the individual performance evaluation report of the public worker.

The individual objectives must meet the following requirements:

- To be specific to the activities involving the performance of public power prerogatives, which means that there can not be any objectives set that would imply the public worker in activities which overcome the attributions which are specific to a public position;

- To be quantifiable - to have a full form of accomplishment. Ideally, the objective should be accompanied by a numerical value, but this does not exclude the existence of a quality standard. For example, the activity must meet explicit levels. The objective could be expressed as: completion of a number X of works in a time frame Y, with uncertainty of less than Z%. An other less explicit example would be 'developing a certain project of normative act within maximum X versions, until a certain date'. A clear objective definition makes possible most of the times to allocate a numerical value to the established objective and this allocation should be done most of the times;

- To be provided with deadlines. Obviously, the deadline shall not exceed the following period for which the evaluation is made, which requires some ingenuity on the part of the evaluator, as it is very likely that the objectives remain the same from one evaluated period to the other. In that case there will be settled intermediary deadlines;

- To be realistic - to be able to be carried out within the deadlines set and allocated resources;

- To be flexible - to be able to be revised according to changes in priorities of public authority or institution.

The performance evaluation goals are extremely important both for individual and organizational behavior. In Table 1, are presented, by synthesizing the most important objectives of performance evaluation activities, according to experts, (Manole, 2006).

The objectives of performance evaluation

Table 1

Objectives	Facilities
The achievement of adequate human resources activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of rational managerial decision in relation to: recruitment, promotions, transfer, demotion, etc. ▪ Consistency of performance and individual contributions to the organizational mission and objectives; ▪ Observation of inconsistencies between organizational objectives and strategies on human resources.
Balanced personnel remuneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Achieving a balance between people and existing positions in the organizational structure; ▪ Fair and balanced recognition of their efforts.
Increasing the workers' motivation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Encourage initiative; ▪ Develops the sense of responsibility; ▪ Perceives the position within the organizational hierarchy and stimulates the performance effort.

Objectives	Facilities
Providing useful information for its own development staff, giving them confidence in their strength.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gives possibility to each employee to know which are the chances of progress in relation to their own performance and organizational objectives; ▪ Knowledge by each employee to its contribution to achieving organizational objectives; ▪ Identifying the most appropriate ways to achieve performance.
Validating the selection programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identifying the workers with unsatisfying results ▪ Insuring the quality of the selection system through the data and information provided by the performance evaluation programs.
Detecting training and individual development needs of the staff and also the effects' evaluation of based on the training and development programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allows establishing the necessary capabilities and aptitudes of different employment positions and also the minimum performance level; ▪ Points out some deficiencies in staff training; ▪ Can provide data and information on the weaknesses or potential of the employees that will benefit from the improvement of professional training; ▪ Determines the individual needs of the employees.
Discussing the medium and long term plans of the employees, as well as their career goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The chance of dialogue; ▪ Each employee has the opportunity to know the chances of development according to their performance, and the objectives of the organization; ▪ Provides the possibility to improve performance in order to achieve the career objectives
Integrating human resource planning in other personnel activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides data and information for the skills inventories; ▪ Creates a necessary basis for an integrated human resources system and also to achieve their permanent diagnosis
Improving the manager – employee relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensures observing the behavior of the subordinates in order to assist employees through counseling
Improving communication and collaboration between the managers and employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gives the possibility to know better the mentioned parties
Applying the equal chance principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allows elaborating the decisions in the human resources area such as it will avoid the unfit appreciation tendency

The performance evaluation period and exceptions to this are provided by law and must be strictly obeyed by every authority and public institution. The person performing this task, the evaluator, has, by law, the following status:

- a) The public leading worker who co-ordinates the management department in which the public performer worker develops his activity or who co-ordinates his activity;

- b) The public leading worker hierarchically superior according to the organizational structure of the authority or public institution, for the public leading worker;
- c) The senior public servant, for the leading public workers he manages or execution public workers, when they are developing their activity in some departments which are not coordinated by a public management worker, except the case when there is a direct report of subordination with the public authority or institution head or its deputy;
- d) The mayor, based on the proposal of the Local Committee, for the area secretary and the subdivision of the city administrative-territorial subdivision;
- e) The authority's manager or public institution or his deputy, for the public workers that are his direct subordinates.

The issues related to the annual assessment of public officials, promoting them (career development), sometimes produce legal effects on their situation therefore they are covered in the status of public workers. Promoting of a system of performance indicators represents an extremely important step in the personnel policy of the Romanian administrative system (U.C.R.A.P. Report Romania, 2007; Government Decision Romania, 2008a; Government Decision Romania, 2008b). Legislators wish for the system of performance indicators to have a double role: on one hand to encourage the public officials to obtain the best results and on the other hand to give a correct assessment of the contribution of each worker on the final result.

There are, at institutional level, four dimensions of evaluation, as follows:

1. Evaluating candidates for public positions;
2. Assessment of beginner civil workers;
3. Individual performance evaluation of the leading and execution public workers in order to grant the qualifications;
4. Evaluating the structure of the positions held by the public workers

The actual evaluation

Theoretical considerations regarding the candidates' evaluation to the public positions

The candidates' evaluation for public office positions is made through competitions and examinations for public offices.

The basic principles for organizing and conducting competitions and exams are:

- Opened competition;
- Selection, made exclusively on the results obtained in the exam or competition;
- The transparency of the evaluation process;

- Confidentiality, through granting the personal data protection of each candidate.

Evaluating candidates for public office positions are made by the competition's committees and, if the case, by the disputes clarifying committees.

The competition committees formed to fill in the execution public positions within the public authorities and institutions consist of 3-5 members:

- 2- 3 public workers who will at least have the category, class and degree of the vacant positions for which the selection is made;
- 1- 2 persons outside the authority or public institution which organizes the competition, usually specialists from specialized Universities or assigned representatives through a naming order or disposal from the manager or coordinating public institution or hierarchically superior.

The assessment is ended only after the review process of the candidates' complaints was completed. In order to do so, other special committees are formed to resolve disputes.

A special case is the assessment of public workers who, for reasons not attributable to them, have interrupted their public worker career and want to return to the public service. For them, the evaluation is made by a committee composed of: two ANFP representatives, a representative of the Administration and Internal Affairs Ministry, a representative of the Public Finances Ministry, a representative of the Ministry of Labor, Social Solidarity and Family. All disputes are resolved by a special commission, consisting of a representative of the Ministry of Administration and Internal Affairs, one of the ANFP and one Ministry of Public Finances.

The evaluation of junior public workers

The evaluation of a junior public worker's activity is usually made within 5 days of completion of the probation period by the compartment manager in which they operate.

The evaluation of the junior public worker's activity consists of assessing the acquisition of theoretical knowledge and practical skills required to perform tasks related to public administration, business knowledge specific authority or public institution and government requirements.

The assessor completes an evaluation report for the probation period on the following:

- Content of the assessment prepared by the junior public worker's advisor;
- Internship report prepared by the junior public worker;
- Assessment interview with the junior public worker.

Depending on them, the evaluator notes the evaluation criteria depending on the degree of duties fulfilled, establishes the assessment qualification and makes proposals regarding the appointment in a permanent civil service or dismissal from the public office.

The main evaluation criteria for the junior public worker are:

- 1) The knowledge degree of regulations specific to the area of activity;
- 2) The knowledge degree of the specifics and principles leading the public administration and the administrative reports within the authority or public institution;
- 3) The ability of fulfilling attributions;
- 4) The adaptability and flexibility degree in fulfilling attributions;
- 5) The aptitude of correctly distinguishing between the characteristics of several options in fulfilling the job attributions and to identify the best action option;
- 6) The ability to share ideas, both written and verbally, written fluency, including the ability to write clear;
- 7) The ability to work in a team, meaning the team spirit, to bring up their contribution through the effective participation, to support the team's activity in accomplishing its objectives.

According to the law mentioned procedures, noting the evaluation criteria and establishing the mark is made as follows:

- The evaluation criteria is noted from 1 to 5, 1 being the smallest grade, and 5 being the highest. The mark represents the accomplishment of each evaluation criteria in finishing job duties;
- The arithmetic media is calculated for all the marks granted for each evaluation criteria and the final mark is obtained;
- The evaluation grade is obtained by transforming the final mark, as follows: between 1.00 and 3.00 – unsatisfying, between 3.00 to 5.00 - satisfying.

The significance of the evaluation rates is the following:

a) 'Unsatisfying' – the junior public worker did not make the proof of the theoretical knowledge and necessary practical skills necessary to perform the public position;

b) 'Satisfying' – the junior public worker made the proof that he/she holds all theoretical knowledge and necessary practical skills to perform the public position.

The junior public worker who is not satisfied by the evaluation's result might dispute the obtained mark, within 5 working days from the date the result was acknowledged, to the evaluator's superior public worker.

Upon finishing the training period, based on the result of the evaluation, the junior public worker will be:

a) Named, by transforming the position, definitive performing public worker in the class corresponding to the finished studies, in the assistant professional degree, in the case he/she obtained upon the activity's evaluation the 'satisfying' mark;

b) Released from the public position, in the case he/she obtained upon the activity's evaluation the 'unsatisfying' mark.

*Individual professional performance evaluation
of the leading and performing public workers*

The evaluation procedure of the individual professional performance is applied to each public worker, by reporting the performance criteria to the degree of fulfillment of the objectives established based on the attributions stated in the job description.

The performance criteria established, are brought to the public worker's attention, at the beginning of the evaluation period.

In order to accomplish the annual individual professional performance, the public worker must have developed a public activity within the last 6 months.

The individual professional performance of the public workers is made by respecting the legal regime of interests' conflicts regarding the public workers.

The evaluation procedure consists of:

- a) Filling in the evaluation report by the evaluator;
- b) The interview;
- c) The counter signing of the evaluation report.

In order to complete the evaluation report, the evaluator:

- a) Analyses the fulfillment of the determined individual objectives;
- b) Notes the performance criteria according to their importance;
- c) Establishes the final evaluation mark of individual professional performance;
- d) Mentions the outstanding results of the public worker, the objective difficulties he met in the evaluated period and any other observations which he considers relevant;
- e) Establishes the needs of professional formation for the year following the evaluated period.;
- f) Establishes the individual objectives for the following year after the evaluation period.

Grading the objectives and performing criteria is made by completing the following steps:

- a) Each objective is marked with grades from 1 to 5 (1 – minimum level and 5 – highest level), the grade expressing the accomplishment degree for the specified objective, from a quantity, quality and deadline point of view;
- b) Each performance criteria is grade from 1 to 5, the mark expressing the appreciation in fulfilling the performance criteria in accomplishing the established individual objectives.

In order to receive the mark for accomplishing the objectives, the arithmetic media is made for all marks received for accomplishing each criterion. The final evaluation mark is the arithmetic media of all grades obtained for the individual objectives and performance criteria.

The significance of the grade is as follows: 1 – minimum level, and 5 – maximum level.

The final evaluation mark is established based on the final grade as follows:

- a) between 1.00- 2.00 - unsatisfying;
- b) between 2.01- 3.50- satisfying;
- c) between 3.51- 4.50 - good;
- d) between 4.51- 5.00 – very good.

The interview, as a stage of the evaluation process, represents an information exchange that takes place between the evaluator and the public worker in which:

- a) It is brought to the public worker's attention all notes made by the evaluator in the evaluation report;
- b) The evaluation report is signed and dated by the evaluated public worker too.

If between the evaluated public worker and the evaluator there are differences of opinion regarding the made notes, the public worker's comments are mentioned in the evaluation report. The evaluator might change the evaluation report if a meeting point is reached.

The law does not establish the moment when the interview will take place. Nevertheless, it would be suitable for the interview to be scheduled the first moment it is reasonable after finishing the evaluation report. The main determinant factor is the notice, which must be sent to the evaluated public worker. He needs time to prepare himself, already being provided with the notice containing any other supplementary objectives established for the period that the evaluation is made. Also, he will have at hand his own job description. It is recommended for the evaluated public worker to have at his disposal between three to five working days after receiving the notice regarding the evaluation interview. The notice will be made in written – being an official event – and will mention the date, hour and location of the interview.

The evaluation report is being handed to the counter-signed party. The counter-signed party is the public worker with a superior hierarchic position than the evaluator's, according to the organisational structure of the public institution. If the evaluator is the director of the authority or public institution, the evaluation report is not counter-signed.

The evaluation report might be modified according to the counter-signer's decision in the following cases:

- a) The appreciation do not correspond to reality;

b) Between the evaluator and evaluated public worker there are differences of opinion that could not be cleared in a friendly manner.

The modified evaluation report in the previously mentioned conditions is brought to the public worker's attention.

The unsatisfied public workers might dispute the result of the evaluation at the authority or public institution's director.

The appeal is made within 5 calendar days from acknowledgement, by the evaluated public worker, of the granted qualification mark and is cleared within 15 calendar days from the appeal presentation deadline expiration.

The appeal's result is mentioned to the public worker within 5 calendar days from the appeal's solving. The unsatisfied public worker might address to the court, according to the law.

Professional performance evaluation for the contractual personnel

Allocating staff is made only through competition or examination, as appropriate, on a vacant position. The competition is open for people from outside the unit or inside the unit. Existing vacancies in position status is opened for competition, as necessary, making the publication, where appropriate, in a newspaper office, locally or by displaying them at the institution at least 15 days before the competition starts. Theme for the contest will be available to applicants by the public institution that holds the competition.

The review committee will be established in order to verify the compliance with the terms of the contest, and also the professional competence of candidates. From the committee are, necessarily, the head of the department that will make the employment, his superior, and if the case, 2 to 3 specialised higher education specialists from research institutes in the field, from the ministry, or any other central or local institutions of the co-ordinating public administration.

The competition consists of a written test, an oral test or interview. Each committee member will mark the written and oral tests with grades from 1-10. In order to be declared admitted, the candidates must obtain at least the grade 7 at each test. The result of the contest shall be recorded in minutes, signed by all the members of the examination committee.

Based on the marks obtained, the examination committee will determine the final competition order. On equal marks obtained from written and oral tests, the committee will determine the successful candidate in relation to personal data contained in the recommendations or to the basic level or further studies (PhD, post-graduate, postgraduate courses and others).

If, at the competition organised in order to fill an empty position there were not several candidates presented, the employment is made by examination. Arrangements and conduct of the competition/exam are determined by regulations approved by the Government.

The persons employed in management positions will be subject to a probationary period under the law. If at the end of the probationary period, a person employed proved to be appropriate for the position, the employment will be finalised from the start of the trial period. Completion shall be based on the hierarchical superior's notes, the unit leader or superior body, according to law. After this period, if the person does not meet the duties, he/she will be passed to a suitable vacant execution position according to the training and competence and, where appropriate, the employment agreement will be cancelled.

Conclusions regarding the actual procedure of professional performance evaluation

The performance evaluation procedure for the public position is applied to each position in relation to the tasks and corresponding job responsibilities, according to the law.

The evaluation of individual job performance and determining the level of the base salary and, where appropriate, the compensation management are made in the month of January of the year following the evaluation of the individual job performance.

The reassessment of the individual job performance, the level of individual base salary and, where appropriate, the allowance for individual leadership, together with the limits prescribed by law, shall be made annually in accordance with law, by hierarchical superior and approved by the authorizing budget coordinator.

The evaluation sheet of the individual job performance and also the individual base salary and, where appropriate, the individual leadership allowance, determined in accordance with the legal methodology, are brought to each employee's attention.

Any employee dissatisfied with the outcome of the individual professional performance evaluation and of the basic salary between individual limits, may approach the competent court under the law.

The process of evaluating individual job performance and establishing the base salary and, where appropriate, the management allowance have a continuing and increasing character and are determined by the increase of the appropriate job duties and responsibilities or professional degree or step function, if any.

Case Studies

In order to better understand the particularities of the performance evaluation activity in the public position, the current study mentions two actual situations as follows:

1. Performance evaluation of a debutant public worker;
2. Performance evaluation of public worker employed in a management position (county secretary).

POSITION: Debutant public worker*Information regarding the employment*

Position: Debutant public worker– reviewer

Previous experience: Real estate agent (1 year)

Studies: undergraduate – “Domnul Tudor” Drobeta Turnu Severin
Highschool

Foreign languages: French – medium level

English – medium level

Personal information

Date of birth: July 7th, 1982

Date of employment: January 20th 2004

Marital status: not married

*Training report of the debutant**Job duties:*

- Handling professional files of he public workers, according to the law;
- Insuring access to the professional files only to the authorized personnel.

Actual development activities

Records of all remuneration changes and record all types of vacations (medical leave, rest, study, etc.).

Record any changes or termination of service. Writing addresses using standard word processing programs, when needed, and developing responses to simple requests from staff, being checked before being issued.

Using Microsoft Word and Excel.

Call answering, but it also involves more than redirecting applicants to the competent person.

Organizing files of other employees when needed and cover routine activities related to copying and distributing materials.

Participation in a course of office automation, workplace training, which also included the improvement in some legislative aspects the job duties.

The advisor during the internship, was his superior in Compartment of Human Resource Management.

Difficulties encountered during the internship

Accommodation with daily work routine was difficult at first.

The developed activity does not seem to be very interesting, the attributions are mainly routine, with little initiative and therefore would like to have a greater role.

The advisor's notes

Attributions:

- Handling professional files of the public workers, according to the law;
- Guarding with maximum security, the professional files according to the law.

Activities developed during the training period:

- Recording, based on the originals, of any changes to personal data of the public workers;
- Record any changes in employment relations of the public workers;
- Record changes in payroll based on the data received from the payroll office;
- Standard issuing certificates;
- Using the photocopier or fax according to requests;
- Advising on matters of personnel, with low degree of difficulty;
- Call answering;

The aptitudes the debutante public worker has proven in fulfilling the job attributions :

The employee has developed an efficient, good quality activity. Understands the specific legislation regarding the management of professional files and the importance of its correct application. She is organized and able to move from one task to another as needed. She has a high will to work. She has very good phone communication skills. Provides and obtains information fairly and pleasantly. Written work done by her is mostly routine, but drafted in a proper manner. Very important, she prepares documents without delay.

The conduct of the debutant public worker during the service:

She is a nice young lady and very eager and willing to assist whenever needed. She is an intelligent and pleasant young woman and faces very well all situations. Initially she found it difficult to accommodate with routine daily activities, arriving late at work. This problem has disappeared in about three weeks.

The way of collaborating with the public institution's personnel:

Has a very good relationship with colleagues and has integrated into the team without any difficulties. She also has a very good relationship with senior staff of the institution with which she comes into contact.

Other tasks: not assigned.

Specialization courses: course office, specializing in the workplace.

Activities outside the institution: attending seminars and conferences.

Proposals to improve the debutant public worker: no.

The evaluation report for the training period

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Mark</i>
1. Knowing the regulations specific to the activity area	3
2. Public administration knowledge	4
3. The ability of fulfilling tasks	3
4. The adaptability and flexibility degree in fulfilling tasks	3
5. The aptitude of correctly distinguishing between the characteristics of several options in accomplishing job attributions and identifying the best action option	2
6. The ability to communicate ideas, both written and orally, writing fluency, including the ability to write clear and brief	4
7. Teamwork	4
8. Professional behavior during working schedule	3
Final stage period mark	Mark 3.25
Evaluation calificative	SATISFYING

Proposals: the employee should continue the currently developed activity

Recommendation: naming into a definitive public position as a referee assistant.

POSITION: Count Secretary*Information regarding the employment*

Position: County Secretary

Previous experience: Inspector, chief officer at the county council and prefecture (1990- 1992)

Inspector – legal control measures at the Prefecture (1992- 1993)

Member of professional associations: The Association of County Secretaries in Romania

Studies: Law University (five years) 1979- 1984

Administration Master degree 2004- 2006

Foreign languages: French - medium

Other: PC user

Personal information

Date of birth: November 13th 1952

Employment date: March 16th 1993

Marital status: Married

*Evaluation Report
of individual professional performance of the managing public worker*

Name and surname of the evaluated public worker: ANTON MARIA				
Public position: Secretary of the County Council Mehedinti				
Remuneration degree:				
Date of the last promotion: March 13 th 1993				
Name and surname of the evaluator:.....				
Position:				
Evaluated period: from December 01 st 2008 to November 30 th 2009				
Formation programs to which the evaluated public worker participated in the evaluated period				
1. Formation County Councils Secretaries - C.N.F.C.A.P.L. Bucharest				
2.				
3.				
Objectives for the evaluated period	% time	Performance indicators	Accomplished %	Mark
1. Organizing, coaching, coordinating and checking the subordinated compartments.	20	P	100%	4
2. Receiving, distributing and chasing the correspondation solving within legal term.	20	P	100%	5
3. Coordinating compartments and activities with legal characteristics with the Mayor's House.	10	P	100%	5
4. Countersigning the documents released but the Hunedoara County Mayor's House.	10	P	100%	5
5. Preparing documents to be debated in the Local Council.	10	P	100%	4
6. Approval for the legality of draft decisions or Mayor's disposals.	10	P	100%	5
7. Attending the Local Council's or special committees' meetings.	10	P	100%	5
8. Attributions received through special laws (L.18/1991, L.10/2001, L.54/1998, etc.)	10	P	100%	4
Objectives revised in the evaluated period	% of time	Performance indicators	Accomplished %	Mark
1.				
2.				
3.				
Final mark for fulfilling objectives: 4.62				
Performance criteria used in the evaluation	Mark	Comments		
1. Implementation ability	5			
2. The ability to efficiently solve problems	5			
3. The ability to assume responsibilities	5			
4. Self-improvement ability	4			
5. Analysis and synthesis ability	5			
6. Creativity and initiative	5			
7. Ability to plan and act strategically	5			

8. Ability to manage the available resources	4			
9. Organizing ability	5			
10. Managing ability	5			
11. Co-ordination ability	4			
12. Control ability	5			
13. Ability of obtaining best results	5			
14. Decisional ability	4			
15. Delegation ability	4			
16. Human resources management ability	5			
17. Ability of developing the personnel's aptitudes	5			
18. Mediation and negotiation ability	4			
19. Appreciation objectivity	5			
Mark for fulfilling the performance criteria: 4.70				
Final evaluation mark: (Final mark for fulfilling objectives + the mark for performance criteria)/ 2 = 4.66				
Evaluation qualification: OUTSTANDING				
Outstanding results:				
1. The ability to encourage the skill development of the subordinated staff, in carrying out tasks, teamwork ability, being an example in dealing with colleagues and settling duties;				
2. Professional and timely completion of tasks set by the laws in force. Objective difficulties encountered in the evaluated period:				
a) Increasing attributions for the leading public workers of the local public administration and also the labor volume;				
b) The high volume of normative acts released and their impossibility of being applied due to the failure of their deadlines for issuing regulations and detailed rules for implementation and inconsistency between the provisions of various laws.				
Other observations:				
1.				
2.				
3.				
Objectives for the following period, for which the evaluation is made:				
Objective	% of time	Performance indicators	Deadline	
1. Organization, direction, co-ordination and verification of subordinate departments.	20	P		
2. Receiving, distributing and tracking correspondence solving, in legal terms.	20	P		
3. Co-coordinating compartments and activities with legal character within the Council.	10	P		
4. Counter signing the issued documents.	10	P		
5. Preparing documents to be debated by the <i>Local Council</i>	10	P		
6. Approval for the legality of draft decisions of the Mayor, counter signing the decisions.	10	P		

7. Attending to the Local Council's or special committees' meetings.	10	P	
8. Attributions received through special Laws (L.18/1991, L.10/2001, L54/1998, etc)	10	P	
Training programs recommended to be attended within the following period to be evaluated:			
1. Specialized formation programs, organized by I.N.A.			
2.			
3.			
Evaluated public worker's comments:			
Agree with the evaluation			
Name and Surname of the evaluated public worker:.....			
Position:			
Evaluator's signature:			
Date:			
Observations or comments of the person making the record:			
Name and Surname of the person making the record:.....			
Position:			
Signature of the person making the record:.....			
Date: 31.01.2010.....			

Source: County Council Mehedinți, (2009).

Conclusions

The previous examples point out the existence of several negative aspects (deficiencies) of the performance evaluating activity in the public position, deficiencies which might be expanded to the entire Romanian administration, meaning:

1. Generally, the evaluation is made by only one evaluator (usually, the hierarchic superior), which leads to the appearance of discriminations;
2. The lack of communication between the evaluated person and the evaluator;
3. Arbitrary or unfair evaluations, which determine the accentuated decrease of labor motivation;
4. Existence of some performance indicators which are difficult to quantify;
5. Deficiency in establishing and clearly informing regarding the objectives, attributions, responsibilities for each employee, and also the hierarchic subordination line;
6. The employees might perceive the performance evaluation as a signal of mistrust in their professional behavior (the lack of confidence);
7. The lack of specific guides, needed in order to prepare the evaluators;

8. The public manager's tendency to emphasize and orient themselves towards managing the resources at an institutional level, and less towards gathering performance results;

9. The lack of transparency and communicating gathered results following the performance evaluation activity at the institutional level;

Considering all the deficiencies of the employees' performance evaluation from the public sector, particularly, but also the deficiencies found from the human resources management point of view, in general, one might say that the public administration in Romania is currently facing (in the context of the deep economic crisis) with several threats, such as:

✓ The field professionals are leaving the system and the human resources migration from the public institutions towards the private ones;

✓ Insufficient funds needed for the training activity (formation and professional development), activity which influences in a final manner the performance level of the employees in the public institutions;

✓ Major difficulties in attracting by the administration and the entire public sector of field specialists, including young university graduates (master, bachelor degree, etc) who are not motivated to develop a career in this area;

✓ Uncertainty for those who work in the public sector regarding their future career;

✓ The lack of necessary legal basis needed for real personnel motivation in the public institutions, and also clearing the existing injustices between the remuneration levels on personnel categories;

✓ Existence of a concerning level of bureaucracy and corruption in the public system, etc.

Final conclusions

It is known that in many European countries, even those who have recently joined the European Union (see the Czech Republic), allocated rewards employees based on the principles of performance and professional competence.

From this perspective, Romanian administration aims for the next period (2010 - 2013) to improve human resources practices (still undeveloped), including those relating to assessment and benchmarking of their employees.

I mentioned at the beginning of this analysis, that this strategic objective will determine the completion of modernization and efficiency of state structures, both at central and local, because the system will work people with real performance.

As an analyst in human resources management, I hope that the Romanian Government will make in the coming period, efforts to overcome sensitive situation, the administration of the country is today (due to the crisis situation which crosses Romania and across Europe) and work towards achieving the strategic objectives set in early 2008.

References

- Androniceanu, A. & Burcea, Șt.G. (2005). "Comparative study regarding the performance measurement systems in the public sector" in the *Administration and Public Management Magazine*, A.S.E. Publishing House, Bucharest, no 4, pp 13- 14.
- County Council Mehedinți, (2009). *Evaluation Report, Romania of individual professional performance of the managing public worker*
- Emilian, R., Tigu, G. and Tuclea C. (2003) *Human Resources Management*, A.S.E. Publishing House, Bucharest.
- Government Decision Romania, (2008a). *The approval of the regulations regarding the organizing and development of the public workers career* (no.611 of 04.06.2008, Official Gazette of Romania, no. 530 of 14.07.2008). Bucharest: The Romanian Parliament.
- Government Decision Romania (2008b). *Regarding the change and addition of government Decision no.611 of 04.06.2008* (no.1173 of 24.09.2008, Official Gazette of Romania, no 677 of 02.10.2008). Bucharest: The Romanian Parliament.
- Law Romania, (2001). *Law regarding the approval of the government's emergency order no. 248/ 2000 for the change of Law no. 188/ 1999* (no. 661 of 2001 Official Gazette of Romania, no. 764 of 30.11.2001). Bucharest: The Romanian Parliament.
- Law Romania, (1999). *Law regarding the public worker's status* (no. 188 of 1999), C.H. Beck Publishing House. Bucharest: The Romanian Government.
- Lefter, V., Marinaș, C. & Nica, E. (2007). *Human Resources Management*, Economic Publishing House, Bucharest.
- Manole, C., (2006). *Human Resources Management*, A.S.E. Publishing House, Bucharest.
- Stanciu, S. (2003). *Human Resources Management, Communication and Public Relation's*. David Ogilvy Publishing House, Bucharest.
- U.C.R.A.P. Report Romania, (2007). *Strategic directions in the public administration's reform*. Retrieved January 14th, 2009 from <http://www.map.gov.ro>.