



SURVEY

**FOR THE 40th MEETING OF THE DIRECTORS-
GENERAL
OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE MEMBER STATES
OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

(Greece, Rhodes, 8 and 9 June 2003)

**“Career Development as an Effective Tool to
Enhance the Attractiveness of Public Employment”**

European Institute of Public Administration (NL)

Spring 2003

***Author of this study: Danielle Bossaert
Lecturer, European Institute of Public Administration***

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR MAKING PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT MORE ATTRACTIVE	7
2. MAIN ELEMENTS OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS IN THE EU MEMBER STATES: A COMPARATIVE VIEW	11
2.1. Promotion Policy	11
2.1.1. Main selection criteria for career advancement.....	11
2.1.2. Current trends in reforming promotion policy	15
2.1.3 Access to leading positions	17
2.2. Mobility Policy	23
2.2.1. Instruments to promote mobility in the EU MS	23
2.2.2. The significance of mobility for career progression.....	28
2.2.3. Reform trends favouring mobility	29
2.2.4. Obstacles to mobility.....	31
2.3. Career paths of senior civil servants	32
2.3.1. Mobility and advancement opportunities for senior civil servants.....	32
2.3.2. Performance management and staff development.....	35
2.3.3. Training programmes for senior civil servants.....	38
3. THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS: TO WHAT EXTENT DO THEY MOTIVATE PUBLIC SECTOR STAFF?	41
3.1. Promotion Policy	41
3.1.1. The trend from purely seniority-based to more merit and performance-based selection and promotion procedures	41
3.1.2. The trend towards reducing promotion opportunities by flattening or “de-layering” administrative hierarchies	42
3.2. Mobility Policy	43
3.2.1. Trend to increase mobility opportunities.....	43
3.3. Career paths of senior civil servants	45
3.3.1. The trend towards more flexible and performance-oriented management of senior civil servants, with greater opportunities for varied work experience.....	45
3.3.2. The trend towards less secure and more unpredictable career prospects.....	46
CONCLUSIONS	47
Annex: Questionnaire.....	49



Career Development as an Effective Tool to Enhance the Attractiveness of Public Employment

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE STUDY CARRIED OUT BY EIPA

1. The attractiveness of public employment depends on a multiple set of elements, among which career development systems are crucial in recruiting and retaining competent staff and in competing effectively with the private sector.
2. An attractive career development system as defined in this study not only responds to organisational needs but also motivates and commits staff.
3. Major prerequisites for motivational career development systems are: a promotion policy with clear rules based on the reward and recognition of individual merit and performance; opportunities for staff development through mobility, training, job enrichment, job enlargement, coaching etc. with attractive career prospects.
4. The study illustrates huge differences between the fifteen Member States' and the European Commission's career development systems. This is very well illustrated by the main features of promotion policy, mobility policy and the career paths of senior

civil servants. One important factor behind these variations is the differing conceptions and philosophies of managing a civil service (career system versus position system).

5. Nonetheless there are some common trends, though they are markedly stronger in some countries than others:

- In general, the EU Member States are moving from the uniform administration of personnel towards more flexible and personalised human resource management which takes greater account of the individual profile of the civil servant and which is characterised by a stronger consideration of individual competences.
- This move is mirrored in promotion policy, which is tending to link career advancement more closely to individual merit, with performance and competences being assessed in yearly appraisals, evaluations and competency-based promotion interviews.
- This move is also reflected in the HRM approach being adopted, which favours more diversified career paths and greater opportunities for varied work experience by encouraging and facilitating mobility within the public sector and between the private and the public sector.
- Last but not least, this development can also be seen in the more diversified career paths of senior civil servants with a stronger focus on performance, job moves and staff development.

6. The study reveals that this overall trend towards a more individualised HRM approach, characterised by a better recognition of individual merit and performance with more opportunities for varied work experience and differentiated career paths, provides important motivational incentives for public sector staff.

7. But this more individualised HRM approach can provide even stronger motivational incentives if it is supplemented by a staff development policy which encompasses regular staff discussions and surveys, realistic goal-setting, the introduction and coaching of new staff, promotion for example through further vocational training, possibilities of job enlargement and job enrichment etc.

8. Last but not least, the study highlights the fact that the ‘new’ trends in promotion policy, mobility policy and the career paths of senior civil servants also have certain potentially demotivating aspects. For instance, the trend towards appointments that are limited in time, compulsory mobility and the wider access of private sector candidates to leading positions means that the career perspectives for senior civil servants are also becoming potentially more uncertain and unpredictable. Also, the stronger focus on individual performance for career advancement and progression must be underpinned by an effective evaluation system with objective criteria for measuring performance. The same is true for the linking of performance to remuneration. In this context, a lot of care must be taken in setting-up an effective evaluation system. Otherwise this fundamentally motivating development can also be disadvantageous.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

*The Greek Presidency has commissioned the European Institute of Public Administration with carrying out a comparative study entitled “**Career Development as an Effective Tool to Enhance the Attractiveness of Public Employment**”. This report is based on the answers given by all the Member States of the EU and the European Commission to the questionnaire (attached to this study) distributed to them by EIPA in February 2003.*

The study addresses a number of issues/topics, including the following:

- *The characteristics and current reform trends of public service career development systems in the EU Member States and the European Commission*
- *Key instruments for ensuring attractive career development such as:*
 - *Promotion policy*
 - *Mobility policy*
 - *Career paths of senior civil servants*

The answers received from the Member States and the European Commission naturally concentrate on some issues rather than others. In addition, the answers received by EIPA varied considerably in terms of their length. The study takes this into account while trying to consider all answers in a balanced way.

Nevertheless, our aim was to make the study as succinct and precise as possible. As a result, some national replies may be quoted or referred to more briefly, more explicitly or in greater depth than others. The author apologises in advance if some Member States and/or the European Commission consider that their answers have not been sufficiently taken into account.

Finally, the study can be found on the Circa homepage at <http://www.forum.europa.eu.int>. The author hopes that the study, which contains constructive proposals for the future work of the Directors-General of the Public Service, will serve to generate a fruitful debate.

I would like to thank the Greek Presidency for the excellent cooperation over the past few months and to express my gratitude to the Directors-General and the various national experts within the Member States and the European Commission for having helped me carry out this study.

Danielle Bossaert

1. The significance of career development for making public employment more attractive

The EIPA report of 2002 on “*Facing the challenges of demographic evolution: Focusing on recruitment policies as a way to enhance the attractiveness of public employment*”, by Christoph Demmke, has very clearly shown that many of the EU Member States are currently looking at reform strategies in the field of human resource management in order to enhance the attractiveness of the public sector and to improve its competitiveness with the private sector. If the public sector wants to position itself as an employer of choice, it is clear that favourable opportunities for career development and progression will be a crucial motivational tool when it comes to recruiting and retaining competent staff. Just to give you some recent examples: a staff survey undertaken in the **Irish** civil service in 1999 showed that lack of career development is still a central factor influencing resignations from the civil service. In particular, the survey discovered that the top six employment-related issues for civil servants were:

- earnings and career progression,
- task responsibility,
- reward and recognition,
- job security,
- progressive work arrangements and
- training/development.

Dissatisfaction particularly with regard to the top three is a major factor behind resignations, the authors noting that “there is a yawning gap between individuals’ aspirations (in respect of these issues) and what the civil service is perceived as delivering”.¹ Another interesting finding of this research was that in **Ireland** for instance,

- barriers to promotion,
- limited opportunities for development and advancement, and
- the mundane nature of some work

are cited as the reasons why young ambitious civil servants are unlikely to remain in the civil service.

However, the author also noted that staff retention at senior levels was not an issue, suggesting that such positions in general

- are more varied,
- carry greater responsibility,

¹ Goldsmith Fitzgerald, “Staff Retention Survey”, on behalf of the Office of the Civil Service and Local Appointments Commission, in Joanna O’Riordan, Peter C. Humphreys, *Career Progression in the Irish Civil Service*, CPMR Discussion Paper 20, Dublin 2002, p. 11.

and are therefore more satisfying.²

The argument that career development is a significant work aspiration is also stressed by other studies conducted in the private sector.³ They point to the major significance of the promotion process in the working lives of employees. The results reveal very clearly that early promotion is perceived as an additional psychological reward, while “late promotion” or “getting stuck” can often result in anxiety, frustration and self-doubt. This means for instance that too lengthy career paths in the civil service which only take into account seniority, insufficient promotion opportunities or slow advancement can become significant sources of job dissatisfaction. Furthermore, the **Dutch Van Rijn** report⁴ identified the improvement of career prospects as an important attractiveness factor of public employment, while a recent study on HRM and job satisfaction in the **Dutch** public sector showed that the lack of career possibilities is an important factor for staff leaving public sector posts.⁵

In general, public employees’ attitudes to their work and careers have changed as a consequence of economic, technological and lifestyle changes, and they consider their work in a different way than their counterparts did thirty years ago. Research illustrates⁶ very well that public employees nowadays very much favour having opportunities to enhance their skills, a flexible work environment with job rotation and horizontal mobility, as well as varied work experience with possibilities for reward and recognition; while they put less emphasis on job continuity and organisational culture. What they want is a stronger matching of their tasks to their strengths, and to be responsible for their work and its results. Another interesting finding in the relevant literature is that today, work commitment is valued much more highly than organisational commitment, which in other words means that there is an increased demand for learning at work and that public employees are now more highly motivated to develop their career paths. The OECD has a similar argument, noting that “individual employees” are demanding to a much greater extent than before conditions tailored to the individual, including job content, opportunities for development, career opportunities, work scheduling and salaries. This leads the OECD to conclude that “a challenge for government organisations is to create workplaces that meet the preferences of both the organisation and the employees”.⁷

² Ibid., p. 19.

³ Rob Goffee, Richard Scase, “Organizational Change and the Corporate Career: The Restructuring of Managers’ Job Aspirations” in: *Human Relations*, Vol. 45, no 4, 1992, p.365.

⁴ Van-Rijn Report, *Investeren in de collectieve sector is investeren in mensen*, Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, The Hague.

⁵ Bram Steijn, “HRM and Job Satisfaction in the Dutch Public Sector”, abstract for the EGPA Conference in Potsdam, September 2002, p.4.

⁶ Mir Ali, Mir Raza, Mosca Joseph B., “The New Age Employee: An Exploration of Changing Employee-Organization Relations”, in: *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 31, no. 2, Summer 2002, p. 187-200; OECD/PUMA, “HRM in the Public Sector”, Paris 2002, p. 2-14; Green Marnie E., “Beware and Prepare: The Government Workforce of the Future”, in *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 29, no. 4, Winter 2000, p. 435-443; OECD, “Public Sector – An Employer of Choice?” *Report on the Competitive Public Employer Project* by Kirsi Äijälä, Paris 2001; Herzberg Frederick, “One more time: How do you motivate employees?”, in: *Harvard Business Review*, January 2003, p. 87-96.

⁷ OECD (2001), p.12.

Traditionally, there is a rather rigid approach to career development in the public sector in most of the EU Member States, in the sense that “seniority” is much more important than “merit and skills”, there are hardly any opportunities for job moves, and civil servants very often reach the top of the hierarchy by the beginning of their fifties with no further career prospects or possibilities for development. These factors count among the major reasons why the public sector is very often looked upon as being “old fashioned” and “too bureaucratic”, with young people seeing the private sector as the real source of innovation and change. This is increasingly the case in **France**, where young people are ever more willing to leave the public sector for a career in the private sector, which is perceived as more dynamic. A recent study found that departures by senior civil servants more than doubled between 1982 (634) and 1998 (1,303).⁸ The OECD identified the following factors as presenting major challenges to the public employer with respect to competitiveness.

- Slow advancement, where seniority has more importance than merit. The main problem identified here is that there seems to be a fixed order of promotion, independent of performance, and there is only a weak tradition of recognising the individual merits of employees.
- Unclear career paths and insufficient career planning. A key issue is to better explain career prospects and career planning, including the opportunities for mobility, in regular performance and career discussions.
- The increased importance of staff development in competitiveness. Elements are gaining in importance such as training, individual coaching, career support and counselling, competence management, attractive career opportunities for senior civil servants, as well as appraisal systems providing advice and feedback for good performance.

This study will examine the extent to which these trends still correspond to the reality in the EU Member States or whether and, if so, how far Member States have already altered their career development and progression systems from being inflexible and purely seniority and rule-based to more merit and skill-based systems with motivating career prospects.

In this study, the examination of career development will not only be rule-focused, describing the existing legal tools and instruments of promotion policy, mobility policy and career paths for senior civil servants (part 1), but the study will also try to critically assess these tools (part 2) by asking how they impact on staff motivation and staff commitment, which are key assets of any organisation and as such for any organisational change. Thus, successful human resource management will be defined by its capacity to introduce policies that not only match organisational needs but also the personal aspirations of civil servants – a match that is not always so easy to make. In their famous book on flexibility in the public services, the HRM experts Farnham/Horton conclude that the main motivation behind the recent personnel reforms seems to be primarily “to deploy staff within organisations to ensure the maximum of efficiency and achievement of organisational goals”⁹, rather than to address the issue of staff motivation, staff development, staff commitment and staff planning. Furthermore, the OECD identified motivation as being at the heart of the human resource problem of

⁸ “The French elite leads a second revolution”, Financial Times, 07 March 2001. <http://news.ft.com>

⁹ Farnham, David; Horton Sylvia, *Human Resources Flexibilities in the Public Services*, London 2000, p.39.

government reform, the fundamental issue being to organise the process that creates public sector employee incentives.¹⁰

This study is divided into two main parts. The first part (chapter 2) will analyse the main elements of career development systems in the EU Member States in a comparative way. This analysis will focus on the following key instruments for ensuring attractive career development and progression:

- **Promotion policy.** A promotion policy based on qualifications and the principle of merit with clear career opportunities and the prospect of accessing higher positions with greater responsibility is a prerequisite for an attractive career development system. A further crucial issue in this context is the extent to which there are opportunities for faster advancement for the most competent and motivated civil servants.

This subsection will mainly deal with the following questions: What are the main characteristics of the promotion systems in the EU Member States? What are the main selection criteria for career advancement? What are the current reform trends in the EU MS? What chances are there of accessing to leading positions?

- **Mobility policy.** If used carefully and if well managed, mobility can contribute to making civil services more attractive by increasing opportunities for career development, by providing varied work experience and by offering benefits to managers, departments and the civil service as a whole. Mobility is potentially a valuable instrument for professional enrichment via the acquisition of new competences through experience in other professional environments and cultures. It can furthermore benefit public organisations by providing them with a useful tool enabling the mobility of civil servants from shrinking sectors to expanding ones.

Among the effective instruments of a coherent and proactive mobility policy is the capacity to direct, guide and advise civil servants so as to better understand their aspirations and the competences they do not use in their current positions, and to find solutions with them with regard to their career prospects. In this context, the evaluation interview has a pivotal role to play.¹¹

This subsection will mainly tackle the following questions: what instruments are there to promote mobility at intradepartmental and interdepartmental level, and between the private and the public sector? To what extent is mobility taken into account for career progression? What are the current reform trends in the EU Member States? What obstacles to mobility remain?

¹⁰ OECD/PUMA, *HRM in the public sector: A neglected subject*, Human Resources Management (HRM) Working Party Meeting, OECD Headquarters, Paris, 7-8 October 2002, p.6.

¹¹ Serge Vallemont, *Gestion des ressources humaines dans l'administration*, Paris 1999, p.4.

- **Career paths for senior civil servants.** In the public as well as the private sector, the way in which leading positions are set up is a key element in attracting and retaining skilled people and in developing an attractive career development system. Many factors play a role here such as the chances for and conditions of access to such positions, attractive career prospects, opportunities for varied work experience, the level of remuneration, incentives for reward and recognition etc.

This subsection will focus on the following questions: what mobility and advancement opportunities do senior civil servants have? What instruments are there to reward good results and for staff development? What training opportunities are there for senior civil servants?

The second part of the study (chapter 3) will look at the question of the extent to which promotion policy, mobility policy and career paths for senior civil servants constitute motivational tools to enhance the attractiveness of the public sector. In this respect, the goal will be to assess career development systems in the EU Member States by basing the relevant arguments on the main incentives that motivate civil servants in their work.

2. Main elements of career development systems in the EU Member States: A comparative view

2.1. Promotion Policy

2.1.1. Main selection criteria for career advancement

In the EU Member States we can, at a theoretical level, distinguish between two different systems of career advancement. The main features of a career system are the allocation of a grade to the civil servant, the independence of the grade from the post as well as the right of the civil servant to a career within this system. On joining the civil service, the civil servant is put within a particular grade, while he/she rises up the hierarchy of grades and holds different positions (for example Head of Unit, Director-General). Access to different careers (e.g. A,B,C) is governed by minimum education requirements (e.g. a university degree for the Executive Civil Service in the **UK**). The rises in grade and salary take place mainly on the basis of seniority.

In a position system, civil servants are recruited to hold specific positions within the civil service. They are recruited for their competences and their aptitude for the vacant post. No career is organised. If they want their careers to develop, they should change jobs. Jacques Ziller has summed up this difference, stating that “in the position system, promotion is an individual problem, whereas in the career system, it is an organisational one”.¹²

¹² Jacques Ziller, *Administrations comparées*, Montchrestien, Paris 1993, p.410.

In general, in the various civil services, the characteristics of both systems are mixed in such a way that one system corresponds more to the career system and another more to the position system. According to an EIPA classification, the civil services of **Belgium, Germany, Spain, Greece, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Austria** and **Portugal** have the dominant features of the career system, while the civil services of **Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden** and the **UK** have the characteristics of a position system. It is furthermore to be noted that there are trends towards convergence between them. As such, the position concept is increasingly to be found in career systems, and by the same token, in position systems categories such as diplomats or military personnel are governed by the career system.

In terms of career advancement, we can say that an advantage of the career system is its high level of stability and the fact that civil servants have a right to career development. Nonetheless, when adopting a more critical view, we must also acknowledge that this system takes a rather rigid and uniform approach to human resource management, and that we have only recently discovered a trend in the career systems of the EU Member States to better recognise and reward individual competences and performance by focusing less on seniority.

A comparison of the EU Member States' civil services shows that in most of them, promotion is not determined by one criterion alone but by a set of criteria of which the most important are years of service, qualifications, performance and competences. In **Greece**, particular account is taken of the years of service when it comes to career progression in the sense that if senior civil servants hold the required qualifications they are almost automatically promoted to the immediately higher grade (apart from management positions) having completed the required years of service. In this sense, the **Greek** civil service is characterised by a rather hierarchical, four-tiered ranking system (D, C, B, A, Director's rank, Director-General's rank). The promotion period from entering rank D to rank A is thirteen years. From rank A to Director's rank, a six-year service at rank A is required, and the performance of a department head's duties for no less than two three-year periods. Then, from the Director's rank to the Director-General's rank, four years of service at the Director's rank are required.

In **Portugal** too, alongside a sufficient grading with regard to performance, seniority is a main promotion criterion (through competition). In general terms, the minimum length of service in the lower category is three years if the performance appraisal has been evaluated as "good". In some careers, such as those of senior, specialist and techno-professional staff, a minimum of five years is required to be eligible for competition for the two highest categories if the performance appraisal is rated "good". There is even the possibility of faster advancement: if the performance appraisal is rated "very good", the minimum length of service required is reduced to three years. Seniority is also relevant to go up the salary scale of the respective categories. The general and special careers as well as the special *corps* have

a number of salary scales that the staff member in each category can go up according to the length of service and a suitable performance appraisal.¹³

The **Austrian** and **Luxembourg** public services are also marked by strongly seniority-dependent aspects. This is the case in particular of the salary scales: for instance, each civil servant in **Austria** has a basic salary scale comprising 19 salary steps, with advancements guaranteed by law (every two years).

In **Spain**, like in **France**, career development takes place within a *corps* system, which however does not have a specific career structure. The *corps* are classified according to the level of education (A, B, C, D, E), and positions are classified into 30 different levels. Besides the requirement of seniority to reach the grade needed to hold a certain post, the **Spanish** career development system has considerable mobility requirements and the proof of work experience in different positions is very important. A change of position is thus a precondition to advancing within the civil service.

Unfortunately, most of the replies did not state the number of grades and levels existing in the senior civil service, which is of course an important factor when it comes to gaining a better understanding of the career opportunities there are as well as the length of the career necessary to accede top management positions.

In general, it should be pointed out that in an increasing number of career systems there is the will to go from a promotion system which is still heavily based on seniority to a system which takes more account of individual merit to be determined on the basis of marks attributed to performance. In **France**, future reforms are envisaged which should take more account of the merits of young civil servants. This means that promotion quotas will no longer be determined according to the vacant posts in the higher grades, as is currently the case, but according to the percentage of civil servants who fulfil the statutory conditions for promotion. Currently, promotion lower down in the *corps* to a higher level within a grade¹⁴ takes around one year, while at the upper end of the *corps* it may take up to four years. These levels also make salary increases possible. Nevertheless, granting reductions in the necessary level of seniority for higher posts to those civil servants who most merit it enables a faster progression to the upper level and, as a result, more favourable career progression. Promotion to a hierarchically higher *corps* is possible via internal competition.¹⁵

A far-reaching reform of promotion policy up to grade A4¹⁶ is also being implemented by the **European Commission**. This quite radical overhaul of the existing human resource

¹³ A performance appraisal less than a pass i.e. less than 4 or 5 out of 10, prevents a reduction in the seniority requirement.

¹⁴ Though the structure type "*corps*" of the public service usually has three grades, some have two and others, albeit very rarely, one.

¹⁵ This type of *concours* is open to civil servants with a certain degree of seniority in the civil service.

¹⁶ This reform focuses on grades from level A8 to level A4. For promotion to higher grades (middle manager A3, Directors and those in the same category A2 and Directors-General and those in the same category A1) the promotion system is different to that for the other grades. To be able to access these functions, the corresponding posts must be vacant.

management system is aimed at linking career advancement more closely to individual performance. The revised policy is based on a new appraisal system, in which the official's performance is quantified through the allocation of merit and priority points.¹⁷ The key indicators for the allocation of these points are conduct, performance and skills. Promotions take place on an annual basis: the officials of the same grade who may seek promotion are compared with each other on the basis of merit. However, although seniority is no longer a fundamental element for promotion, this can only take place if the official has a minimum level – generally two years – of seniority in the same grade.¹⁸ For new officials appointed to the starting grade of their category, this minimum period is 18 months if they are in category B or A. Furthermore, seniority must also be taken into account if the candidates for promotion are of equal merit. With regard to progression up the salary scale, this also happens without changing grade and therefore without promotion; there is biennial and automatic promotion (one salary step) during a period of up to 14 years depending on the grade.

Furthermore, since the revised Federal Career Regulations of 2002, the **German** civil service has also been striving for a greater emphasis on performance-related criteria in promotional decisions, such as the constancy of performance over a long period and the versatility of the staff member while at the same time abolishing the minimum seniority requirement for promotion. Seniority and length of service in a particular position are still important in this respect, in that they have a positive effect on the career. In the **Irish** civil service, the minimum levels of service required to be eligible for promotion to the different grades used to be between one and three years. However, the most recent agreement with the unions, *Sustaining Progress*, has paved the way for all service requirements to be set at two years.

The future **Italian** promotion policy will also most probably have more diversified criteria and less of an emphasis on seniority. This development is being pushed forward by the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court, which stated that seniority cannot be the leading criterion in the promotion system of civil servants because seniority by itself does not represent professional development. The present trend of the government is to value other elements like qualifications, training, professional experience etc. and to attribute, as in the case of the European Commission, specific points for promotion. The principal aim of these points is to prevent incompetent officials with many years of service but without specific qualifications or professional experience from easily reaching higher positions.

As already mentioned above, career advancement in position systems is very strongly based on skills and competences that are quite often listed in job descriptions. In this context, it is striking to note that none of the **Danish, Swedish, Finnish, Dutch or British** answers to the questionnaire mention seniority as a relevant criterion for promotion. For the sake of a better evaluation of career and position systems, it would be revealing to consider the extent to which seniority or years of service play a role in filling vacant positions and whether they play less of a role here than in career systems.

¹⁷ For more information, consult http://europa.eu.int/comm/reform/2002/index_en.htm

¹⁸ It is possible to disregard this rule of minimum seniority in the grade in exceptional and duly justified cases: the time requirement can be reduced by one year for civil servants who are scientific or technical staff in the nuclear field. In fact, this possibility is not used.

The main selection criteria in position systems are, as in the case of the **UK**, a set of core skills and competences such as management and communication skills, as well as specialist knowledge. Individuals who wish to be promoted must in general demonstrate in their work during any selection process that they satisfy the criteria expected for civil servants in the higher grade.

In this respect, an interesting trend is that more and more career systems are trying to introduce selection methods along the same lines as position systems, leading to an optimal match between individual qualifications and competences on the one hand and the competences and level of responsibility required by the vacant position on the other. An ambitious attempt to move in this direction is being made by **Ireland**, where promotion interviews are usually competence-based, focusing on the competences required at the relevant grade. Job analyses have therefore been carried out for all civil service grades, and following this, “key competences” required to carry out the duties at an acceptable level have been identified and defined – such as commitment to achieving results, initiative, teamwork, leadership etc. These form the basis of the selection procedure for the grade in civil service-wide competitions. The reform of the selection procedure in the **European Commission** with the introduction of job descriptions encompassing for instance job requirements such as education, training, knowledge, experience and skills goes in a similar –direction, albeit not yet as far: by making job requirements more transparent, the Commission aims at better assessing to what extent potential candidates are suitable for a vacant post. A better combination between the content of the tests to fill a vacant post and the function to be held is also behind the current **Belgian** career reform. According to the new vision of human resource management, the careers and salaries of civil servants are supposed to evolve parallel to the development of their competences, rather than on the basis of their seniority.¹⁹ In future, the idea is to link progress to tests of competences with the aim of verifying if the civil servants do indeed have the necessary skills to hold certain positions.

2.1.2. Current trends in reforming promotion policy

As the above subsection illustrates, seniority and length of service are still crucial selection criteria for career advancement in many EU Member States. But this section as well as the abovementioned reform initiatives show that Member States are increasingly making their promotion policy more attractive by taking the following steps:

1. Better rewarding merit, which can lead to a more motivational promotion policy, particularly for young civil servants, by putting less emphasis on seniority or by accelerating career progression. With this in view, the **French** Decree no. 2002-682 of 29 April 2002²⁰, reforming the system of grading in the civil service, aims to give more consideration to merit where it concerns promotion to higher grades or levels. It reduces seniority requirements to reach certain posts, making accelerated promotion possible only for

¹⁹ For more information <http://www.copernic-us.be/copernic.jsp?lang=fr>

²⁰ This decree concerns the general evaluation, marking and promotion conditions governing civil servants.

those civil servants whose service has been the best. The civil servants whose grading increases the most have a maximum number of monthly bonus points. The comprehensive **Austrian** salary reform of 1994 also aimed to break through the strong seniority-related unwieldiness of the career system for a greater emphasis on performance criteria: this mainly concerned the salary system, which at the time primarily rewarded age and not performance through – in comparison with the private sector – very low starting and very high end salaries, which was not very motivating for young employees in particular. Through the reform the mainly time-related service classification system was replaced with a job-related classification system based on function groups. The basis for the new salary schemes was a comprehensive evaluation of all jobs according to fully uniform principles. The points system this required was taken over from a consultancy firm and adapted to the central civil service. It takes into account the job-related requirements as regards knowledge, the intellectual capacity to implement the knowledge and to bear responsibility. All in all, the salary curve was made equal or at least brought closer to the salary curves in the private sector: the salaries in the first half of the career – unlike those in the second half of the career – were raised considerably. As a performance motivator, in addition to the salary when taking on high responsibility, there was also a function-related bonus – not only for management functions but also for other jobs which require specialist knowledge or particular skills. The level of this function supplement was dependent on the level of the function group in which the job was placed following an assessment.

With the aim of making public employment more attractive to young qualified candidates, **Italy** reformed its career development system for managerial staff in 1998 and in 2002. The aim was to accelerate career progression by making appointments at top management level more flexible. Since 2002, the percentage of top managerial appointments (first level) given to mid-level managers has gone up. This rule enables the administration to appoint young managers, who may be more motivated and willing to learn new methods and apply new technologies. The acceleration of career progression for young competent civil servants with management potential through a fast-stream programme inspired by the **UK** is also part of the **Danish** new general human resource management policy.

Portugal also aims to make its career system more attractive and merit-oriented in the future by introducing a performance appraisal instrument that rigorously supports a differentiation policy and rewards individual merit by promotion or better remuneration according to results achieved, or for other reasons.

The improvement of promotion policy is also an important element of the reform of the **European Commission**, which is reducing the number of automatic grades considerably and increasing the number of promotions over the whole career.

2. Introducing clearer selection criteria that can lead to a more motivating promotion policy by enhancing the objectivity and transparency of current systems. In this context, **Ireland** introduced a competence approach for staff selection, a major objective being to create a more rational and effective basis for staff selection both at the recruitment and promotion stages. The implementation of a system of competences is also underway in the **Netherlands**: in future, vertical and horizontal career development will be based on proven

development of work-related competences, which will form the basis of the rewards system. In **Belgium** too, promotion in the scale is increasingly dependent on the success of competence measures. For instance, each post – whether expert or management – will be weighted according to established criteria, which will result in its classification in a grade of functions linked to three salary scales (for the first grades of functions) and one single salary scale (for the 3 higher grades).

The primary goal of the **Greek** reform is to develop a promotion system on a whole new basis with clearer selection criteria, while one of the reform trends in **Germany** is to increase the transparency of the selection criteria in promotional decisions.

Another possibility to make current career paths clearer and more transparent is by improving career planning, as is the case in **Finland** for leading positions. Two pilot projects have recently been launched to develop ways in which to take better care of senior civil servants' potential (1997-1999) and to develop career planning for them (2002-2003). The former has led to concrete programmes in a number of organisations, where special attention is paid to improving the selection of potential managers²¹ as well as their career development, either in the form of training or by giving them opportunities for project management or mobility in or outside the organisation. In addition, typical career paths are being examined. The initiatives in the new human resource management policy of **Denmark** aim in a more general way at enhancing the motivation of civil servants by improving the opportunities for staff development and career planning. Some of these initiatives are:

- Career development programmes;
- Career counselling materials;
- Tools for testing career wishes;
- Introduction programmes for new leaders;
- Advisory boards for career and talent development;
- Information material for potential leaders;
- The creation of certain posts dealing with leadership development.

The rest of the countries (**Sweden, UK, Luxembourg**) are not planning to reform their promotion policies at the moment, as attracting staff is not a problem. Indeed, the **Luxembourg** public service is still considered a highly attractive employer on the **Luxembourg** labour market, particularly because of the job security and relatively high rates of pay, especially at the lower and middle career levels.

2.1.3 Access to leading positions

The public administrations in the EU Member States have a very hierarchical structure. Moreover, in many States the set-up of the various ministerial departments follows more or

²¹ The various selection criteria comprise statutory qualifications, qualifications specific to the post in question (e.g. expertise, proven managerial ability, managerial experience at the top level of government) and general qualifications (e.g. extensive experience, teamwork and communication, language proficiency) applying to all top civil servants.

less the same structure. The main difference between ministries is very often, as in the case of **Belgium**, linked to the number of Directorates-General or Directorates, which vary according to the importance and the number of tasks entrusted to each Ministry. In general, in most countries, the executive agencies entrusted with the implementation of more operational public tasks are responsible for their own organisational structure, as is the case in **Sweden**, the **United Kingdom** etc.

As the following table illustrates, in most EU Member States, we can distinguish 4 or even more different levels of hierarchy of leading positions.

The structure of managerial positions/ministerial departments in some EU MS and the European Commission

	Managerial positions	Structure of ministerial departments
Denmark	-Permanent Secretary (18) -Deputy Secretary (53) -Director-General (58) -Deputy Director (90) -Head of Division (574)	-Department -Division
Greece	Not mentioned	-Directorate-General ²² -Directorate ²³ -Sub-Directorate (not always) -Sections -Offices -Independent Offices (not always)
Spain	-Under-Secretary -Secretary-General (political appointment) -Technical Secretary-General -Director-General -Deputy Director-General	Not mentioned
France	-Director-General ²⁴ -Director -Deputy Director -Assistant Director -Head of Division	-Directorate-General ²⁵ -Directorate ²⁶ -Division ²⁷ -Sub-Directorate ²⁸ -Office
The Netherlands	-Secretary-General (Director Personnel) -Director-General (Head Personnel) -Director -Heads	Not mentioned
Austria	-Head of Section -Team Leader -Head of Division -Head of Department ²⁹	-Sections -Teams -Divisions -Departments
European Commission	Director-General (grade A1) (30) Deputy Director-General (grade A1) (21) Director (grade A2) (190) Unit Head (grade A3) (525)	Not mentioned

²² An average of four Directorates-General per ministry in a total of nineteen ministries.

²³ An average of four Directorates per Directorate-General.

²⁴ The posts of Director-General and Director (level N) are filled “at the government’s discretion”.

²⁵ The creation of a Directorate-General is envisaged where it is essential to bring together several Directors under the authority of a Director-General or, exceptionally, where the staff or competences of the Directorate are particularly large.

²⁶ The Directorate should coordinate the action of at least two Sub-Directorates and have suitable staff.

²⁷ By way of exception, in the Directorates-General or Directorates where the competences or staff are particularly large, there could be another layer in between.

²⁸ As a general rule, the Sub-Directorate should not have less than three Offices.

²⁹ The last two subdivisions have been made for reasons of expediency.

Mostly in the 90s, many public sector organisations faced major restructuring for efficiency reasons, which has affected the hierarchical structure of ministerial departments. In this context, some Member States flattened their hierarchies by merging some grades or by abolishing one of the intermediate hierarchical levels so as to streamline decision-making procedures. On the one hand, this development can be seen as rather positive in that it has led to smaller, more flexible performance-focused organisations that give individual civil servants more responsibility and autonomy. On the other hand, in terms of career development senior civil servants sometimes have fewer opportunities now to reach leading positions and consequently more limited career prospects.

Such structural reforms have also been carried through in the **Netherlands** for instance, where the Ministry of Economic Affairs abolished the hierarchical level of Head, while the Directorate-General of Taxes and Customs of the Ministry of Finance abolished the hierarchical levels of Head and Director and introduced the concept of teams supervised by management teams. Also, in **Germany**, the flattening of hierarchies is seen as one of many possibilities to reduce costs and increase effectiveness. There it has even led to the closing or amalgamation of authorities. The number of authorities has accordingly gone down by 121 since 1998 from 654 to 533, while at the same time over 100 federal authorities have been restructured. The number of departments has also been reduced, and the discontinuation of the organisational level of sub-departments is being examined; in particular, the Common Rules of Procedure for Federal Ministries (*Gemeinsame Geschäftsordnung der Bundesministerien*) makes it possible to do away with sub-departments under certain conditions. So, the total number of sub-departments has been reduced by 26 to 217. The consequence of this development is a gradual reduction in leading positions, which leads to limited possibilities for the new recruits to rise up the career ladder. In **Finland**, there has been a slight trend towards flatter hierarchies, which is characterised by the fact that the units were in many cases still divided into offices, with many offices within the units being abolished.

Furthermore, there is a trend towards the merging of hierarchical grade structures. In **Ireland**, for example, the grades of Clerical Assistant and Clerical Officer (lowest grade) have been amalgamated in the past ten years. There has also been a clear trend in the **United Kingdom** in many departments over recent years to merge some grades. In this regard, the **British** report mentions that in a number of departments, promotion prospects of individuals could be restricted as there are relatively few posts at the next highest grade. The main reason for this is that changes in working practices have meant that the functions and responsibilities of the grades concerned have in reality become quite similar in some departments. The Copernic reform in **Belgium** has also led to a reduction in the number of grades distinguishing civil servants within the same level.

³⁰ There are also Deputy Unit Heads and Heads of Sectors, but they are not considered as management posts. The first three levels are called senior management. The level of Unit Head corresponds to middle management.

In **Spain** as well, the reform of the public administration has led to a simplification of the civil service structure in that it involved the reduction and simplification of the number of *corps* and scales. Furthermore, the process of decentralisation entailing the transfer of competences to the regional level has led to a reduction of personnel in the central State administration.

Overall, promotion prospects for civil servants in some States have become worse rather than better, but it must also be added that this “dehierarchisation” can be positive in that it also entails greater responsibility and autonomy for the middle management as well as often a more flexible way of working. Those who are little or not affected by a change of the hierarchical structure are **Sweden, Luxembourg, Italy, Greece, Denmark, Austria**, and the **European Commission**.

Furthermore, as regards access to leading positions, in many countries it is still very difficult for competent and performance-motivated civil servants of a young or relatively young age to take on leadership responsibilities. Thus, in many EU Member States seniority (length of service) and the acquirement of a certain rank is still a precondition for selection to top positions in the sense that top civil servants are very often career “mandarins” with long experience and well-established personal networks.³¹ In **Greece**, for instance, a major condition for civil servants to be promoted to the rank of Director-General is to have completed the required time of service at the Director’s rank (four years). In **Ireland**, only Principal Officers can apply for posts at Assistant Secretary and Secretary-General level, which means only civil servants from the position immediately below. Also in **Portugal**, for the posts of Director of Services or Head of Division, professional experience of at least 4 or 6 years in the level below is required. Somewhat similar rules, which primarily take into account the required seniority and make the gradual climbing of the often long career ladder essential for accessing leadership responsibility, also govern the selection of managers in other Member States. This means that the average age of managers in the public service is high in comparison with the private sector, and it is still difficult in early years to take on management responsibilities even with the appropriate qualifications. To mention but a few examples: in **Germany** the average age to hold similar senior management positions is between 51 and 54,³² while the average age of Secretaries-General and Directors-General in **The Netherlands** is 51.6 and 48.3 respectively.³³ Furthermore, a civil servant in **Greece** has to wait 23 years before he can be promoted to Director-General. According to Page/Wright, senior civil servants in **Austria** must also wait until a few years before they retire to become Heads of Department,³⁴ while in **Italy** higher administrative positions are also primarily reached through age and length of service.³⁵ In **France** as well there is a correlation between seniority and management positions in that it is necessary not to be either too young or too

³¹ Christopher Pollitt, Geert Bouckaert, *Public Management Reform, A comparative analysis*, Oxford 2000, p.74.

³² To name a few examples: Head of Sub-Department Ministry B6: 54 years/3 months; Head of Unit Ministry B3: 52 years/11 months; Head of Unit Ministry A 16: 51 years/4 months. Jürgen Lorse, *Personalmanagement im öffentlichen Dienst*, Luchterhand 2001, p. 176.

³³ Edward C. Page, Vincent Wright, *Bureaucratic Elites in Western European States*, Oxford 1999, p. 218.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p.271.

old to become Head of Division if one wants a chance of being appointed ministerial Director later.³⁶ In the **United Kingdom**, the average age of a senior civil servant (grade 1/1a) was still 51.8 years in 1990-1995.³⁷ Moreover, after reaching this position such senior civil servants are faced with the problem that there is hardly any vertical mobility.

In general, it may be assumed that the significance of seniority is – at least in theory – even more crucial in career systems than in position systems. This is mainly due to the fact that the acquisition of skills and competences are taken more into account during selection procedures in position systems. Unfortunately, the statistics at my disposal were not sufficient to conclude whether senior civil servants in position systems are on average younger than those in career systems. If this were the case, this would be the best proof that skills and competences really matter in this system and that it is mainly the career system that is primarily based on seniority requirements.

³⁶ Ibid., p.71.

³⁷ David Richards, “The Higher Civil Service, the Westminster/Whitehall model and the British Political Tradition”, paper presented at the programme of the French CNRS “Bringing top civil servants back in”, Amiens, France, 15 June 2001.

2.2. Mobility Policy

2.2.1. Instruments to promote mobility in the EU MS

Most national civil services take quite a positive attitude towards a balanced mobility policy for public sector staff, both to optimise the use of staffing resources and for individual professional development. The stated reasons concern on the one hand the development of the full potential of competences of civil servants, the ability to think across departmental boundaries as well as the enhancement of their motivation. On the other hand mobility is necessary in view of the fast changes in public tasks and to make the best possible use of the human resources of the public service precisely because of changing staff requirements. We should however not be blind to the fact that in many places mobility has also been used as an instrument to reduce staff. As Farnham/Horton note in their book on human resource flexibilities in the public services, mobility encourages requests for transfers to other areas or public organisations, offers training which enables an official to move to a vacant post in a higher grade, and requires junior managers to change their location and job description as a condition of promotion.³⁸

Generally it may be stated that in many countries mobility is gaining importance as an HRM instrument and the promotion of mobility is increasingly seen as an integral part of human resource policy. Basically, the following types and possibilities of mobility can be distinguished in the Member States.

1. Structural mobility. This type of mobility takes place across departments and ministries without a change in professional expertise. Mobility is limited to a change of jobs without a change in the content of the work. This type of mobility is not only used for individual career planning and development but also and mainly to prevent administrative fragmentation and the formation of separate administrative subcultures as well as to standardise attitudes and behaviour and to improve internal coordination.

2. Functional mobility. This form of mobility is primarily focused on a change of the area of expertise, which can take place either by moving to another department or by moving to another ministry, agency etc. It helps to prevent tunnel vision and demotivation among civil servants who wish to gain experience in different fields of activity. It also benefits the organisation by, for instance, making it easier to move staff from shrinking to growing areas.

3. Mobility outside the public sector. This form of mobility can include mobility to the private sector and/or to international organisations, providing interesting job enlargement and job enrichment opportunities to individual civil servants through varied job experience, the introduction to new and different working methods and practices, as well as different professional contexts and cultures. Limited mobility to the private sector can also help enhance expertise and managerial skills in the public sector as well as inject fresh ideas into this sector.

³⁸ See Farnham/Horton, op. cit., p.107.

As the table below illustrates, possibilities to move to another job within the public sector are – roughly speaking – offered in all the EU Member States. However, a clear distinction should be made between public sectors in which intraministerial and interministerial mobility is not particularly promoted, such as those in **Greece, Italy and Luxembourg**³⁹, and those where it is easier either because of the organisational characteristics of the public sector, such as the position systems of **Denmark, Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom**, or due to the existence of pro-active instruments encouraging staff movements; as in **Spain, Ireland, France or Germany** etc., or because of a combination of both factors. Particularly in the **United Kingdom, Sweden and Finland**, where human resource management is decentralised to agency or ministerial levels and where career progression depends much more on the individual and on skills and competences than on seniority, mobility is to a certain extent supported by the intrinsic systemic characteristics. In **Sweden**, for instance, anybody can apply for any vacancy in the public administration – with the agency concerned deciding on the different merits. As opposed to this practice, mobility is much more difficult to implement in a system where posts for promotion are often more or less limited to candidates from the same department or ministry or where a move to another administrative unit is only possible if there is a vacancy at the same grade with the same seniority – which is sometimes the case in traditional career systems. In these systems a grade is allocated to each civil servant and a differentiation is made between grades and positions. We have to add here that such a compartmentalised system also entails great risks of departmental and ministerial fragmentation and of the formation of administrative subcultures undermining the unity of the civil service, and the danger of deficits in coordination between different administrative units. Furthermore, limited recognition of experience or seniority acquired in another administration or in the private sector may also constitute a problem in terms of mobility. However, this categorisation in position and career systems does not mean that, in principle, position systems are open to mobility while that mobility opportunities in career systems are generally non-existent. Mobility may not only be supported by the introduction of effective instruments enabling the promotion of staff movements (see below) but also by intrinsic systemic characteristics.

³⁹ In this case, the lack of mobility opportunities is also due to the small size of the country.

Mobility in the civil services of the EU MS

	Within ministries	Between ministries and other public sector organisations	Private/public sector	International organisations
B	Supported/reforms in progress ⁴⁰	Supported/reforms planned	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
DK	Supported	Supported	Possible	Not mentioned
D	Supported/reforms in progress	Supported/reforms in progress	Supported/ reforms in progress	Not mentioned
GR	Possible, but not for managerial positions	Possible, but not for managerial positions	No	Not mentioned
E	Supported	Supported, reforms in progress	Possible	Not mentioned
F	Supported/reforms in progress	Supported/reforms in progress	Supported/ reforms in progress	Supported
IRL	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
I	Supported for managerial positions	Supported for managerial positions	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
L	Possible	Possible	Supported	Not mentioned
NL	Supported	Supported	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
A	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	Supported	Supported
P	Supported/reforms in progress	Supported/ reforms in progress	Supported on certain conditions	Not mentioned
FIN	Supported	Supported	Supported	Not mentioned
S	Supported	Supported	Supported	Not mentioned
UK	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
COM	Supported/reforms in progress	Supported/reforms in progress	-----	Supported/reforms in progress

When comparing the different instruments enabling and promoting mobility within the public sectors of the EU Member States, we can see that the instruments at the disposal of civil servants for developing their competences through varied work experience differ widely in the various States. The following most common approaches can be distinguished:

- **Access to internal competitions for staff from outside the department or ministry.** An interesting example in this context is **Ireland**, where mobility mainly occurs through interdepartmental competitions, through which personnel can be promoted to a higher grade in another department. The purpose is to ensure that there is a spread of experience and high-quality candidates throughout the civil service. This possibility is also offered in **Portugal**. Another interesting scheme for managers can be found in **Italy**, where each administration can appoint 10% of the “first-level” managers and

⁴⁰ Regarding the reforms in progress, see the section “Reform trends favouring mobility”.

5% of the “second-level” managers⁴¹ from other administrations. Moreover, each administration can appoint a number of managers from the private sector with specific qualifications. The percentage of such managers in each administration is 10% of first-level managers and 8% of second-level ones.

- **Leave without immediate resignation from the current post.** Instructive examples in this context are **Finland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Portugal** and **Belgium**. The aim of paragraph 20 of the **Finnish** Civil Service Act for instance is to widen the experience of civil servants in “secure” circumstances by offering them the opportunity to work for another employer – public or private – for a fixed term during which they can maintain their present post. In the **Netherlands**, staff who wish to take up a position in or outside the central government are also guaranteed that they can return to their department of origin within a certain period of time (up to one year). **Portugal** also offers this possibility, i.e. civil servants can temporarily transfer to another department while their service of origin continues to pay their salary. In **Denmark**, local authorities may grant staff leave for a specific period of time during which they can take up another post, for example in another State administration. In **Belgium**, there is the instrument of secondment which works in more or less the same way in that it provides for a mechanism to reduce the participation of the body of origin in the payment of the salary of the civil servant who has chosen this type of mobility voluntarily.

- **Secondment to another administration without/with retention of pay, pension and social security rights.** Besides the abovementioned instruments, Member States have introduced other measures enabling civil servants to change working environments for a certain period of time. The **French** administration in particular uses a highly differentiated set of tools. The most important instruments are: 1) *Mise à disposition* is a situation whereby civil servants who stay in the *corps* of origin keep their position, continue to receive the corresponding pay, but work in an administration other than their own when the latter cannot offer employment that allows *détachement*. 2) *Détachement*, whereby civil servants are placed outside their *corps* of origin but continue to enjoy, within this *corps*, the rights to promotion and pension. 3) *Disponibilité*, whereby civil servants are placed outside their administration or department of origin while relinquishing their rights to promotion and pension on taking up their new position. The temporary leave may for instance be granted on request (e.g. for personal reasons, study or research of general interest, to set up a company etc.) 4) *Hors cadres*: during this time, civil servants may be seconded to an administration or public organisation or to international bodies, while relinquishing their rights to promotion and pension in their *corps* of origin etc.

⁴¹ In Italy, civil servants generally need five years’ seniority to take part in open competitions for management positions.

-Opportunities such as job exchange schemes, rotation, exchange programmes, transfer etc., which are for instance offered in Denmark, Germany etc.

Very extensive opportunities for mobility can be found in the **United Kingdom**, where moves between departments/agencies are encouraged through the advertising of vacancies. When advertising vacancies, business areas can generally opt to do so either to all or some other Departments/Agencies.

An increasing number of Member States is supporting schemes that promote the exchange of experiences between the public and the private sector. Such schemes are mainly of interest to civil servants who wish to work in the private sector for a certain time in order to widen or deepen their knowledge and expertise, but they can also be effective tools to attract qualified candidates with useful professional experience from the private sector.⁴²

Instruments promoting mobility

B	Release of staff to other public authorities (will be introduced)
DK	Job exchange scheme; rotation scheme within ministries; guidelines for rotation outside ministries
D	Job rotation across departments; exchange programmes; transfer; secondment etc.
GR	Not mentioned
E	Public competitive examinations for vacant positions at interministerial level
F	Secondment, release of staff for a maximum duration of 10 years, e.g. to work in the private sector; transfer
IRL	Temporary transfer of staff to other parts of the public sector and occasionally to the private sector; secondment to organisations in the broader public sector, the EU or to social, cultural or sports organisations; interdepartmental competitive promotion
I	Not mentioned
L	Unpaid leave for a maximum period of four years (mobility to the private sector)
NL	Guarantee for civil servants that they can return to their organisation of origin within a certain period of time (up to one year)
A	Not mentioned
P	Intraministerial and interministerial open competition; secondment for a one-year period renewable up to a maximum of three years; transfer and exchange (on a permanent basis)
FIN	Leave of absence from the present post to take up another position for a fixed period of time (one to two years, but in some cases even up to five years); civil servants exchange scheme with Austria, Germany and the UK ; multilateral arrangements with the Nordic countries
S	No particular instruments are mentioned
UK	Secondment (3 months or more); attachment (less than 3 months)
COM	Attachment of officials to Member State administrations for a minimum of 3 months and a maximum of 2 years; leave on personal grounds for one year, which may be renewed twice for up to three years

⁴² In this context, see for instance the section “Reform trends favouring mobility”.

2.2.2. The significance of mobility for career progression

As regards mobility a distinction should be made as to whether it is voluntary, in the interest of the authority, obligatory or an active instrument for career progression. For instance, in some countries functional or structural mobility is even a **compulsory condition for career progression**. The rules on mobility are the strictest in **Spain** where functional or structural mobility is an obligatory condition for each promotion on the career ladder. This makes **Spain** a clear exception compared with the other States and institutions. Only the **European Commission** is planning far-reaching reforms in this context, for instance by making mobility compulsory for sensitive positions, such as those dealing with the awarding of contracts, the determination of rights and obligations, the awarding of subsidies etc. The Commission can also be seen to take a very pro-active approach towards mobility with their plan to enable officials and their departments to assess their careers and professional development within the Commission at the latest five years after they have taken up a new position. However, in most of the countries compulsory mobility is limited to senior positions⁴³. In **France** for instance, functional mobility may, for some *corps*, be a condition for promotion or access to certain positions in the Senior Civil Service, e.g. for appointment to managerial positions (Head of Department, Deputy Director or Assistant Director) in the central State administrations. Recently, functional mobility has also become unavoidable in many sections of the **German** Senior Civil Service. For instance, for the position of Head of Department in the Federal Ministry of the Interior, a civil servant must have had at least three different assignments and, if possible a two-year – but at least one-year – job outside the Ministry, preferably in a closely related or international area. The only EU Member State with an obligatory scheme for mobility for entry positions is **Ireland**. An **Irish** civil service regulation stipulates that **Irish** civil servants who wish to progress from the grade of administrative officer⁴⁴ (entry grade) to the grade of Assistant Principal must complete a year in a line department in order to gain broad civil service experience.

Apart from the above examples, proof of time spent in different positions has, in most Member States, hardly any direct effect on promotions,⁴⁵ i.e. in the sense that mobile officials would rise faster up the hierarchical ladder. Even in the **United Kingdom**, which has a very active mobility policy, mobility is – even though it is considered as an excellent development method – entirely voluntary. On this subject the **Irish** reply points out that, generally, mobility is not specifically taken into account where promotion is concerned but it is considered as a positive development for staff and an opportunity for them to acquire new skills and experience that can clearly be beneficial in their subsequent career. **Denmark** also welcomes the willingness to change jobs and will even pay more attention to mobility in promotion questions.

Basically, the trend in many Member States is for mobility to increasingly be seen as an important instrument in the field of personnel policy, to be used not only in the interest of the

⁴³ Cf. in particular section 2.3 on the existence of attractive career paths of senior civil servants.

⁴⁴ Administrative officer posts are to be found mainly in the departments of the Taoiseach and Finance.

⁴⁵ For the meaning of mobility in the senior civil service, see section 2.3.1.

administration but also in that of the officials themselves. An important reason for this is that voluntary mobility on civil servants' own initiative may be an interesting opportunity for them to enrich and diversify their experience and consequently "increase their efficiency, prevent ossification and the appropriation of a post, satisfy one's personal tastes, improve innate or acquired skills."⁴⁶

2.2.3. Reform trends favouring mobility

When considering the Member States' answers to the questionnaire it seems evident that an increasing number of them are aware of the significance of mobility as an efficient personnel development concept and are introducing active measures to favour mobility within the broader public sector and/or increase its attractiveness.

A very ambitious example in this respect is the future mobility policy of the **European Commission**, where comprehensive mobility, including a change of position after four years, will form an integral part of the human resource policy. According to the new guidelines, the Commission acknowledges that a high rate of mobility can no longer be ignored in the day-to-day running of the Commission in the sense that staff mobility can help the administration to draw on its own resources to maintain dynamism and keep its outlook fresh. Furthermore, as regards recruitment, the Commission stresses the need to have officials who can settle into new duties quickly and take on the responsibilities involved.⁴⁷ In **France** and **Germany**, greater mobility is also part of the most recent reforms of personnel policies. Some examples: in **France**⁴⁸, one of the most recent measures is the strong simplification of the formalities involved in the secondment procedure.⁴⁹ Moreover, the plan is to remove the negative effects of secondments on internal promotion in the host *corps* and to consequently promote the career development of civil servants of the *corps* concerned. To this end, secondments are now considered as real recruitments and thereby are included in the calculation of the budget for access to the *corps* in question via internal promotion. In addition, the conditions on which civil servants can return have been improved for all statutory positions of civil servants, allowing them to move either within the civil service or the private sector.⁵⁰ In **Germany**, a more pro-active approach towards mobility was adopted in July 2002 through the creation of a new provision, stressing the significance of long-term personnel development concepts for the promotion of staff performance. This concerns for instance measures involving changes of assignments to broaden the skills and knowledge of staff.

⁴⁶ See Serge Salon, Jean-Charles Savignac, *Administrations et fonctions publiques en France*, Editions Dalloz, Paris 2002, p. 278.

⁴⁷ http://europa.eu.int/comm/reform/2002/index_en.htm

⁴⁸ See for instance Decree no. 85-986 of 16 September 1985 concerning the special scheme for certain civil service posts and setting out terms for the definitive suspension of duties, amended by Decree no. 2002-684 of 30 April 2002.

⁴⁹ During a secondment, the civil servant is placed outside his/her *corps* of origin, while he/she continues to enjoy, in this *corps*, his/her rights to promotion and pension.

⁵⁰ Through measures such as the obligation to reintegrate civil servants in their administration of origin as soon as possible. The officials in question have to inform their administration of origin – and if necessary their host administration or body – that they wish to reintegrate into their *corps* or extend their mobility, within three months of the expiry of their mobility.

Other countries have taken more isolated measures to promote mobility. In **Finland**, for instance, a special pilot project is run by the Personnel Department of the Ministry of Finance, in which new staff of ministries are offered the opportunity to work in another ministry or agency for a limited period in order to widen their experience. Moreover, the Personnel Department is currently preparing a new booklet on mobility as a means of career development by way of encouragement to agencies as well as civil servants. Of course, the success of an effective mobility policy also largely depends on the diffusion of information about opportunities to move to other jobs. In **Portugal** for instance, a Public Employment Pool is being created which will be available on the Internet. This measure is considered as an additional mechanism to offer employment opportunities in public administration and to strengthen geographical, interdepartmental and professional mobility as it provides information about all open competitions, recruitment needs, the existence of supernumerary staff, as well as data on civil servants requesting new assignments in public administration. Another significant measure to make job movements more efficient and easier, in the interest both of the organisation and the staff, is to coach and counsel staff. This is the case in the **Dutch** public service, where each ministry has management development officers responsible for the recruitment and mobility of managers at intraministerial and interministerial level. Another measure aimed at enhancing the attractiveness of mobility is being introduced in **Belgium**, where staff movements are linked to attractive training opportunities. This new type of job mobility would also offer two training modules to the civil servants in question: the first would focus on generic skills linked to the introduction into a new professional context, the second would aim at the acquisition of new skills or the development of skills, in order to better meet requirements of specific posts in the public service.

Generally, in traditional career systems, mobility between the public and private sector is, to a certain extent, considered a taboo. In these systems, the specific character and tasks of public employment are considered to establish a specific civil service ethos justifying a clear distinction between the two spheres. This is well illustrated by the fact that in many career systems professional experience acquired in the private sector is not or only partly recognised. It is interesting to see that this no longer holds true, judging by the latest developments in the field of mobility between the public and private sector – at least not for all Member States. For instance, there is a recent trend in certain Member States to stimulate exchanges of experience with the private sector and to benefit from the private sector's expertise, mainly at senior level. **Italy**, for instance, has just introduced a law that offers managers the possibility to work in the private sector for a maximum period of five years. In **France**, this possibility has just been extended from six to ten years. **Germany** has the possibility to attract qualified applicants with useful professional experience from the private sector so as to increase the flexibility of the public service. In this regard, for instance, the bill amending the Federal Civil Service Framework Act (BRRG) stipulates that periods of equivalent work within and outside the public service can be counted as part of the probationary period for civil servants. Mobility between the public and the private sector is also promoted in the **Luxembourg** public service by means of a bill to be adopted soon whereby officials who can claim extensive professional experience in the private sector or who have special qualifications required for a vacancy may enter the State service outside the normal conditions of admission, appointment and training. The exchanges of experience with

the private sector are also promoted in **Austria**, where a programme launched in 1996 offers younger qualified federal employees the possibility to familiarise themselves – by exchanging experience with companies – with working methods used in the private sector and thus complement their development.

2.2.4. Obstacles to mobility

The concept of mobility as an active part of modern personnel policy is a relatively recent phenomenon, and only in the past ten years have many Member States introduced active measures to specifically promote mobility. Other reasons besides the abovementioned factors included the changed life/work cycles and – very often – the need for specific expertise from the private sector. Judging by the scarce statistics, there are still very few opportunities for changing jobs. In the **Finnish** public service, such changes have so far been quite insignificant: at the moment, mobility to the private sector is practised by 1.3% of State personnel, while 1.5% of the State personnel comes from the private sector. In comparison, internal mobility (mobility between State agencies) involves 2% of the staff. In this context it is also interesting to see that in **Finland** mobility tends to increase during economic upswings and to decrease during times of economic uncertainty. The **United Kingdom** reported that in 2001-02, there were 3,781 instances of interchange with other sectors, 69% of which were outward secondments. Of the overall total (i.e. inward and outward) exchanges, 864 (29%) were with the private sector. At the **European Commission**, about 1,000 officials of all grades change Directorate-General or department each year. The fact that more than one third of the managers in the **Danish** public sector are considering leaving for a career in the private sector shows that there is an attractiveness issue that needs to be addressed.⁵¹

Evidently, there are many reasons for this relative immobility of public sector staff, and besides by the reluctance of individuals to leave their “home base”, the immobility can also be partly explained by the structural characteristics of public organisations. In this context, it should not be forgotten that such factors as the variety of salary scales and/or allowance schemes in the various departments/ministries or the fact that departments are very internally focused may also considerably contribute to hindering job movement. In this regard, a more harmonised and uniform administrative status and remuneration system could also facilitate the external mobility of staff. Moreover, a more active mobility policy presupposes that there are additional capacities to direct, guide and advise civil servants, and that there is better information on and advertising of vacant positions. All these remarks lead to the conclusion that there is still some room for improvement of the mobility policy of Member States, which is in the interest of individual civil servants.

⁵¹ See the Danish reply to the EIPA questionnaire.

2.3. Career paths of senior civil servants

One of the competitive disadvantages of the public sector was that public servants often reached the top of the hierarchy in their early fifties, which meant that they had no further career challenges or possibilities for personal or professional development. This has changed somewhat in many Member States in that there is now a trend to build a senior civil service with rules distinct from those governing the rest of the civil service. The general aim is on the one hand to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the public sector through enhanced leadership and on the other to increase the professionalism and performance of the public sector by focusing more strongly on management skills and by making top officials more accountable for their results. So far, the **Netherlands**, the **United Kingdom** and **Belgium** have introduced a special centrally-managed scheme for their senior officials, while **Finland** and **Italy** are also working out specific rules for the selection and management of their senior officials. In **Ireland**, the proposals for a Senior Executive Service (SES) are currently being examined by the civil service unions. This service will also be centrally managed through appropriate institutions and procedures in order to provide stability and ensure professionalism of the core group of top managers. One of the prime objectives set out in the White Paper for the Improvement of the Public Service in **Spain** is to establish a senior civil service. The objective is to make this senior civil service a unified group and to assess managers' performance.

2.3.1. Mobility and advancement opportunities for senior civil servants

In some Member States, mobility is at the heart of the reform of the senior civil service; it should improve the competences of senior officials, increase the coordination and coherence between different departments, agencies etc. as well as stimulate the transfer of knowledge from the private to the public sector. Other arguments put forward are those expressed by the **United Kingdom**, i.e. to stop people being trapped in organisations or functions when they are capable of contributing more and better elsewhere⁵² and, as in the case of the **European Commission**, to keep senior officials motivated with new challenges and responsibilities on the horizon. This trend goes so far that in some administrations, for instance in the **European Commission**, senior officials have to change jobs after a certain period of time. The general rule is that A1 and A2 officials, like staff in other grades, should serve for a maximum period of 5 years in any one appointment. Only by way of exception can their appointment be renewed for another two years at the most. At the end of this period, (generally 5, maximum 7 years), the official is reallocated to another post. In the **United Kingdom**, mobility is also looked upon as a requirement for the career development of senior officials in that it is a factor in promotion decisions. Not only is mobility within the public sector valued, but also the skills and experience which individuals gain through, for example, working in other sectors of the economy. In this context, by 2005, 50% of the senior civil service are expected to have acquired experience outside the civil service. According to this Anglo-Saxon view,

⁵² OECD, *Managing the Senior Public Service, A Survey of OECD Countries*, Paris 1998, p.27.

mobility is seen as a factor of improvement and continuous training. The **Netherlands** also attaches particular importance to the mobility of top managers. They are expected to change jobs every five years, whereas members of the top management group have to change within seven years or they may be discharged if after two years of searching there is no other job available.

These examples clearly show that in some countries mobility is already an integral part of the personnel policies for senior officials; in some cases it is not even up to the senior officials themselves to decide whether they want to be “mobile” or not. In general, appointments to leading positions without a time limit are increasingly a thing of the past. In other countries, mobility is enhanced through limited contracts of 3, 5 or 6 years. In some cases, this “mandate” system also means a break with the traditional linear career model as well as tougher working conditions in that a contract might not be renewed in case of bad or inadequate performance. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that the main driving force behind these contract arrangements is not the dismissal of civil servants but rather performance management and remuneration considerations as well as the aim to give the government more flexibility in reassigning senior civil servants.⁵³

The most recent example in this context is the system introduced by the **Belgian** Copernicus reform, setting very strict conditions where performance is concerned. For instance, presidents, Directors-General and Directors are appointed for a period of six years while they are evaluated on the basis of the realisation of their management plan every two years. In case of inadequate performance, they may be dismissed and receive severance pay (for those coming from the private sector) or be transferred (if they come from the federal level). Managers will also receive severance pay if they refuse a transfer. At the end of the six-year period, these managers will have to re-apply for their post and compete with anyone else who meets the conditions to participate in the assessments. Short-term contracts aimed at stimulating mobility have also been introduced in **Italy** (3 years), **Finland** (8 years are planned), **Sweden** and **Denmark**. In **Italy**, contracts between senior officials and the State are based on a result-oriented performance approach, and if for instance the results achieved by a manager are positive he/she may quite quickly move on to the position of Director-General.⁵⁴ It should be pointed out that in the other countries such as **France, Germany, Luxembourg, Greece, Austria etc.** there is no formal system for encouraging mobility among senior civil servants, although in **Germany** senior officials⁵⁵ are initially only appointed for two years. Similarly, in **Austria** positions in the three highest categories are held by people appointed for a maximum period of five years.

The above examples clearly show a positive development in some countries towards more attractive career advancement for senior civil servants through widening mobility opportunities, but this is not the case in many other countries. However, these examples also reveal another aspect of mobility, i.e. a stronger focus on mobility also increases competition

⁵³ Ibid, p.29-30.

⁵⁴ Institut de la gestion publique et du développement économique, *Réformer l'encadrement supérieur: L'expérience de sept pays*, February 2003, p. 36.

⁵⁵ In the highest federal authorities, the positions of Head of Department and Sub-Department; in the other federal authorities those management positions that come under federal salary scale B.

among skilled candidates, all the more so since leading positions are opened up to candidates from the private sector. This is currently the case in for instance **Belgium**, the **United Kingdom**, **Finland**, the **Netherlands**, **Sweden**, **Italy** and **Denmark**, though it should be pointed out that mobility from the private sector generally remains quite limited. In **Germany**, **Ireland**, **Greece**, **Luxembourg** **France**, **Portugal** and **Austria**, there is no tradition of recruiting senior staff from the private sector, and such positions are generally only given to candidates from the public sector. In some of these countries, as in the case of **Germany**⁵⁶ and **Greece**⁵⁷, senior staff are still only recruited from the administration.

Mobility between the private and the public sector

	Possibility to appoint candidates from the private sector to leading positions
B	Yes , the position of chairman of the managing board and –1 management positions are accessible to candidates from outside the administration.
DK	Yes , managerial positions are accessible to candidates from the private sector.
D	Yes , to a certain extent. Management positions in the political sphere (e.g. senior management positions in a ministry, heads of department) are quite often held by people coming from the private sector.
GR	No , management positions are not accessible to people from the private sector
E	No , management positions are not accessible to people from the private sector ⁵⁸
F	Yes , to a certain extent. The positions of Director-General and Director are allocated “at the discretion of the Government” and can therefore be held by non-civil servants. However, the posts of Head of Department, Deputy Director and Assistant Director in the central State administrations are subject to seniority conditions and to membership of a <i>corps</i> of civil servants.
IRL	No , in general, posts at higher executive officer level and upwards are not open to candidates from the private sector.
I	Yes , each administration can appoint a certain number of managers who come from the private sector (10% of the first-level staff ⁵⁹ and 8% of the second-level staff ⁶⁰)
L	No , management positions are not accessible to candidates from the private sector
NL	Yes , candidates from the private sector can be appointed to leading positions
A	Not mentioned
P	Yes , to a certain extent. There is the possibility of secondment of managers (Directors-General and Deputy Directors-General) and specialists from private companies; this is subject to certain conditions.
FIN	Yes , leading positions are accessible to anybody with the required qualifications
S	Yes , leading positions are accessible to anybody with the required qualifications
UK	Yes , leading positions are accessible to anybody with the required qualifications

⁵⁶ In the Federal Ministry of the Interior this principle applies to all positions held at the level of Head of Department as well as to important management positions in area of competence of the Ministry. Only in special cases (e.g. if women are underrepresented in certain functions) are vacancies announced on a wider scale.

⁵⁷ Only civil servants from other services or legal persons governed by public law are entitled to apply for promotion to the rank of Director-General.

⁵⁸ By way of exception, if the specific characteristics of a Director-General function permit, a non-civil servant may hold the position of Director-General, but it needs to be authorised through a decree.

⁵⁹ Managers with senior and more complex duties.

⁶⁰ Managers with more junior and simpler duties.

2.3.2. Performance management and staff development

One of the main competitive disadvantages of the public sector is that salaries of top officials are in general much higher in the private sector, and public servants very often reach the top of the hierarchy in their early fifties, which means that they have no further career prospects or possibilities for development. This can lead to lack of motivation, reduce work commitment or even induce public servants to find a job in the private sector.

Recently, some EU Member States have adopted a more personalised/individualised human resource management approach, e.g. linking the promotion system more to good results, and/or introducing an appraisal system aimed at enhancing staff development through personal support and counselling, and/or setting monetary incentives for good individual performance. However, a comparison between the different EU Member States shows that there are huge differences as regards the introduction of a more specific management system for the Senior Civil Service (SCS).

The most sophisticated system was put in place by the **United Kingdom** in the mid-nineties. One of the main components of this SCS is the introduction of a single performance management and common pay system, to provide information and support where it concerns personal development, career development and succession planning as well as to provide for the growth of knowledge, skills and experience.⁶¹ This system is based on a yearly performance agreement between the SCS member and his/her line manager. The agreement sets out – separately – business, personal development and diversity objectives, while it also contains sections to include measures of growth in competences and use of professional skills and knowledge. Examples of personal development objectives are knowledge and skills recognised as contributing to effectiveness in the current role and for career development, as well as competences drawn from the SCS Competence Framework which comprises six key SCS behaviour.⁶² In order to promote staff and career development, the SCS member is given feedback in regular performance and development reviews, while these reviews are also an opportunity for individuals to discuss career plans and aspirations, training needs and desired career moves over the next two years. It should be pointed out that the career development plans are not part of the main performance review and do not need to be countersigned. Another characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon performance management approach is that there are flexible pay arrangements to reward and retain good performers. Following the performance review, the line manager makes recommendations on the

⁶¹ For the Anglo-Saxon approach to the management of the senior civil service, see: *Senior Civil Service, Performance Management and Reward, Guide to Performance Management in the SCS*, April 2003, p. 1.

⁶² These are the following:

- Giving purpose and direction – creating and communicating a vision for the future
- Making a personal impact – leading by example
- Thinking strategically – harnessing ideas and opportunities to achieve goals
- Getting the best from people – motivating and developing people to achieve high performance
- Learning and improving – drawing on experience and new ideas to improve results
- Focus on delivery – achieving value for money and results

allocation of individuals to a performance tranche and on a level of bonus which is, if appropriate, reviewed by the department's SCS Pay Committee.⁶³

The **Dutch** Senior Civil Service is very much inspired by the Anglo-Saxon concept, but with one major difference which also distinguishes the **Netherlands** from many other EU Member States: compared to the performance management systems in these States, the main task of the ABD (*Algemene Bestuursdienst*), located within the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations and the central body responsible for the SCS, is not to evaluate the individual performance of senior civil servants but primarily to facilitate and support staff development, mobility and management development within the ministries. The focus is very much on the civil servants' personal development of competences. In this context this may even be called – to quote the *Institut de gestion publique et du développement économique* – the mental mobility of senior managers who want to continuously improve their skills and capacities through regular discussions about their aspirations, individual coaching and management development programmes.⁶⁴ All senior civil servants can have regular consultative meetings with career advisers from the ABD as well as with their immediate manager or supervisor. As in the **United Kingdom**, a model of competences⁶⁵ helps in the recruitment and development of senior civil servants. There is no performance pay scheme for the top, and each minister is responsible for performance pay decisions. The performance approach is mainly based on annual work plan agreements entered into by ministers and senior civil servants. The aim of these agreements is to encourage a dialogue between ministers and the SCS about performance targets and how they can be reached.

Besides the United Kingdom and the **Netherlands**, which have set up quite elaborate SCS systems that are characterised by rules that are different from those governing the rest of the civil service, other EU Member States have also introduced incentives to reward merit and good performance of senior civil servants. In some countries, remuneration is no longer based only on seniority criteria – which if applied too strictly can demotivate good performers – but also on performance evaluation and personal competences. In **Italy**, for instance, a Director may rise to the position of Director-General quite quickly if his/her

⁶³ Salary progression, performance tranche allocation and bonus decisions will depend on the level of achievement against the entire performance agreement across the whole performance year. The tranche recommendation is based on an assessment of each SCS member's contribution compared to that of other individuals operating at the same level. The awarding of bonuses depends on relative measures, not just the absolute degree of target achievement, as well as managers' recommendations. Ibid p. 5.

⁶⁴ See above, Institut de la gestion publique et du développement économique, p. 44.

⁶⁵ See model of competences, ibid, p.43.

- Coherent practical application of the governance principles (vision of the future, leadership, capacity to set objectives, creation of networks)
- Capacity to solve problems (capacity to analyse information, sense of judgement, ability to conceptualise, formulation of solutions)
- Interpersonal relationships (ability to listen, sensitivity, flexibility, capacity to collaborate)
- Efficiency (initiative, control, capacity to delegate, reactivity)
- Impact (sense of communication, self-confidence, conviction)
- Flexibility (being energetic, ability to deal with stress, motivation to perform, capacity to learn)
- Attention for the principles of governance (attention for the working environment, alignment with the principles of governance, integrity, commitment)

results are positive. According to the result-oriented management approach, a senior civil servant signs a limited contract with the minister who employs him/her and with whom he/she agrees on the achievement of targets. On the basis of an end-of-contract evaluation it is decided whether he/she will keep the position or be promoted to a higher post. The performance is reflected by the remuneration in the following manner: 20% of the remuneration is linked to the achievement of objectives; 20% is linked to the responsibility of the post and corresponds to the classification by the ministry⁶⁶ and 60% of the remuneration corresponds to the fixed salary.⁶⁷

In **Ireland** too, specific performance-related awards have been introduced for leading positions,⁶⁸ based on achievements against the objectives defined.⁶⁹ The pool for performance-related awards for Assistant Secretaries is 10% of the wage bill for the grade on a service-wide basis; the cost limit applies to all Assistant Secretaries across Departments and is therefore not departmentally based. Within the overall cost limit of 10% of the pay bill, awards of up to 20% of the salary may be made to individuals. The same conditions apply to Deputy Secretaries and other posts. However, because of the small numbers involved, an overall limit of 10% of the payroll for the grade will not be applied.

In the **Danish** schemes, performance-related pay is an additional bonus to reward the top civil servant for meeting a number of predefined qualitative and quantitative targets. The Chief Executive Performance Contracts (CEPC), for instance, use a scale of 0-100. Usually, a proportion of the full bonus described in the contract is paid. In 2000, the average score was 66.9.

Managers who take on extra responsibilities are rewarded for that in **France** as well. The “employment conditions” for management positions provide for a special pay scale. Moreover, allowance schemes make it possible to consider individual situations and to recognise the professional skills of an employee. However, it should be noted that the individual variations are relatively small. They depend on the management criteria set for each ministry. But according to the **French** report, even small differentiations (5% more or less than the average rate) can have a highly stimulating effect.

Spain has also introduced a complementary bonus system rewarding special performance, additional activities and sense of initiative.

As stated at the beginning of this section, there are considerable differences in whether and how EU Member States design specific career development systems for senior civil servants

⁶⁶ For instance, there are 3 different levels in the Ministry of the Civil Service (A-B-C) and 5 in the Ministry of Finance (A-B-C-D-E).

⁶⁷ See above, Institut de la gestion publique et du développement économique, p.17.

⁶⁸ For the two highest levels (Assistant Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries and other posts at the level above Assistant Secretary but below Deputy Secretary).

⁶⁹ The main criteria for these objectives are for instance, that they should go beyond the normal requirements of the job, that they should be compatible with the long-term goals of the organisation, that they should indicate how relative success in reaching the objectives can be assessed, that they should be limited to about three key areas and that they should contain an indication of the relative weight of the objectives.

and how they reward good performance. The strongest trend in the last decade has certainly been the shift from remuneration systems based purely on seniority to remuneration systems based on competences, skills and performance. Accordingly, in some countries, career progression no longer depends only on the time spent in a certain position, but increasingly also on good marks achieved in an evaluation carried out at the end of a limited contract. Of course, this system also entails the possibility – in the case of bad performance – of non-advancement or even demotion. For instance, **Belgian** top managers who come from the private sector may be dismissed with severance pay and this same measure can be applied to civil servants who refuse a transfer further to a bad evaluation. In **Belgium**, salaries in the public sector have been aligned with those in the private sector, while the performance of top leaders is not specifically remunerated. Nevertheless, the pay of civil servants does not depend on seniority but on the weighting coefficient linked to the function. Thus, each post is evaluated on the basis of 12 criteria corresponding to a number of points which in total determine the remuneration level.⁷⁰

Finland, Greece, Luxembourg, Sweden,⁷¹ **Germany, Austria**⁷² and **Portugal** have not yet introduced a special management performance system for senior civil servants. Furthermore, the **European Commission** is committed to introducing a system for the regular appraisal of the performance of its senior officials.

2.3.3. Training programmes for senior civil servants

Training is a key instrument for personnel development and can contribute to staff motivation in that it enables senior officials to better identify and build their abilities and skills, to use individual strengths and to deepen and develop their knowledge. In addition, the range of specific training measures for managers is all the more important in a modern, professional and constantly changing administration where the success of reforms is ultimately and to a decisive extent dependent on having competent civil servants who are prepared to lead.

In some of the civil services analysed, training of senior civil servants is even considered so crucial for the development of a more efficient and performance-oriented civil service as to be compulsory or conditional for certain career moves. This is for instance the case at the **European Commission**. According to the Commission's Strategic Training Framework for 2003, training is compulsory for all new Unit Heads: they must attend a Management Training Programme (MTP) within 6 months of appointment. Moreover, in certain cases training is even a condition: to be able to apply for the post, the candidate must already have attended a particular training course. Moreover, the first appointment as Director is subject to participation in a Management Training Programme (MTP), whereas Unit Heads must have passed the course "First Steps in Managing People" before they are appointed. In **Germany** too, participation in a management course lasting several weeks is – at least at the Federal

⁷⁰ See above, Institut de la gestion publique et du développement économique, p.16.

⁷¹ In Sweden, wages are fixed on an individual basis.

⁷² In this respect it should be pointed out however that in Austria holders of temporary top-level positions receive high fixed salaries.

Ministry of the Interior – a condition for the first appointment in a leading position.⁷³ In **Greece**, one of the criteria, especially for promotion to the rank of Director-General, is the professional training of the candidate, his scientific knowledge and his proficiency in one or more European languages.

In most EU Member States, training is no prerequisite for promotion. Senior civil servants are expected to attend training programmes the content of which is increasingly adapted to the specific challenges they have to face as leaders in constantly changing public organisations and which aim at developing their competences, skills and knowledge in this field.

Examples of special training programmes for top civil servants offering them valuable opportunities for personal and professional development can be seen in, for instance, **Finland** which recently launched a special training programme (JUST) for future public sector leaders. Compared with previous programmes, JUST is more tailored to individual needs and more internationally oriented, with individual foreign benchmarking projects and participation in foreign high-level management courses. Participants in this programme are mostly Directors-General and Directors from ministries who are invited by the Ministry of Finance to take part after consultation with the ministries. They should be potential candidates for even higher management positions.

The development of senior civil servants through specific training is also at the heart of the senior civil service scheme in the **Netherlands**, which has a special candidate programme for managers, starting at the level of head of unit/department. This programme aims to improve the movement of this group of managers to the level of top management. The programme consists of three components: a) a collective component, b) an individual component, c) an element of work experience. The approach in all parts of the programme (which can last from 2 to 4 years) is centred on the following themes: know yourself, know your job as a manager and know the world. The content of the **Belgian** programme PUMP, intended for future managers in the public service, is characterised by theoretical training combined with training periods abroad, group work and individual duties. The training last 6 months and also includes seminars held in **Belgium**.

In the **United Kingdom**, there are several schemes aimed at the development of senior managers, one of which is the Public Service Leaders Scheme⁷⁴: key aspects of this scheme are the ability to draw leaders together from across all parts of the public sector to form an effective network to learn together about different working cultures and share good practice and the challenge of future leadership, as well as to enhance the organisation's ability to handle change. A special feature of this programme is that each participant commits him/herself to this scheme through a personal learning contract. The programme also includes interchange with another part of the public sector through secondment, mentoring or project work, e-learning, network learning events etc.

⁷³ Nevertheless, participation in training courses on the whole plays rather a secondary role in promotion prospects.

⁷⁴ For more information, see www.publicserviceleadersscheme.gov.uk

In **Austria**, **Germany** and **France**, special management training is offered as well. While in **Germany** the training focuses on behavioural learning (rhetoric, communication, negotiation, team development etc.), the courses in **France** mainly concern topics such as the modernisation of the administration, new public management, public management and human resource management. Moreover, **France** also offers interministerial training especially for top civil servants, organised by the ENA in particular. The initial training of senior civil servants is completed by continuous training throughout their career.

In general, it may be stated that nearly everywhere in the EU, training programmes for top civil servants focus on strengthening management capacities.⁷⁵ In the case of the **European Commission**, training activities deal primarily with topics such as first steps in managing people, managing change, communication and dialogue for high performance, managing roles and priorities, personal leadership, efficiency and diversity (including gender diversity). In **Ireland**, these specific courses include strategic management, organisational change and human resource management issues. In **Spain**, the Senior Management Programmes comprise courses on quality management, human resource management, management of change in public administrations and the **Spanish** economy.

⁷⁵ In this context, it is interesting to note that Portugal and Denmark also intend to organise specific training courses for top civil servants.

3. The attractiveness of career development systems: to what extent do they motivate public sector staff?

3.1. Promotion Policy

3.1.1. The trend from purely seniority-based to more merit and performance-based selection and promotion procedures

A promotion policy with clear and transparent selection criteria and procedures is a key element in setting up a motivational career development system. In the model career system, these criteria are such that civil servants, to each of whom a grade is attributed, move up the career ladder mainly on the basis of seniority and merit, while individual performance or working results achieved play a more minor role. This strongly seniority-focused system adheres to the equality principle by objectively applying the same impersonal rules to everybody. According to such logic, every civil servant experiences some career progression in his/her individual career path, something that can of course be motivating. However, it also has to be said that if the seniority principle is applied too rigidly, there will hardly be any possibilities for a more flexible human resource management policy and more individual treatment and rewarding of staff which would, for example offer faster career progression for competent and highly motivated staff, and there will also be a lack of performance incentives. These negative side-effects of a too rigid and egalitarian promotion policy can obviously result in a vicious circle of demotivation.

As the study has shown, selection and promotion criteria can be multiple and include merit, years of service, training, qualifications, competences etc. It is mainly in some of the career systems that seniority or the years of service spent in the public sector still matter to a large extent. Nonetheless, though different in scope and depth, reforms are underway or at least envisaged in many of the EU Member States. Generally, these reforms aim to link promotion more closely to individual performance, to assess merit in yearly appraisals or evaluations⁷⁶ and take individual competences more into account by conducting competence-based promotion interviews and by establishing clearer job descriptions. These efforts to better reward individual merit, performance and competences can substantially contribute to creating a more motivational and attractive promotion policy. This in turn favours the development of human resource management that considers the individual profile of in doing so benefits the civil servant, with a more personalised approach and a stronger consideration of individual competences. In many civil service systems, one major obstacle to a more differentiated approach is the still rather rigid and rule-oriented legal framework where the principle of equality is paramount. For instance, in the EU Member States, opportunities for faster career progression, which can make public employment more attractive in particular to competent and ambitious young civil servants who might otherwise leave for the private sector,⁷⁷ are still an exception. This rather rigid approach to career development is also very

⁷⁶ It is beyond the scope of this report to go into greater detail about what conditions are necessary to conduct an effective evaluation that really measures performance.

⁷⁷ On this subject, compare p.4.

well illustrated by the fact that in many EU Member States it is still rather difficult for civil servants to be appointed to leading positions before the age of 50.⁷⁸ Career progression is still often closely linked to advancement within the grade structure, which makes it difficult to consider differences in competences, motivation, results achieved, performance etc.

Against this background, in order to develop a more motivational and attractive promotion policy as well as bring about a more professional and performance-oriented civil service, it is becoming increasingly important to move from the pure administration of personnel to the active management of human resources. This can be achieved for instance by:

- generally adopting a more personalised HRM approach, which includes introducing more differentiated career paths as well as a more elaborate staff development and motivation policy. Key elements of such a policy are for instance regular staff discussions and surveys, realistic goal-setting, the introduction and coaching of new staff, promotion, for example through further training, motivation through delegation, as well as the creation of an administrative model with which civil servants can identify and which consequently increases the attractiveness of the public service;⁷⁹
- developing clear and transparent selection and promotion criteria and procedures based on the reward and recognition of performance and merit;
- better matching individual qualifications, competences and skills with the content, level of responsibility etc. of vacancies. The ultimate aim is to match as well as possible the skills, competences and interests of staff with the needs of the administration.

3.1.2. The trend towards reducing promotion opportunities by flattening or “de-layering” administrative hierarchies

Research⁸⁰ has shown that promotion opportunities and the promise of “moving up” the administrative hierarchy considerably increase the attractiveness of public employment. For staff in the public as well in the private sector “staying in the same position is interpreted as dropping out”, while promotion is very closely associated with personal development, self-advancement and career success.⁸¹ However, as the study has shown, in the 80s and 90s, many public sectors in the European Union faced major organisational restructuring aimed at increasing efficiency. Major downsizing measures to reduce the costs of public employment were for instance taken in **Finland, Sweden, the UK and Austria**⁸² and are currently planned in **France**. Another trend is the reduction of the number of levels in the hierarchy, which

⁷⁸ On this subject, compare p.18 et seq.

⁷⁹ On this issue compare for example: Rolf Meier, Marion Edel, “Personalentwicklung und Fortbildung” in: *Verwaltung und Fortbildung, Schriften der Bundesakademie für öffentliche Verwaltung, Heft 2, 1997, p.89-97*; Eckart Werthebach, “Mitarbeitermotivation” in: *Verwaltung und Fortbildung, Heft 1, 1997, p. 12-16*; Jürgen Lorse, *Personalmanagement im öffentlichen Dienst*, Luchterhand, Neuwied, 2001, p. 74 et seq.

⁸⁰ Cf. p. 3.

⁸¹ Rob Goffee, Richard Scase, “Organizational Change and the Corporate Career: The Restructuring of Managers’ Job Aspirations”, in: *Human Relations, Vol. 45, no. 4, 1992, p. 364 and 377*.

⁸² Deok-Seob Shim, “Recent Human Resources Developments in OECD Member Countries”, in: *Public Personnel Management, Volume 30, No. 3, Fall 2001, p. 325-326*.

lessens the incentives for staff to aim for promotion. In motivational terms, this means fewer opportunities to reward staff with a higher status or to give them predictable career paths and a steady career progression.

Against this background of less secure public employment and reduced promotion prospects, other motivational instruments are increasingly needed to make career development more attractive such as:

- increased opportunities for job enlargement and job enrichment;
- greater internal mobility as well as mobility between the public and private sector in order to compensate for the lack of vertical mobility and to extend the possibilities for more varied work experience and personal development, these being important staff motivators.

3.2. Mobility Policy

3.2.1. Trend to increase mobility opportunities

Mobility, if used carefully, can be an effective tool to make career development more flexible and varied. It can benefit both the administration and individual staff members by offering more varied work experience and by giving ministerial departments a valuable instrument for making optimal use of human resources. According to the HRM specialist Serge Vallemont, mobility, accompanied by appropriate training, can be an instrument for the “professional remobilisation” of non-managerial staff, offering them a change of professional environment.⁸³ Thus, mobility can become an important element of a comprehensive staff development policy, being a motivational incentive for competent and demanding staff.

As the study has illustrated, in the EU Member States mobility in its diverse forms is increasingly seen as an integral part of modern human resource management. In many Member States and in the European Commission, reforms are underway aimed at stimulating and/or facilitating job changes within the public sector and mobility between the public and the private sector. Among the most common instruments are specific programmes to promote job moves, the linking of mobility to attractive training programmes, the opening-up of promotion competitions to staff from other departments, the facilitation of mobility through amendments to the legislative framework etc.

A striking trend that can be seen in many EU Member States is moreover the promotion of work experience exchanges with the private sector, which increasingly involve senior staff with fixed-term contracts (see 3.3.). One major goal of this increased flexibility is to introduce private-sector working practices and management tools to the public sector. As current experience shows, the influx of staff from the private sector to the public sector remains quite low for different reasons, one of which is undoubtedly the comparatively low salaries in the public sector. And, as the **Danish** example shows, senior civil servants (1/3 of

⁸³ Serge Vallemont, op. cit., p.38.

them) are more tempted to leave the public sector for an attractive position in the private sector than vice versa.

Although most Member States take quite a positive attitude to a balanced mobility policy, there are important differences in the scope and effectiveness of instruments for implementing job moves. For instance, there are great differences between traditional career systems, where the working conditions are sometimes fundamentally different from those in the private sector, and position systems, where these conditions have to a large extent been brought into line with those in the private sector. To give an example: while in the Nordic countries as well as in the **UK** vacancies are open to candidates from both the public and the private sectors, such vacancies in traditional career systems can, in the most extreme cases, only be filled by candidates of the authority concerned. It may be generally stated that obstacles to mobility are considerably greater in career systems than in position systems, if only due to their structure and organisation. Sometimes a change of position in the career system may involve a time-consuming and inefficient administrative procedure lasting several months, making mobility less attractive as a career development instrument. Often a change from one authority to another requires the permission of both authorities, a signed secondment agreement as well as other statements. In addition, internal mobility may also be perceived in a negative way if it hinders the promotion of so-called “established” civil servants.

Among the main obstacles to mobility mentioned by Vallemont where **France** is concerned are obstacles related to status as well as budgetary, professional and family obstacles. In his opinion, an efficient way to overcome these obstacles is for instance to make more use “of secondment swaps” between administrations; to have clearer job profiles stating required know-how, competences and expertise; and to put jobs into groups for the purpose of mobility.

In the administrations of the Member States and the European Commission we can see a gradual change of attitude regarding the different types of mobility: though until now in many States mobility has only been implemented in isolated cases, e.g. to solve conflicts between civil servants etc., it is increasingly being used as an instrument for a more effective personnel policy as well as a tool for attractive career advancement .

Against this background, a coherent and pro-active mobility policy that is attractive to the organisation as well as to its staff should rely on the following:

- the incorporation of the mobility policy in a coherent career planning strategy;
- the consideration of the versatility of the civil servant during staff appraisals against the background of more complex public tasks in a fast-changing economic and technological environment;
- the facilitation of job moves through effective job coaching and job counselling;
- effective and flexible instruments encouraging balanced mobility, for instance through open interdepartmental competitions, secondments, job exchange schemes etc.

3.3. Career paths of senior civil servants

3.3.1. The trend towards more flexible and performance-oriented management of senior civil servants, with greater opportunities for varied work experience

The motivation and retention of competent and skilled staff in the public sector depends to a large extent on the existence of attractive monetary and non-monetary incentives for senior civil servants. In a constantly changing public sector, motivated and committed senior civil servants guarantee more efficient and performance-oriented management.

The study has shown that by the mid-nineties a few countries had created separate management systems for senior civil servants. Basically, these systems (with their country-specific differences) are intended to create a more mobile, flexible and efficient core group of senior civil servants at the top of the civil service who share the same culture and values and have broader civil service experience and managerial competences. Currently, an increasing number of countries are introducing, or are at least planning to introduce, different management rules for senior officials. Common trends in this context are the introduction of fixed-term appointments, the opening-up of certain senior positions to candidates from the private sector, compulsory mobility, performance-related bonuses and a greater consideration of output where promotion is concerned.

Positive incentives for a more attractive career development for senior civil servants are: more diversified and challenging career prospects through increased mobility opportunities as well as a better rewarding of individual contributions through a more differentiated human resource management approach. The growing efforts in an increasing number of Member States to offer tailor-made training programmes for senior officials can also have motivational effects if they are embedded in a more comprehensive career and staff development strategy. More attention should also be paid to individual coaching and counselling as well as to job appraisals balancing individual professional strengths and needs against the goals of the organisation.

However, as will be further discussed below, the trend of new management systems for senior civil servants also calls into question some traditional attractive elements of career development in the public sector compared with those in the private sector.

To ensure the reward and recognition of merit it is important to establish a career development system for senior civil servants based on their personal contribution and performance rather than on grade and seniority. A motivational management policy for senior civil servants entails treating them equitably rather than equally.⁸⁴ The following elements can contribute to reaching this goal and to making career development more attractive:

- a performance management system which is characterised both by regular performance appraisals and by support for staff development and needs;

⁸⁴ Joanna O’Riordan, Peter C. Humphreys, op. cit., p.61.

- a stronger link between career advancement and individual competences, performance⁸⁵ and qualifications;
- the availability of special training for senior staff, providing them with valuable opportunities for personal and professional development.

3.3.2. *The trend towards less secure and more unpredictable career prospects*

One of the key attractions of public employment was that it offered more job security than the private sector.⁸⁶ A major asset of many public sectors was a high degree of job stability and security, or even life-time employment, with the prospect of reaching higher positions with more responsibility. Compared with many posts in the private sector, career paths and prospects in the public sector were quite predictable and the risk of non-advancement or of being demoted was rather low. But with the recent trends towards fixed-term appointments of senior civil servants and the opening-up of certain leading posts to candidates from the private sector, some specific privileges of public employment seem to be diminishing. Limiting the terms of office for top-level appointments and linking contractual renewal to the meeting of targets will make career progression less predictable and increase the risk of non-advancement or demotion. Furthermore, greater access to top positions will inevitably lead to stronger competition between competent candidates and potentially to fewer career opportunities. This trend very well illustrates that there are pros and cons to the new developments in public sector human resource management when it comes to making the public sector more attractive as an employer.

⁸⁵ I will not go more into detail as regards the topic of performance-related pay in view of the uncertain evidence as to its benefits.

⁸⁶ Deok-Seob Shim, "Recent Human Resources Developments in OECD Member Countries", in: *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 2001, p.25.

Conclusions

The attractiveness of public employment depends on a multiple set of factors such as job content, career opportunities, salary, development and training, work scheduling, leadership etc.⁸⁷ As Christoph Demmke's study on the challenges of demographic evolution has shown, career development is a crucial variable in recruiting and retaining competent staff and in competing effectively with the private sector. This is underlined by the fact that many EU Member States and the European Commission are in the process of rethinking key elements of career development-related aspects of human resource management.

The study focused on a comparative analysis of promotion policy, mobility policy and the career paths of senior civil servants as important elements of an attractive career development system. One key question in this context was the extent to which these systems not only meet organisational goals but also provide motivational incentives for staff. Although the analysis revealed huge differences between the public sectors of the fifteen Member States and the European Commission, certain common trends could be seen, which are stronger in some countries than in others: as regards promotion policy, the trend is to move from an equal approach in personnel policies towards more differentiated, individual treatment of human resources. In this context, individual competences, performance and results are becoming more important. However, we should also point out that public servants are quite old when reaching leading positions compared with employees in the private sector. This development can mainly be attributed to the fact that programmes for faster career progression are still an exception. Another trend is that promotion opportunities and career prospects for senior civil servants are becoming less certain and predictable due to such factors as the "de-layering" of administrative hierarchies, the use of fixed-term contracts and the wider access candidates from the private sector have to leading positions. But at the same time the stronger performance-oriented approach towards the senior civil service is also characterised by more motivational effects as individual input and results are better rewarded and recognised, and there are more challenging and varied career prospects as a result of the increased mobility opportunities. Another positive development is that the focus on staff development and staff motivation could potentially give rise to better coaching and counselling. In addition, the introduction of regular staff discussions, realistic goal-setting etc. seems to gradually favour more motivational human resource management in at least a few EU Member States. This trend is also important in terms of encouraging a mobility policy aimed at better matching organisational needs with individual competences and aspirations.

With regard to the future, these reforms should be continued, mainly for the following reason: in the light of budgetary cuts, the abolition of traditional attractive elements of public employment such as the large degree of job stability and the sometimes favourable pension schemes will probably continue in the future. But this development will most certainly not lead to salary increases as a way to make public employment more attractive. In this context, career development can gain in importance as an effective tool to increase the public sector's

⁸⁷ Christoph Demmke, *op. cit.*, p. 20 et seq.

attractiveness and compensate for the deterioration of the abovementioned factors. This will even be more the case if public sectors succeed in setting up career development systems which on the one hand enhance the efficiency and performance of the public sector and on the other create motivational incentives for individual staff.

Annex: Questionnaire

Subject and Content of the Study: Career Development as an Effective Tool to Enhance the Attractiveness of Public Employment

The EIPA report of 2002 on “*Facing the challenges of demographic evolution: Focusing on recruitment policies as a way to enhance the attractiveness of public employment*” has shown that in almost all EU Member States, demographic developments will lead to an ageing of the workforce and consequently to stronger competition with the private sector as regards the recruitment of qualified staff in public administration. One of the main future challenges of national public administrations in this context is to enhance the attractiveness of public employment by measures such as for instance bolstering the image of public employment, improving working conditions, and offering incentives, opportunities and career development possibilities. It becomes increasingly crucial for the public employer – if he wants to remain competitive – to offer civil servants clear career development opportunities as well as the prospect of professional advancement.

Against this background, the Greek presidency decided that the study for the 40th meeting of the Directors-General of the Public Service of the Member States of the European Union in Rhodes should be focused on human resource management and be entitled “Career Development Systems in the EU Member States”.

The aim of the study under the Greek Presidency

The comparative EIPA study will focus on career development as a key factor in enhancing the attractiveness of public employment. The study will mainly involve the following:

a) An analysis of key instruments for ensuring an attractive career development:

-Promotion policy: Clear career opportunities with the prospect of access to higher positions involving a higher degree of responsibility are a major asset of any organisation. One aim of the study is to discuss the different promotion systems in the EU Member States as well as to consider how these systems can contribute to making career development more attractive.

-Opportunities for mobility at government level and between the public and the private sector: In many EU Member States, the increasing mobility has become a highly topical issue in the context of improving the efficiency of human resource management. An increasing number of human resource managers in for instance the **UK** and the **Netherlands** consider it a useful tool which offers managers flexibility and which is valued for its motivating effect on the work force. If used carefully, mobility can contribute to making public administration more attractive by increasing

opportunities for career planning and development and by offering benefits to employees, managers, departments and the public administration as a whole.

-Career opportunities and remuneration for top civil servants: In the private sector as well as in the public sector, the characteristics of top positions are key factors in attracting skilled people and enhancing the image of the organisation. In this context, many factors are in play such as the chances and conditions of access to such positions, the level of the remuneration, the linkage of these positions to performance criteria, the consideration of merit, skills etc.

-Promotion training for senior civil servants: Last but not least, the study will focus on promotion training as another useful instrument to enhance professional development and motivation. In this context, it should be pointed out that some of the EU Member States recently introduced new promotion programmes to improve the attractiveness of career development.

- b) An analysis of the career development systems in the EU Member States with the aim of evaluating the different approaches and practices.

The study will focus particularly on career development so as to provide useful information and inspiration to the Member States in their future work in this field. The study will be based on the **questionnaire** shown below, as well as on literature, documents and other relevant material on the subject. The questionnaire should be filled in and returned to EIPA and to the Greek Presidency **by 1 April 2003 at the latest**.

Question 1: Does your public administration have a promotion system based on the principle of seniority? If so, what is the period required for promotion to the next grade? Is this period applied uniformly and automatically or are there shorter promotion periods for specific categories of personnel (e.g. fast stream in the **UK**)? What are the rules in this regard? What posts are excluded from the statutory scheme of professional advancement?

Question 2: Briefly describe the prerequisites, criteria and procedure applied to an employee's promotion to the next grade. Are there any plans for reforms in this field?

Question 3: If you have a system other than a career system, what are the main promotion criteria?

Question 4: Do you intend to reform your promotion system in order to enhance the attractiveness of public employment?

Question 5: To what extent does your public administration offer opportunities for mobility at interministerial level and between the public and the private sector? What instruments are there and what is their goal? To what extent is mobility taken into account in promotion? Are there plans for reforms in this field?

Question 6: Briefly describe the hierarchical structure of the central public administration. (e.g. Directorates-General, Directorates, sub-Directorates, sections, offices etc.)? How many managerial or leading positions are there within this structure? Are these posts accessible only to employees of the same ministerial department, or also to candidates from other departments and from the private sector?

Question 7: In how far is the administrative reform in your country characterised by a trend towards flatter hierarchies, leading to the removal of many of the steps on the public service promotional ladder and thus to fewer leading positions? Please elaborate on this.

Question 8: Are there any specific rules governing the management of the senior civil service (selection criteria, training, mobility requirements etc.) and what are the criteria for promotion to the posts of Director and Director-General (e.g. grade, seniority, efficiency, achievement of specific targets, responsiveness to citizens' demands and needs)?

Question 9: Is there a separate performance management system for top civil servants, i.e. different from the one for other civil servants? Is there a performance-related pay scheme for top civil servants? If so, please give a brief outline of this scheme.

Question 10: Please describe how training is linked to the career development of civil servants. Is attendance of specific training courses a prerequisite for promotion? Are there any other special programmes for developing future public sector leaders? If so, please give a detailed description.

Practical information:

Your answers, in English, French or German, should be returned by electronic mail by 1 April 2003 at the latest to:

- The European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA), for the attention of the person in charge of the study, Danielle Bossaert, Lecturer (d.bossaert@eipa-nl.com), tel.: 0031 43 32 96367, and for the attention of Dr Christoph Demmke, Associate Professor (c.demmke@eipa-nl.com), tel.: 0031 43 32 96 225.
- The Greek Ministry of the Interior, Public Administration and Decentralisation, General Directorate of Human Resource Management, e-mail: gdkp.ggdd@syzefxis.gov.gr (secr.), d.g.Berg@syzefxis.gov.gr