Funded by
the European Union

# Human Resource Management Indicators

# For Civil Service

## *Guidance in Measurement of Indicators*

*(Core and Good-to-Have Indicators)*

**Author:**

Dea Tsartsidze – EU-funded project "Support to Public Administration Reform in Georgia", Senior Expert on Research and Data Analysis

Wojciech Zielinski - EU-funded project "Support to Public Administration Reform in Georgia", Key Expert in Civil Service

Ia Tsulaia - EU-funded project "Support to Public Administration Reform in Georgia", Senior Expert on Human Resource Management

**December, 2023**

This document has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of the Civil Service Bureau and Sofreco in consortium with Particip and Konrad Adenauer Foundation and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# OVERVIEW

The indicators below aim to support the evidence-informed analysis of the performance of Human Resources (HR) at public bodies. They aim to serve as an assessment tool of HR performance at the level of one individual organization. In particular, they can contribute to the process of elaborating and monitoring HR strategies, but could be useful also for other purposes in strategic Human Resource Management (HRM), such as in Strategic Workforce planning, as well as in daily management of HR.

While many indicators are universal and can apply to human resources at any organization, some of them are crafted especially for public organizations. The list of indicators is broad and allows for selecting relevant indicators, according to the needs of the specific public body. They could also be modified according to these needs. Thus, their descriptions are not detailed and allow for their application in different legal contexts.

In total, 55 indicators have been identified as 'core' and 'good-to-have', covering 9 areas related to HRM. While all indicators are conceptually and methodologically sound, the level of detail and information that underlies them varies. Some indicators rely on internal HRM data, while others require empirical data collection.

Where relevant, certain indicators have been informed by the SIGMA framework, or were adapted from the SIGMA methodological framework[1]. Most indicators were created specifically for the purpose of this publication.

[1] SIGMA& OECD, (2019), Methodological Framework for the Principles of Public Administration, available here

# GUIDING SHEET: HOW TO USE IT?

The instructions below explain key terms used in this Indicator Measurement Guidebook and provide suggestions for using the document.

### *About components of indicator passports*

***Diagnosis section of the indicator passport****:* The guidebook does not define the acceptable, or preferred level of HR performance. It is left to the discretion of each organization to make its own decision about acceptable levels, considering the baseline value / performance of an organization under the indicators and the objectives of their own HR policy. Nevertheless, for some indicators, we provide international benchmarks (from SIGMA Methodological Framework) that could also be used as benchmarks for individual organizations. Where available, these benchmarks have been included under the "definition and rationale" section of the relevant indicator.

***Data collection frequency:*** This section has intentionally been left blank, as there are different HR systems in place at different public bodies. Moreover, data collection frequency could be adjusted to the needs of an organization. For example, some organizations may decide to monitor some aspects of HR on a more frequent basis, whereas others may decide to do it in longer time intervals. Overall, greater availability of resources may allow some organizations to monitor the situation on a more regular basis.

***Disaggregation:*** The main points of analysis, or the disaggregation of information, under the indicators is proposed as a suggestion. This disaggregation could easily be customized, or altered, based on the needs of an organization. The disaggregation criteria used in this document include the following:

- By State Agencies (makes sense if a Ministry is preparing an analytical document, which encompasses all sub-ordinated agencies)
- By type of contract of staff (civil servants, administrative and labor contracts)
- By department
- By unit
- By job families
- By ranks
- By managerial positions
- By positions (type of specialists)
- By sex

***Indicator set:*** In this field we have suggested 'core' indicators and 'good-to-have' indicators. However, it is recommended that each organization chooses indicators according to:

- The needs of an organization
- Relevance to an organization
- The availability of data
- Effort required to collect the data

***Dynamic perspective:*** Most indicators may be used to illustrate a dynamic perspective, i.e., the evolution of the value of the indicator over time. If data is available over a given period of time, we encourage the use of data over such a time series, as this may be informative s to trends and suggestions about the likely evolution of performance in the future. To calculate performance over a time-series, it would be necessary to collect data from at least the last three years. The proposed calculation method is indicated as follows:

$$\left[\left[\frac{year\ x}{year\ x-1}x100\right]-100\right];\left[\left[\frac{year\ x-1}{year\ x-2}x100\right]-100\right];\left[\left[\frac{year\ x-2}{year\ x-3}x100\right]-100\right]$$

### *About key terms*

***Staff:*** The guidebook does not define precisely to which employment category the indicators apply (civil servants, labor code employees, etc.). These guidelines can be applied to different public organizations, some may be part of the civil service, some are not (like LEPLs), while they may operate at both national and sub-national level. Therefore, it is left to the discretion of each public body to decide which employment categories will be included in the analysis. We refer to different employment categories through the use of the general term, "staff"..

***Senior staff:*** For civil servants, senior staff positions are those that qualify as rank 1 under the Public Service Law (art. 25, para 1a). For institutions that do not fall under civil service legislation, senior staff would include the heads of the main, biggest, organizational units (i.e., one level below the head of an organization, or in some situations, the head of an organization may also be included).

***Technical positions:*** For certain indicators, it may be necessary to exclude certain categories of workers in technical positions providing administrative services (such as drivers, cleaners, etc.) executing simple tasks. The guidebook does not provide for a definition of technical staff here, as it will depend on an organization and functional tasks of each public body.

***Public organizations:*** The indicators may be used by public bodies that are covered by the Public Service Law (for example, ministries), but also other bodies, like Legal Entities under Public Laws (LEPLs), or regional or municipal agencies. As such the guidebook uses a single, common term to describe all potential users–i.e., public organizations.

***Job families:*** The methodology often proposes the disaggregation of information by job families. Job families are the groups of positions broken down by functional categories, roles. These include lawyers, economists, accountants, human resource specialists, etc. Although such categorization may be absent in most public organizations in Georgia at present, they are introduced here with a view to encouraging changes in this direction. The introduction of job families improves HR management, including HR performance measurement.

***Gender equality:*** The topic of gender equality is addressed in this guidebook in the following ways:

- Inclusion of specific indicators that highlight potential discrimination against women, such as the percentage of women in leadership roles or the success rate of women in recruitment procedures for senor positions
- To facilitate a more thorough analysis based on gender, it is recommended to disaggregate certain indicators presented below by sex. This will allow for a more

nuanced understanding of any disparities between men and women in the areas being measured.

# PILLAR O: GENERAL INDICATORS

| **INDICATOR 1:** | **Staff distribution** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | The indicator aims to measure the frequency of distribution of staff from various angles. This is a basic HR indicator describing the organization of staff and the level of hierarchization of an organization. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By unit<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By managerial positions<br>▪ By positions (type of specialists)<br>▪ By Marginalized communities | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br># and % of staff by the criteria provided in the disaggregation above.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please run the frequency distribution to identify the frequency.<br>***Example:*** *16% of the staff holds the managerial position* | | | |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR Database | | | |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | |

| **INDICATOR 2:** | **Age distribution** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to measure the distribution of staff by age group. This may be useful in analyzing the age demographic breakdown of an organization and contribute to workforce planning. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br># and % of staff by age group. The suggested age groups are 18-28; 29-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60-69; 70 and above.<br>To calculate this indicator, please run the frequency distribution to identify the frequency of staff members by pre-defined age groups.<br>***Example:*** *47 staff members are in the 29-39 age group category, which represents 34% of total staff in a public body.* | | | |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR Database | | | |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | | | | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually | | | |
| **LIMITATIONS** | Different end-of-the-scale age groups could be defined for women and men to take into account different legally prescribed retirement ages. | | | |

<table>
<tr><th>INDICATOR 3:</th><th colspan="4">Retirement age</th></tr>
<tr><td>AREA RESULTS:</td><td colspan="4">GENERAL INDICATORS</td></tr>
<tr><td>RESULTS LEVEL:</td><td colspan="4">OUTPUT</td></tr>
<tr><td>INDICATOR SET:</td><td colspan="4">CORE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DEFINTION & RATIONALE</td><td colspan="4">This indicator aims to measure the number of staff in retirement age. This is a crucial indicator for workforce planning.<br>A similar indicator could be elaborated to complement this one – i.e., the number of staff in pre-retirement age. The pre-retirement age could be defined as staff approaching retirement, for example up to 5 years before the retirement age.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DIAGNOSIS</td><td>Standard<br>N/A</td><td>Acceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Unacceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Critical<br>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>DISAGGREGATION</td><td colspan="4">▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks</td></tr>
<tr><td>CALCULATION</td><td colspan="4">Unit of measurement: Individual<br># and % of staff in retirement age<br>To calculate this indicator, please run the frequency distribution to identify the frequency of staff members in retirement age. It will be necessary to consider different retirement ages for men and women.<br>Example: 200 of staff are employed in a public organization: 10 in rank 1 positions; 20 in rank 2 positions; 70 in rank 3 positions and 100 in rank 4 positions. The number of staff in retirement age by ranks is the following: rank 1 – 5 staff; rank 2 – 5 staff; rank 3 - 10 staff and rank 4 – 5 staff. So, in total, 12,5% of staff are in retirement age in a public organization. In rank 1, 50% of staff are in retirement age; in rank 2 – 25% of staff, in rank 3 – 14% of staff and 5% in rank 4 staff.  These findings suggest that the demographic challenge and problems with turnover due to retirement concern mostly positions in rank 1 and rank 2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD</td><td colspan="4">HR Database</td></tr>
</table>

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | Different calculation for women and men should be done to reflect different retirement age. In Georgia, there is no mandatory retirement age for civil servants, which means that reaching retirement age does not necessarily mean that someone will leave the job. |

| INDICATOR 4: | Compensation for overtime | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure to what extent overtime work is compensated. It is an important indicator that could indicate the need for improvements in the management and organization of work.<br>As paid overtime is usually associated with increased cost of the workforce, the analysis of this indicator can also be useful for budget-related purposes. It also shows how fairly the staff is treated and whether their rights to overtime compensation are ensured. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By unit<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By position<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By type of compensation | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>% of officially recognized overtime, which is compensated annually. Compensation means that the worker was either paid or provided a day off.<br>**Numerator:** Total hours of overtime that were compensated during the last year<br>**Denominator:** Total hours of officially recognized overtime last year<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100.<br>***Example:*** 54 (Total number of hours that were compensated during 2021) /76 (Total number of overtime hours spent by staff during 2021) *100 = 64% | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR Database |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | Overtime is not recorded in many of public organizations, in order to avoid extra cost. So, the indicator may not be informative, as – in some cases – it is not based on credible, comprehensive data. |

| INDICATOR 5: | Annual Overtime | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the amount of overtime spent by the staff. It is an important indicator that could indicate the need for improvements in the organization of work by better allocating resources or re-engineering processes. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By unit<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By position<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>Calculate the average number of hours of overtime annually<br>***Example:*** On average, 45 hours were worked overtime by a staff member during 2021. | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **LIMITATIONS** | Overtime hours are not recorded in many public organizations, as this may entail extra costs. It is thus possible that the indicator may not be informative or reliable, as – in some cases – it will not be based on comprehensive  or credible data. |

| **INDICATOR 6:** | **Cost of Overtime** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to measure the cost of overtime in relation to the total salary budget. This indicator points to concrete cost related to the organization of work, which requires frequent overtime. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By unit<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By position | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | Share financial resources spent on the compensation for annual overtime in the total remuneration budget.<br>**Numerator:** Total financial compensation for overtime during a year<br>**Denominator:** Total gross salary annual budget for the same year (spent)<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100.<br>This indicator focuses on financial compensation and does not include the compensation in additional free time. If an organization compensates overtime predominantly by free time, it would be necessary to come up with another indicator related to compensation by free time. | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR Database |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | Overtime hours are not recorded in many public organizations, as this may entail extra costs. It is thus possible that the indicator may not be informative or reliable, as – in some cases – it will not be based on comprehensive or credible data. |

| **INDICATOR 7:** | **Staff direct cost** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to measure total operational cost, directly spent on staff by public organizations. This indicator provides valuable data for workforce planning and budget management. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By unit<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Group<br>1. Calculate the total cost spent for all staff, which includes salary budget + rewards + any benefit packages (phone, car and driver costs – if a car and a driver are exclusively assigned to this position) + training costs. | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 2. Present the data by the variables listed above (department, unit, job families, etc.).<br><br>***Example:*** 450 000 GEL has been spent for all the staff in a public organization, out of those 60% spent for administrative and 40 for labor contract staff. |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR Database, other databases of a public organizations. |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The indicator does not cover indirect costs. It covers only these benefits/packages that are directly attributed to a position. |

| INDICATOR 8: | Turnover | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the turnover rate in a public organization. This is a key measure of the ability or effectiveness of an organization to retain staff.<br>In addition, if viewed alongside election cycles and political calendars, staff turnover may also indicate the level of politicization of a public organization. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By age group<br>▪ By new hires (hired during the last year)<br>▪ By performance appraisal results<br>▪ By reason of departure | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** Total number of the staff who left a public organization during the last calendar year / previous 12 months.<br>**Denominator:** Total number of staff at a public organization at the beginning of the last calendar year / previous 12 months.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100.<br>***Example:*** 34 (A total number of staff who left a public organization during 2021) /54 (A total number of staff who worked in a public organization on 1.01.2021) *100 = 64% | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR Database; Exit interviews |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | If performance scores are inflated, the calculation of this indicator will not bring any added value – using the breakdown by performance appraisals results. |

| INDICATOR 9: | Voluntary turnover rate |
|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | GENERAL INDICATORS |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE |

| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | |
|---|---|
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the turnover rate but limits the analysis to cases when the decision to leave a public organisation was made by a staff member.<br><br>While this indicator provides insight on whether a public organization has a problem with high voluntary turnover, it does not aim to provide insight into reasons (like low engagement, low salary competitiveness, etc.) that drive this. High voluntary turnover may indicate to problems with employee engagement, employer competitiveness, etc. |

| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |

| | |
|---|---|
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By age<br>▪ By departments |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br><br>**Numerator**: The number of voluntary resignations in the last calendar year / previous 12 months.<br><br>**Denominator**: The total number of employed staff at the beginning of the last calendar year / previous 12 months.<br><br>***Example***: 45 (a total number of total voluntarily resigned staff during 2021)/ 234 (total number of all staff in a public organization at the beginning of 2021 *100) =19%<br><br>An alternative way of calculating this indicator could be also considered. It would involve calculating the share of voluntary turnover not in total employment, but in the total turnover. Thus, the numerator will be the same, but the denominator would encompass total annual turnover. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | The voluntary resignations can be calculated based on formal documents - according to art. 109 of the Law on Public Service. However, more exact information on the reasons for leaving organisations could be taken from exit interviews, if they are conducted. |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | This calculation requires precise information, which is not always accurately obtained from formal resignation letters. To analyse  the latter, it is important to have exit interviews implemented in a public organization. |

| INDICATOR 10: | Dismissed employee rate by reason | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULT** | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| **INDICATOR LEVEL** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This particular indicator aims to offer insight into the formal reasons for dismissal from a public organization.<br>The information gleaned from this indicator serves to complement the data obtained from other indicators that measure employee turnover and voluntary turnover, providing a more comprehensive understanding of workforce dynamics within an organization. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By age<br>▪ By departments | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: The number of dismissed employees that left a public organization disaggregated by formal reasons during last year.<br>**Denominator**: The total number of employed staff at the beginning of the last calendar year / previous 12 months who left an organization.<br><br>***Example***: 45 (a total number of total voluntarily resigned staff during 2021)/ 234 (total number of all staff in a public organization at the beginning of 2021 *100) =19%<br>*It is worth noting that the Public Service Law, as outlined in Chapter XII, stipulates several grounds for dismissal. This indicator can be disaggregated based on the specific reasons for dismissal that are relevant to an organization's needs. Below is an example of potential categories for grouping these reasons:* | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | - *Disciplinary misconduct*<br>- *Negative results of job performance evaluations*<br>- *Dismissal during or after the trial period*<br>- *Appointment to another position*<br>- *Dismissal based on personal statement*<br>- *Dismissal due to reorganization or liquidation*<br>- *Violation of the law on incompatibility of interests and corruption in a public organization*<br>- *Other reasons*<br><br>***Example***: |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR database and management system |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | |

Example table:

| Reason | % |
|---|---|
| Disciplinary misconduct | 0 |
| Negative results of performance evaluations | 0 |
| Dismissal during or after the trial period | 0 |
| Appointment to another position | 15% |
| Dismissal based on personal statements | 35% |
| Dismissal due to reorganization or liquidation | 20% |
| Violation of the law in compatibility of interests and corruption in a public organization | 0 |
| Other reasons | 30% |

| INDICATOR 11: | Discrimination and harassment rate | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | GENERAL INDICATORS | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | The purpose of this indicator is to monitor the prevalence of harassment and discrimination within a public organization. By gathering information on these issues, this indicator provides a comprehensive view of organization's performance in this area, which can be used to complement the information obtained through other survey-based indicators, such as employee satisfaction and engagement.<br><br>The value of this indicator lies in its ability to provide a unified picture of the prevalence of harassment and discrimination within an organization, which may not be captured by other traditional feedback mechanisms, such as complaints procedures. The indicator's score can reveal potential issues related to harassment and discrimination that may not be immediately apparent, allowing an organization to take proactive steps to mitigate risks and improve human resource procedures. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By departments<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By age<br>▪ By marginalized communities | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br><br>% off respondents who have information about cases of harassment in a public organization<br><br>% of respondents who know about cases of discrimination in an organization.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, it is recommended to conduct a survey. The survey may vary in length and content, depending on organization's needs, and may include questions related to employee harassment and discrimination. It is recommended that discrimination questions address various areas of human resources, including | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | hiring, promotion, professional development, salary setting, and other employment-related issues.<br><br>To ensure a more nuanced analysis of the data, it is essential to disaggregate the results by various demographic factors, such as gender, age, religion, political views, etc. This can help identify potential disparities in the treatment of employees from different groups and guide the development of targeted interventions to address any issues that arise.<br><br>Overall, conducting a comprehensive survey that addresses the range of relevant human resources issues and analyzes the results by various demographic factors can provide valuable insights into organization's performance in terms of promoting a culture of equality and preventing discrimination and harassment.<br><br>The survey questions related to discrimination and harassment can take different forms, depending on organization's needs and the desired level of detail. Some questions can be straightforward, such as asking if employees have personally experienced discrimination or harassment. Other questions can be more indirect, such as asking if employees have heard of any incidents of harassment or discrimination in an organization. An useful way of collecting information may be also exit surveys/interviews.<br><br>***Example***<br>The survey results indicate that a significant portion of employees are aware of harassment of other employees in an organization, with 45% of respondents reporting such awareness. However, only a small percentage of employees (5%) have personally experienced harassment themselves.<br><br>A majority of respondents (60%) stated that there are discriminatory practices in an organization. These discriminatory practices were found to be most prevalent in personnel recruitment (30%) and professional development (25%), with the remaining percentage related to salary determination. Notably, female respondents were more likely to report discriminatory practices, with 70% of female respondents expressing concerns in this area. |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Survey |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Once in 3 years |
| **LIMITATIONS** | |

# PILLAR I: RECRUITMENT

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **INDICATOR 1:** | **Recruitment platforms and channels** | | | |
| **AREA RESULTS:** | RECRUITMENT | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | INPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to identify the number of applications received from recruitment channels and platforms channels. It is an easily actionable indicator – as the results of the measurement can be used to increase the reach of job announcements. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>% of applicants who learnt about the vacancy announcement, by channel of information for example from: government announcement portal, advertisement board in the organisation, press advertisement, friends, social media; hr.gov.ge; LinkedIn.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please run the frequency distribution to identify the frequency of the channels listed by the applicants.<br>In the application documents, a public organization could include the question *"how have you learned about the vacancy?"* with the pre-defined options along with the possibility to add -other- options as well.<br>***Example:*** 45% of applicants indicated that they have learnt about the vacancy from social media. | | | |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | *CSB gov.ge platform* where to integrate additional "how have you learned about the vacancy" (with drop down list and "other" option) – to be considered by the Civil Service Bureau (CSB) | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | After the recruitment process is finalized to collect and analyze information from the applicants participating in the selection process |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |

| INDICATOR 2: | Efficiency of attraction channels | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | RECRUITMENT | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTCOME | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to identify the channels that are more efficient in attracting qualified applicants.<br>This indicator complements indicator 6 and helps making evidence-based decision related to advertising job vacancies. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By rank | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator**: The number of applicants who meet the formal, announced job criteria, broken down by communication channels from which they learned about the announcement. For example: advertisement board in the organisation, press advertisement, friends, social media, LinkedIn; hr.gov.ge, etc.<br>**Denominator**: Total number of applicants who learned about job advertisement from each channel.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator, multiplied by 100.<br>***Example:*** 25 (Total number of staff who met the formal, announced job criteria from a channel of communication, for example, LinkedIn) /89 (A total number of them who learnt about the advertisement from a channel, for example, LinkedIn) *100 = 28%<br>The table below shows the frequency distribution of channel that was applied by the staff who met formal criteria. | | | |

| Channel | Frequency |
|---|---|
| LinkedIn | 60% |
| Hr.Gov.Ge | 45% |
| Friend | 13% |
| Facebook | 12% |
| Other | 32% |

Perform this calculation for all channels listed by applicants and order channels by the level of success in identifying successful candidates.

It is important to consider that the frequencies are not composites of a total (100%). Meaning that it is possible that 95% of LinkedIn applicants may meet the criteria, while 90% of Facebook may also do so.

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | *CSB gov.ge platform* where to integrate additional “how have you learned about the vacancy” (with drop down list and “other” option).<br>Or *survey* run by a HR, especially, if candidates were directly approached |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | After the first stage of recruitment – the check of fulfillment of formal requirements. |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | |
| **LIMITATIONS** | This indicator is useful only, if a public organization uses diverse attraction channels |

| INDICATOR 3: | Duration of recruitment process | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | RECRUITMENT | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | PROCESS | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims at measuring the time that elapses between the announcement of the vacancy and the publication of results of recruitment.<br>It is an important measure of agility of HR processes and ability to fill in vacancies quickly. According to SIGMA methodological framework, values below 90 days are considered satisfactory. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>To calculate this indicator, count the number of days that elapses from the day of posting of the announcement of the vacancy and the publication of recruitment results. The time to issue appointment decision is not considered.<br>***Example:*** If the recruitment results were published on 31 August and the vacancy was announced on 1st August, then the duration of the recruitment is 31 days. This would be considered Acceptable / Satisfactory under the SIGMA framework. | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Data collected during recruitment process | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | Extremely short periods may not always be reflective of a positive recruitment process, as it possible that the merit of applicants are not fully considered in such cases.<br>There are other methods of calculating the length or efficiency of the recruitment process. The alternative is to start the period not when the vacancy is announced, | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | but when the vacancy appears. The alternative related to the end of the period is the decision of the appointment (signing the employment contract). Each of these modalities has advantages and disadvantages. The proposed calculation focuses on the speed and performance of the selection commission. The alternative method, described above could be more useful for managers, as it relates to concrete outcome – appointment of new staff. |

| INDICATOR 4: | Success in attracting candidates |
|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | RECRUITMENT |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | INPUT |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the number of candidates applying to a public organization per vacancy.<br>It is an important indicator to measure the attractiveness of a public body as an employer and efficiency of channels used for advertising vacancies. According to SIGMA Methodological Framework, a good (acceptable) result is 11 or more candidates per position. A very poor (critical) result is 2 or less per position. |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard: N/A; Acceptable: N/A; Unacceptable: N/A; Critical: N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By rank |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator**: Total number of eligible candidates that participated in external recruitment procedures during the latest full calendar year. Eligible candidates are the candidates that fulfill the formal requirements (usually related to education, years of work experience, etc.)<br>**Denominator**: The number of vacancies offered for open recruitment during the same period<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator.<br>***Example:*** 89 (which is a total number of eligible candidates participated during 2021/16 (a total number of vacancies offered during 2021) = 5.56 |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Data collected during recruitment process |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | This indicator makes the most sense, if it is applied with the breakdown by job families and ranks. Usually, there are less candidates for higher-ranked positions or highly specialized positions.<br>The situation of the labor market may also influence the values of this indicator. Usually, higher levels of unemployment mean more candidates are attracted to apply to public organizations. |

| INDICATOR 5: | Hiring success rate | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | RECRUITMENT | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTCOME | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the success in filling in vacancies. A large number unfilled vacancies means not only that an organization may face challenges implementing their tasks due to lack of staff, but results in additional cost and effort needed for repeated recruitments.<br>According to SIGMA Methodological Framework a result exceeding 95% is considered very good. Any result below 55% is considered poor. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By departments | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator**: Number of people appointed to vacancies (as a result of recruitment open to external candidates) during the latest full calendar year<br>**Denominator**: The total number of vacancies announced for open competition in the last year.<br>*Note*: If there is one announcement for several positions, each positions counts. If there is an announcement for 1 position on which several persons can be employed, each person is counted separately.<br>Pending recruitments at the end of a year are excluded from this calculation.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 15 (number of people appointed to announced vacancies during 2021) /67 (total announced vacancies for open competition during 2021) *100= 22% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR database | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS/ COMMENTS** | ***To consider:*** This indicator relates only to recruitments that are open for external candidates.<br>This calculation can be distorted in case an organization does not use competitions or uses them only for certain types of contracting. |

| **INDICATOR 6:** | **Share of failed competitions** |
|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | RECRUITMENT |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTCOME |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator complements the previous one. It aims to measure the share of failed competitions from among all competitions organized. While the previous indicator focuses mostly on the final outcome – whether the position was finally filled in or not, this one looks into the effort necessary to recruit staff. Repeating competitions involves important cost related to the work of HR units, other persons involved in the competition and it delays filling in vacancies. A low level of this indicator may point to problems with attraction of staff, low attractiveness of an employer, but also to inadequate selection techniques and improper employer branding. |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard: N/A<br>Acceptable: N/A<br>Unacceptable: N/A<br>Critical: N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By rank<br>▪ By age |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator**: Total number of competitions organized in a year that ended up with appointments.<br>**Denominator**: Total number of competitions finalized in a year.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply it by 100%<br>***Example:*** 15 (number of competitions that ended with appointment in year ….) /67 (total number of competitions that were finalized in year ….) *100= 22% |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR database |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | |

| INDICATOR 7: | Recruitment effectiveness: % of effectively recruited staff | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | RECRUITMENT | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTCOME | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to measure the ratio of newly employed staff who left a public organization during the first 12 months.<br>It complements the indicators related to examination and appointments. to SIGMA Methodological Framework a good result is 90% or above. Unsatisfactory result is the value below 80%. Low values of the indicator may suggest problems with onboarding or with selection techniques. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By rank<br>▪ By age | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator**: Total number of staff who left an organization within 12 months from the date of their appointment in the year x-2.<br>**Denominator**: Total number of staff appointed in the year preceding the last 12 months (i.e., the year before last – year x-2).<br>This indicator relates only to staff recruited in recruitments that are open for external candidates.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (number of staff who left an organization within 12 months after their appointment in year x-2) /89 (the number of staff who were appointed following open competition in the year x-2) *100 = 28% | | | |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR database | | | |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | Other periods can be considered, depending on the needs of organisations. For example instead of 12 months period, the period of probation could be analysed. |

<table>
<tr><td>INDICATOR 8:</td><td colspan="4">Onboarding satisfaction rate</td></tr>
<tr><td>AREA RESULTS:</td><td colspan="4">RECRUITMENT</td></tr>
<tr><td>RESULTS LEVEL:</td><td colspan="4">OUTCOME</td></tr>
<tr><td>INDICATOR SET:</td><td colspan="4">GOOD TO HAVE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DEFINTION & RATIONALE</td><td colspan="4">This indicator aims to identify the share of satisfied newly appointed staff after the adaptation process. This indicator measures how well the adaptation process is organized in a public organization and could be also used for the assessment of department heads or heads of units (whether they fulfilled well their obligations). The research shows that the first months in new work are decisive for employee`s engagement and motivation level. The performance against this indicator can influence the efficiency of recruitment (indicator 6 and indicator 7).</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DIAGNOSIS</td><td>Standard<br>N/A</td><td>Acceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Unacceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Critical<br>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>DISAGGREGATION</td><td colspan="4">▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By rank<br>▪ By age</td></tr>
<tr><td>CALCULATION</td><td colspan="4">Unit of measurement: Individual<br>"How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the onboarding?"<br>▪ Very satisfied<br>▪ Satisfied<br>▪ Dissatisfied<br>▪ Very dissatisfied<br>Depending on the needs of a public organization, more questions could be crafted, asking about specific elements of onboarding, like , training, provided equipment, etc. Specific questions could be also developed to assess performance of various stakeholders – for example mentor, manager, HR unit.<br>To calculate this indicator, either<br>1: Calculate the % of satisfied (very satisfied or/and satisfied) of newly recruited staff after the adaptation process is completed,<br>Or<br>2. Calculate the mean of responses.</td></tr>
</table>

| | |
|---|---|
| | ***Example:***<br>1.67% of the newly recruited staff during 2021 are either very satisfied or satisfied with the onboarding<br>*Or*<br>2.1,8 is the mean of the responses provided by the newly recruited staff during 2021. To calculate mean, use this formula: calculate the total number of responses for each of level satisfaction (very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied) and add the totals, and divide by the total number of respondents. For example: 1+0+0+3+4+3=11; 11/ 6 (total respondents) = 1,8. |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Survey made one year after appointment (so after the probation period, before the decision on permanent employment – if probation period is applied). |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | After the adaptation process is completed |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | |

# PILLAR II: TRAINING

| INDICATOR 1: | Training budget | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | TRAINING | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | INPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the ratio of funds for training compared to the total salary budget during a year.<br>This indicator shows the importance of professional development for a public organization. According to SIGMA Methodological Framework, the values of 1% and above are acceptable. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** unit<br>**Numerator**: Total annual training budget (spent)<br>**Denominator**: Total annual budget for the salary funds (included all bonuses)<br>This indicator is calculated retrospectively – so it is based on actual spending and not on the budget plan. Training funded by external sources (donors, etc.) is not considered.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 1500 GEL (which was a total 2021 annual spent budget for training) /200000 GEL (total budget spent on the salary during 2021) *100 = 0,75% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR and Salary databases. Annual budget report. | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | For many organizations, a considerable part of training is financed by donors, which is not taken into account in the calculation of this indicator. This indicator also does not cover the free-of-charge trainings organized by central training institutions. Thus, this indicator may not be relevant for public bodies that profit a lot from centralized training courses or donor-funded courses. | | | |

| INDICATOR 2: | Training planning effectiveness | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | TRAINING | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | PROCESS | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to identify the ratio of conducted training courses out of planned training courses during a year.<br>If the value is low (below 50%), it suggests that either the training planning needs overhaul, or training implementation discipline needs to be strengthened. According to SIGMA Methodological Framework, values above 50% are acceptable. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** unit<br>**Numerator**: Total number of conducted training courses during the last year (out of planned trainings). Ad-hoc training courses that were not included in the plan, are excluded. This calculation includes training programs that were provided by donors based on organization's request.<br>**Denominator**: Total number of planned training courses for the last year.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (which is a total number of the planned training courses conducted in 2021) / 89 (a total number of planned trainings in 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Training plan. Annual training report. | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | Unforeseen events may cause low values of the indicator, for example – reprioritization of the tasks of a ministry, assigning new tasks to a public organisation, pandemics and public health crises such as COVID-19, etc. | | | |

| INDICATOR 3: | Training planning effectiveness at individual level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | TRAINING | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the effectiveness of training planning.<br>The results will help determine what is the share of employees who supposed to go through training were actually trained. It complements another indicator which measures the training planning effectiveness on the level of an organization. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By Department | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: the number of employees who got initially planned concrete training module (number is linked to concrete employees who were supposed to receive training)<br>**Denominator**: total number of employees who were supposed to get concrete training module<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply the result by 100. Then calculate average ratio based on all planned training programs.<br>***Example:*** training in management was planned for A, B, C, D, E employees, although training was undertaken by A, C employees. Calculation will be 2 (A,C) / 5 (A,B,C,D,E) * 100 = 40% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Training Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | | | | |

<table>
<tr><th>INDICATOR 4:</th><th colspan="4">Training courses by content</th></tr>
<tr><td>AREA RESULTS:</td><td colspan="4">TRAINING</td></tr>
<tr><td>RESULTS LEVEL:</td><td colspan="4">OUTPUT</td></tr>
<tr><td>INDICATOR SET:</td><td colspan="4">CORE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DEFINTION & RATIONALE</td><td colspan="4">This indicator aims to identify the type of conducted training – i.e., whether it was functional or soft skills or management training.<br>The indicator has an informative purpose, but may be also used to examine whether the type of offered training is in line with an HR Strategy. The categories of training courses may be modified according to the needs of an organization.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DIAGNOSIS</td><td>Standard<br>N/A</td><td>Acceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Unacceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Critical<br>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>DISAGGREGATION</td><td colspan="4">▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks</td></tr>
<tr><td>CALCULATION</td><td colspan="4">Unit of measurement: unit<br># and % of conducted training courses by type for the staff (including civil servants, administrative and labor contracts), in particular<br>▪ Soft skills (for example, creativity, resilience, stress tolerance, communication, conflict management, negotiation, etc.)<br>▪ Technical/functional training (for example administrative law, public procurement procedures, MS Excel)<br>▪ Management (for example: leadership, resource management)<br>Training courses financed from external sources could be included, if relevant data is available. If a training is specifically and exclusively designed for managers, it should be qualified in management category and not in soft skills category.</td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD</td><td colspan="4">Training report.</td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY</td><td colspan="4">Annually</td></tr>
</table>

| | |
|---|---|
| **LIMITATIONS** | Some ministries' training centers have their own classifications, such as social skills, IT skills etc. The categorization of training courses can be modified according to the needs. |

| **INDICATOR 5:** | **Training hours per capita** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | TRAINING | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to calculate the average training hours per member of staff.<br>It complements the indicator on training budget (Indicator 1 under this pillar). The rationale behind this indicator is to assess the extent and quantity of training offered to staff. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ Managerial & non-managerial positions | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator**: Total training hours per year<br>**Denominator**: Total number of staff employed<br>Training courses financed from external sources can be taken into account, if data is available.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (which is a total hour spent on training during 2021) /89 (a total number of staff in 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Training implementation report and HRMIS | | | |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The definition of training is not precise. It could encompass highly specialized, expensive training in small groups and much cheaper and less engaging forms, like participation in a conference, or e-learning. Moreover, it calculates the average and does not address the distribution of training among staff. |

| **INDICATOR 6:** | **Share of trained staff** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | TRAINING | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to identify the share of staff who participated in training courses (including e-learning).<br>This indicator is helpful to understand whether the right to receive training is ensured in practice. According to SIGMA methodological framework, a good result is over 70%. A weak result is below 30%. It complements the previous indicator by addressing the topic of equal access to training. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ Managerial & non-managerial positions | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** A total number of staff who attended at least one training throughout the last year.<br>**Denominator**: Total number of staff in a public organization<br>Training financed from external sources can be taken into account, if data is available.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (a total number of staff who attended at least one training during 2021 – some of them attended more than one training) /89 (a total number of staff members in an organization in 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Training implementation reports and HR database |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The participation intensity in trainings may differ – some staff may participate in several trainings, whereas others in one short training or conference. |

| INDICATOR 7: | Training perception | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | TRAINING | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTCOME | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the perception of organization's staff in relation to offered training courses. This is an important indicator providing insight into the quality of received training and its relevance.<br>This is an index indicator with equal weights for three questions. The weights can be modified according to the needs of public organisations (as well as the questions). | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ Managerial & non-managerial positions | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>To calculate this indicator, consider the following 3 variables:<br>▪ **Number of satisfied training participants out of total participants who answered the question**<br>*How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the training in general?*<br>*Very satisfied*<br>*Satisfied*<br>*Dissatisfied*<br>*Very dissatisfied*<br>▪ **Number of training participants who believe that the training was relevant out of total participants who answered the question**<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "the training was relevant for my professional tasks"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree* | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *Strongly disagree*<br>▪ **Number of participants who believe that they will use the competences acquired during the training in their work out of total participants who answered the question**<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "I will use the competences acquired during the training in my work"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree*<br>*Strongly disagree*<br>This is an index type of indicator. It is calculated as follows:<br>**Numerator:** (Number of satisfied participants (who agree or strongly agree) + number of participants who find the training relevant + number of participants who think they will use the results of the training), divided by three<br>**Denominator:** Total number of participants in the training in the last year who participated in the survey.<br>To calculate this indicator please divide the numerator by the number of questions (3) and then by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 234 (A total number of satisfied participants + number of participants who find the training relevant + number of participants who think they will use the results of the training) divided by 3 (the number of questions), which equals to 78. 78 is further divided by 543 (a total number of participants in the training in 2021) *100 = 14% |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Training evaluation |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | Perception based indicators must not always reflect the real situation. This inidicator does not measure long term effects of training courses or does not measure the knowledge change. The reliability of answers is influenced by proper communication and whether employees perceive surveys as confidential. |

## PILLAR III: CAREER DEVELOPMENT

| INDICATOR 1: | Promotion rate | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | Career development | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | Good to have | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to assess the share of internal promotions in all appointments.<br>This indicator measures to what extent internal human resources are used by a public organization and whether staff members are offered career development opportunities. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By sex | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** A total number of vacancies filled in by internal promotions (according to art. 49 of the Law on Public Service) last year, excluding entry level jobs.<br>**Denominator**: A total number of vacancies, excluding entry level jobs, that were filled in last year (including through external recruitments).<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (a total number of vacancies filled internally during 2021) /89 (a total number of vacancies that were filled during 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | The level of applicability of this indicator differs, depending on internal regulations related to promotions. High values of the indicator are not necessarily positive – it depends on recruitment strategy adopted by a public organization. | | | |

| INDICATOR 2: | Tenure in position | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | Career development | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the tenure of staff in their positions.<br>This is a basic HR-related indicator. It helps to demonstrate the level of experience of staff and its agility. The results of this indicator may be important when preparing to introduce major changes in organizations.<br>Another indicator that could be created would be the tenure of employees within a public organization, and not just in a specific position.<br>A low value of this indicator may point to the lack of experience of staff. A high value of this indicator may point to limited mobility and career development opportunities in an organization. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By ranks | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>Number of staff by their tenure in a position. This indicator could be displayed in ranges.<br>***Example:*** Staff working for up to 3 years in their positions: 32. Staff working from 3 to 6 years in their positions: 45; staff working from 6 years up to 10 years on their positions: 24; staff working for more than 10 years in their positions: 15. | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | As the indicator is pegged to a position, major inter-organizational reshuffles can impact the value of this indicator. In such cases, it is recommended using a | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | complementary indicator to assess tenure of an individual at a public organizational overall. |

| INDICATOR 3: | Transfers in public bodies | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | Career development | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator measures the share of staff that was transfered in the last calendar year. The indicator aims to demonstrate the agility of staff within a public organizations. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** Total number of staff that changed positions horizontally in the last calendar year (according to Art. 47 and 48 of the Law on Public Service). In the case of institutions not covered by the Law on Public Service, the indicator relates to horizontal transfers of staff to a position comparable in hierarchy – which cannot be considered a promotion or demotion.<br>**Denominator**: The total number of staff in a public institution in the last calendar year.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (a total number of vacancies filled internally through horizontal transfers during 2021) /89 (a total number of staff employed in 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | The law on Public Service limits the transfers to transfers to positions with similar tasks. This does not allow to fully utilize the benefits of transfers. | | | |

# PILLAR IV: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

| INDICATOR 1: | Performance appraisal scores distribution | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to identify the distribution of scores (%) of performance appraisals.<br>The results will help to determine the distribution of performance appraisal grades across the workforce and whether it is in line with performance assessment of departments. Ideally, the results should follow the normal distribution curve. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** The number of staff appraised on each of the levels listed below (calculated separately for each level):<br>▪ Exceptional<br>▪ Good<br>▪ Satisfactory<br>▪ Unsatisfactory<br>**Denominator**: Total staff who were assessed in the last assessment period.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (Total number of staff appraised as exceptional during 2021) /89 (Total number of staff assessed during 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **LIMITATIONS** | The levels of achievement in performance appraisal proposed for this indicator apply to civil servants. For public bodies that apply different scales, the indicator will need to be modified accordingly. |

| INDICATOR 2: | Performance appraisal inflation rate | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to identify the ratio of the staff with higher than satisfactory (i.e., exceptional, or good) appraisal scores.<br>The results will help to identify cases where an overly high proportion of staff are appraised highly positively. This is an important measure as an artificial "inflation of appraisal grades" can limit the value of performance appraisals. The maximum acceptable level, according to SIGMA Methodological Framework is 60%. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ Managerial & non-managerial positions | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>% of staff' who received performance appraisals above satisfactory scores (i.e., exceptional, and good – in case of civil servants).<br>***Example:*** 23 persons were appraised and the exception level and 51 at the good level. The total number of appraised persons was 100. Thus, the value of the indicator would be: 74%. | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | HR database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | The levels of achievement in performance appraisal proposed for this indicator apply to civil servants. For public bodies that apply different scales, the indicator would need to be modified accordingly. | | | |

| INDICATOR 3: | Application of performance appraisals in practice | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | PROCESS | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure to what extent the regulations on performance appraisals are applied in practice.<br>The scale of the application of performance appraisals may be even more important than the methodology and results of performance appraisals.<br>This indicator could also be used as an assessment criterion of managers, to determine whether they fulfill their duties correctly. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** The number of staff who were appraised in the last assessment period.<br>**Denominator:** The total number of staff who were eligible for performance appraisal in the last assessment period.<br>The number of eligible staff could be lower than the total number of staff and depends on applied methodology. For example, in some cases, the staff who have worked less than a certain number of months/weeks/days during the appraisal period are not eligible for performance appraisals.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (a total number of staff appraised during 2021) /45 (a total number of staff who were eligible to be appraised during 2021) *100 = 55% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | It depends on performance appraisal methodology and frequency. |
| **LIMITATIONS** | A public organization with weak HR reporting systems may not be able to identify all the staff eligible for performance appraisals. |

| INDICATOR 4: | Appraisal related perceptions | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTCOME | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to explore the attitude of staff in a public organization towards performance appraisals.<br>The results will help determine to what extent performance appraisal procedures are effective in practice and the quality of the process.<br>This is an index indicator with equal weights distributed across the criteria. Public organizations can modify the weights according to their needs. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ Managerial & non-managerial positions | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator** (each number is calculated separately)<br>▪ The number of staff who perceive the evaluation process as fair (out of those who answered the following question)<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "my evaluation process was fair"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree*<br>*Strongly disagree*<br>▪ The number of staff who think that the appraisal process adequately measures performance (out of those who answered the following question)<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "my work objectives were clearly communicated to me before the appraisal cycle started"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree*<br>*Strongly disagree* | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ▪ The number of staff who think that they receive sufficient feedback from their managers (out of those who answered the following question)<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "the feedback I have received from the manager was sufficient"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree*<br>*Strongly disagree*<br>▪ The number of staff who believe that performance appraisals contribute to better training planning who answered the following question:<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "my performance appraisal contributed to better training planning"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree*<br>*Strongly disagree*<br>▪ The number of staff who believe that performance appraisals contribute to better and fairer distribution of rewards (material and non-material)<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "my performance appraisal results influenced the distribution of rewards (material and non-material)"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree*<br>*Strongly disagree*<br>**Denominator**: The number of interviewed staff<br><br>To calculate this indicator, the index is calculated by summing up the numbers in the numerator and dividing them by the number of questions (6) and then dividing by denominator. The result is multiplied by 100%<br>***Example:*** 230 (A total number of staff either strongly agree or agree with statements that evaluation process was fair + adequately measures performance + received feedback was sufficient + contributed to the better training planning + contributed improvement of performance + influenced the distribution of rewards). This number is divided by the number of the questions (5) which = 46. And then 46/543 (the total number of interviewed staff) * 100 = 8.5% |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Survey |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |

| | |
|---|---|
| **LIMITATIONS** | The proposed questions relate rather to the perspective of employees. In addition to this, it is recommended to add at least one question exclusively to managerial staff. Below the proposal.<br><br>The number of managers who believe that performance appraisals contribute to performance improvement of their staff<br>*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement "the performance appraisals contribute to improvement of performance of my subordinated staff"?*<br>*Strongly agree*<br>*Agree*<br>*Disagree*<br>*Strongly disagree* |

| INDICATOR 5: | Appeals to performance appraisals | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to provide information on staff appeals in relation to performance appraisals.<br>This information will be helpful to understand to what extent performance appraisal results are contested and trusted by the staff. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Department<br>▪ By sex | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** The number of appeals against performance appraisal decisions (all appeals, including internal appeals, appeals to appeals to committees – if they exist; and to courts) related to the last performance appraisal cycle. If performance appraisal was appealed internally and then to the next instance – it is counted as one.<br>**Denominator:** The number of performance appraisal decisions in the last performance appraisal cycle.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (15 internal appeals and 10 appeals to the court during 2021) /89 (a total number of staff were assessed during 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Appraisal related data | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | It is difficult to track related information in organisations, where appeals are managed through less formal procedures. In many public organizations, there | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | may be no records of appeals at all, which is a good sign, but it could also mean that staff members are afraid to appeal. |

# PILLAR V: LEADERSHIP

| INDICATOR 1: | Share of managers trained in management techniques | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | Leadership | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the share of senior staff that underwent at least one training on themes and topics (e.g. leadership and management) relevant to senior staff.<br>The results will help determine whether an organization invests in managers in their managerial role to transform them to leaders of public administration reform. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By sex | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** The number of senior staff who underwent at least one leadership training course/program during the last calendar year.<br>**Denominator:** The number of senior staff employed in an organization in the last calendar year.<br>Leadership training is typically designed for higher-ranked, managerial positions to help them manage resources. This could relate, for example to negotiations, HRM, managerial control, delegation of tasks. Training courses financed from external resources can be taken into account, if the information is available.<br>Training designed for non-managerial staff or training courses that do not focus on improving managerial skills are excluded from this calculation.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 25 (Total number of senior staff who attended leadership training during 2021) /89 (Total number of senior staff employed during 2021) *100 = 28% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR database. | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The definition of training is not precise or restricted to specific types and formats. It could cover, for example, postgraduate studies, training courses, e-learning courses, and participation in conferences. What constitutes training for the purposes of this indicator may be adapted to the needs and specifics of an organization. |

| INDICATOR 2: | Share of successful women applicants during recruitment | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | Leadership | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | The purpose of this indicator is to analyze the success rate of women who participate in competitions for managerial positions. It serves as a complementary measure to the gender distribution indicator for managerial positions. In numerous organizations, women are often underrepresented in top management positions, specifically at the first rank. This indicator provides insight into the factors that contribute to the underrepresentation of women in such positions by assessing the success rates of both men and women in these competitions | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** The number of women appointed to the first rank position in the last three years.<br>**Denominator:** The Number of female candidates competing for the first rank position in the last three years (only eligible candidates).<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100%.<br>***Example:*** 1 (Total number of women appointed to first-ranking positions in 2019-2021) /5 (Number of women participating in the competition for first-ranking positions in 2019-2021 X 100% = 20%<br>This indicator is more meaningful, if compared to the same indicator calculated for men. | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR database. | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | | | | |

<table>
<tr><th>INDICATOR 3:</th><th colspan="4">Gender distribution in managerial positions</th></tr>
<tr><td>AREA RESULT</td><td colspan="4">Leadership</td></tr>
<tr><td>INDICATOR LEVEL</td><td colspan="4">OUTPUT</td></tr>
<tr><td>INDICATOR SET:</td><td colspan="4">CORE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DEFINTION & RATIONALE</td><td colspan="4">This indicator aims at measuring the share of women in managerial positions.<br>This is a basic indicator used for measuring whether gender equality objectives are being achieved. According to SIGMA methodological framework, a satisfactory result is beyond 30% (for senior positions -equivalent to rank 1 positions).</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DIAGNOSIS</td><td>Standard<br>N/A</td><td>Acceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Unacceptable<br>N/A</td><td>Critical<br>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>DISAGGREGATION</td><td colspan="4">▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By Department<br>▪ By ranks and political positions</td></tr>
<tr><td>CALCULATION</td><td colspan="4">Unit of measurement: Individual<br>Numerator: 1) the number of women on rank 1 positions and 2) the number of women on rank 2 positions 3) the number of women at political positions<br>Denominator: 1) The total employment on rank 1 positions & 2) the total employment on rank 2 positions 3) the number of women at political positions<br>The results are multiplied by 100.<br>As a result, the indicator will help determine: 1) the share of women in the highest managerial positions in the civil service (rank 1), 2) the share of women in middle managerial positions (rank 2), and 3) the share of women at political positions.<br>In organizations that are not covered by the Law on Public Service, rank 1 is equivalent to heads of the primary, biggest organizational units (often called departments), whereas rank 2 is the equivalent of secondary organizational units (often called units) – which are a part of primary organizational units.<br>Example: An organization employs 2 women and 3 men on category 1 positions, 7 women and 3 men on category 2 positions and only 2 men on political positions. In total the share of women on managerial positions is 53% (9 women on 17 managerial positions). Nevertheless, detailed breakdown shows that the share of women is lower on higher managerial positions – 0% on political positions (0/2); 40% on category 1 positions (2/5) and 70% on category 2 positions (7/10).</td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD</td><td colspan="4">HR database</td></tr>
</table>

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | This indicator should be interpreted together with the basic indicator showing the general breakdown of staff in public organizations by sex. |

| INDICATOR 4: | Turnover among managers | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | Leadership | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the turnover rate among senior staff.<br>The monitoring of the turnover of senior staff is important for determining whether an organization may face problems with the continuity of work.<br>The results may also be connected to the level of politicization of civil service (especially during election years), with higher turnover rates being potentially correlated with higher levels of politicization.<br>According to SIGMA Methodological Framework, a turnover rate below 10% is desirable. A turnover rate exceeding 40% is considered excessive. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By core and support functions<br>▪ By rank (1 and 2) | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator:** The number of senior staff who left their positions in the last calendar year (this includes dismissals from a public organization AND dismissals from the position)<br>**Denominator:** Total number of senior staff employed in a public organization at the beginning of last year. | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | The value of the indicator is usually higher after the changes of government. Thus, its interpretation requires following the political calendar. | | | |

## PILLAR VI: SALARY

| INDICATOR 1: | Average annual salary by department | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | SALARY | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the average salary paid to the staff employed by an organization.<br>It is measured separately for different employment statuses. This is a basic indicator that provides an overview of the salary situation in a public body. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By Department<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By sex | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: The total amount of annual paid gross salaries in the last calendar year.<br>**Denominator**: The average number of staff at a public organization in the last calendar year.<br>Salary is defined as all payments made to staff, including bonuses and other elements of salary.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator. Do this calculation by unit level within organization.<br>***Example***: Department A: 15 000 GEL (annual gross salary paid during 2020) / 15 (total number of staff members of the unit) = 1000<br>Department B: 20 000 GEL (annual gross salary paid during 2020) / 19 (total number of staff members of the unit) = 1053 | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Salary Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The values in different departments may be influenced by the seniority of positions and the tenure of staff members. Smaller units, with higher share of managerial positions may reach higher values. |

| INDICATOR 2: | Base Salary Compression Ratio | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | SALARY | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the base salary compression ratio in public organizations.<br>The value should be calculated separately for different employment statuses. The base salary ratio is the measure of fairness; it also provides insight to what extent a salary system motivates promotions. According to SIGMA Methodological Framework, the acceptable value is between 2 and 10 for the whole organization. It is more useful for public organisations that are not using the fixed salary scale from the Salary Law. In other cases, the value of the indicator is *de facto* determined by the legislation. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts) | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator:** Highest monthly base salary in a state public organization (excluding political appointees – ministers and deputy ministers)<br>**Denominator:** Lowest monthly base salary in a public organization (excluding auxiliary, technical works)<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator.<br>***Example:*** 8000 GEL (highest base salary in an organisation) / 500 (lowest base salary in an organisation) = 16 | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Salary Database; Salary regulations | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **LIMITATIONS** | The indicator relates only to base salaries. If the share of base salaries is low in total remuneration, the explanatory value of the indicator would be low. According to existing regulations, public organizations (covered by the Law on Public Service) have no freedom to influence the salary compression ratio, as base salaries are determined by the salary regulations. |

| INDICATOR 3: | Total Salary Compression Ratio | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | SALARY | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the total salary compression ratio. It should be calculated separately for different employment statuses.<br>This indicator complements the previous indicator (Indicator 2) and is relevant in cases when other elements of salary (other than base salary) constitute a significant part of the total salary. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts) | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: Highest annual total salary paid in a public organization (excluding political appointees – ministers and deputy ministers) in the last calendar year.<br>**Denominator**: Lowest annual total salary paid in a public organization (excluding auxiliary, technical works) in the last calendar year.<br>Total salary includes all elements, like bonuses, etc.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator.<br>***Example***: 34 000 GEL (highest total salary paid in an organisation) / 8000 (lowest total salary paid in an organisation) = 4,25 | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Salary Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | This indicator complements the previous one. | | | |

| INDICATOR 4: | Share of monetary awards in the total salary budget | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | SALARY | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the share of monetary awards paid in the total salary annual budget.<br>The results will help determine whether the share of bonuses in organization's annual budget is not excessive, with due consideration of risks for fairness and merit. According to SIGMA Methodological Framework, the acceptable value is below 20%.<br>As the value of bonuses is limited to maximum 10% of the total salary in the Georgian civil service, the calculation of this indicator makes sense only for non-civil service organisations, when such a limit does not exist. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By Department<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts) | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: Resources spent on monetary awards in the last calendar year for staff<br>**Denominator**: Total salary budget spent in the last calendar year for staff<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply the result by 100<br>***Example:*** 15 000 GEL (resources spend on monetary awards for all employment categories during 2020) / 80 000 (total salary budget spent for all employment categories during 2020 – including base salaries, awards, seniority related payments, etc.) * 100 = 19% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Salary Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **LIMITATIONS** | The indicator measures the average value of bonuses awarded to staff and thus cannot be used to determine factors that lead to disproportionate allocation of bonuses among staff. |

| INDICATOR 5: | Share of non-monetary incentives | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | Salary | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | Output | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | Core | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the share of non-monetary incentives used in an organization.<br>The results will help to understand the level of exercising various forms of incentives and determine if non-monetary incentives are used to balance monetary incentives and increase engagement. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By Department<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts) | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: number of non- monetary incentives used in the last calendar year for staff. Examples of non-monetary incentives can be gratitude letter, thematic rewards and other means existing in an organization.<br>**Denominator**: number of employees who received "good" and "excellent" performance appraisal result in the last calendar year<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply the result by 100<br>***Example***: 10 cases of non-monetary gratitude (during 2020) / 200 cases of above satisfactory evaluation score (during 2020) * 100 = 5% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR Database | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | In case an organization has internal procedure clarifying distinction regarding "good" and "excellent", denominator may need revision. For example if | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | gratitude is allowed only to "good" or only to "excellent" results. Denominator will be respectively only total number "good" or only "excellent" results. |

| **INDICATOR 6:** | **Share of staff who received monetary awards** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | SALARY | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to measure the share of staff who received monetary awards annual basis.<br>The rationale for this indicator is to see whether monetary awards have motivational value. If all staff received bonuses, it would mean that they are *de facto* treated as yet another mandatory element of pay, stripping them out their motivational character. According to SIGMA methodological framework, the acceptable value is 70% or less and a desirable value is below 50%. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By department<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By rank<br>▪ By sex | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Individual<br>**Numerator**: Number of staff who have received at least one monetary award in the previous year.<br>**Denominator**: Total number of staff employed at the end of the calendar year.<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply the result by 100<br>***Example:*** 45 (total number of staff who received at least once monetary award – some of them have received several awards) / 150 (total number of staff members in public organization) * 100 = 30% | | | |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Salary Database | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | |

| **INDICATOR 7:** | **Average monetary awards in departments** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULTS:** | SALARY | | | |
| **RESULTS LEVEL:** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | CORE | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator aims to measure the average monetary reward paid to staff. The rationale for this indicator is to show how monetary awards correlate with the performance of departments against organizational goals. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By Department<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts) | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: Value of monetary rewards paid to all staff in a department in the last calendar year<br>**Denominator**: The number of staff in a department in the last calendar year<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the Denominator<br>***Example***: Department A: 30 000 GEL (total value of monetary awards paid to all staff in Department A during 2020) / 35 (total number of all staff in Department B in 2020) = 857 GEL<br>Department B: 15 000 GEL (total value of monetary awards paid to all staff in the Department B during 2020) / 35 (total number of all staff in Department B in 2020) = 429 GEL<br>Ideally, the distribution of awards in departments should be compared to the performance of departments, if it is measured. | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Salary Database |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The average does not show the situations when some staff received very high monetary awards, whereas other staff received none – i.e., it does not show the distribution of monetary awards across members of staff. |

<table>
<tr><td>INDICATOR 8:</td><td colspan="4">Standard deviation of monetary awards</td></tr>
<tr><td>AREA RESULTS:</td><td colspan="4">SALARY</td></tr>
<tr><td>RESULTS LEVEL:</td><td colspan="4">OUTPUT</td></tr>
<tr><td>INDICATOR SET:</td><td colspan="4">GOOD TO HAVE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?</td></tr>
<tr><td>DEFINTION & RATIONALE</td><td colspan="4">This indicator aims to measure the deviation in distribution of monetary awards.<br>The results will demonstrate to what extent managers differentiate the level of monetary awards. The differentiation of the level of bonuses is a prerequisite for awards having a motivational character.<br>This indicator complements the previous indicators related to the share of monetary awards in the budget and the average amount of monetary award.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">DIAGNOSIS</td><td>Standard</td><td>Acceptable</td><td>Unacceptable</td><td>Critical</td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>DISAGGREGATION</td><td colspan="4">▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By Department<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By ranks<br>▪ By sex</td></tr>
<tr><td>CALCULATION</td><td colspan="4">Unit of measurement: Unit<br>To calculate this indicator, follow these steps:<br>1. Calculate the average salary paid to the managerial staff members during a year, for example = sum (5000 GEL; 4500 GEL; 3400 GEL/ 3 (number of paid salaries)<br>* If using <u>Excel,</u> for example, click in the cell where you want to calculate the average and start formula "=average(B2:B6). In this case, if the range A2:A5 contains the salary of the staff, select the range of B2:B6<br>2. Calculate the standard deviation from the salary paid to the managerial staff members during a year for example = Square Root (variance)<br>* If using <u>Excel</u>, for example, click in the cell where you want to calculate the standard deviation and start formula "=STDEV.P (B2:B6). In this case, if the range A2:A5 contains the salary of the staff, select the range of B2:B6<br>Example: Prepare the list of the managerial staff members and include their salary in the Excel Table<br><table><tr><th>Employees</th><th>Salary</th></tr><tr><td>Staff members1</td><td>470000</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

| | |
|---|---|
| | Staff members2 \| 450000<br>Staff members3 \| 395000<br>Staff members4 \| 455000<br>Staff members5 \| 465000<br>Average =AVERAGE (*B2:B6*) \| 447000<br>Standard Deviation =STDEV.P(*B2:B6*) \| 30124.74<br>In this example, that the salary paid to the staff members is close to the mean. *The higher the standard deviation is the more spread the data is from the mean.* |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Salary Database |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | |

| INDICATOR 9: | Total monthly gross salaries compared to external benchmarks | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | SALARY | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | The indicator aims to compare the total monthly gross salaries in a public organization with the gross salaries paid by other organizations.<br>It is helpful to identify to what extent a public organization is competitive regarding the salaries, which influences other areas of HR, including recruitment and retention policies. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By managerial/non managerial positions | | | |
| CALCULATION | Run a salary survey to calculate the ratio between salaries offered on specific position/ job families in an organization and on the job market.<br>This is usually outsourced to specialized companies and requires identifying which organizations are the most important benchmarks (both within a public sector and outside the public sector) and then matching positions to find relevant benchmarks. | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Salary survey report. | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Every few years | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | In most cases, Salary Surveys are conducted by the third-party consulting organizations. The crucial issues is the right choice of competing organisations and exact matching of positions in an organization with those in the benchmark organisations. | | | |

| INDICATOR 10: | Total monthly gross salary compared to salaries in the country | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | SALARY | | | |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | GOOD TO HAVE | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | The indicator aims to compare the total monthly gross salaries in a public organization with the gross salaries paid in the country.<br>It is a rough measure of salary competitiveness against the salaries of persons working in other sectors. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By departments<br>▪ By managerial/non managerial | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: Average monthly gross salary in a public organization<br>**Denominator**: Average monthly gross salary in the country<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100.<br>***Example:*** 30 000 GEL (average monthly gross salary of public organization) /50 000 GEL (Average monthly gross salary of tertiary educated workers in Georgia *100 =60% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Salary Database; State Statistical Data office | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | This indicator is very general and does not take into account many variables influencing the level of salaries. If data on more relevant salary benchmarks (previous indicator) are available, this indicator should not be calculated. | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Nevertheless, if used in a dynamic perspective – showing the evolution of salaries in an organization compared to salaries in the country over a number of years, it is more informative.<br>A more exact benchmark (if available) would be the data on salaries of tertiary educated workers. |

## PILLAR VII: ENGAGEMENT

| **INDICATOR 1:** | **Absenteeism rate** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULT** | Engagement | | | |
| **INDICATOR LEVEL** | OUTPUT | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | Good to have | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | The aim of the indicator is to measure the rate of absenteeism in a public organization. This measure may point to potential problems with motivation, engagement, and work discipline. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By job families<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By Departments | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: A total number of lost workdays due to absences (excluding chronical illness, paid maternity leave and holidays) during a year<br>**Denominator**: Average number of staff multiplied by the average number of workdays during a year<br><br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100.<br>***Example:*** 450 days (total days of being absent during 2021) /16 500 (Average number of staff employed during 2021 multiplied the average number of working days per staff member - 220) *100 = 2,7% | | | |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | HR database | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The values of this indicator may be distorted due to epidemics, like COVID-19. |

| **INDICATOR 2:** | **Staff self-reported engagement** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AREA RESULT** | Engagement | | | |
| **INDICATOR LEVEL** | Outcome | | | |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | Core | | | |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | | | | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator measures the engagement of the staff in their role and work in a public organization.<br>While some indicators like absenteeism can point to levels of engagement, this indicator recognizes that a survey of staff would be needed to obtain a more holistic measurement of engagement. | | | |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | | | | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ By departments<br>▪ By sex<br>▪ By year | | | |
| **CALCULATION** | **Employee Satisfaction and engagement index.** Different types of surveys are possible to determine self-reported engagement. An example of a short survey, elaborated by the OECD[2], that enables international comparability of results is a survey composed of the following statements:<br>▪ Overall, I am satisfied with my job<br>▪ My job inspires me<br>▪ The work I do gives me a sense of accomplishment<br>▪ I feel a strong personal attachment to my organization | | | |

[2] Based on OECD (2021), "Measuring employee engagement", in Government at a Glance 2021, OECD Publishing, Paris.

| | |
|---|---|
| | ▪ I identify with the mission of my organization<br>▪ It is important to me that my work contributes to the common good<br>The assessment is made on the four level scale: strongly disagree; disagree; neither agree or disagree agree; strongly agree, which are assigned points from 1 to 5.<br>The final result can be calculated in the following way:<br>**Numerator:** The number of points received under the survey.<br>**Denominator:** 30 points (based on the assumption that the survey includes 6 questions) multiplied by the number of survey participants.<br>The overall result should be multiplied by 100 to be expressed in percentage form. |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Satisfaction survey |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | TBD |
| **LIMITATIONS** | There is a risk that due to corporate culture and confidentiality considerations, survey results may not be accurate, not fully reflecting actual attitudes.<br>The proposed 6-question survey has the advantage of simplicity and comparability, nevertheless it is unable to answer questions related to “why” staff feels a sense of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their job. |

# PILLAR VIII: HR UNIT FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT

| INDICATOR 1: | Implementation of HR Strategy | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | HR function- unit assessment | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | Core | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims at measuring progress in the implementation of an HR Strategy of an organization.<br>Specifically, as the HR unit should be responsible for the coordination of the preparation and the implementation of the HR strategy, it measures the success of the HR unit in fulfilling this role.<br>This indicator helps to assess not only the level of implementation of the HR strategy, but also casts a light on the quality and feasibility of HR planning. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator**: The number of actions/activities from the HRM Action Plan fully accomplished within set deadlines in a set period.<br>**Denominator:** The number of all actions/activities from the HRM Action Plan planned to be accomplished during that period.<br>To calculate this indicator, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100.<br>***Example:*** 25 (a total activities have been fully accomplished from the HRM AP during 2021. 3 partially accomplished activities were not included) /30 (a total number of activities planned to be accomplished from the HRM AP during 2021) *100 =83% | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | HR strategy and action plan; reports on the implementation of the HR Strategy and action plan. | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually, or other frequency. | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | This indicator can be calculated only if an HR Strategy, with an Action Plan, exist. | | | |

| INDICATOR 2: | HR Services evaluation |
|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | HR function- unit assessment |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT |
| INDICATOR SET: | Good to have |

**WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?**

| | |
|---|---|
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to provide an evaluation of HR processes by other staff of a public organization.<br>This indicator measures not only to what extent the HR staff fulfills their roles, but is also illustrative of the quality of services and the general attitude of the HR unit. |

**HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |

**DISAGGREGATION**

- By State Agencies
- By rank
- By department

**CALCULATION**

**Employee Satisfaction Assessment with HR Services:** The level of satisfaction with each service. This is an index which measures the answers to several questions.

*"How would you rate your satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the following list of services on the four-point scale"*

| Services | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recruitment | | | | |
| Management of HR files | | | | |
| Setting and management of payment of salaries, including bonuses | | | | |
| Professional development, including planning and organization of trainings | | | | |
| Promotion/mobility policy | | | | |
| Support to performance appraisals | | | | |

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Provision of support to managerial staff</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Provision of support and advise to other staff</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Alignment of HR policy with organizational strategy</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
This is an index type of indicator. It is calculated as follows:
Numerator: Total number of staff members that are satisfied with each of the services (very satisfied and satisfied)/number of questions
Denominator: Total number of surveyed staff members.
To calculate this indicator please divide the numerator and then divide by the total number of services (in this case 9 services) and then by the denominator and multiply by 100%
Example: 234 (A total number of either very satisfied or satisfied staff and dividing by the number of the questions (9) which is = 36. And then 26/543 (the total number of interviewed staff). * 100= 7%
</td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD</td><td>Survey</td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY</td><td>Annually</td></tr>
<tr><td>LIMITATIONS</td><td>The number of questions and the list of the services could vary from one public organization to another.</td></tr>
</table>

| INDICATOR 3: | HR unit competencies' development |
|---|---|
| **AREA RESULT** | HR function- unit assessment |
| **INDICATOR LEVEL** | OUTPUT |
| **INDICATOR SET:** | Core |
| **WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?** | |
| **DEFINTION & RATIONALE** | This indicator measures the participation of the HR staff in professional development activities.<br>The results will help determine whether an organization invests in the development of the competences of their HR staff. |
| **HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?** | |
| **DIAGNOSIS** | Standard: N/A; Acceptable: N/A; Unacceptable: N/A; Critical: N/A |
| **DISAGGREGATION** | ▪ By State Agencies |
| **CALCULATION** | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>**Numerator:** The number of HR staff that at least once in the last year participated in a training on modern HR<br>**Denominator:** The number of staff in the HR unit in the last year.<br>Training financed from external sources counts towards this calculation. However, training on administrative issues, like labour code provisions, registration of files, etc. does not count.<br>To calculate the share of HR staff who participated in a training on modern HR in the last year, please divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply by 100.<br>***Example:*** 7 (a total number of HR staff that at least once during 2021 participated in a training on modern HR) /12 (a total number of HR staff employed in 2021) *100 =58% |
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Training plan, reports |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | This indicator is relevant only for larger organizations that have HR units. Small organizations, where one person is responsible for HR and, in addition, for other tasks, should not use it. |

| INDICATOR 4: | HR advisory services | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AREA RESULT | HR function- unit assessment | | | |
| INDICATOR LEVEL | OUTPUT | | | |
| INDICATOR SET: | Good to have | | | |
| WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE? | | | | |
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims at measuring the role of the HR unit in active provision of advice to other staff of a public organization.<br>The results will show whether the HR unit demonstrates capacity to support an organization and act as a business partner, and also that it takes a proactive approach in doing so. | | | |
| HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED? | | | | |
| DIAGNOSIS | Standard<br>N/A | Acceptable<br>N/A | Unacceptable<br>N/A | Critical<br>N/A |
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies | | | |
| CALCULATION | **Unit of measurement:** Unit<br>To calculate this indicator, count the number of following outputs:<br>▪ Produced manuals/instructions/guidebooks<br>▪ Trainings provided to staff<br>▪ Produced reports on the state of HR in the institution<br>▪ Other strategic reports, like workforce planning report, training needs analysis, etc. | | | |
| DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD | Data from the HR unit | | | |
| DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY | | | | |
| DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY | Annually | | | |
| LIMITATIONS | This indicator does not measure the quality of produced documents. It also does not measure other proactive measures that HR might employ to provide staff advisory services, like phone advice etc. | | | |

| INDICATOR 5: | Assessment of selection process |
|---|---|
| AREA RESULTS: | HR function- unit assessment |
| RESULTS LEVEL: | OUTCOME |
| INDICATOR SET: | CORE |

**WHAT DOES THIS INDICATOR MEASURE?**

| | |
|---|---|
| DEFINTION & RATIONALE | This indicator aims to measure the perceptions of the experiences of applicants during their participation in the selection process.<br>It is an important indicator for measuring the performance of HR unit and influences the general image of a public institution as an employer. High values of this indicator could result in getting more applicants in the future. |

**HOW IS THIS INDICATOR MEASURED?**

| | Standard | Acceptable | Unacceptable | Critical |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DIAGNOSIS | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| | |
|---|---|
| DISAGGREGATION | ▪ By State Agencies<br>▪ By type of contract of staff (administrative and labor contracts)<br>▪ Managerial/non managerial staff |

**CALCULATION**

**Unit of measurement:** Individual

% Of candidates who positively assess the selection process run by a public organization.

This indicator relates only to recruitments that are open for external candidates.

This is an index indicator with equal weights for seven questions. The weights can be modified according to the needs of a public organisation (as well as the questions).

*Note*: The feedback is sought after interview phase, before recruitment decision is announced. Different scales of assessment may be used, for example, to integrate the following questions:

| | Very satisfied | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *"How satisfied are you in general with the selection process run by a public organization?"* | | | | |
| *"Were you well informed before and after each stage of the recruitment?"* | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *"Were all stages of the recruitment process organized in planned time?"* | | | | |
| *"Were the members of the interview panel behaving in a professional way?"* | | | | |
| *"Were the members of the examination panel impartial?"* | | | | |
| *"Were the examination techniques relevant to the tasks of the position?"* | | | | |
| *"Were all instructions clear?"* | | | | |

**Numerator:** (Number of very satisfied or satisfied applicants), divided by seven

**Denominator:** Total number of applicants

To calculate this indicator please divide the numerator by the number of questions (7) and then by the denominator and multiply by 100%.

***Example:*** 234 (A total number of either very satisfied or satisfied staff and dividing the number of the questions (7) which = 33. And then 26/543 (the total number of interviewed staff). * 100= 6%

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHOD** | Survey with the applicants |
| **DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY** | After the selection process, before the appointment. |
| **DATA REPORTING FREQUENCY** | Annually |
| **LIMITATIONS** | The level of difficulty of the recruitment process can influence the results. |