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Permanent mobilization of all the resources (especially the people) to improve in a continuous way:

- all the aspects of the functioning of an organisation
- the quality of goods and services
- the satisfaction of its stakeholders
- its integration into the environment
The CAF Model

**ENABLERS**

- Leadership
- Strategy & Planning
- Partnerships & Resources

**RESULTS**

- People Results
- Citizen/Customer oriented Results
- Society Results
- Key Performance Results

**INNOVATION AND LEARNING**
3rd study on the use of CAF

Previous studies in 2003 & 2005

2 parts:
1. Survey CAF National Correspondents: 21 participated
2. Survey towards the CAF Users: 407 answers

Preparation of survey together with CAF NC

Aims:
- insight in the state of affairs of CAF (in Europe)
- insight in the use (and modalities) of CAF
- Insight in the content of the model (and look for possible improvement)
- Get input from CAF NC’s and users for the future of CAF (its use and its content)
The use of CAF
228 registered CAF Users in 2005

2066 registered CAF Users in 2010
Evolution of the CAF in the member states

- Decreasing
- Stable
- Increasing
Use and potential of the CAF per sector

Potential (n = 19)  Use (n = 21)

1. Local administration (municipality, province)
2. Social services and social security
3. Police and security
4. Schools
5. Customs, taxes and finances
6. Public sector management dep. (R&D, budget, ICT, etc.)
7. Health
8. Higher education and research
9. Culture and cultural heritage
10. Economy, agriculture, fisheries and trade
11. Criminal, justice and law
12. Environment
13. General policy and oversight/audit/coordination
14. Home affairs
15. Transport, infrastructure and public works and utilities
16. Fire services and civil protection services
17. Post and communication
18. Urban and territorial policies (housing, planning, etc.)
19. Foreign affairs
20. Energy
21. Other

Mean score (1 = not at all, 5 = a lot)
Use and potential of the CAF per level

Mean score (1 = not at all, 5 = a lot)

- Local level of government: Potential (n = 20) = 3.29, Use (n = 21) = 2.52
- Subregional level of government: Potential (n = 20) = 1.71, Use (n = 21) = 1.48
- Regional level of government: Potential (n = 20) = 2.33, Use (n = 21) = 2.33
- Central level of government and national/federal authorities: Potential (n = 20) = 3.24, Use (n = 21) = 2.48
Who took the initiative to use the CAF or TQM

Local governments

Percentage of organisations (n = between 349 and 379)
Reasons for using CAF

- The organisation wanted to identify strengths and areas for improvement (Int)
- To increase the performance of the organisation (Int)
- Intention to involve staff in managing the organisation and to motivate them (Int)
- Increased sensitivity of staff to quality (Int)
- Because the top management wanted it (Int)
- For benchmarking reasons (Int)
- Because it is free (Ext)
- Because other administrations in the national or European context also used it (Ext)
- Explicit demand from those politically responsible for the organisation to start an improvement action (Ext)
- Explicit citizen or customer demand for improvement (Ext)
- Because we want to apply for the CAF label (Ext)
- Participation in a national/regional/local innovation programme/project (Ext)
- CAF as a competitive advantage. To attract customers in a competitive context e.g. schools, hospitals, ... (Ext)
- Participation in a national quality award or conference (Ext)
- Because the organisation is suffering financial stress (Ext)

Percentage of organisations (n between 360 and 374)

- Unimportant
- Less important
- Important
- Very important
New themes to be integrated?

Number of CAF NC (n = 21)

- None: 2
- Ethics: 9
- Sustainability: 16
- Transparency: 10
- Other: 11
Results of the use of CAF
Improvement plan developed or not

- No: 12%
- Yes: 10%
- Still working on it: 78%
## Reasons why no improvement plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Important or very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) The organisation had other priorities</td>
<td>75,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Lack of support for developing an improvement plan</td>
<td>46,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Self-assessment was never meant to lead to improvements (it was just a “health check” of the administration)</td>
<td>45,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Lack of time</td>
<td>42,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) No real willingness to change</td>
<td>34,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Lack of financial resources</td>
<td>33,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) The results of the self-assessment were not seen as concrete enough</td>
<td>30,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Management had not been involved in the self-assessment</td>
<td>26,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) The reasons for conducting the self-assessment was only to take part in an award contest</td>
<td>18,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) We did not succeed in identifying relevant areas for improvement</td>
<td>18,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) The results of the self-assessment were not accepted as an adequate picture of the organisation by the management</td>
<td>16,2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quick Wins (n = 256)  Improvement actions (n = 281)

Percentage of organisations

- 5 or less: 65.2%
- 6 - 10: 30.2%
- 11 - 20: 28.5%
- 21 - 50: 17.8%
- 51 - 100: 16.7%
- More than 100: 4.7%
The CAF Model according to the average improvement plan

**ENABLERS**

- Leadership
- Strategy & Planning
- Partnership & Resources

**RESULTS**

- People
- Processes
- Citizen/Customer Oriented Results
- Society Results
- People Results

**Key Performance Results**

**INNOVATION AND LEARNING**
Integration actions in management plan

Percentage of organisations (n = 290)

- Not at all: 9.7%
- To a limited extent: 27.2%
- To a large extent: 45.5%
- To a very large extent: 17.6%
### Obstacles implementing improvement actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a limited extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources.</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
<td>18.70%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of dynamic, focus and motivation to improve the organisation.</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>40.10%</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition / reward.</td>
<td>47.00%</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of external support.</td>
<td>48.40%</td>
<td>33.10%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of involvement of the employees.</td>
<td>35.40%</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of follow up by the project owners.</td>
<td>45.90%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of project management.</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>37.40%</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internal competency.</td>
<td>43.30%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of involvement of the top management.</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
<td>29.70%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other obstacle.</td>
<td>79.10%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of organisations (n = between 281 and 286)
Impact improvement actions on organisation

Percentage of the organisations (n=287)

- Not at all: 2.4%
- To a limited extent: 37.3%
- To a large extent: 45.3%
- To a very large extent: 15.0%
Shift in the TQM focus of the employees

- Not at all: 10.50%
- To a limited extent: 44.10%
- To a large extent: 37.40%
- To a very large extent: 8.00%
Satisfaction with the CAF

Expectations where satisfied
(1=not at all; 10=completely) (mean = 6.7)
CAF again in the future

- Yes: 86%
- No: 14%
Impact of the CAF in the member states

- To a very limited extent
- In a modest way
- To a large extent
Conclusions

- TQM culture remains attractive for the public sector in Europe, even in times of budgetary restrictions and austerity,

- There is still a lot of work to do to reach the whole of the public sector in the EU with these concepts.

- Sustainability, transparency and ethics should be put forward more as well as the principles of excellence in corporate social responsibility, partnerships and innovation, and creativity.
Conclusions

- Guidelines on improvement planning and implementation have to be further developed and a new attempt to stimulate benchmark learning.

- In the organisations using CAF, 45% of the employees are affected by the TQM culture.

- A lot of work remains to be done on real involvement of the citizen/customer and the employees.

- The impact of CAF in the MS should further grow.