Managerial Convergence in Evolution Public Institutions in the European Union

Georgeta MODIGA[1], Gabriel AVRAMESCU[2]

Abstract: Although public management is a new management science, there are already convinced that the extension of the principles and specific approaches, not just a relative thing, it becomes imperative that determines the coordinates of major public sector reform. Otherwise there is the risk of slipping into a formalism stressed, changing some generally accepted fundamental and essential to the detriment of meeting the new management public. Consequently, it is absolutely necessary to give the perception and treatment of the old administrative system in general and public institutions in particular as bureaucratic administrative apparatus are developed rules, regulations, and laws by which they are applied and the transition to new general management principles and legitimate public that the administrative system as a whole and each public by public managers seeking a specified level of performance management, reflected in increasing public interest and satisfaction of specific social needs. Communication is one of effective management tools of change in the organization. It can help to adjust the attitude of the "way of looking at things" and to change behaviors. Mission and objectives managerial communication are closely related to organizational changes and environmental characteristics in which the organization functions. Public relations are essentially communication activities if relationships public management of communication between an organization and its public interest based on public, effective public relations manager must be in permanent contact with the public organization to be able to differentiate any time their communication needs, formulate and convey the message to the characteristics of each of them and track their response to receiving each of the messages.

Keywords: public institution; public management; public relations

Over the years, management in some organizations is becoming more distinct and sophisticated at the same time organizations become much stronger and longer lasting. It is enough to recall the Roman Empire that lasted hundreds of years, where legions of the peoples of Europe and the Middle East, much less organized and coordinated. New lands were known to the responsible government of Rome and roads were built to cross the entire empire, the information and follow them to be relieved and so center empire to intervene promptly and effectively in times that problem.

[1] Associate Professor. PhD, "Danubius" University of Galati, Faculty of Law, Romania. Corresponding author: georgeta.modiga@yahoo.com.
[2] Economist, E-mail: gavramescu@gmail.com

This communication, as we shall see, is an essential requirement for successful management. Roads so famous, some of which are used today, at the same time helped to quickly raise taxes, and the development and transmission of real-time decision for solving problems facing the empire. Of course the importance of these roads have been much higher in legions able to be very mobile, can move easily from one corner of the empire to another to intervene where needed in case of riot or other events.

History shows that, although the organization may be regarded as old as humanity, before the twentieth century can hardly find ways systematically designed and developed the model in which they are conducted. People were especially interested only in how organizations can be used to obtain money or political power.

European Union has triggered the formation of a new body of officials in the European landscape, whose legal status has specific elements of both the civil servants at national and international officials to. Since the first time that the European Union was founded, it was necessary to regulate the legal status of officials of the institutions. Over time, the body of European civil servants underwent several changes both in terms of number and in terms of organization.

Management is a complex activity, with profound implications for the economic, social, political witnessed throughout its evolution and accept different approaches. Such management can be seen as a "process of coordination of human resources, information, - Physical and Financial achievements regarding organization goals." According to his opinion A. Mackensie, management is "a process in which the manager operates with three basic elements: ideas, things and people, making objective through others."

The new public management is met as "market-oriented government" (market based public administration), "post bureaucratic paradigm","entrepreneurial government" (Osborne and Gaebler, 1993). Each of these elements contains relatively similar names:

1) the major change from traditional public administration to focus on results and personal accountability of managers in public administration;

2) from the way traditional organizational - bureaucratic organization of public administration through flexible personnel policies, terms and conditions of employment;

3) performance measurement (performance measurement) in government activities through performance indicators (performance indicators) - systematic evaluation of programs based on the three E: saving, efficiency and effectiveness;

4) the top management of the organization is more committed political decision-makers are at a time in the management of public organization;

5) the government provided public services are exposed to market mechanisms through mechanisms external contracting (contracting out) - separating routing orientation (separation of steering of rowing) (see also Osborne & Gaebler, 1993);

6) reduced government provided public services through privatization and subcontracting (McKinney & Howard, 1998).

Measures to shift from traditional to new public management administration proposed an amendment to NPM are appropriate emphasis in public administration activities from process to results. These are the changes in personnel management, budgeting mode - program budgeting (budget based schedule), performance-oriented budgeting (performance based budget), accounting results (accrual accounting).

Outline of the new management guidelines focus largely on achieving results, objectives and empowering managers to achieve these goals, managers take political decisions, not just technical performance measurement through clear performance indicators, the introduction of competition in the public sector government and less implementation (steering Rather than rowing), privatization of public enterprises.

Traditional Administration owes the theoretical paradigm of Weberian bureaucracy and the notion that politics should be separated from the technical, civil service (civil service) should, according to this view, to be independent, neutral with political objectives, borrowing Weberian concept of neutrality axiological, social sciences over and positivism (sociologist is a social engineer, has a deal with the goals, but only at the means).

The theoretical basis of new public management guidelines are neo -classical economics and private management, rational choice theory, models public - choice follows as a consequence, the assumptions of neo -classical economics, namely the development of its models within the public sector. Social elections at all levels are

considered normal, data, therefore public sector employees make choices, their responsibilities are not just technical agencies have established policies at other levels.

The new public management reform directions thus summarizes: disaggregating, competition, boosting performance. On the other hand, Lane (2000) identifies the characteristic of contraction as a basis for the new public management authority as opposed to primarily used for traditional administration. In addition the new public management tends to replace long-term contracts specific to management (for example, human resources, contracts are indefinitely officials) with short-term contracts (similar, though not so " short " contracts governing the exchange of goods and services - "on the spot" or "spot market contracting") with specific, measurable, specific contracts market and corporate governance. This has important implications in terms of competition, allowing the introduction of market-specific mechanisms in the public sector. Contracting refers to both the external contracting of public services (contracting -out), egg achieving a highway contracting with public money following a public auction, and the contraction in the public sector. If the latter alone contracting agency with higher authority setting targets and performance indicators, and the contracting staff usually at managerial levels.

Professional Management - Managers have responsibility for the results, but also the authority to make decisions, often political, not just technical assume decisions have views they support the public, not just technicians apply policies to others. They are sworn in under a management plan with objectives and performance indicators (level of government), public assumes that plan and figure out how to implement it.

They act like a CEO (chief executive officer) for private companies accountable to the Board of Directors who sworn in and, finally, the general meeting of shareholders. Professional managers who are accountable to the authority vested in office, but they are but agencies and citizens as such, although not directly elected by them, have the freedom to tell citizens through the media, of course policies they promote. By contrast, remember that officials are just technicians; they cannot sustain political viewpoints while on duty and cannot have position papers on public policies they implement technically.

Data refer to measuring progress, operationally implementation, while standards set by comparison desirable levels (minimal or excellence) to be achieved.

Management reform emphasized performance levels of public officials, be they offices, government agencies or employees. In all areas, at all levels are required the development of performance indicators to assess fail informal and collegial organization or individual progress towards goals asumate.5

• Control outputs rather than procedures. The focus is on control results, agencies having greater freedom to plan the budget, human resources, strategy so effectively monitor the results. For example, if schools in Romania, the employment of human resources are done by the inspectorate, leaving very little freedom of schools to promote their policies and actively monitoring results through employment and wage policies. School education reform school management provides the ability to contract directly needed by teachers according to the objectives and needs of each school.

• Disintegration and fragmentation of the public service agency. Disaggregating means dividing broad ministerial department's smaller agencies that operate under managerial autonomy, each being responsible for the provision of well-defined on the underlying domain policies. The model was that of the Next Steps agencies introduced in 1988 in the UK Thatcher government. The basic idea is summarized in the government report recommending the establishment of such agencies "should be established in order to carry out the executive functions of government in a policy and a budget established by a ministerial department." It is assumed that such agencies will become fragmented into a contractual or quasi -contractual relationship (the setting of "target" levels of achievement) with hierarchical authority (department / ministry) for the provision of clear, with good quantity and quality standards specified introducing flexibility and competition in the public sector.

In addition, their employees can be largely contracted staff in turn attached with explicit goals and performance levels.

• The public sector works as an ethics that is different to serving the public interest, the citizen and not the provision of services to certain customers, clients and citizens' interests may not coincide at one point or the public sector has a duty to serve the interest citizens that is both more general and more diffuse cannot always be accurately defined by indicators and targets;

• Specify the public sector (the impossibility of establishing clear objectives and performance indicators - profitability cannot be a criterion citizen is not just a client, introducing market mechanisms do not work in all cases). "Public

management cannot be just a simple economical way to maximize customer satisfaction "(McKinney & Howard, 1998). The public sector ought not only that: he must reconcile a multitude of values and interests, to redistribute resources according to equitable principles and enforce constitutional values.

• Public sector ethos (lifetime employment, the procedures, wage depending on the position, and loyalty to the system) has been altered by the introduction of performance-based monetary systems that often lead to perverse incentives - individuation, loss spirit of teamwork, collective responsibility.

Accountability in the public sector is mediated by politicians, officials and politicians are accountable to, and they to the electorate. On the other hand, the higher authority (ministerial department) has the capacity (human resources, expertise) monitor work of agencies, making their political responsibility to be poor; rather they are evaluated by customers as service provider. However, the integration of services into a coherent program of government fades become quasi - autonomous agencies and accountability to politicians and citizens is diluted.

New Public Management is part of the first generation of public sector reforms, being guided by its efficiency, in particular by reducing costs, yet the public can not be guided only by increasing the quantity of products (outputs) services, but should be focused on quality of life than increasing the quantity and quality of service.

Improved quality of life involves two issues: first, it is an integrated approach to social problems that transgresses simple lines delineated the various services (excessive concern for outputs - products - at the expense of results - outcomes - changes in conditions, behaviors, attitudes, consequences of implementing programs) and secondly the question distribution, equitable allocation of services. Both issues have tended to be ignored by the new public management particularly concerned strictly economic efficiency. An example may be the Romanian higher education where funding is granted, for the most part, on the student equivalent staff.

However, this is only one output, not directly linked to improved public service for citizens. Such a result would be to increase the employability of graduates, their effectiveness (achieved wage) and even social benefits to society (inventions, scientific discoveries, increased productivity associated knowledge, etc.).

Restructuring the public service increased institutional complexity and decreased autonomous capabilities (skills) citizens in solving public problems (multiplication agencies confuses citizens do not know where to go), which led to the failure of the new public management in solving social problems.

Disintegration was followed by reinsertion of departmental control services for government policy to be pursued. The competition was held, but indirectly by measuring performance and setting tables, while stimulation is maintained, but in turn creates problems related to increasing inequalities in the public and uneven performance.

Some specific trends NPM reform stalled, even some processes become reversible after it was found that long-awaited efficiency led to weakening public position and the impossibility of implementing coherent policies to citizens. Reverse trends are manifested by:

• Reinsertion of public sector activities in the private sector had contracted (outsourced) - re- nationalization of the company in charge of rail infrastructure in the UK and airport security in the United States after the attacks of September 11.

• Another trend was that, contrary to the fragmentation (or disaggregating), the reunification of the various agencies to promote coherent policies, and this time the example of the Department of Homeland Security in the United States emerged as a result of the September 11 attacks by unifying approximately 22 federal agencies that aimed fragmented different aspects of internal security. Fragmentation proposed new public management has led to duplication of many hierarchs, to inefficiency and inability coherent policy; example rail regulatory agencies in the UK, the number 3, covering areas fragmented (balkanization, bureaucrats boutique) Railway Safety, licensing railway companies and the investment in rail infrastructure.

All these changes mean moving the focus from business -type efficiency of the administrative unit (which led to the disintegration and fragmentation) on providing quality services citizens, clients of public programs. Particularly effective results in economy and competitiveness achieved through lower costs, however, fragmentation has led to the creation of artificial public service areas, the "balkanization" of bureaucrat's services and the emergence of "boutique" that institutionalize their fields, and their functions without their necessarily a real necessity came from the company in respect of those matters. Unification agencies and holistic approach to many public services becomes possible by using the new

media in the context of government information. Modern communication media influence on public management is achieved through a wide range of changes in cognitive, behavioral, organizational, political and cultural issues related to information systems - the digital era governance.

Digital era governance proposed, instead, a focus on customer needs and eliminating red tape, not so much by introducing competition as using information resources in the provision of public services. Thus, there are services that save time and facilitate customers like "one stop". The provision of such "one- stop" takes various forms, including "one-stop shops" ("one -stop agencies"- multiple administrative services are provided by staff co- located), "unique web windows "(a client-centered integrated interface where multiple services are integrated electronically). Also, such services require greater transparency of public management processes.

New Public Management could not determine governance agility to adapt to new global challenges, to refresh their structures to respond to changing needs and volatile external environment. He remained concerned pre Efficiency and cost reduction, losing sight of the very specific public sector and governance mechanisms for efficient techniques that cannot be substituted but complex processes responsible for implementing collective decisions.

An important aspect of public administration reform is the reform management in the application. A major risk in public administration reform is clutter everyday tasks, leaving little time to look for new solutions to malfunctioning occur.

Consequently, for public administration reform to be successful it is necessary that a large number of target groups (in particular key people at management levels and decision) to express their support and commitment in recognizing the need for change and the implementation of these changes.

Based on the model of integrated development organizations, we can identify four factors blocking the implementation of the updated strategy: strategic (decisional complexity), structural (specify any system bureaucracy, limited human and financial resources, size and complexity), cultural (fear of risk tradition of "continuity" change of mentality) and behavior (lack of individual incentives, misunderstanding ultimate goals, motivation and anxiety behaviors tunes).

Public administration cannot be reformed in a short time. It is a long term process that must be implemented by several consecutive governments in a difficult

environment, competitive and constantly changing. Therefore, it is needed to obtain a political consensus regarding the requirements necessary to achieve the whole process of reform by:

- Large scale dissemination of information on the reform and encouraging citizen participation, civil society, the business environment, the public servants to reform through a democratic exchange of views about the development process;
- Funding reform based on a professional analysis of the current state of the activity and performance of the public administration and based on periodic assessment of the consequences of activities completed;
- Using public administration reform experiences of other countries, especially EU Member States and candidate countries, while maintaining historical and cultural elements of the Romanian public administration;
- A comprehensive reform approach: no change should not be isolated or partially realized, if it was not conceived as an integral and organic part of the whole reform strategies;
- An open approach to reform: reform strategy components will be updated and adapted to changes in the external environment, but other components of reform and transformation, to use in the best way during implementation experience;
- Establish strategic priorities: for each step is set a limited number of priority targets on which will point toward and be allocated the necessary funds. They must be those changes that advance the reform as a whole and shall determine or influence all other transformations;
- Ensure continuity of public administration officials, so that their function during reorganization, decentralization, and so on;
- Coordination and management of the entire reform from a single point at the highest level of government, to ensure coherent implementation strategy. In the reform process, the main factors involved in the coordination, implementation and monitoring measures envisaged are:
• Prime Minister will have the role of coordinating the overall government reform and delegate specific tasks to all Ministers responsible;
• The whole process of public administration reform will be coordinated by the Minister of Administration and Interior;
• Each minister must submit a statement of intent on strategic guidelines for ministry he leads, which may be updated periodically;
• Superior Council for Public Administration Reform, Public Policy Coordination and structural adjustment will analyze sectorial strategies for each ministry or in

whole, and make suggestions and recommendations to ministers by the Prime Minister;

• Three ministers have a special role in the reform process: Minister of Interior, Minister of Public Finance and coordinating minister for the General Secretariat of the Government. The difference between the ministries headed by three ministers in relation to other ministries is that they have a general responsibility for key aspects of the whole public administration, and a specific responsibility for the sector they represent;

• The Ministry of Interior actors involved in the reform process under the authority of the Minister are:

¬ Central Unit for Public Administration Reform, Director of the Ministry of Interior, provides technical support and monitors the entire process of reform. It also provides structure with the Public Policy Unit of the Government Council Secretariat, implementing its decisions;

¬ National Institute of Directors together with the regional centers is responsible for the training of civil servants in central and local public administration; National Agency of Civil Servants is responsible for the management of the public.¬

• Monitoring Groups PAR public counties and ministries coordinated by the Central Unit for Public Administration Reform. These groups are a national network of modernizers, representing an interface between the central and local public administration, between the political and the technical apparatus of public administration.

• Ministry of Finance should develop a new budget system oriented programs and performance to support effective management of performance across the public administration, budget execution processes more flexible and transparent accounting techniques allowing both accounting for assets, as and budgetary flows.

• SGG must prepare systematic reform, long-term management policymaking and policy analysis and evaluation of the central decision-making process;

• In the General Secretariat of the Government, was recently established Public Policy Unit whose mission is to strengthen the capacity of government to coordinate the formulation, implementation and monitoring of public policies, ensuring the role of interface between different institutions with a decisive role in the formulation of public policies.

The concept of performance monitoring plan is one of the most important aspects of public policy reform, here was also included on decentralization policies and the management of the public.

Anticorruption policies will be developed taking into account the recommendations of GRECO and Anti-Corruption Manual issued by the United Nations in 2003. They will be applied based on the following conditions and principles:

- institutional assessment, to identify, define and correctly apply measures to fight corruption and not just chaotic to introduce new regulations, external pressure;
- ensuring the political neutrality of applying anticorruption measures, and the establishment of independent monitoring and evaluation mechanisms;
- transparency of public authorities in developing policies and their application process, including unfettered access to public information;
- achieving the partnership with civil society, the development of institutional mechanisms that ensure the widest possible participation of the citizens in assessing the extent of corruption that affect them directly, and through participation in civic organizations;
- integrated approach by defining the exact sources that generate corruption and coordinating policies and developing common mechanisms to ensure cooperation of public authorities and competent clear demarcation between them, instead of confusion as there is currently competent and that hinder effective implementation applicable laws;
- results orientation by introducing mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation.

References

Andronicescu, Armenia (2005). *New Public Management*. Bucharest: University Publishing House.

Andronicescu, Armenia (2005). *Public Management. Case Studies of Institutions and Government Authorities*. Bucharest: University Publishing House.

Matthew, L. (2002). *Management of Local Development - Decentralization. Innovation. Risk*. Bucharest: Economic Publishing House.

Olaru, S. D. & Sun, C. R. (2001). *Management Public Relations and Anger Management.* Bucharest: Lumina Lex Publishing House.

Paunescu, Michael (2008). *Public Management in Romania*. Iasi: Polirom.

Pocora, Monica (2007). Cauze care genereaza coruptia la autoritatile publice/ Causes that generate corruption in public authorities. *Sesiunea de Comunicari Stiintifice a Institutul de Stiinte Administrative din Republica Moldova, "Administratie publica si buna guvernare"/ The scientific communication session of the Institute of Administrative Sciences of the Republic of Moldova, "Public administration and good governance",* pp. 105-110, Chisinau, 27-28 Oct.

Profinoiu, M. (2009). *Strategic Management of Local Communities*. Bucharest: Publishing House.

Smith, I. D. (2003). *Management*. Galati: Academic Publishing House "Danubius".