

8.1 Kriterien für Kennzahlen (-systeme): Materialien aus dem Vereinigten Königreich (UK)



Die Zentralregierung des Vereinigten Königreichs arbeitet systematisch mit Kennzahlen, siehe im [Beitrag zur Neuen Verwaltungssteuerung](#). Sie hat die Anforderungen an Kennzahlen und Kennzahlensysteme für Ergebnisorientiertes Management [beispielhaft](#) formuliert, [zusammenfassend](#) wie folgt:

Properties of a good systems of performance information:

(Eigenschaften eines guten Systems der Erfolgsmessung, Merkwort: "FABRIC")

Anforderung	Checkliste*)
Focused on the organisation's aims and objectives;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is the performance information focused on the core aims and objectives of the organisation? ○ What actions could the performance information provoke management to take? (If the answer's none then don't collect the information.) ○ Why is the information being collected?
Appropriate to, and useful for, the stakeholders who are likely to use it;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do stakeholders receive the performance information they need? ○ Is it the right information presented in the right way for each group of users?
Balanced, giving a picture of what the organisation is doing, covering all significant areas of work;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do measures cover all significant areas of work in the organisation? ○ Are both financial and non-financial measures collected? ○ Are indicators of future performance included as well as measures of past results?
Robust in order to withstand organisational changes or individuals leaving;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can the system survive changes in personnel and changes in the structure of the organisation? ○ Are there any key people without whom the performance information system couldn't survive?
Integrated into the organisation, being part of the business planning and management processes; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are the results of the performance information system monitored and used as part of the business planning and management process? ○ Is there consistent performance information at all levels of the organisation? ○ Are performance measures for individuals and teams, consistent with measures for the organisation? ○ Do people within the organisation "own" the system? Do they take notice of the results and use them? Did they contribute to its design?
Cost Effective balancing the benefits of the information against the costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are the resources put into collecting performance information proportionate to the benefit of the organisation?

- What is the actual cost to the organisation of the performance information? (Including the burden of form filling, and time spent reviewing the information.)

*) Ergänzung durch die "**Checklist for Performance Information Systems**". B. K.

Criteria for individual performance measures

(Kriterien für die einzelnen Erfolgsmessgrößen). Measures should be

Messgrößen sollten sein	Checkliste*)
<p>Relevant to what the organisation is aiming to achieve;</p> <p>able to Avoid perverse incentives - not encourage unwanted or wasteful behaviour;</p> <p>Attributable – the activity measured must be capable of being influenced by actions which can be attributed to the organisation, and it should be clear where accountability lies;</p> <p>Well-defined - with a clear, unambiguous definition so that data will be collected consistently, and the measure is easy to understand and use;</p> <p>Timely, producing data frequently enough to track progress, and quickly enough for the data to still be useful;</p> <p>Reliable - accurate enough for its intended use, and responsive to change;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the measure attempt to capture success in one of the organisation's objectives? ○ What does the measure tell you about how the organisation is performing? ○ Does the measure encourage any unwanted behaviour? (For example not reporting mistakes.) ○ Could you improve performance against the measure without improving performance in real life? ○ Does the measure allow innovation? For example, does the measure discourage changing the way a service is delivered? ○ Can the measure be influenced by the organisation's actions? ○ Is it clear where accountability for the measure lies? ○ Is there an estimate of the degree to which the organisation affects the measure? ○ Could a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timed) target be set against the measure? ○ Can the measure be expressed clearly, so that it is easy to understand? ○ Does the measure have an unambiguous definition, so it can be collected consistently? ○ Does the measure provide information in time for action to be taken? ○ What's the lag between the event and information becoming available? ○ Does the measure provide information frequently enough to track changes and take actions? ○ Is the performance measure accurate enough for its use? ○ Has the measure been checked by appropriate specialists? (for example statisticians, social

researchers, accountants or scientists.)

Comparable with either past periods or similar programmes elsewhere; and

Verifiable, with clear documentation behind it, so that the processes which produce the measure can be validated.

- Is the measure responsive to change? Will it show significant changes in performance? Will the measure change because of random "noise" rather than actual performance?
- Does the measure allow comparison with past performance?
- Does the measure allow comparison with other organisations delivering a similar service?
- Given the documentation could an objective outsider come up with the same results?
- Does documentation exist so that the process behind the measure can be validated?

*) Ergänzung durch die "[Checklist for Performance Information Systems](#)". B. K.

Quellen: UK Treasury u.a.: [Choosing the right FABRIC: a Framework for Performance Information](#), S. 3 f., ergänzt um die gesondert veröffentlichte "[Checklist for Performance Information Systems](#)".

Entsprechende Anforderungen gelten für die Formulierung von Zielgrößen/ Vorgabewerten, englisch "targets", die Ziele durch Soll-Kennzahlenwerte konkretisieren, siehe [Setting Key Targets for Executive Agencies: A Guide](#), gemeinsam herausgegeben von Cabinet Office, Treasury und National Audit Office, 2003, S. 11.

© für diese Zusammenstellung und die Übersetzungen: Krems - olev.de - 2009-10-09

Die Kriterien gelten auch für die Konstruktion eines Systems von Kennzahlen zu Steuerungszwecken oder - in der deutschen Terminologie - für die Formulierung operativer Ziele.

