

Guideline for Performance Management of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy

Background for Study and its Purpose

Since the enactment of the Framework Act on Architecture in December 2007 until now, a controversy over the validity of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy has been ceaselessly raised. In addition, on the relationships with the currently implementing Framework Act on the National Land, the Urban Planning System in wake of the Act on Planning and Use of National Territory, and the Framework Plan on Landscapes in wake of the recent Act on Landscapes, even experts on architecture and cities have shown mixed opinions on the discrepancy and role between those plans.

So, in order to secure sustainability of the architecture policies along with the ultimate achievement of the goal of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy, it is necessary to arrange a systematic and strategic performance management system reasonably suitable for such policies, enhance the efficiency of implementing the plans and maximize management capability.

the Master Plan for Architecture Policy, a broad-wide plan which covers the buildings and cities as a whole requires a

detailed evaluation method by action task and their evaluation index. However, the scope of such evaluation method and index is pretty much wide and in order to build a performance management system as a plan to be set up for the first time in Korea, prereview is demanded in many respects.

It is meaningful in that this study, the first attempt for performance management of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy intends to categorize the characters of such Policies by action task and review the performance management systems of the currently performed government policies-related laws and systems and those of similar plans, instead of building a complete performance management system, so that I sought to find a direction of performance management to be established in years to come.

Analysis on the Master Plan for Architecture Policy

In order to define the character of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy by action plans, it needs to categorize such action tasks in a multi-faceted aspect. In this study, I categorized and analyzed those tasks in 4 aspects - "Driving Subject," "Character of the Action Task," "Period of Driving the Action Task" and "Whether or not a Performance Index is possibly induced."

The study found that a lot of action tasks bears more than 2 patterns, not a single one and many of them requires a mid-& long-term management. So, it is judged that a performance management too must be conducted around a long-term and process-centered evaluation, rather than a short-term and result-centered one.

A Theoretical Review on Policy Evaluation and Performance Management

I examined the 「Basic Act on the Evaluation of Government Work」, 「National Finance Act」 and 「National Research and Development Project」, the foundation for implementing performance management for the government's policies and projects and analyzed the situation of operating the major institutions, organization of the institutions and their driving system. Also, I reviewed the evaluation and performance management system of the overseas major nations – the United States, United Kingdom and Japan, and checked with the position and character of Korea's performance management system.

As a result, the findings demonstrated that many of those nations reject an uniform evaluation standard for performance management and are going to make use of a flexible evaluation strategy, whose evaluation consequences are mainly reflected in their governments' budget and are being used as a means for enhancing the responsibility and efficiency of the government work.

Performance Management System of Korea's Legal Plans

In order to set up the direction of performance management of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy, I investigated and analyzed the detailed performance systems, like performance index, evaluation method and evaluation index, of the "Action Plan of the Comprehensive National Territory," "Strategy of the Sustainable National Development and Its Implementation Plan," "Basic Plan

on Female Policies,” and “Basic Plan on the Low Fertility·Aging Society Policies” similar to the character of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy.

In the analysis, the findings showed that many of the legal basic plans and their implementation plans were conducting an evaluation on their detailed tasks by policy tasks in terms of evaluation field and items. An quantitative evaluation on a detailed performance index by tasks has not been performed. Exceptionally, in case of the Action Plan of the Comprehensive National Territory and the Strategic Plan on Female Policies, a qualitative and technical evaluation has been mainly conducted without an additional performance index, carrying out a quantitative evaluation in parallel, whenever necessary.

Most of the evaluation has been made by the evaluation committees and the evaluation committees played a role of deliberating on the organizations' own evaluation results and establishing and coordinating the strategic plan and implementation plan.

Direction of Building the Performance Management System of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy

As earlier discussed, policy evaluation or performance management is to evaluate and measure the effectiveness of the policies, which must play a role of comprehensively reviewing an issue of whether the policies and projects implemented by the Master Plans achieved their goals as well as the accompanying effect, adverse effect and a long-term ripple effect.

In summary, the basic direction of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy suggested by this study is as follows:

First, a performance management system must be built from a long-term perspective, not a temporary and fragmental performance measurement.

Secondly, local considerations must be reflected in conducting performance management, avoiding a power-centralized evaluation system.

Thirdly, a sustainable and developmental feedback system must be set up.

The most important purpose of performance management is to analyze its driving process and to utilize it as a basic material for improving and developing the policies in years to come. In order to do so, a strategic and process-centered performance management system, instead of a fragmental evaluation method, must be created.

This study faced a few difficulties in that research was restricted to a 3-month period and an in-depth analysis on the action tasks of the Master Plan for Architecture Policy had to be conducted under the situation where the First Master Plan for Architecture Policy is being established. So, in the study, I divided the process of building a performance management system of the Master Plan into 3 phases (Information Gathering – Building of Performance Management System–Firmly Positioning of Performance Evaluation), based on the investigations and analyses performed in the course of the research and concluded the study by suggesting a performance management roadmap for sustainable improvement and development by 2014, the last year for the First Master Plan for Architecture Policy.