

# **PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FOR PUBLIC INVESTMENT IN SPORT IN GALICIA: CURRENT AND PERSPECTIVE SITUATION**

**Patricio Sánchez**, University of Vigo, Spain, patricio@uvigo.es, Angel Barajs, University of Vigo, Spain

## **INTRODUCTION**

The First Plan for Sports Venues in Galicia (Plan 1989/1999) had as objective to generalize the basic equipments and venues in the entire region. A total amount of 1,100 investments were accomplished in 289 council thanks to that Plan. The Second Plan (2000/2006) tried to develop the former but in 2004 was substituted for the Third Plan (2004/2010). The later changed the objectives focusing in investment with especial demand and incidence in the region. It has supposed a great investment effort without a system for its evaluation. For that reason the Galician Sport Foundation promoted a research with a double objective: a description of the estate of the management in Sport Venues in Galicia and a proposal of tools for measuring the performance of public investments in sports in the region.

## **METHODS**

For our purpose we have conducted a survey throughout different decision-makers in the scope of sport in the region of Galicia (Spain). This supposes 315 councils and 53 regional sport federations.

The questionnaire was designed with several parts, as yes-no questions, multilevel answers and open questions. We intended to cover all the aspects and objectives; therefore, at the end we have reached a total amount of 20 questions divided in three separated parts. The first one was related to the personal data of the interviewed, the second one has to do with the description of his/her mission and the last one contained subjective considerations about the theme.

The main body was contained in the second part of the questionnaire where we have focused on the objectives of our survey. These include the following:

- to know the main characteristics of the different objectives intended,
- to have an idea of the sport budgets,
- to appreciate the relevance of the key-factors in the achievement of success,
- to value the degree (and knowledge) of use of indicators, and
- to obtain a subjective valuation of the use of management indicators.

The questionnaire was sent by postal mail, but a telephone or email contact was frequently necessary. The average response was about a 60% which can be considered as acceptable.

Data treatment was developed by usual means with data sheet. Several controls and filters were established in order to fulfil and copy the answers.

## **RESULTS**

The results show as the use of indicators in the field of management sport seems to be something attractive for the main decision-makers of our region. However this is not a normal practise within our councils.

Moreover it is important to establish some other relevant results of the survey which can be resumed as the following:

high degree of heterogeneity between the functions of the decision-makers in public sport management,  
similar structures and dimensions of the sport services,  
close objectives (specially the main ones) with a great emphasis on:  
promotion of the sport, and  
organization of sport activity,  
low knowledge of the budgets in the sport field  
little handling of information  
lack of systematization thought the information process  
use of very simple (or non existent) management indicators  
inconsistency in the control and evaluation of management performance.

## **DISCUSSION**

The fact that governments have to promote sport means investment on this field. In order to guarantee the right use of public funds implies the use of tools for evaluate this kind of investments.

Currently, the main decision-makers of our region do not use any indicator. We propose the use of performance measurements as those suggested by AECA (1998, 2000) and the Audit Commission (2000). It is not necessary a wide range of indicators. It is most relevant to work with the key measurements (LIRC, 2003).

The use of performance measurement will be enriched if causes are taken into account. We suggest an adaptation of the Balance Scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 1996) to public investments in sport. The main differences appear in the financial and customer perspectives. It would be necessary to change shareholders for tax payers and customers for citizens.

The key indicator matrix (Bauer, 2004) for business would make more operative the balance scorecard. Finally, it is necessary a dynamic use of the performance measurements.

## **REFERENCES**

- AECA (1998): *Indicadores para la Gestión Empresarial*. Propuesta de documento n. 17. Asociación Española de Contabilidad y Administración de Empresas. Madrid.
- AECA (2000): *Indicadores de Gestión para las Entidades Públicas*. Documento n.16. Asociación Española de Contabilidad y Administración de Empresas. Madrid.
- Amar, A. D. (1999): "Sports management: budding profession needs theoretical foundation". *The Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*. Jun/Sep. Vol. 35, pp. 73-74.
- Audit Commission (2000): "On target. The practice of performance indicators". Ministry of Design, Bath.
- Bauer, K. (2004): "Key performance indicators: the multiple dimensions". *DM Review*. October. ([www.dmreview.com](http://www.dmreview.com), entrada 2/9/05).
- COM(1999) 644 final. Bruselas, 10.12.1999.
- Kaplan, R. y Norton, D (1996): *The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- LIRC (2003): *Performance measurement for the development of sport*. Final Report. Leisure Industries Research Centre. Sheffield Hallam University.