



An Coimisiún um Cheapacháin Seirbhíse Poiblí  
Commission for Public Service Appointments

# ANNUAL REPORT 2015





# OUR MISSION

That appointments to public bodies are made in accordance with the principles of probity, merit, fairness and openness and are in line with best practice.

## MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION



**Mr. Seán Barrett T.D**  
An Ceann Comhairle

(An Ceann Comhairle Mr. Seán Ó'Fearghail T.D. replaced Seán Barrett T.D. as Chairman of the Commission following his election as Ceann Comhairle in March 2016.)



**Mr. Martin Fraser**  
Secretary General,  
Department of the  
Taoiseach and  
Secretary General  
to the Government



**Mr. Robert Watt**  
Secretary General,  
Department of Public  
Expenditure and Reform



**Mr. Peter Tyndall**  
Ombudsman  
and Information  
Commissioner



**Mr. Justice Daniel  
O'Keeffe**  
Chairman, Standards  
in Public Office  
Commission

*“The Commission is responsible for engendering trust and confidence in public sector appointments processes that exemplify the principles of probity, merit, transparency, impartiality, consistency and fairness.”*



## INTRODUCTION

2015 marked the Commission's 11th full year in operation as regulator of recruitment and selection to the Civil Service, An Garda Síochána, the Health Service Executive, the Health Information and Quality Authority and a number of other public service bodies.

The Commission is responsible for engendering trust and confidence in public sector appointments processes that exemplify the principles of probity, merit, transparency, impartiality, consistency and fairness. The Commission is committed to ensuring that these core principles achieve the goal of attracting and selecting the strongest possible candidates, thus facilitating the delivery of efficient and effective public services.

The Commission has a significant role to play in underpinning confidence in the system of appointments as a way of engendering trust in those persons appointed to fill these positions. The systems through which individuals are appointed to positions in public bodies are key to the recruitment and selection of the most competent candidates thereby building trust and confidence in the institutions of the State.

In carrying out its brief, the Commission publishes Codes of Practice for recruitment and selection to positions in public sector organisations. It monitors the performance of office holders under its remit on their adherence to the codes through regular monitoring and auditing. It also advises on and promotes the codes of practice and processes allegations of breaches against them as required.

Following a number of years of very limited recruitment activity on foot of the Public Service Recruitment Moratorium, the appreciable increase in recruitment activity in 2014 continued throughout 2015. The Commission again had a busy year investigating complaints from individuals dissatisfied with the manner in which appointment processes were managed, examining requests from civil service organisations to engage a number of staff on short term contracts outside of the normal merit based recruitment arrangements and completing own initiative reviews of appointment processes in three public service organisations.

The Commission is satisfied that the audit and complaint investigation function, developed since its establishment, have proven a robust and effective mechanism for ensuring that appointments to positions within its remit are made on merit, following a fair, open, and competitive process. The Commission is happy to note that public service recruitment and selection practices are, in the main, being conducted in line with the standards established in its codes of practice and that the values and principles defining merit are being respected.

The Commission also wishes to express its gratitude to its Secretariat and support staff in the Information Technology, Corporate Services and Communications units of the Office of the Ombudsman for their hard work over this past year.

## CODES OF PRACTICE

One of the Commission's primary functions is to establish and safeguard the standards to be observed by those responsible for the appointments process in each of the public bodies within its remit. In so doing, the Commission must ensure public confidence in an appointments process that is open, fair, inclusive and, above all, firmly based on merit. The standards established by the Commission are published as codes of practice.

The codes also set out the procedures which those responsible for the appointments process must follow when handling complaints and grievances brought by candidates. There are specific procedures for complaints in relation to a decision affecting a candidate's participation in the appointments process and separate procedures for an allegation of a breach of the code.

The current codes of practice are:

[Appointment to Positions in the Civil Service and Public Service \(No. 01/07\)](#)

[Emergency Short-Term Appointments to Positions in the Health Service Executive \(No. 02/07\)](#)

[Appointment of Persons with Disabilities to Positions in the Civil Service and Certain Public Bodies \(No. 03/07\)](#)

[Atypical Appointments to Positions in the Civil Service and Certain Public Bodies \(No. 04/07\)](#)

[Appointment to Positions Where the Garda Commissioner has Statutory Responsibilities \(No. 01/09\)](#)

The codes reflect the Commission's intent that all appointments processes are conducted with integrity and that decisions are always made on the basis of merit. They offer guidance rather than prescriptive instructions to those who will operate them. This enables recruiters to adopt a flexible and innovative approach to recruitment procedures without compromising the principles of integrity and merit.

The standards that the Commission has established are fundamental to ensuring a recruitment system that is genuinely open to values such as fairness, equality and respect for diversity, as well as meeting the professional imperatives of efficiency and effectiveness. As part of its ongoing commitment to quality assurance, the Commission acknowledges that these standards must be reviewed from time to time, and revised where necessary, to remain relevant. In keeping the codes under review, the Commission will continue to take account of feedback from organisations within its remit and other interested parties, insight gained through audit work and the general flow of queries from departments, offices and other public bodies.

## SAFEGUARDING STANDARDS

The Commission is responsible for ensuring that appointments to public service bodies within remit are made as a result of competitive merit-based appointment processes in accordance with the standards set out in the Codes of Practice. Each year, since its establishment in 2004, the Commission agrees an annual audit plan to monitor and review recruitment and selection practices by organisations within remit across the public service to ensure compliance with the requirements under the Public Service Management Act 2004.

The Commission is responsible for ensuring that appointments to public service bodies within remit are made as a result of competitive merit-based appointment processes in accordance with the standards set out in the Codes of Practice. Each year, since its establishment in 2004, the Commission agrees an annual audit plan to monitor and review recruitment and selection practices by organisations within remit across the public service to ensure compliance with the requirements under the Public Service Management Act 2004.

The Commission, through its audit function, has established a continuing programme for reviewing recruitment and selection practices within Departments/Offices. Over the past decade this ongoing review process has noted that there is generally a high level of compliance with the principles of probity, merit, best practice, fairness and transparency with the majority of appointment processes reviewed meeting both the letter and the spirit of the Codes of Practice. The Commission has consistently noted a genuine commitment among public bodies to achieve and maintain high standards in recruitment to the public service by selecting and appointing candidates on the basis of merit and through open and competitive processes.

During 2015 the Commission received 41 requests for review under Section 8 of the Code of Practice which provided an opportunity to examine recruitment and selection practices across a number of organisations. Any areas for improvement identified during such a review were discussed with the body concerned with a view to improving procedures in line with the principles set out in the Code of Practice. The Commission, through follow-up on the implementation of recommendations, is satisfied that any issues arising were addressed by the organisation concerned.

In addition to the examination of these complaints the Commission completed audits of internal appointment processes managed by the Houses of the Oireachtas Service and by An Garda Síochána.

### **Audit of internal appointment processes managed by the House of the Oireachtas Services**

This Audit entailed an examination of the competition file together with meetings with key personnel in the Human Resources Unit responsible for appointment to positions as:

- Web and Digital Marketing Manager – Open competition
- Advisory Counsel (Grade III) – Open competition
- Senior Researcher Law –Internal Temporary Acting-Up Assignment

The Commission concluded that

- the HR team who planned and managed the recruitment function were committed to meeting their obligations prescribed in the Code of Practice;
- the appointment processes examined were planned and managed very effectively;
- objective, transparent competencies/criteria based on job based knowledge, experience and skills were applied which supported the selection of candidates on merit;
- the Office Holder had clearly and comprehensively documented all stages of the process, including its review of the process.

### **Audit of recruitment processes employed by An Garda Síochána for promoting members to the rank of Sergeant and Inspector**

This Audit generated particular interest as its publication coincided with and largely complimented a review by the Garda Inspectorate. In its Executive Summary the Commission noted that broadly speaking, it was

“...satisfied that the processes incorporate adequate safeguards, including those listed above, that protect the integrity of the selection processes and offer the necessary assurance that candidates are appointed on the basis of their interview performance.”

However the Commission also noted that “notwithstanding the enormous time and resources committed to these appointment processes the Commission considers that there are a number of elements inherent in their design and implementation that do not reflect best recruitment practice, the appointment of candidates on merit and, at the same time, conspire to diminish confidence in the promotion system.”

## Review and Evaluation

These and all other Audit reports are published on the Commission's website – [www.cpsa.ie](http://www.cpsa.ie) – and can be used by Office Holders as a tool to benchmark their own policies and practices. It is important that the public service body addresses any shortcomings identified and the Commission will continue to monitor how its recommendations are implemented.

The Commission acknowledges the continued assistance and co-operation it receives from all organisations within remit. While recognising that these organisations have many competing pressures, the Commission's view is that the benefits of internal reviews of appointment processes by the bodies concerned warrant consideration. Taking this further, the Commission urges the use of periodic internal auditing of recruitment and selection policies and practices as part of each organisation's risk management process.

## COMPLAINTS/REQUESTS FOR REVIEW

The Commission responded to a significant number of enquiries and informal complaints in 2015 in addition to the large number of formal requests for review under Section 8 of the Code of Practice. It accepted 41 complaints in the course of the year in comparison to the record total of 51 it received in 2014.

The Commission considered 48 complaints in 2015.

That said, the Commission considers that increase in complaint activity reflected a loosening of the recruitment moratorium rather than a diminution of standards. Following its examination of these complaints, the Commission is broadly satisfied that there is a genuine commitment among Office Holders to achieve and maintain high standards in the selection and appointment of candidates to public service positions. Furthermore based on its experience of examining complaints the Commission believes there is a good awareness and understanding among Office Holders of their responsibilities and obligations prescribed in the Codes of Practice.

The management of complaints both formal and informal was, once again, a significant feature of the Commission's workload during the year.

The table below provides a breakdown of the complaints considered by the Commission in 2015.

Organisations	Complaints
HSE	23
PAS	8
An Garda Siochana	4
Other	13

While many of these complaints were made against the Health Service Executive (HSE), the Commission is satisfied that the number of complaints against the HSE is relatively small in comparison to the overall number of candidates and the number of appointments made across the HSE.

The Commission's examination of complaints involves a detailed review of the records of the appointment process and, where appropriate, meetings with relevant personnel. In dealing with a complaint, the Commission's remit is to address and respond to the complainant's allegations of breaches of the Code principles.

A summary of some key cases reviewed in 2015 is provided below:

### 1. Complaint in relation to the use of psychometric tests for senior roles in the local authorities.

The CPSA received correspondence from 7 individuals complaining about PAS's decision to deploy psychometric tests for a range of senior positions across the local authorities.

Among the issues raised by the candidates were that

- Psychometric tests are not a valid means of shortlisting candidates
- The psychometric tests are not an appropriate platform for evaluating candidates professional and technical skills
- It is inappropriate to apply the same suite of tests with the same scoring key to different roles
- The on-line psychometric tests are highly vulnerable to exploitation and allow for cheating
- PAS's communications with candidates was flawed and did not inspire confidence in the appointments system. Among the areas candidates complained about in this regard was the alleged failure to properly inform candidates that the tests scores they achieve will be used in future appointment processes

- Employees of the Local Authorities enjoyed an unfair advantage as a number of posts were reserved for existing employees and the tests were not deployed for these confined positions

In its Report, the Commission noted that PAS worked with the Local Government Management Agency (LGMA) as well as the County and City Management Association in developing a robust appointment process for these senior positions across the Local Authorities. It noted that this appointment process represented a significant departure from previous practice which involved bespoke appointment processes for each post in each Local Authority. PAS advised the Commission that the job and person specifications for the different roles were central to the design of the revised appointment process. The Commission was also informed that, following the intervention of the LRC, a limited number of posts which had been filled on an acting basis for 2 or more years were “red-circled” for filling through a confined competition,

The Commission’s report also noted that the job and person specifications for the roles all describe the managerial and leadership requirements for the roles and that the competency profile set out for the roles are virtually identical. It also notes that PAS worked with a well recognised and reputable test provider to deliver appropriate tests for measuring the competencies for the different roles

The Report details the significant efforts PAS took to ensure candidates understood the basis for and format of the different stages of the appointment process.

PAS advised that candidates would be required to sit a parallel version of the tests before the end of the appointment process and as such, candidates who cannot perform at the tests may be disqualified.

Following its examination of the complaints and the information presented by PAS, the Commission concluded that:-

- the tests employed for these appointment processes are effective tools for measuring the competencies identified as important for the role and can be relied upon to screen out those candidates who are least likely to make a success of the role.
- PAS must apply robust retesting before making assignments and report on the numbers of candidates disqualified at that stage
- While PAS provided a great deal of information to candidates in its Candidate Information Booklet and Test Familiarisation Material, it should have clearly flagged the decision to apply the test scores to future appointment processes
- Finally, while acknowledging that structure of the appointment process does not leave external candidates at a disadvantage, there are concerns that Internal Candidates who failed the selection tests and as such have been deemed not to

meet the required standard for some skill areas, may qualify at interview stage for the confined competition for similar posts.

- Accordingly PAS must review the performance of the internal candidates at the later stages in the confined competition with their performance in the open competition to determine the degree to which the results of the psychometric tests correlate with the results of the subsequent stages of the selection process.

## 2. Complaint in relation to the membership of Interview Boards

The Commission received complaints relating the manner in which members of a selection board were selected and prepared for evaluating the candidates for a senior, specialised role. The complainants expressed concern that the members of the selection board did not have the knowledge, experience or adequate training to carry out a properly informed assessment of the candidates for the position.

The Office Holder had convened a three person selection board comprising two of its senior staff and one external expert.

The Office Holder provided the Commission with background information on two of its employees which it had selected to sit on the interview board. It also provided a brief résumé of the external selection board member. Based on this information, the Commission was broadly satisfied that the Office Holder had taken appropriate care and attention in selecting individuals with a thorough knowledge of the requirements of the post in question. The Commission was also satisfied that the Office Holder had taken appropriate steps in briefing the selection board members on the approach they needed to adopt in the conduct of the selection process.

However the Commission did note that, by virtue of the very senior and specialised nature of the position, only a very limited number of the Office Holder's employees could possibly sit on the interview board. It also noted that the two internal members of the Selection Board were at the same level as the position being filled. The Commission observed that internal Board Members are generally selected from those serving at one grade higher than the vacant position as the experience gained in managing those at the grade being filled can provide the Board Members with an invaluable insight into the requirements of the role.

While recognising that Office Holders will face challenges in securing the availability of sufficiently expert internal Board Members at such senior levels particularly when filling positions in highly specialised areas, it recommended that the Office Holder explores alternative options when selecting Board Members for similar posts in the future including the balance between internal and external Board Members.

### 3. Complaints about shortlisting

The Commission received a number of complaints in relation to the manner in which selection boards evaluate candidates in the course of a shortlisting process.

Among the issues raised by Complaints have been:

- The selection criteria employed by the selection did not sufficiently reflect the nature of the role
- The selection board was unfair and inconsistent in its decision making and did not give adequate attention to the content of a candidate's application
- The scores awarded by the selection board did not reflect the candidate's skills
- The feedback provided did not properly explain the decision reached
- Rather than reviewing the candidate's application in light of the objective criteria, the selection board benchmarked the application against other candidates
- There were no objective metrics available to support the manner in which the selection board carried out its evaluation of candidates

In reviewing these and other complaints, the Commission examined the suite of safeguards used by the Office Holders to support the fair, consistent and objective evaluation of candidates.

#### **i. Job and Person Specification**

The Commission considers that an appropriately prepared job description and person specification are key to the conduct of every appointment process. It expects that all Office Holders will have sufficiently robust job descriptions and person specifications which clearly identify the duties and responsibilities of the role as well as the knowledge, experience, skills and personal attributes required. The candidate appointed to the role can expect to be tested on the job and person specifications during the course of an appointment process.

In examining Complaints, the Commission generally asks the Office Holder to provide details on (i) when and how the job description and person specification were prepared, (ii) whether it has been reviewed and updated recently and (iii) how the job and person specifications were considered and approved within the employing organisation. The Commission is particularly concerned that the job description and person specifications have been signed off at an appropriately senior level. It also wishes to ensure that (iv) the person specification is not unnecessarily restrictive and that does not exclude candidates capable of performing the duties of the role.

Where the recruiting organisation provide satisfactory responses to its inquiries, the Commission is generally assured appropriate care has been taken in defining the role.

## **ii. Selection Criteria**

The Commission recognises that it can be challenging to evaluate candidates against all of the different elements of the job and person specification. Particularly when shortlisting from large volumes of candidates; the selection board must be able to focus on how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in a number of key criteria. That said the Commission expects that the shortlisting criteria are sufficiently clear and meaningful that they provide a robust means for differentiating between those candidates most likely to make a success of the role and those who are less suited to the position.

In reviewing the selection criteria used at the shortlisting stage, the Commission checks that it corresponds with key elements of the job description and person specification.

The Commission expects that the recruiting organisation will present draft criteria to the selection board. It recognises that, in some cases, the selection board will make some adjustments to those criteria following their preliminary discussions about the demands of the role.

The Commission has, on occasions, been critical of Office Holders for setting eligibility criteria with a view to reducing the candidate pool to a more manageable number. The Commission is firmly of the view that the public interest is best served when recruiters apply fair and objective criteria that permit the selection of the best candidates from the widest pool of available talent.

It has also been critical of an organisation where the selection board decided to disregard a key element of the shortlisting criteria that corresponded with the published person specification and instead decided to apply criteria of its own.

In the course of its examination of another complaint, the Commission noted that the

## **iii. Membership of the Selection Board**

Given the significant responsibility on the selection board, it is imperative that the Recruiting Organisation takes care in selecting individuals with the knowledge, experience and judgement to evaluate candidates for the role. In examining the membership of the selection board, the Commission will examine the measure taken to ensure that, as a collective, the board had the appropriate background, including any relevant qualifications to test and evaluate candidates on the knowledge and skill areas required for the role.

**iv. Management of Connections between Board Members and Candidates:**

The Commission accepts that it can be extremely challenging to avoid connections between board members and candidates particularly for senior and/or specialist roles where there tends to be a limited pool of sufficiently expert board members available. Instead of trying to avoid these almost inevitable situations, the Commission looks to see what steps the Office Holder has taken to manage these situations. Apart from the general instructions in relation to treating all candidates in a fair and consistent fashion and evaluating them based on the information presented in the course of the appointment process, it expects that the Office Holder will instruct its members of the selection board to make it known to their colleagues on the board which of the candidates s/he knows. While the board will interview all candidates in a consistent fashion, the board members who know candidates will be the last to offer a view on the interview performance of the candidate in question. It also looks to see if this procedure was properly documented in the interview guide issued to Board Members and referred to in the pre-interview briefing.

However in certain cases, the Commission proposed that Office Holders should consider retaining a schedule setting out which board members declared their knowledge of which candidate and confirming that the standard protocol referred to in its Interview Guide had been followed.

**v. Selection Process**

The Commission will expect that the Recruiting Organisation will plan the appointment process in advance. This plan ought to have taken account of the numbers of candidates that are likely to apply and whether a preliminary screening or shortlisting stage will be necessary.

Where shortlisting is used, the Commission expects that the Recruiting Organisation will consider how it will provide for a fair and consistent evaluation of candidates. While candidates are often asked to include a CV in support of their application form, many Public Service recruiters also deploy a structured application form where candidates are asked to highlight the areas in their career to date where they have demonstrated the key criteria.

Recruiting Bodies have regularly informed the Commission that applications are sent out to the selection board some days in advance of the shortlisting meeting along with the job and person specification, a shortlisting criteria and a briefing on how the selection process will be conducted. The Commission understands that Selection Board Members are asked to study the application forms in advance so that they are prepared for the shortlisting meeting.

The Commission understands that, where shortlisting board members have been provided with and have studied the applications in advance of the shortlisting

meeting, they can often segregate candidates quite quickly into categories such as “most likely to attain a competitive standard at interview” ; “most unlikely to attain a competitive standard at interview” and “worthy of further deliberation”. It also understands that the discussions at the shortlisting meetings focus in particular on those applications in this third category.

As well as reviewing the applications of candidates in this third category comprises candidates, members of the selection boards will need to spend time assessing applications where they were not unanimous in their decision on the basis of their initial review.

Notwithstanding which category the candidate features in, the Commission considers that as candidates have gone to the time and trouble of preparing and submitting an application, they deserve to have their applications properly evaluated. As such the Commission considers that clear and meaningful feedback should be available to all candidates which shows that their application was evaluated by the board and which of the criteria they did not demonstrate to the same standard those candidates invited to the next stage of the appointment process. In line with the separate case note on feedback, the Commission expects that Office Holders will provide feedback that explains the decision reached in an appointment process but does not require the Office Holder to provide career development advice.

Finally the Commission accepts that the numbers of candidates invited to attend for interview will reflect not only the performance of candidates in relation to the criteria but also the overall strength of the candidate pool. As shortlisting is often a competitive process, it understands that applications will be compared not only against the selection criteria but also against applications from other candidates.

#### **vi. Marking Scheme**

The Commission accepts that it can be challenging to apply precise empirical measures when evaluating a candidate’s written application. However it considers that the use of a marking scheme can be helpful not only in showing candidates how their application was evaluated by the selection board but also in encouraging selection boards to apply a high level of discipline and rigour during their evaluation of candidates.

## LICENSING

The Commission is responsible for granting recruitment licences to certain public service bodies who wish to conduct their own recruitment. Recruitment licences may be granted either in respect of all positions in the public body (a general licence) or in relation to one or more particular positions (a specific licence).

An application for a recruitment licence must be made to the Commission in which the office holder is required to demonstrate its capability to carry out the selection process in line with the Commission's code of practice. The Commission is available to provide appropriate advice or assistance during the application process.

Each licence granted has certain terms and conditions attached which must be strictly adhered to by the licence holder. The Commission monitors compliance with the terms and conditions of a recruitment licence through its audit function. Although a recruitment licence is not time-limited the Commission has the power to terminate a licence in certain circumstances. This power has not been invoked to date.

During 2015 the Commission granted a general recruitment licence to the **Law Reform Commission**.

The Commission had granted 31 recruitment licences to office holders to the end of 2015 – this includes both general and specific licences. In some instances office holders hold both types of recruitment licence.

## EXCLUDED POSITIONS

The Commission is empowered under Section 8 of the Public Service Management (Recruitment and Appointments) Act 2004 to exclude, by Order, unestablished positions in the Civil Service from the operation of the Act.

In agreeing to exclude these positions from its remit, the Commission requires that the Civil Service Office or Department adheres to guidelines setting out the nature of positions it will exempt and also the length of time that will apply.

Table 1 sets out the principal appointment categories for which such Orders were made or extended in 2015.

**TABLE 1: Orders Made in 2014**

Category	Number of Orders
Students Placement Programmes (including Internships)	14
WAM Projects	19
Ministerial Private Staff	1
Appointments where specific skills were required for time limited periods	10
Engagement of retired staff members (specific skills)	5
Staff Exchange Scheme	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>

Each Order relates to a specific type of position or grade in the Civil Service. The number of orders granted does not reflect the number of persons appointed as more than one person may have been appointed to the position or grade in question,.

In the case of Order relating to Ministerial Private Staff, the conditions of service of the appointees provide that they will cease to hold their positions when the Government or Minister leaves office.

33 Orders were granted to support specific short-term initiatives, i.e. student placement programmes and WAM (Willing Able Mentoring) projects and 6 Orders to facilitate the temporary transfer of staff from other Public Service Bodies to positions in the Public Service. The remaining 15 Orders enabled the engagement of staff to short term appointments where time scales involved did not allow for the running of an open competitive selection process.

## RECRUITMENT ACTIVITY REPORT

All of the figures in this report are based on information/statistics provided to the Commission for the years in question.

TABLE 2: External Recruitment Activity

	Number of Appointments Made			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>CIVIL SERVICE</b>				
Permanent Appointments	276	302	449	1684
Temporary Clerical Staff	1089	889	1285	1572
<b>GARDA SÍOCHÁNA</b>				
GARDA Trainee	0	0	200	0
GARDA Reserve	241	188	89	0
<b>LOCAL AUTHORITY</b> (Local Authorities (Officers and Employees) Act 1926)				
Professional/Managerial				
<b>HEALTH INFORMATION AND QUALITY AUTHORITY</b>	14	27	31	34
<b>HEALTH SERVICE EXECUTIVE</b>	1633	2794	3544	4586
<b>MISCELLANEOUS PUBLIC SERVICE BODIES</b>				21
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>4238</b>	<b>5639</b>	<b>7973</b>

TABLE 3: Internal Recruitment Activity

	Number of Appointments Made			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>CIVIL SERVICE</b>	456	308	811	1365
<b>GARDA SÍOCHÁNA</b> (Sergeant and Inspector)	3	116	228	0
<b>HEALTH INFORMATION AND QUALITY AUTHORITY</b>	0	0	0	2
<b>HEALTH SERVICE EXECUTIVE</b>	0	4	7	358
<b>MISCELLANEOUS PUBLIC SERVICE BODIES</b>				2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>1046</b>	<b>1727</b>

TABLE 4: Temporary Acting Up Positions\*

	Number of Appointments Made			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>CIVIL SERVICE</b>	511	440	556	3048
<b>HEALTH INFORMATION AND QUALITY AUTHORITY</b>	0	0	6	6
<b>HEALTH SERVICE EXECUTIVE</b>	80	26	62	466
<b>MISCELLANEOUS PUBLIC SERVICE BODIES</b>				2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>624</b>

\* Note – The figures reflect the number of new appointments to Temporary Acting Up Posts and not the total number of staff in receipt of Acting Up Allowances



PUBLISHED IN 2016 BY THE COMMISSION  
FOR PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS,  
18 LOWER LEESON STREET, DUBLIN 2

TEL: (01) 639 5750  
EMAIL: [INFO@CPSA.IE](mailto:INFO@CPSA.IE)  
WEB: [WWW.CPSA.IE](http://WWW.CPSA.IE)

designed by **CATALYSTO**<sup>o</sup>