

# **TWINNING CONTRACT**

**JO/13/ENP/ST/23**

## **Strengthening the capabilities of the Department of Statistics in Jordan**



### **MISSION REPORT**

**on**

#### **Activity 3.3: Quality Assurance – II**

Mission carried out by

Ms Karin Blix, Statistics Denmark

Mr Søren Schiønning Andersen, Statistics Denmark

30 March – 3 April 2014

Version: Final



Expert contact information

*Chief Adviser, Karin Blix  
Statistics Denmark  
Sejrøgade 11  
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø  
Denmark  
Tel: +45 3917 3348  
Email: kwb@dst.dk*

*Head of Division Søren Schiønning Andersen  
Statistics Denmark  
Sejrøgade 11  
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø  
Denmark  
Tel: +45 3917 3021  
Email:ssa@dst.dk*

## Table of contents

Executive summary .....	4
1. General comments .....	5
2. Assessment and results .....	5
Follow-up since activity 3.2 .....	5
Purpose 1: Templates for quality assurance checklist .....	7
Purpose 2: Templates for a standard DoS quality declaration .....	8
Purpose 3: Quality indicators to be included in quality declarations .....	9
Purpose 4: Organisational issues .....	9
Purpose 5: Training in quality assurance / quality management .....	10
3. Conclusions and recommendations .....	10
Annex 1: Terms of Reference .....	12
Annex 2: Programme for the mission .....	13
Annex 3: Persons met .....	15
Annex 4: Checklist for data quality assurance in statistical surveys .....	16
Annex 5: Outline of User Satisfaction Assessment Report .....	17
Annex 6: Outline of Employee Satisfaction Report .....	18
Annex 7: Checklist for data quality assurance in statistical surveys .....	19
Annex 8: Draft template for quality declarations in DoS .....	20
Annex 9: Outline for Total Quality Management (TQM) Course .....	22

## List of Abbreviations

CoP	European Statistics Code of Practice
DoS	Department of Statistics of Jordan
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MS	Member State
RTA	Resident Twinning Advisor
SD	Statistics Denmark
SIMS	Single Integrated Metadata Structure
ToR	Terms of Reference
TQM	Total quality management

## Executive summary

This was the third activity in component 3. The activity was carried out in accordance with the ToR and the programme. A very positive meeting was held with DoS' new Director General, who expressed his strong support and ambitions for the quality work in DoS.

The DoS self-assessment was updated following the recent seminar in Rome.

A draft of a quality assurance checklist was developed for DoS. Examples of SD checklists will be submitted to the quality team following this mission. It is recommended to perform a test of the quality checklist on a limited number of surveys, including employment and unemployment and agricultural surveys, which will also be part of the piloting of the template for the quality declarations (see below).

The user questionnaire used in 2012 was presented. It has many relevant elements, but does not cover all five quality dimensions in CoP. The user surveys should be continued, but the questionnaire should be redesigned to cover all five quality dimensions.

The Employee quality awareness questionnaire used in the survey in 2012 was presented. The survey was conducted with one questionnaire covering all staff groups. This is not optimal. When repeated the questionnaire should be differentiated for different personnel groups and the questions should be more targeted to different quality functions in the organisation. A new questionnaire should be ready for the next survey in the fall of 2014.

A brief introduction to the operations book was given. The table of contents and an example of one operation will be translated and submitted to the consultants for comments. Also, a statistical calendar list was briefly presented. The calendar should be extended with a column for the contact person. The statistical calendar list should be implemented as from 2015. The actual usage of the calendar in DoS needs further discussion.

A good draft template for quality declarations (incl. quality indicators) was made by DoS. This is to be further developed with guidelines for completing the declarations. It is recommended that DoS continues with the user oriented approach and select items from SIMS. It is also recommended to further discuss and decide on the appropriate level of granularity. This decision should not be taken by the Quality Team, but rather by DoS' management. The template should be pilot tested on minimum three surveys representing different statistical areas and collection methods. At least one survey should not be the responsibility of members from the Quality Team. The pilots should be conducted before the Action 3.4 mission in May.

The work in the Quality Team is progressing. Contact persons in the Directorates not represented in the Quality Team will be appointed. The team expects this to work well. There is a need to increase the knowledge about the project in DoS. The team will prepare and send a News Bulletin about the project to DoS as a whole. This should be done when the checklist and quality declaration pilots are conducted. There is a wish to look into non-technical processes, including Public Relations. Danish examples will be presented in activity 3.4.

The general Quality Management courses are ready to be restarted. DoS should consider creating a follow-up course specifically targeted statistical work. This should comprise international standards and guidelines for quality management in statistics. It could be considered to include general quality management principles in the various courses for practitioners.

## 1. General comments

This was the third activity in component 3 and the actions planned for this activity were carried out as scheduled in the ToR, cf. annex 1 and the programme, cf. annex 2. The purposes of the mission were:

1. Discuss the draft templates for quality assurance checklist
2. Discuss the draft templates for a standard DoS quality declaration – based on EU standards
3. Discuss possible quality indicators to be included in the quality declarations
4. Discuss organisational issues related to the role of the Quality Division and the quality management in DoS
5. Discuss the programme for the training in quality assurance / quality management

The consultants would like to express their sincere thanks to all officials and individuals met for the kind support and valuable information which we received during the stay in Jordan and which highly facilitated our work. The views and observations stated in this report are those of the consultants and do not necessarily correspond to the views of EU, DoS or SD.

## 2. Assessment and results

### Follow-up since activity 3.2

Mr Mohammad Khalaf informed about the recent appointment of the new Director General for DoS, his Excellency Dr. Qasem Al-Zubi. A meeting between Dr. Al-Zubi, Mr Abed Wadood Matouk, Mr Mohammad Khalaf, the RTA and the consultants was arranged. The meeting was highly positive.

#### *Meeting with the new Director General of DoS*

The consultants explained the main objectives of this component, the activities conducted so far and the progress achieved by the Quality Team. Mr Khalaf added about the project's aspects related to quality awareness in DoS – explaining the supporting and supervising role of the Quality Division and the Quality Team and the overall plans for the upcoming training activities.

Dr. Al-Zubi expressed his strong support for the project and emphasised the need and his ambition for DoS to comply with international standards – in response to recent criticism against DoS and in order to maintain DoS' credibility and position among the best statistical agencies in the region.

Dr. Al-Zubi emphasised the need to strengthen coordination of quality management activities across DoS' organisation and the need to work systematically and harmonise processes in accordance with 'best practice'. In this context the need for more and better documentation was highlighted by Dr. Al-Zubi. The valuable knowledge in the heads of DoS' employees must be written down.

Furthermore, Dr. Al-Zubi stressed the need for the quality awareness to be embedded as a culture – 'the way we work in DoS' – and that this goes for everybody in DoS, not 'just' the core Quality Team and the contact persons in the directorates.

Finally, Dr. Al-Zubi underlined the need for the quality work to be concrete and practical – not theoretical or ‘on the facade’ – and that this requires the active involvement of the practitioners. “Quality is the responsibility of everyone” as it was put.

### *Other activities since activity 3.2*

Mr Khalaf explained that two meetings were held in the Quality Team since activity 3.2: One meeting about the preparation of draft templates for DoS quality assurance checklists and other material sent to SD prior to activity 3.3. Another meeting was held about the material provided by SD about involvement of external stakeholders (i.e. users, data providers, other producers of official statistics) in Advisory Committees.

Mr Khalaf informed that – following recommendations from activity 3.1. and 3.2. – a recommendation had been sent to DoS’ top management to extend the Quality Team with participants from the rest of DoS’ organisation. During the activity Mr Matouk confirmed that the application was approved in the sense that contact persons in relation to the work of the Quality Team in each of the remaining Directorates will be appointed, and that the Quality Team will remain with the present composition of people.

Mr Matouk informed the Quality Team and the consultants about the seminar held in Rome, Italy, earlier in March 2014 with representatives from Eurostat and the MEDSTAT countries about the CoP, which Eurostat wishes the MEDSTAT countries to adopt. In general there was widespread agreement about the CoP principles and the indicators, but in some areas there were discussions about certain conditions in the MEDSTAT countries, and also references to ‘EU standards’ should be changed to ‘international standards’:

- Principle 1 was not fully complied with by one country due to certain conditions about the approval of statistical figures and nomination of chief statistician.
- Principle 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 were agreed with.
- Principle 3 had raised a discussion about the difficult budgetary situation for many MEDSTAT countries, including Jordan. A new CoP indicator about “mobilisation of different sources of financial resources” will be added.
- Principle 4 had raised a discussion about the need for turning the ‘commitment to quality’ into a more anchored ‘quality culture’.
- Principle 7 should be extended to cover not only the business register, but also other registers with basic information in other domains (persons/households, buildings/dwellings etc.).
- Principle 15 had raised a discussion about the proper extent of analysis to be performed by National Statistical Authorities.
- Inspired by discussions among African countries a new principle (no. 16) about ‘coordination and cooperation’ was proposed and will be further discussed.

It was also discussed during the seminar in Rome whether the MEDSTAT countries should adopt the EU CoP, or alternatively adopt a slightly modified ‘MEDSTAT CoP’ which takes into account the different framework conditions in the Mediterranean countries compared to those of EU Member States. Following the discussion the MEDSTAT countries has updated their CoP self-assessments. A follow-up meeting will be held in Luxembourg in May 2014 with the participation of the Director Generals of MEDSTATs NSIs.

It was the perception of Mr Matouk that DoS – to varying degrees – already applies the CoP today. The main areas for improvement are ‘adoption of DoS policies’ in certain areas, ‘quality declarations and quality measurement’, ‘documentation of processes and practices’ and ‘quality commitment/culture’. Committed human resources were seen as the most important precondition, and it was expected that substantial improvements on these areas would need 4-5 years to be achieved.

Finally, the consultants presented the material provided by SD about involvement of external stakeholders in Advisory Committees, cf. above, and explained the practical working arrangements. See also powerpoint slides in separate annex.

### Purpose 1: Templates for quality assurance checklist

Based on the consultants’ review a workshop was held about the draft templates for quality assurance checklists and other material sent by DoS to SD prior to the activity, cf. above.

Especially, the draft generic *quality assurance checklist for surveys* was discussed in detail, and the checklist was modified. For the English version of the modified checklist, please see annex 4. Further modifications were made on the checklist according to the Quality Team’s further discussions; the corrections were reflected on annex 4. This version will now be translated into Arabic and tested in practice on a limited number of surveys. Pros and cons of selecting the same surveys for piloting the check list *and* the template for quality declarations could be considered.

The strategy for implementing such a generic checklist in DoS was discussed and the need to start with a simple approach was emphasized by the Quality Team. However, it was agreed that – as part of the gradual development of a stronger ‘quality culture’ and practice – the approach should be extended in the future. An indicative approach for a version 1, 2 and 3 of the checklist is sketched in the powerpoint slides (see separate annex). It was agreed that the consultants will provide DoS with examples of checklists from SD.

The *operation book* is a collection of operational procedures for ‘technical’ (i.e. statistical) and non-technical work in DoS. It is already in use in DoS today describing quality procedures to be followed. There is a template describing each procedure within the surveys. This template is filled in for all surveys. The objective is to ensure the steps that should be followed when executing surveys within DoS. Responsibilities regarding the different processes within the objective are described. The operation book is introduced to follow the guidelines in HM King Abdullah’s Excellence Award. Not all staff members know the operation book, but all managers know it. The table of contents, the template and one concrete example from the operation book will be translated into English.

The *user questionnaire* has already been used in practice – it has been filled in by approx. 150 users, and a report has been compiled with the results (for a table of contents of the report, see annex 5). The consultants mapped the questionnaire against the dimensions in the statistical quality concept, which revealed that:

- **Relevance** is not well covered in the questionnaire
- **Accuracy and reliability** is not really covered in the questionnaire
- **Timeliness and punctuality** is well covered in the questionnaire
- **Coherence and comparability** is not well covered in the questionnaire

- **Accessibility and clarity** is well covered in the questionnaire

Against that background, it was concluded that there are good reasons for a redesign of the questionnaire prior to the next round in order to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the users' perception of the quality of DoS' statistical products. Also, it seems that some of the current questions are formulated in a normative way and could be more neutral (this could also be due to translation issues).

The *employee quality awareness questionnaire* has also already been used in practice in 2012 (for a table of contents of the report, see annex 6) It was submitted to all DoS staff, but the response rates varied quite a lot among different staff categories. A possible reason for low response rates could be that it is difficult for all staff to answer the same questions. Different approaches to reduce this problem were suggested – one option could be to split the questionnaire into different sections with dedicated questions for the different staff groups. A possible approach for such a differentiation was sketched by the consultants, see annex 7. This sketch was discussed and the idea of separate sections was welcomed, whilst the questions (as sketched) were considered usable in DoS – they need to be more operational.

The *statistical calendar list* is a draft suggestion from the Quality Team. The 'start day' is the day of the start of the field work of the survey. The 'end date' is the date when data is transferred from the collection to the IT directorate. The 'publishing date' and the 'Press news publishing' date can be different dates, but can also be the same date – depending on the surveys. For DoS 'own' surveys the dates are set by DoS and for surveys conducted for external partners, the dates are agreed with the respective partner. It was agreed to add a column for the responsible person (contact person).

## Purpose 2: Templates for a standard DoS quality declaration

A presentation on quality declarations was given by the consultants. An introduction was given to SIMS (Single Integrated Metadata Structure) which is a classification system for quality concepts developed by different forums within the EU system, see Eurostat document ES-TAT/B1/AB D(2013). There is no requirement to use all items described in SIMS, but one may pick items suitable for their own purpose, ambitions and resources.

A presentation was given on the Danish 'two layer' system for quality declarations - a top layer with summary information under seven headings for non-specialised users and a more detailed level for more specialised users. SD has chosen several items from SIMS and some items that are not in SIMS, but still considered valuable in quality declarations. A number of SDs current quality declarations were presented via SDs website – representing survey based, register based, short term as well as structural statistics. For examples see: <http://www.dst.dk/en/Statistik/dokumentation/Declarations.aspx>

DoS is recommended to start out with a *user oriented* approach, cf. SIMS. The 22 user oriented items in SIMS are marked with a 'U' in the Technical Manual of the Single Integrated Metadata Structure (SIMS) (Eurostat document ESTAT/B1/AB D(2013)). It is not recommended to use all items, but to select a manageable number of items covering the most important quality aspects.

Mr Khalaf presented a draft template for quality declaration in DoS. The draft was discussed and checked against the user oriented SIMS items and quality indicators. Against that back-



ground the draft was slightly modified. The draft does not include a distinction between preliminary and final figures as all figures released by DoS are final (except national accounts). Similarly, declarations of revisions are not foreseen. For the modified version see annex 8, where references to SIMS are inserted in **red font**.

The Quality Team will now further develop the draft into a genuine template, i.e. extend it with guidelines to the survey managers for filling in the necessary information. Then the template will be tested on different surveys. It was agreed that the template should be tested on different surveys, i.e. both social, business and economic, both short term and annual, and on a survey with administrative sources (i.e. a minimum of three surveys). The consultants suggested that at least one of the surveys subject to the pilot is a survey that is not the responsibility of anyone in the quality team. The pilot should both be a test of the template as such *and* of the guidelines to fill in the template. The pilot testing of the template should be carried out before the activity 3.4 mission in May.

Taking into account that one of the mandatory results of this component is to have a quality declaration for national accounts published on DoS' website by January 2015 DoS is recommended to consider whether national accounts could be chosen as one of the pilots. Furthermore it is recommended to discuss how the quality declarations in general will be published and how a link can be made between statistical output and quality declaration. This should be coordinated with component 4 (IT and on-line dissemination).

Finally, it is recommended to discuss and decide on the 'level of granularity' – i.e. at which level will quality declarations be made. For example: Should there be one quality declaration per survey or per statistical publication? Should there be one quality declaration for e.g. national accounts as a whole, or should there be one for the annual accounts and one for the quarterly accounts? This decision should not be taken by the Quality Team, but rather by DoS' management.

During this discussion questions were raised about response burden measurement and how high response rates depend on the availability of an updated Business Register. Against that background, Danish practice on these two matters was presented, see separate annex with powerpoint slides.

### Purpose 3: Quality indicators to be included in quality declarations

As a follow up on the quality declarations the consultants gave a presentation of recommended quality indicators given in the Technical Manual, cf. above. The indicators were already largely taken into account in the draft template, cf. above.

### Purpose 4: Organisational issues

The work in the Quality Team is progressing. It was suggested that the Quality Team be extended to also include persons from Directorates that were not yet represented in the team. The idea was accepted, but instead of expanding the Quality Team, it was decided to appoint contact persons in the Directorates that are not represented. This is now in progress and contact persons will soon be appointed. The team expects this to work well.

Generally there is a need to increase the knowledge among the rest of DoS with regard to the project. There was a discussion of how to include non-technical areas in the quality project as

mentioned by Basem Shannak. It was concluded that there is a need to look into non-technical processes, including Public Relations. In activity 3.4 in May, Danish examples will be presented.

There was a discussion on how topics of interest to the whole organisation were usually presented in DoS. Meetings were not used, but instead News Bulletins are sent out. The team will prepare and send one about the quality project. It could be discussed whether to do this on a regular basis.

### Purpose 5: Training in quality assurance / quality management

Mr Khalaf presented the outline for the general TQM training course, which DoS offers – to its own staff as well as to external participants (for the outline, see annex 9). The target group is directors, heads of divisions and survey managers and takes around 15 working hours. In DoS the target group comprises around 150 persons of which around 40 have already taken the course. The course has been discontinued for about 1½ years, but is now ready to be re-started. Substantial course material is prepared and will be handed out to the participants. This course is supplemented by a project management training course, which is related to ‘electronic project management’.

It was generally agreed that it should be considered to create a follow-up to this general course, which should be targeted specifically to the needs of DoS’ staff. This should – among others – comprise international standards and guidelines for quality management in official statistics, but also concrete quality assurance methods and tools in DoS.

Targeted training activities for e.g. enumerators in the field and DoS staff working with data Registration or validation was explained. It was suggested to add an introduction to general quality management principles in the various courses for practitioners. Also, it was the impression that some overall (including administrative information) should be reintroduced in these courses.

Training activities are supported administratively by the Directorate for human resources and administrative affairs.

## 3. Conclusions and recommendations

Topic	Conclusions	Recommendations
Meeting with new Director General	Clear support and goals for the work with issues concerning quality in DoS	
CoP Self assessment	The DoS self-assessment is to be updated following the seminar in Rome. Presentation of the Danish preparatory process will be sent to DoS.	Update the self assessment in a thorough process involving people across DoS directorates and have it approved by top management.
Quality assurance checklist	A draft has been developed for DoS. Examples of SD checklists will be submitted to the quality team.	Perform a test of the quality checklist on a limited number of surveys, including employment and agricultural statistics, which will also be part of the piloting of the template for the quality declarations (see below).

Topic	Conclusions	Recommendations
Operation book	A brief introduction to the operation book was given. The table of contents and an example of one operation book will be translated into English and submitted to the consultants for comments.	
User questionnaire	The user questionnaire used in the 2012 survey was presented. It has many relevant elements, but does not cover all five quality dimensions in CoP.	The user surveys should be continued, but the questionnaire should be redesigned to cover all five quality dimensions.
Employee quality awareness questionnaire	The questionnaire used in the survey in 2012 was presented. One questionnaire for all personnel groups in DoS is not optimal	When repeated the questionnaire should be differentiated for different personnel groups and the questions should be more targeted to different functions in the organisation. A new questionnaire should be ready for the next survey in the fall of 2014.
Statistical calendar list	The calendar should be extended with a column for the contact person.	The statistical calendar should be implemented as from 2015. The actual usage of the calendar in DoS needs further discussion.
Template for quality declarations (incl. quality indicators)	A good draft was made by DoS. This is to be further developed with guidelines for completing the declarations.	Continue with the user oriented approach and select items from SIMS. Discuss further and decide on the appropriate level of granularity. Pilot the template on minimum three surveys representing different statistical areas and collection methods. At least one should not be the responsibility of anyone in the quality team. The pilot should be conducted before the Action 3.4 mission in May.
Organisational issues	The work in the Quality Team is progressing. Contact persons in the Directorates not represented in the Quality Team will be appointed. The team expects this to work well. There is a need to increase the knowledge about the project among the rest of DoS. There is a wish to look into non-technical processes, including Public Relations. Danish examples will be presented in activity 3.4.	The team prepares and sends a News Bulletin about the project to DoS as a whole. This should be done when the checklist and quality declaration pilots are conducted.
Training	The general Quality Management courses are ready to be restarted.	DoS should consider creating a follow-up course specifically targeted statistical work. This should comprise international standards and guidelines for quality management in statistics. It could be considered to include general quality management principles in the various courses for practitioners.

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Terms of Reference</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>EU Twinning Project JO/13/ENP/ST/23</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>30 March-3 April 2014</b></p>
--

### Component 3: Quality and metadata

#### Activity 3.3: Quality Assurance – II

#### 0. Mandatory results and benchmarks for the component

- Statistics published by DoS are quality assured and documentation is improved (April 2015)
- Assessment report on current situation (January 2014)
- The consequences of applying the European Statistics Code of Practice in DoS are discussed (April 2014)
- Develop a standard format for a quality declaration (July 2014)
- A quality declaration for the national accounts is completed and published on the DoS website (January 2015)
- Develop a metadata strategy (January 2015)
- Design and test a quality audit (April 2015)

#### 1. Purpose of the activity

- Discuss the draft templates for quality assurance checklist
- Discuss the draft templates for a standard DoS quality declaration – based on EU standards
- Discuss possible quality indicators to be included in the quality declarations
- Discuss organisational issues related to the role of the Quality Division and the quality management in DoS
- Discuss the programme for the training in quality assurance / quality management

#### 2. Expected output of the activity

- Templates for quality assurance checklists to be piloted in selected statistical domains
- Template for quality declaration to be piloted in statistical domains
- Transfer of the Danish and in general the European Union, experience in quality and metadata
- A lining up of work programme for the next activity (3.4, scheduled to 4th - 8th May 2014)

#### 3. Participants

##### DoS:

Mr Mohammad Khalaf, Head of Quality Division (*Component Leader*)

##### Quality team:

Mr Bassam Azzain, Mr Baskim Shannak, Mr Mohammad Damrah, Mr Duraid Al-Shawawreh

##### MS experts:

Mrs Karin Blix, Senior Adviser, External Economy, Statistics Denmark

Mr Søren Schiønning Andersen, Head of Division, External Economy, Statistics Denmark

## Annex 2: Programme for the mission

Time		Place	Event	Purpose / detail
Sunday, afternoon	12.00 – 01.00	Hotel /DoS	Meeting with RTA	To discuss the programme of the week
	01.00 – 03.30		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Follow-up since Activity 3.2
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
Monday, morning	08.30 – 09.30	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.30 – 12.00		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discuss the draft templates for quality assurance checklist
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Monday, afternoon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discussions of the draft templates for quality assurance checklist
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
Tuesday, morning	08.30 – 09.30	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.30 – 12.00		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Presentation of the EU standard for quality declarations.  Discuss the draft templates for a standard DoS quality declaration – based on EU standards
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Tuesday, afternoon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discuss the draft templates for a standard DoS quality declaration – based on EU standards
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing

Wednesday, morning	08.30 – 09.30	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.30 – 12.00		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discuss possible quality indicators to be included in the quality declarations
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Wednesday, after-noon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discuss organisational issues related to the role of the Quality Division and the quality management in DoS
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
Thursday, morning	08.30 – 09.30	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.30 – 12.00		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discuss the programme for the training in quality assurance / quality management
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Thursday, afternoon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Presentation for BC Component leader and Quality team.
	03.00 – 04.00		Debriefing with BC Project Leader	Conclusions and decisions and their consequences for the next activity and the implied work programme for BC Experts

### **Annex 3: Persons met**

DoS:

Dr. Qasem Al-Zubi, Director General of DoS  
Mr Abdel Wadood Matouk, BC project leader

Quality Division:

Mr Mohammad Khalaf, Head of Quality Division (*Component Leader*)  
Mr Duraid Al-Shawawreh, Quality Division

Quality Team:

Mr Bassam Al-Zain, Agricultural Survey Directorate  
Mr Basem Shannek, Development & Strategic Planning Unit  
Mr Mohammad Damrah, Economic Survey Directorate

RTA Team:

Amal Aliah, RTA Assistant  
Dina Moghrabi, Interpreter  
Thomas Olsen, RTA

**Annex 4: Checklist for data quality assurance in statistical surveys**

No	Process	Yes	No	Attach evidence
<b>Preparation and data collection/registration</b>				
1	Has the sample frame been updated?			
2	Has the sample design been checked?			
3	Has the questionnaire been reviewed (and updated if necessary)?			
4	Have enumerators been trained for this survey?			
5	Has the enumerators' ability to fill the questionnaire been tested?			
6	Has the trainer's ability to train the enumerators been evaluated?			
7	Has the accuracy of filling the questionnaires in the field been monitored and reported to DoS?			
8	Has the data entry software been checked by IT Directorate?			
9	Have auditors and encoding staff (validation and editing) in DoS been trained?			
10	Has data entry staff in DoS been trained for this survey?			
<b>Data processing in Statistical Division</b>				
11	Have micro data entry been audited and mistakes corrected?			
12	Does the survey results produced by the IT Directorate compare to the results obtained by the statistical division?			
13	Does the survey results compare previous survey results?			
<b>Publication / dissemination</b>				
14	Have publications, reports etc. been prepared?			
15	Do publications comply with DoS reporting procedures (i.e. the technical writing criteria)?			
16	Did the publication of results meet the pre-defined deadline?			



## Annex 5: Outline of User Satisfaction Assessment Report

September 2012

1. Background
  - 1.1 introduction  
217 questionnaires received and analyzed
  - 2.1 Objectives  
define the types of data needed by users and preferable ways / formats to receive data
  - 3.1 Tools  
a 2-part questionnaire, i.e. one for identification data of users and another on satisfaction over provided service
  - 4.1 population  
a simple random sample of 217 people, distributed through email
2. Key results
  - 2.1 population characteristics  
60% males 40% females. 42% of the respondents were in the age group 30-39 years. Over 40 years group formed 31% of respondents and less than 30 years formed 27% of the population.
  - 2.2 statistical interests  
Interest in economic statistics was the highest at 74%, followed by social and population statistics at 66% and environment at 41%. Agricultural statistics 32%, other interests 28%.
  - 2.3 Preferable data receipt method  
69% prefer DOS website, 66% prefer email, 25% prefer to get it personally and 2% chose other methods
  - 2.4 Preferable data format  
93% want to receive electronic copies, 29% of users prefer paper, and 2.3% prefer other methods
  - 2.5 User satisfaction level about statistics  
General dissatisfaction on all items, easiness of data collection, comprehensiveness and DOS website.

TABLE 1 – satisfaction regarding the value of DOS services

### 3. The Questionnaire

1- Questions about data users

2- Questions on DOS Quality of services from user point of view

## **Annex 6: Outline of Employee Satisfaction Report**

### Executive Summary

Summary of satisfaction results on various work aspects

### Background

Introduction

Importance of Study

Study framework

Study objectives

Key definitions

Population characteristics

Employee key characteristics

Sex

Age

Academic qualification

Years of experience

Division

### Key findings of employee satisfaction assessment

Communication channels with managers and individuals

Benefits

Salaries and promotions

Professional development

Productivity

### Key findings of employee suggestions

### Summary of results

### Recommendations

### Appendices

#### Questionnaire

1- Personal data

2- job satisfaction assessment

3- suggestions

**Annex 7: Checklist for data quality assurance in statistical surveys****INDICATIVE SKETCH – FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY!**

Staff group	Question	Scale
<b>All DoS staff</b>	1.1: Are you familiar with DoS' quality policy?	fully to some extent to a limited extent No
	1.2: Are you familiar with the statistical quality concept and its dimensions?	Fully to some extent to a limited extent No
	1.3: Have you read the Statistics Code of Practice?	yes/no
	...	
<b>Managerial staff</b>	2.1: Have you explained and discussed DoS' quality policy with your staff?	yes/no
	2.2: Are the quality assurance procedures in your division written down and available to all staff?	yes/no
	2.3: Have you discussed your division's quality assurance procedures with your staff?	yes/no
	...	
<b>Academic staff</b>	3.1: Are you familiar with HM King Abdullahs excellence program?	Fully to some extent to a limited extent
	3.2: Do you gradually improve the quality assurance procedures in your survey?	Yes/no
	...	
<b>Clerical staff (statistics)</b>	4.1: Are you familiar with the quality assurance procedures within your division?	Fully to some extent to a limited extent
	4.2: Can you perform the quality assurance procedures within your area of work?	Fully to some extent to a limited extent
	4.3: Do you have the necessary time to do the quality assurance?	Always most often rarely
	...	
<b>IT staff</b>	5.1: Are you trained in methods to quality assure IT systems	Fully to some extent to a limited extent
	5.2: Do you ensure that your IT programs are reviewed, tested and documented?	yes/no
	...	
<b>Field workers</b>	6.1: Are you familiar with the interview guidelines for your surveys?	Fully to some extent to a limited extent
<b>Admin. Staff</b>	7.1: Are quality assurance procedures defined for your division?	yes/no
	7.2: Can you perform the quality assurance procedures within your area of work?	Fully to some extent to a limited extent

## Annex 8: Draft template for quality declarations in DoS

### 0. Administrative information:

#### 0.1 Name of Survey: (example add the name of survey in the line below: **[extra]**)

Employment & Unemployment Survey

#### 0.2 Directorate/Contact Person: (Add name of directorate execute the survey and the name of person in charge and his address) **[extra]**

Population Surveys Directorate – Mohammad Al Jundi, Tel. 5300700, ext. ..., email: ....

#### 0.3 Purpose and Historical Background: **[extra]**

The survey's aims at:

1. Defining demographic, social and economic characteristics of the population and human resources.
2. Defining the professional structure and economic activities and work status of the employed.
3. Knowing the reasons that drive employed individuals to look for a new or additional jobs

#### 0.4 Users and Applications: **[SIMS item S.14.1]**

Users: social and economic experts, social researchers, employed individuals within the labour market.

Applications: economic and social planning, educational applications

#### 0.5 Source: **[extra]**

Data is collected in an annual survey conducted over four visits

#### 0.6 Authorized institution to collect and publish data: **[extra]**

Department of Statistics in accordance with law no... / year ...

### 1. Content:

#### 1.1 Content description: **[extra]**

The survey provides data on the demographic, social and economic characteristics of households and working individuals, covering Jordanian nationals who are over 15 years of age. It also describes the working status of this group, classified in terms of sex, sector, marital status, unemployment period, age groups and ways used to find a job.

#### 1.2 Concepts and Definitions: **[extra]**

- Urban and Rural areas: For the purposes of this survey, communities of 5,000 people or more, according to the last population census in 2004, are considered urban areas, while communities with less population are considered rural areas.
- Private household:
- Head of household:
- Age in full years:
- Nationality:
- Enrollment in an educational institution:
- Years accomplished successfully:
- Educational status:
- Academic qualification (specialization):
- Marital status:

- Economic activity:

**1.3 Variables: [extra]**

See above

**1.4 Classifications: [extra]**

Published tables depend on data classified in terms of age from 15 years and above, and according to gender and working status

**2. Timeliness and punctuality:****2.1 Reference period: [extra]**

The survey was conducted over the months of February, May, August and November 2012

**2.2 Date of dissemination: [SIMS item S.16.1.1 / indicator 16.1]**

Available

**2.3 Compliance with dissemination deadline [SIMS item S.16.1.2 / indicator 16.2]**

Available:

**2.4 Frequency: [extra]**

Annual

**2.5 Length of comparable time series: [SIMS item S.17.2]****3. Accuracy and reliability:****3.1 Overall accuracy: [SIMS item S.15.1]**

Very high

**3.2 Sources of inaccuracy: [SIMS item S.15.2 and S.15.3]**

The sample

**3.3 Available accuracy measures: [SIMS item S.13.2]**

Descriptive accuracy measures

**4. Comparability:****4.1 Comparability over time: [SIMS item S.17.2]**

This data is comparable with the previously produced data, as the same methodology is used and international standards are applied.

**4.2 Geographical comparability: [SIMS item S.17.1]****4.3 Comparability with other statistics: [SIMS item S.18.1 and S.18.2]**

This data is comparable with other statistics that use the same definitions and international classifications relevant to employment and unemployment.

**5. Accessibility:****5.1 Dissemination format: [extra]**

Data is published in printed and electronic formats, the latter on DOS website: (links)

## **Annex 9: Outline for Total Quality Management (TQM) Course**

### **The Concept of TQM**

- 1- Definition
- 2- Definition of TQM management

### **The Objectives of TQM and benefits**

#### **The requirements to apply TQM**

- Rephrasing the organizational culture
- Promotion and marketing of TQM program
- Teaching and training
- Cooperating with consultants
- Forming working groups
- Encouragement and incentives
- Supervision and follow up
- Strategy of application

### **Total Quality Management and leadership**

#### **Stage for TQM management**

- Define the concepts of TQM for the organization
- Planning TQM
- TQM management
- Training and improvement

### **Strategic quality management**

- How quality benefits employees
- Keeping customer satisfied
- Using process-oriented approach
- Persistence
- Rewarding verified quality management
- Legal aspects and responsibility
- Quality in part of leadership

### **Elements of TQM**

#### **Quality planning (Hoshin Management Cycle)**

#### **Quality tools**

- Check sheets
- Flow charts
- Control charts
- Pareto charts
- Cause and effect diagram
- Quality Function Deployment

### **Quality Measurement**

- Six Sigma
- Desap approach

- Quality indicators

**Table 1: List of Standard Quality Indicators (Eurostat 2005d)**

Quality component	Indicator	1=Key 2=Supportive 3=Advanced
Relevance	R1. User satisfaction index	3
	R2. Rate of available statistics	1
Accuracy	A1. Coefficient of variation	1
	A2. Unit response rate (un-weighted/weighted)	2
	A3. Item response rate (un-weighted/weighted)	2
	A4. Imputation rate and ratio	2
	A5. Over-coverage and misclassification rates	2
	A6. Geographical under-coverage ratio	1
	A7. Average size of revisions	1
Timeliness and Punctuality	T1. Punctuality of time schedule of effective publication	1
	T2. Time lag between the end of reference period and the date of first results	1
	T3. Time lag between the end of reference period and the date of the final results	1
Accessibility and Clarity	AC1. Number of publications disseminated and/ or sold	1
	AC2. Number of accesses to databases	1
	AC3. Rate of completeness of metadata information for released statistics.	3
Comparability	C1. Length of comparable time-series	1
	C2. Number of comparable time-series	1
	C3. Rate of differences in concepts and measurement from European norms	3
	C4. Asymmetries for statistics mirror flows	1
Coherence	CH1. Rate of statistics that satisfies the requirements for the main secondary use	3