Performance Measurement in Private HEIs: Performance Indicators, Data Collection and Analysis



Zuhair Al-Hemyari, Ph.D.

Prof., Ministry of Higher Education, Oman June 11-12, 2015 Florence, Italy



Overview of Presentation

- What are PM approaches?
- What are PIs?
- Benefits of PIs
- Population and the sample size of the study
- The results?



The most efficient approach to assure the PM were:

- External Quality Monitoring (EQM);
- Total Quality Management (TQM);
- **SMART** performance pyramid;
- Balanced Scorecard (BS)and
- **Performance Indicators.**



Definition of Performance Indicators (PIs)

■ "A range of statistical parameters representing a measure of the extent to which a HEI or a program is performing in a certain quality dimension" (the UNESCO).

Literature Review

Kaufman (1988) has published the first paper of our interest, which coined the concept of performance measures/indicators (PMs/Is).

It is worth to be mentioning that many papers have also conducted on PMs/Is. Examples include:

Cave et al., (1979), Akiyoshi and Kaiser (2003), Bird (2005), Chaney et al. (2007),



Literature Review

Bird(2005), Chaney et al. (2007), Franceschini et al., (2008), Chalmers et al., (2008), Shun-Hsing et al. (2008), Striteska, and Spickova (2012), Al-Hemyari & Al sarmi(2013, 2014,2015) and Al sarmi & Al-Hemyari (2014a,b,c).



Benefits of PIs

- to enable HEIs benchmark their own performance,
- to provide reliable information to the government,
- to contribute to the public the accountability and transparency,



Benefits of PIs-Continued

- for continued advancement of institutional performance and
- reinforcing the quality of teaching and learning.

Research Objectives

The research was planned to serve the following objectives:

- **To select and apply some important PIs in private HEIs.**
- to study and compare the performance of private HEIs through the PIs.



In order to appraise the quality of any HEI and its performance, the broad goals of HEI should be clearly defined (the priority areas of HEIs were identified and 5 goals were proposed (Alsarmi & Al-Hemyari, 2014a)),



Methodology-Continued

constructed and refined to present brief, measurable and clear objectives (thirty objectives were refined and they were categorized under the five goals(Alsarmi & Al-Hemyari, 2014b)),



Methodology-Continued

Then, a set of PIs were selected and aligned with refined objectives (150 PIs were refined for all objectives and the characteristics of PIs were studied (Alsarmi & Al-Hemyari, 2014c)). In this paper 20 PIs are applied and studied in 30 private HEIs.



The target population of this research has included all the academic staff (1907) and students (40281) of 30 HEIs.

The total sample size was 4571 and was taken proportionally to 11% from each HEIs.

Results

The numerical results of the 20 PIs are given in this paper, where the actual performance and the average of each PI of HEIs are obtained. The performance of the 30 HEIs to be grouped into three groups and given by the following Table.

Results

PI_i	Performance of HEIs		
	below average	average	good
1	8,9,11,12,14,15,19,24,29	10,16,28	1-7,13,17,18,20-23,25-27,30
2	1-4,6,7,15,17,19,27	5,26,28,29	8-14,16,18,20-25,30
3	1-4,6,8,12-14,17,23,	5,11,15,18,30	7,9,16,19-22,24-29
4	2-4,6,10,12-14,24,25,27	16-19,23,28	1,5,7-9,11,15,20-22,26,29,30
5	2-4,6,8,12-14,16 18,24, 27	15,23,25,28,30	1,5,7,9,11,19-22,26,29
6	2-4,8-10,12-14,16-18,24,27	15,19,23,25,28,30	1,5,6,7,11,20-22,26,29
7	6,7,15,17,19,20,22,24,30	2,4,25,29	1,3,5,18,8-14,16,18,21,16,27,28
8	1,5,7,12,15,16,20,22,23,25,2 6,28,30	11,18,21	2-4,6,8-10,13,14,17,19,24,27,29
9	2-4,	6,7,9,10,12,13,15,20,2 2,28,30	1,5,8,11,14,21,23-27,29
1 0	2,3,6,24,28	4,7,8,12,14,16,17,19- 20, 24,25,30	1,5,9,11,13,15,18,21,23,26,27,28

Results-Continued

11	2,3,6,24,28	4,710,12,14,16,17,19,	1,5,11,13,15,18,22,23,26,27,
		20,21,25,30	29
12	2-7,9,15,16,19,21,25,28-30	17,26	1,8,10-14,18,20,22,23,24,27
13	6,7,10,15,17,19,20,21,24,25,27,28	1,5,8,9,11,16,18,23,30	2-4,12,13,14,22,26,29
14	6,8,19,21,22,24,27	2-4,5,7,9,10,11,15,20, 25,26, 29	1,12-14,16-18,23,28,30
15	2,3,6,12,13,14,17,25	4,16,18,19,24,28,30	1,5,7-11,15,20-23,26,27,29
16	5,7-11,17,19,26,27,29,30	1,12,14,16,18,20,21,2 3,24,28	2-4,6,15,22,25,
17	2-4,5-7,13,16,17,21,23-25	18,29	1,8-12,14,15,19,20,22,26-28,30
18	2-7,10,16,17,19,21,24-26, 29,30	12,15,23,27,28	1,8,9,11,13,14,18,20,22,
19	2,5,6,12-14,16,18,19,23-25,29,30	7	1,3,4,8-11,15,17,20-22,26-28,
20	1-4,8,9,12-14,23,	11	5-7,10,15-22,24-30

References

- [1] Akiyoshi, Y. and Kaiser, F. (2003), System-Level and Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century', UNESCO, Bucharest, pp. 1-227. http://www.eric.ed.gov/
- [2] Al-Hemyari, Z. A. and Al-Sarmi, A. M. (2015), Developing and Establishing Statistical Indicators for Fostering the Quality of Omani HEIs. International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education (IJCDSE), Volume 6, Issue 2, pp. 2142-2151.
- [3] Al-Hemyari, Z. A. and Al-Sarmi, A. M. (2013), Ranking and performing indicators for HEIs, Proceedings of the Fourth International Statistical Conference, Union of Arab Statistician, Baghdad, Nov. 20-22, p.299-319.
- [4] Al-Hemyari, Z. A. and Al-Sarmi, A. M. (2014), Features of performance indicators in quality improvement of HEIs, Proceedings of the Ireland International Conference in Education (IICE), Oct. 26-28, Dublin, pp. 390-395.

References

- [5] Al-Sarmi, A. M. and Al-Hemyari, Z. A. (2014a), Goals and objectives: Statistical techniques and measures for performance improvement of HEIs in Oman, Int. J. of Management in Education Vol. 8, No. 3, pp.244–264.
- [6] Al-Sarmi, A. M. and Al-Hemyari, Z. A. (2014b), Quantitative and qualitative indicators to assess the performance of higher education institutions, Int. J. of Information and Decision sciences, Vol.6, No. 4, pp.369-392.
- [7] Al-Sarmi, A. M. and Al-Hemyari, Z. A. (2014c), Statistical characteristics of performance indicators, Int. J. of Quality and Innovation, Vol.2, No.3-4, pp. 385-309.
- [8] Bird, S. M. (2005), Performance indicators: good, bad, and ugly, Journal of Royal Statist., Society, Vol. A,168, No. 1, pp. 1–27.
- [9]Cave, M., Hanney, S., Henkel, M., and Kogan, M. (1997), The Use of

References

Performance Indicators in Higher Education: The Challenge of the Quality Movement, 3rd edition, Jessica Kingsley Publishers: London.

[10]Chalmers, D., Lee, K. and Walker, B. (2008), International and national quality teaching and learning performance models in use. http://www.uwa.edu.au/

[11] Chaney, B. H., Eddy, J. M., Dorman, S. M., Glessner, L., Green, B. L. and Lara-Alecio, R. (2007), Development of an Instrument to Assess Student Opinions of the Quality of Distance Education Courses, The American Journal of Distance Education, Vol.21, No. 3, pp.145–164.

[12] Franceschini, F., Galetto, M., Maisano, D. and Mastrogiacomo, L. (2008), Properties of Performance Indicators in Operations Management: A Reference Framework, The International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, Vol. 57, No.2, pp137-155.



- [13] Kaufman, R. (1988), Preparing useful performance indicators, Training and Development Journal, Vol. 42, No. 9,pp.80–83.
- [14] Shun-Hsing Chen , Wang, Hui-Hua and Yang, King-Jang (2008), Establishment and application of performance measure indicators for universities, The TQM Journal, Vol. 21, Issue 3, pp.1-10.
- [15] Striteska, M. and Spickova, M.(2012), Review and Comparison of Performance Measurement Systems, J. of Organizational Management Studies, Vol. 2012, pp.1-13.

Questions





Thank you