Assessing Faculty and Staff by using KPI

Prof. Dr. Baan Jafar Sadiq

Department of English-College of Education for Women/ University of Baghdad
Email: ban@copew.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Abstract

A key performance indicator (KPI) is a measurement type of performance that helps to understand how the institution and, the organization are performing and permits to understand if an institution is directed in the right direction or not. The current paper aims to assess the faculty and staff by using metrics of KPI through analyzing the data collected from Baghdad University/ College of Education – Departments of English. Finally, the paper reveals the faulty direction of Baghdad University in managing the faculty and staff category by loading the staff with more hours without any rewards or even research grants and training abroad. Thus, these reasons affect the learning process and the whole performance of the university. The University of Baghdad would pay more attention to its staff by increasing the number of instructors and employees sending the staff for training and rewarding the productive staff for improving the performance of the university. Baghdad University is one of the ancient universities and it should keep the attention to the global list of universities.

Keywords: KPI, Faculty and Staff, Assessing, Performance Measurement

Introduction
The Problem and the Significant of the Paper
Higher education determines the development of any society because it promotes economic growth and provides every individual with the foundation for a successful career. Therefore, the main theme of this study is the quality of higher education, understood as the pursuit of continuous improvement of all higher education processes and their outcomes to realize an ideal knowledge-based economy and society (Chou & Gornitzka, 2014): 2).

The World University Rankings were launched in 2003, and the Shanghai Rankings were launched in the first year. Various ranking lists have appeared and gained popularity among students and the academic community within a short period of time. Currently, you can find various rankings, such as Shanghai Ranking (ARWU), Times HE, U-Multi Ranking, QS (Quacquarelli Symonds), Leiden Ranking (Lazi´c, et al., 20021: 7). A review of the relevant literature includes an examination of the institutional quality of higher education, the demand for accountability systems in higher education, and examples of accountability systems used in higher education. One accountability system for higher education is the Malcolm Baldrige

Standards of Educational Excellence. The Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) was developed by the North Central Association's Commission on Higher Education based on the educational standards of this Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award. . AQIP was developed as an alternative accreditation process based on continuous improvement to promote quality practices in higher education institutions. Finally, the importance of identifying and using key performance indicators (KPIs) is demonstrated (Breakwell & Tytherleigh, 2010: 3).

Through the using of key performance indicators and analyzing the criteria of it, the higher education in any country reveals a range of weakness and strength as well the problems, including finance, research, quality, practical impact, and post-graduation professional fulfillment. The solution to these problems is strategic planning and strategies implementation in universities and institutions. Strategy, on the other hand, is the path to a desired position, therefore, universities need a strategic plan and measuring metrics for successfully tracking the progress towards set of goals. That means that there is a need for indicators that measure organizational performance at an organizational level and are intended to be used within university or institution to support strategic processes. (Petrov and Kamenova Timareva, :2014, 1).

Table (1)
Ranking of National Higher Education Systems 2020 Melbourne Institute

Rank (2020)	Rank (2019)	Country	Score (2020)	Score (2019)	Rank (2020)	Rank (2019)	Country	Score (2020)	Score (2019)
1	1	United States	100.0	100.0	26	27	China	56.8	54.7
2	2	Switzerland	90.1	88.6	27	28	Malaysia	56.1	54.5
3	5	Denmark	85.7	82.5	28	29	Slovenia	55.4	53.6
4	7	Singapore	84.5	81.3	29	26	Czech Republic	54.8	55.2
5	4	Sweden	84.3	82.9	30	30	Italy	54.5	53.4
6	3	United Kingdom	83.6	84.5	31	32	Chile	54.3	51.3
7	6	Canada	83.2	81.9	32	31	Poland	52.6	52.2
8	9	Finland	82.8	80.4	33	#35	Hungary	51.3	48.5
9	8	Australia	82.2	80.9	34	34	South Africa	49.7	48.7
10	10	Netherlands	81.6	80.2	35	#35	Russia	49.1	48.5
11	11	Norway	80.5	77.8	36	#38	Ukraine	47.8	45.1
12	12	Austria	79.3	77.2	37	37	Greece	47.4	47.0
13	13	Belgium	75.6	73.6	38	33	Slovakia	47.2	49.6
#14	14	New Zealand	72.7	71.5	39	42	Turkey	46.3	43.3
#14	15	Hong Kong SAR	72.7	70.2	40	#38	Argentina	46.0	45.1
16	16	Germany	70.5	69.6	41	40	Brazil	45.6	44.1
17	17	France	68.6	67.6	42	41	Serbia	44.2	43.4
18	18	Israel	67.4	67.3	43	43	Croatia	43.6	42.1
19	19	Ireland	66.0	64.7	44	45	Romania	43.0	41.7
20	20	Japan	61.9	61.7	45	44	Bulgaria	42.7	41.8
21	21	Taiwan–China	60.5	60.5	46	46	Thailand	42.3	41.2
22	22	Saudi Arabia	59.3	59.3	47	48	Iran	42.2	39.2
23	24	Spain	58.6	57.3	48	47	Mexico	41.7	41.1
24	23	Korea	58.0	57.4	49	49	India	39.6	38.8
25	25	Portugal	57.6	56.8	50	50	Indonesia	35.0	33.5

*Ranking of National Higher Education Systems 2020 Melbourne Institute

As the colleges and universities in the United States are trying with acquiring KPI, other countries such as the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Canada, mandate KPI for their colleges and universities. In the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England mandates KPI and benchmarks for each organization. These KPI focus on six broad aspects of established performance: (1) participation of historically marginalized and underrepresented groups; (2) student progression in the curriculum or time to graduate; (3) learning outcomes of each degree; (4) efficiency of learning and teaching; (5) job placement or employment of graduates and; (6) research output of the university (Breakwell & Tytherleigh, 2010). While the table has shown the top 50 ranking of national higher education but University of Baghdad did not appear even with top 100.

Most activities will have more than one key performance indicator. The measurements should provide results that compare to the universities' goals and also measure increases or decreases in costs to achieve those outcomes. In addition, the board should evaluate key performance indicators for risks as part of the overall picture. Multiple key performance indicators in higher education boards will ensure progress in productivity and effectiveness. Boards should look to various departments within the institution such as finance, risk management, technology, compliance, etc. to contribute tools that will help them set appropriate key performance indicators. In contrast, the nonacademic criteria are focused on current and former university students' achievements (Lazi´c, et al., 2021:2)

Staff are the most important resource for any university or institution and usually the largest factor of cost. Academic staff work like other professionals in an environment where they have a fair degree of autonomy and, in some cases, no fixed working hours. Those engaged in research and enterprise activities may spend a lot of time in activities that are difficult to plan and manage, and often take place outside the institution. Yet as market and financial pressures increase, institutions need to be able to monitor and manage staff performance, and they also need to invest in their staff and to manage their portfolios of activity in a more strategic way. These issues create challenges for colleges and institutions, and Human Resources strategies are still relatively recent and weak in many higher education colleges (Cubie, 2006:3).

Baghdad University depends on traditional academic performance which focuses on students' achievement and the rate of their students each year while rating higher education institutions, it's important to consider the concept of outcomes as the quality not the quantities. Appropriate metrics should measure the end outcome because they provide a better indicator of how students may or may not be successful in the real world after their college days are over. Also, the satisfaction of the students as well the staff and faculty as an important key for successful teaching and the ecology of the learning environment.

The current paper is significant because Baghdad university needs appropriate measures and results to have a meaningful way to compare themselves with peer universities. Knowing KPI of other institutions and being able to benchmark can aid colleges and universities in the approach, deployment, learning and integration of strategic planning, and areas of growth leading to performance excellence. This means that the higher education in universities need metrics which should measure the organizational performance at these universities and be used inside the universities to support the strategic process. Thus, key performance indicators refer to the responsibility of the governing body to monitor institutional performance. This new and additional guidance should help higher education at universities and their governing bodies in thinking about how they can best carry out this responsibility.

The Aim of the Research
The research aims at using key preforming inductors to assess the University of Baghdad according the faculty and staff.

The Question of the Research
The research answers the question whether University of Baghdad succeed or failed in their leading to their staff and faculty.

The definition of the term
KPI
Higher education KPIs are used to understand how an institution, university and department, or even a student is progressing toward their goals. KPIs are not goals themselves briefly it is the tools you need to understand and measure success.

Also, it means "represent a set of measures focusing on those aspects of organizational performance that are the most critical for the current and future success of the organization" (Parmenter, 2010, p. 4).

Related studies
Petrov and Kamenova-Timareva (2014)
This study surveys many types of assessing higher education institutions and presents a framework for the evaluation of KPI in HEIs. The key performance indicators for higher education institutions, developed by Craig Kennedy, and the UK Performance Indicators (UKPIs) for higher education (HE). The study uses many criteria for developing HEIs such as A. Academic Perspective B. Financial Perspective C. Research Perspective D. Facilities Perspective E. Sustainability Perspective.

The current study uses one criterion in assessing HEIs, which is the faculty and staff such as Average Faculty Salary and Benefits Employee Satisfaction Faculty, Tenure Rate Number of Endowed Chairs and Professorships Staff, Turnover Rate Staff participation in central HR training because there are many of information that could not be reached by the author for the other criteria.

Zatul iffah, etal (2021)
The aim of this paper is to examine the influence of students' differences in gender, nationality, and educational level on their perception of the educational attributes of teaching quality, research quality, and internationalization quality of the Malaysia Public Research Higher Education Institutions (MPRHEIs) in meeting the challenge of global sustainability. The sample of the paper is 500 students from five MPRHEIs who were selected as the respondents of the study, which comprised undergraduates in their second year and above as well as local and international postgraduates. The paper has used a questionnaire and the findings show that most hypotheses in the study are supported. There is agreement between this paper and Zatul iffah (2021) in using one criterion in the assessment HEIs. But, the finding of this study disagrees with the current paper.

Methods of the Research
The sample of the research is the College of Education for Women / Department of English. The research has interviewed many instructors as well it has prepared a questionnaire to collect the data of the research. The questions have been asked to 33 instructors in the academic year 2020-2021

The research has chosen one KPI category which is related to academic faculty and the staff for its importance, as the author's point of view, which is disregarded from the University of Baghdad rather it has depended on the amount of publication research and the students' graduation rather than the quality of the learning. Thus, the current research has relied on these items in the questionnaire. Also, the paper has added other items for their importance such as awards, research grants, staff participation abroad for higher education training, and

the satisfaction of academic faculty and staff to investigate the qualities of the instructors and the progress of the university to improve their students and instructors.

Table (2)
The items of the questionnaire

	Items	N=33	%	Global	Serbia
Key performance indicator of academic Faculty & Staff	Faculty Workload	33	91	4%	4%
	Student-to-Faculty Ratio	908	27.5	3%	4%
	Faculty & Staff Tenure Rate	2	454	3%	5%
	Faculty Turnover	0	0	56%	10%
	Awards	1	0.03	61%	6%
	Researchers grants	0	0	3%	6%
	Facility & staff satisfaction	33	24	74%	61%
	Researches publication	65	1.9	20%	4%
	Staff participation in abroad HE training	0	0	56%	6%

Amount of grant/awards received External grants Faculty receiving grants/awards Grants/awards applied Grants/awards received Internal grants Publications Scholarly activity other Students receiving grants/awards (Ballard,2013:67). The last column is about the comparison of Baghdad University and Serbia institution of technology (Lazi´c, etal , 2021: 9-14)

Results
The results have shown that 91% of the sample is over loading by more hours they responsible for i.e (assistant instructor 12 hours, instructor 10 hours, assistant professor 8 hours, professor 6 hours) while most vast of the sample have more than 24 hours weekly and 60% of the sample have more than 30 hours weekly.
The number of students in the department is (894) students divided into four levels, the first-year stage is (384) , the second-year stage is (220) students, the third-year stage is (185) students, and the fourth-year stage is (105). Furthermore, the department has 14 students in the higher studies. The total number of students is 908. So, the percentage of the staff to the students is (27.51%). The instructors of the department also should teach English to other departments. The total amount is increased to (33.34 %) . While the item of the faculty & Staff tenure rate is 454 because the department has only two employees, the instructors are duty about many administrative things in the department. The zero percentage is scored for the item of the faculty turnover undoubtedly 0% and staff participation in abroad HE training. contrary to the part of award and researchers grants 0.0 3 %. This means that one of the instructors has an award from Baghdad University and none of the instructors have got research grants. So, from these reasons above the staff have 24% satisfaction which is represented low satisfaction comparing with other staff. Finally, the staff is productive in publishing the research because the total number of publications as articles or books is 65 in the academic year 2020-2021. Contrary to Lazi´c, etal (2021) compare Serbia institutions of technology, and Ballard (2013) compares Western Michigan University with other higher education systems both studies reveal high satisfaction of academic staff and faculty that reflects the number of awards, the ratio of the academic staff with the students, the present

number of training abroad and grants but both studies conflicting with this paper from the low number of the mentioned above with the huge number of work loading of Baghdad University's staff sample which reflect the low satisficing of them. High scores of satisfaction of both students and academic staff reflect the quality of the institution. Thus, the results have shown the poor performance of the Baghdad University System and revealed its competitiveness problems.

Discussions of the Results

All the data have revealed that there is mismanagement from the Baghdad University to the staff and faculty because the university has loaded the instructors with more than the proposed hours and students without rewards and grants. Forevermore, the instructors are responsible for publishing their research, and take many Administrative positions simultaneously with teaching and supervising the students also, the academic staff is not satisfied with their vocation. The University of Baghdad might improve its ranking in higher education by paying more attention to KPIs and the whole performance of the university not focusing on special indicators and disregarding the other. furthermore, the University of Baghdad could make a benchmark for comparing the academic year with its and with other global universities. Heading the staff and faculty is a crucial element for the ecology of the teaching and learning environment as well as for improving society.

Recommendations

The institutions as well as the universities are recommended to concentrate on the staff and faculty members, instructors, and professors who are crucial for the learning process. Thus, giving them training and awards for their research lowers the time of teaching because most of them are loaded by the times and the huge numbers of students. These points will lower the quality of the learning and teaching.

The institutions as well as the universities are recommended to put their criteria for developing the KPI and paying more attention to improving their learning and teaching.

References

Breakwell, G. M., & Tytherleigh, M. Y. (2010). University leaders and university performance in the United Kingdom: Is it "who" leads, or "where" they lead that matters most? Higher Education, 60(5), 491-506. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9311-0 Brooks, R. (2005). Measuring university quality. The Review of Higher Education, 29(1),1–21.

Brodjonegoro, S. S. (2009), "Higher education reform in Indonesia", www.tfhe.net/resources/satryo_soemantri_brodjonegoro2.htm

Chauhan, C. P. S. (2008), "Higher education: current status and future possibilities in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka", Analytical Reports in International Education, Vol. 2. No. 1, pp. 29-48.

Chou, M. H., Gornitzka, A. (Eds.) Building the Knowledge Economy in Europe: New Constellations in European Research and Higher Education Governance; Edward Elgar Publishing: Chatterham, UK, 2014; ISBN 978 1 78254 528 6

Parmenter, D. (2010). Key performance indicators (KPI): Developing, implementing, and using winning KPI's. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Petrov, Petar & Kamenova-Timareva, Marina. (2014). Key Performance Indicators a Framework for Higher Education Institutions.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343480859

Ranking of National Higher Education Systems. (2020). Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic & Social Research University of Melbourne. March 2020.https://www.universitas21.com/agm-2020/u21-rankings

Petrov, P., and Kamenova-Timareva, M. (2014) A Key Performance Indicators a Framework for Higher Education Institutions.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343480859

Appendix (1) The Questionnaire

No.	The item	The answer
1	How many weekly hours are you responsible for teaching?	
2	What are the numbers of the students that you are responsible for teaching	
3	Have you responsible to contact student? How many hours?	
4	Have you received an award from Baghdad University? How many?	
5	Have you received research grants from Baghdad University? How many?	
6	What are your satisfaction about your vocation ?	
7	Have you received any training abroad?	
8	How many research have you published in academic year 2021- 2020?	
9	Have you turn into part time for department administration?	