8 Validation of KPIs identified

8.1 Chapter Introduction

The author (Scott.P, 2011) in his article in Guardian talks about the importance of KPIs – He mentions that The Universities need to know whether their students are progressing, completing their courses and finding jobs. They need to make sure their research is sustainable. Good management information is essential to ensure universities operate effectively – as business organizations.

In this context, it is essential that the KPIs that we have identified (It includes the elements mentioned by the author) - is also validated by the users - especially the staff and the Management of the college.

The process of identification/ selection of the KPIs have been dealt in the earlier chapters of this thesis work. However, it is to be verified that the KPIs identified are useful and the data to support the KPIs are available in the college.

In this chapter, validation survey conducted among the staff members is discussed.

8.2 Survey for validation process

1. The initial list of KPIs have been prepared and shown to the acting dean of the college, Dr.Ahemed Al Bulushi – Based on his experience and knowledge of the systems and the strategic plans, the KPIs have been reviewed by him and approved.

2. The approved list of KPIs was shown to 11 Heads of the Departments of the college, by way of a survey questionnaire to find out their opinion in respect of the relevance of the KPIs and the availability of data for the listed KPIs.

The list of KPIs is as per the Excel data in annexure 9. The questionnaire was a dichotomous one eliciting YES or No answers. For each of the KPIs, the respondent was asked to tick an Yes or No answer, if they, in their opinion think that the data for the KPI is available in the college records.
It was found that some of the respondents left a few KPIs – without answering – mentioned that they are not aware about the data availability. The survey in its entirety is given in annexure12. The outcomes of the data analysis are also covered in this chapter.

8.3 Data Collection & Analysis

Appendix H shows excel file (‘56 KPIs developed and the relevant data’) for the 56 KPIs and the data pertaining to the years 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13, (i.e) a span of six semesters. However, this data is to be read subject to the limitations mentioned in para 1.8. The data is based on the assumptions that concerned staff is aware of the performance status in those years pertaining to these KPIs.

The Figure 0 indicates that the data is either not available- or the KPI itself is not in place yet and hence the data is not given importance and not tracked or available.

The dichotomous responses from the 11 Heads of Department are recorded in the same excel sheet. The responses from the HoDs are highlighted in the excel table. If the respondent feels that the KPI data is available, it is marked as ‘Y’, otherwise it is marked as ‘N’. However, if the respondent is not aware, then it is marked as ’0’

The cover sheet of the survey given to the eleven respondents also included following statements: Do you believe that the 56 KPIs identified/developed would help in improving the performance monitoring of the college.

☐ Yes, It would help in monitoring the performance of the identified performance criteria.

☐ No, it would not help in monitoring the identified performance criteria

All the 11 respondents agreed positively that the KPIs developed would help in monitoring the performance criteria of the KPIs identified.

The data collected and the survey results show that as there is no KPI system installed in the college yet, the performance measurement and monitoring is also not in place. By analyzing the responses, we note that in each of the three KPI perspectives (Student/Staff/Management), the respondents felt that the data is not available to the extent of 30 to 35% in the college records.
This means that one third of the data requirement may not be available in the college records. By any means this is a significant percentage of required data and the college management should ensure availability of the data and the field personnel like the Heads of Departments are made aware that such data is available in the appropriate locations.

It is apt to point out the views of the author (Brown.C., 2012), that, unless these indicators are linked in a meaningful way to the drivers of institutional effectiveness, desired improvements in service, productivity, and impact are unlikely to occur. For the indicators to be properly linked, the college should have a system established and the institutional awareness is vital for the sustenance of the system.

8.4 Chapter summary

It is important to recall here that the data in the relevant excel sheet is based on the feedback from the concerned administrative personnel but may not be accurate as the KPIs are not in place and the data themselves relate to past academic years as KPIs are yet to be officially recognized.

It is possible to verify the progress of each of the KPIs, with the help of the chosen BSC software and monitor them with respect to the individual targets that can be decided at a time when the KPI system is installed.

As the KPIs take into consideration all the three perspectives of the three important stakeholders, namely, the Students(customers), staff and the Management, this kind of performance Measurement and Monitoring would help put the College in a spiraling orbit of progress.

This would also help in knowing that the Mission and Vision statements are not for mere cosmetic process but are meaningful charting tools for achieving the goals of the Institutions.

In the next chapter, the thesis work is briefly summarized and conclusions, recommendations are listed.