Towards Convergence of Higher Education Indicators - A System Perspective

Maree Pather (Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria, South Africa)

Categorise the HEI indicators below:

Are these performance indicators, risk indicators or quality indicators?

- Graduation-rate
- Drop-Out rate
- Staff-Turnover rate
- ICT-Cost per Student-FTE
- Student FTE: Student Headcount ratio
 [DOES IT MATTER?.... CALL THEM
 STATUS INDICATORS, OR M&E I's, IF YOU LIKE!]



Are they worth monitoring?

• Is a pulse beat worth monitoring?

...It is 'ALL RELATIVE' to what information is required, why it is required, when it is required and by whom it is required...







Avoiding information overload...How?



Reducing complexity...

| | | Key Performance Areas (e.g. Portfolios of Executive Management Committee) | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Systems-Based Convergence: Monitoring-and-Evaluation of | | | Teaching & Learning | | Research | | | Finance | Other Management Portflios |
| Strategy, Quality, Risk | | | M&E (Performan/ e/Quality) Indicators | | | | | | |
| | | | M&EI1 | M&E12 | M&EI3 | 1&EI4 | M&EI5 | M&EI6 | Other M&EI's |
| 50 | | Objective1 | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R | $\{n_{i}x_{i}, y_{i},\}, R$ | KyJr}R | {n,x,y,i, \ R | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,j,},R |
| - E | 븝 | Objective 2 | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R | (n,x,y,i, 1R | x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,} | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R |
| 22 ā | 6 | Objective3 | {n,x,y,i,},R | {nxyi}R | {n,x | vi,},R | {n,x,y,i,} | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R |
| 응 글 | | Objective4 | {n,x,y,i,},B | R | 1/ Busine | ACC \ | {n,x,y,i,},R | x,y,j,},R | {n,x,y,j,},R |
| | 9 2 | Objective5 | {n,x,y,i, | Strat ` | | },R | $\{n, x, y, i,, \}, R$ | V, i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R |
| | oal Ca | Objective6 | {n,x,y,i | Planning | Area | S,R | $\{n, x, y, i,, \}, R$ | LR LR | {n,x,y,i,},R |
| | | O bjective 7 | | lomonto | In X | NJ }R | $\{n, x, y, i,\}$ | Monitori | ng <u>}</u> R |
| N 5 | | orojective8 | {n,x,y,i,} | | {n.x.v.i | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i, | and | ↓ <i>R</i> |
| | | Objective9 | {n,x,y,i,},R | $\sigma^*=1/(n-1)\tilde{\Sigma}(x)$ | -509 Carl 2.R | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i, | | R |
| | 0 | Objective10 | $\{n_{X}, y, i,\}, R$ | a refers to relativ | Averal BR | $\{n, x, y, j,\}$ R | 4 | Evaluatio | n |
| | | Objective11 | {nxvi }R | achievement; a | sthew of BR | loxvi 1R | loxvi 18 | element | S VI IR |
| Ŭ Ŭ | é È | Objective 12 | {nxvi }R | number of period | $\frac{1}{R}$ | la xvi | = $i $ R | {nxvi }R | {nxvi }R |
| DCC |) G | Objective13 | {nx.v.i}R | change in the Mi | LR LR | In XVI | il.R | {nxyi}R | {n.x.v.i}R |
| DSU | | Objective14 | {nx,y,i}R | the change in the | target / | Inxyinin | ISK TUX.V.I | {n,x,y,i}R | {n,x,y,i,}R |
| v perspectives | als a | Objective15 | {n,x,y,i,},R | | .J.R | {n,x,y,i,},R | $\{n, x, y, i,\}, R$ | {n,x,y,j,}R | {n,x,y,j,},R |
| | 0 | Objective16 | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,j,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R | {n,x,y,i,},R |

Essential points to keep in mind...

- Using the worksheet per se would not be very practical unless the number of planning elements is small.
- The framework is intended to be implemented as a software system with
 - data-capture interfaces,
 - analysis-and-reporting capability and
 - M&E I-dashboards.
- Some of the function-cells could be vacant, depending on whether indicators are used are not.

Converged schema...

- As with Balanced Scorecard strategic maps (Kaplan and Norton, 1996), the converged-planning schema can be cascaded from corporate governance and executive management planning down to tactical and operational planning.
- The software system could be implemented to aggregate M&EI's hierarchically upwards, consistent with the top-down cascade of goals and objectives.



Values for TI's can be obtained using various methods, e.g. calculating the standard deviation of changes in the TI-value and the benchmark over the monitoring-interval.

 $\sigma^2 = 1/(n - 1) \Sigma(x_i - y_i)^2$

Where σ is the relative performance in period *i*; *n* is the number of periods over which it is measured; *x* is the change in the TI; *y* is the change in the benchmark; *i* is the monitoring period.

If the benchmark is a variable such as CPIX, the benchmark would change periodically.

Quality/Performance Criteria

- QFD allows a QPS (Quality Performance Score) by using the criteria (hierarchical measurable indicator systems) in a self-assessment.
- Similar to quality awards criteria, e.g. :
 - the **Deming** Quality Awards (Japan),
 - the Malcom Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) and
 - the European Quality Award (EQA) awarded by the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM).
- [Actual M&E I's should be presented as metrics metrics should be derived where M&E I's are qualitative - such as Net Present Value (NPV), Benefit-Cost Ratio, Graduation-Rate, etc.]

Framework Focus

- The methods and processes used (e.g. SWOT analyses, TQM, QFD, BSC, MBNQA-criteria) and risk management are incidental to this proposed framework;
- For example, prior risk-classification and risk-assessment are presupposed here;
- the focus is on capturing and tracking the indicators that emerge from such processes.

Choosing actual HEI indicators

- A useful guide is the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning publication (Michaela Martin, Claude Sauvageot, 2011): "Constructing an indicator system or scorecard for higher education -A practical guide".
- Other useful sources for indicators include:
 - Ruben B.D. (1999). "Toward a Balanced Scorecard for Higher Education: Rethinking the College and University Excellence Indicators Framework". State University of New Jersey, White Paper
 - NIST (2013). Baldrige Performance Excellence Programme, http://www.nist.gov/baldrige.