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Context

- **SEEU opened in October 2001**
- **SEEU’s Status: “Private-Public not-for-profit”**
- **Major Donors (~ 35 mil €):**
  - United States/Agencies
  - EU/European Commission
  - European States/Agencies
  - Republic of Macedonia.
- **More than 12000 graduates**
- **Actually studying ~ 3500 students in three cycles of studies**
- **Five faculties; 16 BA; 23 MA/MSC & 11 PHD Programmes**
- **Budget income structure:**
  - 85% students fees
  - 10% State Budget
  - 5% Entrepreneurial Activities and Research
Numbers and data drive decisions in sports, business, and other fields. Yet in academia, publication lists are still the primary basis for hiring, promotion, and funding decisions. Some administrators and researchers are adopting new methods for assessing academic achievement, however. Large universities may subscribe to comprehensive, costly vendor-based performance panels. Other institutions and individuals design their own algorithms and dashboards.
Why apply the Balanced Scorecard to Akademia?

- Unlike “good old times”, universities today face growing expectations and must provide increased accountability for the outcomes they produce.
- Central administration: academic scorecard makes easier for University to accomplish strategic goals though assigning metrics to every academic unit. Is very important for decentralized (to the deans level without provost involvement into budget decisions) institution to see that unit is increasing or declining.
- It offers a format within which to establish common measures across academic units, that have shared characteristics (e.g.: cluster of schools within University of Southern California)
- Simplicity of system enables to explain budget decisions by showing relationship to academic scorecard indicator.
MEASURING PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Beware of the new brooms that sweep away meaningful data – and people
Objectives

• Address the EU Policy framework for efficiency and effectiveness
• Maintain the national leading role in establishing trends and innovative QA processes
• Use institutional data to set standard performance and
• Motivate the best performing individuals
Measuring academic performance

- Student evaluation
- Teaching observation
- Student achievement
- Digital profile
- Research output
**Instrument 1**: Student evaluation

**Student Evaluation TE**

- **Faculty TE**
- **SEEU TE**
- **Professor 1**
- **Professor 2**

The graph shows the evaluation of different components of a course by students. The x-axis represents different stages of the course: Course, Interaction, T&L, Assessment, and Student Self-evaluation. The y-axis represents the evaluation scores ranging from 2.00 to 4.00. The lines indicate the performance of different evaluators and teachers over these stages.
Instrument 1: Student evaluation

Peer standard – above X (out of 4) in the two categories

• The course
• The teacher

Dilemmas:
- New on-line every semester/every course student evaluation
- New set of simplified understandable questions
- Relevance of the sample
**Instrument 2**: Teaching observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEU</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instrument 2: Teaching observation**

Acceptable (peer) standard?! Overall above X out of 5 in all categories

- Learning & Teaching
- Class Management
- Resources Used
- Student Knowledge Progress assured

*Dilemmas:*
- The relevance/’biased’ of Observers/Observation
- Every Year Observation (announced) + Peer Assessment
- Checkboxes or written reports?
**Instrument 3:** Student achievement

How it is measured?
The average value of three components:

1. Pass/Fail rate
2. Number of students serviced by certain professor for a course
3. Average grade of students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>SEEU Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEEU</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor1</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor2</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUT IF WE DIDN’T MEASURE THINGS WE WOULDN’T KNOW HOW GOOD WE WERE AT MEASURING THE THINGS THAT WE’RE MEASURING!
**Instrument 4: Research activities**

![Graph showing research activities for Professor 1, Professor 2, All, and Productive.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Professor 1</th>
<th>Professor 2</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Productive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference proceedings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrument 4: Research activities

Standard including Dilemmas:
- One minimal-overall University or Faculty standard expressed with points (5; 7; 10?)
- Shall we set ‘motivation’ standards, for best researchers? (ex. 1 or 2 Web of Science Publication; International Monography, or...)

NEW: List of conferences and journals and relevant points – SEEU Standard; New Academic Promotion Rule (ex. Full Prof. – min one WoS)
**Instrument 5: Digital profile (Google Classroom)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEEU</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>14,2</td>
<td>4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing the comparison of resources and assignments between SEEU, FACULTY, P1, and P2.]
Instrument 5: Digital profile

**Standard:**
- Not acceptable university standard: Level 1
- University standard: Level 2
  - Individual targets and time-frame
  - Monitoring progress

*NEW (incl. dilemma):* How many measurement components (Level of resources; Assignments; Interaction...)?

*University standard for motivation: Level 3*
### Overall Performance data-driven Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEEU</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Achievement**: Measures the extent to which the goals are achieved.
- **GC**: General Competence.
- **Observation**: Observational feedback.
- **Evaluation**: Quality of evaluations and assessments.
- **Research**: Research productivity.
- **Grade**: Overall performance grade.
Final Project

Dear students,

It is approaching the 'presentation' day of the final project - announced date is June 9th, Friday, at 17 o'clock. On Thursday 24:00 is the deadline for the submission of the documentation and the presentations of the Final Project should be in ppt and to be done within 10-15 min.

Good luck

I'm sending you the aspects of the Final Project that will be evaluated - stated in the
"And this is the only performance indicator that's moving up. Unfortunately, it's my blood pressure."
Question for discussion

• Should standards be defined for academic performance/output?
• What is an acceptable standard for the academic performance and how to define it?
• What if individuals are over or below the standard – reward / what ‘improvement path’ or ‘punishment’?
• How to integrate other performance processes (administration, quality of student life etc.) for the overall performance of a HE institution?