



WAYS TO EVALUATE THE EXPERIENCE OF IMPLEMENTING KPA KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES

Ashurova Muborak Khairullaevna

Senior Lecturer at Bukhara state university Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Davlayorova Aziza

Student of Bukhara State University Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Abstract: *This article highlights information on methods for assessing the experience of implementing the main CPA indicators in foreign universities.*

Keywords: *Effective personnel management, KPI, strategic planning, academic Policies and Procedures, administrative leadership and personnel management, economic efficiency.*

Effective personnel management is currently becoming one of the main conditions for the achievement of stable and leading positions in the education market by educational institutions. The effectiveness of personnel management directly affects the competitive advantages of an educational institution. This is because the educational and economic efficiency of teaching activities is achieved only as a result of the interaction of labour resources with the material, financial, informational and other types of resources of the institution. In this regard, personnel is of paramount importance in the face of fierce competition in the modern economy.

The KPI of managers is developed with the aim of stimulating the achievement of indicators, increasing competitiveness among the country's universities and increasing their place in the line of top - advanced universities in the world. Studying the experience of implementing key performance indicators at the National Research Technological University "MISiS" , it was found that KPIs for Vice-Rectors in areas of activity are usually determined as follows, the incentive payment is calculated based on the results of the calendar year for the quality and high results of work, according to the achievement of target values of key performance indicators activities.

Thus, the Vice-Rector for Science and Innovation has the following KPIs for MISiS leaders:¹

The number of articles in Web of Science and Scopus with the exception of duplication per 1 faculty member 0,5 articles per 1 faculty member in 2021 - with a specific weight of 35%

The number of articles in Web of Science and Scopus with an impact factor above 1,3 with the exception of duplication per 1 faculty member 0,15 articles per 1 faculty member in 2021 with a share of 20%

¹ https://kpfu.ru/portal/docs/F1630376731/KPI.rukovoditelj_MISiS.pdf



Average citation rate per 1 faculty member, calculated on the totality of articles included in the Web of Science and Scopus databases (for the last 5 years), excluding their duplication 2,9 per 1 faculty member with a specific weight of 20%

The proportion of FRS with a foreign PhD and/or 2 years of work experience in leading international universities included in the top 500 in the QS or THE rankings, research centers and international high-tech organizations in the number of FRS is 1% of the number of FRS in 2021 with a share of 10%

The share of scientific and research workers aged 30-55 37% - as of December 31, 2021 with a specific weight of 5% Volume of R&D per year + 20% to the value of 2020 - as of December 31, 2021 with a specific weight of 10%

The payment is made at the end of the calendar year. In case of fulfillment of the set KPI by 100% - paid in full. If the target values are met by 70-99% - in proportion to the achievement of KPI, taking into account their specific weight. If the target values are met up to 69%, no payment is made for any of the KPIs. If the Employer makes a decision on non-fulfillment of key indicators, the incentive payment is not made, the additional agreement loses its legal force.

Unlike MISiS University, in the Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, KPIs are developed on the basis of job descriptions, regulations on the structural unit, in accordance with the levels of effective behavior of the competency framework and the Strategy of the Academy. So in the performance map of the Academy employee, we can see that the key performance indicators are divided into three parts by the director or in other words by the administrative and management staff:

1. Strategic planning (weight: 15 points)
2. Academic Policies and Procedures (weight: 60 points)
3. Administrative leadership and personnel management (Weight: 20)

Despite the fact that the implementation of the strategic plan of the Academy² as in all organizations, one of the main tasks of the directors is the bias and the main emphasis is on the conduct of the Academic policy and its procedures, i.e. as we have already understood, the KPI process approach is being implemented here. Thus, monitoring and improving existing educational programs allows you to get 20 points, while the implementation of the strategic plan of the Academy (Institute (NSGP)) (execution of all activities = 100%) allows you to get 15 points. The development of new educational programs is estimated at a low 5 points. The actualization of Syllabus disciplines, the introduction of interactive teaching and assessment methods, on the contrary, is estimated at 20 points. Moreover, the organization of internships and internships is rated higher than 10 points, than the fulfillment of the plan for admission to postgraduate education programs (number of enrolled students - planned number of students * 100) adds only 5 points to the directors' treasury.

² <http://law.apa.kz/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Polozhenie-ob-effektivnosti-deyatelnosti.doc>



The third part of the directors' KPIs includes the formation of a positive image of the Institute as a preferred employer 10 points, in other words, the Academy takes care of its image in order to hire a highly qualified teaching staff. Next comes satisfaction of students with the quality of programs and their administration, i.e. effective PR and relationship with trainers for ongoing program evaluation.

The National Center for Academic Accreditation and Evaluation (NCAAA) has identified 17 key performance indicators at the program level. All of which are lined with the evolving program accreditation standards.

Key Performance indicators: specific forms of evidence used by the institution or any other agency to provide evidence of quality performance. The basic performance indicators are one of the most important tools for assessing the quality of academic programs according to the criteria and rules of the National Center for Academic Assessment and Accreditation, and are among the most prominent practices that contribute to decision-making and follow-up processes and continuous development and improvement.

Furthermore, NCAAA ³affirms that “a report describing and analyzing the results of each indicator (including: performance changes and comparisons according to sites and gender) is expected with a precise and objective identification of strengths and aspects that need improvement”. Table no. 1 shows the KPIs divided according to the programmatic quality standards established by the Center with their symbols and description. While Table 2 shows the objectives, polarity, measurement time, rate of measurement, and the target value for these indicators.

Table -1 KPIs

standard	Code	Key Performance Indicators	Description
--1 Mission and Objectives	KPI-P-01	Percentage of achieved indicators of the program operational plan objectives	Percentage of performance indicators of the operational plan objectives of the program that achieved the targeted annual level to the total number of indicators targeted for these objectives in the same year
--3 Teaching and Learning	KPI-P-02	Students' Evaluation of quality of learning experience in the program	Average of overall rating of final year students for the quality of learning experience in the program on a five-point scale in an annual survey

³<https://www.kfupm.edu.sa/deanships/dad/Documents/AAC/NCAAA%20Documents/H3.%20Handbook%20Part%203.pdf>



Based on a study of existing approaches to the development and implementation of key performance indicators, it was revealed that at present there is no universal methodology for developing a KPI system. Various authors suggest using their own methods. Based on the considered methods for the formation of key performance indicators, an algorithm for constructing a KPI system was developed, the key difference of which is that it takes into account the main thing - the analysis of the enterprise's activities. Since any management begins precisely with an analysis of the current state of the institution, determining the desired state in the future, specifying what, how and when should be done to achieve the goals.

LIST OF REFERENCES:

1. Laws and regulations of the Republic of Uzbekistan
2. Decree of the president of the republic of uzbekistan on approval of the concept of development of the system of higher education of the republic of Uzbekistan until 2030th dated October 08, 2019 UP-5847
3. The Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. –T.: O'zbekiston, 1993
4. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev to the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan // National News Agency of Uzbekistan. / People's word. January 25, 2020
5. David Parmenter Key Performance Indicators – developing, implementing and using winning KPIs (4th Edition)
6. Alexey Konstantinovich Klochkov KPI and staff motivation. Full collection of practical tools
7. Safina DM Management KPI_ raining guide
8. Djurayev RX, Tolipov manuals. Dictionary of pedagogical terms. Tashkent-2008
9. Olmasov A., Vahobov A. Economic theory. text book. TDIU. - T .: Economics and Finance, 2014. 226 p
10. Abdurakhmonov QX Human development. text book. T .: Economics, 2013. - 542 pages