

# A Guideline of Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University: Case of QS World University Rankings

Napasri Suwanajote and Atcharapun Daiporn

Department of International Affairs, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand

Email: {napasri.su, atcharapun.da}@ssru.ac.th

**Abstract**—The research of A Guideline of Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings was aimed to search for a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU as the Student Development Division was assigned and to improve the efficiency and decrease the time of performance monitoring. The sample group of this study was 14 staff from 6 faculties, 7 colleges and 1 graduate school who are responsible for the performance report. The data was gathered by using the questionnaire and the statistics for data analysis were percentage (%), mean (X) and standard deviation (S.D.). The findings revealed that all staff who answered the questionnaire for improving a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings were 4 male (28.57%) and 10 female (71.43%) and most of them have been working for 1 – 5 years total 5 staff (35.72%) and 6 – 10 years total 5 staff (35.72%), the overall of understanding of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings was in the high level ( $X = 4.04$ ,  $S.D. = 0.5669$ ) and most of their understanding of the data gathering process of the host section was in the high level ( $X = 4.21$ ,  $S.D. = 0.4258$ ), and the overall of satisfaction with performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings was in the high level ( $X = 3.84$ ,  $S.D. = 0.5701$ ) and most of their satisfaction with data sending process of the host section was in the high level ( $X = 4.21$ ,  $S.D. = 0.4258$ ).

**Index Terms**—guideline, performance report, indicators

## I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the performance report by indicators [1] on the university level as the Student Development Division was assigned for the fiscal year 2018, it was in the high level. The Student Development Division by the quality administration section of the department of general administration which is responsible for monitoring [2] and reporting the maximum efficiency [3] or achieving the goal by the date as the university assigned for the fiscal year.

The Student Development Division by the quality administration section of the department of general

administration found the issue and obstacle from reporting the performance by indicators even if the assessment result achieved the goal of all indicators but the efficiency of assessment result was not 100% which it indicated that it was not qualitative to improve the operation. The causes were as follows:

- 1) There was many staff who are responsible for reporting each performance report such as the performance report, quality assurance and university rankings etc. and a lack of intercommunication on the information of performance report which affected to the inconsistency and incompleteness.
- 2) A lack of understanding on the description of indicators which affected to the unclearness and inconsistency.
- 3) A lack of understanding on reporting the performance by indicators which affected to the unclearness and incompleteness.
- 4) A lack of understanding on attaching the documents for reporting the performance by indicators which affected to the unclearness and incompleteness.
- 5) A lack of understanding on the process of gathering the performance report which affected to the lack of punctuality as scheduled.
- 6) A lack of understanding on the process of concluding the performance report which affected to the lack of punctuality as scheduled.

Consequently, it should be improved on a guideline of performance report during the year to achieve the goal of indicators [4]. Due to the issue and obstacle from the previous year, the Student Development Division would like to find out a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings by assessing the efficiency of performance for the fiscal year 2019 for being a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU) efficiently and perfectly.

## II. OBJECTIVE

1. To find out a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of Suan Sunandha

Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings as the Student Development Division was assigned.

- To enhance the efficiency and decrease time of performance monitoring.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### A. Population and Sample Group

The population for the research of A Guideline of Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings was staff of SSRU.

The sample group for the research of A Guideline of Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings was 14 staff from 6 faculties, 7 colleges and 1 graduate school.

#### B. Research Methodology

The research of A Guideline of Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings was the qualitative research, the data was gathering by the questionnaire which divided into 2 parts; Part 1 – General information consisted of gender, year of work experience and section and Part 2 – Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings consisted of 5 topics for the level of understanding on the performance report and 5 topics for the level of satisfaction with the performance report by using 5 rating scales as the criteria of Likert Scale as follows;

- 5 represented to the highest level
- 4 represented to the high level
- 3 represented to the moderate level
- 2 represented to the low level
- 1 represented to the lowest level

#### Results

The number and percentage of general information - Gender revealed that all staff who answered the questionnaire for improving a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings were 4 male (28.57%) and 10 female (71.43%) as shown in Table I as follows:

TABLE I. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GENERAL INFORMATION – GENDER

No.	Gender	Amount	Percentage
1	Male	4	28.57
2	Female	10	71.43
	Total	14	100.00

The number and percentage of general information – Year of work experience revealed that all staff who answered the questionnaire for improving a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings have been working for 1 – 5 years total 5 staff (35.72%), 6 – 10 years total 5 staff (35.72%), 11 – 15 years total 2 staff (14.28%), 16 – 20 years total 1 staff (7.14%) and 21 – 25

years total 1 staff (7.14%) consecutively as shown in Table II as follows:

TABLE II. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GENERAL INFORMATION – YEAR OF WORK EXPERIENCE

No.	Year of work experience	Amount	Percentage
1	1 – 5 years	5	35.72
2	6 – 10 years	5	35.72
3	11 – 15 years	2	14.28
4	16 – 20 years	1	7.14
5	25 – 21 years	1	7.14
	Total	14	100.00

The performance report by indicators on the requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings – Understanding on the performance report revealed that it was in the high level ( $X = 4.04$ ,  $S.D. = 0.5669$ ), when it was considered in each topic, it revealed that the understanding on the description of indicators as the section was assigned was in the high level ( $X = 4.00$ ,  $S.D. = 0.6794$ ), the understanding on the performance report as the section was assigned was in the high level ( $X = 4.07$ ,  $S.D. = 0.6157$ ), the understanding on attaching the documents for the performance report as the section was assigned was in the high level ( $X = 3.79$ ,  $S.D. = 0.5789$ ), the understanding on the process of data gathering was in the high level ( $X = 4.21$ ,  $S.D. = 0.4258$ ), and the understanding on the process of data conclusion was in the high level ( $X = 4.14$ ,  $S.D. = 0.5345$ ) as shown in Table III as follows:

TABLE III. PERFORMANCE REPORT BY INDICATORS ON THE REQUIREMENT OF SUAN SUNANDHA RAJABHAT UNIVERSITY (SSRU): CASE OF QS WORLD UNIVERSITY RANKINGS – UNDERSTANDING ON THE PERFORMANCE REPORT

No.	Understanding on the performance report	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1	The understanding on the description of indicators as the section was assigned	4.00	0.6794	High level
2	The understanding on the performance report as the section was assigned	4.07	0.6157	High level
3	The understanding on attaching the documents for the performance report as the section was assigned	3.79	0.5789	High level
4	The understanding on the process of data gathering	4.21	0.4258	High level
5	The understanding on the process of data conclusion	4.14	0.5345	High level
	Total	4.04	0.5669	High level

The performance report by indicators on the requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings – Satisfaction with the performance report revealed that it was in the high level ( $X = 3.84$ ,  $S.D. = 0.5701$ ), when it was considered in each topic, it revealed that the satisfaction with the process of monitoring the performance report was in the high level ( $X = 4.14$ ,  $S.D. = 0.1069$ ), the satisfaction with the process of reporting the performance report was in the high level ( $X = 4.21$ ,  $S.D. = 0.4258$ ), the satisfaction with handling questions on the

performance report was in the high level ( $X= 3.50$ ,  $S.D.= 0.6504$ ), the satisfaction with preparing the meeting of the performance report was in the high level ( $X= 3.64$ ,  $S.D.= 0.8419$ ) and the satisfaction with the services / facilitation was in the high level ( $X= 3.71$ ,  $S.D.= 0.8254$ ) as shown in Table IV as follows:

TABLE IV. PERFORMANCE REPORT BY INDICATORS ON THE REQUIREMENT OF SUAN SUNANDHA RAJABHAT UNIVERSITY (SSRU): CASE OF QS WORLD UNIVERSITY RANKINGS – SATISFACTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE REPORT

No.	Satisfaction with the performance report	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1	The satisfaction with the process of monitoring the performance report	4.14	0.1069	High level
2	The satisfaction with the process of reporting the performance report	4.21	0.4258	High level
3	The satisfaction with handling questions on the performance report	3.50	0.6504	High level
4	The satisfaction with preparing the meeting of the performance report	3.64	0.8419	High level
5	The satisfaction with the services / facilitation	3.71	0.8254	High level
	Total	3.84	0.5701	High level

#### IV. CONCLUSION

From the research of A Guideline of Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings revealed that all staff who answered the questionnaire for improving a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings were 4 male (28.57%) and 10 female (71.43%) and most of them have been working for 1 – 5 years total 5 staff (35.72%) and 6 – 10 years total 5 staff (35.72%), the overall of understanding of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings was in the high level ( $X= 4.04$ ,  $S.D.= 0.5669$ ) and most of their understanding of the data gathering process of the host section was in the high level ( $X= 4.21$ ,  $S.D.= 0.4258$ ), and the overall of satisfaction with performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings was in the high level ( $X= 3.84$ ,  $S.D.= 0.5701$ ) and most of their satisfaction with data sending process of the host section was in the high level ( $X= 4.21$ ,  $S.D.= 0.4258$ ).

#### V. DISCUSSION

The findings of A Guideline of Performance Report by Indicators on the Requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings revealed that all staff who answered the questionnaire for improving a guideline of performance report by indicators on the requirement of SSRU: case of QS world university rankings were as follows:

The total of the performance report by indicators on the requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University

(SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings – Understanding on the performance report was in the high level ( $X= 4.04$ ,  $S.D.= 0.5669$ ) and most of them had the understanding on the process of data conclusion in the high level ( $X= 4.21$ ,  $S.D.= 0.4258$ ) which was consistent with Thongchai Santiwong [5], Principles of Management on the concept and principle of controlling and monitoring the performance.

In addition, the total of the performance report by indicators on the requirement of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU): Case of QS World University Rankings – Satisfaction with the performance report was in the high level ( $X= 3.84$ ,  $S.D.= 0.5701$ ) and most of them had the satisfaction with the process of reporting the performance report in the high level ( $X= 4.21$ ,  $S.D.= 0.4258$ ) which was consistent with Supawadee Saeau and Sirirat Deesorn [6], Development of Multimedia for Self-Learning on Computer System for Grade 7 Students of Sansuk School, Chonburi Province on the satisfaction assessment, Kamonrat Intaratas and Porntip Yenjabok [7] Principles and Theory of Communication on the efficiency of communication, Wanisa Kaewsuk [8], A Study of Social Online Communication and Donation: Case of Dog Foundation 2014 on the types of online social network and Atinan Tantrakul [9], Information Technology and Communication Need in the Organization: A Case Study of ASDECON Corporation CO., Ltd.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Atcharapun conducted the research; gathered and analyzed the data, wrote and translated the paper; and Napsari approved the final version.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University for invaluable help throughout this research.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] U. Laohawichian, *Public Administration: Subject Characteristics and Dimensions*, Bangkok. Sematham Printing, 2001.
- [2] A. N. Ranong. *Lecture on RO701: Operation Management. National Institute of Development Administration*. [Online]. Available: [http://www.geocities.com/dol\\_nida/Strategic\\_07\\_1.htm](http://www.geocities.com/dol_nida/Strategic_07_1.htm)
- [3] C. Chaloeemeeprasert, *Readiness of Public Sector on Strategic Performance Based Budgeting: SPBB and Case of Department of Disease Control*, Ministry of Public Health, Bangkok. Chulalongkorn University Press. 2003, pp. 1/39 – 1/40.
- [4] S. Tiyoa, *Principles of Administration*, Bangkok: Thammasat Printing, 2000, pp. 293 – 315.
- [5] T. Santiwong. *Principles of Management*, Bangkok: Thai Wattapanich Publishing, 1988, pp. 145 – 160.
- [6] S. Saeau and S. Deesorn, "Development of multimedia for self-learning on computer system for grade 7 students of sansuk school, chonburi province," Educational Technology Program, Faculty of Education, Burapha University, 2006.

- [7] K. Intaratas and P. Yenjabok. *Principles and Theory of Communication*. [Online]. Available: <https://pirun.ku.ac.th/~agrpct/envelop/com%20theory.doc>
- [8] W. Kaewsuk, "A study of social online communication and donation: case of dog foundation 2014," Strategic Communication Program, Master of Communication Arts. Bangkok University, 2014.
- [9] A. Tantrakul, "Information technology and communication need in the organization: A case study of ASDECON corporation CO., Ltd.," Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, 2012.

Copyright © 2020 by the authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License ([CC BY-NC-ND 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided that the article is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.



**Atcharapun Daiporn** was born in Nakorn Ratchasima province, Thailand on May 11, 1986, and graduated the Master of Business Administration in Marketing from Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand. She is an international affairs staff at the Department of International Affairs, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University.



**Napasri Suwanajote** was born in Bangkok city, Thailand on January 13, 1980, and graduated the Master of Education in English from Hanyang University, the Republic of Korea.

She is the Assistant to the President for International Affairs at the Department of International Affairs, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University.