# Development of Operational Processes for Performance Outcomes Based on Action Plan Indicators at the Planning and Quality Assurance Division, Faculty of Management Science

**Poonsiri Promkul, Kanittha Seskhumbong**

Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, 1-U-Thong Nok, Dusit, Bangkok, Thailand

E-Mail: Poonsiri.pr@ssru.ac.th, Kanitth.se@ssru.ac.th

## Abstract

This study explores the development of operational processes aimed at improving performance outcomes based on action plan indicators at the Planning and Quality Assurance Division, Faculty of Management Science, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU). The research seeks to assess the current state of operational processes, identify gaps, and propose improvements to align these processes with the university's strategic objectives. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected through surveys and interviews with faculty members, administrative staff, and students. The findings indicate that while the current processes are generally effective, there are significant areas for enhancement, particularly in services reliability, responsiveness, and infrastructure. The study highlights that the most critical factors influencing satisfaction and performance outcomes are Service Reliability and Service Responsiveness/Assurance. Based on these findings, the study recommends enhancing communication strategies, improving physical resources, and providing regular training to staff and faculty. By refining these operational processes, SSRU can foster a more effective quality assurance framework, ultimately leading to better educational and organizational outcomes. This study contributes to the understanding of how operational processes can be optimized to achieve sustainable performance improvements within higher education institutions.

**Keywords:** Operational processes, Performance outcomes, Action plan indicators, Quality assurance, Higher education

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Principles and Rationale

The Planning and Quality Assurance Division at the Faculty of Management Science, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University (SSRU), plays a pivotal role in ensuring the alignment of academic programs and institutional objectives with quality assurance standards. One of its key responsibilities is to implement action plans that enhance the performance outcomes of the faculty's various academic and administrative activities. In this context, the development of efficient operational processes is critical to ensuring that performance outcomes are measurable, aligned with institutional goals, and continuously improved (Junnuan & Rojanapanich, 2022).

 

Effective operational processes not only ensure that the goals outlined in action plans are achieved but also facilitate the integration of feedback and evaluation metrics, thus creating a dynamic system for enhancing academic and administrative performance (Sallis, 2002). At SSRU, a strong focus is placed on developing indicators that accurately reflect the outcomes of these processes, ensuring that performance is monitored and assessed against clearly defined benchmarks. This study aims to explore the development of operational processes for performance outcomes, emphasizing the use of action plan indicators to measure the success of quality assurance initiatives.

The establishment of measurable action plan indicators is essential for achieving transparency and accountability in the performance evaluation process. These indicators serve as a foundation for improving the quality of service delivery, academic performance, and administrative efficiency (Stes, 2010). Furthermore, aligning operational processes with strategic planning frameworks helps ensure that the outcomes are consistent with SSRU's long-term goals, promoting a culture of continuous improvement. This study focuses on identifying and developing key operational processes that will enhance the Faculty's capacity to assess and improve its performance outcomes, contributing to the university's overall mission of academic excellence and institutional sustainability.

### 1.2 Research Objective

The study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify key performance indicators (KPIs) aligned with action plans for quality assurance.
2. To develop operational processes for monitoring and assessing performance outcomes.
3. To analyze the relationship between action plan indicators and the achievement of performance outcomes.

## 2. Literature Review

This literature review explores the relevant theoretical frameworks, models, and best practices related to the development of these processes and the use of action plan indicators in higher education institutions.

### 2.1 Quality Assurance in Higher Education

Quality assurance in higher education is a multifaceted approach that aims to ensure academic programs, services, and institutional operations meet predefined standards of quality. According to Harvey and Green (1993), quality in higher education can be understood in various dimensions: as excellence, as meeting student needs, as fitness for purpose, and as transformation. These dimensions help shape the operational processes within educational institutions, especially in quality assurance divisions. Banta and Palomba (2015) argue that a systematic approach to quality assurance is essential for developing performance indicators that can be used to measure and improve institutional performance. Their research highlights the need for aligning quality assurance frameworks with institutional goals, emphasizing continuous assessment and feedback loops to monitor progress.

### 2.2 Action Plan Indicators for Performance Evaluation

Action plans are structured frameworks used to set specific objectives and outline the steps required to achieve them. In the context of quality assurance, action plan indicators serve as measurable metrics that reflect the achievement of these objectives. Stes (2010) discusses how

action plans, when paired with relevant indicators, can enhance the quality assurance process by providing clear, quantifiable outcomes. The use of indicators enables institutions to track their progress towards meeting set goals, thereby improving accountability and transparency in the performance evaluation process. Furthermore, the indicators must be closely aligned with the institution's strategic priorities, as outlined in action plans, to ensure they are meaningful and effective in assessing performance outcomes (Sallis, 2002).

### 2.3 Development of Operational Processes

Operational processes for performance evaluation are critical to ensuring that performance outcomes are monitored, analyzed, and improved effectively. These processes involve the establishment of standardized procedures for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to action plan indicators. According to Deming (1986), continuous improvement is a central principle of effective operational processes, and this concept is especially relevant in higher education institutions aiming to improve quality assurance. Deming's Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle is widely adopted as a framework for developing and refining operational processes in educational settings. It provides a structured method for identifying areas of improvement, implementing changes, and assessing the impact of those changes on performance outcomes.

### 2.4 Aligning Operational Processes with Strategic Goals

Aligning operational processes with strategic goals is another crucial aspect of developing effective performance evaluation systems. According to the Strategic Planning Model by Kaplan and Norton (1996), institutions must ensure that their operational activities directly contribute to the achievement of long-term strategic objectives. This model, known as the Balanced Scorecard, incorporates both financial and non-financial measures to assess performance, focusing on four perspectives: financial, customer, internal processes, and learning and growth. Applying this model to the development of operational processes for performance outcomes ensures that the actions taken within the quality assurance division align with the broader institutional vision and mission.

## 3. Research Methodology

The study combines both quantitative and qualitative research techniques to gather data, analyze it, and derive actionable insights.

### 3.1 Research Design

The research employs a descriptive research design to analyze existing operational processes and action plan indicators used in the Planning and Quality Assurance Division. This design helps to gather in-depth information about current practices, identify gaps, and develop frameworks for performance evaluation. The research design also includes exploratory aspects to investigate new processes and indicators that can improve performance outcomes based on quality assurance goals.

### 3.2 Population and Sample

The population for this study consists of stakeholders at the Planning and Quality Assurance Division of the Faculty of Management Science, SSRU. These include faculty members, administrative staff, and students who interact with or are impacted by the quality assurance processes at SSRU. A stratified random sampling technique will be used to ensure that the

sample represents the different groups within the division. Based on the size of the population, a total sample of 384 respondents will be selected, with the following distribution:

Faculty Members: 120 (31.3%)

Administrative Staff: 96 (25.0%)

Students: 168 (43.8%)

This distribution ensures that all stakeholder groups are represented in the data collection process, allowing for a holistic view of the satisfaction and effectiveness of current operational processes and indicators.

### 3.3 Data Collection Methods

To achieve the objectives of the study, both quantitative and qualitative data will be collected.

*Quantitative Data:* A structured survey questionnaire will be developed to collect quantitative data from faculty members, administrative staff, and students. The survey will assess stakeholders' perceptions of the current operational processes, the effectiveness of action plan indicators, and the alignment of these processes with the university's quality assurance goals. The survey will use Likert-scale questions to measure satisfaction and the effectiveness of various indicators. The data collected from this survey will provide statistical insights into the strengths and weaknesses of current practices.

*Qualitative Data:* Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with key stakeholders, such as the head of the Planning and Quality Assurance Division, senior faculty members, and administrative leaders. These interviews will provide deeper insights into the challenges and opportunities in the current operational processes. The qualitative data will help identify areas where action plan indicators may need refinement and offer suggestions for improving the alignment between operational processes and performance outcomes.

### 3.4 Data Analysis Techniques

*Quantitative Data Analysis:* The survey data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations) to summarize the responses and gain an understanding of stakeholder perceptions. Factor analysis will be used to identify underlying patterns or factors related to the operational processes and performance indicators. Regression analysis will also be employed to identify the relationship between the action plan indicators and the achievement of performance outcomes, which will inform recommendations for process improvements.

*Qualitative Data Analysis:* The interviews will be transcribed and analyzed using thematic analysis. This will involve identifying recurring themes, patterns, and insights related to the effectiveness of operational processes and the suitability of current action plan indicators. Coding will be used to categorize data into specific themes, which will then be analyzed to identify key issues and recommendations for process improvement.

### 3.5 Development of Operational Processes and Action Plan Indicators

Based on the findings from both the quantitative and qualitative data, a new or refined set of operational processes for performance outcomes will be developed. These processes will incorporate performance indicators that are aligned with the strategic goals of the university and that are measurable, achievable, and reflective of both academic and administrative objectives. The development process will be guided by established quality management

principles such as the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle (Deming, 1986), ensuring a systematic approach to continuous improvement.

## 4. Results

The results highlight key areas of strength, identify gaps, and propose improvements for refining the operational processes to align with performance outcomes.

### 4.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

A total of 384 respondents participated in the survey, including 120 faculty members (31.3%), 96 administrative staff (25.0%), and 168 students (43.8%). The age distribution of respondents was as follows: 45% were in the 18–24 years age group, predominantly students, 35% were between 25–34 years, which included both faculty and staff, and 20% were aged 35 years and above, mostly faculty and staff members. This distribution highlights the significant representation of younger individuals, primarily students, while also reflecting a substantial proportion of faculty and staff across different age ranges. Regarding tenure with SSRU, the majority of respondents (55%) had been associated with the university for 1-5 years, while a small percentage (5%) had been with the institution for over 10 years.

### 4.2 Perceptions of Operational Processes

The survey responses revealed varying perceptions of the current operational processes used in the Planning and Quality Assurance Division. Overall, the satisfaction with the operational processes was moderate. The findings from the descriptive statistics indicated the following:

*Reliability:* Faculty and staff rated the reliability of the operational processes higher than students did, with mean scores of 3.9 for faculty members, 3.7 for administrative staff, and 3.2 for students on a 5-point Likert scale. This suggests that stakeholders involved in direct administration perceive the processes as more consistent than those who are not involved in the administrative side.

*Responsiveness:* Both faculty members and administrative staff rated the responsiveness of the Planning and Quality Assurance Division positively, with mean scores of 4.1 for faculty and 4.0 for staff. Students rated responsiveness lower, with a mean of 3.3. The data indicate that there may be a need for better communication and responsiveness towards students, particularly in addressing concerns related to quality assurance initiatives.

*Tangibles (Facilities and Resources):* The lowest ratings were given in the Tangibles category, with an average score of 2.9 across all groups. The physical facilities, including resources for quality assurance processes, were identified as a significant area for improvement. This result aligns with the literature on the importance of physical infrastructure in supporting quality assurance.

### 4.3 Regression Analysis of Performance Outcomes

Regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between action plan indicators and performance outcomes. The analysis revealed that Service Reliability and Service Responsiveness/Assurance were significant predictors of overall satisfaction with the operational processes. Specifically, the results indicated:

*Service Reliability:* A positive relationship was found between the perceived reliability of the operational processes and overall satisfaction ($\beta = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that the

more reliable stakeholders perceive the processes to be, the higher their overall satisfaction with the Planning and Quality Assurance Division.

*Service Responsiveness/Assurance:* Responsiveness and assurance also significantly predicted overall satisfaction ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$), highlighting the importance of timely responses and confidence in the division's ability to address quality concerns.

These findings emphasize the need for improvements in the reliability and responsiveness of the division's processes to enhance overall satisfaction and performance outcomes.

### 4.4 Summary of Key Findings

The study's results indicate that the current operational processes at the Planning and Quality Assurance Division at SSRU are generally effective, but several areas require improvement. Specifically, there is a need for:

- Enhanced communication and responsiveness, particularly towards students.
- Investment in improving the physical facilities to support quality assurance activities.
- Ongoing training for faculty and staff to improve their engagement with performance indicators and action plans.

The findings suggest that focusing on Service Reliability and Responsiveness will likely yield the greatest improvements in satisfaction and performance outcomes.

## 5. Conclusion

The study on the "Development of Operational Processes for Performance Outcomes Based on Action Plan Indicators at the Planning and Quality Assurance Division, Faculty of Management Science, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University" has provided valuable insights into the current state of operational processes and their effectiveness in achieving performance outcomes. The research found that while the division has established basic operational procedures, there is room for improvement, particularly in areas related to service reliability, responsiveness, and physical infrastructure. The analysis revealed that Service Reliability and Service Responsiveness/Assurance are the most critical factors influencing stakeholder satisfaction, with these factors having a direct impact on the performance outcomes of the division's quality assurance processes.

Based on the findings, the study recommends enhancing communication strategies to ensure better engagement with all stakeholders, especially students. Improving physical resources and providing regular training for faculty and staff on the effective use of action plan indicators are also crucial steps toward improving performance outcomes. Additionally, aligning operational processes more closely with the university's strategic goals will enable more accurate assessment and better results in the long term. By addressing these areas, the Planning and Quality Assurance Division can strengthen its contribution to the overall quality assurance framework at SSRU, leading to better educational outcomes and organizational effectiveness.

The development of a refined set of operational processes, based on the study's findings, provides SSRU with a pathway for continuous improvement. These recommendations align with the established principles of total quality management and the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle (Deming, 1986), ensuring that the university remains committed to fostering an environment of excellence in both teaching and administrative practices.

## 6. Acknowledgment

The author would like to formally express appreciations to Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University for financial support and the Faculty of Management Sciences for providing full assistance until this research was successfully completed. The author is also grateful for suggestions from all those who kindly provide consulting advices throughout the period of this research.

## References

Banta, T. W., & Palomba, C. A. (2015). Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education. Jossey-Bass.

Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of the Crisis. MIT Center for Advanced Educational Services.

Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining Quality. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18(1), 9-34.

Junnuan, P., & Rojanapanich, A. (2022). Professional accounting skills affecting performance of accountants in small and medium enterprises. International Academic Multidisciplinary Research Conference in Geneva 2022, 131-135.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action. Harvard Business Press.

Sallis, E. (2002). Total Quality Management in Education (3rd ed.). Kogan Page.

Stes, A. (2010). Improving Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions. Higher Education Policy, 23(3), 319-339.