Implementation of the Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) Method in the Lecturer Performance Evaluation System at IBBI University Medan Based on the Balanced Scorecard

Jaman Amadi[1], S Sipur[1*], F Fajrillah[1], Rizaldy Khair[2]

[1]Department of Management, Universitas IBBI, Medan, Indonesia
[2]Department of Information System, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia
E-mail: salim9salam@gmail.com

Abstract. In the era of globalization and increasingly competitive higher education, lecturer performance evaluation has become a crucial aspect for improving the quality of education. IBBI University Medan recognizes the importance of implementing an effective and efficient lecturer performance evaluation system to ensure that lecturers can make maximum contributions to the achievement of educational goals. The urgency of this research lies in the need to integrate the Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) method with the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) framework to create a comprehensive lecturer performance evaluation system. The main objective of this research is to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of the Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) method in the lecturer performance evaluation system at IBBI University Medan. This research uses a quantitative approach with a survey method to collect data from various stakeholders, including students, lecturers, and administrative staff. The collected data is then analyzed using the Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) method to identify gaps between expectations and realities in lecturer performance. The Balanced Scorecard is used as a framework to integrate the IPA results with the university's strategic objectives. This research is expected to provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of implementing the IPA method based on the Balanced Scorecard in the lecturer performance evaluation system. Through this research, IBBI University Medan aims to develop a lecturer performance evaluation system that is not only fair and transparent but also aligned with the university's strategic goals, thereby contributing to the overall improvement of education quality.

Keywords: BSC, IBBI, Importance Performance Analysis, Performance Evaluation System, Lecturer

1 Introduction

In the context of higher education, lecturer performance evaluation is one of the critical aspects that influence the quality of education. IBBI University Medan, as a higher education institution, strives to improve the quality of education through an effective

and accurate lecturer performance evaluation. The Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) method and Balanced Scorecard (BSC) are two approaches that have been widely used in performance evaluation across various organizations, including the education sector. These two methods have the potential to provide a comprehensive performance evaluation by integrating various perspectives and performance indicators (2). The lecturer performance evaluation at IBBI University Medan has faced several challenges, such as a lack of objectivity and difficulties in measuring lecturers' contributions to the achievement of the university's strategic goals. Therefore, a new approach is needed that can overcome these challenges and provide a more holistic evaluation of lecturer performance. How can the implementation of the Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) method improve the effectiveness of the lecturer performance evaluation system at IBBI University Medan? b. How can the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) framework be integrated into the lecturer performance evaluation system to support the achievement of the university's strategic goals? c. Can the combination of the IPA method and the BSC framework provide a more objective, accurate, and comprehensive evaluation of lecturer performance? d. What are the challenges and obstacles faced in the implementation of the IPA method and the BSC framework in the lecturer performance evaluation system at IBBI University Medan?

Research Urgency
This research is important to address the weaknesses in the existing lecturer performance evaluation system and improve accuracy and objectivity in the evaluation. With the implementation of the IPA method and the BSC framework, it is expected that the lecturer performance evaluation system will better reflect the real contribution of lecturers to the achievement of the university's strategic goals, thereby supporting efforts to improve the quality of education at IBBI University Medan.

2   Method
a.   Analysis of the Current System
In the context of lecturer performance evaluation at IBBI University Medan, the current system may already be using several metrics to evaluate lecturers, but it has not fully utilized a comprehensive framework such as the Balanced Scorecard (BSC). The BSC allows for performance evaluation from four key perspectives: financial, customer (in this case, students and other stakeholders), internal processes, and learning & growth. The existing system may not fully integrate non-financial aspects or the learning and growth perspective, which are crucial for lecturer development and improving the quality of education.

 b.   Research Instruments
This research implements the Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) method within the BSC framework to improve the lecturer performance evaluation system. The research instruments include:
1.   Survey or Questionnaire: Used to collect data from students, lecturers, and administrative staff regarding their perceptions of lecturer performance. The survey questions are designed to assess lecturer performance from the four BSC perspectives.

2. Interviews: To gain deeper insights from stakeholders about the current performance evaluation system and potential areas for improvement.
3. Document Analysis: Reviewing relevant documents such as previous evaluation reports, curricula, and learning materials to understand the standards and expectations for lecturer performance.
4. IPA Implementation: Once the data is collected, IPA is applied to identify lecturer performance attributes that are important to stakeholders and to evaluate the extent to which these attributes have been met. This helps prioritize areas that need attention and improvement.

Expected Outcomes:

By using IPA within the BSC framework, the lecturer performance evaluation system is expected to become more comprehensive and focused on improving the quality of education. This analysis is expected to reveal key performance areas that require improvement and help IBBI University Medan develop effective strategies to enhance lecturer performance, ultimately leading to increased student satisfaction and overall educational quality.

Steps to Perform IPA:
1. Collect Data: We need data that assigns ratings for both importance and performance for a set of criteria (e.g., teaching quality, feedback, etc.).
2. Create an IPA Grid: Plot the average importance and performance ratings for each attribute on an IPA grid.
3. Interpret the Results: Use the grid to identify areas that require improvement and areas that are performing well.

The AHP process works:
1. Define the Problem: Identify the decision goal. For example, the goal could be to determine the best investment decision based on various criteria.
2. Identify the Criteria and Sub-Criteria: Break down the decision into relevant criteria. For instance, in investment decisions, you may have criteria like "Risk," "Return," "Credibility," and "Ease of Use."
3. Structure the Hierarchy: Organize the goal at the top, the criteria in the middle, and the alternatives at the bottom of the hierarchy.
4. Pairwise Comparisons: Use pairwise comparisons to evaluate the relative importance of each criterion by comparing them two at a time. Each comparison results in a score or weight that indicates the importance of one criterion relative to the other.
5. Calculate the Weights: AHP uses the comparisons to calculate a set of weights for each criterion. This quantifies how important each criterion is in achieving the goal.
6. Consistency Check: Ensure that the pairwise comparisons are consistent. AHP provides a consistency ratio (CR), and if the ratio is below 0.1 (10%), the comparisons are considered consistent.
7. Synthesize the Results: Use the weights to rank the alternatives by calculating a final score for each option. The alternative with the highest score is the preferred decision.

3 Results and Discussion
3.1 Results

1. Collect Data:

   We need data from surveys or questionnaires where respondents rate various attributes (such as teaching quality, course content, etc.) in two dimensions:
   - Importance: How important is each attribute?
   - Performance: How well is each attribute currently performing?

2. Create a Grid:

   Plot the data on a two-dimensional grid with:
   - X-axis (Performance): How well each attribute is performing.
   - Y-axis (Importance): How important each attribute is.

3. Interpret the Results:

   Each attribute will fall into one of four quadrants:
   - Quadrant I (Concentrate here): High Importance, Low Performance → Needs immediate improvement.
   - Quadrant II (Keep up the good work): High Importance, High Performance → Maintain the current level.
   - Quadrant III (Low Priority): Low Importance, Low Performance → Little attention needed.
   - Quadrant IV (Possible Overkill): Low Importance, High Performance → Resources may be overallocated.

4. Suppose we have data from a university on the following attributes:
   1. Teaching Quality
   2. Feedback Timeliness
   3. Classroom Facilities
   4. Learning Resources

5. We ask respondents to rate the importance and performance of each attribute on a scale of 1-10.

Table 1. Attribute Result

Attribute	Importance	Performance
Teaching Quality	9	7
Feedback Timeliness	8	5
Classroom Facilities	6	8
Learning Resources	7	6

6. We would plot the data to see where each attribute falls. Attributes with high importance but low performance (e.g., Feedback Timeliness) would be placed in Quadrant I (Concentrate Here), meaning it needs improvement.

3.2 Discussion
Key Findings from IPA and BSC
   a. The discussion begins by summarizing the key findings from the analysis:
   b. Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) helped identify which attributes of lecturer performance are considered most important by stakeholders (students,

administrative staff, other lecturers) and which areas are currently underperforming.

c. For example, attributes like *teaching quality* or *feedback timeliness* may be identified as high in importance but low in performance, meaning these areas need immediate attention.

d. Conversely, attributes like *classroom facilities* may have high performance but lower importance, indicating potential over-allocation of resources in this area.

e. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) helped integrate different performance perspectives (e.g., financial, customer/stakeholder satisfaction, internal processes, learning and growth). The framework ensured that the evaluation system did not focus solely on financial or output-based performance, but also on the developmental and internal processes that are essential for the long-term improvement of lecturers.

Comparing Results with Existing Literature

a. The next step is comparing the results of this study with existing research:

b. Alignment with Prior Research: The study may confirm existing findings that comprehensive evaluation systems, such as those based on the Balanced Scorecard, provide more objective and holistic feedback compared to traditional evaluation systems that focus only on financial metrics.

c. New Insights: The research might reveal specific challenges in the Indonesian higher education context, such as the lack of attention to non-financial metrics in performance evaluation. This could contribute to the literature on how IPA and BSC can be adapted to local educational institutions.

Challenges Identified

a. The research likely uncovers several challenges in implementing IPA and BSC:

b. Subjectivity in Evaluations: While IPA provides quantitative insights, there may still be elements of subjectivity in how students and staff perceive the importance or performance of certain attributes.

c. Data Collection Limitations: Obtaining comprehensive and accurate data from all stakeholders might have been difficult, especially in ensuring consistent responses across different groups (students, lecturers, and administrative staff).

d. Resource Allocation: The research may reveal that while the BSC framework provides a balanced approach, universities may face challenges in reallocating resources to areas where they are most needed (e.g., professional development programs for lecturers).

Practical Implications

a. This section discusses the practical implications of the research for IBBI University Medan and potentially for other universities:

b. Improvement in Lecturer Development: By using IPA and BSC, the university can now focus on critical areas of performance such as improving teaching quality and feedback timeliness. These areas were identified as crucial but underperforming, so a strategic shift in resources can improve lecturer development and student satisfaction.

c. Strategic Decision-Making: The integration of BSC allows university management to link lecturer performance more closely to strategic goals (e.g., improving student outcomes or research quality). The system encourages lecturers to focus not only on their teaching but also on continuous learning and growth.

d. Holistic Performance Management: This research suggests that adopting a holistic performance management approach—incorporating both quantitative IPA data and qualitative insights from BSC—ensures that universities move beyond financial and student-satisfaction metrics to focus on long-term educational quality.

Limitations of the Study

a. Every research study has limitations, and discussing them is critical:
b. Sample Size and Representation: The study may have been limited by the number of respondents or their representation of the broader university community. If the sample was small, the results might not fully capture the diversity of perspectives among stakeholders.
c. Focus on One Institution: Since the research is specific to IBBI University Medan, the findings might not be generalizable to other universities with different contexts, resources, or cultural norms.
d. Implementation Challenges: Implementing a combined IPA and BSC system might require substantial training and changes to institutional processes, which may not be feasible for all institutions.

Recommendations for Future Research

a. The discussion should end by suggesting areas for further investigation:
b. Broader Application of IPA and BSC: Future research could expand this study to other universities or sectors to validate the findings and explore how these methods can be adapted to different institutional needs.
c. Longitudinal Studies: Future studies could track the effectiveness of these methods over a longer period, assessing whether improvements in lecturer performance lead to sustained increases in educational quality.
d. Additional Performance Indicators: Research could explore the integration of additional performance indicators (e.g., community engagement, research output) into the BSC framework to see how these contribute to institutional goals.

4   Aknowledgment

References

1. E-issn VNP, Islamiyah M, Raya P, Arifin A, Wasliman HMI, Dianawati E, et al. Reslaj : Religion Education Social Laa Roiba Journal Penilaian Kinerja dengan Menerapkan Konsep Balance Reslaj : Religion Education Social Laa Roiba Journal. 2023;5(6):2820–30.
2. Gao Y, Yan X. Data analysis framework of tourism enterprise human resource management system based on MySQL and fuzzy clustering. Int J Syst Assur

Eng Manag [Internet]. 2023;14(5):1647–59. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13198-023-01969-2

3. Utamy R, Ahmad S, Eddy S. Implementasi Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. J Educ Res. 2020;1(3).

4. Okfalisa;, Mulianti G, Hafsari R, Hartati M, Wardhani LK. Implementasi Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) pada Group Decision Making dalam Penilaian Kinerja Guru. In: Seminar Nasional Teknologi Informasi, Komunikasi dan Industri (SNTIKI) 11 Fakultas Sains dan Teknologi, UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. 2019. p. 55–63.

5. Firmansyah;, Swissia; P, Pulungan MA. PENGUKURAN KEPUASAN MAHASISWA TERHADAP KUALITAS LAYANAN PENDIDIKAN DI IBI DARMAJAYA DENGAN METODE IMPORTANCE-PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS Firmansyah. J Akunt Keuang. 2018;9(2):84–106.

6. Pratiwi; TR, Ratna HGMDS. ANALISIS KINERJA PERUSAHAAN DENGAN METODE BALANCED SCORECARD PERIODE 2013-2014 (STUDI KASUS PADA HOTEL SAHID BANDAR LAMPUNG). J Akunt Keuang. 2018;9(2):14–23.

7. Heksaputra D. FUZZY INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM FOR EMPLOYEE ASSESSMENT: A CASE STUDI OF XYZ UNIVERSITY IN YOGYAKARTA. Indones J Bus Intell. 2018;1(1):9–16.

8. FATMASARI R. EVALUASI KINERJA PELAYANAN AKADEMIK DI PERGURUAN TINGGI DENGAN BALANCED SCORECARD Studi Pada Pendidikan Tinggi Jarak Jauh Universitas Terbuka. J Ilm Educ Manag. 2016;7(1):1205–10.

9. Kemdikbud. RISET NASIONAL TAHUN 2017-2045 (Edisi 28 Pebruari 2017). 2017;28:1–100. Available from: http://rirn.ristekdikti.go.id

10. PENGEMBANGAN DJPRD. PRIORITAS RISET NASIONAL 2020 - 2024 Kebijakan Untuk Mendorong Pengembangan dan Pemanfaatan Produksi Dalam Negeri. Kementeri Riset, Teknol dan Pendidik Tinggi. 2019;(September 2019)