





Center for Quality, Faculty of Engineering, University of Kragujevac







3rdQO QUALITY RESEARCH

ISBN 978 - 86 - 6335 - 056 - 4 Conference on **Quality of Life**

3rd International Conference on Quality of Life



CONFERENCE MANUAL

November 28th-30th - 2018, Kopaonik Faculty of Engineering, University of Kragujevac 3rd International conference on Quality of Life

ISBN: 978 - 86 - 6335 - 056 - 4

| Editors: | <i>Dr Slavko Arsovski</i> , full professor Faculty of Engineering, Kragujevac <i>Dr Miladin Stefanović</i> , full professor Faculty of Engineering, Kragujevac <i>Dr Danijela Tadić</i> , full professor Faculty of Engineering, Kragujevac | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Technical Editor: | <i>Dr Aleksandar Aleksić</i> , assistant professor Faculty of Engineering, Kragujevac | | | | |
| Publisher: | FACULTY OF ENGINEERING 34000 KRAGUJEVAC Sestre Janjić 6 CENTER FOR QUALITY 34000 KRAGUJEVAC Sestre Janjić 6 | | | | |
| For publishers: | Dr Dobrica Milovanović, full professor Dr Miladin Stefanović, full professor | | | | |
| No. of copies: | 200 | | | | |
| Printing: | Faculty of Engineering, Kragujevac | | | | |

Copyright © Faculty of Engineering, University of Kragujevac, 2018. Copyright © Center for Quality, Kragujevac, 2018.

Publication of Conference manual and organization of 3rd International Conference on Quality of Life is supported by: Department of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia

Izdavanje Zbornika radova, organizovanje i održavanje 3rd International Conference on Quality of Life podržalo je: *Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja Republike Srbije* International conference on Quality of Life

Programme Committee

- 1. Prof. dr Slavko Arsovski, Faculty of engineering, University of Kragujevac, Kragujevac, president
- 2. Prof. dr Tadeusz Sikora, *The Department of Quality Management, Cracow* University of Economics, Kraków, Poland
- 3. Prof. dr Ezendu Ariwa, London Metropolitan Business School, London Metropolitan University, London, UK
- 4. Prof. dr Tadeja Jere Lazanski, University of Primorska, Koper, Slovenia
- 5. Prof. dr Mirko Soković, Faculty Of Mechanical Engineering, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia
- 6. Prof. dr Milan Perović, Faculty Of Mechanical Engineering, University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro
- 7. Prof. dr Zdravko Krivokapić, Faculty Of Mechanical Engineering, University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro
- 8. Prof. dr Goran Putnik, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal
- 9. Assoc. Prof. dr Martí Casadesús, Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain
- 10. Assoc. Prof. dr Iñaki Heras, Universidad del País Vasco, San Sebastian, Spain
- 11. Prof. dr Stanislav Karapetrović, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada
- 12. Prof. dr Miroslav Badida, Technical University of Košice, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Department of Environmental, Studies and Information Engineering, Košice, Slovakia
- 13. Prof. dr Danijela Tadić, Faculty of engineering, University of Kragujevac, Kragujevac, Serbia
- 14. Prof. dr Jovan Filipović, Faculty of organizational sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 15. Prof. dr Zora Arsovski, Faculty of economics, University of Kragujevac, Kragujevac, Serbia
- 16. Assoc. Prof. dr Gordana Nikolić, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia
- 17. Prof. dr Miladin Stefanović, Faculty of engineering, University of Kragujevac, Kragujevac, Serbia
- 18. Dr Prasun Das, SQC & OR Division of the Indian Statistical Institute (ISI), Kolkata, India
- 19. Prof. dr. Ayşegül Akdogan Eker, Yıldız Technical, University Mechanical Faculty, Beşiktaş/İstanbul-Turkey
- 20. Prof. dr Bülent Eker, Namık Kemal University, Tekirdağ-Turkey
- 21. Prof. dr Georgeta Rață, U.S.A.M.V.B. Timișoara, România
- 22. Paul M. Andre, AQE Group, Chicago, Illinois, USA
- 23. Prof. dr Krešimir Buntak, University North, Koprivnica, Croatia
- 24. Prof. dr Petroman Ioan, Faculty of Agricultural Management, U.S.A.M.V.B. Timişoara, România

Dear friends,

By providing international platform, 3. International Conference on Zuality of Life 2018 will gather experts from industry and academia in order to exchange ideas and present results of ongoing research in a range of topics.

This Conference has a motto "From quality to happiness".

We invite you to participate in this important event.

Sincerely yours. President of Programme Committee

Prof. dr Slavko Arsovski

3rd International conference on Quality of Life

fe

lality

Content:

| 1. | Slavko Arsovski QUALITY OF LIFE: AN INTEGRATOR OF |
|-----|---|
| | OLD AND NEW PARADIGMS1-6 |
| 2. | Tamara Jakovljevic, Tadeja Jere Jakulin, Gregor Papa THE ROLE OF COLOUR SENSING AND DIGITALIZATION |
| | ON THE LIFE QUALITY AND HEALTH TOURISM |
| 3. | Aysel İçöz, Bülent Eker ROLE OF ACTIVE, SMART PACKAGING |
| | IN REDUCTION OF FOOD LOSS |
| 4. | Bülent Eker, Aysel İçöz FOOD PACKAGING WASTES, RENEWABLE PACKAGING |
| | AND THEIR IMPACT ON LIFE QUALITY |
| 5. | Mustafa Cem Aldag, Bulent Eker WHAT IS QUALITY 4.0 IN THE ERA OF INDUSTRY 4.0? |
| 6. | Bülent Eker, Ayşegül Eker THE IMPACT OF THE USE OF INDUSTRIAL ROBOTS |
| | ON EFFICIENCY INCREASE |
| 7. | Bülent Eker, Sedat Erdal IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNIQUE IN FABRIC |
| | DEFECT CONTROL APPLICATIONS ON TEXTILE INDUSTRY |
| 8. | Pooja Choudhary, Amit Gangotia TOURISM DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNITY WELL-BEING |
| | AND QUALITY OF LIFE: A MEDIATION ANALYSIS |
| 9. | Zorica Lazić, Tijana Cvetić, Miloš Petronijević HOW MUCH QUALITY OF LIFE IS RELATED TO STUDENTS SUCCESS: CASE STUDY |
| 10. | Gamze Acar, Nur Beysen, Bülent Eker HOME-WORK BALANCE/BALANCE |
| | OF WORK FAMILY |
| 11. | Ayça Tepe, Bülent Eker THE IMPACT OF TECHNOPARKS ON THE ECONOMY |
| 12. | Vasco de Oliveira, Rute Meneses CLINICAL ASPECTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE |
| | IN TINNITUS PATIENTS |
| 13. | Miladin Stefanović DIGITAL COMPETENCES AND ENTERPRENEUIRAL |
| | FRAMEWORK IN DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH QUALITY |
| | COURSES IN HIGHER EDUCATION |

ife 3rd International conference on Quality of Life

| 14. | Jasna Radulović, Danijela Nikolić, Jasmina Skerlić, Mina Vasković Jovanović ENERGY PAY-BACK TIME AND CO2 EMISSIONS | |
|-----|---|---------|
| | OF PV SYSTEMS | 77-84 |
| 15. | Tijana Cvetić, Oliver Momčilović, Gordana Nikolić, Slađana Vujičić SYSTEM MODEL OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AT WORK DURING MASTER STUDIES | |
| 16. | Miroslav Vulić, Eleonora Desnica, Aleksandar Pavlović USED AUTOMOBILE BATTERIES AS A NEW | |
| | DEVELOPMENTAL AND ECOLOGICAL CHALLENGE | 93-98 |
| 17. | Marija Zahar Đorđević, Nikola Komatina, Nemanja Ignjatov ANALYSIS OF STARTUP COMPANIES AND PROJECTS | |
| | IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA | |
| 18. | Angelina Pavlović, Goran Bošković, Nebojša Jovičić, Snežana Nestić, Nemanja Stanisavljević THE POSSIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTING CIRCULAR ECONOMY IN COMPANIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA | 105-112 |
| 19. | Katarina Stojanović PERCEPTION OF URBAN QUALITY OF LIFE IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD - A CASE STUDY OF NOVI SAD | |
| 20. | Sanja Puzović, Vladan Paunović, Jasmina Vesić Vasović, Zoran Nešić THE INFLUENCE OF THE LEAN IMPLEMENTATION ON WORK ENVIROMENT QUALITY | |
| 21. | Vladan Paunović, Sanja Puzović, Jasmina Vesić Vasović, Zoran Nešić | |
| | INFLUENCE OF LEAN IMPLEMENTATION ON QUALITY | |
| | OF BUSINESS OF NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS | |
| 22. | Zoran Antić, Zoran Nešić, Đorđe Mihailović SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON IMPROVING THE | |
| | QUALITY OF RAILWAY OPERATIONS | |
| 23. | Marija Vuković, Goran Bošković, Nebojša Jovičić, Saša Jovanović TECHNO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF A SOUND ABSORBING | |
| | BARRIER MADE OF RECYCLED TEXTILE MATERIALS | 133-136 |
| 24. | Nenad Todić, Slobodan Savić, Dušan Gordić, Snežana Vulović, Vanja Šušteršič MATHEMATICAL MODELING AND EXPERIMENTAL | |
| | VERIFICATION PARAMETERS VALVE PLATE OF | |
| | AXIAL PISTON PUMPS OF WATER HYDRAULIC | |

3rd International conference on Quality of Life



| 25. | Ranka Gojković, Snežana Nestić, Slaviša Moljević, Aleksandar Đorđević, Aleksandar Aleksić |
|-------------|---|
| | EDUCATING STUDENTS FROM WBC TO |
| | IMPROVE ENTREPRENEURIAL COMPETENCIES143-148 |
| 26. | Dragan Cvetković, Aleksandar Nešović, Jasmina Skerlić, Danijela Nikolić BUILDING SHADOW IMPACT TO THE |
| | PRIMARY ENERGY CONSUMPTION149-156 |
| 27. | Nikola Komatina, Nikolina Ljepava, Danijela Tadić THE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE AND APPLICATION OF |
| | MULTICRITERIA DECISION-MAKING METHODS |
| | IN SELECTION OF INDUSTRY EQUIPMENT157-164 |
| 28. | Hrvoje Puškarić, Marija Zahar Đorđević, |
| | Snežana Nestić, Jelena Jovanović, Danijela Tadić OLIALITY OF PROJECT I JEE CYCLE 165-170 |
| 20 | Piotr Kafal |
| <i>2)</i> . | OVERQUALITY CONCEPT IN ORGANIZATIONS |
| 30. | Marko Đapan, Ivan Mačužić, Petar Todorović, Marija Savković, Milan Radenković IMPROVING RESEARCHERS' OUALITY OF LIFE |
| | AND WORK AT UNIVERSITY OF KRAGUJEVAC175-180 |
| 31. | Aleksandar Aleksić, Snežana Nestić, Miladin Stefanović ANALYSIS OF THE KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS |
| | IN SERBIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTUIONS AND |
| | PROPOSAL OF THEIR WEIGHTS |
| 32. | Danijela Nikolić, Jasmina Skerlić, |
| | Dragan Cvetković, Jasna Radulović, Saša Jovanović BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PASSIVE SOLAR HEATING |
| 33. | Biljana Tošić, Jelena Ruso, Jovan Filipović QUALITY MANAGEMENT IN HEALTH CARE: CONCEPTS, |
| | PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS |
| 34. | Bojan Stojčetović, Živče Šarkoćević, Dragan Lazarević, Aleksandar Đorđević, Bojan Prlinčević RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES FOR IMPROVEMENT |
| | OF ELECTRICITY QUALITY SUPPLY IN ŠTRPCE MUNICIPALITY201-204 |
| 35. | Bojan Stojčetović, Đorđe Nikolić, Živče Šarkoćević, Aleksandar Đorđević, Goran Stojanović MEASURES FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF |
| | ELECTRICITY SUPPLY IN ŠTRPCE |

ife 3rd International conference on Quality of Life

| 36. | Aleksa Sekulovic, Mladen Djuric, Bojan Labovic |
|-----|--|
| | SHEDDING LIGHT ON 8D METHODOLOGY: |
| | HOW QUALITY EXPERTS SYSTEMIZED KNOW-HOW |
| | FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS |
| 37. | Oliver Momčilović, Dragan Doljanica, Gordana Nikolić |
| | HYBRID IPA F-DEMATEL MODEL FOR ANALYSIS |
| | OF COMMITMENT, ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING |
| | AND JOB SATISFACTION |
| 38. | Miladin Stefanović, Aleksandar Đorđević, |
| | Hrvoje Puškarić, Nebojša Abadić |
| | IMPROVING QUALITY OF TRAINING BY USING |
| | A WEB BASED SYSTEM FOR REMOTE PROGRAMMING |
| | OF CNC SIMULATORS |
| 39. | Jovan Milivojević |
| | INFLUENCE OF COSMIC ENVIRONMENT |
| | ON HUMAN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT |
| | OF NEW DIMENSIONS ON THE QUALITY OF LIFE |
| 40. | Ljubiša Bojić |
| | MASS MEDIA USE AND WELLBEING |
| 41. | Ljubiša Bojić |
| | PERSONAL STANDS AND WELLBEING |

Aleksandar Aleksić¹⁾ Snežana Nestić¹⁾ Miladin Stefanović¹⁾

1) University of Kragujevac, Faculty of Engineering, Serbia {aaleksic, s.nestic, miladin}@kg.ac.rs

ANALYSIS OF THE KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN SERBIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTUIONS AND PROPOSAL OF THEIR WEIGHTS

Abstract: In this paper, the issue of addressing the weights of different key performance indicators (KPIs) within higher education institutions (HEIs) in Serbia has been treated. Since performance based management is not yet established, this research has a goal to set appropriate suggestions of directions how to define a finite model for determining the value of adopted system of performances. The analytical hierarchy process (AHP) is proposed as a suitable framework for the determination of KPIs weights. An illustrative example for the determination of KPIs weight related to scientific research activity.

Keywords: Performance, management higher education institutions

1. INTRODUCTION

The number of EU countries have adopted performance based management system for HEIs which have been used for funding of HEIs based on performances [1]. Generally, HEIs in EU have different goals such as:

- to enhance performance values in core activities – continual quality improvement,
- to strengthen accountability and transparency (satisfy stakeholders' demands,
- to encourage HEIs' profiling and diversification,
- to enhance human capital [2],
- and to align national and regional institutional policies and activities.

Having insight into ongoing changes in Serbia, it may be suggested that there is a need for Serbian HEIs to interconnect with EU environment and to provide and use the best experience from EU in development of its model that will be compatible with EU in the terms of establish performance system. On the other side, HEIs in Serbia are adopting new study programs in compliance with the demands of accreditation standards which may be seen as institutional pattern of structure and functioning [3].

In practice, Republic of Serbia is facing the challenge of defining the model for performance evaluation, profiling and ranking of institution and study programs in Serbian higher education systems. This challenge is partially faced in the scope of activities of international project Project No 573820-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP – PESHES.

The motivation for this research comes from the fact that is necessary to provide optimization of the indicators for study programs, institutions and HE. In the same time, it is necessary to provide process of tuning of the indicators, definition of limits and scopes. As the proposed indicators are new and unknown to Serbian higher education systems, it is meaningful to define values and limit for specific indicators. In this paper, the approach for determining the weights of indicators is proposed. The proposed method is tested on one group of the proposed indicators within the project.

There are many methods that may be used for the determination of criteria weight of good classification. It may be said that some of them are good for solving some types of problems, but they cannot be used for others. For example, the traditional ABC method may not be appropriate to provide a good classification of items in practice [4]. If there is a goal to make the classification more realistic, the more criteria and imprecise data should be used so this problem is going to become a multi-criteria classification problem under uncertainties. However, for the purpose of this research where definition of KPIs and determination of their weight is focus, unprecise data is not



going to be studied. Due to suitability for the determination of criteria weights, the chosen framework for the research is AHP method [5]. It was assumed that weights of criteria are different and are defined by the matrix of pairs for comparison of relative relation of criteria importance.

The goal of this paper is to propose KPIs of related to scientific research activity of HEIs and proposal how to determine the weights of KPIs in Serbian higher education institutions related to emerging performance-based management system for HEIs. It is worth to mention that the proposed performance-based management system for HEIs is supposed to be supported by appropriate information system for collecting and managing input data.

This paper is organized in the following way: in Section 2 the problem statement is given, in Section 3 the analytical hierarchy framework is analysed, Section 4 the determining of the KPIs'weights related to scientific research activity is proposed, and the conclusion is set in the Section 4.

2. THE LITERATURE REVIEW

For the purpose of determining how successful are some study programs and HEIs, it is necessary to propose some system for determining for success assessment. This kind of system may be used for benchmarking of study programs and HEIs, too. In that sense, performance can be treated as values necessary to determine the success of a HEIs activities. The rate of success may be assessed through the performance of organization so very are identification important tasks and assessment of performances. Each performance has its quantitative or qualitative representation or indicator by which the performance value is determined so these indicators may be explained as KPIs [6]. The goal of performance assessment is to identify which element of HEis' activities is not meeting the set demands. That information basically represents input data for strategy forming and decision-making process, so the appropriate corrective measures may be proposed for the set goals could be achieved. This way of thinking may be very useful since study programs, and HEIs simultaneously may be assessed. Different tools may be used for determining of criteria weights.

2.1 Basic assumptions of AHP as base for determining KPIs weight

It may be said that AHP (Saaty, 1990) is one of the most used methods of multicriteria decision making methods. Basically, it belongs to the group of techniques related to multiatribute decision analysis and the methods of ranking. The basic assumptions of the method may be articulated as hierarchy, priority settings and the check of consistency (Agarski, 2015). Setting the hierarchy is related to definition of hierarchy levels of decision making. The goal of analysis is set at the top of hierarchy and criteria and subcriteria are set below (c_1, \ldots, c_n) . The treated alternatives are set at the bottom (a_1, \ldots, a_n) . The idea of introducing hierarchy is to decompose complex problem into smaller pieces so it can be treated in easier way (figure 1).



Figure 1 – An example of hierarchy in AHP method

Figure 1 shows the general hierarchical order of AHP analysis. The basic purpose of the method is to determine the weight coefficients of all elements of the hierarchy, that is, the goal, the criteria, the subcriteria and the alternatives.

The prioritization is set by performing a comparative analysis of each pair of elements at each hierarchical level. In this case, the decision maker for each pair of comparisons expresses an estimate on the Saaty's scale of measures [1-9]. Numerical values on Saaty's scale of measure are explained in Table 1.

| The significance | The definition | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | The two elements are equally | | | |
| 1 | important in relation to the set | | | |
| | goal | | | |
| 3 | One element in relation to the | | | |
| 5 | other is slightly more important | | | |
| | One element in relation to the | | | |
| 5 | other has a far greater | | | |
| | importance | | | |
| 7 | One element in relation to the | | | |
| / | other is much more important | | | |
| | One element in relation to the | | | |
| 9 | other has an absolute and | | | |
| | extreme importance | | | |
| | The values in between are | | | |
| 2, 4, 6, 8 | representing a compromise | | | |
| | between defined values | | | |

Table 1 – Saaty's scale (Saaty, 1990)

Based on the presented comparison of each element considered with each other element, the pairwise matrix is obtained. The pairwise matrix A can be presented as follows:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & P(a_1, a_2) & \cdots & P(a_1, a_n) \\ P(a_2, a_1) & 1 & \cdots & P(a_2, a_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ P(a_n, a_1) & P(a_n, a_2) & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Checking consistency is a very useful technique developed in this method. It is used to determine whether the decisions of decision makers are consistent. Consistency checks are performed using the eigenvector method. The eigenvector of matrix A is determined:

A·w=λ_max·w

w is the determined weights' vector.

 λ -max is the maximum value of eigen vector of matrix A. The value of λ -max is greater or equal to K (Eigen value of matrix A) whose elements are positive and reciprocal. If the matrix is consistent, then

λ max=K.

The CR (Consistency Ratio) is determined as:

$CR=(\lambda \text{ max-K})/(K-1)$

The CI (Consistency Index) is determined as ratio of CI and RI (Random Index):

CI=CR/RI

The values of RI are presented in the Table 2 where RI depends on matrix dimension (denoted in upper row of the table 2).

Table 2 - Random index (Saaty, 1990)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.58 | 0.9 | 1.12 | 1.24 | 1.32 |
| 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 1.41 | 1.45 | 1.49 | 1.51 | 1.48 | 1.56 | 1.57 |

The consistency index CI should be less than 0.1, which in fact means that the inconsistency of the decision makers' assessment should not be higher than 10% [5].

However, the practice supports the fact that in complex decision-making issues, when considering many criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives, it often happens that the CI consistency index is greater than 0.1, and that the resulting solution is nevertheless chosen as optimal. This problem closely attached to the attitude of the decision makers.

The advantage of AHP is that ay be extended in various ways. The extension may be delivered by applying fuzzy numbers type I [7], fuzzy numbers type II [8], intuitive fuzzy numbers [9], etc.

4. DETERMINNG THE WEIGHTS OF KPIS RELATED TO SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ACTIVITY

In the scope of activities of international project Project No 573820-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP – PESHES, different performances have been analysed. In compliance with that, it is suggested that the considered performance is composed of four KPIs named:

- 1) Scientific capacity of the institution,
- 2) Publishing of journals,
- 3) Organizing conferences, and
- 4) Publishing activity.

1) Scientific capacity of the institution This KPI represent the number of scientific research activity results produced by full-time employees of the HEI (S_{HEI}) divided by the number of full-time employees of the HEI with scientific and research degrees (E_{HEI}) and multiplied with Hirsch index (h).

Scientific capacity of the institution

$$=\frac{S_{HEI}}{E_{HEI}} \times h$$

The number of scientific research results

3rd International Conference on Quality of Life, November 2018



scientific includes research papers. monographs, technical solutions and patents (M10, M20, M40, M50, M80 i M90), determined by categorization of The Ministry of Science shall, in accordance with the applicable Rulebook on the procedure, method of evaluation and quantitative presentation of scientific research results of researchers, for the relevant field of science. The relevant field of science include: 1) natural-mathematical and medical; 2) technical-technological and biotechnical, 3) social and 4) humanistic; h -The Hirsch index for the institution (for the HEI from the natural-mathematical, technicaltechnological and medical educational and scientific fields, while for the institutions of the socio-humanist field h = 1).

2) **Publishing of journals** represents the KPI that include the sum of scientific coefficients addressing the position of the journal that is published by the HEI.

Publishing of journals= $\sum_{i=1}^{n} M_i$

 $\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{the}$ number of journals that are published by the HEI

M – the coefficient denotes the value which is equal to scientific result identified by Rulebook on the procedure, method of evaluation and quantitative presentation of scientific research results of researchers by groups (21a, M22, M23, M24 and M51). These are applicable to the identified fields of science: 1) naturalmathematical and medical; 2) technicaltechnological and biotechnical, 3) social and 4) humanistic.

3) Organizing scientific events represents the KPI that include the sum of scientific events organized by the HEI.

Organizing scientific events = $\sum_{t=1}^{m} S_t$

m – the number of scientific conferences organized by the HEI during the year

S – the coefficient represents the value of the scientific event, in accordance with the relevant Rulebook on the procedure, the method of evaluation and the quantitative expression of the scientific research results of the researcher organized by the HEI. The coefficient is calculated as follows:

| International scientific event: | S = 0.5 |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| National scientific event: | S = 0.2 |

4) Publishing activity

Publishing activity represents the number

of used ISBN for published items of HEI in the last five calendar years (P_{ISBN}) divided by the total number of HEI's full time employed teachers and associates (FTA).

Publishing activity
$$=\frac{P_{ISBN}}{FTA}$$

ISBN is related to books related to education process.

4.1 An illustrative example

For the purpose of illustrative example, the working group members from University of Kragujevac have made assessment by consensus. The input data is presented in table 3.

| T 11 1 | T 1 | | - | | | • |
|------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----------|
| Tablas | 140 | 144 (111111) | nt. | naw | C 00144 | navicou |
| 1 unie 5 – | · Inc | munix | <i>UI</i> | nun | s com | 114115011 |
| | | | ~ | | ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ | |

| Assessing | KPI | KPI | KPI | KPI |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| criteria | (i=1) | (i=2) | (i=3) | (i=4) |
| weight | | | | |
| KPI (i=1) | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 |
| KPI (i=2) | 0.333 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| KPI (i=3) | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| KPI (i=4) | 0.143 | 0.333 | 0.5 | 1 |

The input data is normalized and presented in table 4.

| 1 | able | 4 – | the | norma | lized | data | matrix |
|---|------|-----|-----|-------|-------|------|--------|
| - | | | | | | | |

| Assessing | KPI | KPI | KPI | KPI |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| criteria | (i=1) | (i=2) | (i=3) | (i=4) |
| weight | | | | |
| KPI (i=1) | 0.5860 | 0.6537 | 0.6179 | 0.5074 |
| KPI (i=2) | 0.1951 | 0.2179 | 0.2471 | 0.2175 |
| KPI (i=3) | 0.1172 | 0.1090 | 0.1236 | 0.1450 |
| KPI (i=4) | 0.0838 | 0.0726 | 0.0618 | 0.0725 |

The obtained weights of KPIs are presented in table 5.

| Assessing criteria weight | KPI weights |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| KPI (i=1) | 0.5860 |
| KPI (i=2) | 0.2179 |
| KPI (i=3) | 0.1236 |
| KPI (i=4) | 0.0725 |

The consistency of the matrix is tested, and it is acceptable.

 $\lambda_{max}=4.0281,$

C.R. =0.009369,

C.I. =0.01041

After determining the weights, the value of the proposed performance can be obtained. For the purpose of illustrative example, input data is obtained from the Faculty of engineering, University of Kragujevac:

Scientific research activity= $0.5074x \frac{S_{HEI}}{E_{HEI}} \times h+$

$$0.2179 \mathrm{x} \sum_{j=1}^{n} M_j + 0.1236 \mathrm{x} \sum_{t=1}^{m} S_{t=1}$$

 $0.0725 x \frac{P_{ISBN}}{FTA}$

Scientific research activity=1.22

In compliance with the calculation, it may be said the KPI (i=1) - Scientific capacity of the institution, has the greatest weight under the performance of Scientific research activity. It is justifiably since existence of this KPI in real conditions makes the largest impact on research and teaching process in the HEI. The second place in rank is connected to the KPI of publishing journals activity. It is very important since this kind of HEI makes impact on others and participates in creating new directions in research agenda, regionally or even wider.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the performance of scientific research activity of one HEI has been analysed. For the purpose of determining this performance, the four KPIs have been proposed. Those KPIs have been explained in terms of quantification. The second part of the paper is used for the proposal how to determine the weights of the proposed KPIs. For the purpose of determining KPIs weights, AHP has been used and tested.

The proposed KPIs and the proposal how to determine their weights may be used in other HEIs in Serbia as a part of performance management system for HEIs.

The constraint of the proposed methodology is that it takes account the opinion of decision makers team in terms of consensus. The future research should cover aspects of aggregating different opinions of decision makers into one.

REFERENCES:

- Kahveci, T.C. and Taşkın, H., (2013). Integrated Enterprise Management System for Higher Education Institutions based on Strategic and Process Management: The Case Study of Sakarya University. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 106, 1505-1513.
- [2] Zlate, Ş. and Enache, C., (2015). The interdependence between human capital and organizational performance in higher education. *Proceedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 180, 136-143.
- [3] Janićijević, N., (2015). The reactions of universities to imposing new a institutional pattern: the case of higher education in Serbia. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 174, pp.1550-1559.
- [4] Millstein, M.A., Yang, L. and Li, H., (2014). Optimizing ABC inventory grouping decisions. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 148, 71-80.
- [5] Saaty, T. L., (1990). How to make a decision: the analytic hierarchy process, *European Journal Operational Research*, 48, 9–26.
- [6] Suryadi, K., (2007). Framework of measuring key performance indicators for decision support in higher education institution. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 3(12), 1689-1695.
- [7] Tadic, D., Gumus, A. T., Arsovski, S., Aleksic, A., & Stefanovic, M. (2013). An evaluation of quality goals by using fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methodology. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, 25(3), 547-556.
- [8] Kahraman, C., Öztayşi, B., & Onar, S. Ç. (2017). Interval Type-2 FAHP: A Multicriteria Wind Turbine Selection. *Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process*, 205.
- [9] Wu, J., Huang, H. B., & Cao, Q. W. (2013). Research on AHP with interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy sets and its application in multi-criteria decision making problems. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 37(24), 9898-9906.

Acknowledgment: Research presented in this paper was supported by ERASMUS plus call, Project No 573820-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP – PESHES.

3rd International Conference on Quality of Life, November 2018



e 3rd International conference ality on Quality of Life

A., Aleksić, S., Nestić, M., Stefanović