

# IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION METRICS FOR ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING SOLUTION – A CASE OF KIBABII UNIVERSITY

## ABSTRACT

Most institution of higher learning are implementing and Enterprise Resource planning (ERP) in automating various activities. The architecture of most of the ERP is based on the Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) where each module can be called as service. In most of the contract signed between the vendor and the university, payment is tied to the level of implementation. The Question is how to then measure the level of implementation? This paper proposes a metric that could be used in evaluation of the degree of implementation. The metric was derived based on an acceptance test on each of functionality of module as per terms of reference. The result of a test was rated as a Fail, Pass, or Query. The result was then coded such that a fail was assigned a zero (0), pass one (1) and query a half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ). From which a metric was derived which measures the level implementation.

**Key Words:** ERP, Metrics, Implementation, SOA, Test, Module, User, Acceptance.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Kibabii University started as University College and became a chartered University in 2015 as the 23<sup>rd</sup> Public University in Kenya (Charter 2015, Webmaster 2018). On inception in 2012, the University had incomplete, unfurnished classrooms, laboratories and offices. The ICT infrastructure, that is structured cabling had been laid in the Administration block and University Library only. Several computers were purchased for student and staff on which basic Microsoft application were installed. The Finance department used Quick Books and payroll software. The University outsourced for website development hosting.

The ICT infrastructure was later enhanced by use of the last mile radio link to provide internet to the organization at 10Mbps, this link is today used as back link. This data rate was increased to 21Mbps then 66Mbps, 82Mbps, then 110 and at the present speed is 400 Mbs. The University now receives internet bandwidth through a last mile fibre link. The Campus network continues to be enhanced with campus fibre backbone in place. Several hotspots have been installed to allow the students and members of staff access the net. The University has a Directorate of ICT whose mandate are to (Mbuguah SM 2018):

- Establish and maintain ICT infrastructure and services.
- Advance the intellectual and human resource capacity through use of E-resources.
- Publicize University programmers, activities and promote its public image.
- Automate University wide services

The Directorate has purposed continue automating most services through the use of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution. The implementation of the ERP was not without challenges which informs the need of this paper to share the challenges to proposed solution.

The paper consist of an Introduction , Description of the ERP case, Challenges realized in the implementation, proposed solutions,

## 2.0 ERP CASE DESCRIPTION

39 The University initiated the procurement process, by request of expression of interest (EOI) for ERP  
40 solution. In EOI, a brief overview of the University, including staff levels, student and number computers  
41 available, processes and their input and outputs were provided.  
42

43 The EOI set evaluation criteria for bidders , one of the them was that the bidder must have evidence of  
44 having implemented a similar system in a University environment. Out of the twelve bidders who  
45 responded to the call, only three qualified to the next stage. In this stage, a request for proposal was  
46 submitted to the successful bidders and with terms of reference (TOR). After evaluation of bidders, ABNO  
47 Software international was awarded the tender and signed contract based on the TOR. It was decided  
48 that payment was to be staggered, and paid based on degree of implementation. However, nobody  
49 provided specific method of measurement or metrics.  
50

51 After signing the Contract the stakeholders agreed on a project implementation management structure.  
52 The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic and Student affairs) (DVC (ASA)) was designated the patron of  
53 project. DVC (ASA) was to chair the ERP implementation committee that was tasked with monitoring and  
54 solving implementation issues as they did arise. DVC (ASA) was also to report to University Management  
55 board (Statutes 2017) on ERP implementation progress and issues arising.  
56

57 The Director ICT was designated as project manager. He was to report to ERP implementation committee  
58 on progress and any issues that may require resolving. After evaluation of the work done, he was to  
59 report back to committee. After validating the report, the committee could use it to advise the University  
60 management on the amount to be paid to vendor.

## 61 **2.1 Challenges encountered in implementation of the ERP**

62 The ERP implementation is largely complete, and is now in the support phase. Three of the major  
63 challenges experienced were:

- 64 (a) Attitude change. The ERP forces people to adopt a certain workflow. The acceptance  
65 that there is a system is in place, that it is not business as usual, has been constant  
66 source of friction.
- 67 (b) Training of users. Initially users took training casually and hence took too long to adopt  
68 the system and continue making errors as they use the system. Also because there are  
69 many concurrent activities happening at the University, then training within campus has  
70 not been very effective.
- 71 (c) Lack of metrics for measuring the level of implementations. There is need to assess the  
72 degree of implementation for modules. There were no metrics in place to solve this  
73 problem, looking at available Service oriented metrics (Mbuguah& Wabwoba, 2014) and  
74 ERP metric available. Yet university management required an absolute figure to enable  
75 them determine the payment.

## 76 **2.2 Need for Metrics**

77 The University ascribes to ISO 9001:2015 where one of the principles is evidence based decision making.  
78 Hence the measurement and proposed metrics must be of quality and objective. Software metric is a  
79 measure of software characteristics which are quantifiable or countable. Metrics can enable planning,  
80 organization, control and improvement. Software metrics should have the following Characteristics  
81 (Stacktify , 2018). They should be

- 82 - Simple and computable.
- 83 - Objective.
- 84 - Consistent.
- 85 - Independent of programming language.
- 86 - Easy to calibrate and adaptable.
- 87 - Easy and cost effective to obtain.
- 88 - Able to be validated for accuracy and reliability.

89 - Relevant to the development of high quality software products.

90 We ascribe to these characteristics of metrics and these were put into consideration as the metrics  
91 were designed.  
92

### 93 **3.0 Related Studies**

94 CGN (2006) carried out a research on ERP project measurements where they found out that the most  
95 successful projects were those where there was a high degree of Political and Operational achievement.  
96 On the contrary, the ones that had high Technical and Economic achievement, but low Political and  
97 Operational achievements were perceived as less successful in the long term.  
98

99 They argued that to determine the true success of an ERP project, firms must make a paradigm shift that,  
100 incorporates a holistic approach and multi-dimensional view that includes targets, constituents, and a  
101 sequence of measurements over a long-range time frame. Only by transcending the traditional, singular  
102 financial view of return of investment (ROI) can one truly identify and differentiate successful ERP  
103 programs that provide long-term strategic value.  
104

105 On technical aspect the rating was on whether the implementation is :

- 106 - Fully achieved
- 107 - Mostly achieved
- 108 - Partially achieved
- 109 - Failed to achieve

110 Siriku (2017) presented a paper titled measuring implementation success with a balanced Scorecard. He  
111 argued that Large Scale ERP implementation success factors consists of project management  
112 competence, knowledge sharing, ERP system quality, understanding, user involvement, business  
113 process engineering, user involvement, top management support and organization support.  
114

115 Ahad et al.(2018) have written on ERP Post implementation Success Assessment :An Extended  
116 Framework. In the paper they emphasis the importance of post implementation success assessment and  
117 propose an extended model based on on the original model by Ifinedo et al.(2010). That did encompass  
118 service quality, system quality, information quality, individual impact, workgroup impact and organization  
119 impact surrogates.  
120

121 There are many more authors who have highlighted various others aspects of ERP and metrics but none  
122 has attempted to measure the level of implementation of degree of implementation which is the key  
123 contribution of this paper.  
124

## 125 **4.0 PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THREE CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED**

### 127 **4.1 Attitude**

129 Moutaz H and Henrik M (2017) did carry out a research on user resistance. They identified factors that  
130 cause people to resist a new system. The factors were: people, system, interaction approaches,  
131 perceived risk and habit. They also identified strategies that can be used reducing user resistance such  
132 as participative training and top management commitment. We are in support of these finding and  
133 continue to state that change of altitude will take time to be realized but as staff continue to use the  
134 system they will gradually buy into the system and their attitude will gradually change. Also continues  
135 enforcement of the workflow by the senior management will force those who are reluctant to adopt to do  
136 so.  
137

138 It has also been recommended that most the services be automated and integrated within the ERP. Top  
139 management has discouraged any process being undertaken outside the ERP that involves service  
140 already included in the modules.  
141

## 142 4.2 Training of Users

143  
144 Derek (2017) argues that training must be implemented in the right way, and it must be tailored to staff in  
145 order to maximize its effectiveness. He lists the following eight training pitfalls to avoid:

- 146 - Training the wrong people
- 147 - Not training enough people
- 148 - Incorrect mix of eLearning
- 149 - Opting for public vs. private training
- 150 - Training at wrong times
- 151 - Having wrong training partner
- 152 - Incomplete training
- 153 - Not training at all

154 The authors concur with the above since the errors being experienced in the system are user based, and  
155 this could be tied up to effectiveness of the training. Generally most of the users are demanding for more  
156 training. This should be done either formally or informally by the vendor and ICT staff. It has also been  
157 recommended by users that future training been done away from campus to allow the participants to fully  
158 concentrate.

## 159 160 161 4.3 Lack Metrics

162 To determine the level implementation Directorate of ICT (DICT), the ABNO team and the internal auditor,  
163 visited the various users in the various departments for user acceptance tests. User acceptance tests are  
164 tests carried out by the end use to validate if all business requirements are fulfilled or not. Use of live data  
165 and real uses cases makes this testing an important part of the release cycle.(UAT 2018) The question  
166 then was how to evaluate the level implementation in face of nonexistent metrics. The solution then was  
167 to come up implementation metrics.

### 168 169 4.3.1 ERP Implementation Metrics

170 The metric has to be sufficiently objective to satisfy both the vendor and the client. The vendor had  
171 prepared a questionnaire on user acceptance. But had not provided an objective transformation of the  
172 questionnaire into a metric.

173  
174 The team carried out an acceptance test based on each of functionality of module as per terms of  
175 reference (TOR) which informed the contract. The result of the test was then rated as Fail, Query or  
176 Pass. Fail if it failed outright, query if the user was fully satisfied and Pass if a given functionality  
177 performed as required.

178  
179 The result was then coded such that a fail is assigned a zero (0), a query (1/2) and pass one (1). The 1/2  
180 assigned to query which the arithmetic mean of 0, and 1.

181  
182 The concept was borrowed from the Tristate logic in Digital logic where we have high (1), low (0) and  
183 high impedance (Z) states (Kurt W.2017).

184  
185 The metric for implementation was then defined as  
186 
$$\text{Implementation \%} = \{((\text{no pass} + \frac{1}{2} (\text{no of queries})) / (\text{total number of tests})) * 100\}$$

### 187 188 4.3.2 Validation of metrics

189 Validation of metrics can be done both theoretically and empirically. Muketha et al., (2011) posits that  
190 main goal of theoretical validation is to establish the theoretical soundness of the metrics. Several  
191 researches such Fenton et al., (1998), Weyuker (1988) and Briand et al., (1998) have studied the metrics  
192 for quite some time.

193 The proposed metric is a size metric because the level implementation increases from 0% when there is  
 194 no implementation to 100% for full implementation. Theoretical validation shows that it may not be  
 195 possible for implementation to be below zero (0) % or above 100%.

196  
 197 Considering zero case then

198  $Implementation \% = \{((no\ pass + \frac{1}{2} (no\ of\ queries)) / (total\ number\ of\ tests)) * 100\}$

199 No of passes = 0

200 No of queries = 0

201 Substituting into the equation

202  $Implementation \% = \{((0 + \frac{1}{2} (0)) / (total\ number\ of\ tests)) * 100\}$

203 = 0

204

205 Considering the case of complete successful implementation

206 No of passes = total number of tests

207 No of queries = zero (0)

208 Substituting into equation

209  $Implementation \% = \{((no\ pass + \frac{1}{2} (no\ of\ queries)) / (total\ number\ of\ tests)) * 100\}$

210

211  $Implementation \% = \{((total\ number\ of\ tests + \frac{1}{2} (0)) / (total\ number\ of\ tests)) * 100\}$

212 = total number of tests/total number of tests \*100

213 = 1\*100 = 100%

214

215 Empirical tests can also be based on Weyukker criteria and /or the Lionel Briand criteria.

216

217 But as has been, argued by Muketha (2011) and others Weyukker criteria is best for complexity metrics.

218 Since the proposed metrics are size then Weyukker criteria may not apply here.

219

220 Briand et al.(1998) postulates that a size metric can be assessed based on ,non-negative, null and  
 221 additive properties. For non negativity it means that the size of metric should > 0, and this applies to the  
 222 proposed metrics. The metric null value for an empty set and the metrics from the modules can be  
 223 additive. Hence we may conclude that the metrics are theoretically sound.

224

225

#### 226 4.4 An application of metrics on instances of the Implementation

227 Table 1 gives the results for result of application of the metrics where serial no 8 -18 represents the sub-  
 228 modules in the integrated finance module.

229 Table 1: ERP USER ACCEPTANCE RESULTS

S/NO	Module name	Fail	Query	Pass	Total no Functionalities
1	Student Management	2	0	13	15
2	Student academics	2	0	20	22
3	Student Portal	2	3	6	11
4	Hostel And Accommodations	3	0	14	17
5	Human Resource	0	5	30	35
6	Procurement and Inventory	14	3	31	48
7	Time tabling	1	0	15	16
8	Finance -student finance	0	1	24	25
9	IGA	12	0	0	12

10	Account payable	0	1	17	18
11	Imprest management	2	0	10	12
12	Cash management	3	2	10	15
13	Bank Reconciliation	2	3	1	6
14	Projects	4	0	0	4
15	Budgeting modules	3	0	7	10
16	Fixed assets	24	0	0	24
17	Payroll	31	0	0	31
18	Finance -Reports	1	7	2	10
19	Total	106	25	200	331

230  
231 From table 1 the total number of tests were 331 of which 200 were passes while 25 were queries and 106  
232 were fails.

233 From the above data the percentage user acceptance =  $((25 \times 1/2) + 200) / 331 \times 100 = 64.2\%$

234 However it should be noted that the following modules were not tested because they were not in use:

235 Project, IGA, Fixed asset, and scored zero.

236 Payroll module was scored zero but the user had requested for two days before the tests would be done.

237 It should be noted that the recommendation on payment to the vendor, at this point in time was 64.2% of  
238 the bided sum.

#### 239 **4.5 Application of the Metrics to Specific Modules**

##### 240 **4.5.1 Student Management**

241 In this module 15 functionalities were tested out of which 2 failed. The tests that failed were: generating of  
242 admission/registration reports and generation of admission /regrets letters. The users acceptance from  
243 module was  $(13/15) \times 100 = 86.7\%$

244 It was suggested that users of module should upload students' photos and other details.

##### 245 **4.5.2 Student Academics**

246 In this module 22 functionalities were tested out of which 2 failed. The tests that failed were

- 247 - Capture class attendance by lecturers
- 248 - Generating departmental mark sheets
- 249 - The users acceptance from module was  $(20/22) \times 100 = 90.9\%$

250 It was also suggested that system control should be enhanced on the student unit registration so that  
251 units to be registered once.

##### 252 **4.5.3 Student portal**

253 In this module 11 functionalities were tested out of which 2 failed. The tests that failed were

- 254 - Students can view their attendance records on line.
- 255 - Students can view the fee records on line.
- 256 - The users acceptance from module was  $(7.5/11) \times 100 = 68.2\%$

257 In this module, the following had not been utilized:

- 258 - Viewing exam results on line and printing of unofficial transcript online.
- 259 - Viewing class and exam time tables online.

260 It was noted that functionalities that are not clear should be reviewed.

##### 261 **4.5.4 Hostel and Accommodations**

262 A total of 17 functionalities were tested of which three failed. These were:

- 263 - Capture damages caused by students and invoice appropriately
- 264 - Occupancy rate
- 265 - Accommodations fees collected per hostel/campus/school etc.

266 Online booking and room rates had not been used.

267 The users acceptance for this module was  $(14/17)*100 = 82.4 \%$

#### 268 **4.5.5 Human Resource**

269 A total of 35 functionalities were tested out which 5 had queries.

- 270 - Employee service history
- 271 - Monitoring employee suspension, discharge and disciplinary actions
- 272 - Keep record of employee training awards and appraisals
- 273 - Track employees performance reviews
- 274 - List of employees due for appraisal

275 The users acceptance for this module was  $(32.5/35)*100 = 92.9 \%$

#### 276 **4.5.6 Procurement**

277 A total of 48 functionalities were tested out of which 14 failed. These were:

- 278 - Ability to consolidate departmental procurement plans and link it university budget
- 279 - System should allow different types of costing methods for inventory
- 280 - They system should be able to show rejected or good returned records
- 281 - Produce report on price list and price updates per supplier
- 282 - Produce reports on cancelled PRNs
- 283 - Produce reports on cancelled LPOs
- 284 - Produce reports on rejected or goods returned
- 285 - Rating of appraisals of suppliers
- 286 - Have full audit trail of all stock movements
- 287 - Expiry dates tracking in case of perishable goods
- 288 - Generate report inventory movement
- 289 - Generate stock taking reports
- 290 - Generate report on inventory evaluation summary's

291 The users acceptance for this module was  $(32.5/48)*100 = 67.7 \%$

#### 292 **4.5.7 Time Tabling**

293 A total of 16 functionalities were tested out of which 1 failed. It was not possible to produce time table reports based on lecturer.

295 The users acceptance for this module was  $(15/16)*100 = 93.8 \%$

#### 296 **4.5.8 Student finance**

297 A total of 25 functionalities were tested with one query. The query was ability to generate invoices to eligible students only.

299 The users acceptance for this module was  $(24.5/25)*100 = 98 \%$

300 It was noted that the system took time to generate reports. Also configuration of emailing demand notices to student had not been configured.

#### 302 **4.5.9 Finance IGA**

303 In this module none of the 12 functionalities were tested.

304 The users acceptance for this module was  $(0/12)*100 = 0 \%$

#### 305 **4.5.10 Accounts Payable**

306 A total of 18 functionalities were tested with only one query and no fail. The query was ability to vote and stop payment of cheques especially where there exists:

- 308 - Double entries on suppliers names
- 309 - List of suppliers contact is not complete e.g. pin no's
- 310 - No separation of capital and recurrent creditors

311 The users acceptance for this module was  $(17.5/18)*100 = 97.2 \%$

#### 313 **4.5.11 Imprest Management**

314 A total of 12 functionalities were tested with 2 fails. The fails were

- 315 - Automatic alerts for overdue unaccounted for imprest.

316 - Online approval. The users acceptance for this module was  $(10/12)*100 = 83.3 \%$

#### 317 **4.5.12 Cash Managements**

318 A total of 15 functionalities were tested with 3 fails. These were:

- 319 - Create alarm features for a predetermined amount payable at time in each bank account.
- 320 - Ability to keep cheque disbursement register.
- 321 - Uncollected cheques list available.
- 322 - The users acceptance for this module was  $(11/15)*100 = 73.4 \%$

#### 323 **4.5.13 Bank Reconciliation**

324 A total of 6 functionalities were tested with 2 fails and 3 queries. These were:

- 325 - Full bank and cash reconciliations including deposits disbursement and adjustments..
- 326 - Flexibility to import transaction from various banks systems.

327 The users acceptance for this module was  $(2.5/6)*100 = 41.7 \%$

#### 328 **4.5.14 Projects**

329 In this module none of the 4 functionalities were tested. There was no user.

330 The users acceptance for this module was  $(0/4)*100 = 0 \%$

#### 331 **4.5.15 Budget**

332 A total of 10 functionalities were tested with 3 fails. These were

- 333 - Send alerts to vote holders whose balances are significantly low
- 334 - Print a vote holder 's statement
- 335 - Vote expenditure summary

336 The users acceptance for this module was  $(7/10)*100 = 70 \%$

#### 337 **4.5.16 Fixed assets**

338 In this module none of the 24 functionalities were tested. There was no user.

339 The users acceptance for this module was  $(0/24)*100 = 0 \%$

#### 340 **4.5.17 Payroll**

341 In this module none of the 31 functionalities were tested because the user requested for more time before assessment of module could be done.

343 The users acceptance for this module was  $(0/31)*100 = 0 \%$

#### 344 **4.5.18 Finance reports**

345 A total 10 functionalities were tested with one fail and seven queries. The fail was notes to the financial statement with comparative figures.

347 The users acceptance for this module was  $(5.5/10)*100 = 55 \%$

### 349 **5.0 Evaluation of Metrics**

350 The office of Auditor General in Kenya has the mandate to audit within six months after end of each  
351 financial year ,any entity funded by public funds(OAG: 2018). Kibabii University is one such  
352 organization. In September 2018 officers from the Auditor general visited Kibabii University to exercise  
353 their mandate. and in their audit they wanted to find out what criteria was used in payment of ERP. We  
354 informed that the payment was based on the application of the the above define metrics, which  
355 determined the percentage of implementation. This percentage of implementation was then used to  
356 determine the percentage of payment. They sampled several payment vouchers and we showed them  
357 the metric used in computation of the level of implementation and corresponding payment. The officers  
358 were satisfied that metrics were valid. Hence confirming and evaluating the metrics. They also did not  
359 raise any audit query.

360

### 361 **6.0 CONCLUSION**

362 In conclusion we set out to identify the key challenges that are experience during ERP implementation  
363 were mainly altitude, training of the users and lack of implementation metrics.

364



365 On altitude we proposed way to win over users and borrowed from what other authors have found out on  
366 overcoming resistance. On training we also found out what are effective strategies and we have proposed  
367 further training and if possible away from the University to allow for the participant to fully engaged.  
368

369 On metrics we found out that metrics that measured the level implementation and tied it to the payment  
370 for work done were missing. We defined our own , theoretically and empirically validated them. The office  
371 of auditor general did not raise any audit query on the way we applied out metrics to decide on amount to  
372 be paid to the vendor. We believe this is an evaluation of our metrics be fit for purpose. We believe this  
373 metric will go along way in assessing the level implementation.  
374

375 However, we are aware that measure of query which was all rounded up to half , irrespective of how near  
376 or far from implementation the query was, is limitation of the metric.

## 377 6.0 REFERENCES

- 378 1. Ahad Z.R , Ali Z., Seyed M.H.B (2018): ERP Implementation Success Assessment: An extended  
379 framework. Published by IGI Global
- 380 2. Briand, L.C., Morasca, S. and Basilli, V.R. (1996):Property-based software engineering  
381 measurement, *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*
- 382 3. Charter (2015). Kibabii University Charter 2015
- 383 4. CGN( 2006) Measuring ERP, Published by CGN Business Performance Consulting
- 384 5. Derek L. (2017) Eight Common mistakes organization Make with ERP in Enterprise Technology  
385 Adoption
- 386 6. Fenton N. E.and Pfleeger S. L. (1997). *Software Metrics: A Rigorous and Practical ,*  
387 *Approach*, . Boston, MA, USA,: PWS Publishing Co
- 388 7. ISO:9001:2015 fifth Edition
- 389 8. Kurt W.(2017).*Introduction to Digital Logic*. Morga & Claypool Publishers
- 390
- 391 9. Mbuguah S.M( 2018). ICT-Directorate Retrived from <https://kibu.ac.ke/ict-directorate/> accessed  
392 15th June 2018.
- 393
- 394 10.Mbuguah S. &Wabwoba F. (2014). *Attackability Metrics Model for Secure Service*  
395 *Oriented Architecture*.Lambert Academic Publishing
- 396
- 397 11.Moutaz H. & Henriek M. (2017). User Resistance in ERP implementation: A literature review  
398 *ScienceDirect Elsevier*.
- 399 12. Muketha G.M.(2011) Size And Complexity Metrics as Indicators of Maintainability , of  
400 Business Process Execution Language Process Models. PhD Thesis , University Putra  
401 Malaysia
- 402 13. OAG (2018): Mandate retrieved on 13/12/2018 from  
403 <https://www.oagkenya.go.ke/index.php/about-us/mandate>
- 404 14. Siriluck (2017): Measuring ERP Implementation Success with balanced Scorecard, *the 23<sup>rd</sup>*  
405 *Journal Americas conference on Information System*
- 406 15. Stackify (2017) What are software metrics and how can we track them retrieved 14/12/2018 at  
407 <https://satackify.com/track-software-metrics/>
- 408
- 409 16. Statues(2017) Kibabii University statutes 2017
- 410

- 411 17. UAT (2018): A complete guide user acceptance test. Retrieved from  
412 <https://www.softwaretestinghelp.com/> on 14/12/2018  
413
- 414 18. Webmaster (2018). History of Kibabii University .Retrieved from <https://kibu.ac.ke/history/> on 14<sup>th</sup>  
415 June 2018
- 416 19. Weyuker E.J.(1998) Evaluating Software complexity measures, *IEEE transaction on* ,  
417 *Software Engineering*

UNDER PEER REVIEW