Complete Integration of NorthStar Learning Systems as a Performance Management System in Education

Angel Ruzicka

Department of Business, Indiana University

BUSE-E559: Performance Management

Dr. Alysa Lambert

September 18, 2025

Executive Summary

NorthStar Learning Systems requires a performance management system that is straightforward to use, fair, and centered on learner impact. This project integrates the literature we studied with a practical design that aligns with how work is done at NorthStar. The system clarifies expectations through a clean goal flow, tracks progress with a concise set of indicators, supports frequent coaching and development, and links results and behaviors to recognition that people trust. It is designed to be clear from the start and durable throughout its lifespan.

The design begins with performance planning that aligns three to five SMART goals per person, team, and organizational priorities. Monitoring relies on a concise KPI dictionary that defines formulas, data sources, and review cadences, ensuring data is understandable and actionable. Feedback and development are not one-time events; they are ongoing processes. Monthly one-on-ones and twice-yearly development conversations result in specific plans that include skill-building, stretch assignments, and growth opportunities.

Technology and ethics keep the system usable and trusted. A cloud-based platform integrates with the LMS, CRM, and payroll. Role-based dashboards make information visible to managers and employees. Data practices emphasize minimization, role-based access, retention discipline, and a plain language description of what is collected and why. Quarterly fairness audits verify rating distributions and development opportunities. Training, short how-to communications, and office hours reduce friction. Evaluation focuses on adoption and usability, as well as people outcomes such as engagement and mobility, and learner and client outcomes, including satisfaction and timely feedback. The result is a transparent, growth-oriented system that keeps attention on learner success and sustainable performance.

Complete Integration of NorthStar Learning Systems as a Performance Management System in Education

Performance management systems (PMS) are most effective when grounded in theory and supported by evidence. For NorthStar Learning Systems, I have selected two theoretical frameworks, Goal-Setting Theory and the Balanced Scorecard, which I believe provide both motivational leverage and strategic alignment with our goals. In an environment where both commonly recognized and reputable Learning Management Systems and Performance Management Systems exist, I believe it is of the utmost importance to ensure that NorthStar is thorough, unique, and fully developed. This section is vital for our business, as it will explain the theories we have chosen, demonstrate how they apply to our PMS design, and provide examples to justify why they are well-suited for NorthStar.

Goal-Setting Theory

Goal-Setting Theory, developed by Edwin Locke and Gary Latham, basically argues that people perform better when they have clear, specific, and challenging goals rather than vague or easy ones. The primary ingredients that make this approach effective are clarity, difficulty, feedback, commitment, and setting smaller sub-goals along the way (Locke & Latham, 2002). This is an ideal environment for substituents to learn and grow. By doing this, employees feel like they can achieve these sub-goals more easily while also having a larger goal to strive for. Aguinis (2023) emphasizes goal setting as a crucial component of performance planning, where goals should adhere to the SMART model (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound). Just as significantly, employees should be involved in shaping them. Aguinis also points out that goal setting is not just a one-time activity but an ongoing cycle of planning, acting,

reviewing, and adjusting (Aguinis, 2023, pp. 45-60). When people help set their own goals, they are more motivated and invested, resulting in higher performance.

For NorthStar Learning Systems, which combines online and in-person training, precise and meaningful goals will be essential for keeping instructors, students, and organizational priorities aligned. For example, a practical goal for an instructor could be to "increase the hybrid course completion rate by 10% over the next two semesters". That is measurable, specific, and time-bound, and it also opens the door for smaller targets, such as boosting student engagement in online modules or increasing the number of instructor check-ins. Additionally, built-in feedback loops, such as mid-semester reviews, will help instructors track progress and adjust before it is too late to matter.

Many organizations already utilize versions of Goal-Setting Theory with success. Tech companies, for instance, often use OKRs (Objectives and Key Results) to set ambitious goals, break them down into measurable outcomes, and track progress. Another example is how many marketing and management agencies use KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) to measure the performance of advertising campaigns and A/B testing. Aguinis (2023) does not delve into OKRs or KPIs in great depth; however, the principles remain the same: strong goals, regular feedback, visible commitment, and alignment with broader organizational strategies. People naturally perform better when they can track their own metrics and have clearly outlined expectations and goals.

Balanced Scorecard

The Balanced Scorecard, created by Kaplan and Norton (1992), is about expanding how organizations measure performance beyond financial metrics alone. It looks at four key

perspectives: financials, customers, internal processes, and learning and growth. The idea is that if a company focuses solely on financial outcomes, it overlooks all the other drivers that contribute to long-term success. Instead, the Balanced Scorecard connects strategy to action by setting goals and metrics in each area, showing how they influence one another. Aguinis (2023) notes that this broader approach helps performance management systems remain valid and strategically aligned, rather than being one-dimensional. More recent research also emphasizes that the Balanced Scorecard is most effective when leaders treat it as a living tool, which involves regularly updating measures, making connections between perspectives, and using it to inform decisions (Tawse et al., 2023). So, how does this relate to NorthStar?

For NorthStar Learning Systems, this framework naturally makes sense. As an organization focused on education and training, success cannot be judged solely by financial results; instead, it should be measured by the differences we make across the board. The Balanced Scorecard lets NorthStar track outcomes that reflect its mission and impact. For example:

Financials: revenue per course, the cost of retaining a student, salaries, etc.

Customers: student satisfaction or the percentage of learners hitting their goals.

Internal Processes: how quickly instructors provide feedback or how often course content is updated.

Learning & Growth: hours of professional development for instructors, new technologies adopted, or the overall quality of instructional materials.

These perspectives connect to create a strong balance. For example, improving instructor training (Learning & Growth) should lead to better feedback systems (Internal Processes), which in turn improve student satisfaction (Customers), ultimately resulting in increased retention and revenue (Financials). This interconnected approach ensures that NorthStar is not just reacting to financial outcomes but is building sustainable performance across the board. For NorthStar, applying this means leadership gains a comprehensive view of progress. At the same time, employees can see how their day-to-day efforts contribute to the mission, which can increase motivation and productivity.

Integration & Justification

Goal-Setting Theory and the Balanced Scorecard complement each other for NorthStar. Goal setting provides motivational push and clarity at the individual and team levels. On the other hand, Balanced Scorecard provides structural and strategic scaffolding to ensure that the goals being set are aligned with organizational priorities across multiple dimensions. By combining them, NorthStar's PMS will ensure strategic congruence, provide validity, maintain practicality, and enhance acceptability (Aguinis, 2023). Overall, when combined, these theories can ensure success at NorthStar.

Literature Review Final Thoughts

Overall, Goal-Setting Theory provides the behavioral and motivational foundation for NorthStar's performance planning processes, emphasizing clarity, challenge, feedback, and employee participation. The Balanced Scorecard ensures that these goals are part of a broader strategic system that tracks multiple perspectives, aligns operations with the mission, and provides a map for continuous improvement. Together, they offer a theoretically strong,

evidence-backed framework for designing a performance management system that supports both instructor development and organizational growth at NorthStar.

Performance Management System Design

NorthStar is a learning organization dedicated to delivering a robust performance management system to all our stakeholders. It needs to drive clarity, coaching, and continuous improvement for a hybrid team that builds courses, supports learners, and partners with clients. The design below draws from Goal-Setting Theory, the Balanced Scorecard, contemporary performance management research, and evidence-based HR thinking about what changes behavior at work (Aguinis, 2023). The aim is straightforward: to align everyone on what excellent performance looks like, monitor progress fairly and transparently, provide feedback that people can act upon, and connect results to rewards in a way that feels equitable and understandable.

Performance Planning

Every employee and their manager co-create three to five SMART goals that align directly with NorthStar's strategy. We use a brief goals canvas that captures the statement, measure, data source, target, timeframe, dependencies, and supports the employee's needs. Roles are clarified through current job descriptions and a concise role charter that outlines the purpose of the job, key responsibilities, key stakeholders, and decision-making rights. New hires complete onboarding with the charter in hand, then set initial goals within the first two weeks. If new hires have any concerns or questions about the charter, they should bring these to their direct manager. Problems can be escalated up the chain of command as necessary.

To maintain tight alignment, we waterfall goals from organizational priorities to departmental plans and then to individual goals. To prevent tunnel vision, each person's goals map to the four Balanced Scorecard perspectives: learner or customer, internal process, learning and growth, and financial or stewardship (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Weighting depends on the role being discussed and varies from role to role. As a default, goals are weighted 60 percent on results and 40 percent on behaviors and collaboration. In learner-facing roles, we place greater emphasis on quality and student outcomes; however, in design or operations roles, we weigh project process quality.

Integrating our Selected Theories

Cadence matters for commitment and follow-through. NorthStar runs quarterly planning and refreshes. We set or renew goals in Q1, check alignment and make adjustments in Q2, confirm stretch targets in Q3, and finalize year-end targets in Q4. Managers hold monthly one-on-ones that include a five-minute review of goals. If priorities move, we update the goals in the system rather than working off stale plans. This combines the core principles of Goal-Setting Theory with practical application. Specific and challenging goals enhance performance when individuals buy into them and receive feedback, particularly when they can see progress and adjust their strategies as needed (Locke & Latham, 2002). If we fail to adjust towards new goals and plans, then our team will likely feel cornered by old ideas and perceive a diminished value in future goals.

Linking goals to the Balanced Scorecard keeps attention focused on leading indicators, such as course quality, learner satisfaction, and team capability growth, rather than just short-term numbers (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Examples include:

Instructor: Increase on-time assignment feedback from 86 percent to 95 percent by December 15, measured in the LMS turnaround report.

Learning Designer: Reduce first-week defect rate in new course launches from 7 percent to 3 percent by the end of Q3.

Partnerships: Improve renewal rate from 84 percent to 90 percent this fiscal year, tracked in the CRM, with two client health checks per quarter per account.

Performance Monitoring

We maintain a KPI dictionary for each role, which includes clear definitions, formulas, data sources, and thresholds for green, yellow, and red statuses. Three categories of data feed the system. First, results from our LMS, CRM, and finance tools. Second, quality indicators like rubric-based observations and QA audits. Third, experience data such as learner satisfaction, instructor peer feedback, and client pulse surveys. Managers and employees see the same dashboard. Instructors view student progress, completion rates, and the turnaround times for feedback. Designers focus on cycle time, defects, and adoption, while partnerships concentrate on pipeline, renewals, and relationship health. We use monthly one-on-ones for formal check-ins. For at-risk metrics, such as student pace, the system triggers weekly nudges that prompt targeted outreach. Quarterly, HR and leadership review the validity and fairness of KPIs across teams.

KPI selection and validation follow a two-step check. We begin with strategy and translate it into a concise set of leading and lagging indicators. Stakeholders review the design for face validity and unintended consequences, and then we run a 60-day pilot with parallel tracking to test signal quality. We discard vanity metrics that do not predict outcomes and add

context notes, ensuring that a number is never read in isolation. This approach reflects evidence-based management guidance to measure things accurately and ensure the data are useful for decision-making (Cascio & Boudreau, 2011). Accurate and valuable data is non-negotiable when making successful business decisions.

Performance Appraisal

NorthStar uses a semiannual appraisal cycle that combines 360-degree feedback with behaviorally anchored rating scales. Each employee receives input from themselves, their manager, two peers, and one cross-functional partner. For roles that involve interacting with learners or clients, we use aggregated survey data rather than individual comments to protect their privacy. The overall assessment blends a narrative summary with ratings on results and behaviors.

We use a five-point scale with behavior anchors that define what “meets” and “exceeds” look like in plain language. For example, “collaborates across teams” at level 3 describes regular and reliable collaboration that moves work forward, while level 5 describes proactive alignment, constructive conflict management, and measurable impact on shared outcomes. Before each cycle, raters complete a brief training session on using the anchors and avoiding common biases, such as recency, halo, and the "similar-to-me" effects. After individual reviews, managers participate in calibration sessions by function to test for rating inflation or compression and to review evidence against the anchors. We do not force a distribution; instead, the intent is fairness and consistency, not quotas. Employees may request a second review if they believe their appraisal misapplied the anchors or missed relevant evidence, and HR logs these cases to improve guidance.

This method aligns with NorthStar's context, as our work is collaborative and learner-impact focused, so a single vantage point can overlook critical behaviors that make the system work. Multisource input increases perceived fairness and provides richer coaching material, which is linked to stronger developmental outcomes in the research (Aguinis, 2023). Behaviorally anchored scales increase clarity by describing observable actions rather than leaving raters to guess what each number means.

Feedback and Development

We distinguish between two types of conversations when it comes to feedback and development. Firstly, we like to have monthly one-on-ones that focus on progress, blockers, and light feedback tied to goals and anchors. Then, twice a year, we hold a dedicated development conversation that is separate from compensation meetings. Managers use a simple coaching method by asking the employee to complete their self-assessment, sharing observations tied to goals and anchors, co-creating one or two focus areas, and concluding with clear next steps and support. Every employee maintains an Individual Development Plan, which includes one skill goal, one role stretch, and one career exploration goal. We employ a 70-20-10 approach, which involves approximately 70 percent on-the-job training through stretch assignments, 20 percent through mentorship and peer learning, and 10 percent through courses or certifications. Examples include co-leading a course redesign, facilitating a client retrospective, or earning a credential in learning analytics.

Training is modular and applied learning. For evaluation, we use the Kirkpatrick model. Level 1 captures reactions such as usefulness. Level 2 measures learning, such as a scored activity. Level 3 checks behavior back on the job through observation or work artifacts. Level 4

seeks results such as faster launch cycles or improved learner outcomes (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). When the data is available, we estimate business impact and reinvest in what works. When performance dips, we launch a 60-day improvement plan that specifies the gap, the standard, the support, and the check-in cadence. The plan ends with a decision supported by evidence. This approach matches a learning organization. We teach growth to our learners, so our internal system needs to model growth. Ongoing coaching keeps feedback timely. IDPs and stretch work build capability faster than courses alone. Measuring development closes the loop, enabling us to determine which investments are yielding results.

Reward and Recognition

Ratings inform, but do not dictate, compensation decisions. At year's end, managers propose base pay adjustments within market bands using three inputs: performance, unique skills or critical roles, and internal equity. Eligible roles also offer an annual variable pay opportunity tied to results and the business's overall health. For example, “meets expectations” maps to a target bonus, while “exceeds” maps to a higher multiplier. We perform equity analyses each cycle and correct disparities.

Recognition is not only financial. We run a visible program that includes peer shout-outs in monthly forums, quarterly NorthStar Impact Awards for cross-team wins, and spot bonuses for extraordinary effort on time-sensitive initiatives. We also fund learning stipends for certifications and conferences, and we make career paths and criteria transparent so that employees can see how to grow within our organization. Publishing award criteria in plain language and providing a clear rationale for pay decisions supports procedural justice, which enhances perceived fairness and commitment (Colquitt, 2001). Employees should not be

confused about benefits, bonuses, or incentives; instead, they should feel confident in knowing how to excel and achieve each potential opportunity.

Implementation Plan

NorthStar will roll out the PMS in three phases over six months: a brief prepare window to finalize the KPI dictionary and behavior anchors, configure the platform, and recruit change champions; a pilot with two representative teams to set SMART goals, run 1:1s, test dashboards, and hold a mini calibration; and an expansion to all teams followed by the first complete cycle with rater training, 360 inputs, calibration, and development plans. Training is practical and short: a 2-hour manager workshop on coaching, anchors, and bias traps; 45-minute employee orientation on goals, dashboards, and self-reviews; change-champion office hours; and just-in-time micro-videos and in-tool tips.

Communication begins with a CEO kickoff and a cascade deck, followed by a three-part "how to" series, an open Teams or Slack channel staffed by HR during Phases 1 and 2, and brief progress updates with fixes shipped. Change management centers on a cross-functional Steering Group, an always-on feedback widget, pilot and cycle retros, a simple change-request form, and a sunset rule to remove low-value steps. Likely sources of resistance include "another system," rating anxiety, data confusion, manager time pressure, AI skepticism, and privacy concerns.

Mitigation includes retiring duplicate spreadsheets, establishing strong behavioral anchors and concise rater training, a plain-language KPI dictionary, and role-based dashboards. Overall, it is essential to mitigate as much as possible while remaining flexible and understanding that an entirely new process will naturally undergo the trial-and-error process. Mistakes are not feared but instead encouraged, as we would rather perfect our craft than overlook potential errors that could occur down the line.

Technology and Ethics

NorthStar will use a lightweight, integrated HR tech stack built around a cloud PMS (for goals, 1:1s, 360s, and calibration) connected to the LMS, CRM, and payroll, with role-based dashboards in Power BI or Looker Studio, quick pulse surveys in Qualtrics or Google Forms, and a simple recognition plug-in like Bonusly. Ethical guardrails ensure the system's trustworthiness: data minimization and clear purpose statements, single sign-on with role-based access, encryption in transit and at rest, a three-year retention schedule, and a plain-language "How your data is used" notice in the tool. AI features remain advisory and explainable, never making decisions on their own, and employees can see the inputs behind any summary or flag. Quarterly fairness audits verify rating distributions, recognition and pay outcomes, and access to development opportunities across approved groups, with findings logged and remedial actions taken. Bias mitigation also includes behavior anchors, brief rater training, calibration to align standards, and periodic spot checks of narrative feedback to ensure consistency and a respectful tone.

Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

NorthStar will evaluate the PMS on adoption, people outcomes, and learner or client results, then act on findings through a clear governance cadence. Adoption metrics include the percentage of employees with current SMART goals, monthly 1:1 completion, rater training completion, calibration coverage, and on-time review completion. People's outcomes include engagement and eNPS, manager effectiveness, internal mobility, completion of IDPs, retention of strong performers, and reduction of regrettable turnover.

Learner and client results include satisfaction scores, on-time instructor feedback, first-week course defect rates, client renewal rates, and program margins. HR Analytics compiles

role-based dashboards monthly and conducts quarterly audits of fairness in rating distributions, recognition, pay outcomes, and access to development opportunities. Feedback is gathered through always-on in-tool prompts, short pulse surveys at key milestones, and semiannual focus groups. The PMS Steering Group reviews the data quarterly, prioritizes issues, assigns owners, and tracks fixes in a public action log with due dates. Semiannually, cycle retros update behavior anchors, training, or processes as needed, and an annual effectiveness review with leadership confirms targets for the next cycle, while sunsetting low-value steps to ensure the system stays lean and trusted.

Conclusion

Taken together, this project gives NorthStar a performance system that works in the real world. We started with a clear foundation for what great looks like, turned it into a usable design with roles, SMART goals, fair evaluations, and real development, and then built the practical scaffolding to make it live through tech, ethics, and a phased rollout. As we move into the following cycles, the priorities are to keep the goals fresh, maintain visible coaching, prune what is no longer useful, and continue sharing what we learn. Hence, the system remains trusted and genuinely helps people do their best work.

References

Aguinis, H. (2023). Performance Management (5th ed.). Pearson Publishing.

Cascio, W. F., & Boudreau, J. W. (2011). Investing in people: Financial impact of human resource initiatives (2nd ed.). FT Press.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021 9010.86.3.386

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. Harvard Business Review, 70(1), 71-79.

Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). Evaluating training programs: The four levels (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57(9), 705-717.

Tawse, A., et al. (2023). Thirty years with the balanced scorecard: What we have learned. Journal of Business Strategy.