Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 398 - 410

Decision-Making Efficiency and Organizational Productivity in Higher Education Institutions: A Case Study of Universities in Uganda

Musiimenta Nancy[1], Ahumuza Audrey[2]
1,2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract

Background: Decision-making is a critical managerial function that directly influences institutional performance and productivity in academic institutions. Universities in Uganda face increasing pressure to make prompt and effective decisions amid limited resources, growing student populations, and competitive educational demands, yet bureaucratic delays continue to undermine operational efficiency and institutional outcomes.

Main Objective: To examine the influence of prompt decision-making on productivity in universities in Uganda.

Methods: This cross-sectional study employed a mixed-methods approach with 384 respondents selected through stratified random sampling from six universities (three public and three private) in Uganda. Data were collected using structured questionnaires and key informant interviews, and analyzed using Stata version 17. Univariate analysis computed descriptive statistics; bivariate analysis employed Pearson's correlation and Chi-square tests; and multivariate analysis applied multiple linear regression to assess predictive effects of prompt decision-making on productivity, controlling for confounders.

Key Results: Prompt administrative decision-making showed strong positive correlations with staff productivity ($r=0.687$, $p<0.001$), with speed of decision implementation emerging as the strongest predictor ($\beta=0.334$, $p<0.001$) in a model explaining 68.2% of productivity variance. Prompt academic decision-making explained an additional 44.2% of variance in institutional performance beyond control variables ($\Delta R^2=0.442$, $p<0.001$), with research approval efficiency ($\beta=0.356$, $p<0.001$) demonstrating the largest effect. Private universities demonstrated significantly higher productivity scores ($M=3.58$) compared to public universities ($M=3.18$), while critical bottlenecks were identified in procurement processes ($M=2.85$), administrative approvals ($M=2.76$), and examination processing ($M=2.95$).

Conclusion: Prompt decision-making was a vital determinant of both staff productivity and institutional performance in Ugandan universities, with all three research hypotheses receiving strong empirical support. Universities that implemented rapid decision processes, transparent communication systems, and streamlined approval mechanisms achieved significantly higher productivity levels, better research outputs, and enhanced competitive positioning.

Recommendation: Universities should implement technology-driven management information systems with automated workflows to eliminate manual processing bottlenecks, reduce approval turnaround times, and enhance transparency across procurement, human resources, academic registries, and research administration.

Keywords: prompt decision-making, institutional productivity, staff productivity, academic decision-making, administrative efficiency, universities, Uganda, higher education management

Introduction

Decision-making is a critical managerial function that directly influences institutional performance and productivity. In academic institutions, prompt decision-making enhances operational efficiency, supports effective resource allocation, and promotes timely academic and administrative processes. Universities in Uganda operate in an

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

increasingly competitive environment characterized by limited resources, growing student populations, and evolving educational demands (Julius & Isaac Kazaara, 2024; Julius & Twinomujuni, 2025a; Nancy & Benard, 2023). Consequently, the ability of university leaders to make quick and well-informed decisions is essential for maintaining institutional productivity, staff morale, and service delivery. However, delays in decision-making often result in inefficiencies, bureaucratic bottlenecks, and reduced institutional performance. Therefore, this study investigates the relationship between prompt decision-making and productivity in Ugandan universities, with the aim of identifying how timely managerial actions contribute to improved academic and administrative outcomes.

Prompt decision-making is not merely about speed but about achieving a balance between timeliness and the quality of choices made (Abe & Mugobo, 2021; Ariyo & Kazaara, 2024; Nancy, 2024; Nicholas & Deus, 2024). In modern academic settings, where information changes rapidly, the ability of managers and faculty leaders to interpret data and make timely interventions determines the competitiveness and adaptability of institutions. Effective decision-making also reflects strong leadership, functional communication systems, and a culture of accountability. In contrast, slow or inconsistent decisions can delay institutional reforms, hinder innovation, and reduce responsiveness to students' and staff needs. Thus, understanding how prompt decision-making translates into measurable productivity outcomes in universities is vital for improving management practices in Uganda's higher education sector.

Background of the Study

Decision-making in higher education institutions plays a central role in shaping their strategic direction and operational success. Globally, research has shown that prompt and evidence-based decisions contribute to higher productivity by reducing response times, minimizing costs, and ensuring effective implementation of institutional plans (Mintzberg, 1976; Simon, 1997). In developed academic systems, universities adopt decentralized and data-driven decision frameworks that enhance timely responses to academic and administrative challenges. Such systems have been associated with improved staff motivation, better allocation of resources, and enhanced institutional competitiveness (Alam et al., 2020; Ariyo et al., 2023; Isaac et al., 2023; James & Jacob, 2023; Julius & Nelson, 2023).

In Uganda, the higher education landscape has expanded rapidly, with both public and private universities striving to deliver quality education under constrained resources (Dorothy et al., 2023; Lutaaya et al., 2023). This growth has increased the complexity of decision-making processes, as administrators must balance academic standards, financial constraints, and regulatory compliance. However, bureaucratic governance structures and limited access to real-time data have slowed down the decision-making process in many institutions. Reports from the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE, 2023) indicate that delayed decisions on staffing, academic approvals, and resource allocation have negatively affected institutional efficiency and overall productivity. Understanding the dynamics of prompt decision-making within this context is therefore essential to identifying practical solutions for enhancing institutional performance and competitiveness in Uganda's university system (Adenike Ph & Abayomi Ph, 2023; Farooq & Sultana, 2022; Musa et al., 2023).

Problem Statement

Despite the recognized importance of timely decisions in enhancing institutional performance, many universities in

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Uganda continue to experience delays in decision-making processes. These delays often stem from hierarchical approval systems, poor communication flow, and a lack of technological integration in management processes. As a result, key functions such as academic scheduling, procurement, staff deployment, and student services are often executed inefficiently (Charles et al., 2023; Julius & Twinomujuni, 2025b; Kevin et al., 2023; Ntirandekura & Christopher, 2022; Paul & Gracious Kazaara, 2023). This negatively affects productivity, leading to missed deadlines, reduced staff motivation, and compromised academic quality. While studies in organizational management have highlighted the role of prompt decision-making in improving performance, there is limited empirical evidence on how it influences productivity specifically in Ugandan universities. This study, therefore, seeks to bridge this knowledge gap by examining the relationship between prompt decision-making and productivity in academic institutions.

Main Objective of the Study

To examine the influence of prompt decision-making on productivity in universities in Uganda.

5. Specific Objectives

1. To assess the relationship between prompt administrative decision-making and staff productivity in universities in Uganda.
2. To examine the effect of prompt academic decision-making on institutional performance in Ugandan universities.
3. To identify challenges that hinder prompt decision-making and propose strategies to enhance decision efficiency in universities in Uganda.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between prompt administrative decision-making and staff productivity in universities in Uganda?
2. How does prompt academic decision-making affect institutional performance in Ugandan universities?
3. What are the main challenges hindering prompt decision-making in universities, and what strategies can improve decision efficiency?

Research Hypotheses

H_1: There is a significant relationship between prompt administrative decision-making and staff productivity in universities in Uganda.
H_2: Prompt academic decision-making significantly influences institutional performance in Ugandan universities.
H_3: Challenges in decision-making processes have a significant negative effect on overall productivity in universities in Uganda.

Methodology

The study adopted a cross-sectional research design and employed a mixed-methods approach to examine the influence of prompt decision-making on productivity in universities in Uganda. Both quantitative and qualitative data

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 398 - 410

were collected from a representative sample of academic and administrative staff. The study population consisted of staff members from six selected universities (three public and three private) in Uganda. A sample size of **384** respondents was determined using Cochran's formula (1977) for large populations, ensuring adequate precision and statistical power. This sample size was sufficient to detect a minimum effect size of 0.3 with 80% power at a 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$). Participants were selected using a stratified random sampling technique, ensuring representation across academic departments and administrative units. Data were collected using structured questionnaires for the quantitative component and key informant interviews for the qualitative aspect. The questionnaire captured dimensions of decision-making timeliness, communication flow, leadership responsiveness, and indicators of institutional productivity (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023).

Quantitative data were analyzed using Stata version 17. Univariate analysis involved computing descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages to summarize demographic characteristics and key study variables. Bivariate analysis employed Pearson's correlation and Chi-square tests to examine associations between prompt decision-making indicators and productivity outcomes. For multivariate analysis, a multiple linear regression model was applied to assess the predictive effect of prompt decision-making (independent variable) on institutional productivity (dependent variable), controlling for confounders such as university type, staff experience, and leadership style. The model was specified as:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \cdots + \beta_k X_{ki} + \epsilon_i$$

where $Y_i$represented productivity scores and $X_{1i} \ldots X_{ki}$represented decision-making attributes. Assumptions of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and absence of multicollinearity were tested using residual plots, Shapiro-Wilk test, and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). Additionally, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to examine the incremental contribution of prompt decision-making over structural and contextual factors. Qualitative data were thematically analyzed to complement quantitative findings, providing contextual insights into how decision-making processes influence institutional productivity.

Results:

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N=384)

Characteristic	**Category**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Gender	Male	228	59.4%
	Female	156	40.6%
University Type	Public	192	50.0%
	Private	192	50.0%
Staff Category	Academic Staff	230	59.9%
	Administrative Staff	154	40.1%
Work Experience	Less than 5 years	112	29.2%
	5-10 years	145	37.8%

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 398 - 410

	11-15 years	89	23.2%
	Over 15 years	38	9.9%
Position Level	Junior Staff	198	51.6%
	Mid-level Staff	134	34.9%
	Senior Management	52	13.5%
Department	Science & Technology	96	25.0%
	Social Sciences	118	30.7%
	Business & Management	82	21.4%
	Administration	88	22.9%

The demographic characteristics revealed that the sample comprised 384 respondents with a male majority (59.4%) and female representation of 40.6%, indicating a gender imbalance that reflected the broader composition of university staff in Uganda. The distribution across university types was perfectly balanced with 50% from public and 50% from private institutions, which ensured comparative analysis between the two sectors. Academic staff constituted 59.9% of the sample while administrative staff made up 40.1%, demonstrating adequate representation of both categories essential for examining decision-making processes from multiple perspectives. The work experience distribution showed that most respondents (37.8%) had between 5-10 years of experience, followed by those with less than 5 years (29.2%), suggesting a relatively young workforce with sufficient institutional memory to assess decision-making effectiveness over time.

The stratified sampling technique successfully captured representation across different hierarchical levels, with junior staff forming the largest group (51.6%), followed by mid-level staff (34.9%) and senior management (13.5%). This distribution was appropriate as it reflected the typical pyramidal organizational structure in universities. Departmental representation was fairly balanced, with Social Sciences having the highest participation (30.7%), followed by Science & Technology (25.0%), Administration (22.9%), and Business & Management (21.4%). The diversity in departmental representation was crucial for understanding how prompt decision-making affected productivity across different functional areas. The sample characteristics indicated that Cochran's formula had been appropriately applied, yielding a representative sample with sufficient statistical power to detect significant relationships at the predetermined alpha level of 0.05.

Table 2: Relationship Between Prompt Administrative Decision-Making and Staff Productivity

Variable	**Mean (SD)**	**Productivity Score r**	**χ^2**	**p-value**	**Interpretation**
Speed of Decision Implementation	3.42 (0.89)	0.687**	-	<0.001	Strong positive correlation
Communication Clarity	3.28 (0.94)	0.612**	-	<0.001	Moderate positive correlation

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Resource Allocation Timeliness	2.98 (1.02)	0.591**	-	<0.001	Moderate positive correlation
Procurement Process Efficiency	2.85 (1.08)	0.548**	-	<0.001	Moderate positive correlation
Staff Deployment Responsiveness	3.15 (0.97)	0.634**	-	<0.001	Moderate positive correlation
Administrative Approval Speed	2.76 (1.11)	0.523**	-	<0.001	Moderate positive correlation
Overall Staff Productivity Score	3.38 (0.86)	-	-	-	Dependent variable
University Type vs Productivity			24.67	<0.001	Significant association
- Public Universities	3.18 (0.91)				
- Private Universities	3.58 (0.76)				
Experience vs Productivity			31.45	<0.001	Significant association
- Less than 5 years	3.02 (0.88)				
- 5-10 years	3.42 (0.79)				
- 11-15 years	3.61 (0.82)				
- Over 15 years	3.78 (0.71)				

Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01; Productivity measured on 5-point Likert scale

The Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated statistically significant positive relationships between all dimensions of prompt administrative decision-making and staff productivity at the p<0.001 level. The speed of decision implementation exhibited the strongest correlation with productivity (r=0.687, p<0.001), indicating that when administrative decisions were executed quickly, staff productivity increased substantially. This finding was consistent with organizational behavior theories suggesting that decisiveness reduces uncertainty and enhances operational efficiency. Communication clarity (r=0.612, p<0.001) and staff deployment responsiveness (r=0.634, p<0.001) also showed moderately strong positive correlations, suggesting that transparent information flow and timely human resource decisions were critical determinants of productivity. The weakest, though still significant, correlation was observed with administrative approval speed (r=0.523, p<0.001), which nonetheless confirmed that bureaucratic delays negatively affected staff performance.

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 398 - 410

The Chi-square tests revealed significant associations between institutional characteristics and productivity outcomes. Staff in private universities reported significantly higher productivity scores (M=3.58, SD=0.76) compared to their counterparts in public universities (M=3.18, SD=0.91), with $\chi^2=24.67$, $p<0.001$. This difference suggested that private institutions may have more streamlined decision-making structures with less bureaucratic red tape. Furthermore, work experience demonstrated a significant positive association with productivity ($\chi^2=31.45$, $p<0.001$), with senior staff (over 15 years) reporting the highest productivity scores (M=3.78, SD=0.71) compared to those with less than 5 years (M=3.02, SD=0.88). This pattern indicated that experienced staff may have developed coping mechanisms for navigating institutional decision-making processes or may have been better positioned within networks that facilitated quicker access to resources. The consistently low means for procurement process efficiency (M=2.85) and administrative approval speed (M=2.76) highlighted critical bottlenecks in university administrative systems that warranted immediate attention from institutional leadership.

Table 3: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis - Predictors of Institutional Productivity

Predictor Variable	β (Unstandardized)	SE	β (Standardized)	t-value	p-value	95% CI	VIF
Constant	0.842	0.234	-	3.598	<0.001	[0.382, 1.302]	-
Speed of Decision Implementation	0.312	0.048	0.334***	6.500	<0.001	[0.218, 0.406]	1.82
Communication Clarity	0.187	0.045	0.205***	4.156	<0.001	[0.099, 0.275]	1.76
Resource Allocation Timeliness	0.156	0.041	0.185***	3.805	<0.001	[0.075, 0.237]	1.64
Staff Deployment Responsiveness	0.198	0.043	0.223***	4.605	<0.001	[0.113, 0.283]	1.71
Administrative Approval Speed	0.089	0.037	0.115*	2.405	0.017	[0.016, 0.162]	1.58
University Type (Private=1)	0.234	0.082	0.136**	2.854	0.005	[0.073, 0.395]	1.23
Work Experience (years)	0.023	0.009	0.122**	2.556	0.011	[0.005, 0.041]	1.18
Leadership Style Score	0.142	0.038	0.176***	3.737	<0.001	[0.067, 0.217]	1.45
Model Statistics							
R^2	0.682						
Adjusted R^2	0.675						
F-statistic	100.45***						

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 398 - 410

Durbin-Watson	1.94						
Mean VIF	1.55						

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

The multiple linear regression model was statistically significant (F=100.45, p<0.001) and explained 68.2% of the variance in institutional productivity (R^2=0.682, Adjusted R^2=0.675), indicating a strong predictive model. The speed of decision implementation emerged as the strongest predictor of productivity (β=0.334, t=6.500, p<0.001), demonstrating that for every one-unit increase in decision implementation speed, productivity increased by 0.312 units when holding other variables constant. This finding provided robust empirical support for Hypothesis 1, confirming that prompt administrative decision-making significantly influenced staff productivity. Staff deployment responsiveness (β=0.223, t=4.605, p<0.001) and communication clarity (β=0.205, t=4.156, p<0.001) also emerged as significant predictors, reinforcing the importance of timely human resource decisions and transparent communication systems. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values ranged from 1.18 to 1.82, with a mean VIF of 1.55, indicating no multicollinearity concerns as all values were well below the threshold of 10.

Institutional and contextual factors also contributed significantly to the model. University type was a significant predictor (β=0.136, t=2.854, p=0.005), with private universities showing higher productivity levels by 0.234 units compared to public universities, controlling for other factors. Work experience demonstrated a positive effect (β=0.122, t=2.556, p=0.011), confirming that more experienced staff achieved higher productivity levels. Leadership style score was also significant (β=0.176, t=3.737, p<0.001), suggesting that effective leadership facilitated prompt decision-making and enhanced productivity outcomes. The Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.94 indicated minimal autocorrelation in the residuals, confirming the validity of the regression assumptions. Interestingly, administrative approval speed, while significant (p=0.017), had the smallest standardized coefficient (β=0.115), suggesting that while bureaucratic efficiency mattered, its direct impact on productivity was weaker compared to other decision-making dimensions. These findings collectively supported the hypothesis that prompt administrative decision-making significantly predicted staff productivity in Ugandan universities.

Table 4: Effects of Prompt Academic Decision-Making on Institutional Performance

Academic Decision Domain	Performance Indicator	Mean Score (SD)	Correlation (r)	Regression β	p-value	Effect Size (Cohen's d)
Curriculum Approval Speed	Time-to-market for programs	3.12 (0.96)	0.641**	0.298***	<0.001	0.72 (Medium)
	Student enrollment growth	3.28 (0.89)	0.587**	0.245***	<0.001	0.68 (Medium)
Examination	Results release	2.95 (1.05)	0.608**	0.267***	<0.001	0.65

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Processing Time	timeliness					(Medium)
	Student satisfaction	3.08 (0.92)	0.573**	0.234**	0.002	0.61 (Medium)
Research Approval Efficiency	Research output volume	3.45 (0.84)	0.694**	0.356***	<0.001	0.81 (Large)
	Grant success rate	3.32 (0.91)	0.659**	0.312***	<0.001	0.75 (Medium)
Academic Staffing Decisions	Teaching quality scores	3.51 (0.78)	0.623**	0.289***	<0.001	0.70 (Medium)
	Faculty retention rate	3.38 (0.87)	0.596**	0.256***	<0.001	0.66 (Medium)
Academic Calendar Adherence	Semester completion rate	3.67 (0.72)	0.612**	0.278***	<0.001	0.69 (Medium)
	Program delivery efficiency	3.55 (0.81)	0.628**	0.291***	<0.001	0.71 (Medium)
Hierarchical Regression Results						
Model 1: Control variables only	$R^2 = 0.287$					
Model 2: + Academic decision-making	$R^2 = 0.729$	$\Delta R^2 = 0.442$***	F-change = 156.32***	<0.001		
Overall Institutional Performance Score	3.33 (0.73)	-	-	-	-	

Note: All correlations significant at **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01

The analysis of prompt academic decision-making revealed significant positive relationships with all institutional performance indicators, with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.573 to 0.694 (all p<0.001). Research approval efficiency demonstrated the strongest association with institutional performance, showing a correlation of r=0.694 with research output volume and the largest standardized regression coefficient (β=0.356, p<0.001). This finding was particularly important as it indicated that streamlined research approval processes directly enhanced scholarly productivity, which was a core mission of universities. The effect size for research approval efficiency was large (Cohen's d=0.81), suggesting substantial practical significance beyond statistical significance. Curriculum approval speed also showed strong effects, with faster program approvals correlating significantly with both time-to-market for new programs (r=0.641, p<0.001) and student enrollment growth (r=0.587, p<0.001), indicating that institutional

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

agility in academic planning translated into competitive advantages in attracting students.

The hierarchical regression analysis provided compelling evidence for Hypothesis 2, demonstrating that prompt academic decision-making explained an additional 44.2% of variance in institutional performance beyond control variables alone (ΔR^2=0.442, F-change=156.32, $p<0.001$). Model 2, which included academic decision-making variables, achieved an overall R^2 of 0.729, indicating that the full model explained 72.9% of the variance in institutional performance. Examination processing time, while showing a moderate correlation with results release timeliness ($r=0.608$, $p<0.001$) and student satisfaction ($r=0.573$, $p<0.001$), had a mean score of only 2.95, the lowest among all academic decision domains. This highlighted a critical area requiring improvement, as delayed examination processing undermined student satisfaction and institutional reputation. Academic calendar adherence showed strong performance metrics, with semester completion rates achieving the highest mean score ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.72$) and significant correlations with program delivery efficiency ($r=0.628$, $p<0.001$). The consistency of medium-to-large effect sizes across all academic decision domains confirmed that prompt academic decision-making had substantial practical implications for institutional performance in Ugandan universities, thereby supporting the central thesis that decisiveness in academic matters was a key driver of institutional success and competitiveness.

Conclusion

This study examined the influence of prompt decision-making on productivity in universities in Uganda, guided by three specific objectives. The first objective assessed the relationship between prompt administrative decision-making and staff productivity, and the findings confirmed a significant positive relationship ($r=0.687$, $p<0.001$), with speed of decision implementation emerging as the strongest predictor of productivity ($\beta=0.334$, $p<0.001$). The regression model explained 68.2% of variance in staff productivity, demonstrating that timely administrative decisions regarding resource allocation, procurement, staff deployment, and approval processes significantly enhanced operational efficiency and staff performance. The second objective examined the effect of prompt academic decision-making on institutional performance, and results showed that academic decision-making explained 44.2% of additional variance in institutional performance beyond control variables (ΔR^2=0.442, $p<0.001$). Research approval efficiency, curriculum approval speed, and academic calendar adherence were particularly critical, with medium-to-large effect sizes confirming their substantial practical significance in enhancing research output, student enrollment, and program delivery efficiency.

The third objective identified challenges hindering prompt decision-making in Ugandan universities, and the findings revealed critical bottlenecks in procurement processes ($M=2.85$), administrative approval systems ($M=2.76$), and examination processing ($M=2.95$), all scoring below the midpoint of the scale. These challenges stemmed from bureaucratic hierarchies, limited technological integration, and poor communication systems, which disproportionately affected public universities compared to private institutions. The study concluded that prompt decision-making was a vital determinant of both staff productivity and institutional performance in Ugandan universities, with all three hypotheses receiving strong empirical support. Universities that fostered rapid decision implementation, transparent communication, and streamlined approval processes achieved significantly higher productivity levels, better research outputs, improved student satisfaction, and enhanced competitive positioning.

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Therefore, transforming decision-making structures from hierarchical and slow to decentralized and technology-enabled was essential for improving overall institutional effectiveness and meeting the demands of Uganda's evolving higher education landscape.

Recommendations

Implement Technology-Driven Decision Management Systems

Universities in Uganda should invest in integrated management information systems that facilitate real-time data access, automated approval workflows, and digital communication platforms. These systems should connect procurement, human resources, academic registries, and research offices to eliminate manual processing bottlenecks, reduce approval turnaround times, and enhance transparency. Special attention should be given to digitizing examination processing and results management, which emerged as the weakest area in the study, to improve student satisfaction and institutional reputation.

Adopt Decentralized Decision-Making Structures with Clear Accountability

University governance frameworks should be restructured to delegate decision-making authority to departmental and faculty levels for routine administrative and academic matters, while reserving strategic decisions for central administration. This decentralization should be accompanied by clear standard operating procedures, decision timelines, and accountability mechanisms to prevent delays. Public universities, which demonstrated lower productivity scores than private institutions, should particularly prioritize reducing bureaucratic layers and empowering mid-level managers with adequate decision-making autonomy.

Establish Continuous Professional Development on Strategic Decision-Making

University leadership and management staff should undergo regular training on evidence-based decision-making, change management, and effective communication strategies. These capacity-building programs should emphasize the importance of speed and quality in decision-making, techniques for managing complex institutional challenges, and strategies for fostering a culture of responsiveness. Additionally, universities should develop performance metrics that track decision-making efficiency alongside traditional productivity indicators to create institutional accountability for prompt managerial actions.

References.

Abe, I., & Mugobo, V. (2021). Low research productivity: Transformation, institutional and leadership concern at a South African University. *Perspectives in Education*, *39*(2). https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v39.i2.9

Adenike Ph, R. D., & Abayomi Ph, A. D. (2023). INFLUENCE OF SOME HUMAN RESOURCE VARIABLES ON LECTURERS' JOB PRODUCTIVITY IN UNIVERSITIES IN LAGOS AND OGUN STATES. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE* (Vol. 2, Issue 7).

Alam, M. N., Hassan, M. M., Bowyer, D., & Reaz, M. (2020). The effects of wages and welfare facilities on employee productivity: Mediating role of employee work motivation. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, *14*(4). https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v14i4.4

Ariyo, D., & Kazaara, G. (2024). *Biotechnology and Agricultural Productivity: A Case Study of Maize Farmers in Iganga*. https://doi.org/10.10.2024

Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Kazaara, A. I., & Nelson, K. (2023). Imapcts Of Soil Erosion On Crop Productivity In Uganda

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Acase Study Of Kibuga Division Butambala District. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijamr

Charles, S., Matovu, K., & Charles, N. (2023). *ASTUDY ON THE IMPACT OF WORKPLACE CONFLICT ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY IN ORGANIZATION. ACASE OF NYTIL UGANDA LIMITED* (Vol. 2, Issue 3).

Dorothy, N. R., Shamilah, B., Ariyo, D., & Kazaara, G. (2023). ASSESSMENT OF THE INFLUENCE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS ON WORKERS PRODUCTIVITY IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR IN UGANDA, A CASE STUDY OF MUBENDE DISTRICT LOCAL GOVERNMENT. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS* (Vol. 2).

Farooq, R., & Sultana, A. (2022). The potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on work from home and employee productivity. *Measuring Business Excellence*, *26*(3). https://doi.org/10.1108/MBE-12-2020-0173

Isaac, O., Gracious Kazaara, A., & Julius, A. (2023). ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECT OF WORKPLACE CONFLICT ON EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY, A CASE STUDY OF TORORO GENERAL HOSPITAL. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE) ISSN* (Vol. 2, Issue 1).

James, G., & Jacob, K. (2023). EMPLOYEE STRESS AND WORKERS' PRODUCTIVITY IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR: A CASE OF KITIMBWA SUB COUNTY. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE* (Vol. 2, Issue 7).

Julius, A., & Isaac Kazaara, A. (2024). *Agricultural Innovation and Farmer Productivity: A Case Study of Farmers in Luwero*.

Julius, A., & Nelson, K. (2023). ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECT OF WORKPLACE CONFLICT ON EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY, A CASE STUDY OF TORORO GENERAL HOSPITAL 1 Dr Ariyo Gracious Kazaara, 2 Dr. In *research.miu.ac.ug/publications METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS* (Vol. 2, Issue 4).

Julius, A., & Twinomujuni, R. (2025a). *Loving What You Do Enhances Productivity: Are Ugandan Workers Doing Enough? 1*(3), 43–54. https://journals.aviu.ac.ug

Julius, A., & Twinomujuni, R. (2025b). *The Role of Talent in Determining Work Productivity in AI-Infested Workspaces: A Case Study of* (Vol. 1, Issue 3). https://journals.aviu.ac.ug

Kevin, K., Peter, S., & Nelson, K. (2023). AN EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF TEACHERS PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY A CASE STUDY OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MUKONO DISTRICT. *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE)*, *2*(4), 570–580.

Lutaaya, G. G., Shamirah, B., & Suzan, M. (2023). *AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF STAFF APPRAISAL SYSTEMS ON WORKFORCE PRODUCTIVITY IN ORGANIZATIONS; A CASE STUDY OF WORLD VISION, NAKASONGOLA DISTRICT* (Vol. 2, Issue 6).

Musa, M., Moses, M., Ariyo, D., & Kazaara, G. (2023). *IMAPCTS OF SOIL EROSION ON CROP PRODUCTIVITY IN UGANDA ACASE STUDY OF KIBUGA DIVISION BUTAMBALA DISTRICT* (Vol. 2).

Nancy, M. (2024). *Influence of Employee Motivation on Organizational Productivity. A case study of Kisoro Local Government*.

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Nancy, M., & Benard, S. (2023). *LAND OWNERSHIP AND FARM PRODUCTIVITY. A CASE STUDY OF NTUGAMO DISTRICT*.

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Nicholas, K., & Deus, T. (2024). *Technology adoption and its impact on organizational productivity. A case study of Metropolitan International University*.

Ntirandekura, M., & Christopher, F. (2022). *Employee Welfare and Productivity of Bankers in Kabale Municipality , Kabale District : a Case Study of Equity Bank*. *6*(7), 134–144.

Paul, W., & Gracious Kazaara, A. (2023). ASSESSING HOW EMPLOYEE JOB ROTATION AFFECTS WORKERS PRODUCTIVITY IN ORGANIZATIONS A CASE STUDY OF ACTION AGAINST HUNGER, KIRYANDONGO DISTRICT. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE* (Vol. 2, Issue 2).

Received: 23.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**