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ABSTRACT

Adequate staff-students ratio (SSR) is one of the important National Universities Commission (NUC) prescribed criteria to be implemented in manpower planning by Universities in Nigeria. Forecasting manpower requirement has been used for economic planners and even the academic sector. In other to avoid imbalance, the manpower requirement is very vital in determining the desired output in a system. This study is aimed at predicting the adequate manpower required in a unit of an academic institution. Manpower related data of the Mechanical Engineering Department, Federal University of Technology, Akure Nigeria were collected. The data collected includes manpower capacity and students population over a period of thirteen consecutive years. The regression analysis based model was formulated and applied to analyze the collected data. Based on the analyzed data, trends of \( y_x = 170.31 + 30.96x_x \), \( y_l = 7.70 + 0.04x_l \), and \( y_t = 8.59 + 0.02x_t \) are obtained respectively for the student's population size, lecturers and technical staff requirements, where \( x_x \) and \( X \) are economic indicators. The obtained trends equations were then subsequently applied to compute SSRs and recommendations were made. The developed model was implemented in a computer software, using the Visual Basic programming language, in order to

*Corresponding author: Email: Rilwan.Apalowo@nottingham.ac.uk;
facilitate its solution procedure. The outcome of this study will aid the management of the institution in effective manpower determination and students number projection in future years. This will also assist the institution to plan for effective SSR based on the recommendation of NUC.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Manpower planning is an important factor that determines the level at which production facilities are being utilized to achieve the desired objectives of an organization. Manpower requirement of any organization has to be planned for, just as we budget for the amount of money to be spent [1,2]. It is important to note that an organization would suffer a huge setback if the manpower structure is not properly settled. The rate at which the production facilities are being transformed into goods and services depends greatly on the manpower structure. In this sense, low-performance manpower operates at low productivity rate as a result of some factors like ability, age, capacity, health status etc., while high-performance manpower can operate at a high productivity rate.

Moreover, it is expected that a high performing worker should be more efficient than a low performing one, in terms of transforming resources into goods and/or services [3]. But, this will be done at a higher cost as well. It is also worthy to note that, not all duties require highly skilled workers. Some duties can be done effectively by low performing staff, especially when they are subjected to proper training and re-training. Hence, to minimize cost, appropriate manpower should be employed based on the available production capacity, time and skill of operation required.

Many quantitative techniques have been applied to determine effective size of manpower to be engaged at a particular time. The most common among them include the Workload method [4-8], Maintenance times analysis [9], Dynamic programming [10], Multiple Activities Process Chart [11], Queuing System [12-14]. Moreover, different models have been developed and applied in this line of study. Among them are descriptive-predictive model [15], normative model [16,17] and lognormal model [18]. Optimisation approach was applied for optimal staffing, based on forecast demand, in [19] and to increase organisation’s competitiveness through effective manpower planning in [20]. A conceptual approach to explore the significance of manpower planning has also been carried out in some studies. In [21], the impact of effective manpower planning was conducted on personnel service performance and on the academic standard in [22].

In an academic institution, where there are various duties requiring different skills, such as research, teaching, administrative and technical duties, it is imperative to schedule personnel to duties based on skill and requirement. Also, there is a prescribed criterion regarding staff-students ratio (SSR) which must be implemented by institutions. This ratio, according to the National Universities Commission (NUC), ensures adequate teaching and learning in academic institutions [22]. However, in developing nations like Nigeria, the manpower structure is in a way such that personnel are either over-worked or under-worked. Hence, SSR mostly falls short of the recommended level in various institutions. This problem can be solved by proper manpower requirement determination.

This study aims at establishing models to determine the number of students and respective level of manpower requirements in a technical department of an institution in Nigeria. This will aid the institution to plan for effective SSR based on the recommendation of NUC. Solution procedure of the developed models is implemented in a computer software using Visual Basic programming language. The paper is organised as follows: Methodology used is presented in Section 2. Section 3 presents results and discussion of findings. Finally, conclusions on the presented work are given in Section 4.

2. METHODOLOGY

In achieving the objective of this study, data were collected, classified, analyzed and a regression model was formulated based on the data analyzed. The academic unit whose data was studied is the Mechanical Engineering Department of the Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria. The data were
collected through the use of a questionnaire and oral interviews. The data that were collected include the numbers of students, lecturers and technical staff in the department for a period of thirteen (2005/2006 to 2017/2018) consecutive academic years.

The regression method of least squares was applied in estimating the trend from the collected data. The trend for the number of manpower required (lecturers and technical staff) depends on the number of students which serves as the economic indicator.

The data of thirteen years of the students’ population was used to determine the projected number of students for the next seven years. The projected trend of each of these numbers of students, lecturers and technical staff required (lecturers and technical staff) depends on the number of students which serves as the economic indicator in the analysis of manpower (i.e. manpower), \( Y_c \) is calculated value found from the trend line and \( \bar{Y} \) is average of the actual values of the dependent variables. The rule of thumb for interpreting the coefficient of correlation \( r \) is as given in Table 1.

\[
Y_c = A + B \bar{X}
\]

\[
\sum Y = NA + B \sum X
\]  

\[
\sum XY = A \sum X + B \sum X^2
\]

\( N \) is the number of observed data.

The degree of agreement of the formula with real data was determined by the coefficient of correlation \( r \) which is given as in Equation (7)

\[
r = \frac{1 - \frac{\sum (Y_c - \bar{Y})^2}{\sum (Y - \bar{Y})^2}}
\]

\( Y_a \) is actual value of the dependent variables, \( Y_c \) is calculated value found from the trend line and \( \bar{Y} \) is average of the actual values of the dependent variables. The rule of thumb for interpreting the coefficient of correlation \( r \) is as given in Table 1.

| Value of \( r \) | Interpretation         |
|------------------|------------------------|
| 0.90 – 1.00      | Very high correlation  |
| 0.70 – 0.90      | High correlation       |
| 0.40 – 0.70      | Moderate correlation   |
| 0.20 – 0.40      | Low correlation        |
| 0.00 – 0.20      | Slight correlation     |

Source: [9]

### 2.1 Data Collection

As this study involves academic staff manpower determination in a department of an institution, data relating to lecturers and technical staff were collected. These entail personnel involved in academic activities, such as teaching, research and lab work in the department under study. The data were extracted from the institution’s admin units with the aid of interviews, questionnaires and surveys. Data collected span 2005/2006 to 2017/2018 academic session. Data relating to students population over the stated period of years were also obtained. These served as an economic indicator in the analysis of manpower determination.

Obtained raw data of students’ population and academic staff (lecturers and technical staff) are presented in Tables 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

### 2.2 Data Analysis

The trend equations of the number of students and manpower requirements were determined by analysing the data collected on the students and staff population over the thirteen years under review. These were done respectively as in...
Tables 5, 7 and 9. The trend equation in each case was then used to determine the projected number of students respectively, and staff requirements in the next seven years, as presented in Tables 6, 8 and 10. The trend equations developed (mathematical models) was implemented in computer software developed using Visual Basic programming language.

**Table 2. Collected data for students population at various levels (academic year)**

| Session   | 100 level | 200 level | 300 level | 400 level | 500 level |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 2005/2006 | 46        | 61        | 40        | 56        | 19        |
| 2006/2007 | 41        | 68        | 59        | 30        | 22        |
| 2007/2008 | 52        | 59        | 60        | 57        | 43        |
| 2008/2009 | 74        | 59        | 54        | 64        | 40        |
| 2009/2010 | 80        | 68        | 55        | 54        | 50        |
| 2010/2011 | 79        | 77        | 68        | 55        | 63        |
| 2011/2012 | 70        | 58        | 70        | 59        | 49        |
| 2012/2013 | 105       | 100       | 95        | 90        | 90        |
| 2013/2014 | 105       | 108       | 102       | 92        | 88        |
| 2014/2015 | 108       | 110       | 105       | 100       | 90        |
| 2015/2016 | 110       | 110       | 101       | 94        | 90        |
| 2016/2017 | 115       | 115       | 106       | 97        | 91        |
| 2017/2018 | 120       | 117       | 112       | 105       | 101       |

**Table 3. Collected data for lecturers in various ranks**

| Session   | P | R | SL | LI | LII | AL | GA |
|-----------|---|---|----|----|-----|----|----|
| 2005/2006 | 2 | - | 1  | 4  | 2   | 4  | 3  |
| 2006/2007 | 2 | - | 1  | 4  | 2   | 4  | 3  |
| 2007/2008 | 2 | - | 1  | 4  | 2   | 4  | 3  |
| 2008/2009 | 2 | 1 | 2  | 3  | 6   | 6  | -  |
| 2009/2010 | 2 | 1 | 2  | 3  | 6   | 6  | -  |
| 2010/2011 | 2 | 2 | 3  | 2  | 5   | 6  | 1  |
| 2011/2012 | 2 | 2 | 3  | 2  | 5   | 6  | 1  |
| 2012/2013 | 2 | 2 | 3  | 2  | 5   | 6  | 1  |
| 2013/2014 | 2 | 1 | 3  | 7  | 5   | 5  | 2  |
| 2014/2015 | 2 | 1 | 3  | 8  | 5   | 5  | 3  |
| 2015/2016 | 2 | 1 | 3  | 10 | 6   | 4  | 2  |
| 2016/2017 | 2 | 1 | 3  | 13 | 4   | 4  | 2  |
| 2017/2018 | 2 | 1 | 3  | 4  | 11  | 4  | 5  |

**Table 4. Collected data for technical staff in various ranks**

| Session   | CT | ACT | ST | TI | TII | SS | HC | SLA |
|-----------|----|-----|----|----|-----|----|----|-----|
| 2005/2006 | 1  | 1   | 1  | 1  | 2   | 2  | 3  | 2   |
| 2006/2007 | 1  | 1   | 1  | 2  | 2   | 2  | 2  | 2   |
| 2007/2008 | 1  | 1   | 1  | 2  | 2   | 2  | 2  | 2   |
| 2008/2009 | 1  | 1   | 1  | 2  | 2   | 2  | 3  | 2   |
| 2009/2010 | 1  | 1   | 1  | 2  | 2   | 2  | 4  | 3   |
| 2010/2011 | 1  | 1   | 1  | 2  | 2   | 2  | 4  | 3   |
| 2011/2012 | 1  | 1   | 1  | 1  | 2   | 2  | 4  | 3   |
| 2012/2013 | 1  | 1   | 3  | 2  | 2   | 2  | 4  | 3   |
| 2013/2014 | 1  | 1   | 3  | 3  | 2   | 2  | 3  | 3   |
| 2014/2015 | 1  | 1   | 3  | 3  | 2   | 2  | 3  | 3   |
| 2015/2016 | 1  | 1   | 3  | 3  | 2   | 2  | 3  | 3   |
| 2016/2017 | 1  | 1   | 4  | 3  | 2   | 2  | 3  | 3   |
| 2017/2018 | 1  | 1   | 4  | 3  | 2   | 2  | 3  | 3   |

**Key:** CT- Chief Technologist, ACT- Assistant Chief Technologist, ST- Senior Technologist, TI- Technologist I, TII- Technologist II, SS- Senior W/S Supervisor, HC- Head Craftman, SLA- Senior Lab Assistant
The regression parameters were obtained as

By solving the above equations simultaneously, the regression parameters were obtained as

Therefore the trend equation for the student population was determined by substituting the values of $a$ and $b$ in Equation (4). That is,

Hence, the trend values for the thirteen years and the projected trend values for the students' population in the next seven years are presented in Table 6.

### Table 5. Analysis of data of students' population

| Year      | No of students ($y_s$) | $x_s$ | $x_s^2$ | $x_s y_s$ |
|-----------|------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|
| 2005/2006 | 222                    | 1     | 1       | 222       |
| 2006/2007 | 220                    | 2     | 4       | 440       |
| 2007/2008 | 271                    | 3     | 9       | 813       |
| 2008/2009 | 291                    | 4     | 16      | 1164      |
| 2009/2010 | 307                    | 5     | 25      | 1535      |
| 2010/2011 | 342                    | 6     | 36      | 2052      |
| 2011/2012 | 306                    | 7     | 49      | 2142      |
| 2012/2013 | 480                    | 8     | 64      | 3840      |
| 2013/2014 | 495                    | 9     | 81      | 4455      |
| 2014/2015 | 513                    | 10    | 100     | 5130      |
| 2015/2016 | 505                    | 11    | 121     | 5555      |
| 2016/2017 | 524                    | 12    | 144     | 6288      |
| 2017/2018 | 555                    | 13    | 169     | 7215      |

$n = 13$ \( \sum y_s = 5031 \) \( \sum x_s = 91 \) \( \sum x_s^2 = 819 \) \( \sum x_s y_s = 40851 \)

Substituting these values in Equations (5) and (6) gives

\[ 5031 = 13a + 91b \]
\[ 40851 = 91a + 819b \]

By solving the above equations simultaneously, the regression parameters were obtained as

\[ a = 170.31, \ b = 30.96 \]

Hence, the trend values for the thirteen years and the projected trend values for the students' population in the next seven years are presented in Table 6.

### Table 6. Students' population trend values for the thirteen years and projected values for the next seven years

| Year      | Students population  | $y_s$ |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------|
| 2005/2006 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 201.27 |
| 2006/2007 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 232.23 |
| 2007/2008 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 263.19 |
| 2008/2009 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 294.15 |
| 2009/2010 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 325.11 |
| 2010/2011 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 356.07 |
| 2011/2012 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 387.03 |
| 2012/2013 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 417.99 |
| 2013/2014 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 448.95 |
| 2014/2015 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 479.91 |
| 2015/2016 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 510.87 |
| 2016/2017 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 541.83 |
| 2017/2018 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 572.79 |

The projected trend values of students' population for the next seven years:

| Year      | Students population  | $y_s$ |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------|
| 2018/2019 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 603.75 |
| 2019/2020 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 634.71 |
| 2020/2021 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 665.67 |
| 2021/2022 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 696.63 |
| 2022/2023 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 727.59 |
| 2023/2024 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 758.55 |
| 2024/2025 | $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$ | 789.51 |
The degree of agreement of the calculated data, using the trend equation, with the real data is determined by the coefficient of correlation $r$ which is given in Equation (7). The correlation analysis parameters are determined and presented as thus

$$\sum (y_a - \bar{y})^2 = 15471.66$$

$$r = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\sum (y_a - \bar{y})^2}{\sum (y_a - \bar{y})^2}} = 0.958$$

Table 7. Analysis of data of lecturers’ population

| Year     | No of students ($X$) | No of lecturers ($Y$) | $X^2$  | $XY$ |
|----------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------|------|
| 2005/2006| 222                  | 16                    | 49284  | 3552 |
| 2006/2007| 220                  | 16                    | 48400  | 3520 |
| 2007/2008| 271                  | 16                    | 73441  | 4336 |
| 2008/2009| 291                  | 20                    | 84681  | 5820 |
| 2009/2010| 307                  | 20                    | 94249  | 6140 |
| 2010/2011| 342                  | 21                    | 116964 | 7182 |
| 2011/2012| 306                  | 21                    | 93636  | 6426 |
| 2012/2013| 480                  | 21                    | 230400 | 10080|
| 2013/2014| 495                  | 25                    | 245025 | 12375|
| 2014/2015| 513                  | 27                    | 263169 | 13851|
| 2015/2016| 505                  | 28                    | 255025 | 14140|
| 2016/2017| 524                  | 29                    | 274576 | 15196|
| 2017/2018| 555                  | 31                    | 308025 | 17205|

$N = 13 \sum X = 5031 \sum Y = 291 \sum X^2 = 2136875 \sum XY = 119823$

Table 8. Lecturers’ population trend values for the thirteen years and projected values for the next seven years

| Year     | Lecturers population
|----------|----------------------|
|          | $Y = 7.70 + 0.04X$   |
| 2005/2006| = 7.70 + 0.04(222)   | 16.58 |
| 2006/2007| = 7.70 + 0.04(220)   | 16.50 |
| 2007/2008| = 7.70 + 0.04(271)   | 18.54 |
| 2008/2009| = 7.70 + 0.04(291)   | 19.34 |
| 2009/2010| = 7.70 + 0.04(307)   | 19.98 |
| 2010/2011| = 7.70 + 0.04(342)   | 21.38 |
| 2011/2012| = 7.70 + 0.04(306)   | 19.94 |
| 2012/2013| = 7.70 + 0.04(480)   | 26.90 |
| 2013/2014| = 7.70 + 0.04(495)   | 27.50 |
| 2014/2015| = 7.70 + 0.04(513)   | 28.22 |
| 2015/2016| = 7.70 + 0.04(505)   | 27.90 |
| 2016/2017| = 7.70 + 0.04(524)   | 28.66 |
| 2017/2018| = 7.70 + 0.04(555)   | 29.90 |

The projected trend values of lecturers’ population for the next seven years:

| Year     | Lecturers population
|----------|----------------------|
| 2018/2019| = 7.70 + 0.04(603.75) | 31.85 |
| 2019/2020| = 7.70 + 0.04(634.71) | 33.09 |
| 2020/2021| = 7.70 + 0.04(665.67) | 34.33 |
| 2021/2022| = 7.70 + 0.04(696.63) | 35.57 |
| 2022/2023| = 7.70 + 0.04(727.59) | 36.80 |
| 2023/2024| = 7.70 + 0.04(758.55) | 38.04 |
| 2024/2025| = 7.70 + 0.04(789.51) | 39.28 |
Substituting these values in Equations (5) and (6) gives

\[
\begin{align*}
291 &= 13a + 5031b \\
119823 &= 5031a + 2136875b
\end{align*}
\]

Solving the resulting expressions simultaneously gives

\[
\begin{align*}
a &= 7.70, \quad b = 0.04
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, the trend equation for the lecturers’ population was determined by substituting the values of \(a\) and \(b\) in Equation (4). That is

\[
Y = 7.70 + 0.04X
\]

Hence, the trend values for the thirteen years and the projected trend values for the lecturers’ population in the next seven years are presented in Table 8.

The degree of agreement of the calculated data, using the trend equation, with the real data is determined by the coefficient of correlation \(r\) which is given in Equation (7). The correlation analysis parameters are determined and presented as thus

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum(Y_a - Y_c)^2 &= 52.63 \\
\sum(Y_a - \bar{Y})^2 &= 317.08 \\
r &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{52.63}{317.08}} \\
&= 0.913
\end{align*}
\]

Table 9. Analysis of data of technicians’ population

| Year    | No of students (X) | No of technicians (Y) | \(X^2\)  | \(XY\)  |
|---------|--------------------|------------------------|---------|---------|
| 2005/2006 | 222                | 13                     | 49284   | 2886    |
| 2006/2007 | 220                | 12                     | 48400   | 2640    |
| 2007/2008 | 271                | 13                     | 73441   | 3523    |
| 2008/2009 | 291                | 14                     | 84681   | 4074    |
| 2009/2010 | 307                | 16                     | 94249   | 4912    |
| 2010/2011 | 342                | 15                     | 116964  | 5130    |
| 2011/2012 | 306                | 15                     | 93636   | 4590    |
| 2012/2013 | 480                | 18                     | 230400  | 8640    |
| 2013/2014 | 495                | 18                     | 245025  | 8910    |
| 2014/2015 | 513                | 18                     | 263169  | 9234    |
| 2015/2016 | 505                | 18                     | 255025  | 9090    |
| 2016/2017 | 524                | 19                     | 274576  | 9956    |
| 2017/2018 | 555                | 19                     | 308025  | 10545   |
| \(N = 13\) | \(\sum X = 5031\) | \(\sum Y = 208\)       | \(\sum X^2 = 2136875\) | \(\sum XY = 84130\) |
Table 10. Technicians’ population trend values for the thirteen years and projected values for the next seven years

| Year     | Technicians population | Y  |
|----------|------------------------|----|
| 2005/2006| = 8.59 + 0.02(222)     | 13.03|
| 2006/2007| = 8.59 + 0.02(220)     | 12.99|
| 2007/2008| = 8.59 + 0.02(271)     | 14.01|
| 2008/2009| = 8.59 + 0.02(291)     | 14.41|
| 2009/2010| = 8.59 + 0.02(307)     | 14.73|
| 2010/2011| = 8.59 + 0.02(342)     | 15.43|
| 2011/2012| = 8.59 + 0.02(306)     | 14.71|
| 2012/2013| = 8.59 + 0.02(480)     | 18.19|
| 2013/2014| = 8.59 + 0.02(495)     | 18.49|
| 2014/2015| = 8.59 + 0.02(513)     | 18.85|
| 2015/2016| = 8.59 + 0.02(505)     | 18.69|
| 2016/2017| = 8.59 + 0.02(524)     | 19.07|
| 2017/2018| = 8.59 + 0.02(555)     | 19.69|

The projected trend values of technicians’ population for the next seven years:

| Year     | Technicians population | Y  |
|----------|------------------------|----|
| 2018/2019| = 8.59 + 0.02(603.75)  | 20.67|
| 2019/2020| = 8.59 + 0.02(634.71)  | 21.28|
| 2020/2021| = 8.59 + 0.02(665.67)  | 21.90|
| 2021/2022| = 8.59 + 0.02(696.63)  | 22.52|
| 2022/2023| = 8.59 + 0.02(727.59)  | 23.14|
| 2023/2024| = 8.59 + 0.02(758.55)  | 23.76|
| 2024/2025| = 8.59 + 0.02(789.51)  | 24.38|

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analyses of data obtained on the students and staff numbers for a period of thirteen years yield the trend equations of $y_s = 170.31 + 30.96x_s$, $Y = 7.70 + 0.04X$, and $Y = 8.59 + 0.02X$ respectively for the students’ population size, lecturers and technical staff requirements. As presented in Tables 6, 8 and 10, the trend equations were used to determine the respective trend values for the thirteen years under study. The correlation coefficient analyses also yield correlation coefficients $r$ of 0.958, 0.913 and 0.959 respectively for the relationship between the actual values and calculated trend values (using the trend equation). This indicates a very high correlation between actual data and calculated trend value in the cases of students and staff (manpower) data. Consequently, the trend equations are used to determine the projected number of students as well as the number of manpower required in the next seven years.

Fig. 1 presents the trend of students’ population in the thirteen years under review and the projected number of student in the next seven years as determined using the trend equation. Fig. 2 presents the graphical representation of the number of manpower trends over the thirteen years and the next seven years. It was observed that students’ population size increases almost linearly with the year. Level of manpower determined over this period also follows a similar trend.

To evaluate the compliance of obtained SSR against the recommendation of NUC (as presented in Table 11), SSRs of the department, for the years under review, are plotted against the NUC’s recommended SSR. This is presented in Fig. 3. It was observed that SSR of the department conforms to NUC recommendation in the first seven years (2005/2006 to 2011/2012) under review. It, however, falls short of the recommended value over the next six years (2012/2013 to 2017/2018) and it was projected that this trend will continue in the next seven years (2018/2019 to 2024/2025) under projection. In fact, based on calculated trends for the students’ population size and manpower requirement, this trend tends to continue unless adequate manpower is added to break even.

Having successfully demonstrated the application of the developed model, it was then implemented in a computer software using Visual Basic programming language. The data input
and results interfaces of the computer software developed for the established mathematical models are presented in Figs. 3 and 4 respectively. This software was validated by comparing its results with the manually calculated result and both give similar results.

![Graph showing students' population]

**Fig. 1. Students’ population in the thirteen years and next seven years**

**Table 11. Calculated staff-students ratio (SSR) in comparison against NUC recommendation [22]**

| Year       | No of students | No of academic staff | SSR (Calculated) | SSR (NUC recommendation) |
|------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 2005/2006  | 222            | 29                   | 0.13             | 0.11                     |
| 2006/2007  | 220            | 28                   | 0.13             | 0.11                     |
| 2007/2008  | 271            | 29                   | 0.11             | 0.11                     |
| 2008/2009  | 291            | 34                   | 0.12             | 0.11                     |
| 2009/2010  | 307            | 36                   | 0.12             | 0.11                     |
| 2010/2011  | 342            | 36                   | 0.11             | 0.11                     |
| 2011/2012  | 306            | 36                   | 0.12             | 0.11                     |
| 2012/2013  | 480            | 39                   | 0.08             | 0.11                     |
| 2013/2014  | 495            | 43                   | 0.09             | 0.11                     |
| 2014/2015  | 513            | 45                   | 0.09             | 0.11                     |
| 2015/2016  | 505            | 46                   | 0.09             | 0.11                     |
| 2016/2017  | 524            | 48                   | 0.09             | 0.11                     |
| 2017/2018  | 555            | 50                   | 0.09             | 0.11                     |
| **Projected trend values** | | | | |
| 2018/2019  | 603            | 52                   | 0.09             | 0.11                     |
| 2019/2020  | 634            | 54                   | 0.09             | 0.11                     |
| 2020/2021  | 665            | 56                   | 0.08             | 0.11                     |
| 2021/2022  | 696            | 58                   | 0.08             | 0.11                     |
| 2022/2023  | 727            | 60                   | 0.08             | 0.11                     |
| 2023/2024  | 758            | 62                   | 0.08             | 0.11                     |
| 2024/2025  | 789            | 64                   | 0.08             | 0.11                     |
Fig. 2. Manpower requirements for the thirteen years and next seven years

Fig. 3. Comparison of the calculated Staff-Student ratio (••) against NUC recommendation (---)

(a)
Fig. 4. Data input interface of the computer software: (a) Lecturers, (b) Technical staff

Fig. 5. Results Interface for the required manpower

4. CONCLUSION

Data on the students’ population and academic staff were collected from the Mechanical Engineering Department, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria. These were analyzed and mathematical models established, using the regression-based method. This led to the determination of the trend values of students’ population and manpower requirement over the period of years in view and to forecast the level of manpower required in any future year. The projected number of students and the respective level of manpower requirement determined through the established models will have high accuracy because it was also established that the mathematical models have a very high correlation with the actual data. These were then applied to calculate SSRs and compared against NUC recommendation. This was done for the years under review and for the projected future years.

It was observed that the department’s SSRs have fallen short of NUC recommended value for a period of six consecutive years, and based on projected calculations, it was also observed that this trend will continue over the coming years. Based on these observations, it is recommended that more academic staff are needed in the department in order to meet NUC set criteria on SSR.

The developed mathematical models were also implemented in a computer software using the Visual Basic programming language to facilitate its solution procedure. The study has given insight into how best manpower can be effectively planned in a technical department of an institution. The study is versatile and can be
adapted to all departments in the institution and the entire institution as a whole.
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