

# Arkansas Public Higher Education Faculty Performance Reviews

Academic Year 2017-18



Academic Affairs

December 2018

**Arkansas Department of Higher Education**  
423 Main Street, Suite 400 Little Rock, AR 72201

## **REPORT ON ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

---

Arkansas Code Annotated §6-63-104 and Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB) policy 5.5 require that each college and university conduct an annual performance review of faculty members. Pursuant to this statute, Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) staff is required to monitor the faculty evaluation processes adopted at public institutions, and make a report to the Coordinating Board and Legislative Council each year. Each institution must have on file with ADHE a plan detailing the procedures for faculty evaluation at each institution. Significant amendments to these plans are to be submitted for Board approval.

Institutions were required to submit a report to ADHE that describes the process followed during the 2017-2018 academic year. Those reports are summarized below.

### **Faculty Performance Review Activities**

Faculty performance was assessed using a variety of methods including assessment by students, classroom visits by administrators, peer review, and self-evaluation activities. Findings were shared with faculty members being evaluated and, when appropriate, an improvement plan was jointly developed between the faculty member and the administrator who conducted the evaluation. Evaluation methods and timeframes of the process varied among institutions. All teaching faculty members including teaching assistants as well as full-time, part-time, adjunct, and visiting faculty were evaluated.

### **Institutional Monitoring of the Evaluation Process**

Administrators at various levels were responsible for oversight of the evaluation process. Results, whether related to faculty performance or to the effectiveness of the process, were monitored and appropriate actions were taken. Evaluation results provided the basis for personnel promotion, merit salary increases, and reappointment decisions.

### **Notable Findings**

Based on established faculty review processes, the performance of most faculty members exceeded satisfactory standards. The process itself was seen as a valuable tool for identifying procedural improvements for improved faculty performance and satisfaction.

## **Plans Developed as a Result of These Findings**

Specific remedial or disciplinary actions were taken as a result of performance deficiencies revealed by the evaluation process. Most often, this involved the development of professional improvement plans. In addition, changes in institutional process have been addressed when warranted.

## **Overall Sense of Satisfaction Concerning the Faculty Performance Review**

Appropriate stakeholders were involved in the formulation of the institution's faculty performance evaluation plan. Most faculty members viewed the process as a useful tool for providing continuous assessment and improvement in instruction delivery and student learning.

## **Efforts in Working with Faculty Having Demonstrated Deficiencies in the Use of the English Language**

The English language proficiency of faculty members at all institutions was assessed prior to employment and then on an ongoing basis through student and administrator evaluations of faculty members' classroom performances. A variety of means including increased use of PowerPoint presentations, required participation in English as a Second Language courses, and accent reduction training were used to remedy the few deficiencies that were found.

## **Compliance with Statutory Requirements that Colleges of Education Work Collaboratively with Accredited Public Schools**

The collaboration between Colleges of Education and the public schools in their respective areas was documented in these reports. Institutions partnered with public schools through Educational Renewal Zone, secondary career centers, educational cooperatives, and other programs that encouraged high school students to pursue postsecondary education. Institutions also engaged in numerous activities that provided assistance with staff development and school improvement programs, including advisory councils, professional development, mentoring programs, teacher job fairs, and data collection and needs assessments.