

# **Arkansas Division of Higher Education**

## **Annual Review of Faculty Performance**

**Academic Year  
2019-2020**



**Academic Affairs**

**December 2020**

**Arkansas Division 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. Appendix A contains ADHE instructional report on the annual review of faculty performance instrument. 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 2019-2020 academic year. Those reports are summarized below. Because of the COVID19 pandemic, many faculty performance review activities were delayed until Summer 2020 or early Fall 2020.

### **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.

Appendix

Appendix A      2019-2020 Institutional Report on the Annual Review of Faculty  
Performance

**Appendix A**  
**2019-2020 Institutional Report on the Annual Review of Faculty Performance**

**Elements of the Faculty Performance Review Process**

1. Summarize the overall faculty performance review process.

The process to gather evaluative information includes the following:

2. How are faculty peers involved in faculty performance?
3. How are students involved in faculty performance?
4. How are administrators involved in faculty performance?
5. How do faculty members self-evaluate their performance?
6. Describe how faculty knowledge and use of student support tools (i.e. early alert) and advising techniques (i.e. intrusive advising) are used to evaluate faculty performance.
7. Describe any other activities used to evaluate faculty performance.

**Institutional Monitoring of the Faculty Performance Review Process**

1. Does the institution monitor the annual faculty review process? \_\_Yes \_\_No
2. If yes, describe the procedures and persons responsible for the monitoring.
3. If no, describe measures that are being taken to begin annual monitoring.

**Use of Review Findings**

1. How are faculty performance results used in decisions related to promotions, salary increases or job tenure?
2. Describe how faculty performance results are used at your institution to guide short and long-term faculty development.
3. Based on faculty performance results, identify the following area(s) of improvement that are being examined for next academic year.

**English Fluency of Teaching Faculty**

1. How do students and administrators review the English fluency of all teaching faculty—full-time, part-time, and graduate teaching assistants?
2. What measures are in place to assist deficient faculty in becoming English proficient?
3. Summarize English deficiency findings and note action taken by the institution.

**Support for Accredited Public Schools**

1. **Four Year Institutions:** Describe how did the College of Education and related discipline faculty members at your institution work collaboratively with accredited public schools in Arkansas this academic year.
2. **Two Year Institutions:** Describe how did the institution's related discipline faculty members work collaboratively with accredited public schools in Arkansas this academic year.

**Notable Findings and Future Plans**

1. List any notable findings from the annual faculty review process conducted during the year that may have implications for future annual faculty reviews.
2. Describe any plans or revisions to the annual faculty review process this year that have been developed as a result of the following:
  - a. Notable findings listed above (see question #1)
  - b. the institutional placement plan
  - c. the productivity funding formula

**Level of Faculty Satisfaction with Current Process**

1. On the scale below, indicate the faculty's overall sense of satisfaction with the annual review process. If the rating is low (1 or 2), briefly describe corrective measures that will be implemented.

1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9---10  
low high