

REPORT ON ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Arkansas Code Annotated §6-63-104 and Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB) policy require that each college and university conduct an annual performance review of faculty members. The Arkansas Division of Higher Education (ADHE) staff are also required to make an annual report to the Coordinating Board and Legislative Council. Each institution is required to submit a report to ADHE that describes the process followed during the 2023-2024 academic year. Institutional plans are on file with ADHE. Institutions are required to conduct rigorous, consistently applied, annual review of all faculty.

Faculty Performance Review Activities

Annual reviews include evaluation of teaching, scholarship, service, advising, overall productivity, and planning expectations for all instructional faculty. There are various methods including assessment by students, classroom monitoring visits, administrator review, peer review, and self-evaluation activities utilized in the faculty performance review process. Evaluation methods and timeframes of the process varied among institutions. All teaching faculty members including full-time, part-time, adjunct, visiting faculty, and teaching assistants were evaluated.

Institutional Monitoring and Overall Satisfaction of the Evaluation Process

Administrators and academic leaders 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 addressed or facilitated. Evaluation results provided the basis for personnel promotion, merit salary increases, and reappointment decisions. Faculty who scored lower were provided with timely opportunities for faculty development. Institutions offered faculty mentors, workshops, critiques of course syllabi, and opportunities to collaborate on faculty development projects.

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 of instructional delivery and student learning.

Notable Findings

Most institutions indicated no notable findings were present during the annual faculty review process.

Other mentionable findings are summarized below:

- Faculty members regularly collaborate with their peers (HEI and K12) across Arkansas as well as nationally.
- Many institutions cited Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems and Learning Management systems (LMS) as an area of improvement for process and efficiency. This is a result of many institutions in the state having either recently changed or are currently undergoing a change of ERP and/or LMS systems.
- Artificial Intelligence (AI) is an area of needed faculty training and development.
- Institutions continue to improve and implement assessment and evaluation software, such as Insights, Helio Campus, Watermark, and Mentor
- Several institutions specifically mentioned focused improvements in online course development and faculty support.
- Observation forms and assessment tools are being discussed, evaluated, and updated at multiple institutions.
- The faculty peer review components are being strengthened and modernized at many institutions.
- One institution mentioned improving professional development specifically for skills in teaching and instruction for industry experts who teach workforce/occupational courses.

English Fluency of Teaching Faculty

At most institutions both the student evaluation of the faculty and administrative evaluation of the faculty address English fluency. Responses to the student English fluency rating are monitored and faculty leadership and administration are notified when ratings raise concerns. In addition, student concerns related to English fluency may be addressed immediately with department/division leaders. English fluency is also appropriately considered in the instructor hiring process across all institutions.

No faculty deficiencies in English fluency that warranted action were identified in the past review cycle.

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

The collaboration between institutional Colleges of Education and the public schools in their respective areas was documented in these reports. Institutions partnered with public schools through Educational Renewal Zones, 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, field service programs, professional development, mentoring programs, teacher job fairs, and data collection and needs assessments.

Improvement Plans Developed as a Result of These Findings

When appropriate, improvement plans were developed between the faculty member and the administrator who conducted the evaluation. Specific remedial or disciplinary actions were taken because of performance deficiencies revealed by the evaluation process. Most often, this involved the development of professional improvement plans. In addition, changes in the institutional process have been addressed when warranted.

Appendix

Appendix A Template - 2023-2024 Institutional Report on the Annual Review of Faculty Performance

Appendix A

2023-2024 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:
 - Notable findings listed above (see question #1)
 - the institutional placement plan
 - 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