Arkansas statute (ACA 6-63-104) and AHECB policy require that each college and university conduct and report findings to the Coordinating Board and Legislative Council. Please use this form to collect the information required for reporting purposes.

Directions: Summarize the Annual Faculty Performance Review process at your institution. Should you need to elaborate further on any of the points, attach additional information as an appendix to this form. The report is due to ADHE by end of day on Friday, June 15, 2018.

A. **Elements of the Faculty Performance Review Process:**

1. Summarize the overall faculty performance review process.

   During the 2017-18 academic year there were some minor changes to the faculty evaluation process but none of the changes resulted in substantive changes to the evaluation instrument. The Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas (PCCUA) faculty are evaluated by examining instructional delivery, instructional design, and course management. The 2017-18 Faculty Evaluation Survey indicated that 90% of the faculty responders felt the slight changes made to the evaluation process and the detailed scoring directions made assembling and scoring portfolios easier.

   **Instructional Delivery**

   Instructional delivery outcomes are measured by administering a comprehensive student evaluation to two randomly selected classes each fall and spring semester. No fewer than twenty students can evaluate an instructor.

   **Instructional design** outcomes are measured by reviewing an instructor’s teaching portfolio. Teaching artifacts presented in the portfolio reflect work identified through syllabi, measurements, and outcomes. A faculty member’s college service, community service, and professional development activities are also included in the portfolio. The peer review committee is composed of one faculty member selected by the instructor from his or her division, one faculty member selected by the division dean from the division, and one faculty member from another division selected by the Faculty Development Committee. Faculty course management is also examined.
Faculty are evaluated for their skills in course management by examining.

PCCUA has a Faculty Evaluation Appeal process in place if a faculty member believes a peer or dean has provided an inaccurate or unfair evaluation outcome. The Faculty Evaluation Appeal Committee reviews appeals and makes recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Instruction. The Vice Chancellor reviews the appeal and makes the final decision whether to accept or reject the appeal.

2. How are faculty peers involved in faculty performance?

Faculty are integral to the evaluation process. They serve as peer evaluators for the portfolio of at least two other faculty members and play a major role in evaluation appeals by serving on the Faculty Evaluation Appeal Committee. Faculty determine the kind of changes which are made to the evaluation document.

3. How are students involved in faculty performance?

Students complete a questionnaire for faculty members being evaluated in at least two classes taught by that faculty member. This is done each fall and spring semester. In order to ensure that a student can adequately assess instruction, the evaluation is not administered until the eighth week of classes. Students complete the survey anonymously to ensure they have the freedom to make critical comments without fear of retribution. The instrument allows the student to respond to specific aspects of instruction but also provides an opportunity for the student to provide responses to questions or make general comments to open ended questions. Each campus has a classified employee designated to administer the student evaluation. Instructors are required to leave the classroom during the student evaluation process.

4. How are administrators involved in faculty performance?

All faculty are evaluated by a dean or program director. Evaluation meetings are scheduled by deans or program directors to discuss the faculty evaluation outcomes. Both the faculty member and the dean sign the evaluation. Once this is completed the Vice Chancellor for Instruction reviews the faculty evaluation outcomes.

5. How do faculty members self-evaluate their performance?

Faculty members do not provide an evaluation score for their own work; however they are responsible for compiling the portfolio and sharing artifacts which demonstrate the quality for instructional design such as syllabi, syllabi and course changes, projects, samples of grading, and other kinds of assignments.
which are evaluated. When the dean meets with the faculty member about the
evaluation outcomes, that instructor is asked to provide input into the evaluation
and to make comments on the reporting form.

6. Describe any other activities used to evaluate faculty performance?

Faculty service related to the college, professional development, and the
community are important to PCCUA and are included in the faculty evaluation
process. Last year, faculty increased the number of service activities in each
service category to ten points for instructors who wanted to be considered
exceptional. This number of activities was too high and was not useful in
identifying exceptional instructors. In fact, PCCUA found that quality and
commitment to service (sometimes only one external service) was more
important than involvement in many activities. Based on this observation by
faculty and reinforced by the Faculty Evaluation Survey outcomes, the number
of service activities has been reduced to five which was the initial requirement
before the 2017-18 academic year.

B. **Institutional Monitoring of the Faculty Performance Review Process:**
1. Does the institution monitor the annual faculty review process
   ___ X Yes  _____ No

2. If yes, describe the procedures and persons responsible for the monitoring.
   Deborah King, Vice Chancellor for Instruction and Debbie Hardy, Director of
   Assessment and institutional Effectiveness

3. If no, describe measures that are being taken to annual monitoring.

C. **Use of Review Findings**
1. How are performance results used in decisions related to promotions, salary
   increases, or job tenure?

   Performance reports are not used to influence promotion and tenure because
   PCCUA has no tenure.

D. **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 assistants)?
There is a question on the student evaluation about English fluency; however, PCCUA has no foreign or non-English speaking instructors employed.

2. What measures are in place to assist deficient faculty in becoming English proficient?

N/A

3. Summarize English deficiency findings and note action taken by the institution.

N/A

E. College of Education Support for Accredited public schools in Arkansas?
1. If applicable, how does the institution’s College of Education and related discipline faculty members work collaboratively with accredited public schools in Arkansas?

N/A

F. 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 reviews.

Sixty full time and twenty-five part-time faculty from the divisions of Allied Health, Applied Technology, Arts and Sciences, Business and Information Systems, and Career and technical Centers were evaluated. The overall Instructional Delivery average for full time faculty was 2.8 on a 3 and Part-time faculty has a 2.8 on a three point scale. Point scale. The Instructional Design average outcome for full time faculty was 2.88 on a 3.0 scale and 2.88 on a 3.0 for part-time faculty.

Student Evaluation of Instruction- Calendar Year 2017

Number of Full-Time Faculty Evaluated – 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Instructional Delivery</th>
<th>Instructional Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Information Systems</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Center</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average- Full-Time</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Part-Time Faculty Evaluated – 26
Faculty Evaluation - 2018 (Calendar year 2017)

Number of faculty completing portfolio evaluations – 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Portfolio Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Information Systems</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Center</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Portfolio Evaluation Overall Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Year Trend – Student Evaluation</th>
<th>Instructional Delivery</th>
<th>Overall Delivery Average</th>
<th>Instructional Design</th>
<th>Overall Design Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Describe any plans or revisions to the annual faculty review process that have been developed as a result of the findings noted above. (Any significant revision to an institution’s annual faculty review plan must be submitted to ADHE separate from this report and received by June 1, 2018 in order to be considered for approval by the AHECB at the July 2018 board meeting).

No significant or substantive changes will be made to the evaluation.

G. Level of Faculty Satisfaction with Current Evaluation 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
Generally, faculty are satisfied with the evaluation outcomes. Faculty completed the annual faculty survey and the responses to the survey were not surprising. All faculty did not complete and submit the survey, of those who did, the average outcome was a 6.0 on a scale of 10.0.

Summary of Faculty Responses

On a scale of 1-10 how would you rank the PCCUA Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = 6 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = 7 = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = 2 8 = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = 5 9 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = 11 10 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2  Do you think the Faculty Evaluation should be on-line?
Question 2  Yes = 18
No = 6
Comments:  Accountability
Some faculty would need computer training
Makes process of evaluation easier to submit
As is, this is primarily only documents - this could easily be moved online
Unsure if this will help
Doesn't matter
Student's evaluations of faculty possibly, but you may not get much response
Doesn't matter
Easier

Question 3  Would you complete an e-folio rather than a portfolio?
Question 3  Yes = 21
No = 4

Question 4  If you could change one aspect of the evaluation, what would it be?
Question 4  Include student & peer evaluations
Put everything online (maybe in Blackboard for security reasons)
More interaction
Putting online
Focus on actual classroom practice
Verify and clarify what is acceptable for prof. develop., college serve & comm.
service
If you make student mad prior to evaluation - student will always put "never"

Peer evaluation - time required back to Dean. Frequently portfolio's are received no distant campus and due to be returned same day. It is very difficult to complete peer evaluation and return to distant campus all in one day.
The script
I would get rid of the portfolio's
Not sure

Question 5  Do you think the Faculty Evaluation should be changed?
Question 5  Yes = 9
No =  12
Comments:  Does it truly evaluate faculty?
I would incorporate more interaction
Scrap move to observational criteria
Rather not respond as I have not created a portfolio
Actual observation
Base info needed on something other than syllabus change
Faculty put committees in portfolio that they never attend, are monetary donations acceptable for community service?
Proof for changes in curriculum, I do not think this is a great way because some are putting things on paper but not doing in classroom.
Not certain how to change
I question the effectiveness of the process
I believe the portfolio's are a waste of time. Most people just put stuff in it. No real substance in them.
Faculty evaluations are important but extremely subjective.