



EXHIBIT E

Arkansas Department of Higher Education

423 Main Street, STE 400 • Little Rock, Arkansas • 72201-3818 • (501) 371-2000 • Fax (501) 371-2001

Asa Hutchinson
Governor

Dr. Brett Powell
Director

August 1, 2015

The Honorable Bill Sample, Chair
The Honorable David Branscum, Chair
Arkansas Legislative Council
State Capitol Building
Little Rock, AR 72201

Dear Senator Sample and Representative Branscum:

Arkansas Code Annotated §6-63-104 requires that each college and university conduct an annual performance review of faculty members. The Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) is responsible for monitoring the evaluation process and reporting its findings to the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board and to the Legislative Council by August 1 of each year.

Attached is the report for the 2014-2015 academic year. Institutional plans are on file with ADHE.

Should you require additional information, please let me know and we will be happy to provide.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Brett A. Powell".

Brett A. Powell, Ed.D.
Director

Attachments:

Arkansas Department of Higher Education
REPORT ON ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE
Fiscal 2015

Arkansas Code Annotated §6-63-104 requires that each college and university conduct an annual performance review of faculty members. The Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) is responsible for monitoring the evaluation process and reporting the findings to the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board and to the Legislative Council by August 1 of each year. Each institution has submitted a report to ADHE that describes the process followed during the 2014-2015 academic year. Institutional plans are on file with ADHE.

Faculty Performance Review Activities

All teaching faculty members including teaching assistants as well as full-time, part-time, adjunct, and visiting faculty were evaluated. 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.

Institutional Monitoring of the Evaluation Process

Appropriate stakeholders were involved in the formulation of the institution's faculty performance evaluation plan. Administrators at various levels were responsible for oversight of the evaluation process. Evaluation results provided the basis for personnel promotion, merit salary increases, reappointment decisions, and a modification of the process if warranted. Based on established faculty review processes, the performance of most faculty members exceeded satisfactory standards. While performances exceeded satisfactory, merit increases were not given due to funding not available. 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. Faculty members viewed the process as a useful tool for providing continuous assessment and improvement in instruction delivery and student learning.

Working with Faculty Having 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. It was noted that there were some English language use deficiencies identified for a few

Arkansas Department of Higher Education
REPORT ON ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

instructors. During the professional improvement plan session, these instructors were directed to be especially attentive to student comprehension in any communication that is carried out in the English language. The instructors also were encouraged to invite students to one-on-one consultations, to provide personalized learning assistance during faculty office hours, to slow their speech, and to attend accent reduction training.

College/University Collaboration with Accredited Public Schools

The collaboration between the Colleges of Education and the public schools in their respective areas was documented in the reports. Institutions engaged in numerous activities that provided assistance with staff development and school improvement programs, including advisory councils, professional development, mentoring programs, teacher job fairs, internship location for teacher preparation, and data collection and needs assessments. Institutions also 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. It was noted that while not required, several two-year institutions worked with public schools on improvement activities.