

Review of: "Creating Happy Educational Environment in Engineering Institutions to Sustain Outstanding Performance by Well-Accomplished Faculty Teams Through “Rodeorr” Model"

Zdeněk Linhart

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I found the article not ready for publication. Therefore, I am presenting notes for improvement of the article.

Equity is all assignments or Equity in all assignments? You find it between used questions.

I would join both “Other References” and “References” to one section and respect the citation norm.

Engineering is mentioned 63 times. Engineering Institutions only 11 times. Engineering is altered with “science (5 times), and technology (11 times)”. But used questions are applicable also in humanities. Therefore, I would remove the specification of engineering, science, and technology or add questions which cannot be answered by teachers of business, genomics or humanities.

Also “institution” is not clearly defined. They are mentioned as education institutions, professional institutions, and learning institutions as “Institutional achievement”, “autonomous institution“, and “happiness in the institution” are discussed. All those respondents who answered nil or never see institutions more according to theory “iron cage” than “learning organisation”. It indicates optimism of author who believes that institutions have a brain. Position between those two extremes should be clarified by citations in literature overview instead in chapter “synthesis” which refers to this point by sentence “The “RODEORR” model is based on learning organization theory“ without mentioning the name of the theory. Also, “administrative strategies, institutional vision, mission, goals, rules, and regulations” denies keeping standards according to accreditation office. I left my last university because my diploma assignments were seemingly not “vision, and mission”.

The problem is in citation “Thanikachalam. V. (2023) [15][16][17][18][19][20][21][22][23][24] developed a model for art and science of creating high-performing faculty members and retaining them in Indian engineering institutions. he(Capital H) established the need to eliminate the toxic leaders ...” is that “model” is equal to “established need” which is a decision. Also the author specifies the model in his objectives as “Develop an empirical model of continuous faculty improvement from recruitment to retirement”. I would remove the word “empirical” because collected data can be empirical or experimental but not model. Model should produce reproducible results with certain bias. But, the model in this article is neither quantifying “continuous faculty improvement“, nor “happy educational environment” in conclusion. Therefore, I would remove the keyword “model” from the title. I asked AI to propose title for set of activities o” recruitment, orientation

courses, faculty development programs, continuous evaluation of faculty's achievement, utilizing the many emerging opportunities, administering appropriate rewards based on the outstanding performance of the faculty members, and treating the retired faculty with the due pension benefits" and the proposed title is "Comprehensive Faculty Lifecycle Management and Recognition Program". I would change this title to "Analysis of Faculty Lifecycle Management and Recognition Program" as no results of neither recognised faculty nor observed activities on number and performance of students were presented.

Chapter discussion should cite results of other authors and compare them with results of this article.

Chapter "Validation" with sentences such as "they plan to implement stage by stage" or "they felt that they could convince their Board to pilot this model after presenting it in the faculty meeting" is very suggestive.

I would rename chapter "Open Feedback" to "methodology" and move all used questions and first paragraph of chapter "Questionnaire". Remaining tables with commented answers of respondents should be in chapter "Results" including secondary data processing instead of comments and repeated percentages. Tables should have headlines. I wouldn't use "factor" as it, for example "**Factor-1: Recruitments**" is a step or stage.

I would remove promises about the future such as "Questions relating to expected happiness will be developed, validated, and administered. The purposely selected research participants will be responding to the 53 questions. Their response will be analyzed and synthesized. A happy environment will be developed and validated through a set of three institutions." Because this article is presenting results already.

Neither chapter "Population" nor chapter "The purposely selected research participants" are explaining "The purposely selected research participants". Explain the key for selection of participants, please.

Correct citations in the text such as "Happiness at the workplace includes work engagement, job satisfaction, and effective organizational commitment. Sae-hoon Lee, et al. (2023) ^[4] concluded that their results showed a positive impact of innovativeness in entrepreneurial orientation on college competitiveness, and risk-taking and risk-taking in entrepreneurial orientation and organizational commitment. orientation on both college competitiveness." If you cite by name and year do not also cite by index. The problem of this citation is that "Happiness" is associated with three independent factors and several dependent factors such as "innovativeness in entrepreneurial orientation on college competitiveness, and risk-taking and risk-taking in entrepreneurial orientation and organizational commitment. orientation on both college competitiveness". I would remove the general factor "happiness" if you have more specific dependent factors. I do not understand the end of the sentence "organizational commitment. orientation on both college competitiveness" as two factors are not listed there.

I would conclude the list of notes by general comment. Phases of Faculty Lifecycle Management are understandable. Unfortunately, they are not operationalised according to answers of segments of respondents.