

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

Afam Uzorka¹

¹ Kampala International University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. **Clarity of the Model:** The "RODEORR" model presented in the research is comprehensive and addresses various aspects of faculty development from recruitment to retirement. However, providing a more detailed explanation of each factor in the model. A breakdown of how each factor contributes to the overall goal of sustaining outstanding performance by faculty teams would enhance the clarity of the model.
2. **Empirical Validation:** The empirical validation process involving 306 faculty members from one state is commendable. However, expanding the sample size to ensure a more representative and diverse perspective. Additionally, including data on the demographics of the participants and institutions involved would strengthen the validity and generalizability of the findings.
3. **Alignment with Existing Literature:** The paper mentions that many researchers have focused on specific aspects of faculty development. It would be beneficial to explicitly discuss how the "RODEORR" model aligns with or extends existing literature on faculty development. This will provide a context for readers to understand the novelty and contribution of the proposed model.
4. **Implementation Challenges:** While the model is well-structured, I suggest addressing potential challenges in implementing each factor. Discussing practical considerations, potential barriers, and strategies for overcoming challenges will enhance the feasibility of adopting the "RODEORR" model in different engineering institutions.
5. **Quantitative Metrics for Evaluation:** The paper mentions continuous evaluation of faculty performances, accomplishments, and innovations. To strengthen the practicality of this aspect, I recommend incorporating specific quantitative metrics or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that institutions can use to objectively assess faculty performance and contributions.
6. **Inclusion of Stakeholder Perspectives:** I propose considering the perspectives of various stakeholders, such as students, administrators, and industry professionals, in the development and implementation of the "RODEORR" model. Incorporating diverse viewpoints will enrich the model and ensure a holistic approach to faculty development.
7. **Clarity on Reemployment Criteria:** The paper mentions that outstanding faculty members can be reemployed if they desire to contribute further. I suggest providing explicit criteria and guidelines for reemployment to ensure transparency and fairness in the process. This will also address potential concerns about favoritism or bias in rehiring practices.
8. **Integration of Technology in Faculty Development:** Given the current emphasis on digital learning and technology, I

recommend discussing how the "RODEORR" model incorporates technology-driven approaches in faculty development. This could include leveraging online platforms, virtual training, and collaborative tools to enhance the effectiveness of the proposed model.

9. Conclusion and Future Directions: The conclusion could be strengthened by summarizing the key contributions of the "RODEORR" model and its implications for the field of engineering education. Additionally, providing suggestions for future research directions in faculty development would contribute to the academic discourse on this important topic. Overall, I acknowledge the significance of the "RODEORR" model in promoting a happy and educational environment for faculty development. Addressing the above points will enhance the rigor, applicability, and impact of the research.