A LEAN SIX SIGMA FRAMEWORK FOR FACULTY MONITORING AND EVALUATION: INCORPORATING DATA ANALYTICS, MACHINE LEARNING, AND PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Sarah Andrea B. Viana*
[1]Doctor in Information Technology, La Consolacion University of the Philippines (Philippines)

sarah.viana@email.lcup.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study presents a Lean Six Sigma framework tailored for faculty monitoring and evaluation in educational institutions, integrating advanced data analytics, machine learning, and process management methodologies. Addressing the limitations of traditional faculty evaluation systems, this research introduces a streamlined, data-driven approach to enhance the effectiveness and reliability of performance assessments. The framework uniquely combines theoretical principles with practical applications, demonstrating its scalability and alignment with broader institutional goals such as accreditation, improved student outcomes, and strategic decision-making.

Key elements of the study include a comprehensive analysis of existing faculty evaluation methods, a detailed conceptual framework illustrating the integration of Lean Six Sigma and Natural Language Processing, and a critique of related literature grouped into thematic categories. The research utilizes a mixed-methods approach to validate the framework, incorporating pilot testing, triangulation, and system reliability measures. Findings underscore the potential of this innovative framework to drive improvements in faculty performance, institutional policies, and regional educational reforms, offering valuable insights for the broader educational technology community.

Keywords: Lean Six Sigma, faculty evaluation, data analytics, machine learning, process management, Natural Language Processing, educational technology, institutional performance, mixed-methods research, system scalability.

1. INTRODUCTION

In higher education, faculty play a crucial role in shaping the learning experience and ensuring the success of students. Monitoring and evaluating their performance is an essential part of maintaining and improving the quality of education. However, traditional faculty evaluation methods often struggle with challenges such as subjectivity, inefficiency, and difficulty handling large volumes of feedback. As a result, institutions are looking for smarter, more effective ways to assess and support their faculty members.

This study explores how PHINMA Saint Jude College can enhance its faculty monitoring and evaluation system by combining innovative tools and methodologies. By integrating Lean Six Sigma principles with data analytics and machine learning, this research aims to design a system that provides clear, objective insights into faculty performance while also being efficient and easy to use. One key aspect of this approach is using Natural Language Processing (NLP) to analyze student and faculty feedback. This allows the system to go beyond numbers and extract meaningful insights from qualitative data, such as sentiments and opinions, helping the institution better understand the needs and experiences of its community.

At its core, this research is about improving not just how faculty performance is evaluated but also how the process itself can support continuous growth and improvement. Through Lean Six Sigma, inefficiencies in the current system can be identified and addressed, while data-driven

Tools offer a more personalized, actionable approach to feedback. As student populations grow and educational demands evolve, implementing a system like this is a step forward in creating a more responsive, effective, and sustainable evaluation process.

By combining technology with proven process management techniques, this study aims to contribute to the broader goal of ensuring high-quality education at PHINMA Saint Jude College, where both faculty and students thrive in a supportive and dynamic learning environment.

Effective faculty performance evaluation is critical in maintaining the quality of education within any academic institution. However, traditional evaluation methods often rely on generic surveys, manual observation, or outdated data collection techniques. These approaches present numerous challenges, including subjectivity, lack of actionable insights, inefficiency, and limited alignment with institutional goals. As education becomes increasingly data-driven, there is a pressing need to modernize evaluation processes to ensure they are robust, accurate, and aligned with the dynamic needs of both educators and learners.

One significant gap in current systems is the inability to systematically integrate diverse data sources, such as classroom observation metrics, feedback from students, and institutional performance benchmarks. Traditional systems often lack automation and scalability, making it challenging to process large volumes of qualitative and quantitative data efficiently. For instance, institutions that rely heavily on manual processes may experience delays in generating reports or providing timely feedback, limiting opportunities for faculty development.

Moreover, faculty evaluations often fail to identify specific areas for improvement in teaching methodologies, pedagogical strategies, and classroom engagement. This shortfall has a direct impact on the overall learning experience and student outcomes. As classrooms evolve to include hybrid and virtual learning models, the need for an innovative, technology-driven approach to faculty evaluation has become more urgent.

The proposed system addresses these challenges by introducing a comprehensive, data-driven approach to faculty monitoring and evaluation. It leverages cutting-edge technologies such as Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Machine Learning (ML) to process and analyze data collected through Classroom Observation Protocol for Undergraduate STEM (COPUS) observations, student feedback, and institutional benchmarks. These technologies enable the system to identify patterns, correlations, and trends in teaching performance, providing evidence-based recommendations for faculty development.

To enhance the efficiency, consistency, and scalability of the evaluation process, the study incorporates Lean Six Sigma principles. These principles focus on eliminating inefficiencies, ensuring continuous improvement, and aligning the evaluation process with institutional goals. The

system is designed to integrate seamlessly into the academic ecosystem, providing customized reporting and analytics for faculty, administrators, and stakeholders.

The study's conceptual framework underscores the integration of key components—system development, natural language processing, Lean Six Sigma, operational research, and pedagogy. These interconnected layers form the foundation of the proposed system, emphasizing the importance of aligning technology with pedagogical goals. By utilizing COPUS as a central input mechanism, the system processes classroom data through advanced algorithms and outputs actionable insights that directly inform faculty development and institutional decision-making.

This study addresses a critical gap by connecting evaluation practices with technological advancements, ensuring that the system is not only effective but also adaptable to the unique needs of different academic institutions. By aligning the conceptual framework with the research objectives, the proposed system offers a novel approach to faculty monitoring and evaluation. It not only provides tools for immediate improvements but also establishes a foundation for long-term benefits, such as improved teaching quality, enhanced student outcomes, and a more data-driven approach to institutional management.

Through this innovative integration of modern technologies and pedagogical principles, the research aims to contribute significantly to the broader educational technology community, providing a model for how institutions can embrace data-driven solutions to improve teaching and learning experiences.

1. IMPLEMENTATION METHOD

The implementation of the Lean Six Sigma framework for faculty monitoring and evaluation involves a systematic approach to ensure effectiveness, scalability, and alignment with institutional goals. The process begins with the Define Phase, where objectives are identified, inefficiencies in current systems are mapped, and success criteria are set in collaboration with stakeholders. In the Measure Phase, baseline data is collected, and key performance indicators (KPIs) are identified to align with broader goals such as accreditation and student outcomes. The Analyze Phase uses machine learning and Natural Language Processing (NLP) to uncover patterns and insights from qualitative and quantitative data, comparing the effectiveness of traditional methods with the proposed framework. During the Improve Phase, a prototype of the system is developed and piloted in selected departments or campuses, with refinements made based on feedback. The Control Phase establishes mechanisms to monitor the system’s performance, provides training for users, and integrates continuous feedback for updates. Finally, the framework’s scalability and reliability are validated through triangulation and documentation of best practices, ensuring its applicability across different institutions and paving the way for future enhancements in faculty evaluation systems.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The implementation of the Lean Six Sigma framework yielded significant improvements in faculty monitoring and evaluation processes. By integrating data analytics and machine learning, the system provided more accurate and actionable insights, effectively addressing gaps in traditional evaluation methods. Natural Language Processing (NLP) enabled the analysis of qualitative feedback, offering a comprehensive view of faculty performance. The framework demonstrated strong alignment with institutional goals, such as enhancing student outcomes and achieving accreditation standards, by linking performance metrics to broader objectives. Pilot testing revealed the system's scalability and adaptability to various academic environments, while stakeholder feedback highlighted its transparency and ease of use. However, challenges such as the initial learning curve for users and the need for continuous updates emphasized the importance of robust data management and training. Overall, the Lean Six Sigma framework proved to be a transformative tool for faculty evaluation, with potential applications in other areas of academic management, paving the way for a more data-driven and efficient approach in educational institutions.

3. CONCLUSION

The Lean Six Sigma framework for faculty monitoring and evaluation has proven to be an effective, scalable, and data-driven solution to address the limitations of traditional evaluation systems. By integrating advanced technologies such as data analytics and Natural Language Processing, the framework provides comprehensive insights into faculty performance, linking them to broader institutional goals such as accreditation, student success, and professional development. The pilot implementation demonstrated its adaptability to various academic settings and its ability to enhance transparency, efficiency, and decision-making.

While the framework presents a robust alternative to existing systems, challenges such as the initial learning curve and the need for continuous updates underscore the importance of training, stakeholder engagement, and ongoing system refinement. This research contributes to the growing field of educational management by showcasing the potential of Lean Six Sigma principles in driving institutional improvement. Future work can expand on these findings by exploring the application of this framework in other domains, such as curriculum development or resource optimization, further solidifying its value in the academic landscape.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112-133.
- Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P., Miller, J. E., & Seldin, C. A. (2010). *The academic portfolio: A practical guide to documenting teaching, research, and service*. Jossey-Bass.
- Romero, C., & Ventura, S. (2010). Educational data mining: A review of the state of the art. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews), 40*(6), 601-618. https://doi.org/10.1109/TSMCC.2010.2053532
- Agrawal, R., Imieliński, T., & Swami, A. (1993). Mining association rules between sets of items in large databases. In *Proceedings of the 1993 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data* (pp. 207-216). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/170035.170072
- Baer, L. L. (2014). *Analytics in higher education: Benefits, barriers, progress, and recommendations*. Educause.
- Daniel, B. (2015). Big data and analytics in higher education: Opportunities and challenges. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 46*(5), 904-920. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12230
- Antony, J. (2014). *Lean Six Sigma for higher education: Research and practice*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Sunder, V. M., & Antony, J. (2018). A conceptual Lean Six Sigma framework for quality excellence in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 35*(4), 857-874. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-10-2016-0173
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. SAGE Publications.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Teo, T. (2011). Factors influencing teachers' intention to use technology: Model development and test. *Computers & Education, 57*(4), 2432-2440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.008
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Flick, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Kish, L. (1965). *Survey sampling*. Wiley.

- Levy, P. S., & Lemeshow, S. (2008). *Sampling of populations: Methods and applications* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Bernard, H. R. (2017). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (6th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sommerville, I. (2016). ***Software engineering* (10th ed.). Pearson.**
- Pressman, R. S., & Maxim, B. R. (2020). ***Software engineering: A practitioner's approach* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.**
- Kim, D.-H., Yoon, H. B., Sung, M., Yoo, D.-M., Hwang, J., Kim, E. J., Lee, S., & Shin, J.-S. (2015). Evaluation of an international faculty development program for developing countries in Asia: The Seoul Intensive Course for Medical Educators. BMC Medical Education, 15, 224. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-015-0518-8
- Moradi, N. (2022). Performance evaluation of university faculty by combining BSC, AHP, and TOPSIS: From the students' perspective. *International Journal of the Analytic Hierarchy Process*, 14(2). https://doi.org/10.13033/ijahp.v14i2.915
- Anthony, S. G. (n.d.). *Lean Six Sigma in higher education institutions: The need to change* [E-book]. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Gastelum-Acosta, C., Limon-Romero, J., Baez-Lopez, Y., Tlapa, D., García-Alcaraz, J. L., Puente, C., & Perez-Sanchez, A. (2021). Modeling critical success factors of lean six sigma in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlss-03-2021-0047