FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE PHILIPPINE EASTERN VISAYAS REGION

Donald M. Patimo

Northwest Samar State University, Philippines

Address for Correspondence:
donald.patimo@nwssu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

The main concern of this study was the assessment of the faculty performance evaluation system of State Universities and Colleges in the Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. Specifically, the study sought answers to research questions on how the faculty performance is evaluated with regards to evaluation procedures, instruments, and criteria and what is the present and desired faculty performance evaluation system considering the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. In search of answers to the abovementioned research questions, the researcher made use of the descriptive-assessment research design. The respondents of this study were administrators, faculty members, and students from the main campuses of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. As result, the researcher found out that the most common evaluation procedure used were administrative observation in the class and the administration of appraisal instrument. Rating scales were extensively employed evaluation instrument and the most commonly used evaluation criteria were teaching commitment, mastery of the subject matter, teaching for independent learning, and classroom management. In addition, the SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines unanimously expressed their desire to implement a faculty performance evaluation system that adheres to the standards of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. At the present, the existing faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines generally followed the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy.

Keywords: Faculty Performance, Evaluation System, Metaevaluation, Utility Standard, Feasibility Standard, Propriety Standard, Accuracy Standard

INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the organization's most valuable asset. They define the efficiency, effectiveness and over-all quality of service in any organization. The acquisition, utilization and development of financial, material, technological and market resources of the organization which may be exhaustible are dependent on human resources (Payos, 2010). These resources are directly related to organizational behavior such as knowledge, ability, decision making and intelligence of the human resource base. Because of the value of the people within and behind the organization, it is very important that the organization takes special care to ensure the satisfaction of their human resources. If the human resource is available, capable and satisfied, the other resources can be of great use to the organization.

Evaluating faculty effectiveness is important in every institution of higher education. Assessing teaching performance enables one to gauge the quality of instruction represented

by the institution and facilitate better learning among students. Assessing the effectiveness with which various functions of the faculty members are performed is essential to a variety of important administration recommendations and decisions. The evaluation system also provides feedback which influences the faculty member's self-image and professional satisfaction. The faculty performance management system establishes a climate which communicates the institution's commitment to professional improvement and confidence that every faculty member will make a valuable contribution to the achievement of shared goals (Goe, 2007).

The processes in the performance evaluation of instructors, professors, and professionals of the SUCs are highly critical since it is used to decide on matters such as hiring, rehiring, and promotion. Hence, there should be careful calibration and continuous study of the instruments used to assess the teachers. Moreover, there is a need to evaluate the process of evaluating faculty performance of SUCs in Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines. Through a study, it may be determined whether the existing processes and instruments in the different SUCs met the Joint Committee Standards for Evaluation. The Joint Committee Standards set a common language to facilitate communication and collaboration in evaluation through the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy of an evaluation (Stufflebeam, 2000).

It was on this reason that a study, which aimed to assess the faculty performance evaluation system of State Universities and Colleges in the Philippine Eastern Visayas Region, was conceived. Specifically, the study sought answers to research questions on how the faculty performance is evaluated with regards to evaluation procedures, instruments, and criteria and what is the present and desired faculty performance evaluation system considering the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy.

METHOD

This study made use of the descriptive-assessment research design. A descriptive-assessment research design is used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe what exists with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. The study was conducted at different SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines, namely Eastern Samar State University (ESSU), Eastern Visayas State University (EVSU), Leyte Normal University (LNU), Naval State University (NSU), Northwest Samar State University (NwSSU), Palompon Institute of Technology (PIT), Southern Leyte State University (SLSU), Samar State University (SSU), University of Eastern Philippines (UEP), and Visayas State University (VSU). Survey questionnaires were distributed among the evaluation personnel, faculty members and students in order to elicit the needed data for this research study.

Complete enumeration was used for the evaluation personnel respondents of the study, which include the deans and members of evaluation committee. Random sampling technique was used to determine the sample size of the faculty members and students in each involved SUCs. The total number of respondents for this study representing the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students proportionally distributed from the different SUCs in Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines was 1,604 individuals. Statistical tools like frequency and ranking, means, standard deviations, and One-Way Analysis of Variance were used for the analysis of the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 shows the frequency and ranking on how the faculty performance is evaluated with regards to evaluation procedures, instruments, and criteria. The most common evaluation procedure presently used in SUCs of Philippine Eastern Visayas Region involves

the administrative observation in the class and the administration of appraisal instrument. Rating scales are extensively employed evaluation instrument in SUCs of Philippine Eastern Visayas Region and the least employed evaluation instruments are the free form method and ranking. The most commonly used criteria in SUCs of Philippine Eastern Visayas Region are the teaching commitment, mastery of the subject matter, teaching for independent learning, and classroom management.

Table 1: Frequency and Ranking on How Faculty Performance is Evaluated in State Universities and Colleges of Philippine Eastern Visayas Region with regards to Evaluation Procedure, Instrument, and Criteria

Variables	Frequency	Rank
EVALUATION PROCEDURE		
Administrative Observation in the Class	10	1.5
Administration of Appraisal Instrument	10	1.5
Self-evaluation	8	3.5
Student Evaluation	8	3.5
Peer Evaluation	7	5
Group Feedback	2	6
Others	1	7
EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS		
Rating Scale	10	1
Checklists	3	2
Performance Record	2	3
Free Form Method	1	4.5
Ranking	1	4.5
EVALUATION CRITERIA		
Teaching Commitment	10	2.5
Mastery of the Subject Matter	10	2.5
Teaching for Independent Learning	10	2.5
Classroom Management	10	2.5
Research Involvement	8	5.5
Publications	8	5.5
Professional Responsibilities	6	7.5
Others	6	7.5
Personality and Character	5	9
Student and Faculty Relations	4	11.5
Physical Health	4	11.5
Mental Health	4	11.5
Peer Relations	4	11.5
Community Relations	2	14
Professional Growth	1	17
Teacher and Administrator Relations	1	17
Teacher and Professional Relations	1	17
Educational Attainment	1	17
Trainings Attended	1	17

These findings also showed in the study of Berk (2005), Oli (2018), Hornstein (2007), and Agsalud (2017). According to the Berk (2005), a unified conceptualization of teaching effectiveness through the use of multiple sources of evidence, such as student ratings, peer ratings, and self-evaluation, can provide an accurate and reliable base for academic decisions. These multiple sources of evidence are also evident from the study of Oli (2018) on the assessment practices by content faculty, student-teaching supervisor, and cooperating mentors of pre-professional Mathematics teachers in state universities in Northeastern Philippines.

Among these multiple sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness, Hornstein (2007) considered observation and rating scales as the most common and necessary and common

compared to other evaluation procedures and instruments to measure teaching competence. Agsalud (2017) consider also found out the level of teaching effectiveness along commitment, knowledge of the subject matter, teaching for independent learning and management of learning.

Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviations on the perception of the respondents on the existing practices of the faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. From the perspective of the evaluation personnel, faculty members and students, the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy were rated as "Generally True". Findings further disclose that the existing practices of the faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region generally follow the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy.

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviations on the Perception of the Respondents on the Existing Practices of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas

Standards	Evaluation Personnel			Faculty Members			Students			OVERALL		
	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd
Utility	3.89	GT	0.61	3.73	GT	0.69	3.94	GT	0.53	3.86	GT	0.61
Feasibility	3.84	GT	0.69	3.63	GT	0.76	3.98	GT	0.56	3.84	GT	0.67
Propriety	3.63	GT	0.81	3.52	GT	0.86	3.96	GT	0.61	3.78	GT	0.75
Accuracy	3.93	GT	0.73	3.69	GT	0.81	4.06	GT	0.56	3.91	GT	0.70
OVERALL	3.82	GT	0.65	3.64	GT	0.73	3.98	GT	0.51	3.85	GT	0.63

Legend:
4.51 – 5.00	(VT)	Very true of our faculty evaluation system
3.51 – 4.50	(GT)	Generally true of our faculty evaluation system
2.51 – 3.50	(TS)	True to some extent
1.51 – 2.50	(TL)	True to a very limited extent
1.00 – 1.50	(NT)	Not at all true

The same findings were also displayed in the study of Oli (2019) where evaluation experts assessed the extent to which mathematics assessment practices satisfy meta-evaluation criteria of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy employed by Mathematics Educators in some select State Universities in the Philippines. The assessment practices of the Mathematics Educators were also meta-evaluated with high ratings on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy.

Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviations on the perception of the respondents on the desired practices of the faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. From the perspective of the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students, the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy were rated as "I desire this descriptor, as is, as a characteristic of the system". Findings further disclose that the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy are necessity for an effective and efficient faculty performance evaluation system.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviations on the Perception of the Respondents on the Desired Practices of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region

Standards	Evaluation Personnel			Faculty Members			Students			OVERALL		
	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd	$\bar{x}$	Int.	sd
Utility	4.27	D	0.70	4.28	D	0.65	4.29	D	0.50	4.28	D	0.57
Feasibility	4.33	D	0.76	4.25	D	0.72	4.32	D	0.55	4.29	D	0.63
Propriety	4.40	D	0.72	4.25	D	0.78	4.28	D	0.57	4.28	D	0.67
Accuracy	4.42	D	0.68	4.35	D	0.70	4.35	D	0.53	4.36	D	0.61
OVERALL	4.35	D	0.68	4.28	D	0.67	4.31	D	0.48	4.30	D	0.57

Legend:
4.51 – 5.00 (SD) I strongly desire this descriptor as a characteristic of the system
3.51 – 4.50 (D) I desire this descriptor, as is, as a characteristic of the system
2.51 – 3.50 (DM) I desire this descriptor with some modifications
1.51 – 2.50 (ND) I don't want this descriptor as a characteristic of the system
1.00 – 1.50 (NA) This descriptor is not applicable in evaluating faculty

These findings of the study are consistent with Stronge and Tucker (2017) about meta-evaluation standards. A quality teacher evaluation system should reflect the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, namely propriety, utility, feasibility and accuracy. Accuracy is one of the standards of meta-evaluation that make sure the question produced and information disseminated in the evaluation is both valid and useable. Feasibility is one of the standards of meta-evaluation that make sure the evaluation conducted is in a realistic, well-considered, diplomatic, and cost-conscious manner. Propriety is one of the standards of meta-evaluation that ensure the questions in the evaluation are done in an ethical and legal manner. Utility is one of the standards of meta-evaluation that stand as a check for how much the evaluation in question caters to the information needs of its users.

These findings also supported in the study of Hussin (2017). The researcher found out the propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy standards of meta-evaluation as important attributes of a sound and fair teacher evaluation.

Table 4 exhibits the result of the one-way Analysis of Variance on the perception of the respondents on the existing practices of the faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. The table exposed the differences on the perceptions of the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students on the existing practices with regards to the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy.

Table 4: One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Perception of the Respondents on the Existing Practices of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region

Standards	F	df	p-value
Utility	21.615**	1603	0.000
Feasibility	54.060**	1603	0.000
Propriety	67.112**	1603	0.000
Accuracy	55.608**	1603	0.000
OVERALL	57.620**	1603	0.000

Legend:
** – Highly significant at 0.05 level (p-value < 0.01)

In order to easily identify the differences of the responses among evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students, the results of the post hoc test using Tukey HSD is presented in Table 5. As can be seen on the table, the respondents are grouped into evaluation personnel and faculty members, evaluation personnel and students, and faculty members and students. Evaluation personnel and faculty members differ on perception as to the standards on utility, feasibility, and accuracy. Evaluation personnel and students differ on perception as to the propriety standard. Lastly, the faculty members and students differ on the responses as to the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy.

Table 5: Post Hoc Test Using Tukey HSD on the Perception of the Respondents on the Existing Practices of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region

Standards	Paired Respondents	Mean Difference	Standard Error	p-value
Utility	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.16*	0.066	0.046
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.49ns	0.065	0.726
	Faculty Members and Students	-0.21**	0.031	0.000
Feasibility	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.21**	0.072	0.009
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.14ns	0.070	0.102
	Faculty Members and Students	-0.36**	0.034	0.000
Propriety	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.10ns	0.080	0.403
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.33**	0.078	0.000
	Faculty Members and Students	-0.43**	0.038	0.000
Accuracy	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.25**	0.074	0.003
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.13ns	0.073	0.183
	Faculty Members and Students	-0.374**	0.036	0.000
Overall	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.18*	0.067	0.020
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.16*	0.065	0.034
	Faculty Members and Students	-0.34**	0.032	0.000

Legends:
    ns – Not significant at 0.05 level (p-value > 0.05)
    * – Significant at 0.05 level (p-value < 0.05)
    ** – Highly significant at 0.05 level (p-value < 0.01)

Table 6 displays the result of the one-way Analysis of Variance on the perception of the respondents on the desired practices of the faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. The table divulged the differences on the perceptions of the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students on the desired practices with regards to the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. The data reveals that the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region share the same desire to consider the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy to the faculty performance evaluation system of their respective state university or college. The similarity on their responses expresses the importance of these standards for an effective and efficient implementation of the faculty performance evaluation system for a state university or college.

Table 6: One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Perception of the Respondents on the Desired Practices of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region

Standards	F	df	p-value
Utility	0.082ns	1603	0.921
Feasibility	2.324ns	1603	0.098
Propriety	2.060ns	1603	0.128
Accuracy	0.453ns	1603	0.636
OVERALL	0.831ns	1603	0.436

Legend:
ns – Not significant at 0.05 level (p-value > 0.05)

Table 7 shows the result of the t-test on the perception of the respondents between the existing and desired practices of the faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. As shown in the table, the perception of the respondents differ between the existing system and their expressed desired practices with regards to the utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy.

Table 7: Test of Significant Difference on the Perception of Respondents between the Existing and Desired Practices of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region

Standards	t-value	df	p-value
Utility	-20.352**	3206	0.000
Feasibility	-19.471**	3206	0.000
Propriety	-19.974**	3206	0.000
Accuracy	-19.212**	3206	0.000
OVERALL	-21.473**	3206	0.000

Legend:
** – Highly significant at 0.05 level (p-value < 0.01)

In order to easily identify the differences of the responses among evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students, the results of the post hoc test using Tukey HSD is presented in Table 8. As can be seen on the table, the respondents are grouped into evaluation personnel and faculty members, evaluation personnel and students, and faculty members and students. Evaluation personnel and faculty members differ on perception as to the standards on utility, feasibility, and accuracy. Evaluation personnel and students differ on perception as to the propriety standard. Lastly, the faculty members and students differ on the responses as to the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. The respondents' desired practices are significantly different from what exists in the existing system of faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region.

Table 8: Post Hoc Test Using Tukey HSD on the Perception of the Respondents between the Existing and Desired Practices of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region

Standards	Paired Respondents	Mean Difference	Standard Error	p-value
Utility	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.18*	0.070	0.041
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.49ns	0.066	0.726
	Faculty Members and Students	0.20**	0.033	0.001
Feasibility	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.29**	0.073	0.002
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	0.14ns	0.080	0.102
	Faculty Members and Students	0.39**	0.084	0.000
Propriety	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.15ns	0.089	0.405
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	0.43**	0.028	0.001
	Faculty Members and Students	-0.53**	0.048	0.003
Accuracy	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.25**	0.084	0.003
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.13ns	0.093	0.185
	Faculty Members and Students	0.404**	0.096	0.000
Overall	Evaluation Personnel and Faculty Members	0.20*	0.067	0.029
	Evaluation Personnel and Students	-0.19*	0.045	0.034
	Faculty Members and Students	0.35**	0.092	0.001

Legends:

ns – Not significant at 0.05 level (p-value > 0.05)

* – Significant at 0.05 level (p-value < 0.05)

** – Highly significant at 0.05 level (p-value < 0.01)

Oli (2019) tested also the differences and similarities on the evaluation experts' assessment on the extent to which mathematics assessment practices satisfy meta-evaluation criteria of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy in select state universities in the Philippines. The overall feasibility and propriety are of about the same level in the assessments while the assessment on utility and accuracy differ across the four state universities.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were drawn. The researcher found out that the most common evaluation procedure used were administrative observation in the class and the administration of appraisal instrument. Rating scales were extensively employed evaluation instrument and the most commonly used evaluation criteria were teaching commitment, mastery of the subject matter, teaching for independent learning, and classroom management.

The evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students obtained different experiences, roles, and environment with regards to the implementation of the existing faculty performance evaluation system in the Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. On the other hand, the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students share the same desire to consider the standards on utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy to the faculty performance evaluation system of their respective state university or college. The desired practices of the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students were significantly different from what exists in the existing system of faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines.

REFERENCES

Afriadi, B. (2018). EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT CLASS CONCEPT (Case Study: Student Behavior Problematics). *JISAE: JOURNAL OF INDONESIAN STUDENT ASSESMENT AND EVALUATION*, *4*(2), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.21009/JISAE.042.07

Agsalud, P. L. (2017). Teaching effectiveness of the teacher education faculty members in Pangasinan State University Asingan Campus, Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 5(1), 16-22.

Berk, R. A. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. International journal of teaching and learning in higher education, 17(1), 48-62.

Goe, L. (2007). The link between teacher quality and student outcomes: A research synthesis. National comprehensive center for teacher quality.

Hornstein, H. A. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance. Cogent Education, 4(1), 1304016.

Hussin, S. (2017). Spiral Dynamics in the Implementation of Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Policy in A Centralized Education System. MOJEM: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management, 2(2), 22-37.

Oli, M. C. (2018). The Assessment Practices by Content-faculty, Student-teaching Supervisor and Cooperating Mentors of Pre-professional Mathematics Teachers in State Universities in Cagayan Valley Region in the Philippines â€. JISAE (Journal of Indonesian Student Assesment and Evaluation), 4(2), 60-82.

Oli, M. C. (2019). Using DELPHI TECHNIQUE IN META-EVALUATING THE MATHEMATICS ASSESSMENT PRACTICES OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATORS. JISAE (Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation), 5(1), 33-44.

Payos, Ranulfo P. (2010). Human Resource Management: From Practitioner's Point of View. Philippines: Rex Book Store, Inc.

Stronge, J., & Tucker, P. (2017). Handbook on Teacher Evaluation with CD-ROM. Routledge.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. (2000). The methodology of metaevaluation as reflected in by the Western Michigan University Evaluation Center. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 14(1), 95.