



International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)

ISSN 2307-4531
(Print & Online)

<http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied>



Performance Evaluation: A Self Assessment to Promote UST Faculty Members' Career Development

JAMES R. PLATON*

The Graduate School, University of Santo Tomas, Espana Manila, Philippines

Email Address: jamesplaton@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study was a self-assessment of faculty members of UST centered on 'teaching performance, academic advising, departmental duties, scholarships, behavior, and improvement. The evaluation employed the Likert scale and frequency scores. The results revealed that teaching performance described the teachers highly satisfactory at mean of 4.54; they met expectation in 'advising' at a mean of 2.09; they exceeded expectation in 'departmental duties' with a mean of 1.75; they did not exhibited at all a negative behavior at a mean of 4.45; positive behavior was exhibited 'most of times' at a mean of 1.43. The teachers' 'scholarships' involvement' was most prevalent in 'workshop' followed by 'chair of a conference'; and less prevalent in 'conference paper,' 'editorial' and 'publication.' It was concluded that the faculty members did not achieve a general performance at the utmost. Thus, the study provided a career development program to improve further the qualities of the teachers.

Keywords: self-assessment; teaching performance; advising; departmental duties; scholarships; performance improvement; career development.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: jamesplaton@yahoo.com.

1. Introduction

Faculty performance evaluation plays an important role in educational personnel reform. The purpose of evaluation is to discuss and provide examples of the teacher's strengths and weaknesses, clarify job expectations, identify training and development needs, and determine realistic career paths within the organization. Faculty performance evaluation provides powerful support for education system personnel decisions in promotion, prize and punishment, employment and dismissal.

UST has a regimen of evaluation tools to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of teachers, and these include administrative, peer and student evaluation tools. On the other hand, there is self evaluation tool known as Self Evaluation Instrument (SEI) given by UST for Faculty members to accomplish primarily for promotional purposes. However, SEI is more on listing the scholarly works & achievements for a specified period of time. Considering the fact that there are other information such as intrinsic attitude, ideas and perceptions not known to administration, peers and students, these information are well relevant to the desire of teachers for career development. It is as well important to include a more extensive self-evaluation process among the regimen of evaluation tools that measure the effectiveness of teachers. This is important because the end of this study is to achieve a career development program for the benefit of teachers, students, administration and all other concerns, thus, the teachers' point of view regarding their performance is might as well be known through self-assessment process.

The self-assessment method is possibly a biased estimate of our own teaching effectiveness, but this type of evaluation can provide support for what we do in the classroom and can present a picture of our teaching unobtainable from any other source.

2. Review of Literature

The study reviewed the various aspects that influence the effectiveness of teachers' general performance that included: teaching performance, advising, departmental duties, behavior, scholarship, and improvement.

2.1 Teaching Performance

It is discussed that one way for students to learn is illustrate to them; show them pictures, diagrams, sketches, schematics, flow charts and plots. Instructors must know how to devise these needs such that they are ready to facilitate better opportunity for students to learn. An illustration is a visual representation that clarifies the information given to us in a book, story, essay, poem or even an advertisement. They typically are in the form of a sketch, photograph or some other type of artwork. Many illustrations today are not just the handiwork of a particular artist, but are often created with the help of various computer software applications. Illustrations convey a message as much as, or often even more than, the written word [1] .

Project-based learning.PBL is a new learning approach which places greater emphasis on targeting the learning of complex experiences, geared to a specific goal or objective, in place of the traditional academic approach strongly focusing on rote memorization of multiple information items alienated from their practical, real-world

uses. The objective is the one of equipping young generations with the mental tools needed to face the complex, fast-changing nature of the information-based economy [2].

2.2 Advising

Academic advising plays an essential role in helping students formulate sound education and career plans based on their interests and abilities. Their School of Education Advisement Center (SEAC) is a place where students can sit down with an advisor one-on-one and discuss their individual concerns and questions. Each student is an important new member of their education community. Furthermore, Campbell (2008) viewed academic process as an educational process it plays a critical role in connecting students with learning opportunities to foster and support their engagement, success, and the attainment of key learning outcomes. He said that academic advising as an educational process moves it from a paradigm of teaching that focuses on information or inputs to a paradigm of learning that focuses on outcomes for student learning. In this way, academic advising supports key institutional conditions that have been identified with promoting student success [3].

2.3 Departmental Duties

Community College faculty members are expected to do their fair share of serving on a variety of departmental and college committees, including hiring committees, the Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee. These committees do not require an exorbitant amount of time but do meet on a regular basis, usually monthly or bi-weekly. Committee assignments require more of a time commitment during special instances, including college accreditation and financial or academic audits conducted by state or district officials. On occasion, faculty members are assigned to participate in evaluating fellow faculty members' job performance. [4] Institutional service performed by faculty members includes serving on internal committees and advisory boards, mentoring and advising students, and assuming part-time administrative appointments as program or unit leaders. In some cases, faculty members also assume term appointments in fulltime roles as mid-level or senior level institutional administrators [5].

2.4 Behavior

There were varying opinions among faculty members and administrators regarding the appropriateness of social interactions with students, such as whether socializing with students at a bar violated a faculty-student boundary. However, there was general agreement that faculty members socially interacting with students should not buy them drinks or discuss other students with them and should not initiate social network friendships with students, but that taking a student employee to lunch is acceptable [6]. Economic and market globalization in the United States has engendered a multicultural learning environment that challenges both faculty and students. Diversity in the classroom is further complicated by nonverbal communication, which impacts on students' attitudes toward faculty members [7].

2.5 Scholarship

Partial understanding emerges as other topics related to each of the defining aspects of the academic profession require treatment through the scholarship of integration. He said that the academic labor market constitutes a topic that pertains to both the structure of the academic profession and to careers. Teaching role performance stands as a topic germane to teaching as a core function of the academic profession. The adjustment of faculty new to the academic profession represents a topic related to the careers of academic professionals. Perhaps, the scholarly community will address these topics through the scholarship of integration [8].

A writing workshop is a technique used to allow both students and teachers to write and practice reading and writing skills at their own pace. A writing workshop is an instructional model that views writing as an ongoing process, including planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing writings. One of the many benefits of these workshops is that they allow teachers to redefine their roles within the classroom. Writing workshops allow teachers to model writing, to act as facilitators, to collaborate with students, and to hold individual conferences throughout the writing process (9).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

3.1.1 Descriptive Quantitative Research. The study employed a descriptive quantitative method of research. A self-assessment survey on faculty performance evaluation and satisfaction of faculty members was carried out on issues involving teaching performance, academic advising, departmental duties, behavior, and scholarships.

3.1.2 Selection/Subjects and Study Site. The research locale shall be the University of Santo Tomas (UST). The researcher presently is a member of the UST faculty and eagerly interested in determining how the faculty members of UST perform their role in promoting the welfare of the university and its departments, the learning opportunities of the students, opportunities for career development of faculty members, and developing UST as a conducive community for learning.

Considering that UST had over a thousand faculty members, the researcher would face so much difficulty in the management of data gathering and evaluation of results, furthermore, money and time might serve as financial constraint because of the volume of the would-be participants. Hence, the researcher carried out purposive sampling, and chose only one college department – the College of Commerce and Business Administration. There were approximately 100 faculty members in the chosen Department and all of them considered as participants in the self-assessment survey. However, there were circumstances that did not permit considering all these faculty members. There were those who had made leaves of absence and some had not completed a year of experience. One year experience for the participants was necessary because the survey sought the assessment of the faculty members' improvement from the last year to the present. Hence, the total number of participants engaged in the survey was 91 faculty members.

3.1.3 Data Measure/Instrumentation. A self-assessment questionnaire on faculty performance evaluation and satisfaction developed by the University of Notre Dame (NDU, 2013) was used as the data gathering instrument.

The questionnaire focuses on five essential issues: teaching performance, advising, departmental duties, behavioral and overall assessment of improvement.

3.1.3.1 Teaching Performance. This issue consists of 16 variables, and each variable was given the scale of: 1 – highly unsatisfactory; 2 –very unsatisfactory; 3 – satisfactory; 4 - very satisfactory; and 5 – highly satisfactory.

3.1.3.2 Advising. This issues consists of 4 variables, and each was given the scale of: 1 – exceeds expectation; 1- meets expectation; 3 – fairly meets expectation; and 4 – fails to meet expectation.

3.1.3.3 Departmental Duties. This issue has 4 variables and each was rated: 1 – exceeds expectation; 2 – meets expectation; 3 - fairly meets expectation, and 4 – fails to meet expectation.

3.1.3.4 Behavioral. This issue consists of 5 negative behavior and 2 positive behavior. Each variable was rated: 1 – most of the times; 2 – sometimes; 3 – seldom; 4 – rarely; and 5 – not at all.

3.1.3.5 Scholarship. This issue has 5 categories. The frequency score in each category was counted.

3.1.3.6 Overall Assessment. This issue has 5 variables. Each variable was rate: 1 – improved highly significantly; 2 – improved significantly; 3 – improved somehow; 4 – deteriorated somehow; 5 – deteriorated significantly; and 6 – deteriorated highly significantly.

3.1.4 Data Gathering Procedure. Initially the faculty members were notified of the survey and their permission to participate was encouraged. When the faculty members agreed, the copies of the questionnaire were reproduced. Each faculty member was given a copy and allotted one week to fill in their answers and then the questionnaires were retrieved.

3.1.5 Ethical Consideration. Request was initiated for the participation of the faculty members. A formal letter was made for this asking for the consent of the faculty members.

3.1.6 Mode of Analysis. The Likert Scale data were averaged using the following formula:

$$X_a = \sum x/n \quad (1)$$

Where:

X_a = weighted average

x = score in each item

n = number of scores

The above formula was used in calculating the means for the data in the following issues: teaching performance, advising, departmental duties, behavior, and overall assessment.

The demographic profile of the faculty members were useful in the analysis: teaching load and date of joining. For the analysis of this purpose, the teachers were classified according to whether the teacher was teaching

professional/major subjects or general education subjects. When counted, there were a total of 52 teachers handling major subjects and 39 teachers handling general education subjects. There were 42 teachers with experience of 5 years and below, and there were 49 teachers with experience of 6 years and above.

The means for all teachers, the means for each group, either teaching major or general subjects, or with experience of 5 years and below, or teaching for 6 years and above, were also calculated. The following tests of difference were conducted:

1. Test of difference between the grand mean for 5 years and below and the grand mean for 6 years and below.
2. Test of difference between the grand mean for teachers handling major subjects and teachers handling general education subjects.
3. The above test are expressed by following null and alternative hypotheses:
 - a. No significant difference between grand mean of 5 years & below and 6 years & above.
 - b. No significant difference between grand mean of major subjects and general education subjects.
 - c. The statistical test used was ANOVA.
 - d. Scientific symbols for the statement of hypothesis:

Null hypothesis: $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ (2)

Alternative hypothesis: $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ (3)

4. Regarding scholarship, frequency scores were converted to percentage, and the difference in pairs was analyzed using the t-test.

4. Results

The result of the self-assessment questionnaire investigation was evaluated and summarized in the following tables:

Table 1. Teaching Performance

	Grand Mean	Interpretation	F-test (.05)	t-test (.05)
All teachers	4.54	Very satisfactory	Significant	
Teachers of 6 years & above	4.53	Very satisfactory	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of 5 years & below	4.55	Very satisfactory	Significant	
Teachers of major subjects	4.56	Very satisfactory	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of general education	4.52	Very satisfactory	Significant	

The teaching performance consisted of 16 variables, each of the variable had it respective mean. The grand mean of the 16 variables was 4.54, interpreted as ‘very satisfactory. Using the ANOVA, the difference among the means of 16 variables was found significant at .05 level. The grand mean of teachers with 6 years experience and above was 4.53, interpreted as ‘very satisfactory.’ The difference in means among the variables was found significant. The grand mean of teachers with experience of 5 years and below was 4.55, interpreted as ‘very satisfactory.’ The difference among variables was also found significant. The t-test was conducted between the grand mean of teachers with experience of 6 years and above, and teachers with experience of 5 years and below and the results found it not significant. The teachers of major subjects got a grand mean of 4.56, interpreted as ‘very satisfactory.’ The difference among variables was found significant. Teachers of general education subjects got a grand mean of 4.52, interpreted as ‘very satisfactory.’ The difference among variables was found significant. The difference in means between teachers handling major subjects and general education subjects was found not significant.

The next investigated was the involvement of faculty members involving ‘advising’ activities. The self-assessment ratings regarded on this issue is illustrated in Table 2, as follow:

Table 2. Advising

	Mean	Interpretation	F-test	t-test
All teachers	2.06	Met expectations	Significant	
Teachers of 6 years & above	2.11	Met expectations	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of 5 years & below	2	Met expectations	Significant	
Teachers of major subjects	1.97	Met expectations	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of general education	2.17	Met expectations	Significant	

Advising activities consisted of 4 variables. The advising involvement of all teachers was rated was 2.06, interpreted as ‘met expectations.’ The difference in means among variables was found significant. The teachers with 6 years experience and above was rated 2.11, interpreted as ‘met expectations.’ The difference in means among variables was found significant. The difference between means of teachers with 6 years experience above and 5 years experience and below was found not significant. Teachers handling major subjects got a mean rating of 1.97, and an interpretation of ‘met expectations.’ The difference in means among the variables was found significant. Teachers handling general education subjects had a mean of 2.17, interpreted as ‘met expectations’. The difference in means among variables was found significant. The difference in means between handling major subjects and general education was found not significant.

‘Departmental duties’ was the next involvement of faculty members considered in this research. Table 3 exhibits the results

Table 3. Departmental Duties

	Mean	Interpretation		
All teachers	1.75	Exceeds expectations	Significant	
Teachers of 6 years & above	1.8	Met expectations	Significant	Not
Teachers of 5 years & below	1.69	Exceeds expectations	Significant	significant
Teachers of major subjects	1.77	Met expectations	Significant	Not
Teachers of general education	1.72	Exceeds expectations	Significant	significant

The activities of teachers as to be part of their departmental duties consisted of 6 variables. The involvement of all teachers in departmental duties was rated 1.75, interpreted as ‘exceeds expectations’. The difference in means among variables was found significant. The Teachers with experience of 6 years and above got a mean of 1.8, interpreted as ‘met expectations.’ The difference in means among variables was found significant. Teachers with experience of 5 years and below got a mean of 1.69, with an interpretation of ‘exceeds expectations.’ The difference in means between teachers of 6 years and above and teachers of 5 years and below was found not significant. Teachers handling major subjects was accorded with a mean 1.77, with an interpretation of ‘met expectations.’ The difference among variables was found significant. Teachers handling general education subjects was accorded with a mean of 1.72. The difference among variables was also significant. The difference in means between teachers handling major subjects and teachers handling general subjects was found not significant.

The next issue evaluated was the ‘behavioral’ characteristics of faculty members. This consist of the negative and positive behavior exhibited by teachers. The negative behavior of teachers comprised of 5 variables. The negative behavior of all teachers was rated 4.45, interpreted as ‘not at all exhibited’. The difference among variables was found not significant. Teachers of 6 years and above got a mean of 4.42, interpreted as ‘not at all exhibited.’ The difference among variables was significant. The teachers of 5 years and below had a mean of 4.37, interpreted as ‘not at all expect5ed.’ The difference among variables was significant. The difference in means between teachers of 6 years and above and teachers of 5 years and below was not significant. Teachers of major subjects had a mean of 4.42, equivalent to ‘not at all exhibited. The difference among variables was significant. Teachers handling general education was given a mean of 4.51, equivalent to ‘not at all exhibited.’ The difference among variables significant. The difference in means between teachers handling major subjects and those handling general education was not significant. Table 4 shows the results.

The positive behavior comprised of 2 variables. The positive behavior of all teachers was rated 1.44. interpreted as ‘exhibited most of the times. The difference between the 2 variables was significant. The positive behavior of teachers of 6 years and above had a mean of 1.48, interpreted as ‘most of the times. The difference between the 2 variables was not significant. The positive behavior of teachers of 5 years and below was rated 1.18, equivalent to ‘exhibited most of the times.’ The difference between the two variables was not significant. The difference in means between teachers of 6 years and above and teachers of 5 years and below was not

significant. The positive behavior of teachers handling major subjects had a mean of 1.58, interpreted as ‘exhibited most of the times.’ The difference in means between the 2 variables was not significant. The positive behavior of teachers handling general education got a rate of 1.24, regarded as ‘exhibited most of the times. The difference in means between the 2 variable was not significant. The difference in means between the positive behavior of teachers handling major subjects and those handling general education was found significant.

Table 4. Behavioral

Negative Behavior	Grand Mean	Interpretation	F-test	t-test
All teachers	4.45	Not at all exhibited	Not significant	
Teachers of 6 years & above	4.42	Not at all exhibited	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of 5 years & below	4.37	Not at all exhibited	Significant	
Teachers of major subjects	4.42	Not at all exhibited	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of general education	4.51	Not at all exhibited	Significant	
Positive Behavior				
All teachers	1.44	Exhibited most of the time	Significant	
Teachers of 6 years & above	1.48	Exhibited most of the time	Not significant	Not significant
Teachers of 5 years & below	1.18	Exhibited most of the time	Not significant	
Teachers of major subjects	1.58	Exhibited most of the time	Not significant	Significant
Teachers of general education	1.24	Exhibited most of the time	Not significant	

Scholarship activities are supposed to improve the general qualities of teachers. The involvement of teachers on scholarship was also evaluated. The total involvement of all teachers in scholarship activities was 497. ‘Workshop’ was the most prevalent at 200 or 40%, next was by ‘chair of conference at’ 102 or 21%, followed by ‘editorial’ at 87 or 18%, then ‘publication’ at 62 or 12%, and the least was ‘conference paper’ at 46 or 9%. The total distribution of frequency scores was classified to teachers with experience of 6 years and above, and 5 years and below, and these were converted into respective percentages. The difference in percentage means was test and the result was found significant. The total distribution of frequency scores was also classified according

to teachers handling major subject and those handling general education subjects. Similarly, the respective frequencies were converted into percentage. The difference in percentage mean between teachers handling major subjects and those handling general education subjects was also found significant. The results are tabulated and shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Scholarship

Scholarship	6y & above		5y & below		Total		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Conference paper	32	0.70	14	0.3	46	0.09	
Chair of conference	83	0.81	19	0.19	102	0.21	
Editorial	77	0.89	10	0.11	87	0.18	
Publication	37	0.60	25	0.4	62	0.12	
Workshop	174	0.87	26	0.13	200	0.40	
Total	403	.77	94	.23	497	1.00	
t-test (%)	Significant						
Scholarship	Maj. Subject		Gen. Education		Total		
	F	%	F	%			
Conference paper	31	0.67	15	0.33			
Chair of conference	64	0.63	38	0.37			
Editorial	57	0.66	30	0.34			
Publication	34	0.55	28	0.45			
Workshop	153	0.77	200	0.23			
Total	339	.765	158	.235			
t-test (%)	Significant						

The overall assessment of faculty members from the recent years up to the present regarding the five issues such as teaching performance, advising, departmental duties, behavioral and scholarship was conducted. It is illustrated in Table 6.

The overall assessment of teacher performance comprised 5 variables. All teachers accorded a mean of 1.94, interpreted as 'improved significantly'. The difference among 5 variables was found not significant. Teachers of 6 years and above gave a mean of 2.05, interpreted as 'improved significantly.' The difference among variables was tested and found significant. Teachers of 5 years and below gave a mean of 1.8, interpreted as 'improved highly significantly.' The difference among variables was found significant. The difference in means between teachers of 6 years and above and 5 years and below was found not significant. Teachers of major subjects got a

mean of 1.82, interpreted as ‘improved highly significantly.’ The difference among variables was found significant. Teachers of general education accorded a mean of 2.09, interpreted as ‘improved significantly.’ The difference among variables was found significant. The difference in means between teachers of major subjects and teachers of general education was found not significant.

Table 6. Overall Assessment

	Grand Mean	Interpretation	F-test	t-test
All teachers	1.94	Improved significantly	Not significant	
Teachers of 6 years & above	2.05	Improved significantly	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of 5 years & below	1.8	Improved highly significantly	Significant	
Teachers of major subjects	1.82	Improved highly significantly	Significant	Not significant
Teachers of general education	2.09	Improved significantly	Significant	
Mean	1.94	Improved significantly		
F-test		Significant		

5. Conclusion

From the findings gathered in this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

5.1 The teaching performance of all the faculty members of the College of Commerce and Business administration were highly satisfactory. This was true whether the teachers had short or long years of teaching experience. It was also verified in terms of the issues involving 16 classroom activities considered in the study. In like manner, it was also true whether the teachers were handling major subjects or general education subjects, including the 16 items considered in the study.

5.2 Regarding the difference in means among the 16 variables in teaching performance, significant difference was calculated. Hence, although each variable could be interpreted as highly satisfactory, there is still room for improvement for some variables. Considering all teachers, these include arriving on time in class, using educational aid, available during office hours. As far as teachers with experience of 6 years and above, emphasis in improvement should be accorded on using education aids and materials, availability during office hours, arriving on class on time, and encouraging library search. Regarding teachers handling major subjects, improvement may be focused on arriving in class on time, giving examinations that covers lecture, and

availability during office hours. With regards with teachers handling general education subjects, more improvement can be made on the variables such as availability during office hours, and arriving in class on time.

5.3 The advising activities of all faculty members had met their expectations. This was true whether the teachers had short or long years of experience as faculty members, and this was also verified involving the four various advising activities considered in the study. The same was true whether the teachers were handling major or general education subjects, and the four various advising activities considered in the study. As far as the variables in advising is concerned, more effort from teachers with experience of 6 years & above to improve on the issue of showing advisor's name and room, and follow up on academic progress. With regards to teachers with 5 years & below, emphasis should be given more on the issue of showing the advisor's name and room. For those handling major subjects, more effort must be accorded on the issue of showing the advisor's name and room. Concerning teachers handling general education subjects, more effort for improvement should be given on the issue of showing the advisor's name and room.

5.4 The involvement of all faculty members in the departmental duties was found to have met expectations. However, it was concluded that teachers with long years of teaching experience had met expectations better than those teachers with short years of teaching experience. Likewise, the level of meeting expectations varied as regard the six items considered in the study. Considering the two kinds of subjects the teachers taught, the same level of meeting expectations was concluded, including the six advising activities considered in the study. Still, more improvement can be initiated by teachers with experience of 6 years & above in order to excel further, but greater focus should be accorded on the issue of the instructor's active engagement in discussions, and fulfillment of duties in the Department. For teachers with experience of 5 years & below, an improvement on the issue of active engagement in discussions, and fulfillment of duties in the department should be given greater emphasis. For those handling major subjects, greater attention should be accorded on the issue of instructor's attendance, participation, meetings, engagement in discussions, and fulfillment of duties in the Department. With regards those handling general education subjects, more effort should be accorded to the fulfillment of the instructor's effort in departmental duties.

5.5 The negative behavior of all teachers had rarely happened. The same was true whether the teachers had short or long years of experience or handling major subjects or general education subjects. As far as positive behavior of all the faculty members was concerned, it was concluded that it sometimes happened in general. However, for teachers with long years of experience, positive behavior happened sometimes, and for those with short years of experience, it happened most of the time. As far as teachers handling major subjects, it happened sometimes, where for those handling general education subjects, it happened most of the time.

5.6 For teachers with experience of 6 years & above, improvement on negative behavior must be initiated in some variables and this should be focused on the issue of answering cell phone during classes and getting absent without prior notice. From teachers with experience of 5 years & below, they should exert greater effort to avoid answering cell phones during class hours. For teachers handling major subjects, there was still a room for improvement in some variables such as answering cell phone during lectures, and cooperating with the

administrators. With regards to teachers handling general education subjects, there was still a room for improvement in the area of using cell phones during lectures and cooperating with the administrators. As far as positive behavior was concerned, teachers with experience of 6 years and above, no difference was found and performance can be interpreted as highly satisfactory. For teachers with experience of 5 years & below, no significant difference was found, thus, improvement may not be necessary as their performance was highly satisfactory.

5.7 Considering all teachers, more teachers had involved themselves in workshops and as chair of conferences. The same was true for teachers having short and long years of experience. However, it was concluded that teachers with long years of experience had greater participation in scholarship activities than those teachers with short years of experience. At the same time, teachers handling major subjects had greater participation in scholarship activities than those handling general education subjects.

5.8 All the faculty members had improved significantly considering the overall assessment of their performance. However, the teachers with long years of experience had improved significantly, better than those teachers with short years of experience. The teachers who handled major subjects had improved significantly, better than those who handled general education subjects.

In view of the foregoing conclusions, a career program was appropriate formulated, as follow:

Title of the Program: Two-Day Seminar/Workshop to Improved Overall Performance of the Faculty Members of the Department of Commerce and Business Administration of UST.

Aim of the Seminar-Workshop: The purpose of the program is to facilitate skills and techniques to the instructors in order to improve their overall teaching performance with the hope of enhancing their opportunities for career development.

This is a consolidated career development program that caters to address the weaknesses of the faculty members as exhibited by the itemized results of their self-evaluation on five major issues: teaching performance, advising, departmental duties, behavioral, and scholarships.

Program Implementation, Supervision, Assistance and Monitoring of Activities.

- a. Senior Faculty Member
- b. Two Instructors of CCBA
- c. Four senior students of CCBA

Role:

- a. These people will coordinate with the resource speakers and facilitators, and participants as to the schedule of lectures and workshop.
- b. Prepare Powerpoint presentation

- c. Prepare and distribute leaflets and program schedules
- d. Provide lunch and snack
- e. Take notes of the proceedings

Resource Speakers/Facilitators:

- a. Dean of the College of Commerce and Business Administration
- b. Assistant Dean of the CCBA
- c. Two Professors of CCBA
- d. Invited resource speaker on scholarships

Schedule of Seminar Workshop: Sunday and Monday during the start of the enrollment period for School Year 2014-2015.

Budget for Seminar-Workshop: P50,000.00

First Day (Saturday, 8:00-10:00 A.M.): Lecture on Teaching Performance

Topics for Discussion:

- a. Importance of arriving in class on time
- b. Techniques in conducting library search
- c. Methods of providing feedback progress in the course
- d. Types of educational aid, materials and activities
- e. Relevance of availability of instructors during office hours

Participants: All faculty members of CCBA. The lecture serves as a learning medium for teachers with lower teaching performance and serve as a review for those who performed highly satisfactorily.

10:00-10:15: Break-time-free snacks for all

10:15-12:00: Open forum on teaching performance

12:00-12:30: Lunch Break - Free Lunch

12:30-2:00 P.M: Lecture on Advising

Topics:

- a. Instructor's availability during advising period, with their rooms and room numbers
- b. Issues that may require student guidance

- c. Importance for the students to know where advisers can be found when necessary
- d. Follow-up on academic progress

2:00-2:15: Break time - free snacks

2:15-4:00: Lecture on Departmental Duties

Topics:

- a. The different departmental duties that instructors should learn and participate
- b. Importance of instructor's attendance during meetings
- c. Participation of instructors during discussions
- d. Instructor's fulfillment of departmental duties

Behavioral

8:00-9:00 A.M. Lecture on Behavior

Topics for Discussion:

- a. Negative behavior that include different class disturbance such as entertaining cellphone calls, eating in class and others
- b. Positive behavior that the instructors should promote inside the classroom such as professionalism, friendliness, and cooperation

9:00-10:00 A.M. Open forum on the issue of class behavior

10:00-10:15 A.M. Break time - free snacks

10:15-12:00 P.M. Workshop on Advising and Departmental Duties

12:00-12:30 P.M. Lunch Time - Free lunch

12:30-2:00 P.M. Lecture on Scholarships

Topic for Discussions:

- a. Preparation of conference paper
- b. Chairing a conference
- c. Editorial activities
- d. Publishing a school articles
- e. Conducting a workshop

2:00-3:00 P.M. Open forum on scholarships

3:15-3:30 - Break time - Free snacks

3:30-5:30 P.M. Workshop on Scholarships

Topics for workshops:

- f. Preparation of conference paper
- g. Chairing a conference
- h. Editorial activities
- i. Publishing a school articles
- j. Conducting a workshop

References

[1] R. A.Beck .“Survey of 12 Strategies to Measure Teaching Effectiveness.”*International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Volume 17, Number 1. 48-62[2005].

[2] B. Pearlman. (2010). Project-Based Learning: How Students Learn Teamwork, Critical Thinking And Communication Skills. [On-line]. Available:<http://www.masternewmedia.org/project-based-learning-how-students-learn-teamwork-critical-thinking-and-communication-skills/>,[April 30, 2013]

[3] Utah Valley University.(2013). Rights & Responsibilities.[On-line]. Available: <http://www.uvu.edu/education/about/advising.html>,[March 29, 2013].

[4] L. Martin. Faculty Roles in Community Colleges.[On-line]. Available: www.ehow.com/info_7875468_faculty-roles-community-colleges,[November, 2013]

[5] F. Hamarick. (2002). Faculty Roles and Responsibilities (Encyclopedia of Education).[On-line]. Available: <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3403200230.html>,[October 8, 2013].

[6] F. Schneider, M/ Jones, K. Farris, F. Havrda, K. Jackson, and T. Hamrick. 2011. Faculty Perceptions of Appropriate Faculty Behaviors in Social Interactions with Student Pharmacists. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3138356/>[May 20, 2013].

[7] E. Okoro and M. Washington. "Communicating in a Multicultural Classroom: A Study Of Students' Nonverbal Behavior And Attitudes Towards Faculty Attire". *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*. Voi.8, No. 7, 2011.

[8] J. Braxton. "Introduction: Understanding the Defining Aspects of the Academic Profession Through Through the Scholarship of Integration". *The Journal of the Professoriate* .ISSN 1556-7699, 2011.

[9] E. Wilkins. "What are the benefits of a writing workshop for teachers?" [On-line]. Available :http://www.ehow.com/info_12275590_benefits-writing-workshop-teachers.html, [May 15, 2013].