



---

## **Faculty Development Program Policies in State Universities and Colleges: The Case of Cagayan State University**

Ludivina P. Cauilan\*

*Cagayan State University, Carig Sur, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan Valley, 3500, Philippines  
Email: ludivinacauilan9@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

This study was conducted to determine the implementation of Faculty Development Program policies in State Universities and Colleges focusing on the case of Cagayan State University, Philippines. Faculty members from the eight campuses of Cagayan State University served as the primary respondents together with administrative Officials who are charged with the implementation of the faculty development program policies. The result of the study revealed that there is no specific line item budget for faculty development. Its fund is sourced out from the income of the State University. This is a limiting factor in extensively extending the privilege to faculty members. Results also reveal that most of the faculty development programs availed are short term with a maximum period of 5 days. These are usually in the form of seminar workshops and training workshops. Thirty one percent (31%) of the faculty members availed of this privilege for the last five years(2012-2016). With respect to long term faculty development programs i.e enrolment to masteral degree and doctoral degree programs, only 24.3% were accorded the privilege through the faculty development program of Cagayan State University. Results also revealed that there is a need to review and enhance the existing faculty development program policies of the University particularly prequalification screening policies, processing policies, extension of the term of the grant and policies in case of breach of contract.

**Keywords:** Faculty Development; Faculty development program; adherence; policies; faculty.

---

\* Corresponding author.

## **1. Introduction**

The expanding array of changing roles of faculty members today, demand dynamism in the educational system in order to respond effectively to the call for quality and globally competitive graduates. The qualifications and competencies of the faculty are critical factors in achieving such. One way to address this is by providing support and training to faculty members to enhance their work performance. Faculty development programs have proven to be successful for improving teaching skills in higher education. Faculty members in higher education should attend FDP training activities on regular basis [1]. To remain in the forefront, faculty development programs need to broaden their focus, consider diverse training methods and formats, conduct more rigorous program evaluations, and foster new partnerships and collaborations [2]. For it to be effective, it has to consider the fundamentals of a clear vision, right perspective, network, responsiveness, and integrity [3]. Besides, faculty members have to be abreast with current trends as influenced by rapid technological developments. As a process, faculty development interventions are affected by many factors. In one study, it was found out that teacher-student interaction or human character components in becoming a good educator are lacking in their faculty development workshops [4]. Another study reiterates the incorporation of FDPs for improving the academic performance of faculty with resultant enrichment of learners' knowledge and skills [5]. Low teacher qualification inevitably leads to low standards of learning achievement among students, hence there is a need to encourage and provide assistance to Higher Education Institutions to enable them to meet the requirement [6]. Future challenges and directions are really important to consider in making decisions about faculty development in light of the changing context of faculty roles and responsibilities. Faculty developers in one study identified three critical factors: the changing professoriate; the changing nature of the student body; and the changing nature of teaching, learning, and scholarship [7]. In the case of electrical and electronics engineering, five reasons were cited for the need to organize faculty development program: 1. To make the faculty skilled in latest technologies; 2. To make faculty integrate more technology onto their teaching; 3. To orient faculty to institution's objective and vision; 4. To expand faculty roles; and, 5. To help faculty find work balance [8]. It is also important to note that academic vitality is dependent on faculty member's interest and expertise[9]. Similarly, budget availability for faculty development is also considered a critical factor[10]. Further, to make faculty development an institutional value and a professional practice, it must be structured from recruitment to post-tenure review [11]. According to William Arthur Ward [12], mediocrity is not tolerated and just being good is not appreciated. In the context of higher education, adherence to policies of faculty development programs is important for State Universities and Colleges.

## **2. Statement of the Problem**

The study generally aimed to assess the adherence of State Universities and Colleges to faculty development policies. Specifically, it sought to answer the following:

1. What is the average budget allotted for faculty development for the last five(5) years?
2. What is the percentage of faculty who were extended the privilege for faculty development for the last five(5) years under the following classification?

- 2.a. short term
  - 2.a.a. seminars/workshops?
  - 2.a.b. trainings?
- 2.b. long term
  - 2.b.a. Masters Degree/s?
  - 2.b.b. Doctorate degree/s?
  - 2.b.c. Post-doctoral degree/s?
3. What is the extent of observance of the policies on faculty development in terms of:
  - 1.a Pre-qualification screening;
  - 1.b Processing documentary requirements;
  - 1.c Extension of Contract; and,
  - 1.d Penalty in case of breach of contract
4. What is the percentage of grantees who complied with the conditions set forth in their contract for faculty development.
5. What problems were encountered by the faculty in availing the privilege for faculty development?

### ***2.1 Significance of the Study***

The assessment on the implementation of the faculty development program policies in state universities and colleges is a significant endeavor in many ways for the following:

**The national government.** The result of this research study could serve as basis for national legislators in revisiting existing laws applicable to educational institutions concerning quality and responsive education to suit the global market requirements and demands of the fast changing trends in education;

**The State Universities and Colleges.** The results of this study could serve as baseline data for state universities and colleges in the country regarding the relationship of faculty development and performance for institutional quality assurance.;

**The faculty members.** The result of this study could be used by educational institutions to enhance the opportunities of their respective existing faculty members. The findings of the study could also help resolve the

problems encountered by faculty members with respect to availment of the faculty development programs offered by the University not only for enhancing teaching performance but also for NBC 461 evaluation and AACCU accreditation purposes.

**Future Researchers.** This study can serve as their reference in conducting parallel studies about faculty development programs.

## ***2.2 Scope and Delimitation of the study***

The study sought to assess the implementation of the faculty development program policies of State Universities and Colleges focusing on the case of Cagayan State University, Philippines.

## ***2.3 Time and Locale of the Study***

The study was conducted at Cagayan State University, Philippines which has eight (8) campuses namely: Andrews, Aparri, Carig, Gonzaga, Lallo, Lasam, Piat and Sanchez Mira. It was conducted in CY 2017.

## **3. Materials**

The materials used in this study are the academic manual, and the University faculty development policies of Cagayan State University

## **4. Research Design**

This study made use of the descriptive survey method as it elicited information on the adherence of State Universities and Colleges to faculty development policies and the funding allotted for the program

### ***4.1 Respondents and Sampling Procedure***

The data were obtained from the 210 faculty members occupying a regular plantilla position and the School Administrators in charge with the implementation of the faculty development program in the Cagayan State University. Data pertaining to faculty development policies and implementation guidelines were obtained from the academic manual, administrative manual and training officer of the University. Likewise, other pertinent information pertaining to the faculty development program were gathered from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Budget Office and the Accounting Office. The Slovin's formula with 5% margin of error was used to determine the sample size of the study from the total population.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:  $n$  – number of samples

$N$  – is the total population

$e$  - is the allowable error (0.05)

The distribution of the respondents according to campus is shown in the table below. This data was taken from the Human Resource Management Office.

**Table 1:** Distribution of the Respondents per Campus

Campus	Total Number of Regular Faculty	Number of Population Samples
Andrews	105	50
Aparri	60	29
Carig	136	65
Gonzaga	37	17
Lallo	26	12
Lasam	11	5
Piat	32	15
Sanchez Mira	35	17
Total	442	210

These faculty population samples per campus were identified using the systematic random sampling where all the faculty members were given equal chances of becoming respondents to the study. The record from the Human Resource Management Office was used to identify the  $n$ th sample after a random start. The number of population samples per campus was also determined based on the total faculty members that each campus has. In identifying the faculty respondents, the names of the faculty per campus written in a piece of paper were put in a fish bowl and drawn one at a time until the total number desired was completed. The faculty whose names were drawn constituted the respondents of the study. Total enumeration was adopted for the administrators' group in consideration of the fact that very few of them are involved in the faculty development program. These are the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Director of Instruction, the Human Resource Management Officer, budge officer, accountant and the Training Officer of the University.

**4.2 Instrumentation**

Data from the faculty respondents were gathered through the use of a structured interview questionnaire. The data obtained from the respondents were validated through personal interview and documentary analysis.

The questionnaire for the faculty elicited information as regards their profile to ascertain their faculty rank and other socio-economic background. It likewise determined the particular faculty development program availed by the faculty. The respondents were also asked to evaluate how the program was implemented based on existing policies. On the other hand, the school administrators were interviewed to have a fair interpretation of the results. The interview guide was the policy set forth in the Official documents provided by the pertinent Offices. Data on the list of grantees and the percentage of those who fully complied with the terms and conditions of the program were also obtained from the training Officer. Moreover, data on the imposition of the sanctions to those who breached the contract were also obtained from the training officer of the University.

## **5. Statistical Treatment of Data**

Data were analyzed by using frequency counts, percentages, and means, . To ease the discussion, results were presented in the form of tables and graphs. In the tables, one hundred percent may not be obtained because of rounding effects. For the weighted means, the following scale was used for the interpretation of the findings.

5.00 - 4.01	strictly observed	strongly agree
4.00 - 3.01	not strictly observed	agree
3.00 - 2.01	seldom observed	fairly agree
2.00 - 1.00	never observed	disagree

## **6. Results and Discussion**

This chapter presents the statistically treated data in tabular form and their corresponding analysis and interpretation.

### **University Budget Allocation for Faculty and Staff Development for the Last Five Years**

Data gathered from the Budget Office of the University reveal that there is no specific budget allocation for faculty development. There is no line item budget specifically for faculty development that is allowed under DBM Laws, Rules and Regulations for State Universities and Colleges. However, the Cagayan State University in recognizing the importance of faculty development in pursuit of its vision had instituted an alternative strategy to address this concern for its faculty members. Faculty development programs ranging from seminar-workshops to graduate education have been extended to the faculty. The expenditure for this purpose has been drawn from the income of the University in accordance with CHED Memorandum Order No. 20 Series of 2011. This income source where financial assistance could be drawn is under Fund 164 but oftentimes inadequate because there are other programs and projects of the University that depend on it like curriculum development and student development. Applicants for faculty development especially the long term ones like graduate education are screened based on existing faculty development policies adopted by the University as stipulated in its academic manual. Those who qualify are required to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the

University to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions set forth for the advantage of both the University and the grantee.

**Extent of Observance of the Prequalification Screening Policies of the Faculty Development Program of Cagayan State University**

Table 2 shows the extent of observance of the prequalification screening policies of the Cagayan State University Faculty Development Program. It is revealed from the same table that the prequalification screening policies are seldom observed with an overall mean of 2.92. These prequalification policies include four items. The first deals with the specialization applied for which must be in line with the priority program areas of study which is rated 2.92. The second deals with the completeness of requirements needed for admission and grant of the program(2.96), followed by the capability of the applicant to do the course work(2.98) and the last one is that the applicant should pledge to complete the scholarship within the term specified in the contract(2.8). This finding could serve as basis for the program implementers to improve the extent of observance of the policy so that the program will be more responsive to its objectives. Besides, the policies of the program must be strictly observed in light of the verticalization requirement of graduate degrees to the thrusts of the University as defined in the academic manual.

**Table 2:** Extent of Observance of the Faculty Development Program Prequalification Screening Policies

Prequal Policies	Andrews	Aparri	Carig	Gonz	Lallo	Lasam	Piat	S.M.	Mean
1	3.26	2.83	2.6	3.0	2.75	3.0	2.8	3.12	<b>2.92</b>
2	3.32	2.83	2.82	3.0	2.75	3.0	2.8	3.18	<b>2.96</b>
3	3.3	2.93	2.92	2.76	3.0	3.0	2.73	3.18	<b>2.98</b>
4	3.28	2.90	2.69	3.0	2.5	2.2	2.8	3.06	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>2.92</b>

**Scale:**

5.00 – 4.01– strictly observed

4.00 – 3.01 – not strictly observed

3.00 – 2.01 – seldom observed

2.00 – 1.00 - never observed

**Extent of Observance of the Faculty Development Program Processing Policies**

The extent of observance of the faculty development program processing policies was also assessed. The items

included in this particular aspect are those that deal with the flow from application to approval or denial of the application. The findings reveal as shown in table 3 that policies on this respect are also seldom observed with a mean rating of 2.81. The policy on the requirement for recommendation by the dean, recommendation by the scholarship committee until the approval of the scholarship contract was seldom observed. All items under this section are rated the same in terms of adjectival description although the numerical rating are different.

**Table 3:** Extent of Observance of the Faculty Development Program Processing Policies

Process Policies	Andrews	Aparri	Carig	Gonz	Lallo	Lasam	Piat	S.M.	Mean
1	3.1	3.03	2.83	3.0	2.92	2.8	2.8	3.06	<b>2.94</b>
2	3.34	3.10	2.8	2.47	2.83	2.8	2.47	3.24	<b>2.88</b>
3	3.34	3.03	2.88	2.65	2.83	2.8	2.60	3.18	<b>2.92</b>
4	3.26	2.97	2.85	3.0	2.67	2.8	2.73	3.06	<b>2.92</b>
5	3.22	2.97	2.83	2.53	2.5	2.4	2.53	3.06	<b>2.76</b>
Mean	2.65	3.02	2.84	2.73	2.75	2.72	2.62	3.12	<b>2.81</b>

**Scale:**

5.00 – 4.01 – strictly observed

4.00 – 3.01 – not strictly observed

3.00 – 2.01 – seldom observed

2.00 – 1.00 - never observed

**Extent of Observance of the Policies for Extension of Scholarship**

The findings on the observance of the policies on extension of the scholarship grant are revealed in table 4. This particular aspect of the policy requires that the grantee should write an application for extension and that such application should be accompanied by a certification from the adviser on the necessity for extension. As can be gleaned from the table, the policies on extension are seldom observed with an overall mean of 2.84. The policies according to the respondents are most of the time foregone because an application letter for extension already suffices. The interview conducted also revealed that the extension of the term of the grant oftentimes exceed the allowable period as stipulated in the academic manual.



**Table 4:** Extent of Observance of the Faculty Development Program Policies on Extension of Scholarship Grant

Extension Policies	Andrews	Aparri	Carig	Gonz	Lallo	Lasam	Piat	S.M.	Mean
1	3.3	2.83	2.77	2.71	2.83	2.8	2.73	3.18	<b>2.89</b>
2	3.2	2.9	2.66	2.65	2.67	2.4	2.6	3.18	<b>2.78</b>
Mean	3.25	2.87	2.72	2.68	2.75	2.6	2.67	3.18	<b>2.84</b>

**Scale:**

5.00 – 4.01 – strictly observed

4.00 – 3.01 – not strictly observed

3.00 – 2.01 – seldom observed

2.00 – 1.00 - never observed

**Perceived Problems on the Implementation of the Faculty Development Program**

Table 5 reveals that the faculty members from the different campuses agree that the existence of the faculty development program opportunities is not well disseminated to the faculty with a mean rating of 3.56. They likewise agree that policies are not well defined with a mean rating of 3.30, processing is slow(3.61), and payment of stipend is always delayed(3.61).

**Table 5:** Perceived Problems on the Implementation of the Faculty Development Program

Perceived Problems	Andrews	Aparri	Carig	Gonz	Lallo	Lasam	Piat	S.M.	Mean
1	3.56	4.14	4.32	4.35	4.42	2.2	2.33	3.12	<b>3.56</b>
2	2.28	3.97	3.78	3.76	3.92	2.8	2.73	3.18	<b>3.30</b>
3	2.54	4.10	4.25	4.18	4.25	2.2	4.2	3.12	<b>3.61</b>
4	2.46	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.35	2.2	4.4	3.12	<b>3.61</b>
Mean	<b>2.71</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.52</b>		

**Scale:**

5.00 – 4.01 – strongly agree

4.00 – 3.01 – agree

3.00 – 2.01 – fairly agree

2.00 – 1.00 - disagree

## **7. Summary of Findings**

The study was conducted to assess the implementation of the faculty development program of the Cagayan State University. It specifically determined the percentage of faculty beneficiaries in terms of seminars, workshops, training and graduate degree programs. It also sought to know the level of observance of the policies in the prequalification screening, processing of documents, extension of contract and breach policies. Moreover, the problems encountered were also assessed utilizing the faculty members and the policy implementers as the source of data. The descriptive survey method was used in the study. The primary sources of data are the 210 faculty members from the different campuses. The data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages and means. The findings reveal that the policies of the faculty development program of the University were seldom observed in the prequalification screening, processing, and compliance with the terms and conditions of the grant. It was also found out that opportunities for faculty development are not well disseminated to the faculty, the policies are not well defined and there is delay in the processing of documents as well as in the payment of financial remunerations to the grantees.

## **8. Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The very low total percentage of faculty grantees of the faculty development program of the University leads to a conclusion that the program is not responsive to the requirement for quality education as mandated by the Commission on Higher Education.
2. The findings that prequalification screening policies, the processing policies, and penalty provision policies were seldom observed had led the researcher to conclude that the training office of the University which takes charge of faculty development had failed to deliver its functions effectively;
3. The finding on the seldom observance of the penalties for breach of contract leads to the conclusion that financial resources of the University are wasted; and,
4. The seldom observance of the policies and the problems encountered by the faculty means that there is a poor faculty development program of the University.

## **9. Recommendations**

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were drawn:

1. Opportunities for faculty development should be widely disseminated by the training office and other offices concerned so that all interested and qualified faculty members will have equal chances to avail

the program.

2. Policies should be strictly enforced in order to fully achieve the objectives and essence of the program; and
3. The Administration should propose for a specific budget allocation for faculty development as this program is a very important aspect in the professional growth of the faculty.

## **References**

- [1] Ashraf M. F. Kamel. Role of Faculty Development Programs in Improving Teaching and Learning
- [2] Yvonne Steinert. Faculty Development in the New Millenium: Key Challenges and Future Directions
- [3] <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/faculty-development/five-fundamentals-faculty-development>
- [4] Shuh Shing Lee, et.al. Impact of Faculty Development Programs for Positive Behavioral Changes Among Teachers: A Case Study
- [5] Guraya, Salman Y., et.al. The Impact and Effectiveness of Faculty Development Program in Fostering the Faculty's Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Competence: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis
- [6] <https://ched.gov.ph/faculty-development-program-facdev/>
- [7] <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/faculty-development-challenge-going-forward>
- [8] <https://www.skyfilabs.com/blog/5-reasons-why-you-should-organize-a-faculty-development-program-in-electrical-and-electronics-engineering-eee>
- [9] Wilerson L. and Irby DM. Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices: A Comprehensive Approach to Faculty Development. Acad Med 1998;73:387-96
- [10] LuAn Wilkerson. Starting a Faculty Development Program: Strategies and Approaches
- [11] Henry W. Smorynski. Making Faculty Development an Institutional Value and a Professional Practice
- [12] <https://goodreads.com/quotes/166029-the-Mediocre-Teacher>