

Short Research Article

Performance of Graduate Studies Department Professors in Pedagogy: A Basis for Faculty Development Program

ABSTRACT

This descriptive-normative study assessed the graduate school professors' level of performance along the various dimensions of instruction. The respondents of this study were the Graduate studies professors and students enrolled in Mindanao State University (Main) Marawi, Lanao del Sur, a total of 122 respondents using convenient sampling techniques. The study utilized a modified questionnaire. The data were treated using weighted mean, ranking, and frequency count. The study revealed that: the graduate studies professors always perform the various dimension of instruction along comprehensive knowledge of the teaching field; deontology and availability for teacher-student communication; presentation skills, passion for teaching; class preparation and management; student examination; quality of teaching materials; moderate in research and scientific productivity; administrative skills; and reputation. The researchers concluded that the graduate studies professors possess the essential knowledge and understanding in performing tasks along the various dimensions of instruction. The proposed Faculty Development Program when implemented can effectively improve the level of performance of the graduate studies professors along areas that is found moderate.

Keywords: Development program, performance, graduate studies, professors, pedagogy.

ABBREVIATION

CSPEAR: College of Sports, Physical Education and Recreation
COA: College of Agriculture
DE: Descriptive Equivalent
WE: Weighted Mean
MSU: Mindanao State University (Main)

1. INTRODUCTION

The quality of graduates produced by academic institutions reflects instruction provided to them. This means that academic institutions should conduct quality audits of teachers who are directly implementing the curriculum for their students. Educators and professors, as the most important resource in schools, are critical to raising educational standards. Improving the efficiency and equity of education is largely dependent on

ensuring that professors are highly skilled, well-resourced, and motivated to perform to the best of their abilities. Raising teaching performance may be the policy direction most likely to result in significant gains in student learning [1, 2,3].

In educational settings, performance evaluation is a continuous, routine, and mandatory exercise. Its importance to students' learning outcomes and school accountability cannot be overstated [4]. Performance evaluation has come to refer to a wide range of activities that organizations use to assess employees, develop their competencies, improve performance, and allocate rewards [5].

In turn, effective monitoring and evaluation of teaching is critical to the continuous improvement of a school's teaching effectiveness. It is critical to understand instructors' strengths as well as the aspects of their practice that could be improved. In this regard, evaluating professors and educators is a critical step toward improving teaching and learning and raising educational standards [6].

Titanji et al. [7] explain that the purpose of periodic monitoring and evaluation in an educational system is twofold: to create and nurture a culture of performance appraisal and to provide information that can be used to improve performance. This is consistent with [8] contention that performance appraisal serves two primary functions: the first is evaluative (or administrative), as the term "appraisal" implies, and the second is developmental.

Faculty performance appraisal, to be more effective and encompassing, should be a check-and-balance activity. This means that different groups should be able to evaluate the teacher's performance independently to bring about the teacher's overall performance.

Obasi and Ohia (6) clearly discussed this saying that faculty performance appraisal by students is very useful in providing feedback about teaching that can result in improved instruction. Further, students are the main source of information about the learning environment, including teachers' ability to motivate students for continued learning, rapport, or degree of communication between instructors and students. Clearly, evaluation, when done properly, will translate into wider opportunities for improvement.

Furthermore, Archer North Performance Appraisal System (9) posited that it is a structured formal interaction between a subordinate and supervisor that usually takes the form of periodic interview (annual or semiannual) in which the work performance of the subordinate is examined and discussed. It is undertaken with a view to identifying strengths and weaknesses as opportunity for improvement and skills development.

The teaching profession is not an exception in this regard. Performance appraisal of professors and instructors is important in understanding each professor's abilities and competencies. It helps to measure their performance/university and to evaluate their contribution towards the attainment of specified school goals (10). Effective professors are capable of inspiring significantly greater learning gains in their students when

compared with their weaker colleagues. Value-added assessment studies in Tennessee show that the difference in achievement between students who attended classes taught by low-quality teachers for three consecutive years is sizeable.

Supported by Taylor and Tyler (11) which emphasized that evaluation is concerned with quality, in this regard, evaluation opens opportunities for teachers to identify their strengths and weaknesses as well as to target windows for professional development and improvement.

In addition, OECD (12) stressed the aims or objectives of teacher evaluation; namely to seek improvement on the teacher own practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further professional development. Improvement means teachers can be helped to further harness their craft for gainful teaching-learning activities. In fact, OECD (13) pointed out that raising teaching performance is perhaps the policy direction most likely to lead to substantial gains in student learning.

The role professors play is so critical especially if student learning is at stake. Performance of faculty members in pedagogy is relevant to highlight the areas that need improving for the sake of students, who are the final recipients of the education process (14). Professors' development program is a mechanism for improving teaching and learning. In a well-designed staff development system, the instruments and procedures can constitute valuable professional development for instructors and enable the university management to assess teachers' performance.

Success as a university faculty member is dependent on having a clear understanding of how to combine the elements of teaching, research and original creative work, and service in a way that makes the best use of the time and resources available. Faculty members are expected to make substantive contributions to the learning of their students and to their field, as well as to make service contributions to their field and the university (15; 16). This contention is very important especially in the graduate school program.

The graduate school is the highest unit of the university. As such, its function is to encourage and facilitate the training of instructors and students in the discovery of new knowledge and the analysis and re-evaluation of existing knowledge. It leads the way for all the other units in the practice of scholarship shown by its full publication and the use of the scientific method in inquiry as evidenced in its research (17, 18).

Graduate school faculty members are therefore looked up to be the epitome of expertise and well-rounded professionals who are expected to be rendering essential inputs to the learning of their students and to their field. They should be the model of content mastery, productive research, effective leadership, and untarnished reputation. These expectations and more require that these faculty members should be properly evaluated as a form of quality audit and at the same time corporate social responsibility of the academe.

Part of the internal quality assurance practice of Mindanao State University is to ensure that the faculty members – both in the graduate and undergraduate levels - are well-developed and supported to ensure effective delivery of instruction. One way of supporting faculty members along this area is the conduct of intensive supervisory activities that aim to determine the faculty members' strengths and some areas that can still be improved. One of these supervisory practices is the regular conduct of the faculty members in instructional performance through the Faculty Performance Assessment System.

The Graduate Studies program of Mindanao State University has been serving the community since for decades through the offering of the Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Arts in Education (Major in Educational Management, English, Mathematics and Science), master's in Business Administration, master's in Public Administration, and master's in Library and Information Science, Master of Science in Physical Education and Master in Agricultural Science. However, many professors have not been fully evaluated as to their overall instructional performance and using specific performance assessment tool appropriate to graduate studies level is in place. The graduate studies professors are evaluated using the same evaluation tool used in the undergraduates' programs.

The Graduate studies program of Mindanao State University undergo formal visitation by the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines. (AACUP). One of the key areas that was scrutinized by the team of assessors is the area of faculty. The area of faculty highlights the needs for well-supervised, carefully selected, and highly qualified roster of faculty members because of an intensified faculty development plan. Hence, the study will assess the level of performance of the professors of the graduate studies along the identified dimensions and a possible input for faculty development and supportive program.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study used descriptive-normative research design and utilized the method of research which concerns itself with the present phenomena in terms of conditions, practices beliefs, processes, relationships, or trends invariably is termed as "descriptive survey study". This type of research method is not simply amassing and tabulating facts but includes proper analyses, interpretation, comparisons, identification of trends and relationships. On the other hand, normative research design tries to define how things should be. The descriptive-normative method was used to determine the level of performance of the Graduate Studies Professors of Mindanao State University along the dimensions of instruction. The population of this study is composed of Graduate Studies professors and graduate students enrolled in the programs in Mindanao State University (Main) Marawi, Lanao del Sur, during the School Year 2021-2022. There was a total of 122 respondents, 27 Graduate Studies Professors and 95 graduate student's voluntaries participated in the survey using convenient sampling technique. Thus 100% retrieval rate was achieved; the primary data gathering tool utilized in this study was adopted research questionnaire modified from Arnautu and Panc's study in (19). The research questionnaire is divided into parts: Part I is on the profile of Graduate Studies

Professors in terms of gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years of teaching in the graduate studies, number of seminars attended, number of research produced, and types of research conducted; Part II focused on the behaviorally anchored rating scales on the dimensions of graduate studies instruction. The data gathered were processed using the following statistical tools and techniques. Problem 1 that dealt with the profile of Professors, frequency count and percentage were utilized. Problem 2 which focused on the determination of the level of performance of the Graduate Studies Professors of MSU (Main) along the various dimensions, and Problem 3 which is on the determination of capabilities and constraints of the Graduate Studies Professors along the dimensions, weighted means and ranking were used. More so, to determine the capabilities and constraints of professors along their performance, all indicators that fell on 3.51 and above were considered as capabilities, while those which fell on 3.50 and below were classified as constraints.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents

| Program | Total Number of Respondents |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Graduate Studies Professors | 27 |
| Graduate Studies Students | 95 |
| Total | 122 |

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of Graduate Studies Professors

The Graduate Studies Professors of Mindanao State University who involved in this study consist of ten or 37.00% male and 17 or 63.00% female respondents from the Graduate Studies Professors who participated in the study. From this list, fifteen (55.5%) are single, ten (37.04%) are married; and two (7.41%) is widowed. Based on the two indicators, the findings show that the professors are of diverse demographic profiles. This also shows that in the academe, females dominate over male counterpart.

In addition, there are fifteen (55.55%) professors who have completed their post-graduate studies and twelve (44.45%) have finished their graduate degrees. Accordingly, based on the number of years of teaching in the graduate school, a great majority fourteen (51.85%) of the respondents have rendered not more than three years in service to the Graduate Studies Program; eight (29.63%) have been teaching for more than sixteen years, while five (18.52%) have taught in the program from 11-15 years. This means that the professors have made themselves qualified to teach in the graduate school by virtue of their added academic achievements. Furthermore, their teaching experience adds to the rich academic background making them assets in the graduate studies program. As regards the conduct of research, only fifteen professors (55.55%) have conducted research and published in referral journals aside from their dissertation/ thesis papers.

Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors

Comprehensive Knowledge of the Teaching Field

Table 2 shows the Graduate Studies Professors' knowledge of the teaching field. As gleaned from the table, the Graduate Studies Professors were rated Excellent with a mean of 4.57. This means that the professors are very effective facilitators of learning, are well-trained to manage classes, and well-experienced academicians who can enrich their classroom interactions with their rich academic and industry experiences.

This implies that the faculty members are very qualified to teach with their academic qualifications and relevant academic and industry experiences that substantiate their classroom interactions. This is supported by the fact that the faculty members, aside from being well-experienced and season and licensed educators, have the appropriate master's and Doctorate degrees aside from their exposure to various updating and continuing professional conferences.

Table 2. *Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors along Comprehensive Knowledge of the Teaching Field*

| A. Comprehensive Knowledge of the Teaching Field | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|---|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R | |
| 1. has/have updated information in his/my teaching field | 4.77 | 4.41 | 4.59 | E | 2. | 5 |
| 2. is/am receptive to new trends and share them with his/my students | 4.68 | 4.59 | 4.64 | E | 1 | |
| 3. frequently offer relevant examples from his/my professional expertise | 4.62 | 4.53 | 4.58 | E | 4 | |
| 4. revise and update his/my class materials every year | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.48 | VG | 5 | |
| 5. use concepts from his/my professional area with ease | 4.65 | 4.53 | 4.59 | E | 2. | 5 |
| Sub-mean | 4.64 | 4.51 | 4.57 | E | | |

Legend: E – Excellent; VG – Very Good

Furthermore, this implies that Mindanao State University has a well-qualified pool of expert in teaching pedagogy and workforce who keep on updating themselves with the newest trends, practices, and innovations that benefit their students.

Among the indicators, the faculty were rated highest along their being receptive to new trends and share them with their students with a rating of 4.64, interpreted as Excellent. This means that the professors are always in search for avenues that can further enrich their knowledge, not just of their subject matter but also on innovative industry practices, which they incorporate in their classroom interactions.

This shows that the faculty members regularly update their knowledge base to improve their practice and to meet new teaching demands (20). In addition, the result is an indicator to the faculty members' active membership to organizations which regularly conducts updating seminars and colloquia. This result may also reflect the fact that faculty members strictly adhere to the provisions of Republic Act 10912 or the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Act of (21).

Among the indicators, the professors' practice of revising and updating class materials was ranked lowest; although it was rated with a mean of 4.48 interpreted as Very Good. This means that the faculty members continually update their class materials including among others their course syllabus, class presentation materials and lecture notes. However, the result implies that the need for faculty members to continuously endeavor to incorporate new teaching strategies and materials, as well as, to integrate research and outcomes-based instructional activities to keep their course responsive to the needs of the students and to highly engage their learners in the educative process. It further implies that updated course materials can enhance the teaching – learning process thereby delivering better quality of teaching.

More so, *The Progressive Teacher*, quoted the National Curriculum Framework of India claiming that teachers have basic responsibility to develop basic capabilities of students noting that student achievement is directly proportional to the quality of teaching provided by the professors in the classroom (22).

Deontology and Availability for Teacher-Student Communication

Table 3 shows the Graduate Studies Professors' duty and their availability for teacher-student communication.

Table 3. *Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors along Deontology and Availability for Teacher-Student Communication*

| B. Deontology and Availability for Teacher-Student Communication | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R |
| 1. is/am interested in the professional evolution of his/my students | 4.63 | 4.82 | 4.73 | E | 2 |
| 2. promote professional ethics in his/my students' future careers | 4.72 | 4.82 | 4.77 | E | 1 |
| 3. show a non-discriminatory and impartial behavior in his/my relationship with his/my students | 4.61 | 4.71 | 4.66 | E | 3 |
| 4. offer consultation and online support to his/my students | 4.36 | 4.53 | 4.45 | VG | 5 |
| 5. facilitate the students' independent learning process | 4.54 | 4.65 | 4.60 | E | 4 |
| Sub-mean | 4.55 | 4.70 | 4.62 | E | |

Legend: E – Excellent; VG – Very Good

As gleaned from the table, the Graduate Studies Professors were rated Excellent with a mean of 4.62. This means that the professors are indeed living up to their obligation to support and monitor their students by opening avenues for communication and collaboration in and out of the classroom or the academic campus. This implies that the professors are also practicing the principle of *in loco parentis* which means that the teaching force also act as supportive adult advisors to the graduate school students while they are in the process of attaining their graduate degree.

Furthermore, the result also indicates that the professors are very willing to spare their time for consultation activities and other related academic matters that have direct impact to the progress of the students.

Among the five indicators, the professors were highest with a mean of 4.77, rated Excellent, along the professors' practice of promoting professional ethics in the students' future careers. This means that the faculty members are doing their share in shaping the future of the students and that they are making sure that the students are honed to be ethical and moral leaders and managers of the institution they belong to. This runs parallel with the institutional vision -mission to produce professionally competent individuals imbued with ethical decision-making principles and good characters.

Among the indicators, which ranked lowest was the indicator on the offer consultation and online support to his/my students which generated a mean of 4.45, rated as Very Good. This means that the professors create ways to communicate with their students outside the walls of their classrooms. They also provide consultations, follow-up discussions and distance learning using social groups and networks. This was supported by Poth (23) which equally mentioned 5 ways that professors can easily communicate with their students outside the wall of the classrooms by using; messaging tools, A class website or LMS, create virtual wall, infographics creations and use of blogging. However, the Graduate Studies professors need to strengthen their know-how in terms of new technological trends to further intensify the teacher-student relationship for them to perform their task as second parents to their students.

Presentation Skills

Table 4 shows the Graduate Studies Professors' presentation skills. As gleaned from the table, the Graduate Studies Professors were rated Excellent with a mean of 4.57. This means that the faculty members have the capacity to sustain the interest of their students through clear and understandable verbal communication.

Table 4. *Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors along Presentation Skills*

| C. Presentation Skills | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|--|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R | |
| 1. manage to keep the attention of my students for the entire class | 4.56 | 4.47 | 4.52 | E | 4 | |
| 2. allow class dialogues meant to clarify the information that is presented | 4.64 | 4.71 | 4.68 | E | 1 | |
| 3. get students involved in the explanation and demonstration of the theory | 4.62 | 4.71 | 4.67 | E | 2 | |
| 4. use audio-visual support (PowerPoint presentations) and other audio motion media | 4.67 | 4.65 | 4.66 | E | 3 | |
| 5. Allow students use technology in their presentations (moving technology innovation) | 4.39 | 4.53 | 4.46 | VG | .5 | |

Sub-mean 4.58 4.56 4.57 E

Legend: E – Excellent; VG – Very Good

This also means that the professors have competence in using their oral communication skills in the delivery of their lessons which effect better teaching and productive learning.

Among the indicators, the professors were highest with a mean of 4.57, rated Excellent, along the professors’ practice of allowing class dialogues meant to clarify the information that is presented. This means that the faculty members encourage their students to participate into classroom discourses to elucidate ambiguous and unclear ideas. This also means that they are open and are willing to entertain various ideas which lead to intellectual sharing of knowledge and insights.

On the contrary, the Graduate Studies professors ranked lowest in the use of technology in their presentation (moving tech innovation), with a mean of 4.46 apiece, rated as Very Good. This means that the professors frequently utilize appropriate teaching resources and other forms of instructional technology in their classes. In the study of Claiborne et al., (24) stressed that there are various techniques, methods and technologies for helping learners acquire new knowledge. The use of computers can help the teachers teach more effectively, expanding the educational horizons of students and making information more readily available.

Furthermore, the result implies that the professor’s inadequacy in using technological aids affect the quality of student learning. This agrees with the result of the study of Harris et al., (25) and Amelink et al. (26)when emphasis that teachers have adequate skills in using technology. Hence, the professors must proficiently utilize technological aids for interactive learning environment.

Passion for Teaching

Table 5 presents the Graduate Studies Professors’ passion for teaching. As gleaned from the table, the Graduate Studies Professors were rated Excellent with a mean of 4.68. This means that the professors possess enthusiasm and genuine love for teaching. This also means that they are encouraging and motivating, have a systematic way of doing things which are student-centered and acquire the necessary skills in developing their learners’ reasoning abilities and attitudes.

The indicators reveal the faculty members were highest with a mean of 4.71, rated Excellent, along availability to share the information I know, that goes beyond requirement. This means that the faculty members are updated with the latest developments in their subject matter thus, providing their learners’ new principles and ideologies which are beneficiary in their field of specialization. This also means that the faculty members continuously undergo professional trainings which are being shared and presented to their class to further enhance their students’ knowledge and improve their academic skills.

Table 5. Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors along Passion for Teaching

| D. Passion for Teaching | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, | S | P | M | D | R |

| being a GS Professor... | | | | E | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|--|
| 1. convey enthusiasm in his/my field, both verbally and nonverbally | 4.75 | 4.65 | 4.70 | E | 2 | |
| 2. inspire the students to get involved (aside from theory and practice) | 4.64 | 4.65 | 4.65 | E | 4 | |
| 3. is/am available to share the information he/I know, that goes beyond the class requirements | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.71 | E | 1 | |
| 4. keep my class time during the proposed timeframe | 4.75 | 4.62 | 4.69 | E | 3 | |
| 5. make connections between previous themes, I make sure previous information is understood, before introducing new information. | 4.55 | 4.70 | 4.63 | E | 5 | |
| | Sub-mean | 4.68 | 4.67 | 4.68 | E | |

Legend: E – Excellent

On the other hand, the faculty members were lowest with a mean of 4.65, rated as Excellent, along inspiring students to get involved. This means that the faculty members encourage their students to be participative and engaged in intellectual endeavors and community immersion and extension programs of the university. This also means that the professors were supportive in attaining the vision-mission of the university which motivates their students to do the same. This was supported by DepEd Vision – Mission (27) and Stephanie (28).

Class Preparation and Management

Table 6 presents the Graduate Studies Professors' class preparation and management. As gleaned from the table, the Professors were rated Excellent with a mean of 4.55. This means that the professors have the capacity to convey information through utilizing appropriate methodologies in presenting their lessons and can achieve their intended instructional objectives. More so, they can prepare their course syllabi, including content, evaluative techniques and activities which lead to facilitation of the teaching and learning process.

Table 6. *Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors along Class Preparation and Management*

| E. Class Preparation and Management | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|--|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R | |
| 1. organize his/my class according to the feedback he/I receive | 4.51 | 4.41 | 4.46 | VG | 5 | |
| 2. offer concrete examples to hard-to-understand concepts | 4.60 | 4.65 | 4.63 | E | 1 | |
| 3. adapt the teaching methods to his/my students' needs | 4.52 | 4.53 | 4.53 | E | 3 | |
| 4. have clear class objectives and he/I follow a | 4.58 | 4.65 | 4.62 | E | 2 | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|---|
| systematic plan to attain them | | | | | |
| 5. follow the conventional curriculum | 4.66 | 4.35 | 4.51 | E | 4 |
| Sub-mean | 4.57 | 4.52 | 4.55 | E | |

Legend: E – Excellent; VG – Very Good

In the above indicators, the faculty members rated Excellent with a mean of 4.63 with highest rank in offer concrete examples to hard-to-understand concepts to their students

This means that the professors assure that their students were able to internalize and clearly grasped the sample of the lesson by using several examples to illustrate the teaching. This also means that the faculty members were aware that their students' learning should be realized to help them have a complete perspective of the topics learned and to prepare them in their future endeavors. Moreso, the professors were lowest with a mean of 4.41, rated as Very Good, along organization of class according to feedbacks.

This means that the faculty members respond affirmatively to their student comments and responses. This also means that the faculty members take the challenge to enhance and improve their teaching methodologies and techniques as they received feedback through the evaluation of their students. It was revealed that there are several ways to monitor your teaching including feedback from students and colleagues. It is important to all professors to understand if their teaching is effective so they can develop it in the future (29).

Quality of Teaching Materials

Table 7 presents the Graduate Studies Professors' quality of teaching materials. The Professors were rated Very Good with a total mean of 4.49. This means that the faculty can formulate a complete course syllabus, clear and realistic course requirements, as well as practical and useful examinations. This also means that they can formulate and achieve intended instructional objectives (30).

Table 7. Level of Performance of Graduate School Professors along Quality of Teaching Materials

| G. Quality of Teaching Materials | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R |
| 1. is/ampreoccupied with elaborating additional teaching materials (case studies) | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.40 | VG | 4 |
| 2. find a balance between the difficulty level of the class and the information sent to his/my students | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.37 | VG | 5 |
| 3. is/am clear in expressing tasks and subjects which are found in the class contents | 4.59 | 4.59 | 4.59 | E | 2 |
| 4. show a proof of curricular innovation | 4.58 | 4.35 | 4.47 | VG | 3 |
| 5. is/am using instruction materials that is | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|---|
| necessary and important for the students | 4.60 | 4.65 | 4.63 | E | 1 |
| Sub-mean | 4.53 | 4.38 | 4.49 | VG | |

Legend: E – Excellent; VG – Very Good

The indicators that rank first shows the faculty members rated Excellent with a mean of 4.63 in using instruction materials that is necessary and important for the students and meet up the requirement of learning modalities. This implies that the professors know adequate instruction materials that useful and meaningful to each and individual of their classes that they are teaching (31;32). This also means that the Professors knows where to adequately acquired and find materials that will benefit to their various learners.

In indicators that is rated lowest, thou the professors were still rated Very Good with a mean of 4.37 in finding a balance between the difficulty level of the class and the information sent to the students. This means that the faculty members see to it that their lessons and examples should be translated according to the real practice of their students in the world of work. This should be anchored within the context of lifelong learning that students should perform after school life.

CHED Memorandum Order 46, Series of 2012 emphasized on outcomes-based education (OBE). Outcomes-based education is an educational theory that bases each part of an educational system around goals (outcomes). By the end of the educational experience, each student should have achieved the goal. This method helps students to be ready and understand better the nature of their work ones they will graduate in their program.

Research and Scientific Productivity

Table 8 presents the Graduate Studies Professors' research and scientific productivity. As gleaned from the table, the Graduate School Professors were rated Good with a mean of 3.26. This means that the faculty members engaged themselves to one among the tri-logic function of higher educational institution, research. This also means that they practice the vision-mission of the institution which is to engage themselves in relevant research as well as the vision-mission of the graduate studies which is to become responsive researchers by providing developmental programs on quality instruction, relevant research, and sustainable extension (33).

Among the given indicators, the Professors rated Very Good with a mean of 3.72 in conducting research that are highly complex and are perceived as being novel in the field. This means that some professors engaged in innovative and significant research which are related and beneficial to their course. However, most of the faculty members find it difficult to do research because of time constraint. More so, in the study of Karimian et al., (34) revealed that despite of the increased incentive in research by the school, still only few are takers. Research is a productive endeavor that supports extension and quality instruction, leading to new knowledge and improved practices. Its scarcity can affect quality and standards (35).

Furthermore, the faculty members rated Good with a mean of 3.12 in publish articles/research that are theoretically and methodically rigorous. This means that the faculty members somewhat submit well-structured articles/research to institutional and scholarly journals. It is expected for a graduate studies faculty to conduct scholarly research since the graduate school is the most effective means of developing capacities related to doing research that will improve educational theory and practice in the many different aspects of the educational process (CHED Memorandum Order 53, Series of 2007).

Table 8. *Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors along Research and Scientific Productivity*

| H. Research and Scientific Productivity | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|--|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R | |
| 1. conduct research that are highly complex and are perceived as being a novelty in the field | 4.49 | 2.94 | 3.72 | VG | 1 | |
| 2. have published in refereed journals | 4.39 | 1.59 | 2.99 | G | 3 | |
| 3. bring new research projects to the institutions they belong to | 4.36 | 2.71 | 3.54 | VG | 2 | |
| 4. is/am affiliated at national and international research centers (over the past 2 years) | 4.36 | 1.53 | 2.95 | G | 4 | |
| 5. publish articles/research that are theoretically and methodically rigorous | 4.29 | 1.94 | 3.12 | G | 5 | |
| Sub-mean | 4.38 | 2.14 | 3.26 | G | | |

Legend: VG – Very Good; G - Good

More so, different programs in the graduate studies require research as their output as a preparation to their final paper, thesis and/or dissertation. More than this, accreditors of higher educational institutions also encourage schools and universities to conduct and have collaborative research publication in refereed journals for it to be used as sources of information for others who are also conducting the same and/or related study.

Administrative Skills

Table 9 presents the Graduate Studies Professors' administrative skills. The Professors were rated Very Good with a mean of 4.30. This means that the faculty members have a good sense of leadership and administration which are essential in creating decisions and policies for the improvement of student learning process. Further, it opens avenue for knowledge sharing among faculty and students which lead to the observance of institutional philosophy, vision-mission, goals and core values.

In the given indicators, the faculty members rated Very Good with a mean of 4.41 in pre-occupied with the promotion of the institution's image. This means that the faculty members do adhere to the mandates of the institution's vision-mission to commit to the integral total development of human and to the search for truth, virtue, and academic excellence. More so, they also adhere to the objective of the graduate studies which is

to promote and strengthen academic excellence in all levels of education to produce graduates who are competent to meet future needs in humankind; with high impact research and innovation; strengthen and sustain extension services, while integrate peace education programs in the university.

Table 9. *Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors along Administrative Skills*

| I. Administrative Skills | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R |
| 1. bring my contribution to the development of the department/faculty/university | 4.63 | 4.12 | 4.38 | VG | 2 |
| 2. initiate study programs, postgraduate courses, training and development courses | 4.53 | 3.41 | 3.97 | VG | 4 |
| 3. know the structures, interactions and organizational objectives; I integrate them and understand them | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.35 | VG | 3 |
| 4. is/am pre-preoccupied with the promotion of the institution's image | 4.57 | 4.24 | 4.41 | VG | 1 |
| 5. is/am value the importance of collaboration in leadership | 4.63 | 4.12 | 4.38 | VG | 2 |
| Sub-mean | 4.59 | 4.00 | 4.30 | VG | |

Legend: VG – Very Good

This also reveals the responsibilities in the transformation towards a better society through task-specialization and differentiated role contributions to achieve the optimum quality of life (36).

Specifically, the faculty members rated Very Good with a mean of 3.97 in initiating study programs, postgraduate courses, training and development courses. This means that the faculty members create initiatives for the full advancement of their learners through leadership conventions and seminars, attending and presenting papers in research fora, benchmarking, and involvement in relevant extension programs.

Reputation

Table 10 presents the Graduate Studies Professors' reputation. As gleaned from the table, the Graduate Studies Professors were rated Very Good with a mean of 4.32. This revealed that the professors have a good image and character as bearers of intellectual wisdom and expertise, which was reflect what it is to be expected of a graduate studies professor.

Among the given indicators, the professors were rated Very Good with a mean of 4.32 in having been participated in professional associations. This means that graduate studies professors are members and/or officers of different associations in their respective fields. Through professional associations, professors advance their knowledge and skills in their given profession as well as serving as overseer of the legitimate practice of their profession.

Meanwhile, the professors were rated Good with a mean of 2.65 in having been an associate professor or a visiting professor at an abroad university for at least one month.

Table 10. Level of Performance of Graduate School Professors along Reputation

| J. Reputation | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | S | P | M | DE | R |
| 1. have been a moderator or a keynote speaker at international scientific conferences over the past five years | 4.21 | 1.59 | 2.90 | G | 3 |
| 2. is/am a member of the editorial committee of refereed journals | 4.09 | 1.53 | 2.81 | G | 4 |
| 3. have been an associate professor or a visiting professor at an abroad university for at least one month | 4.17 | 1.12 | 2.65 | G | 5 |
| 4. have participated in professional associations | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.32 | VG | 1 |
| 5. have performed services in the national evaluation committees | 4.26 | 2.06 | 3.16 | G | 2 |
| Sub-mean | 4.20 | 2.13 | 3.17 | G | |

Legend: VG – Very Good; G – Good

This means that one of the expectations of being a graduate studies professor is to be part of greater professional development opportunities which could deepen the horizon of their given field. However, to be a visiting professor is a tedious task for it demands a lot of preparations and connections. Though, being a visiting professor and exchange professors is a good training ground to widen and enhance the graduate school professors' profession, still, it is difficult most especially so that they are only working as part-time faculty in the graduate studies department. However, this finding runs parallel with the study found out about involving of faculty members engaging in professional development connections when there is no adequate support through finance and moral (37; 38).

Overall Summary of Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors

Table 11 shows the overall summary of data relative to the level of performance of graduate studies professors. In general, the graduate studies professors obtained an overall mean of 4.29, interpreted as Very Good. This means that the faculty members practice their duties and responsibilities as bearers of knowledge and skills in improving and enhancing the capabilities of education and business professionals.

Table 11. Overall Summary of Level of Performance of Graduate School Professors

| Indicators | S | P | M | DE | R |
|--|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| 1. Comprehensive knowledge in the teaching field | 4.64 | 4.51 | 4.58 | E | 4 |
| 2. Deontology and availability for teacher- | 4.55 | 4.70 | 4.63 | E | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| student communication | | | | | |
| 3. Presentation skills | 4.58 | 4.56 | 4.57 | E | 3 |
| 4. Passion for teaching | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.68 | E | 1 |
| 5. Class preparation and management | 4.57 | 4.52 | 4.55 | E | 5 |
| 6. Quality of teaching materials | 4.53 | 4.38 | 4.46 | VG | 6 |
| 7. Research and scientific productivity | 4.38 | 2.14 | 3.26 | G | 8 |
| 8. Administrative skills | 4.59 | 4.00 | 4.30 | VG | 7 |
| 9. Reputation | 4.20 | 2.13 | 3.17 | G | 9 |
| | Sub-mean | 4.53 | 3.96 | 4.24 | VG |

Legend: E – Excellent; VG – Very Good; G – Good

Specifically, the results show that the level of performance of graduate studies professors namely, passion for teaching was the highest with a mean of 4.68. This manifests that the professors possess enthusiasm in the teaching-learning scheme most especially in developing and updating new educational and business trends.

Meanwhile, the data reveals that there is a need to strengthen the research and scientific productivity and reputation of the graduate studies professors since graduate school is a research-based curriculum wherein they develop and practice educational and business models, which revealed the standard reputation of university professors.

Capabilities and Constraints on the Level of Performance of Graduate Studies Professors

Table 12 presents the capabilities and constraints on the level of performance of graduate studies professors along comprehensive knowledge of the teaching field; deontology and availability for teacher-student communication; presentation skills; passion for teaching; class preparation and management; and quality of teaching materials; research and scientific productivity; administrative skills; and reputation.

It is shown from the table that a total of three indicators under research and scientific productivity and another three indicators under reputation were found to be constraints. The results means that the graduate studies program has not intensified the engagement of faculty members to scientific research activities, in the production of more responsive and more collaborative research endeavors, and in publishing academic works to internationally peered journals.

One of the important qualifications of faculty members in the graduate studies professors is their active involvement in research or in the generation of new body of knowledge. Being the apex of the academic ladder, the professors need to be purveyors of knowledge discovery and that they are at forefront of utilization of research products in the improvement of classroom instruction.

Furthermore, the result also shows that the graduate studies professors still lack some sort of exposure to external academic environment as they are perceived to have weak presence or participation either as international speakers/research presenters, members of editorial committee for refereed journals and visiting or exchange professors. This means that the faculty members, to further improve their qualifications, further strive to be part of professional circles and organizations that can expose them to more academic-related endeavors which eventually can be transferred to classroom learning.

Hence, the graduate studies department must intensify its programs and activities pertaining to research and connections to other professional services to enhance professors' abilities and potentials. Also, the graduate studies department has to offer more research activities and study and professional grants for professors to develop their character in their chosen profession.

Table 12. *Capabilities and Constraints on the Level of Performance of Graduate School Professors*

| A. Comprehensive Knowledge of the Teaching Field | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------|
| INDICATORS... Generally, my GS Professor/ I, being a GS Professor... | M | C A P | CON |
| 1. has/have updated information in his/my teaching field | 4.59 | √ | |
| 2. is/am receptive to new trends and share them with his/my students | 4.64 | √ | |
| 3. frequently offer relevant examples from his/my professional expertise | 4.58 | √ | |
| 4. revise and update his/my class materials every year | 4.48 | √ | |
| 5. use concepts from his/my professional area with ease | 4.59 | √ | |
| B. Deontology and Availability for Teacher-Student Communication | | | |
| 1. is/am interested in the professional evolution of his/my students | 4.73 | √ | |
| 2. promote professional ethics in his/my students' future careers | 4.77 | √ | |
| 3. show a non-discriminatory and impartial behaviour in his/my relationship with his/my students | 4.66 | √ | |
| 4. offer consultation and online to his/my students | 4.45 | √ | |
| 5. facilitate the students' independent learning process | 4.73 | √ | |
| C. Presentation Skills | | | |
| 1. manage to keep the attention of my students for the entire class | 4.52 | √ | |
| 2. allow class dialogues meant to clarify the information that is presented | 4.68 | √ | |
| 3. get students involved in the explanation and demonstration of the theory | 4.67 | √ | |
| 4. use audio-visual support (powerpoint presentations) & other audio motion media | 4.66 | √ | |
| 5. Allow students presentations using moving technology innovation | 4.46 | √ | |
| D. Passion for Teaching | | | |
| 1. convey enthusiasm in his/my field, both verbally and nonverbally | 4.70 | √ | |
| 2. inspire the students to get involved (aside from | 4.65 | √ | |

| | | | |
|---|------|---|---|
| theory and practice) | | | |
| 3. is/am available to share the information he/I know, that goes beyond the class requirements | 4.71 | √ | |
| 4. keep my class time during the proposed timeframe | 4.69 | √ | |
| 5. make connections between previous themes, I make sure, previous information is understood, before introducing new information. | 4.63 | √ | |
| E. Class Preparation and Management | | | |
| 1. organize his/my class according to the feedback he/I receive | 4.46 | √ | |
| 2. offer concrete examples to hard-to-understand concepts | 4.63 | √ | |
| 3. adapt the teaching methods to his/my students' needs | 4.53 | √ | |
| 4. have clear class objectives and he/I follow a systematic plan to attain them | 4.62 | √ | |
| 5. follow the conventional curriculum | 4.51 | √ | |
| F. Quality of Teaching Materials | | | |
| 1. is/am preoccupied with elaborating additional teaching materials (case studies) | 4.40 | √ | |
| 2. find a balance between the difficulty level of the class and the information sent to his/my students | 4.37 | √ | |
| 3. is/am clear in expressing tasks and subjects which are found in the class contents | 4.59 | √ | |
| 4. show a proof of curricular innovation | 4.47 | √ | |
| G. Research and Scientific Productivity | | | |
| 1. conduct researches that are highly complex and are perceived as being a novelty in the field | 3.72 | √ | |
| 2. have published in refereed journals | 2.99 | | √ |
| 3. bring new research projects to the institutions they belong to | 3.54 | √ | |
| 4. is/am affiliated at national and international research centres (over the past 5 years) | 2.95 | | √ |
| 5. publish articles/researches that are theoretically and methodically rigorous | 3.12 | | √ |
| H. Administrative Skills | | | |
| 1. bring my contribution to the development of the department/faculty/university | 4.38 | √ | |
| 2. initiate study programs, postgraduate courses, training and development courses | 3.97 | √ | |
| 3. know the structures, interactions and organizational objectives; I integrate them and understand them | 4.35 | √ | |

| | | |
|--|-------------|---|
| 4. is/am pre-preoccupied with the promotion of the institution's image | 4.41 | √ |
| 5. is/am value the importance of collaboration in leadership | 4.38 | √ |

I. Reputation

| | | |
|--|-------------|---|
| 1. have been a moderator or a keynote speaker at international scientific conferences over the past five years | 2.90 | √ |
| 2. is/am a member of the editorial committee of refereed journals | 2.81 | √ |
| 3. have been an associate professor or a visiting professor at an abroad university for at least one month | 2.65 | √ |
| 4. have participated in professional associations | 4.32 | √ |
| 5. have performed services in the national evaluation committees | 3.16 | √ |

Legend: Cap – Capabilities; Con - Constraints

3.1. Formulation and Validation of proposed Graduate Studies Professors Development Program

Based on the results and findings of the study, the researchers crafted a development program to evaluate and give adequate supports to the graduate studies professors regarding their areas needed development. The Professors performance appraisal by students is a composite of seven (7) dimensions of instruction namely: comprehensive knowledge of the teaching field; class preparation; classroom management skills; quality of teaching materials; student assessment; deontology and availability for teacher-student communication; and passiofor teaching; For the professors performance appraisal by the graduate studies chairmen and Deans, the said dimensions of instruction for the students are included. Added to it are the three (3) other dimensions: research and scientific productivity; administrative skills; and reputation.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In the light of above-cited findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The Mindanao State University (Main) Marawi, Graduate Studies Professors are qualified and possess intensive and extensive pedagogical knowledge needed in higher level of learning.
2. The professors are well-respected for their high level of competence, but they still need to enhance their research and scientific productivity skills.
3. The development program for graduate studies professors can be a great help to holistically evaluate the performance of graduate school professors and support their needs if looking into by administrators of the University.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The results and implications of the study must be presented to the Committee of Graduate Studies departments of MSU (Main) Marawi for future adoption and proposal programs.
2. The MSU (Main) Graduate Studies Professors must endeavor to undergo progressive faculty development activities like seminars and trainings to further capacitate themselves especially along the identified gray areas.
3. The Graduate Studies Chairmen, Academic Dean must allocate more budget to support the Faculty Development Program especially on the conduct of research.

6. LIMITATIONS

In comparison to prior research investigations, the current study included several drawbacks, such as a larger proportion of participating in this study.

CONSENT

Written and verbal consent was obtained from the respondent and informing them the goal of the study.

REFERENCES

1. OECD (2014) Education at a Glance (OECD Publishing, Paris).
2. OECD (2009), OECD review on evaluation and assessment for improving school outcomes: design and implementation plan for the review. OECD, Paris [OLIS Document EDU/EDPC (2009)3/REV1].
3. Anderson SC., Humlum MK., Nandrup AB. Increasing instruction time in school does increase learning. PNAS.2016; 113 (27): 7481-7484. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1516686113>.
4. Bichi AA. Evaluation of teacher performance in schools: Implication for sustainable

- development goals. *Northwest Journal of Educational Studies*. 2017; 2(1): 103-113.
5. Sawchuk S. Issues A-Z: Teacher evaluation: An issue overview. *Education Week*. 2015. Available: <http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/teacher-performance-evaluation-issue-overview.html/>.
 6. Obasi KK, OHIA AN. Teacher Performance Evaluation Techniques in Public and Private Secondary Schools in Southeast Nigeria. *Global Journal of Educational Research*. 2014;13,117-123. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjer.v13i2.8>.
 7. Titanji PF, Youh N. Supervision of instruction in Cameroon: Are pedagogic inspectors doing their work? *International Studies in Educational Administration*. 2010; 38 (2):21-40.
 8. Santiago P, Benavides, F. Teacher evaluation. www.oecd.org/edu/teacherevaluationportgal2009.
 9. Archer North Performance Appraisal System. Performance Appraisal. 2010. Accessed 12 July 2022. Available: www.performance-appraisals.com/intro.htm.
 10. Obasi KK. Teacher performance appraisal and quality secondary education delivery: The planning challenges. *African Journal of Educational Research and Development*. 2011; 4, (2): 217-223.
 11. Taylor E, Tyler J. The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review*. 2012; 102 (7):3628-3651.
 12. OECD. *Teacher evaluation: A conceptual framework and examples of country practices*. 2009. Mexico: OECD Publishing.
 13. OECD. *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing, and retaining effective teachers*. 2005. Paris: OECD Publishing.
 14. Arnautu E., Panc I. *Evaluation criteria for performance appraisal of faculty members*. 2015. (Accessed July 28, 2022, from <https://bit.ly/2v2Exzk>).
 15. National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). *State Teacher Policy Yearbook: 2011*. Texas. (Accessed on July 13, 2022, from www.nctq.org).
 16. CHED Memorandum Order 46, Series of 2012. Policy-Standard to Enhance Quality Assurance (QA) in Philippine Higher Education Through an Outcomes-Based and Typology-Based QA.
 17. Carey K. Is everybody ready for the big migration to online college? *The New York Times*. No. 2020. Accessed 12 July 2022. Available: <https://www.nytimes.com>.
 18. CHED Memorandum Order 15, Series of 2019. Policies, Standards, And Guidelines for Graduate Programs. (Accessed on July 14, 2022, from <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/CMO-No.-15-Series-of-2019-%E2%80%93-Policies-Standards-and-Guidelines-for-Graduate-Programs-Updated.pdf>).
 19. Elena A, Loana P. Evaluation Criteria for Performance Appraisal of Faculty Members, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2015;203,386-392. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.313>.
 20. Guerriero S. Teachers' pedagogical knowledge and the teaching profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2014; 2 (1), 7.
 21. Republic Act 10912 or the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Act of 2016.

22. Thosar A. *Teachers Must Timely Update*. The Progressive Teacher. 2015. Accessed 13 July 2022. Available: <http://www.progressiveteacher.in/teachers-must-timely-update/>.
23. Poth RD. How to communicate with your students outside classroom. 2022. Accessed 22 July 2022. Available: <https://www.teachthought.com/technology/5-ways-communicate-students-outside-classroom/>.
24. Claiborne L., Morrell J., Bandy J., Bruff D., Smith G., Fedesco H. Teaching Outside the classroom. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. 2020. Accessed 13, July 2022. Available from <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/teaching-outside-the-classroom/>.
25. Harris L J., Al-Bataineh TM., Al-Bataineh A. One to One Technology and its Effect on Student Academic Achievement and Motivation. *Contemporary Educational Technology*. 2016, 7(4), 368-381.
26. Amelink C., Scales G., Tront J. Student use of the Tablet PC: Impact on student learning behaviors. *Advances in Engineering Education*. 2012, 3(1), 1-17.
27. DepEd Vision – Mission Core Value. Accessed 15 July 2022. Available from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/about-deped/vision-mission-core-values-and-mandate/>.
28. Stephanie L. 7 Ways This University Is Helping Students Find Their Purpose. 2022. Available from <https://www.topuniversities.com/student-info/choosing-university/7-ways-university-helping-students-find-their-purpose>.
29. UCL Arena Centre. Evaluating your teaching. 2019. Accessed 12, July, 2022. Available from <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teachinlearning/publications/2019/aug/evaluating-your-teaching>.
30. Nilson, L. B. *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors*. (2003). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
31. Academic Success Center. Using Learning Modalities.2020. Available from [https://asc.tamu.edu/Study-Learning-Handouts-\(1\)/Learning-Modalities](https://asc.tamu.edu/Study-Learning-Handouts-(1)/Learning-Modalities).
32. Verde A., Valero JM. Teaching and Learning Modalities in Higher Education During the Pandemic: Responses to Coronavirus Disease 2019 From Spain. 2021. *Front. Psychol. Sec. Educational Psychology* <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648592>.
33. MSU-System Bulletin of Information, 2021.
34. Karimian Z, Sabbaghian Z, Salehi A, Sedghpour BS. Internal Obstacles in Research Activities: Faculty Members' Viewpoints in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. *IJME*. 2012;11(7):750–63.
35. NejatizadehA., Sarnayzadeh M., Kahnouji K., Ghasemi R., Nakhodaei N. Constraining Factors of Research among faculty members at Hormozgan University of Medical Sciences. *Electronic Physician*. 8(5): 2405–2409. doi: 10.19082/2405.
36. CHed Memorandum Order 53, Series of 2007. Policies and Standards for Graduate Programs in Education for Teachers and Other Education Professionals.
37. McQuiggan AC. Faculty development for online teaching as a catalyst for change. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*.16(2). Accessed July 13, 2022, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ971044.pdf>.
38. OECD. The professional development of teachers. 2009. Accessed on July 23,

2022, from <https://www.oecd.org/berlin/43541636.pdf>.

UNDER PEER REVIEW