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ABSTRACT
This study aimed to have a comprehensive understanding of the Teaching Performance of the Graduate School Professorial Lecturers at Rizal Technological University. This served as input in enhancing teaching strategies and methodologies in preparation for the formulation and implementation of an outcomes-based education in the Graduate School. Considering its relevance and appropriateness, the results of the GS Students’ Faculty Performance Evaluation using a modified instrument, a 15-item questionnaire wherein the criteria on Commitment, Knowledge of the subject, Teaching for independent learning and Management of learning were adopted from the Performance Evaluation Questionnaire approved by the Civil Service Commission (CSC) as measure for instruction by State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) were utilized as data of the study. Using the 5-point Likert scale where: 5-Outstanding, 4-Very Satisfactory, 3-Satisfactory, 2-Fair and 1-Poor, the study showed that the Graduate School Professorial Lecturers manifested an outstanding performance in the Management of Learning and obtained very satisfactory performance in Commitment, Knowledge of subject and Teaching for Independent learning. The positive comments noted by the students included expertise and mastery of the subject, professionalism and good communication while enhancement of teaching strategies integrating technological advancement is highly recommended.
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Introduction
The ASEAN 2015 obliged Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to develop the graduates’ competencies at least to be at par and consistent with the competencies expected of various professionals. On this note the Commission on Higher Education issued Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 46, series 2012, known as “Policy-Standard to Enhance Quality Assurance (QA) in Philippine Higher Education through an Outcomes Based and Typology-Based QA” discussed the role of the state in providing quality education to its citizens.

Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) is an approach to education in which decisions about the curriculum are driven by the exit learning outcomes that the students should display at the end of the course (Caguitla, et. al., 2013). In this context, the Philippine HEIs are challenged to produce Filipino graduates who can engage meaningfully in their communities, in building the nation, productive and competitive, especially in the globalization of professional practice.

Initially, with the influx of technology, the primary role of teachers in the classroom was almost not visible. This time, teachers are expected to reinvent themselves to better serve the students and the school. Colleges and Universities have likewise started restructuring themselves to address the demand for better learning.

The current changes in the Philippine educational system warranted an expert, competent teacher as an agent in the implementation of Outcomes- Based Education. Their role is indispensable role not only in molding the mindset of individuals, in providing them not only the necessary skills that will address the labor market, giving them the aptitude and spirit to become productive members of society.

As the most significant resource in schools, the teacher remains to be the key in realizing the high standards that is continuously emphasized among colleges and universities. Improving the efficiency
and equity of schooling depends on the teacher’s skills, resourcefulness and motivation in performing their best (OECD, 2005).

Evaluating faculty effectiveness is important in nearly every institution of higher education. A regular evaluation of teachers is essential in identifying their strengths as well as weakness so that aspects where it could still be developed. It also provides feedback which influences the faculty member’s self-image and professional satisfaction and establishes a climate which communicates the institution’s commitment to professional improvement and confidence that every faculty member will make a valuable contribution to the achievement of shared goals.

Evaluation of teaching performance worldwide which is similarly conducted among state colleges and universities in the country are carried out through peer observation, self-reflection, supervisor’s rating and students’ evaluation (Looney, 2011).

Using the students’ evaluation in assessing teaching performance remains to be an issue (Centra, 2003). Despite its controversies, the use of students to evaluate effectiveness in instruction is however, the most widespread form (Crumbley & Reichelt, 2009).

Seldin (1999) stated that historically, student ratings have dominated as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness for the past 30 years. McKeachie (1997) noted that “student ratings are single most valid source of data on teaching effectiveness. In fact, there is little evidence of the validity of any other source of data on teaching effectiveness (Marsh & Roche, 1997).

On the contrary, Ory (2011) stated that the collection of student ratings is not the only way to evaluate instruction teaching effectiveness. However, it is properly understood considering the reasons that since the students have the unique opportunity of observing the teachers daily, they are more objective than other alternatives.

The increasing need and demand for accountability in higher education has called for the adoption and made students’ evaluation as key instrument on teaching effectiveness (Stehle, Spinath & Kadmon, 2012. The nature of the learning environment determines the kind of faculty that the HEI hires, retains, and develops (CHED, 2014).

In the professional life of a teacher, to be effective is a complex process. It requires the continuous development of his personal growth and the honing of his professional competence. Bandura (1993) Social Cognitive Theory explained that an in-depth understanding of human behavior can be done through social interaction. From this framework, teacher’s belief in his or her personal ability to execute the courses of action is needed to positively affect student performance.

Awareness of teaching performance of faculty members and its relevance in the implementation of the OBE is necessary. Thus, the handbook of the Commission on Higher Education’s (CHED’s) on Typology, Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) and Institutional Sustainability Assessment served as the framework of this study. As mentioned, the Philippine government has been implementing educational reforms for the past few years to address the demands and challenges of an international community.

As defined by the CHED, Outcomes-based education (OBE) is an approach that focuses and organizes the educational system around what is essential for all learners to know, value, and be able to do to achieve the desired level of competence.

Thus, teachers play a vital role in supplying supporting and promoting instruction and learning of high quality (Darling-Hammond, 2005). Quality education cannot be achieved without the efforts of dedicated and highly committed teachers. Evaluating teaching performance is the strongest link between what the teachers can do and what the students should achieve.
MATERIALS AND METHODS
The documentary analysis technique was used as the main tool to gather the required data of the study. Considering its appropriateness and relevance, the researcher utilized the results of the GS Students’ Faculty Performance Evaluation administered by the Graduate School to its Professorial Lecturers in two rating periods: Second Semester 2013 – 2014 and First Semester 2014 – 2015. The GS Student Faculty Performance Evaluation instrument is a modified instrument composed of four dimensions enumerated as: Commitment, Knowledge of the subject, Teaching for independent learning and Management of learning. These four dimensions were culled out from the Civil Service Commission (CSC) – approved Performance Evaluation System (PES) on instruction. Each dimension has descriptive benchmark statements. Items were rated on a 5 – point Likert scale ranging from (5) outstanding, (4) very satisfactory, (3) satisfactory (2) unsatisfactory and (1) poor. Weighted mean was used to determine the teaching performance of the professorial lecturers in each dimension. The CSC - approved Performance Evaluation System guide reflected below as basis in the interpretation of the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Verbal Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.60 – 5.00</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60 - 4.59</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60 - 3.59</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60 - 2.59</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 1.59</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Profile of the Respondents
The RTU - GS has an actual count of forty six (46) professorial lecturers. From this number, only forty (41) professorial lecturers were available during the first evaluation period (Second Semester 2013-2014). Hence, only the results of the performance evaluation of the professorial lecturers in the first administration were considered in the second evaluation period (First Semester 2014-2015). 3 (7%) of the GS Professorial Lecturers are aged 75 – 84 , 5(12%) are within 65 – 74 years, 13 (32%) are 55 – 64 years old, 14 (34%) are 45 – 54 years old, 5 (12%) are 35 – 44 years with 1 lecturer aged 34 as the youngest in the group. With regards to their type of school and academic preparation, twenty one (21) or 51% of the GS lecturers completed their Advanced Studies from private and 49% (20) from public universities here and abroad; 16 (78%) are PhD ; 6 (15%) with PhD units and 3(7%) are Masters’ degree holder.

Teaching Performance of the GS Professorial Lecturers
The benchmark statement stated as “Clarifies the targets and performance standards for the course “has a mean of 4.62 and interpreted as “Very Satisfactory”; “Motivates the students to study more about he course” has a mean of 4.46 and interpreted as “Very Satisfactory”; “Accommodates student consultation even outside teaching hours” has a mean of 4.34 and interpreted as “Very Satisfactory”. With a weighted mean of 4.47 and interpreted as “Very Satisfactory”, this implies that the GS Professorial Lecturers show commitment to their profession.

Quinn (1997) stated that the teacher’s commitment to students and their profession cannot be devalued and therefore the more committed teacher is the least affected by any policy reforms. Factors influencing the levels of commitment of the teachers in schools and in the wider education systems must necessarily be the focus of an important field of research leading to the introduction of reform and change within classrooms and lecture theatres, schools, institutions and learning centers, and national systems of education(Razak,2009)

The indicators such as “handles the subject effectively” and “shows adequate ability to answer the questions of the students” having a mean of 4.65 and 4.62 respectively and interpreted as “Outstanding.” While the other indicators “ relates the topics in the course to other discipline and
contemporary issues” has a mean of 4.45; “emphasizes and clarifies important points” has a mean of 4.52 and “exhibits mastery and broad knowledge of the course” obtained a mean of 4.54 and interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” The weighted mean of 4.56 interpreted as “Very Satisfactory” implies that the GS Professorial Lecturers possess the expertise in teaching the subject.

To teach all students according to today’s standards, teachers need to understand subject matter deeply and flexibly so they can help students create useful cognitive maps, relate one idea to another, and address misconceptions (Shulman, 1987). The teacher’s ability to motivate students his ability to use relevant instructional materials and what students learned are strong evidences of teachers’ expertise of the subject. This was supported by Robert (2014) which accordingly he mentioned that the most effective teachers have deep knowledge of the subjects they teach, and when teachers’ knowledge falls below a certain level it is a significant impediment to students’ learning.

“Creates a classroom atmosphere which stimulates student to participate in class discussions” and “Asks thought provoking questions” has a mean of 4.39 and 4.43 respectively and interpreted as “Very satisfactory, and “Outstanding” in the indicator “Respects students opinions and ideas.” having a mean of 4.70. The GS Professorial Lecturers manifested a very satisfactory performance on Teaching for Independent Learning having a weighted mean of 4.51.

To actively involve students, more process-oriented teaching is encouraged (Bolhuis and Voeten, 2001). Teaching strategies were forwarded to promote independent learning including scaffolding, provide opportunities to self-monitor; offering models of behavior; develop language for learning and feedback on homework (Gorman, 1998; Black, 2007; Montalvo and Torres, 2004).

Classroom climate is a significant teacher factor. The climate is usually seen as associated with the behavior of the stakeholders, whereas culture is seen as measuring the values and norms of the organization (Heck Marcoulides, 1996; Hoy, Tater, & Bliss, 1990).

Expectations towards students in higher education have changed overtime. Learning cannot be considered as a passive knowledge-consuming process anymore. Students are expected to be more autonomous and more self-regulated in their learning (Boekaerts, 2006). They have to be prepared to be lifelong learners. In order to foster the development of these competences on a student level, learning environments and teaching approaches in higher education need to be supportive in this respect. Students gradually have to be provided with more freedom in their learning process (Vermunt & Verloop, 1999).

In a research on “What makes a great teaching”(Robert, 2014) quality of instruction (Strong evidence of impact on student outcomes) includes elements such as effective questioning and use of assessment by teachers. Specific practices, like reviewing previous learning, providing model responses for students, giving adequate time for practice to embed skills securely and progressively introducing new learning (scaffolding) are also elements of high quality instruction.

The indicators “ Commands respect through good grooming and professional behavior,” “Manifest interest in the welfare of students,” and “Attains the objectives of the course” obtained a mean score of 4.61, 4.65 and 4.60 respectively and interpreted as “Outstanding” while “Deals with students professionally and tactfully” is interpreted as “Very Satisfactory” has a mean of 4.50. The weighted mean for the teaching performance of the professorial lecturers on Management of Learning of 4.62 is interpreted as Very Satisfactory.

Classroom climate covers quality of interactions between teachers and students, and teacher expectations: the need to create a classroom that is constantly demanding more, but still recognizing students’ self-worth. A teacher’s abilities to make efficient use of lesson time, to coordinate classroom resources and space, and to manage students’ behavior with clear rules that are consistently enforced,
are all relevant to maximizing the learning that can take place. These environmental factors are necessary for good learning rather than its direct components.

To be effective, professional behaviors exhibited by teachers such as reflecting on and developing professional practice, participation in professional development, supporting colleagues, and liaising and communicating with students are necessary in the management of learning. Overall, among the four dimensions included in this study, the GS Professors obtained an outstanding performance in the Management of Learning with a weighted mean of 4.60 and Very Satisfactory performance in Knowledge of Subject (x = 4.56); Teaching for Independent Learning (x = 4.51) and last but not the least a mean of 4.47 on Commitment.

In a review conducted by Berk (2005) on Twelve potential sources of evidence to measure teaching effectiveness, the student evaluation was considered as a necessary source of evidence of teaching effectiveness for both formative and summative decisions as compared with peer ratings, self-evaluation, videos, student interviews, alumni ratings, employer ratings, administrator ratings, teaching scholarship, teaching awards, learning outcome measures, and teaching portfolios. On the contrary, Cohen and Mesachie (1980) identified 10 criteria of teaching effectiveness which colleagues, but students, could not assess, two of which describe indirect influences (commitment to teaching and support for departmental efforts).

Both positive and negative comments were forwarded by some GS students on the teaching performance of the Graduate School Professorial Lecturers where majority of the GS Professorial Lecturers (41) were noted to have mastery and expertise of the subject, show respect to students’ opinions and ideas (36), motivate, inspire and encourage students participation (32). Likewise, a good number of the GS Professorial Lecturers exhibits professionalism (23), the competency in the subject taught and good communication skills. On the other hand, some of the negative comments posted include: limited hands-on activities, particularly in IT subjects, poorly prepared examination, tone of voice (too soft/fast) and inadequate IT facilities.

Providing feedback is a way to test teacher quality. As stated by Andrews (1995) teacher evaluation is "one of the most powerful tools for improving instruction. Effective evaluation by high-quality evaluators will improve teacher-administrator communication, motivate teachers to improve classroom practices, assist in the counseling out of incompetent teachers, and ultimately improve student achievement".

Nevo (1994) stated that evaluation could make better teachers for the benefit of the students, because better teaching might inspire better learning. However, in order for teacher evaluation to be effective in terms of improving teacher performance, it has to be formative, and therefore descriptive rather than judgmental in its nature. This improvement is even more likely to occur if schools or school districts connect their evaluations to professional development courses that are provided in order to foster improvement in teaching practice (Natriello1990).

Finally, the practice of teacher evaluation can also provide opportunities to recognize quality teachers (Andrews, 1995). This recognition can serve as a motivation for other teachers to strive for improving their instructional practices. This is especially important for teachers who cannot always be aware of what is expected from them since they do not have many chances of interacting with each other to exchange knowledge and skills (Sweeney, 1994). Therefore, the teacher evaluation process can allow teachers to obtain reassurance about their performance, and feel good about it (Sweeney, 1994).

The evaluation process can also effect the improvement of the overall performance of the school (Iwanicki, 1990). Specifically, when evaluations are soundly based, teachers will try to avoid behaviors that caused other teachers to be evaluated negatively, and adopt behaviors that were associated with positive evaluations (Natriello, 1990). This will help develop high standard norms for individual schools.
Relationship of the GS students’ comments to the Teaching Performance of the Professorial Lecturers

As viewed from the general comments forwarded by the GS students on the teaching performance of the GS Professorial Lecturers, both the positive and negative comments of the students are good evidences or documents to support the performance of the GS Professorial lecturers in the four dimensions, namely: Knowledge of the subject, Commitment, Teaching for Independent Learning and Management of Learning.

The GS Professorial Lecturers with Outstanding rating in his teaching performance generate positive comments from the students. Mastery of the subject, professionalism, good communication, motivating and encouraging students’ participation and competency in the subject taught are among the comments highlighted by students as key factors in the teaching performance of the RTU GS Professorial Lecturers. This can be supported Hattie’s (1999) statement that feedback-focused, appropriate and update-learning-related should be one of the basic criteria to be effective teacher. According to Graham et al (2001) effective teachers should get good feedback of learning process from students as measure of their performance to give important data to schools and make their performance better.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The current evaluation instrument may be reviewed to incorporate other significant variables that can assess faculty teaching performance focused on outcomes-based education (OBE). The areas needing improvement such as inadequate hands-on activities, poor teaching strategies and techniques need immediate action to continuously retain/increase enrollment of the GS students. Likewise, students’ should be provided with proper orientation on how to give precise and meaningful feedback and understand the importance, benefit of the faculty evaluation.

There is a need to review the qualifications/portfolio of the current pool of Professorial Lecturers. As part of their professional growth, attendance to seminars, trainings and workshops which can enhance their teaching techniques and strategies integrating modern technologies must be encouraged, including renewal of licensed required for board courses. Likewise, participation of the faculty members in training and seminars is highly encouraged to provide them update on Outcomes-Based Education.

More comprehensive evaluation of the professorial lecturers should be performed to capture a more realistic picture of each faculty. Students’ feedback must be considered seriously to assure teacher and teaching quality.

Further, this may be conducted to match and compare with a parallel study in another institution leading to a more detailed account of the teaching performance of Graduate School Professors among State Colleges and Universities (SUCs).
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