

Correlates of Teaching Effectiveness of the General Education Faculty in a State University of the Philippines

Jean S. Dumbrique
University of Northern Philippines

ABSTRACT

Universally recognized and accepted as a direct and promising strategy to improve education outcomes is improving the teacher quality and measuring teaching effectiveness. This study investigated variables that influence the students' evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of the general education (GE) faculty of a state university in the Philippines for the Second Semester, School Year 2014-2015. It looked into factors pertaining to the professional profile of the GE faculty members that affect the students' evaluation of the faculty teaching with the use of correlational research design. Findings revealed that of the variables considered, length of service in the teaching profession has a significant inverse relationship with the students' evaluation of the faculty members' teaching effectiveness particularly regarding their commitment. The findings suggest that the GE faculty should continue to live up to the precept that teaching is a vocation. Teachers should not let their commitment wane as their length of service gets longer. The faculty members whether in the early years of teaching or the experienced faculty must be likewise provided with faculty development programs. The university should consider a shift to online student evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness.

Keywords: *student evaluation, independent learning, correlational research design*

INTRODUCTION

The faculty members constitute the backbone of an educational institution. As such, the realization of the institution's goals and objectives largely depends upon the faculty members for its success. Hammond, 2010 reported that parents, practitioners, and policymakers agree that the key to improve public education is placing highly skilled teachers in all classrooms. To this, she stressed the necessity of evaluating teacher effectiveness with a reliable and valid system of performance assessments based on common standards that would provide consistency in gauging teacher effectiveness, help track educational progress, flag areas of need, and anchor a continuum of performance throughout a teaching career.

Students' evaluation of faculty performance is given high importance in many educational institutions. Such importance must be due to the fact that the students are the day-to-day partners of the faculty members in the teaching-learning process. The students are the regular recipients of the services of the teachers and witnesses of what they do in the classroom and how they do it. McGee (as cited in Gump, 2007) admits that although instructor evaluations at

the post secondary level are also carried out by peers, administrators and the individual instructor themselves, the most ubiquitous are evaluations by students. Greenwald and Gillmore (1997), likewise admitted that appraisals of instructors effectiveness by experts might provide more valid assessments than traditional Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) but that alternative exceeds the cost of students ratings.

Marsh (as cited in Gump, 2007) claimed that the ubiquity of students' evaluation of college teaching effectiveness resulted to it being probably the most thoroughly studied form of personnel evaluation, and highly supported by empirical research. Gump (2007) related the voluminous research on Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) and the potential biases in SETs and reported that over the past seven decades, ratings have been shown to be of potential value to several constituents in addition to administrators, who may also use SET for the identification of excellence in teaching. Thus, faculty members have to reach and perform to their teaching potential.

In the state university considered in this study, evaluation of teaching effectiveness by the students is a regular practice. Every term, a faculty member is evaluated by his/her students. Hammond (2010) reported that one lesson from varied reforms to improve schools is the repeated finding that teachers are the fulcrum determining whether any school initiative tips toward success or failure and the emphasis that improving teacher quality has received universal recognition and acceptance as one of the most direct and promising strategies for improving education, outcomes. This posed the challenge for the researcher to find out the students evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of the general education faculty members and determine whether there are professional variables in the faculty profile that influence the students' evaluation of their teaching effectiveness.

Marsh (as cited in Gump, 2007) mentioned that research on SETs and the various factors that may affect or otherwise bias them appeared almost as soon as student evaluation procedures were introduced in the 1920s at several major universities in the U. S. This report fittingly mirrors the claim that students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness are probably the most thoroughly studied form of personnel evaluation. Most of earlier studies delved into potential biases, reliability and validity, and methods by which these are obtained. For example, Goe, Bell and Little (2008), conducted an extensive research synthesis on how teacher effectiveness is currently measured and provides practical guidance on how best to evaluate teacher effectiveness. It synthesizes the research on teacher effectiveness and the different instruments used to measure it. Also, it defines the components and indicators that characterize effective teachers, extending this definition beyond teachers' contribution to student achievement gains to include how teachers impact classrooms, schools, and their colleagues as well as how they contribute to other important outcomes for students.

In a similar endeavor, Doyle (2004) made suggestions as to what an efficient evaluation process might look like including attempting to define in which areas of instruction students are qualified to give meaningful feedback to faculty and which they are not.

The literature on factors that may influence SETs includes other variables such as those that pertain to students profile, their grades or student learning. Cohen (as cited in Doyle, 2004) found that students' ratings of the amount learned in the course and their overall ratings of the teacher and the course are highly correlated. Those who learned more gave their teachers higher ratings. To them, a teacher's effectiveness is about student learning. This was also advanced by Angelo and Cross (as cited in Doyle, 2004) when they said that teaching in the absence of learning is just talking. What a student learns, however, is not always within the teacher's control.

Goe (2007) provided an up-to-date, comprehensive compilation and review of the recent research regarding teacher impact on student achievement. He organized using a framework of inputs, processes, and outcomes, it synthesized the claims about the link between teacher quality and student academic achievement. He too compiled other studies that examined faculty-related factors mostly about the faculty members' characteristics or socio-demographic profile in addition to a few work-related or teacher quality factors. Teacher attributes and teacher quality are correlated to teaching effectiveness but as measured by the teacher's contribution to student learning (Aaronson, Barrow, Sanders, Nye, Konstantopoulos, Hedges and Noell [as cited in Goe, 2007]).

While there are claims that student ratings of teachers may be susceptible to bias, student feedback is a valuable source of information for both formative and summative purposes. For this reason, student feedback is usual activity carried out through surveys in universities. In Macquarie University, student feedback and evaluation are primary components of its quality enhancement cycle as detailed in its Quality Enhancement Framework as well and external quality assurance reporting requirements.

The novelty of this study lies on the consideration of variables that are all involving the faculty members professional advancement, professional development and achievement – factors that the researcher thinks may pronounce difference among the faculty members that may have a bearing in their teaching skills. The choice for the general education faculty members as participants also contribute to the novelty of this study for the University considered institutionalized its articulation program in the school year 2012-2013. Faculty members teaching the general education subjects from the different colleges of the University were grouped university-wide into three departments, namely Languages and Humanities, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences and Philosophy. The new set-up is to create a system for the participation and involvement of all faculty members in each field in working together and agreeing on course content, teaching strategies, uses of

technology, and student assessment and grading system/criteria. While all the literature cited are relevant, this study has a different scope as it investigates antecedent correlates to student evaluation of teaching effectiveness of general education faculty members from the faculty professional factors.

This study examined the student evaluation of teaching effectiveness of the general education faculty members in a state university in the Philippines. Specifically, the study attempted to determine their professional attributes (b) determine the level of the student evaluations of the teaching effectiveness (commitment, knowledge of the subject matter, teaching for independent learning) and (c) test the significant relationship between the student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and the faculty professional profile.

This study will hopefully serve as a promising approach in identifying if the articulation efforts on general education of the University have driven the GE faculty members towards professional development and have caused them to improve their subject matter knowledge, design, and delivery of instruction, classroom management, and evaluation of and support for student learning. The results can serve as a database that can be used by the Department Heads, the Deans, the Administration and the Personnel Services and Training Division of the University to track, analyze, and manage teaching effectiveness of the faculty and to plan and design faculty development programs. The study can also provide fundamental information and data for faculty members to reflect on and use in their efforts to improve their teaching effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY

Fifty-six of the 112 general education faculty members from the Department of Languages and Humanities, Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy of the University of Northern Philippines during the Second Semester of School Year 2014-2015 participated in this study. These faculty members were selected through cluster random sampling method. All the participants gave informed consent.

To elicit information as to the professional factors about the faculty members, the researcher used the Personal Information Sheet. The factors include the following: educational attainment, status of appointment, official designation, number of preparation/s or subject/s taught per semester along field of specialization, number of preparation/s or subject/s taught per semester not related to specialization but had to teach due to need, number of years teaching the preparation/s or subject/s, length of service in the teaching profession, number of seminars/training attended related to specialization, number of research publications in refereed or CHED-accredited journal/s, number of published books/coursebooks, and membership to relevant professional organizations. The researcher used documentary analysis technique

to elicit the students' evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of faculty members which was the primary instrument of the study.

The correlational research design was used to determine which professional factors in the profile of the faculty members affect the students' evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of the faculty members. Simple linear correlational analysis using Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) was performed to determine the relationships of the variables.

The norm used by the researcher was adopted from the Vice President for Academic Affairs Office, University of Northern Philippines.

Mean Range	Item Descriptive Rating	Overall Descriptive Rating
4.6 - 5.0	Outstanding (O)	Very High (VH)
3.6 - 4.59	Very Satisfactory (VS)	High (H)
2.6 - 3.59	Satisfactory (S)	Moderate (M)
1.6 - 2.59	Needs Improvement (NI)	Low (L)
1.00-1.59	Poor (P)	Very Low

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As presented in Table 1, majority of the general education (GE) faculty members of the University have master's degree (64.3%) and have an official designation (73.2%). A great majority have a permanent status of appointment (78.6%). Almost all (98.2%) have teaching load along their specialization with the majority having two preparations per semester followed by a good percentage having three preparations per semester. A few (10.7%), however, were assigned one teaching preparation which is not related to their specialization but they had to teach it due to need.

Table 1
Professional Profile of the General Education Faculty Second Semester,
SY 2014-2015

Professional Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1. Educational Attainment		
Baccalaureate Degree	12	21.4
Master's Degree	36	64.3
Doctorate Degree	8	14.3
Total	56	100.0
2. Status of Appointment		
Part-Time	4	7.1
Contractual	8	14.3
Permanent	44	78.6
Total	56	100.0
3. Official Designation		
With Administrative Function	41	73.2
Full-Time Faculty	15	26.8
Total	56	100.0
4. Number of Preparation/s or Subject/s Taught Per Semester in line with Field of Specialization		
0	1	1.8
1	9	16.1
2	20	35.7
3	18	32.1
4	6	10.7
5	1	1.8
6	1	1.8
Total	56	100.0
5. Number of Preparation/s or Subject/s Taught Per Semester Not Related to Specialization but had to Teach Due to Need		
0	50	89.3
1	6	10.7
Total	56	100.0
6. Number of Years Teaching the Preparation/s or Subject/s		
1-5	12	21.4
6-10	13	23.2
11-15	12	21.4
16-20	9	16.1
21-25	1	1.8
26-30	3	5.4
31-35	6	10.7
Total	56	100.0
7. Length of Service in the Teaching Profession		
1-5	10	17.9
6-10	13	23.2
11-15	12	21.4
16-20	7	12.5
21-25	3	5.4
26-30	4	7.1
31-35	6	10.7
36-40	1	1.8
Total	56	100.0

Correlates of Teaching Effectiveness of the General Education Faculty in a State University of the Philippines

8. Number of Seminars/Trainings Attended Related to Specialization		
None	4	7.1
1-5	22	39.3
6-10	19	33.9
11-15	3	5.4
16-20	4	7.1
21-25	1	1.8
26-30	1	1.8
31-35	2	3.6
Total	56	100.0
9. Number of Research Publications in Refereed or CHED-Accredited Journal/s		
None	41	73.2
1	9	16.1
2	1	1.8
3	3	5.4
4	1	1.8
5	1	1.8
Total	56	100.0
10. Number of Published Books/Coursebooks		
None	53	94.6
1	2	3.6
2	1	1.8
Total	56	100.0
11. Membership to Relevant Professional Organization/s		
None	11	19.6
1-2	25	44.6
3-4	17	30.4
5-6	1	1.8
7-8	2	3.6
Total	56	100.0

This finding manifests that the University is compliant to the Commission on Higher Education's (CHED) vertical articulation policy that the specialization of the faculty members is the basis of their teaching load. It likewise implies that the Heads of the three departments for general education, namely Department of Languages and Humanities, Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy are observing the policy on faculty loading particularly regarding assigning faculty members to teach the general education courses offered from the 12 colleges of undergraduate education in the University and regarding the number of preparations vis-à-vis number of units. The presence of a few (10.7%) who were assigned with four subject preparations and one faculty member (1.8%) who were given five and six subjects each along their field of specialization. This is due to the request of the other colleges for them to teach major subjects.

The study also found out that the greater percentage (23.2%) of the GE faculty similarly have been in the teaching profession and have been teaching their assigned preparation/s for 6-10 years. A great percentage (21.4%) were likewise found out similarly to have been in the teaching profession and have been assigned the same teaching preparation/s for 11-15 years. A great

percentage (39.3%) have attended 1-5 seminars/trainings that are related to their specialization, and a good percentage (33.9%) have attended 6-10. The majority (73.2%) have no research publications in refereed or CHED-accredited research journal. Of the few (26.8%) who have, more than half have only one.

This finding supports the result of Sanyal and Varghese (as cited in Salazar-Clemeña and Almonte-Acosta, 2007) that universities in the developing world have retained strong teaching functions and weak research functions. It may likewise speak of the lack of CHED-accredited research journal from among the HEIs in Region I. This, in turn, supports the observation of Clemeña (as cited in Dumbrique and Alon, 2013) that despite the initiatives of the CHED to promote and encourage research in the public and private HEIs, the current state of higher education research in the Philippines leaves much to be desired in terms of quantity, quality, thrusts, and contribution to national development.

Betsey (as cited in Nuqui and Cruz, 2012) added that faculty members become less research productive because teaching is allocated with too much time. Kurtz et al. (as cited in Nuqui and Cruz, 2012) opined that those faculty members who have more administrative duties could not allocate the amount of time they desired to accomplish a research endeavor. It must be recalled that most of the general education faculty of the University have an administrative function.

Most (94.6%) have no published books/coursebooks. Only one (1.8%) of the GE faculty has two published books/coursebooks while two of them (3.6%) have only one published book/coursebook. Almost half (44.6%) have a membership to 1-2 relevant professional organizations while one (1.8%) has a membership to 5-6 relevant professional organizations.

Table 2 shows that regarding commitment, the GE faculty have high ($X=4.3$) level of performance. A close look on the mean ratings would reveal that they got the same and highest rating regarding “regularly comes to class on time, well-groomed and well prepared to complete assigned responsibilities” and “keeps accurate records of students’ performance and prompt submission of the same.”

Table 2
Level of Teaching Effectiveness regarding Commitment of the General Education Faculty Members

Indicators/ Items	\bar{X}	DR
1. Demonstrate sensitivity to students' ability to attend and absorb content information.	4.33	Very Satisfactory
2. Integrates sensitivity in his/her learning objectives with those of the students in a collaboration process.	4.23	Very Satisfactory
3. Makes self-available to students beyond official time.	4.23	Very Satisfactory
4. Regularly comes to class on time, well-groomed and well-prepared to complete assigned responsibilities.	4.36	Very Satisfactory
5. Keeps accurate records of students' performance and prompt submission of the same.	4.36	Very Satisfactory
Over All	4.30	High

This finding speaks of the high regard for punctuality and the high commitment and conformity of the GE faculty in fulfilling their official duties. It also implies that the GE faculty are faithful and religious in ensuring that the records of their student performance are free from errors.

It was regarding “integrates sensitivity to his/her learning objectives with those of the students in a collaboration process” and “makes self-available to students beyond official time” where they got the same and lowest rating (\bar{X} =4.23).

This finding may not necessarily mean that the GE faculty members are not intensely willing to make themselves available for the students beyond official time. It could be possible that the need for the faculty beyond official time is without prior notice or appointment by the students. For the GE faculty to improve further along this indicator of commitment, consultation hours should be set by every faculty member for his/her students/classes in the same manner that class advisers do for their advisory classes. It is interesting to note, however, that the GE faculty got a **very satisfactory** level of performance in all the items /indicators of commitment. This finding could be due to the need for the students and the desire of the faculty for their students to learn the desired outcomes.

As to teaching effectiveness regarding knowledge of subject matter, it could be seen from Table 3 that the GE faculty members have high (\bar{X} =4.36) level of performance as well. In each of the five items, the students rated the faculty members' performance as **very satisfactory**. They got the highest rating (\bar{X} =4.47) in “explains the relevance of present topics to the previous lessons, and relates the subject matter to relevant current issues and/or daily life activities” while they got the lowest rating (\bar{X} =4.28) in the item “integrates subject to practical circumstances and learning intents/purposes of students.

Table 3
Level of Teaching Effectiveness regarding Knowledge of Subject Matter of the
General Education Faculty Members

Indicators/ Items	\bar{X}	DR
1. Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter (explains the subject matter without relying solely on the prescribed textbook.)	4.41	Very Satisfactory
2. Draws and share information on the state of the art of theory and practice in his/her discipline.	4.31	Very Satisfactory
3. Integrates subject to practical circumstances and learning intents/purposes of students.	4.28	Very Satisfactory
4. Explains the relevance of present topics to the previous lessons, and relates the subject matter to relevant current issues and daily life activities.	4.47	Very Satisfactory
5. Demonstrates up-to-date knowledge and awareness on current trends and issues of the subject.	4.33	Very Satisfactory
Over All	4.36	High

This item where the GE faculty obtained the lowest rating regarding knowledge of subject matter confirms the finding where they got the lowest rating regarding commitment as mentioned earlier. This could be due to the primary consideration of the faculty members of the need for the students to attain the desired learning objectives/outcomes.

From Table 4, the GE faculty members likewise have high (\bar{X} =4.33) level of performance regarding teaching for independent learning. In all the five items/indicators, they were rated by the students as **very satisfactory**. They got the highest rating (\bar{X} =4.41) in the component “encourages students to learn beyond what is required and help/guide the students on how to apply the concepts learned.” This finding points out that the faculty members give a premium on teaching the students to learn how to learn.

Table 4
Level of Teaching Effectiveness regarding Teaching for Independent Learning of the General Education Faculty Members

Indicators/ Items	\bar{X}	DR
1. Creates teaching strategies that allow students to practice concepts they need to understand (Interactive discussion)	4.36	Very Satisfactory
2. Enhances student self-esteem and gives due recognition to students' performances.	4.28	Very Satisfactory
3. Allows students to create their course with objectives and realistically defined student-professor rules and make them accountable for their performance	4.23	Very Satisfactory
4. Allows students to think independently and to make their own decisions and to hold them accountable for their performance.	4.37	Very Satisfactory
5. Encourages students to learn beyond what is required and help/guide the students on how to apply the concepts learned.	4.41	Very Satisfactory
Over All	4.33	High

The finding that they got the lowest rating ($\bar{X}=4.23$) on the item "allows students to create their course with objectives and realistically defined student-professor rules and make them accountable for their performance' jibes with the findings where they got the lowest ratings regarding commitment and knowledge of subject matter. This speaks of the constancy of the GE faculty in considering as more essential the attainment by every student of the desired learning outcomes/objectives as contained in the course syllabus over the individual learning objectives/intents/purposes of the students.

Table 5
Level of Teaching Effectiveness regarding Management of Learning of the General Education Faculty Members

Indicators/ Items	\bar{X}	DR
1. Creates opportunities for intensive and extensive contribution of students in the class activities (e.g. breaks the class into dyads, triads or buzz/task groups).	4.23	Very Satisfactory
2. Assumes roles as the facilitator, resource person, coach inquisitor, integrator, referee in drawing students to contribute knowledge and understanding of the concepts at hand.	4.25	Very Satisfactory
3. Designs and implements learning conditions and experiences that promote a healthy exchange of ideas and confrontations.	4.28	Very Satisfactory
4. Structures/ re-structures learning and teaching-learning context to enhance the attainment of collective learning objectives.	4.28	Very Satisfactory
5. Use of Instructional Materials (audio/video materials: fieldtrips, films showing, computer aided instruction and, etc.) to reinforce learning processes.	4.15	Very Satisfactory
Over All	4.24	High

Data in Table 5 show that the GE faculty obtained high ($\bar{X}=4.24$) level of teaching effectiveness regarding management of learning. They got the same and highest rating ($\bar{X}=4.28$) in the items “designs and implements learning conditions and experiences that promote a healthy exchange of ideas and confrontations” and “ structures/ re-structures learning and teaching-learning context to enhance the attainment of collective learning objectives.” Again, this means that the GE faculty gives higher importance and priority to the attainment of desired collective learning objectives or outcomes over individual learning objectives/intents of students. It also indicates that they are faithfully carrying out the mandate for general education particularly in developing students’ ability to communicate, discern and reason out.

Table 6
Summary of the Level of Teaching Effectiveness of the General Education Faculty Members

Level of Teaching Performance	\bar{X}	DR
1. Commitment	4.30	High
2. Knowledge of Subject Matter	4.36	High
3. Teaching for Independent Learning	4.33	High
4. Management of Learning	4.24	High
Grand Mean	4.31	High

As shown in Table 6, the GE faculty obtained high ratings as a whole in all the four aspects of teaching effectiveness, namely commitment ($\bar{X}=4.30$), knowledge of subject matter ($\bar{X}=4.36$), teaching for independent learning ($\bar{X}=4.33$), and management of learning ($\bar{X}=4.24$) which resulted to a grand mean equivalent to high ($\bar{X}=4.31$) level of overall teaching effectiveness. The findings are an indication that, to the students, the GE faculty members are performing their instruction function **very satisfactory**.

Table 7
Correlation Coefficients between the Professional Profile and the Teaching Effectiveness of the General Education Faculty Members

Professional Factors	Commitment	Knowledge of Subject Matter	Teaching for Independent Learning	Management of Learning	Overall
Educational Preparation	.079	.104	.123	.100	.105
Status of Appointment	-.155	-.068	-.019	-.041	-.073
Official Designation	.076	.225	.131	.146	.151
Number of Preparation/s or Subject/s Taught Per Semester Along Field of Specialization	-.020	-.015	-.023	-.058	-.030
Number of Preparation/s or Subject/s Taught Per Semester Not Related to Specialization but had to Teach due to Need	.180	.162	.198	.130	.173
Number of Years Teaching the Subject/s	-.212	-.080	-.133	-.141	-.146
Length of Service in Teaching Profession	-.275*	-.179	-.218	-.217	-.229
Number of Seminars/Training Attended Related to Specialization	.050	.047	.118	.104	.082
Number of Research Publications in refereed or CHED accredited Journal/s	.186	.174	.194	.199	.195
Number of Published Books/Coursebooks	.053	.122	.024	.087	.075
Membership/Affiliation to Relevant Professional Organization/s	-.099	-.103	-.110	-.134	-.115

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

It is evident from Table 7 that all the 11 independent variables do not have a significant relationship to knowledge of subject matter, teaching for independent learning, management of learning and to overall teaching performance. Length of service in the teaching profession, however, was found out to have a significant inverse relationship with commitment as indicated by their correlation coefficient of $-.275$ which is significant at 0.05 level, hence, the variable that stands alone as correlate of teaching effectiveness regarding commitment of the GE faculty.

The finding implies that the longer the length of service of the faculty in the teaching profession, the lower is the students' evaluation of his/her teaching effectiveness regarding commitment. Length of service goes with age. Creighton (2001) explained the occurrence of this phenomenon when she opined that it is crucial for senior faculty to keep their teaching skills sharp as many colleges and universities institute post-tenure review, tie merit pay raises and awards to periodical evaluations of teaching performance.

The above-mentioned finding further implies that regardless of educational attainment, status of appointment, official designation, number of preparations/subjects taught per semester, number of seminars/training attended related to one's specialization, number of research published in refereed or CHED-accredited research journals, number of published books/coursebooks, and membership to relevant professional organizations, the general education faculty members can perform their teaching/instruction function well.

In a related research, Hanushek and Rivkin (as cited in Gordon, Kane and Staiger, 2006) summarized the research on the predictive power of completion of master's degree and found little consistent evidence that graduate degree attainment can identify effective teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

This research found out that of the variables considered in the study, length of service in the teaching profession came out as the only factor which has a significant relationship with the students' evaluation of the teaching effectiveness particularly regarding commitment of the GE faculty members. However, the relationship is inverse.

The longer the service of the faculty in the teaching profession, the lower is the students' evaluation of his/her teaching effectiveness regarding commitment, and vice versa. Length of service in the teaching profession then stands alone as a correlate of teaching effectiveness regarding commitment of the GE faculty.

Further, regardless of educational attainment, status of appointment, official designation, number of preparations/subjects taught per semester, number of years teaching the preparation/s or subject/s, length of service in the teaching profession, number of seminars/training attended related to one's specialization, number of research published in refereed or CHED-accredited research journals, number of published books/coursebooks, and membership to relevant professional organizations, the students' evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of the GE faculty members is **very satisfactory**.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions drawn from the findings suggest that the GE faculty should continue to live up to the precept that teaching is a vocation. They should not let their commitment wane as their length of service gets longer. The faculty members whether in their early years of teaching or are experienced faculty must be provided with sufficient faculty development programs and opportunities so that all aspects of teaching effectiveness will be addressed well by the GE faculty. Continuing Faculty Development Programs shall be conducted. The University should consider a shift to on-line student evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness. Students evaluation should be given higher percentage in the

computation of overall teaching effectiveness (from the present 40% to 50% or 60%) as the students are the faculty members' day-to-day partners in the teaching-learning process, the regular recipients of the services of the teachers and witnesses of what the faculty members do in the classroom and how they do it.

LITERATURE CITED

- Clemeña, R. M. and Acosta, S. A. (2007). Developing research culture in Philippine Higher Education Institutions. Retrieved on December 10, 2015 from unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/.../157869e
- Creighton, L. (2001). Teaching toolbox—improving with age. Retrieved on December 9, 2015 from <http://www.asee-prism.org/>
- Cunningham, G. K. and Stone, J. E. (2005). Value-added assessment of teacher quality as an alternative to the national board for professional teaching standards: What recent studies say. Retrieved on December 8, 2015 from <http://www1.udel.edu/educ/whitson/897s05/files/Cunningham-Stone.pdf>
- Doyle, T. (2004). Evaluating teacher effectiveness: learner centered teaching. Retrieved on February 1, 2015 from <https://learnercenteredteaching.wordpress.com/articles-and-books/evaluating-teacher-effectiveness—research-summary>
- Dumbrique, J. S. and Alon, T. A. (2013). Research productivity of business administration faculty, University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*, Volume 6. Retrieved on March 5, 2014 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271339921_Research_Productivity_of_Business_Administration_and_Accountancy_Faculty_University_of_Northern_Philippines_Vigan_City
- Greenwald, A. G. and Gillmore, G. M. (1997). Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. Retrieved on January 8, 2016 from https://faculty.washington.edu/agg/pdf/Gwald_Gillmore_AmPsychologist_1997.OCR.pdf
- Goe, L. (2007). National comprehensive center for teacher quality the link between teacher quality and student outcomes. Retrieved on January 6, 2016 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED521219.pdf>
- Goe, L., Bell, C. and Little, O. (2008). Approaches to evaluating teaching effectiveness. Retrieved on January 6, 2016 from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED521228>

- Gordon, R., Kane, T. J. and Staiger, D. O. (2006). Identifying effective teachers using performance on the job. Retrieved on January 8, 2016 from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/200604hamilton_1.pdf
- Gump, S. E. (2007). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and the leniency hypothesis: a literature review. Retrieved on January 13, 2016 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ787711.pdf>
- Hammond, L. D. (2010). Evaluating teacher effectiveness how teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching. Retrieved on March 5, 2014, from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535859
- Little, O., Goe, L. and Bell, C. (2016). A practical guide to evaluating teaching effectiveness. National comprehensive center for teacher quality. Retrieved on January 10, 2016 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED543776.pdf>
- Nuqui, A. V., and Cruz, R. C. (2012). Determinants of faculty research productivity in augustinian higher education institutions in luzon. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*, 3(1). Retrieved on January 14, 2015 from <http://iamure.com/publication/index.php/ije/article/view/191>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher deeply acknowledges and appreciates the invaluable support and cooperation of the general education faculty of the University of Northern Philippines who were the respondents of the study, the enabling help and assistance from the University Research Office, the Office of the Vice President for Research and Extension, and the UNP Administration. Heartfelt thanks are likewise extended to all students of the University – then, now, and would be – as they are the *raison d'être* of our beloved institution. Special thanks to my dearest sons, Jerico Isaiah and Jakov Ivan, for being constant sources of inspiration, diligence and joy.

Correlates of Teaching Effectiveness of the General Education Faculty in a State University of the Philippines