

Professional Development, Faculty Competencies and Job Satisfaction: Their Relationship to Institutional Performance

Dr. Cecilia Navarro-Obon

Faculty, College of Arts and Sciences, PHINMA- University of Iloilo, Iloilo City (5000), Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900140>

Received: 12 September 2026; Accepted: 17 September 2026; Published: 03 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationships among higher education institutions' (HEIs) provisions for professional development, faculty teaching competencies, and job satisfaction, and their collective bearing on institutional performance among Teacher Education Program (TEP) faculty in the province and city of Iloilo, Philippines. Using a descriptive research design, data were gathered from 155 faculty members across 26 HEIs through researcher-made questionnaires, with institutional performance assessed via Board Licensure Examination for Professional Teachers (BLEPT) passing rates, accreditation level, and graduation rate. Results showed that professional development provisions were more frequently practiced across all HEI classifications, with no significant differences by type, category, geographical location, size, or status, except for in-service training, which differed significantly by institutional category. Faculty competencies were rated excellent across all groups, while job satisfaction was generally very high, with collegial relations and job interest as the strongest subscales. Most HEIs recorded average institutional performance. Chi-square analyses revealed no significant relationships between institutional performance and any of the three independent variables. These findings suggest that while professional development, competency, and satisfaction are well-established in these HEIs, their influence on measurable institutional outcomes may be mediated by other structural and contextual factors that warrant further investigation.

Keywords: professional development, faculty competencies, job satisfaction, institutional performance, teacher education, licensure examination, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The performance of an academic institution is, in many ways, a reflection of everything it stands for, its mission, its values, and its commitment to the people it serves. At the core of any higher education institution (HEI) are three interacting elements, its infrastructure, its people, and its students. Of these, the faculty holds the most direct influence over educational outcomes. They are the ones who carry instruction into the classroom, contribute to research, engage with the broader community, and sustain the daily life of the institution.

When an HEI is viewed as a system, its overall performance depends on how well these components work together. Over time, institutions that consistently reflect on their practices tend to develop a clearer sense of what drives quality outputs and how to sustain them. Among the most visible indicators of institutional quality in the Philippine context is how well graduates perform in standardized assessments, particularly in the Board Licensure Examination for Professional Teachers (BLEPT), alongside the institution's accreditation status and graduate throughput.

The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) uses these measures as the basis for recognizing HEIs as Centers of Excellence (COEs) or Centers of Development (CODs) and for granting autonomous or deregulated status. In teacher education specifically, an institution's Board Licensure Examination for Professional Teachers (BLEPT) passing rate is a key benchmark. Data from the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) reveal that national BLEPT passing rates have historically hovered below 55%, with some fluctuation across years (Abao et al., 2023). Studies have consistently linked low passing rates to substandard educational quality, and

institutions that fail to meet the national average often face questions about the adequacy of their programs and faculty preparation. Alongside licensure performance, accreditation status, including recognition as a COE or COD, is considered the ultimate measure of an HEI's compliance with established quality standards. Accreditation serves as a quality stamp affirming that an institution has undergone rigorous external peer evaluation against predefined standards, and research confirms its role in driving improvements in institutional quality and educational excellence (Kumar et al., 2020). Examining faculty perceptions of accreditation further reveal varying degrees of improvement in teaching and learning practices, suggesting that accreditation processes, when properly implemented, can meaningfully elevate instructional standards (Bougherira and Elasmarr, 2022).

Achieving these benchmarks demands more than good intentions. An institution must function holistically, ensuring that its faculty are not only well-selected at the point of hiring but are continuously supported in their professional growth. Faculty development programs play a critical role in equipping educators with the skills necessary to meet evolving pedagogical demands, evidence shows they significantly improve faculty knowledge, teaching competence, and professional proficiency over time (Bilal et al., 2019). Institutions that provide structured, transparent pathways for career advancement tend to report higher levels of faculty engagement and satisfaction, particularly when opportunities include research participation, professional certification, and cross-disciplinary collaboration. Without such investment, even capable faculty members risk becoming pedagogically stagnant as their fields evolve around them. While many lecturers demonstrate content expertise, gaps persist in innovative teaching practices and student-centred pedagogy, making continuous pedagogical training critical to maintaining instructional quality in higher education (Wagiran et al., 2023). A review of studies across 13 countries concluded that development programs within HEIs are central to meeting individual faculty needs, stimulating professional progress, and improving overall academic performance (Smith and Wyness, 2024).

Enhancing teacher performance not only improves student academic outcomes but also stimulates educators' professional enthusiasm and creativity, serving as a sustained driving force for institutional sustainability. Reviews confirm that teacher professional development contributes significantly to improving student learning outcomes through enhancing pedagogical competence and classroom management (Dewi et al., 2024). This connection between faculty development and student outcomes is well-supported in the literature. Research confirms that institutional factors, including faculty preparation, curriculum alignment, and instructional delivery, have considerable influence on how well graduates perform in the licensure examination (Cadosales et al., 2023). The effective delivery of curriculum and instruction has been identified as a significant predictor of BLEPT performance, underscoring the importance of enhancing faculty competence to provide students with appropriate training and preparation.

Yet professional development alone does not capture the full picture. A growing body of literature highlights the relevance of development programs within HEIs in meeting individual faculty needs, stimulating professional progress, and improving overall academic performance, but notes equally that a supportive work environment, work-life balance, and equitable recognition are critical to sustaining these gains. Faculty who feel supported by their institutions tend to invest more deeply in their teaching, and this investment finds its way into better student preparation and outcomes (Smith and Wyness, 2024). Teachers' job satisfaction has a significant bearing on the quality of instruction they deliver, and research reviewing empirical studies across multiple countries found that satisfaction levels meaningfully influence student achievement, though the relationship is complex and context-dependent (Hoque et al., 2023). Faculty job satisfaction is shaped by multiple factors, including job autonomy, skill variety, and institutional climate, all of which bear on teaching effectiveness and organizational commitment (Chen, 2023).

Research affirms that job satisfaction affects productivity, faculty report that their performance improves with positive feedback and diminishes under stress or inadequate institutional support. Despite this, nearly one-third of faculty in higher education disagree that their institution invests meaningfully in their career development, and a substantial proportion feel that institutional leaders do not demonstrate genuine concern for their well-being (Smith and Wyness, 2024).

Not all HEIs in the province of Iloilo provide adequate provisions for professional development, and it cannot be assumed that faculty members in these institutions experience strong job satisfaction or possess competencies adequate for the demands of contemporary teacher education. Given these realities, this study was undertaken to examine the relationships among professional development provisions, faculty competencies, and job satisfaction, and to determine how these variables relate to institutional performance.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine whether HEIs' provisions for professional development, faculty competencies, and job satisfaction among Teacher Education Program (TEP) faculty have a significant relationship with institutional performance for the Second Semester of Academic Year 2023-2024.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the frequency of practice of professional development provisions when taken as a whole and when classified according to (a) in-service training, (b) educational programs, and (c) school activities, by type, category, geographical location, size, and status of HEI?
2. Is there a significant difference in the frequency of practice of professional development provisions by (a) in-service training, (b) educational program, and (c) school activities, according to type, category, geographical location, size, and status of HEI?
3. What is the level of teaching competencies of faculty members when taken as a whole and when classified by type, category, geographical location, size, and status of HEI?
4. Is there a significant difference in the level of teaching competencies of faculty members according to type, category, geographical location, size, and status of HEI?
5. What is the level of job satisfaction among faculty members when taken as a whole and in terms of (a) job contentment, (b) job relations with co-workers, (c) job security, and (d) job interest, according to type, category, geographical location, size, and status of HEI?
6. Is there a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction among faculty members as a whole and across its dimensions, according to type, category, geographical location, size, and status of HEI?
7. What is the institutional performance of HEIs based on (a) BLEPT passing percentage, (b) accreditation level of the Teacher Education Program, and (c) graduation rate?
8. Is there a significant relationship between institutional performance and the frequency of practice of professional development provisions, the level of faculty competencies, and the level of job satisfaction, respectively?

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study carry meaningful implications for multiple stakeholders in higher education. For the Professional Regulations Commission and CHED, the data offer an empirical basis for reviewing and refining policies on licensure examinations and institutional standards, including criteria for accreditation and autonomous status, insights that are increasingly relevant given documented concerns about consistently low BLEPT passing rates across many Philippine HEIs. For school administrators, the results can guide the design of faculty development programs that better align institutional provisions with actual faculty needs and teaching demands, ultimately translating into improved student outcomes. Teacher Education faculty members stand to benefit from a clearer picture of their own professional strengths and areas for growth, while education students gain indirectly through the improved instructional quality that typically follows from faculty development. Human resource personnel may also draw on the findings to develop more responsive approaches to faculty support and retention, given the well-established link between job satisfaction and organizational performance.

Finally, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on teacher education quality in the Philippine context and provides a foundation for future researchers examining similar questions in other regions or institutional settings.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to examine the relationships among HEIs' professional development provisions, faculty teaching competencies, job satisfaction, and institutional performance. Descriptive research is suited for characterizing the current state of conditions and practices within a defined population without manipulating variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). It was particularly appropriate here given the need to profile both individual faculty characteristics and institutional performance indicators across multiple HEIs. Institutional performance was assessed through three indicators: the 2024 BLEPT passing rate, the Teacher Education Program accreditation level, and the graduation rate for Academic Year 2023–2024.

Respondents and Sampling

The study involved 155 faculty members who had been teaching professional education subjects in the Teacher Education Program (TEP) of HEIs in the city and province of Iloilo. Purposive sampling was used, given that the target group, faculty handling professional education courses, was limited in number and specifically defined; all eligible members were included as participants (Memon et al., 2025). Heads of the Teacher Education Program were separately surveyed through a one-page instrument to provide institutional profile data, including HEI type, category, geographical location, size, and status, as well as institutional performance data. They were not included in the faculty respondent pool.

Of the 26 HEIs covered, 20 were public (State Universities and Colleges) and six were private institutions. The distribution of faculty respondents largely reflected these proportions: 78.1% were from public HEIs and 21.9% from private ones. More respondents were from colleges (55.5%) than universities (44.5%), from rural HEIs (72.9%) than urban ones (27.1%), from small institutions with enrollment of 1,000 or below (69.7%) than from big ones (30.3%), and from old institutions operating for more than ten years (88.4%) than from new ones (11.6%). These figures are consistent with the geographic and institutional distribution of HEIs across the province.

The faculty respondents' age ranged from 20 to 68 years, with a mean of 46. The majority were female (72.3%), which is characteristic of the teaching profession in the Philippine context. In terms of educational attainment, 35.5% held master's degrees and were working toward a doctorate, while 32.9% were already doctoral degree holders, a distribution reflecting the push for advanced qualifications driven by national compensation policies for state institutions. Most respondents (32.9%) had ten or fewer years of teaching experience, while 14.2% had been in service for 29 to 36 years.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a researcher-made, two-part questionnaire. Part I gathered general respondent information. Part II contained three instrument sets: (1) a 30-item questionnaire on professional development provisions (10 items each for in-service training, educational programs, and institutional activities); (2) a 30-item faculty competency assessment adapted from evaluation instruments used in higher education; and (3) a job satisfaction scale with four subscales covering job contentment, relations with co-workers, job security, and job interest.

Responses to the professional development and job satisfaction scales used a five-point Likert-type format ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). Mean scores were converted to descriptive ratings using a 0.80 step interval derived from Guilford's scaling method. The rating scales were as follows in Table 1.

Table 1. Presents the scale used to interpret mean scores gathered.

Professional Development Provisions		Faculty Competencies		Job Satisfaction	
Scale	Description	Scale	Description	Scale	Description
4.21–5.00	Most Frequently Practiced	4.21–5.00	Excellent	4.21–5.00	Very Satisfied
3.41–4.20	More Frequently Practiced	3.41–4.20	Very Good	3.41–4.20	Satisfied
2.61–3.40	Frequently Practiced	2.61–3.40	Good	2.61–3.40	Moderately Satisfied
1.81–2.60	Least Frequently Practiced	1.81–2.60	Fair	1.81–2.60	Dissatisfied
1.00–1.80	Infrequently Practiced	1.00–1.80	Poor	1.00–1.80	Very Dissatisfied

Institutional performance data from the BLEPT passing percentage, TEP accreditation level, and graduation rate, were gathered via a separate researcher-made survey sheet completed by TEP heads. A composite scoring system (ranging from 2 to 9) was used to categorize overall institutional performance as High (7–9), Average (4–6), or Low (1–3), based on the following criteria: BLEPT passing rate above or below the national average (scored 2 or 1), accreditation level from Not Accredited to Level 5 (scored 0 to 5), and graduation rate above or below the mean of 66% across 26 HEIs (scored 2 or 1).

Validity and Reliability

The instrument underwent face and content validation by a panel of experts using an eight-point criteria framework, following review and revision by the research adviser. Content validity was prioritized to ensure that items were relevant, representative, and clearly aligned with the study's constructs (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Reliability was established through a pre-test involving 30 faculty members from other institutions identified not belonging to the final respondent population. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess internal consistency, a widely accepted coefficient in educational research, with values of 0.70 and above considered acceptable for research purposes (Zakariya, 2022). The resulting coefficients were 0.88 for professional development provisions, 0.83 for faculty competencies, and 0.86 for job satisfaction, all well above the accepted threshold.

Data Gathering and Analysis

The validated questionnaire was personally administered to respondents after obtaining approval from institutional heads. Retrieved data were coded, encoded, and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Descriptive statistics illustrating mean, frequency, and percentage, were used to profile respondents and summarize the levels of professional development provisions, faculty competencies, and job satisfaction. For inferential analysis, the Mann-Whitney U test, a non-parametric alternative to the independent samples t-test, was applied to examine differences between two-group classifications. The Chi-square test of independence was used to determine whether significant relationships existed between institutional performance and each of the three independent variables. A significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ was applied throughout.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Professional Development Provisions

Across all HEIs in the study, professional development provisions were rated more frequently practiced overall ($M = 3.80$). Among the three components, in-service training recorded the highest mean ($M = 4.01$), followed by institutional activities ($M = 3.88$) and educational programs ($M = 3.70$), all falling within the same descriptive

category. These figures suggest that institutions are consistently, though not maximally, investing in faculty development. Continuous professional development (CPD) is widely recognized as essential for equipping educators with updated pedagogical practices, digital competencies, and assessment strategies (Fernández-Batanero et al., 2020; Kalim & Bibi, 2024), and the present findings confirm that Iloilo HEIs are actively, if not fully optimally, fulfilling this function.

When grouped by HEI type, both public and private institutions rated professional development as more frequently practiced, with public HEIs recording slightly higher means across all three components. This is consistent with the expectation that state colleges and universities (SUCs) benefit from government subsidies that provide a more stable financial base for training activities, while private institutions depend largely on tuition revenue (Table 1). By category, university faculty rated provisions somewhat higher than college faculty across all components, an observation attributable to the additional funding support that accredited and research-active universities tend to receive from CHED and other government agencies. Still, neither group exceeded the most frequently practiced threshold, suggesting that even well-resourced institutions have not yet institutionalized faculty development as a routine operational priority. Research echoes this pattern: effective CPD programs require sustained commitment and structural follow-through, not merely periodic training events (Fernández-Batanero et al., 2020).

Interestingly, faculty from rural HEIs consistently rated professional development provisions slightly higher than their urban counterparts ($M = 3.89$ vs. $M = 3.78$). Similarly, big HEIs ($M = 3.91$) outsourced small HEIs ($M = 3.84$), which is plausible given that institutions with larger enrollments generate more revenue and can more readily fund development activities. Faculty from old HEIs ($M = 3.88$) rated provisions slightly higher than those from new ones ($M = 3.73$), reflecting the expectation that newer institutions, still focused on building infrastructure and establishing operations, have yet to prioritize sustained faculty development programs. As one review of faculty development noted, structured programs require organizational maturity and long-term commitment to achieve meaningful impact (Pereza et al., 2025).

Table 2. Professional Development Provisions by HEI Classification (Mean Scores).

HEI Classification	In-Service Training	Educational Programs	Institutional Activities	Overall PD
Public	4.03	3.75	3.92	3.90
Private	3.92	3.54	3.76	3.74
College	3.93	3.63	3.83	3.80
University	4.10	3.79	3.95	3.95
Urban	3.96	3.62	3.80	3.78
Rural	4.04	3.73	3.91	3.89
Big (>1,000)	4.05	3.78	3.90	3.91
Small ($\leq 1,000$)	3.99	3.67	3.87	3.84
Old (>10 yrs)	4.02	3.73	3.89	3.88
New (≤ 10 yrs)	3.89	3.50	3.80	3.73
Whole Group	4.01	3.70	3.88	3.80

Scale: 4.21–5.00 = Most Frequently Practiced; 3.41–4.20 = More Frequently Practiced.

Differences in Professional Development Provisions

Mann-Whitney U tests revealed no significant differences in the frequency of professional development provisions across any of the five HEI classification variables, type, category, geographical location, size, or status, for the three components and overall, with all p values exceeding .05, except for the in-service training component under category ($U = 2376.50$, $p = .033$), where university-based faculty rated it significantly higher than college-based faculty. This lone significant finding points to the greater in-service training opportunities that universities tend to provide, likely tied to stronger research cultures and additional funding. The absence of significant differences across other groupings suggests that basic professional development provisions have

become sufficiently standardized across HEIs in Iloilo, regardless of location, size, or operational age, and reflects a broader shift toward institutionalizing faculty support as a minimum expectation rather than a competitive advantage.

Faculty Teaching Competencies

Faculty members rated their overall teaching competencies as excellent ($M = 4.34$). This high self-assessment was consistent across all HEI classifications except for faculty from new institutions, who rated their competencies as very good ($M = 4.19$), a distinction that is descriptively notable but, as subsequent inferential analysis reveals, not statistically significant. The highest-rated individual competencies included building rapport with students ($M = 4.62$), guiding students toward skill mastery ($M = 4.53$), and applying fair and inclusive assessment practices ($M = 4.52$). These findings align with evidence from the Philippine context that teachers generally rate themselves as highly competent, particularly in relational and instructional domains (Padohinog et al., 2024).

Across type (public: $M = 4.33$; private: $M = 4.35$), category (college: $M = 4.29$; university: $M = 4.38$), location (urban: $M = 4.32$; rural: $M = 4.34$), and size (big and small: both $M = 4.33$), competency ratings were uniformly excellent with negligible differences. Only under HEI status was a descriptive distinction apparent, faculty from old HEIs scored higher ($M = 4.35$) than those from new ones ($M = 4.19$), suggesting that longer institutional history provides more opportunities for professional growth and competency refinement. A study on teacher competency standards in the Philippine context similarly found that institutional experience and organizational support were among the key factors associated with excellence in pedagogical performance (Padohinog et al., 2024).

Table 3. Faculty Competencies by HEI Classification

HEI Classification	Mean	Description
Public	4.33	Excellent
Private	4.35	Excellent
College	4.29	Excellent
University	4.38	Excellent
Urban	4.32	Excellent
Rural	4.34	Excellent
Big (>1,000)	4.33	Excellent
Small ($\leq 1,000$)	4.33	Excellent
Old (>10 yrs)	4.35	Excellent
New (≤ 10 yrs)	4.19	Very Good

Note. Scale: 4.21–5.00 = Excellent; 3.41–4.20 = Very Good.

Differences in Faculty Competencies

Mann-Whitney U tests found no significant differences in faculty competencies across all five classification variables: type ($U = 2046.00$, $p = .962$), category ($U = 2723.00$, $p = .379$), geographical location ($U = 2261.50$, $p = .653$), size ($U = 2464.50$, $p = .775$), and status ($U = 943.50$, $p = .106$). These results suggest that teaching competency in the Iloilo HEI context is not primarily an institutional function but rather a faculty-driven quality, one shaped by individual commitment to professional growth, peer mentorship, and personal practice. The finding that rural faculty perform at the same level as their urban counterparts challenges the conventional assumption that geographic proximity to urban resources enhances professional competence, a pattern potentially explained by the democratizing role of digital information access in leveling the professional learning field (Padohinog et al., 2024). For public school faculty, the NBC 461 salary system provides a built-in incentive to maintain and upgrade qualifications, which may also help explain the consistency of competency levels regardless of institutional profile.

Job Satisfaction

Overall, faculty members were very satisfied with their jobs ($M=4.22$). Among the four components, job relations with co-workers received the highest rating ($M=4.31$, very satisfied), followed by job interest ($M=4.28$, very satisfied), job contentment ($M=4.15$, satisfied), and job security ($M=4.14$, satisfied). The particularly high satisfaction with collegial relationships aligns with research demonstrating that positive workplace interactions have significant direct effects on motivation, job satisfaction, and productivity (Abun et al., 2018; Perez et al., 2025). The high score on job interest is equally telling that faculty who view teaching as a vocation, as a meaningful profession with clear institutional purpose, tend to sustain higher intrinsic motivation even in the absence of strong extrinsic rewards (Hoque et al., 2023).

By type, public HEI faculty were very satisfied overall ($M=4.24$), while private HEI faculty were satisfied ($M=4.13$). The gap in job security satisfaction was most pronounced between the two groups ($M=4.19$ vs. $M=3.94$), consistent with evidence that tenured public employment confers a stability and psychological security that private-sector positions often cannot match (Falatah et al., 2021; Caoagdan et al., 2023). College faculty registered slightly higher overall satisfaction ($M=4.25$) than university faculty ($M=4.18$), with the most notable gap in job relations with co-workers ($M=4.40$ vs. $M=4.20$). This may reflect the more concentrated social environment of colleges, where smaller faculty pools and fewer administrative divisions tend to foster tighter collegial bonds. By contrast, universities, with their wider program portfolios and more complex administrative structures, may inadvertently diffuse the sense of community that is so central to job satisfaction among faculty.

Rural faculty reported higher overall satisfaction ($M=4.25$) than their urban counterparts ($M=4.13$), with consistent gaps across all four components. This pattern may reflect the greater sense of community purpose that rural faculty experience through closer integration with local students and communities, a psychosocial benefit that urban settings may not readily replicate. Faculty of big HEIs were very satisfied ($M=4.29$) compared with small HEI faculty who were satisfied ($M=4.19$), with the largest difference in job contentment ($M=4.28$ vs. $M=4.10$). In terms of HEI status, both old and new HEI faculty were very satisfied, though faculty from new institutions scored slightly higher overall ($M=4.27$ vs. $M=4.21$), an intriguing finding that may reflect the enthusiasm and strong institutional identity characteristic of early-stage organizational cultures (Abdulpatta et al., 2024).

Table 4. Job Satisfaction by Component: Overall Summary.

Component	Mean	Description
Job Contentment	4.15	Satisfied
Job Relations with Co-workers	4.31	Very Satisfied
Job Security	4.14	Satisfied
Job Interest	4.28	Very Satisfied
Overall Job Satisfaction	4.22	Very Satisfied

Note. Scale: 4.21–5.00 = Very Satisfied; 3.41–4.20 = Satisfied.

Differences in Job Satisfaction

Mann-Whitney U tests revealed no significant differences in overall job satisfaction or its four components across type, category, geographical location, and status groupings (all p values $> .05$). One exception was noted: for HEI size, job relations with co-workers differed significantly between big and small institutions ($U=2017.00$, $p=.042$). Faculty from big HEIs reported stronger satisfaction in collegial relations ($M=4.46$ vs. $M=4.25$), suggesting that larger institutions may benefit from more diverse professional communities that enrich interpersonal faculty dynamics. The general absence of significant differences across groups is consistent with research indicating that job satisfaction in academic settings tends to be shaped more by the intrinsic nature of teaching and collegial culture than by institutional structural characteristics (Hoque et al., 2023; Bongalonta, 2022).

Institutional Performance

Of the 26 HEIs, 96.2% posted BLEPT passing rates above the national average of 50%, with only one institution falling below. This broadly positive performance is encouraging, though it must be read against the context that the national benchmark itself remains low, historical data indicate the national BLEPT passing rate has consistently been below 50% (Abao et al., 2023; Cadosales et al., 2023). Surpassing such a modest threshold does not necessarily indicate instructional excellence; it reflects baseline adequacy. Prior research has established that the BLEPT passing rate is a proxy for the quality of teacher preparation, and institutions that merely exceed the national average while not achieving high absolute pass rates may still need to strengthen curricular alignment and instructional practices (Gatpandan et al., 2023).

For accreditation, the distribution was: Level 4 (7.7%), Level 3 (15.4%), Level 2 (34.6%), Level 1 (23.1%), and not accredited (19.2%). The preponderance of institutions at Level 1 and Level 2 reflects the broader landscape of Philippine HEIs where accreditation remains a work-in-progress for many institutions. One institution had attained Level 4 accreditation with autonomous status and ISO certification, a rare achievement that signals sustained, system-wide institutional quality (Kumar et al., 2020). On graduation rate, 53.8% of HEIs exceeded the mean rate of 66%, while 46.2% fell below it. Graduation rates, while often overlooked in quality assessments, are a critical proxy for institutional commitment to student completion and program delivery effectiveness (de Castro Galvao et al., 2024). Together, the three performance indicators paint a picture of an institutional landscape that is broadly functional but unevenly developed in its capacity to achieve higher-order quality benchmarks.

Table 5. Institutional Performance Indicators (N = 26 HEIs)

Indicator	Category	f	%
BLEPT Passing %	Above national average	25	96.2
	Below national average	1	3.8
Accreditation Level	Level 4	2	7.7
	Level 3	4	15.4
	Level 2	9	34.6
	Level 1	6	23.1
	Not accredited	5	19.2
Graduation Rate	Above mean (66%)	14	53.8
	Below mean (66%)	12	46.2
Overall Performance	High (7–9)	3	11.5
	Average (4–6)	20	76.9
	Low (1–3)	3	11.5

Overall institutional performance score: BLEPT passing rate (1–2) + Accreditation Level (0–5) + Graduation rate (1–2) = Total (2–9).

Relationships Between Independent Variables and Institutional Performance

Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to determine whether institutional performance was significantly associated with professional development provisions, faculty competencies, and job satisfaction, respectively. The results consistently showed no significant relationships across all three analyses.

The relationship between professional development provisions and institutional performance was not significant ($\chi^2 = 7.024$, $df = 4$, $p = .134$). Most HEIs that more frequently practiced professional development reported average levels of institutional performance. While the literature strongly affirms that faculty development programs are necessary for sustaining teaching quality and faculty engagement (Bilal et al., 2019; Smith and Wyness, 2024), the present findings suggest that the frequency of professional development practice, as perceived by faculty, may not directly translate into measurable institutional performance outcomes within the timeframe examined. This gap between development activities and performance impact is not uncommon:

research has noted that training transfer requires structural follow-through, institutional reinforcement, and time to manifest in improved outcomes (Pereza, 2025).

Similarly, faculty competencies did not have a significant relationship with institutional performance ($\chi^2 = 7.716$, $df = 4$, $p = .103$). This finding is worth reflecting on carefully. While the theoretical connection between teaching competence and student outcomes is well established (Padohinog et al., 2024; Hoque et al., 2023), the uniform distribution of competency ratings at the excellent level may have created a ceiling effect that obscured meaningful variance. Put differently, when nearly all faculty self-rate at the top of the scale, the measure loses its ability to discriminate between institutions that may genuinely differ in instructional effectiveness. Future research using peer or supervisor evaluations, rather than self-assessment alone, may yield more nuanced insights.

Finally, job satisfaction showed no significant relationship with institutional performance ($\chi^2 = 1.985$, $df = 4$, $p = .739$). The majority of HEIs had very satisfied faculty and average institutional performance, suggesting that satisfaction and performance, though theoretically linked, may be mediated by a range of other institutional factors not captured in this study. This aligns with the complexity of the satisfaction-performance relationship identified in the broader literature, where satisfaction is a necessary but not sufficient condition for improved institutional outcomes (Hoque et al., 2023; Chen, 2023). Unmeasured variables such as student entry characteristics, curriculum alignment with BLEPT content, institutional leadership quality, and adequacy of learning resources may be stronger proxies for institutional performance than faculty perceptions of professional development, competency, and satisfaction alone.

Table 6. Chi-Square Analysis: Relationships with Institutional Performance

Variable	χ^2 Value	df	p-value	Remarks
Professional Development Provisions	7.024	4	.134	Not Significant
Faculty Competencies	7.716	4	.103	Not Significant
Job Satisfaction	1.985	4	.739	Not Significant

Note: Significance level set at $\alpha = .05$.

CONCLUSION

The study points to a clear and consistent picture, across the HEIs studied in Iloilo, professional development provisions are actively practiced, faculty competencies are strong, and job satisfaction is generally high, yet none of these variables showed a statistically significant relationship with institutional performance. This outcome is worth examining carefully, because it challenges a straightforward assumption that has often gone unquestioned in educational research, that doing the right things for faculty will, in fairly direct ways, improve institutional outcomes.

On professional development, institutions across all classifications, public and private, urban and rural, college and university, were providing training and development activities with reasonable, though not maximal, consistency. The fact that ratings clustered in the more frequently practiced range rather than most frequently practiced suggests that while the intent is present, professional development has not yet been fully institutionalized as a core organizational practice. The one exception worth noting was in-service training, which differed significantly between colleges and universities, with university faculty rating it higher. This gap likely reflects the stronger research cultures and larger resource bases that universities tend to maintain. The broader uniformity across other variables, however, suggests that basic professional development has become something of a shared baseline expectation across Iloilo HEIs, a floor, not yet a ceiling.

Faculty self-rated their teaching competencies as excellent across nearly all groupings, with the only descriptive distinction arising between old and new HEIs, faculty in older institutions rated themselves slightly higher, which makes intuitive sense given the longer professional histories these institutions afford. What this consistency also signals, though, is a possible ceiling effect in the self-assessment instrument: when nearly everyone rates

themselves at the top of the scale, meaningful institutional differences in actual instructional quality may be masked. This is an important caveat for interpreting the null finding between competency and institutional performance.

Job satisfaction was high overall, with the strongest satisfaction expressed in collegial relations and job interest, areas that tend to reflect the intrinsic rewards of teaching rather than institutional provisions per se. Public HEI faculty and those in rural and bigger institutions reported marginally higher satisfaction, while the only statistically significant finding in this domain was that faculty in big HEIs were more satisfied with co-worker relations than those in smaller ones. The general absence of significant group differences reinforces the view that job satisfaction in teaching is shaped more by the relational and vocational dimensions of the work than by the structural characteristics of the employing institution.

As for institutional performance, the majority of HEIs fell in the average range, a finding that is broadly consistent with the national picture for Philippine teacher education institutions, where many exceed the national BLEPT average but few achieve the sustained quality indicators that distinguish high-performing institutions. The accreditation data were particularly telling: fewer than a quarter of HEIs had reached Level 3 or above, and nearly one in five remained unaccredited. This is a substantive quality gap that deserves institutional and policy attention, independent of the study's primary findings.

Taken together, the null relationships across all three Chi-square analyses do not invalidate the importance of professional development, competency, or satisfaction. What they do suggest is that these variables, while necessary, are not sufficient conditions for institutional performance, at least not as operationalized here and within this particular sample. Institutional performance outcomes in teacher education are likely shaped by a wider constellation of factors: student entry characteristics, the rigor of curriculum-BLEPT alignment, quality of academic leadership, adequacy of learning resources, and the depth of faculty-student interaction, among others. This study gives us a useful baseline, but also a clear indication of where the more complex questions lie.

RECOMMENDATIONS

HEIs are encouraged to move beyond treating professional development as a periodic activity and instead anchor it as a standing institutional policy with dedicated funding and regular needs-based updating. Development programs should be designed not in general terms but with specific attention to what faculty identify as their actual gaps, supported by periodic feedback mechanisms such as peer observation or portfolio assessment that allow for meaningful, individualized growth. Maintaining faculty competencies over time requires this kind of sustained, targeted investment, particularly as curriculum demands and licensure examination specifications continue to shift. On accreditation, every HEI should work toward a higher accreditation level with a clear, time-bound roadmap, recognizing that formal external quality review remains one of the most credible signals of institutional commitment to excellence. For CHED and policymakers, the null findings of this study signal the need for more differentiated support especially for smaller and newer institutions with limited development capacity as well as deeper investment in research that identifies which institutional variables most directly drive BLEPT performance, graduation rates, and accreditation advancement. Future researchers are encouraged to explore multi-source competency assessments, longitudinal designs, and the roles of academic leadership, institutional culture, and curriculum-BLEPT alignment as potential mediators of institutional performance, areas that this study, by design, could not fully address.

REFERENCES

1. Abao, E. L., Petancio, J. A. M., Sanchez, J. M. P., & Sumalinog, G. G. (2023). Performance of beginning teachers in the licensure examination for teachers: a national study. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1240658>
2. Abdulpatta, A. H., Pelotos, L. V., & Segundo, T. P. (2024). Exploring Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction among Public School Teachers: A Comprehensive Study. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(IX), 494–508. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.809045>

3. Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Agoot, F., & Benedict, S. (2018). Measuring workplace relationship and job satisfaction of Divine Word Colleges employees in Ilocos Region. *International Journal of Current Research*, 10(11), 75279–75286. <https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.33015.11.2018>
4. Bilal, Guraya, S. Y., & Chen, S. (2019). The impact and effectiveness of faculty development program in fostering the faculty's knowledge, skills, and professional competence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences*, 26(4), 688–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2017.10.024>
5. Bongalonta, M. B. (2022). Job satisfaction of faculty members of state Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Bicol, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(5), 935–947. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.05.19>
6. Bougherira, M. R., & Elasmara, M. H. (2022). Impact of academic accreditation on teaching and learning: Faculty members' perceptions. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 47(2), 167–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2022.2102412>
7. Cadosales, M. N. Q., Sanchez, J. M. P., Cordova, M. E., Merin, J. A., & Augusto, W. S., Jr. (2023). Exploring the predictive influence of licensure examination results for beginning teachers' performance: The case of the Philippines. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1252368. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1252368>
8. Caoagdan, A., Milallos, J., Grino, R. H., Vigonte, F. G., & Abante, M. V. (2023). Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A comparative analysis within the sphere of public and private administrative domains. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4628371>
9. Chen, C. Y. (2023). Are professors satisfied with their jobs? The factors that influence professors' job satisfaction. *Sage Open*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181515>
10. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book255675>
11. de Castro Galvao, J., Tucker, F., & Attewell, P. (2024). Bending the Curve: Institutional Factors Associated with Graduation Rates. *Higher education policy*, 37(2), 278–302. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-023-00304-5>
12. Dewi, A. E. R., Kalil, N. C., Hidayat, H., & Juniati, S. R. (2024). Exploring the relationship between teacher professional development and student learning outcomes. *Journal of Pedagogi*, 1(5), 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.62872/a5xyk576>
13. Falatah, R., Almuqati, J., Almuqati, H., & Altunbakti, K. (2021). Linking nurses' job security to job satisfaction and turnover intention during reform and privatization: A cross-sectional survey. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 29(6), 1578–1586. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13279>
14. Fernández-Batanero, J. M., Montenegro-Rueda, M., Fernández-Cerero, J., & García-Martínez, I. (2020). Digital competences for teacher professional development. Systematic review. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(4), 513–531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1827389>
15. Gatpandan, M. A. C. C., Cruz, M. G. E. V., & Paguta, R. B. (2023). The Factors Affecting Licensure Passing Rates of Philippine State Universities and Colleges – A Panel Regression Analysis. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management*, 6(12), 83-94. <https://journal.ijresm.com/index.php/ijresm/article/view/2884>
16. Hoque, K. E., Wang, X., Qi, Y., & Norzan, N. (2023). The factors associated with teachers' job satisfaction and their impacts on students' achievement: A review (2010–2021). *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10, Article 177. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01645-7>
17. Kalim, U., & Bibi, S. (2024). Assessing Teacher Competencies in Public Schools of Pakistan: A pathway for improving the effectiveness of professional development programs for teachers. *SAGE Open*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241236060>
18. Kumar, P., Shukla, B., & Passey, D. (2020). Impact of accreditation on quality and excellence of higher education institutions. *Revista Investigación Operacional*, 41(2), 151–167. <https://rev-inv-ope.pantheonsorbonne.fr/sites/default/files/inline-files/41220-01.pdf>
19. Memon, M. A., Thurasamy, R., Ting, H., & Cheah, J. H. (2025). Purposive sampling: A review and guidelines for quantitative research. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, 9(1), 1–23. https://jasemjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/JASEM90101_Memonetal2025.pdf

20. Padohinog, E., Liwanag, B., & Balsicas, N. (2024). Teacher self-efficacy through achievement goals, instructional strategies, and student engagement in the Philippine setting. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal (APHERJ)*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.56278/apherj.v11i1.2618>
21. Pereza N, Hauser G, Dević Pavlić S, Marić I, Sotošek V, Grgasović T and Mršić-Pelčić J (2025) How to create a faculty development program that transforms medical education according to actual institutional needs: evidence-based approach and experience at the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Medicine, Croatia. *Front. Med.* 12:1513119. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2025.1513119
22. Smith, B., & Wyness, L. (2024). What makes professional teacher development in universities effective? Lessons from an international systematised review. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 29(4), 1550–1572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2386666>
23. Wagiran, W., Pardjono, P., Triyono, M. B., Pratama, G. N. I. P., & Köhler, T. (2023). The future of vocational competence: Perspective of vocational teachers, industries, and educational experts. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(4), 543–560. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16431a>
24. Zakariya, Y. F. (2022). Cronbach's alpha in mathematics education research: Its appropriateness, overuse, and alternatives in estimating scale reliability. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1074430. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1074430>