

Classroom Performance Evaluation of the Faculty of Baguio Central University

Perfecto M. Lopez, EdD, Maria Lourdes G. Eguia, EdD, Jamaica Luisa D. Simon, BS Psychology

Baguio Central University, No. 18, A. Bonifacio Street, Baguio City 2600, Cordillera Administrative Region, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2023.10819>

Received: 15 July 2023; Revised: 22 August 2023; Accepted: 29 August 2023; Published: 23 September 2023

ABSTRACT

This research was undertaken primarily to assess the classroom performance evaluation of the faculty members of Baguio Central University. Specifically, it sought to answer the following queries: Profile of the faculty members taking into consideration their gender, college where teaching, educational qualification, and years of teaching experience; Level of classroom performance of the faculty members along the four (4) areas of evaluation: 1) Commitment to his/her Profession, 2) Knowledge of the Subject Matter, 3) Teaching for Independent Learning, and 4) Management of Learning; and, the Dominant classroom practices of the faculty members most like and most unlike by the students. The research design employed was the descriptive assessment design with documentary analysis. The profile of the faculty members, their obtained mean ratings, and overall mean ratings in the four areas of evaluation as well as the dominant classroom practices like most and unlike most by the students were used as data for analysis.

The study revealed the following results: the female faculty members outnumbered their male counterparts; the majority of the faculty members belong to the College of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts and from the College of Nursing and School of Midwifery; majority of the faculty members are holders of a master's degree; majority of the faculty members belong to the youngest group in terms of years of teaching experience; while there is disparity in their mean ratings and overall mean ratings of the faculty members, the students expressed a high level of satisfaction on the classroom performance of the said faculty members.

In their comments and suggestions, the students also expressed the most like and most unlike classroom practices of the faculty members.

Keywords: Profile of the faculty members, Classroom performance evaluation of the faculty members, Dominant classroom practices of the faculty members, Quantitative-Descriptive design

INTRODUCTION

Does performance evaluation improve the quality of teaching? Why is performance evaluation necessary? Who should evaluate the performance of teachers?

Teacher evaluation, generally, refers to the formal process a school uses to review and rate teachers' performance and effectiveness in the classroom. Ideally, the findings from these evaluations are used to provide feedbacks to teachers and guide their professional development (Sawchuck, 2015).

In the article of Jackson (2013) entitled, "The Teacher Evaluation: An International Perspective", cited by Vivien Stewart, the Senior Advisor to Asia Society and author of Summit Reports where she shared her discourse on why evaluate teachers. Stewart shared that teachers' appraisal systems are seen as potentially

powerful engine for improving teaching and offering of new roles for outstanding teachers. At the same time, the scale of public investment in education and the urgent need for improved student outcomes has led to increased demand for accountability.”

One essential justification of performance evaluation of teachers is to facilitate the improvement of teaching. Through performance evaluation, the strengths and weaknesses could be assessed along the areas taken into consideration in the performance evaluation tool.

According to Danielson (2018), a curriculum director and administrator, in her article entitled “The Handbook for Enhancing Professional Practice”, emphasized that “Teacher evaluation can be an opportunity for genuine professional learning. When organized around clearly established and accepted standards of practice, teacher evaluation offers an opportunity for educators to reflect seriously on their practice and promote learning.” She further stressed that “evaluations help teachers align their goals with school’s vision and mission, engage in professional learning programs, upgrade skills along educational improvements, monitor the students’ learning more effectively, and reflect or do self-evaluation.”

In addition, in the article entitled, “Teachers Assessment and Evaluation”, it was specified that “one core purpose of teacher assessment and evaluation should be to strengthen knowledge, skills and dispositions and classroom practices of professional educators.”

Also, Galangco (2012) conducted research on the teacher evaluation practices of evaluators in the University of Baguio. She pointed out that one of the major purposes of teacher evaluation is “seeks to improve the teachers’ practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further development-the improvement function”.

Why should students be involved in the performance evaluation of their teachers? How reliable are the students to judge the teaching performance of the faculty members?

Students are always considered as partners of management in the improvement of teaching in educational institutions. As such, the students’ participation in the evaluation of teaching performance is a clear indication that school management honors and supports the teaching-learning process.

As stakeholders, student evaluation provides useful feedback from the clientele’s point of view and first-hand information. It has to be emphasized that the day-to-day teaching-learning encounters are between the students and their teachers. Students are considered “to have a front seat to observe teachers’ behavior and classroom processes and the best judge of what they have learned.”

In the article of Tumwebaze (2013), entitled “Should Students be Allowed to Evaluate their Teachers?”, he mentioned that “there is a school of thought that believes that since pupils spend a lot of their time with their teachers in the classroom, they are the body that should evaluate them.”

In a similar article entitled “Why Should Students Evaluate their Teachers?” by Jeffrey (2011) pointed out that “students, through evaluating their teachers, can provide insight to their instructors on what they are doing and what they need to improve.”

According to Johnson (2012) in his article entitled “Should Students Evaluate their Teachers?” an online survey of 1,883 students from 10 European countries was administered by two researchers, one from Canada, Charles Balanger, and the other from United Kingdom, Bernard Londen. They wanted to know what the students expect and what they experience from their instructors.”

Johnson pointed out that the survey found “Overall, the gap between the expected and the experienced proved to be overwhelmingly significant.”

The Room 241 Team (2012), in its article “Students Evaluating Teachers: What Educators Need to Know”, enumerated advantages of students evaluating teachers, to wit: Educators can identify current strengths and weaknesses in the areas that need development; Students can guide teachers toward providing an educational experience they truly enjoy; Students can highlight a teacher’s positive aspects which can fire the teacher’s enthusiasm; and, Teachers will be likely less complacent if they know they will be evaluated regularly.

Every semester, Baguio Central University (BCU) conducts the instructors’ evaluation by the students through the Human Resource Development Office (HRDO). This evaluation aims to assess the instructors’ classroom performance along the following four (4) areas of the evaluation tool: 1) Commitment to his/her Profession; 2) Knowledge of the Subject Matter; 3) Teaching for Independent Learning; and 4) Management of Learning.

The results of the assessment of the student evaluation of their teachers will serve as an instrument to identify their (teachers) strengths and weaknesses and to be used by management to facilitate faculty growth, development, tenure, and promotion among others.

The study endeavored to assess the classroom performance evaluation of the faculty members. It sought to determine the profile of the faculty members in terms of gender, college where teaching, educational qualification, and years of teaching experience; the level of classroom performance from the computed mean ratings and overall mean ratings obtained by the faculty members and the dominant classroom practices of the faculty members most like and most unlike by the students. The level of classroom performance used the following arbitrary ranges and their corresponding descriptions: 4.51-5.00 (Outstanding); 3.51-4.50 (Very Satisfactory); 2.51-3.50 (Satisfactory); 1.51-2.50 (Fair); and 1.00-1.50 (Poor). This study was anchored on the Theory of Performance (Bacon, 2001) and the concept on Assessment.

THE METHODOLOGY

This study employed the Descriptive Assessment research design (Ariola, 2006). According to this research design, it is a fact-finding activity that describes conditions that exist at a particular time. Further, in the descriptive assessment design, no hypotheses are proposed or tested, variable relationships are examined and no recommendations for actions are suggested.

The study focused on the profile of the faculty members, the main ratings and overall mean ratings they obtained along the four areas of the evaluation tool, and the dominant classroom practices of the faculty members most like and most unlike by the students.

This research undertaking was conducted in Baguio Central University, Baguio City involving sixty (60) faculty members who were evaluated by their students during the 1st Semester, Academic Year 2022-2023. Faculty members of the Graduate School and of the Basic Education (Elementary, Junior High School, and Senior High School) were excluded. Sampling was not utilized considering that there were only sixty (60) faculty members involved. Besides, it was the profile of the faculty members, their obtained mean ratings and overall mean ratings, and the comments and suggestions of the students that were subjected to data analysis.

For the profile of the faculty members and their common classroom practices most like and most unlike by the students, frequencies, percentages and ranks were presented in tabular form. The level of classroom performance was classified into five (5) arbitrary ranges and their corresponding descriptions: 4.51-5.00 (Outstanding); 3.51-4.50 (Very Satisfactory); 2.51-3.50 (Satisfactory); 1.51-2.50 (Fair); and 1.00-1.50 (Poor).

During the conduct of this study, the faculty members who were evaluated as well as the students who evaluated them were not identified. The results were presented in aggregate form and not in individual presentation. The provisions of the Data Privacy Law were strictly observed. The researchers endeavored that all sources of information, materials and other resources used in relation to the conduct of this study were properly acknowledged.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Faculty Members of Baguio Central University

The succeeding tables present the profile of the faculty members who were evaluated by their students taking into consideration the following: 1) college where teaching; 2) educational qualification; and 3) years of teaching experience. The gender is also considered.

College Where Teaching

Table 1 presents the profile of the faculty members along the college where they are teaching. Of the sixty (60) faculty members, 33 percent are from the College of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts (CTELA); 27 percent from the College of Nursing and School of Midwifery (CNSM); 13 percent from the College of Criminal Justice Education (CCJE); 12 percent from the College of Engineering (COE); 8 percent from the College of Business Administration (CBA); and 7 percent from the College of Hospitality and Tourism Management (CHTM). As shown on the said table, the CTELA and CNSM have the highest number of faculty members considering that that these two colleges have the most number of faculty members while CHTM and CBA have the least number of faculty members. The same table also reveals that forty-five percent are males while 55 percent are females.

Table 1. Profile of the Faculty Members by College Where Teaching and Gender (n=60)

College Where Teaching	Gender		Total
	Males	Females	
College of Business Administration	2	3	5
College of Criminal Justice Education	6	2	8
College of Engineering	6	1	7
College of Hospitality and Tourism Management	2	2	4
College of Nursing and School of Midwifery	6	10	16
College of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts	5	15	20
Total	27	33	60

Educational Qualification

Table 2 presents the profile of the faculty members according to their educational qualification. As shown in the table, forty percent are master's degree holders; thirty-five percent are bachelor's degree holders; and twenty-five percent are doctorate degree holders. The profile is indicative that majority of the faculty members are holders of the minimum educational qualification to teach in the tertiary level – a master's degree. It can be noted, however, that there is a big percentage of faculty members teaching with only a

bachelor’s degree. This could be attributed to the dearth of applicants with the appropriate master’s degree who were hired to handle specialized subjects during the said term.

Table 2. Profile of the Faculty Members According to Educational Qualification and Gender (n=60)

Educational Qualification	Gender		Total
	Males	Females	
Bachelor’s Degree	13	8	21
Master’s Degree	8	16	24
Doctorate Degree	6	9	15
Total	27	33	60

Years of Teaching Experience

Table 3 presents the profile of the faculty members according to years of teaching experience and gender. The years of teaching experience include those from other educational institutions. In terms of years of teaching experience, 50 percent belong to then bracket (0-4 years); 20 percent, (15-19 years); 12 percent, (10-14 years); 10 percent, (5-9 years); 7 percent, (20-24 years); and 1 percent, (25-Above years). The table shows that majority of the faculty members evaluated belong to the youngest bracket and most probably they are still probationary in their employment status. Only few of the faculty members to the oldest brackets.

Table 3. Profile of the Faculty Members According to Years of Teaching Experience and Gender (n=60)

Years of Teaching Experience	Gender		Total
	Males	Females	
0 – 4	16	14	30
5 – 9	2	4	6
10 – 14	3	4	7
15 – 19	5	7	12
20 -24	1	3	4
25 – Above	0	1	1
Total	27	33	60

Level of Classroom Performance Evaluation of the Faculty Members as Perceived by the Students Along the Areas of the Evaluation Tool

The succeeding tables present the results of the classroom performance evaluation of the faculty members by the students along the four (4) areas of the Evaluation Tool: 1) Commitment to his/her Profession; 2) Knowledge of the Subject Matter; 3) Teaching for Independent Learning; and 4) Management of Learning taking into consideration of the profile of the faculty members, to wit: college where teaching, educational qualification and years of teaching experience.

Classroom Performance of the Faculty Members by College Where Teaching

Table 4 shows the classroom performance of the faculty members according to the college where they are teaching.

College of Business Administration. The table shows that the faculty members of the college are the

highest in “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.53) and lowest in “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.41). However the mean ratings are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory). Likewise, the mean ratings along “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.48) and “Management of Learning” (4.46) are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory”. The average mean rating of the faculty members of the college is 4.47 interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

College of Criminal Justice Education. The table shows that the faculty members of the college are highest in “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.38) and lowest in “Commitment in his/her Profession” (4.23). However, the mean ratings are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” Likewise, the mean ratings along “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.26) and “Management of Learning” (4.25) are interpreted “Very Satisfactory.” The obtained average mean rating of the faculty members of the college is 4.26 interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

College of Engineering. The table reveals that the faculty members of the college obtain the highest mean along “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.28) while lowest along “Management of Learning” (4.02). The areas along “Commitment to his/her profession” (4.25) and “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.12) have mean ratings considered as “Very Satisfactory”. The average mean rating of the college is 4.17 (Very Satisfactory.”

College of Hospitality and Tourism Management. The faculty members of the college obtain their highest mean rating along “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.12) and lowest along “Management of Learning” (3.99). In the other two areas “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” and “Teaching for Independent Learning obtain a mean rating of 4.08 and 4.04 respectively. The mean ratings of the faculty members of the college are all interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” Likewise, the average mean of the college of 4.06 is also interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

College of Nursing and School of Midwifery. The mean ratings of the faculty members of the college are all interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” Their highest mean of 4.40 is along “Commitment to his/her Profession” while they obtain the lowest rating along “Management of Learning.” The mean rating along “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” and “Teaching for Independent Learning” is 4.37 and 4.27 respectively. The average mean performance of the college is 4.32 interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

College of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts. The faculty members of the college are rated the highest along “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.53) which is interpreted as “Outstanding” and lowest along “Management of Learning” (4.44) interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” The mean ratings in the two other areas along “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.46) and “Teaching for Independent Learning (4.45) are also interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” The overall mean rating of the college is 4.47 (Very Satisfactory).

Table 4. Classroom Performance of the Faculty Members Along the Areas of Evaluation According to the College Where Teaching

Areas of Evaluation	College Where Teaching						Average Mean
	CBA	CCJE	COE	CHTM	CNSM	CTELA	
Commitment to his/her Profession	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.12	4.40	4.46	4.33
Knowledge of the Subject Matter	4.41	4.38	4.28	4.08	4.37	4.53	4.34
Teaching for Independent Learning	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.27
Management of Learning	4.46	4.25	4.02	3.99	4.24	4.44	4.23

Overall Average Mean	4.47	4.28	4.17	4.06	4.32	4.47	4.30
----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Legend:

CBA-College of Business Administration

CCJE-College of Criminal Justice Education

COE-College of Engineering

CHTM-College of Hospitality and Tourism Management

CNSM-College of Nursing and School of Midwifery

CTELA-College of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts

Comparing the mean performance of the faculty members of the colleges, CTELA and CBA share an equal rank of 1.5; CNSM ranks third; CCJE ranks fourth; COE ranks fifth; and CHTM rank sixth.

On the four areas of performance evaluation, “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” has the highest average mean of 4.34, followed by “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.33), “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.27) and the lowest is “Management of Learning” (4.23). However, all the obtained average mean ratings of the faculty members in these said areas taking into consideration the college where they are teaching are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

The overall average mean performance of the faculty members is 4.30 interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” This could mean that the students have high level of satisfaction on the classroom performance of the faculty members of Baguio Central University.

Classroom Performance Evaluation of the Faculty Members by Educational Qualification

Table 5 shows the classroom performance evaluation of the faculty members along the areas of evaluation according to educational qualification.

Bachelor’s Degree. Among the four areas of evaluation, those faculty members who are holders of bachelor’s degree have the highest mean rating of 4.46 along “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” and the lowest along “Management of Learning” with a mean rating of 4.30. However, all the mean ratings in the areas of evaluation are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” The average mean performance of the group is 4.36 classified as “Very Satisfactory.”

Master’s Degree. The group is evaluated highest along “Commitment to his/her Profession” with a mean rating 4.37 followed by “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.33), “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.28) and lowest along “Management of Learning” (4.24). The mean ratings in the four areas are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” Likewise, the average mean performance of the group is 4.30 (Very Satisfactory).

Doctorate Degree. Among the doctorate degree holders, their obtained mean performance are ranked accordingly: highest, “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.44); second, “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.41); third “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.36); and lowest, “Management of Learning” (4.33). The obtained mean ratings as well as the average mean performance of the group (4.39) are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

Table 5. Classroom Performance of the Faculty Members By Educational Qualification

Areas of Evaluation	Educational Qualification			Average Mean
	BS	MA	DOC	
Commitment to his/her Profession	4.36	4.37	4.41	4.37
Knowledge of the Subject Matter	4.46	4.33	4.44	4.41
Teaching for Independent Learning	4.33	4.28	4.36	4.32
Management of Learning	4.30	4.24	4.33	4.29
Overall Average Mean	4.36	4.30	4.39	4.35

Legend:

BS-Bachelor’s Degree

MA-Master’s Degree

DOC-Doctorate Degree

Based on their average mean performance, it is evident that the doctorate degree holders obtain a higher mean performance (4.39) compared to that of the bachelor’s degree (4.36) and of the master’s degree (4.30).

Comparing their performance along the four areas of evaluation, ranked first is “Knowledge of Subject Matter” (4.44); second, “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.37); third, “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.32); and last, “Management of Learning” (4.29). The overall average mean performance of the group is 4.35 (Very Satisfactory).

The results imply that the students have high level of satisfaction in the classroom performance of the faculty members of the University when educational qualification is taken into consideration.

Quoting part of the Coleman Report in his article “In Schools, Teachers Quality Matters Most, Goldhaber (2023) mentioned that “there is less evident from research today that teachers’ educational background (having a master’s degree in particular) matters most to students.”

Classroom Performance of the Faculty Members By Years of Teaching Experience

Table 6 presents the classroom performance of the faculty members taking into consideration their years of teaching experience.

0 – 4 years. Ranked highest among the youngest group of faculty members is “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.29); second, “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.27); third, “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.20); and the lowest, “Management of Learning” (4.16). All the mean ratings obtained by the group are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.” Likewise, their average mean performance is 4.23 also interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

5 – 9 years. The mean ratings obtained by this group are ranked accordingly: first, “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.48); second “Management of Learning” (4.43); third, “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.42); and fourth, “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.40). The obtained average mean rating of the group is 4.43. All the obtained ratings and the average mean rating of the group are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

10 – 14 years. Ranked 1 among this group is “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (4.61); ranked 2.5 with equal mean rating of 4.50 are “Commitment to his/her Profession” and “Teaching for Independent Learning; and last is “Management of Learning” (4.47). All the obtained mean ratings are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory”. Likewise, the average mean rating of 4.52 is also interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

15 – 19 years. Going over the mean ratings obtained by this group shows that “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” has the highest mean of 4.47; followed by “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.46); “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.39); and last is “Management of Learning” (4.47). All the obtained mean ratings as well as the average mean rating of 4.42 are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

20 – 24 years. Noticeably, this group has the highest obtained mean ratings with their corresponding ranks: first, “Commitment to his/her Profession” (4.69); second, “Knowledge of the Subject Matter”, (4.63); third, “Teaching for Independent Learning” (4.61); and fourth, “Management of Learning” (4.60). However, all the obtained mean ratings including the group average mean of 4.63 are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

25 – Above years. As shown in the table, this group has the following obtained mean ratings: “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” (3.98); “Commitment to his/her Profession”; (3.82); “Teaching for Independent Learning” (3.65); and “Management of Learning” (3.64). All the mean ratings obtained by the group including their average mean of 3.77 are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

Going over the groups’ average mean ratings, it shows that those who are 20-24 years of teaching experience have the highest average mean rating (4.63); second, the 10-14 years group (4.52); third, the 5-9 years group(4.43); fourth, 15-19 years group (4.42); fifth, 0-4 years group (4.23); and sixth, 25-above years group (3.77). The overall average performance of the group when years of teaching experience is 4.33 interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

The above results are indicative that the college faculty members are perceived by the students to have high level satisfactory performance when years of teaching experience is taken into consideration.

Table 6. Classroom Performance of the Faculty Members According to Years of Teaching Experience

Areas of Evaluation	Years of Teaching Experience						Average Mean
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-Above	
Commitment to his/her Profession	4.27	4.40	4.50	4.46	4.69	3.82	4.36
Knowledge of the Subject Matter	4.29	4.48	4.61	4.47	4.63	3.98	4.41
Teaching for Independent Learning	4.20	4.42	4.50	4.39	4.61	3.65	4.30
Management of Learning	4.16	4.43	4.47	4.37	4.60	3.64	4.28
Overall Average Mean	4.23	4.43	4.52	4.42	4.63	3.77	4.33

Kini and Podolsky (2016) in their article entitled “Teaching Experience and Teaching Effectiveness” reviewed 30 studies within the last 15 years that analyzed the effect of teaching experience on outcomes in the United States. One of their findings was that “Teaching experience is positively associated with student achievement gains throughout a teacher’s career. Gains in teacher’s effectiveness associated with experience are steepest in teacher’s initial years but continue to be significant as teachers reach the second, and often third decades of their career.” The said authors further emphasized that “there is variation in teacher effectiveness at every stage of the teaching career, so not every inexperienced teacher is less effective, and every experience teacher is more effective.”

Classroom Practices of the Faculty Members Most Like and Most Unlike by the Students

The current study also looked into the classroom practices of the faculty members most like and most unlike by their students. These dominant classroom practices of the faculty members were quoted *verbatim* from the comments and suggestions by the students.

Table 7.1, on one hand, enumerates the classroom practices of the faculty members most like by the students. Gleaned from the said table, the enumerated classroom practices of the faculty members most like by the students are the top 10 ranked accordingly: Rank 1, “Good teacher/good in teaching”; Rank 2, “Excellent/outstanding teacher”; Rank 3, “Effective teaching strategies”; Rank 4, “Approachable and kind”; Rank 5, “Teacher is considerate and/or understanding and/or patient”; Rank 6.5, “Explains the lesson well” and “Inspires/ motivates students to become better”; Rank 8, “Relates subject to real-life situations”; Rank 9, “Knowledgeable in the subject being taught”; and Rank 10, “Boosts students confidence.”

Table 7.1. Classroom Practices of the Faculty Members Most Like by the Students

Classroom Practices Most Like by Students	Frequency
Approachable and kind	50
Effective teaching strategies	54
Teacher is considerate and or understanding/patient	45
Good teacher/good in teaching	89
Excellent/outstanding teacher	61
Explains the lesson well	38
Knowledge of the subject being taught	16
Boosts students confidence	10
Inspires/motivates students to become better	38
Relates subject to real-life situations	19

Table 7.2, on the other hand, enumerates the classroom practices of the faculty members most unlike by the students. The top 10 classroom practices of the faculty members most unlike by the students are hereby ranked accordingly: Rank 1, “Improve ways/strategies in teaching/explain more the lesson for better understanding”; Rank 2, “Late in coming to class”; Rank 3, “Improve examinations”; Rank 4, “Improve classroom management”; Rank 5, “Too fast in speaking and explaining the lesson”; Rank 6, Not considerate”; Rank 7, “Provide more activities or examples for students to understand more the topic/subject; Rank 8.5, “Absenteeism” and “Be more patient”; and Rank 10, “Displays or shows favoritism.”

Table 7.2. Classroom Practices of the Faculty Members Most Unlike by the Students

Classroom Practices Most Unlike by Students	Frequency
Displays/shows favoritism	12
Improve classroom management	20
Late in coming to class	28
Improve ways/strategies in teaching/explain more for better understanding	67
Too fast in speaking and explaining the lesson	18
Not considerate	16
Absenteeism	13

Provide more activities/examples for students to understand more the subject/topic	15
Be more patient	13
Improve examinations	21

In summary, the profile of the faculty members who were evaluated by the students shows that the College of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts has the most number of faculty members evaluated (33%), followed by the College of Nursing and School of Midwifery (27%). These two colleges have the most number of faculty members in the University. In terms of educational qualification, most of the evaluated faculty members are holders of master’s degree (42%); bachelor’s degree (31%); and doctorate degree (27%). By years of teaching experience, 50% comprise the 0-4 years; 20% are in the 15-19 years group and a lone faculty member (1%) is the 25-Above years.

In terms of classroom performance evaluation, the faculty members of the College of Teacher Education and Liberal Arts and the College of Business Administration have equal highest overall average mean (4.47); followed by the College of Nursing And School of Midwifery (4.32); College of Criminal Justice Education (4.28); College of Engineering ((4.17); and College of Hospitality and Tourism Management (4.06). By educational qualification, the holders of doctorate degree have the highest overall average performance (4.39); followed by the holders of bachelor’s degree (4.36) and holders of master’s degree (4.30). Taking into consideration the years of teaching experience, the top three groups in terms of overall average mean are: 1) 20-24 years (4.63); 2) 10-14 years (4.52); and 3)5-9 years (4.43). It can be noted that all the mean ratings as well as the overall average mean ratings obtained by the faculty members along the four areas of the evaluation specified in the performance evaluation instrument are interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

The computed mean ratings and the overall average performance obtained by the faculty along the four (4) areas of evaluation taking into consideration the college where teaching, educational qualification and years of teaching experience are diversified. However, it can be gleaned that based on the arbitrary ranges, such obtained average mean ratings and the overall average performance of the faculty are categorized only as very satisfactory and cannot be interpreted as outstanding performance.

The current study also presents the top 10 practices of the faculty members most like as well as the top 10 practices of the faculty members most unlike by the students. These practices are culled verbatim from the comments/suggestions of the students who evaluated them (faculty members).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted to assess the classroom performance evaluation of the faculty members of Baguio Central University. Specifically, it sought to answer the following queries: Profile of the faculty members in terms of gender, college where teaching, educational qualification, and years of teaching experience; Level of classroom performance of the faculty members along the four (4) areas of evaluation: 1) Commitment to his/her Profession, 2) Knowledge of the Subject Matter, 3)Teaching for Independent Learning, and 4)Management of Learning; and the dominant classroom practices of the faculty members most like and most unlike by the students.

The study revealed that the number of faculty members is an ample size as subjects of the study; the female faculty members outnumbered their male counterparts; the master’s degree holder have the highest share of faculty members evaluated and the youngest group in terms of years of experience have the highest number of faculty members evaluated.

In spite of the disparity of mean ratings obtained by the faculty members along the areas of evaluation, the

students who evaluated them demonstrate their high level of satisfaction on the classroom performance of the said faculty members.

In their comments and suggestions, the students have expressed what they like most and unlike most as far as classroom practices of faculty members are concerned.

Therefore, the Human Resource Development Office in the profile of the faculty members must include their: 1) employment status (fulltime-permanent, fulltime-probationary, part-time/contractual; 2) civil status (single, married). The faculty members of the Graduate School be included in the scope of the study. There is need for the faculty members of the University to obtain a much higher level of satisfaction from the side of the students. There must be a resolve on the part of the faculty members to sustain the good classroom practices appreciated and most like by the students and strive to improve on their classroom practices most unlike by the same.

REFERENCES

1. Ariola, M. (2006). Principles and Methods of Research. Manila: Rex Book Store
2. Bacon, W. (2018). Theory of Performance. <https://www.ipi.org/essay/Theories-of-Performance-Evaluation-FJXTGZKXU>
3. Danielson, C. (2018). The Handbook of Enhancing Professional Practice. Retrieved from <https://safetyculture.com/topics/teacher-evaluation>.
4. Galangco, R. (2015). The Teacher Evaluation Practices of Evaluators in University of Baguio. The Refereed Multidisciplinary and Scholarly Journal of the University of Baguio, 1 (1), 62.
5. Goldhaber, D. (2023). "In Schools, Teacher Quality Matters Most". Retrieved from educationnext.org/in-schools-teacher-quality-matters-most-coleman
6. Kini, T. & Podilsky, A. (2016). "Teaching Experience and Teacher Effectiveness". Retrieved from <https://www.aft.org/ae/fall2016/notebook>
7. Jackson, A. (2013). The Teacher Evaluation: An International Perspective. Retrieved from <https://blogs.edweek.org>.
8. Jeffrey, J. (2011). "Why Should Students Evaluate their Teachers?". www.huffingtonpost.com.html
9. Johnson, B. (2012). Should Students Evaluate their Teachers?. Retrieved from www.edutopia.org/blog/student-evaluation
10. Sawchuck, J. (2015). "The Teacher Evaluation: An Issue Overview". www.edweek.org
11. Teacher Assessment and Evaluation: The National Education Framework for Transforming Education. . .www.nea.org
12. The Room 241 Team (2012). "Students Evaluating their Teachers: What Educators Need to Know". <https://education.cu-portland.edu/blog>
13. Tumwebaze, P. (2013). "Should Students Be Allowed to Evaluate their Teachers?". <https://newtimes.co.rw>.