

# **The Implications of Online Faculty Evaluation by Students to PUP Branches and Campuses Faculty: Basis for Policy Review and Implementation**

**Jerielyn V. Reyes, DBA<sup>1</sup>, Arapia C. Ariraya, MC<sup>2</sup>, Reynaldo A. Guerzon, MC<sup>3</sup>**  
Polytechnic University of the Philippines  
jvreyes@pup.edu.ph<sup>1</sup>, acariraya@pup.edu.ph<sup>2</sup>, raguerzon@pup.edu.ph<sup>3</sup>

## **Abstract**

Any faculty evaluation by students is a good yardstick to measure how effective faculty in delivering classroom duties. The results from this exercise are expected to provide indexes that will guide policy makers and implementers if it is about time to revisit and reassess prevailing practices related to teaching performance. Thus, this study aims to determine the perception of the PUP faculty from branches and campuses about the student's online evaluation and investigate the implication of results to their performance as teachers in higher education institution. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to interpret data. The researchers utilized primary data through self-administered survey questionnaire and secondary data as well. Findings revealed that in general, the faculty find the criteria in four areas of evaluation namely: commitment, knowledge of the subject, teaching for independent learning and management of learning, acceptable. They agree with the rating scale and its equivalent description. The perceived delivery of faculty duties in four areas showed improvement. The faculty recognized that their personal and social development had improved. When respondents were grouped according to highest educational attainment, significant difference was observed on commitment area. Majority of the faculty felt that students do not fully understand the content of the evaluation instrument, and worst, they use it as an opportunity to get even with the professors they dislike. It is therefore recommended to simplify the statements in the instrument to make it more student-comprehensible. To further improve the performance of the faculty, deans and chairpersons may identify administrative concerns of their faculty and address areas that need training, retooling, mentoring, and other forms of intervention as they may see appropriate.

**Keywords:** Online Student Evaluation, Faculty Commitment, Knowledge of the Subject, Independent Learning, Learning Management

## INTRODUCTION

Effective teaching is paramount in preparing college learners to become productive and functional members of the society. To ensure that there is quality instruction in higher education institutions, regular faculty evaluation by the students is done to measure effectiveness of classroom teaching experience, improve performance, and document accountability. This serves as a form of summative and formative evaluation (Kelly, 2012). Taylor and Tyler (2012) acknowledged that a well-structured evaluation system could enhance teachers' effectiveness and that a performance evaluation can be an effective form of teachers' professional development. The focus should be on the development rather than a tool in rewards-and-punishment incentive scheme. It was suggested by Yew, Kanaki, Manickam, Jen, and Hoay (2015) that institution of learning has to develop its own instrument according to the institutional needs aligned with good practices in teaching and learning.

Students are capable of making valid and reliable judgements about classroom teaching performance given the fact that they have longer exposure to instructional experience. Coe, Aloisi, Higgins, and Major (2014) expressed that student ratings are valid, reliable, and cost-effective, relates to future achievement, valuable for teacher formative feedback, and require minimal training. They can do so if given accurate feedback, constructive ideas, and resource assistance. The performance reviews should be used for information and encouragement. According to O'Kell (2017) the best evaluations are those that identify problems where they exist, but also the ways and means of encouragement that can lead to improvement. Most teachers desire more from an evaluation system, according to Darling-Hammond (2014), who believes that teacher assessment should be viewed as a component of a teaching and learning system that fosters continuous improvement.

Being evaluated by students give educators mixed feelings. Students feedback can provide enormous help for teacher's self-awareness; insights on how to improve their teaching style. The evaluation could have a lasting impact to professors' personal and professional development. Student evaluation is no doubt had impact and made difference on teaching which is generally beneficial. Murray (2005) observed that over the past 30-40 years, college teaching has improved and is partly due to student evaluation. However, Stark and Freishtat (2014) also observed the same as pedagogical advancements could be suppressed by down grading the course content if teachers are motivated to receive high ratings from students. The possibility remains that student evaluation of teaching does cause grade inflation and lowering of academic standards.

Important decisions like merit reviews, tenure and promotions are based in part on these evaluations. Online faculty evaluation by the students is being used in the Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP) system and this study considered its Luzon branches and campuses. This evaluation by the students is intended to promote the quality of instruction; a part in the development of a culture of excellence. The evaluation of students makes up 30% of the overall Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) of the State Universities and Colleges' implementation of National Budget Circular No. 461 procedures, which is a crucial factor in assessing a faculty candidate's eligibility for a certain rank.

PUP adapted the NBC 416 Instruction areas which covers commitment, knowledge of the subject, teaching for independent learning and management of learning for the evaluation process. The commitment area pertains to a deep sense of responsibility in rendering service for the well-being of students as well as the advancement of the discipline. According to Mart (2013), teaching calls for dedication, which is essential for learners to succeed in maintaining their learning. While knowledge of subject gauges the expertise of the faculty within the chosen field or discipline. Coe et al (2014) attested that the most effective teachers have deep knowledge of the subjects they teach, and when teachers' knowledge falls below a certain level it is a significant impediment to students learning.

Moreover, the teaching for independent learning has to do with enabling students to maximize their learning potentials and Alsharif and Qi (2014) found out that the instructor's enthusiasm has very high correlation with student intrinsic motivation and vitality. With this, the desire to learn can be infectious which is beneficial for all the learners. Equally important is the management of learning where a faculty member succeeds in creating a conducive learning environment while guiding, monitoring, and evaluating student learning. Merillat's and Scheibmeir's (2016) analysis showed a positive correlation between an instructor's desire to learn more about teaching and learning best practices and students' perception of progress toward objectives, excellence of teacher, and the overall course score.

It takes a lot of effort to become effective teacher. Chianese (2015) emphasized that teachers must not lose their enthusiasm and they need to assess their learning instrument and methodologies could help them in their professional development. Buskist, Keeley, and Irons (2006) implied that those faculty who are taking teaching seriously are very reflective on how they can become more effective teacher leading them to improve teaching practices and student learning.

In the assessment of performance, the study is anchored in the Self-Determination Theory initially developed by Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan. Self-Determination Theory or simply SDT states that humans have inherent growth tendencies as seen in their consistent effort, agency and commitment (Deci & Ryan 2012). The social and cultural factors could facilitate or undermine the quality of performance with sense of volition and initiative. The three innate needs: competence, relatedness, and autonomy when satisfied will motivate an individual to perform at the optimal function and growth but when thwarted within social context will have a devastating impact. It would seem that evaluation is an apparent means of guiding the instructors towards professional development and improvement, as Iliya and Ifeoma (2015) acknowledged that recognition and feedback were significant motivators for teachers. Evaluation provides feedback and recognition that motivates teachers to improve and grow in their profession. Therefore, a meaningful evaluation should be used to uplift the intrinsic needs of faculty, thereby, motivating them to improve their discipline.

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

In this paper, the researchers aim to determine the perception of PUP faculty from branches and campuses about the student's online faculty evaluation and investigate the effect of the result of the evaluation to their teaching improvement. It tests the significant difference on improvement according to profile of the faculty and the significance of the factors that affect their performance as well as their personal assessment for improvement.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This study used descriptive research method designed to gather information from the faculty of PUP branches and campuses on their perception about the students' online faculty evaluation and its impact to their performance. Inferential statistics was also used to interpret data. It utilized non-probability sampling through convenience sampling technique where availability of respondents was considered.

The researchers surveyed 218 faculty members from the 12 PUP branches and campuses that are currently using online faculty evaluation. Ten (10) from Bansud, 24 from Bataan, 10 from Cabiao, 25 from Lopez, 13 from Paranaque, 12 from Pulilan, 16 from Quezon City, 20 from Ragay, 12 from Sablayan, 21 from Sta. Rosa, 26 from Sto. Tomas, and 29 from Taguig. All faculty respondents were considered regardless of status, rank, position and designation.

To obtain primary data, the researchers formulated an instrument utilized for the study. The research instrument underwent several revisions and was validated by experts in education and in guidance and counselling disciplines. It was pre-tested to 30 respondents from the main campus and had been through Cronbach's alpha reliability test that obtained .095 alpha coefficient result which means higher level of internal consistency of the items in the instrument.

The survey instrument contained three parts. The first part was the respondent's profile where checklists were provided. The second part has five (5) items on the agreement on the acceptability of rating bracket and its descriptors, same with applicability of the content of evaluation instrument to the discipline the respondents teach. The improvement on teaching has seven (7) items, while knowledge of subject and teaching for independent learning both have five (5) items, while management of learning has four (4). The third part which is on the improvement on personal development has seven (7) and social development has three (3) items.

The five (5) point Likert scale was used to measure the agreement or disagreement of the respondents' answer to different variables. The second part is the acceptability of the student evaluation instrument in the personal assessment of the faculty. The third part is the determination of implication of faculty evaluation. The total of 41 items for the assessment part.

The study also solicited opinion through the open-ended questions in the survey instrument regarding the evaluation process and comments on the items that need inclusion or deletion.

The gathered data were computed and analyzed using three statistical methods: (1) Frequency and Percentage, (2) Weighted Mean, (3) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The faculty demographic profile revealed that there was almost equal representation between male (45.87%) and female (51.83%) academic staff from PUP branches and campuses and is dominated by married faculty members (57.34%). Their ages range between 31-40 years old (32.57%) which means that the pool of faculty are considered young and idealistic. The demographic profile of the faculty from PUP branches and campuses could mean that they have the ideal set of academic staff based on demographic characteristics that could greatly impact the performance of their students.

The faculty academic background showed that members from PUP branches and campuses are primarily with part-time status and instructor rank. Thirty-three 33% (n = 72) have been faculty for 5-10 years, a young group, considering that most of the campuses were established barely a couple of years ago. Majority of the faculty, 54.13% (n = 118) belong to purely faculty designation, and 34.4% (n = 75) have been in their current position for 2-5 years.

The influx of students to state colleges and universities and the placement of faculty members to administrative positions compelled the institutions to hire faculty through contracts, job orders and emergency instructor on a part-time basis.

With regard the highest educational attainment, 43.12 % (n = 94) of the faculty have Master's units and only 28.90% (n = 63) completed Master's degree. The finding shows that most of faculty from the PUP branches and campuses are pursuing master's degree while teaching to justify their presence in the academe. Only 9.63% (n = 21) has doctoral units; 8.26% (n = 18) finished doctoral degree while 8.26% (n = 18) has bachelor's degree only. A small percentage, 1.83% (n = 4) has no response.

**Table 1**  
Agreement on the Acceptability of Rating Bracket and its Descriptor

Appropriateness of rating used	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Outstanding is equivalent to above 91-100%	4.38	Highly Acceptable
Very Satisfactory is equivalent to above 71-90.99%	4.17	Acceptable
Satisfactory is equivalent to 51-70.99%	4.16	Acceptable
Fair is equivalent to above 31-50.99%	4.23	Acceptable
Poor is equivalent to 20-30.99%	4.22	Acceptable
Overall Weighted Mean	4.23	Acceptable

Table 1 shows the agreement or disagreement on the acceptability of the content of faculty evaluation as to the rating scale and its equivalent description and all the items in the four areas of evaluation. It revealed that outstanding bracket of 91-100% was highly acceptable for faculty with a WM of 4.38, while all the other category was deemed acceptable with WM of 4.17. Highly acceptable is with WM of 4.3 to 5; acceptable WM of 3.5 to 4.2; somewhat acceptable, WM

of 2.7 to 3.4; least acceptable 1.9 to 2.6, and not acceptable with WM of 1 to 1.8. The overall WM for the appropriateness of the bracket of the ratings is 4.23. The respondents agreed that the contents of all the four areas in the evaluation instruments are acceptable with an overall WM of 4.23.

**Table 2**  
Applicability of the Content of Evaluation Instrument to the Discipline

Areas	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Commitment	4.42	Highly Applicable
Knowledge of subject	4.56	Highly Applicable
Teaching for independent learning	4.56	Highly Applicable
Management of learning	4.42	Highly Applicable
Overall Weighted Mean	4.49	Highly Applicable

Table 2 shows the applicability of the content of evaluation instrument to the discipline. The commitment area garnered an overall WM of 4.42, knowledge of the subject area yielded an overall WM of 4.56, teaching for independent learning had an overall WM of 4.52, and the management of learning yielded, with WM 4.35. All were verbally interpreted as highly acceptable.

This generally showed that faculty from PUP branches and campuses find the evaluation tool applicable to their discipline or the subjects they are teaching. The agreement of the faculty with the survey instrument indicated that there is no question with the rating and the content in the evaluation.

This clearly manifests that adapting NBC 461 of instruction is a sound decision for PUP administration. These four areas which are determined in NBC 461 are generally applicable to all disciplines in the higher education. These four areas in instruction are what deliver academic excellence which are common to any discipline in the higher education.

On the other hand, faculty respondents said that online evaluation is good in evaluating the competencies of professors if students utilize it judiciously. They felt that many students do not understand the evaluation and the meaning of its contents. Additionally, students seem not to fully understand the questions nor the statements in the instrument. They said that the evaluation instrument is good and well-studied but there should be actions after the data were collected, analyzed, evaluated, and published.

The validity of the process is dependent on how faculty perceived the properties of the evaluation process because motivation to improve will come from the confidence on the system. Moreover, the work of Taylor and Tyler (2012) suggested that well-structured evaluation systems can not only serve the sorting purpose but can also enhance education through improvements in teacher effectiveness. Performance evaluation can be an effective form of teacher professional development.

**Table 3**  
Online Student Evaluation Improvement on Teaching

Areas of Teaching	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>COMMITMENT</b>		
Faculty evaluation results help me become sensitive to students' abilities	4.18	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results make me available for students	4.14	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results motivate me to regularly come to class	4.11	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results make me conscious of my grooming	4.05	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results inspire me to have well-prepared lessons	4.17	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results impel me to keep accurate records of students	4.16	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results prompt me to submit documents on time	4.14	Had improved
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>Had improved</b>
<b>KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT</b>		
Faculty evaluation results encourage me to master my subject	4.2	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results inspire me to draw and share information on the state-of-the-art theories and practices	4.15	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results interest me to integrate subject into practical circumstances	4.15	Had improved



Areas of Teaching	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Faculty evaluation results guide me to have a clear learning intent; relate topics to relevant current issues	4.17	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results help me demonstrate up to date knowledge.	4.18	Had improved
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>Had improved</b>
<b>TEACHING FOR INDEPENDENT LEARNING</b>		
Faculty evaluation results enhance my strategies for interactive discussion	4.15	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results help me recognize students' performance	4.11	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results enrich my approach in making students accountable to their performance	4.13	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results increase my intent to level up students learning potentials	4.11	Had improved
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>Had improved</b>
<b>MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING</b>		
Faculty evaluation results inspire me to design and implement better learning condition for healthy exchange and confrontations	4.11	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results help me expand creating opportunities for intensive and extensive contribution of students in the class activities	4.08	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results help me develop a better structure/re-structures learning and teaching context to attain collective learning objectives	4.09	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results move me to use exceptional instructional materials to reinforce learning process.	4.03	Had improved
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>Had improved</b>

Table 3 reveals how the result of student evaluation improved instruction and commitment, knowledge of subject, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning of faculty.

The overall weighted mean of 4.13 indicated that the commitment of faculty improved. Being sensitive to student's ability had the highest weighted mean of 4.18 while being conscious of grooming had the lowest at 4.05 WM. Having well prepared lesson got 4.17 WM, keeping accurate record, 4.16 WM; availability to student and prompt submission both yielded 4.14 WM, and coming to class regularly with 4.11 WM. The result of evaluation and feedback from students make the teachers more conscious about their commitment to the students. Mart (2013) also made the same observation that the commitment of teachers makes effective contribution to students' performance and achievements. A committed teacher always makes every effort to advance student's professional competence by providing them a quality learning environment and endeavors their students to be well-educated in their community.

In terms of knowledge of the subject, it yielded an overall weighted mean of 4.17. Mastery of the subject had the highest weighted mean of 4.20. All the other variables gained almost similar weighted mean with had improved verbal interpretation. This practically shows that evaluation inspires the faculty to upgrade their scholastic abilities and level up the discipline; expertise that could improve students' academic performance. It is evident in the study of Coe et al (2014) that content knowledge in a model of teaching effectiveness has a strong impact at least in curriculum areas such as math, literacy, and science on student outcomes. The most effective teachers have deep knowledge of the subjects they teach, and when teachers' knowledge falls below a certain level it is a significant impediment to students' learning.

As a result of evaluation, instruction for more independent learning improved with an overall weighted mean of 4.13. Enhancing the strategies for interactive discussions got the highest weighted mean of 4.15. Enriching the approach in making students accountable for their performance had 4.13 WM, while recognizing student's performance and the desire to encourage students to learn more than what is required, both yielded 4.11 WM. This may mean that student evaluation had influenced the faculty to improve their ability in organizing teaching-learning processes that could enhance the learning potentials of students.

It also shows how instruction improved the faculty's management of student learning. The faculty recognized that instruction toward management of student learning had improved with an overall weighted mean of 4.08. Designing and implementing better learning condition for healthy exchange and confrontations garnered the highest weighted mean of 4.11. Structuring or re- structuring learning and teaching context to attain collective learning objectives had WM 4.09, while

creating opportunities for intensive and extensive contributions of students in class activities got WM 4.08. Using exceptional instructional materials to reinforce learning process got the lowest WM of 4.08. It could be deduced from the findings that student evaluation imbued the faculty to improve instruction and provide opportunities for an engaging learning environment.

The faculty from PUP branches and campuses expressed their thoughts and opinions about student's online evaluation. Faculty recognized that student's online evaluation helped them improve and enhance their teaching methods which is necessary for their professional growth.

Evaluation is good if students speak the truth, but it is terrible if not. Many expressed disappointment that students do evaluation subjectively. Some said that evaluation is not accurate in determining the actual performance of faculty members because most students are not matured enough, especially when they are driven by their emotions. Skedsmo and Huber (2018) made the case that mismatches between the data offered by present teacher evaluation models and the kind of feedback teachers require to enhance their practices call for stronger teacher voices and engagement in the redesign of teacher evaluation systems as well as the use of data to boost the relevance of these systems for improving practice. Similar to this, the fundamental problem with an evaluation system, particularly end-of-semester evaluations, is that while the benefits to teachers, departments, and institutions are evident, those benefits to students are less evident, according to Alvero (2019).

There were faculty who said that the evaluation was being used by abusive students to discredit and take revenge on their professors; unfair for faculty who are doing their job whole-heartedly. Such becomes an opportunity to disrespect them thereby demoralizing the teachers. According to Santoro (2011) demoralization can lead to feeling depressed, discouraged, shameful, and hopeless. In her closer analysis, demoralization is more apt term for some experienced educators who feel that they can no longer do good work. Evaluation has a noble intention, but it does not separate truthful response from vindictive and ill-motive answer.

Additionally, there were good teachers who do not receive good rating when a professor failed the students who do not qualify the course requirements and not because of teacher factor. Also, receiving an evaluation from the students who are frequently absent is also unfair. According to Stroebe (2016), grading leniency offers substantial incentives for instructors to teach in ways that would result in positive student ratings since many instructors believe that the average student favors courses that are entertaining, take little work, and result in high

grades, thus they feel under pressure to conform to those expectations. The same observation from the study of Carrell and West (2010) was found that students reward professors who increase achievement in contemporaneous course but not with professors who deepen their learning.

Some faculty members sensed that students make fun of the evaluation and they didn't take it seriously. According to the respondents, there were students who did not read the contents and there were times when they let other students to do the evaluation for them. They didn't care of the results, too. Yew et al. (2015) said that student evaluation on teaching instruments will be useful and effective for educators depending on the quality of response of students especially if they understand the questions and answer them with honesty.

Another area of concern expressed by the respondents is the difficulty in getting an outstanding rating from those with large number of student evaluators and with too many subject loads. Faculty suggested that student must have a thorough orientation on the purpose of evaluation. They need to pledge before answering the evaluation instrument. They say that students must base their answer on facts and be objective rather than subjective. Students should be more decent in giving bold comments. It was also suggested to require students to write comments. The evaluation must be done with proper monitoring to ensure that only student account holder should do the evaluation. It was also recommended to simplify the content and infuse the OBE concepts in the evaluation instrument.

There are faculty who believed that moral values, behavior and interpersonal relations of the faculty be included in the evaluation instrument. It should also contain the impact of teachers' input on the development of learners. Attendance of the faculty on punctuality, tardiness and absenteeism were also asked to consider. There are faculty who felt that the use of state-of-the-art learning equipment should not be included in the content of evaluation given the fact that they are not available because of budget constraints. The use of technology is dependent upon the subject and there are subjects which are better taught without it.

**Table 4**  
Improvement on Personal and Social Development

Personal Development	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Evaluation results help me think of the specific areas of my academic strengths and weaknesses	4.21	Had improved
Evaluation results make me reflect on my lesson effectiveness, specific teaching strategies, and behaviors across different categories of students	4.15	Had improved
Evaluation results motivate me to develop a written growth and development plan	4.06	Had improved
Evaluation results inspire me to monitor my progress relative to the professional growth plan	4.06	Had improved
Evaluation results help me understand profoundly my teaching profession	4.13	Had improved
Evaluation results help me transform my attitude towards teaching profession	4.09	Had improved
Evaluation results allow me to change my perception about teaching practice	4.1	Had improved
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>Had improved</b>

Social Development	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Faculty evaluation results inspire me to mentor other teachers and share ideas and strategies	3.91	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results encourage me to adhere to school rules and regulations	4.02	Had improved
Faculty evaluation results influence me to participate in school initiatives.	4.01	Had improved
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>Had improved</b>

Table 4 shows the impact of evaluation results to faculty's personal growth and social development. The evaluation helped the faculty improve as a person with an overall WM of 4.11. The item on reflecting the specific areas of academic strengths and weaknesses gained 4.21 WM. The evaluation results also made the faculty more reflective on their effectiveness across varying students' characteristics with WM of 4.15. Likewise, the evaluation gave the faculty an-

depth understanding of the teaching profession with WM of 4.13; the perception of the faculty on teaching practice, WM of 4.10, as well as the attitude towards teaching with WM of 4.09. Both the motivation in developing written growth plan and monitoring progress relative to professional growth garnered 4.06 WM. The faculty had become more reflective on the effectiveness as a person and as a professional. Teachers who are taking their roles to the students seriously certainly would like to make themselves better in every aspect as the educator, particularly on their teaching practices so students could learn more from them (Buskist & Keejey, 2015). Teaching is a dynamic blend of performance art and science that is influenced in no small measure by the teacher’s personality, the student’s motivation, and institutional vagaries. Becoming a better teacher requires understanding how these factors interact and change over time and such comprehension seems most likely to be prompted by intentional and reflective evaluation and analysis.

Tables 3-4 shows how instruction areas, personal and social development of faculty improved. The study revealed that the performance of faculty had improved in all four areas of instruction. The evaluation made faculty more dedicated and responsible in rendering professional service to the students and the advancement of the discipline. This manifest that it inspires the faculty to upgrade their scholastic abilities and level up the discipline; expertise that could improve students’ academic performance. Student evaluation had influenced the faculty to improve their ability in organizing teaching-learning processes that could enhance the learning potentials of students. This imbued the faculty to improve instruction and provide opportunities for an engaging learning environment.

It could be gleaned that faculty took the result of evaluation seriously. The faculty became more reflective toward their effectiveness and efficiency as teacher. The results showed that evaluation had a positive impact on them and realized the formative purpose of evaluation.

**Table 5**  
Significant Different of Improvement as per Educational Attainment

Indicator	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean	F-value	p-value
Improvement on Commitment	With Bachelor’s Degree	4.35	2.485	0.045
	With Masters Units	4.25		
	With Master’s Degree	4.06		
	With Doctoral Units	3.74		
	With Doctoral Degree	4.17		

Indicator	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean	F-value	p-value
<b>Improvement on Knowledge of Subject</b>	With Bachelor's Degree	4.07	2.075	0.085
	With Masters Units	4.32		
	Master's Degree	4.1		
	With Doctoral Units	3.82		
	With Doctoral Degree	4.11		
<b>Improvement on Teaching for Independent Learning</b>	With Bachelor's Degree	3.99	1.757	0.139
	With Masters Units	4.28		
	With Master's Degree	4.07		
	With Doctoral Units	3.8		
	With Doctoral Degree	4.09		
<b>Improvement on Management of Learning</b>	With Bachelor's Degree	3.93	1.091	0.362
	With Masters Units	4.19		
	With Master's Degree	4.06		
	With Doctoral Units	3.83		
	With Doctoral Degree	3.98		
<b>Personal Development</b>	With Bachelor's Degree	4.01	1.917	0.109
	With Masters Units	4.24		
	With Master's Degree	4.14		
	With Doctoral Units	3.77		
	With Doctoral Degree	3.88		
<b>Social Development</b>	With Bachelor's Degree	3.93	0.727	0.574
	With Masters Units	4.06		
	With Master's Degree	3.99		
	With Doctoral Units	3.73		
	With Doctoral Degree	3.83		

Table 5 shows the significant difference on the level of improvement of faculty when grouped according to educational attainment, the p-value for impact on level of improvement p-value of.045 which is less than the assumed level of significance of.05. There is no significant evidence to conclude that improvement of faculty have no significant difference when respondents are grouped by highest educational attainment.

It could be deduced that the faculty evaluation by the students have no varying impact on improvement depending on the level of education of the faculty.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study revealed that generally the student evaluation instrument is applicable to the discipline they are teaching. It is evident in the findings that evaluation helped the faculty in their commitment, knowledge of subject, teaching for independent learning, management of learning as well the personal and social development. Although the evaluation made impact on them in terms of improvement in their profession but there are still much to do to realize the full potential on the improvement of the faculty. Dismays were also expressed about the evaluation particularly on the too much freedom of students to discredit their professors. The findings revealed the significant difference on improvement on commitment when respondents were grouped based on educational attainment.

Students should be trained to be more effective evaluators by affirming the purpose of evaluations. Students must learn how to provide meaningful feedback particularly on the written comments. Gathering as much written commentary from students would be useful in interpreting numerical data and more likely to pinpoint specific aspects of teaching that would be meritorious or would need improvement. As findings showed that faculty assessed themselves improved on personal level, the learning organization must also be introduced so that the institution would likewise benefit from these improvements.

It is also recommended to provide a development program for faculty on how to handle mean spirited or harshly critical student commentary. However, for comments with serious accusations, the dean or the chairperson must investigate the veracity in discreet manner and do reprimand if necessary. It is about time to simplify the instrument that students could understand the content and this would provide chance to use the OBE concept. It is recommended to have another study about evaluation on the perspective of students.



## REFERENCES

- Alsharif, N. Z., & Qi, Y. (2014). A three-year study of the impact of instructor attitude, enthusiasm, and teaching style on student learning in a medicinal chemistry course. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 78(7).
- Alvero, A. M., Mangiapanello, K., & Valad, J. (2019). The effects of incentives, instructor motivation and feedback strategies on faculty evaluation response rates in large and small class sizes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(4), 501-515.
- Buskist, W., Keeley, J., & Irons, J. (2006). Evaluating and improving your teaching. *Observer*, 19(4), 27-30.
- Buskist, W., & Keeley, J. (2015). Becoming an excellent teacher.
- Carrell, S. E., & West, J. E. (2010). Does professor quality matter? Evidence from random assignment of students to professors. *Journal of Political Economy*, 118(3), 409-432.
- Chianese, G. (2015). Developing and assessing teaching effectiveness. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 692-695.
- Coe, R., Aloisi, C., Higgins, S., & Major, L. E. (2014). What makes great teaching? review of the underpinning research.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). One piece of the whole: Teacher evaluation as part of a comprehensive system for teaching and learning. *American Educator*, 38(1), 4.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory.
- Iliya, A., & Ifeoma, L. G. (2015). Assessment of Teacher Motivation Approaches in the Less Developed Countries. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(22), 10-17.
- Kelly, M. (2012). *Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness: Considerations for Ontario universities*. Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities.
- Keeley, J. W., Ismail, E., & Buskist, W. (2016). Excellent teachers' perspectives on excellent teaching. *Teaching of Psyc*

- Mart, C. T. (2013). A passionate teacher: Teacher commitment and dedication to student learning. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 2(1), 437-442.
- Merillat, L., & Scheibmeir, M. (2016). Developing a quality improvement process to optimize faculty success. *Online Learning*, 20(3), 159-172.
- Murray, J., & Male, T. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: Evidence from the field. *Teaching and teacher education*, 21(2), 125-142.
- O’Kell, R. (2017, February 22). *The problem with annual performance evaluations*. University Affairs. <https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/problem-annual-performance-evaluations/>
- Santoro, D. A. (2011). Good teaching in difficult times: Demoralization in the pursuit of good work. *American Journal of Education*, 118(1), 1-23.
- Stark, P. B., & Freishtat, R. (2014). Sept 26. *An Evaluation of Course Evaluations*.
- Skedsmo, G., & Huber, S. G. (2018). Teacher evaluation: the need for valid measures and increased teacher involvement. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 30(1), 1-5.
- Stroebe, W. (2016). Why good teaching evaluations may reward bad teaching: On grade inflation and other unintended consequences of student evaluations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(6), 800-816.
- Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628-51.
- Yew, T. M., Jen, L. S., Dawood, F. K., & Hoay, K. C. (2018). Designing an instrument for providing better student feedback on teaching effectiveness. *MOJES: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 14-22.
- Stroebe, W. (2016). Why good teaching evaluations may reward bad teaching: On grade inflation and other unintended consequences of student evaluations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(6), 800-816.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Dr. Jerielyn V. Reyes** is the Chief for Marketing and Promotions in the Open University System Institute of Continuing Professional Development with concurrent position as Program Chair of the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration Major in Marketing Management. A thesis adviser to Master in Business Administration and Master in Communication students in OUS. Also, the GAD Coordinator in the OUS. A regular faculty member in the College of Communication for the program Bachelor in Advertising and Public Relations, a former chairperson of this program. Have published various researches in international and local peer reviewed journals. Likewise, presented research papers to international research conferences. An extentionist for the Open University System and the College of Communication. Earned the degrees Doctor in Business Administration and Master in Business Administration in PUP Graduate School and Bachelor in Advertising and Public Relations also in PUP.

**Reynaldo A. Guerzon** is currently a full-time faculty at PUP since 2012 under the Department of Advertising and Public Relations, College of Communication. Previously the Chairperson of the said department from 2013 to 2017. Prior to joining the academe, he was an advertising practitioner for almost 20 years. Worked as Media Research Analyst at McCann Erickson, Philippines, a multi-national, full-service advertising agency. Handled the accounts like UniLab, Johnson & Johnson, Nestle Phils., Gillette Phils, BPI, Del Monte and Cathay Pacific Airlines to mention a few. Currently, taking up Doctor of Philosophy in Communication (Phd Comm) at PUP Graduate School this semester. Earned a Master in Communication degree at PUP Open University last 2016. Also, graduated cum laude at PUP, Bachelor in Advertising and Public Relations.

**Arapia C. Ariraya** is an experienced Chairperson with a demonstrated history of working in the higher education industry. Skilled in Media Production Management, Communication Campaigns, Film Production, Corporate Communications, Broadcast Journalism. Strong media and communication professional with Juris Doctor units and a Master in Mass Communication focused in Communication, Media Laws and Ethics, Media Literacy and Media Studies from Polytechnic University of the Philippines.