

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2023, Vol. 4, No. 12, 4239 – 4243

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.12.07>

## Research Article

### Performance Evaluation Practices of Select Higher Education Institution in the City of Manila: Basis for Enhancing Faculty Performance

Ernell Bautista Gutierrez\*

Graduate School – Business Program, Emilio Aguinaldo College – Manila, Manila, Philippines, 1000

#### Article history:

Submission December 2023

Revised December 2023

Accepted December 2023

#### \*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

[ernell.gutierrez@eac.edu.ph](mailto:ernell.gutierrez@eac.edu.ph)

## ABSTRACT

Performance evaluation practices for faculty members has been an effective method to improve faculty performance, thus, educational institution must give paramount importance on ways to improve the performance of their faculty members. Indicated in the study of Mamatha, H et al (2021), higher education institutions being the major economic drivers in a nation rely on their faculty for quality of education. Traditional methods of performance evaluation based on quantitative data are more of a mathematical calculation than a scientific approach. The research sought answers to the effectiveness of evaluation practices in terms of student evaluation, peer evaluation and immediate superior evaluation as mechanism to enhance performance of faculty members. The research employed a quantitative-descriptive methodology and the main participants in the research are academic heads and faculty members. Results revealed that, the current evaluation practices of the select educational institution are effective as assessed by the participants. In terms of identifying differences, results revealed that between academic head and faculty members, there was no significant difference in the assessment about student evaluation, peer evaluation and immediate superior evaluation. On the other hand, when faculty members are categorized in terms of employment status, result revealed that their assessment differs on the three evaluation practices.

**Keywords:** *Immediate superior evaluation, Implementation, Instrument, Peer evaluation, Scheduling, Student evaluation, Utilization*

## Introduction

Faculty members as pillars of education must continuously improve their performance to ensure an effective delivery of quality education. Improving such performance, educational institution must establish as strong evaluation practices directly link with faculty

performance. As mentioned by Benosa, B & Oñate, J (2023), one of the essential ingredients in establishing trust in academic institutions among its stakeholders is the quality of its learning providers. Hence, it is imperative to continually adapt innovations to improve educators' evaluation process and deliver a reliable

#### How to cite:

Gutierrez, E. B. (2023). Performance Evaluation Practices of Select Higher Education Institution in the City of Manila: Basis for Enhancing Faculty Performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 4(12), 4239 – 4243. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.04.12.07

result for data-driven decision-making. Supported in the study of Patacsil, F et al (2022), evaluating faculty members' performance is a very complex area to study and predicting the performance of these faculty members is a very difficult and challenging task. Patacsil, F et al (2022) emphasized that the core of education is teaching and learning, and teaching-learning works to its fullest when there are effective teachers.

Thus, the study determined the perspective of participants about Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation in terms of its effectiveness in enhancing faculty performance.

## Methods

The study utilized a quantitative design which is descriptive in nature. Descriptively, the extent of effectiveness of Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation in improving individual faculty performance are assessed. For each domain, Instrument, Processes and Utilization are indicated and assessed. Lastly, differences on assessment among participants are determined and analysed.

## Sample and Sampling

One hundred and ten participants are utilized in the study through a random sampling technique. Specifically, fifty (50) heads and sixty (60) faculty members. Faculty members were also identified based on their employment status.

## Research Instrument

A self-made four-point scale instrument is used in the study with items specifically for Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation. Indicators from the three domains are subjected to reliability test by way of Cronbach Alpha and obtained the following coefficients 0.811, 0.829 and 0.801 respectively. Pearson correlation is also used and determined the validity of the items in the instrument and obtained a P-value of  $< 0.05$ , deemed valid. Likewise, participants were asked to answer the four-point scale instrument for Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation with the following interpretation:

3.51 – 4.00	Highly Effective
2.51 – 3.50	Effective
1.51 – 2.50	Somewhat Effective
1.00 – 1.50	Not Effective

## Result and Discussion

### Demographic Profile of the Participants

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Student's Profile

Position	f	%
Academic Heads	50	45
Faculty Members	60	55
Total	110	100
<b>Employment Status for Faculty</b>		
Permanent	35	58
Probationary/Contractual	25	42
Total	60	100

Majority of the participants are faculty members with permanent employment status in their respective institution.

### Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation

Results revealed that, the participant's overall assessment on Student Evaluation, Peer

Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation is Highly Effective as shown in Table 2 with overall mean values of 3.56, 3.62 and 3.60 respectively.

**Table 2. Summary of Assessment towards Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation**

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
Student Evaluation	3.56	Highly Effective
Peer Evaluation	3.62	Highly Effective
Immediate Superior Evaluation	3.60	Highly Effective

Legend: 4.00-3.51 Highly Effective 3.50-2.51 Effective, 2.50-1.51 Somewhat Effective, 1.50-1.00 Not Effective

Participants deemed that student evaluation, peer evaluation and immediate superior evaluation are effective in terms of improving faculty performance. For educational institution, as mentioned by Patacsil, F et al (2022), the core of education is teaching and learning, and teaching-learning works to its fullest when there are effective teachers. Thus, practices to

ensure improvement in faculty performance must be establish and likewise implemented. Evaluation practices plays a critical role in improving the performance of faculty members, regardless of the method and or practices, all evaluations are designed and can be used to improve performance.

**Table 3. Differences on Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation based on Position**

Indicators	Position	Mean	Sig-Value
Student Evaluation	Head	3.56	0.807
	Faculty	3.54	
Peer Evaluation	Head	3.52	0.811
	Faculty	3.60	
Immediate Superior Evaluation	Head	3.62	0.815
	Faculty	3.57	

\*\* Significant at alpha 0.05

Results revealed that, there are no significant differences in the assessment of participants towards Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation. Academic Heads and Faculty members expressed the same perspective in terms of effectiveness of the evaluation practices to improve faculty performance with P-value > 0.05 respectively for the three domains. Academic heads utilize

evaluation results to suggest ways to improve performance of faculty members. On the other hand, faculty members also used evaluation results as guide to determine areas for improvement. Thus, both considers that Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation as an effective practice for improving faculty members performance.

**Table 4. Differences on Student Evaluation, Peer Evaluation and Immediate Superior Evaluation based on Employment Status for Faculty Members**

Indicators	Position	Mean	Sig-Value
Student Evaluation	Permanent	3.34	0.048
	Probationary	3.56	
Peer Evaluation	Permanent	3.52	0.890
	Probationary	3.52	
Immediate Superior Evaluation	Permanent	3.57	0.711
	Probationary	3.59	

\*\* Significant at alpha 0.05

Results revealed that, for peer evaluation and immediate superior evaluation, participants expressed same assessment with P-value of  $>0.05$ . However, in terms of student evaluation, participant's assessment differ as indicated in the P-value of  $< 0.05$ . Most of the utilization on faculty evaluation are focused on the results and feedbacks of student evaluation, thus, for faculty members who are not yet permanent, they consider the effectiveness in terms of utilization as a significant area of performance evaluation in relation to their employment status.

## Conclusion

Performance evaluation practices plays a critical role in enhancing the individual performance of faculty members. The effective implementation of these practices is significant and should be given a paramount importance by educational institutions. The continuous improvement of evaluation practices is also a must since the need and demand of the aca-deme in terms of delivery of instructions are also continuously changing.

## Acknowledgement

The researcher would like to acknowledge Dr. Lino C. Reynoso, Dean of EAC Graduate School for his support and encouragement.

## References

Als Ghaffarian, S & Osam, Necdet (2021). A Study of Teacher Performance in English for Academic Purposes Course: Evaluating Efficinecy. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/21582440211050386>

Benosa, B & Oñate, J (2023). Design and Development of Faculty Evaluation System (FPES) v.20) <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/acp/article-abstract/2602/1/030020/2890978/Design-and-development-of-faculty-performance?redirectedFrom=fulltext>

Botaccio, LA, Rincon, AN, Ortega, JL, Fuentes, AR (2020). Evaluation for Teachers and Students in Higher Education. <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/10/4078>

Chirchir, KM & Lentangule, S (2021). The Influence of Teacher Performance Appraisal and Development Implementation on the Secondary Students' Examination Scores in Public Schools in Kenya. Volume 2, No.6. <https://ej-edu.org/index.php/ejedu/article/view/199>

Constantinou, C & Wijnen-Meijer, M (2020). Student Evaluations of Teaching and the development of a comprehensive measure of teaching effectiveness for medical schools. <https://bmcmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12909-022-03148-6>

Frederick F. Patacsil, Paulo V. Cenas, Bobby F. Roaring, Jennifer M. Parrone, and Daniel Bezalel A. Garcia (2022). Evaluating Pangasinan State University Faculty Performance Using Associative Rule Analysis. International Journal of Information and Education Technology, Vol. 12, No.1. <http://www.ijiet.org/vol12/1582-IJET-2959.pdf>

Lohman, Laura (2021). Evaluation of university teaching as sound performance appraisal. Volume 70. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191491X21000341>

Mamatha, HK, Sridhar, RM, Balasubramanian, S (2021). Multi-criteria Decision Analysis for Faculty Performance Evaluation in Higher Education Institution. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3822074](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3822074)

Patacsil F et al (2022). Evaluating Pangasinan State University Faculty Performance Using Associative Rule Analysis. <https://www.ijiet.org/show-165-1955-1.html>

Paudel, KP (2021). Level of Academic Performance among Faculty Members in the Context of Nepali Higher Educational Institution. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1294740.pdf>

Peck, C. A., Young, M. G., & Zhang, W. (2021). Using teaching performance assessments for program evaluation and improvement in teacher education. National Academy of Education Committee on Evaluating and

Improving Teacher Preparation Programs. National Academy of Education

Prieto, J, Guede-Cid, A, Cid-Cid, A, Leguey, S (2023). Major increases in teachers' performance evaluations: Evidence from student evaluation of teaching surveys. <https://tuningjournal.org/article/view/2299>

Shum, Simon, Lim, Lisa, Boud, David, Bearman, Margaret, Dawson, Philip (2023). A comparative analysis of the skilled use of automated feedback tools through the lens of teacher feedback literacy. <https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-023-00410-9>

Suparsa, IM, Seteni, M, Asih, D, Telagawathi, N (2021). Teacher Performance Evaluation through Knowledge Sharing and Technol-

ogy during the COVID 19 Pandemic. Volume 18. <https://webology.org/data-cms/articles/20220129094754pmWEB18168.pdf>

Yazdanparast A., Rahimi R, Khoshkholgh R, Marvi N. (2020). Evaluation of Professors' Performance in Online Teaching during Covid-19 Pandemic from the Perspective of Medical Students of Bushehr University of Medical Sciences, Iran. Med Edu Bull 2020; 2(1): 125-32. DOI:10.22034/MEB.2021.289691.1000

Zhao, Luying, Xu, Pei, Chen, Yusi, Yan, Shuangsheng (2022). A literature review of the research on students' evaluation of teaching in higher education. Volume 13. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1004487/full>