



BEST PRACTICES OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN REGION 02 ALONG FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: BASES FOR POLICY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT

DR. EDITHA MONTILLA MUHALLIN-Dean, School of Business Administration and
Governance University of Cagayan Valley Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines 3500

ABSTRACT: *Changed societal conditions make continuous faculty vitality essential not only to institutional success, but also to national welfare. Faculty development initiatives have changed in focus and form over time, as well as what themes and methods have persisted. The Faculty Development Program (FDP) is a critical factor to ensure quality education. It varies from institution to institution. Some institutions have their faculty development programs with an outline of goals and objectives in response to and for accreditation requirements. In this study, the researcher wanted to find out the best practices of private higher education institutions in region 02 along faculty development program as bases for policy review & development. The study used the descriptive method of research. It also employed qualitative approach in obtaining the needed data. The said method aimed to describe and present the best practices of the private higher education institutions in the region along faculty development program. The respondents of the study were the Vice Presidents or their representative of the 32 Private Higher Education Institutions of Region 02. Total enumeration was employed. The study utilized an interview guide that was constructed based on the objectives of the study focusing on the faculty development program of private higher education institutions in Region 02. This study made use of descriptive statistics in the analysis of data. The frequency, percentage counts and rank distribution were used in the analysis of the profile of private higher education institutions in Region 2, status of faculty development programs of private higher education institutions, issues and problems encountered in the implementation of faculty development programs and the best practices of higher education institutions along development program. The weighted mean was used in the analysis of the extent of implementation of the faculty development programs among private higher education institutions in improving quality education. Basing on the findings, the researcher concludes that all private higher learning institutions have their faculty development program in place, but their manner of*



implementation varies. The autonomous institutions implement well their faculty development, but not so much with non-autonomous institutions with accredited programs. As to non-autonomous institutions without accredited programs, implementation is to a very limited extent. As to best practices, the respondent higher learning institutions have diverse practices which means they have their own best practices depending upon the capacity of their respective institutions. As influenced by the conclusions, the researcher recommends that the management should involve faculty members in planning and decision-making, especially on setting the direction towards which the institution is going so that faculty members give personal commitment for all plans and actions of the institutions and should allow other institutions to benchmark and share their other best practices.

KEYWORDS: best practices, faculty development, policy review, policy development, incentives, CMO 40, financial assistance, seminars, trainings, accreditation

INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Development Program (FDP) is a critical factor to ensure quality education. It varies from institution to institution. Some institutions have their faculty development programs with an outline of goals and objectives in response to and for accreditation requirements. Others promote improvement through helping individuals to evolve, unfold, mature, grow, cultivate, produce, and develop themselves as individuals and as contributors to the institution's mission while some others facilitate the professional, personal, organizational, and instructional growth of faculty members. Institutions have made faculty development as an integral part of their on-going activities and placed faculty development in the center.

CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) 40, s. 2008 which requires all higher education institutions (HEIs) faculty to have finished at least a master's degree has been in order for strict implementation since School Year 2011-2012. Hence, there is a need to encourage and provide assistance to HEIs to enable them meet in full compliance this CMO requirement.



More than 50% or 70,000 higher education institution's (HEIs) faculty need to upgrade their qualifications and competencies through going back to school and attending seminars and trainings and other related means of upgrading competencies and skills in order to improve the quality of teaching in HEIs. The vast majority of students in higher education are being taught by faculty who possess no more than the level of qualification they finished in College. Low teacher qualification inevitably leads to low standards of learning achievement among students.

In view of the faculty's vital role in influencing education outcomes, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) requires that teachers at higher education institutions must have at least a master's degree in the fields in which they teach. Faculty members are the most important factor in achieving these goals since they are responsible for implementing the tasks directly associated with goals. In building the strong foundation of an educational system, colleges and universities have been sufficiently alert to the ever-changing circumstances of their instructional staffs and adequately resourceful in meeting their changing needs for professional development. Faculty development has always surfaced as a priority concern since academic institutions need effective faculty members in order to enhance and maintain academic excellence (CMO)# 40, s. 2008.

Institutions that have made faculty development an integral part of their on-going activities usually place the faculty development in a center that provides services to the institution as a whole. As such, it is directed by the institution and is staffed by professional in various aspects of teaching and learning. An institution where faculty development is more of an ad hoc process, faculty development activities may be provided by a staff from a variety of departments and programs, sometimes coordinated through an academic service office, sometimes coordinated with staff development programs. The most wide-ranging and successful programs are free-standing and dedicated specifically to on-going faculty development.

The faculty development program provides interim state assistance to both attract distinguished faculty from throughout the world to New York's academic research centers



and retain leading researchers already working in institutions of higher education in New York. Top scientists and scholars are more successful in acquiring financial support for research and draw the best junior research and graduate students to New York's research institutions, and research conducted by top light scientists generates the greatest interest from the business and investment communities (New York Institute of Higher Education, 2006).

Changed societal conditions make continuous faculty vitality essential not only to institutional success, but also to national welfare. Faculty development initiatives have changed in focus and form over time, as well as what themes and methods have persisted. The key steps undergirding any successful faculty development program, offering more detailed guidance on two steps in particular (1) assessing faculty and institutional vitality needs, using either a broad or targeted assessment approach; and (2) tailoring faculty development strategies to best meet the specialized needs of specific faculty groups, using case examples of new, midcareer, and senior faculty. Guidelines for designing and maintaining an institutional office for faculty development that can support and coordinate department-level initiatives are designed in the end (Faculty Development Programs, Carole J. Bland and Kelly R. Risbey, 2006)

A faculty development plan should ensure that everyone involved with an institution clearly understands the role of teaching and learning at that institution. It should also set goals for teaching and learning and describe strategies for meeting those goals. The goals evolve directly from the mission-vision statement. The strategies, then, are specific, clearly defined approaches to meeting those goals in ways that guide future professional development activities for faculty (NYARC 2006).

Faculties receiving funding from this program are expected to develop, define and conduct nationally and internationally recognized research with strong commercial potential; act as the focal point for multi-disciplinary research teams in the institution; attract additional external funding from federal foundation and other public. (Allyn & Bacon, 2005).



As distance education practice continues to evolve, so do the needs for effective faculty development practices (Jugdev, Kam, 2008). Faculty development needs can be somewhat unique in distance education. Faculty concerns relate to centralized service delivery, technology, course development, time concerns over the lack of autonomy, a sense of isolation and feeling overworked. Such issues, if not addressed or clarified in the context of how distance education courses are delivered, can further isolate and dislocate faculty. In light of these challenges, there is a need to assess the university's faculty development needs.

According to Debra de Rosa, Ph.D., and Deborah Simpson (2005), faculty development is critical for meeting accreditation requirements, helping teachers succeed as facilitators of effective learning, enabling faculty members to pursue teaching as scholarship and ongoing quality improvement of the clerkship, and establishing a professional development plan for faculty members' continuous growth as teachers and educators.

The study investigated the culture of excellence of six top performing private higher education institutions in Northern Mindanao. These are the conclusions of the study: the culture of excellence is largely a function of efficient and effective quality assurance management systems such as voluntary accreditation and international certification. The external evaluation in the quality assurance audits promotes the achievement of comparable standards with the best practices in the Philippines and abroad. Some accredited schools have acquired ISO certification, a move that enhances the quality assurance management system. The schools' culture of excellence generates the intended teaching and learning outcomes manifested through integral development of graduates, high performance in licensure examinations, high employability, and global competitiveness. The efficiency and effectiveness of the governance and management of the schools have an overriding influence on the quality of teaching and research. Generating higher research productivity among the faculty, fund sourcing from partnership and entrepreneurial activities that generate non-tuition revenues remain the serious challenges of the school management



The study conducted by Corazon Gregorio (2008) described the impact of internal faculty development program seminars on teaching effectiveness of the teachers of Technological Institute of the Philippines Manila. It assessed the internal faculty development program seminars, resource-person related factors and level of effectiveness of the teachers before and after internal faculty development program seminars. It also attempted to determine the significant difference that exists between the level of effectiveness of the teachers before and after attending the internal faculty development program seminars. Six areas were considered in the assessment of the levels of the teaching effectiveness of the teachers of TIP Manila before and after the internal FDP seminars. Findings showed that the internal faculty development program seminars applicability, content, relevance, and objectivity were found to be excellent based on the computed mean. However, with respect to the internal faculty development program, seminar's duration was very good. Furthermore, findings showed that the level of effectiveness of the teachers as indicated in their performance ratings were found to be very good after attending the internal FDP seminars. It can be inferred that the internal FDP seminars are truly effective means in enhancing the teacher's effectiveness. In conclusion, there is a significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teachers before and after attending internal FDP seminars.

Faced with the challenge of delivering quality service to end-users, organizations are forced to come up with measures how to beat the challenge. In this case, venturing into development and training is seen as a promising step.

The faculty members are the most important resources of any higher educational institution. As such, faculty development must be considered essential element in nurturing and supporting this invaluable resource. By enabling faculty members to meet individual goals as teachers, scholars and leaders, the broader goals and missions of the educational institution are also met. While the responsibility for such development falls largely on the individual. Institutional leaders also bear the moral and professional responsibility to foster the growth of those faculty members they have recruited and hired.



In Region 02, Private Higher Education Institutions saw the need for faculty at the tertiary level to have at least a master's or doctoral degree in the field in which they teach to improve their qualifications and teaching methods for better learning which in turn would translate into higher passing rate in professional licensure examinations and greater productivity of graduates. It is along this line where the researcher realized the need to look into the faculty development program of higher education institutions in Region 02 and their best practices as she believes that such is necessary pre-requisite for policy review and development. Hence, this study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In this study, the researcher wanted to find out the best practices of private higher education institutions in region 02 along faculty development program as bases for policy review & development. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of Private Higher Education Institutions in Region 02 in the following classifications:

- 1.1 Autonomous
- 1.2 Non-Autonomous with Accredited Programs
- 1.3 Non-Autonomous without Accredited Program

2. What is the status of the Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Education Institutions in Region 02 in terms of:

2.1 Staff development

2.1.1 Sends faculty to training and seminars

- International
- National
- Regional
- Local

2.1.2 Assists faculty in their professional growth and Development. Faculty members are allowed to:



- act as consultants
- act as accreditors
- be speakers or lecturers
- act as project proponents
- act as organizers
- be module writers
- to go as faculty exchange

Organizational Development

Compliance to government requirements

Vertical articulation

Accreditation

Provision of support like

Benchmarking

Faculty exchange

Developing trust for faculty development

Membership in professional organizations

Officership

Building linkages

Networking, cooperatives, and faculty clubs

3. To what extent is the effect of faculty development program to quality education?

4. What are the issues and problems encountered in the implementation of Faculty Development Program along:

4.1. Financial Concerns

4.1.1 Insufficient budget for the Faculty Development Program

4.1.2 No financial assistance from the Administration

4.1.3 Very expensive training fee

4.2 Personal concerns



- 4.2.1 Family problems
- 4.2.2 Attitude problems
- 4.2.3 Too old to go for further studies
- 4.2.4 Low morale
- 4.2.5 Hesitation to finish graduate studies
- 4.2.6 Younger ones do not want to be tied with the Institution
- 4.2.7 Not interested in training or seminar

4.3 Administrative concerns

- 4.3.1 Lack of support from the administration
- 4.3.2 Priority program is limited
- 4.3.3 The same people are sent to
seminars/trainings
- 4.3.4 Distance of trainings or seminars
- 4.3.5 No faculty development program

5. What are the best practices of higher education institutions of Region 02 in the implementation of faculty development program in the following classifications:

- 5.1 Financial Assistance
- 5.2 Moral Assistance
- 5.3 Technical Assistance

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used the descriptive method of research. It also employed qualitative approach in obtaining the needed data. The said method aimed to describe and present the best practices of the private higher education institutions in the region along faculty development program. The respondents of the study were the Vice Presidents or their representative of the 32 Private Higher Education Institutions of Region 02. Total enumeration was employed. The study utilized an interview guide that was constructed based on the objectives of the study focusing on the faculty development program of



private higher education institutions in Region 02. This study made use of descriptive statistics in the analysis of data. The frequency, percentage counts and rank distribution were used in the analysis of the profile of private higher education institutions in Region 2, status of faculty development programs of private higher education institutions, issues and problems encountered in the implementation of faculty development programs and the best practices of higher education institutions along development program.

The weighted mean was used in the analysis of the extent of implementation of the faculty development programs among private higher education institutions in improving quality education. To further interpret the weighted mean, the following criterion scale was used:

| Numerical Value | Mean Range | Descriptive Scale |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| 5 | 4.20-5.00 | Very much |
| 4 | 3.40-4.19 | Much |
| 3 | 2.60-3.39 | Moderate |
| 2 | 1.80-2.59 | Little |
| 1 | 1.00-1.79 | Very little |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

After thoroughly and painstakingly summarizing the data gathered from the interview guide, the researcher presents them to shed light to the problems of this study. The analysis and interpretation of data are presented following the interview guide.



Table 1: Profile of Private Higher Education Institutions in Region 02

| Indicator | Autonomous | Non-autonomous with accredited programs | Non-autonomous without accredited programs |
|----------------------|------------|---|--|
| 1. UNIVERSITY | | | |
| 1.1 Sectarian | | | |
| 1.1.1 School 1 | √ | | |
| 1.1.2 School 2 | √ | | |
| 1.1.3 School 3 | | √ | |
| 1.1.4 School 4 | √ | | |
| 1.2 Non-Sectarian | | | |
| 1.2.1 School 5 | | √ | |
| 1.2.2 School 6 | | √ | |
| 2. College | | | |
| 2.1 Sectarian | | | |
| 2.1.1 School 7 | | √ | |
| 2.1.2 School 8 | | √ | |
| 2.1.3 School 9 | | √ | |
| 2.1.4 School 10 | | | √ |
| 2.1.5 School 11 | | | √ |
| 2.1.6 School 12 | | | √ |
| 2.1.7 School 13 | | | √ |
| 2.1.8 School 14 | | √ | |
| 2.2 Non-Sectarian | | | |
| 2.2.1 School 15 | | √ | |
| 2.2.2 School 16 | | | √ |
| 2.2.3 School 17 | | √ | |
| 2.2.4 School 18 | | √ | |
| 2.2.5 School 19 | | | √ |
| 2.2.6 School 20 | | | √ |



| | | | |
|------------------|--|---|---|
| 2.2.7 School 21 | | | √ |
| 2.2.8 School 22 | | √ | |
| 2.2.9 School 23 | | | √ |
| 2.2.10 School 24 | | | √ |
| 2.2.11 School 25 | | | √ |
| 2.2.12 School 26 | | | √ |
| 2.2.13 School 27 | | | √ |
| 2.2.14 School 28 | | | √ |
| 2.2.15 School 29 | | | √ |
| 2.2.16 School 30 | | | √ |
| 2.2.17 School 31 | | | √ |
| 2.2.18 School 32 | | | √ |

As disclosed by the above data, there were 32 private higher education institutions as respondents where six (6) are classified as universities while twenty-six (26) are classified as colleges. Of these 6 universities, 4 are sectarian while 2 are non-sectarian. Further, three (3) are autonomous and three (3) are non-autonomous with accredited programs. Of the twenty-six (26) institutions classified as colleges, eight (8) are sectarian while eighteen (18) are non-sectarian. Of these eight (8) sectarian colleges, four (4) are non-autonomous institutions with accredited programs and four (4) non-autonomous institutions without accredited programs. On the other hand, the eighteen (18) non-sectarian colleges are composed of four non-autonomous institutions with accredited programs and fourteen (14) non-autonomous without accredited programs.

As further revealed by the data, most of the respondent institutions in the region are classified as non-autonomous without accredited programs which is an indication that they have not yet undertaken steps or moves for upgrading to effect quality instruction or education. This fact implies, too, that faculty development program is affected as they are not stringently considering the requirements or standards of Commission on Higher Education and other agencies for evaluation and monitoring to establish quality standards.



2. Status of the Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Education Institutions in Region 02

2.1 Staff development

Table 2.1: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on Status of the Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Institutions along Staff Development

| Items | Autonomous | | Non-Autonomous w/ Accredited Programs | | Non-autonomous w/o Accredited Program | | Total | Rank |
|---|------------|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | F | % | | |
| Sends Faculty to training/Seminar | | | | | | | | |
| International | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| National | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.81 | 16 | 88.89 | 28 | 5 |
| Regional | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 18 | 100 | 31 | 1.5 |
| Local | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 18 | 100 | 31 | 1.5 |
| Assists faculty in their professional growth & development. | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty members are allowed to: | 3 | 100 | 8 | 72.73 | 15 | 83.33 | 26 | 7.0 |
| • act as consultants | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 13 | 72.22 | 26 | 7.0 |
| • act as accreditors | 3 | 100 | 11 | 100 | 16 | 88.89 | 30 | 3.5 |
| be speakers or lecturers | | | | | | | | |
| • act as project | 2 | 66.67 | 8 | 72.73 | 12 | 66.67 | 24 | 9.5 |



| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|---|-------|----|-------|----|-----|
| proponents | | | | | | | | |
| • actas organizers | | | | | | | | |
| • be module writers | 2 | 66.67 | 7 | 63.64 | 15 | 83.33 | 24 | 9.5 |
| • to go as faculty exchange | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.81 | 18 | 100 | 30 | 3.5 |
| | 2 | 66.67 | 8 | 72.73 | 15 | 83.33 | 26 | 7.0 |

Along staff development, which is shown on the above table, all respondent higher education institutions, autonomous and non-autonomous with accredited programs, manifested that in terms of sending faculty members to seminars and trainings, they all perceived that management always sends faculty for local and regional levels only as affirmed by the highest rank of these two levels. Sometimes management also sends faculty to national but never or seldom to international seminars and trainings except for the autonomous institutions which are required to send faculty to international trainings and seminars to maintain their being autonomous institutions. In terms of assistance for professional development which concerns participation or personal involvement of faculty, the provision “act as project proponents” was perceived to be highly practiced as it was given the highest rank while the provisions “act as organizers” and “be module writers” were ranked lowest. Overall, while sending faculty for international seminars or trainings poses a problem to the respondent institutions except for autonomous ones, still it is highly commendable that the higher learning institutions in the Region have faculty development program intact and implemented.

3.2 Organizational Development



**Table 2.2: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Status of the
Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Education
Institutions along Organizational Development**

| Items | Autonomous | | Non-Autonomous with Accredited programs | | Non-autonomous w/o Accredited Program | | Total | Rank |
|---|------------|------|---|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Compliance to CHED Requirements | | | | | | | | |
| 1.Vertical Articulation | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.90 | 12 | 66.6 | 25 | 1 |
| 2. Accreditation | 3 | 100 | 11 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 7 |
| Provisions of support like: | | | | | | | | |
| • Benchmarking | 2 | 66.6 | 8 | 72.73 | 12 | 66.6 | 22 | 2 |
| • Faculty exchange | 3 | 100 | 8 | 72.73 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 8.5 |
| • Developing trust fund for faculty development | 3 | 100 | 7 | 63.64 | 7 | 38.89 | 17 | 5.5 |
| • Membership in professional organizations | 2 | 66.6 | 9 | 81.82 | 6 | 33.33 | 17 | 5.5 |
| • Officership | | | | | | | | |
| • Building linkages | 1 | 33.3 | 6 | 54.55 | 4 | 22.22 | 11 | 8.5 |
| • Networking, | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.82 | 7 | 38.89 | 19 | 4 |
| cooperatives and faculty clubs | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.82 | 9 | 50 | 21 | 3 |

As to Organizational Development, the respondent institutions manifested compliance to Commission on Higher Education's requirements on vertical articulation especially the



autonomous institutions which faithfully complied with these requirements. As regards accreditation, both autonomous and non-autonomous with accredited programs observed such requirement. It is highly noted that although vertical articulation has been considered by all respondent institutions, the non-autonomous institutions without accredited programs should try to improve their implementation of said requirement if they are to serve their client with quality education and for them to at least consider accreditation for proper guidance in achieving quality education. As to other supports for professional development, faculty members are pampered with opportunities on benchmarking and networking, cooperatives and faculty clubs which are the strongest points among all the provisions while the weakest were faculty exchange and officership. Overall, it is noteworthy that the respondent higher learning institutions are responding to the mandates of quality education as manifested in their responses on the above provisions except for the demand on accreditation for the non-autonomous without accredited programs which is expected as revealed by their status.

3. Extent of the Effects of the Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Education Institutions in Region 02 in Improving Quality Education

Table 3: Extent of the Effects of Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Education Institutions in Improving the Quality of Education

| Items | Autonomous | | Non-Autonomous with Accredited programs | | Non-autonomous Without Accredited Programs | |
|--|------------|-----------|---|------|--|----------|
| | Mean | DS | Mean | DS | Mean | DS |
| High passing rate in board exams | 5.0 | Very much | 4.0 | Much | 2.45 | Little |
| Absorption of graduates in the employment market | 5.0 | Very much | 3.5 | Much | 2.89 | Moderate |
| Increase in the number of | 5.0 | Very | 4.0 | Much | 4.0 | Much |



| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| competent faculty members | | much | | | | |
| Improved quality of instruction | 5.0 | Very much | 3.5 | Much | 2.85 | Moderate |
| Improved academic qualifications | 5.0 | very much | 3.5 | Much | 2.85 | Moderate |
| Category Mean | 5.0 | Very much | 3.60 | Much | 3.20 | Moderate |

As shown by the data on the other page, the extent of effectiveness of faculty development program of private higher education institutions in improving the quality of education has been rated as “very much” by autonomous institutions. On the other hand, the non-autonomous institutions rated the effects as “much” while the non-autonomous without accredited programs was rated as “moderate”. A further analysis of the data, reveal that faculty development program of private higher education institutions play “much” in the improvement of the quality of education.

4. Problems Encountered in the implementation of the Faculty Development Program

Table 4.1: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Problems Encountered in the Implementation of Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Education Institutions along Financial Concerns

| Items | Autonomous | | Non-autonomous with accredited programs | | Non-autonomous without accredited programs | | Total | Rank |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----|---|-------|--|-------|-------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Insufficient budget for the FDP | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.82 | 17 | 94.44 | 29 | 1.5 |



| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|---|-------|----|-------|----|-----|
| No financial assistance from the administration | 0 | 0 | 7 | 63.64 | 16 | 88.88 | 23 | 5 |
| Very expensive training fee | 3 | 100 | 7 | 63.64 | 18 | 100 | 29 | 1.5 |
| Sharing of training and seminar fee is not attractive | 2 | 66.6 | 9 | 81.82 | 15 | 83.33 | 26 | 4 |
| Travel allowance is not realistic | 2 | 66.6 | 9 | 81.82 | 17 | 94.44 | 28 | 3 |

As to problems encountered along financial assistance, data reveal that management has poor financial support system as manifested by the highest rank given on the items “insufficient budget for the faculty development program” and “very expensive training fee.” While there may be financial assistance extended to faculty, still it is not sufficient because the respondent higher learning institutions non-autonomous with accredited programs and the non-autonomous without accredited programs-made an admission that no financial assistance is given by the administration. Only the autonomous institutions agree that indeed their management extend financial assistance. This means that the autonomous institutions have greater care for their status compared with the other two groups of respondent higher learning institutions.

Table 4.2: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Problems Encountered in the Implementation of Faculty Development Program Of Private Higher Education Institutions along Personal Factors

| Items | Autonomous | Non-Autonomous w/ Accredited Programs | Non-Autonomous w/o Accredited Programs | Total | Rank |
|-------|------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------|------|
|-------|------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------|------|



| | f | % | f | % | F | % | | |
|--|---|-------|---|-------|----|-------|----|-----|
| Family problems | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.82 | 14 | 77.78 | 26 | 2 |
| Attitude problems | 2 | 66.66 | 8 | 72.73 | 17 | 94.44 | 27 | 1 |
| Too old to go for further studies | 1 | 33.33 | 4 | 36.36 | 10 | 55.55 | 15 | 6 |
| Low morale | 2 | 66.66 | 3 | 27.27 | 17 | 94.44 | 22 | 4.5 |
| Hesitation to finish graduate studies | 2 | 66.66 | 7 | 63.64 | 15 | 83.33 | 24 | 3 |
| Younger ones do not want to be tied with the Institution | 1 | 33.33 | 6 | 54.54 | 15 | 83.33 | 22 | 4.5 |
| Not interested in training or seminars | 0 | - | 0 | - | 12 | 66.67 | 12 | 7 |

In terms of personal factors as problems encountered in the implementation of Faculty Development Program, the “attitude problems” has been ranked highest which indicates that the faculty themselves are the problems and not the system employed by management. Although the problem lies on the faculty’s attitude, it is also impressive that they ranked as the lowest the provision “not interested in training or seminars” which manifests that the faculty members still recognize the importance of attending trainings or seminars. They still have the desire to attend such, only that there is still that attitude problem which they need to overcome.



Table 4.3: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Problems Encountered in the Implementation of Faculty Development Program of Private Higher Education Institutions

Along Administrative Factors

| Items | Autonomous | | Non-Autonomous w/ Accredited Programs | | Non-Autonomous w/o Accredited Programs | | Total | Rank |
|--|------------|-----|---------------------------------------|-------|--|-------|-------|------|
| | F | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Lack of support from the administration | 0 | - | 8 | 72.73 | 14 | 77.78 | 22 | 3 |
| Priority program is limited | 0 | - | 7 | 63.64 | 17 | 94.44 | 24 | 2 |
| The same people are being sent to seminar/training | 0 | - | 5 | 45.45 | 15 | 83.33 | 20 | 4 |
| Distance of seminars or trainings | 3 | 100 | 8 | 72.73 | 18 | 100 | 29 | 1 |
| No faculty development program | 0 | - | 0 | - | 8 | 44.44 | 8 | 5 |

The respondent higher learning institutions reflect on the data above their perception regarding the problems encountered in the implementation of faculty development program along administrative support. It is highly noted that the distance of seminars or trainings gives the most problem of all problems to the respondents. This means that the venue really causes a problem. On the other hand, the respondent institutions admit the existence of faculty development program when they gave the provision, "no faculty development program" the lowest rank. While there may be problems encountered, the management should still be commended for having the faculty development program in place. However, the management has to convince faculty members that no matter what the distance of the seminars and trainings would be, they should take advantage of these



for it is their way of sharing support to the institution in its quest for delivery of quality education.

5. Best Practices in Implementing the Faculty Development program

Table 5.1: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Best Practices of the Autonomous Institutions in the Implementation of the Faculty Development Program Along Administrative Assistance

| Items | Autonomous | | Non-autonomous w/ Accredited Programs | | Non-autonomous w/o Accredited Program | | Total | Rank |
|---|------------|-----|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Information dissemination on career development | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.82 | 16 | 88.89 | 28 | 5.5 |
| The Inst. permits both faculty & adm. to plan so as to obtain desired result of the program | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 17 | 94.44 | 30 | 2.5 |
| Personnel development is awarded in a competitive basis | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.82 | 17 | 94.44 | 20 | 12 |
| Strong linkage with local and international school for research program | 3 | 100 | 6 | 54.54 | 9 | 50 | 18 | 14 |
| Foreign exchange is recognized by the Institution | 3 | 100 | 7 | 63.64 | 14 | 77.78 | 24 | 10 |



| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|----|-----------|----|-----------|----|-----|
| Administration supports faculty development program to improve instruction | 3 | 100 | 9 | 81.8 2 | 18 | 100 | 30 | 2.5 |
| Opportunities for rank promotion | 3 | 100 | 8 | 72.7 3 | 17 | 94.4 4 | 28 | 5.5 |
| Opportunities for promotion in an administrative position | 3 | 100 | 8 | 72.7 3 | 15 | 83.3 3 | 25 | 9 |
| Allows faculty and personnel to report half day to give way for their schooling | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.9 1 | 14 | 77.7 8 | 27 | 7 |
| Members of the administration are given one slot student scholar | 3 | 100 | 8 | 72.7 3 | 12 | 66.6 7 | 23 | 11 |
| Sends personnel for schooling during summer | 3 | 100 | 7 | 63.6 4 | 16 | 88.8 9 | 26 | 8 |
| Strong linkage with local & international exchange program | 3 | 100 | 6 | 54.5 4 | 9 | 50 | 18 | 14 |
| Granting of birthday, study and incentive leave | 3 | 100 | 8 | 72.7 3 | 18 | 100 | 29 | 4 |
| Provides return service for employees who are sent for training and seminars | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.9 1 | 18 | 100 | 31 | 1 |
| Allows faculty exchange | 2 | 66.6 6 | 7 | 63.6 4 | 9 | 50 | 18 | 14 |

Shown on the other page are the practices of the respondent higher learning institutions along administrative assistance. It is revealed that although they implement their faculty development program as to administrative assistance, the respondent higher learning



institutions are commendable of their practices on “return service for employees who are sent for seminars and trainings” which was ranked first. This means that the respondent institutions have effective ways of getting the most out of the knowledge gained by faculty in seminars and trainings attended. However, it is also noted that the respondent institutions admitted weaknesses along management’s reluctance in local & international linkages for research, local & international exchange program and faculty exchange program. The best practices of the respondent higher learning institutions are “provision on return service”, “administration supports faculty development program to improve instruction”, “permission of both faculty and administration to plan together”, “granting of birthday, study and incentive leave”, “opportunities for promotion in rank”, “information dissemination in career development”, “allowing faculty and personnel to report half day to give way for their schooling” and “sends faculty for schooling during summer.”

Table 5.2: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Best Practices of the Private Higher Education Institutions in the Implementation of the Faculty Development Program along Financial Assistance

| Items | Autonomous | | Institutions w/ Accredited Programs | | Institutions w/o Accredited Program | | Total | Rank |
|--|------------|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Giving of cash incentives for full blown researches | 3 | 100.0 | 10 | 90.91 | 16 | 88.89 | 29 | 1 |
| Giving of salary increase | 3 | 100.0 | 10 | 90.91 | 12 | 66.67 | 25 | 5 |
| Loan payable through salary deduction | 3 | 100.0 | 6 | 54.55 | 17 | 94.44 | 26 | 4 |
| Financial grants for thesis & dissertation writing | 3 | 100.0 | 8 | 72.73 | 16 | 88.89 | 27 | 3 |
| Tuition fee discounts for dependents and direct family members | 3 | 100.0 | 8 | 72.73 | 17 | 94.44 | 28 | 2 |



| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|---|-------|----|-------|----|-----|
| Granting of honoraria at various levels of excellent performance | 3 | 100.0 | 8 | 72.73 | 12 | 66.67 | 23 | 6.5 |
| Ensure funding for faculty until the completion of the graduate school program | 3 | 100.0 | 8 | 72.73 | 12 | 66.7 | 23 | 6.5 |

As to best practices along financial assistance, all respondent higher learning institutions believe that their management is best in giving cash incentives for full blown research. This cannot be denied by the ratings given to this provision which is ranked 1. However, their management is weak along granting of honoraria to various levels of excellent performance and on ensuring the funding for faculty until the completion of the graduate school program. It is also impressive that for the autonomous institutions, all provisions have been practiced to the fullest. Overall, the best practices along financial assistance are “giving of cash incentives for full blown researches”, “tuition fee discounts even for the members of the family”, “financial grants for thesis and dissertation writing” and “loan payable through salary deduction.”

Table 5.3: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Best Practices of the Private Higher Education Institutions in the Implementation of the Faculty Development Program

Along Moral Assistance

| Items | Autonomous | | Non-Autonomous w/ Accredited Programs | | Non-Autonomous w/o Accredited Program | | Total | Rank |
|---|------------|-----|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | F | % | | |
| Birthday celebrators are recognized every month and mass is | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 13 | 72.22 | 26 | 2 |



| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|----|-------|----|-------|----|---|
| heard to honor them | | | | | | | | |
| Strong unity and working relationship with members of the administration and owners of the institution | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 17 | 94.44 | 30 | 1 |
| Rest and Recreation are well provided | 3 | 100 | 7 | 63.67 | 10 | 55.56 | 20 | 3 |

As to best practices along moral assistance, it is very evident from the data above that all respondent higher learning institutions agree that the best practice of their institution is having a strong unity and working relationship with members of the administration and owners of the institutions as they ranked the provision number one. Of the three (3) provisions, they perceived as the poorest the provision “rest and recreation are well provided.” The best practices, on the other hand, are “strong unity and working relationship with members of the administration and owners of the institution” and “birthday celebrators every month are recognized, and mass is said to honor them.”

Table 5.4: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution on the Best Practices of the Private Higher Educational Institutions in the Implementation of the Faculty Development Program Along Technical Assistance

| Items | Autonomous | | Institutions w/ Accredited Programs | | Institutions w/o Accredited Program | | Total | Rank |
|---|------------|-----|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Inviting technical experts outside of the Institution to be speakers during trainings | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 15 | 83.33 | 28 | 1.5 |
| Use of institution's facilities | | | | | | | | |



| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|----|-------|----|-------|----|-----|
| for free | 3 | 100 | 7 | 63.64 | 9 | 50 | 19 | 3 |
| Provision of on-line education for faculty and personnel | 3 | 100 | 6 | 54.55 | 9 | 50 | 18 | 4 |
| Strong linkage with alumni who are locally and internationally based | 3 | 100 | 7 | 63.64 | 7 | 38.89 | 17 | 5 |
| Executives from partner agencies are invited to be part-time professors | 3 | 100 | 10 | 90.91 | 15 | 83.33 | 28 | 1.5 |

As to technical assistance, it is perceived by the respondent higher learning institutions that “inviting technical experts outside the institution to be speakers during seminars and trainings” and “executives from partner agencies are invited to be part-time professors” are their

best practices. On the other hand, the weakest is “strong linkage with alumni who are locally and internationally based.” As the data reveal, the use of institutional facilities for free is among the best practices which management of the respondent higher learning institutions are practicing.

CONCLUSIONS

Basing on the findings, the researcher concludes that all private higher learning institutions have their faculty development program in place, but their manner of implementation varies. The autonomous institutions implement well their faculty development, but not so much with non-autonomous institutions with accredited programs. As to non-autonomous institutions without accredited programs, implementation is to a very limited extent. As to best practices, the respondent higher learning institutions have diverse practices which means they have their own best practices depending upon the capacity of their respective institutions.



RECOMMENDATIONS

As influenced by the conclusions, the researcher recommends the following:

For Autonomous Institutions:

- Management should involve faculty members in planning and decision-making, especially on setting the direction towards which the institution is going so that faculty members give personal commitment for all plans and actions of the institutions.
- They should allow other institutions to benchmark and share their other best practices.

For Non-autonomous Institutions with Accredited Programs:

- Management should strictly implement the faculty development program by making it feasible and achievable through a strong financial, administrative, moral, and technical assistance or support.

For Non-autonomous Institutions without Accredited Programs

- Administration of the non-autonomous institutions without accredited programs as well as the Commission on Higher Education should not only look into the Faculty Development Program but has to monitor the implementation of all the areas in order to ensure delivery of quality education.

For all Private Higher Education Institutions:

- Other researchers should conduct a similar study including other variables not discussed in the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books



Brancato, V. (2003). Professional development in higher Education. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 98, 59-65.

MacKinnon, GE., III Administrator and Dean Perceptions Toward Faculty Development in Academic Pharmacy. AmJ pharm Educ. 2003;67 Article 97.

Published Materials

Allyn & Bacon, 2004 Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners: The SIOP Model, 2/E

Crew, Tena, Christine Brown and Jessica Milles, Assessing Faculty's Technological Needs, EDUCAUSEonline, December 22, 2009.

De Rosa, Debra & Deborah Simpson, Culture of Excellence in Line with Accreditation, International Certification and Quality Assurance Management.

Froyd, Jeff, Debra Fowler, Jean Layne & Nancy Simpson, Frameworks of Faculty Development, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2005

Gregorio, Corazon C., Impact of Internal Faculty Development Program in Teaching Effectiveness: An Assessment, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2008) TIP-Manila.

Leaño, Roman D., Correlation of Training Program and Performance of Teachers, Vol. 5, No. 1 2008, TIP-Manila

Moeini, Hosein, A Need Analysis Study for Faculty Development Programs in METU and Structural Equation Modeling of Faculty Needs, Medical East Technical University, September 2005



Pracchyapruit, Apipa (2001) Socialization of New Faculty at A Public University in Thailand, Unpublished Dissertation, Michigan State University, Department of Educational Administration.

Tabotabo, Claudio V., The Impact of External Faculty Development Training Programs on Teaching Effectiveness, Vol. 1 NO. 1, 2008, TIP-Manila, Research Journal.

Unpublished Materials

Amistad, Rodolfo, (2002) CHED-FAPE College Faculty Development Program and Its Implication to the Faculty Development of Higher Education Institutions, 2002

Dee, J., Daly C & Henkin, Faculty Development as a self-organizing system, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association of New York. (2008)

Dawayon, Marinel P. Five Year Development Program for Isabela State University –Cauayan Campus 2011-2016, November 2011

Fryd, Jeff, Fowler, D., Layne J and Simpson N., Frameworks of Faculty Development, Georgia Institute of Technology (2005)

Japos, Genaro V. The Culture of Excellence of Private Higher Institutions, Liceo de Cagayan University, September 25, 2007

Jugdev. Kam, Nov 2008) Study of Faculty Development Needs in Distance Education presented at the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE) Conference in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, November 24-26, 2008

Morales Ten-Year Development Plan for the University of La Salette, 2005



Robinson, Mary Elizabeth, An Examination of Faculty Development Practices at the American Community College, May 2011.

Somera, (2009 Professional Enhancement of Administration 2nd faculty of SUCs in Region 1

Journals/Memoranda/Periodical

CHED's National Higher Education Research Agenda (NHERA), 1998 -2007

Commission on Higher Education 44, Series 2008, Policies and Guidelines for the Grant of Autonomous and Deregulated status to Private Higher Education Institutions.

CMO No. 57 Series of 2005, Guidelines for CHED support for Paper Presentation in International Conference

(CMO 19. Series 1998, Art. V Section 15

Grossman, Louis H. (1994) Pursuing A Comprehensive Faculty Development Program: Making fragmentation Work Journal of Counseling & Development, May-June 94, Vol. 72 Issue 5

New York Institute of Higher Education, 200 Professional and Organizational development Network in Higher Education, 2002.

Wagner, Walter, The MORE Model of Faculty Development, Florida State University, 2010.

Internet Resources

www.FAPE

[\(http://tlt.its.psu.edu/](http://tlt.its.psu.edu/)

[http://www.worldcampus.psu.edu/facdev101/index.](http://www.worldcampus.psu.edu/facdev101/index)

[http://www.unl.edu/peerrev/\)](http://www.unl.edu/peerrev/)



<http://www.schreyer institute.psu.edu/>

<http://www.newfoundations.com/OrgTheory/Hutchinson721.html>

www.OSI.edu.ph)