

Faculty development programs among state universities and colleges in the province of Iloilo: Basis for a faculty development model



Marissa C. Limson *

College of Management, Northern Iloilo State University, Estancia, Iloilo, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 September 2022

Received in revised form

6 April 2023

Accepted 19 April 2023

Keywords:

Faculty development programs

State universities and colleges

Engagement levels

Satisfaction levels

Demographic profiles

ABSTRACT

The current investigation aimed to assess the level of participation and recognition received by faculty members from State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Province of Iloilo as part of their faculty development programs. The obtained results will be utilized to develop an improved five-year faculty development plan. This study employed a quantitative research design, utilizing a descriptive method to determine the degree of engagement with various components of the faculty development program, which would serve as the basis for the faculty development model. A total of 848 respondents were randomly selected through simple random sampling and completed a survey questionnaire. Frequency count, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were employed to provide a descriptive analysis of the data. Furthermore, Chi-Square, Mann Whitney U Test, and Kruskal Wallis Test were utilized to examine significant differences in the extent of faculty development program utilization. The findings indicate that the majority of faculty members from SUCs expressed "very satisfied" levels of satisfaction regarding their engagement in scholarships, seminars, training, conferences, and symposia. They also reported being "satisfied" with their involvement in other faculty development programs, with the exception of fellowships. Moreover, the study revealed that there was no significant relationship between the extent of satisfaction with the faculty development program components and demographic profiles, except for the plantilla position. Post hoc analysis indicated significant differences among respondents holding the positions of instructors and associate professors, as well as assistant professors and associate professors.

© 2023 The Authors. Published by IASE. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

With the advent of the new millennium, many societies are embarking on serious and promising educational reforms (Margetson, 1994). One of them concerns professional development initiatives which focused on improving classroom instruction by observing the impact of mandatory policies on faculty instruction. In other words, one of the key elements of most of these reforms is the professional development of teachers—that is, for society to finally realize that teachers are not only one of the "variables" that must be changed to improve the educational system, but they are also the most important agent of change in these reforms (Watson,

2014). Rightly so because research shows that quality teachers are essential to enhance student learning and quality teacher training is deemed essential to have quality teachers (Liston et al., 2008).

In this respect, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) regards teachers to be one of the most controlling and authoritative forces for equitable, accessible, and quality education (Toukan, 2018). Moreover, they serve as the key to sustainable global development. However, the same organization finds that their training, recruitment, retention, status, and working conditions remain worrisome. This needs to be addressed as in-service teacher training is considered necessary to support teachers, and eventually improve education (Santoro et al., 2012).

Furthermore, although teacher support is present, the approaches and strategies used are often based on theories and practices that do not have a significant impact on professional learning. In essence, most faculty development programs have

* Corresponding Author.

Email Address: marissa.limson@nisu.edu.ph

<https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2023.06.015>

Corresponding author's ORCID profile:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5379-6458>

2313-626X/© 2023 The Authors. Published by IASE.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

little prospect to improve or strengthen the quality of teaching and learning (Ingvarson et al., 2005).

In the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) maintains that quality education lies to a great extent in the qualifications and competencies of teachers. Furthermore, puts emphasis that the Faculty Development Program (FDP) is a pivotal element in building a powerful and effective educational system. In different studies throughout the years, faculty development has always emerged as a top concern. It is said that the Philippines will lag behind its Asian neighbors if it does not invest in producing experts in universities and colleges. It is worth noting the countries around the Philippines are currently embracing cutting-edge trailblazing initiatives and technological breakthroughs. With this in mind, fortifying faculty qualifications should be a priority as the faculty members are the greatest asset of an educational institution. They fulfill the mission of the school and largely represent its quality.

CHED's (2016) CMO No. 3, made the picture even bleaker. It states that in 1998, only 33 percent of Higher Educational Institutions (HEI's) faculty had advanced degrees. Faculty development programs had been intensified which raised the number to 50 percent in 2015. However, it fell short of the minimum faculty requirements as indicated in the existing Policies, Standards, and Guidelines (PSGs) for the offering of academic programs. The same document claims that the Philippines remains behind its ASEAN neighbors, specifically Vietnam (60%) and Malaysia (69%). The Commission on Higher Education (CHED, 2016) in its Faculty Development Program II acknowledges once again, in its goal of awarding scholarships, that the quality of education is highly dependent on the qualifications and skills of the teaching staff. The Faculty Development Program (FDP) aims to advance the academic degree of higher education teachers to master's and doctoral levels. Through this program, improvements in faculty qualifications and teaching strategies are expected to contribute directly to improved student learning, resulting in higher professional licensure exam passing rates, as well as graduate productivity. This serves as the reason why the Commission under the said CMO came up with the Guidelines for Graduate Education Scholarships for Faculty and Staff Development in the K to 12 Transition Period. The goal is to invest more in teacher training (CHED, 2016).

The preceding discussion only speaks about CHED's additional role in helping universities improve the qualifications of teachers, an opportunity not available for everyone. Simply put, the HEIs themselves have a major responsibility of strengthening the academic credentials of their faculty and staff. It is one of their operational mandates. However, a study on the implementation of Faculty Development Program policies in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) found that there is no specific budget for the said program (Ullian and Stritter, 1997). The money used here comes from the

income of the University. The same study reveals that teachers mostly availed short-term non-degree programs such as updating activities, seminar workshops, and training. Few sought degree programs such as earning graduate degrees.

With these premises and research findings, short-term or long-term teacher training programs should be viewed as complementing each other. Both help strengthens the academic preparation of teachers, which eventually benefits students. Although college teachers are considered experts in their field, a lot of them may not have been trained in effective teaching (Rowbotham, 2015). Furthermore, it was mentioned that having a faculty development program helps in acquiring the best teaching practices. Finally, it was expounded that an essential aspect of faculty development is helping teachers understand their very nature as teachers and instilling in them the belief that they can succeed in what they do (Rowbotham, 2015). By designing and evaluating new development programs, especially in this day and age, a better understanding of the impact of development programs on both the teachers and the students is expected to be realized. Thus, the researcher has come up with this study.

In this study, the researcher attempted to investigate the extent to which SUC teachers in Iloilo Province availed of and received awards as part of their faculty development programs when taken as a whole and classified according to age, sex, designation, plantilla position, highest educational attainment, and number of years in the academic service. The results would serve as the basis for developing an enhanced five-year plan for faculty development.

2. Research methods

2.1. Research design

This study adopted a quantitative study design using the descriptive method to find out the extent of availing of the faculty development program components as the basis for a faculty development model. This method is used to gather data about a group of people to describe aspects or characteristics of the population to which that group belongs (Balnaves and Caputi, 2016). In particular, survey and correlation methods were used in this study. The survey collects data to test hypotheses or to answer questions about the current state of the subjects under investigation. Correlational research is concerned with establishing relationships between two or more variables in the same population or between the same variables in two populations (Curtis et al., 2015).

2.2. Research respondents

The respondents of this investigation were the faculty members of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Iloilo Province. These included West

Visayas State University (WVSU), Iloilo Science and Technology University (ISAT-U), Iloilo State College of Fisheries (ISCOF), and Northern Iloilo State University (NISU). The respondents were chosen using stratified, cluster, and simple random sampling designs. The respondents were classified according to age, sex, designation, plantilla position, highest educational attainment, and number of years in academic service.

Table 1 shows that 374 or 44.10% were under forty years old, and 474, or 55.89% respondents were forty years and above. A total of 500 (58.96%) female teachers and 348 (41.04%) male teachers participated in the study. In contrast, 99 or 11.67% out of 800 faculties are with the designation.

Table 1: Indexed data distribution

Profile	Frequency	Percent
Age		
21-30	127	14.98
31-40	247	29.13
41-50	262	30.90
51-60	191	22.52
61 and above	21	2.47
Sex		
Male	348	41.04
Female	500	58.96
Designation		
Faculty	749	88.33
With designation	99	11.67
Plantilla position		
Instructor	313	36.91
Asst. professor	306	36.08
Associate professor	209	24.65
Professor	20	2.36
Highest educational attainment		
Baccalaureate degree	25	2.95
With master's degree units	122	14.38
With master's degree	327	38.56
With doctoral units	266	31.37
With doctoral degree	107	12.62
Post-doctoral	1	0.12
Number of years in teaching		
Below ten years	297	35.02
10 - 20	316	37.27
Above 20 years	235	27.71

On the other hand, feminization in the teaching profession is a global issue (Griffiths, 2006), meaning that women already dominate the job, and gender imbalance in the teaching profession will increase even more in the years to come. Though teaching is a woman-dominated profession (Toukan, 2018), the highest-paying positions and ranks are still occupied by men (Alkadry and Tower, 2011).

Table 1 presents the result of the respondent's plantilla position, highest educational attainment, and number of years in teaching. Three hundred thirteen or 36.91% of faculty members hold Instructor items, three hundred six, or 36.08% are Assistant Professors, two hundred nine, or 24.65% with Associate Professor, and twenty, or 2.36% are professors. About 551 faculties have been in the teaching profession for ten years or above. Likewise, 327, or 38.56% are with a Master's Degree, while 107, or 12.62% are holders of a doctoral degree. The rest of the faculty are finishing their post-graduate studies. Meanwhile, many teachers decide to stay in the profession despite the challenges of the job

because they enjoyed their work (Galiza et al., 2018). They also believed that their teaching experience impacted student achievement (Goe and Stickler, 2008). Finally, it revealed that teachers with more work experience feel better qualified to perform their duties and define their professional identity which plays a vital role in their professional development and identity (Makovec, 2018).

2.3. Research instrument

The instrument used to collect key data was a researcher-designed questionnaire that was validated by three experts to determine reliability and validity. It had two parts. Part 1 detailed the information about the respondents such as age, sex, designation, plantilla position, highest educational attainment, and number of years in academic service. Part II was the checklist proper which contained the extent of availment of the faculty development program components. The instrument underwent pilot testing in other SUCs to ensure its validity and reliability.

2.4. Data analysis

The researcher secured the permission of the presidents of the subject SUCs. Once approved, the researcher personally handed out a copy of the questionnaire to the respondents. Similarly, the researcher sent the respondents a letter informing them of the nature of the study and ensuring that all responses would be kept strictly confidential. They also had the option of withdrawing from the study as respondents if they felt uncomfortable doing so. After obtaining the answered questionnaire, the researcher processed, analyzed, and interpreted the data.

2.5. Statistical treatment

Frequency counting, percentage, and ranking were used to describe the demographic profile of the respondents. Weighted means and standard deviations were determined in order to see the extent of availing of the respondents relative to the faculty development program components. Chi-Square, Mann Whitney U Test, and Kruskal Wallis Test were employed to treat the significant difference in the extent of availing of the faculty development program components when grouped according to profile. To test for a significant relationship between the extent of availing of the faculty development program components and the demographic profile, the Spearman Ranked Coefficient of Correlation was used

3. Results and analysis

This section provides for the presentation, analysis, and interpretation in accordance with the statement of the problem. The presentation followed

this sequence: Number of SUC's faculty development programs among SUCs in the province of Iloilo; extent of availing of the Faculty Development Program components among SUC faculty when taken as a whole and when classified as to demographic profile; the significant difference in the extent of availing of the Faculty Development Program Components among the SUC Faculty when classified according to demographic profile; and significant relationship between the extent of availing of the Faculty Development Program Components and the demographic profile among the SUC Faculty.

3.1. Faculty development program among the SUCs in the province of Iloilo

Faculty development programs (FDPs) have proven to improve teaching skills in higher education (Kamel, 2016). Faculty members need to be prepared enough by some sort of faculty development program (FDP) to deal with the rapid changes and shifting paradigms in medical education, healthcare delivery systems, and clinical practice. Without such training, teaching is often reduced to instructors presenting their understanding of the subject by one-way lecturing (Steinert, 2011).

Table 2 results show that most of the SUCs faculty are aware of all the faculty development programs of their SUCs. Seminars, training, conferences, symposia, etc., were among the most availed program under faculty development. High-quality professional training programs for faculty members have become essential for higher education institutions to compete in this ever-changing world (Kamel, 2016).

Professional training programs produce promising outcomes in learning and teaching practices, and many Faculty Development Programs have proven effective in developing faculty skills and educational leadership. Indeed, today, faculty development constitutes a strategic lever for institutional excellence and quality and is essential for advancing institutional readiness to bring in the desired change in response to the ever-growing complex demands facing universities and colleges (Kamel, 2016).

Also, faculty participation in a faculty development program has improved student success and student retention as well as has a positive impact on student learning (Perez et al., 2012), Faculty members who took pedagogical training credits reported higher self-efficacy than those who did not (Postareff et al., 2007).

Table 2: Faculty development program among the SUCs in the province of Iloilo

Development program	No. of teachers who are aware	%	No. of teachers who availed	%
Scholarships	803	94.69	350	41.27
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia, etc.	845	99.65	827	97.52
Fellowships	693	81.72	378	44.58
Sabbatical leave	731	86.20	383	45.17
Thesis/dissertation grants	787	92.81	465	54.83
Leave with pay	819	96.58	562	66.27
Leave without pay	800	94.34	333	39.27
Research grants	756	89.15	377	44.46
Extension grants	717	84.55	328	38.68
Utility model grants	626	73.82	190	22.41
Patents grants	682	80.42	211	24.88
Research publication incentive	698	82.31	474	55.90
Paper presentation incentive	692	81.60	514	60.61
Faculty award for instruction	579	68.28	207	24.41
Faculty award for research	707	83.37	311	36.67
Faculty awards for extension	655	77.24	234	27.59
Faculty award for production	493	58.14	178	20.99

3.2. Satisfaction levels of faculty development program by demographic profile

Universities must provide competitive levels of a work environment conducive to faculty needs to attain faculty commitment. This can only be achieved if universities emphasize continuous improvement and identify mechanisms for quality improvement (Chang and Pribbenow, 2016). Moreover, factors such as faculty workload, salary, benefits, research, and teaching can enhance academic quality (Meyer, 1998).

Table 3 reveals that most of the SUCs faculty are "very satisfied" with their availing of scholarships, seminars, training, conferences, and symposia. They were "satisfied" with their availing of other faculty development programs except for fellowship, which they were "moderately satisfied." Empowering

faculty by providing access to development opportunities will enable them to achieve academic success and satisfaction.

3.3. Satisfaction on faculty development program by age groups

Table 4 presents the satisfaction levels of faculty members with regard to their participation in Faculty Development Programs, segmented by age groups. Faculty members aged 21 to 30 expressed "very satisfied" levels of satisfaction in availing scholarships, seminars, training, research grants, utility grants, patents grants, paper presentation incentives, and faculty awards for instruction and research. Similarly, faculty members aged 31 to 40 reported being "very satisfied" with scholarships.

Among faculty members aged 41 to 50, "very satisfied" ratings were observed for scholarships,

while "moderate satisfaction" was indicated for fellowships.

Table 3: Overall satisfaction levels of the faculty development program and its classification by demographic profile

Development program	w \bar{x}	Verbal description	SD
Scholarships	4.45	Very Satisfied	1.26
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia, etc.	4.40	Very Satisfied	1.40
Fellowships	3.40	Moderately Satisfied	1.73
Sabbatical leave	4.10	Satisfied	1.47
Thesis/dissertation grants	4.18	Satisfied	1.46
Leave with pay	4.13	Satisfied	1.47
Leave without pay	3.82	Satisfied	1.49
Research grants	4.15	Satisfied	1.38
Extension grants	4.16	Satisfied	1.48
Utility model grants	4.22	Satisfied	1.37
Patents grants	3.99	Satisfied	1.42
Research publication incentive	4.02	Satisfied	1.53
Paper presentation incentive	4.16	Satisfied	1.52
Faculty award for instruction	4.04	Satisfied	1.52
Faculty award for research	3.89	Satisfied	1.57
Faculty awards for extension	3.92	Satisfied	1.46
Faculty award for production	3.93	Satisfied	1.38
Composite	4.06	Satisfied	1.47

Verbal description (VD); 5.20 – 6.00 Extremely satisfied (ES); 4.36 – 5.19 Very satisfied (VS); 3.52 – 4.35 Satisfied (S); 2.68 – 3.51 Moderately satisfied (MS); 1.84 – 2.67 Slightly satisfied (SS); 1.00 – 1.83 Not satisfied (N)

Furthermore, faculty members aged 50 and above expressed "very satisfied" levels of satisfaction in availing scholarships, seminars, and training, as well as leave with pay, while "moderate satisfaction" was reported for fellowships.

In summary, faculty members across all age groups tended to be "satisfied" with their opportunities for career advancement in their current positions. Notably, individuals in the younger age bracket (21-30 years old) exhibited higher levels of satisfaction ("very satisfied")

compared to those aged 31 and older, who indicated being "satisfied" with their chances for advancement. Overall, the differences in satisfaction levels among different age groups regarding the availment of faculty development programs were relatively modest. Boumans et al. (2011) suggested that career opportunities and motivation were more pronounced among younger employees compared to their older counterparts. This implies that the motivation of younger workers increases as they are presented with more career opportunities.

Table 4: Satisfaction levels of faculty development program among SUC faculty, grouped by age

Development program	21 – 30 yrs old			31 – 40 yrs old			41 – 50 yrs old			> 50 yrs old		
	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD
Scholarships	4.63	VS	1.42	4.46	VS	1.27	4.41	VS	1.16	4.44	VS	1.33
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia, etc.	4.55	VS	1.37	4.34	S	1.44	4.35	S	1.34	4.44	VS	1.42
Fellowships	3.67	S	1.78	3.60	S	1.75	3.34	MS	1.67	3.08	MS	1.72
Sabbatical leave	4.09	S	1.43	3.95	S	1.44	4.13	S	1.45	4.27	S	1.56
Thesis/dissertation grants	4.26	S	1.49	4.09	S	1.37	4.14	S	1.51	4.27	S	1.49
Leave with pay	4.14	S	1.53	3.99	S	1.48	4.05	S	1.48	4.36	VS	1.42
Leave without pay	4.08	S	1.34	3.91	S	1.46	3.72	S	1.61	3.68	S	1.48
Research grants	4.50	VS	1.23	4.21	S	1.42	4.00	S	1.37	4.09	S	1.40
Extension grants	4.21	S	1.53	4.23	S	1.38	4.16	S	1.47	4.01	S	1.58
Utility model grants	4.68	VS	1.20	4.15	S	1.23	4.20	S	1.27	3.96	S	1.68
Patents grants	4.50	VS	1.24	4.07	S	1.24	3.96	S	1.40	3.65	S	1.64
Research publication incentive	4.35	S	1.35	4.04	S	1.49	3.81	S	1.54	4.08	S	1.62
Paper presentation incentive	4.59	VS	1.47	4.06	S	1.49	4.09	S	1.52	4.13	S	1.55
Faculty award for instruction	4.77	VS	1.12	3.94	S	1.41	4.09	S	1.49	3.61	S	1.77
Faculty award for research	4.69	VS	1.33	3.69	S	1.50	3.87	S	1.45	3.68	S	1.78
Faculty awards for extension	4.21	S	1.36	4.13	S	1.10	3.88	S	1.40	3.61	S	1.79
Faculty award for production	4.32	S	1.22	3.91	S	1.24	3.97	S	1.35	3.58	S	1.63
Overall	4.37	VS	1.38	4.04	S	1.39	4.01	S	1.44	3.94	S	1.58

Verbal description (VD); 5.20 – 6.00 Extremely satisfied (ES); 4.36 – 5.19 Very satisfied (VS); 3.52 – 4.35 Satisfied (S); 2.68 – 3.51 Moderately satisfied (MS); 1.84 – 2.67 Slightly satisfied (SS); 1.00 – 1.83 Not satisfied (NS)

3.4. Satisfaction on faculty development program by gender

Table 5 shows the extent of availment of the Faculty Development Program when grouped according to sex. Both sexes (male and female) are "very satisfied" when it comes to their availment of scholarship programs and seminars, conferences, field trips and etc.

Generally, both males and females were "satisfied" with their availment of faculty development programs in their colleges or universities. Faculty development has also meant bringing in new faculty men and women into the system with new ideas and fresh perspectives with the hope that such people will serve as catalysts in keeping their departments flexible and constantly changing. To secure a high level of performance,

schools should monitor the satisfaction level of their faculty regardless of gender (Al-Smadi and Qblan, 2015).

One of the reasons faculty get frustrated with their organization is that there is no room for advancement or any effort to develop their skills. On the contrary, faculty feel more motivated to attend training and other career development activities if this means career progress, a chance for promotion,

or for self-improvement. Training is a way to show faculty that the organization cares about them and their goals. So, employing multiple ways for employees to access their learning is a way to increase motivation. Issuance of proper guidelines for promotion, assurance of security, good teaching, and learning materials, motivation to further studies, etc. could help the university achieve job satisfaction among its faculty (Amos et al., 2015).

Table 5: Satisfaction levels of the faculty development program among faculty members in SUCs, stratified by gender

Development program	Male			Female		
	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD
Scholarships	4.37	VS	1.23	4.51	VS	1.28
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia, etc.	4.44	VS	1.39	4.37	VS	1.40
Fellowships	3.59	S	1.75	3.27	MS	1.71
Sabbatical leave	4.08	S	1.43	4.13	S	1.51
Thesis/dissertation grants	4.01	S	1.48	4.29	S	1.44
Leave with pay	4.08	S	1.46	4.16	S	1.48
Leave without pay	3.91	S	1.38	3.76	S	1.57
Research grants	4.06	S	1.35	4.20	S	1.40
Extension grants	4.01	S	1.42	4.27	S	1.52
Utility model grants	4.26	S	1.18	4.18	S	1.48
Patents grants	3.93	S	1.37	4.03	S	1.47
Research publication incentive	3.98	S	1.61	4.05	S	1.46
Paper presentation incentive	4.18	S	1.57	4.15	S	1.48
Faculty award for instruction	4.11	S	1.38	4.01	S	1.61
Faculty award for research	3.96	S	1.51	3.86	S	1.61
Faculty awards for extension	3.82	S	1.44	3.98	S	1.47
Faculty award for production	3.79	S	1.38	4.02	S	1.38
Overall	4.04	S	1.43	4.07	S	1.49

Verbal description (VD); 5.20 – 6.00 Extremely satisfied (ES); 4.36 – 5.19 Very satisfied (VS); 3.52 – 4.35 Satisfied (S); 2.68 – 3.51 Moderately satisfied (MS); 1.84 – 2.67 Slightly satisfied (SS); 1.00 – 1.83 Not satisfied (NS)

3.5. Satisfaction on faculty development program by designation

The result in Table 6 shows that faculty without designation are "very satisfied" with their availment of scholarships, training, and seminars while faculty with the designation are "very satisfied" with their availment of scholarships program. A look at the literature shows that research designed to investigate whether or not job satisfaction increases with rank is few (Oshagbemi, 1997), however, most of the evidence that does exist suggests that job rank/level/position is a reliable predictor of job satisfaction with workers at higher ranks/levels/positions generally being more satisfied with their jobs compared to those at lower ranks/levels/positions (Oshagbemi, 2003). Higher-ranked employees indicate higher levels of job satisfaction because higher-level jobs tend to be more complex and have better working conditions, pay and promotion prospects, supervision, and responsibility (Cranny et al., 2010).

Before COVID-19, faculty delved into remote, hybrid, and online instruction and have increased their educational technology tool comfort and skill levels. However, given the sudden shift to remote learning, many instructors did not have the time or opportunity to explore hybrid and online learning pedagogical best practices prior to beginning to teach online. Moreover, faculty who want to develop a richer, more research-guided teaching practice enthusiastically attend pieces of training and seminars and even availed of scholarship grants to

develop their teaching practice, receive professional enrichment, and build a stronger community of professional practice amongst their fellow faculty.

In general, all faculty members are "satisfied" with their availment of all the programs under each SUCs Faculty Development Program component. Faculty training, seminars, scholarships, etc., are educational experiences designed exclusively to deepen and enrich their teaching practice. Trainings that used technological innovation promote the quality of university faculty performance (Abouelenein, 2016).

3.6. Satisfaction on faculty development program by position

Table 7 results show that Instructors are "very satisfied" with their availment of scholarship grants and "moderate satisfied" with fellowships. While, Associate Professor Rank, they were "very satisfied" with their availment of the scholarships, utility model, and patent grants as they were "moderately satisfied" with fellowships. Also, both Associate Professors and Professors are "very satisfied" with scholarships, sabbatical leave, thesis/dissertation grants, and leave with pay. In general, SUCs faculty regardless of their academic rank are "satisfied" with their availment of components under the Faculty Development Program.

Teacher's job satisfaction has many important and far-reaching implications that it contributes to teacher well-being as satisfied teachers are less susceptible to stress and burnout (Kyriacou and

Sutcliffe, 1977) amount of participation in professional development was positively related to teacher perceptions of job satisfaction. This result, in line with a number of previous findings, stresses the role of professional development not only for enhancing instructional quality but also as a factor in

promoting teacher retention by raising teacher satisfaction with the job (Ingersoll et al., 2014). These relations, however, may also be reciprocal as teachers who feel more content with the job might be more inclined to participate in professional development programs (Nir and Bogler, 2008).

Table 6: Satisfaction levels of the faculty development program among SUC faculty, grouped by designation

Development program	Faculty			With designation		
	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD
Scholarships	4.45	VS	1.28	4.48	VS	1.18
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia. etc	4.40	VS	1.43	4.35	S	1.14
Fellowships	3.32	MS	1.76	4.02	S	1.32
Sabbatical leave	4.14	S	1.48	3.80	S	1.42
Thesis/dissertation grants	4.17	S	1.47	4.21	S	1.43
Leave with pay	4.13	S	1.49	4.11	S	1.35
Leave without pay	3.79	S	1.50	3.95	S	1.48
Research grants	4.10	S	1.40	4.32	S	1.27
Extension grants	4.18	S	1.52	4.07	S	1.30
Utility model grants	4.29	S	1.42	3.95	S	1.15
Patents grants	4.07	S	1.46	3.69	S	1.24
Research publication incentive	4.05	S	1.55	3.73	S	1.32
Paper presentation incentive	4.19	S	1.54	3.91	S	1.29
Faculty award for instruction	4.11	S	1.57	3.84	S	1.37
Faculty award for research	3.91	S	1.63	3.78	S	1.25
Faculty awards for extension	4.00	S	1.48	3.62	S	1.35
Faculty award for production	4.06	S	1.42	3.57	S	1.19
Overall	4.08	S	1.49	3.96	S	1.30

Verbal description (VD); 5.20 – 6.00 Extremely satisfied (ES); 4.36 – 5.19 Very satisfied (VS); 3.52 – 4.35 Satisfied (S); 2.68 – 3.51 Moderately satisfied (MS); 1.84 – 2.67 Slightly satisfied (SS); 1.00 – 1.83 Not satisfied (NS)

Table 7: Satisfaction levels of the faculty development program among SUC faculty, segmented by plantilla position

Development program	Instructor			Assistant professor			Associate professor		
	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD
Scholarships	4.40	VS	1.24	4.36	VS	1.31	4.55	VS	1.24
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia, etc.	4.19	S	1.48	4.48	S	1.39	4.57	VS	1.25
Fellowships	3.39	MS	1.73	3.31	MS	1.78	3.52	S	1.67
Sabbatical leave	3.88	S	1.38	4.07	S	1.59	4.35	VS	1.42
Thesis/dissertation grants	3.86	S	1.47	4.14	S	1.47	4.41	VS	1.42
Leave with pay	3.93	S	1.47	4.02	S	1.49	4.45	VS	1.41
Leave without pay	3.63	S	1.41	3.89	S	1.58	3.99	S	1.50
Research grants	4.00	S	1.38	4.09	S	1.39	4.31	S	1.36
Extension grants	4.03	S	1.46	4.29	S	1.46	4.20	S	1.52
Utility model grants	4.01	S	1.35	4.75	VS	1.06	4.10	S	1.49
Patents grants	3.91	S	1.27	4.40	VS	1.31	3.84	S	1.57
Research publication incentive	3.97	S	1.47	4.04	S	1.61	4.04	S	1.50
Paper presentation incentive	4.08	S	1.55	4.21	S	1.56	4.18	S	1.44
Faculty award for instruction	3.75	S	1.45	4.30	S	1.43	4.13	S	1.63
Faculty award for research	3.91	S	1.48	3.79	S	1.67	3.97	S	1.57
Faculty awards for extension	3.82	S	1.34	4.16	S	1.40	3.84	S	1.58
Faculty award for production	3.82	S	1.22	4.13	S	1.45	3.87	S	1.49
Overall	3.92	S	1.42	4.14	S	1.47	4.14	S	1.47

Verbal description (VD); 5.20 – 6.00 Extremely satisfied (ES); 4.36 – 5.19 Very satisfied (VS); 3.52 – 4.35 Satisfied (S); 2.68 – 3.51 Moderately satisfied (MS); 1.84 – 2.67 Slightly satisfied (SS); 1.00 – 1.83 Not satisfied (NS)

3.7. Satisfaction on faculty development program by education level

The findings presented in Table 8 indicate that faculty members holding bachelor's degrees reported a moderate level of satisfaction with their participation in faculty development programs, particularly regarding scholarships, fellowships, sabbatical leave, and awards for extension. It is worth noting that some of these faculty members with bachelor's degrees are newly hired full-time instructors who are still becoming acquainted with the SUCs, including the administrative structure, support services, academic and professional opportunities, and student life. Additionally, new residential faculty members often find themselves unfamiliar with the SUCs environment. It is crucial for them to have sufficient time and opportunities to engage in formal and informal interactions with

colleagues, mentors, and key administrators to develop relationships and gain an understanding of the SUCs culture through conversations, activities, project design, and implementation. Exposure to the diversity and dynamics across the culture of SUCs fosters collegiality, collaboration, and ultimately contributes to student success, learning, and the sustained scholarship of faculty members in teaching and learning.

In contrast, faculty members holding master's or doctoral degrees expressed satisfaction ranging from satisfied to very satisfied with their experiences in availing faculty development programs. This can be attributed to the fact that a majority of them have been engaged in teaching for more than a decade and have had multiple opportunities to participate in the faculty development programs.

Hence, faculty development programs (FDPs) designed for teachers, often considered as a "train

the trainer" approach, hold significant importance in higher education systems and contribute to the

growth and success of individual institutions in today's context.

Table 8: Satisfaction levels of the faculty development program among SUC faculty, categorized by educational attainment

Development program	Bachelor's degree			With master's degree units			With master's degree			With doctoral degree units			With doctoral deg./postdoc		
	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD
Scholarships	3.50	MS	1.64	4.42	VS	1.20	4.53	VS	1.30	4.36	VS	1.24	4.60	VS	1.22
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia,	3.64	S	1.40	4.53	VS	1.26	4.36	VS	1.56	4.37	VS	1.27	4.57	VS	1.25
Fellowships	3.16	MS	1.49	3.23	MS	1.69	3.13	MS	1.79	3.78	S	1.64	3.52	S	1.74
Sabbatical leave	3.50	MS	1.45	4.00	S	1.45	4.07	S	1.46	4.08	S	1.49	4.45	VS	1.48
Thesis/dissertation grants	3.64	S	1.50	4.06	S	1.43	4.19	S	1.44	4.08	S	1.50	4.53	VS	1.42
Leave with pay	3.65	S	1.84	4.20	S	1.35	4.24	S	1.44	3.91	S	1.56	4.39	VS	1.30
Leave without pay	3.69	S	1.70	3.64	S	1.30	3.89	S	1.41	3.83	S	1.58	3.83	S	1.64
Research grants	3.93	S	1.54	4.24	S	1.32	4.05	S	1.33	4.13	S	1.41	4.35	VS	1.43
Extension grants	4.00	S	1.63	4.23	S	1.38	3.93	S	1.43	4.35	S	1.48	4.34	S	1.61
Utility model grants	4.09	S	1.70	4.39	VS	1.23	3.95	S	1.41	4.23	S	1.41	4.65	VS	1.11
Patents grants	3.73	S	1.62	4.09	S	1.19	3.74	S	1.48	4.21	S	1.35	3.98	S	1.51
Research publication incentive	3.62	S	1.61	4.16	S	1.45	4.14	S	1.55	3.89	S	1.50	4.05	S	1.57
Paper presentation Incentive	4.30	S	1.70	4.40	VS	1.28	4.19	S	1.62	3.99	S	1.49	4.33	S	1.41
Faculty award for instruction	4.22	S	1.48	3.96	S	1.31	3.77	S	1.46	4.21	S	1.59	4.27	S	1.66
Faculty award for research	4.20	S	1.40	4.32	S	1.36	3.79	S	1.64	3.67	S	1.55	4.29	S	1.53
Faculty awards for extension	3.45	MS	1.63	3.92	S	1.35	3.87	S	1.37	3.99	S	1.42	4.00	S	1.71
Faculty award for production	3.75	S	1.58	4.04	S	1.20	3.78	S	1.29	4.04	S	1.44	4.04	S	1.60
Overall	3.77	S	1.58	4.11	S	1.34	3.98	S	1.47	4.07	S	1.47	4.25	S	1.48

Verbal description (VD); 5.20 – 6.00 Extremely satisfied (ES); 4.36 – 5.19 Very satisfied (VS); 3.52 – 4.35 Satisfied (S); 2.68 – 3.51 Moderately satisfied (MS); 1.84 – 2.67 Slightly satisfied (SS); 1.00 – 1.83 Not satisfied (NS)

3.8. Satisfaction on faculty development program by teaching experience

The findings presented in Table 9 demonstrate that faculty members with less than ten years of teaching experience expressed a "very satisfied" level of satisfaction with their participation in scholarship programs, seminars, and training. They also reported being "moderately satisfied" with the fellowship program. Faculty members with ten to twenty years of experience indicated being "very satisfied" with scholarship programs, seminars, training, and extension grants. Faculty members with more than twenty years of teaching experience expressed "very satisfied" levels of satisfaction with scholarship programs, seminars, training, and thesis or dissertation grants. They reported being "moderately satisfied" with the fellowship grant.

Overall, faculty members, regardless of their teaching experience, expressed satisfaction with all components of their respective SUCs Faculty Development Program. Job satisfaction is an emotional state that arises from the evaluation of one's job experience.

Teachers play a pivotal role in the educational process, and their job satisfaction is a crucial factor that determines their effectiveness. Low job satisfaction is a clear indication of deteriorating teaching standards, while high job satisfaction contributes to well-organized work, particularly in teaching. Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job, an affective reaction to one's job, and an attitude towards one's job.

4. Conclusion

The findings indicate that a majority of the respondents participated in seminars, training,

conferences, symposia, and similar activities within the faculty development program. However, there was no significant difference in the level of satisfaction with the program when the respondents were categorized by age, educational attainment, and years of teaching experience. On the other hand, a significant difference was observed in the extent of satisfaction with the program based on the respondents' plantilla positions. Specifically, there was a notable distinction between instructors and associate professors, as well as assistant professors and associate professors.

No discernible relationship was identified between the extent of satisfaction with the program components and the five demographic profiles of the respondents. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the administration of the SUC prioritize faculty members who have served for 10 to 20 years and are within the age range of 40 to 50. As a significant portion of the faculty members are women, it is essential to address issues related to women's empowerment and gender sensitivity. Encouraging instructors to pursue a master's degree is also necessary, while those who already hold a master's degree should be motivated to pursue a Ph.D.

Despite the absence of a significant difference in program participation among the respondents, SUC administrators should exert substantial effort in motivating newly-hired faculty members to pursue a master's degree, which is a crucial qualification for obtaining a plantilla position. Finally, administrators should devise incentive schemes or merit-based methods to encourage faculty members with plantilla positions to avail of the faculty development program. Offering cash incentives, additional leave credits, or reducing faculty teaching load could serve as effective incentives to attract more beneficiaries.

Table 9: Satisfaction levels of the faculty development program among SUC faculty, segregated by years of teaching experience

Development Program	Below 10 years			10–20 years			Above 20 yrs		
	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD	w \bar{x}	VD	SD
Scholarships	4.38	VS	1.36	4.51	VS	1.24	4.43	VS	1.22
Seminars, trainings, conferences, symposia, etc.	4.36	VS	1.45	4.46	VS	1.37	4.36	VS	1.36
Fellowships	3.37	MS	1.79	3.53	S	1.70	3.25	MS	1.68
Sabbatical leave	3.85	S	1.42	4.17	S	1.54	4.28	S	1.42
Thesis/dissertation grants	3.93	S	1.48	4.16	S	1.48	4.38	VS	1.40
Leave with pay	3.95	S	1.51	4.11	S	1.50	4.34	S	1.37
Leave without pay	3.63	S	1.52	4.08	S	1.42	3.71	S	1.52
Research grants	4.06	S	1.47	4.21	S	1.29	4.13	S	1.40
Extension grants	4.01	S	1.53	4.38	VS	1.40	4.04	S	1.49
Utility model grants	4.11	S	1.36	4.32	S	1.31	4.20	S	1.46
Patents grants	4.00	S	1.30	4.16	S	1.37	3.77	S	1.57
Research publication incentive	4.10	S	1.46	3.90	S	1.59	4.10	S	1.51
Paper presentation incentive	4.14	S	1.59	4.04	S	1.56	4.35	S	1.36
Faculty award for instruction	4.05	S	1.36	3.94	S	1.64	4.18	S	1.52
Faculty award for research	4.08	S	1.48	3.75	S	1.64	3.89	S	1.56
Faculty awards for extension	4.11	S	1.27	3.84	S	1.43	3.85	S	1.61
Faculty award for production	4.05	S	1.21	3.96	S	1.41	3.76	S	1.52
Overall	4.01	S	1.44	4.09	S	1.46	4.06	S	1.47

Verbal description (VD); 5.20 – 6.00 Extremely satisfied (ES); 4.36 – 5.19 Very satisfied (VS); 3.52 – 4.35 Satisfied (S); 2.68 – 3.51 Moderately satisfied (MS); 1.84 – 2.67 Slightly satisfied (SS)

Compliance with ethical standards

performance. Maxwell Macmillan International, New York, USA.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Curtis E, Comiskey C, and Dempsey O (2015). Correlational research: Importance and use in nursing and health research. *Nurse Researcher*, 6(1): 20-25.

<https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2016.e1382> PMID:27424963

Galiza JDR, Nicdao RF, and Armando Jr MG (2018). Educational attainment, teaching experience, professional development and self-efficacy as predictors of chemistry content knowledge: Implication for the development of a national promotion examination. *KIMIKA*, 29(2): 7-22.

<https://doi.org/10.26534/kimika.v29i2.7-22>

Goe L and Stickler LM (2008). Teacher quality and student achievement: Making the most of recent research. TQ Research and Policy Brief, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, Washington, USA.

Griffiths M (2006). The feminization of teaching and the practice of teaching: Threat or opportunity? *Educational Theory*, 56(4): 387-405.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2006.00234.x>

Ingersoll R, Merrill L, and May H (2014). What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition? CPRE Research Reports, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Philadelphia, USA.

Ingvarson L, Meiers M, and Beavis A (2005). Factors affecting the impact of professional development programs on teachers' knowledge, practice, student outcomes and efficacy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13: 10.

<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v13n10.2005>

Kamel AM (2016). Role of faculty development programs in improving teaching and learning. *Saudi Journal of Oral Sciences*, 3(2): 61-68.

<https://doi.org/10.4103/1658-6816.188073>

Kyriacou C and Sutcliffe J (1977). Teacher stress: A review. *Educational Review*, 29(4): 299-306.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191770290407>

Liston D, Borko H, and Whitcomb J (2008). The teacher educator's role in enhancing teacher quality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(2): 111-116.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108315581>

Makovec D (2018). The teacher's role and professional development. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, 6(2): 33-45.

<https://doi.org/10.5937/ijcrsee1802033M>

Margetson D (1994). Current educational reform and the significance of problem-based learning. *Studies in Higher*

References

Abouelenein YAM (2016). Training needs for faculty members: Towards achieving quality of university education in the light of technological innovations. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(13): 1180-1193.

<https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2015.2377>

Alkadry MG and Tower LE (2011). Covert pay discrimination: How authority predicts pay differences between women and men. *Public Administration Review*, 71(5): 740-750.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02413.x>

Al-Smadi MS and Qblan YM (2015). Assessment of job satisfaction among faculty members and its relationship with some variables in Najran University. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(35): 117-123.

Amos PM, Acquah S, Antwi T, and Adzifome NS (2015). A comparative study of factors influencing male and female lecturers' job satisfaction in Ghanaian higher education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(4): 1-10.

Balnaves M and Caputi P (2016). Introduction to quantitative research methods. SAGE Publications, London, UK.

Boumans NP, De Jong AH, and Janssen SM (2011). Age-differences in work motivation and job satisfaction. The influence of age on the relationships between work characteristics and workers' outcomes. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 73(4): 331-350.

<https://doi.org/10.2190/AG.73.4.d> PMID:22474915

Chang AL and Pribbenow CM (2016). The ASM-NSF biology scholars program: An evidence-based model for faculty development. *Journal of Microbiology and Biology Education*, 17(2): 197-203.

<https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.v17i2.1094>

PMid:27158300 PMCid:PMC4858355

CHED (2016). CHED memorandum order 22, series 2016. Commission on Higher Education Government Agency, Quezon City, Philippines.

Cranny CJ, Smith CP, and Stone EF (2010). Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their

- Education, 19(1): 5-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079412331382103>
- Meyer KA (1998). Faculty workload studies: Perspectives, needs, and future directions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1, Volume 26, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, USA.
- Nir AE and Bogler R (2008). The antecedents of teacher satisfaction with professional development programs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(2): 377-386.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.03.002>
- Oshagbemi T (1997). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in higher education. *Education+Training*, 39(9): 354-359.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00400919710192395>
- Oshagbemi T (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(12): 1210-1232.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/03068290310500634>
- Perez AM, McShannon J, and Hynes P (2012). Community college faculty development program and student achievement. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36(5): 379-385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920902813469>
- Postareff L, Lindblom-Ylänne S, and Nevgi A (2007). The effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(5): 557-571.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.013>
- Rowbotham MA (2015). The impact of faculty development on teacher self-efficacy, skills and perspectives. IERC Faculty Fellow Report 2015-1, Illinois Education Research Council, Edwardsville, USA.
- Santoro N, Reid JA, Mayer D, and Singh M (2012). Producing 'quality' teachers: The role of teacher professional standards. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(1): 1-3.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2012.644508>
- Steinert Y (2011). Commentary: Faculty development: The road less traveled. *Academic Medicine*, 86(4): 409-411.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e31820c6fd3>
PMid:21451270
- Toukan EVD (2018). Educating citizens of 'the global': Mapping textual constructs of UNESCO's global citizenship education 2012-2015. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 13(1): 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197917700909>
- Ullian JA and Stritter FT (1997). Types of faculty development programs. *Family Medicine*, 29(4): 237-241.
- Watson C (2014). Effective professional learning communities? The possibilities for teachers as agents of change in schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(1): 18-29.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3025>