Comparison between the Teaching Efficiency Ratings of Faculty Members by the Students, Peers and Academic Chairs

Israel S. Labastilla

Department of Humanities, Education and Social Science, Mindanao State University-Maigo School of Arts and Trades, Maigo, Lanao del Norte, 9206 Philippines
Email address: israel_s_labastilla@yahoo.com

Abstract—The role of multi-stakeholders in objective performance assessment and evaluation among faculty members has been recognized and adopted by many colleges and universities worldwide including the Mindanao State University (MSU) System of which MSU-Maigo School of Arts and Trades (MSU-MSAT) has been integrated into since 2001. Specifically, teaching performance among faculty members which is officially called Teaching Efficiency Rating (TER) by the MSU System is determined by three (3) groups of raters: students, peers and academic chairs. As an integrated campus, MSU-MSAT has actually adopted this multiple method or "cross-rating" system of evaluation. It is unfortunate however that there has been no study conducted in MSU-MSAT yet specifically to check the consistency of the ratings by the students, peers and academic chairs. This study therefore was undertaken to compare the TERs of the faculty members from MSU-MSAT during the first semester, Academic Year 2017-2018. This study specifically compared the differences of the TERs of faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs, and of the weighted TERs of faculty members when grouped by academic department. The study used descriptive-comparative method. Documentary analysis was the main tool employed in gathering data. Frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were used in the initial analysis of data. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) One-Way Classification and t-test for Correlated Data and Uncorrelated Data were employed in the comparative analysis. The findings showed that the TERs of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs are equally exceptional but vary remarkably. When categorized by academic department, the weighted TERs are likewise equally exceptional except from the Department of Industrial Technology (DIT). The differences also vary remarkably. It is recommended that the multiple method or "cross-rating" system of evaluating teaching efficiency be sustained with the instruments reviewed and revised periodically which should take cognizance among other things of the distinctive nature and characteristics of the academic departments to ensure objective, consistent, relevant and fair implementation of the evaluation system. Also, the evaluation criteria, guidelines and procedures should be exhaustively reviewed, updated and oriented to ensure validity and reliability of the results.

Keywords— Comparison between ratings, teaching efficiency ratings.

I. INTRODUCTION

"The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers" (Henard and Liprince-Ringuet, 2008) because they are "the most important resource in schools" (Santiago, 2011). According to Taheri, et al. (2014), faculty members are "one of the main pillars of a university and their function plays a fundamental role in the overall efficiency of the university educational system" This explains the popular concept by Sir Ken Robinson: "There is no system in the world or any school in the country that is better than its teachers. Teachers are the lifeblood of the success of schools" (Salcito, 2013 and ism, 2013).

The role of faculty members generally encompasses three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and service whose proportion of time a faculty member spends in each area varies generally by institution type and more specifically from institution to institution (Preparing Future Faculty, 2018). However, it has been pointed out that of the three areas of teaching, research and service, the teaching role is the most widely shared among faculty members across institutional types (Education Encyclopedia, 2018). According to Kalra, et al. (2015), the primary purpose of institutions of higher education is actually teaching.

The teaching role of faculty members reflects their centrality in addressing the primary educational mission among colleges and universities. As faculty members teach, they disseminate and impart basic or applied knowledge to students and assist students with the learning process in order to basically address the aim of teaching which is to make student learning possible (Ramsden as cited by Henard and Liprince-Ringuet, 2008). This role makes teaching as a complex process involving the interweaving of content knowledge, pedagogy skills and knowledge, and appreciation of the multi-faceted nature of students to be able to point to evidence that learning has occurred (Kalra, et al., 2015).

The teaching role came under increased scrutiny as studies such as the Wingspread Report as cited by the Educational Encyclopedia (2018) appeared. New approaches to revitalizing teaching effectiveness include placing an emphasis on effective pedagogy and paying increased attention to the learning needs of students. Consequently, an emphasis on faculty members as facilitators of students' learning has emerged. This focus on learning incorporates a broad set of goals for learners, such as students' mastery of content, their abilities to consider and critique, and the development of skill sets that enable students to undertake career positions. The Preparing Future Faculty (2018) stated that over the last decade, much work has been accomplished in advancing the

notion of a scholarship of teaching wherein the endeavor of teaching becomes a dynamic interchange of knowledge between the teacher and the learner, with pedagogical approaches being continuously assessed for effectiveness for the student as well as in relation to the subject matter. The work of Ernest Boyer, Parker Palmer and others in this area has greatly elevated the perception of teaching as an important and valued role for faculty members.

It becomes imperative therefore that the quality of performance on the teaching role of faculty members be continuously and systematically examined. Numerous studies have shown that the feedback of these results will enable teachers to identify their strengths and weaknesses in order to improve the former and overcome the latter (Taheri, et al., 2014). This is likewise pointed out by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) of the University of Michigan (2016) when it averred that evaluation of teaching can have many purposes including collecting feedback for teaching improvement and gathering data as part of personnel decisions.

In order to carry out the evaluation process appropriately, the CRLT (2016 and 2018) has emphasized the use of multiple methods involving multiple sources of data being the most important consideration for collecting information about the activities, accomplishments and effectiveness in teaching of faculty members. This should be undertaken in order to have valid and reliable results of assessing the instructional efficiency and effectiveness of faculty members. According to Santiago and Benavides (2009), gathering multiple sources of evidence about teacher practice meets the need for accuracy and fairness of the evaluation process taking into account the complexity of what a good teacher should know and be able to do.

The participation of multiple evaluators is often seen as a key to successful practices; at least more than one person should be involved in judging teacher quality and performance (Peterson, and Stronge and Tucker as cited by Santiago and Benavides, 2009). Danielson and McGreal (2000) explained that the "360-degree evaluation systems" which incorporate the participation of many kinds of evaluators, support the idea that a teacher's competence may be seen from several different perspectives and that it should be exemplary (or at least adequate) from all those different angles.

The Mindanao State University (MSU) System like the many other colleges and universities worldwide is adopting this scheme where the students, peers and academic chairs are specifically required to evaluate every semester what it is officially called the Teaching Efficiency Ratings (TER) of the faculty members (MSU BOR Resolution No. 71, s. 1992). Basically, these three (3) groups of raters evaluate the faculty members using three different sets of instruments from which their respective perceptions would be drawn particularly on four (4) components, each consisting of several elements resembling those from Santiago and Benavides (2009) which are: (1) planning and preparation comprising the elements of demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy, demonstrating knowledge of students, selecting instructional goals, designing coherent instruction, and assessing student

learning; (2) The classroom environment which includes creating an environment of respect and rapport, establishing a culture for learning, managing classroom procedures, managing student behavior, and organizing physical space; (3) Instruction which includes communicating clearly and accurately, using questioning and discussion techniques, engaging students in learning, providing feedback to students, and demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness; and (4) professional responsibilities which include reflecting on teaching, maintaining accurate records, communicating with authorities, growing and developing professionally, and showing professionalism.

It has been emphasized that the students are the most reliable source of evaluation of faculty members because they have the most exposure to the teaching responsibilities of the faculty members concerned. The students are in the best position to express their concerns about the teaching efficiency of teachers whose views and opinions should be considered regardless of their level of knowledge. There is however a contention when Bandy (2018) asserted that students may not always be the best evaluators since they often have limited disciplinary training. They can have biases against certain faculty unrelated to teaching effectiveness, and they can be less cognizant of institutional goals or values than faculty. Hutchings as cited by Bandy (2018) stressed that an over-reliance on student evaluations in processes of professional review can cause faculty to become overly concerned about receiving positive student evaluations which can lead faculty to adopt a consumer model of education, shaping teaching to meet the needs of students over the needs of disciplines or institutions. This in turn, Madu and Kwei as cited by Henard and Liprince-Ringuet (2008) may not encourage the faculty members to develop strategies that would help students in the long run, and may lead them instead to adopt short-term strategies. Hence, the peers have been considered as another group of raters given the concept that when done in formative and summative forms alongside student evaluations, the peers can ensure that both faculty members and students will have a voice in their evaluation, and that faculty members have greater autonomy to innovate and to teach rigorously. Moreover, this can give them the opportunity to focus more intentionally on what helps students to learn best, and therefore more directly focus on the quality of their teaching.

There are however criticisms likewise identified for peers as raters of faculty members' teaching performance. According to Bandy (2018), the most common is bias when peers involve limited or unprofessional approaches in the process due to personal reasons. Also, standards of excellence or their application can be highly subjective thus making the results contentious much more if standards are not defined in advance through rigorous research and open, collaborative processes. Power relations in departments or programs can likewise unduly influence open and thorough evaluation. Hence, another group has been involved composed of the department chairs.

According to Taheri, et al. (2014), the department chairs have the most accurate information about the teaching of

14

subjects such as simplicity and complication, allotting necessary time to teaching, using the course syllabus, and being skillful in the subject taught, etc. Also, they opined that the department chairs have awareness of the duties and of the quality of teaching of faculty members, better understanding of the issues, and knowledge in the courses of study and the relevant syllabi, among others. However, the disadvantages for the department chairs as raters were cited as well. Personal reasons and insufficient information about some activities and accomplishments of the faculty members may be among the factors.

Since the integration of the Maigo School of Arts and Trades (MSAT) into the MSU System back in 2001, it has adopted the multiple method or "cross-rating system" of the MSU System specifically in determining the TER of the faculty members which "recognizes the role of multi-stakeholders in objective assessment and feedbacking" (Philippine Civil Service Commission, 1999). It is unfortunate however that to this day, there has been no study conducted specifically to check the consistency of ratings of the three (3) groups of raters: students, peers and department chairs. Some faculty members question and are dismayed with the ratings they receive from the students, peers or department chairs which usually results to interpersonal conflict and demoralization contrary to the enhancement of organizational effectiveness and productivity which is among the primary aims of faculty evaluation.

This study therefore was conducted to foremost look into this matter by specifically comparing the differences of the TERs of faculty members based on the perceptions of the students, peers and department chairs as raters. In like manner, it sought to measure the differences of the weighted TERs of faculty members when grouped according to academic department.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study attempted to compare the teaching performance of the faculty members from Mindanao State University – Maigo School of Arts and Trades (MSU-MSAT) during the first semester, Academic Year 2017-2018. It specifically sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are the TERs of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs?
2. Is there a significant difference between the TERs of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs?
3. What are the weighted TERs of these faculty members when grouped by academic department?
4. Is there a significant difference between the weighted TERs of the faculty members when grouped by academic department?

III. METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive-comparative method designed "to compare and conclude that one (1) group is better than the other if significant difference exists" (Villanueva, 2013). The method was specifically used in finding the significance of the difference between the TERs of the faculty

members by the students, peers and academic chairs. Data utilized in this study were limited to the TERs of the 65 faculty members from MSU-MSAT during the first semester of Academic Year 2017-2018. These faculty members were distributed among seven (7) academic departments as follows: (1) Department of Humanities, Education and Social Science, 15; (2) Department of Natural Science and Mathematics, 7; (3) Department of Computer Science, 7; (4) Department of Hotel and Restaurant Management, 8; (5) Department of Industrial Technology, 7; (6) Department of Engineering Technology, 11; and (7) High School Department, 10.

The documentary analysis technique was used in gathering the above data through the Office of the Dean of Instruction that maintains complete, accurate and updated records and reports relative to curriculum and instruction. The study basically considered the TERs of the faculty members particularly by the students, peers and academic chairs. The weighted TERs were likewise computed and used particularly in comparing TERs by academic department. These were determined given the respective weights of ratings by the students, peers and academic chairs of 50 percent, 20 percent and 30 percent in the case of the first six academic departments cited above, and 30 percent, 20 percent and 50 percent in the case of the High School Department (MSU BOR Resolution No. 211, s, 2005).

The TERs were categorized into five (5) as stated below to define their corresponding qualitative descriptions (MSU BOR No. 211, s. 2005).

Numerical Rating	Descriptive Rating
93-100	Outstanding (O)
85-92	Very Satisfactory (VS)
75-84	Satisfactory (S)
66-74	Poor (P)
50-65	Failed (F)

The statistical tools used in the analysis and interpretation of data were as follows: (1) Frequency which was used in the counting of the data gathered; (2) Percentage which was used to determine the relative distribution of data into categories; (3) Mean which was used to determine the overall teaching performance of faculty members; (4) Standard Deviation which was used to determine how spread out the TERs were; (5) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) One-Way Classification which was used in testing the significance of the difference between the TERs of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs, and when weighted TERs were grouped by academic department; and (6) t-test for Correlated Data and Uncorrelated Data which were likewise respectively used since the initial conclusion arrived at using ANOVA was that of significance of difference which necessitated to find out which pairs were really significantly different.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teaching Efficiency Ratings of the Faculty Members by the Students, Peers and Academic Chairs

Table 1 reflects data representing the ratings of the faculty members by the three (3) groups of raters: students, peers and

academic chairs. It is hereby pointed out that the raters from every group and their number varied from faculty to faculty given the department assignment and teaching loads of the faculty members. In the case of the students as raters, only those who met the cut-off date set by the computerized Faculty Evaluation System were considered. However, they constituted over 85 percent of the total number of students who were supposed to participate in the evaluation.

TABLE 1. Teaching Efficiency Ratings of Faculty Members by the Students, Peers and Academic Chairs as Raters

Rating		Raters					
		Students		Peers		Academic Chairs	
Numerical	Descriptive	f	%	f	%	f	%
93-100	Outstanding	41	63.08	50	76.92	54	83.08
85-92	Very Satisfactory	19	29.23	15	23.08	11	16.92
75-84	Satisfactory	5	7.69	-	-	-	-
66-74	Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-65	Failed	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		65	100	65	100	65	100
Mean		93.49		94.97		95.81	
Standard Deviation		4.16		3.27		3.70	
Interpretation		Outstanding		Outstanding		Outstanding	

Data as regards students as raters show that there were 41 or 63.08 percent who were rated "Outstanding"; 19 or 29.23 percent were rated "Very Satisfactory", and only five (5) or 7.69 were rated "Satisfactory". No one was rated "Poor" and "Failed". Consistently, the mean was 93.49 and the standard deviation was 4.16 which mean that the majority got high ratings whose variability ranges between the "Outstanding" and "Very Satisfactory" categories. This shows that the students have recognized the effort of their respective faculty members in terms of their teaching duties and responsibilities implying that the faculty members themselves were able to deliver the "goods" in the opinion of the students.

Regarding peers as raters, 50 or 76.92 percent got "Outstanding" rating, while 15 or 23.08 percent got "Very Satisfactory" rating. Nobody was rated "Satisfactory", "Poor" or "Failed." These data had the corresponding mean and standard deviation of 94.97 and 3.27 suggesting that the faculty members have generally perceived themselves being exceptional with their teaching-related duties. Implicitly, they equally function well in the area of teaching thus ensuring effective learning.

The data with regard to the ratings by the academic chairs disclose that 54 or 83.08 percent of the faculty members were rated "Outstanding". Only 11 or 16.92 percent were rated "Very Satisfactory." Nobody got a rating under the "Satisfactory", "Poor" and "Failed" categories. The mean was obviously high, 95.81 while the standard deviation was 3.70. Generally, the data mean that the faculty members have met the teaching standards set by the university as perceived by the academic chairs implying that these faculty members have equally given their best with regard to their teaching duties based on the academic chairs' perception.

Although the ratings by the students, peers and academic chairs were equally outstanding, the data further revealed that the academic chairs have given the highest ratings while the students, the lowest. These imply that the academic chairs have best recognized the teaching efficiency of the faculty members. The students, on the other hand, prove being most critical. This is also evidenced by the largest amount of variation from the students' group suggesting versatility and representativeness as raters.

Significance of the Difference on the TERs of the Faculty Members by the Students, Peers and Academic Chairs

Table 2 reflects the data used to test the significance of the difference between the TERs of the faculty members by the three (3) groups of raters. Since the F-value of 7.80 was very much higher than the corresponding critical value of 3.04, the hypothesis of no significant difference on the TERs of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs was not accepted. In order to point out however the pairs of raters whose ratings substantially vary, t-values were computed for the three (3) pairs: students and peers, students and academic chairs, and peers and academic chairs.

The computed t-values were 2.58, 4.10 and 2.46, respectively. These t-values were equally greater than the critical value of 2.00 based on 64 degrees of freedom at five (5) percent significant level. The results simply show that the ratings of the students, peers and academic chairs on the teaching efficiency of the faculty members differ to a significant extent. While it appears that the ratings of the three (3) groups are equally high, yet they vary substantially. This suggests that the students, peers and academic chairs look at the teaching performance of the faculty members at a considerably varying degree. Generally, the results point out the advantage of the cross-rating system which involves all possible stakeholders in performance evaluation because each group has its perception which may prove distinct and different from the other groups.

TABLE 2. Test on the Significance of the Difference on the Teaching Efficiency Ratings of the Faculty Members by the Students, Peers and Academic Chairs
(F, 7.80> CV, 3.04 where df_{BG}=2, df_{WG}=192 and p=0.05)

Raters	Means	t-value	df	p	CV	Decision
Students and Peers	93.49 and 94.97	2.58	64	0.05	2.00	Do not accept H_0.
Students and Academic Chairs	93.49 and 95.81	4.10	64	0.05	2.00	Do not accept H_0.
Peers and Academic Chairs	94.97 and 95.81	2.46	64	0.05	2.00	Do not accept H_0.

H_0: There is no significant difference on the teaching efficiency ratings of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs.

Weighted TERs of the Faculty Members by Academic Department

Table 3 discloses data about the weighted TERs of the faculty members categorized by academic department. It appears that among the seven (7) academic departments, six (6) had the overall weighted TERs equivalent to "Outstanding". The Department of Computer Science (DCS) had the highest value of 97.39. The Department of Industrial

Technology (DIT) had the lowest of 92.02, only "Very Satisfactory." The data suggest that other than a few from the DIT, the faculty members were able to carry out exceptionally their teaching responsibilities. The students, peers and academic chairs look at them being efficient and effective which is ideal being the fundamental agents of the university in carrying out its mission where teaching is among the essential components.

TABLE 3. Weighted Teaching Efficiency Ratings of Faculty Members

Faculty	Academic Department						
	DHESS	DNSM	DCS	DHRM	DIT	DET	HS
1	95.63	96.32	98.41	95.83	93.85	94.55	90.66
2	94.87	95.57	98.93	94.31	92.88	92.73	98.14
3	89.64	96.16	97.79	97.78	87.15	95.76	95.00
4	91.61	91.45	98.70	94.67	87.98	91.51	94.36
5	95.40	94.82	90.43	96.91	94.21	93.00	98.43
6	91.03	95.20	98.29	94.14	95.40	96.95	95.74
7	97.25	96.14	99.15	96.69	92.68	93.74	95.90
8	94.58	-	-	94.95	-	94.26	91.87
9	94.86	-	-	-	-	96.06	97.51
10	95.28	-	-	-	-	95.86	92.68
11	88.39	-	-	-	-	92.74	-
12	92.68	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	91.26	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	95.21	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	94.39	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weighted TER	93.47	95.09	97.39	95.66	92.02	94.29	95.03
I	O	O	O	O	VS	O	O
SD	2.45	1.57	2.87	1.26	2.95	1.64	2.52

Significance of the Difference between the Overall Weighted TERs of the Faculty Members When Grouped by Academic Department

Table 4 presents the data used to test the significance of the difference between the overall weighted TERs of the faculty members by academic department. Based on the computed F-value of 3.33 which is greater than the corresponding critical value of 2.25, the null hypothesis in general was not accepted. In order to specifically determine however the particular pairs of departments whose overall weighted TERs substantially varied, t-values were computed revealing that significant difference existed between DHESS and DCS, DHESS and DHRM, DNSM and DIT, DCS and DIT, DCS and DET, and DHRM and DIT. The results imply that notwithstanding the high ratings of faculty members across the departments, remarkable variations of teaching efficiency still exist among departments suggesting that the evaluation needs to further address the very nature and characteristics of every academic department. The one-size-fit-all concept of the evaluation system might not have worked well among the seven (7) departments because different departments, on the basis of their respective course offerings, obviously require different instructional approaches, settings, materials, tools, etc. Technology courses, for example, have more hands-on activities than their counterparts.

TABLE 4. Test on the Significance of the Difference on the Teaching Efficiency Ratings of the Faculty Members When Grouped by Academic Department (F, 3.33> CV, 2.25 where $df_{BG}=6$, $df_{WG}=58$ and $p=0.05$)

Pair of Academic Departments		Mean		t-value	df	p	CV	Decision
DHESS	DNSM	93.47	95.09	1.526	20	0.05	2.09	Accept H_0.
DHESS	DCS	93.47	97.39	3.14	20	0.05	2.09	Do not accept H_0.
DHESS	DHRM	93.47	95.66	2.25	21	0.05	2.08	Do not accept H_0.
DHESS	DIT	93.47	92.02	1.15	20	0.05	2.09	Accept H_0.
DHESS	DET	93.47	94.29	0.918	24	0.05	2.06	Accept H_0.
DHESS	HS	93.47	95.03	1.472	23	0.05	2.07	Accept H_0.
DNSM	DCS	95.09	97.39	1.714	12	0.05	2.18	Accept H_0.
DNSM	DHRM	95.09	95.66	0.720	13	0.05	2.16	Accept H_0.
DNSM	DIT	95.09	92.02	2.253	12	0.05	2.18	Do not accept H_0.
DNSM	DET	95.09	94.29	0.976	16	0.05	2.12	Accept H_0.
DNSM	HS	95.09	95.03	0.057	15	0.05	2.13	Accept H_0.
DCS	DHRM	97.39	95.66	1.432	13	0.05	2.16	Accept H_0.
DCS	DIT	97.39	92.02	3.195	12	0.05	2.18	Do not accept H_0.
DCS	DET	97.39	94.29	2.747	16	0.05	2.12	Do not accept H_0.
DCS	HS	97.39	95.03	1.681	15	0.05	2.13	Accept H_0.
DHRM	DIT	95.66	92.02	2.956	13	0.05	2.16	Do not accept H_0.
DHRM	DET	95.66	94.29	1.876	17	0.05	2.11	Accept H_0.
DHRM	HS	95.66	95.03	0.608	16	0.05	2.12	Accept H_0.
DIT	DET	92.02	94.29	1.972	16	0.05	2.12	Accept H_0.
DIT	HS	92.02	95.03	2.12	15	0.05	2.13	Accept H_0.
DET	HS	94.29	95.03	0.767	19	0.05	2.09	Accept H_0.

H_0: There is no significant difference on the teaching efficiency ratings of the faculty members when grouped by academic department.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the conclusions below are drawn.
1. The TERs of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs are equally exceptional.
2. The TERs of the faculty members by the students, peers and academic chairs remarkably vary.
3. When categorized by academic department, the weighted TERs of the faculty members are likewise equally exceptional except from the Department of Industrial Technology (DIT) who still need improvement to be at par with those from the other departments.

4. Generally, the weighted TERs of the faculty members categorized by academic department likewise vary to a remarkable extent.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations below are advanced for consideration.

1. The multiple method or "cross-rating" system in evaluating the teaching efficiency of the faculty members should be sustained although the evaluation instruments should be periodically reviewed and revised in order to make them relevant and responsive.

2. Evaluation criteria, guidelines and procedures should likewise be exhaustively reviewed and updated in order to keep the validity and reliability of the results.

3. An objective and comprehensive orientation about the evaluation system among raters should be regularly conducted to minimize if not eliminate bias and other forms of subjectivity which are expected in any evaluation by perception.

4. All academic departments should ensure consistent and fair implementation of the evaluation system in order to ensure that the faculty members get the ratings they most deserve regardless of the academic departments they are serving.

5. In the revision of the evaluation instruments, the distinctive nature and characteristics of each and every academic department should be studied and factored in for possible department customization.

6. An intensive study about the faculty evaluation system should be conducted to identify particular areas requiring modification and improvement.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Henard and S. Liprince-Ringuet. (2008). The path to quality teaching in higher education. Retrieved on August 3, 2018 from http://www1.oecd.org/education/imhe/44150246.pdf

[2] P. Santiago. (2011). "Teachers matter: attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers," OECD paper presented during the Accession Seminar for Slovenia at Ljubljana, Slovenia on 25 May 2011. Retrieved on August 6, 2018 from http://www.mizks.gov.si/fileadmin/mizks.gov.si/pageuploads/podrocje/mednarodno/OECD_seminar/Gradivo_OECD_Teachers_Matter_Santiago.pdf

[3] M. H. Taheri, H.R. Ryasi, M. Afshar and M.R. Mofatteh. (2014). "Comparison between student rating, faculty self-rating and evaluation of faculty members by heads of respective academic departments in the school of medicine in Birjand University of Medical Sciences in Iran," *Journal of Education and Health Promotion, Vol. 3:34*. Retrieved on March 26, 2018 from goo.gl/HNZJS4.

[4] A. Salcito. (2013). Daily adventures. Retrieved on August 2, 2018 from http://dailyedventures.com/index.php/2013/07/23/sir_ken_robinson/

[5] ism. (2013). "Teachers: the lifeblood of your school's success," *The Source for Academic Leadership, Volume 11, No. 1*. Retrieved on August 2, 2018 from https://isminc.com/blog/academic-leadership/vol-11/no-1/teachers-the-lifeblood-of-your-schools-success

[6] Preparing Future Faculty. (2018). Faculty roles and responsibilities. Retrieved on July 29, 2018 from http://www.preparing-faculty.org/pffweb.roles.htm

[7] Education Encyclopedia. (1972). "Faculty roles and responsibilities - the teaching role, the research role, the service role, integration of faculty roles and responsibilities," StateUniversity.com. Retrieved on March 26, 2018 from goo.gl/5BrRBV3.

[8] K. Vinita, G. Negi and V. D. Chauhan. (2015). "Comparison of two formats for student evaluation of teacher effectiveness," *International Journal of Applied Basic Medical Research*. Retrieved on March 24, 2018 from goo.gl/UeSpLg

[9] Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan. (2016). Evaluation of teaching. Retrieved on March 28, 2018 from goo.gl/7gKugA.

[10] (2018). Guidelines for evaluating teaching. Retrieved on March 27, 2018 from goo.gl/Hc81FL.

[11] P. Santiago and F. Benavides. (2009). "Teacher evaluation: a conceptual framework and examples of country practices," OECD paper presented at the OECD-Mexico workshop towards a teacher-evaluation framework in Mexico: international practices, criteria and mechanism held in Mexico City on 1-2 December 2009. Retrieved on August 3, 2008 from http://www.oecd.org/education/school/44568106.pdf

[12] C. Danielson and T. McGreal. (2000). "Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice," Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). Alexandria, Virginia.

[13] Mindanao State University Board of Regents (MSU BOR) Resolution No. 71, s. 1992.

[14] Mindanao State University Board of Regents (MSU BOR) Resolution No. 211, s. 2005.

[15] J. Bandy. (2018). Peer review of teaching. Vanderbilt University. Retrieved on March 25, 2018 from goo.gl/njKN4f.

[16] Philippine Civil Service Commission Memorandum Circular No. 25, s. 1999. Model agency performance evaluation system. Retrieved on August 2, 2018 from https://www.csguide.org/items/show/415.

[17] J. B. Villanueva. (2013). Types of Descriptive Research. Retrieved on March 28, 2018 from goo.gl/woxdMQ.

18