

Competencies of College Faculty Members of the Mindanao State University Tawi-Tawi College of Technology and Oceanography (Msu-Tcto): Their Implication to Teaching and Learning Efficiencies

Charity Joy B. Hashim¹

¹ Mindanao State University-Tawi-Tawi, Bongao, Tawi-Tawi, Philippines

Abstract: *Teaching has been described as the process of imparting knowledge and unifying process that affects almost every phase of growth, thinking, and personal and social development of the learners. It emphasizes the development of integrated personality of the child/learner – his abilities, habits, knowledge, skills, and attitudes. In other words, effective teaching and learning are the results of the integrated personality of the teacher. Thus, it is imperative that the teacher must be competent enough to achieve teaching effectiveness.*

Keywords: *Competencies, Teaching and Learning Efficiencies*

1. Introduction

Teaching has been described as the process of imparting knowledge and unifying process that affects almost every phase of growth, thinking, and personal and social development of the learners. It emphasizes the development of integrated personality of the child/learner – his abilities, habits, knowledge, skills, and attitudes. In other words, effective teaching and learning are the results of the integrated personality of the teacher. Thus, it is imperative that the teacher must be competent enough to achieve teaching effectiveness.

Teacher competencies are defined as “the set of knowledge, skills, and experience necessary for future, which manifests in activities” Gupta, R. C (1976) define competencies as “knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, motivations and beliefs people need in order to be successful in a job”.

This paper aims to discuss and identify the general framework of teachers’ competencies. Among college faculty members of MSU-TCTO and how they relate to teaching and learning efficiencies. Teachers’ competencies affect their values, behaviors, communication, aims, and practices in school and also they support professional development and curricular studies. Thus, the discussion on teachers’ competencies to improve the teaching-learning process in school is of great importance.

2. Problem Statements

1. What is the socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - a. Gender
 - b. Civil Status
 - c. Work Status
 - d. Length of Service
 - e. Field of Specialization
 - f. Scholarship Enjoyed
 - g. Highest Educational Attainment and
 - h. Academic Awards?

2. What is the level of faculty efficiency as measured by Teaching Efficiency Rating?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the socio-demographic profile and their competencies?
4. Is there significant difference in the ratings of the faculty based on the TER?

3. Methods

This research utilizes the survey approach of research using descriptive method. It was constituted of College faculty members of MSU-TCTO with a total of fifty two (52) coming from the different colleges, regardless of the field of specialization and length of service. Teaching Efficiency Rating (TER) result was used by the researcher in identifying their Teaching Competency.

The data for this study were the computerized Teaching Efficiency Rating (TER) of the faculty members, Academic year 2014-2015. Data were taken from the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. These were supplemented by the respondents' profile.

4. Results

Distribution of Respondents by Gender of the MSU-TCTO

Gender Respondents	Frequency	Percent
Male	26	50.0
Female	26	50.0
Total	52	100.0

Distribution of Respondents by Martial Status of the MSU-TCTO

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	14	26.9
Married	37	71.2
Widow/Widower	1	1.9
Total	52	100.0

Distribution of Respondents by Appointment Status of the MSU-TCTO

Work Appointment Status	Frequency	Percent
Contract of Service	8	15.4
Regular/Permanent	44	84.6
Total	52	100.0

Distribution of the Respondents by Length of service in Years in MSU-TCTO

Length of Service	Frequency	Percent
1-5 years	13	25.0
6-10 years	5	9.6
11-15 years	5	9.6
16-20 years	11	21.2
21-25 years	5	9.6
26 and more years	13	25.0
Total	52	100.0

Distribution of Respondents by Field of Specialization in the different Department Colleges of
MSU-TCTO

Field of Specialization	Frequency	Percent
Math/Stat	8	15.4
Language	13	25.0
Social Sciences	7	13.5
Sciences (Physical, Natural, etc)	6	11.5
Education	3	5.8
ICT	3	5.8
Sports	3	5.8
Others	2	3.8
Teaching Arabic	1	1.9
Marine Biology	3	5.8
Aquaculture	1	1.9
Coastal Resource Mgnt	1	1.9
Computer Education	1	1.9
Total	52	100.0

Distribution of Respondents by Scholarship Enjoyed as Faculty Grantee

Scholarship Enjoyed	Frequency	Percent
None	31	59.6
APDP	13	25.0
CHEDPDF	6	11.5
SSST	1	1.9
DOST	1	1.9
Total	52	100.0

Distributions of respondents by Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Baccalaureate Degree	14	26.9
Units in Master's Degree	10	19.2
Masteral Degree	22	42.3
Ph.D./Ed.D./DPA	6	11.5
Total	52	100.0

Distribution of Respondents by Honor/Awards as they obtained their Baccalaureate Degree

Honors/Awards	Frequency	Percent
None	30	57.7
Cum Laude	15	28.8
Magna Cum Laude	7	13.5
Total	52	100.0

Distribution of Respondents by Other Awards as They Obtained their Highest Educational
Attainment

Other_Awards	Frequency	Percent
None	37	71.2
Academic Excellence	5	9.6
DOST Excellence Award	1	1.9
Others	8	15.4
LET Topnotcher	1	1.9
Total	52	100.0

What is the level of faculty efficiency as measured by Teaching Efficiency Rating?

The Teaching Efficiency Ratings of the Respondents by Student, Peer and Superior in
MSU-TCTO

Ratings	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rater_stud	38.1325	1.32401	52
Rater_peer	28.9052	0.65693	52
Rater_sup	27.8779	1.94183	52
Total	94.8960	2.33554	52

Is there a significant relationship between the socio-demographic profile and their competencies?

Summary of the Correlation Coefficient of the Relationship of TER and the Demographic Profile of the
Respondents - **Correlations**

		Gender	Marital Status	Work Status	Service length	FOS	Scho Enjoyed	HE Attain	Baccal Awards	Other_Award
Gender	Correlation Value	1	.040	-.213	-.071	-.102	-.098	-.126	.080	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.776	.129	.619	.472	.489	.372	.571	1.000
Marital Status	Correlation Value	.040	1	.561	.515	.008	-.031	.615	-.099	.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.776		.000	.000	.953	.828	.000	.487	.173
Marital Status	Correlation Value	-.213	.561	1	.544	.368	.004	.482	-.188	.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.129	.000		.000	.007	.977	.000	.181	.499
Service length	Correlation Value	-.071	.515	.544	1	.385	.191	.510	-.354	.144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.619	.000	.000		.005	.174	.000	.010	.308
FOS	Correlation Value	-.102	.008	.368	.385	1	.242	-.015	-.293	.068
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.472	.953	.007	.005		.083	.914	.035	.630
Scho Enjoyed	Correlation Value	-.098	-.031	.004	.191	.242	1	.169	-.011	.291
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.489	.828	.977	.174	.083		.231	.938	.036
HE Attain	Correlation Value	-.126	.615	.482	.510	-.015	.169	1	.077	.156
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.372	.000	.000	.000	.914	.231		.587	.270
Baccal Awards	Correlation Value	.080	-.099	-.188	-.354	.293	-.011	.077	1	.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.571	.487	.181	.010	.035	.938	.587		.828
Other Award	Correlation Value	.000	.192	.096	.144	.068	.291	.156	.031	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1.000	.173	.499	.308	.630	.036	.270	.828	
Rater_stud	Correlation Value	.040	-.066	-.119	.094	-.055	.050	.029	.121	-.145
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.778	.641	.402	.506	.699	.724	.837	.394	.305
Rater_peer	Correlation Value	.024	-.099	-.070	-.044	.341	-.130	-.024	-.023	.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.866	.485	.620	.756	.013	.356	.866	.873	.879
Rater_sup	Correlation Value	.019	.158	.480	.266	.162	.048	.067	-.078	-.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.895	.263	.000	.057	.252	.737	.637	.581	.787
TER	Correlation Value	.037	.044	.308	.251	.014	.037	.048	.003	-.103
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.795	.757	.026	.072	.924	.795	.734	.981	.465

3a. Is there significant difference in the ratings of the faculty based on the TER?

Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the TER by Department and by rater of the Respondents

Tests of Between-Subject Effects

source		Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Correct Model	Rater_stud	31.174 ^a	8	3.897	2.878	.012
	Rater_peer	8.947 ^b	8	1.118	3.682	.002
	Rater_sup	100.645 ^c	8	12.581	5.902	.000
Intercept	Rater_stud	46778.784	1	46778.784	34544.547	.000
	Rater_peer	26705.623	1	26705.623	879 13.852	.000
	Rater_sup	24757.246	1	24757.246	11613.986	.000
.DeptCode	Rater_stud	31.174	8	3.897	2.878	.012
	Rater_peer	8.947	8	1.118	3.682	.002
	Rater_sup	100.645	8	12.581	5.902	.000
Error	Rater_stud	58.229	43	1.354		
	Rater_peer	13.062	43	.304		
	Rater_sup	91.662	43	2.132		
Total	Rater_stud	75701.956	52			
	Rater_peer	43468.537	52			
	Rater_sup	40605.482	52			
Correct Total	Rater_stud	89.403	51			
	Rater_peer	22.009	51			
	Rater_sup	192.307	51			

a. R Squared = .349 (Adjusted R Squared = .228)

b. R Squared = .407 (Adjusted R Squared = .296)

c. R Squared = .523 (Adjusted R Squared = .435)

5. Conclusions

On the level of faculty efficiency as measured by TER, the teaching efficiency rating (TER) of MSU-TCTO faculty members is an aggregate of student's rating (30%), peer's rating (30%) and superior's rating (30%) to get the total TER (Teaching Efficiency Rating). Thus, the sum of the three mean score which is 94.8960 is the MSU-TCTO faculty member average teaching efficiency rating or TER. It is also noted that the influence of socio-demographic profile of the respondents on the competencies of the faculty, the teaching efficiency rating (TER) is only significantly related to the respondents' status of appointment (Work status). While the rest of the variables for the demographic profile do not warrant for the significant relationship. However, on the significant difference in the ratings of faculty by department and by raters, there is a significant difference in the mean score of the faculty TER as rated by the students, peer, and superior by department.

Therefore, from the given result we cannot generalize the teaching competency of the faculty members. This is due to insufficient number of data presented, perhaps if data or sample size will be added then possibly we can warrant the teaching competency of the said study.

6. Recommendations

From the given findings, here are some of the recommendations

1. More studies should be conducted related to teaching competency.
2. More respondents or bigger sample size must be considered.
3. Hiring of qualified and competent teachers is important.
4. Regular sending of faculty members to seminar/workshops and trainings.
5. Provision of adequate and updated materials for teaching.

References

- [1] Agno, Lydia N. *Principles of Teaching 2. A Modular Approach*. Published in 2010 by C and E Publishing, Inc.
- [2] Aquino, Gaudencio (1971). *Curriculum Development Principles and Techniques*.
- [3] Adjawi, Maria Liza B. (2001). *Teaching Efficiency Rating (TER) of the Muslim and Non-Muslim Faculty*. Unpublished Thesis.
- [4] Aradais, Langka B. (2000). *Teaching effectiveness of the Public Secondary School Teachers of Bongao*.
- [5] Aripin, Hasana H. (2006). *Professional Competencies and Instructional Needs of High School Teachers of vocational Schools in Tawi-Tawi: Implications to Quality Instruction*.
- [6] Barr (1961) conducted studies on “*Professional Competency and Teacher Effectiveness*”.
- [7] Bhagoliwal (1982) conducted a study entitled “*A Study of Personality Characteristics associated with teaching effectiveness*”.
- [8] Gupta R. C. (1976). *Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness through Personality Tests*”.
- [9] Kanakala, Jayaran (2010) conducted a study on “*The Impact of Professional Competency and Creativity of Professional Pleasure*”.
- [10] Karbasioun, M., Mlder, M., & Biemeans, H. (2007). *Competence Standards, Vocations and Professions: Competence-profiling for Vocational and Professional Education*.
- [11] Madi, Marjuni M. (2005). *Teachers’ Performance and the National Achievement Test Results of Grade IV Pupils in the Division of Tawi-Tawi*.
- [12] Roy, Samanta (1971). “*A study of Teacher Attitude and its relationship with Teaching Efficiency*”.
- [13] Wesselink, R., Biemans, H., Mulder, M. & Van den Elsen, E. R. (2007). *Competitiveness Measurement of Curricula in Vocational Education: competence-Based Teaching and Learning*.