The Development Needs of Cebu Technological University Faculty: Towards A Faculty Development Program

ADELINE P. DELA CRUZ
Cebu Technological University, Barili Campus, Barili, Cebu Philippines

Abstract- ***The main objective of this research was to determine the development needs of the faculty of Cebu Technological University with the end in view of developing a faculty development program. Specifically, it sought to determine the profile of the respondents and the development needs of the faculty in terms of: instructional development, professional development, organizational development, career development, and personal development. Using the descriptive survey method and with the aid of a researcher-made questionnaire, the following findings were established: 1) as to the profile of the respondents, majority of them were in the 31-40 year old age bracket, majority were females, majority were married, 40% had a doctorate degree, majority had instructor ranks than professor ranks, most were given designations in addition to their teaching load, and majority of the respondents had less than 5 years of teaching experience; 2) instructional development, professional development, and personal development were highly needed, while organizational development and career development were needed.***

Indexed Terms- ***development needs, instructional development, professional development, organizational development, career development, personal development***

I. INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Development Program (FDP) is a critical factor towards building the strong foundation of an educational system to ensure quality education. In previous and current studies, faculty development has always surfaced as a priority concern. (https://ched.gov.ph/faculty-development-program-facdev/). In view of the faculty's vital role in influencing education outcomes, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) requires that teachers at higher education level must have at least master's degree in the fields in which they teach.

The Cebu Technological University (CTU) is one of the higher education institutions (HEIs) and one of the fewer state universities and colleges (SUCs). CTU envisions itself as "A premier, multi-disciplinary technological university." The goal of CTU is to: "produce scientifically and technologically-oriented human capital equipped with appropriate knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It shall likewise produce relevant research, strengthen linkages with the industry, community, and other institutions and maintain sustainable technology for the preservation of the environment." (http://www.ctu.edu.ph/vmgo/)

The administrators determine which activities need to be included in the faculty development program. It will then be cascaded to the middle management and implemented to the rank-and-file faculty. This practice was perceived to be less effective because the activities did not address the specific needs of the faculty (please see Annex on Focus Group Discussion). It has been observed in the past FDP activities, when they were rolled out, the faculty just simply went along with the activities for the sake of compliance. Hence, FDP activities can be futile if they do not meet the real needs of the faculty.

Faculty development program (FDP) is crucial to the attainment of institutional goals as well as the faculty's personal development goals. But for this program to be effective and efficient, it must properly assess the needs of the faculty. The faculty must be surveyed first before any faculty development program will be implemented. As it has been said: "those who will be affected must be consulted." By surveying the faculty as to what the kinds of development activities that they

really need, then the university can avoid wasting valuable resources. on unnecessary activities.

As a faculty of Cebu Technological University, this researcher has observed that there were surveys conducted on the training needs of the faculty. However, it did not take into consideration the other dimensions of faculty development. In some campuses, the results of the surveys were being set aside and not used as the basis for the preparation of the five-year faculty development plan. Thus, this faculty-researcher is prompted to undertake this study to address the vital missing links. The result of this study can be proposed as basis for a faculty development plan.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Faculty development has been defined as that wide range of activities that institutions apply to support faculty members' roles. It includes programs designed to improve the faculty members' performance in the areas of instruction, research, extension, production, administration, and leadership roles to augment organizational capacities and culture.

In the 1970's, the concept of faculty development has expanded to include a variety of activities and programs. Bergquist and Phillips were among the first to offer some conceptual ideas about the field. Their model included three (3) related components of faculty development: instructional development, personal development, and organizational development. Instructional development included activities such as curriculum development, teaching diagnosis, and training. Personal development involved practices that promote faculty growth, such as interpersonal skills training and career counseling. Organizational development aimed to improve the organization's environment for teaching and decision making, and it included activities for both administrators and the faculty members. Example of activities under this component are team building and managerial training. Gaff's model also included instructional and organizational development. In comparison to Bergquist and Phillips' concept, Gaff viewed instructional development as focusing more on course and curriculum design.

Riegle (1987) in his article *Conceptions of Faculty Development* stated that there were five (5) phrases interchangeably used to mean faculty development, but they have different meanings, and they are as follows:

1. Instructional development emphasizes the development of faculty skills involving instructional technology, microteaching, media, courses, and curricula;
2. Professional development emphasizes the growth and development of individual faculty in their professional roles;
3. Organizational development emphasizes the needs, priorities and organization of the institution;
4. Career development emphasizes preparation for career advancement;
5. Personal development emphasizes life planning, interpersonal skills, and the growth of faculty as individuals."

This study is anchored on Riegle's conceptual framework of faculty development because it is more comprehensive.

III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Tindugan (2013) studied "The implementation and practices of faculty development programs of SUCs in Leyte." She has observed that state universities and colleges in Leyte have a functional faculty development program. It promoted work-life balance in the programs and activities they provided to their faculty members. The faculty considered the following as best practices: assistance in thesis/dissertation writing and opportunities for service credits, field trips, socializations, sports and other recreational activities They understood the policy on requirement and allocation of scholarship assistance. The administration is generally supportive, and monitoring scheme existed. Budget allocation, policy dissemination, faculty orientation, and monitoring procedures were the observed limitations of the faculty development program. She proposed an improved faculty development program for the next five years to address the gaps observed. (Tindugan, L., Journal of Education and Human Resource Development, Vol. 1, 2013)

Somera (2009) conducted a similar study titled "The Status of Faculty Development Programs of Selected Universities and Colleges in Region 1: Basis for a Proposed Faculty Development Program." This study presented the practices that state universities and colleges (SUCs) undertook in Region 1 to promote the development of both the administrators and faculty through their faculty development program. The output of the study was a proposed functional Faculty Development Plan fit for the professional development of administrators and faculty of Region 1 SUCs which may also be suited to other higher education institutions in the Philippines. (The Trinitian Researcher, Phil. E-Journals, Vol. 2, No.1, 2009).

Garbo (2009) also studied the faculty development activities of the four (4) northern campuses of Cebu Technological University. She concluded that the mode of conducting faculty development activities of four (4) northern campuses of the CTU System, as well as the implementation of the activities for the personal and professional development of the faculty. She recommended the following actions: 1) Conduct wide information dissemination to the teachers regarding PASUC evaluation criteria; 2) conduct an annual survey of teachers' training needs before the close of the school year to be the basis in planning and implementing development activities; 3) Implement activities such as orientation, short-term courses, trainings and seminars for non-teaching personnel and teachers in preparation for new work assignments; 4) involve the teachers, through the faculty association president, in preparing the annual budget; 5) augment the implementation of the less extensive development activities for the personal enhancement of the faculty; 6) Increase implementation of the less extensive activities for the professional development of the faculty especially in the areas of classroom management and the preparation of instructional materials; 7) Problems encountered in the implementation of the development program must be given attention.

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This study followed the quantitative descriptive survey method supported with key informant interview and focused group discussion. It involves the collection of data which is used to describe the attributes, attitudes, and opinions of the people and phenomena. Through this method, inferences can be made about possible relationships and differences which may exist between variables and between respondent groups.

A survey questionnaire was used to collect data from the administrators and the faculty members of Cebu Technological University who were the main respondents of this study. To minimize drawing wrong conclusions due to incorrect but socially acceptable answers, the researcher also employed the qualitative method with key informant interview and a focused group discussion (FGD) with key school personnel. The following are the key informants:

Key informant 1. Campus Directors. The Campus Directors as managers of their respective campuses were important key informants because they were the decision makers especially on decisions as to who will be sent to seminars, workshops, trainings, and other faculty development activities.

Key informant 2. The Human Resource Management Officers (HRMO). The HRMOs were also key informants because they design training programs, and they also gave advices to the decision makers like the Campus Directors and/or Presidents and Vice Presidents as to the types of trainings and as to who among faculty will be sent.

Key informant 3. The Faculty Presidents. Another key informant are the faculty presidents in each campus. As the leader elected by the rank-and-file faculty, the faculty president is their representative in all the council meetings in the Campus. At the University level, a president is elected from among the local campus faculty presidents who shall represent them in CTU's Board of Regents' (BOR) meetings. He or she is called the Faculty Regent.

This study was conducted in the nine (9) pioneer campuses of CTU. The following lists the names of these nine (9) campuses and their addresses:

1. CTU Main Campus, R. Palma Street, Cebu City, 6000 Cebu;
2. CTU Argao Campus, Isidro Kintanar Street, Lamacan, Argao, 6021 Cebu;
3. CTU Barili Campus, Barili, 6036 Cebu;

4. CTU Carmen Campus, R.M. Avenue, Carmen, 6005 Cebu
5. CTU Daanbantayan Campus, Agujo, Daanbantayan, 6013 Cebu
6. CTU Danao City Campus, Sabang, Danao City, 6004 Cebu
7. CTU Moalboal Campus, Poblacion, Moalboal, 6032 Cebu
8. CTU San Francisco Campus, San Francisco, Camotes Islands, 6050 Cebu
9. CTU Tuburan Campus Barangay 8, Tuburan, 6043 Cebu

Cebu Technological University is considered the biggest state university in Cebu with a student population averaging more than 40,000 per semester and spread across all the sattyelite and extension campuses. Its creation was anchored on the following laws: 1) Batas Pambansa Bilang 412: "An Act Converting the Cebu School of Arts and Trades in Cebu City into a Chartered College to be known as the Cebu State College of Science and Technology…" 2) Republic Act 9744, "An Act Converting the Cebu State College of Science and Technology in the city of Cebu and all its satellite campuses located in the province of Cebu into a state university to be known as the Cebu Technological University (CTU) and appropriating funds therefor," and 3) Republic Act 11185, "**A**n Act Integrating the Cebu City Mountain Extension Campus as a Satellite Campus of the Cebu Technological University, and Appropriating Funds Therefor, Amending for the Purpose Republic Act 9744."

The respondents were randomly taken from the total faculty population which were subdivided into two groups: Administrators (Admin) or the faculty designated to manage and supervise the rank-and-file faculty and the Faculty referring to the rank-and-file faculty or those faculty who were under the management and supervision of the administrators.

Table 1
The Respondents

Name of CTU Campus	Admin Total	Admin Sample	Faculty Total	Faculty Sample	Total Pop.	Total Sample
CTU Main	52	19	245	31	297	50
CTU Argao	19	9	53	12	72	21
CTU Barili	19	17	36	16	55	33
CTU Carmen	10	5	38	11	48	16
CTU Daanbantayan	15	14	42	16	57	29
CTU Danao	19	10	55	25	74	35
CTU Moalboal	19	18	57	15	76	33
CTU San Francisco	11	10	22	16	33	26
CTU Tuburan	17	5	47	13	64	18
Total Numbers	181	106	595	155	776	262

Table 1 *presents* the respondents in terms of total and sample population per category. In each campus, the first presented is the administrators' total and sample population followed by the faculty's total and sample population. As shown on the table, the four (4) campuses which had the highest sample sizes were: CTU Main Campus, with 50 out 262, with a 19% retrieval rate. This was followed by CTU Danao, 35 out of 74, with a retrieval rate of 47%. Next was, CTU Barili with 33 out of 55, the highest retrieval rate of 60%; and CTU Moalboal with 33 out of 76, with a retrieval rate of 43%. CTU Barili got the highest retrieval rate of 60% because this was the home campus of the researcher so she did her best to get more respondents to complete and return the questionnaires.

A total of 262 respondents participated in this study which was considered sufficient considering that the targeted sample size was only 257. To determine a sufficient sample size, the Raosoft sample size calculator was being utilized. According to Raosoft, with a population of 776, with a 5% margin of error, at 95% confidence level, and 50% response

distribution, the recommended sample size is 257. Thus, upon reaching 262 respondents, data gathering was closed.

The main data-gathering instrument was a survey questionnaire which was developed by the researcher. The items were based from the authors cited in the review of related literature such as Tindugan (2013), Somera (2009), and Garbo (2009).

Part I surveyed the demographic profile of the respondents, namely: age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, position/designation, and number of years teaching experience.

Part II surveyed the faculty's development needs based on Riegle's five (5) dimensions such as: instructional development, professional development, organizational development, career development, and personal development.

Since this survey questionnaire was assembled by the researcher, hence, the instruments were tested with regards to validity and reliability. For face validity, it was determined by a graduate of Doctor of Management major in Human Resource Management, whereas the content validity was determined by the human resource management officers (HRMOs) and also by the faculty presidents of each campus.

For qualitative method, interview question guides, and focus group discussion activity designs (Appendix D) were used. In the interview with key informants, question guides were used to obtain data on how faculty development program activities were implemented in their campuses.

The Likert scale method was used in the questionnaire to quantify the extent to which they assess their level of needs for each item described in the statements. The numerical and qualitative descriptions used in the questionnaire are as follows:

Weighted Mean Scale Range	Description	Interpretation
3.26 – 4.00	Highly Needed	This means that the item is Needed all the time.
2.51 – 3.25	Needed	This means that the item is Needed most of the time
1.76 – 2.50	Less Needed	This means that the item is Needed sometimes
1.00 – 1.75	Not Needed	This means that there is No Need observed.

The researcher followed the protocol in conducting research in the different campuses. Prior to distribution of questionnaire, the researcher sought the permission of the university president and the respective campus directors. When permission was secured, the researcher went to distribute the questionnaires in each campus. The faculty presidents also assisted in the distribution and collection of the questionnaires. To increase response rate, the researcher also invited some faculty to answer thru the online Google survey form.

During the conduct of the survey, the researcher always announced to both the faculty and administrators the purpose of the study. In order to motivate them to participate, the researcher also explained to them that the result of the study can be proposed in crafting a faculty development program. As soon as the survey questionnaires were collected, they were immediately encoded into the Google survey form and stored in Google Drive, so that the collected data could be secured. As soon as sufficient number of respondents was reached, then data gathering was closed, and data were summarized, analyzed, and interpreted.

The data were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. First, the responses of the participants were tabulated based on their demographic profile. The weighted mean was being used to describe the respondents' demographic profile and their development needs. To get the weighted mean, the researcher used the formula illustrated below:

$$WM = \frac{\Sigma f x}{n}$$

Where: WM = weighted mean
Σ = summation
f = number of respondents under each scale
x = weight assigned to each scale
n = number of respondents

To interpret the results, a hypothetical weighted mean range was established.

The scale ratings used the weighted mean scale together with their corresponding description and interpretations as follows:

Weighted Mean Scale Range	Description	Interpretation
3.26 – 4.00	Highly Needed	This means that the item is Needed all the time.
2.51 – 3.25	Needed	This means that the item is Needed most of the time
1.76 – 2.50	Less Needed	This means that the item is Needed sometimes
1.00 – 1.75	Not Needed	This means that there is No need observed.

In determining the relationships between variables as well as the differences between respondent groups, appropriate statistical treatment was applied using the Statistical Package for Social Science Research (SPSS). Results from computations and statistical treatments were useful tools in the analysis and interpretation of relevant data, as well as in validating theories upon which this study is anchored.

Specifically, on the test of difference between the assessments of administrators and faculty members regarding the faculty's development needs, the t-test of difference was employed. In determining the relationship between the demographic profile of the faculty and their development needs, the t-test was also employed.

To interpret the results, the t-test or parametric test for two independent samples/groups was used to compare two means, the means of two independent samples or two independent groups.

The formula is
Where:

$$t = \frac{\overline{X_1} - \overline{X_2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS_1 + SS_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

t = the t – test
$\overline{X1}$ = the mean of group 1
$\overline{X2}$ = the mean of group 2
$SS1$ = the sum of squares of group 1
$SS2$ = the sum of squares of group 2
$n1$ = the number of observations in group 1
$n2$ = the number of observations in group 2

In determining the relationship between the demographic profile of the faculty and their development needs, the Chi-square test for independence was used. A chi square (χ^2) statistic is a test that measures how expectations compare to actual observed data (or model results). The data used in calculating a chi square statistic must be random, raw, mutually exclusive, drawn from independent variables, and drawn from a large enough sample.

The formula is as follows:

$$X^2 = \Sigma \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

Where: O = the observed frequency
E = the expected frequency

The Research Ethics Guidebook (www. ethicsguidebook.ac.uk) presents the six key principles when conducting research, namely: 1) ensuring quality and integrity in research; 2) seeking informed consent; 3) respecting the confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents; 4) ensuring participants of their voluntary participation; 5) avoiding harm to the participants; and 6) to show that research conducted is independent and impartial. In the conduct of this research, these principles were reviewed and strictly followed and adhered to by the researcher in order to advance the integrity of this scholarly work.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is about the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data to answer the problems of the study. The data were presented in tabular format; then they were analyzed and interpreted based on specific problems of the study. The arrangement of presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data was according to the sequence of the specific problems presented in Chapter 1, hence divided into the following Parts:

Part 1. Demographic Profile of the Faculty in Terms of Age, Sex, Civil Status, Educational Attainment, Academic Rank, Position/Designation, & Length of Teaching Experience.

Part 2. The development needs of the faculty in terms of:
2.1 Instructional development;
2.2 Professional development;
2.3 Organizational Development;
2.4 Career Development; and
2.5 Personal Development.

Part 3. Difference between the assessment of administrators and the faculty regarding the faculty's development needs.

Part 4. Relationship between the demographic profile of the faculty and their development needs.

VI. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE FACULTY

Demographics refer to particular characteristics of a population. Demographic profile provides data regarding research respondents and is important in determining whether the individuals in a particular study are a representative sample of the target population for generalization purposes.

In Part 1. There were seven tables (Tables 3 to 9) describing the demographic profile of the respondents. These tables answered the specific question number 1: What is the profile of the faculty in terms of: age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, position/ designation, and number of years teaching experience?

Table 3
Respondents' Profile in terms of Age Group/Generation

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
61 – 65 years old	16	6.10%
51 – 60 years old	58	22.14%
41 – 50 years old	51	19.47%
31 – 40 years old	82	31.30%
21 – 30 years old	55	20.99%
Total	262	100%

Table 3 classifies the respondents according to Age Group. As can be seen from Table 2, the highest number of respondents belongs to Age Group 31-40 years with 31.30% or 82 out 262 respondents; the second highest is Age Group 51-60 years old with 22.14% or 58 respondents out of 262; the third highest went to Age Group 21-30 years old with 20.99% or 55 respondents out of 262. Trailing behind but not so far below was Age Group 41-50 years old at 19.47% with 51 respondents; and the least number of respondents were those belonging to the Age Group 61-65 years old at 6.11% with only 16 respondents.

It was understandable that the last group would have the least number of respondents because some faculty have already retired upon reaching the minimum retirement age of sixty (60) years old. On the other hand, it was also understandable that most of the respondents would be those within the 31-40 years old age bracket because this was the average age where most of the working population belongs.

Table 4
Respondents' Profile in terms of Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	120	45.8%
Female	142	54.2%
Total	262	100%

Table 4 classifies the respondents according to Sex. As can be seen in this table, almost there's almost equal distribution of respondents between the two sexes. However, the female respondents exceeded the

male respondents but with just a few percentage points. The female respondents accounted for 54.2% or 142 out of 262 respondents, while the male respondents were 45.8% or 120 out of 262. This was truly representative of the actual situation in the University wherein there were more female faculty than the male faculty.

Table 5
Respondents' Profile in terms of Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	69	26.33%
Married	180	68.7%
Separated	4	1.53%
Widowed	9	3.44%
Total	262	100%

Table 5 classifies the respondents according to civil status. Most of the respondents were Married which comprised 68.7% or 180 out of 262, followed by the Single respondents at 26.33% or 69 out of 262. The Widowed comprised 3.44% with nine (9) respondents, and the least number were the Separated with 1.53% or four (4) out of 262 respondents.

Table 6
Respondents' Profile in terms of Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's degree	12	4.58%
With units in Master's degree	31	11.83%
Master's degree, completed	59	22.52%
With units in doctorate degree	56	21.37%
Doctorate degree, completed	104	39.69%
Total	262	100.00%

Table 6 classifies the respondents according to Educational Attainment. Those with completed Doctorate degree with 39.69% or 104 respondents; those with completed master's degree with 22.52% or 59 respondents; those with some doctorate units accounted for 21.37% or 56 respondents; those with some units in master's accounted for 11.83% or 31 respondents, and the least number of respondents were those with bachelor's degree with only 12 respondents or 4.58%.

The data above was a positive reflection of the University's recruitment policy (CTU Faculty Merit System) to hire only those applicants with the highest qualifications especially in terms of educational attainment. CTU anchored their policy on the Commission on Higher Education (CHED)'s policy which can be found in all CHED Memorandum Orders (CMOs) Policies, Standards, Guidelines (PSGs) which stipulated master's degree in the field of specialization as the minimum education qualification of the faculty, although sometimes, the hiring of bachelor's degree holder can be allowed but only in fields where there is a dearth of master's degree graduate (e.g., Marine Engineering, etc.) This policy was being supported by the Civil Service Commission (CSC MC 10, s. 2012; and CSC MC 17, s. 2013) which only approves appointment of faculty if they meet the minimum education qualification which is master's degree in the field of specialization. This accounts for the very few bachelor's degree respondents. Temporary appointment was issued to a faculty who is not yet full-pledged master's degree, and it is renewable yearly with very satisfactory (VS) performance. As soon as they graduated from their vertically-aligned master's degree, then their appointment shall be confirmed as permanent.

Table 7
Respondents' Profile in terms of Academic Rank

Academic Rank	Frequency	Percentage
Instructor	111	42.36%
Assistant Professor	70	26.72%
Associate Professor	70	26.72%
Professor	11	4.20%
Total	262	100%

Table 7 classifies the respondents according to Academic Rank. The highest number of respondents were those at Instructors rank at 42.36% with 111 respondents out of 262. Next, the Assistant Professors and Associate Professors tied at 26.72% or with 70 respondents each, and the least number of respondents were those in the Professorial rank at 4.2% with only eleven (11) respondents. The descending pattern in

frequency number and its inverse relationship was observed here in Table 7. It means frequency number went down as we go to higher academic ranks. This is truly reflective of the present situation wherein there were very few occupying Professorial ranks.

In the most recently concluded faculty evaluation covering the period 2013-2016, it showed that out of the 601 total faculty who submitted for evaluation, only 32 faculty reached Professorial ranks, but only 18 of them passed the accreditation for a full-fledged Professor; adding the 18 to the 22 full-pledged Professors totals only to 40 which is only 5% Since the total faculty holding regular plantilla items already reached 800 as of the time of writing this paper. Considering that the maximum number of Professorial items allowed each SUC is up to 20% or 160 items in this case, then it shows that there is still plenty of room at top Professorial ranks. Professorial items are open for those who will qualify. Hence, there is a need for more faculty development activities to assist the faculty to reach their full potential in terms of promotion on the job.

Table 8
Respondents' Profile in terms of Positions/Designations

Positions/Designations	Frequency	Percentage
No designation	88	33.59%
Faculty Association Officers	13	4.96%
Department/ Function Chair	73	27.86%
Dean/ Asst. Dean	24	9.16%
Campus Director/ Asst. Campus Director	10	3.82%
Other Positions/ Designations	54	20.61%
Total	262	100.00%

Table 9
Respondents' Profile in terms of Number of Years Teaching Experience

Number of Years Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
less than 5 years	70	26.72%
5 to 9 years	59	22.52%
10 to 19 years	51	19.47%
20 to 29 years	44	16.79%
30 years and above	38	14.50%
Total	262	100.00%

Table 9 classifies the respondents according to number of years teaching experience. It shows the number of respondents in each category range of number of years teaching experience. As shown in this table, the number of respondents would decease as the number of years teaching experience would increase. For example, the highest number of respondents belong to Group 1 or those who have less than five years teaching experience at 26.72% with 70 respondents. Then Group 2 (with 5 to 9 years teaching experience) lowered to 22.52% with 59 respondents; then Group 3 (with 10 to 19 years teaching experience) lowered to 19.47% with 51 respondents; similarly, Group 4 (with 20 to 29 years teaching experience) lowered to 16.79% with 44 respondents. Likewise, Group 5 (with 30 years and above teaching experience) further lowered to 14.5% with 38 respondents.

The descending pattern in frequency number and its inverse relationship was also observed in Table 7 which classified respondents according to academic rank. Frequency numbers would go down as higher academic ranks were being accounted. For example, Instructor rank at 42.37% or 111 out 262 respondents; it lowered to 26.72% with 70 respondents each for Assistant Professors and Associate Professor, respectively. And it further went down to 4.2% with 11 respondents.

The similar pattern shown in Table 7 and 9 brings to the conclusion that the most number of faculty were those in the early stages of their teaching career (with less than five years in teaching experience). Since they were still younger and still developing their skills and qualifications, thus, they were still at the lower academic ranks. Further, it means that while there were many starters, but only very few were reached the retirable years of 60-65 years; similarly, there were very few who achieved the higher Professorial ranks.

VII. THE DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF THE FACULTY

The succeeding tables, Tables 10 to 14 present the faculty's development needs grouped into the five dimensions such as: Instructional development, professional development, organizational development, career development, and personal development.

Table 10
The Instructional Development Needs of the Faculty

Indicators	Respondents				Total Item Average	
	Administration n = 107		Faculty n = 155			
A. Instructional Development Needs	μ	Description	M	Description	μ	Description
1. Academic counseling;	2.96	Needed	3.02	Needed	2.99	Needed
2. Adapting effective teaching methods and strategies;	3.42	Highly Needed	3.42	Highly Needed	3.42	Highly Needed
3. Assessing and measuring student's learning;	3.31	Highly Needed	3.33	Highly Needed	3.32	Highly Needed
4. Managing student's behavior in the classroom;	3.28	Highly Needed	3.19	Needed	3.24	Needed
5. Preparing course plan/ syllabus;	3.21	Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.29	Highly Needed
6. Understanding adult learners;	3.12	Needed	3.21	Needed	3.16	Needed
7. Updating content knowledge;	3.43	Highly Needed	3.48	Highly Needed	3.45	Highly Needed
8. Using computer technologies in instruction;	3.42	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.39	Highly Needed
9. Designing and constructing curriculum;	3.34	Highly Needed	3.35	Highly Needed	3.34	Highly Needed
10. Evaluating and revising curriculum;	3.32	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.35	Highly Needed
11. Making instructional materials; and	3.38	Highly Needed	3.32	Highly Needed	3.35	Highly Needed
12. Planning lessons based on curriculum.	3.36	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed
Factor Average	3.30	Highly Needed	3.32	Highly Needed	3.31	Highly Needed

Factor Range: (Highly Needed)	3.26 – 4.00	HN
(Needed)	2.51 – 3.25	N
(Less Needed)	1.76 – 2.50	LN
(Not Needed)	1.00 – 1.75	NN

Table 10 shows the instructional development needs. Instructional development is the first dimension in faculty development program. It emphasizes on the faculty's need to develop skills in instructional technology, microteaching, media, courses, and curricula. It is geared towards improving student's learning through better teaching methods and strategies; thus, it's also known as instructional improvement.

In 8 out of 12 items, the administrators and the faculty were unanimous in rating the following items as highly needed (HN): 1) Adapting effective teaching methods and strategies (3.42); 2) Assessing and measuring student's learning (3.32); 3) Updating content knowledge (3.45); 4) Using computer technologies in instruction (3.39); 5) Designing and constructing curriculum (3.29); 6) Evaluating and revising curriculum (3.35); 7) Making instructional materials (3.35); and 8) Planning lessons based on curriculum (3.6).

In the same manner, both administrators and faculty have similarly rated Academic advising and understanding adult learners as Needed (N). The former has an average rating of 2.99 (3.02 from Administrators and 2.96 from the Faculty), while the latter have an average rating 3.16 (3.12 from the Administrators, while 3.21 from the Faculty).

However, the administrators and the faculty differed in the following items, as follows: Managing student's behavior in the classroom and Preparing course plan/ syllabus. In Managing student's behavior in the classroom, the Administrators rated it as highly needed (HN) with 3.28 score, while the Faculty rated it as Needed (N) with a score of 3.19. In Preparing course plan/syllabus, the rating is reversed. While the administrators rated it as Needed (N) with a score 3.21, the faculty, on the other side, rated it as highly needed (HN) with a score of 3.37. These two items also differed in the average ratings. While Managing student's behavior in the classroom got an average score of 3.24 (Needed), Preparing course plan/syllabus got an average score of 3.29 (Highly Needed).

The result was confirmed during the focused group discussion (FGD). The faculty and administrators alike admit that they really need to develop themselves especially in adapting effective teaching methods and strategies because these are very crucial in delivering the lessons to the students. Furthermore, of computer technologies in instruction is also a perceived vital need as we are now living in the digital age. According to one participant in the FGD, integrating technologies in teaching carries with it a need to properly train our instructors in matters relating to computer skills.

Table 11
The Professional Development Needs of the Faculty

Indicators	Respondents				Total Item Average	
	Administration n = 107		Faculty n = 155			
B. Professional Development Needs	μ	Description	μ	Description	μ	Description
1. Continuing education thru:						
1.1Advanced degree programs (master's and doctorate); and	3.36	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed

1.2 Other specialized programs relevant to field of the faculty.	3.28	Highly Needed	3.44	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed
2. Participation in activities sponsored by professional Organizations, such as:						
2.1 Attending local meetings, conferences, workshops, etc.;	3.36	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed
2.2 Attending regional, national conferences, workshops, etc.;	3.41	Highly Needed	3.47	Highly Needed	3.44	Highly Needed
2.3 Attending international conferences, workshops, etc.;	3.36	Highly Needed	3.55	Highly Needed	3.45	Highly Needed
2.4 Presenting papers at conferences and workshops;	3.37	Highly Needed	3.39	Highly Needed	3.38	Highly Needed
2.5 Serving as officer/board member in professional organizations; &	2.79	Needed	2.96	Needed	2.87	Needed
2.6 Coordinating events sponsored by professional organizations.	2.80	Needed	2.98	Needed	2.89	Needed
3. Enhancing research capability						
3.1 Preparing research proposals;	3.27	Highly Needed	3.44	Highly Needed	3.35	Highly Needed
3.2 Presenting findings of research in a public forum; and	3.29	Highly Needed	3.40	Highly Needed	3.34	Highly Needed
3.3 Publishing research in recognized journals.	3.45	Highly Needed	3.46	Highly Needed	3.45	Highly Needed
Factor Average	3.22	Needed	3.32	Highly Needed	3.27	Highly Needed

Factor Range: 3.26 – 4.00 HN (Highly Needed)
2.51 – 3.25 N (Needed)
1.76 – 2.50 LN (Less Needed)
1.00 – 1.75 NN (Not Needed)

Table 11 presents the professional development needs of the Faculty. Professional development includes activities which promote the growth of the faculty in their professional roles. The activities are categorized into three: 1) Continuing education; 2) Participation in activities sponsored by professional Organizations; 3) Enhancing research capability.

In the first category, Continuing education, both the administrators and faculty rated it as highly needed (HN): advanced degree programs got an average score of 3.37 while 3.36 for other specialized programs relevant to the field of the faculty.

In the second category, Participation in activities sponsored by professional organizations, the first four sub-items were rated by both administrators and faculty similarly as Highly Needed (HN), with the following average score: 3.38 for Attending local meetings, conferences, workshops, etc.; 3.44 for Attending regional, national conferences, workshops, etc.; 3.45 for Attending international conferences, workshops, etc.; and 3.38 for Presenting papers at conferences and workshops. In the last two sub-items, both administrators and faculty both rated similarly but the rating was Needed (N) with an average rating

of: 2.87 for Serving as officer/board member in professional organizations; and 2.89 in Coordinating events sponsored by professional organizations. In general, the factor average for the second category, Participation in activities sponsored by professional Organizations, was Highly Needed (HN) with an average of 3.27.

Relating the results with the FGD, the participants opined that professional development is really highly needed because of CHED and Civil Service Commission's entry level requirements of being a master's degree holder, meaning a faculty member will not be given plantilla item of Instructor 1 if they are not master's degree holder. Moreover, master's degree holder faculty need to upgrade themselves professionally through continuing education for them to have points for the promotion of their academic rank.

Also, in the aspect of participation in activities sponsored by professional organizations, some members of the faculty during the FGD said that it turns out that it is the faculty member's own effort and initiative to look for opportunities to attend in conventions for professionals because there was no definite plan for this. Hence, they highly needed equal opportunities as mandated for attending such activities.

- Organizational Development Needs

This dimension is concerned with the organization's vision, mission, goals, and outcomes and how the faculty can help achieve them.

Table 12 presents the organizational development needs of the faculty.

Table 12
The Organizational Development Needs of the Faculty

Indicators	Respondents				Total Item Average	
	Administration n = 107		Faculty n = 155			
C. Organizational Development Needs	μ	Description	μ	Description	μ	Description
1. Discussions on the university's vision, goals & objectives (VMGOS);	3.16	Needed	3.12	Needed	3.14	Needed
2. Integrating the university's VMGOs in the lessons;	3.24	Needed	3.18	Needed	3.21	Needed
3. Relating the VMGOs to the faculty's duties and responsibilities;	3.27	Highly Needed	3.21	Needed	3.24	Needed
4. Relating the VMGOs with the research goals of the university; and	3.26	Highly Needed	3.21	Needed	3.24	Needed
5. Relating the VMGOs with the community extension projects.	3.29	Highly Needed	3.23	Needed	3.26	Highly Needed
Factor Average	3.24	Needed	3.19	Needed	3.22	Needed

In the first two items, both the administrators and the faculty rated them as Needed (N) with the following average score: 3.14 in Discussions on the university's vision, goals & objectives (VMGOS); and 3.21 in Integrating the university's VMGOs in the lessons. In the last three items, the administrators and faculty differ in their opinions. While the administrators rated the last three items as Highly Needed (HN), the faculty rated them as Needed (N). In Relating the VMGOs to the faculty's duties and responsibilities, the administrators rated it with a 3.27 (HN), while faculty 3.24 (N). In Relating the VMGOs with the research goals of the university, the administrators rated it 3.26 (HN) while the faculty 3.24 (N). In Relating the VMGOs with the community extension projects, the administrators rated it 3.29 (HN), while the faculty 3.23 (N). On the overall, both the administrators and faculty have rated this dimension on organizational development needs as Needed (N) with an average score of 3.22.

- Career Development Needs

This dimension emphasizes on the faculty's preparation for career advancement. A career development plan is a tool used to help each faculty to identify strengths and areas for growth and set attainable *goals* for future progress in a chosen field of endeavor. In order to strengthen one's teaching practices, a faculty needs to develop a personal career development plan.

Table 13 shows the career development needs.

Table 13
The Career Development Needs of the Faculty

Indicators	Respondents				Total Item Average	
	Administration n = 107		Faculty n = 155			
D. Career Development Needs	μ	Description	μ	Description	μ	Description
1. Career counseling;	3.10	Needed	3.12	Needed	3.11	Needed
2. Succession planning;	3.16	Needed	3.14	Needed	3.15	Needed
3.Leadership trainings; and	3.30	Highly Needed	3.32	Highly Needed	3.31	Highly Needed
4. Providing opportunities to promotable faculty to "shadow" soon-to-retire administrators.	3.28	Highly Needed	3.16	Needed	3.22	Needed
Factor Average	3.21	Needed	3.19	Needed	3.20	Needed

Among the five items, Leadership trainings scored the highest; both administrators and faculty rated it as Highly Needed (HN) with an average score of 3.31. Likewise, both respondents agree in rating Career Counseling and Succession Planning as Needed (N) with an average rating of 3.11 for the first item and 3.15 for the second item. However, they differ in their opinion in item 4, Providing opportunities to promotable faculty to "shadow" soon-to-retire administrators; while administrators rated it with a score of 3.28 Highly Needed (HN), buy the faculty rated it with 3.20 Needed (N). But the overall factor average for both administrators and faculty was similar at an average score of 3.20 Needed (N).

- Personal Development Needs

Personal development needs refer to that dimension which focuses on the growth of the faculty as a whole person. It aims to promote a healthy work-life balance to develop a well-rounded personality. Thus, it takes

into consideration all the other needs of the faculty in terms of the physical, spiritual, social, cultural, environmental, financial, and even legal needs.

Table 14
The Personal Development Needs of the Faculty

Indicators	Respondents				Total Item Average	
	Administration n = 107		Faculty n = 155			
E. Personal Development Needs	μ	Description	μ	Description	μ	Description
Physical, Health and Medical Needs						
1.1 Health improvement programs.	3.33	Highly Needed	3.41	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed
1.2 Medical Counselling;	3.22	Needed	3.23	Needed	3.23	Needed
1.3 Recreational activities (games, sports);	3.28	Highly Needed	3.34	Highly Needed	3.31	Highly Needed
1.4 Time to engage in sports or health-promoting. . .	3.30	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed	3.33	Highly Needed
1.5 Stress Management.	3.41	Highly Needed	3.39	Highly Needed	3.40	Highly Needed
2.Financial Needs						
2.1 Assistance in processing for one's security of tenure;	3.13	Needed	3.33	Highly Needed	3.23	Needed
2.2 Assistance for children's education;	3.11	Needed	3.34	Highly Needed	3.23	Needed
2.3 Financial incentives to faculty who will finish their master's or doctorate degrees;	3.45	Highly Needed	3.54	Highly Needed	3.50	Highly Needed
2.4 Financial management seminars;	3.36	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed
2.5 Medical aid & hospitalization assistance;	3.57	Highly Needed	3.59	Highly Needed	3.58	Highly Needed
2.6 Opportunity for service credits;	3.45	Highly Needed	3.50	Highly Needed	3.47	Highly Needed

2.7 Other incentives aside from mandatory compensation; and	3.56	Highly Needed	3.48	Highly Needed	3.52	Highly Needed
2.8 Pre-retirement seminars.	3.36	Highly Needed	3.28	Highly Needed	3.32	Highly Needed
3.Social, Cultural, Environmental, and Spiritual Needs						
3.1 Awards, rewards, recognitions for job well done. .	3.32	Highly Needed	3.27	Highly Needed	3.29	Highly Needed
3.2Cultural events like town fiestas, etc.;	2.85	Needed	2.88	Needed	2.87	Needed
3.3 Family days in school;	3.03	Needed	3.10	Needed	3.07	Needed
3.4 Field trips;	3.19	Needed	3.17	Needed	3.18	Needed
3.5 Formation of special interest groups . . .	3.04	Needed	3.08	Needed	3.06	Needed
3.5 Regular socialization (convocation programs);	3.02	Needed	3.06	Needed	3.04	Needed
3.6 Spiritual retreats and . . .	3.17	Needed	3.20	Needed	3.18	Needed
3.7 Support to join organizations,	3.12	Needed	3.16	Needed	3.14	Needed
3.8 Visit to Museums	2.77	Needed	2.99	Needed	2.88	Needed
3.9 Disaster preparedness.	3.28	Highly Needed	3.27	Highly Needed	3.28	Highly Needed
4.Legal Needs						
4.1 Legal counseling;	3.30	Highly Needed	3.27	Highly Needed	3.29	Highly Needed
4.2 Orientation on CTU Code, school rules & regulations, etc.;	3.40	Highly Needed	3.28	Highly Needed	3.34	Highly Needed
4.3 Orientation on RA 4670 Magna Carta for Public School Teachers;	3.38	Highly Needed	3.39	Highly Needed	3.39	Highly Needed
4.4 Orientation on RA 7836 Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994;	3.46	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed	3.41	Highly Needed

4.5 Orientation on RA 6713 Code of Conduct & Ethical Standards;	3.41	Highly Needed	3.39	Highly Needed	3.40	Highly Needed
4.6 Orientation on RA 10173 Data Privacy Act of 2012;	3.35	Highly Needed	3.43	Highly Needed	3.39	Highly Needed
4.7 Orientation of Executive Order No. 2, s. 2016 Freedom of Information (FOI) Program;	3.41	Highly Needed	3.44	Highly Needed	3.42	Highly Needed
4.8 Orientation on RA 11210 An Act Increasing the Maternity Leave Period to 105 days for Female Workers…;	3.14	Needed	3.25	Needed	3.20	Needed
4.9 Orientation on EO No, 80: Performance-based Incentive System for Government Employees…; and	3.37	Highly Needed	3.43	Highly Needed	3.40	Highly Needed
4.10 Orientation on RA 7877 An Act Declaring Sexual Harassment Unlawful in the Employment, Education, Training… .	3.36	Highly Needed	3.37	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed
Factor Average	3.29	Highly Needed	3.31	Highly Needed	3.36	Highly Needed

Table 14 shows the personal development needs. It emphasizes the growth of the faculty as individuals thru planning for work-life balance and interpersonal skills. Personal development or self-development refers to possessing personal strengths and characteristics that aid teachers define and make sense of their teaching practice and of themselves as individuals. The items in this dimension are categorized into four groups: 1) Physical, Health and Medical Needs; 2) Financial Needs; 3) Social, Cultural, Environmental, and Spiritual Needs; and 4) Legal Needs.

In the first category, Physical, Health and Medical Needs, both the administrators and faculty agree that the items are all Highly Needed (HN) except for one item: Medical Counseling which they both rated as Needed (N). In item 1, Health improvement programs, the administrators rated them at 3.33 (HN), while the faculty at 3.41 (HN). In Item 2, Medical Counseling, the administrators rated them at 3.22(N), while the faculty at 3.23 (N). In Item 3, Recreational activities (games, sports), the administrators rated them at 3.28 (HN), while the faculty at 3.34 (HN). In item 4, Time to engage in sports or health-promoting activities, the administrators rated them at 3.30 (HN), while the faculty at 3.36 (HN). In Item 5, Stress Management, the administrators rated them at 3.41 (HN), while the faculty at 3.39 (HN).

In the second category, Financial Needs, both the administrators and faculty agree that the last six items

are Highly Needed (HN), but they differ in opinion in the first two items wherein the administrators rated them as Needed (N), while the faculty rated them as Highly Needed (HN). In item 1, Assistance in processing for one's security of tenure, the administrators score is at 3.13 (N), while the faculty rated it at 3.33 (HN). Also, in item 2, Assistance for children's education, the administrators rated it at 3.11 (N), while the faculty at 3.34 (HN). In the next six items, both the administrators and the faculty rated them as Highly Needed (HN), as follows. In item 3, Financial incentives to faculty who will finish their master's or doctorate degrees, the administrators rated it at 3.45 (HN) while the faculty at 3.54 (HN). In item 4, Financial management seminars, the administrators rated it at 3.36 (HN), while the faculty at 3.37 (HN). In item 5, Medical aid & hospitalization assistance, the administrators rated it at 3.57 (HN), while the faculty at 3.59 (HN). In item 6, Opportunity for service credits, the administrators rated it at 3.45 (HN), while the faculty rated it at 3.50 (HN). In item 7, Other incentives aside from mandatory compensation, the administrators rated it at 3.56 (HN), while the faculty at 3.48 (HN). In item 8, Pre-retirement Seminars, the administrators rated it at 3.36 (HN), while the faculty at 3.28 (HN).

In the third category, Social, Cultural, Environmental, and Spiritual Needs, the administrators and faculty have agreed in all items. In item 1, Awards, rewards, recognitions for job well done, both respondents rated it as Highly Needed (HN), with administrators rating at 3.32 (HN), while the faculty at 3.27 (HN). In the next seven items, both respondents have similar ratings at the Needed (N) level. In item 2, Cultural events like town fiestas, etc., the administrators rated it at 2.85 (N), while the faculty at 2.88 (N). In item 3, Family days in school, the administrators rated it at 3.03 (N), while the faculty at 3.10 (N). In item 4, Field trips, the administrators rated it at 3.19 (N), while the faculty at 3.17 (N). In item 5, Formation of special interest groups (hobbies, clubs, etc.), the administrators rated it at 3.04 (N), while the faculty at 3.08 (N). In item 6, Regular socialization (convocation programs), the administrators rated it at 3.02 (N), while the faculty rated it at 3.06 (N). In Item 7, Spiritual retreats and recollections, the administrators rated it at 3.17 (N), while the faculty at 3.20 (N). In Item 8, Support to join organizations, associations, etc., the administrators rated it at 3.12 (N), while the faculty rated it at 3.16 (N). In Item 9, Visit to Museums, the administrators rated it at 2.77 (N), while the faculty rated it at 2.99 (N). In the last item, Item 10Disaster preparedness, the administrators rated it at 3.38 (HN), while the faculty rated it at 3.27 (HN).

In the fourth category, Legal Needs, both the administrators and faculty have similarly rated all items as Highly Needed (HN) except for one item in which they both rated it as Needed (N). In Item 1, Legal Counselling, the administrators rated it at 3.30 (HN), while the faculty at 3.27 (HN). In Item 2, Orientation on CTU Code, school rules & regulations, etc., the administrators rated it at 3.40 (HN), while the faculty at 3.28 (HN).

In Item 3, Orientation on RA 4670 Magna Carta for Public School Teachers, the administrators rated it at 3.38 (HN), while the faculty at 3.39 (HN). In Item 4, Orientation on RA 7836 Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994, the administrators rated it at 3.46(HN), while the faculty at 3.36 (HN). In Item 5, Orientation on RA 6713 Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards, the administrators rated it at 3.41 (HN), while the faculty at 3.39 (HN).In Item 6, Orientation on RA 10173 Data Privacy Act of 2012, the administrators rated it at 3.35 (HN), while the faculty at 3.43 (HN). In Item 7, Orientation of Executive Order No. 2, s. 2016 Freedom of Information (FOI) Program, the administrators rated it at 3.41 (HN), while the faculty at 3.44(HN). In Item 8, Orientation on RA 11210 An Act Increasing the Maternity Leave Period to 105 days for Female Workers…, the administrators rated it at 3.14 (N), while the faculty at 3.25(N).In Item 9,Orientation on EO No, 80: Performance-based Incentive System for Government Employees…, the administrators rated it at 3.37 (HN), while the faculty at 3.40(HN). In Item 10, Orientation on RA 7877 An Act Declaring Sexual Harassment Unlawful in the Employment, Education, Training…, the administrators rated it at 3.36 (HN), while the faculty at 3.37(HN).

- SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN THE ASSESSMENT BETWEEN THE ADMINISTRATORS AND THE FACULTY REGARDING THE FACULTY'S DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Table 15 shows the results of the hypothesis testing on the difference of assessment between administrators and the faculty regarding the Faculty Development needs of the latter, in the dimensions of instructional, professional, organizational, career and personal development.

First, in terms of instructional development needs, the t-test for independence computed value is -.211. The two-tailed test with equal variances assumed generates a sig. value of .833 which is greater than .05 level. This means that the difference is not significant. Hence, the decision is not to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 15
Hypothesis testing on the Difference of Assessment between the Administrators and the Faculty Regarding the Faculty's Development Needs

Compared Groups	t computed value	df	Sig. value	Interpretation	Decision
Administrators and the Faculty on Instructional Development Needs	-.211	260	.833	There is no significant difference.	Do not Reject the Null Hypothesis.
Administrators and the Faculty on Professional Development Needs	-1.513	260	.132	There is no significant difference.	Do not Reject the Null Hypothesis.
Administrators and the Faculty on Organizational Development Needs	.561	260	.575	There is no significant difference.	Do not Reject the Null Hypothesis.
Administrators and the Faculty on Career Development Needs	.068	260	.946	There is no significant difference.	Do not Reject the Null Hypothesis.
Administrators and the Faculty on Personal Development Needs	-.460	260	.646	There is no significant difference.	Do not Reject the Null Hypothesis.

This result means that both the administrators and the faculty signify the importance of developing the faculty in terms of instruction. Instruction, being the first of the tri-focal functions of the faculty is very vital for student development. A university needs a well-trained and developed faculty to improve their quality of teaching as well as the curriculum. This justifies Riegle's conceptual framework of faculty development which involves instructional technology, microteaching, media, courses, and curricula.

The hypothesis testing on the difference of assessment between administrators and the faculty on the latter's professional development needs in terms of professional development reveals a t-test computed value of -1.513. Independent t-test, two-tailed test with equal variances assumed generates a sig. value of .132 which is greater than .05 level. This means that the difference is not significant. Hence, the decision is not to reject the null hypothesis.

Professional development elaborates the continuance of education, attendance to professional organization's activities and enhancement of the research capabilities of the educators. This result simply elaborates how the faculty and the administrators mean professional

development. Both respondents regard this development need as highly needed. In continuation, the results of the hypothesis testing on the difference of assessment between administrators and the faculty on the latter's organizational development needs has a t-test computed value of .561 and generates a sig. value of .575. Since the sig. value is greater than .05 level, this difference can be interpreted as insignificant. Hence, the decision is not to reject the null hypothesis.

There is no significant difference between the assessment of the administrators and faculty relating to organizational development. This exemplifies the common claim of both groups on the magnitude of this faculty need. As the faculty needs to belong in a humane and just working environment, so the organization must also properly orient and inculcate in the minds of the faculty the former's vision, mission, goals and objectives so that the faculty may integrate this in their daily functions.

In terms of career development, the t computed value is .068, a very minimal value. The sig. value of .946 is greater than .05 which only suggests non-rejection of the null hypothesis. This means that there is no significant difference between the assessment of the administrators and faculty. They are one in signifying the very important need of the faculty to develop their career in the university.

In terms of personal development needs, the t computed value is -.460 while the sig. value is .646. Since the sig. value is greater than .05, the difference can be interpreted as insignificant and suggests non-rejection of the null hypothesis. This means that the administrators and the faculty are one in their assessment of faculty development in the personal aspects. The personal development needs in the aspects of physical, socio-cultural, financial and legal are highly needed by the faculty.

- RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE FACULTY AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Table number 16 exhibits the results of the hypothesis testing on the relationship between the faculty's demographic profile and their assessment on faculty development needs. The Chi-square test for independence was applied to statistically treat the variables.

Table 16
Hypothesis testing on the Relationship between the Demographic profile of the Faculty and their Assessment on Development Needs

Demographic Variables and Faculty Development Needs	X^2	df	Critical Value at .05 sig. level	Interpretation	Decision
Age group and development needs	14.23	12	21.03	There is no significant relationship.	Do not Reject the Null Hypothesis.
Sex and development needs	9.62	3	7.82	There is a significant relationship.	Reject the Null Hypothesis.
Civil Status and development needs	3.68	9	16.92	There is no significant relationship.	Do not reject the Null Hypothesis.
Educational Attainment and development needs	11.20	6	12.59	There is no significant relationship.	Do not reject the Null Hypothesis.
Academic Rank and development needs					

	15.35	9	16.92	There is no significant relationship.	Do not reject the Null Hypothesis.
Position/designation and development needs	2.41	3	7.82	There is no significant relationship.	Do not reject the Null Hypothesis.
Length of Teaching Experience and development needs	12.06	12	21.03	There is no significant relationship.	Do not reject the Null Hypothesis.

In terms of age group, the Chi-square test for independence derived a 14.23 computed value. The result is a lesser value compared with the critical value of 21.03, at .05 alpha level. This leads to non-rejection of the null hypothesis. This means that there was no significant relationship between profile in terms of age group of faculty and their assessment of faculty development needs. In other words, the assessment on faculty development needs is independent on age group. Age factor cannot affect the faculty's assessment on their development needs.

In terms of the relationship between sex and faculty development needs, the Chi-square computed value is 9.62. The result is a greater value compared with the critical value at 7.82. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This means that there is a significant relationship between profile in terms of sex of faculty and their assessment on faculty development needs. Being male or female is an influencing factor in the assessment of development needs. It can be evidenced by the mean of the groups, where the males assessed development needs as *highly needed*, while the females assessed it as *needed.*

In terms of civil status, the Chi-square computed value is 3.68 while the critical value is 16.92. This leads to the non-rejection of the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between profile in terms of civil status of the faculty and their assessment on development needs. Simply put, the faculty's assessment is not dependent on their civil status. When educational attainment and faculty development needs are correlated, the Chi-square computed value is 11.20 which is lower than the critical value of 12.59. This can be interpreted that there is no significant relationship between the profile in terms of educational attainment of faculty and their assessment on development needs. The faculty's assessment is independent of their educational attainment.

The result of the test statistic on Chi-square test for independence on academic rank and development needs of the faculty garnered a 15.35 test value and a critical value of 16.92 which means that there is no significant relationship between profile in terms of the academic rank of faculty and their assessment on development needs. The faculty's assessment is not dependent on whether the faculty is an instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or in the professor level, for that matter.

In terms of whether the faculty is given or designated to a particular position in the university, with the chi-square computed value of 2.41, it is lesser than the critical value of 7.82 at 3 degrees of freedom. There is no significant relationship between profile in terms of the position/designation of faculty and their assessment on development needs, thus the null hypothesis is not rejected. The faculty's assessment is not dependent on whether or not he/she is assigned to or designated a position in the university.

Lastly, in terms of the length of teaching experience of the faculty, the chi-square value is 12.06, much lower compared to the critical value of 21.03 at .05 level of significance. This also leads to non-rejection of the null hypothesis because faculty assessment in this aspect is independent on the length of teaching experience of the faculty as educators.

The result can be summarized that in general, the demographic profile of the faculty is not related to the assessment of instructors in their development needs. This can be well-construed as a very apparent need for faculty development across demographics.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concluded that faculty development is inevitably very vital in the work-life balance of a faculty, regardless of age group, civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, position or designation and length of teaching experience of the faculty. Both the administrators and the faculty claimed, in general terms, that faculty development is highly needed. This is another validation of Riegle's Conceptual Framework of Faculty Development (1987). Based on his framework, the development needs of the faculty point to the five dimensions: instructional, professional, organizational, career, and personal.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher presents the following recommendations as anchored from the findings to address the faculty development needs of Cebu Technological University.

Primary Recommendation

The researcher recommends that the proposal for a Five-Year Faculty Development Program shall be implemented.

Secondary Recommendations

1. Replication and related studies should be conducted after a few years from program implementation to determine changing development needs of the faculty.
2. Further research shall be considered by other members of the faculty to address development needs not covered in the study like enhancing capabilities for community extension and production which are among the functions of higher education institutions (HEI) faculty.

REFERENCES

[1] Batas Pambansa Bilang 412: An Act Converting the Cebu School of Arts and Trades in Cebu City into a Chartered College to be known as The Cebu State College of Science and Technology, Expanding Its Jurisdiction and Curricular Programs. Retrieved from: https://www.lgu.ph/listings/batas-pambansa-bilang-412/

[2] Bergquist, W., et al. (1975). *Components of an effective faculty development program.* Journal of Higher education. Vol. 46 (20; 177. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271565823_Components_of_an_Effective_Faculty_Development_Program

[3] Centra, John A. (1978). *Types of faculty development programs.* The Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 49, No. 2. Ohio State University Press https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00221546.1978.11776610

[4] CHED Memorandum Orders https://ched.gov.ph › memorandum-orders

[5] Consul, Stella Marie D. (1996). "A Survey on the Professional, Spiritual, Social and Economic Needs of the Faculty of Sacred Heart Schools for Boys." Cebu Normal University, Cebu City.

[6] CMO No. 26 Series of 2009, "Revised Implementing Guidelines of the Commission of Higher Education—Faculty Development Programs (CHED FDPs) Phase 2" https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.26-s2009-1.pdf

[7] CMO No. 20 Series of 2011, "Policies and Guidelines for the Use of Income, Special Trust Fund, and Programs of Receipts and Expenditures of the State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.20-s2011.pdf

[8] CMO No. 03, Series of 2016. Guidelines on Graduate Education Scholarships For Faculty and Staff in the K to 12 Transition Period https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CMO-No.-3-Series-of-2016.pdf

[9] CSC MC 10, s. 2012: "Education Requirement for Faculty Positions in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) and Local Colleges and Universities," *CIVIL SERVICE GUIDE: A Compilation of Issuances on Philippine Civil Service,*

[10] CSC MC 15, s. 2001: "Eligibility Requirement for Non-SUC Instructor/Professor Positions," *CIVIL SERVICE GUIDE: A Compilation of Issuances on Philippine Civil Service*

[11] CTU Faculty Manual http://www.ctu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Final-Preliminaries-Faculty-Manual.pdf

[12] CTU Faculty Profile. published in the CTU website http://www.ctu.edu.ph/faculty-profile/

[13] CTU Vision, Mission, Goals, and Outcomes http://www.ctu.edu.ph/vmgo/

[14] Faculty Manual. Board of Regents Resolution Number 9, series of 2016, Board of Regents of the Cebu Technological University, Cebu City.

[15] Faculty Merit System, Board of Regents Resolution Number 25, series of 2016, dated May 11, 2016. Board of Regents of the Cebu Technological University, Cebu City.

[16] Garbo, Lucila (2009). "Faculty Development Activities of Northern Campuses of Cebu Technological University." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Cebu Technological University, Cebu City.

[17] Gillespie, K. J. and Douglas J. Robertson, (2010). *A* Guide to Faculty Development, 2nd edition. San Francisco, California, USA: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley imprint, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

[18] National Budget Circular (NBC) 461: "Revising and Updating the Compensation and Position Classification Plan for Faculty Positions Embodied in National Compensation Circular (NCC) No. 69" Retrieved from: https://www.dbm.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/NBC-No.-461.pdf

[19] Pinili, Teresa Nilda G., (2013). "Effectiveness of the Faculty Development Program of St. Theresa's College Cebu: Initiatives for an Integrated Faculty Development Program" Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Doctor in Management major in Educational Management, University of San Jose Recoletos, Cebu City.

[20] Qualification Standards for Faculty Positions/Ranks in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) and Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs)," *Civil Service Guide: A Compilation of Issuances on Philippine Civil Service*, https://www.csguide.org/items/show/734.

[21] Republic Act No. 11185 (lawphil.net) "*An Act Integrating the Cebu City Mountain Extension Campus as a Satellite Campus of the Cebu Technological University and Appropriating Funds Therefor, Amending for the Purpose Republic Act No. 9744.*"

[22] Republic Act 9744: "*An Act Converting the Cebu State College of Science and Technology System in the City of Cebu and All Its Satellite Campuses Located in the Province of Cebu into a State University to Be Known as the Cebu Technological University (CTU) and Appropriating Funds Therefor.*"

[23] Riegle, R. P. (1987). Conceptions of Faculty Development. *Educational theory*, Winter 1987, Volume 37 (No. 1), 55-59. Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1741-5446.1987.00053.x

[24] Schroeder, C. M. and Associates (2011). Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change. Sterling, Virginia, USA: Stylus Publishing LLC.

[25] Somera, Froilie D. (2009) "The Status of Faculty Development Programs of Selected Universities and Colleges in Region 1: Basis for a Proposed Faculty Development Program," Trinitian Researcher Vol. 2, No. 1 (2009) – The Phil. E-Journals.]

[26] Tindugan, Lilibeth (2013) "The implementation and practices of faculty development programs of SUCs in Leyte," Journal of Education and Human Resource Development, Vol, 1, 2013 https://ched.gov.ph/faculty-development-program-facdev/ http://www.ctu.edu.ph/university-charter/ http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html