ACCESS TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND WORK PERFORMANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ZAMBOANGA PENINSULA, PHILIPPINES

OMAR D. RAMDI,
Zamboanga Peninsula polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City
email address: oramdi@zppsu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. *This study examined the extent of faculty members' access to faculty development programs and their perceived work performance in selected higher education institutions in Zamboanga Peninsula, Philippines. Using a quantitative descriptive research design, the study gathered self-reported data from 317 faculty member-respondents of two government HEIs in Zamboanga Peninsula, Philippines through a structured survey questionnaire. The instrument measured access to faculty development programs identified in the faculty manual and work performance indicators in terms of commitment, mastery of subject content, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning. Descriptive statistics, particularly mean and standard deviation, were used to analyze the data. Findings revealed that access to faculty development programs was generally slightly accessible, indicating that faculty members had limited access to programs such as scholarship assistance, research support, mentoring, deloading, sabbatical opportunities, instructional resources, and recognition mechanisms. In contrast, respondents reported very high levels of work performance across all indicators, particularly in commitment, content mastery, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning. The findings suggest that although faculty members maintain strong perceived instructional performance, limited access to faculty development programs may constrain the systematic and equitable enhancement of professional growth. The study recommends that higher education administrators strengthen the implementation, monitoring, communication, and equitable distribution of faculty development opportunities to sustain and improve faculty performance.*

Keywords: Access, faculty development, instructional performance, professional growth, work performance, Zamboanga Peninsula

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions (HEIs) continue to face persistent challenges in sustaining effective faculty development programs while maintaining high levels of faculty work performance. Despite increasing institutional demands for instructional quality, research productivity, accreditation compliance, and global competitiveness, many faculty members still experience limited access to professional development opportunities, inadequate institutional support, and unequal participation in training and scholarship programs [1, 2]. These concerns became more evident during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, when teachers were compelled to rapidly transition to technology-mediated instruction despite varying levels of preparedness and institutional support. In the Philippine context, these conditions are particularly critical in state HEIs where resource limitations, employment disparities, and organizational constraints continue to influence faculty development initiatives [3]. These realities raise important concerns regarding how demographic characteristics, employment arrangements, and institutional support mechanisms shape faculty access to development opportunities and work performance outcomes among teachers in higher education institutions.

Faculty Development Programs in Higher Education

Faculty development refers to structured and continuous learning opportunities intended to enhance faculty members' pedagogical competencies, research capability, leadership skills, and professional growth. In higher education institutions, faculty development programs (FDPs) are considered essential because they improve teaching quality, strengthen research productivity, and contribute to institutional competitiveness in the global academic landscape [4, 5]. FDPs also provide opportunities for faculty to adapt to educational innovations, integrate digital pedagogies, and align instructional practices with accreditation standards and stakeholder expectations. In the Philippines, professional development became increasingly indispensable in addressing gaps in online teaching readiness and research engagement during and after the pandemic [6, 7], These findings suggest that faculty development programs must not only be available but also responsive to institutional realities and faculty needs.

Work Performance and Institutional Expectations

Work performance in higher education is commonly assessed through teaching effectiveness, research productivity, extension services, and administrative involvement. In the Philippine educational system, performance evaluation frameworks such as the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) are designed to align faculty contributions with institutional goals and organizational performance standards [8]. However, Sawchuk [9] argued that evaluation systems often focus more on performance measurement than on meaningful professional growth and development. More recent studies further indicate that institutional leadership and support systems significantly influence faculty performance outcomes. Abid *et al*. [10] demonstrated that academic leadership positively affects faculty teaching performance, while Launio *et a*l. [11] found that limited institutional support, workload demands, and resource constraints hinder faculty productivity despite existing development mechanisms. These findings imply that faculty work performance cannot be examined independently from institutional support structures and faculty development opportunities.

Demographic Factors and Faculty Development Participation

Empirical studies consistently report that demographic and socio-economic factors influence faculty participation in

professional development programs. Kamel [12] emphasized that faculty development initiatives improve instructional practices and institutional effectiveness; however, inequitable access to development opportunities often exists across age groups, employment classifications, and institutional settings. In the Philippine setting, Limson [1] found that *plantilla* position significantly influenced faculty satisfaction with development programs, indicating that employment-related conditions affect access to professional growth opportunities. Chin *et al*. [6] likewise identified financial and logistical constraints as major barriers to sustained professional development among teachers. These findings suggest that faculty access to professional development is not solely determined by institutional availability of programs, but also by demographic realities and organizational conditions.

Age, Experience, and Faculty Development

Age and work experience remain important considerations in understanding faculty engagement in professional development activities. Pranoto *et al.* [13] found that age and years of teaching experience were not significantly related to teaching performance; however, the study emphasized that continuous professional learning remains necessary across all experience levels. Similarly, Limson [1] reported that faculty participation in development activities did not significantly vary according to age, although institutional opportunities and employment conditions affected faculty satisfaction with development programs. Conversely, Chin *et al.* [6] noted that older faculty members experienced greater challenges in adapting to technology-mediated teaching, limiting their participation in some development initiatives. These studies indicate that age and teaching experience may influence faculty readiness, adaptability, and engagement in professional development programs.

Gender and Faculty Development Opportunities

Gender also shapes faculty experiences in higher education institutions. International studies reveal that female academics often carry invisible academic labor, including mentoring, pastoral care, and student support responsibilities, which are not always recognized in career advancement systems. Winnington [14] observed that women academics were frequently assigned administrative and student-support roles that limited opportunities for research-oriented professional growth. Bam *et al*. [15] further found that care-related expectations negatively affected women academics' well-being and career progression. In the Philippines, women comprise the majority of teachers in basic education, with female teachers accounting for 88.3% in primary education and 71.48% in secondary education [16], [16]. Despite women's numerical representation in the teaching profession, Launio *et al*. [11] highlighted that access to research grants, leadership opportunities, and faculty development support remains uneven. These findings underscore the importance of examining gender-related disparities in faculty development and work performance.

Employment Status and Faculty Development Access

Employment status has also emerged as a significant determinant of faculty development participation and work performance. Sawchuk [9] noted that contingent and part-time faculty often experience limited access to institutional development opportunities. In Philippine HEIs, Limson [1] similarly found that *plantilla* position significantly affected faculty satisfaction with development programs, suggesting that permanent employment conditions provide greater access to professional growth opportunities. Yee et al. [17] further reported that the increasing proportion of faculty members with graduate degrees in the Philippines was partly driven by institutional scholarship support and regulatory requirements from the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). More recent findings by Abid *et al.* [10] confirmed that employment stability enhances faculty engagement in developmental activities, thereby improving work performance outcomes. These studies collectively suggest that employment inequities continue to shape access to faculty development opportunities in higher education institutions.

Research Gap and Purpose of the Study

Although existing studies have extensively discussed faculty development and work performance, limited research has examined the relational dynamics among socio-demographic profile, employment status, work performance, and access to faculty development programs within localized contexts such as Zamboanga City. Most previous studies focused on broader institutional or national contexts, leaving limited empirical evidence regarding how demographic and employment-related conditions shape faculty development experiences in state higher education institutions in Region IX. This study addresses this gap by examining the relationship among socio-demographic characteristics, employment status, work performance, and access to faculty development programs among HEI teachers in Zamboanga City. The findings of the study are expected to contribute to institutional policy development, faculty support mechanisms, and evidence-based strategies for strengthening faculty development initiatives in higher education institutions. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of sex, marital status, age, highest educational attainment, length of service, employment status, academic rank, faculty designation, and training exposure?
2. What is the respondents' perceived ease of access to the faculty development programs provided by the participating higher education institutions?
3. What is the perceived level of work performance of the respondents?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative correlational research design to examine the relationships among socio-demographic profile, employment status, work performance, and access to faculty development programs among teachers in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Zamboanga City. Correlational research determines the degree and direction of relationships among naturally occurring variables without manipulating them [18]. This design was appropriate because the study aimed to identify whether significant associations exist among teachers' demographic characteristics,

employment conditions, work performance, and access to faculty development opportunities.

The study was conducted in two state HEIs in Zamboanga City: a Polytechnic State University and a State College specializing in Marine Sciences and Technology. These institutions represent differing academic orientations and organizational cultures, thereby providing broader institutional perspectives regarding faculty development and work performance. The selection of varied institutional contexts aligns with Patton's [19] principle of maximum variation, which seeks to capture diverse experiences across settings.

The respondents consisted of 347 faculty members who were selected through simple random sampling. Simple random sampling gives every member of the population an equal chance of selection, thereby minimizing selection bias and strengthening the generalizability of findings [20]. This procedure was appropriate because it ensured fair representation of teachers across different employment statuses, academic ranks, and professional backgrounds.

The research instrument consisted of three parts. Part I gathered the respondents' socio-demographic profile, including age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, years in service, employment status, academic rank, faculty designation, area of specialization, seminars and trainings attended, and scholarships availed. Part II measured teachers' work performance using researcher-adapted items anchored on the Quantitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) under NBC No. 461 [21]. The instrument assessed four dimensions of work performance: commitment, mastery of subject content, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning. Part III assessed the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the trainings and seminars attended for faculty development. The 12-item scale for faculty development was developed by the researcher, validated by content experts, and tested for reliability. All items in Parts II and III were measured using a five-point Likert scale, with the corresponding scale interpretations presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Scale, Range of Scores, and Interpretation of Data Analysis

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation (Access to Faculty Development Program)	Verbal Interpretation (Work Performance)
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very Satisfied (VS)	Very High Performance (VHP)
4	3.41 – 4.20	Satisfied	High Performance
3	2.61 – 3.40	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (N)	Moderate Performance (MP)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Dissatisfied (DS)	Low Performance (LP)
1	1.01 – 1.80	Very Dissatisfied (VD)	Very Low Performance (VLP)

The validity of the instrument was validated through expert validation involving the Faculty President, a Human Resource designate, and a director with expertise in educational administration. The evaluators used the Good and Scates validation criteria [22]. The instrument obtained a mean validation score of 4.75, indicating that it was highly valid and suitable for research purposes.

Data collection was conducted during the second semester of Academic Year 2024-2025 through a paper-and-pen survey questionnaire. This method enabled the researcher to immediately address respondents' clarifications and ensure completeness of responses. Prior to data gathering, permission letters were secured from the administrators of the participating HEIs. The data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to describe the variables [23]. Ethical protocols were strictly observed throughout the study as recommended by Panter and Sterba [24]. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Ethics Review Board before data collection. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, and participation was entirely voluntary. Anonymity and confidentiality of responses were maintained, and no form of coercion was involved during participant recruitment and data gathering.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 2 presents the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of sex, marital status, age, highest educational attainment, number of years in the institution, employment status, academic rank, faculty designation, and school affiliation, while Table 3 shows the seminars and trainings attended by the respondents according to type, scope, and duration. These profile variables provide important contextual information in understanding the respondents' professional background and their access to faculty development opportunities in higher education institutions.

Table 2. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile Variables	f	%
Sex		
Male	221	61.90
Female	136	38.10
Marital Status		
Single	81	22.69
Married	270	75.63
Separated	6	1.68
Age		
25-39	197	55.18
40-63	160	44.82
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	44	12.32
Master's Graduates or with units	231	64.71
With units in Doctoral Degree	73	20.45
Doctoral Graduate	9	2.52
Number of working Experience		
1-5 Years	38	10.64
6-10 Years	77	21.57
11-15 Years	102	28.57
16-20 Years	69	19.33
21 years and more	71	19.89
Employment Status		
Contractual	57	15.97
Temporary	80	22.41
Permanent	220	61.62
Academic Rank		
Instructor I-III	94	26.33
Assistant Professor I-IV	129	36.13
Associate Professor I-V	79	22.13

Professor I-VI	54	15.13
College Professor	1	0.28
Faculty Designation		
With Administrative Designation	211	59.10
Without Administrative Designation	146	40.90
Academic Institution		
Polytechnic State University	209	58.5
Marine Sciences State College	148	41.5

Table 3. Number of Seminars and Training Attended

Seminars and Training Attended	F
Related to Course/Specialization	
Local	309
National	324
International	0
Related to Designation	
Local	239
National	294
International	28
Length of Seminars/Trainings	
1-3 days	231
4-6 days	297
7-10 days	32
11 days and above	3

Extent of Access to Faculty Development Program

The results show that respondents perceived their access to faculty development programs as generally limited or slightly accessible overall (M = 2.38, SD = 0.65). Among the identified programs, the most accessible was the opportunity for faculty sabbatical and service credits (M = 2.91, SD = 1.23), followed by faculty deloading of teaching load (M = 2.64, SD = 0.95) and faculty mentoring (M = 2.64, SD = 0.83), all interpreted as moderately accessible. In contrast, the least accessed program was the monitoring and evaluation of faculty development to suit institutional needs (M = 1.94, SD = 0.94), followed by the perception that faculty development is available to all teachers at all levels (M = 2.01, SD = 0.99) and awards and promotion in recognition of a job well done (M = 2.03, SD = 0.90). These findings suggest that while some faculty development provisions are moderately available, the overall accessibility of the programs remains relatively low across the HEIs under study.

Table 4. Extent of Access to Faculty Development Programs

Faculty Development Program	Mean	S	VD
1. Attendance to seminar, conference, and training related to specialization	2.24	1.14	SA
2. Full scholarship assistance in pursuing Graduate Studies.	2.43	0.92	SA
3. Assistance to research and extension including paper publishing.	2.63	0.79	MA
4. Assistance in thesis and dissertation writing.	2.54	0.92	SA
5. [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
7. Purchase of instructional material, books, and	2.18	0.92	SA
8. Opportunity for faculty sabbatical and service	2.91	1.23	MA
9. Faculty Development is monitor and evaluates	1.94	0.94	SA
10. Awards and promotion in recognition to a job well-done.	2.03	0.90	SA
11. Faculty De-loading of teaching load.	2.64	0.95	MA
12. Faculty mentoring.	2.64	0.83	MA
Mean Score	2.38	0.65	SA

Perceived Level of Work Performance of the Respondents

Commitment. The results shown in Table 5 indicated that the respondents perceived their level of commitment to work as very high overall *(M = 4.53, SD = 0.39).* The highest-rated indicator was demonstrating sensitivity to students' ability to attend and absorb content *(M = 4.87, SD = 0.35),* suggesting that respondents strongly recognized their attentiveness to students' learning needs. This was followed by integrating learning objectives with students in a collaborative process *(M = 4.59, SD = 0.57)* and making themselves available to students beyond official time *(M = 4.47, SD = 0.66).* The lowest-rated indicator was regularly coming to class on time, well-groomed, and well-prepared to complete assigned responsibilities *(M = 4.36, SD = 0.60),* although it remained within a high level of perceived commitment. Overall, the findings indicate that respondents reported strong commitment to their teaching responsibilities, particularly in terms of sensitivity to students' learning capacity and collaborative engagement.

Table 5. Perceived Level of Commitment to Work of the Respondents

Statements	Mean	SD	VD
1. Demonstrates sensitivity to students' ability to attend and absorb content	4.87	0.350	VHP
2. Integrates sensitively his/her learning objectives with those students in a collaborative process.	4.59	0.570	VHP
3. Makes self-available to students beyond official time	4.47	0.660	VHP
4. Regularly comes to class on time, well-groomed and well-prepared to complete assigned responsibilities.	4.36	0.600	VHP
5. Keep accurate records of students' performance and prompt submission of the same.	4.37	0.660	VHP
Overall Mean	4.53	0.390	VHP

Knowledge of Mastery Content. The results shown in Table 6 indicate that respondents perceived their level of knowledge and mastery of subject content as very high overall *(M = 4.51, SD = 0.57).* The highest-rated indicator was demonstrating mastery of the subject matter without relying solely on the prescribed textbook *(M = 4.68, SD = 0.47),* followed by explaining the relevance of present topics to previous lessons and relating the subject matter to current issues or daily life activities *(M = 4.62, SD = 0.53).* These findings suggest that respondents considered themselves highly competent in explaining, contextualizing, and connecting subject content to meaningful learning situations. The lowest-rated indicator was integrating the subject with practical circumstances and the learning intents or purposes of students *(M = 4.31, SD = 0.69),* although it still reflected a high level of perceived mastery. Overall, the findings imply that respondents reported strong content knowledge, particularly in subject matter mastery, relevance-making, and awareness of current disciplinary trends.

Table 6. Level of Perceived Knowledge of Mastery Content of the Respondents

Statements	Mean	SD	VD
1. Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter (explain the subject matter without relying solely on the prescribed textbook)	4.68	0.470	VHP
2. Draws and share information on the state on the art of theory and practice in his/her discipline.	4.44	0.600	VHP
3. Integrates subject to practical circumstances and learning intents/purposes of students.	4.31	0.690	VHP
4. Explain the relevance of present topics to the previous lessons, and relates the subject matter to relevant current issues and/ or daily life activities.	4.62	0.530	VHP
5. Demonstrates up-to date knowledge and/or awareness on current trends and issues of the subject.	4.49	0.560	VHP
Overall Mean	4.51	0.570	VHP

Teaching for Independent Learning The results show that respondents perceived their level of teaching for independent learning as very high overall (M = 4.39, SD = 0.61). The highest-rated indicator was creating teaching strategies that allow students to practice using concepts they need to understand through interactive discussion (M = 4.70, SD = 0.46), indicating that respondents strongly viewed themselves as facilitating active and concept-based learning. This was followed by allowing students to create their own courses with defined objectives and accountability structures (M = 4.38, SD = 0.61) and allowing students to think independently and make decisions while being accountable for their performance (M = 4.38, SD = 0.65). Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicator was enhancing students' self-esteem and giving due recognition to students' performance or potential (M = 4.15, SD = 0.67), although it still reflected a very high level of perceived performance. Overall, the findings suggest that respondents reported strong teaching practices that promote student independence, active participation, accountability, and application of learned concepts.

Table 7. Level of Perceived Teaching for Independent Learning

Statements	Mean	SD	VD
1. Creates teaching strategies that allow students to practice using concepts they need to understand (interactive discussion).	4.70	0.460	VHP
2. Enhance student self-esteem and or gives due recognition to students' performance/potentials.	4.15	0.670	VHP
3. Allows students to create their own courses with objectives and realistically defined student-professor rules and make them accountable for their performance.	4.38	0.610	VHP
4. Allows students to think independently and make their own decisions and holding them accountable for their performance based largely on their success in executing decisions.	4.38	0.650	VHP
5. Encourages students to earn beyond what is required and help/guide the students how to apply the concepts learned.	4.34	0.650	VHP
Overall Mean	4.39	0.608	VHP

Management of Learning. The results indicate that respondents perceived their management of learning as very high overall (M = 4.49, SD = 0.54). The highest-rated indicator was assuming roles as facilitator, resource person, coach, inquisitor, integrator, and referee in drawing students to contribute to knowledge and understanding of concepts (M = 4.68, SD = 0.47), followed by creating opportunities for intensive or extensive student contribution in class activities (M = 4.60, SD = 0.49). These findings suggest that respondents strongly perceived themselves as active facilitators of participatory and collaborative learning. The lowest-rated indicator was designing and implementing learning conditions and experiences that promote healthy exchange or confrontation of ideas (M = 4.29, SD = 0.62), although it still falls within a very high level of perceived performance. Overall, the findings imply that respondents demonstrate strong classroom management practices that support student engagement, interaction, and the effective use of instructional materials to reinforce learning.

Table 8. Level of Perceived Management of Learning of the Respondents

Statements	Mean	SD	VD
1. Creates opportunities for intensive and /or extensive contribution of students in the class activities (e.g. breaks class into dyads, triads, or buzz/ task group.	4.60	0.490	VHP
2. Assume roles as facilitator, resource person, coach inquisitor, integrator, and referee in drawing students to contribute to knowledge and in understanding of the concepts at hand.	4.68	0.470	VHP
3. Designs and implements learning conditions and experience that promotes healthy exchange and /or confrontations.	4.29	0.620	VHP
4. Structures/ res-structures learning and teaching –learning context to enhance attainment of collective learning objectives.	4.31	0.550	VHP
5. Use of Instructional materials (audio/video materials, fieldtrips, film showing, computer aided instructions and etc.) to reinforces learning processes.	4.55	0.590	VHP
Overall Mean	4.486	0.544	VHP

The findings on access to faculty development programs indicate that the respondents perceived these opportunities as only slightly accessible overall, suggesting that the provisions identified in the faculty manual may not have been fully experienced or equally utilized across faculty groups. This result is important when viewed in relation to the respondents' demographic profile, particularly their employment status, academic rank, years in service, educational attainment, specialization, and previous attendance in seminars and trainings. Faculty members with permanent status, higher rank, longer service, or stronger institutional networks may have greater awareness of and access to development opportunities, while junior, contractual, or lower-ranked faculty may encounter more limitations [25], [26]. Although programs such as sabbatical/service credits, faculty deloading, and mentoring

appeared relatively easier to access, the low ratings on monitoring and evaluation, availability to all teachers, and recognition through awards and promotion suggest possible gaps in equity, implementation, and communication, 1 , 27]. This finding supports the report of [28, 27] which emphasizes that faculty development must be systematic, inclusive, needs-based, and institutionally monitored to contribute meaningfully to professional growth and instructional quality.

The respondents' perceived work performance was generally very high across the four indicators: commitment, mastery of subject content, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning. This finding implies that despite limited access to some faculty development programs, the respondents still reported strong professional performance in areas directly related to teaching responsibilities. This may be attributed to the respondents' accumulated teaching experience, academic preparation, specialization, and participation in previous seminars or graduate studies, which may have strengthened their confidence and competence in instruction. The high ratings in commitment and mastery of content suggest that faculty members remain professionally responsive to students' needs and are able to demonstrate content expertise, contextualization, and relevance of lessons [19, 30]. Similarly, the very high ratings in teaching for independent learning and management of learning indicate that respondents perceived themselves as capable of facilitating active, participatory, and learner-centered instruction. These results are consistent with the literature which frame faculty performance in terms of commitment, subject mastery, independent learning, and management of learning,[21, 31].

The findings imply that access to faculty development programs remains an important institutional factor in sustaining and further improving faculty work performance. While the respondents already perceived themselves as performing at a very high level, the limited accessibility of faculty development opportunities may restrict the continuous upgrading of competencies, especially among faculty members who may need more support due to rank, employment status, specialization, or limited exposure to training and scholarship opportunities. If access to faculty development remains uneven, high work performance may depend largely on individual initiative rather than on a structured institutional mechanism for professional growth. Thus, HEIs need to strengthen the implementation, monitoring, and equitable distribution of faculty development programs so that all faculty members, regardless of demographic background, can benefit from opportunities for graduate education, research support, mentoring, instructional innovation, and professional recognition. This reinforces the literature cited in the study which argues that faculty development is most effective when it is accessible, aligned with institutional needs, and directly connected to the enhancement of teaching performance and student learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the study concludes that faculty members perceived access to faculty development programs as generally limited, suggesting that although such programs are provided in the faculty manual, their implementation and availability may not be fully experienced across all respondents. However, the respondents reported very high levels of work performance in terms of commitment, mastery of subject content, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning. This indicates that faculty members continue to demonstrate strong professional competence and instructional commitment despite the limited accessibility of development opportunities. The findings further imply that strengthening the accessibility, monitoring, and equitable implementation of faculty development programs may help sustain and further enhance faculty performance, particularly by ensuring that professional growth opportunities are responsive to the needs of faculty members across different ranks, employment status, years of service, specialization, and educational attainment.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited by its reliance on self-reported data, which may have been influenced by respondents' subjective perceptions, recall, and possible social desirability bias. Since no triangulation was conducted, the findings were not validated through other data sources. Moreover, the study employed a purely quantitative and descriptive methodology; thus, the analysis was limited to describing the respondents' perceptions without establishing causal relationships or explaining the deeper reasons behind the observed results.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For HEI administrators, it is recommended to strengthen the implementation, monitoring, and equitable distribution of faculty development programs. Since access to these programs was perceived as limited, administrators may establish a transparent faculty development plan that clearly identifies available programs, eligibility requirements, application procedures, timelines, and expected benefits.

For faculty members, they may actively participate in available faculty development opportunities and maintain professional documentation of their training, research, instructional innovations, and performance accomplishments. Since respondents reported very high work performance, faculty members are encouraged to sustain their commitment, subject mastery, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning by engaging in continuing professional development, peer mentoring, research activities, and reflective teaching practices.

For future researchers, conduct a more comprehensive study using mixed methods and triangulated data sources. Since the present study relied on self-reported data and descriptive quantitative analysis, future studies may include interviews, focus group discussions, document analysis, classroom observations, and institutional records to validate faculty perceptions and provide deeper explanations of the findings. Future researchers may also use inferential statistical analysis to examine whether access to faculty development programs significantly predicts faculty work performance and whether demographic variables such as rank, employment status, educational attainment, specialization, and years in service influence access and performance.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Limson, "Faculty development programs among state universities and colleges in the province of Iloilo: Basis for a faculty development model," *Institute of Advanced Science Extension,* vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 119-128, 2023.

[2] T. Quiao, B. McDermott and J. Thannhauser, "Faculty Engagement In Professional Development," *Papers on Postsecondary Learning and Teaching,* vol. 7, pp. 81-89, 2024.

[3] F. Aldaba, J. Sescon and K. Alconis, "Strengthening CHED's Developmental and Regulatory Capacity," EDCOM2, https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/document/pidsdps2441.pdf ?utm_source=chatgpt.com, 2024.

[4] Y. Steinert, L. Naismith and K. Mann, "Faculty development initiatives designed to promote leadership in medical education. A BEME systematic review: BEME Guide No. 19," *Medical Teacher ,* vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 483-503, 2012.

[5] R. M. Cotta, E. de Souza Ferreira, F. de Aguiar Franco, G. da Costa Souza Barros, J. Toledo Januario, T. Moriera and R. Lopez MArtin, "The effectiveness of faculty development programs for training university professors in the health area: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *BMC Medical Education,* vol. 24, p. 768, 2024.

[6] J. M. Chin, G. S. Ching, F. del Castillo, T. Wen, Y. Huang, C. Del Castillo and S. M. GubgonTrajera, "Perspectives on the Barriers to and Needs of Teachers' Professional Development in the Philippines during COVID-19," *Sustainability,* vol. 14, no. 1, p. 470, 2022.

[7] B. Vergonia, "Ready to go? Profiling Philippines high school teachers' readiness for blended learning in post-COVID-19 era," *Journal of Educational Management and Instruction,* vol. 2, no. 1, 2022.

[8] Civil Service Commission, *Guidelines in the Establishment and Implementation of Agency Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS),* 2012.

[9] S. Sawchuk, "Teacher Evaluation: An Issue Overview," 3 September 2015. [Online]. Available: https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/teacher-evaluation-an-issue-overview/2015/09.

[10] M. N. Abid, L. Siming, H. Chao, M. Amin and S. Sarwer, "Enhancing faculty teaching performance through constructive leadership with a mediating role of job satisfaction," *Scientific Reports,* vol. 15, no. 13454, 2025.

[11] C. C. Launio, F. D. Samuel, A. Banez, M. C. Talastas, L. Sito and K. B. Dela Cruz, "Motivating Factors and Challenges of Faculty Members in a State University in the Philippines in Publishing Journal Articles," *Journal of Scientometric Research,* vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 866-876, 2024.

[12] A. Kamel, "Role of faculty development programs in improving teaching and learning," *Saudi Journal of Oral Sciences,* vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 61-68, 2016.

[13] Y. K. Pranoto, D. Fitri Utam and L. Latiana, "Do Teachers' Experiences and Ages Contribute to Their," in *Proceedings of the 11th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering*, Singapore, 2021.

[14] R. Winningtom, "The Gendered Role of Pastoral Care Within Tertiary Education Institutions: An Autoethnographic Reflection During COVID-19," *ursing Praxis in Aotearoa New Zealand,,* vol. 3, pp. 37-40, 2021.

[15] A. Bam, C. Walters and J. Jansen, "Care and academic work in a pandemic lockdown: a study of women academics in South Africa," *Higher education,* vol. 87, p. 1791–1807, 2023.

[16] World Bank, "Primary education, teachers (% female) - Philippines," 19 March 2026. [Online]. Available: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.TCHR.FE.ZS?locations=PH&utm_source=chatgpt.com.

[17] K. M. Yee, G. Ducanes and C. C. David, "Graduate Degrees of Higher Education Faculty in the Philippines: Status and Ways Forward," 2018. [Online]. Available: https://serp-p.pids.gov.ph/publication/public/view?slug=graduate-degrees-of-higher-education-faculty-in-the-philippines-status-and-ways-forward.

[18] J. Creswell, "Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches," Thousand Oaks, California, Sage, 2009.

[19] M. Patton, Qualitative research and evaluation methods, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002.

[20] J. R. Fraenkel, N. E. Wallen and H. H. Hyun, How to Design and Evaluate Research in education, New York, NY: MGraw-Hill, 2012.

[21] Department of Budget and Management, Government of the Philippines, 1998.

[22] C. Goods and D. Scates, *Methods of Research: Educational, Psychological and Sociologica,* East Norwalk, CT: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

[23] A. Field, Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics, 6th edition ed., Sage, 2024.

[24] A. T. Panter and S. K. Sterba, Handbook of Ethics in Quantitative Methodology, Routledge, 2011.

[25] B. L. Hott and T. Tietjen-Smith, "The professional development needs of tenure track faculty at a regional university," *Research in Higher Education Journa,* vol. 35, pp. 1-12, 2018.

[26] A. Giladi, N. Davidovitch and L. Ben-Meir, "The Professional Identity of Academic Lecturers in Higher Education Post-COVID-19 in Israel," *Education Sciences,* vol. 12, no. 6, p. 408, 2022.

[27] P. Kneale, J. Winter, R. Turner, L. Spowart and R. Muneers, "Evaluating Teaching Development Activities in Higher Education: A Toolkit," Highe reducation Academy, 2016.

[28] L. Darling-Hammond, M. E. Hyler, M. Gardner and D. Espinoza, "Efective Teacher Professional Development," Learning Policy Institute, 2017.

[29] DepEd DO 42, s. 2017 , "National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers," 2017. [Online]. Available: https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers/.

[30] L. S. Shulman and L. S. Shulman, "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching," vol. 15, no. 2, 1986.

[31] G. Wright, "Student-Centered Learning in Higher Education," *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education,* vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 92-97, 2011.

[32] L. B. Holm-Nielsen, "Universities: From Local Institutions to Global Systems? Implications for Students, Staff and Institutions," *Europena Review,* vol. 26, no. S1, pp. S124-S148, 2018.

[33] F. A. Cimene, E. C. Du, O. C. Alonsabe, J. A. Kurangking and M. D. Santander, "Teaching and Learning in the Digital Age: Technology's Impact on Filipino Education," in *Navigating the*

educataional Landscape: Philosophy, trends, and Issues in teh Philippines, 2023, pp. 40-49.

[34] S. Baylan, "A contextual analysis of the university research agenda of select teacher education institutions in the Philippines: policy implications and future directions," *Asian Journal of University Education,* vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 662-675, 2023.

[35] A. C. Marasigan, B. Hajan, N. J. Castolo, R. Obliopas, G. S. Digo, O. A. Imam, J. L. De Vera, J. Aquino, J. C. Anito, F. Colicol, M. Buenaventura, KoiralaI and S. C. Bazer, "Dress like the Global North and eat like the Global South": why do faculty contributions to university research productivity matter?," *Frontiers in Education,* vol. 10, no. 1576981., 2025.

[36] "Philippines Female Teachers in Primary Education," 2025. [Online]. Available: https://tradingeconomics.com/philippines/primary-education-teachers-percent-female-wb-data.html.

[37] D. Brooks and M. McCormack, Driving Digital Transformation in Higher Education, Louisville, CO: EDUCAUSE, 2020.

[38] World Bank, "Digital Transformation of Philippine Higher Education," The world BAnk, Washington, DC, 2022.

[39] S. Sangwa, A. Butera and M. Placide, "Open Access Digital Transformation of Higher Education: A Post-COVID Review of Adoption, Quality Assurance, and Governance Challenges," *Current Research Bulletin,* vol. 2, no. 7, pp. 120-133, 2025.

[40] World Bank, "Secondary education, teachers (% female) - Philippines," 19 MArch 2026. [Online]. Available: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.SEC.TCHR.FE.ZS?locations=PH.

[41] DBM Circular, "NBC 461 QCE Operations MAnual," 1998, Philippines, 1998.