

Title: Analysis of Faculty Overload and Teaching Effectiveness
Author(s): Ma. Carmela T. Mancao
Journal Name: Research Series
Journal Citation: No. 92
Publication Date: August 2007
Publication Type:

Abstract:

It was the purpose of this research to verify if the current practice of allowing faculty members to carry teaching overload/s affects teaching effectiveness as evaluated by students through the use of the Faculty Evaluation Scale.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following: 1) What is the profile of overload of faculty members per semester? 2) What is the evaluation profile of the faculty with overload? 3) Are there significant differences in the faculty evaluation results between the 1st and the 2nd semesters? 4) Is there a correlation between the number of overload and faculty evaluation results? 5) What is the profile of faculty members with overload and/or outside teaching load, and /or study load, and/or consultation services? (This category is now referred to as "overload+) 6) Are there significant differences in the faculty evaluation results of the faculty with overload+ between the 1st and the 2nd semesters? 7) Is there a correlation between the number of overload+ and faculty evaluation results?

Overload, as used in this study, refers to the number of teaching or non-teaching loads a faculty member has in addition to the five (5) regular teaching/non-teaching loads. Overload+ refers to other activities of the faculty members, such as outside teaching loads, study loads and consultation services, which are over and above their regular and overloads at PNU.

The Faculty Evaluation Scale, which is being administered to the students for them to evaluate their professors' performance, was used as the main instrument in this study. This scale has four components, namely: 1) Commitment, 2) Knowledge of Subject Matter, 3) Teaching for Independent Learning, and 4) Management of Student Learning. According to the findings of the study conducted by Ochave and Abulon (2006) using the G Theory, this instrument is precise and has the ability to detect professors' competence inside the classroom.

A total of 178 (85%) out of 210 were evaluated during the 1st semester of School Year 2005-2006, while 61 (28%) out of 216 faculty members were evaluated during the 2nd semester of the same year.

Almost all of the faculty members had overloads during the first and second semesters, school year 2005-2006. Forty-five percent (45%) for both semesters, carried 12 units, or four teaching overloads. This translates to a total of 37 hours per week, computed as 25 hours for mandatory regular workload plus twelve hours overload.

The following are the important findings of the study: 1) There were more faculty members who had 4 to 5 teaching/non-teaching overloads and overload+, than those who had only 0-3 overloads during both semesters of school year 2005-2006; 2) The Faculty got an Evaluation Rating mean which is interpreted as Very Satisfactory. 3) Obtaining a high mean performance is achievable whether a faculty has two or four overloads; 4) Overload + does not influence the performance evaluation by the students of a faculty with a seemingly hectic and demanding schedule; 5) The number of overloads has no effect on the students' evaluation of the faculty teaching performance, as proven by the insignificant difference in the mean performance between the two groups of faculty. In fact those who had more overloads garnered a slightly higher mean score; 6) The first hypothesis – the lower the number of overload, the higher the faculty performance evaluation – was rejected. It was noted that one can attain an Outstanding evaluation from students even with five overloads. On the other hand, a faculty member with one to two overloads received a mere Satisfactory rating.

A meticulous scrutiny of the faculty ratings, however, revealed that permitting the faculty members to handle over loads might have an adverse effect on their performance. A total of twenty-seven (27) faculty members during the school year 2005-2006 were assessed below the required Very Satisfactory rating. Worse, there were six faculty members who garnered Satisfactory rating for both 1st and 2nd semesters but who were given overload just the same. Five of them even had 4 or more overloads. This may mean that the Faculty Manual provision to grant overload only to those who have Very Satisfactory and Outstanding ratings, has not been observed. There is also the possibility that the rating given to the faculty is not only from the students' evaluation but also from peers, from the department head and from self. There is a need to clarify the operational definition of the required "Very Satisfactory" rating to permit faculty to carry overload.

Another problem as to the reliability of the results of the students' evaluation of faculty is the manner in administering the Faculty Evaluation Scale to students. Informal investigation on this matter revealed the absence of trained personnel in managing the entire faculty evaluation process. The clerical force assigned in the Office of the Vice President for Academics are sent out to classes to administer the Faculty Evaluation Scale without prior orientation. Interviews with randomly selected students on this matter disclosed that when the clerks enter the classroom to request students to evaluate the concerned professor, the students, particularly the upper class sections) are not properly reminded of the importance of the evaluation process. Some students admitted that they rate a professor on a personal stance, not on one's professional effectiveness.