

## PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE PHILIPPINE EASTERN VISAYAS REGION

**Donald M. Patimo**  
Northwest Samar State  
University, Philippines

**Alamat Korespondensi**  
donald.patimo@nwsu.edu.ph

### ABSTRACT

The main concern of this study was the assessment of the faculty performance evaluation instrument of State Universities and Colleges in the Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. Specifically, the study sought answers to research questions on what are the psychometric properties of the evaluation instrument and what are the problems identified with regards to the faculty performance evaluation instrument. In search of answers to the abovementioned research questions, the researcher made use of the descriptive-assessment research design. The respondents of this study were administrators, faculty members, and students from the main campuses of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. As result, the researcher found out that the faculty performance evaluation instrument of the SUCs was valid and administrable, but not yet tested for reliability. The serious problems identified on the faculty performance evaluation system of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region were primarily related to the evaluation criteria and procedure such as the lack of involvement of administrators, faculty, and students in the construction of the evaluation system.

**Keywords:** Faculty Performance, Evaluation System, Metaevaluation, Psychometric Properties, Validity, Reliability, Administrability

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the organization's most valuable asset. They define the efficiency, effectiveness and over-all quality of service in any organization. The acquisition, utilization and development of financial, material, technological and market resources of the organization which may be exhaustible are dependent on human resources (Payos, 2010). These resources are directly related to organizational behavior such as knowledge, ability, decision making and intelligence of the human resource base. Because of the value of the people within and behind the organization, it is very important that the organization takes special care to ensure the satisfaction of their human resources. If the human resource is available, capable and satisfied, the other resources can be of great use to the organization.

Evaluating faculty effectiveness is important in every institution of higher education. Assessing teaching performance enables one to gauge the quality of instruction represented by the institution and facilitate better learning among students. Assessing the effectiveness with which various functions of the faculty members are performed is essential to a

variety of important administration recommendations and decisions. The evaluation system also provides feedback which influences the faculty member's self-image and professional satisfaction. The faculty performance management system establishes a climate which communicates the institution's commitment to professional improvement and confidence that every faculty member will make a valuable contribution to the achievement of shared goals (Goe, 2007).

The processes in the performance evaluation of instructors, professors, and professionals of the SUCs are highly critical since it is used to decide on matters such as hiring, rehiring, and promotion. Hence, there should be careful calibration and continuous study of the instruments used to assess the teachers. Moreover, there is a need to evaluate the process of evaluating faculty performance of SUCs in the Philippine Eastern Visayas Region. Through a study, it may be determined whether the existing processes and instruments in the different SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines met the standards of psychometric properties.

It was on this reason that a study, which aimed to assess the faculty performance evaluation system of State Universities and Colleges in the Philippine Eastern Visayas Region, was conceived. Specifically, the study sought answers to research questions on what are the psychometric properties of the evaluation instrument and what are the problems identified with regards to the faculty performance evaluation system.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This study made use of the descriptive-assessment research design. A descriptive-assessment research design is used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe what exists with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. The study was conducted at different SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines, namely Eastern Samar State University (ESSU), Eastern Visayas State University (EVSU), Leyte Normal University (LNU), Naval State University (NSU), Northwest Samar State University (NwSSU), Palompon Institute of Technology (PIT), Southern Leyte State University (SLSU), Samar State University (SSU), University of Eastern Philippines (UEP), and Visayas State University (VSU). Survey questionnaires were distributed among the evaluation personnel, faculty members and students in order to elicit the needed data for this research study.

Complete enumeration was used for the evaluation personnel respondents of the study, which include the deans and members of evaluation committee. Random sampling technique was used to determine the sample size of the faculty members and students in each involved SUCs. The total number of respondents for this study representing the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students proportionally distributed from the different SUCs in Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines was 1,604 individuals. Statistical tools like frequency and ranking, percentage distribution, means, and standard deviations were used for the analysis of the data.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The psychometric properties of an evaluation instrument are important in order to

make certain for its appropriateness and effectiveness. It is for this reason that this study attempted to uncover the psychometric properties of the faculty performance evaluation instrument of SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines with regards to validity, reliability, administrability, and other properties such as total number of items and estimated time to accomplish the instrument.

Table I displays the validity, reliability and administrability of the faculty performance evaluation instrument of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region through frequency and percentage distribution. With respect to the validity of the faculty performance evaluation instrument, the respondents have unanimously agreed to the consistency of the items, relevance of the items, presentable appearance, readability of the items, adequacy of space provided, clarity and comprehensiveness of the instruction, and appropriateness of the language used which is equal to 10 or 100 percent. The statements on the instrument were judged by 9 or 90 percent of the respondents to be perfectly clear.

With respect to reliability, the respondents are one in informing that the faculty performance evaluation instrument is not yet tested for reliability. With respect to administrability, 10 or 100 percent of the respondents definitely agreed to the easy administration, clarity and completeness of the instruction, and easy scoring facilitation of the faculty performance evaluation instrument. Four or 40 percent of the respondents judged that the time limits, oral instructions, and sample questions to be clearly specified. Nine or 90 percent of the respondents decided that the provisions for the preparation, distribution, and collection of the evaluation instruments to be clearly specified.

From these results, it can be deduced that majority of the considered points for validity and administrability were unanimously judged by the respondents to be evident in the faculty performance evaluation instrument of SUCs in Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines. On the other hand, the researcher found out that the evaluation instruments used in the faculty performance evaluation instrument are not yet tested for reliability.

There were also numerous studies that evaluated evaluation instruments with the use of psychometric properties of validity, reliability, and administrability. Hanafi (2016) evaluated the developed reading comprehension test from the result of tryouts show that the test has fulfilled the criteria of valid, reliable and administrable. Bhat and Beri (2016) made use of the psychometric properties on validity and reliability of the Teachers Perceived Job Performance (TPJP) scales in higher education. Reliability and validity were also considered in the study of Johari and Yahya (2012). With these psychometric properties, the job performance constructs under study were suitable for Malaysian studies. Conway and Huffcutt (1997) examined the psychometric properties using interrater reliabilities within and between subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings of job performance. Sass, Lopez, Oliveira and Martin (2016) found out that the Behavior and Instructional management Scale's (BIMS) psychometric properties provided evidences of factorial validity and internal consistency reliability.

Table 1: Distribution of the "Yes" Responses to the Psychometric Properties of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Region VIII with regards to Validity, Reliability and Administrability

Psychometric Properties	f	%
<b>VALIDITY</b>		
Are items in the evaluation instrument consistent?	10	100
Are the items in the evaluation instrument relevant to faculty performance?	10	100
Are the questions in the evaluation instrument perfectly clear and unambiguous?	9	90
Is the evaluation instrument presentable in appearance?	10	100
Are the size of the letters and lettering style used in the evaluation instrument readable?	10	100
Is there an adequate space provided for the answers to the evaluation instrument?	10	100
Are the instructions given in the evaluation instrument clearly stated and comprehensible?	10	100
Is the language used in each of the statements in the evaluation instrument appropriate for the topic and for the idea being asked?	10	100
<b>RELIABILITY</b>		
Is the evaluation instrument tested for reliability?	0	0
<b>ADMINISTRABILITY</b>		
Is the evaluation instrument easy to administer?	10	100
Are the instructions in the evaluation instrument clear and complete?	10	100
Are time limits, oral instructions, and sample questions clearly specified?	4	40
Are the provisions for the preparation, distribution, and collection of the evaluation instruments clearly specified?	9	90
Is the scoring of the evaluation instrument easily facilitated?	10	100

The remaining psychometric properties such as the total number of items in the evaluation instrument and estimated time to accomplish the evaluation instrument are presented in Table 2 through frequency and

percentage distribution. As shown in the table, 1 or 10 percent of the SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region employed 34 items evaluation instrument, 1 or 10 percent employed 30 items, 2 or 20 percent employed 25 items, 1 or 10 percent employed 24 items, 1 or 10 percent employed 21 items, and 4 or 40 percent used 20 items. These data indicate that majority of the SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region makes use of 20 items evaluation instrument. From these data, it can be also figured out that the average number of items in the evaluation instruments of the SUCs in the region is 27 items.

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution on the Psychometric Properties of the Faculty Performance Evaluation System of State Universities and Colleges in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region with regards to Total Number of Items in the Evaluation Instrument and Estimated Time to Accomplish the Evaluation Instrument

Properties	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Total Number of Items in the Evaluation Instrument</b>		
34 items	1	10
30 items	1	10
25 items	2	20
24 items	1	10
21 items	1	10
20 items	4	40
TOTALS	10	100
<b>Estimated Time to Accomplish the Evaluation Instrument</b>		
40 minutes	1	10
10 minutes	2	20
6 minutes	2	20
5 minutes	5	50
TOTALS	10	100

With regards to the estimated time to accomplish the evaluation instrument, 1 or 10 percent of the SUCs in Eastern Visayas Region of the Philippines estimated 40 minutes, 2 or 20 percent answered 10 minutes, 2 or 20 percent responded 6 minutes, and 5 or 50 percent approximated 5 minutes. These data indicate that majority of the SUCs in the region needs 5 minutes to accomplish the evaluation instrument. From these data, it can be computed that the average estimated time to accomplish the evaluation instruments of the SUCs in the region is 15.25 minutes.

There were also numerous studies that evaluated evaluation instruments with the use of psychometric properties of total number of items and estimated time to accomplish. Teman, Minter, and Kasten (2016) recommended to minimize the number of items to improve the resident assessment and faculty evaluation. In the study of Utomo and Sayuti (2017), the researchers found out that the try out tests on the assessment instrument model development

that the time allotment to finish and other assessment attributes shall be appropriate and matched from one to another so that it can be applied well.

Table 3 reveals the ranked problems identified by the three groups of respondents of the study, namely the evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students. As shown in the table, the first five problems can be considered as the most serious problems of the faculty performance evaluation systems of SUCs in the Eastern Visayas Region of Philippines.

The first five problems and the most serious problems are the following. The problem on the lack of involvement of evaluation personnel, faculty members, and students in the construction of the evaluation system is considered as the highest. This is followed by the problem on the faculty members are not clear on evaluation criteria and weighing system, the purpose of present faculty evaluation system is not made clear to faculty members, lack of checks and balances in the evaluation process and faculty members are not clear..

Table 3: Frequency and Ranking of the Problems Identified by the Respondents

Problems	Evaluation Personnel		Faculty Members		Students		Overall	
	f	Rank	f	Rank	f	Rank	f	Rank
There is lack of involvement of administrators, faculty, and students in the construction of the evaluation system.	55	1	299	1	328	4	682	1
Faculty members are not clear on evaluation criteria and weighing system.	23	16.5	257	4.5	388	1	668	2
The purpose of present faculty evaluation system is not made clear to faculty members.	25	14.5	164	18	385	2	574	3
There is lack of checks and balances in the evaluation process.	47	4	253	6	272	11	572	4
Faculty members are not clear as to how they are rated.	19	20	198	13	347	3	564	5
There is no guidelines for peer participation in evaluation.	34	6	233	8	291	6.5	558	6
Evaluation data are not accompanied with a plan for improvement when shared to faculty members.	50	2	269	2	225	17	544	7
Other service accomplishments such as doing consulting and editorial work outside of the institution are not given due credit.	28	11	257	4.5	257	12	542	8
There is lack of due process in evaluating faculty members.	25	14.5	199	12	288	8	512	9
The present evaluation scheme and reward system fail to encourage professional development of faculty.	40	5	261	3	202	20	503	10
Evaluation procedures are not applied fairly.	30	9.5	176	15	291	6.5	497	11
Evaluation procedures are not applied consistently.	22	18	184	14	287	9	493	12
Schools do not look at merit pay as method for rewarding instructional excellence.	32	7.5	214	9	246	15	492	13
Weight given to each type of faculty work is not mutually agreed upon by faculty and administrators together.	30	9.5	238	7	222	18	490	14
Weights are assigned to different criterion/indicator.	20	19	162	19	295	5	477	15
Evaluation data are not shared with teacher concerned.	26	13	208	10	241	16	475	16
The faculty performance rating does not support the attainment of institutional mission.	15	21	165	17	284	10	464	17
Trust and communication are wanting between faculty and evaluators.	23	16.5	172	16	256	13.5	451	18
Evaluators are inadequately trained.	48	3	202	11	189	22	439	19
Student rating serves as the sole criterion for the faculty evaluation.	14	22	159	20	256	13.5	429	20
Administration of the evaluation is not standardized.	32	7.5	138	21	190	21	360	21
Faculty members show resistance to evaluation process.	10	23	124	23	219	19	353	22
Scoring of the evaluation is not standardized.	27	12	133	22	188	23	348	23
Others	1	24	14	24	20	24	35	24

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were drawn. Majority of the evaluation personnel agreed that the faculty performance evaluation system of their respective SUC was valid and administrable, but not yet tested for reliability. Majority also of the SUCs in the region made use of evaluation instruments with 20 items and required 5 minutes to be completely accomplished.

As result, the researcher found out that the faculty performance evaluation instrument of the SUCs was valid and administrable, but not yet tested for reliability. The serious problems identified on the faculty performance evaluation systems of SUCs in Philippine Eastern Visayas Region were primarily related to the evaluation criteria and procedure such as the lack of involvement of administrators, faculty, and students in the construction of the evaluation system.

#### 5. REFERENCES

Afriadi, Bambang. 2018. "EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT CLASS CONCEPT (Case Study: Student Behavior Problematics)." *JISAE: JOURNAL OF INDONESIAN STUDENT ASSESMENT AND EVALUATION* 4 (2): 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.21009/JISAE.042.07>.

Afriadi, Bambang. *A Review Of Tolerance Education In The Development Of Children To Adulthood Case Study: Know The Facts Objective*. no. 1, 2020, pp. 18–52.

---. *Problematika Pendisiplinan Perilaku Normatif Dalam Kegiatan Piket Kelas*. pp. 527–36.

"A STUDY ON PERSONALITY THAT INFLUENCES By FAUZIAH BINTI OTHMAN Research Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Business Administration." 2009.

Bhat, S. A., & Beri, A. (2016). Development and validation of teachers perceived job performance scale (TPJP) in higher education. *Man in India*, 96(4), 935-944.

Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1997). Psychometric properties of multisource

- performance ratings: A meta-analysis of subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings. *Human Performance*, 10(4), 331-360.
- Goe, L. (2007). The link between teacher quality and student outcomes: A research synthesis. National comprehensive center for teacher quality.
- Hanafi, H. (2016). Developing reading comprehension test for the first semester students of english department. *ELLITE: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 1(1).
- Johari, J., & Yahya, K. K. (2012). An Assessment of the Reliability and Validity of Job Performance Measurement (Satu Penilaian terhadap Kebolehpercayaan dan Kesahan Pengukuran Prestasi Kerja). *Jurnal Pengurusan (UKM Journal of Management)*, 36.
- Payos, Ranulfo P. (2010). *Human Resource Management: From Practitioner's Point of View*. Philippines: Rex Book Store, Inc.
- Sass, D. A., Lopes, J., Oliveira, C., & Martin, N. K. (2016). An evaluation of the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale's psychometric properties using Portuguese teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 279-290.
- Teman, N. R., Minter, R. M., & Kasten, S. J. (2016). Utility of factor analysis in optimization of resident assessment and faculty evaluation. *The American Journal of Surgery*, 211(6), 1158-1163.
- Utomo, U., & Sayuti, S. A. (2017). Developing an Instrument Model to Assess Teachers' Creativity in Designing and Teaching Music Subject. *Harmonia Journal of Arts Research and Education*, 17(1), 13-22.