Print ISSN 2094-1064
Online ISSN 2244-0437

Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research
doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.7828/ljher.v12i1.963

Students' Perspective on Teacher Performance and Teacher Effectiveness

ROSELLA O. ORTIZ
ORCID No. 0000-0003-4801-0622
roortiz@liceo.edu.ph

RAMON G. ABRERA, JR.
ORCID No. 0000-0002-6645-8271
rabrera@liceo.edu.ph
Liceo de Cagayan University
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Using the mixed method research design, this study attempted to determine the relationship between *teacher performance* and *teacher effectiveness*. Two hundred academics were evaluated by 2000 college students from two autonomous universities in Mindanao, Philippines. The two survey questionnaires, namely: Student Assessment of Teacher Performance (SATP) and Teacher Effectiveness Inventory (TEI) served as the main sources of data. While interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) were used to validate the quantitative data provided by the respondents, correlation statistics was used to test the hypothesis. With regard to the findings, it was found out *that teacher performance* is strongly correlated *with teacher effectiveness*. This correlation implies that students can best tell whether or not a teacher is effective. What teachers do and how things are done inside the classroom based on performance standards determine *teacher effectiveness*. There is a need to develop a program that intends to enhance teacher effectiveness. Likewise, it is imperative that institutions of higher learning evaluate their organizations' processes of assessing *teacher performance* and *teacher effectiveness.*

Keywords: Management, teacher performance, teacher effectiveness, mixed method, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Teacher effectiveness is an important area of investigation that has emerged in recent years among educational researchers around the globe. A growing body of research has shown that teacher effectiveness is a strong predictor of student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hanushek & Lindseth, 2009; Muñoz & Chang, 2007; Stronge, Ward, Tucker, & Hindman, 2009).

Even in Southeast Asia, particularly, the Philippines, accrediting bodies such as the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA) and the Philippine Accrediting Association of Colleges and Universities (PAASCU) posited that quality instruction is influenced by a combination of factors, which may include but are not limited to quality teachers, state-of-the-art facilities, support services, leadership, governance, research, and extension. The quality of teachers is a prerequisite to quality teaching, and quality teaching happens because of effective teaching. Effective teaching requires effective teachers. Thus, even the Quacquarelli Symonds (2012) survey marks effective teaching as a major standard for comparative ranking among universities.

Understanding the drivers of teacher effectiveness is a major management issue among higher education institutions (HEIs). A better understanding of what constitutes teacher effectiveness has significant implications for decision makings regarding the preparation, recruitment, compensation, in-service professional development, and evaluation of teachers (Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011). Thus, this study was conceptualized not only as a major input to university management decision in developing and nurturing effective teachers within the organizational structure but also more especially that of ensuring student quality through teacher effectiveness.

FRAMEWORK

Supported by the studies of researcher-educators Darling-Hammond (2009, 2010, & 2011) and Stronge & Ward (2007, 2011), which established factors that have a significant bearing on *teacher effectiveness*, this study is also anchored on the *teacher performance* framework developed by Liceo de Cagayan University (LdeCU). The same framework was tested in the same university and at the University of Mindanao (UM). Both are in Mindanao, Philippines and share certain similarities in organizational culture and structure being private and

autonomous HEIs.

Stronge and Tucker (2000) described effective teachers as having distinctive qualities that impact and make a difference in the students' lives. Likewise, Jerald (2003) stated that effective teaching must be defined by good teaching outcomes. Stronge, Ward, and Grant (2011), on the other hand, believed that seeming to be a good teacher and actually being a good teacher can be very different. Thus, using student learning–as a component of teacher evaluation that is based on multiple data sources such as student feedback through assessment–can approximate *teacher effectiveness*.

In this study, *teacher effectiveness* can be gleaned from the teachers' behaviors that impact the teaching-learning process as assessed by students. Darling-Hammond (2009) asserted that schools need a mix of knowledge, skills, and abilities among their academics to inform curriculum decisions and to meet the needs of their students. Manifestations of *teacher effectiveness* can be drawn from the students' feedback on *teacher performance* and the teachers' effect on students. This teacher effectiveness can be gleaned by the students' personal accounts of their teachers' impact.

Teachers are said to be effective if they are able to cultivate thinking skills, stimulate interest in the subject, and motivate students to initiate their own learning; are approachable and helpful, present learning materials well, challenge students intellectually, set high standards, and have good elocutionary skills (Weimer, 2013). *Teacher effectiveness* is the dominant factor influencing student academic growth (Stronge, 2009). Also, teacher effectiveness is gauged by students according to their experiences of *teacher performance* in the classroom. Hence, in this study, the general expected learning outcomes of classroom instruction were the focus of gauging teacher effectiveness.

Moreover, standards-based evaluations of teaching, according to Darling-Hammond (2009), have been found to be significantly related to student achievement. Such standards-based evaluations help teachers improve their practice and effectiveness. Hence, this study used the framework developed and customized by LdeCU to determine *teacher performance* through the students' assessment. In this study, the Student Assessment of Teacher Performance (SATP) was utilized to define and measure *teacher performance*. This standard-based tool was developed by a group of academics specifically convened to become part of a team that redesigned the teachers' performance evaluation scheme of LdeCU.

Cascading from the philosophy and principles of faculty evaluation, the standards of teacher performance were formulated within the context of LdeCU's

core values and upright practices and the requirements of sound teaching born from researches and literatures. There were eight standards of teacher performance, but only six were used for student assessment: namely, *personal attributes, instructional delivery, student engagement, learning environment, assessment, and communication skills*. The other two standards professionalism and community service were excluded because they could not be captured objectively in the classroom.

Bustos-Orosa (2008), in her study, concluded that good teaching is the confluence of several critical factors, namely: personality-based dispositions, teaching competence, content mastery and expertise, and pedagogical knowledge. Decent teaching combines the value of good classroom management, organization, effective planning, and the teachers' personal characteristics, which justify the inclusion of *personal attributes* as part of the standards. Stronge, Tucker, and Hindman (2008) asserted that a teacher's personality is one of the first sets of characteristics to look for in an effective teacher because a large part of the teacher's influence on the students lies more on the person than his/her instructional competence. While knowledge of subject matter is essential, teachers accomplish more by the force of their personality and example, than by their lesson plans and assignments.

Researches on teaching capability reveal that to have an effective *instructional planning and delivery*, teachers plan and make sound instructional decisions that demonstrate a deep understanding of the content, pedagogy, and curriculum implementation that promote engagement and persistence (McEwan, 2002; Zwart, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2010). It is significant that planned instruction should be logically related to the actual instruction, and the assessments should relate to the plans and instruction (Cantor 2005; Egan, Welch, Page, & Sebastian, 1992). Making sound instructional decisions is a function of planning. Effective teachers do not only show mastery of the lesson but also prepare timely and relevant teaching plans/syllabi aligned with the programs of studies of their specific area of discipline to be organized for systematic presentation of the concepts utilizing appropriate instructional strategies (Covino & Iwanicki, 1996). Effective teachers, likewise, employ available technologies to enhance communication and learning and apply contemporary principles of learning theory and teaching methodology (Lanouette, 2012).

The above cited activities encourage students to engage and participate actively in the learning process. *Student engagement* is the key factor in student learning and other desirable outcomes in higher education (Darling-Hammond, 2007;

Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2007; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005; Finn & Zimmer, 2012). Student engagement is generally considered as one of the better predictors of learning and personal development. Carini, Kuh, & Klein (2006) said that the premise is self-evident, which means that the more students study or practice in a subject, the more they tend to learn. The primary tasks of the teacher are to design engaging tasks and activities for students that call upon them to learn what the school has determined they should learn and to lead them to succeed in the completion of these tasks.

To engage students, effective teachers need to be adept at organizing and maintaining an appropriate *learning environment*. Crucial to the *learning environment* is the teachers' capability to establish good discipline, efficient routines, smooth transitions, and ownership of the environment as components of establishing a supportive and collaborative climate (Shellard & Protheroe, 2000). Having generated this learning climate, effective teachers stimulate and sustain students' interests in the lesson (Auster & Wylie, 2006; Freed, 2005). Interests in lesson resulting to meaningful task behaviors occur when lessons are clearly discussed and constructively supportive to real-life experiences.

Discussions that offer clear explanations and directions are requisites of strong *communications* skills. Teachers need to ask the right questions and handle effectively the students' responses. They need to manifest active listening skills that contribute to wholesome interpersonal relationships. Frymier & Houser (2000) acknowledged the existence of interpersonal variables that are positively related to learning and asserted that the nature of student-teacher relationships is essential to effective learning outcomes.

To promote wholesome working interpersonal relationships with students, feedback is necessary to improve their performance. Extensive studies around the globe show that in consistently applying the principles of *assessment* of student learning, impressive gains in student achievement especially for struggling learners can be attained (Black & William, 1998; Stiggins, 2007). The assessment of student learning begins when teachers share their achievement goals and objectives, when they continuously assess progress, analyze the results, and adapt instruction to improve student performance. The capability to use varied techniques for evaluating student performance and to develop performance-based assessment tools for a more objective evaluation of student achievement is a manifestation of the teachers' skills for assessment (James & Fleming, 2004). An assessment of student learning matters more than ever in the changing world of higher education and with changing expectations society has of its university

graduates (Stefani, 2004).

The current study, therefore, revolved around the *personal attributes, instructional delivery, student engagement, learning environment, assessment, and communication skills* of teachers as the main factors measured in the students' assessment of teacher performance. The students' evaluations of teacher performance are considered an accepted practice for decades and are found to be the most frequent form of assessment of teacher performance (Becker & Watts, 1999; Davis, 2009; Onwuegbuzie *et al.*, 2007; Parayitam, Desai, & Phelps, 2007).

Owoyemi and Adesoji (2012), cited Salsali's (2005) observation that the interest in evaluating teacher performance has increased over time, and the acceptance of the need to evaluate teaching has continued to grow. According to Papandreou (1995), as cited by Polancos, Ortiz, and Cinches (2013), this new approach emphasizes not what one believes to be good teaching, but the characteristics and behavior of teachers that influence or result to expected learning outcomes for students. An overview of recent literatures on teacher effectiveness reveals that there is no standard or commonly agreed upon definition or list of effective teaching qualities. The study postulated teacher performance as one of the multiple ways of determining teacher effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2011).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study attempted to determine the relationship between teacher effectiveness and teacher performance. Specifically, it intended to find out how students assessed teacher effectiveness and teacher performance according to the following standards, namely: personal attributes, assessment, student engagement, instructional delivery, communication, and learning environment.

METHODOLOGY

The mixed method was used in this study. More specifically, the use of triangulation method was employed as a means of mutual confirmation of measures and validation of findings (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). The combination of survey questionnaires, interview, and focus group discussions (FGDs) counteracts the validity threats that each design posed to the data gathered or the inference that was derived from its results (Palinkas *et al.*,

2010). Survey questionnaires were utilized to measure quantitatively the variables under study. The interview and FGDs provided the qualitative data, which were measured through quantitative means. They enriched the analyses and discussions of the correlation between teacher performance and teacher effectiveness.

Liceo de Cagayan University and University of Mindanao were the research environments of the study. They were chosen on the basis of similarity in their status being autonomous, private, and non-sectarian higher education institutions. Their autonomy from the close supervision of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) is based on their "long tradition of integrity and untarnished reputation," "commitment to excellence," and "sustainability and viability of operations" (CHED CMO, 2012). Such status allows them to design their own curricula, offer new programs and put up branches or satellite campuses without having to secure permits, confer honorary degrees, and carry out operations without much interference from CHED. These, being the case, presuppose that they share organizational characteristics and practices that are common to both of them, which allowed the researcher to draw meaningful inferences from the data collected from the respondents coming from these universities.

Two thousand (2000) college students were the respondents of this study. One thousand six hundred fifty students came from LdeCU and 350 students were from UM. They were selected through stratified random sampling to ensure enough representation from the different departments and colleges of the two universities. Each of the two hundred college teachers were evaluated respectively by 10 college students; these teachers were selected through simple random sampling in terms of teacher performance and teacher effectiveness.

Two researcher-made survey instruments were utilized in this study. These were the Student Assessment of Teacher Performance (SATP) and the Teacher Effectiveness Inventory (TEI). Each of them was tested for reliability and validity. Composed of 24 items and with a reliability coefficient of 0.80, the SATP was used to measure teacher performance. Its content was validated by a group of teachers from Liceo de Cagayan University who were part of the study group that created it. This instrument, which was answered by the students, covered *teacher performance standards such as personal attribute, assessment, student engagement, instructional delivery, communication, and learning environment;* all of which were anchored on the philosophy, mission-vision, and core values of LdeCU.

Composed of 13 items and with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95, the TEI was the second instrument that assessed teacher effectiveness on the basis of the

teachers' impact on the students and the depth of the students' understanding of certain principles and theories and issues related to life, their critical thinking and evaluative skills, and the development of their confidence and a better sense of self. This instrument was adapted from Tumapon and Ortiz (2015). The main data gathering tools for this study were the survey questionnaires, which were complemented with interview and FGDs. These were done to validate the quantitative data gathered from the assessment of students as regards the performance and effectiveness of their teachers.

The data gathering procedure at LdeCU underwent several steps. First, the researcher secured the permission of the deans of the 12 colleges of the University to administer the assessment tools among the student-respondents. Second, after the permission was granted, the researcher contacted the chairs and program coordinators and explained to them the purpose of the study. Third, after their cooperation was secured, the administration and retrieval of the survey instruments followed. Fourth, the data were then processed and tabulated. The mean responses were derived by averaging the student-respondents' responses to the questionnaires. Percentages and standard deviations were computed to draw a deeper meaning from the quantitative data gathered from the student-respondents. Fifth, the student-respondents were interviewed to find out their perceptions of their teachers' classroom performance and effectiveness. Sixth, the researcher and her mentor linked with the UM graduate school research coordinator and presented her a concept paper. After an agreement was reached, the UM graduate school research coordinator took the responsibility of gathering the data at her end. After a month, the answered survey questionnaires were sent back to the researcher. Only 42 teachers and 350 students from UM participated in the study. Finally, FGDs were conducted to gather the student-respondents' perception of their teachers' performance and effectiveness.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first objective of the study was to find out how the students regarded teacher effectiveness. Table 1 shows the distribution of the varying responses of the students as regards their perception of teacher effectiveness. It is argued that improving teacher quality presupposes an improvement in teacher competence and effectiveness. Darling-Hammond (2010) asserted that one of the few areas of consensus among education policymakers, practitioners, and the general public today is that improving teacher quality is one of the most direct and

promising strategies for improving education outcomes in all levels.

Overall, 20% (412) of the students rated their teachers as having very high effectiveness while 69.2% (1383) evaluated their teachers as high in effectiveness. Almost 10% (193) evaluated their teachers as moderate in effectiveness. Among the items that measured *teacher effectiveness*, items 2 and 4 got the highest mean ratings ($\bar{x}$ =4.35 interpreted as high effectiveness). These results imply that the student-respondents agreed that their teachers *helped and improved their ability to interpret and evaluate information and allowed them to participate actively in the learning experiences because of the teaching methods they used.*

However, it is quite interesting to note that item 10, although still classified as high effectiveness, got the lowest mean: *"I have developed confidence in expressing myself through the facilitating skills of my teacher"* ($\bar{x}$=4.19). This result implies that although the teachers are seen as highly effective in this aspect, the development of confidence can be seen through both internal and external processes. Kanter (2004) posited that confidence consists of expectations of favorable outcomes. When a student, for example, expects a favorable outcome in sharing his/her thoughts in class, then he/she will be willing to invest mental and emotional energy or other resources to do it. The presence or absence of this investment shapes his/her ability or inability to perform in class. *Confidence* can be linked to a student's sense of self-efficacy–the belief in one's own ability to complete tasks and reach goals (Lippke *et al*., 2009). Such personal belief may be influenced by the teacher's feedback.

Table 1. Frequency, Percentage, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Student-Respondents' Assessment of Their Teacher Effectiveness

Range	Teacher Effectiveness	Frequency	Percentage
4.66 – 5.00	Very High	412	20.6
3.67 – 4.66	High	1383	69.2
2.67 – 3.66	Moderate	193	9.7
1.67 – 2.66	Low	12	.006
1.0 – 1.66	Very Low	0	0
Total		2000	100

Over-all mean : 4.29
Description : High effectiveness
SD : 0.31

Item Statements	Mean	SD	Qualifying Statement
1. The quality of teaching in this course gives me the opportunity to deepen my understanding of principles and theories.	4.33	0.40	High Effectiveness
2. As a result of taking this course, my ability to think critically (i.e. analyze, interpret and evaluate information) improved.	4.35	0.37	High Effectiveness
3. In this course, I have improved my presentation skills through the use of multimedia, factsheets, overhead projector, etc.	4.23	0.44	High Effectiveness
4. The teaching method in this course has kept me actively participate in the learning experience.	4.35	0.51	High Effectiveness
5. Overall, I gained a great deal from this course.	4.32	0.37	High Effectiveness
6. The classroom atmosphere that my teacher maintains encourages me to learn more effectively.	4.33	0.36	High Effectiveness
7. My teacher's way of communication allows me to understand the concepts he/she is trying to impart.	4.31	0.40	High Effectiveness
8. My teacher's ways of evaluation have made me aware of my class standing.	4.28	0.38	High Effectiveness
9. My teacher's behavior has positively influenced my ideas on how to behave as a future professional.	4.32	0.34	High Effectiveness

10. I have developed confidence in expressing myself through the facilitating skills of my teacher.	4.19	0.69	High Effectiveness
11. I have gained a sense of fairness with the way my teacher rates me.	4.21	0.40	High Effectiveness
12. If I were to become a teacher someday, I would mentor my students the way my teacher did.	4.29	0.37	High Effectiveness
13. The learning environment that my teacher establishes brings out the best in me.	4.23	0.39	High Effectiveness
Overall Mean	**4.29**		High Effectiveness

A student who attributes his/her abilities to internal reasons (e.g. his/her intelligence and competence) will more likely display confidence in dealing with challenging tasks. While teachers can facilitate the development of confidence, students will have to overcome confidence issues at their own pace especially when they have not yet learned to attribute things to their own capabilities and control (Kanter, 2004). This analysis is corroborated by students who participated in the FGDs. At least nine (9) students in a series of FGDs conducted in the Psych laboratory of LdeCU in the Summer of 2014, mentioned that *"my teachers praise us when we do a good job at presenting our report but I cannot avoid feeling terrified whenever I face my classmates and my teachers. I think it has something to do with the ability to communicate and articulate my thoughts. I am afraid I'll embarrass myself in front of everyone."*

Stronge and Tucker (2000) emphasized that *teacher effectiveness* can be gleaned from distinctive qualities that epitomize good teachers-and one of those qualities is the ability to make a difference in students' lives. Such may be revealed using student feedback through assessment which can approximate teacher effectiveness (Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011). This is the basic reason why the students of the teacher-respondents were asked to evaluate the latter, instead of the teachers

reporting their level of self-perceived effectiveness. This process was done to control social desirability on the part of the teachers involved in this study. In this study, teacher effectiveness can be gleaned from teacher behaviors that impact the teaching-learning process as assessed by students.

The second objective was to determine how students regard teacher performance in terms of the following standards: personal attribute, assessment, student engagement, instructional delivery, communication, and learning environment.

Table 2. Frequency, Percentage, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Student-Respondents' Assessment of Teacher Performance Using the SATP Scale

Range	Teachers Performance	Frequency	Percentage
4.66 – 5.00	Outstanding	611	30.55
3.67 – 4.66	Very satisfactory	1261	63.05
2.67 – 3.66	Satisfactory	122	6.1
1.67 – 2.66	Fair	6	0.3
1.0 – 1.66	Needs Improvement	0	0
Total		2000	100
	Over-all mean	: 4.42	
	Description	: very satisfactory performance	
	SD	: .281	

Item Statements	Mean	SD	Qualifying Statement
1. Uses appropriate words and actions.	4.47	0.32	Very Satisfactory
2. Starts and ends class on time.	4.47	0.31	Very Satisfactory
3. Maintains a wholesome relationship with students satisfactory	4.47	0.33	Very Satisfactory
4. Is well-groomed in coming to class.	4.57	0.31	Very Satisfactory

5. Comes to class regularly.	4.46	0.36	Very Satisfactory
Mean for Professionalism	**4.49**		**Very Satisfactory**
6. Provide us with a regular feedback on our performance.	4.27	0.39	Very Satisfactory
7. Gives instructions clearly.	4.47	0.34	Very Satisfactory
8. Shows fairness in rating students.	4.41	0.35	Very Satisfactory
9. Explains the basis for computing grades.	4.24	0.37	Very Satisfactory
10. Returns checked test papers on time.	4.16	0.44	Very Satisfactory
11. Gives tests that represent lesson coverage.	4.45	0.34	Very Satisfactory
Mean for Assessment	**4.33**		**Very Satisfactory**
12. Uses appropriate teaching strategies.	4.43	0.37	Very Satisfactory
13. Explains lessons clearly.	4.49	0.30	Very Satisfactory
14. Relates lessons to real life experiences.	4.35	0.32	Very Satisfactory
15. Sustains our interest in class.	4.35	0.36	Very Satisfactory

Mean for Student Engagement	**4.41**		**Very Satisfactory**
16. Shows mastery of the lesson.	4.53	0.49	Very Satisfactory
17. Cites current information to supplement the lesson.	4.35	0.37	Very Satisfactory
18. Adopts technology to enhance communication& learning	4.13	0.55	Very Satisfactory
Mean for Instructional Delivery	**4.34**		**Very Satisfactory**
19. Uses a clear and understandable language in teaching.	4.70	0.34	Outstanding
20. Speaks well with a well-modulated voice.	4.47	0.37	Very Satisfactory
21. Listens attentively to students' concerns.	4.45	0.36	Very Satisfactory
Mean for Communications	**4.54**		**Very Satisfactory**
22. Keeps a student friendly & encouraging learning atmosphere.	4.45	0.37	Very Satisfactory
23. Praises our positive behavior.	4.35	0.34	Very Satisfactory
24. Interacts with students professionally and courteously.	4.42	0.34	Very Satisfactory
Mean for Learning Environment	**4.41**		**Very Satisfactory**
Overall Mean	**4.42**		**Very Satisfactory**

Table 2 shows the 2000 student-respondents' assessment of teacher performance. As shown, 93.6% (1,872) claimed their teachers to be very satisfactory to outstanding while 6.4% (128) claimed their teachers to be fair to satisfactory. Of the six standards measuring teacher performance, communication was rated the highest ($\bar{x}$ =4.54, interpreted as very satisfactory) by the students.

Specific indicator to this standard is the teachers' use of clear and understandable language ($\bar{x}$ =4.70). Although still interpreted as very satisfactory, assessment garnered the lowest mean rating ($\bar{x}$=4.33). Returning checked test papers on time ($\bar{x}$=4.16) registered the least mean rating among the items that measure the standard on assessment.

A part of the disconnect between assessment and providing immediate feedback to students results from the teachers' difficulty to return checked test papers on time so that students may still benefit from the feedback. These results resonate with James and Fleming (2004) who contended that the capability to use varied techniques for evaluating the students' performance and to develop performance-based assessment tools for a more objective evaluation of student achievement is a manifestation of the teachers' skills for assessment (James & Fleming, 2004).

Furthermore, adopting available technology to enhance communication and learning got the lowest mean rating ($\bar{x}$ =4.13) in the instructional delivery standard. According to the student-respondents, adopting and promoting digital technology to enhance communication and learning are two of the many challenges in their classrooms. Reasons included the limited ratio between the users and the available working technological resources at the University Media Center (UMC), the lack of available training personnel to assist teachers in the exploration and management of their own IT resources, and the resistance of some to get out of their comfort zones and do extra efforts in learning new strategies.

Table 3. Correlation Result between Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Performance

Variables	Teacher Performance
Teacher Effectiveness	.78**

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (1 tailed)
* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (1 tailed)

Cursory inspection of Table 3 shows the significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and teacher performance (r=.78; a=0.01); hence, the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The strong significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and teacher performance (r=0.78) is consistent with existing literatures, which emphasize that teacher effectiveness can be drawn from the students' feedback and personal accounts of the impact of teacher performance on the their academic life (Stronge, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2010).

CONCLUSIONS

Teacher effectiveness is a much sought construct among institutions of higher learning if only to define good teaching. Teacher effectiveness is directly linked to teacher performance. Between teachers and students, it is the latter, as recipients of teacher actions in the classroom, who can best tell whether or not a teacher is effective. Teacher qualifications, certifications, and training will prove nothing unless teachers are able to translate them to actual classroom performance that will create change in the way students look at the process of learning and of life. Only then will teachers be evaluated as effective by the students.

How things are skillfully and artfully performed in the classroom while the teacher is interacting with the students is the strongest indicator of teacher effectiveness. Focusing on what teachers do and how things are done inside the classroom based on performance standards or expectations helps determine teacher effectiveness in the institutions of higher learning involved in this study.

A feedback mechanism involving students and using valid and reliable assessment tools will help measure teacher performance and teacher effectiveness. It is then imperative that institutions of higher learning evaluate their organizations' processes of assessing teacher performance and teacher effectiveness. Thus, a strong and holistic performance evaluation system that motivates teachers to aspire to become the best of what they can be in the classroom in the context of the schools' core values is urgent. This performance evaluation system can facilitate the development of teacher qualification, competency, and other personal characteristics relevant to effective teaching.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings and conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations were formulated and addressed to the universities involved in the study:

The administration may consider the implementation of "The Teacher Effectiveness Quality Assurance Program" to ensure better teacher performance vis-à-vis teacher effectiveness.

The teacher performance evaluation system should be reviewed regularly to ensure its relevance in truly reflecting authentic teacher performance; this system, as a support and feedback mechanism, should be enhanced to motivate the teachers further to attend, improve, and meet the expected performance standards in the practice of their profession.

The current policies should be reviewed to determine how the teachers' workload may be arranged effectively and afford the students an effective feedback mechanism as regards the prompt checking and returning of test papers and other student outputs, thereby helping improve their academic performance.

An organizational support in the form of periodic assessment of how teachers spend their professional time may be done to create more awareness and control of time-wasting practices. Finally, a further study may be conducted on how teachers will be encouraged to utilize strategies that cater to the learning needs of slow learners and minority students and the factors that impede such utilization.

LITERATURE CITED

Auster, E. & Wylie, K. (2006). Creating active learning in the classroom. Journal of Management Education, Vol 30, No. 2

Becker, W. E., & Watts, M. (1999). How departments of economics evaluate teaching. American Economic Review, 344-349.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. Granada Learning.

Borbon, M. L. F. C., & Cinches, M. F. C. (2013). The Process of redesigning a faculty evaluation scheme: Building a culture of trust, self-efficacy and autonomy in participative decision-making. Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research, 8 (1).

Bustos-Orosa, M. A. (2010). Inquiring into filipino teachers' conceptions of good teaching: A qualitative research study. The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 17(2).

Cantor, J., & Schaar, S. (2005). A dynamic relationship: The impact of formal and informal assessment on a professional development school for In-Service Non-Credentialed Teachers. Teacher Education Quarterly, 59-77.

Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages*. Research in higher education, 47(1), 1-32.

Covino, E. A., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1996). Experienced teachers: Their constructs of effective teaching. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10 (4), 325-363.

CMO 33 (2015).Series of 2012, "Addendum to CMO No. 18, Series of 2012, otherwise known as "Updated list of higher education institutions (HEIs) granted autonomous and deregulated status"". Commission on Higher Education (Philippines). August 17, 2012. Retrieved February 26, 2015.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8(1). Retrieved January 22, 2004 from http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2007). Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do. John Wiley & Sons.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Recognizing and enhancing teacher effectiveness. The international journal of educational and psychological assessment. Vol. 3 (9) Time Taylor Academic Journals²ISSN 2094-0734.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). President Obama and education: The possibility for dramatic improvements in teaching and learning. Harvard Educational Review, 79(2), 210-223.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Rothman, R. (2011). Teacher and leader effectiveness in high-performing education systems. Alliance for Excellent Education.

Davis, G. F. (2009). Managed by the markets: How finance re-shaped America. Oxford University Press.

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K.S. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter?. In Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 97-131). Springer US.

Egan, M. W., Welch, M., Page, B., & Sebastian, J. (1992). Learners' perceptions of instructional delivery systems: Conventional and television. American Journal of Distance Education, 6(2), 47-55.

Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. Communication Education, 49(3), 207-219.

Hanushek, E. A., &Lindseth, A. A. (2009). Schoolhouses, courthouses, and statehouses: Solving the funding-achievement puzzle in America's public schools. Princeton University Press.

James, D., & Fleming, S. (2004). Agreement in student performance in assessment. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1(05), 32-50.

Jerald, C. (2003). Beyond the rock and the hard place. Educational Leadership, 61(3), 12-16.

Kanter, R.M. (2004). Confidence: Leadership and the psychology of turnarounds. Retrieved February 18, 2015 at http://www. centreforconfidence.co.uk /pp/overview.php?p=c2lkPTY=

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2007). Piecing together the student success puzzle: Research, propositions, and recommendations. Jossey-Bass.

Lippke, S., Wiedemann, A. U., Ziegelmann, J. P., Reuter, T., & Schwarzer, R. (2009). Self-efficacy moderates the mediation of intentions into behavior via plans. American Journal of Health Behavior, 33(5),521-529.

Muñoz, M. A., & Chang, F. C. (2007). The elusive relationship between teacher characteristics and students academic growth: A longitudinal multilevel model for change. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20(3-4), 147-164.

McEwan, E. K. (2002). Seven steps to effective instructional leadership. Corwin Press.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. Qualitative Report, 12(2), 281-316.

Owoyemi, T. E., & Adesoji, F. A. (2012). Isolation of teaching effectiveness factors from nigerian senior secondary school chemistry students' point of view.British Journal of Arts & Social Sciences, 9(2).

Palmer, B. W., Lanouette, N. M., & Jeste, D. V. (2012). Effectiveness of multimedia aids to enhance comprehension of research consent information: a systematic review.

Palinkas, L. A., Aarons, G. A., Horwitz, S., Chamberlain, P., Hurlburt, M., &Landsverk, J. (2011). Mixed method designs in implementation research. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 38(1), 44-53.

Papandreou, C. A., & Adamopoulos, D.X. (1997). A framework for the application of distributed broadband multimedia communication services in education and training. Education and Information Technologies, 2(3), 207-218.

Pascarella, E. T., &Terenzini, P.T. (2005). How college affects students (Vol. 2). K. A. Feldman (Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Parayitam, S., Desai, K., & Phelps, L.D. (2007). The effect of teacher communication and course content on student satisfaction and effectiveness. Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 11(3), 91.

Pfaff, M.E. (2000). The effects on teacher efficacy of school based collaborative activities structured as professional study groups.

Polancos, D. T., Cinches, M. F. C., & Ortiz, R. O. (2013). The reliability and validity of student assessment of teacher performance (SATP) Scale: A confirmatory factor analysis. Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research, 9(1).

Protheroe, N. (2008). Teacher efficacy: What is it and does it matter?. Principal, 87(5), 42-45.

Salsali, M. (2005). Evaluating teaching effectiveness in nursing education: An Iranian perspective. BMC medical education, 5(1), 29.

Shellard, E., & Protheroe, N. (2000). Effective teaching: How do we know it when it we see It?. ERS, Educational Research Service.

Stefani, L. (2004). Assessment of student learning: Promoting a scholarly approach. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1(1), 51-66.

Stewart, V. (2011). Raising teacher quality around the world. The Effective Educator. 68(4), 16-20

Stronge, J.H. (2002). Qualities of effective teachers. Alexandria, VA: Association for supervision and curriculum development.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., Tucker, P. D., & Hindman, J.L. (2007). What is the relationship between teacher quality and student achievement? An exploratory study.Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20(3-4), 165-184.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., Tucker, P. D., & Grant, L.W. (2009). Teacher quality and student learning: What do good teachers do. Teacher Education Journal.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Journal of Teacher Education, 62(4), 339-355.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., Tucker, P. D., & Grant, L.W. (2009). Teacher quality and student learning: What do good teachers do. Teacher Education Journal.

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P.D. (2000). Teacher evaluation and student achievement. Student assessment series. NEA Professional Library, Distribution Center, PO Box 2035, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701 -2035.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L.W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Journal of Teacher Education, 62(4), 62(4), 339-355.

Symonds, Q. (2012). QS Asian University Rankings 2012.

Weimer, M. (2013). Defining teaching effectiveness. The Teaching Professor Blog.

Zwart, R. C., Wubbels, T., Bergen, T. C., & Bolhuis, S. (2007). Experienced teacher learning within the context of reciprocal peer coaching. Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 13(2), 165-187.