

Needs Assessment of the Graduate School of the University of Bohol

CHERRY F. MALAQUE

0000-0002-3206-8857

cherrymalaque@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Needs assessment is a part of the organization's planning process to identify the gaps that transpired on the present conditions and the desired outcomes. The main thrust of this study is to assess the needs of the professors and students of the graduate school of the University of Bohol as basis for proposing a development program. Standards then must be checked in the light of its relevance and needs of the teachers, students and the industry where they are expected to flourish in the teaching-learning process. This study used the normative survey method with the aid of the standardized questionnaire to conduct a survey of the instructional and research needs of the Graduate School. Results showed that professors identified the following top rank priorities: *designing effective assessments, developing students' critical thinking skills and course and curriculum development*. The students had the following top rank needs: *developing critical thinking skills, incorporating active learning strategies into courses, course curriculum development, designing effective assessments and writing across the curriculum*. The needs of both professors and students were perceived by both groups as *Moderately Needed* which cannot be attributable to whatever factors which caused these needs to be felt or perceived by them as such because those were not dealt in this study.

KEYWORDS

Needs Assessment, curriculum development, normative survey method, Tagbilaran City, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The Graduate Studies hatched a project for accreditation to accrediting bodies to continuously upgrade its quality and standards in preparing its clients for wide opportunities that await them. Faculty weighs heavily in the area to be appraised because of its interrelatedness and interdependence with the instruction. Standards then must be checked in the light of its relevance and needs of the teachers, students and industry where they are expected to flourish in the teaching-learning process. But before this paradigm will evolve, a needs assessment of the Graduate Studies faculty and students is a prerequisite.

This provided the researcher the impetus to conduct this needs assessment so that whatever findings may surface will form the basis for proposing a sound development program.

The word faculty refers to a department of instruction in an educational institution (Merriam-Webster, 1974). It can also be considered as a department teaching a specified subject in a university or college. Functions of the faculty maybe defined in four overlapping tasks as follows (Bowen & Schuster, 1986):

Instruction. The main function of faculties is instruction, that is, direct teaching of students. Instruction involves formal teaching of groups of students in classrooms, laboratories, studios, gymnasias, and field settings. It also involves conferences, tutorials, and laboratory apprenticeships for students individually. Instruction also entails advising students on matters pertaining to their current educational programs, plans for advanced study, choice of career, and sometimes more personal matters.

Research. Faculties contribute to the quality and productivity of society not only through their influence on students but also directly through the ramified endeavors called as research. This term is used as shorthand for all the activities of faculties that advance knowledge and the arts. The activities may be classified as research if they involve the discovery of new knowledge or the creation of original art and if they result in dissemination usually by means of some form of durable publication.

Public service. Public services can be performed by faculties in connection with their teaching and research. The most notable is health care delivered by faculty in universities, hospitals and clinics. Faculties are also engaged in activities designed specifically to serve the public, usually in an educational and consulting capacity. Perhaps the most important public service function of faculties is that they serve as a large pool of diversified and specialized talent available on call

for consultation and technical services to meet an infinite variety of needs and problems.

Institutional governance and operation. Faculties, individually and collectively, usually occupy a prominent role in the policies, decisions, and on-going activities falling within the wide-ranging realm of institutional governance and operation. Faculty members contribute enormously to institutional success through their efforts to create and sustain a rich cultural, intellectual, and recreational environment in the campus.

As it can be seen the work of faculty members is extraordinarily important to the economic and cultural development of the nation. If the quality of the system and its people deteriorate, it will be less able to provide the teaching, research, and public service activities.

The growing diversity of the student population, societal needs, changes in expectations about the quality and assessment of education, rapid changes in information and technology and their impacts on teaching and learning, nature and value of assessment, and paradigms about teaching and learning have made many instructors to reconsider not only the importance of the content they are teaching, but also the effectiveness of their teaching methods based on students' learning.

According to Chism, Lees and Evenbeck (2002), the basic model of teaching changed from teaching as transmission of content to teaching as the facilitation of learning. In the decades preceding the 1970s faculty development programs in higher education institutions were similar to in-service programs.

Brawer (1990) stated that during the 1960s, when institutions of higher education were admonished by their students and other critics for their impersonality, and when community college spokespersons castigated the universities while lauding their own colleges as teaching institutions, the universities became concerned with further developing their own staff members. In the mid 1970s, faculty development went through a major metamorphosis from context and process-based programs to programs designed to develop faculty members as teachers and facilitators of learning. Faculty development efforts, which gained wide support in the 1960s in North America, continue to be widely supported today. Wilkerson and Irby (1998) believe that the development of teaching improvement practices in higher education through the decades of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s has showed that each of these decades is characterized by a predominant learning theory. Behavioral theories in the 1970s, cognitive theories in the 1980s, and social learning theories in the 1990s guided

research and teaching practices related to faculty development programs.

Nathan (1994) indicated that faculty development is no longer an optional or dispensable “add-on” to the list of benefits available to faculty at universities in the United States. Faculty development programs have become increasingly burdened with the responsibility of fixing what is wrong with the universities, at least to the extent that what is wrong is a function of faculty shortcomings and inadequacies.

According to Daigle and Jarmon (1997) faculty development is an important component of building and maintaining human capital, which in turn is part of the total capital assets of the university. Much like the supporting physical and technology infrastructures, intellectual capital should be planned and managed around broad institutional goals for the future. Hitchcock & Stritter (1992), suggest that the concept of faculty development is evolving and expanding. Faculty development, originally defined as the improvement of teaching skills, has expanded to include all areas of a faculty member’s responsibility. In May 1997, the Senate of Ohio State University appointed a commission to address a number of concerns pertaining to faculty development. The Commission was charged with making recommendations, as appropriate, regarding how the University could enhance its support of faculty professional development.

Based on final report of the Commission, “faculty vitality, both from the perspective of professional expertise and from the perspective of enthusiasm and engagement, is a sine qua non of a successful university. Although faculty members accept the primary responsibility for maintaining that vitality, the growing pressures and demands facing faculty make it increasingly challenging for many to find the time and resources needed for professional development. The rapid growth of knowledge, sweeping technological change, and increasing social demands on the academy make it imperative that even the best of our universities work to ensure that adequate institutional means for professional development are made available to faculty” (Commission of Faculty Development and Careers, 1999).

Higher education cannot simply rely on current methods of faculty preparation because these methods may leave instructors unprepared for the challenges of the twenty-first century (Miller, 1997). Cohen, Manion and Morrison,(1996), believe that even being able to update with the developments due to exponential increase in knowledge and information and use of new technologies, has become a major challenge for faculties. It is unavoidable that the extended use of information technology will bring a revolution in teaching and learning, just

as it has brought a revolution in knowledge and its acquisition. According to Simpson(1990), during an earlier period of academic history, a professor might have expected mastery of the knowledge in a given area of expertise as a realistic goal.

Rate of knowledge development today, however, makes this no longer feasible. Therefore, part of becoming a scholar is to live with the fact that complete mastery of a particular subject is not possible. Also, the rate at which technology is developing compounds the lack-of-mastery feeling of professors. In some instances, technology is growing at a rate that exceeds professors' ability to assimilate and use new information before the knowledge is already obsolete. Faculty development represents an investment in human capital. Educational institutions receive a return on this investment in the form of an improved institution over time. Disciplines also receive a return through improved research and better training or the next generation of the profession provided by the graduates of faculty development programs. The return to individual faculty members comes in the form of improved vitality and growth that can help sustain them in their academic careers. Faculty development has high payoff potential; thus it is important to design and implement effective programs (Hitchcock & Stritter,1992).

Faculty development can play a significant role in fostering an environment conducive to valuing a broad definition of scholarship, especially with respect to what constitutes the scholarship of teaching (Watson, Grossman, 1994). It is required in higher education institutes since it develops and reinforce the abilities of faculty members. It leads faculty members to operate with increasing autonomy while having an extensive view of new educational reforms. They are prepared to work more effectively as individuals and also as members of a society through faculty development programs. They should understand themselves and their functions very well in order to improve their teaching as a part of developing the education system.

Steinert (2000) highlights that academic vitality is dependent upon faculty members' interest and expertise. In addition, faculty development has a critical role to play in promoting academic excellence and innovation. Faculty members, by better understanding of themselves and their social environment, can promote such developments. In general, faculty development programs, whatever their nature, are essential if universities are to respond to changes in (a) expectations about the quality of undergraduate education, (b) views regarding the nature and value of assessment, (c) societal needs, (d) technology and its impact on

education, (e) the diverse composition of student populations, and (f) paradigms in teaching and learning (Millis, 1994). A good faculty development program is a process designed to create a climate where recognition, institutional support and professional development are addressed (Pendleton, 2002).

On Definition and dimensions of faculty development. As mentioned previously, faculty development is a process of enhancing and promoting any form of academic scholarship in individual faculty members. It refers to programs and strategies that aim both to maintain and to improve the professional competence of faculty members in fulfilling their tasks in the higher education institutes. It includes programs or activities that lead to expand the interests, improve the competence, and facilitate the professional and personal growth of faculty members in order to improve the quality of faculty instruction, research and student advisement. There exist several definitions for the faculty development and its dimensions. Besides the similarities between faculty development definitions, there is an overlap among its defined dimensions.

According to Scott (1990), in 1979 the American Association for Higher Education proposed a definition for faculty development, which went beyond the dominant emphasis on teaching. Based on this definition, faculty development is the theory and practice of facilitating improved faculty performance in a variety of domains, including the intellectual, the institutional, the personal, the social, and the pedagogical.

Faculty development can also be defined as any planned activity designed to improve an individual's knowledge and skills in areas considered essential to the performance of a faculty member. The aim is to improve faculty members' competence as teachers and scholars. Hence, colleges and universities try to renew and maintain vitality of their staff. Prachyapruit (2001), defined faculty development programs as activities that are designed to help faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars. In general, faculty development is addressed to faculty in all disciplines and to administrators who wish to help shaping an environment in which student learning can flourish. The California Post secondary Education Commission sees the purpose of faculty development as means toward providing better education for students than would be possible without such support (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1988).

According to the same commission, most faculty development activities fit into two major categories, improving instruction and increasing knowledge. Programs oriented toward improving graduate instruction for students with diverse learning styles, improving the faculties' abilities to use new technology,

and developing new means of student assessment are subsumed in the first category. Programs oriented to increasing knowledge, which fall into the second order, include retraining faculty for teaching in a related field and affirmative action development.

Millis (1994) mentions that faculty development can take many guises. Distinctions have traditionally been made between three terms: (a) faculty development (activities such as classroom visits or one-on-one counseling intended to improve the teaching skills of an individual faculty member) (b) instructional developments (activities such as media support or curriculum design focused on the student, the course, or the curriculum); and (c) organizational development (activities such as campus-wide retreats intended to improve institutional resources or climate). Dilorenzo & Heppner (1994) define faculty development as a process of enhancing and promoting any form of academic scholarship in individual faculty members. In practice, however, these definitions overlap, and virtually all activities affect the individual faculty member.

California Postsecondary Education Commission (1988) reported four clusters of faculty development activities: professional, instructional, curricular, and organizational development. Professional development promotes the expertise of faculty members within their primary discipline; it is often accomplished through research grants and sabbatical grants, professional conference attendance, and similar discipline-oriented activities. Instructional development improves the faculty's ability to teach more effectively. It includes videotaping classes, observing and commenting on teaching styles, and attending conferences on teaching. Curriculum development is aimed at evaluating or revising the curriculum. And finally, organizational development engages faculty members in improving their institution and its environment for teaching and decision-making. It includes evaluating institutional efforts to retain its minority students, strengthening institutional relationships, and preparing self-study reports for accreditation.

A detailed classification of faculty development activities as described by Chun (1999) based on four dimensions: instructional, personal, professional and organizational. As it can be seen, there are slice differences in definitions of faculty development. According to Watson and Grossman (1994), these differences often depend on whether one is addressing the appropriate focus of a faculty development program or, more philosophically, the sphere of activities that affect the growth and development of faculty in their jobs. As a philosophy, faculty development is seen by most scholars as broadly encompassing, in the holistic tradition. As a program, it is necessarily limited by an institution's scope

and mission, the environment within which faculty live, the expectations for faculty performance, and the existence of other programs that address faculty development concerns.

In summary, the purposes for faculty development programs are: improving teaching, improving faculty scholarship, personal development, curriculum development, and institutional development. While the purpose remains constant, the emphasis given to any of these components varies in different institutions.

On typical activities in faculty development. As described previously, there are several definitions for the faculty development and its dimensions that showed similarities between themselves and overlapping among the dimensions. In our study, a four dimension structure of faculty development; instructional, personal, professional and organizational, described by Chun (1999) was selected. In a consideration of faculty development based on four dimensions, instructional development is an academic specialization that may be defined as the systematic and continuous application of learning principles and educational technology to develop the most effective and efficient learning experiences for students.

Instructional development usually takes a different approach for the improvement of the institution. These programs have as their focus the course, the curriculum and student learning. In this approach, instructors become members of a design or redesign team, working with instructional design specialists to identify appropriate course structures and teaching strategies to achieve the goals of instruction. Instructional development programs can also examine how a course fits into the overall departmental and institutional curriculum; they help define instructional goals and methods which will maximize learning; they evaluate course effectiveness in terms of goal achievement; they produce or evaluate learning materials for use in the course. Many instructional development programs include a media design component (POD, 2003).

According to Prachyapruit (2001), instructional development refers to programs on improving teaching skills and techniques, course design and development, improving the understanding of students' learning behavior, and improving skills in learning evaluation. Workshops designed to help faculty to use a system approach to instruction or to explore general issues or trend in education are examples of instructional development activities. In addition, faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on course improvement, specialists assist individual faculty in instructional or course development by consulting on course objectives and course design are considered as other activities in instructional

dimension. Finally, informal assessment by colleagues for course improvement is another example of instructional faculty development activities.

Personal development can be defined as activities and programs that seek to insure continuing faculty motivation, energy and productivity over the course of an academic career, including personal stress counseling, training in interpersonal skills, or career planning workshop. Systematic ratings of instruction by students to help faculty improvement, workshops and consultations to help meet the developmental interests and concerns of faculty members and administrators, are examples of personal development activities. Personal development activities also include faculty with expertise consulting with other faculty on teaching; and a policy for leaves for developmental purposes (Chun, 1999)

Simpson (1990) mentioned that professional development programs may emphasize improvement of teaching or the encouragement of faculty to participate in experiences that enrich their careers. Types of professional development in use include workshops, written descriptions of effective practice, the use of expert or peer consultation and mentoring, and involvement in a development process (such as funded course development). Faculty members as well as institutions need to know which of the types are most effective (Sunal, Hodges, Whitaker, Freeman, Edwards, Johnston, Odell, 2001).

Finally, organizational development presents activities designed to create effective organizational environments for teaching and learning, including training and team building, conflict management or problem solving, or the creation of a campus office to support faculty development (Chun, 1999). Organizational development activities include workshops on team building, joint decision-making and problem-solving and also annual awards for excellence in teaching. Moreover, institutional policy statements and practices emphasizing and elevating the importance of teaching are categorized in organizational development activities.

The main thrust of this study is to assess the needs of the professors and students of the graduate school of University of Bohol as basis for proposing a development program.

Specifically, this sought to discover answers to the following facets of the problem:

1. To what extent is the needs assessment of the graduate school as perceived by the professors and students?
2. Is there a significant degree of difference in the responses of graduate students and professors on the assessment of their needs?

METHODOLOGY

This study used the normative survey method, with the aid of the standardized questionnaire to conduct a survey of the instructional and research needs of the Graduate School of the University of Bohol.

The respondents of the study are the Professors and Students of the University of Bohol Graduate School and Professional Studies. The Convenient Random Sampling was used.

Table I. Distribution of Respondents
(N=92)

Respondents	Questionnaire		Percent
	Distributed	Returned	
A. Professors	31	29	93.54
B. Students	100	63	63.00
Total	131	92	70.22

Table I reports the distribution of respondents. A total of ninety-two (70.22 percent) was retrieved out of the one hundred thirty-one questionnaire forms broken down as follows: twenty-nine (93.54 percent) out of the thirty-one distributed to the professors and sixty-three (63.00 percent) out of the one hundred questionnaire forms distributed to the students.

The researcher used the standardized tool for needs assessment. The data were collated, cleaned and analyzed utilizing frequencies, percentages, weight mean and significant difference of correlated means.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Needs Assessment of the Graduate School as Perceived by Professors
N=29

Items	GN		MN		SN		NN		WM	DV	R
	F	WV	F	WV	F	WV	F	WV			
1. Developing students' critical thinking skills	12	48	11	33	6	12	0	0	3.21	MN	2
2. Incorporating active learning strategies into my courses	10	40	11	33	7	14	1	1	3.03	MN	10.5

3. Increasing student motivation	7	28	14	42	8	16	0	0	2.97	MN	13.5
4. Upgrading knowledge and skills in your decision	11	44	10	30	7	14	1	1	3.07	MN	8
5. Scholarship of teaching and learning	9	36	11	33	6	12	3	3	2.90	MN	17.5
6. Using technology to enhance learning	7	28	11	33	9	18	2	2	2.79	MN	25
7. Designing effective assessments	16	64	10	30	3	6	0	0	3.45	GN	1
8. Course and curriculum development	12	48	10	30	6	12	1	1	3.14	MN	3
9. Collecting evidence needed to validate that outcomes have been met	11	44	11	33	5	10	2	2	3.07	MN	8
10. Theory and practice of online learning	12	48	9	27	7	14	1	1	3.10	MN	5
11. Developing leadership skills	8	32	12	36	6	12	3	3	2.86	MN	20.5
12. Mentoring for new faculty	6	24	13	39	9	18	1	1	2.83	MN	23.5
13. Writing across the curriculum	11	44	10	30	7	14	1	1	3.07	MN	8
14. Brain research and instructional strategies	12	48	10	30	5	10	2	2	3.10	MN	5
15. Teaching strategies for under prepared students	9	36	13	39	6	12	1	1	3.03	MN	10.5
16. Developing teaching portfolios	7	28	13	39	7	14	2	2	2.86	MN	20.5
17. Student learning styles/ multiple intelligence	13	52	8	24	6	12	2	2	3.10	MN	5
18. Classroom Management	9	36	12	36	5	10	3	3	2.93	MN	15.5
19. Teaching strategies for adult learners	9	36	12	36	6	12	2	2	2.97	MN	13.5
20. Copyright issues and online teaching	9	36	12	36	5	10	3	3	2.93	MN	15.5
21. Writing proposal grant	10	40	9	27	6	12	4	4	2.86	MN	20.5
22. Academic honesty and plagiarism	11	44	9	27	7	14	2	2	3.00	MN	12
23. Peer review of teaching	6	24	11	33	7	14	5	5	2.62	MN	27
24. Team teaching	8	32	7	21	10	20	4	4	2.66	MN	26
25. Teaching strategies for monitoring students	8	32	12	36	7	14	2	2	2.90	MN	17.5
26. Designing service learning activities	5	20	16	48	7	14	1	1	2.86	MN	20.5
27. Writing manuscript and conference proposals	10	40	8	24	7	14	4	4	2.83	MN	23.5
Composite mean									2.97	MN	

Legend:

1.0-1.74	Not Needed	NN
1.75-2.49	Seldom Needed	SN
2.50-3.24	Moderately Needed	MN
3.25-4.0	Greatly Needed	GN

Table 2 unravels the assessment of the professors on the needs Assessment. The first five in the ranking were: Item 7, “*Designing Effective Assessments*” ranked first with the weight mean of 3.45, following the rank; “*Developing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills*” at 3.21; “*Course and Curriculum Development*,” 3.14; a triple tie of 3.10 each among items 10, 14, and 17 as enumerated: “*Theory and Practice of On-line Teaching*,” “*Brain Research and Instructional Strategies*,” and “*Student Learning Styles / Multiple Intelligences*.” All of the above as well as the remaining items earned the descriptive rating of **moderately needed** which means that without these dimensions, they can only be **less effective**. Their composite mean was 2.97.

“*Designing Effective Assessment*” ranked first. The implication is that the assessment tool they are frequently exposed and used is “pencil and paper test.” There are activities like reporting, panel and focused group discussion, and reporting that demand different criteria from the traditional pencil and paper test. These activities need rubrics for objective scoring, but it could be that they have difficulty in designing rubrics.

“*Developing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills*” ranked second because this jibes with the sentiment aired by the foremost educator and former President of the University of the Philippines, Jose Abueva, a decade ago:

“It is thus that many of our students surrender their individuality to the textbook and cannot think for themselves. When they attempt to make their own judgment, they become more pedantic. Unless a student develops the habit of critical thinking, his college education is a sham.”

This statement rings truth until today.

“*Course and Curriculum Development*.” This is so because their knowledge on this is generally more on the theoretical, rather than practical or applicational on

how a course and curriculum develop.

“*Theory and practice of On-Line Learning.*” The implication is that they are not familiar with the procedures of on-line learning. They did not undergo a “crush course” or even a briefing on the processes of on-line .Most open accounts only because this is needed by the Department like what this researcher is experiencing.

“*Brain Research and Instructional Strategies.*” The implication is that on this area, they are most exposed to the lecture method and reporting.Hence, lesser on the applicational aspect. The knowledge of the theory of educational psychology on attention span and retention of the brain in relation to the application of the relevant instructional strategies is not in depth.

“*Learning Styles/ Multiple Intelligences.*” The implication is that respondents are not familiar with the multiple intelligences tool to determine what kind of intelligence the student is gifted with. This lack of exposure would result into lack of knowledge in understanding, and interpreting the multiple intelligence tool.

Likewise, the proper application of the learning styles in relation to which hemisphere of the brain (whether right or left) the particular style is suited to and most effective is not often applied.

Table 3. Needs Assessment of the Graduate School as Perceived by Graduate Students

N=63

Items	GN		MN		SN		NN		WM	DV	R
	F	WV	F	WV	F	WV	F	WV			
1. Developing students' critical thinking skills	30	120	18	54	8	16	7	7	3.13	MN	1
2. Incorporating active learning strategies into my courses	22	88	30	90	7	14	4	4	3.11	MN	2.5
3. Increasing student motivation	19	76	26	78	11	22	7	7	2.90	MN	15
4. Upgrading knowledge and skills in your decision	20	80	25	75	14	28	4	4	2.97	MN	9
5. Scholarship of teaching and learning	21	84	28	84	9	18	5	5	3.03	MN	6
6. Using technology to enhance learning	18	72	21	63	18	36	6	6	2.81	MN	20
7. Designing effective assessments	21	84	29	87	9	18	4	4	3.06	MN	4

8. Course and curriculum development	29	116	18	54	10	20	6	6	3.11	MN	2.5
9. Collecting evidence needed to validate that outcomes have been met	17	68	24	72	13	26	9	9	2.78	MN	23
10. Theory and practice of online teaching	13	52	31	93	12	24	7	7	2.79	MN	21.5
11. Developing leadership skills	18	72	30	90	10	20	5	5	2.97	MN	9
12. Mentoring for new faculty	19	76	30	90	9	18	5	5	3.00	MN	7
13. Writing across the curriculum	26	104	20	60	11	22	6	6	3.05	MN	5
14. Brain research and instructional strategies	20	80	24	72	12	24	7	7	2.90	MN	15
15. Teaching strategies for underprepared students	20	80	26	78	10	20	7	7	2.94	MN	11.5
16. Developing teaching portfolios	15	60	25	75	15	30	8	8	2.75	MN	24.5
17. Student learning styles/multiple intelligence	18	72	30	90	10	20	5	5	2.97	MN	9
18. Classroom management	19	76	24	72	16	32	4	4	2.92	MN	13
19. Teaching strategies for adult learners	14	56	25	75	18	36	6	6	2.75	MN	24.5
20. Copyright issues and online teaching	17	68	28	84	11	22	7	7	2.87	MN	18
21. Writing grant proposal	15	60	29	87	10	20	9	9	2.79	MN	21.5
22. Academic honesty and plagiarism	14	56	18	54	25	50	6	6	2.63	MN	27
23. Peer-review of teaching	15	60	30	90	15	30	3	3	2.90	MN	15
24. Team teaching	16	64	21	63	15	30	11	11	2.67	MN	27
25. Team strategies for monitoring students	16	64	26	78	16	32	5	5	2.84	MN	19
26. Designing service learning activities	16	64	29	87	13	26	5	5	2.89	MN	17
27. Writing manuscript and conference proposal	18	72	27	81	14	28	4	4	2.94	MN	11.5
Composite mean									2.91	MN	

Legend:

1.0-1.74	Not Needed	NN
1.75-2.49	Seldom Needed	SN
2.50-3.24	Moderately Needed	MN
3.25-4.0	Greatly Needed	GN

Table 3 presents the needs assessment of the graduate Studies as perceived by the students. All the twenty-seven items were ranked as follows: ranked 1, “*Developing Critical Thinking Skills*”, 3.13; rank 2 were a tie of items 2 and 8 with 3.11 each; namely: “*Incorporating Active Learning Strategies Into My Courses*,” and “*Course Curriculum Development*,” “*Designing Effective Assessments*,” 3.06; and “*Writing Across the Curriculum*.”

The lowest was a tie of 2.67 each between items 22 and 24.

All these items arrived at a composite mean of 2.91 **or Moderately Needed**; hence, they are only **Slightly Effective**.

“*Developing Students Critical Thinking Skills*.” The reason for this is that the same as that propounded for the professors that students lack the capacity to think for themselves because they surrender their individuality to the textbooks.

“*Incorporating Learning Strategies Into My Courses*” tied for second place with “*Course and Curriculum Development*” because in incorporating learning strategies into the courses is a part of developing a course and curriculum. Incorporating learning strategies is integrated in the syllabus once a course and curriculum is developed. Hence, interrelated.

“*Designing Effective Assessment*.” This ranked first among the professors but only fourth among the students which means that their deficiency is not so deeply felt the way the professors felt / perceived it. This is so because the public school teachers who constitute the majority of respondents have more frequent seminars on assessments compared to the professors.

However, despite their seminars and trainings, they still perceived that without this skill, they can only be less slightly effective.

Writing across the curriculum. This boils down to deficiency in terms of proficiency in writing most especially that writing across the curriculum is different from the usual ordinary essay or creative writing.

Table 4. Significant Correlation Between the Needs Assessment of the Graduate School as Perceived by Professors and Graduate Students

Items on Needs Assessment	Perception of Professors X	X ²	Perception Of Graduate Students Y	Y ²	XY
1	3.21	3.13	10.3041	9.7969	10.0473
2	3.03	3.11	9.1809	9.6721	9.4233
3	2.97	2.9	8.8209	8.4100	8.6130

4	3.07	2.97	9.4249	8.8209	9.1179
5	2.90	3.03	8.4100	9.1809	8.7870
6	2.79	2.81	7.7841	7.8961	7.8399
7	3.45	3.06	11.9025	9.3636	10.5570
8	3.14	3.11	9.8596	9.6721	9.7654
9	3.07	2.78	9.4249	7.7284	8.5346
10	3.10	2.79	9.6100	7.7841	8.6490
11	2.86	2.97	8.1796	8.8209	8.4942
12	2.83	3	8.0089	9.0000	8.4900
13	3.07	3.05	9.4249	9.3025	9.3635
14	3.10	2.9	9.6100	8.4100	8.9900
15	3.03	2.94	9.1809	8.6436	8.9082
16	2.86	2.75	8.1796	7.5625	7.8650
17	3.10	2.97	9.6100	8.8209	9.2070
18	2.93	2.92	8.5849	8.5264	8.5556
19	2.97	2.75	8.8209	7.5625	8.1675
20	2.93	2.87	8.5849	8.2369	8.4091
21	2.86	2.79	8.1796	7.7841	7.9794
22	3.00	2.63	9.0000	6.9169	7.8900
23	2.62	2.9	6.8644	8.4100	7.5980
24	2.66	2.67	7.0756	7.1289	7.1022
25	2.90	2.84	8.4100	8.0656	8.2360
26	2.86	2.89	8.1796	8.3521	8.2654
27	2.83	2.94	8.0089	8.6436	8.3202
Sum	80.14	78.47	238.62	228.51	233.18
Mean	2.97	2.91			
$r = 0.45146$					
Critical value of r at 25df and 0.05 level of significance is 0.3809					
Result: Significant					
Ho: Reject					

Table 4 shows the statistical treatment on the perceptions of the professors and the students in the assessment of the Graduate Studies Department.

The computation yielded a t of **0.45146** which was much higher than the critical value of t of **0.3809** at **9 df** and at **0.05** level of significance, hence, **significant**.

This means that both the students and the professors were not in accord in their perceptions on this aspect because they differed in their perceptions as shown by the fact that “*Designing Effective Assessments*” was rated 3.45 among

the professors whereas “*Developing Critical Thinking Skills*” ranked first of 3.13 among the students.

“*Developing Students Critical Thinking Skills*” was rated second with 3.21 by the professors whereas “*Incorporating Active Learning Strategies Into my Courses*” and “*Course Curriculum Development*” tied for second among the students.

Rated third by the professors was “*Course and Curriculum Development*” of 3.14 whereas “*Designing Effective Assessments*” was ranked fourth by the students of 3.06.

The last in rank was a tie of 3.15 each in “*Theory and Practice of On-Line Learning*,” “*Brain Research and Instructional Strategies*” and “*Learning Styles/ Multiple Intelligence*” among the professors.

On the other hand, rated fifth by the students was “*Writing Across the Curriculum*.”

CONCLUSION

The needs assessment proved to be very helpful towards guiding the Graduate Studies in the thrust of giving quality education, and a favorable outcome for accreditation.

The needs of both professors and students were perceived by both groups as Moderately Needed, the factors of which could not be attributed to whatever factors perceived by the respondents as such because these were not dealt with in this study.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bowen, H. R. & Schuster, J.H. (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brawer, Florence B. (1990). Faculty development: The literature, *Community College Review*, Summer 90, Vol. 18. Issue 1, p50.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. (1988). State policy for faculty development in higher. Commission Report, No. 88-17. Sacramento, California: The Commission.
- Centra, J. A. (1979). *Determining faculty effectiveness*. San Fransisco, CA:

Jossey-Bass.

Chin, Wynne W. (1998). Issues and Opinion on Structural Equation Modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, 22 (1): VII-XVI March 1998.

Chism, Nancy Van Note.; Lees, N. Douglas; Evenbeck, Scott. (2002). Faculty Development For Teaching. *Liberal Education*, Summer 200, 34-41.

Chun, Ji-Yong. (1999). A National Study of Faculty Development Need in Korean Junior Colleges. A dissertation presented to the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Cohen, Louis; Manion, Lawrence; Morrison, Keith (1996) A guide to teaching practice, Routledge, London.

Commission of faculty development and careers.(1999). Final report. Ohio State University.

Daigle, Stephen L.; Jarmon, Carolyn G. (1997). Building the campus infrastructure that really counts. *Educom Review*, Jul/Aug 97, Vol. 32 Issue 4, p35.

Grossman, Louis H. (1994). Pursuing a comprehensive faculty development program: Making fragmentation work. *Journal of Counseling &Development*, May/June 94, Vol. 72 Issue 5.

Hitchcock, Maurice A. & Stritter, Frank T. (1992). Faculty development in the health profession: conclusions and recommendations. *Medical Teacher*, 1992, Vol. 14 Issue 4, p295.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17, 201-227.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). Changing leadership for changing times. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

- Merriam-Webster.(1974).Dictionary, Pocket Books, New York.
- Miller, Anthony A. (1997). ERIC review—back to the future: Preparing community college faculty for the millenium. *Community College Review*, Summer 97, Vol. 25 Issue 1, p83.
- Millis, Barbara (1994). Faculty Development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, May/June94, Vol. 72Issue 5, p454.
- Nathan, Peter E. (1994). Who should do faculty development and what should it be? *Journal of Counseling & Development*, May/June94, Vol. 72 Issue 5, p508.
- Pendleton, Ernesta P. (2002). Re-Assessing Faculty Development. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, July 2002, Vol. 19, Issue 19.
- Prachyapruit, Apipa (2001). Socialization Of New Faculty At A Public University In Thailand. Unpublished dissertation. Michigan State University, Department of Educational Administration.
- Scott, Judith Herbert. (1990). Role of community college department chairs in faculty development. *Community College Review*, Winter 90, Vol. 18 Issue 3, p12.
- Schuster, J. H. (1990). Faculty issues in the 1990's: New realities, new opportunities. *New Direction for Higher Education*, 18(70).
- Schuster, J. H., Wheeler, D. W., & Associates. (1990). *Enhancing faculty careers. 'Strategies for development and renewal'*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Simpson, Edwin L. (1990) *Faculty renewal in higher education*. Robert E. Krieger publishing company, Malabar, Florida.
- Steinert, Yvonne (2000). Faculty development in the new millenium: key challenges and future directions. *Medical Teacher*, Jan 2000, Vol. 22 Issue 1, p44.

Stritter, F. T. (1983). Faculty evaluation and development , in: C.H. Mcguire,
R. P.