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Abstract: Research findings on training effectiveness have not only been in tug of war for several years but have also been scarce in educational institutions. In an attempt to address such gap, this study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the faculty retooling seminar via mixed sequential research methods. The quantitative comparison between the faculty performance before and after they attended the retooling seminar revealed a significant difference in favour of the pre-retooling. However, in the qualitative results the study participants disclosed that faculty retooling was effective in enhancing their teaching strategies and pedagogy of love. They further attributed such increased to their trainings attended, technical knowledge, personal efforts and drives, constructive feedbacks from their academic heads, university policy on performance standard, industry experience and peer support. However, some teachers of technical courses noted the inappropriateness and insufficiency of the faculty retooling and those who decreased in their performance pointed out their adjustment period as the cause. Hence, the study inferred that despite the effectiveness of the faculty retooling, it fell short in addressing the needs of the technical course teachers. These results implied that in future faculty retooling seminars the proponents must consider the needs of technical course teachers.
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Introduction

Training must serve its purpose otherwise it will become a futile exercise downgrading the organizational quality and competitiveness (Anastasiou, 2011, Mohamed & Alias, 2012). Training organizers must therefore ensure the attainment of their desired outcomes (Dass, 2010) such as increased level of work performance and organizational capacity. In fact, several studies have established the positive relationship between employees training and their work performance (De Meuse, et.al 2007; Ehrhardt, et.al 2011; Ji, et.al; Jones, et.al; 2011; Thang, e.al 2010). However, Esreyel (2002) said that training evaluations programs were often inconsistent or missing because of insufficient allocation of budget and time; lack of expertise; blind trust in training solutions; or lack of methods and tools. Kumpikaite (2007) also said that despite the companies’ recognition of the importance of evaluation, few have actually evaluated their training programs. Similarly, Thang, et.al (2010) declared that regardless of the number of advocates who emphasized the role of training in improving firm performance, it remained criticized as too expensive and have vague outcomes in the job. Furthermore, Anastasious (2011) asserted that although training was positively acknowledged by the participants, its need assessments and evaluation policies remained absent.

In a study among seven public and fifteen private universities across the Philippines, Calma (2011) found out the lack of specific training to develop the staff for research and supervision. In the University of Mindanao, despite the average of 63.75 onsite and 782.25 offsite training, only one research was conducted to trace the benefits of teacher training to student learning (Cayogyog, 2013). So far, no research was undertaken to measure the effects of training on the teaching performance of employees, making this study institutionally, regionally, and even nationally relevant.

The human capital theory particularly its applicability to education and training served as the anchor theory of this study. Kessler & Luksesmann (2006) argued that the employer sponsored training is actually regarded as an investment in general human capital. Almendarez, (2011) further argued that in human capital theory, education is essential in enhancing the productive capacity of the population because an educated population is at the same time a productive population. This emphasis on productivity served as the backbone of this study because it is the immediate goal of training the workforce. Furthermore, this theory suggested that expenditures on training and education were so costly and should be regarded as investments because of their contribution to the personal and organizational income (Psacharopolous & Patrinos 2004; Rauch, et.al2005).
The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of faculty retooling on the teaching performance of the faculty. Specifically, it sought to determine the significant difference in the levels of the teaching performances of the faculty before and after they attended the training on faulty retooling. It further sought to draw out the experiences and insights of the study participants on the attributions of the increase and decrease in their post retooling teaching performance.

Methodology

This study utilized a mixed sequential method of research. The quantitative part utilized the single group experiment which Jackson (2008) described as a way of measuring the effectiveness of an intervention by giving pre-test and post-test to one group. Trochim (2006) explained that the single group experiment determined its base line data from the pre-test scores of the group which underwent an intervention and eventually the post test. The hypothesis might be drawn that the intervention caused the change or gain from pre-test to post-test. In this study, the researcher utilized the pre-faculty retooling performance evaluation results of the training participants as the baseline data. The difference between the results of their pre and post-retooling performance evaluations determined the effectiveness of the said training. The qualitative method via individual interview and focus group discussion drew out the attributions of the improvement and non-improvement of faculty teaching performance.

The researcher employed the universal and purposive sampling techniques. The participants of the faculty retooling in 2013 served as the respondents of this study. Among them, the top 10 increase earners in post-retooling faculty evaluation results participated in a focus group discussion while the top ten decrease earners joined in an in-depth interview. He complied with the ethical requirements of this study such as permission to undertake the study, anonymity and secrecy of the information obtained, and informed consent of the study participants. He analyzed the quantitative data via t-test and the qualitative data through coding and categorization that drew out the emergent themes.

Quantitative Results and Discussion

Level of Faculty Teaching Performance

The statistics shown in Table 1 reflected the evaluation of the students on the teaching performance of their teachers before they attended the training on faculty retooling. As indicated, the evaluation focused on performance domains such as knowledge of the subject matter, teaching strategies, classroom management, and professional traits. Results showed that the overall mean of the performance of the teachers was 4.28 described as high which means very satisfactory. The means of all indicators ranged from 4.20 to 4.37 were also described as high which means very satisfactory. Among the indicators, the teaching strategies obtained the lowest mean (4.20) and the classroom management gained the highest mean of 4.37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Domain</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Descriptive Interpretation</th>
<th>Descriptive Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the subject matter</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Management</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional characteristics/traits</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics in Table 2 revealed a similar result with Table 1. All evaluation domains were rated high with an overall mean of 4.21 which means very satisfactory performance. The domain on teaching strategies and methodologies still obtained the lowest mean and classroom management maintained the highest mean among the evaluation domains. This means that although they were both in the high level, more attention should be given to teaching strategies and methodologies.
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Table 2: Level of Faculty Teaching Performance after the Retooling Seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Domain</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Descriptive Interpretation</th>
<th>Descriptive Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the subject matter</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Management</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional characteristics/traits</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics indicated that the teachers performed very satisfactorily in all domains. This means that the teachers have thorough knowledge of the lessons and related them to practical experiences. They made their lessons relevant to the course and have the ability to accomplish their lessons’ objectives. These results resonated with the conclusion of Obiekezie, & Timothy (2011) that the teachers' knowledge of subject matter facilitated students’ performance. Hence, the teachers must be knowledgeable in their subject area to be able to meaningfully influence their students learning.

Their teaching strategies, although had the lowest mean among the teaching domains, still belonged to the very satisfactory level. This means that the teachers performed very satisfactorily in organizing their lesson, engaging students in classroom discussion, using the supplementary activities and instructional materials, and encouraging critical thinking skills. In Romania, Mutiu (2011) found out that intergroup discussion, class debate, teaching stories, teaching using PPT, games, problem based learning, lecture and discussion, JIT teaching and case studies were strategies that could be applied successfully in universities.

Among the teaching domains, the classroom management skills gained the highest mean. This means that the teachers performed very satisfactorily in using their class time effectively and in maintaining order and discipline in their classes. Mohammad (2008) noted that the form and setting of the class have great effect on the learners. Nuoffer (2011) further noted that fostering positive discipline reduces disruptions in the classroom learning. Furthermore, this kind of discipline according to Strahan, Mellie, Hundley, & Faircloth, (2005) was helpful and essential. The students also have recognized the prompt and regular attendance of their teachers in their classes. In the study of Roby (2013) he noted that teachers’ attendance in their classes, though not alone, appeared to have important impact in students’ achievement.

In terms of the professional characteristics or traits, the teachers have clear and audible voices, good command of English language, fair treatment of students, respect for students’ opinions, and acting as role models to students.

The results of the pre-to-post retooling performances of the teachers indicated that they were consistent in the high level of their performance, which means very satisfactory. This result implied that since the teachers were already performing very satisfactorily prior to the retooling seminar, the seminar could help them in either increasing or maintaining their very satisfactory performance.

Test for Significant Difference

In order to determine the effectiveness of the faculty retooling seminar in improving the faculty teaching performance, the researcher compared the mean results of pre and post retooling performance evaluations through t-test.

Table 3: T-test for the Significant Difference in the Faculty Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Computed t-value</th>
<th>Probability Value @ .05</th>
<th>Decision on H0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Subject Matter</td>
<td>Before Retooling</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.749</td>
<td>.007*</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Retooling</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>Before Retooling</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>.014*</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The statistics in Table 3 showed that when the means of the pre and post retooling teaching performances of the respondents were compared, the null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected because all p-values were less than 0.05 level of significance set for this study. This means that the pre and post retooling teaching performances of the faculty significantly differed in favor of the former. These results further means that the retooling seminar was not effective in improving the teaching performance of the faculty. This result run counter with the proposal of AlRweithy & Alsaleem (2014). However, further analysis pointed out that the difficulty to increase an already high level performance is a natural tendency.

Qualitative Results and Discussion

Experiences of the Retooling Participants

The statistical results ignited my interest to pursue the triangulation with another research method. I wanted to holistically investigate such attribution in order to convince my readers that my efforts to provide a well-thought-out explanation were beyond reasonable doubt. In doing a mixed research method, I realized that triangulation enriched the research outcomes. Other researchers who used the mixed research methods backed up my claim (Abro, Khurshid, & Aamir, 2015; Malina, Hanne, & Selto2011).

In this study, I drew out two themes that captured the entire sharing of my participants’ experiences such as improvement of their teaching strategies and enhancement of their pedagogy of love.

Improvement of Teaching Strategies

When I facilitated the FGD, I admired the openness and sincerity of my study participants. They shared without inhibition their experiences during their retooling seminar. A participant claimed that through such retooling, he improved his teaching strategies. It answered his prayer because teaching strategy was never part of his undergraduate course. Furthermore, he became a better teacher in UM for 10 years due to trainings and seminars. Another participant appreciated both the basic and new teaching techniques which she applied in her classes. Pahore & Shaikh (2011) attested that teacher training was beneficial for professional development and teaching performance.

As we continued the discussion, my participants became more specific in sharing their experiences relative to the effectiveness of the retooling seminar. They effectively handled their classes with varied learning calibres; sold their subjects to disinterested students; set the learning mood of their classes; and became more loving to their students. They knew what to do in teaching and how to do them while teaching, something which they did not learn as accountants, engineers, business managers, and HRM teachers. I was deeply moved by their sharing because these were important components of classroom motivation. They erased the tensions inside the class and lightened the learning tasks of the students. These sharing reinforced the claim of Ciolan (2013) who said that setting the learning environment is important in creating a meaningful learning experience for students.

My participants further shared their newly learned techniques such as differentiated instruction for students with multiple intelligence and interactive learning. Edwards, Carr, & Siegel (2006) described differentiated instructions as outcomes of teacher training. Omatseye (2007) explained that interactive learning could elicit the students’ interest and participation. It stimulated the learners’ imaginative and conceptual thinking and sharpened their logical reasoning skills. Hence, my participants became innovative and dynamic in attracting the interest of their learners. They learned how to utilize games, poem writing, drawing, etc. in their classes. Afari, et. al (2013), found out that the use of games especially in Mathematics classes could helped deliver
an effective instruction. My interviewees who decreased in their post retooling evaluation results had also unanimously claimed that the showcase of new teaching strategies had improved their teaching styles.

I treated their sharing as outright testimonies of the contribution of faculty retooling on the increased of their teaching performance. My interpretation resonated with the findings of AlRweithy & Alsaleem (2014) who observed significant difference in the performance of the training participants favoring the post training observation.

**Enhancement of the Teachers’ Pedagogy of Love**

Teaching is a combination of styles and love or better known as competence and character. No matter how intelligent a teacher is, if he has no love for his students, his teaching would drown to nothingness. I developed this philosophy in my 27 years of teaching. And, the article on teaching children to love learning (2009) affirmed such philosophy. It emphasized the significant role of creative teaching in instilling love for learning. My study participants acknowledged the outcomes of the pedagogy of love in teaching. They understood the emotional and psychological states of their students as they endeavoured to do the role of second parents. They felt elated whenever they heard positive feedbacks from their students. Consequently, they strived to become sensitive to their students’ conditions and generously appreciated their contributions whenever possible. They radiated the energies of caring teachers. Hence, I joined with the hope of Banks (2009) that teachers would eventually foster the greater sense of caring for their students’ lives either through pedagogical or nurturing type of caring. I also joined with the claim of Ferguson (2010) that students would participate in class activities and discussions when their teachers cared about them. In my study in 2013, I found out that the pedagogy of love had a distinct character on the benefit of teacher training to students’ learning. Eren (2014) also explained that the relationships between prospective teachers’ emotions about teaching and responsibility for student motivation, achievement, relationships with students, and teaching were strongly and positively mediated by their academic optimism.

**Limitations of the Faculty Retooling Seminar**

Despite the positive remarks by the study participants on retooling, they never failed to see its weaknesses. They identified at least two limitations of the retooling seminar such as inappropriateness and insufficiencies. Some of them noted the inappropriateness of retooling seminar. No matter how good the training was, if it did not fit to the expectations and needs of the participants, it could never hit 100% of its targeted outcomes. Huque & Vyas (2008) found out that even if the training kept the participants informed about latest development, it failed to help them adjust to the changing circumstances. Likewise, my participants noticed that the teaching strategies which they learned during retooling seminar were very generic in nature. Consequently, they hardly found its applicability and context in highly technical courses. They longed for varied yet appropriate strategies for their fields of specialization such as engineering and accounting courses. Other study participants highlighted the insufficiencies of retooling seminar. They found it lacking, especially in addressing the entire problems in their classes. The pedagogy of love was over emphasized than the technical side of the content subjects.

**Attribution of the Increase in Teaching Performance**

Majority of the study participants attributed their teaching performance to their retooling seminar as it honed their teaching competence and character. After such retooling, they corrected their flaws and transformed themselves from being moody to approachable and creative mentors. They inspired students to actively engage in their class discussions and activities.

Other participants did not attribute entirely their increase in performance to faculty retooling. Obviously, the retooling had enhanced their teaching strategies but whether or not the increase in their performance was attributed to it remained difficult to ascertain. They noted several possible attributions of their increase in performance. They first referred to their technical knowledge of the course. They acquired them during their years of schooling and honed them further when they earned their graduate degrees. I found their sharing reasonable because teachers were not devoid with skills as they entered in the teaching profession. In fact, several studies confirmed the positive correlation between academic preparations of teachers and academic achievements of students (Croninger, et.al, 2007; Clotfelter, et.al, 2007; Buddin &Zamarro2009; Aaronson, et.al, 2007).
They also gave credit to their personal efforts and drives or passions. I concurred with this contention because no matter how much we bombard the teachers with training on teaching strategies, without their drive or passion to teach, they would never become better teachers. Tauber & Mester (2007) saw teachers’ drives or enthusiasms as one of the contributory factors to students’ learning. Carbonneau, et.al (2008) identified the passion for teaching as predictor of teaching performance and an effective means in reducing teachers’ burnouts.

They also recognized their dean’s mentoring efforts in discussing with them their strengths and weaknesses. They gave constructive feedbacks which motivated them to perform better just as Sundli (2007) recognized the importance of mentoring in professional development.

My participants attributed further their increase in performance to the University standard policy. They avoided below satisfactory performance ratings; otherwise, the University would sanction them. I could associate this sharing to the finding of Ahn & Vigdor (2014) that accountability sanctions have positive effect on performance. The study participants also pointed out that their industry experiences might as well contribute to their improvement in teaching. Similarly, Zeichner (2010) highlighted the sound interplay between academics, practitioners, and community experts in creating better learning opportunities. Peer feedbacks and supports also contributed to their increase in performance just as Scheeler, Congdon & Stansbery (2010) pointed out that immediate giving of feedback to co-teachers is a good method of peer coaching. These sharing of the FGD participants were outright affirmations that retooling was one but not the only attribution of the increase in their performance evaluation results.

**Reasons for Non-Improvement in Performance**

All interviewees dissociated their decrease in performance from retooling seminar. They claimed that retooling had enhanced both their teaching competence and their pedagogy of love. Instead, they pointed out the transition period from their retooling seminar to post-retooling performance evaluation as possible cause. The period which covered just a month and half could still be considered as period of adjustment. One participant also considered his transition from fulltime administrative employee to a fulltime professor as part of the adjustment period. He had to adjust particularly to hot classroom conditions which he described as humid one. Another interviewee shared his disappointment because despite his efforts to use varied strategies he still decreased in his performance result. He likewise attributed such problem to his adjustment period in using some strategies which he was never used to. I believe these teachers should enhance their adaptive skills in teaching. Corno (2008) pointed out that adaptive teachers could easily adjust to adaptive teaching strategies that addressed appropriately the varying needs of students.

An interviewee honestly accepted that what he did was not enough to improve his performance. He needed to strive harder in the period covered by the next evaluation. He expressed his desire to undergo series of trainings especially on classroom management where his performance did not improve. He accepted humbly his shortcomings, and manifested his crystal clear desire to cling to any learning opportunities. Hence, I sympathized with advocates of learning as passion (Fredricks, Alfeld, & Eccles, 2010) who proposed for the creation of a school environment that promotes passion for learning.

The rest of the interviewees revealed their difficulty in using the strategies that they learned during the retooling because their subjects were very technical. However, they did not attribute their decrease in performance to their retooling seminar. Instead, they manifested their discontentment on the appropriateness of the tool used in assessing their performance in highly technical classes particularly those of the College of Engineering. Baker, et.al (2010) cited some problems with the use of students rating in assessing teachers’ performance. They recommended considering many factors in assessing teachers’ performance.

**Suggestions for Improvement of the Faculty Retooling Seminar**

The study participants gave their suggestions on how to improve the retooling seminar. First, they suggested incorporating sessions that would be useful to teachers of technical courses. They appreciated the retooling however the strategies taught were too generic and the participants from technical courses could hardly apply them in their classes. They longed for sessions that were context-sensitive, specializations-based, and facilitated by experts of their fields. I believed this clamour resonated with the idea that strategies must be varied such as conceptualizing, contextualizing, and problem-centring (Nikitina, 2006).
Second, they suggested conducting the seminar before the classes begin. The participants needed ample time to conceptualize and design strategies that would be useful to their classes. If necessary, they could ask their retooling masters to critique their planned strategies. I admired their desire for mentoring. In fact, Castro, et.al (2010) recognized help seeking as one of the varied teaching strategies utilized by resilient teachers.

Third, they suggested designing and demonstrating diverse teaching strategies. This would look like a strategy bank from where the teachers could anytime withdraw any appropriate strategy for specific lessons. This would range from a generic to highly specialized strategies for any prescribed class time (1 hr, 2hrs, etc.). They further suggested that the strategy bank shall be program-based. Embedding learning strategies within a particular discipline, according to Kennelly, et.al (2010), improved learning outcomes.

Fourth, they suggested designing a retooling seminar that would be light and participants friendly. This would address information overload experienced by other training participants. They claimed that some video presentations were not participants-friendly for they felt awkward to criticise them and even to listen to others who criticized the performance of their fellow teachers. Some presenters suffered from being traumatized because some comments were very personal. They wished that the video presentations were filtered before they were shown to the participants. I empathized with them because enjoyment is a natural desire of any individual. After all, happiness is defined as the reason behind all human endeavours (Frey & Stutzer, 2010). I believe teachers could facilitate learning very well if the learners found joy and happiness in what they did.

Fifth, they suggested improving the mechanisms in monitoring the progress of the retooling participants. They found this useful in documenting how well the participants have actualized the strategies which they learned from retooling seminar. Van Lonkhuijzen, et.al (2010) emphasized the need for policy formulation to evaluate and report effects of training programs.

Conclusion and Implications for Practice

The quantitative results of the study inferred that faculty retooling had no bearing on the post retooling performance of the faculty participants across colleges. However, the qualitative results signified attributions of the increased performance of some retooling participants to different factors; primarily, to their retooling seminar which enhanced their teaching strategies and pedagogy of love. They further ascribed such increase to their trainings attended, technical knowledge, personal efforts and drives, constructive feedback from their academic heads, university policy on performance standard, industry experience and peer supports. Those who decreased in their performance pointed out their adjustment period as the main reason. The time span from their retooling seminar to the beginning of their classes in June was too short. They were still adjusting to new strategies that they learned. Moreover, they recognized their deficiencies in technical teaching strategies as another reason. For the limitations of the retooling seminar, they identified two factors such as inappropriateness of strategies taught and insufficiency of the training itself. Hence, they desired diversified teaching strategies applicable to technical and highly specialized courses like those of the colleges of engineering and accountancy.

The findings of this study have important implications for practice, especially in conducting the faculty retooling seminar. Its proponents endeavoured a lot to make it effective. However, results of this study implied the need to consider its recommendations and suggestions for improvement. Hence, proponents of faculty retooling should give utmost attention to the needs of the faculty of technical courses. They shall engage the representatives of the concerned courses in planning through constant consultation meetings.
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