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ABSTRACT
This descriptive research was conducted to determine the four primary functions of faculty in a private higher education institution: instruction, research, community service or extension, and production, which is the basis of their performance evaluation. A researcher-made survey questionnaire was distributed to 56 faculty members from different programs of a private college who served as the study's respondents. Results showed that the respondent's four primary functions were described as agree. At the same time, their performance based on their functions was rated as very satisfactory. Findings revealed that the problems encountered by the respondents in the delivery of their tasks include having insufficient books or references in teaching, no research seminars and training provided for faculty, lack of institutional support in terms of community extension services, and not enough knowledge in book publication and the cost of printing is high. Some recommendations were made to help the institution and its faculty tackle the issues related to their functions.
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1. Introduction
Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines concentrate on their four primary functions. These functions include instruction, research, community service or extension, and production. The institution's task focus is moving around information, data, and abilities to the students. Moreover, new theories and methods that society can utilize are the focus of research. On the other hand, community service or extension is another function of different states, universities, colleges (SUCs), and HEIs that intends to provide sustainable development to the community through their different outreach programs. Lastly, production services are now being strengthened to augment the resources and revenues of SUCs and HEIs (Chua, 2010). Its faculty members carried out these four fundamental functions.

Under National Budget Circular 461 s. 1998 states that the revised and updated Common Criteria for Evaluation (CCE) and Modified Point Allocation (MPA) will be used to evaluate all faculty members in higher education programs, as well as heads and administrators of SUCs and CHED Supervised Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), including TESDA Technician Education Institutions (TEIs). In addition, the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) and the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) have jointly issued Circular No. No. 1 dated May 29, 2003, and 1-B dated June 21, 2007, citing the four areas, which are as follows: 1) Quality and Relevance of Instructions; 2) Research capabilities and results from the previous three years; (3) Community relations and services, as well as (4) Resource management. The significant indicators that have been mentioned are the ones that would be used to evaluate the development and performance of the various faculty members in SUCs and HEIs.
Meanwhile, a faculty member’s ability to instruct students can be determined by their educational background and professional experience. One more action of a scholarly foundation where faculty participate in the execution of effort drives is accomplishing expansion work or local area administration. Research, in which faculty members must provide information to advance the university and the country, is another essential function of HEIs. (Quitoras & Abuso, 2021). Moreover, research is a crucial component of an academic context that forms the foundation of reality for instruction and extension. In addition, according to the Guidelines for Granting Autonomous Status to Private Higher Education Institutions published by the Commission on Higher Education in 2019, at least 50% of full-time faculty members or at least 30% of full-time faculty must have actively participated in research or creative work within the previous five years. There must be patents or publications in scholarly journals for at least 10% of full-time faculty. At least 5% of full-time faculty members have recently published works in books with recognized academic publishers and articles in internationally indexed journals.

All faculty members will likely focus on the four major areas: instruction, research, service to the community, and production. All these functions are intimately connected, and none can be separated when considering higher education (JICA, 2005). Faculty in colleges who do not also conduct research and disseminate their findings to the academic community aren’t helping their pupils (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015). They are also expected to perform service relevant to their assignment and of value to their institution or profession. Since they must contribute to the institution’s goal, vision, and mission, they must devote more time to research and other outreach or community service initiatives. As a result, their involvement in research can occasionally suffer outside of their teaching responsibilities.

Further, CHED monitored these HEI functions through its Regional Quality Assurance Team (RQAT). However, most faculty of the different programs of the private HEI focused only on the delivery of instruction and community extension services. Only a few have conducted and published research, and fewer have production such as published books, handbooks, modules, and the like. Some of these faculty who had also conducted research were those who recently graduated with their master’s degrees in the institution and complied with CHED Memorandum Order No. 15, series of 2019. Even though those who were not experienced faculty members were only teaching the subjects by the book rather than relying solely on research activities to teach, it is essential to provide faculty members with enriching experiences outside of the classroom. It will help improve the quality of education faculty members without graduate degrees receive. (JICA, 2015). Therefore, this study was conducted based on the researcher’s observation. Additionally, this research proposed recommendations to address faculty members’ problems in delivering their functions. Likewise, limited resources were also used to assess the ability of the faculty to perform their function.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Functions of Higher Education Faculty

The generators and transmitters of knowledge in the Philippine educational system are the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) (Inigo, 2017). Every faculty member in HEI has four significant functions: instruction, research, community service or extension, and production. Each of these faculty functions in the HEI is supposed to meet minimum standards in terms of quality of provision. The minimum standards in terms of the quality of provision in HEIs are crucial in determining the integrity of an institution and the quality of graduates (Kis, 2005). According to Salazar- Clemeña and Almonte-Acosta (2007), all these aspects of higher education teaching must be promoted to holistic faculty service to their students and the community. Training programs must adequately prepare faculty members of higher education (Twale, 2013). Mentorship must also be provided for further training of faculty members (Phillips & Dennison, 2015). In their training and teaching, service to humanity must be emphasized (White, 2010). As an institution of higher learning, colleges and university faculty are mandated not only to teach but also to produce knowledge and apply the fruits of the intellect to benefit the greater Community (Pinoy Exchange, 2013).

HEIs address their mission to facilitate learning through several avenues: (i) their curricula; (ii) the teaching carried out by their faculty; and (iii) the delivery through which students gain access to learning environments (Asian Development Bank, 2011). Higher education institutions rely heavily on evaluation records to assess the quality of their education programs. To teach in higher education institutions, one must prove that they are academically prepared and have the expertise and experience required to do the task.

An instructor’s adequate teaching proficiency in higher education can influence students’ motivation to learn (Knowles et al., 2005; Thompson & Clayton, 2004). The fundamental rule of instructing known to most educators in advanced education today is the teaching method; thus, a persistent test to quality showing in advanced education is a teacher’s restricted collection in pedagogical standards. Besides the training in their substance regions, most educators at schools and colleges need to improve their abilities to show grown-up students in advanced education (Sogunro, 2017).

However, knowing an organized and well-prepared instructor to teach a course is relatively easy. Clear syllabi and expectations, an exciting and educational method of teaching (i.e., "capturing audience’s attention"), appropriate pacing and transitions, relevant
classroom activities, clear assessment rubrics, and efficient classroom management practices are all examples of adequate preparation and organizational skills. A good teacher usually wants to know before the start of the class meeting. In general, the degree of education is well-executed instruction that is well-aligned with standards and meets students’ learning needs, learning styles, interests, and expectations. It is a combination of pedagogical ability, sufficient preparation, and practical organizational skills; the value of content knowledge; technological proficiency, resourcefulness; and the dispositional characteristics of teachers (Sogunro, 2017).

Research is another primary function of faculty members in HEIs. They are expected to produce knowledge beneficial to the institution and national development (Quitoras & Abuso, 2021). Besides, the worth of exploration is far past a straightforward expansion to the collection of information; several ways research has an impact and adds value. They are: 1) expanding valuable information, 2) preparing gifted individuals, 3) making new logical instrumentation and procedures with clients utilizing such offices, and 4) teaming up in research undertakings and organizations with clients.

Faculty members at colleges and universities must play a more significant role in creating and disseminating knowledge. Institutional research and scholarly publications impact academic ranking and accreditation (Wichian, Wongwanich, & Bowarnkitiwong, 2009). Participation in conferences, whether as a keynote speaker, paper presenter, poster presenter, session chairperson, or scientific committee member (Rowley-Jolivet, 2002), is necessary for faculty members writing research articles. One of the most critical ways information is disseminated throughout the academic discourse community is through the oral presentation of papers at conferences (Hood & Forey, 2005).

Paper publications are another means of disseminating research findings. When under pressure to publish, faculty, professionals, or even students at the graduate level may be hesitant to look into controversial issues or specific local problems for fear of not having their work published. (Jordão, 2019). Research conducted by Nasution (2006) revealed that some faculty stated that it was a requirement for them to make professional and academic presentations and publish their research in academic journals. The findings of Ambong et al. (2022) showed that faculty members reported having refereed publications in the past five years comprised 15.92% (n=43) of the total tenured faculty members. Among these faculty members, 70.09% have published in refereed journals, and 20.93% have published in refereed journals and conference proceedings. The majority, or 69.46%, have their works published as co-authored work, while about a quarter, or 25.58%, are published as sole authors.

However, in HEIs, not all faculty members are involved in research. Most would prefer to step outside their natural habitat; teaching or the research culture in colleges and universities may still be in its infancy (Quitoras & Abuso, 2021). Wa-Mbaleka (2015) argues that the seven most difficult obstacles stopping faculty members from publishing sufficiently or at all include “a lack of training on publication, fear of rejection, a lack of enthusiasm, faculty inactivity, inadequate funding, and a lack of institutional support.” Despite faculty members’ reluctance, the CHED in the Philippines has severely compelled HEIs to produce research outputs.

Lack of time has been identified as one of the significant individual factors believed to be influencing faculty research productivity in numerous studies (Angaiz, 2015; Hoffmann & Koufogiannakis, 2014; Alghanim & Alhamali, 2011; Williams, 2013; Webber, 2011; Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2008; Kaya & Weber, 2003). Additionally, authors such as Webber, 2011; Santo et al., 2009) found no significant effect on research productivity based on civil status and sex; others (Webber, 2011; Usang et al., 2007; Kaya & Weber, 2003) confirmed that male and female academic staff, as well as married and single academic staff, had significantly different levels of research productivity. The findings of Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta (2008) showed that faculty members did not consider any aspects of institutional research culture in their institutions as vital. However, the most cited factors that restrain faculty members from conducting research are identified as lack of institutional research support (Hoffmann & Koufogiannakis, 2014); teaching load (Alghanim & Alhamali, 2011; Webber, 2011; Jung, 2012); lack of library resources (Hoffmann & Koufogiannakis, 2014).

The research advocacy is conveyed to colleges by giving profoundly concentrated instructive encounters to prepare professionals in the different specialized and disciplinal regions and underlining the advancement of new information and abilities through innovative work. By emphasizing bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degree programs, the focus is on learning new things. The CHED believes that national direction and state investments in research, innovation, and extension in HEIs must be anchored on the discovery-applied research continuum, which maintains a balance between discovery and applied research.

The Commission in the Philippines requires all institutions of higher learning to provide free community service and outreach programs. (Llenares & Decaris, 2018). One such law is the National Service Training Program (NSTP) Act of 2001 (Republic Act 9163), which emphasizes HEIs’ dedication to offering, promoting, and maintaining community service. Recently, the Commission has initiated activities aimed towards refocusing extension services.
HEIs and the Community should work together in ways that benefit both parties. Engagements of this kind also have the potential to broaden the meaning of academics’ work and world and add fresh perspectives and ideas to the intellectual process (Soska & Butterfield, 2013). On the one hand, stakeholders in the community gain a deeper comprehension of the relevant issues and the authority to make decisions that will improve their current circumstances. Nasution’s (2006) study revealed that of the NOCEI-member HEIs interviewed, six (66.7%) respondents confirmed that their institutions had a special department that provided services to the surrounding communities. Director of Extension Services, Vice Chancellor for Community Affairs, or Community Relations Officer are all possible titles for the officer. Community service was included in the academic curriculum of only three institutions (33.3%).

The methods by which HEIs deliver extension programs vary. Other delivery methods involve faculty and staff programs to address community development through educational cohorts, social service, public health, livelihood, technical training, consultations, and direct application of R&D output. Other delivery methods involve students assisting local organizations (Llenares & Deocaris, 2018).

According to Fawzi and Al-Hattami (2017), academic productivity is a primary indicator of career success in all academic fields. In addition to research, production is regarded as one of the measures of how good something is in the institution, faculty career success, interest in institutional rankings and prestige seeking. Based on the National Budget Circular-Common Criteria for Evaluation (NBC-CCE), faculty should participate in the invention, patented inventions, innovations, publications, and other creative works (NBC 461 Operations Manual, 2011). Innovations consist of improvements/ modifications made to an existing design, process, or product. There is a corresponding point for every published: original, edited, or compiled, copyright/published within the last ten years as an author, co-author, reviewer, compiler, editor, and translator. Although Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs) faculty members are encouraged to publish their research, CHED has yet to be fully implemented because academics may have focused only on teaching (Ulla et al., 2021).

### 2.2 Job Performance of Faculty

Job performance is the achievement of a person's work in a certain period of a standard work process (Virginia, 2021). Torrington et al. (2008) define performance as usually interpreted as the output of a combination of ability and motivation, given appropriate resources. Hence, motivating people became a key component of most management work. Given sufficient resources, performance was generally seen as a combination of skill and motivation, and encouraging people became an essential part of most management responsibilities.

Further, he described that it could be monitored, measured, and evaluated as outcomes at the employee level and linked with the organizational goals. Thus, job performance is a vital determinant of organizational success. According to Towler (2018), the five-factor models' linkage between personality and job performance in the organizational context are emotional stability, openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extroversion affect job performance.

Academics is the operational core of private higher education institutions, local colleges, and universities. Their performance largely determines the quality of the student’s higher education experience and, thereby, such institutions’ contribution to society (Capellaras, 2005). Because it affects the quality of the education students, receive, faculty performance significantly impacts their lives. The achievement of student learning outcomes can be used to evaluate a faculty member’s job performance (Shrestha, 2019).

Every year, faculty performance is evaluated by states, colleges, and universities. The evaluator, typically the dean, is responsible for determining how well each faculty member taught compared to other members of the academic unit that year—consequently, the faculty’s performance throughout the two academic terms. Faculty colleagues and administrators must occasionally assess a faculty member’s teaching more generally. In these cases, the evaluators should answer whether the employee’s showing execution was sufficient during the pertinent period to warrant residency, advancement, or an educational grant (Saliendra, 2018).

While some research findings demonstrate no correlation between education level and performance, others do. Additionally, several studies demonstrate a negative correlation between education level and undesirable work behaviors, which impair job performance (Naseer, 2010). Several researchers concluded that teacher job performance (JP) is the qualitative and quantitative accomplishment of teacher work using indicators: personal, social, professional, pedagogical, and achieving learning outcomes (Virginia, 2021). Additionally, previous research has identified various factors that influence academic staff performance and has shown that academic staff performance is critically important. They cover everything from classroom behavior and attitude to staff responsibilities and workplace conditions. In addition, these factors significantly impact employee retention in the field.
3. Methodology
A total of 56 faculty members of the research locale were personally forwarded a survey questionnaire which served as the study's respondents. These were faculty members assigned to the different programs of the college department in the institution. They were given ample time to answer the questionnaire. The research site is a private higher education institution (HEI) in Central Luzon.

A descriptive research design was used in the study. In presenting the data, a quantitative method is employed. Data collected were tallied, analyzed, and interpreted through frequency count, percentage, mean and standard deviation.

4. Results and Discussion
4.1 Profile of the Respondents
Findings showed that the average age of the respondents was 29 years old, females, single, had college degrees, had been in service for less than five years, with nine workloads, and had 8 hours allotment for work.

4.2 Primary Functions of Faculty
Table 1 presents the four primary functions of the respondents in terms of instruction, research, community service or extension, and production, which was rated as strongly agree with an overall mean of 2.95.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETERS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service or Extension</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over-all Mean</strong></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruction.** In terms of instruction, it was rated by the respondents, with a mean of 3.69, described as strongly agree. It obtained the highest mean among the four primary functions of faculty members in the college department of the institution. Findings indicate that the respondents focused more on instruction because they are expected to teach than other functions. They also have expertise when it comes to teaching.

Moreover, since most faculty were new in service, their priority was teachings. Faculty members engaged in various teaching strategies established by their work institutions. Based on the study of Wiseman and Hunt (2001), successful instructors are always proficient in their methods of instruction and able to inspire their students or create an atmosphere in which they succeed. A good teacher usually wants to study more before the start of the class meetings. As explained by Wa-Mbaleka (2015), an instructor must demonstrate academic readiness to teach in higher education institutions, have expertise in teaching, and have mastery of their field. Moreover, they have the experience required to perform the task. Further, according to Sogunro (2017), in general, instructions in which the faculty members effectively carry out education can meet the student’s learning needs, interests, and expectations and are well aligned with higher education standards.

**Research.** Findings revealed that research attained a mean of 2.30, described as disagree. It has the lowest mean among the primary functions of faculty. It illustrates that faculty were inactive when it came to research. Their struggles with research may be due to the following factors: lack of time to conduct research because of the number of workloads assigned to every faculty (Alghanim & Alhamali, 2011; Webber, 2011; Jung, 2012); lack of library resources, and lack of institutional research support (Hoffmann & Koufogiannakis, 2014); lack of training, seminars, or workshop; and limited financial resources for research. Research is one of the significant functions of higher education institutions. CHED (2019) mandates Philippine colleges, universities, and HEIs to sustain the nation’s development and progress through research. However, according to Quitoras and Abuso (2021), not all faculty members in higher education institutions were involved in the research. A study by Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta (2008) presents that faculty members did not deem any aspects of their institutions’ research cultures crucial. Similarly, Sanyal et al. (2019) indicated that some universities, colleges, and HEIs in the developing world had retained adequate instructions but were weak regarding research function. Furthermore, the study of Velasco (2022) identified limited resources to use by faculty members, preventing them from publishing and presenting research.

**Community Service or Extension.** From Table 1, it can be gleaned that community service or extension obtained a mean of 3.18, described as agreement. It was rated as the second-highest mean among the functions of faculty members of the institution. It implies that the faculty agreed that they had been involved in conducting different activities or programs for the benefit of the community. For several years, the institution, headed by the assigned Extension Coordinator, has dedicated its efforts to community
outreach programs like gift-giving and adopting a barangay to improve the lives of those less fortunate families. Aside from community outreach programs, it also includes an education-related program in line with their field, such as computer literacy training programs for different barangays. The Higher Education Modernization Act of 1997 in the Philippines mandates Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to participate in community extension programs (Montalbo, 2016). According to Magnaye and Ylagan (2021), the extension policy states that HEIs are mandated to collaborate with communities, establishments, schools, and other industries to facilitate the transmission of information, technology, and even goods or services in a specific location.

**Production.** Rank third among the primary functions of faculty members was production, with a mean of 2.61, described as agreeing. It connotes that faculty members agree that they had developed and provided students with modules, e-learning materials, and handouts. However, they could not produce published books that would be used for teaching and learning for the students. The faculty in the institution may lack knowledge of writing and publishing books. Aside from research, production is also known as one of the measures of the institution’s quality and career success among faculty members, interest in institutional rankings, and prestige seeking (Fawzi & Al-Hattami, 2017). Based on the National Budget Circular—Common Criteria for Evaluation (NBC-CCE), every faculty should participate in the invention, patented inventions, innovations, publications, and other creative works. Although Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs) faculty members are encouraged to publish their research, CHED has not been fully implemented because academics may have focused only on teaching (Ulla et al., 2021).

**4.3 Performance of Faculty**

The performance of the faculty respondents in the four primary functions was “very satisfactory,” as depicted by the overall mean of 2.52. The findings revealed that faculty respondents performed outstandingly in instruction with a mean of 3.63; in community service or extension with 2.43, described as satisfactory; production performance with 2.07, also described as satisfactory, while research performance obtained the lowest mean of 1.96, described as satisfactory. The finding implies that even if faculty members are given teaching loads beyond the Commission’s standards and other assignments, they can still do what is expected. However, it is noticeable that faculty members’ performance in research was relatively low though it falls on a satisfactory rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Performance of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARAMETERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service or Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-all Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4 Problems of the Respondents in the Delivery of Their Functions**

The data presented were the respondents’ problems in delivering their functions in HEI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Problems of the Respondents in the Delivery of Their Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARAMETERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service or Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the result of the study, the faculty encountered the following problems in the delivery of their functions: instruction, research, community service or extension, and production.

Regarding instruction, it can be noted that the respondents had insufficient books/references to be used in teaching. Teaching with insufficient books/references means adapting curriculum/topics from various sources, including journals, lab books, websites, packaged curricula, and other teachers (Ruth, 2005).
No seminars/training is provided for faculty when it comes to research. The lack of seminars/training needed to conduct research for publication makes the faculty members feel afraid of trying. Perhaps, they fear rejection in the event of submitting a research paper. They think the submitted research may be considered unacceptable for publication or presentation, thus making them feel ashamed (DeCapua & Wintergerst, 2004; McInnes, 2012).

Lack of institutional support was the major problem encountered by the respondents in terms of community service or extension. CHED has mandated that universities and colleges in the Philippines provide community-based educational and civic services. However, how can the faculty properly implement their services to the community if no support is extended to them for their proposed activities or programs? Likewise, not all faculty were required to participate in the community outreach activities or extension of the institution.

Not enough knowledge of book publication and printing costs are pricey. Due to this, faculty could not write and publish a book of their own or co-authored with their colleagues. They feel unprepared for book publication.

4.5 Proposed Recommendations
The proposed recommendations based on the respondents’ problems are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient books/references to be used in teaching</td>
<td>The institution should provide more updated books/references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No seminars/training provided for faculty.</td>
<td>At least five books per title for the last ten years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional support for community extension activities</td>
<td>Providing capacity-building seminars, training, and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on research &amp; writing for publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough knowledge of book publication and printing costs are</td>
<td>Design and implement guidelines on community service or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pricey.</td>
<td>extension activities that align with the field of specialization per program and should be supported by the institution to make it materialize. Moreover, once these extension activities have been implemented, the program should be appropriately monitored and evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing training on how to write and publish books. Look for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a publishing company that offers a lower cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusions
Generally, faculty members strongly agree that they carry the four primary functions. However, the respondents disagree on research functions. Meanwhile, faculty performance based on their functions was rated as very satisfactory. The respondent’s problems in the delivery of their functions affect their performance. These include insufficient books/references for teaching, no research seminar or training provided for them, lack of institutional support for community extension activities, and not enough knowledge of book publication and printing costs are pricey. Recommendations were made to these problems, including providing more and updated books/references with at least five books per title for the last ten years, providing capacity-building research seminars, training, and workshops, designing and implementing guidelines on community service or extension aligning with their field of specialization, monitoring, and evaluation of the program implemented, providing training on how to write and publish books and look for a lower cost on publication.

6. Recommendations
The following recommendations were derived from the findings: Faculty members should pursue higher education to comply with the requirements, gain more knowledge, and improve their skills. The institution should provide an assigned research and publication coordinator, thus, will be in charge of seminars, training, workshops, research, and production. Faculty should exert more effort, specifically involvement in research, community service or extension, and production, to perform satisfactorily. Significant recommendations on the problems faculty members encounter should be made possible for them to deliver their functions well. Further studies should be conducted on faculty performance in different HEIs to include other variables not mentioned in the study.
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