

# Effect of Seminar on Teaching on the Performance of Teachers in Higher Education

Rowena C. Perez and \*Ruth A. Ortega-Dela Cruz  
University of the Philippines Los Baños, Philippines

## Abstract

Effective teaching in higher education depends on faculty development opportunities such as teaching seminars. This paper delves deeper into the research surrounding how such seminars influence the teaching performance of higher education teachers. This study used a survey research design to examine the effect of Seminar on Teaching (SOT) on the teaching performance rating of randomly selected 172 faculty members of a higher education institution in the Philippines. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Results of the t-test showed significant differences in the performance of the faculty members before and after attending the SOT, with an average teaching performance score of 1.5503 (equivalent rating of 80.67) before attending the SOT and 1.4965 (equivalent rating of 83.33) after attending the SOT. Overall, the findings showed that the seminar greatly helped the higher education institutions' faculty members improve their teaching performance and that the seminar was effective among the faculty members, especially those newly hired or inexperienced in teaching. As educational institutions continue to prioritize the professional development of their faculty, understanding the impact of seminars on teaching has become crucial for fostering a culture of continuous improvement in higher education.

*Keywords:* Seminar on teaching, teaching performance, higher education, faculty development, students, Philippines

## Introduction

Higher education's complex and dynamic nature demands that teachers continually adapt and refine their pedagogical skills (Ortega-Dela Cruz, 2020). According to Kennedy (2016) and Nyaaba et al. (2023), continuous professional development can positively affect teaching effectiveness and enhance student learning outcomes, engagement, and satisfaction. One of these professional development programs is teaching seminars and workshops, which provide dedicated spaces for faculty to engage in critical reflection, learn new approaches, and exchange best practices (Heron & Wason, 2023). Faculty members' varied needs and interests are catered to through the rich tapestry of learning experiences provided by such seminars. Some offer a strong basis for teaching excellence by delving into core pedagogical concepts, including active learning, efficient assessment methods, and classroom management approaches. Others focus on problems unique to their specialty,

adjusting their strategies to fit the particulars of each industry. Research-oriented workshops expose teachers to recent findings in learning and pedagogy, supporting the implementation of evidence-based teaching approaches. Technology-focused seminars give faculty members the skills to easily incorporate digital technologies into their lessons.

One of the higher education institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines has been holding a Seminar on Teaching (SOT) twice a year (before the start of the semester) to give newly hired teachers and other interested faculty members tips or pointers on effective teaching. Effective teaching and developing teaching strategies were the primary objectives of SOT; thus, the teaching performance of the participants was anticipated to improve after attending the seminar. The university had spent much effort and operating costs on the seminar. Since its implementation, no studies have been conducted and published yet to investigate the effect of the SOT on the

teaching performance of faculty members after attending the seminar.

This study was conducted to determine the effect of Seminars on Teaching (SOT) on teaching performance among selected faculty members in a higher education institution (HEI) in the Philippines. The results of this study may help universities analyze the ongoing seminars being conducted for faculty members, enabling them to identify and retain those who have cultivated a warm and cordial teaching relationship with their students. It may also help the administration enhance or reinforce the university's awareness in their efforts to achieve success in improving the teaching-learning process. Thus, they would be informed of the development or improvement of the seminar.

Specifically, this study (i) described the profile of the respondents, (ii) determined the teaching performance ratings of faculty members who attended the SOT, and (iii) analyzed the difference in the teaching performance rating by faculty rank before and after attending the SOT.

### Literature Review

Teachers' performance significantly affects students' experiences and learning results in higher education. Teachers frequently use seminars as a professional development tool to improve their teaching methods. This literature review incorporates findings from several studies to examine how seminars affect instructors' effectiveness as teachers in higher education.

Seminars provide opportunities for faculty to acquire new knowledge and skills related to effective teaching practices (de Grave et al., 2014). Active learning, assessment, technological integration, and classroom management techniques fall into this category.

Seminars affect education beyond merely imparting knowledge. These courses encourage critical reflection by asking teachers to consider their methods and students' educational experiences. Peer review, self-assessment tasks, and vital conversations are frequently incorporated

into seminars, which encourages faculty members to reflect on their methods of instruction, pinpoint areas in need of development, and obtain a more complex understanding of their students' educational experiences. A growth mindset is fostered through collaborative learning activities and peer feedback, which promotes constant adaptation and improvement. Research has indicated that faculty motivation and engagement can be improved through participation in well-designed seminars, resulting in a revived love of teaching and a more profound feeling of community among colleagues (Steinert et al., 2016).

Several studies have suggested a positive correlation between attendance at seminars on teaching and overall teaching effectiveness (Lizette Neng & Cheo, 2022; Shojaee et al., 2016). Educators who devote time to seminars for professional development exhibit enhanced classroom management, stronger communication abilities, and greater capacity to address the varied needs of their pupils. Studies show that overall teaching efficiency and active seminar engagement correlate positively (Akpan & Ita, 2015; Yoon & Kim, 2022). Suryanti and Arifani (2021) showed a positive relationship between blended professional training and mathematics teachers' creativity and teaching effectiveness. Teachers who participate in seminars for continuous professional development typically improve their ability to manage the classroom, engage with students, and communicate.

Even with their well-established advantages, educational institutions encounter certain obstacles when trying to optimize the teaching impact of seminars, and many need to help allocate sufficient resources and staff to create, implement, and maintain professional development programs of the highest caliber. To ensure long-term impact and buy-in from faculty, it is imperative to ensure that seminars are relevant to their needs and interests. Robust assessment methodologies that extend beyond participant satisfaction and examine their influence on faculty practices and student learning outcomes are necessary to evaluate the efficacy of teaching seminars.

The literature offers evidence that seminars favorably impact teachers' ability to teach in higher education. Attending seminars has repeatedly been linked to increased confidence in teachers, adoption of cutting-edge pedagogical techniques, increased teaching efficacy (Ortega-Dela Cruz, 2016), and improved student learning outcomes. More studies are necessary to find the best ways to maximize educators' professional growth in the context of higher education and to investigate the precise mechanisms by which seminars work.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory posits that individuals learn by observing others and modeling their behaviors (Bandura & Walters, 1977; Vahedi, 2020). Participation in teaching seminars provides educators with opportunities to observe and learn from peers and expert presenters. Through interactions during seminars, educators can acquire new teaching strategies, refine existing practices, and adopt innovative approaches to enhance their teaching performance. Malcolm Knowles' Adult Learning Theory emphasizes the significance of experiential learning and self-directed learning for adult learners (Knowles, 1980). Teaching seminars offer a platform for self-directed investigation of teaching techniques and pedagogical ideas, catering to adult educators' specific requirements. Teachers take charge of their professional development by actively participating in seminars to enhance their teaching ability (Knowles et al., 2014).

Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger's notion of *Communities of Practice* emphasizes the value of social interaction in education and career advancement (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Teaching seminars function as communities of practice where educators gather to discuss ideas, share experiences, and work together to address teaching problems. Teachers gain a common repertory of teaching techniques by being involved in these communities, thereby enhancing their teaching ability (Wenger, 1999). In his theory of reflective practice, Donald Schön highlighted the value

of introspection in professional development. Teachers can participate in reflective practice at teaching seminars by critically analyzing their approaches, evaluating their efficacy, and pinpointing improvement areas. Teachers can improve their performance by making deliberate changes to their practices based on reflective discussions and feedback from seminars (Schön, 2017). According to Jack Mezirow's transformational learning theory, learning entails critically analyzing presumptions and beliefs to produce transformative perspectives and behavior shifts (Mezirow, 1991). Teaching seminars can help educators have life-changing experiences by questioning their preconceived notions about education, introducing them to different viewpoints, and promoting trial and error of novel teaching strategies. Teachers may exhibit improved teaching effectiveness due to transformative learning experiences (Shields, 2021).

The theoretical framework described above combines several ideas and theories to explain how teaching seminars affect teachers' performance in higher education. By applying principles from social learning, adult learning, communities of practice, reflective practice, and transformative learning, the framework thoroughly comprehends how attending seminars can support educators' ongoing efforts to improve their instruction methods.

### **Methodology**

#### **Research Design**

This study used a descriptive design. A descriptive study attempts to describe existing conditions without analyzing relationships among variables (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2013). This type of research aims to describe the data and characteristics of the study. The idea behind this type of research is to study frequencies, averages, and other statistical calculations.

#### **Research Participants**

The study sample was composed of faculty members from a higher education institution in the Philippines. In particular, the study employed

random sampling of 172 respondents to cover 145 instructors and 27 assistant professors who were teaching undergraduate courses and had attended SOT.

### **Instrumentation**

The researchers requested from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Instruction (OVCI) a copy of the list of participants in the SOT for five academic years. The list selected participants who handled undergraduate courses and had at least one semester of teaching experience. These were verified using the OVCI database of faculty profiles. Furthermore, the faculty teaching performance was based on the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) result, which included both numerical and written comments from the students. The SET comprises five categories that assess each faculty member regarding how they handle the lecture/recitation and laboratory/computation classes. Specifically, how s/he meets student's expectations regarding his/her preparedness for teaching, delivery of subject matter, relationship with students, use of time, and use of appropriate evaluation procedure, it uses a seven-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (7), disagree (6), slightly disagree (5), neither agree nor disagree (4), slightly agree (3), agree (2) to strongly agree (1).

The SET is the main tool used by the university to assess teaching performance. Students are required to complete the SET in the last three weeks of the semester or trimester or during the last week of the midyear term. The university has been using the SET since 1980 and has undergone several changes over the years.

### **Data Analysis**

The researcher used secondary data analysis with descriptive and inferential statistics, such as frequency and percentage, and an independent t-test using Microsoft Excel. They employed a t-test to analyze the difference in teaching performance ratings by faculty rank before and after attending the SOT, with a significance level of 0.05.

## **Results and Discussions**

### **Profile of the respondents**

A total of 172 faculty members were involved in the study, with nine colleges participating in the seminar (Table 1). The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) had the highest number of participants, with 105 faculty members (61.05% of the total). This is because CAS has the largest number of temporary faculty members, accounting for 61% of college faculty members. The College of Engineering and Agro-Industrial Technology (CEAT) followed 33 faculty members, accounting for 19.19% of the total. This college has the second largest number of temporary faculty members, comprising 68% of the college's faculty. The College of Forestry and Natural Resources (CFNR) had eight participants (4.65% of the total) and the College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) had seven participants (4.07 %). The College of Economics and Management (CEM) had six participants (3.49 %).

In contrast, both the College of Agriculture (CA) and the College of Development Communication (CDC) had three participants each, accounting for 1.74% of the total. Finally, the School of Environmental Science and Management (SESAM) had the lowest number of participants, with two or 1.16% of the total. SESAM had the least number of faculty members participating in the study as most of its faculty members were tenured or permanent.

Table 1 also shows that there were 145 instructors and 27 assistant professors in total. This was because most of the participants in the seminar were instructors, and a majority of the newly hired faculty members from the university were instructors. This was also due to the "up or out" tenure rule of the university. Among the instructors, the largest number of participants was from the CAS (100 or 68 %). This college had the largest number of instructor positions among the nine colleges included in the study, with 196 (49%). This was followed by CEAT with 31(21%). It had 41 or 51% of instructor rank positions. CEM and CFNR with four (3%),

CHE with three or 2%, CA and CDC with 2 and 1 ( 1%), respectively, while CVM and SESAM had no instructor participants. The lowest faculty rank positions from both colleges were Assistant Professors, and most were permanent.

**Table 1**

*Distribution of Faculty According to College and Rank*

*Distribution of Faculty According to College and Rank*

College	Instructor		Assistant Professor	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
CA	2	1	1	4
CAS	100	68	5	19
CDC	1	1	2	7
CEAT	31	21	2	7
CEM	4	3	2	7
CFNR	4	3	4	15
CHE	3	2	2	7
CVM	0	0	7	26
SESAM	0	0	2	7
n	145	100	27	100

This implies that CAS has a larger population of undergraduate students than other colleges and that most faculty members ranked in positions at the said college were instructors. Among the assistant professors, CVM had the largest number of participants, seven (26%).

*Distribution of Faculty According to Teaching Performance Rating*

Rank	Improved Performance Rating After SOT		Not Improved Performance Rating After SOT		Total
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	
	Instructor	91	63	54	
Asst. Prof.	15	56	12	44	27

CAS had 5 or 19%; CFNR had 4 or 15%; CDC, CEAT, CEM, and SESAM had 2 or 7% for each, and CA had 1 or 4%. The number of assistant professor faculty members from CVM was the highest among the other colleges because an assistant professor is the lowest faculty rank at the said college.

**Teaching performance ratings of the respondents**

Table 2 shows the distribution of the faculty in the study regarding teaching performance ratings. There were 145 instructors and 27

assistant professors. Among the instructors, 91, or 63%, improved their teaching performance rating, whereas 54, or 35%, did not show an improved teaching performance rating. Regarding the rank of assistant professors, 15, or 56%, demonstrated improved teaching performance ratings, while 12 (44 %) did not improve teaching performance ratings after attending SOT.

This shows that instructors improved their teaching performance compared with assistant professors in terms of teaching performance ratings. This also indicates that the SOT result was more effective for instructors than for assistant professors of the university regarding the teaching performance rating after SOT. This could be a result of the assistant professors having already established their style in teaching from other institutions before they joined the university, and they might need to meet the expectations from the lectures of the resource speakers regarding teaching strategies.

**Table 2**

Table 3 shows the average SET of faculty members according to their rank before and after attending the seminar, based on their student evaluation of teaching performance. The results showed that instructors and assistant professors had improved teaching based on the results of the average SET score before and after attending SOT, with 1.552 (before SOT) and 1.502 (after SOT) for instructors and 1.555 (before SOT) and 1.492 (after SOT) for assistant professors. A significant positive increase in the SET score implies a significant improvement in the teaching performance rating after attending

SOT. The seminar helped the university faculty members improve their teaching performance. This seminar conducted by the university was effective for faculty members, especially those who were newly hired or inexperienced in teaching.

### Analysis of difference in the teaching performance rating by faculty rank before and after attending the SOT

Using the independent t-test, the results showed that there was a significant difference in the performance of the instructors before and after attending the SOT ( $t [145] = 1.502$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). This also revealed that instructors' teaching performance scores improved after the SOT. On the rank of assistant professors, the results demonstrated that there was no significant difference in the SET score before and after SOT ( $t [27] = 1.555$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ).

Overall, the faculty members included in the study were 172, with an average teaching performance score of 1.5503 (equivalent rating of 80.67) before attending the SOT and 1.4965 (equivalent rating of 83.33) after attending the SOT. The study affirms the findings of Akpan and Ita (2015) and Yoon and Kim (2022), which showed a relationship between participation in seminars and training programs and instructional methods employed by educators. These programs allow participants to experience cutting-edge pedagogical techniques to improve and broaden their educational methodologies. Overall, teachers who attend workshops and training sessions are more successful (Lizette Neng & Cheo, 2022; Shojaee et al., 2016). These programs help teachers improve their ability to manage the classroom, communicate effectively with students, and better meet the requirements of their diverse student body.

**Table 3**

#### *Average Teaching Performance of Faculty Before and After Attending the Seminar on Teaching (SOT) by Rank*

Rank	<i>f</i>	%	Average Teaching Performance Score			
			Before SOT	After SOT	T value	p-value
Instructor	145	84.30	1.552	1.502	3.46	0.00
Asst Prof	27	15.70	1.555	1.492	1.47	0.08

### Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of seminars on teaching performance among educators in higher education settings. It sought to determine how the Seminar on Teaching (SOT) affected the teaching performance ratings of 172 faculty members selected randomly from a Philippine higher education institution. Many of the SOT participants were from the CAS since the university has a large student population with the largest number of temporary instructor positions. Most of the participants were instructors rather than assistant professors. Many of the newly hired faculty members who attended the seminar were instructors. The average performance of the faculty included in the study after attending the SOT was better. Regarding the effect of the

SOT on performance among the selected faculty members, the teaching performance scores of the faculty included in the study improved after the SOT. Instructors improved their teaching performance compared to assistant professors in terms of their teaching scores.

The study's findings have direct implications for the university where it was conducted. Thus, the following recommendations are offered: the university must continue holding seminars on college teaching for recently hired faculty members and for veteran faculty members to inform them of the current technological and educational developments.

The university, through OVCI, should regularly conduct studies or research on the

impact of the seminars. They must assess the subjects that should receive more attention during the seminars and evaluate the seminars themselves, including any areas that need to be developed or improved. For participants to fully understand the topics that are most important for improving their teaching performance, the seminar's schedule or allotment must also be considered.

Concerning the study's limitations, further research on the same study is required to consider other demographic characteristics of the participants, such as age, civil status, sex, years of teaching, and education, to determine how these variables affect their overall teaching performance. It is also suggested that the other items of the SET be delved deeper into, such as preparedness for teaching, subject matter delivery, relationships with students, time management, and appropriate evaluation procedures. Teaching seminars play a vital role in enhancing the teaching performance of higher education faculty members. These programs can foster effective teaching practices that ultimately benefit students and contribute to institutional success by providing continuous learning, reflection, and skill development opportunities. Teaching seminars are not merely one-off workshops; they catalyze ongoing development in higher education. These programs can enable teachers to provide their students with life-changing educational experiences by allowing them to hone their craft, experiment with new ideas, and build relationships with the academic community.

It is imperative to consider the design, implementation, and maintenance of these worthwhile endeavors to guarantee that they fulfill their complete potential and foster a vibrant educational atmosphere for educators and learners alike. This paper provides a springboard for the further exploration of the multifaceted world of teaching seminars. Delving deeper into specific seminar formats, content areas, and evaluation methods can offer valuable insights into the role of seminars in shaping educators' teaching performance in higher education.

## References

- Akpan, C. P., & Ita, A. A. (2015). Teacher professional development and quality universal basic education in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(9), 65-76.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory*: Prentice-hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- De Grave, W., Zanting, A., Mansvelder-Longayroux, D. D., & Molenaar, W. M. (2014). Workshops and seminars: enhancing effectiveness. *Faculty Development in the Health Professions: A Focus on Research and Practice*, 181-195. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-7612-8\\_9](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-7612-8_9)
- Heron, M., & Wason, H. (2023). Developing dialogic stance through professional development workshops. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2271892>
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of educational research*, 86(4), 945-980. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800>
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Cambridge Adult Education.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2014). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429299612>
- Lizette Neng, S., & Cheo, N. (2022). The effect of teachers' participation in seminars on their teaching effectiveness in secondary schools in Tubah Sub Division. *Procedia of Philosophical and Pedagogical Scienc-*

- es,178-191. <https://procedia.online/index.php/philosophy/article/view/272>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Nyaaba, R. A., Abdul-Gafaar, S., Akulga, C. A., & Kwakye, D. O. (2023). Assessing the impact of continuous professional development of teachers and its effects on satisfaction, achievement, and engagement: Colleges of Education, Northern Ghana. *Journal of Education and Teaching Methods*, 2(2), 41-57. <https://doi.org/10.58425/jetm.v2i2.178>
- Ortega-Dela Cruz, R.A. (2020). Pedagogical practice preferences among generational groups of learners: Towards effective twenty-first century higher education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 17 (5), 1-19. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol17/iss5/6/>
- Ortega-Dela Cruz, R.A. (2016). Influence of student English utility and teacher efficacy on English proficiency of high school students. *International Journal of Languages Education and Teaching* 4 (3), 267-275. ISSN: 2198 – 4999, <http://dx.doi.org/10.18298/ijlet.1647>
- Schön, D. A. (2017). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315237473>
- Shojaee, A., Foroghi, A., & Saeidan, N. (2016). A survey of teaching skills workshops influencing professors' performance in university students' classrooms. *Sociological Studies of Youth*, 7(21), 119-134.
- [https://journals.iau.ir/article\\_529797.html](https://journals.iau.ir/article_529797.html)
- Shields, C. M. (2021). Transformative leadership theory: critical, comprehensive, and activist. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Educational Leadership and Management Discourse* (pp. 1-18). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Anderson, B., Barnett, B. M., Centeno, A., Naismith, L., ... & Dolmans, D. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update: BEME Guide No. 40. *Medical teacher*, 38(8), 769-786. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1181851>
- Suryanti, S., & Arifani, Y. (2021). The relationship between blended mathematics professional training and teachers' creativity and effectiveness. *International journal of instruction*, 14(2), 139-154. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1291124>
- Vahedi, Z. (2020). Social learning theory/social cognitive theory. *The Wiley Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences: Models and Theories*, 401-405. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119547143.ch67>
- Wallen, N. E., & Fraenkel, J. R. (2013). *Educational research: A guide to the process*. Routledge.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yoon, I., & Kim, M. (2022). Dynamic patterns of teachers' professional development participation and their relations with socio-demographic characteristics, teacher self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, 103565. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103565>