JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES

ISSN Print: 2984-8288, ISSN Online: 2984-8385
Vol. 3 No. 6, pp. 118-127, June 2025

Transforming Graduate School Faculty Development: Insights from Training Needs Analysis

Eric Arthur N. Dio
University of St. La Salle, La Salle Ave., Bacolod City, Philippines

Author Email: e.dio@usls.edu.ph

Date received: March 31, 2025
Date revised: April 18, 2025
Date accepted: May 12, 2025

Originality: 92%
Grammarly Score: 99%
Similarity: 8%

Recommended citation:
Dio, E. A. (2025). Transforming graduate school faculty development: Insights from training needs analysis. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(6), 118-127. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.207

Abstract. This study aimed to identify the training needs of graduate school faculty at a private higher education institution in the Visayas, Philippines. Using a descriptive research design and total enumeration, 48 faculty members from the Arts & Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, and Nursing programs participated. A survey questionnaire was utilized to gather data on training attended, training needs, motivating and hindering factors, and preferred training pedagogy. Descriptive statistics were employed for analysis. Results showed that most faculty had participated in development training in the past five years, particularly in educational technology, learning management systems (LMS), and research ethics. Despite being highly experienced educators with over 10 years of experience, participants expressed the need for ongoing training. The most attended training included technology use in education, LMS, research ethics, institutional research protocols, research mentoring, proposal writing, rubrics, and assessment methods. Identified training needs were instructional techniques and subject matter mastery (teaching and learning), technology use and LMS (educational technology), research publication, qualitative research, and mentoring/advising (research). Key hindrances to participation included workload, job responsibilities, limited support, cost of training, and amount of time required. Motivating factors were relevant topics, expert speakers, and convenient schedules. Preferred training modes were seminars, certification/diploma courses, and workshops. The study recommends that an effective and comprehensive faculty development program be formulated and adopted to provide continual training that would enhance the skills and knowledge of the faculty, adapting to the current demands of the educational landscape.

Keywords: Educational technology; Faculty development; Faculty training challenges; Instructional techniques; Training needs.

1.0 Introduction

Effective and efficient resource management is fundamental for organizations to meet goals, sustain operations, and support long-term growth. Among these resources, human capital remains central to achieving institutional success, particularly in knowledge-driven organizations like higher education institutions (HEIs). Human resource development, primarily through targeted training, enhances individual competencies and the institution's capacity to adapt to evolving educational demands. Contemporary models of HRM emphasize employee development as a strategic function that strengthens institutional performance (Nica, 2022).

In HEIs, training faculty is essential to maintaining academic excellence. Faculty members must continuously update their knowledge, teaching methodologies, and use of technology to meet the dynamic expectations of learners and the global academic community. Alamro (2021) emphasized the critical role of teaching in shaping competent and values-driven citizens, while Mohiuddin et al. (2022) argued that higher education institutions

contribute significantly to societal welfare by producing a knowledgeable and engaged workforce. In the Philippines, graduate education—classified under Levels 7 and 8 of the Philippine Qualifications Framework—requires institutions to deliver advanced, integrative, and research-intensive instruction aligned with the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order Number 15, Series of 2019.

Despite this mandate, faculty development programs were placed on hold during the pandemic. With the return to regular academic operations, there is an urgent need to design responsive training programs for graduate faculty. To ensure relevance and effectiveness, it is essential to assess current faculty training needs and the factors that motivate or hinder their participation. This study was, therefore, conducted to identify these needs and challenges, forming the basis for a comprehensive and future-ready faculty development program.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

To ensure that the research objectives were addressed systematically, a suitable design was selected based on the nature of the inquiry. A descriptive approach was deemed most appropriate since the study focused on understanding current conditions and perceptions without manipulating variables. The study, therefore, utilized a descriptive research design. Stangor (2011) discussed descriptive research as describing and identifying attributes of a particular phenomenon or current state. In this study, the participants' profile was described, along with their perceived training needs and the motivating and hindering factors that affected their decision or situation to attend job-related training and activities.

2.2 Research Participants

The study's participants were the graduate school faculty members from 2019-2024. Five academic years were covered due to the unique operations of the Graduate School, wherein a faculty member may not be given an academic load continuously but may be given after 2-3 years or more years, depending on the program's need. The study included both part-time and full-time faculty, adults, but not those more than 59 years old. There are around 50-60 faculty members in the Graduate School. Total enumeration was employed; however, as an inclusion criterion, those who are retired, resigned, and those part-time faculty identified as non-rehire were not eligible to be part of the study. A total of 48 graduate school faculty members were able to participate in the study.

2.3 Research Instrument

The study utilized a survey questionnaire as its primary research instrument. The constructs were primarily based on the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines (CEAP) framework, which was also employed in the study by Estacio et al. (2020). The original CEAP questionnaire contained only nine items and did not reflect recent educational developments, such as learning management systems. Additional variables were incorporated into the questionnaire. The instrument underwent the Good and Scates validity test. It was reviewed and validated by one School Dean, two Department Chairs, and two faculty members, resulting in an average rating of 4.89. The instrument was subjected to a reliability test, and a Cronbach's Alpha score of 0.944 was obtained, indicating high internal consistency.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The study commenced by requesting the agency's consent from the university through the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (AVCAA). After the approval of the AVCAA, the researcher requested the faculty list and official university email of the target participants. Emails were sent to the target participants using their institutional email addresses and informing them of the background and rationale of the study. Participants were informed of their rights as participants and their choice to participate or not to participate in the study. A link to the Google Form was attached, and they can proceed to the link if they wish to participate in the study. Before answering the actual questions of the survey, an informed consent form (ICF) was filled out by the participant indicating his or her understanding of the study and questionnaire, in addition to his or her free and voluntary participation. For the online survey, the participant indicated this by reading the informed consent form, and a button should be clicked indicating understanding and consent. The researcher explained to the participants the purpose of the study, the data-gathering process, and how the data would be used and disposed of. Before answering, the survey questionnaire was presented to the participants to assess the questions and information that needed to be gathered. Other items, such as rights to anonymity, benefits of the study, confidentiality, the

right to withdraw, and the right to a copy of the consent form, were also discussed with the participants. Although no known risk was identified and reported, this was mitigated by ensuring no personal information was gathered, and anonymity was part of the questionnaire. Furthermore, the survey used Google Drive, which has a high level of cybersecurity.

2.5 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, such as frequency counts and percentages, were used. The data were presented and analyzed using frequencies and percentages to identify the participants' profile, training attendance, motivating and hindering factors, and preferred training pedagogy. The mean and standard deviation were used to determine the training needs. The mean scores result was interpreted using the following guide:

Table 1. *Scale, Mean, and Verbal Description*

Scale	Mean	Verbal Description
4	3.50-4.00	Very High need for the particular training area/topic
3	2.50-3.49	High need for the particular training area/topic
2	1.50-2.49	Low need for the particular training area/topic
1	1.00-1.49	Very Low need for the particular training area/topic

2.6 Ethical Considerations

The study underwent an ethics review by the Research Ethics Review Office, which is accredited by the Philippine Health Research Ethics Board (PHREB). It began only after receiving ethical clearance from the Research Ethics Review Committee. Agency consent was secured through the approval of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The researcher also obtained the free and prior informed consent of all participants. During the survey, participants' preferred time and location were respected. Participation was voluntary, and those who chose not to participate were fully respected. No incentives, compensation, or reimbursement were provided. Confidentiality was strictly observed, identities were not disclosed, and all raw data were destroyed after processing. To ensure safety when answering online and paper-based questionnaires, the instrument excluded personal and sensitive information and focused solely on their training needs. Survey responses were securely stored. After the study, paper forms were shredded and disposed of using environmentally friendly methods. Both raw and processed data were stored in Google Cloud Storage to prevent data breaches and protect the information. Access was strictly limited to the researcher, enumerator, data processor, and statistician. Files in Google Drive were permanently deleted after the completion of the study.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Participants

Most participants (85.42%) have doctorate degrees in their specialization, and only 14.58% hold a master's degree. All participants have post-graduate degrees, which is a requirement for teaching in a graduate school. It is also worth noting that 32 or 85.42% of the participants are full-time faculty. These faculty members are teaching in their respective colleges. As regards the academic programs where the participants belong, 16 participants (33.33%) are from the Arts and Sciences, followed by Business with 11 or 22.92%. The number of participants per program would indicate the program's size in terms of the number of students. The number of years of teaching experience of the faculty was also determined. In Table 2, the graduate school faculty has a varied number of years of experience; 14 participants, or 29.17%, have been teaching in the graduate school, while 12, or 25%, have been teaching for more than 20 years already.

3.2 Training Attendance

In teaching and learning, 35 or 72.92% of the participants attended training and seminars on classroom management. This is followed by instructional techniques, with 33 participants attending. On the other hand, mastery of subject matter and motivational techniques were the least taught, and the learning topics the participants could attend. Around 36 or 75 % of the participants could attend the learning evaluation training. This includes evaluating students, rubrics, and assessment methods and techniques. On the other hand, educational technology training is among the highly attended training courses by the participants. This contributed to the modality change during the pandemic, wherein classes were conducted online and eventually a hybrid of online and face-to-face. Also, the university established the Academic Information Management Systems (AIMS) and, for familiarization, conducted training. A respectable number of the participants were able

to attend research-related training. Research Ethics (79.17%), Institutional Research Protocol (77.08%), Research Mentoring/Advising (75%), and Proposal Writing (75%) are among the top research topics that the participants were able to attend. Although Qualitative Research garnered the lowest, 31 or 64.58% of the participants could still attend. Data shows that in various areas, the majority of the participants could attend these trainings, with education technology training garnering the highest frequency and mastery of subject matter and motivational techniques garnering the lowest. This indicates that the graduate school faculty of the university are well-trained professionals and continually improve their skills and capabilities by attending relevant seminars and training.

Table 2. *Profile of the Participants*

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Highest Educational Degree		
Master's Degree	7	14.58
Doctorate Degree	41	85.42
Faculty Status		
Full-Time	32	85.42
Part-Time	16	14.58
Graduate Program Where Faculty Belongs		
Arts & Sciences	16	33.33
Business	11	22.92
Education	9	18.75
Engineering	8	16.67
Nursing	4	8.33
Years of Teaching Experience In the Graduate School		
less than 5	5	10.42
5-10	14	29.17
11-15	9	18.75
15-20	8	16.67
more than 20	12	25.00

Table 3. *Training Attendance of the Participants*

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching and Learning		
Organization & Planning for Instruction	31	64.58
Mastery of Subject Matter	28	58.33
Motivational Techniques	28	58.33
Instructional Techniques	33	68.75
Classroom Management	35	72.92
Learning Evaluation		
Evaluating Students	34	70.83
Rubrics	36	75.00
Assessment Methods & Techniques	36	75.00
Educational Technology		
Use of Technology in Education	43	89.58
Learning Management System (CANVAS)	43	89.58
Academic Information Management Systems (AIMS)	35	72.92
Research		
Research Mentoring/Advising	36	75.00
Proposal Writing	36	75.00
Review of Related Literature	33	68.75
Institutional Research Protocol	37	77.08
Research Ethics	38	79.17
Quantitative Research	34	70.83
Qualitative Research	31	64.58
Research Publication	33	68.75
Others	8	16.67

3.3 Training Needs

Teaching and Learning

Teaching and learning are processes wherein the educator identifies and develops learning objectives and implements teaching strategies that combine various elements (Munna & Kalam, 2021). Among the various areas of teaching and learning, Instruction Techniques garnered the highest mean with 2.60 SD ±1.00, interpreted as High. According to Seechaliao et al. (2017), instructional techniques, also known as pedagogy, are composed of

various methods such as teaching by lecturing, teaching by demonstrating, teaching by using small group discussion, teaching by using simulations, using field trips as teaching technique, teaching by using induction and teaching by using deduction. They further added that instructional techniques are one type of educational innovation. As an educational innovation, faculty can use pedagogy to help them effectively deliver their lectures. The need for training in instructional techniques may vary from one university to another or even from one faculty member to another. Estacio et al. (2020) provided a different result, which showed that no training is needed in this area in the school of their study. On the other hand, Amparado et al. (2017) showed that developing teaching materials and tools for instruction is an immediate training need for their faculty. In graduate school, the need for training in instructional techniques may be prompted by the fact that they are dealing with post-graduate, adult learners and that the usual lecture-type, teacher-centered approach may be ineffective.

Table 4. *Teaching and Learning Area*

Indicators	Mean	±SD	Interpretation
Organization & Planning for Instruction	2.54	0.97	High
Mastery of Subject Matter	2.56	0.97	High
Motivational Techniques	2.52	1.01	High
Instructional Techniques	2.60	1.00	High
Classroom Management	2.21	0.92	Low
Overall Mean	**2.49**	**0.97**	**Low**

Mastery of subject matter follows instructional techniques in terms of the training needs of the graduate school faculty, with a Mean Score of 2.56 and SD ±0.97. Bueno (2023), in his analysis, discussed that mastery of subject matter is a key factor in achieving educational objectives. Bueno added that students' satisfaction and achievement is higher if they have highly knowledgeable professors. This would denote that ongoing professional development to enhance the faculty's subject knowledge must be done regularly (Bueno, 2023; Trivette et al., 2017). The participants' acknowledgment of continual learning to enhance and keep abreast of the latest information on their subject matter would indicate the willingness and commitment of the faculty to continual improvement.

Learning Evaluation

Table 5 shows that in terms of Learning Evaluation, there is a high need for training for Rubrics and Assessment Methods, with both having a mean of 2.69. DeLuca et al. (2019) mentioned in their study that educational policies and professional standards have prioritized assessment-driven teaching as a core instructional strategy and have established teacher assessment literacy as a fundamental competency for the contemporary educator. This thought was further supported by Ewais et al. (2020), who discussed that to meet the course objectives, learning goals, outcomes, and assessment tools must be aligned.

Table 5. *Learning Evaluation Area*

Indicators	Mean	±SD	Interpretation
Evaluating Students	2.54	0.92	High
Rubrics	2.69	1.01	High
Assessment Methods & Techniques	2.69	0.99	High
Overall Mean	**2.64**	**0.97**	**High**

Ragupathi and Lee (2020) presented the importance of rubrics as they provide scoring guides that give students a better understanding of what is being assessed, on what criteria grades are based, and what standards are expected. Furthermore, they discussed that a rubric is an assessment tool that explicitly lists the criteria for student work and articulates the levels of quality for each criterion. On the other hand, Meijer et al. (2020) discussed how assessment is becoming more of a challenge to higher education teachers due to changes in the academic landscape, such as the now popularly used approach of collaborative learning. They added that construct validity and the elicitation of the correct behavior among students in the collaborative learning approach pose challenges in assessment. Considering that most graduate school faculty employ collaborative learning as one teaching strategy, participants may have concluded that effective rubric construction and assessment are necessary.

Educational Technology

Another area assessed by this study is the use of technology in education, together with the specific use of a learning management system (LMS) and the academic information management system (AIMS). The faculty of

the Graduate School acknowledged a high need, particularly for the use of educational technology, with a mean of 2.63 SD ±0.96. The use of technology in education has become crucial at present if teachers want to connect with students. Present-day students are known to be digital natives with access to various digital platforms and technology, making information readily available through their computers, tablets, and smartphones (Jones et al., 2018), thus teachers must enhance their teaching strategies and instructional models with innovative educational technology (Jaipal-Jamani, et al., 2018). Cam et al. (2021) discussed that in the studies of Ilter (2014) and Keengwe and Georgina (2012), most teachers only use PowerPoint presentations, data storage, and downloading. Hunter (2016) espoused the use of technology in developing teaching pedagogy and instructional materials in all content courses.

Table 6. *Educational Technology Area*

Indicators	Mean	±SD	Interpretation
Use of Technology in Education	2.63	0.96	High
Learning Management System (LMS)	2.56	1.01	High
Academic Info Mgt System (AIMS)	2.52	0.99	High
Overall Mean	**2.57**	**0.99**	**High**

The faculty were also asked about their need for training on the University's LMS and AIMS, which were both recognized as high need, with a Mean of 2.56 SD **±**1.01 for LMS and 2.52 SD **±**0.99 for AIMS. Although both platforms have been used intensively since around 2020, some functionality and features of the two systems may not have been fully utilized. Thus, a need for training. Zanjani (2017) in his study discussed that LMSs are instrumental in providing knowledge sharing, collaboration, critical thinking, and higher-order thinking. Zanjani also discussed how LMS has become a central platform for many universities to deliver e-learning. In the case of the academic information system, or AIMS, Rachmat et al. (2022) discussed AIMS as an important support infrastructure that can facilitate academic service activities for students and teachers and promote a conducive learning atmosphere. LMS and AIMS are two important educational technology tools for the study participants. LMS is used for the enhancement of the delivery of learning, while AIMS is used for recording, grade verification, and student evaluation. The high need for training, as indicated by the study participants, may have been due to the necessity to fully utilize the systems' features.

Research

Table 7 presents that in the research area, Research Publication training posed the highest need among the graduate school faculty, with a mean of 2.85, verbally interpreted as high with SD ±0.88. This is followed by Research Mentoring and Qualitative Research, with a mean score of 2.75 (High). In their study, Abouelenein et al. (2016) recognize the need for research training in providing quality education. They have also recommended their university research training in research ethics, writing, statistics, journal editing, and publication. Commission on the Higher Education Department (CHED) 's memorandum (CMO 15; S., 2019) emphasized the importance of publishing graduate school faculty research in international, national, and local journals. Furthermore, part of the functions of the GS faculty is to mentor students in their research in course requirements, along with thesis and dissertations. In the study of Sicat et al. (2016), research advising, mentoring, and conducting qualitative methods were also recognized as urgent training needs.

Table 7. *Research Area*

Indicators	Mean	±SD	Interpretation
Research Mentoring/Advising	2.75	0.98	High
Proposal Writing	2.56	1.03	High
Review of Related Literature	2.56	0.99	High
Institutional Research Protocol	2.63	0.96	High
Research Ethics	2.63	0.96	High
Quantitative Research	2.58	0.94	High
Qualitative Research	2.75	1.02	High
Research Publication	2.85	0.88	High
Overall Mean	2.66	0.97	High

Chin et al. (2022) discussed in their study on teachers' professional development that research is one of the focus areas identified by their participants as a need for their development. This has emerged both in their qualitative and quantitative analysis. In the study of Real (2023), findings show that teachers have manifested competencies in research; however, they have further recommended the continuation of research training, particularly

attendance in conferences and seminars related to their field. This would indicate that research training is a continual process for professors to be adept in new trends, information, and skills in their field of specialization.

3.4 Factors that Motivate Participants to Attend Training

When the participants were asked about what reasons or factors would motivate them to attend faculty development training (Table 8), 31 participants, or 64.58% responded that relevant training topics, followed by speakers with high expertise with 30 participants, or 62.50%, and convenient training time with 26 or 54.17% of the participants. It can be seen that the faculty participants are willing to attend faculty development training provided that this could add value to their knowledge and skills, consequently providing personal and professional growth.

As mentioned by Dailey-Hebert et al. (2014), faculty are very particular about opportunities that capitalize on their motivation for growth and reward their investment. Consistent with the discussed barriers or hindering factors to training, which mentioned being busy at work as the topmost reason, participants are willing to attend if the time is convenient. Motivational factors may again vary per institution and person. In the study of Roodi (2023), salaries and wages, training incentives, and persuading professors are the top motivating factors. On the other hand, in the study of Dailey-Hebert et al. (2014), the desire to enhance learning, pay increases, professional growth, personal interest, and the monetary compensation for training are the topmost reasons.

Table 8. *Factors that Motivate Participants to Attend Training*

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Relevant training topics	31	64.58
Speakers with high expertise	30	62.50
Convenient training time	26	54.17
Prestigious Certificate/diploma	24	50.00
Convenient training location	23	47.92
Available training information	20	41.67
Budget allocation for training	18	37.50
Online training	18	37.50
Enjoyable/ not boring training programs	18	37.50
Recognition of training in job promotions	18	37.50
Affordable training cost	16	33.33
Company incentives	16	33.33
Opportunities to travel if the training is outside the city	1	2.08
If friends are also attending	1	2.08

3.5 Factors that Hinder Participants from Attending Training

Table 9 presents a range of factors that may hinder participants from attending development training. Thirty of the participants, or 62.50%, believed that being too busy at work was the primary reason for not attending faculty development training. Job responsibility was also indicated by 29 or 60.42% of the participants. Limited support for training, cost of training, and the amount of time required for training are the third factors that hinder faculty participants of the study from attending training at 31.25% or 15 participants.

In their study, Chin et al. (2022) also indicated work schedule conflict as a barrier to training, as mentioned by their study participants. However, they have also included training cost and pre-requisites to training (qualifications, experience, seniority) as major barriers. In another study conducted among medical college professors in Bangladesh, findings show work overload as the second topmost reason hindering their faculty from attending training (Rahman, 2018). The study of understanding the barriers and hindering factors to attending training would help in the design of an appropriate faculty development plan or program and ensure proper attendance. In the case of Dailey-Hebert et al. (2014), scheduling, irrelevant topics, and untimely initiative are the main barriers their participants have cited. As Abouelenein et al. (2016) discussed in their study, faculty development is both a self-development and institutional development, thus, training ensures improved quality standards of an HEI.

Table 9. *Factors that Hinder Participants from Attending Training*

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Too busy at work	30	62.50
Job Responsibilities	29	60.42
Limited support for training	15	31.25
Cost of Training	15	31.25
Amount of time required for training	15	31.25
Training topics are not relevant	14	29.17
Lack of support	10	20.83
No Information about the offered training	10	20.83
Training offered at an inconvenient /far place	8	16.67
Limited support for training	8	16.67
Family responsibilities	7	14.58
I do not feel the need for training	6	12.50
Health reasons	5	10.42
Cost of learning materials	5	10.42
Training is offered at an inconvenient time	4	8.33
No budget for training	4	8.33
Cost of learning materials	3	6.25
The topics I want do not seem to be available	3	6.25
Financial Constraints	3	6.25
No available in-house training	3	6.25
I do not feel the need for training	2	4.17
No available externally offered training	2	4.17
I do not enjoy training	1	2.08
Training topics	1	2.08

3.6 Preferred Training Pedagogy

Bilal et al. (2019), citing the works of Guraya et al. (2016), discussed that a dynamic and energetic faculty development program can lead to the enrichment of faculty skills in five domains, namely: teaching, assessment, curriculum, organizational leadership, and mentoring. It is imperative that all faculty training be aligned with the preferred delivery of the target participants. In this study, the faculty were asked about their preferred training pedagogy. Seminars proved to be the top choice with 29 participants, or 60.42%, choosing this mode of training. Certification is the next choice with 25 participants or 52.08%, followed by diploma courses with 23 participants or 47.92% favoring this training pedagogy.

Table 10. *Preferred Training Pedagogy*

Pedagogy	Frequency	Percentage
Seminars	29	60.42
Certification training	25	52.08
Diploma courses	23	47.92
Workshops	21	43.75
Online Certifications	19	39.58
Intensive training	17	35.42
Webinars	16	33.33
Online training	16	33.33
Use of Apps	8	16.67
Computer-based training	5	10.42
Hands-on training	2	4.17
Case studies	2	4.17

3.7 Summary of the Overall Mean Score per Area

The results of the training needs assessment reveal that graduate school faculty members express the highest need for development in the areas of Research, Learning & Evaluation, and Educational Technology, all of which were interpreted as High. These findings indicate that faculty members seek further support in enhancing their research competencies, improving strategies for assessing student learning, and effectively integrating educational technologies into their instruction. In contrast, the area of Teaching & Learning received a lower Mean score, with a Low interpretation. This suggests that faculty members feel relatively more confident in their current teaching methods and classroom management practices and thus perceive less need for additional training in this area. Overall, the results point to a growing demand for specialized and advanced training in research and evaluation

practices, as well as digital tools for teaching—key areas that are essential in maintaining academic excellence and adapting to the evolving demands of graduate education.

Table 11. *Overall Mean Score per Area*

Area	Mean	±SD	Interpretation
Research	2.66	0.97	High
Learning & Evaluation	2.64	0.97	High
Educational Technology	2.63	0.96	High
Teaching & Learning	2.49	0.97	Low

4.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings of this research highlight the key insights and implications that address the central objectives of the study. Concerning the training attended by the participants, the top training attended was Use of Technology in Education, Learning Management System (CANVAS), Research Ethics, Institutional Research Protocol, Research Mentoring/Advising, Proposal Writing, Rubrics, Assessment Methods & Techniques. Regarding the training needs indicated by the participants, instructional techniques and mastery of the subject matter are the top two needs in the teaching and learning area. In the educational technology area, the use of technology and the Learning Management System are the two highest needs in terms of training. Lastly, research publication, qualitative research, and research mentoring/advising were recognized by the participants as training needs in the area of research.

Being too busy at work, having job responsibilities, limited support for training, cost of training and amount of time required for training were the top reasons considered by the participants as hindrances or challenges in attending faculty development training. On the other hand, relevant training topics, speakers with high expertise, and convenient training were the top considerations to motivate the graduate school faculty to participate in training using seminars, certification/diploma courses, and workshops. Generally, the graduate school faculty are highly trained in various facets of their academic function. However, this does not hinder them from continually improving their skills and knowledge by seeking training opportunities.

5.0 Contribution of Authors

The sole author reviewed the final content of the paper.

6.0 Funding

This paper is funded by the university's Center for Research and Engagement through its Faculty Research Program.

7.0 Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this research.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The author would like to express his heartfelt acknowledgment and sincere gratitude to the Center for Research and Engagement, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Graduate School for their invaluable support in facilitating this research. Their guidance and resources were instrumental in completing this study.

9.0 References

Abouelenein, Y. A. M. (2016). Training needs for faculty members: Towards achieving quality of university education in the light of technological innovations. Educational Research and Reviews, 11(13), 1180-1193. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2015.2377

Alamro, A. R. (2021). Training needs in light of the degree of awareness of modern teaching strategies and their application in the tertiary level during the COVID-19 pandemic. Education Research International, 2021, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8521514

Amparado, M. A., Bedina, S., & Agbay, C. (2017). Training needs analysis of a university in Central Visayas, Philippines. IAMURE, 19(1), 77-87. https://tinyurl.com/4wk63hjf

Bilal, S., Guraya, Y., Chen, S. (2019). The impact and effectiveness of faculty development program in fostering the faculty's knowledge, skills, and professional competence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences, 26(4), 688-697. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2017.10.024

Bueno, D. C. (2023). Examining faculty's mastery of subject matter: A student-centered analysis. Institutional Multidisciplinary Research and Development Journal, 4, 1-6. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED631162.pdf

Çam, Ş. S., & Erdamar Koç, G. (2021). A needs analysis study on technological pedagogical content knowledge of faculty members. Education and Information Technologies, 26(5), 5337–5363. https://doi:10.1007/s10639-021-10540-0

Chin, J. M. C., Ching, G. S., del Castillo, F., Wen, T. H., Huang, Y. C., del Castillo, C. D., Gungon, J. L., & Trajera, S. M. (2022). Perspectives on the barriers to and needs of teachers' professional development in the Philippines during COVID-19. Sustainability, 14(1), 470. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010470

Commission on Higher Education. (2019). CMO No. 15, series of 2019: Policies, standards and guidelines for graduate programs. https://tinyurl.com/78wwrh3k

Dailey-Hebert, A., Mandernach, B. J., Donnelli-Sallee, E., Norris, V. R. (2014). Expectations, motivations, and barriers to professional development: Perspectives from adjunct instructors teaching online. Journal of Faculty Development, 28(1), 67–82. https://tinyurl.com/4e9w3ss7

DeLuca, C., Chapman-Chin, A., & Klinger, D. A. (2019). Toward a teacher professional learning continuum in assessment for learning. Educational Assessment, 24(4), 267–285. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2019.1670056

Estacio, M. B., Ramos, B. A., Fulong, L.V., Ramirez, R. L. & Baptista, G. O. (2020). Training needs assessment of the faculty of a university in northern Philippines: A cohort study. *Salettinian Open Academic Review*, 2(1). https://www.ejournals.ph/article.php?id=16427

Ewais, A., Awad, M., & Hadia, K. (2020). Aligning learning materials and assessment with course learning outcomes in MOOCs using data mining techniques. In I. Hatzilygeroudis, I. Perikos, & F. Grivokostopoulou (Eds.), Advances in Integrations of Intelligent Methods (Vol. 170, pp. 1–25). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1918-5_1

Guraya, S. Y., Guraya, S. S., Mahabbat, N. A., Fallatah, K. Y., Al-Ahmadi, B. A., Alalawi, H. H. (2016). The desired concept maps and goal setting for assessing professionalism in medicine. Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research (JCDR), 10(5), JE01. https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2016/19917.783

Hunter, M. A. (2016). Innovative approaches to faculty development for technology integration: Evaluation of a three-tiered model (Doctoral dissertation). Fielding Graduate University

İlter, İ. (2014). Teacher candidates' opinions related to the methods and techniques used by the instructors. The Journal of International Social Research, 7(35), 532–575. https://tinyurl.com/2hwky5w8

Jaipal-Jamani, K., Figg, C., Collier, D., Gallagher, T., Winters, K. L., & Ciampa, K. (2018). Developing TPACK of university faculty through technology leadership roles. Italian Journal of Educational Technology, 26(1), 39-55. https://doi.org/10.17471/2499-4324/984

Jones, S., Johnson-Yale, C., Millermaier, S., & Pérez, F. S. (2009). U.S. college students' internet use: Race, gender, and digital divides. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14(2), 244–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01439.x

Keengwe, J., & Georgina, D. (2012). The digital course training workshop for online learning and teaching. Education and Information Technologies, 17(4), 365–379. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-011-9164-x

Nica, A. (2022). Trust and competency: An organizational performance perspective. Journal of Defense Resources Management, 13(1), 41-57. https://tinyurl.com/99w7vbb8

Meijer, H., Hoekstra, R., Brouwer, J., & Strijbos, J. W. (2020). Unfolding collaborative learning assessment literacy: A reflection on current assessment methods in higher education. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45(8), 1222–1240. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1729696

Mohiuddin, M., Hosseini, E., Faradonbeh, S. B., & Sabokro, M. (2022). Achieving human resource management sustainability in universities. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(2), 928. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19020928

Munna, A., Kalam, M. A. (2021). Teaching and learning process to enhance teaching effectiveness: Literature review. International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI) 4, 1-4. https://doi.org/10.33750/ijhi.v4i1.102

Rachmat, A. R., Baharuddin Hamzah, B. H., & Muhammad Niswar, M. N. (2022). Evaluation of academic information system using Delone and Mclean success model: A case study of academic information system Hasanuddin University. Jurnal Sistem Informasi, 18(1), 62-75. https://doi.org/10.21609/jsi.v18i1.1114

Ragupathi, K., & Lee, A. (2020). Beyond fairness and consistency in grading: The role of rubrics in higher education. In: C.S. Sanger & N.W. Gleason (Eds.), Diversity and inclusion in global higher education: Lessons from across Asia (pp. 73-95). Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1628-3

Rahman, S., Noman, F., Sultana, A., & Khatoon, S. (2018). Barriers to faculty development in undergraduate medical education in Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Medical Education, 9(10). https://doi.org/10.3329/bjme.v9i1.36232

Real, D. V. C. (2023). Training needs analysis of the teachers in a university in Cavite, Philippines. SDCA Asia-Pacific Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 5(2), 15. https://doi:10.5281/zenodo.8219668

Roodi, M. (2023). Factors and solutions affecting the success of development and improvement programs for faculty members. Quarterly Journal of Training and Development of Human Resources 10(38), 32-59. https://istd.saminatech.ir/en/Article/44038

Sicat, A. T., Bagtas, E. M., & Calaguas, J. Q. (2016). Faculty training needs assessment in research: Input to the development of a faculty research development program. Ad Meliora, 35-48. https://rpo.ua.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/2-Training-Needs-Assessment.pdf

Stangor, C. (2011). Research methods for the behavior science (4th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Trivette, C. M., Dunst, C. J., Hamby, D. W., & O'Herin, C. E. (2009). Characteristics and consequences of adult learning methods and strategies. Research Brief, 3(1), 1-33. https://tinyurl.com/ynpr5kvz

Zanjani, N. (2017). The important elements of LMS design that affect user engagement with e-learning tools within LMSs in the higher education sector. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 33(1). https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.2938