Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers
The PROFESIOLab electronic, peer-reviewed, open-access Magazine

ISSN 1989 – 9572

DOI: 10.47750/jett.2023.14.05.033

Professional Learning Community And Institutional Organizational Performance Of A Public Higher Education Institution In Region 02 Philippines

Anderson G. Gonzales*

Journal for Educators,Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (5)

https://jett.labosfor.com/

Date of reception: 08 May 2023

Date of revision: 21 June 2023

Date of acceptance:13 July 2023

Anderson G. Gonzales (2023). Professional Learning Community And Institutional Organizational Performance Of A Public Higher Education Institution In Region 02 Philippines.*Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*,Vol. 14(5). 346-366

---

[1]Associate Professor 2, College of Engineering and Architecture,Cagayan State University,

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers
The LabOSfor electronic, peer-reviewed, open-access Magazine

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (5)
ISSN 1989 –9572
https://jett.labosfor.com/

Professional Learning Community And Institutional Organizational Performance Of A Public Higher Education Institution In Region 02 Philippines

Anderson G. Gonzales*
Associate Professor 2, College of Engineering and Architecture,Cagayan State University,
Email: andy.gonzales@csucarig.edu.ph,

ABSTRACT
This study examined the levels of professional learning community (PLC) among faculty members and their relationship to the organizational performance (OP) of a public higher education institution (HEI). Specifically, it examined the profile of the respondents, their levels of professional learning community as well as the overall and per campus organizational performance of the HEI.
This study employed mixed research design and the study was conducted in the different campuses of a public higher education institution in region 02, Philippines. Respondents of this study composed of 210 faculty members who were given regular plantilla positions in the institutions and have served five or more years in the university. The study used random-proportional sampling. The CEOs and the college deans of the different campuses are the study participants of this study.
In determining the frequency count, rank, percentage, and mean, descriptive statistics was used to analyze the respondents' profile and their level of PLC. Analysis of variance was utilized in assessing the differences ofPLC and OP. All analyses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using IBM SPSS. Sequential explanatory design was utilized to analyze the factors explaining the quantitative result of the study through interview with the CEOs and select deans of different colleges in the campuses.

Keywords: Professional Learning Community, Organizational Performance, Higher Education Institution

INTRODUCTION

Organizations typically have their own unique characteristics or personality that define the environment in which employees carry out their responsibilities (Paajanen, et al., 2005). The environment which characterizes this organization reflects its culture. Many organizations are competing to survive in this volatile and fierce market environment. In such condition both motivation and performance of the employees are essential tools for the success of any organization in the long run. Having highly motivated and high performing employees bring high organizational performance. However, one of the critical issues in organizational outcomes is "measuring performance as it highlights the evolution and achievement of the organization" (Dobre O.I., 2013).
Premised that organizational performance (OP) or outcomes is closely connected to motivation, a study conducted byZlate & Cucui (2015) claimed that developing organizational strategies for motivating the university employees becomes the main goal of organizational management nowadays in order to improve the organizational performances/outcomes. One of the strategies is the provision of incentives like bonuses, travels and other perks which may extrinsically motivate employees to contribute to organizational success.
Aside from improving employee motivation, a critical concern is how to measure organizational performance (OP). Traditionally, organizational performance was focused on what institutions have in terms of financial inputs and resources. But currently, there has been a shift from evaluating inputs to outcomes(Liu, 2011). In this context, outcomes have been evaluated through a comparison between the last results of an organization and its objectives as well as goals (Hooi & Payambarpour, 2017). Inasmuch as organizations would want to deliver a positive and rewarding outcomes, employees are expected to work collaboratively, with passion, love, and commitment to ensure that Major Final Outputs (MFOs) are met, and all employees have bested the targets being set.
In a competitive and high performing organization, a high-level performance of an organization is a must. Employees are enabled to take greater ownership of their jobs When there is a high level of performance, and go beyond their personal interests for the sustained development of the organization (Gould-Williams, 2003 as mentioned byOgbonnaya & Valizade, (2018)).
In the Philippines, organizational performance (OP) for government owned and controlled corporations and agencies are measured using the unified Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS). "The RBPMS is an integrated tool that serves as a single performance management, monitoring, and measurement

system for the Philippine national government agencies (NGAs), government-owned and -controlled corporations (GOCCs), select constitutional commissions, state universities and colleges (SUCs), and water districts, in place of the multiple and disparate performance management systems that were implemented before RBPMS' implementation" (dap.edu.ph, 2018). The RBPMS also aids in determining entitlement for incentives of agencies and employees. This is with the goal of recognizing commendable accomplishments of agencies and employees in the government.

On the other hand, various study indicates that Professional Learning Community (PLC) has a strong relationship with organizational performance(Akhtar et al., 2018; Hussein et al., 2014). Through PLC, teachers create a space where they can engage in useful conversations to help them perform well in their functions inside and outside their classrooms(Capili-Balbalin, 2017). Interestingly, the dimensions of PLC that help in organizational performance include, a) supportive and shared leadership; b) shared vision and mission; c) collegial trust; d) shared practices. Congruently, these factors are essential to the organization's formation and sustainability of PLCs (Pang & Wang, 2016a).

Professional learning community (PLC)has been defined in many ways. From an organizational perspective, PLC is defined as a community where it is perceived as a whole-school reform requiring commitment and active participation of each member to improve student learning (Capili-Balbalin, 2017).

The model of PLC being established in Wales is characterized by teachers participating in decision-making, having a sense of purpose, engaging in collaborative work, and accepting joint responsibility for the outcomes of their work. Empowering teachers in this way and providing them with opportunities to lead is based on a simple but powerful idea that if schools are to meet learners' needs, they must provide opportunities for teachers to innovate, develop, and learn together (Harris & Jones, 2010). PLC model in Wales is one that embraces networking and collaboration and has the potential to secure significant change and improvement(Ghosh et al., 2009;Harris & Jones, 2010; Spillane et al., 2016). This really confirms that PLC supports the networks of schools and can motivate and increase innovation as well as collaborate to raise collective and individual performance(Spillane et al., 2016). Many developed countries like the United States and in Asia like China, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Korea, have adopted the concept of PLC and have noticed significant impacts to their educational systems. There may be variations in their conceptualization of PLC and the differences in practices, nevertheless, a closer examination of their implementation has revealed fundamental similarities (Pang & Wang, 2016b).

Since 1950, China has a long history of developing teachers' professional proficiency and teaching skills through partnership or teamwork in school-based frameworks. A study in this country proves PLC is a great model in achieving positive outcomes (Capili-Balbalin, 2017). Chen (2020) had found out in her study that PLC in China has remained a top-down teacher collaboration strategy for their professional development and claimed that it has improved school performance.

In South Korea, Lee & Kim (2016) claimed that its government has started its initial stage of supporting school-based PLCs by formulating relevant rules and regulations. They found out that teachers in South Korea showed the highest extent of involvement in three components of school-based PLCs: Shared vision, De-privatized Practice, and Collaborative Teaching (joint teaching). Further, they revealed that the level (i.e., frequency) of South Korean teachers' involvement in their school-based PLCs in three components was significantly higher than those of teachers in other countries.

In Singapore education,Salleh(2016) proposed PLC facilitation framework. The study revealed that the formed framework was not only supportive of the development and maintenance of PLCs, but it also ensured that learning in PLC is effectively translated to teaching practices and in ensuring the sustainability of the PLCs.

To date, there are scant studies in the Philippines investigating the relationship between PLC and OP. With the implementation of RBPMS, many higher education institutions have missed to avail the Performance Based Bonus (PBB) incentive. Faculty and administrative staff of have been curious in examining the factors that may possibly explain why some parameters of its organizational outcomes as reflected in the PBB were missed. Some claim, that it can be attributed to the fragmented system in which the university approaches its planning, implementation, and evaluation of organizational outcomes. Still, others attribute it to the inability of the university officials and employees to collaborate and empower each other towards the attainment of planned organizational outcomes.

It is within this context that this study has been conceptualized to examine the association of professional learning community and organizational performance. This is with the hope to determine important points that a certain public higher institution has missed in adhering with the mandates of the government for a better organizational performance. Significantly, the study's findings will be a foothold to improve its organizational outcomes and contribute to regional and national development.

General Objective of the Study

With the above foregoing, this study aims to determine the association between the professional learning community and institutional organizational performance of a public higher education institution in region 02.

Specific Objectives of the Study

1. This study aims to determine the level of professional learning community of the respondents as revealed by the Professional Learning Community Assessment Questionnaire (PLCA).
2. This research seeks to assess the overall and per campus organizational performance of a public higher education institution in Region 02 as revealed by the parameters and results of the Performance Based Bonus (PBB) CY 2016 – 2019.
3. This study intends to determine if there is a significant difference in the level of professional learning community of the respondents when grouped according to campus assignment.
4. This study aspires to ascertain if there is a significant difference in the PLC of the respondents when their campuses are grouped according to organizational performance
5. This study aspires to determine what profile variables and PLC dimensions predict campus organizational performance.

METHODS

Research Design

A mixed research design was utilized to answer the objectives of the study. "The mixed-methods sequential explanatory design consists of two distinct phases: quantitative followed by qualitative" (Creswell et al. 2003 as mentioned by Ivankova, et al, 2006). In this design, the quantitative data is collected and analyzed first. Then the qualitative data are collected and analyzed to help explain, or elaborate on, the quantitative results obtained in the first phase. "The second, qualitative, phase builds on the first, quantitative, phase, and the two phases are connected in the intermediate stage in the study" (Ivankova et al., 2006).

The quantitative part constitutes the descriptive and inferential analysis of this study. The descriptive part examined the levels of professional learning community of the faculty members and the organizational performance of a public higher education institution in Region 02, Philippines.

On the other hand, the associational part of the study investigated the differences and relationship of the levels of PLC when respondents are grouped according to their campus assignments and organizational performance of their campuses. The qualitative part utilized sequential explanatory design as the researcher uncovered the factors explaining the result of the study. This was done through interview with the Campus Executive Officers and select deans of different colleges in the campuses.

Respondents/Participants and Sampling Procedures

The respondents of this study were the regular faculty members of this institution who have rendered five (5) years or more services to the university. The five-year inclusion criterion is to ensure that they have more or less been exposed to the university especially in its operations and other professional development undertakings. The respondents were selected using stratified random sampling. Table 1 below shows the population and sample respondents per campus.

For the study participants, there were six (6) Campus Executive Officers and nine (7) college deans who answered the structured questionnaire. Since the CEOs and deans are faculty members themselves, they were utilized as study participants for the qualitative part of the study.

Table 1: Frequency of Respondents per Campus

Campus	Total Number Of Faculty Members (Regular)	*Sample Respondents
Campus 1	118	53
Campus 2	74	33
Campus 3	113	51
Campus 4	37	17
Campus 5	27	13
Campus 6	15	7
Campus 7	25	12
Campus 8	53	24
TOTAL	462	210

*Calculated using Slovin's Formula

Research Instruments

Three instruments were used in the study. In measuring the Professional Learning Community (PLC), the Professional Learning Community Assessment – Revised (PLCA-Revised) developed byOlivier et al., (2009) was utilized. The PLCA-R assesses six dimensions of PLCs which are: shared and supportive leadership; shared values and vision; collective learning and application; shared personal practice; supportive condition –

relationships; and supportive condition – structures. This instrument has 52 items of which faculty members were asked to respond to each item using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). It can be administered on multiple occasions to track PLC development and progress over time. Some of the texts from the original PLCA-R questionnaire were contextualized to suit to the experiences and environment of the respondents. For instance, all the "staff" texts of the original PLCA-R copy were changed to "faculty" with the permission of the authors.

The internal consistency of PLCA-R was measured using Cronbach's alpha when the questionnaire was piloted in using 1,209 respondents by the developers (Blitz & Schulman, 2016). Further, the reliability of the total score in the questionnaire was found to be acceptable (.97). Reliability coefficients were also measured for each factored subscale as follows: Shared and Supportive Leadership (.94), Shared Values and Vision (.92), Collective Learning and Application (.91), Shared Personal Practice (.87), Supportive Conditions-Relationships (.82), Supportive Conditions-Structures (.88) (Blitz & Schulman, 2016).

To measure organizational performance, the performance-based bonus parameters were used. Section 1 of Executive Order No. 80, s. 2012, which directed the adoption of the PBI System for government employees defines the PBB as a top-up bonus that is given to personnel of bureaus or delivery units based on their contribution to the accomplishment of their agency/department's overall targets and commitments. The incentive is granted subject to the following criteria: 1) achievement by the departments of performance targets under their respective Major Final Outputs (MFOs), and Priority Program/Project commitments as agreed with the President under the five KRAs under EO No. 43, s.2011; and 2) accomplishment of good governance conditions set by the AO 25 IATF, established under AO 25, s.2011 to harmonize national government performance monitoring, and information and reporting systems.

Finally, a structured questionnaire was crafted to be answered by the Campus Executive Officers together with the select deans. This questionnaire elicited the factors and explanations of the quantitative data.

Data Gathering Procedures

The researcher requested permission from the University President to conduct the study through the graduate school dean. Thereafter, letter of permission was forwarded to the Campus Executive Officers seeking for the approval to float the questionnaires to the faculty members. The faculty roaster of the campus was used to randomly sample the faculty members to be the respondents of the study. The researcher administered the questionnaires through google form. The form also elicited the respondents' free and prior informed consent before proceeding to the questionnaire. Even though surveys were conducted online, guides and instructions were given to campus representatives on the proper handling of the questions being distributed.

For the qualitative part, the structured questionnaire was forwarded to the CEOs and deans of the different colleges. The study participants were interviewed either personally, through google meet and through Facebook messenger.

For the results of the PBB, the researcher sought permission from the Planning Director of the University specifically for the documents which are in the documentary analysis. The data obtained were subjected for statistical analysis after its encoding in the database.

Statistical Tools and Treatment

Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage and mean, were used to analyze the levels of professional learning community and organizational performance. The differences in the levels of professional learning community and organizational performance and profile variables of the respondents were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The test of relationships was examined using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. Meanwhile, the predictors of campus performance level were treated using discriminant analysis. Lastly, the qualitative data were used in strengthening the findings derived from the quantitative data. The best and appropriate answers or explanations were drawn to support the quantitative analysis.

For the organizational performance, the data were analyzed using the rank provided by the PBB forced-ranking committee ranging from good, better, best. The ranking and distribution of campuses is based on Inter-Agency Task Force guidelines. The delivery units, which are the 8 campuses of a public higher education institution, were forced-ranked according to their accomplishment of targets and were categorized as Best delivery unit (top 10 percent of ranked delivery unit), Better delivery units (next 25 percent), Good delivery units (remaining 65 percent). The University Performance Management Group (PMG) formed was responsible in ranking the delivery units according to their performance following a normal distribution. In this regard, the institution having eight (8) campuses has 1 best delivery unit, 2 better delivery units and 5 good delivery units. All statistical analysis was analyzed using 0.05 level of significance.

FINDINGS

The Profile of the Respondents

Table 2 illustrates the profile of the respondents. Majority of the respondents are female (124 or 59%). As to highest educational attainment, most of the respondents are holders of masteral degree (106 or 50.5%), followed by doctoral degree (92 or 43.8%) and bachelor's degree (12 or 5.7%). With regard to age group, most of the respondents have an age ranging from 40-49 (68 or 32.4%), followed by 30-39 (62 or 29.5%). As to length of service, majority of the respondents have served the institution for 5-9 years (103 or 49%). Finally, with respect to academic rank, majority of the respondents are holders of Instructor Position (104 or 49%) followed by Assistant Professor (51 or 24.3%).

Table 2: The Profile of the Respondents

Category		FREQUENCY (N=210)	PERCENT (%)
SEX	MALE	86	41
	FEMALE	124	59
AGE	20 – 29	45	21.4
	30 – 39	62	29.5
	40 – 49	68	32.4
	50 & above	35	16.7
Highest Educational Attainment	BS/AB	12	5.7
	MA/MS	106	50.5
	PhD/EdD/DPA	92	43.8
Academic Rank	Instructor 1	88	41.9
	Instructor 2	5	2.4
	Instructor 3	10	4.8
	Assistant Professor 1	12	5.7
	Assistant Professor 2	9	4.3
	Assistant Professor 3	10	4.8
	Assistant Professor 4	20	9.5
	Associate Professor 1	10	4.8
	Associate Professor 2	9	4.3
	Associate Professor 3	11	5.2
	Associate Professor 4	8	3.8
	Associate Professor 5	12	5.7
	Professor 1	3	1.4
	Professor 2	1	0.5
	Professor 3	2	1
Years of Service in the Institution	5 – 10	103	49
	11 – 15	49	23.3
	16 – 20	11	5.2
	21 – 25	22	10.5
	26 & more	25	11.9

Level of Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Supportive Leadership

Table 3 shows that the respondents' PLC along shared and supportive leadership is high ($\bar{x}$ =4.14). This means that shared and supportive leadership in this institution is seen as part of the collaborative work. With the presence of collaborative work, it may suggest that there is interaction between and among leaders and faculty members of the university in pursuit for an improvement in the organization. This may be attributed to the conduct of academic council meeting from college to university which provides opportunity for the faculty members and university officials to discuss essential and critical issues, as well as organizational goals. The shared governance through the academic council is one great platform for the university management to make the faculty members own the policies that are approved during the council meeting. As one CEO mentioned: "The academic council meeting is one good practice of the university to involve the faculty members in key decision making. We have three levels of academic council and the engagement of the faculty members in these meetings become their avenue to ventilate their problems, issues and concerns as well as in criticisms to policies adopted in the university."(CEO-3). The high PLC on shared and supportive leadership supports the finding of Stewart & Dillard, (2017) that teachers who have a concept on shared leadership fosters a multitude of interactions that build capacity for change particularly because these changes promote increased student learning".

The result of this study is similar to that of Carter & McCann (2017);Al-Mahdy & Sywelem, (2016). In their study, supportive leadership was rated high by their respondents.

The statement with the highest mean (x=4.27) is "The dean is proactive and addresses areas where support is needed". This finding means that faculty members believed that the dean, who basically managed them, directly listens to them, and utilizes the data sources in making instructional decisions which supports their needs. The yearly submission of Office Performance Commitment Report (OPCR) as well as targeting and monitoring of the performance of the different offices make the deans to plan ahead and conduct catch up plan to address deviations in realizing the targets. In the words a college dean: We are required to submit OPCR that contains our targets for each year. With this report, we tend to be proactive and address the requirements for quality assurance. Before finalizing the report, I present it before the faculty members. It is during the presentation that their support along instruction, research, extension and production is obtained." (CD-5)

The statement with lowest weighted mean of 3.96 but still with a descriptive value of high is "Faculty members have accessibility to key information". Such finding implies that faculty members are given the opportunity to avail of the information they need. It also suggests that the university observes transparency in its governance. For example, faculty members can readily obtain key information from various middle and top-level officials when they conduct research and accreditation. This situation is well elucidated by one college dean in this statement: "The university observes transparency in terms of its documents. All employees are free to come to different offices to obtain the data they need for their research and accreditation. While we observe transparency, we nonetheless require them to observe data privacy." - (CD-1).

Table 3: Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Shared and Supportive Leadership

Statements	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Shared and Supportive Leadership			
1. Faculty members are consistently involved in discussing and making decisions about most school issues.	3.98	0.93	High
2. The dean incorporates advice from faculty members to make decisions.	4.24	0.78	Very High
3. Faculty members have accessibility to key information.	3.96	0.90	High
4. The dean is proactive and addresses areas where support is needed.	4.27	0.83	Very High
5. Opportunities are provided for faculty members to initiate change.	4.11	0.83	High
6. The dean shares responsibility and rewards for innovative actions.	4.19	0.81	High
7. The dean participates democratically with faculty members sharing power and authority.	4.25	0.82	Very High
8. Leadership is promoted and nurtured among the faculty members.	4.16	0.81	High
9. Decision-making takes place through committees and communication across grade and subject areas.	4.19	0.81	High
10. Stakeholders assume shared responsibility and accountability for student learning without evidence of	3.98	0.85	High

imposed power and authority.			
11. Faculty members are multiple sources of data to make decisions about teaching and learning.	4.25	0.78	Very High
Category Mean	4.14		High

Level of Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Shared Values and Vision

Table 4 reveals that the PLC shared values and vision of the respondents is very high ($\bar{x}$ = 4.20). The very high result on shared values and visions depicts how faculty members value each other as they work together for a common goal. When asked about the reason for the very high shared values and vision of the respondents, one CEO has this to say: "The shared values and vision among faculty members is high because the middle level management discuss it with them. In fact, we conduct orientation program whenever there's a change in vision, goals, and core values of the university as this is required during accreditation. But personally, I think faculty members have shared values and vision because they see themselves united. Irrespective of changes ininstitutions' presidency, they need to work for the good of the university. Their loyalty is not on who sits as the president but for the institution which they consider as their "bread and butter"- (CD-4).

The result of the study is in congruent with the study of Al-Mahdy & Sywelem (2016) who stated that "having shared vision enables individuals to work productively as a group toward a common goal". Further, the result of this study is also analogous to the observations of Teague, (2012) who posited that "values and beliefs guide the behavior of individuals no matter where they work or in what endeavor".

Among the statements along shared values and vision, the statement that incurred the highest weighted mean ($\bar{x}$ =4.32) is "Policies and programs are aligned to the school's vision". This data suggests that there is constructive alignment between the vision and the policies and programs of the university. Such is reflected in the organizational performance set by the university relative to the SUC levelling and PBB. The various programs, activities and projects of the university as congruent with the state of life that it intends to achieve. The constructive alignment between these concerns are always examined during the conduct of strategic planning. The targets of the university in its four-fold functions are always attuned to its vision. In relation to this explanation, a CEO expressed these thoughts: "I think it is very basic in all organizations to see that its programs, projects and policies are attuned with its vision. In the case of our institution, the alignment of these things is framed during the crafting of Strategic Plan. It is this document that ensures that all activities of students, faculty members, and university officials are contributory to the realization of the vision set by management. As practiced, the making of the university vision is top-bottom and bottom-top. In effect, there is guarantee that everyone in the university provides quality and responsive education. – (CEO-6). This finding is similar to Teague's (2012) result in which the high regard of the respondents in this statement indicates adherence to the school's value statements which is to deliver quality and excellent services to its clienteles. Accordingly, the school improvement is being ensured when school's value statements outline what the community members are committed (Ciurysek et al., 2012 as mentioned by Al-Mahdy&Sywelem (2015).

The lowest rated statement with weighted mean at 4.08 but still with high descriptive value is "Data are used to prioritize actions to reach a shared vision". This finding suggests that decisions and actions in the university are data-driven and research generated. It also means that prioritization of actions is conducted such that the most essential ones are given focus. In narrative of one CEO, he said: "For the shared vision of the university to be realized, the university officials always consider relevant, complete, and timely data. For example, I remember the president in one ManCom meeting wherein she held in abeyance the decision for one agenda item because she wants a complete data before giving her action on the matter. I recalled her saying that she can always stand on an action she takes for as long as her decision is backed up with data." – (CEO 5)

Table 4: Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Shared Values and Vision

Statement	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Shared Values and Vision			
1. A collaborative process exists for developing a shared sense of values among faculty members.	4.19	0.85	High
2. Shared values support norms of behavior that guide decisions about teaching and learning.	4.24	0.82	Very High
3. Faculty members share visions for school improvement that have an undeviating focus on student learning.	4.17	0.89	High
4. Decisions are made in alignment with the school's values and vision.	4.31	0.79	Very High
5. A collaborative process exists for developing a shared vision among faculty members.	4.22	0.87	Very High

6. School goals focus on student learning beyond test scores and grades.	4.17	0.89	High
7. Policies and programs are aligned to the school's vision.	4.32	0.78	Very High
8. Stakeholders are actively involved in creating high expectations that serve to increase student achievement.	4.11	0.88	High
9. Data are used to prioritize actions to reach a shared vision.	4.08	0.93	High
Category Mean	4.20		Very High

Level of Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Collective Learning and Application

Table 5 shows the assessment of the respondents along collective learning and application. It reveals that collective learning and application among the faculty members is high with a mean of 4.17. This result denotes that there is a process of continuous learning and collaboration within the community of educators in this institution. It also implies that capacity for dialogue among the faculty members is fostered as a way of seeking new knowledge and apply the learning to solutions that address students' needs. This is evident in the different outputs of the faculty members that high quality education is being served to their clienteles like high board exam ratings, and numerous awards and commendations in research and wide implementation of extension services. The high collective learning and application of the respondents is explained by a college dean in this fashion: "Collective learning is evident among faculty members of the university because we give them various opportunities to do this. For instance, the making of course syllabi is a collective undertaking of faculty members who teach the same specialization. Instructional materials such as modules and books are also encouraged to be written through collaboration. This is on top of the fact that many researches are now conducted collaboratively by faculty members that they are interdisciplinary in nature." – (CD-3)

Result of this study is comparable to the study ofIsmail (2015) when he found out that collective learning and application is in the "high" level in terms of the degree of existence of PLCA-R dimensions as rated by their respondents.

Among the indicators of collective learning and application, the statement with the highest weighted mean is "Faculty members are committed to programs that enhance learning" ($\bar{x}$ =4.26, "very high"). This data implies the high commitment of the faculty members in enhancing the learning of their students. Perhaps, such commitment is reflected in the good result of the board examinations and national competency (NC) undertaken by the students as well as their favorable performance in inter-school competitions at the local, regional and national levels. Also, the good employment of the students is also a reflection of the faculty members' ability to develop learners who are marketable in the industries. One college dean expounds this concept in the following words: "The commitment of faculty members to the learning of their students is mirrored in the high percentage of passers in the different board examinations. For me, our institution's education has proven its value with the presence of topnotchers and high institutional passing rate relative to national passing rate. I believe our graduates are competitive too because we beat other institutions during competitions. Most importantly, the fact that our graduates are employable is an indicator that the faculty members have done a great job in the formation of their students." – (CD-6).

On the other hand, the statement with the lowest weighted mean is "Faculty members collaboratively analyze student work to improve teaching and learning." ($\bar{x}$=4.11- high). Although it is the lowest among the statements, it has still a high descriptive value. Such data connotes that faculty members are one in enhancing teaching and learning. This data also affirms the previous finding that the faculty members are working collaboratively in the making of instructional materials as well as research and extension undertakings. One CEO revealed the reason for this finding in these statements: "One evidence that the faculty members are collaboratively working in analyzing student work is the subject on Course Audit. This course is a form of review to prepare students to take board examination. The mechanism for such review class is that all teachers would lecture on a specific subject depending on their field of specialization. In this process, the faculty members share their review materials with one another to substantiate lessons acquired by the students for the past semesters. Aside this, team teaching and mentoring is practiced between the senior and junior faculty members. In this way, the rookie teacher is shared with methodologies and materials to improve his/her teaching. Significantly, there are also researches conducted by the faculty members examining the results of the board examination and determine specific competencies which were not taught or covered in the course syllabi." – (CEO-1)

Table 5: Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Collective Learning and Application

Statements	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Collective Learning and Application			
1. Faculty members work together to seek knowledge, skills and strategies and apply this new learning to their work.	4.20	0.89	Very High
2. Collegial relationships exist among faculty members that reflect commitment to school improvement efforts.	4.20	0.88	Very High
3. Faculty members plan and work together to search for solutions to address diverse students' needs.	4.18	0.89	High
4. A variety of opportunities and structures exist for collective learning through open dialogue.	4.13	0.90	High
5. Faculty members engage in dialogue that reflects a respect for diverse ideas that lead to continued inquiry.	4.17	0.89	High
6. Professional development focuses on teaching and learning.	4.19	0.84	High
7. Faculty members and stakeholders learn together and apply new knowledge to solve problems.	4.11	0.90	High
8. Faculty members are committed to programs that enhance learning.	4.26	0.82	Very High
9. Faculty members collaboratively analyze multiple sources of data to assess the effectiveness of instructional practices.	4.15	0.88	High
10. Faculty members collaboratively analyze student work to improve teaching and learning.	4.16	0.89	High
Category Mean	4.17		High

Level of Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Shared Personal Practice

Table 6 illustrates that the respondents rated the shared personal practice "high" ($\bar{x}$ =4.08). This result implies that there is a review of teachers' behavior by colleagues and feedback as well assistance activity to support individual and community improvement. When asked about how shared personal practice is done in the university, the CEOs and college deans are one in saying that this is evident on many occasions like accreditations, curricular enhancement, research and extension undertakings as well design of instructional materials for the students and other clienteles. Specifically, here's the narration of a college dean relative to this matter: "I am confident that the faculty members have high shared personal practice because there are numerous evidences showing such practice. One is accreditation in which they work together in making their academic programs compliant to the standards set by AACCUP. The same shared personal practice is reflected in the faculty members engagement during curriculum enhancement, module, and book writing development as well as research and extension activities. The fact that we pass the accreditation standards and that instructional materials are produced is a good index that faculty members gel together in making all things work for the university as they endeavor to work on this own professional development." – CD – 5).

Looking into the indicators of shared personal practice, the statement "Faculty members informally share ideas and suggestions for improving student learning" ($\bar{x}$ =4.23 - very high) incurred the highest mean. This finding denotes that do not only formally share their ideas during academic council meetings, curriculum enhancement, and the like. They definitely share their ideas and suggestions informally through team teaching and casual conversations. Their stay in the faculty room may be a good avenue for them to discuss matters to be addressed relative to learning outcomes. Also, the presence of group chat for between and among fields of specialization may be a good platform to brew innovative ideas that may address issues and problems of their students towards higher academic performance.

Meanwhile, the statement with the lowest weighted mean but still with high descriptive value is "Faculty members regularly share student's work to guide overall school improvement" ($\bar{x}$ =3.96). This data implies that assessment of students' works are shared during formal and informal meetings for discussion and possible resolution. On such occasion, the data shared become a baseline for developing interventions and new undertakings to improve how things are done in the university. This may be in the form of instruction, research, and extension engagements of the students and faculty members.

Table 6: Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Shared Personal Practice

Statements	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Shared Personal Practice			
1. Opportunities exist for staff members to observe peers and offer encouragement.	4.05	0.91	High
2. Faculty members provide feedback to peers related to instructional practices.	4.03	0.92	High
3. Faculty members informally share ideas and suggestions for improving student learning.	4.23	0.82	Very High
4. Faculty members collaboratively review student work to share and improve instructional practices.	4.10	0.91	High
5. Opportunities exist for coaching and mentoring.	4.03	0.90	High
6. Individuals and teams have the opportunity to apply learning and share the results of their practices.	4.13	0.85	High
7. Faculty members regularly share student's work to guide overall school improvement.	3.96	0.93	High
Category Mean	4.08		High

Level of Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Supportive Condition for Relationships

Table 7 shows that the supportive conditions on relationships were found to be at high level in the institution with a mean of 4.07. This data means that trust and respect as relational factor has evolved between faculty members. This is in alignment to the characterization of the elements involved in relational supportive conditions in a PLC. According to one CEO, the faculty members are supportive to one another because they become to same college, campus and university. The supportive character of the faculty members is shown in their ability to help each other prepare their NBC documents. It is also seen when they share their handouts obtained from the seminars and trainings that they obtained. This is usually done during the echo seminar wherein those who were sent to trainings and seminars are directed to share whatever they have learned from such undertaking. Also, this finding corroborates the earlier data that faculty members collaborate during accreditation, curricular enhancement, instructional materials development as well as research and extension activities. All these undertakings glue the faculty members together leading to greater personal and professional productivity and self-esteem. Such finding relates with that of Hipp & Huffman(2003) in their study who concluded that supportive conditions on relationships and structures are the "glue that is critical to hold the other dimensions together". It also affirms the observation of Teague (2012) who stated that relational conditions are exemplified by trust, respect, caring relationships, recognition, celebration, risk taking, and reflective dialogue. Thus, this dimension is very much important in PLC.

Among the indicators of supportive conditions for relationships, the statement which was rated very high by the faculty respondents is "Caring relationships exist among faculty members and students that are built on trust and respect" with a mean of 4.20. The existence of caring relationship marked by trust and respect among faculty members and students is evidenced by the mentoring given by the senior to the junior faculty. It is also reflected by the absence or little conflict between and among faculty members and students in various colleges and campuses. If conflict may arise, they find means and ways to settle them immediately so as to build better relationship. One CEO has this to say about this matter: "Trust and respect are visible among faculty members and students in my campus. For several years of my stint as CEO, there were very few instances in which I settled conflicts between and among teachers and students. If there is any, they settle it among themselves or if they are brought before my attention, they arrive at good negotiations or comprises just to settle their disputes. For me, this is one reason why we are productive in the campus and that we have high performance in PBB and other quality assurance measures prescribed by the university" – (CEO-5). The presence of supportive conditions for relationship affirms the study of Stamper (2015) who revealed that faculty members who demonstrate communal thought are able to breed feeling of openness and sharing. Further, he stressed that the importance of trust and respect is indispensable to ensure that the workplace is productive and successful.

Table 7: Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Supportive Conditions on Relationships

Statements	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Supportive Conditions – Relationships			
1. Caring relationships exist among faculty members and students that are built on trust and respect.	4.20	0.88	Very High
2. A culture of trust and respect exists for taking risks.	4.09	0.92	High
3. Outstanding achievement is recognized and celebrated regularly in school.	3.97	0.98	High
4. Faculty members and stakeholders exhibit a sustained and unified effort to embed change into the culture of the school.	3.99	0.91	High
5. Relationships among faculty members support honest and respectful examination of data to enhance teaching and learning.	4.11	0.90	High
Category Mean	4.07		High

Level of Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Supportive Condition on Structures

Table 8 reveals that there is high regard of the faculty members on supportive conditions on structures with a weighted mean of 4.0. This finding is a manifestation that faculty members are willing to share their time and resources to their colleagues. The sharing of time and resources are reflective of their unity despite of their differences. Such practice is shown during programs, competitions and other similar undertakings. For instance, faculty members are able to share any amount to augment funds of students and faculty members who participate in competitions as well as during intramurals. To have a successful program, they also find time watching the activities as a show of their moral support to students and their colleagues. One CEO further explained this reason in the following words: "What I saw among faculty members specifically in my campus is their unity as shown in the resource sharing activities that they do. I remember, a lot of faculty members donated a certain amount to push through a certain program because they find it valuable. The same happened when we joined a national competition in which the funds for such was not enough. I saw numerous teachers giving amount to students who could not afford to join the competition because of financial concern.

Among the statements along supportive conditions for structures, the statement "Resource people provide expertise and support continuous learning" with a mean of 4.10 (High). The finding illustrates that senior faculty members are able to share their expertise in instruction, research, and extension to the younger ones. A good example of this is during the conduct of in-house review wherein experts in research and extension help young colleagues in refining their proposals for possible funding. During seminars and workshops conducted by the university, organizers would always group senior and junior faculty members for possible mentoring.

On the other hand, the statement with the lowest mean at 3.86 but still with high descriptive value is "Fiscal resources are available for professional development". The high level obtained by the respondents in this statement implies that they are assured of fiscal resources allocated by the university for their continuing professional development. A good proof for this is the number of seminar and trainings availed by the faculty members each year. Moreover, scholarship programs are also provided to them as a way of enhancing their competence in their field of specialization. Cash incentives are also given to those who produce research and extension projects that are utilized for instruction, research, extension and production. Availment of these cash incentives are enshrined in the research and faculty manual of the university.

Table 8: Professional Learning Community of the Respondents along Supportive Conditions on Structures

Statements	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Supportive Conditions – Structures			
1. Time is provided to facilitate collaborative work.	4.00	0.96	High
2. The school schedule promotes collective learning and shared practice.	4.05	0.88	High
3. Fiscal resources are available for professional development.	3.86	0.96	High
4. Appropriate technology and instructional materials are available to staff.	3.92	0.91	High
5. Resource people provide expertise and support	4.10	0.82	High

continuous learning.			
6. The school facility is clean, attractive, and inviting.	4.03	0.90	High
7. The proximity of year level and department personnel allows for ease in collaborating with colleagues.	4.04	0.87	High
8. Communication systems promote a flow of information among faculty members.	4.06	0.93	High
9. Communication systems promote a flow of information across the entire university community including central office personnel, parents, and community members.	4.02	0.92	High
10. Data are organized and made available to provide easy access to faculty members.	3.93	0.99	High
Category Mean	4.00		High

Summary Table on the Professional Learning Community of the Respondents

Table 9 reflects the summary of the respondents' assessment on the different dimensions of PLC. Among the five dimensions, shared values and visions registered the highest grand mean at 4.20 with a descriptive value of "very high". The very high shared values and visions of the faculty members shows that they support the norms of behavior and guide decisions about teaching and learning in the school. According to Hipp & Huffman (2003), this is specifically exemplified in their unwavering focus on student learning. The consistent focus of the faculty members on student learning is very well manifested in the generally good performance of the university in board examinations across academic programs. It may also be evidenced by the generally good employability of the graduates of the university across programs and campuses based on graduate tracer studies conducted among its graduates. One college dean presents this idea in the following words: "The shared values and vision of an institution is reflected the kind of graduates it produces. If the faculty members are able to graduate students who are imbued with the competencies defined in its institutional graduate attributes and program outcomes, then they manifest shared values and vision. In our university, there are substantial evidences that we share the same values and vision because we have been successful through the years in making them pass the board examinations and employ them based on the needs of the industry. Moreover, passing the accreditation is also a good indicator that faculty members contribute to the realization of shared values and vision of the university." – (CD-2).

The result of this study on the level of PLC is similar to that ofAbdallah et al., (2021) and Stamper (2015) who found out that the respondents who participated in their study have a high level of PLC skills.

Table 9: Summary Table on the Professional Learning Community of the Respondents

DIMENSIONS OF PLC	Category Mean $\bar{x}$	Interpretation
Shared and Supportive Leadership	4.14	High
Shared Values and Vision	4.20	Very High
Collective Learning and Application	4.17	High
Shared Personal Practice	4.08	High
Supportive Conditions – Relationships	4.07	High
Supportive Conditions – Structures	4.00	High
Overall Weighted Mean	4.11	High

Level of Organizational Performance of a Public Higher Education Institution in Region 02

Table 10 exhibits the level of organizational performance of a public higher education institution based on the Performance Based-Bonus parameters for CY 2016-2019. It shows that the institution was generally compliant to its Major Final Output (MFOs), Support to Operations (STO) and General Administration and Support Services (GASS); Good Governance Condition; Public Management Financial Reports; Procurement Requirements; Other Cross-Cutting Requirements; and Posting of Operations Manual or ISO Certification. The general compliance of the university implies that the faculty members, administrative staff and university officials were realizing their targets and they have translated the budget of the university into tangible outcomes. One CEO has this to say regarding this matter: We are compliant with the indicators of the PBB because the president demands compliance for her directives, policies, guidelines and the different campuses collectively perform to attain the university objectives. And campuses are not separate entities from the university but they are part of the whole system. This is corroborated by another CEO in these words: Even though we rank one of

the lowest during the PBB evaluations, I perceive good organizational performance. We believe that we contributed a lot for SUC levelling in terms of board examination results and quality assurance. Consistent good performance in board examinations of CAHS, CBEA and CTE, good bar results of the College of Law, high number of NC passers of CHM, high accreditation levels of our academic programs, both in the undergraduate and graduate programs, and ISO certification show campus' great accomplishments and better organizational performance outcomes. Yes, we think we have performed better, with or without PBB incentive.

While the university was generally compliant in almost all the parameters, there were years when it has not shown its compliance. For example, the institution incurred non-compliant rating for Agency Review and Compliance Procedure for SALN together with Annual Procurement Plan (APP) for both Common-used and non-common-used Supplies and Equipment in 2016. Likewise, three non-compliant ratings for PhilGEPS Posting, APP for Common-used Supplies and Equipment, and Compliance with FOI Program.

The non-compliance of the university may be explained by several factors. For instance, one CEO asserted that "The different indicators in the PBB are limited and do not measure the actual performance of the university. Yes, our campus is always compliant. The university is also compliant, too, but CHED in the recent evaluation did not validate the submitted documents despite the DBM's acknowledgement of the good performance of the university." Another factor was shared by one College Dean who mentioned the following: "the rating obtained by the campus in the PBB ranking is due to some targets that were not met due to some factors beyond control of the campus. Example is on research, the number of publications is less than the target because the journal publishing entities are slow in evaluating submitted papers. Likewise, funds for publication are limited."

Lastly, the non-compliance of the university in some parameters is explained by one College Dean in these words: "The requirements are met and complied but the problems are those previously incurred liabilities that were not yet solved and cannot be solved in a short period. These previous problems are the main reasons why PBB incentives were not given to employees."

Table 10: Organizational Performance of a Public Tertiary School in Region 02 for CY 2016-2019

PBB REQUIREMENTS		2016	2017	2018	2019
MAJOR FINAL OUTPUT					
	Higher Education Services	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	*NO VALIDATION
	Advanced Education Service	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	*NO VALIDATION
	Research Service	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	*NO VALIDATION
	Technical Advisory and Extension Services	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	*NO VALIDATION
STO AND GASS					
	Support to Operation	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	General Administrative Support Services	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
GOOD GOVERNANCE CONDITION					
	Transparency Seal	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	PhilGEPS Posting	Compliant	Compliant	Non-compliant	Compliant
	Citizen's Charter	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
PUBLIC MANAGEMENT FINANCIAL REPORTS					
	Budget and Financial Accountability Report	Compliant	Non-Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	COA Financial Reports	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	Report on Ageing Cash Advances	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	Full implementation of at 30% of prior	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	year's Audit Recommendation				
PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS					
	FY 2018 APP-non-common-used Supplies	-	-	Non-Compliant	-
	& Equipment				
	Indicative FY 2019 – APP non-common-used	-	-	-	Compliant
	Supplies and Equipment				
	FY 2019 AAPP – common-used Supplies and	-	-	-	Compliant

	Equipment				
	FY 2017 APP-non-common-used Supplies & Equipment	-	Non-compliant		
	FY 2016 APCPI	Compliant			
	Conduct of Early Procurement	-	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
OTHER CROSS-CUTTING REQUIREMENTS					
	Agency Review and Compliance Procedure	Non-compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	(SALN)				
	Compliance with FOI Program		Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
	Posting of Guidelines on System of Ratings	-	-	-	Compliant
	and Rankings				
Posting of Operations Manual or ISO Certification		-	Compliant	Non-compliant	Compliant

Per Campus Level of Organizational Performance of the Institution

Table 11 reveals the level of organizational performance of each campus of the university. It shows that Campus 2 emerged as the highest performing campus as they were ranked first in the said rating periods. Campus 7 ranked second and Campus 3 as well as Campus 8 tied for third place. The lowest performing campus was Campus 1. Interview with the CEO of Campus 2 reveals that: "One basic reason why we consistently ranked high in the PBB is because the targets assigned for Campus 2 was realistic. I have been a CEO of this campus for many years and one thing that I guard was the target assigned to my campus. I see to it that our campus targets are feasible relative to our competency as a delivery unit. Also, we consistently ranked first in the PBB because we work collaboratively in accomplishing our targets. Our best practice is seen in our periodic review of our performance and the high motivation that the people of this campus have. We set our goals and collectively exert effort to reach those goals. I believe our efforts and energy in the campus are in synergy that is why we perform better than other campuses."

On the other hand, the CEO of Campus 7 asserted that: We performed well in the past years because we keep on working whether there's a PBB or not. The ranking obtained by our campus was an output of collaborative efforts and cooperation between and among the employees in the campus. Meanwhile, CEO of Campus 3 explained their performance in the following words: Our campus is the best but PBB has limited indicators to measure the actual performance of all campuses. We believed that we performed well because other data not captured in the PBB show that we performed well. Furthermore, the CEO of Campus 1 justified its lowest rank in the following words: We obtained low ranking in the PBB because we have higher targets than other campuses even though we have more accomplishments than them. The indicators do not ask "How many?" but "What is the ratio of accomplishments over the targets."

Table 11: Level of organizational performance of per campus for CY 2016 – 2019

Campus	Ranking				Average	Final Rank	Descriptive Statistics
	2016	2017	2018	2019			
Campus 1	3	8	7	8	6.5	8	Good
Campus 2	5	3	1	1	2.5	1	Best
Campus 3	2	4	8	3	4.25	3.5	Better
Campus 4	8	7	4	4	5.75	7	Good
Campus 5	6	2	6	7	5.25	6	Good
Campus 6	7	1	5	5	4.5	5	Good
Campus 7	1	6	3	2	3	2	Better
Campus 8	4	5	2	6	4.25	3.5	Better

Difference in the Level of Professional Learning Community of the Respondents by Campus Assignment

Table 12 shows the non-significant difference in the level of PLC of the respondents when grouped according to campus assignment. This can be gleaned from the computed f-value of 1.259 and probability value (Sig.) at 0.272 thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. The lack of difference in the PLC of the respondents by campus assignment suggests that irrespective of wherever they are working in the university, their PLC is the same. This finding can be accounted to the fact that there are practices in the university wherein faculty members are

given the opportunity to work together. For instance, teachers from Andrews Campus are tapped in the instruction, research and extension activities of other campuses. Also, the structure of the university provides opportunities for PLC development because there is one university dean for the different colleges found in various campus. This structure allows the teachers to craft and implement the same curriculum, course syllabi and other related activities. This was affirmed by one College dean in these words: In my opinion, PLC of faculty members are the same across campuses because we have one university dean who makes us all collaborate in crafting the curriculum, course syllabi and other projects and activities of the same college.
Blacklock et al. (2009) in his study on the five dimensions of PLC, found the same result. The findings showed that PLC of teachers particularly their collective learning and application of learning is similar among all of the schools because of similarity in organizational structure. Furthermore, he asserted that even though there are unique practices among schools, their PLC is the same due to same policies and organizational structure.

Table 12: Test of difference in the professional learning community of the respondents by campus

Campus	Mean	SD	F-value	Prob.	Decision
Campus 1	3.95	0.72	1.259	0.272	Accept Ho
Campus 2	4.35	0.70			
Campus 3	4.06	0.67			
Campus 4	4.25	0.52			
Campus 5	4.13	0.40			
Campus 6	3.88	1.36			
Campus 7	4.19	0.46			
Campus 8	3.95	0.72			

Difference in the Professional Learning Community of the Respondents when Campuses are Grouped According to Organizational Performance

Table 13 presents that there is no significant difference in the PLC of the respondents when grouped according to their campus OP. This is reflected in the computed f-value of 2.537 and probability of 0.082. The acceptance of the null hypothesis signifies that the PLC of the respondents are similar irrespective of the organizational performance of the campuses. Irrespective whether the campuses have high or low organizational performance, the PLC of the respondents is the same.
This finding is attributed to the fact that the different campuses adhere to one organizational structure, vision and core values. Also, the different campuses share generally the same strategies, practices and work conditions. Consequently, the faculty members across campuses show the same level of collaboration in their quest for practices that improve their office and college performance.
One college dean emphasized this concept in these statements: "The campuses with high and low organizational performance show the same PLC because we basically follow the same policies, strategies, practices and work conditions. Since the campuses are considered delivery units, the faculty members tend to work hand in hand to contribute in the realization of university vision and goals. The faculty members believe that they may have low or high organizational performance but at the end of the day they are all integral members of one university."

Table 13: Test of difference in the professional learning community of the faculty grouped according to organizational performance

PBB Level	Mean	SD	F-value	Prob.	Decision
Good	4.03	0.72	2.537	0.082	Accept Ho
Better	4.11	0.68			
Best	4.35	0.70			

Predictors of Campus Organizational Performance Level

To determine the discriminating factors of levels of organizational performance (good, better, best), a discriminant analysis was run using the profile variables, organizational system thinking and professional learning community assessment scores of the respondents. The study tested the hypothesis that these factors can adequately identify the campus whose organizational performance is good, better, best. The results are shown in Tables 14 and 16.
The test of eigenvalues reveals two discriminant functions that could explain group classification of the respondents. Function 1 can explain 81.3 percent of the variations in group classification, while Function 2 could explain 18.7 percent. Consequently, the canonical correlation of Function l is bigger (0.301) than the other (0.150). As suggested, Function 1 could adequately explain variations in the group classification.
The Wilks` lambda indicates the existence of a difference between groups, that is, the effect of the variables of the model upon the discrimination between groups. As shown, Function 1 has Wilk's lambda of 0.889 whose

associated chi-square value of 24.336 is highly significant (p =0.000) at df = 4. On the other hand, Function 2 has a Wilk's lambda of 0.978 and chi-square value of 4.467 (p =0.031) at df = 1. It means that there are significant differences in group composition based on the campus organizational performance level.

Table 14: Chi-square test results

Tests	Function 1	Function 2
Eigenvalue		
Value	0.100	0.023
Percentage	81.3	18.7
Canonical R	0.301	0.150
Wilk's Lambda	0.889	0.978
Chi-square	24.336	4.467
Df	4	1
p-value	0.000	0.031

The standardized canonical coefficients and structure coefficients for the two discriminant functions are shown in Table 21. Two variables are entered into the discriminant function equation. The highest factor loading in Function 1 is Highest Educational Attainment with 0.897 and 0.890, respectively. It means that for every standard deviation unit increase in the education of a faculty, the chance to be classified to an organization with higher level of performance is 0.89 units. Thus, this function is labeled as Education. On the other hand, the variable Shared values and vision heavily loads in Function 2 with a coefficient of 0.890 and 0.897, respectively. It means that for every standard deviation unit increase in the faculty's shared values and vision, the probability of his/her organization get a higher level of campus organizational performance increases by 0.890 units.

Hence, highest educational level and shared values and vision are both catalysts of a performing campuses. Both variables can predict the campus performance of the respondents. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that an increase in educational level will subsequently leads to higher employee productivity (Ng & Feldman, 2009; Chen, (2020); Makinde et al., (2018)).

Likewise, the study of Yang et al., (2018)is affirmed by the current study that "honoring shared values in the organization has a positive influence on employee engagement and desire to pursue excellence".

Table 15: Standardized and structure coefficients

Predictors	Function 1 (Education)		Function 2 (Values and Vision)	
	Standardized Coefficients	Structure Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	Structure Coefficients
Highest Educational Attainment	0.897	0.890	-0.443	-0.455
Shared Values and Vision	0.455	0.443	0.890	0.897

For these reasons, there are two discriminant functions to compute the performance level of the faculty's organization, namely:

Discrimination Function 1 = (0.890*Education) + (0.443*Shared values and vision score)

Discrimination Function 1 = (-0.455*Education) + (0.897*Shared values and vision score)

Table 16 presents the percentage accuracy of performance classification of the faculty's organization. Based on the figures, only 13.3 percent of the 90 faculty who belong to the campus with good performance were correctly classified; only 66.7 percent of the 87 faculty whose campus was classified as Better campus were correctly grouped; and 57.6 percent of the 33 faculty whose campus was considered Best were correctly classified. Overall, the two variables (education and shared values and vision) could significantly predict 48.1 percent of the campus organizational performance. This finding implies that higher educational attainment and shared values and vision of the respondents yield higher organizational performance. Such finding maybe attributed to the fact that higher degree is a requirement of the university in acquiring a regular plantilla position as stated in the different CHED Memorandum Orders (CMOs) for each of the programs and as attested by CSC Memorandum Circular No. 22 S. 2016. This is also true to other organizations around the world as "most organizations use education as an indicator of a person's skill levels or productivity, they frequently employ it as a prerequisite in hiring decisions" Ng & Feldman, (2009).

On the other hand, the impact of shared values and vision to organizational performance is affirmed by numerous studies showing that employees' high vision and values increase their commitment and quality

performance leading to high organizational productivity (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Alavi & Karami, 2009; Bart & Hupfer, 2004; Dobrinić & Fabac, 2021).

Table 16: Percentage accuracy of performance classification

Original PBB Classification	Predicted PBB Group Classification			Total
	Good	Better	Best	
Frequency				
Good	12	46	32	90
Better	6	58	23	87
Best	3	11	19	33
Percent				
Good	13.3	51.1	35.6	100.0
Better	6.9	66.7	26.4	100.0
Best	9.1	33.3	57.6	100.0

48.1% of original grouped cases correctly classified.

CONCLUSIONS

The professional learning community (PLC) of the respondents is high as they work collaboratively to achieve better results for the students that they serve. In terms of performance outputs, the university is generally compliant to the different major final outputs and good governance conditions. The institution has realized its commitment to the government by being compliant to the good governance conditions and major final outputs. A great contributory factor to this organizational performance is the very favorable professional learning community of the faculty members.

This study found out that the professional learning community of the respondents do not differ irrespective of their campus assignment. Analysis of this study also showed that there is no significant difference in the PLC of the respondents by organizational performance level.

Also, their favorable professional learning community do not spell differences in the organizational performance of the different campuses.This means thatemployees and administrative heads, specifically in a higher education institution, must consider that organizational performance is not just influenced by faculty members' professional learning community. This is influenced by numerous interplaying factors like administrative concerns which are beyond the domain of the faculty members. Thus, these administrative factors may explain the non-availment of the university of the Performance-Based Bonus for the past years.

REFERENCES

1. Abdallah, R., Abdat, R. M., & Hill, C. (2021). Extent of implementing the characteristics of professional learning communities at the UAE special education centers. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 20(4), 265–283. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.4.14
2. Akhtar, C. S., Awan, S. H., Naveed, S., & Ismail, K. (2018). A comparative study of the application of systems thinking in achieving organizational effectiveness in Malaysian and Pakistani banks. International Business Review, 27(4), 767–776. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2018.01.001
3. Al-Mahdy, Y. F. A., & Sywelem, M. M. G. (2016). Teachers' perspectives on professional learning communities in some Arab countries. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 5(4). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2016.1349
4. Alavi, M. T., & Karami, A. (2009). Managers of small and medium enterprises: Mission statement and enhanced organizational performance. Journal of Management Development, 28(6), 555–562. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710910959729
5. Bart, C. K., & Hupfer, M. (2004). Mission statements in Canadian hospitals. Journal of Health Organization and Management, 18(2), 92–110. https://doi.org/10.1108/14777260410538889
6. Bart, C. K., Hupfer, M., Dobrinić, D., Fabac, R., Kirkpatrick, S. A., Locke, E. A., Alavi, M. T., Karami, A., Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W. J., Stick, S. L., Hord, S. M., Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W. J., Stick, S. L., Date, S., Number, C., Demir, S. B., Creswell, J. W. J., & Clark, V. P. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. Field Methods,

18(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260

7. Blacklock, P. J., Ed, M., Huffman, J. B., Laney, J. D., Coe, M. A., & Member, C. (2009). Improving Exemplary Texas Elementary Schools : a Descriptive. Differences.
8. Blitz, C. L., & Schulman, R. (2016). Measurement instruments for assessing the performance of professional learning communities Tools. National Center for Education, Evaluation and Regional AssistanceNational Center for Education, Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 1–72.
9. Capili-Balbalin, W. (2017). Research Commons at the University of Waikato Copyright Statement : The Development of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in the Philippines : Roles and Views of Secondary School Principals A thesis The University of Waikato. 1994.
10. Carter, R. S., & McCann, J. M. (2017). A Case Study of the Relationship Between Professional Learning Communities and Teacher Efficacy. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 157. http://ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/2173181405?accountid=9838%0Ahttp://ucalgary-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/openurl/01UCALG/UCALGARY??url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&genre=disse
11. Chen, L. (2020). A historical review of professional learning communities in China (1949-2019): some implications for collaborative teacher professional development. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 40(3), 373–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1717439
12. Dobrinić, D., & Fabac, R. (2021). Familiarity with Mission and Vision: Impact on Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. Business Systems Research, 12(1), 124–143. https://doi.org/10.2478/bsrj-2021-0009
13. Ghosh, C., Liang, M., Petrova, M. T., Knoll, M. S., IPF, Geltner, D., Fisher, J., Ke, Q., IPF, Wratten, T., Wheeler, D., Giacomini, E., Ling, D. C., Naranjo, A., Overview, D. P., Evans, J. D. J. R. G., Jones, T. A., Mueller, G. R., Hoesli, M., … Zietz, J. (2009). No 主観的健康感を中心とした在宅高齢者における健康関連指標に関する共分散構造分析Title. Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics, 23(1), 77–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.qref.2017.01.001%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cirp.2016.06.001%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2016.12.055%0Ahttps://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfatigue.2019.02.006%0Ahttps://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2019.04.024%0Ahttps://doi.org/1
14. Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2010). Professional learning communities and system improvement. Improving Schools, 13(2), 172–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480210376487
15. Hipp, K. K., & Huffman, J. B. (2003). Professional learning communities: Assessment-development-effects. International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, 4, 1–22.
16. Hooi, L. W., & Payambarpour, S. A. (2017). Significance on Organizational Performance of Global Mncs: Management Development, Human Resource System, or Employee Engagement? August 2017. https://doi.org/10.20472/iac.2016.023.039
17. Hussein, N., Mohamad, A., Noordin, F., & Ishak, N. A. (2014). Learning Organization and its Effect On Organizational Performance and Organizational Innovativeness: A Proposed Framework for Malaysian Public Institutions of Higher Education. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 130, 299–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.035
18. Ismail, O. H. (2015). Professional Learning Communities in Higher Education: The Case of Sultan Qaboos University, Oman. 3(7), 141–150.
19. Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. Field Methods, 18(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260
20. Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(1), 36–51. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.36

21. Lee, M., & Kim, J. (2016). The emerging landscape of school-based professional learning communities in South Korean schools. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 36(2), 266–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2016.1148854
22. Liu, O. L. (2011). Outcomes Assessment in Higher Education: Challenges and Future Research in the Context of Voluntary System of Accountability. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 30(3), 2–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2011.00206.x
23. Makinde, O. G., Tayo, F. O., Olaniyan, & Toyin S. (2018). The Effect of Employee Engagement and Educational Qualification on Employee Productivity in Nigerian Banking Industry. 20(9), 9–17. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2009060917
24. Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). How broadly does education contribute to job performance? Personnel Psychology, 62(1), 89–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.01130.x
25. O.I, D. (2013). Employee Motivation and Organizational Performance. Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research, 5(1)(1), 53–60.
26. Ogbonnaya, C., & Valizade, D. (2018). High performance work practices, employee outcomes and organizational performance: a 2-1-2 multilevel mediation analysis. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29(2), 239–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1146320
27. Olivier, D. F., Antoine, S., Cormier, R., Lewis, V., Minckler, C., & Stadalis, M. (2009). Professional learning communities assessment-revised, March. Annual Meeting of the Louisiana Education Research Association, D, 1–7.
28. Paajanen, P., Kantola, J., Karwowski, W., & Vanharanta, H. (2005). Applying Systems Thinking in the Evaluation of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Creation. Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics, 3(3), 79–84.
29. Pang, N. S. K., & Wang, T. (2016a). Professional learning communities: research and practices across six educational systems in the Asia-Pacific region. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 36(2), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2016.1148848
30. Pang, N. S. K., & Wang, T. (2016b). Professional learning communities: research and practices across six educational systems in the Asia-Pacific region. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 36(2), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2016.1148848
31. Salleh, H. (2016). Facilitation for professional learning community conversations in Singapore. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 36(2), 285–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2016.1148855
32. Spillane, J. P., Shirrell, M., & Hopkins, M. (2016). Designing and Deploying A Professional Learning Community (PLC) Organizational Routine: Bureaucratic and Collegial Arrangements in Tandem. Les Dossiers Des Sciences de l'éducation, 35, 97–122. https://doi.org/10.4000/dse.1283
33. Stamper, J. C. (2015). A study of teacher and principal perceptions of professional learning communities. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 153. https://search.proquest.com/docview/1734472794?accountid=13042%0Ahttp://oxfordsfx.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/oxford?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&genre=dissertations+%26+theses&sid=ProQ:Education+Database&atitle=&title=A+
34. Stewart, C. S., & Dillard, T. (2017). Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of a Professional Learning Community. 10256604, 228. http://ezproxy.um.edu.my:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1864754074?accountid=28930
35. Teague, G. M. (2012). The Principal ' s Role in Developing and Sustaining Professional Learning Communities : A Mixed Methods Case Study.
36. Yang, B., Luo, Y., Sun, Y., Lu, W., & Kang, L. (2018). Simulation and Experimental Research on Magnetic Circuit of MRF Yield Stress Testing Device. Journal of Failure Analysis and Prevention,

18(5), 1286–1292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11668-018-0520-7

37. Zlate, S., & Cucui, G. (2015). Motivation and Performance in Higher Education. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 180(November 2014), 468–476. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.146