TO STUDY THE IMPACT OF ASSESING AND REPORTING STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME COMPETENCY Vs DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF FACULTIES IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

P.Mekala, Manian.K
Assistant Professor
MBA Department RVS Institute Of Management Studies Sulur

ABSTRACT

Competency-based learning is learner focused and works naturally with independent study and with the instructor in the role of facilitator. Learners often find different individual skills more difficult than others. Competency based education system ultimately responsible for the quality of the program and engaging with students in a way that helps those students achieve mastery.In which students take on the role of teachers and teachers take on the role of students. In this paper the study aims at investigating the Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency by the faculty in relation to their age, Qualification ,marital, status, designation, department and experience.

The sample consists of 500 teachers from arts and science and engineering background in Coimbatore city. Teaching competency rating scale constructed and validated by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin. The data was analysed using descriptive and differential analysis. The study reveals that the teachers have high level of teaching competency. It also concluded that there is significant difference is found between demographic profile and Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency in their teaching method.

Keywords: Competency, learning, Education, Teaching, demographic, Outcome

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is a process of human enlightenment and empowerment for the achievement of a better and higher quality of life. A sound and effective system of education result in the enfoldment of learner's potentialities, enlargement of their competencies and values. Recognizing such an enormous potential of education, all progressive societies have committed themselves to the universalization of education with an explicit aim of providing "Quality education for all." A differentiated tertiary education system, assessing the development of competencies among students presents a methodological challenge. From this perspective, modeling and measuring academic competencies as well as their preconditions and effects set high thresholds.

Another challenge is the question of a suitable criterion (e.g., future job requirements) that will help to evaluate the acquisition of competence. The requirements of possible job areas and also the academics are changingconstantly. Sigrid Blömeke-(2013). It's facilitating learning, or the acquisition of knowledge, skills, value, beliefs, habits, educational methods include storytelling, discussion, teaching, training, and directed research. Education frequently takes place under the guidance of educators, but learners may also educate themselves. Education can take place in formal or informal settings and any experience that has a formative effect on the way one thinks, feels, or acts may be considered educational.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

(Vescio, 2008)an overview of the characteristics of professional communities. The well-developed professional learning communities have positive impact on both teaching practice and student achievement. He discussed about the how professional learning communities will help the students to achieve students achievement in this connection the viability of PLCs will be determined by their success in enhancing students achievement. The greater the extent of reported staff involvement in professional and pupil learning, the higher was the level of pupil performance and progress in both primary and secondary schools. The empirical studies that connect PLCs with changes in teaching practices and student learning. The review process is a strategy for determining the quality of a research report. This focus clearly limited the scope of the review as few published studies have looked at the impact of PLCs.

(Miyazoe, 2009)the study about the effectiveness of three different online writing activities in formal university education: Forums , blogs, and wikis. The interview script analysis clarified the different merits students perceived from each activity. The variations provided by the blended course design served well in meeting challenges. The started the research with different question like how do students perceive each of the three online tools, are they effective in helping the students acquire the target language and if yes in what ways can we quantify the resulting progress. This study takes a step forward in terms of how to think of online writing an dits effectiveness in our language teaching and learning strategies. The fact that the result to date supports its usefulness is quite encouraging.

(Broko, 2004)he discussed about general pedagogical knowledge, subject matter content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, curricular knowledge and extended this distinction further to knowledge of learners, knowledge of the philosophical and historical aims of education. The professional development program he discussed focus on a limited number of subject area and grade focus ona limited number of subject area and grade levels.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To know the factors influencing of assessing and reporting student learning outcome competency by the faculty.

- To identify the significant difference between demographicprofile of faculty andassessing and reporting students learning outcome competency.

4. HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

- There is no significant difference between different age group of faculty in their assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency.
- There is no significant difference between different educational qualification groups of assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency.
- There is no significant difference between marital status of facultyand their assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency.
- There is no significant difference between different department group of facultyand their assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency.
- There is no significant difference between different designation of facultyand their assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency.
- There is no significant difference between different experience group of facultyand their assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency.

5. METHODOLOGY

KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sphercity

TABLE – 5.1

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.831
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square	1.932E3
Df	36
Sig	.000

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

The present study has been conducted on the faculty working in colleges located in Coimbatore District of Tamil Nadu state. A random sample of 500faculty have been selected for the present study. The investigator employed normative survey method for this study.The scale consists of 9 statements related to three major components namely Assessment of the students and students' progress. Samples are undertaken 5 point Likert scale analysis.These statements are tested with reliability and validity through two tests namely KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sphercity. Factors analysis was done to categories the statement into verified classification. The data was analysed using descriptive analyses with the help of SPSS package.

Two tests namely Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures of sampling adequacy (KMO) & Bartlett's Test of Sphercity

have been applied, to test whether the relationship among the variables has been significant or not as shown in table (a) The result of the test shows that with the significant value of .000 there is significant relationship among the variable chosen. KMO test yields a result of 0.831, which states that factor analysis can be carried out appropriately for these 9 statements which are taken for the study

ROTATION

Since the idea of factor analysis is to identify the factors that meaningfully summarize the sets of closely related variables, the rotation phase of the factor analysis attempts to transfer initial matrix into one that is easier to interpret. Varimax rotation method is used to extract meaningful factors. This is given in Table 5.2

TABLE 5.2
ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX

	Component	
Plans and uses purposeful assessment tasks	0.21	0.802
Includes the use of ICT enriched assessment tasks	0.598	0.302
Provides students with clear and constructive feedback on performance within an appropriate time frame	0.614	0.505
Plans and conducts monitoring and assessment activities	0.799	0.012
Designs and uses a basic recording system of appropriate detail and utility	0.846	0.103
Records student learning outcomes accurately and consistently	0.838	0.161
Provides detailed, accurate and informative written and oral reports on student progress	0.681	0.254
Uses reporting procedures that articulate with college policies	0.493	0.459
Encourages on-going constructive dialogue with parents and caregivers about student progress and achievement.	0.023	0.843

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

We notice that statements" Includes the use of ICT enriched assessment tasks", "Provides students with clear and constructive feedback on performance within an appropriate time frame ", "Plans and conducts monitoring and assessment activities ", "Designs and uses a basic recording system of appropriate detail and utility", "Records student learning outcomes accurately and consistently", "Provides detailed, accurate and informative written and oral reports on student progress", "Uses reporting procedures that articulate with college policies ",have loadings of 0.302,0.505,0.012,0.103,0.161,0.254 and 0.459 on factor 1, this suggests that factor 2 is a combination of these variables. At this point, a suitable phrase which captures the essence of the original variables to form the underlying concept, factor 1 could be named as "Assessment of the students". In case of the factor 2 columns, the

statements "Plans and uses purposeful assessment tasks, "and "Encourages ongoing constructive dialogue with parents and caregivers about student progress and achievement." have high loadings of 0.802 and 0.843 respectively. This indicates that factor 2 is the combination of these three variables and named as "Students progress".

TABLE 5.3

VARIABLES IDENTIFIED FOR FACTOR SCORES

S.No	Variable	Factors
1	Includes the use of ICT enriched assessment tasks	Assessment of the students
2	Provides students with clear and constructive feedback on performance within an appropriate time frame	
3	Plans and conducts monitoring and assessment activities	
4	Designs and uses a basic recording system of appropriate detail and utility	
5	Records student learning outcomes accurately and consistently	
6	Provides detailed, accurate and informative written and oral reports on student progress	
7	Uses reporting procedures that articulate with college policies	
8	Plans and uses purposeful assessment tasks	Students' Progress
9	Encourages ongoing constructive dialogue with parents and caregivers about student progress and achievement.	

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

Thus the 9 variables which were selected for the study, using principle component analysis have been reduced to 2 factor model and each factor have been given a name which is associated with the corresponding variables based on the values obtained from the rotated component matrix table.

6. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

ANOVA has been applied to test the significant difference in the respondents' opinion towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency and their demographic variables taken for the study at 5% level of significance (Age, Educational qualification, Marital status, Department, Designation, Total years of teaching experience, Type of school for most part of school education, UG Education and PG Education)

Table 6.1 (a) indicate the respondents' level of agreeability towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcome competency based on demography profile, its mean value and Standard deviation results.

TABLE 6.1

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE RESPONDENTS

Age Group		**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
	Less than 30 years	204	37.8725	4.39474
	30 - 40 years	210	36.2048	5.61363
	41 - 50 years	65	40.9692	2.58583
	51 years & above	21	34.5714	.50709
	Total	500	37.4360	4.96096
Qualification		**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
	PG	234	37.5299	4.61212
	M.Phil	123	37.6748	6.03065
	PhD	143	37.0769	4.48798
	Total	500	37.4360	4.96096
Marital Status		**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
	Married	320	37.6469	5.12817
	Unmarried	176	37.0795	4.66775
	Widow/Divorced/Separated	4	36.2500	3.50000
	Total	500	37.4360	4.96096
Department		**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
	Computer studies	74	38.9459	4.41011
	Arts	64	34.9688	5.25831
	Engineering	74	35.8243	5.89255
	Management	194	38.2165	4.39790
	Science	94	37.5851	4.61510
	Total	500	37.4360	4.96096
Designation		**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
	Professor/ HOD	115	35.3913	5.98931
	Associate Professor	69	38.5507	5.45715
	Assistant Professor	236	37.8136	4.41554
	Guest Lecturer	80	38.3000	3.42145
	Total	500	37.4360	4.96096
Experience		**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**

	Less than 5 years	137	36.6131	5.09505
	5 - 10 years	169	37.4260	5.93583
	10 - 15 years	119	38.9916	3.98407
	15 - 20 years	75	36.4933	2.62716
	Total	500	37.4360	4.96096

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

The highest mean score of 40.3 is found among the respondents who are in the age category of 41 to 50 years. Highest standard deviation of 5.6 is found among the respondents who are in the age category of 30 to 40 years and lowest standard deviation of 0.5 is found among the respondents who are in the age category of 51 years and above.

The highest mean score of 37.6 is found among the respondents who are in the category of M.Phil. Highest standard deviation of 6.03 is found among the respondents who are in the category of M.Phil and lowest standard deviation of 4.4 is found among the respondents who are in the category of Ph.D qualification.

The highest mean score of 37.6 is found among the respondents who are in the category of married. Highest standard deviation of 5.1 is found among the respondents who are in the category of married and lowest standard deviation of 3.5 is found among the respondents who are in the category of window/Divorced/Separated.

The highest mean score of 38.9 is found among the respondents who are in the category of Computer science department. Highest standard deviation of 5.89 is found among the respondents who are in the category of engineering and lowest standard deviation of 4.3 is found among the respondents who are in the category of Management.

The highest mean score of 38.5 is found among the respondents who are in the category of Associate professor. Highest standard deviation of 5.9 is found among the respondents who are in the category of Professor/HOD and lowest standard deviation of 3.4 is found among the respondents who are in the category of Guest Lecture.

The highest mean score of 38.9 is found among the respondents who are in the category 10-15 years' experience. Highest standard deviation of 5.9 is found among the respondents who are in the category of 5-10 years of experience and lowest standard deviation of 2.62 is found among the respondents who are in the category of 15-20 years of experience.

Ho: "There is no significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the age groups of the respondents".

TABLE 6.2

ANOVA- AGE AND LEVEL OF AGREEABILITY OF THE RESPONDENTS TOWARDS ASSESSING AND REPORTING STUDENTS LEARNING OUTCOMECOMPETENCY

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1340.989	3	446.996	20.266	.000
Within Groups	10939.963	496	22.056		
Total	12280.952	499			

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

The ANOVA result table 6.2 shows that at 5% level of significance, the significant value is 0.000. As the significant value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and the result shows that there exists significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the age groups of the respondents. It is implied that the level of agreeabilityno differs from one age group to another.

Ho: "There is no significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the marital status of the respondents"

TABLE 6.3

ANOVA- AGE AND LEVEL OF AGREEABILITY OF THE RESPONDENTS TOWARDS ASSESSING AND REPORTING STUDENTS LEARNING OUTCOMECOMPETENCY

Dimension 2-Assessing and Reporting Student Learning Outcome

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27.516	2	13.758	.558	.573
Within Groups	12253.436	497	24.655		
Total	12280.952	499			

The ANOVA result table 6.3 shows that at 5% level of significance, the significant value is 0.573 As the significant value is equal to 0.57, the null hypothesis is accepted and the result shows that there exists significant

difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Accessing and reporting students learning outcome competency among the qualification of the respondents. It is implied that the level of agreeability there is differs from one gradation to another.

TABLE-6.4

ANOVA-MARITAL STATUS AND LEVEL OF AGREEABILITY OF THE RESPONDENTS TOWARDS FACILITATING STUDNETS LEARNING COMPETENCY

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	42.219	2	21.109	.857	.425
Within Groups	12238.733	497	24.625		
Total	12280.952	499			

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

The ANOVA result table 6.4 shows that at 5% level of significance, the significant value is 0.425. As the significant value is less more 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and the result shows that there exists significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the marital status of the respondents. It is implied that the level of agreeability there is differs from one marital respondent to another.

Ho: "There is no significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the department respondents"

TABLE 6.5

ANOVA-DEPARTMENT AND LEVEL OF AGREEABILITY OF THE RESPONDENTS TOWARDS FACILITATING STUDNETS LEARNING COMPETENCY

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	870.788	4	217.697	9.444	.000
Within Groups	11410.164	495	23.051		
Total	12280.952	499			

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

The ANOVA result table 6.5 shows that at 5% level of significance, the significant value is 0.000 As the significant value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and the result shows that there exists significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the qualification of the respondents. It is implied that the level of agreeability there is no differs from one department to another.

Ho: "There is no significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the designation of the respondents"

TABLE-6.6

ANOVA-DESIGNATION AND LEVEL OF AGREEABILITY OF THE RESPONDENTS TOWARDS FACILITATING STUDNETS LEARNING COMPETENCY

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	659.892	3	219.964	9.388	.000
Within Groups	11621.060	496	23.430		
Total	12280.952	499			

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

The ANOVA result table 6.6 shows that at 5% level of significance, the significant value is 0.000. As the significant value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and the result shows that there exists significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the qualification of the respondents. It is implied that the level of agreeability there isno differs from one designation to another.

Ho: "There is no significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the experience group of the respondents"

TABLE- 6.7

ANOVA-EXPERIENCE AND LEVEL OF AGREEABILITY OF THE RESPONDENTS TOWARDS FACILITATING STUDNETS LEARNING COMPETENCY

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	447.392	3	149.131	6.251	.000
Within Groups	11833.560	496	23.858		
Total	12280.952	499			

Sources: Primary data collected from faculty

The ANOVA result table 6.7 shows that at 5% level of significance, the significant value is 0.000. As the significant value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and the result shows that there exists significant difference in the mean values of the level of agreeability of the respondents towards Assessing and reporting students learning outcomecompetency among the experience of the respondents. It is implied that the level of agreeability there is no differs from one experienced faculty to another.

CONCLUSION:

The work postulated in this paper "The impact of assessing and reporting the students learning outcome competency vs demographic Profile of faculty in educational institution" describes that the demographic factors like age, Qualification, Department, Designation, Marital status and experience have influence the facilities for students learning competency by faculty members. It is worth mentioning combining faculty' to their demographic profile.

Reference:

Cheng, G. (2009). Using game making pedagofy to facilitate student learning of interactive multimedia. *Australasian Jounal of Educational Technology*, 204-220.

Franzoni, A. L. (2009). Student Learning Styles Adaptation Method Based on Teaching Strategies and Electronic Media. *International Forum of Educational Technology & Society*(ISSN 1436-4522), 15-29.

J.Anith, P. (2014). Competency Mapping Model: Drive For Education. *IRD India, 2*(4), 24-30.

Ng'ambi, D. (2012). Usng Podacasting to Facilitate student Learning:A Constructivist Perspective. *International Forum of Educational Technology & Society*(ISSN 1436-4522), 181-192.

Broko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: mapping the terrain. (3. N. 8, Ed.) *Education Research,* 3-15.