

Ensuring Quality Instruction Amidst the Performance of Support and Core Functions of Faculty: Input for Establishing Workload Policy

Mark Jameson E. Perez

Pampanga State University, Pampanga, Philippines

Author Email: meperetz@pampangastateu.edu.ph

Date received: July 26, 2025

Date revised: November 4, 2025

Date accepted: November 14, 2025

Originality: 99%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 1%

Recommended citation:

Perez, M. J. (2025). Ensuring quality instruction amidst the performance of support and core functions of faculty: Input for establishing workload policy. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(12), 187-202.

<https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.599>

Abstract. This sequential explanatory research design study aimed to determine the quality of instruction being facilitated by faculty with contract of service employment status. At the same time, they performed their support and core functions. The inputs served as a basis for establishing recommendations for a workload policy. The study involved 180 respondents and five participants affiliated with the state university, specifically in Region III. The researcher-designed questionnaires were used in this study to assess teaching performance, time management and workload balance, institutional support, job satisfaction and performance perception, administrative efficiency, and task management. Participants were asked about the factors that hinder them in delivering quality teaching and administrative performances. The results showed that COS faculty effectively deliver lessons and adapt teaching strategies to meet students' needs. However, the additional and excessive workloads hinder their ability to provide timely feedback, maintain work-life balance, and innovate course materials. They can manage their tasks efficiently through delegation, but sometimes the teaching responsibilities are compromised due to limited institutional resources. Nevertheless, their contributions remain sustainable and impactful, ensuring they remain committed to delivering quality education and services. The findings revealed that multitasking impacts faculty teaching effectiveness due to limited resources, time constraints, compensation disparities, role conflicts, and administrative burdens. To address these issues, the faculty typically resorts to collaborative peer mentoring, stress management, time management, and mindfulness practices to stay focused. The study recommends regular training programs, provision of adequate resources, flexible scheduling, collaboration, performance-based incentives, and reduction of administrative tasks for faculty engaged in innovation, extension, research, and accreditation.

Keywords: Instruction; Policy; Quality; Support; Workload

1.0 Introduction

As teachers, we take pride when our students excel in their crafts and endeavors, and that can only be made possible with the quality of instruction provided by every educational frontline leader. On the other hand, students are unsatisfied when they receive a poor education that fails to inspire them to do more in their academic journey. Several factors contribute to the dilemmas teachers face in delivering quality instruction, including the support and core functions they perform. The core function of instructors is focused on teaching and learning. Meanwhile, the support function involves administrative tasks, research, mentorship, and community

engagement. These functions contribute to the overall success of the students they teach and the institution where they belong.

The center of the instructor's role revolves around teaching, assessing, and mentoring the students as they gain knowledge and prepare them for their future careers. Beyond classroom instruction, instructors also guide students in their career paths, providing feedback and encouragement to help them achieve their academic goals (Ancho & Bongco, 2019). Meanwhile, the supporting functions of instructors focus on their educational duties, curriculum development, and community outreach. Learning this, the temporary employment status of Contract of Service (COS) instructors presents unique challenges that may affect their job stability, workload, and even their professional growth in the field. Considering these challenges, it may impact the overall teaching and administrative performance of the COS instructors, making it essential for the institutions to recognize and address these concerns.

In the study by Sengsoulintha (2025), teachers are commonly prone to experiencing challenges in academia, including multiple functions and designations, various duties and responsibilities, additional administrative tasks, and external academic services, in addition to their instructional obligations. With these, educators are reportedly facing difficulties due to excessive workload, which can impact their role and planning, leading to task failure or delay in completion. Aside from these, the study by Afdal (2025) also found that teachers' roles require them to develop their integrative digital knowledge and competencies, encompassing social, pedagogical, and technical aspects. In connection with the study, if COS faculty are dedicated to performing their instructional duties but lack digital and technological competencies, it will only add to their burden in achieving their tasks. Instructors in any academic community are expected to possess digital literacy skills, particularly in the era of artificial intelligence. Another pressing issue that educators in higher education institutions are currently facing is their ability to adapt in the post-COVID world. Although some instructors have shifted to the modern way of teaching and learning after the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, it was found that some teachers need to relearn and return to the traditional teaching pedagogy (Case and Luongo, 2025). In relation to the study, it is beneficial that teachers are familiar with virtual and digital innovations and interventions; however, it is still important to consider that traditional teaching methods should not be overlooked. Educators must refrain from overreliance on artificial intelligence and synchronous learning activities. According to a study by Tareke et al. (2024), various reformative initiatives have been introduced in the higher education sector to address the challenges faced by teachers, including curriculum development, differentiation, quality concerns, inadequate educational resources, poor working environments, and professional skill gaps, among others. These aforementioned perennial problems are factors that can directly affect the support and core functions of faculty. For learning institutions to provide quality, accessible, and equitable education, educational stakeholders – both internal and external – must collaborate closely to address these concerns.

The voluminous tasks and paperwork to be accomplished and submitted by the teacher lead them not to perform well. The primary duties and responsibilities of faculty with a contract of service employment status involve effective and efficient classroom management, attending classes and school-related activities and meetings, conducting consultations with students who are facing various problems and issues, continuous development of instructional materials and course syllabi, enhancing and revising outcome-based education curriculum, and others. Aside from these, there are faculty members who are designated as head or coordinator of a particular unit or office in academia, which consumes their time preparing the necessary office documents to achieve all the indicators stipulated in the Office Performance Commitment (OPC). According to Pacaol (2021), the interaction between the teacher, student, and learning environment is essential to the educational process. However, it is the teacher who has power over the two factors and is professionally exposed to a variety of difficulties, such as an increase in workload. Due to the development of teaching and learning, as well as education in general, this educational issue has been a primary area of focus for educational scholars since the second half of the 20th century. It is commonly assumed that excellent teaching plays a considerable, if not the most significant, role in how learners develop their academic undertakings (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002). It is further assumed that there is a demand for quality instruction (Banks et al., 2005).

According to Jomuad et al. (2021), certain factors, such as job insecurity, pose a threat to the stability of the employment status of COS instructors, causing emotional and financial stress. Additionally, a lack of long-term

career progress makes it difficult for instructors to attain professional growth and stability (Shoss, 2017). Furthermore, lower job morale and emotional exhaustion reduce the motivation of instructors in performing both duties efficiently (Lüleci & Çoruk, 2018). Also, according to Joint Circular No. 1, series of 2017, which was issued together by the Civil Service Commission (CSC), Commission on Audit (COA), and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM), the ultimate aim of this joint circular is to protect Job Order (JO) and Contract of Service (COS) workers. This states that these workers should not be required to perform the same duties, responsibilities, and functions as regular employees. They also should not be given any administrative positions or asked to oversee or manage regular or career employees.

In general, recommending a workload policy for faculty with a contract of service status is necessary to ensure a balance between the performance of their support and core functions. Despite fulfilling their instructional duties, such as preparing and delivering lessons, conceptualizing instructional materials, constructing assessment tools, and providing feedback, instructors' excessive tasks beyond these teaching-related responsibilities are considered one of the significant challenges for them. Additionally, the administrative tasks they must perform while fulfilling their instructional duties can significantly impact the quality of their outputs. Thus, there is a pressing need to conceptualize and implement a workload policy to ensure quality instruction and achievable administrative performance.

This study examined the quality of instruction being facilitated by faculty members in contract service employment status. At the same time, they perform their support and core functions to establish a workload policy based on these inputs. Specifically, it aims to answer the following:

1. How may the faculty with a contract of service employment status assess their teaching performance amidst the performance of their support and core functions?
2. How may the faculty with a contract of service employment status's administrative performance be described as they fulfill their instructional functions?
3. What are the factors being considered that hinder the delivery of quality instruction amidst the performance of the support and core functions of faculty with a contract of service employment status?
4. What are the factors being considered that hinder the delivery of quality performance of the support and core functions of the faculty with a contract of service employment status as they fulfill their instructional functions?
5. Based on the results and findings of the study, what input may be proposed in establishing a workload policy?

This study is grounded in the Role Theory by Katz & Kahn (1978) and Biddle (1986), which suggests that individuals in an organization who hold multiple roles or designations can impact the clarity of their performance. In this study, if faculty members under contract for service employment status are performing both instructional duties and administrative functions, it can result in role conflicts that could lead to reduced productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency among instructors. Therefore, a policy recommendation regarding their workload is necessary to address this gap and prevent burnout and inefficiency among instructors.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This research study employed a mixed-methods approach to assess the quality of instruction provided by faculty members as they performed their support and core functions. The results and findings can be used to inform the development and establishment of a workload policy. According to Creswell and Clark (2011), mixed-methods research primarily focuses on gathering, analyzing, and integrating both quantitative and qualitative data across one or a series of studies. This study utilized the sequential explanatory design. This design aims to collect quantitative and qualitative data at various points in time. The design consists of two phases: a quantitative phase and a subsequent qualitative phase (Creswell et al., 2014). The researcher interpreted the relevant results by summarizing and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative findings. Next, discussed how and to what extent qualitative results contributed to the explanation of quantitative results. The researcher employed a sequential explanatory research design to analyze the gathered data in the quantitative phase, and the collected data were essential in the qualitative phase, specifically in generating questions for the participants of this study. Its main goal is to better understand research issues by integrating two research approaches, rather than relying on just one. Therefore, this study sought to comprehensively develop inputs for workload policy based on the results and findings.

2.2 Participants and Sampling Technique

The respondents of this study were the 180 faculty with a contract of service employment status who had support and core functions and were affiliated with the state university, particularly in Region III. The respondents were selected using a convenience sampling technique, as it facilitated easy access to the data for the researcher. This sampling technique was employed because the researcher considered the availability of respondents and those who had only given their consent to participate in the survey questionnaire. On the other hand, the five participants in the study were COS faculty members who were designated as coordinators or chairpersons of a specific unit. The purposive sampling technique was used in selecting the participants following this set of criteria: a) must have at least 3-5 years of experience as unit coordinator or chairperson; b) must have at least a very satisfactory or outstanding performance rating; c) must have attended relevant training and seminars; and d) received at least local achievement or recognition as unit coordinator or chairperson. The sampling technique used for the qualitative phase was used to ensure that the gathered data are valid, reliable, and substantial.

2.3 Research Instrument

The instruments used by the researcher were a survey questionnaire and interview questions, which were developed based on various related literature, specifically on ensuring quality instruction amidst the performance of support and core functions of faculty. To satisfy the requisite validity and reliability, the questionnaires were presented to the research panel or experts, where their insights and suggestions were incorporated. The questionnaires were validated by the three experts who are dexterous in their respective fields of specialization, particularly in research, language, and educational management. Firstly, the research expert validator must have published or presented research in a reputable national or international journal. Secondly, the language expert validator must be at least a holder of a master's in linguistics or language education. Lastly, the educational management expert validator must be a campus director or college dean with a proven professional and academic track record. The validators' inputs were taken into consideration in the final form of the questionnaire. They were requested to assess the comprehensiveness and clarity of every indicator and whether the descriptive rating scale is appropriate. The calculated value of Cronbach's Alpha was 0.97, indicating excellent internal consistency. The survey questionnaire was administered via Google Forms. Moreover, the interview was held either face-to-face or online.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher followed the procedure of collecting the data and administering the questionnaire. First and foremost, the researcher wrote a formal letter seeking the approval of the relevant authorities. Then, the researcher prepared the plan of activities and informed consent of the key informants for the online data gathering. The respective campus directors and deans of the concerned faculty complied with the ethical standards. For the quantitative phase, the survey questionnaire was given to the respondents through Google Forms. For the qualitative phase, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews, either online or face-to-face. The participants received a brief overview of the study's nature, their rights, and their role in the study. The follow-up interviews were scheduled at a time and online venue designated by the participants (e.g., Google Meet, Zoom Meeting, Messenger). Each participant was interviewed only once, but they had the opportunity to add information, ask questions, and modify previous statements as needed. All the participants' interviews were recorded with their consent. Afterward, the recordings were transcribed verbatim and converted into text for analysis, classification, and categorization. A research and language expert validated the qualitative data. In addition, the data were triangulated with the quantitative data to determine if there were similarities or contrasting statements.

2.5 Data Analysis Procedure

For the quantitative phase, descriptive statistics will be used to process and interpret the gathered data. According to Bryman (2006), a quantitative data analysis is an approach that is systematic and is used to investigate collected numerical data, wherein the researcher transforms what is observed and gathered into numerical data. Data that consists of numerical values or counts, with a unique number assigned to each record, is referred to as quantitative data. Based on these mathematical inferences, researchers can use this quantifiable data in statistics and mathematics to make decisions in the real world. Surveys, polls, and questionnaires sent to a particular population are the most widely used techniques for collecting data for statistical analysis. One of the best ways to get reliable results that help you make better decisions is to use quantitative data in research. In summary, quantitative data

are the basis of statistical analysis. Measurable and verifiable data provide information about quantity. Quantitative data defines numbers; qualitative data is descriptive. Quantitative data analysis will be employed by carefully examining the collected data. After examining the data, the researcher described the numerical data in words.

For the qualitative phase, qualitative data analysis is grounded in an interpretive philosophy. The researcher employed this process to analyze the collected data during the research. Richards (2009) maintained that suitable data analysis requires the researcher to closely examine and interpret the data with a broad array of understanding. The data analysis in the context of this study commenced when the researcher carefully read and transcribed the qualitative data. Afterwards, the data were distributed into meaningful analytical units. Keypoint coding was used to apply important concepts by analyzing specific parts of the text. According to Stuckey (2015), coding follows a systematic process of determining emergent codes. Coding involves sorting data by topic, idea, or category, and code-labeling similar parts of the text for easy reference later for comparison and analysis. Similar codes are grouped into concepts because they share specific properties that characterize the pattern. To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the qualitative data, the researcher followed particular criteria in selecting the study participants. The researcher spent time with the participants asking for their insights and experiences. Additionally, multiple data sources were utilized, including interviews, observations, and documents, to verify and cross-check the findings.

The quantitative data were analyzed using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree). The mean ranges and verbal interpretation include: 1.00-1.75=Strongly Disagree, 1.76-2.50=Disagree, 2.51-3.25=Agree, 3.26-4.00=Strongly Agree. Also, the mean and standard deviation were identified. On the other hand, to identify patterns and themes, a thematic analysis of the qualitative data was used.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

The researcher adhered to ethical requirements throughout the entire research period. The researcher explained the nature and purpose of the research study and discussed the views and decisions of the key informants. Additionally, all the information was treated with the utmost confidentiality. The study was conducted in accordance with research ethics to prevent potential problems in its future conduct. Additionally, the key informants were informed about their contribution and the purposes, aims, and objectives of this research study. A statement was provided on the consent form to respect and protect the rights of participants to full disclosure, self-determination, confidentiality, non-maleficence, and privacy. Additionally, the participants' freedom to withdraw from the study was considered, and a statement was provided regarding the indication of a safe space, logistics, and technical provisions or considerations for both participants and researchers for online surveys and interviews.

3.0 Results, Findings, and Discussion

3.1 Quantitative Phase

Table 1 presents the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status on their teaching performance, as well as their performance in support and core functions.

The table displayed below shows that the indicator with the highest calculated mean value is 3.82, with a standard deviation of 0.38, which indicates that the respondents strongly agree that they used to ensure that their lessons were presented effectively and efficiently as they followed the course contents and objectives while performing their core and support functions. However, the lowest calculated mean value is 1.83, with a standard deviation of 0.38, indicating that the respondents disagree with the notion that they can still provide timely feedback and assessments to their students while fulfilling their support and core functions. In conclusion, the calculated mean score of 2.69, with a standard deviation of 0.47, indicates that faculty members with a contract of service employment status generally agree that they have satisfactorily performed their teaching duties while also fulfilling their support and core functions.

Table 1. *Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Teaching Performance Amidst the Performance of their Support and Core Functions in Terms of Teaching Performance*

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
I ensured that my lessons were presented effectively and efficiently, following the course content and objectives while performing my core and support functions.	3.82	0.38	Strongly Agree
I can still innovate courses and learning materials while performing my core and support functions.	1.84	0.37	Disagree
I can still provide timely feedback and assessments to my students while accomplishing my support and core functions.	1.83	0.38	Disagree
I ensure that I can still adapt to the teaching strategies to meet the students' needs, interests, and expectations while managing my workload effectively.	3.38	0.52	Strongly Agree
I am putting extra effort into preparing my lessons so that the students can receive a quality and accessible education while I perform my support and core functions.	2.57	0.72	Agree
Total	2.69	0.47	Agree

Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree

Table 2 presents the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status on their teaching performance, as well as their support and core functions in terms of time management and workload balance. As shown in the table, the highest calculated mean value is 3.15, with a standard deviation of 0.47, indicating that the respondents generally agree that they are good time managers and effectively ensure their teaching and administrative tasks are accomplished. On the contrary, the lowest calculated mean value is 1.47, with a standard deviation of 0.50, which reveals that the respondents strongly disagree that the academic responsibilities assigned to them do not affect their instructional effectiveness. In general, the mean value of 2.06, with a standard deviation of 0.48, indicates that faculty with a contract of service employment status disagree that they have sufficient time management and workload balance while performing their support and core functions.

Table 2. *Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Teaching Performance Amidst the Performance of their Support and Core Functions in Terms of Time Management and Workload Balance*

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
I am a good time manager and ensure my teaching and administrative tasks are accomplished.	3.15	0.47	Agree
The additional tasks or workload I am assigned do not hinder me from attending to my teaching responsibilities.	2.02	0.42	Disagree
I can submit the required requirements on time for teaching and non-academic tasks without compromising quality.	1.82	0.45	Disagree
The non-academic responsibilities assigned to me do not affect my instructional effectiveness.	1.47	0.50	Strongly Disagree
I can still maintain a work-life balance while fulfilling my instructional responsibilities, providing support, and performing core functions.	1.86	0.56	Disagree
Total	2.06	0.48	Disagree

Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree

Table 3 shows the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status on their teaching performance and the performance of their support and core functions in terms of Institutional Support. As presented in the table, the indicator with the highest calculated mean value is 3.89, with a standard deviation of 0.32, indicating that respondents strongly agree that the institution has policies and guidelines to help them manage their teaching and other responsibilities. On the other hand, the lowest calculated mean value is 3.13, with a standard deviation of 0.33, indicating that respondents agree the institution provides them with adequate training, workshops, and orientation to manage their instructional, support, and core functions efficiently and effectively. In conclusion, a general mean value of 3.58, with a standard deviation of 0.35, indicates that faculty with a contract of service employment status strongly agree that they have institutional support in performing their support and core functions.

Table 3. *Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Teaching Performance Amidst the Performance of their Support and Core Functions in Terms of Institutional Support*

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
The institution provides me with adequate training, workshops, and orientation to manage my instructional, support, and core functions efficiently and effectively.	3.13	0.33	Agree
The institution recognizes the challenges I face as a faculty member and a coordinator.	3.86	0.35	Strongly Agree
The institution makes me feel valued in the organization as I fulfill my teaching, support, and core functions.	3.83	0.37	Strongly Agree
The institution provides me with clear directions about what is expected of me to accomplish.	3.19	0.40	Agree
The institution has established policies and guidelines to assist me in managing my teaching and other responsibilities.	3.89	0.32	Strongly Agree
Total	3.58	0.35	Strongly Agree

Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree

Table 4 presents the data on the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status regarding their teaching performance, as well as their support and core functions, in terms of job satisfaction and performance perception. As displayed in the table, the highest calculated mean value is 3.89, with a standard deviation of 0.31, indicating that the respondents strongly agree that they believe students appreciate their teaching performance, as it contributes to their support and core functions. On the other hand, the lowest mean value is 3.53, with a standard deviation of 0.50, indicating that respondents strongly agree they can obtain a very satisfactory or outstanding student rating despite the performance of their support and core functions. In general, the calculated mean value of 3.76, with a standard deviation of 0.40, indicates that faculty with a contract of service employment status strongly agree that they have job satisfaction and a positive perception of their performance, amidst the performance of their support and core functions.

Table 4. *Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Teaching Performance Amidst the Performance of their Support and Core Functions in Terms of Job Satisfaction and Performance Perception*

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
I feel satisfied with my teaching performance despite the additional workloads assigned to me.	3.68	0.47	Strongly Agree
I can consistently achieve a very satisfactory or outstanding student rating, despite the performance of my support and core functions.	3.53	0.50	Strongly Agree
I feel valued whenever I contribute to actual accomplishments that help attain goals and improve the institution.	3.82	0.39	Strongly Agree
I can maintain my motivation and enthusiasm to teach by fulfilling my support and core functions.	3.88	0.32	Strongly Agree
My students appreciate my teaching performance as I contribute to my support and core functions.	3.89	0.31	Strongly Agree
Total	3.76	0.40	Strongly Agree

Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree

Table 5 presents the data on the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status regarding their administrative performance, in relation to their instructional functions, in terms of administrative efficiency and task management. As shown in the table, the indicator with the highest mean value is 2.89, with a standard deviation of 0.41, indicating that respondents agree they ensure their tasks are accomplished and submitted on time without compromising their teaching performance. Meanwhile, the lowest calculated mean value is 2.82, with a standard deviation of 0.41 and 0.39, indicating that the respondents agree that they delegate tasks to their colleagues and monitor them to ensure efficient handling of their teaching and administrative tasks. In conclusion, a mean score of 2.85, with a standard deviation of 0.41, suggests that faculty members with a contract of service employment status believe they possess administrative efficiency and effective task management, despite the demands of their instructional functions.

Table 5. Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Administrative Performance Amidst the Performance of their Instructional Functions in Terms of Administrative Efficiency and Task Management

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
I effectively complete my support and core functions while managing my instructional duties.	2.82	0.41	Agree
I ensure the submission of quality accomplishment reports despite my teaching load.	2.83	0.41	Agree
I can plan and accomplish my support and core functions without compromising my instructional responsibilities.	2.87	0.43	Agree
I ensure that my tasks are accomplished and submitted on time without compromising my teaching performance.	2.89	0.41	Agree
I used to delegate tasks to my colleagues and monitor their progress to efficiently handle my teaching and administrative responsibilities.	2.82	0.39	Agree
Total	2.85	0.41	Agree
Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree			

Table 6 presents the data on the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status regarding their administrative performance in relation to their instructional functions, specifically in terms of time management and work-life balance. As reflected in the table, the highest calculated mean value is 3.21, with a standard deviation of 0.41, indicating that the respondents agree that they allocate specific time to balance their support and core functions without compromising the quality of their teaching. However, the lowest mean value is 2.10, with a standard deviation of 0.42; this indicates that the respondents disagree with the notion that they can manage support and core functions without compromising their teaching tasks. In general, the mean score of 2.82, with a standard deviation of 0.42, indicates that faculty members with a contract of service employment status agree that they have effective time management and work-life balance.

Table 6. Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Administrative Performance Amidst the Performance of their Instructional Functions in Terms of Time Management and Work Balance

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
I allocate specific time to balance my support and core functions, ensuring that the quality of teaching is not compromised.	3.21	0.41	Agree
I manage my support and core functions without compromising my teaching tasks.	2.10	0.42	Disagree
I can handle unexpected additional workloads without negatively impacting my instructional performance.	2.51	0.50	Agree
I ensure that both support and core functions, alongside my instructional functions, are appropriately managed.	3.12	0.41	Agree
I usually collaborate with my colleagues to share the burden of my support and core functions, allowing me to attend to my teaching responsibilities.	3.18	0.38	Agree
Total	2.82	0.42	Agree
Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree			

Table 7 presents the data on the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status regarding their administrative performance, in relation to their instructional functions, in terms of institutional support and resources. As presented in the table, the indicator with the highest calculated mean value is 3.86, with a standard deviation of 0.35. This indicates that the respondents strongly agree that the institution provided training, workshops, and orientation to enhance their administrative efficiency. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score is 2.07, with a standard deviation of 0.40, indicating that respondents disagree with the institution's provision of adequate resources, such as office supplies, staff, and finances, to successfully achieve the plans and targets of their assigned unit or office. In conclusion, the general weighted mean of 3.09, with a standard deviation of 0.37, suggests that faculty members with a contract of service employment status on their administrative performance agree that they have institutional support and resources to support the performance of their instructional functions.

Table 7. Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Administrative Performance Amidst the Performance of their Instructional Functions in Terms of Institutional Support and Resources

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
The institution provides support so I can fulfill all my support and core functions.	3.17	0.37	Agree
The institution equips me with the necessary administrative skills to effectively accomplish the assigned support and core functions.	3.21	0.41	Agree
The institution provides me with adequate resources, including office supplies, staff, and finances, to successfully achieve the plans and targets of my assigned unit or office.	2.07	0.40	Disagree
The institution ensures that I receive timely feedback to enhance the quality of my performance.	3.13	0.34	Agree
The institution provides training, workshops, and orientation to enhance my administrative efficiency.	3.86	0.35	Strongly Agree
Total	3.09	0.37	Agree

Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree

Table 8 presents the assessment of faculty with a contract of service employment status on their administrative performance, in relation to their instructional functions, in terms of job satisfaction and performance perception. As shown in the table, the highest mean value is 3.54, with a standard deviation of 0.50, indicating that respondents strongly agree that they feel supported by their colleagues and students as they perform their support and core functions, as well as their teaching duties. Furthermore, the lowest mean score is 3.29, with a standard deviation of 0.45, indicating that respondents strongly agree that their colleagues are motivated to work due to their impactful contributions to the institution. In general, the mean score of 3.37, with a standard deviation of 0.47, indicates that faculty with a contract of service employment status strongly agree that they experience job satisfaction and a positive perception of their performance while performing their instructional functions.

Table 8. Assessment of Faculty with a Contract of Service Employment Status on their Administrative Performance Amidst the Performance of their Instructional Functions in Terms of Job Satisfaction and Performance Perception

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Interpretation
I feel satisfied with my administrative performance as I fulfill my teaching responsibilities.	3.34	0.47	Strongly Agree
I believe that my colleagues are motivated to work because of the impactful contributions I have made to the institution.	3.29	0.45	Strongly Agree
I appreciate the support of my colleagues and students as I perform my support and core functions, as well as my teaching duties.	3.54	0.50	Strongly Agree
I feel valued in the workplace because the institution recognizes my efforts in its improvement.	3.37	0.48	Strongly Agree
My administrative performance brings a sustainable impact to the institution's stakeholders.	3.31	0.46	Strongly Agree
Total	3.37	0.47	Strongly Agree

Legend: 4.00-3.26 – Strongly Agree 3.25-2.51 – Agree 2.50-1.76 – Disagree 1.75-1.00 – Strongly Disagree

3.2 Qualitative Phase

The findings regarding the presented problems were based on the responses of the participants. In this study, six themes were formulated, each with its corresponding sub-themes: Managing Workload and Multitasking, Providing an Inclusive and Structured Learning Community, Quality Instruction and Coping Mechanisms, Workload Preparation and Resources, Enhancing Commitment and Workplace Flexibility, and Administrative Performance and Coping Mechanisms.

Quality Instruction Barriers While Performing the Support and Core Functions in Terms of Managing Workload and Multitasking

Theme 1: Managing Workload and Multitasking

In the dynamic landscape of higher education, one of the biggest challenges instructors face in delivering quality education is managing their workload and multitasking. Heavy workload often requires instructors to juggle multiple responsibilities, resulting in multitasking. Considering this, multitasking between teaching and the administrative roles of instructors can significantly affect the instructor's ability to focus on one task at a time. This could impact the instructor's performance. Following this, here are the themes that emerged:

Sub-theme 1: Inadequate Time and Lack of Focus

"Also, having an administrative workload in performing the support and core functions impacts work-life balance, thus reducing time for the actual teaching." (IP1)

"One of the primary challenges I encounter in delivering quality instruction while fulfilling my support and core functions is time management." (IP2)

"Lesson planning and preparing new instructional materials is sometimes redirected to activities related to my support and core functions." (IP2)

"Excessive documentation and other compliance requirements reduce focus on teaching." (IP4)

"My focus is divided, too, which vastly affects my performance." (IP5)

Sub-theme 2: Balancing Workload and Multitasking

"An excessive workload negatively impacts my teaching performance, as there are times when I must prioritize administrative and support-related responsibilities over direct instruction for my students." (IP2)

"As a faculty under COS, I may not be able to perform my other tasks, especially in teaching, because of the multiple tasks to be submitted and accomplished." (IP3)

"It creates a problem in delivering quality instruction to their learners, especially when they do multiple tasks outside the teaching job, like attending seminars, meetings, doing administrative work, and many more." (IP3)

"We cannot avoid skipping classes just to do what is asked of us to do." (IP5)

In a complex and dynamic environment such as the field of teaching, managing workloads and multitasking are common challenges that teachers often face. The participants shared their experiences regarding their performance in support and core functions that impact the delivery of quality instruction, including inadequate time and lack of focus, as well as balancing workload and multitasking. One of the emerging issues related to instructional performance while fulfilling the core and support functions of instructors under a service contract is the administrative tasks assigned to them, which negatively impact their time for actual teaching and learning. One of the participants noted that instead of allocating their time to lesson planning and constructing instructional materials, it is sometimes redirected to administrative tasks. The excessive workload, multiple designations, multitasking, and skipping attending classes lead to a lack of concentration. The participants also noted that job security, job compensation, recognition, support, and uncompensated workloads trigger this kind of challenge.

Theme 2: Providing an Inclusive and Structured Learning Community

Creating an inclusive, collaborative, and structured learning environment, especially for instructors who hold Contract of Service (COS) status, is often a challenge as they try to balance both their teaching responsibilities and administrative roles. The emerging sub-themes indicate that limited resources, access to learning technologies, inadequate institutional support, and policies collectively contribute to the overall performance of Contract of Service (COS) instructors.

Sub-theme 1: Limited Resources and Access to Learning Technologies

"whereas we all know that having updated and the latest technology is very essential in providing quality instruction, but is often constrained by resources and time." (IP1)

"lack of resources like the availability of updated instructional materials, specifically of specialized books, projectors, etc." (IP3)

"Inadequate resources make it challenging to balance my teaching responsibilities with support and core functions." (IP4)

Sub-theme 2: Inadequate Institutional Support and Policies

"Through institutional policies, I can set clear expectations and provide an outline for my development." (IP1)

"Institutional policies, administrative support, and available resources significantly influence my teaching performance. These factors provide a solid foundation and serve as a guide, allowing me to perform my duties effectively without having to start from scratch." (IP2)

"A supportive school environment in terms of policies, support, and resources strengthens the capability of a teacher to perform his/her tasks. It creates an engaging and vital support to all the teachers." (IP3)

"Limited institutional support." (IP4)

Limited access to learning technologies is viewed as one of the challenges that instructors face in fulfilling their core and support functions. This is evident in the instructors' responses as they share their struggles with insufficient technological resources and a lack of available learning materials and equipment.

Theme 3: Quality Instruction Coping Mechanisms

As part of the challenges that instructors face in maintaining the quality of instruction while performing their administrative duties, the instructors shared how they cope. This is all visible in the following emerging themes: *"collaborating with colleagues to have support, expertise, and enhance professional growth" (IP1)*

"adapting and being flexible to adjust my teaching strategies and meet students' needs to make sure that there is always learning" (IP1)

Listing down all the work that needs to be accomplished and doing it before the deadline, and using the given time for coordinators to do the tasks." (IP3)

"Prioritization of tasks".(IP4)

Administrative Performance Barriers While Performing the Instructional Functions in Terms of Workload Preparations and Resources

Theme 4: Workload Preparations and Resources

Apart from the mentioned challenges, one of the significant challenges that instructors face is ensuring adequate workload preparation and resource management. Few instructors have mentioned that they struggle in delivering quality education, especially when they have limited access to teaching and administrative resources. These are all noticeable on the emerging sub-themes below:

Sub-theme 1: Excessive Teaching Load Preparations

"One of the challenges I face in efficiently fulfilling my support and core functions while managing my instructional duties is the need to teach new subjects every semester." (IP2)

Due to the limited number of loads, we are usually given more than two or three preparations, four to five preparations, so that we can have more loads to take." (IP5)

Sub-theme 2: Insufficient Support and Resources

"Lack of support with others- while performing your duties and responsibilities in line with the support and core functions, other co-workers have little to no support to accomplish certain tasks/activities/programs/projects of your unit." (IP3)

"Lack of resources, especially in terms of financial support." (IP3)

Theme 5: Enhancing Commitment and Workplace Flexibility

Considering the challenges above, balancing teaching and administrative responsibilities often leads to conflict within the workplace, and flexibility and adaptability are essential. This can be seen in the following sub-themes:

Sub-theme 1: Balancing Teaching and Administrative Responsibilities

"The role conflict as a COS faculty and coordinator has a significant impact on my overall performance, which sometimes leads to decreased job satisfaction, motivation, and productivity because this conflict causes stress and emotional exhaustion." (IP1)

"Balancing instructional responsibilities with administrative tasks can lead to time constraints, reduced focus on lesson preparation, and increased work-related stress. This conflict sometimes affects my ability to provide quality instruction and fulfill my support duties effectively." (IP2)

"Juggling both roles divides my time and focus, making it difficult to give my full attention to each." (IP4)
"staying late at school to finish the given task." (IP5)

Theme 6: Administrative Performance Coping Mechanisms

Balancing both academic and administrative duties can tend to overwhelm instructors, especially those who handle multiple roles within the institution. Specific coping mechanisms help them to stay focused and work effectively based on their functions. This is evident in the following sub-themes that emerged:

Sub-theme 1: Task Prioritization

"I implement strategies such as creating a detailed schedule, setting deadlines for each task, and breaking larger tasks into smaller, manageable steps." (IP2)

"Make a to-do list, stay organized, and set realistic deadlines for you to accomplish different tasks." (IP3)

Sub-theme 2: Mindfulness and Positive Work Attitude

"I practice mindfulness or meditation to manage stress and stay focused at all times." (IP1)

"One of my coping mechanisms, I have to effectively perform my support and core functions while attending to my instructional responsibilities, is mindset." (IP5)

Sub-theme 3: Building a Support System

"I seek support from colleagues and immediate supervisors when needed." (IP1)

"Also, since I am surrounded by co-workers who happen to be friends too, I feel like the workloads become lighter." (IP5)

3.3 Integrated Data Analysis

It is very common in most countries for university teachers to have administrative tasks and administrative positions (Garcia-Gallego et al., 2015). These administrative duties involve school management tasks. Based on the results of the quantitative data, most instructors agree that their performance in teaching, while fulfilling their support and core functions, is relevant and timely in terms of following the course content and objectives, adapting teaching strategies to meet students' needs, and preparing lessons. This is supported by the qualitative data gathered from the participants, which indicates that lesson planning and preparing instructional materials are sometimes redirected to activities related to their support and core functions. Additionally, the gathered data from the respondents in the quantitative analysis shows that participants disagreed with the idea that they can innovate courses and learning materials while providing timely feedback and assessment to their students, as they were primarily focused on accomplishing their support and core functions. The participants' responses in the

qualitative data support this, as they stated that having an administrative workload while performing support and core functions impacts their work-life balance, thereby reducing the time and focus available for actual teaching. The participants also added that excessive administrative workload negatively impacts the delivery of quality instruction among learners. Furthermore, the quantitative data revealed that most instructors put extra effort into lessons to provide quality instruction to their students. This is quantitative data that corroborates the gathered qualitative data from the participants. The participants expressed that they implement different organizational strategies, such as setting realistic deadlines, creating a detailed schedule, and breaking down larger tasks into smaller, manageable steps. On the other hand, the participants' responses to the results in Table 1 differ from those of the emerging themes. Based on the quantitative data, the instructors agreed that they could ensure that their lessons were presented effectively and efficiently while performing their core and support functions. This is in contrast to their follow-up statements found in the qualitative data. According to their statements, having an administrative workload, excessive documentation, and other compliance requirements leads to divided attention, which significantly affects their performance in teaching.

The implications of the results from quantitative data analysis and qualitative data analysis, based on the teaching performance of instructors and their support and core functions, can vary in terms of responsibilities within the institution. For instructors who can efficiently balance their time between core and administrative functions, it leads to more productive and engaging quality instruction (Karadağ, 2018). Additionally, it helps them cultivate their administrative skills as an effective support system for the institution. However, for instructors who struggle to balance their heavy administrative workload with their core function, this can negatively impact their teaching performance by reducing the time allocated for lesson planning, preparing instructional materials, and focusing on lesson delivery. This will eventually lead to possible burnout and professional stress for the instructors due to excessive workload and lack of enthusiasm in teaching (Kryshtanovych et al., 2022).

The quantitative data gathered from the participants revealed that the instructional effectiveness of COS instructors is affected by the non-academic tasks assigned to them. This is substantiated by the qualitative data, which indicates that instructors are unable to perform other tasks, especially teaching, as they must complete multiple administrative tasks within a given deadline. Moreover, the data collected from the quantitative analysis shows that instructors struggle to maintain a work-life balance while fulfilling their instructional responsibilities, as they need to meet the required deadlines for teaching and non-academic tasks without compromising the quality of their work. This is supported by their statements in the qualitative data, which indicate that one of the primary challenges they face is delivering quality instruction that does not compromise student learning while balancing their tasks as a support system for the institution. Lastly, the data from Table 2, which presents quantitative information, indicate that additional workload and tasks assigned to COS instructors hinder their ability to attend to their teaching roles. This is supported by the participants' responses collected in qualitative data, which indicate that excessive workload negatively impacts their teaching performance. They report difficulty in delivering quality instructions to learners when they are required to perform multiple tasks outside their teaching job, such as seminars, meetings, and administrative tasks assigned to them. In contrast to the quantitative data, which revealed that instructors are good time managers, the qualitative data presented statements that vary from this finding. The participants stated that they have divided their focus between their teaching job and their support function-related work.

This implies that the time constraints, additional workload, and administrative tasks assigned to instructors have significantly impacted their performance in their teaching roles. From this, we can infer that the workload balance and job efficiency of COS instructors are affected. From shortened lesson planning to delayed feedback, these factors can impact the students' learning experience (Fyfe et al., 2021). This can be an excellent opportunity to refine institutional policies and make workload adjustments to help COS instructors enhance their job performance while also improving their support effectiveness.

Another quantitative data collection shows that instructors receive support and recognition from the institution as they fulfill their teaching, support, and core functions as faculty members and coordinators. This is corroborated by the qualitative data collected from the participants, which shows they seek support from their colleagues and immediate supervisors when needed. Additionally, they surround themselves with coworkers who lighten their workloads. Lastly, the collected quantitative data from the participants reveal that the institution provides

adequate training, workshops, and seminars to support their role as a system within the institution. To add, the instructors agreed that the institution provides clear directions about what is expected of them to accomplish. This is supported by the statements of the participants in the qualitative data gathered, which indicate that through institutional policies, instructors can set clear expectations, as this also provides an outline for their development. Furthermore, the instructors also stated that administrative support significantly influences their teaching performance, as this factor provides a solid foundation that allows them to perform their duties effectively. However, some responses from the instructors, as collected in the quantitative data, vary from those gathered in the qualitative form. It is revealed that the institution provides support, but only to a limited extent. This corroborates the instructors' statement that they experience limited support from the institution.

This implies that institutional support has a significant impact on the quality of teaching, motivation, and effectiveness of COS instructors. These factors impact the overall professional growth of COS instructors, as fair workload distribution and administrative support are expected from the institution (Nuss & Kogan, 2022).

The study also revealed that COS instructors can obtain very satisfactory student ratings despite performing their support and core functions. Additionally, the instructors are satisfied with their teaching performance, despite the additional workloads assigned to them. This is corroborated by the qualitative data, which indicates that they adapt and adjust their teaching strategies to meet the students' needs, ensuring that learning is always ongoing. However, despite the positive responses from the quantitative data, such as instructors feeling valued for their contributions to the institution's accomplishments, maintaining motivation and enthusiasm to teach, and students' appreciation of the instructors' performance in supporting and fulfilling their core functions, the qualitative data responses show otherwise. The qualitative data reveal that instructors often encounter problems, including a limited number of loads, inadequate resources, and role conflict. As a COS faculty member and a coordinator, this often leads to decreased job satisfaction, motivation, and productivity due to stress and emotional exhaustion.

This implies that the relation between quantitative data and qualitative data shows that COS faculty often face job insecurity, which impacts their motivation and job satisfaction (Lee et al., 2017). Additionally, when the instructors feel motivated through recognition and adequate support from the institution, they are more likely to excel in both teaching and core functions as instructors and support systems of the institution.

In this study, it was also found that the quantitative data show that few COS instructors can plan, accomplish, and the quality of the accomplishment reports on their support and core function requirements is not compromised despite their workload. This is supported by their statements, which are gathered and presented in the qualitative data. The instructors stated that listing down all the work that needs to be accomplished helps them ensure quality output. Additionally, the quantitative data revealed that COS instructors ensure their tasks are performed and submitted on time. This is substantiated by the qualitative data gathered from the participants. The prioritization of tasks, completing requirements before deadlines, and utilizing time effectively help coordinators stay focused and adhere to deadlines. Furthermore, the quantitative data reveal that instructors delegate tasks to their colleagues to help them monitor and manage their teaching and administrative responsibilities more efficiently. This is supported by the statements found in the qualitative part, such as collaborating with colleagues to have support, expertise, and enhance professional growth. Although certain instructors noted positive correlations between the qualitative and quantitative data, there are still contrasting implications between the two. This is evident in the quantitative data gathered, which ensures that tasks are accomplished without compromising teaching performance. The statements from the participants in the qualitative data, however, show otherwise. The instructors mentioned that having too much workload negatively impacts their ability to balance instructional responsibilities with administrative tasks, which often leads to time constraints resulting in reduced focus on lesson preparation and increased work-related stress. Moreover, the quantitative data related to the delegation of tasks by the instructors to their colleagues also has a negative counterpart in qualitative data gathered from the participants. The qualitative data indicate a lack of support from others when performing duties and responsibilities in line with the support and core functions. Furthermore, instructors feel that their coworkers have little to no support in accomplishing specific tasks within their unit.

The implications of these factors, as evident in the comparison between the quantitative and qualitative data, have significant implications for the task management and productivity of COS instructors. Multitasking challenges

often result in task overload, which may affect the performance of both teaching and core functions of instructors (Hamid et al., 2024). Considering the impact on the workload balance of instructors, which is likely due to excessive administrative tasks, it may lead to potential burnout and job dissatisfaction.

Another result from the quantitative data shows that the respondents handle unexpected additional workloads without negative impacts on their instructional performance. Additionally, the results from the quantitative data indicate that instructors can manage their support and core functions without compromising teaching quality. This is supported by the qualitative data gathered from the participants, which states that a proper mindset helps them to perform their tasks effectively.

Next, the quantitative data gathered indicate that participants collaborate with their colleagues to reduce the burden of their functions. This is corroborated by the qualitative data gathered from the participants, which states that collaborating with colleagues helps them in terms of support, expertise, and enhances professional growth. Additionally, the quantitative data revealed that instructors cannot manage their support and core functions without compromising their teaching responsibilities. This is evident in the qualitative data. The statements from the instructors indicate that they are struggling to maintain a work-life balance in fulfilling their duties. On the contrary, the quantitative data that shows instructors can handle and manage unexpected additional workload without impacting the instructional performance does not corroborate with the results of the qualitative data. The participants shared that having an administrative workload reduces their time for actual teaching. The participants also shared that excessive compliance requirements reduce their time for lesson planning, preparing instructional materials, and focusing on education.

Lastly, the implications of these factors, particularly the prioritization of tasks, suggest that effective time management is essential for the COS faculty to balance lesson planning and administrative duties without compromising teaching quality. Moreover, balanced workload distribution allows instructors to be more effective in both functions.

Findings from the qualitative data suggest that COS instructors generally perceive the institutional support as positive. The faculty members specifically agree that they have received training and workshops. Qualitative data responses from participants support this sentiment, as instructors shared their experiences regarding the support that the institution provides. The instructors mentioned that institutional policies, administrative support, and available resources significantly impact the teaching performance of instructors, as they enable them to perform their duties effectively without having to start from scratch. Additionally, based on the quantitative data analysis, the COS instructors disagree that the institution provides adequate resources, such as office supplies, staff, and finances. This is evident in the qualitative data, where COS instructors reported that there is limited institutional support, particularly in terms of financial support.

However, contradictory data emerge between qualitative and quantitative data. Based on the quantitative data analysis, the institution ensures that it receives timely feedback to enhance the quality of performance. The instructors pointed out that juggling both roles divides their time and focus, making it difficult for them to provide full attention to each function, which results in reduced productivity and motivation. These findings suggest that while the institution prioritizes the administrative skills of each instructor, the gaps in resource allocation may hinder the overall performance of the instructors (Dougherty et al., 2016). Addressing issues like this may improve the job satisfaction and motivation of instructors, leading to more balanced and efficient functions.

Another quantitative data shows that COS instructors feel supported by their colleagues and students as they perform their administrative tasks. This is corroborated by the statements found in the qualitative data analysis, which indicate that a supportive school environment, in terms of policies, support, and resources, enhances a teacher's ability to perform their tasks, as it creates an engaging and vital support system for all teachers. However, some responses from the quantitative data, such as instructors feeling satisfied with their administrative performance, feeling motivated to work, and the administrative performance having a sustainable impact on stakeholders, vary from the qualitative data collected – instructors mentioned in the qualitative data analysis that they feel emotional exhaustion.

These findings suggest that job satisfaction, support from colleagues and the institution, and recognition have a significant impact on the performance of instructors. Providing better support from the institution, such as resource funding, streamlined administrative processes, and fair workload distribution, can lead to long-term improvements in job efficiency and productivity.

4.0 Conclusion

The study's results showed that faculty members with a contract of service employment status can still present their lessons effectively and efficiently, in accordance with the course contents and objectives. Additionally, they can still adopt teaching strategies tailored to meet their students' needs, interests, and expectations. However, they also believe that they can no longer innovate course and learning materials while performing their support and core functions, and have experienced difficulty in providing timely feedback to their students. The additional workloads assigned to them often hinder their ability to attend to their teaching responsibilities. When it comes to submitting the required documents on time, the quality of their outputs is usually compromised. Moreover, they believe that they lack a work-life balance while fulfilling their instructional responsibilities, providing support, and performing core functions. Furthermore, to address this gap, the institution provides adequate training, workshops, and orientations to manage its teaching and administrative tasks. As a reward for their commitment and dedication to work, they often feel valued and recognized, as the institution addresses the challenges they have encountered. With their contributions and actual accomplishments for the betterment of the institution, they can still maintain their enthusiasm to teach.

As to their administrative performance, they can plan and accomplish their administrative tasks without compromising their instructional responsibilities. In addition, they used to delegate tasks to their colleagues, with monitoring, to handle their teaching and administrative tasks efficiently. On the contrary, they have experienced compromising their teaching responsibilities while managing their support and core functions. Indeed, the institution does not provide adequate resources, such as office supplies, staff, and finances, to successfully attain the plans and targets of its assigned unit or office. Although this is the case, the institution continues to provide training, workshops, and orientation to enhance the efficiency of its administrative functions. In general, the COS faculty members with designations are satisfied and motivated to work due to their impactful contributions to the institution. With the unwavering support of their colleagues and students, they can feel their worth, which enables them to bring more sustainable impact and services to the institution's stakeholders.

The study's findings showed that multitasking and managing excessive workloads negatively impact their teaching functions. The challenges involved include limited access to learning technologies, inadequate time, excessive workload, and compensation disparities, as well as insufficient institutional support and resources, communication barriers, administrative burdens, task prioritization, managing deadlines, and maintaining focus. In addition, they also experience role conflict as faculty members with a designation that can impact their teaching and administrative roles. To address these, the participants also noted several coping mechanisms for successfully delivering quality instruction while performing their support and core functions through collaborative teaching, stress management, strategic organizational development, and effective time management. In addition, they usually seek support from their colleagues and immediate supervisors, and resort to mindfulness and meditation to manage their stress and stay focused at all times.

In general, based on these results and findings, this study recommends that COS faculty with administrative responsibilities should attend regular training, workshops, and seminars on teaching and administrative performance. The institution must provide the necessary resources, materials, and equipment to enhance and ensure the quality of its outputs. It is also important to consider implementing flexible scheduling and workload distribution to balance teaching and administrative duties. Promote collaboration among the teaching and non-teaching staff and establish performance-based incentives and rewards. The results and findings of the study can serve as the basis for proposing a workload policy tailored explicitly for faculty with a contract of service employment status, to be presented to the administrative and academic councils. Most importantly, provide time credits or reduce the administrative tasks for faculty who are not only engaged in teaching and administrative functions but also in research, innovation, extension, and accreditation.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

The author solely conducted this research study.

6.0 Funding

The author's affiliation supported this research study.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The author declares and confirms that no conflict of interest exists among all concerned participants, respondents, or institutions that could affect the credibility or content of this article.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The author dedicates this research undertaking to the Lord, his family, friends, colleagues, and affiliated institution. Sincere thanks are also extended to the participants, respondents, validators, statistician, and grammarian whose contributions significantly contributed to the success of this study.

9.0 References

- Afdal, M. (2025). Implementing digital technology in learning in the digital era: Challenges and opportunities for teachers. *ETIC (Education and Social Science Journal)*, 2(5), 488–496.
- Ancho, I., & Bongco, R. (2019). Exploring Filipino teachers' professional workload. *Journal of Research Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 9(2), 19–29. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol9.no2.2.2019>
- Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. (pp. 232–274). Jossey-Bass.
- Biddle, B. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1), 67–92. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.12.1.67>
- Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 97–113.
- Case, K., & Luongo, N. (2025). "Return to remote: Are higher education instructors prepared for the future in a post-COVID world?", *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development* 44(2). doi: <https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.6260>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 13–25.
- Dougherty, K. J., Jones, S. M., Lahr, H., Natow, R. S., Pheatt, L., & Reddy, V. (2016). Looking inside the black box of performance funding for higher education: Policy instruments, organizational obstacles, and intended and unintended impacts. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2(1), 147–173. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.1.07>
- Fyfe, E. R., De Leeuw, J. R., Carvalho, P. F., Goldstone, R. L., Sherman, J., Admiraal, D., Alford, L. K., Bonner, A., Brassil, C. E., Brooks, C. A., Carbonetto, T., Chang, S. H., Cruz, L., Czymoniewicz-Klippel, M., Daniel, F., Driessen, M., Habashy, N., Hanson-Bradley, C. L., Hirt, E. R., & Motz, B. A. (2021). ManyClasses 1: Assessing the generalizable effect of immediate feedback versus delayed feedback across many college classes. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459211027575>
- García-Gallego, A., Georgantzis, N., Martín-Montaner, J., & Pérez-Amaral, T. (2015). (How) Do research and administrative duties affect university professors' teaching? *Applied Economics*, 47(45), 4868–4883.
- Hamid, A., Ricopuerto, J., & Sanson, K. (2024). Rationalization of the scope of work: Evaluation of imbalances and opportunities for multi-tasking. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 1(1), 1–12.
- Jomoad, P. D., Antiquina, L. M. M., Cericos, E. U., Bacus, J. A., Vallejo, J. H., Dionio, B. B., Bazar, J. S., Cocolan, J. V., & Clarin, A. S. (2021). Teachers' workload in relation to burnout and work performance. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*. <https://tinyurl.com/yc8ma4>
- Karadağ, N. (2018). Views of instructors about academic productivity. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 14(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2018.154.1>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). Organisation als system. In *Handlungssysteme* (pp. 217–231). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-85709-5_15
- Kryshtanovych, M., Akimova, L., Akimov, O., Parkhomenko-Kutsevil, O., & Omarov, A. (2022). Features of creative burnout among educational workers in the public administration system. *Creativity Studies*, 15(1), 116–121.
- Lee, C., Huang, G., & Ashford, S. J. (2017). Job insecurity and the changing workplace: Recent developments and the future trends in job insecurity research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 335–359. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104651>
- Lülicci, C., & Çoruk, A. (2018). The relationship between morale and job satisfaction of teachers in elementary and secondary schools. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 13(1), 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2018.137.3>
- Nuss, S. V., & Kogan, V. V. (2022). Student-centered approaches to Russian language teaching: Reflections on practice, additional considerations, and the importance of institutional support for teachers (1st ed.) [PDF]. Taylor & Francis.
- Pacaol, N. (2021). Teacher's workload intensification: A qualitative case study of its implications on teaching quality. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 8(1), 43–60.
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Sengsoulintha, K. (2025, August). Teacher educators' challenges: Focusing on teacher training colleges in Laos. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 10, p. 1614060). Frontiers.
- Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1911–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691574>
- Stuckey, H. L. (2015). The second step in data analysis: Coding qualitative research data. *Journal of Social Health and Diabetes*, 3(1), 7–10.
- Tareke, T. G., Woreta, G. T., Zewdu, G. T., Amukune, S., Oo, T. Z., & Józsa, K. (2024). Overview of Ethiopian public higher education: Trends, system, challenges, and quality issues. *Education Sciences*, 14(10), 1065.