Extent of Disabilities and Teaching Performance Evaluation Among Educators of St. Dominic College of Asia

Theodore de Leon Madriaga
St. Dominic College of Asia
theodoremadriaga@gmail.com

Abstract – *The task of an educator inevitably becomes more challenging, especially if he/she has or will eventually develop a disability, which may make teaching responsibilities difficult to a certain extent. The purpose of this study is to identify the nature and severity of the disability, and to establish various ways in which St. Dominic College of Asia (SDCA) can offer assistance. Review of literature was done using Google Scholar and Medline. Data was collected by using a self-answered questionnaire. Findings showed that each respondent had experienced at least one form of disability, with varying difficulties. Possible solutions to reasonably accommodate these educators were recommended. Such tools will allow them to perform their tasks with respect to their capabilities to enable them to be productive and become fully-integrated members of society. Disabled educators can still have the opportunity to teach. The mandated laws have made it possible for these individuals to be given provisions according to their capabilities and their needs. Educational administrators, whether in the process of selecting/hiring potential employees, or current faculty staff who develop any form of disability while in the service (as classified by the ICF), are encouraged to keep equity in mind. Reasonable accommodations will aid these educators to maximize their potential. Twenty-four educators participated in the research study, thirteen (13), male and eleven (11), female. The age group 31-35 years old obtained the highest percentage of 33.33%; the age group of 20-25, 46-50 and 56-60 received 12.50% each respectively; while the rest of the age group 26-30, 36-40 garnered 8.33%. The relationship between teaching performance and disability statistically showed that an educator's disability may influence their teaching career to a moderate extent. Some recommendations in accommodation for these educators were suggested.*

Keywords – *disability, teaching performance, motor ability, sensory ability, mental ability, hypersensitivity or allergy.*

Introduction

Educators who are born with or had developed a disability in the teaching profession encounter various degrees of difficulty in accomplishing the tasks required of them. The purpose of this study is to formulate solutions in order to accommodate educators with disabilities, and to identify the nature and severity of disabilities experienced by a number of SDCA faculty.

In the Philippines, 1,443 people of the 92.1 million household populations (1.57 percent) had some form of disability, (2010 Census of Population and Housing); this number was higher compared to the 1.23 percent recorded in the 2000 census.

There is increasing evidence in literature describing the experiences of individuals with disabilities, especially those among students. The passing of international laws to protect and promote the rights of disabled persons has raised awareness of issues with disability in school administrations when dealing with students as well as employees.

On the other hand, very little has been published about the experiences of teachers with disabilities.

The various tasks expected and skills required of a teacher on a daily basis already presents a challenge to any individual, even more so to educators who possess some form of disability. Most recent statistics revealed that over 600,000 elementary and high school teachers taught in the school year 2010-2011 (DepEd). Over 100,000 educators taught at tertiary institutions in the year 2008-2009 (CHED). Among these figures, there was no available data to indicate the number of educators who are disabled.

As of the first semester of Academic Year 2015-2016, St. Dominic College of Asia has a total of one hundred eighty eight (188) faculty members, comprising of eighty four (84) males and one hundred four (104) female educators. About 19% (35 members) belonged to the age groups of 26-30 and 31-35 years old. This was followed by 15% (25-28 faculty members) belonging to the age groups of 20-25 and 36-40 years old. The rest of the faculty belonged to the age group of 41 years old and above with 4% to 10% composition. Excluded in the study are the Deans, Program Chairs, and auxiliary staff for confidential reasons.

The Faculty Evaluation of St. Dominic College of Asia is conducted every semester of every academic year to evaluate the quality of a teacher's teaching performance and, in addition, is a requirement stipulated in Handbook of Instruction. Revolutionizing education is the major goal of the institution with a trademark of quality instruction and competent educators, thereby producing quality and productive graduates.

However, the performance, work, and teaching services rendered by the educators may or may not be equal to the expected outcome due to different factors. These may include the lack of upgrades in learning facilities and the health of the educators. The focus of the study is about the health of the educators, specifically the different types of disabilities that they may have developed through years of teaching. These disabilities comprise of four types: motor, sensory, mental, and hypersensitivity of the educators, all of which may affect the learning system for the students as a whole.

This study aims to know the extent of disabilities and teaching performance among educators in St. Dominic College of Asia. Specifically, the researcher would like to answer the following questions: What is the profile of the respondents in terms of Age and Gender? What is the extent of the respondents' disabilities in terms of: Motor Ability, Sensory Ability, Mental Ability, and Hypersensitivity/allergy? What is the faculty evaluation of respondents in terms of: Excellent, Very Satisfactory, Average, Fair, and Poor? Is there a significant difference between the extent of disabilities and the teaching performance evaluation of the respondents? Is there a significant relationship in the extent of disabilities and the faculty evaluation to the respondents' profile? Can disabled educators, to some extent, perform quality teaching in the institution? The following hypotheses will be tested statistically: There is no significant relationship between the extent of disabilities and the teaching performance evaluation among the respondents. On the other hand, there is a significant relationship in the extent of disabilities and the teaching performance evaluation to the profile of the respondents.

There were limitations and barriers to this research project which affected the accuracy of the study. The first—and greatest—limitation is time constraint. The researcher is retiring next year due to age. Besides teaching load and RLE duty, commitments to accomplish institutional end-term requirements added stressful moments contributing to overall exhaustion. Though enough

time was provided between the conceptualization of the title and the presentation of this work, there is still a great deal of knowledge that can be gained from this study had there been more time allotted for data gathering. Secondly, the respondents for this study consisted only of selected educators from the said institution. Hence, the sum of the population and data gathered (including the results of this study) is not representative of the general population. Thirdly, convenience sampling was used for the study, and would not reflect the greater scope for a wider population. The incidence was identified with the use of a questionnaire, though patterned after tools made by those with authority and/or suggested by a health professional. This is a quantitative, qualitative, correlation research about the extent of disability and the teaching performance of educators in a classroom setting, by which the researcher attempted to determine the extent of a relationship between two or more variables using statistical data. This means that even with the degree of difficulty or limitation, which is deemed subjective by educators (qualitative form of data), the data will be collected in a quantitative manner by using the appropriate tools and questions suggested by consultation with the school physician.

The study was conducted in SDCA faculty rooms where the researcher personally approached the educators. This was performed by going from faculty member to faculty member with the assistance of the faculty secretary. The faculty secretaries of each school did not participate in this study and only assisted the researcher in collecting data from the respondents.

The survey was conducted during the educators' break times and during regular school hours (a time when students were on their break or lunch period instead). This timing was selected so that the researcher would have sufficient time to orient the participants on the survey questionnaire and answer any queries they may have. In addition, the researcher had a firm belief that conducting the survey during break period would allow more time for the respondents to objectively answer the survey with their undivided attention.

In the Philippines, the Republic Act 7277, or the Magna Carta for Disabled Persons, was passed in 1991. According to this law, disability is defined as (1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more psychological, physiological, or anatomical function of an individual, or activities of such individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment.

The World Health Organization has modified its definition of disability with the introduction of The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). It is a framework for describing and organizing information on functioning and disability. This was approved for use by the World Health Assembly in 2001.

The ICF provides a framework for monitoring the rights of disabled people, as well as for national and international policy formulation (UN, 2006). It consists of four components: (1) body functions, (2) activities, (3) participation, and (4) environmental factors.

In the International Classifications of Functioning, the following criteria of body functions among people with regards to situational work conditions may include (1) mental functions,(2) sensory functions and pain, (3) voice and speech functions, (4) cardiovascular functions, (5) hematological functions, (6) immunological and respiratory systems, (7) functions of the digestive system, (8) metabolic systems, (9) endocrine systems, (10) genitourinary and reproductive functions, (11) neuromusculoskeletal and movement-related functions, and (12) functions of the skin and related structures (WHO, Disability, 2001: 29-30).

These activities may include: (1) Learning and applying knowledge, (2) General tasks and demands, (3) Communication, (4) Mobility, (5) Self-care, (6) Domestic life, (7) Interpersonal interactions and relationships, (8) Major life areas, (9) Community, (10) Social and civic life (WHO, Disability, 2001: 29-30).

The body structure in the ICF include the following: (1) structure of the nervous system, (2) the eye, (3) ear and related structures, (4) structures involved in voice and speech, (5) structure of the cardiovascular system, (6) structure of the immunological and respiratory systems, (7) structures related to the digestive system, (8) structures of the metabolic and endocrine systems, (9) structures related to genitourinary and reproductive systems, (10) structures related to movement, and (11) the skin and related structures.

In the ICF category, the environmental factors include: (1) products and technology and its toxicity, (2) natural environment such as natural calamity, human-made changes to environment such as construction hazards at sites and unfavorable sounds effects, (3) support and services of the institution, (4) attitudes, and behavior, and (5) systems and rules as in institutional policy.

Like the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), RA 7277 also incorporates the "reasonable accommodation" policy, which is required of employers to consider when employing teachers with any disability (that is inclusive under the ICF). These may include: improvement of existing facilities, modification of work schedules, reassignment to a vacant position, acquisition or modification of equipment or devices, appropriate adjustments to materials or policies, and provisions of auxiliary aids and services. Such accommodations will allow disabled educators to perform their tasks, according to their respective ability.

One of the challenges in undertaking this study is to find out how disabled educators are faring in their chosen profession. One study done gave helpful insights on the life and experiences (both positive and negative) of disabled educators from choosing a particular career path, until they are on the field itself. Barriers, possible solutions and successful coping strategies used by disabled educators were also explored (Merchant, 1981).

A recent noteworthy publication to mention is one that reflected the experiences of disabled educators who participated in the Teacher Induction Scheme in the nation of Scotland (Matheson & Morris, 2011). Similarly in England, another survey on disabled teachers provided valuable insights (Rieser, 2008) as well. Both studies also revealed the accommodations provided by the school to these individuals, which will be helpful in providing recommendations which will be applicable to SDCA.

Currently, there is no available literature locally that has investigated the situation of disabled teachers. Hopefully, this study will be a model to the future researcher involving teaching performance of disabled educators giving in quality learning to the students.

An innovative research study was conducted at the University of Alberta, which analyzed the performance outcomes of seasoned educators when being tested on the computer and the internet. Research found that seasoned educators felt less confident about their computer knowledge than younger adults. They were also concerned about how memory issues may impact their performance. "This lack of confidence is a major factor in older adults' ability to become proficient with computer technology, which unfortunately results in less computer use," said Dr. Patricia Boechler from the University of Alberta. The study also highlights the obstacles experienced by

educators such as a significant decrease in sensory keenness, particularly with vision and hearing, as well as a decrease in motor skills due to health problems, such as arthritis and tremors.

The perception of the disabled teacher lies mainly on self-evaluation. The feeling of inadequacy in performing classroom instructions can be considered to some as a disability. But in the real sense, there is no such thing as a disabled teacher by heart. Pictures of teachers who are wheelchair-bound and teaching students cannot be considered disabled, since the purpose of teaching is to convey knowledge and learning to the students. Guided with prosthesis and gadgets, some disabled teachers were more competent in classroom teaching setting than abled teachers. There are no statistics available on the internet except that of Anderson (1998), Enhancing Diversity, "The Disabled Teachers".

According to Barrett, Joan of ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education on the topic of teacher evaluation, there was public concern about how teacher evaluation was a major problem in the school system. The state laws in Washington DC needed reform to be more effective in evaluating a teacher's performance.

Common methods for evaluating teachers, such as measurement tests of teacher characteristics, student achievement test scores, and ratings of teachers' classroom performance, have been ineffective. Some research has been done to improve the evaluation process, but the teacher assessment, in general, remains unnoticed. This study provides information about evaluation types, criteria, methods, procedure, and successful evaluation strategies.

Darling-Hammond and others (1993) defined teacher evaluation as "collecting and using information to judge." Two evaluation types exist: formative and summative. Formative evaluation is a tool used to improve instruction. Summative evaluation is a tool used to make personnel decisions. Both evaluation uses have received much attention in recent literature as the teaching profession considers evaluation an integral part of staff development and the administration looks to evaluation data as evidence in accountability debates.

The developmental problems of teacher evaluation programs in the institution begin with the fundamental consideration. The criteria used to determine teacher quality would seem to center on the teaching, learning, assessment cycle. The teaching methods and techniques of a teacher from another course differ from those of others.

A research done by Grant, Carl A. and Sleeter, Christine E. (2011), gave insights on teachers' disability studies about the effects of teaching with disabilities in motor skills that can affect the student's learning attention perspectives. The study was done to 210 students with learning disabilities, and 45% of the class gained poor learning behavior to teachers with limited motor functioning (with walking impairment and eye disability) compared to almost 49% of substitute teachers.

According to Soar (1983), evaluation criteria must be measurable. The current literature generally agrees that good teaching means effective teaching. A good teacher teaches; students, in response, learn. But there are serious disadvantages in evaluating teachers by their students' achievement. The promulgated institutional policy in evaluating educators may be reformed from time to time as needed for a quality faculty evaluation process.

The most important characteristic for any successful evaluation method is validity - whether a test or procedure measures what it intends to measure. It becomes inappropriate, meaningless, and

useless to make specific inferences from invalid measurements. Evidence of validity must be accumulated to support inferences made from evaluation results.

Successful evaluation methods also must be reliable, effective, and efficient (Wise, 1984). Reliability means consistency. An evaluation must always give similar scores, ranking, or ratings for similar tests, regardless of the evaluator or the evaluatee. Effectiveness implies that the evaluation provides results in their most useful format. Summative evaluation yields a teacher performance score or rank that does not have to be interpreted to be used for accountability. Formative evaluation initiates the improvement of weak areas. Efficiency refers to spending time and money for evaluation, training, materials, and procedures to ensure the desired results.

Present evaluation programs consist of varying combinations. Strengths and weaknesses accompany the descriptions of the educators. At present, St. Dominic College of Asia has a standard quality of evaluating educators in their teaching performance. The process includes teacher interview, competency teaching, classroom observation, students' ratings, peer review, students' achievement, and self-evaluation. St. Dominic College of Asia has redefined procedures to improve validity and reliability. The evaluation procedure begins with a survey conducted by each department or school acknowledged by their respective deans for the evaluation of the faculty. All the data collected from the faculty will be analyzed and tabulated by the Human Resource Department.

Certain percentage level formulated by the institution is to be followed. For the Faculty Evaluation on Performance, the graded ratings will be evaluated by (1) self-evaluation - 10%, (2) Peer review - 15%, (3) Program Chair - 25%, (4) Dean - 40%, and (5) HR - 10%. (Human Resource Dept., SDCA)

On teaching evaluation, a certain percentage is followed according to the Handbook of Instruction. (1) Program Chair- 20%, (4) Dean- 30%, and (5) Students - 50%.

For self-evaluation and peer review, a faculty member is given sets of faculty evaluation sheets to rate an employee, their selves, and others depending on the number of faculty to be evaluated. In the evaluation sheet, a set of questionnaires regarding the faculty member’s attributes and personality is to be graded into a Likert Scale and its equivalent. (1) Excellent: 5.00-4.376, (2) Very Satisfactory: 4.375- 3.76, (3) Average: 3.75-3.126, (4) Fair: 3.125-2.51, and (5) Poor: 2.50 and below. Poor teaching performance is recommended for termination of contract while good performance is recommended for continuation of contract (HR, SDCA).

There is no literature that may support an ideal age for teaching in the academe. Teaching in an institution requires certain qualifications to comply and requirements to submit for evaluation. Fulfilling the requirements when applying for a job in teaching may take some time. Teaching in the academe should comply with the institutional rules and together with Department of Education policy, educators must have come to an age level appropriate for a teaching career.

Aside from physical as well as mental forms of a teacher’s limitation in teaching, some teachers may develop hypertension or other related illnesses due to stress from teaching work load. According to Dr. Irma Marie Yape, Chair of the Philippine Heart Association, during the Medical Outreach Mission in Cebu City on October 13, 2013, 32% of the teachers developed hypertension regardless of accountable age and gender both in private and public schools. The medical mission developed a program to raise teachers’ awareness about different strategies and inform them of the

effects of stress and other illnesses leading to heart disease. In the research study's findings, three hundred (300) teachers were found out to have hypertension. Hypertension can be controlled thru following the guidelines as stated in PHA medical mission for the benefit of the teachers. Physical disability may not be interpreted as a whole for being incapable of teaching.

Questionnaires and interviews were utilized as evaluation tools for the participants in the study.

Methodology

A survey was used to identify the nature and severity of disability an educator had been experiencing. The criteria for inclusion in this study were faculty members presently employed at SDCA and are educators teaching at college level. Data was collected using a self-answered questionnaire which was given by the researcher to the participants, to be accomplished as soon as they were able. Participants were only required to indicate age, gender, level of limitations or ability related to motor ability, sensory ability, mental ability, hypersensitivity and faculty evaluation grade in their teaching performance on the said questionnaire to maintain anonymity. The data was collected personally by the author from the participants in order to ensure complete confidentiality of the data. The school secretaries assisted as well. The data collected was then tabulated.

The samples in the study were taken from instructors of all SDCA schools: the School of Health Science Professions, the School of Arts and Science Education, School of Business Computer System, and the School of International Hospitality and Tourism Management in their respective field of instructions. The instructors were approached and asked to answer a questionnaire that included their bio data, age, gender, physical limitations, and other data pertaining to teaching performance while teaching students.

Only instructors who are currently employed by St. Dominic College of Asia were approached. Participants were willing to share detailed experiential information regarding their teaching concerns.

The study used purposive convenience sampling, which involves the handpicking of subjects. This method is also called judgmental sampling. This type of sampling is based on the assumption that the researcher or the chosen expert has knowledge about the population of interest, the type of the study, and convenience sampling, which can be accidental or incidental. This involves choosing readily available people or objects of the study.

This approach is the most frequently used sampling method in research for practical reasons.

In order to obtain an understanding of this phenomenon, this study strove to cover more than 20% of the total instructors in St. Dominic College of Asia.

The researcher will determine the cases of instructors' teaching experience, based from the result of the study. The researcher will create input for a possible accommodation which will be provided in the future by the institution. This is the reason the researcher carefully chose the questions asked to remain on the point of concern.

The tool that the researcher utilized in the study was guided by the principle of limitation as mentioned previously in ICF, both quantitative and qualitative. The researcher looked into the methods on the school physician systematically analyzed the limitations as a quantitative data. This means that the researcher would formulate a way to make physical limitation a quantifiable

form of data. Accordingly, the researcher created survey questions that were easy to answer and would not take more than five to eight minutes to complete. The questionnaire contained the demographic profile of the respondents, their physiological indices (age, gender and exposure, and the types of activities they may have during teaching), and the teaching performance evaluation as reflected on the First Semester Faculty Evaluation, AY 2015-2016 assisted by the Human Resource Department of St. Dominic College of Asia.

The researcher patterned the tool by combining the list of activities the instructors were expected to do from the BS OHSAS 18001:2007 Occupational Health & Safety Administration Services standard, used the principles of the data gathered, and then treated in both the physical disability scale and numeric limitation scale. This means that in every activity the respondents will be asked what level of limitation or difficulty they felt while teaching and afterwards. The scores are then totaled as their physical limitation score, which can range from 1 being the lowest value to 4 being the highest value.

The limitations in the questionnaires were arranged into different physical functions such as (1) motor ability, (2) sensory ability, (3) mental ability, and (4) sensitivity or allergy. To determine the limitation or disability, each physical functioning was graded by, (1) no difficulty/limitation, (2) mild difficulty/limitation, (3) moderate difficulty/limitation, and (4) severe difficulty/limitation.

Aside from the activities in the questionnaires provided, the researcher also asked about the respondents' age, gender, and teaching performance grade.

In preparation for validating the questionnaire, the study utilized a survey questionnaire as the primary instrument in gathering the data needed. The research coordinator's suggestions and approval of the thesis were sought.

During data gathering, the researcher took into consideration the number of instructors currently employed in the institution in order to have sufficient questionnaires available. Beforehand, the researcher submitted a soft copy to the Research Department Coordinator, Dr. Jonathan Adanza, to provide a copy to him and take suggestions. A statistical interpretation and analysis was then prepared along with the presentation of data.

The tool was patterned after the Occupational Health and Safety guidelines, and a questionnaire was tailored to the four items of physical disability or pain scale.

Another tool was sought, which was patterned after the Institutional Faculty Evaluation, with the assistance of Human Resource Department and the school physician. The letter was approved by the Head of Administrative Services and the Vice President for Academic and Research.

The researcher then approached a statistician to analyze and validate the data gathered. Inquiries to the statistician were also performed to ascertain the propriety of the equations used to test the hypothesis and the null-hypothesis.

Results

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents according to Age Group

Age	Frequency

20-25	3
26-30	2
31-35	8
36-40	2
41-45	0
46-50	3
51-55	1
56-60	3
61-65	2
66 and above	0
TOTAL	**24**

In table 1, the majority of the respondents belonged the age group 31-35 years old at 33.33%, the age group of 20-25, 46-50 and 56-60 were at 12.50% each respectively, while the rest of the age group 26-30, 36-40 garnered 8.33%. Although it is more frequent among 31-35 year olds, it can affect any age group. In fact, experts estimate that as much as 70% of most teachers in this age category and also members of the general public believe that teachers who have worked in the field for a long time tend to be flexible and open to changes, compared to other groups of teachers with years of professional experience (Tůmová1 A., 2001).

Table 1.2 Distribution of Study Participants by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	13	54.17
Female	11	45.83
TOTAL	**24**	**100%**

In table 1.2, in terms of gender, majority of the respondents were male at 54.17% and females at 45.83%. A study done by Robert M. and Chiu, Ming Ming (2010) suggested that the female teachers had greater workload stress, greater classroom stress from student behaviors, and lower classroom management self-efficacy. Teachers with greater workload stress had greater classroom management self-efficacy, whereas teachers with greater classroom stress had lower self-efficacy and lower job satisfaction. Work load stress within the two years was reported by 150 respondents (81.12%). Of the 150 respondents reporting effects of work load, 72 (48%) were males and 78 (52%) were females. This showed significant association ($P<0.05$) between gender (sex) and prevalence among teachers. The study did not conclude that female were most susceptible to teaching workload effects since it could also affect the male teacher population.

Table 2.1.1. Results in Extent of Motor Ability (MA)

Respondents	**Weighted mean(motor)**	Sta
1	2.00	
2	1.71	

3	1.43
4	1.43
5	1.14
6	1.57
7	2.86
8	2.00
9	1.00
10	1.43
11	2.00
12	1.71
13	2.71
14	1.86
15	1.29
16	1.29
17	1.00
18	1.00
19	2.71
20	1.86
21	1.00
22	2.57
23	1.14
24	2.43
Total Weighted Mean(TWM)	1.714166667

In the extent of limitations in motor ability among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia, it was figuratively noted that teachers were significantly affected (Mean= 1.714166667, SD =0.50634). The various tasks expected and skills required of a teacher on a daily basis already presents a challenge to any such individual, even more so to educators who possess some form of disability (DepEd). The results showed that there was higher susceptibility among teachers in higher education to develop motor limitations. Motor abilities like prolonged standing in front of the class, bending in classroom activities, sitting, moving around the room or even writing on a whiteboard or doing paper works and typing or encoding in computers can cause muscle weakness and bone fragility after a period of time.

These figures greatly support the need of educators to have a chance at reasonable accommodations in the institutions where they are employed. A research done by Grant, Carl A. and Sleeter, Christine E. (2011) gave insights on teachers' disability studies on the effects of teaching with motor skills that can affect the students' learning attention perspectives. A study was done on 210 students with learning disabilities, whereby 45% of the class gained poor learning behavior due to teachers with limited motor functioning compared to almost 49% to substitute teachers.

Table 2.2.1. Results in Extent in Sensory Ability (SA)

Respondents	**mean (sensory)**	Standard Deviation
1	1.71	1.112697
2	1.43	0.786796
3	1.57	0.534522
4	2.00	1
5	1.00	0
6	1.14	0.377964
7	2.43	0.786796
8	3.00	1.290994
9	1.29	0.48795
10	1.00	0

11	1.00	0
12	2.00	1
13	3.00	0
14	2.00	0.57735
15	1.43	0.534522
16	1.00	0
17	1.00	0
18	1.00	0
19	2.14	0.377964
20	2.14	0.690066
21	1.86	1.069045
22	2.14	0.690066
23	1.57	0.534522
24	2.57	0.534522
	1.725833	0.516074

With regards to the extent of limitations in sensory ability among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia, it was noted that teachers were significantly affected (Mean=1.725833, SD =0.516074). Mary Ann Sullivan (2012) of the American Foundation for the Blind expressed that teachers may face challenges on Sensory Efficiency and Expanded Core Curriculum in an educational setting because of different factors. The external part of the classroom setting and the physical aspect of the teachers' well-being pose great challenges in the learning environment. The results showed that there is higher susceptibility among teachers in higher education to develop sensory limitations. Sensory ability limitations may include viewing computers, looking at papers, obtaining information from the computer screen, and limitations in communicating with others due to hearing problems that can develop in a period of time. The figures greatly support the need of educators to be provided with some assistance.

Table 2.3.1. Extent of Limitations in Mental ability (Men A)

Respondents	mean (mental)	Standard Deviation
1	2.13	0.834523
2	1.88	0.353553
3	1.75	0.707107
4	2.50	1.414214
5	1.13	0.353553
6	2.50	1.195229
7	2.25	0.46291
8	2.75	0.886405
9	1.25	0.46291
10	1.00	0
11	1.63	0.916125
12	2.63	1.06066

13	3.00	0
14	1.25	0.46291
15	1.13	0.353553
16	1.50	0.534522
17	1.38	0.517549
18	1.00	0
19	2.38	0.517549
20	1.75	0.707107
21	2.13	0.353553
22	3.25	0.46291
23	1.38	0.517549
24	2.13	0.353553
TWM	1.903333	0.559498

Table 2.4.1.Extent of Hypersensitivity among Respondents

Respondents	mean (Allergy)	Standard Deviation
1	2.50	1
2	1.00	0
3	1.00	0
4	4.00	0
5	2.00	0.8165
6	1.00	0
7	1.00	0
8	2.75	0.5
9	1.00	0
10	1.00	0
11	4.00	0
12	3.75	0.5
13	2.25	1.5
14	2.75	1.2583
15	1.00	0
16	1.00	0
17	2.75	0.5
18	1.00	0
19	1.00	0
20	1.00	0
21	1.75	0.9574
22	2.00	0
23	1.25	0.5
24	2.25	0.5
	1.875	0.334675

With regards to the extent of limitations in hypersensitivity or allergy among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia, it was figuratively noted that teachers were significantly affected (Mean=1.875, SD =0.334675). The results showed that there is higher susceptibility among teachers in higher education to develop hypersensitivity reactions. A teachers' allergies may include writing materials such as chalk or ink, cleaning materials used by cleaners in the classroom,

the humidity and temperature of the room, and proper ventilation. All of these pose problems among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia.

Most of the respondents figuratively made suggestions on other alternatives to be used in such conditions that affect their health, especially educators with a history of bronchial asthma and skin allergy. Some educators developed chest discomfort during actual exposure to the offending agent. Again the institution may be given the opportunity to look into the needs of the teachers regarding this problem. There was no literature supporting the issue on this matter.

The following tables below are some details on faculty evaluation measuring teaching performance among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia.

Table 3.1. Distribution of Respondents according to Teaching Performance (n=24) and Total Mean

Participants	Teaching Performance Mean (TWM)	Total Disability (TWM)
1	3	2.084821
2	4	1.504464
3	5	1.4375
4	3	2.482143
5	3	1.316964
6	4	1.553571
7	3	2.133929
8	4	2.625
9	4	1.133929
10	3	1.107143
11	3	2.15625
12	4	2.522321
13	5	2.741071
14	5	1.964286
15	5	1.209821
16	5	1.196429
17	4	1.53125
18	4	1
19	4	2.058036
20	3	1.6875
21	5	1.683036
22	5	2.491071
23	4	1.334821
24	5	2.34375
	1.803333	1.804129

With regards to the extent of teaching performance among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia, it was figuratively noted that teachers were significantly affected (Mean=1.803333, SD =1.804129). The results showed that there is higher susceptibility among teachers in higher education to develop hypersensitivity reactions to certain substances. A teachers' allergy may be caused by writing materials such as chalk or ink, cleaning materials used by cleaners in the classroom, the humidity and temperature of the room and improper ventilation. Most of the respondents figuratively made suggestions about other alternatives to be used in such conditions affecting their health, especially educators with a history of bronchial asthma and skin

allergy. Chest discomfort was developed during the actual exposure by some educators during the interview. Again the institution may be given the opportunity to look into the needs of the teachers regarding this problem. There was no literature supporting the issue on this matter.

Table 4. Statement of the Problem: Is there a significant difference in the extent of disabilities and faculty evaluation to the profile of the respondents?

Faculty Evaluation	MoA	SA	MeA	Allergy	F- value	Df	P- value
Excellent	1.82	1.8	1.72	1.75	2.64	4	1.09
Very Satisfactory	1.54	1.6	1.86	1.72	2.6	4	2.69
Average	1.82	1.6	1.77	2.21	2.69	4	1.02

In the table above for each profile of the faculty evaluation, the computed value is greater than the critical value of 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference in the extent of disability and the teaching performance among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia.

Statement of the Problem: Is there a significant difference in the extent of disabilities and faculty evaluation to the profile of the respondents when group according to age? The two-tailed P value equals 0.5061. By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant. Confidence interval, the mean of disability minus faculty teaching evaluation performance equals 0.37500. 95% confidence interval of this difference: from -0.75130 to 1.50130. There is no significant difference in the extent of disabilities and faculty evaluation to the profile of the respondents in age.

Table 5. Statement of the Problem: Is there a significant difference in the extent of disabilities and faculty evaluation to the profile of the respondents? (Gender)

Gender	MoA	SA	MeA	Allergy	F- value	Df	P- value
Male	1.63	1.52	1.66	1.38	2.52	4	0.93
Female	1.69	1.87	1.98	2.39	2.6	4	1.13

In the table above for each profile of the faculty evaluation, the computed value is greater than the critical value at 0.05 level of significance, hence the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference in the extent of disability and gender among educators of St. Dominic College of Asia.

Table 6. Average distribution of Teaching Performance

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
average	7	1.8171	.56488	.21350
very satisfactory	9	1.5700	.59672	.19891
excellent	8	1.8225	.66704	.23583
Total	24	1.7263	.59816	.12210

Summary of Findings

For motor limitations, the age group 31-35 years old garnered the highest percentage at 33.33%, followed by the age group of 20-25, 46-50, and 56-60, all of which got 12.50% each respectively. The rest of the age groups 26-30, 36-40 received 8.33%. In terms of gender, majority of the respondents were male at 54.17%, while females were at 45.83%. Eight respondents (33%) were noted to have mild difficulty when standing in front of the class for a period of time, and five (21%) had moderate difficulty.

Half of these educators (50%) encountered mild problems while bending in class activities, and four (17%) suffered moderate difficulty with the same activity. 46% (11 individuals) had mild problems when sitting or while sitting down, with only 8% (2 individuals) suffering from moderate difficulty. Five of the respondents (21%) were noted to have mild difficulty with mobility around the room, with three educators encountering moderate and severe difficulties respectively, at 13% each.

Twenty-nine percent (7 individuals) were noted to have mild limitations in writing on chalkboard or whiteboard, with three teachers (13%) suffering from moderate and one (4%) from severe difficulty. Six teachers (25%) were revealed to have mild difficulty when writing on paper. When faced with the same task, two educators (8%) encountered moderate hardship, and one (4%) suffered from severe difficulty.

42 % (10 individuals) of the educators were noted to have mild difficulty or limitation in typing or keyboarding in computers. Two teachers (8%) had moderate difficulty and one educator (4%) encountered severe difficulty with the same task. In sensory limitations, twenty-nine percent (7 individuals) of the respondents were having mild difficulty while looking at/reading computer screens or papers for a prolonged period of time due to visual problems. Also, six (25%) encountered moderate difficulty and one (4%) suffered from severe difficulty when performing the said task.

One-third of the participants (33%) had mild difficulty in viewing papers due to vision problems, with seven (29%) suffering from moderate difficulty. While obtaining information from the internet, seven teachers (29%) had mild impairment, six (25%) had moderate difficulty, and one (4%) had severe difficulty. Where limitation in viewing papers is concerned, seven educators (29%) had mild difficulty, five (21%) had moderate difficulty, and one (4%) had severe impairment.

Five respondents (21%) were noted to have mild difficulty in communication problems; three had moderate difficulty (13%) and two (8%) had severe impairment. Where communication over the telephone is concerned, seven of the participants (29%) suffered from mild difficulty, while two people (8%) encountered moderate difficulty due to a hearing problem.

Four teachers (17%) claimed a delayed response due to mild hearing problems. One (4%) had moderate impairment, while another one (4%) encountered severe difficulty. The frequency of those who answered with moderate and severe limitation was both at 4%.

The correlation or Pearson's r between the age and the disability (motor, sensory, mental and hypersensitivity) is (m=1.80), which denotes a weak relationship, while the correlation between the gender and the disability is r= 0.303858, which denotes weak relationship. The correlation between the age and the teaching performance is r= 0.438407, which denotes moderate

relationship, while correlation between gender and the teaching performance is -0.2604, denoting no difference.

The correlation or Pearson's r between the disabilities and the teaching performance is r= 0.0291, which denotes weak relationship. In both the anovas done, the findings conclude that the limitations felt by the educators have a significant difference. Lastly, the research hypothesis predicted that a disability score's mean would be greater than the teaching performance score's mean (a positive difference) thus the critical region is on the greater side of distribution. This is the reason that the critical region is defined by 2.0461 Therefore the hypothesis should be rejected since the computed t = 11.25 > + p=0.0001.

The mean of teaching performance minus disability equals 2.23753725000. 95% confidence interval of this difference was from 1.83750376454 to 2.63757073546. There is a moderate relationship between the educators disability in comparison with the teaching performance to the profile of the respondents. The t-value is 11.25888 while the p-value is < .00001, (df = 46, SD= 0.199). The result is significant at p < .05, confirming that the presence of disability among educators affects their teaching performance.

Conclusion

Disabled educators can still have the opportunity to teach. The mandated laws have made it possible for these individuals to be given provisions according to their capabilities and their needs. Educational administrators, whether in the process of selecting/hiring potential employees, or current faculty staff who develop any form of disability while in service (as classified by the ICF), are encouraged to keep equity in mind. Reasonable accommodations will aid these educators to maximize their potential.

In the statistical treatment, there is a moderate relationship between the educators disability in comparison with the teaching performance to the profile of the respondents. T value = 2.11, p value greater than the level of significance at 5% = 0.001, thereby rejecting the null hypothesis. There is a significant difference between the teaching performances of the educators in the presence of disability. Markedly, educators have decreased teaching performance in the classroom when physical limitation occurs. Recent research studies suggested educators with limitations may be given some accommodations to improve teaching performance even in the presence of disability.

Recommendation

The author recommends further investigation into this broad field, so that a picture of the actual situation of these individuals in the local setting can be obtained. This will also help improve existing laws and, perhaps in the future, aid lawmakers in passing new laws for the protection and well-being of these educators.

This is to develop and campaign on what needs to be changed for disabled teachers in order for them to achieve full equality in all areas of life, making equality a daily reality, to recognize the multiple identities of disabled people, including the full range of impairments as well as link with disabled people also struggling against sexism, racism, homophobia and other forms of discrimination.

Recommendation for those with motor limitations:

The following are recommendations for the motor abilities of educators. On difficulty in standing for prolonged periods of time, alternate between standing and sitting down. Rearrange student seat plan, ex. semi-circle where the instructor is visible to everyone. Use of supportive footwear, ex. shoes with adequate padding.

On bending in classroom activities/obtaining materials: have students come to the teacher when needed or when directed to do so. Have other students assist the teacher as necessary. Have most commonly used materials be placed on shelves/drawers that are easy to access.

On sitting down: alternate between sitting and standing. Take rest breaks. Use ergonomic chairs, especially for those with chronic back problems or individuals who are unable to stand on account of disability.

On mobility around the room/school grounds: Use appropriate devices to aid individuals with mobility problems (ex. wheelchair, crutches). Let individuals with walking disability use ground floor classrooms, preferably near important facilities like toilets, emergency exits, and faculty rooms. Have an accessible path of travel which is clear at all times. Provide appropriate parking.

Dexterity on chalkboard/whiteboard/paper: Use a writing aid. Use a PC projector. Alternate between tasks. Provide writing line guides, clip board/paper holders.

Dexterity on machines (computer). Use ergonomic keyboard/wrist rests for support.

Recommendation for those with sensory limitations:

For the educators with problems on sensory limitations, the following suggestions are recommended.

Looking at computer screen and papers for a prolonged period of time due to visual problems: Take regular breaks in-between to rest the eyes. Use screen filter on monitor for glare reduction. Change font size. In computer utilization, the educator may provide a larger-sized monitor with high resolution, high contrast, and flicker-free features. Provide adequate lighting.

In communicating in person/phone due to speech or hearing problem: Use hearing aids. Reduce background noise and improve acoustics example is keeping classroom doors and windows closed, improving etiquette). Allow written communication.

Delay of responding to alarm systems, example like Fire alarm due to hearing problem: Use visual signals, example is flashing lights on alarm systems, in addition to auditory components. Have students or another employee alert the individual in case of alarm going turning off.

Recommendation for those with mental limitation:

For the educators with difficulty in mental limitation, the researcher would like to suggest the following.

To maintain concentration and ability to learn or understand: Plan for a period of time to devote to uninterrupted work. Provide adequate lighting.

In undertaking and completion of research work: Divide tasks into smaller portions.

In recalling names and events: Write down short notes. Request for printed minutes of meeting. Provide written as well as verbal instructions.

In accomplishing deadlines: Provide reminders of important deadlines example is memo, text messages, email. Write deadlines on colorful items example is label posting and paste where it can be seen by the individual easily.

In managing time: Provide organizational tools.

In the presence of mental conditions (e.g., anxiety disorder): Request support from colleagues and administrators. Ensure a regular daily routine schedule as much as possible. Provide the teacher with his/her own classroom. Allow ample time and training for individual to learn new responsibilities. Consider providing in-service training on stress management.

Recommendation for those with allergies:

For the educators with allergy problems, the following are suggested:

Allergy to chalk: Refrain from using chalk; this may help reduce skin allergy. Try to use alternatives that are available. One may use a PC projector instead of a chalkboard. Providing good ventilation may help in reducing allergic reaction inside the classroom.

Avoiding chemicals e.g. cleaning products, ink, and other substance: Avoid the substance. Use products that are less irritating. Provide adequate ventilation. Have maintenance jobs done while the building or room is unoccupied.

References

A. Book

1. Agresti, A., Franklin, C. (2007) Statistics: The Art and Science of Learning from Data (2nd Edition)
2. Anderson, R. J., Keller, C. E., & Karp, J. M. (Eds.). (1998). Enhancing diversity: Educators with disabilities. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press
3. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2002). Reasonable accommodation and undue hardship under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Retrieved October 1, 2015.
4. Grant, Carl A. and Sleeter, Christine E. (2011) About Turning on Learning: Five Approaches for Multicultural Teaching Plans for Race, Class, Gender and Disability, 4th Ed.
5. Handbook of Instructions. St. Dominic College of Asia.
6. Human Resource Department File system. St. Dominic College of Asia.
7. Matheson, I., Morris, P. (2011). Reflecting on experiences of people with disabilities participating in the Teacher
8. Merchant, D., Gilmore J. & Moore, A. (1981). Educators with disabilities: A resource guide. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
9. MIS Department, St. Dominic College of Asia. Statistics File System.
10. National Council on Disability. Retrieved October 1, 2015, at January 10, 2016.
11. Republic Act 7277, or the Magna Carta (1991) Scope of Disabled Persons.
12. Tůmová1, Anna (2001), Effects of Age and Length of Professional Experience on Teachers' Attitudes to Curricular Reform, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague.
13. Whetzel, M., Goddard, T. (2009). Occupation and Series: Accommodating Educators with Disabilities. Job Accommodation Network (JAN). October 2, 2015 , https://askjan.org/media/educators.html

14. Yape, Irma Marie, (2013) Chair of Philippine Heart Association, during the Medical Outreach Mission in Cebu City Daily News.

B. Internet Website

1. Albert, J. Are We Making it Easier for Our Teachers? October 5, 2015, http://www.nscb.gov.ph/sexystats/2013/SS20130426_teacher.asp
2. Griffith, K., Cooper, M. (2002) Are Educational Administrators Prepared to Meet the Needs of Employees with Disabilities? October 2, 2015, https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-340930591/are-educational-administrators-prepared-to-meet-the
3. Induction Scheme: Report on Survey Responses. October 6, 2015, http://www.gtcs.org.uk/web/FILES/FormUploads/reflecting-on-experiences-people-with-disabilities-in-tis.pdf
4. Rieser, R. (2008). Disabled Teachers Survey. October 6, 2015 http://www.nut.org.uk/files/Survey-Disabled-Teachers-2008.pdf
5. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. October 2, 2015, http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/icd/ICFoverview_FINALforWHO10Sept.pdf
6. http://www.ched.gov.ph/index.php/home/media/data/statistic/ched-statistics/, October 6, 2015
7. http://www.eeoc.gov/policy/docs/accommodation.html