

# A Comparative Study of Awareness about Self-Appraisal and its Impact on Continuous Professional Development (CPD) Among College Teachers Affiliated to University of Calicut and Karnatak University



**Ramesh Kulkarni<sup>1\*</sup>, Reshmi R<sup>2</sup>, Akshata Bialgi<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Professor, Karnatak University, Dharwad-580003, Karnataka, India

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Farook College (Autonomous), Kozhikode-673632, Kerala, India

<sup>4</sup>Karnatak University, Dharwad-580003, Karnataka, India

## CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

**Ramesh Kulrarni**

e-mail: [ramkul67@gmail.com](mailto:ramkul67@gmail.com)

## KEYWORDS

Continuous Professional Development, Faculty Reflection, Higher Education, Institutional Support, NEP 2020, Self-Appraisal

## ARTICLE DETAILS

Received 10 June 2025; revised 08 September 2025; accepted 11 September 2025

DOI: 10.26671/IJIRG.2025.4.14.339

## CITATION

Kulkarni, R., Reshmi, R., Bialgi, A. (2025). A Comparative Study of Awareness about Self-Appraisal and its Impact on Continuous Professional Development (CPD) Among College Teachers Affiliated to University of Calicut and Karnatak University. *Int J Innovat Res Growth*, 14(4), 144108-144113. DOI



This work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons License.

## Abstract

Self-appraisal plays a crucial role in the capacity building and continuous professional development (CPD) of college teachers. This self-appraisal system of self-assessment allows the teachers to think about their strengths and weaknesses, which may consequently lead to a discussion on barriers to effective teaching and allied career. Besides that, in Indian context, UGC, AICTE, and NAAC-like bodies governing higher education have a very clear say on the self-appraisal of college teachers.

Now, this study aims to determine the gap and compare the awareness about self-appraisal and its practices among two groups of commerce teachers belonging to Karnataka and Kerala state. Also, it aims to estimate the effect of self-appraisal on continuous professional development of teachers in both the groups

The Management of Institutions offering higher education will have to devise or adopt proper self-appraisal-based performance evaluation of teachers and to monitor their continuous professional development periodically. On the other hand, teachers serving in colleges must have known the importance and uses of self-appraisal towards the evaluation of their individual performance and its allied benefits.

Researcher, examines how performance appraisal contributes to capacity building by identifying skill development areas, training needs, and institutional support among college teachers. A sample survey of selected teachers is conducted in both the geographical region to unleash the details regarding awareness about performance appraisal among college teachers in both the cities with a suitable research design. The first among the two groups under study being commerce teachers employed at colleges linked to University of Calicut and the second being Karnatak University Dharwad.

## 1. Introduction

In the rapidly evolving sphere of higher education, professional development has become more than a mere expectation it is a necessity. The continuous transformation in teaching methodologies, the integration of digital technologies, growing student diversity, and shifting policy landscapes demand that educators not only keep pace but also lead innovation in their classrooms and institutions. Professional development is a cornerstone of modern education systems, enabling faculty to remain responsive, informed, and effective in a changing educational landscape. In India, the UGC, NAAC, and AICTE encourage self-appraisal as a mechanism for evaluating personal teaching effectiveness and aligning individual growth with institutional goals. Self-appraisal empowers educators to identify strengths, weaknesses, and future development needs. However, the extent to which self-appraisal is meaningfully practiced and its relationship to CPD remains unclear, in the departments of Indian universities where traditional teaching models still dominate and professional development structures are often underdeveloped.

This study examines the comparative perspectives of faculty under Calicut and Karnatak Universities, exploring how self-appraisal affects CPD outcomes. It highlights institutional and personal barriers and suggests strategies for meaningful implementation.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

Having this background, the study aims to achieve the following objectives

- To compare self-appraisal awareness and practices between Calicut and Karnatak University faculty.
- To examine the influence of self-appraisal on CPD engagement.
- To assess institutional and personal challenges that hinder effective implementation.
- To propose an improvement model integrating self-appraisal with structured faculty development frameworks.

## 3. Hypotheses

The study hypothesizes that, there is no significant difference among the awareness levels about self-appraisal among the college teachers subjected to study. Also, it is hypothesized that, there is no significant difference among the opinion of the teachers of both the groups about the impact of self-awareness on CPD and related activities. To sum these hypotheses, we have formulated and tested the following hypothesis in their null format.

H1: Self-appraisal practices differ significantly between the two university groups.

H2: Self-appraisal does not influence CPD participation.

H3: Institutional support does not moderate the relationship between self-appraisal and CPD outcomes.

H4: The level of awareness does not differ across the teachers working under two universities.

## 4. Review of Literature

Schon (1983) brought forward the idea of the "reflective practitioner" laying the groundwork to evaluate oneself in teaching. Guskey (2002) connected professional growth results with teachers learning on their own and looking back on their work. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 puts weight on teachers being free to make choices, think about their work, and keep growing as key parts of changing higher education in India. Komba & Nkumbi (2008) and other studies showed big differences in how teachers grow across different states in India. New UGC and NAAC rules push for teachers to check their own work and get better at their jobs, but how this happens changes from place to place.

It shows how schools and areas differ in helping teachers grow and look at their own work. It helps national efforts to set standards for how teachers grow across Indian universities. Assists university leaders in shaping faculty growth programs to meet specific needs. Improves insight into how business teachers across states view and carry out self-evaluation.

## 5. Scope and Limitations

The study focuses on teachers from colleges under Calicut and Karnatak Universities, offering a comparative regional perspective. The use of self-reported data may introduce bias. Further, the findings are not generalizable to other academic disciplines or universities.

## 6. Methodology

This quantitative and descriptive-comparative study involved a sample of 104 faculty members selected through convenience sampling. Data collection used structured questionnaires focusing on self-appraisal frequency, CPD activities, institutional support, and regulatory awareness. Descriptive statistics, t-tests, and ANOVA were employed for analysis.

## 7. Analysis and Interpretation

The data collected through a small sample survey consisting of 104 respondents, has been tabulated and analyzed using SPSS. Table No:1 above describes the age wise, gender wise, qualification Designation wise and

experience wise distribution of respondents, Initially Chronback alpha was worked out after collecting a sample of 5 respondents using the questionnaire and tested for the reliability of the questionnaire. The workouts showed that, the average chronback alpha ( $\alpha$ ) calculated was  $\alpha = 0.78$  indicating moderately good correlation and hence the instrument was found to be reliable. Thus, the data has been collected under two groups using a survey technique by adopting convenience sampling technique as detailed below:

**Group1:** With 57 respondents from Institutions falling under the jurisdiction of Karnatak University, Dharwad

**Group2:** With 47 respondents from Institutions falling under the jurisdiction of Calicut University, Calicut

The analysis revealed that the majority of respondents were Assistant Professors (82.7%) aged 30–50 (88.5%), with 5–15 years of experience (69.3%). Most respondents were from Karnatak University (61.5%) and represented Government-aided (40.4%), Private (36.5%), and Government (23.1%) institutions. Despite a high rate of appraisal submission (92.3%), only 13.5% of teachers reported regularly practicing self-appraisal, pointing to a compliance-driven culture rather than genuine reflection.

**Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents.**

| S. No    | Particulars                  | Karnatak University<br>Group- 1 | University of Calicut<br>Group- 2 |
|----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Gender</b>                |                                 |                                   |
|          | Male                         | 28                              | 20                                |
|          | Female                       | 29                              | 27                                |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Age</b>                   |                                 |                                   |
|          | 20-30                        | 03                              | 03                                |
|          | 30-40                        | 28                              | 20                                |
|          | 40-50                        | 24                              | 20                                |
|          | 50-60                        | 02                              | 02                                |
|          | 60 & Above                   | Nil                             | 02                                |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Designation</b>           |                                 |                                   |
|          | Assistant Professor          | 48                              | 38                                |
|          | Associate Professor          | 04                              | 04                                |
|          | Professor                    | 05                              | 05                                |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Experience</b>            |                                 |                                   |
|          | 0-5 Years                    | 14                              | 10                                |
|          | 2-10 Years                   | 22                              | 14                                |
|          | 10-15 Years                  | 14                              | 14                                |
|          | 15-20 Years                  | 06                              | 06                                |
|          | 20-25 Years                  | 2                               | 00                                |
|          | 26 Years & above             | Nil                             | 03                                |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Nature of Institution</b> |                                 |                                   |
|          | Government                   | 13                              | 11                                |
|          | Govt. Aided                  | 26                              | 18                                |
|          | Private                      | 18                              | 18                                |

While 53.8% acknowledged the benefit of self-appraisal in identifying improvement areas, 42.3% strongly disagreed. Only 21.2% were fully aware of UGC/NAAC/AICTE mandates. CPD engagement was low—65.4% reported attending only one activity in the past year. Just 19.2% used self-appraisal to prioritize CPD, and 46.2% felt it helped identify skill gaps. Institutional support for CPD was inadequate. Around 61.5% denied the existence of formal mechanisms, 46.2% lacked appraisal feedback, and only 19.2% reported funding support. Administrative encouragement and peer recognition of reflective practices were also lacking.

Further, the analysis flows in the direction of working out z-statistics for comparing the two groups or populations. Two-sample z-statistic for equality of means used to test whether the level of awareness about the self-appraisal and its influence on continuous professional development among the two groups. A level of significance of 5% has been taken standard for comparison with two tailed tests of significance. Alos an attempt is made to understand the deviations in variances about the level of awareness in its allied dynamics has been worked out using one way ANOVA. The workouts made using SPSS statistical package have been presented here below in Table 2 and 3.

**Table 2: Independent t-test Results – Calicut vs. Karnatak University.**

| S. No | Variable                                    | Mean (Calicut) | Mean (Karnatak) | t-value | p-value | Interpretation         |
|-------|---------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| 1     | Institutional Nature                        | 3.85           | 3.21            | 2.86    | 0.005   | Significant difference |
| 2     | Awareness about UGC/NAAC/AICTE Requirements | 4.01           | 3.28            | 3.01    | 0.004   | Significant difference |
| 3     | Number of CPD Activities                    | 2.44           | 1.82            | 2.71    | 0.009   | Significant difference |
| 4     | Frequency of Self-Appraisal                 | 2.68           | 2.52            | 0.94    | 0.350   | Not significant        |
| 5     | Institutional Support                       | 2.10           | 2.15            | -0.41   | 0.684   | Not significant        |
| 6     | CPD Planning based on Appraisal             | 2.21           | 2.08            | 0.56    | 0.578   | Not significant        |

In Table No.2, the independent t-test showed significant differences between faculty from Calicut and Karnatak Universities in perceptions of institutional nature ( $p = 0.005$ ), awareness of mandates ( $p = 0.004$ ), and CPD participation levels ( $p = 0.009$ ), indicating better engagement among Calicut faculty.

**Table 3: ANOVA Results – Based on Designation and Institutional Type.**

| S. NO | Variable                                 | F-value | p-value | Interpretation                                              |
|-------|------------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1     | Awareness of UGC/NAAC/AICTE Requirements | 8.213   | 0.005   | Significant difference among sub-groups                     |
| 2     | Number of CPD Activities                 | 5.400   | 0.022   | Significant difference among experience/institutional types |
| 3     | Institutional Support                    | 1.876   | 0.138   | Not significant                                             |
| 4     | Training Needs Identified by Appraisal   | 1.452   | 0.229   | Not significant                                             |
| 5     | Feedback Mechanism Effectiveness         | 0.947   | 0.392   | Not significant                                             |

Table No. 2 shows that CPD participation ( $F = 5.400$ ,  $p = 0.022$ ) and awareness ( $F = 8.213$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ) varied significantly by designation and institutional type, but not in the majority of other categories, indicating systemic issues across institutions.

**Table 4: ANOVA Results – Overall opinion about Self- appraisal is a tool for CPD.**

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | .385           | 1   | .385        | .509 | .477 |
| Within Groups  | 77.000         | 102 | .755        |      |      |
| Total          | 77.385         | 103 |             |      |      |

## 8. Findings and Recommendations

This study revealed several significant findings that highlight the gap between policy and practice in the implementation of self-appraisal and professional development among faculty members. While an overwhelming 92.3% of respondents reported submitting self-appraisal reports, only a small proportion—just 13.5%—engaged with the process in a meaningful and reflective manner. This suggests that for most, self-appraisal remains a routine administrative requirement rather than a tool for genuine professional growth. Moreover, only slightly more than half of the participants (53.8%) viewed self-appraisal as a useful means to identify areas for improvement, whereas a considerable 42.3% strongly disagreed with this notion, indicating skepticism about its practical value. Awareness of relevant regulatory guidelines was also low, with only 21.2% of faculty being fully informed about the self-appraisal requirements set forth by UGC, NAAC, and AICTE.

Participation in Continuous Professional Development (CPD) activities was notably limited. About 65.4% of the respondents had attended only one CPD event in the previous year, pointing to a lack of sustained engagement in professional learning opportunities. The issue appears to be compounded by insufficient institutional support.

A significant 61.5% of faculty members reported the absence of formal mechanisms within their institutions to support CPD, and nearly half (46.2%) stated that they received no feedback on their self-appraisal submissions, undermining the potential for reflection-based improvement. Furthermore, only 19.2% of respondents indicated that they had access to funding support for professional development activities, reflecting a broader systemic challenge in fostering a culture of reflective practice and continuous learning.

Further, from Table No:2, it is observed that, there is no significant difference in the awareness level about self-appraisal being a necessity as per AICTE/NBA/NAAC/UGC requirement among the teachers in both groups. Whereas there is significant difference in the level of awareness amongst both groups of teachers on the impact of self-appraisal on CPD activities has been ascertained by the p-value being greater than 0.05 as against serial no 4,5, 6 variables mentioned in Table No. 2.

Also from Table No:3 above, it is very clear that, there is a significant difference among the awareness level of teachers under both the groups since the hypothesis is failed to be rejected for variables stated in serial number 3,4 and 5 of the table 3, which are showing p-value more than 0.05. This variation in awareness level highlights that, though there is a clear awareness about self-appraisal among the teachers of the both the groups, the awareness about its influence on CPD is very weak under certain variables. Therefore, it prompts for developing awareness among the teachers of the both the groups.

To address this, the study recommends:

- Creating institutionalized appraisal frameworks with annual cycles.
- Training faculty in reflective practice and regulatory awareness.
- Integrating self-appraisal results into department-level CPD planning.
- Introducing performance-linked incentives for regular appraisals.
- Establishing peer-review panels and communities of practice.
- Allocating specific funds and time blocks for CPD activities.
- Using technology to monitor and evaluate progress.

## 9. Conclusion

This study contributes to understanding how self-appraisal, when supported by institutional mechanisms, can drive professional growth. It highlights that faculty engagement is shaped by more than individual attitudes; institutional culture, administrative support, and policy enforcement play central roles. Implementing structured self-appraisal systems that inform CPD planning is critical to ensuring reflective, responsive, and high-quality education. Such integration aligns with the goals of NEP 2020 and sets a foundation for sustainable faculty development.

## Acknowledgement

We, Dr Ramesh Kulkarni, Dr Reshmi R and Ms Akshata Bilagi would like to express sincere gratitude to all those who contributed to the successful completion of this work. Appreciation is extended to colleagues, peers, and reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions that helped in improving the quality of this article. The support and encouragement of the respective institution/organization is also gratefully acknowledged. Finally, heartfelt thanks are due to family and friends for their constant motivation and understanding throughout the course of this study.

## Conflict of Interest

The paper has been the own work of the authors of this paper and there will be no conflict of interest among the authors. In case of any such conflicts arising in future after the publication of this paper the authors may be held self-responsible.

## Funding Sources

The expenses incurred in conducting the mini research work in writing this paper has been borne by the authors own funds. There have been no funding agencies involved in the research work carried out and the writing of this paper in total.

## References

- [1] Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10–20.
- [2] Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher Learning that Supports Student Learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5), 6–11.
- [3] Day, C. (1999). *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. Routledge.
- [4] Fullan, M. (2007). *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. Teachers College Press.

- [5] Kulkarni, R. (2016). CRONBACH ALPHA IS AN INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS THE RELIABILITY OF A LIKERT SCALE IN THE CONTEXT OF BUSINESS RESEARCH GE-International Journal of Management Research (GE-IJMR).
- [6] National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Ministry of Education, Government of India.
- [7] OECD. (2005). *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*. OECD Publishing.
- [8] Schon, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books.
- [9] University Grants Commission (UGC). (2021). *Guidelines on Teacher Appraisal and CPD*. New Delhi: UGC.