INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT

OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL

Vol 12, Issue 1, (2023) E-ISSN: 2226-6348

# Evaluation of the Professors' Management Application in Virtual Learning Context throughout the COVID-19 Pandemic as Perceived by the Health Science Students

Rufo S. Calixtro Jr., Jennalyn M. Carrasco-Argete, Lolita L. Cunanan, Roldan D. Concepcion

University of Perpetual Help System Laguna (UPHSL)/University of Perpetual Help-Dr. Jose G. Tamayo Medical University (UPH-DJGTMU) Laguna, Philippines 4024

Email: calixtro.rufo@uphsl.edu.ph, carrasco.jennalyn@uphsl.edu.ph, cunanan.lolita@uphsl.edu.ph, concepcion.roldan@uphsl.edu.ph

**To Link this Article:** http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v12-i1/16578 DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v12-i1/16578

***Published Online:*** 16 March 2023

**Abstract**

The student's evaluation of the teaching performance is considered the most effective and desirable resource in improving its quality with regard to the educational system. Our aim was to evaluate the professors' performance in online teaching from the standpoint of health science students during the COVID-19 pandemic. A total of 137 teachers were assessed by the 1,583 health science students at the University of Perpetual Help Laguna. The teaching performance indicator perceived by the students as excellently performed is expertise in the subject matter. All indicators are predictors of excellent online teaching performance. The health science students of the university were highly contented with what had been experienced with their professors' online teaching performance and requested to improve on the faculty members' preparation prior to the online classes.

**Keywords:** Evaluation, Teaching Performance, Online Teaching, COVID-19, Health Science

## Introduction

One of the pillars that sustain the quality of the university education system is the performance of its faculty members (Escribano, 2018; Chamorro-Atalay et al., 2019). Teaching performance evaluation promotes their professional enhancement and development allowing them to become more efficient in teaching, thus improving the quality of education. There are various ways of evaluating teacher performance, however, the student-based evaluation is considered the most effective. The students' evaluation of teaching is being regarded as a significant support to enhance the quality of educational system. Furthermore, students' evaluation of teaching is regarded by many authors as the only tangible source and the best type of evaluation since students, being taught directly by their professors, are in the best position to evaluate their professors' educational activities (Emery et al., 2003). In this method, the student is usually asked some questions to assess the quality of their professor's educational activities. The results are utilized to inform professors of their strengths and

weaknesses for them to enhance their teaching quality. As a result, teaching evaluation is utilized as an essential tool to make decisions and determine the right teaching policy, especially at the university level (Arabi et al., 2012; Derakhshan et al., 2013; Darabi et al., 2013).

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, many higher educational institutions utilized different Learning Management Systems (LMS) and practiced flexible learning to adapt to pedagogical requirements to teach 21st-century learners. This learning modality became a necessity as serious threats to the health and safety of students brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic forced them to migrate to an online platform. Migration from the traditional face-to-face teaching learning modality to virtual learning led to the many challenges and adjustments that most educational institutions faced when the COVID-19 pandemic arose. The inadequate technological infrastructure of most educational institutions coupled with the student's lack of equipment to participate in online courses, unable to access online materials from home, and being unable to leave home for a long time were among the challenges encountered (Apriyanti, 2020). Such factors were obstacles to the success of the virtual learning implemented. One approach to ensure the continuity of the learning process virtually is to capacitate the faculty members with the knowledge, skills, and practices they can apply in an online learning set-up. A part of their initial faculty training is the effective and efficient utilization of their Learning Management Systems such as Canvas®, BlackBoard®, Moodle®, and many more. This technology became the most significant and appropriately utilized in ensuring the continuity of the learning process in the still ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

As the rapid migration to virtualize learning during the COVID-19 pandemic took place, the question of whether online learning is effective in developing the necessary skills of students is still subject to a regulated discussion. Under the present circumstances, the University of Perpetual Help-Dr. Jose G. Tamayo Medical University Laguna is adjoined with a context where it must adopt and respond actively to the rapid change wanting not to neglect its pedagogical principles which allows it to obtain a quality teaching process that equips the future health sciences graduates of becoming real-world-ready health practitioners. As the university was forced to change its educational model rapidly, the way learning and teaching are conducted must also change. Since not all teachers are prepared to assume the teaching process using digital tools (Chirikov et al., 2020), it is therefore necessary to evaluate teacher performance in this context (Restauri, 2016).

**Research Objective**

The primary aim of the study is to

- determine the perceptivity of health science learners about their professors' teaching performance in a virtual learning environment of the medical university; and
- analyze the teaching performance under the context of online or virtual learning implemented by the university in response to the declaration of a health emergency brought about by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

## Methods

### Research Design

The study utilized a non-experimental research design, to assess the teaching performance for improvement of teaching-learning process in the new normal. The correlation analysis of

teachers' online performance done in this study will bring about a frame of reference for the university administrators to establish action plans that contribute to improving the teaching-learning for the following academic semesters, considering that the university although in the process of transitioning back to face-to-face classroom set-up, the virtual classrooms will still be integrated to the so-called hybrid learning in the new normal.

**Site of the Study**

The site of the study is the University of Perpetual Help-Dr. Jose G. Tamayo Medical University Laguna, a higher education institution specializing in medicine and health science programs and shared campus location with the University of Perpetual Help System Laguna in the City of Binan, Province of Laguna, Philippines. It was granted university status by the Commission on Higher Education in 1997. Formerly known as Perpetual Help College of Laguna, it was the first university in the city of Binan. There are nine health science undergraduate programs namely Dentistry, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Nursing, Pharmacy, Midwifery, Radiologic Technology, and Respiratory Therapy with one graduate program which is the Doctor of Medicine. The academic governing body which is directly under the office of the University President is called the Executive Committee (EXECOM) chaired by the Chancellor and composed of the Executive Director, program deans, and department heads. During the first semester of school year 2022-2023, it has more than 2,500 student enrollees with more than 150 faculty members.

**Population and Sample**

The population is made up of all faculty members of the medical university assigned to teach in the different courses (general education and professional) of nine health sciences undergraduate programs namely Dentistry, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Medical Technology, Midwifery, Nursing, Pharmacy, Radiologic Technology and Respiratory Therapy, whose number is 137 teachers. The population is the same as the sample since it is possible to carry out the evaluation of faculty members' performance from the perspective of the students to all teachers who are part of the population under analysis. The evaluation of faculty members' performance is carried out by 1,583 students representing 87.25% of the total students officially enrolled from the previously mentioned programs for the academic year 2021-2022. 73.5% of the students are female and the most number of student enrollees are from the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (27%).

**Data Collection Technique**

The data were collected via survey where the instrument used is the questionnaire floated through the School Automate®, a system where the enrollment, faculty loading, and grades were viewed and encoded. All of the lecture classes were conducted online hence the transactions were made online as well. The undergraduate health science students belong to the Colleges of Dentistry, Nursing, Midwifery, Pharmacy, Medical Technology, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Radiologic Technology, and Respiratory Therapy.

The self-made survey questionnaire (the UPH-FLY On-line Teaching Performance) contained four indicators of teaching performance: the faculty, the faculty and netiquette, facilitating learning, and expertise in the subject matter. Indicator 1 – The Faculty – with five specific criteria describing how a faculty prepares a student to the on-line class, keep them a proactive participant throughout the synchronous discussion and maximizes time of on-line meetings.

Indicator 2 – The Faculty and Netiquette – with five specific criteria focusing on the proper behavior and interaction of a faculty with students in an on-line classroom setting. Indicator 3 – Facilitates Learning – with 13 specific criteria where a faculty is evaluated on their skills and expertise to facilitates the learning process effectively and efficiently in an on-line setting. The fourth indicator – Expertise of the Subject Matter – with 3 specific criteria where perception regarding on how a faculty is knowledgeable of the subject matter he/she is teaching both professionally and practically. Each criterion is rated from a Likert scale of 1 to 4 where 4 is Excellent; 3 – Very Good; 2 – Good; and 1 – Needs Improvement. The average mean for each indicator is multiplied by its weight and the product is summated to determine the overall teaching performance. Mean range of 3.51 – 4 is rated as Excellent; 2.67 – 3.50 – Very Good; 1.84 – 2.66 – Good; and 1 – 1.83 – Needs Improvement. These indicators established in the questionnaire were approved by resolution of the Executive Committee (a council composed of the Chancellor, Executive Director, and Program Deans and Department Heads) level of the Medical University on September, 2021. The performance evaluation tool was utilized for the first and second semester of school year 2021-2022.

**Ethical Consideration**

The personal information such as providing the names and surnames of the participants was not compulsory. The participation of the respondents was optional and were assured that the information would be extracted in a general manner and their identities would not be disclosed. The results of the study would be available upon request.

**Validation of the Data Collection Instrument**

The data collection instrument (the UPH-FLY On-line Teaching Performance questionnaire) undergone two validation process. Firstly, is the validation of the content of the instrument (content validity); and secondly is the validation of data collected from the instrument (internal consistency/reliability). Content was validated by a group of program deans with expertise in teaching measurements and evaluation. In order to determine the Cronbach alpha (for internal consistency/reliability), the statistical software SPSS V25 was used, the results showed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.925, indicating a high homogeneity and equivalence of response of all indicators (Rodriguez-Rodriguez & Reguant-Alvarez, 2019).

**Results and Discussion**

**Demographic Profile of the UPH-DJGTM Laguna Faculty Members**

As shown in Table 1, majority of the teachers are females (55.47%). This indicates that in the teaching profession, there are more females than male teachers. This supports the finding of Kelleher et al, (2011) that more females are more likely to work in an environment that involves interpersonal dimensions such as the teaching profession. Kelleher et al (2011) added that this is supportive of the commonly recognized worldwide contention that the teaching profession continues to be increasingly feminized profession.

Most faculty members are working on a full-time basis (52.55%) indicating that the faculty members are more available and accessible to the students' learning needs. They give more meaningful interactions to their students suggesting that faculty status is related to student learning outcomes and success (Jacoby, 2006), although does not significantly result to higher retention and graduation rates among students (Rossol-Allison & Alleman Beyers, 2011).

A greater number of teachers taught health professional core courses (81.02%) as expected since change in the curriculum of all health sciences programs were mandated by the Commission on Higher Education in 2017 to be outcomes-based. These upgrading of curriculum expects their graduate to apply their professional competencies and skills in the provision of their respective health profession services.

Table 1
*Demographic Profile of the UPH-DJGTMU Faculty Members*

| | Frequency (N =137) | % |
|---|---|---|
| Sex | | |
| Male | 61 | 44.53 |
| Female | 76 | 55.47 |
| Faculty Status | | |
| Full-time | 72 | 52.55 |
| Part-time | 65 | 47.45 |
| Classification as to the courses taught | | |
| Professional | 111 | 81.02 |
| General Education | 26 | 18.98 |
| Size of class handled | | |
| Small (≤ 50) | 55 | 40.15 |
| Medium (51-150) | 45 | 32.85 |
| Large (> 150) | 37 | 27.00 |

As to the number of students handled, 40.15% have less than 50 students enrolled in their respective courses. This finding affirmed that teachers handling small classes are giving more individual attention to their students, effectively control and manage their virtual classroom as well as build better relationships with their students (Wang & Calvano, 2022).

**Perception of Teaching Performance by each Indicators**

Table 2 shows the mean of the items for the first indicator of Teaching Performance – The Faculty. The table indicates the basic faculty preparation for online classroom instruction which is one of the most important practices in setting a good atmosphere for the learners. The four criteria resulted in excellent ratings (3.52-3.57) while the first criterion resulted in only a very good rating (3.42). With this, one of the practices that the faculty has to improve is showing the students how relevant starting the session with a prayer both in online and in face-to-face classes. Aside from creating a positive atmosphere in the virtual classroom, the students may look forward to the new opportunities, lessons, conversations, and positivity that the day brings. Since it is a practice of the institution, it must be implemented in the preparation of classroom instruction. This will also flourish the culture of the institution in instilling to their students the Perpetualite core value of Love of God strengthening its mission of producing spiritually guided health professionals committed in in the achievement of the highest quality of life. Overall, the faculty members were perceived by their students as excellent (3.52) in preparing their lessons prior to the actual synchronous discussion of lessons.

Table 2
*Health Sciences Students' Perception of Online Teaching Performance for Indicator 1 - The Faculty*

| Indicator 1 – The Faculty | 1st sem AY 2021-2022 | 2nd sem AY 2021-2022 | AVERAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| The faculty starts and ends the class with a prayer. | 3.36 (VG) | 3.48 (VG) | 3.42 (VG) |
| The faculty wears appropriate attire and presents themselves well and their environment/background is conducive to learning. | 3.56 (E) | 3.56 (E) | 3.56 (E) |
| The faculty maintains a professional and positive demeanor while delivering lectures. | 3.55 (E) | 3.55 (E) | 3.55 (E) |
| The faculty is able to explain the lesson in English clearly and can keep students interested in the topic. | 3.52 (E) | 3.54(E) | 3.53 (E) |
| The faculty follows their exact class schedule (starts and ends on time) and maximizes the time for synchronous learning. | 3.57 (E) | 3.55 (E) | 3.56 (E) |
| AVERAGE | 3.51(E) | 3.54 (E) | 3.52 (E) |

*Legend: 3.51 – 4 – Excellent (E); 2.68 – 3.50 – Very Good (VG); 1.84 – 2.67 - Good (G); 1 – 1.83 – Needs Improvement (NI)*

Shown in Table 3 is the category for the faculty and netiquette. The faculty must initiate good behavior in online classes and the criteria were created in order to determine if these standards were encouraged. According to the table, the criterion *"the faculty checks that the student is in their complete school uniform and checks students' environment before the start or during the class to ensure minimal distractions*" obtained a mean of 3.46, which is the only criterion that

Table 3
*Health Sciences Students' Perception of Online Teaching Performance for Indicator 2 – The Faculty and Netiquette*

| Indicator 2 – The Faculty and Netiquette | 1st sem AY 2021-2022 | 2nd sem AY 2021-2022 | AVERAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| The faculty greets students with courtesy | 3.6 (E) | 3.56 (E) | 3.58 (E) |
| The faculty checks that the student is in their complete school uniform and checks students' environment before the start or during the class to ensure minimal distractions. | 3.42 (VG) | 3.5 (VG) | 3.46 (VG) |
| The faculty regularly checks the attendance during students` synchronous sessions and/or their LMS (Moodle) logs. | 3.57 (E) | 3.55 (E) | 3.56 (E) |
| The faculty allows students to unmute when they have inquiries or clarifications regarding the subject matter. | 3.61 (E) | 3.56 (E) | 3.59 (E) |
| The faculty regularly checks on each student and maintains proper online class decorum. | 3.51 (E) | 3.53 (E) | 3.52 (E) |
| AVERAGE | 3.54 (E) | 3.54 (E) | 3.54 (E) |

*Legend: 3.51 – 4 – Excellent (E); 2.68 – 3.50 – Very Good (VG); 1.84 – 2.67 - Good (G); 1 – 1.83 – Needs Improvement (NI)*

was not rated excellently. This criterion has to be improved since multi-tasking, mind-wandering, and using digital-devices were extensively found to be the distractions that detriment students' learning performance in an online classroom environment (Wang, 2022). Thus, this will impair their focused attention during synchronous classes. As wearing school uniforms create a level playing field among students in traditional classroom set-up and keep students focused on their education, checking their uniforms before starting synchronous learning will instill discipline, train them to act professionally, and found to reduce the possibility of distracting the students. The criterion *"the faculty allows students to unmute when they have inquiries or clarifications regarding the subject matter"* was rated the highest (3.61) by the student respondents. This showed that the week-long intensive training and proficiency certification in the use of the school's learning management system (Moodle®) conducted by the university prior to the opening of school year 2021-2022 was effective in providing the faculty members to acquire proper teaching-learning environment netiquette.

The primary tasks that faculty members must performed to facilitate learning in an online environment are listed in Table 4. The criterion – *"the faculty welcomes questions and is open to corrections from students and makes sure that students understand the lesson"*, receives the highest rating (3.55; excellent) from the students. This quality of the teacher as an effective facilitator of learning encourages faculty-student contact, fosters collaborative learning between the faculty and students, and promotes active learning that are best practices to ensure success in an online learning environment. On the other hand, the criterion – *"the faculty provides timely feedback and discusses the results of students' quizzes and activities"*, was perceived to be the least practiced among the faculty members, receiving

a rating of 3.46 interpreted as “very good”. A teacher in giving feedback is enabling the students to identify their strengths, target areas to improve, and stay on track. In an online environment, where students are trained to become self-paced learners, feedback becomes a powerful construct in designing a quality online teaching and are used as leveraged to improve the effectiveness, increase efficiency, and maintain appeal in online courses However, Simonson et al (2019) stressed that the feedback must concentrate on the content, analysis, creativity, and problem-solving rather than spending too much time pointing out each and every detail of what students must improve. Further, feedback to be effective must be timely – be given while there is still time for the learners to act on it and to monitor and adjust their learning, and of quality – appropriately assessed that expands learning and understanding as well as encourages continued participation. In online learning environment, the feedback must be integrated in the learning environment design connected to what and how the assessment will work during the instruction. The faculty is therefore encouraged to have resources for his/her assessment such as rubrics and key to corrections and must be transparent in evaluating their students which can be done via the grade sheets in the Learning Management System

An improvement from very good (3.50) to excellent (3.52) overall rating was noted among the faculty members which affirmed the purpose of semestral teacher evaluation as a way of providing opportunities for improvement and sustain best practices. Overall, the students perceived that their teachers facilitate learning of their students excellently (3.51).

Table 5 shows the subject matter expertise of the faculty members as perceived by the students. All indicators showing that the faculty members as the subject matter experts were perceived by the students as excellent (3.54 - 3.56). The item that obtained the highest rating (3.56) is the criterion – *“the faculty uses real-world examples and scenarios and topic-related activities”*, implying that the faculty is using real-world examples, real-life scenarios and practical applications of related topics. This is in line with the mission of the university to produce real-

Table 4
*Health Sciences Students' Perception of Online Teaching Performance for Indicator 3 - Facilitating Learning*

| Indicator 3 – Facilitates Learning | 1st sem AY 2021-2022 | 2nd sem AY 2021-2022 | AVERAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| The faculty posts and discusses learning outcomes and expectations of the course/modules and ensures understanding. | 3.52 (E) | 3.52 (E) | 3.52 (E) |
| The faculty uploads learning materials of their lessons in advance (days before the discussion). | 3.47 (VG) | 3.49 (VG) | 3.48 (VG) |
| The faculty gives opportunities to engage in active learning (i.e., peer review, interactive simulations, web research, experience-based projects, and multimedia presentations including learning outside the virtual classroom) to keep students interested and motivated. | 3.50 (VG) | 3.52 (E) | 3.51 (E) |
| The faculty stimulates critical and creative thinking skills by giving a variety of assessments such as exercises, assignments, quizzes, and forum discussions. | 3.54 (E) | 3.53 (E) | 3.54 (E) |
| The faculty provides clear instructions for assignments/activities and responds promptly to students' inquiries. | 3.52 (E) | 3.52 (E) | 3.52 (E) |
| The faculty allows a 3-day to the one-week period before the deadline for submission of assignments and tasks/activities. | 3.55 (E) | 3.53 (E) | 3.54 (E) |
| The faculty provides timely feedback and discusses the results of students' quizzes and activities. | 3.42 (VG) | 3.49 (VG) | 3.46 (VG) |
| The faculty welcomes questions and is open to corrections from students and makes sure that students understand the lesson. | 3.55 (E) | 3.54 (E) | 3.55 (E) |
| The faculty is open to and available for scheduled online consultation outside of class hours. | 3.46 (VG) | 3.51 (E) | 3.49 (E) |
| The faculty schedules regular short breaks during 3-hour classes and/or provides asynchronous activities in between live discussions. | 3.49 (VG) | 3.52 (E) | 3.51 (E) |
| The faculty is online and available for questions and clarifications during asynchronous activities within the scheduled class time. | 3.50 (VG) | 3.52 (E) | 3.51 (E) |
| The faculty encourages students to use other readings, research papers, and the MU E-library to supplement lectures and textbook information. | 3.45 (VG) | 3.50 (VG) | 3.48 (VG) |
| The faculty provides a supportive distance learning | 3.50 (VG) | 3.52 (E) | 3.51 (E) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| environment and exhibits a genuine interest in the students learning process. | | | |
| AVERAGE | 3.50 (VG) | 3.52 (E) | 3.51 (E) |

*Legend: 3.51 – 4 – Excellent (E); 2.68 – 3.50 – Very Good (VG); 1.84 – 2.67 – Good (G); 1 – 1.83 – Needs Improvement (NI)*

world ready health practitioners. This also shows the extensive professional experience and competence of the faculty members. Teachers must grasp subject matter extensively and flexibly in order to assist students to develop usable cognitive maps according to what is needed by the students when they practiced their respective health professions in the future. As part of their pedagogical knowledge, a faculty must necessary share relevant information and practical application with their students.

This indicator of teaching performance was given the highest overall rating (3.55) among all other indicators by the students affirming the practice of the university to hire the best and the most competent health professionals as teachers. After all, the quality of teachers significantly affects the students' performance and aligned with the mantra of the university as being the "home of the board topnotchers".

Table 5
*Health Sciences Students' Perception of Online Teaching Performance for Indicator 4 - Expertise in the Subject Matter*

| Indicator 4 – Expertise in the Subject Matter | 1st sem AY 2021-2022 | 2nd sem AY 2021-2022 | AVERAGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| The faculty expounds on and explains the topic in a way that students understand. | 3.54 (E) | 3.54 (E) | 3.54 (E) |
| The faculty uses real-world examples and scenarios and topic-related activities. | 3.56 (E) | 3.55 (E) | 3.56 (E) |
| The faculty asks good questions and provides clear answers to students' questions. | 3.55 (E) | 3.55 (E) | 3.55 (E) |
| AVERAGE | 3.55 (E) | 3.55 (E) | 3.55 (E) |

*Legend: 3.51 – 4 – Excellent (E); 2.68 – 3.50 – Very Good (VG); 1.84 – 2.67 - Good (G); 1 – 1.83 – Needs Improvement (NI)*

**Analysis of the Overall Perception of the UPH-DJGTMU Online Teaching Performance**

Table 6 shows the overall online teaching implementation to each indicator. According to the perceptivity of health science learners, the mean range of 3.56-3.61, indicates an excellent online teaching performance. It should be noted that the teaching performance was rated within a range of 1 (lowest) to 4 (highest). Although on the average there is an excellent online teaching performance, the results obtained by each indicator will specifically describe.

Table 6
*Overall Online Teaching Performance of the UPH-DJGTMU Faculty Members*

| | Mean (SD) | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Indicator 1 - The Faculty | 3.56 (±0.257) | Excellent |
| Indicator 2 - The Faculty and Netiquette | 3.60 (±0.237) | Excellent |
| Indicator 3 - Facilitates Learning | 3.57 (±0.251) | Excellent |
| Indicator 4 - Expertise in the subject matter | 3.61 (±0.247) | Excellent |
| Overall Teaching Performance | 3.59 (±0.246) | Excellent |

Legend: 3.51 – 4 – Excellent (E); 2.68 – 3.50 – Very Good (VG); 1.84 – 2.67 - Good (G); 1 – 1.83 – Needs Improvement (NI)

With regards to the first indicator the faculty, which reflects how a faculty prepares a student to the on-line class, keep them a proactive participant throughout the synchronous discussion and maximizes time of on-line meetings, it can be indicated that the students perceived 57.66% of teachers presented an excellent performance and 42.34% had a very good performance.

Regarding the indicator 2 the faculty and Netiquette, which focuses on the proper behavior and interaction of a faculty with students in an on-line classroom setting. It can be indicated that 62.77% of the teachers presented an excellent performance and 37.23% presented a very good performance.

With regards to the third indicator facilitating learning, which reflects the faculty members' skills and expertise to facilitates the learning process effectively and efficiently in an on-line setting, it can be indicated that 60.58% of the teachers presented an excellent performance, 38.69% presented very good performance, and only one (0.73%) presented a good performance.

Regarding the last indicator expertise of the subject matter, which reflects how a faculty is knowledgeable of the subject matter he/she is teaching both professionally and practically. It can be indicated that 67.15% of the teachers presented an excellent performance, 32.12% presented a very good performance, and only 1 or 0.73% presented a good performance.

**Influence and relationship between specific indicator and overall online teaching performance**

The influence and its relationship of specific factors have on the overall teaching accomplishment will be supported statistically, using linear regression test in the SPSS v25 licensed software. Initially we will begin with the analysis of each specific factor and the overall online teaching performance factor. The ANOVA statistic informs whether or not there is a significant relationship between the factors analyzed through the critical value of significance.

Table 7 indicates the value of significance, which is equal to 0.000, that indicates which both factors are related linearly. In this regard, the multiple correlation coefficient R, or Pearson's coefficient, is 0.884, which means that the degree of relationship is very high. Likewise, by means of the R squared, it can be indicated that 78.2% of the variation of the qualification of the overall online teaching performance factor (Y) is due to the perception of the students

with indicator - the faculty (X). This is translated by means of the following linear regression: Y = 0.578 + 0.845X ≈ Overall Online Teaching Performance = 0.578 + 0.845 The Faculty

Regarding the indicator – the faculty and netiquette, Table 8 shows the critical value of significance equal to 0.000, which indicates that both factors are linearly related; in turn, the Pearson coefficient is 0.944, which means that the degree of relationship is very high. Likewise, R squared is equal to 0.891, so it can be indicated that 89.1% of the variation of the rating of the overall teaching performance factor (Y) is due to the perception of the students with the indicator – the faculty and netiquette (X). This is translated by means of the following linear regression: Y= 0.063 + 0.978X ≈ Overall Online Teaching Performance = 0.063 + 0.978 The Faculty and Netiquette.

Table 7
*The Faculty and the Overall Online Teaching Performance*

| Model | R | R square | Parameter estimates | | ANOVA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | constant | b | Significance |
| 1 | 0.884[a] | 0.782 | 0.578 | 0.845 | .000 |

[a]. Predictors: (Constant), The Faculty

Table 8
*The Faculty and Netiquette and the Overall Online Teaching Performance*

| Model | R | R square | Parameter estimates | | ANOVA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | constant | b | Significance |
| 1 | 0.944[a] | 0.891 | 0.063 | 0.978 | .000 |

[a]. Predictors: (Constant), The Faculty and Netiquette

Regarding facilitating learning, Table 9 shows the critical value of significance equal to 0.000, which indicates that both factors are linearly related. In turn, the Pearson coefficient is 0.989, which means that the degree of relationship is very high. Likewise, R squared is equal to 0.979, so it can be indicated that 97.9% of the variation in the rating of the overall online teaching performance factor (Y) is due to the perception of the students with the faculty as facilitator of learning (X). This is translated by means of the following linear regression: Y= 0.131 + 0.967X ≈ Overall Online Teaching Performance = 0.131 + 0.967 Facilitating Learning

Table 9
*Facilitating Learning and the Overall Online Teaching*

| Model | R | R square | Parameter estimates | | ANOVA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | constant | B | Significance |
| 1 | 0.989[a] | 0.979 | 0.131 | 0.967 | .000 |

[a]. Predictors: (Constant), Facilitating Learning

Regarding the faculty members' expertise in the subject matter, Table 10 shows the critical value of significance equal to 0.000, which indicates that both factors are linearly related. In turn, the Pearson coefficient is 0.987, which means that the degree of relationship is very

high. Likewise, R squared is equal to 0.975, so it can be indicated that 97.5% of the variation in the rating of the overall online teaching performance factor (Y) is due to the perception of students with the faculty members' expertise in the subject matter (X). This is translated by means of the following linear regression: Y= 0.047 + 0.975X ≈ Overall Online Teaching Performance = 0.047 + 0.975 Expertise in the subject matter

Table 10
*Expertise in the subject matter and the Overall Online Teaching*

| Model | R | R square | Parameter estimates constant | b | ANOVA Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.987[a] | 0.975 | 0.047 | 0.981 | .000 |

[a]. Predictors: (Constant), Expertise in the subject matter

Based on the statistical result, facilitating learning is the indicator that has a greater influence on the perception of students with online teaching performance, with an R2 value of 0.979, this influence is 97.9%, closely followed by the expertise in the subject matter, which has an R2 value of 0.975, indicating an influence of 97.5%. This affirmed that the faculty members were perceived to be an excellent facilitator of learning in an online environment. It encompasses that the faculty members possessed all the important roles of facilitating learning such as pedagogical, social, managerial, and technical, roles that may result to an efficient and effective online teaching-learning process. The least influence factor is the first indicator – the faculty, with an R2 value of 0.782, indicating an influence of 78.2% to the overall online teaching performance. Though it has the lowest influence, it is still a significant factor that is perceived by the students to have an effective teaching-learning process in online set-up, may be utilized to further improve and sustain their excellent online teaching performance.

Overall, preparing the students for a synchronous learning will set a positive and motivating tone for students to sustain their focus during the entire online session, thus, facilitating even more effectively the online learning process. Couple with the expertise in the subject matter of the faculty members possessing the vital qualities of online facilitator will result to an effective online teaching-learning environment.

**Conclusion**

This research aimed to deliberate a favorable teaching performance, in accordance with the perception of the health science learners. Though the entire education sector has not been ready for such a drastic transformation in teaching-learning modality brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, most teachers found it significantly to innovate their new teaching methodologies, incorporating interactive digital tools through videos and online forums, creating in this way friendly, flexible, and engaging online classroom environments, taking into consideration the nature of the health science programs. In general, the results validate that the excellent online teaching performance of UPH-DJGTMU faculty members significantly influence the motivation and the favorable perception of the students in health science programs. It was determined that the efforts made by the faculty members in facilitating learning in the online classroom, present a best perception by the health science students while the faculty preparation before conducting online synchronous classes is the one that

presents the least perception. However, all indicators were favorably perceived by the students which affirmed that during the implementation and conduct of virtual learning, the faculty members were able to practiced favorably all indicators of an effective and efficient online teaching pedagogy. The study recommended the university to develop a progressive faculty development plan aimed at enhancing skills of its faculty members in terms of teaching preparation of lessons prior to actual online classes as well as strengthening and sustaining the better perceived practices such as the roles of faculty as facilitator and expert source of professional information facilitating learning in virtual learning environment to sustain the needs and interests of students even during the return to the traditional face-to-face classes. Further, the administration is encouraged to develop new evaluation instrument adapted to the needs of the students once they return back to the traditional face-to-face classroom; and continue having a regular student evaluation of teaching performance to provide perception about their professional development so that the authorities in charge must take certain measures to improve the educational service that is provided. Under the new context of education that will be demanded from the return of the students to face-to-face classes, the best practices obtained on virtualized education, the teachers must continuously have trained in the use of new technological tools and strategies, which take into consideration the various characteristics of each teacher. All these efforts will imprint a better accomplishment and greater development in terms of digitization.

In addition, with the presence of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Philippine education system applied different LMS for the faculty members to facilitate an online learning platform, and synchronized e-learning was the remedy at that time. However, in the beginning, most of the learners came online for the first time. They lacked the experience and confidence to learn online using a new medium. After some time, most learners can overcome most of the technical issues related to online learning platforms. But the learning challenges are still problematic in online learning during the pandemic.

Furthermore, it greatly influenced the learners' performance and learning outcomes as well as the preparedness of the faculty. The study established the efforts made by them in promoting distance learning and, offering the best perception by the health science students. With the support of the administration, it is encouraged to develop new evaluation instruments adapted to the needs of both the students and facilitators of the learning process.

**References**

Apriyanti, C. (2020). Distance learning and obstacles during Covid-19 outbreak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 7(2), 68-83.

Asghar, A. M. A., Zahra, A. B., & Nages, K. (2012). Explaining the Pros and Cons of Different Sources of Faculty Evaluation from the Viewpoints of Medical University Academics. *Trides in Development of Medical Education*, 9 (1): 65-76.

Chamorro-Atalaya, O., Santillan, D. A., Bedrinana, J. Y., Chacon, Y. L., & Choque, M. D. (2019). The correlation of the specific and global performance of teachers in UNTELS Engineering Schools. *Advances in Science, Technology and Engineering Systems Journal (ASTESJ)*, 4(6), 196–202. https://doi.org/10.25046/aj040625.

Chirikov, I., Semenova, T., Maloshonok, N., Bettinger, E., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2020). Online education platforms scale college STEM instruction with equivalent learning outcomes at lower cost. *Science advances*, *6*(15), eaay5324. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aay5324.

Darabi, M. R., Derakhshan, A., Maleki, G., & Saeidi, M. (2013). Comparison and review of opinions of professors and students of Mashhad University of Medical Sciences about the criteria of a good university professor. *Strides in Development of Medical Education*,10(4): 355.

Derakhshan, A., Darabi, M. R., Saeidi, M., & Kiani, M. A. (2013). Survey of Mashhad University of Medical Sciences students' views on the criteria of a good professor. *Medical Ethics Journal*, 7(25): 97.

Emery, C., Kramer, T., & Tian, R. (2003). Return to academic standards: A critique of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(1): 37-4 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241457600_Return_to_academic_standards_A_critique_of_student_evaluations_of_teaching_effectiveness.

Escribano, E. (2018) Teacher performance as a factor associated with educational quality in Latin America*. Education Journal*, 42(2), 242-251. https://doi.org/10.15517/REVEDU.V42I2.27033.

Fender, D. (2000). Student and Faculty Issues in Distance Education Occupational Safety and Health Graduate Programs. *Journal of Safety Research*, 33(2), 175-193. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4375(02)00024-5.

Harrison, R., Hutt, I., Thomas-Varcoe, C., Motteram, G., Else, K., Rawlings, B., & Gemmell, I. (2017). A Cross-Sectional Study to Describe Academics' Confidence, Attitudes, and Experience of Online Distance Learning in Higher Education. *Journal of Educators Online*, 14(2). https://doi.org/10.9743/jeo.2017.14.2.3.

Herman, J. H. (2012). Faculty Development Programs: The Frequency and Variety of Professional Development Programs Available to Online Instructors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(5), 87-106. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1000093.pdf.

Hughes, J., Ofstad, W., & Fuentes, D. (2022). Changing the foundations of faculty development by developing a quality learning environment. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 14(10, 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2021.11.003.

Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education*. 77(6), 1081-1103.

Kelleher, F., Severin, F. O., Khaahloe, M. B., Samson, M., De, A., Afamasaga-Wright, T., & Sedere, U. M. (2011). *Women and the teaching profession: exploring the feminization debate*. Commonwealth Secretariat. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000212200.

Kumar, A., & Renu, J. (2018). Faculty Evaluation System. *Procedia Computer Science*, 125; 533–541. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.12.069.

Narciss, S. (2013). Designing and Evaluating Tutoring Feedback Strategies for digital learning environments on the basis of the Interactive Tutoring Feedback Model. *Digital Education Review,* 23(1), 7-26. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258422092_Designing_and_Evaluating_Tutoring_Feedback_Strategies_for_digital_learning_environments_on_the_basis_of_the_Interactive_Tutoring_Feedback_Model.

Persellin, D., & Goodrick, T. (2010). Faculty development in higher education: Long-term impact of a summer teaching and learning workshop. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10, 1-13. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Faculty-Development-in-Higher-Education%3A-Long-term-Persellin-Goodrick/3402657795faad95831c218b555d503ef5a2453b.

Restauri, E. (2016). Faculty-student interaction components in online education: What are the effects on student satisfaction and academic outcomes. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Faculty-student-interaction-components-in-online-on-Restauri/cb2f18cf10f5ecb56b141c55e659c8aade37f26f.

Rodriguez-Rodriguez, J., & Reguant-Alvarez, M. (2019). Calculate the reliability of a questionnaire or scale using trhe SPSS: Cronbach's alpha coefficient. *REIRE Revista d'Innovacio I Recerca en Educacio,* 13(2), 1-13. https://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/REIRE.

Rossol-Allison, P. M., & Beyers, A. N. J. (2011). *The Role of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty in Student Learning Outcomes* (ED531726). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED531726.pdf.

Sezer, H., & Sahin, H. (2021). Faculty development program for coaching in nursing education: A curriculum development process study. *Nurse education in practice*, *55*, 103165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2021.103165.

Simonson, M., Simaldino, S., Albright, M., & Zvacek, S. (2019). *Teaching and Learning at a Distance: Foundations of Distance Education* (ED445216). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED445216.

Wang, L., & Calvano, L. (2022). Class size, student behaviors and educational outcomes. *Organizational Management Journal*, 19(4), 126-142. https://www.emerald.com/insight/1541-6518.htm.

Wang, C. (2022). Comprehensively summarizing what distracts students from online learning: a literature review. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2022(12),1-15. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364286609_Comprehensively_Summarizing_What_Distracts_Students_from_Online_Learning_A_Literature_Review.