

Student Evaluation of Online Teaching (SEoOT) in Higher Education Institution During COVID-19 Pandemic: Basis for Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

Erna V. Yabut¹, Avelina R. Raqueno² and Nhoriel I. Toledo³

Abstract

Effective monitoring and evaluation of teaching even during the onset of COVID 19 pandemic is central to the continuous improvement of the effectiveness of teaching ensuring that teachers are highly skilled, well resourced, and motivated to perform at their best. This study aimed to evaluate the teaching performance of faculty when it shifted to full online modality during the pandemic. The online teaching performance evaluation was analyzed about the variables such as sex, highest educational attainment, employment status, length of service, age, type of courses handled and the structure of delivery. Results showed that the faculty members did exceptional performance and exceeds performance expectations. Younger batch of faculty who are newly graduates and belonged to Gen Z, Gen Y and Xennials, under probationary status, 20 years of teaching, and male faculty were rated higher performance. Furthermore, those handling core and prof core courses were rated higher by the students.

Keywords: Teaching Performance, Online Teaching, Quantitative Method, Input-Process-Output Model, Age Generations, Type of Courses, Employment Status, Learning Blocks, Performance Improvement Plan.

INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization classified COVID-19 as a worldwide epidemic on March 11, 2020. In the weeks that followed, several towns and countries enacted lockdowns, and many the world's educational systems transitioned to remote learning for students in kindergarten through higher education (Johnson, Seaman, & Veletsianos, 2021). The result was unparalleled. To avoid the COVID-19 virus, the government should temporarily close all public venues, including schools and colleges (Bhamani et al., 2020). No matter their level of experience or motivation, all teachers throughout the pandemic had to adapt their curricula and instructional strategies to match the needs of online instruction (Boysen, 2020). The teachers are responsible for completing the activities for each lesson, and students are expected to perform the learning tasks according to the provided directions (Cheng, 2020). However, due to the COVID-19 outbreak, offline teaching should be replaced with online instruction, and teachers should use the internet in the teaching process (Tukan, 2020).

Schools disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic should be aware of how to preserve the quality of their students' online classroom activities and how to improve their physical and mental learning skills throughout the pandemic (Zhao et al., 2020). With this, each instructor is tasked with developing their technical learning in relation to their teaching skills (Tukan, 2020). The uses of applications may be progressively discovered by teachers and students. However, using the programs alone is not enough to advance teaching approaches. The development of pedagogical solutions that incorporate every aspect of the teaching and learning process is required to raise educational quality (Zaheer et al., 2018).

Future, in-depth studies of online education, especially those that focus on students (Zhang et al., 2020), will need to investigate the problems with online learning that keep students from doing well in school (Mailizar et al., 2020) and the quality of online learning (Basilaia & Kvavadze, 2020). Universities can find ways to

¹ Graduate School, Centro Escolar University, Manila, 1005, Philippines

² School of Science and Technology, Centro Escolar University, Manila, 1005 Philippines, Email: araqueno@ceu.edu.ph, (Corresponding Author)

³ School of Science and Technology, Centro Escolar University, Manila, 1005 Philippines

improve online education and speed up the process by creating original course material and good management of technology (Sun et al., 2020).

Another issue that teachers and administrators had to deal with was whether using student assessments of education to determine the effectiveness of instruction during a pandemic (Boysen, 2020). The researchers thought that this feedback from students would aid institutions in adjusting to the changes in the educational system brought on by the pandemic and helping them plan appropriately because many educators have adapted to online learning.

Students' Evaluations of Teaching

Using the feedback from student evaluations to inform and enhance instruction is the aim of enhanced engagement (Boysen, 2020). As a result, it is a typical, empirically supported practice for model teachers to consider student feedback and adjust considering the results of student evaluations (Richmond et al., 2014).

The pandemic's effects on student evaluations varied as much as higher education institutions do (Boysen, 2020). Students and professors at Ohio State University were told to consider student assessments "holistically" considering the pandemic as they continued as normal (Malone, 2020). Student evaluation forms were altered by other universities. For instance, the University of Michigan incorporated inquiries into the shift to online instruction (Love, 2020), whereas Wake Forest University changed to solely asking open-ended concerns (Wake Forest University, 2020).

Asking about the effectiveness of online instruction and student engagement, as any unsolved concerns may have long-term effects for higher education as well as the future form of the developed and delivered programs (Szopiński & Bachnik, 2022). According to students' views of educational services, interactions between students and the learning environment have a direct impact on students' motivation and enjoyment (Stukalina, 2012).

METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of teachers' classroom performance has been part of the Quality Management System of Centro Escolar University.

During the COVID Pandemic, a committee was assigned to review the existing instrument and formulated items appropriate to the learning modality of online learning. They adapted the instrument prepared by Sherry Stewart and Lori Kogan (2015) for the Evaluation of Online Courses/teaching in the Department of Clinical Sciences and the instrument used by B. Jean Mandernach (2005) of the Department of Psychology from Park University. The instrument is called Evaluation of Online Teaching and five (5) domains were identified that includes Managerial, Content, Pedagogical, Social, and Technical and each item for each domain is evaluated using 4-Point Scale. The overall mean performance for each teacher is converted into percentage score and given the descriptors: 91-100 (Outstanding), 81-90 (Superior), 71-80 (Very Satisfactory), 61-70 (Satisfactory), 51-60 (Moderately Satisfactory), and 50 and below (Unsatisfactory).

The University implemented the block scheduling system starting first semester of SY 2020-2021. The semester is divided into 4 learning blocks and each learning block is consist of 5 weeks with two to three courses taken by students per learning block. The administration of the instrument is conducted every after-Midterm Examination of each learning block. Link of the evaluation instrument is posted in the CEU LEAPS, the online teaching-learning platform of Centro Escolar University. All the teachers are evaluated by their students in the different courses they handled.

Teachers are provided with a link so that they can view the results of their online teaching evaluation online. A conference with their Dean/Department head is also conducted especially when they obtained a rating implying a Satisfactory and below rating.

Mean was used to describe the online teaching performance of the teachers and standard deviation determined the homogeneity/heterogeneity of the evaluation of the teachers. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is used to determine the significant difference of the online performance evaluation of the teachers when they

are grouped according to their length of service, employment status, age, and rank while t-test for independent samples was used to compare the performance evaluation of the male and female teachers.

RESULTS

Online Teaching Performance Evaluation

Table 1. Assessment of the Online Performance Evaluation of the Teachers by the Students

	Mean	S.D.	Description
1. Provides orientation to the course and its structure including course outcomes, requirements, submission, and grading policies.	3.66	.659	Exceptional performance
2. Conducts virtual classes once a week	3.77	.574	Exceptional performance
3. Sets an effective system for communication between and among the students and the teachers.	3.57	.749	Exceptional performance
4. Responds clearly to all student inquiries (in the course discussion or via email) within 24-hr period.	3.53	.797	Exceptional performance
Managerial	3.63	.599	Exceptional performance; exceeds performance expectations.
Demonstrates mastery of subject matter (during virtual meetings when answering questions, or providing feedback, etc.)	3.61	.703	Exceptional performance
Content	3.61	.703	Exceptional performance; exceeds performance expectations.
6. Provides constructive feedback on tasks such as in correcting answers, highlighting strengths, and providing suggestions for improvement.	3.50	.802	Exceptional performance
7. Encourages students' continued interaction/ engagement through the use of questions or comments posted in the discussion forum.	3.57	.743	Exceptional performance
8. Keeps discussion during virtual class on the topic.	3.63	.698	Exceptional performance
9. Uses variety of assessment tools that gauge student progress.	3.52	.759	Exceptional performance
10. Gives timely, corrective feedback for online activities.	3.49	.810	Consistently meets and at times exceeds performance expectations.
11. Assigns grades that reflects/differentiates the quality of student performance as well as the quantity	3.54	.772	Exceptional performance
Pedagogical	3.54	.679	Exceptional performance; exceeds performance expectations.
12. Communicates a sense of enthusiasm and excitement	3.55	.758	Exceptional performance
13. Demonstrates respectful conduct that encourages everyone to be respectful in their words and actions	3.67	.661	Exceptional performance
14. Promotes a positive online class environment through praising desirable learning behaviors such as asking questions, expressing ideas and accomplishing tasks.	3.62	.705	Exceptional performance
15. Effectively handles inappropriate discussion postings or other unacceptable online behavior.	3.63	.686	Exceptional performance
Social	3.62	.650	Exceptional performance; exceeds performance expectations.
16. Ensures that all links are accessible and working.	3.61	.711	Exceptional performance
17. Navigates the CEU LEAPS proficiently.	3.60	.719	Exceptional performance
Technical	3.61	.684	Exceptional performance
Overall	90.05	15.15	Superior

The students evaluated their course teachers based on four (4) Domains: Managerial, Content, Pedagogical, Social, and Technical using the 4-Point Likert Scale.

It can be seen from the table that the overall average rating of the teachers is Superior with a mean of 90.05 and the standard deviation obtained of 15.15 shows that the assessment of the students are heterogenous.

Considering the domains, the overall mean of the different domain ranging from 3.54 to 3.63 shows that teachers showed exceptional performance implying that they exceeded performance expectations. The highest mean rating is on Managerial and the lowest is on Pedagogical. The students' ratings are homogenous under

the Managerial domain as shown by the low standard deviation while their evaluation is quite heterogenous on the other domains.

Comparison of Online Teaching Performance Evaluation

According to Degree

Tabular values show that there is a significant difference in the evaluation of online teaching of the teachers as shown by the p-values of each domain which is less than 0.05 level of significance. It can be observed from the Post Hoc results that the teachers who have finished their bachelor’s degree are found to have a significant difference with those who have completed their masters and doctorate degree and that those who have finished their masters differs significantly in their teaching performance with those who have completed their doctorate.

Looking at the obtained mean rating for each group, it can be noted that the teachers who completed a higher degree obtained a lower performance evaluation than those who have finished lower degree.

Table 2. Comparison of the Evaluation of Online Teaching Performance of the Teachers when they are Grouped According to their Degree

		Mean	S. D.	F-value	p-value	Sig	Remarks (Post Hoc)
Managerial	Doctorate (D)	3.58	0.63	154.000	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	D VS M D VS B M VS B
	Master (M)	3.62	0.61				
	Bachelor (B)	3.70	0.54				
	Total	3.63	0.60				
Content	Doctorate (D)	3.58	0.73	120.173	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	D VS M D VS B M VS B
	Master (M)	3.59	0.73				
	Bachelor (B)	3.69	0.63				
	Total	3.61	0.70				
Pedagogical	Doctorate (D)	3.49	0.71	189.288	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	D VS M D VS B M VS B
	Master (M)	3.52	0.70				
	Bachelor (B)	3.63	0.60				
	Total	3.54	0.68				
Social	Doctorate (D)	3.57	0.69	174.700	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	D VS M D VS B M VS B
	Master (M)	3.60	0.67				
	Bachelor (B)	3.70	0.56				
	Total	3.62	0.65				
Technical	Doctorate (D)	3.53	0.73	279.882	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	D VS M D VS B M VS B
	Master (M)	3.58	0.71				
	Bachelor (B)	3.71	0.58				
	Total	3.61	0.68				
Overall	Doctorate (D)	88.72	15.95	214.440	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	D VS M D VS B M VS B
	Master (M)	89.48	15.68				
	Bachelor (B)	92.08	13.28				
	Total	90.05	15.15				

According to Employment Status

The table indicates the results the comparison of the teaching online performance evaluation when teachers are assessed by their employment status.

Table 3. Comparison of the Evaluation of Online Teaching Performance of the Teachers when they are Grouped According to their Employment Status

		Mean	S. D.	F-value	p-value	Sig	Remarks (Post Hoc)
Managerial	Permanent (Pe)	3.59	0.63	176.348	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Pe VS Pr, FT, L Pr VS FT, L FT VS L
	Probationary (Pr)	3.77	0.47				
	Fixed Term (FT)	3.70	0.55				
	Lecturer (L)	3.64	0.59				
	Total	3.63	0.60				
Content	Permanent (Pe)	3.56	0.74	148.541	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Pe VS Pr, FT, L Pr VS FT, L
	Probationary (Pr)	3.76	0.56				

Student Evaluation of Online Teaching (SEoOT) in Higher Education Institution During COVID-19 Pandemic: Basis for Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

	Fixed Term (FT)	3.68	0.63				FT VS L
	Lecturer (L)	3.64	0.68				
	Total	3.61	0.70				
Pedagogical	Permanent (Pe)	3.48	0.72	240.577	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Pe VS Pr, FT, L Pr VS FT, L FT VS L
	Probationary (Pr)	3.71	0.53				
	Fixed Term (FT)	3.63	0.60				
	Lecturer (L)	3.57	0.66				
	Total	3.54	0.68				
Social	Permanent (Pe)	3.56	0.70	195.174	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Pe VS Pr, FT, L Pr VS FT, L FT VS L
	Probationary (Pr)	3.75	0.52				
	Fixed Term (FT)	3.69	0.57				
	Lecturer (L)	3.67	0.61				
	Total	3.62	0.65				
Technical	Permanent (Pe)	3.54	0.73	278.122	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Pe VS Pr, FT, L Pr VS FT, L FT VS L
	Probationary (Pr)	3.76	0.52				
	Fixed Term (FT)	3.72	0.58				
	Lecturer (L)	3.60	0.70				
	Total	3.61	0.68				
Overall	Permanent (Pe)	88.71	16.08	242.534	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Pe VS Pr, FT, L Pr VS FT, L FT VS L
	Probationary (Pr)	93.77	11.59				
	Fixed Term (FT)	92.05	13.32				
	Lecturer (L)	90.55	14.86				
	Total	90.05	15.15				

It can be seen from the table that there is a significant difference in the performance evaluation of the teachers based on the assessment of their students as presented by the p-values which are less than 0,05 level of significance. It can be observed from the results of the mean rating that the probationary teachers were given the highest mean rating and followed by the fixed term teachers. Meanwhile, the permanent teachers obtained the significantly lowest mean rating.

According to Length of Service

Table 4. Comparison of the Evaluation of Online Teaching Performance of the Teachers when they are Grouped According to their Length of Service

		Mean	S. D.	F-value	p-value	Sig	Remarks (Post Hoc)
Managerial	0-5	3.69	0.56	95.75	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	0-5 VS 11-15, 21 & above 6-10 VS 11-15, 21 & above 11 VS 31 & above 16 VS 21 & above 21 VS 31 & above 26 VS 31 & above 31-35 VS 36 & above
	6-10	3.69	0.54				
	11-15	3.61	0.61				
	16-20	3.72	0.53				
	21-25	3.60	0.61				
	26-30	3.59	0.64				
	31-35	3.47	0.69				
	36 above	3.51	0.64				
	Total	3.63	0.60				
Content	0-5	3.68	0.65	83.94	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	0-5 VS 11-15, 21 & above 6-10 VS 11-15, 21 & above 11-15 VS 26 & above 16-20 VS 21 & above 21-25 VS 31 & above 26-30 VS 31 & above 31-35 VS 36 & above
	6-10	3.68	0.64				
	11-15	3.59	0.71				
	16-20	3.72	0.63				
	21-25	3.56	0.74				
	26-30	3.56	0.76				
	31-35	3.45	0.81				
	36 above	3.50	0.77				
	Total	3.61	0.70				
Pedagogical	0-5	3.62	0.61	127.21	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	0-5 VS 11-15, 21 & above 6-10 VS 11-15, 21 & above 11-15 VS 16 & above 16-20 VS 21 & above 21-25 VS 31 & above 26-30 VS 31 & above
	6-10	3.61	0.61				
	11-15	3.52	0.68				
	16-20	3.60	0.65				
	21-25	3.49	0.72				
	26-30	3.48	0.74				
	31-35	3.35	0.78				
	36 above	3.38	0.74				
	Total	3.54	0.68				
Social	0-5	3.69	0.58	114.77	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	0-5 VS 11-15, 21 & above

	6-10	3.69	0.56				6-10 VS 11-15, 21 & above 11-15 VS 26 & above 16-20 VS 21 & above 21-25 VS 26 & above 26-30 VS 31 & above
	11-15	3.58	0.67				
	16-20	3.66	0.62				
	21-25	3.58	0.68				
	26-30	3.55	0.72				
	31-35	3.45	0.77				
	36 above	3.47	0.74				
	Total	3.62	0.65				
Technical	0-5	3.70	0.61	144.17	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	0-5 VS 11-15, 21 & above 6-10 VS 11 & above 11-15 VS 16-20, 26 & above 16-20 VS 21 & above 21-25 VS 31 & above 26-30 VS 31 & above 31-35 VS 36 & above
	6-10	3.65	0.63				
	11-15	3.58	0.69				
	16-20	3.72	0.59				
	21-25	3.56	0.72				
	26-30	3.54	0.75				
	31-35	3.40	0.81				
	36 above	3.44	0.76				
	Total	3.61	0.68				
Overall	0-5	91.83	13.68	133.13	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	0-5 VS 11-15, 21 & above 6-10 VS 11-15, 21 & above 11-15 VS 16-20, 26 & above 16-20 VS 21 & above 21-25 VS 31 & above 26-30 VS 31 & above 31-35 VS 36 & above
	6-10	91.53	13.54				
	11-15	89.31	15.34				
	16-20	92.06	13.76				
	21-25	88.93	15.78				
	26-30	88.54	16.64				
	31-35	85.59	17.47				
	36 above	86.52	16.60				
	Total	90.05	15.15				

It can be gleaned from the results that there is a significant difference in the performance evaluation of the teachers when they are grouped according to their length of service as indicated by p-values which are all less than 0.05 level of significance. Considering the obtained mean rating of each group, it can be observed that the faculty who have been with CEU for 16-20 years obtained the highest mean rating. Furthermore, the evaluation ratings increase as length of service increases until the range of 16-20 years but evaluation ratings of the teachers become lower for those whose been with CEU for more than 20 years until 36 and above. Thus, it can be noted that the 16-20 years in service is the peak of the evaluation ratings.

According to Sex

Table 5. Comparison of the Evaluation of Online Teaching Performance of the Teachers when they are Grouped According to their Sex

	Sex	Mean	S.D.	t-value	p-value	Sig
Managerial	Male	3.63	0.61	-.144	P = 0.886 > 0.05	NS
	Female	3.63	0.59			
Content	Male	3.64	0.69	5.396	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S
	Female	3.60	0.71			
Pedagogical	Male	3.56	0.67	4.856	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S
	Female	3.53	0.68			
Social	Male	3.63	0.63	4.060	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S
	Female	3.61	0.66			
Technical	Male	3.65	0.65	9.935	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S
	Female	3.59	0.70			
Overall	Male	90.58	14.95	5.384	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S

	Female	89.83	15.23			
--	--------	-------	-------	--	--	--

Tabular values show that the male and female teachers are found to have a significant difference in each domain of the performance evaluation as shown by the p-values which are less than 0.05 level of significance except in Managerial where the male and female have the same mean and thus the male and female teachers' performance evaluation have no significant difference. Results of the mean rating further showed that the male have slightly higher mean rating performance evaluation over the female. Though only a slight difference in the mean ratings is noted but the difference between the male and female teachers are found to be statistically significant.

According to Age

Table 5. Comparison of the Evaluation of Online Teaching Performance of the Teachers when they are Grouped According to their Age

		Mean	S. D.	F-value	p-value	Sig	Remarks (Post Hoc)
Managerial	Gen Z	3.71	0.55	213.925	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Z VS X, BB Y VS X, BB Xennials VS X, BB X VS BB
	Gen Y	3.70	0.55				
	Xennials	3.71	0.52				
	Gen X	3.63	0.60				
	Baby Boomers (BB)	3.49	0.67				
	Total	3.63	0.60				
Content	Gen Z	3.67	0.66	183.923	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Z VS Y, X, BB Y VS X, BB Xennials VS X, BB X VS BB
	Gen Y	3.71	0.62				
	Xennials	3.69	0.62				
	Gen X	3.60	0.71				
	Baby Boomers (BB)	3.47	0.81				
	Total	3.61	0.70				
Pedagogical	Gen Z	3.65	0.61	262.489	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Z VS X-BB Y VS X-BB Xennials VS X-BB X VS BB
	Gen Y	3.64	0.60				
	Xennials	3.63	0.60				
	Gen X	3.53	0.69				
	Baby Boomers (BB)	3.37	0.77				
	Total	3.54	0.68				
Social	Gen Z	3.71	0.56	196.972	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Z VS Y-BB Y VS X, BB Xennials VS X-BB Gen X VS BB
	Gen Y	3.70	0.57				
	Xennials	3.68	0.58				
	Gen X	3.60	0.66				
	Baby Boomers (BB)	3.48	0.74				
	Total	3.62	0.65				
Technical	Gen Z	3.75	0.56	359.867	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Z VS Y to BB Y VS X-BB Xennials VS X-BB X VS BB
	Gen Y	3.72	0.58				
	Xennials	3.70	0.58				
	Gen X	3.59	0.70				
	Baby Boomers (BB)	3.41	0.79				
	Total	3.61	0.68				
Overall	Gen Z	92.39	13.49	286.746	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	Z VS X- BB Y VS X- BB Xennials VS X- BB X VS BB
	Gen Y	92.25	13.33				
	Xennials	92.00	13.26				
	Gen X	89.75	15.41				
	Baby Boomers (BB)	86.09	17.21				
	Total	90.05	15.15				

It can be seen from the table that there is a significant difference in the online teaching performance of the teachers belonging to the different each group in each domain as noted from the p-values which are all less than 0,05 level of significance.

Looking at the computed mean ratings for each group for each domain, it can be observed that the youngest age group has the highest mean performance ratings and those who are older have lower performance mean evaluation. Furthermore, the standard deviation show that the ratings obtained by the teachers are homogenous as shown by the low standard deviation.

According to Learning Block

Table 6. Comparison of the Evaluation of Online Teaching Performance of the Teachers when they are Grouped According to the Learning Block

		Mean	S. D.	F-value	p-value	Sig	Remarks (Post Hoc)
Managerial	LB1	3.62	0.58	13.726	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	LB1 VS LB 4 LB2 VS LB4 LB3 VS LB4
	LB2	3.63	0.60				
	LB3	3.62	0.64				
	LB4	3.67	0.60				
	Total	3.63	0.60				
Content	LB1	3.61	0.69	18.443	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	LB1 VS LB 4 LB2 VS LB4 LB3 VS LB4
	LB2	3.61	0.71				
	LB3	3.59	0.74				
	LB4	3.67	0.67				
	Total	3.61	0.70				
Pedagogical	LB1	3.53	0.65	21.259	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	LB1 VS LB2 LB1 VS LB 4 LB2 VS LB4 LB3 VS LB4
	LB2	3.54	0.68				
	LB3	3.53	0.73				
	LB4	3.60	0.67				
	Total	3.54	0.68				
Social	LB1	3.63	0.61	20.042	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	LB1 VS LB3 LB1 VS LB 4 LB2 VS LB4 LB 2 VS LB3 LB3 VS LB4 LB2 VS LB3
	LB2	3.61	0.66				
	LB3	3.58	0.72				
	LB4						
	Total	3.65	0.65				
Technical	LB1	3.62	0.65	34.596	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	LB1 VS LB2 LB1 VS LB3 LB1 VS LB4 LB2 VS LB4 LB3 VS LB4
	LB2	3.57	0.68				
	LB3	3.62	0.68				
	LB4	3.61	0.71				
	Total	3.66	0.66				
Overall	LB1	3.61	0.68	20.066	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	LB1 VS LB 4 LB2 VS LB4 LB3 VS LB4
	LB2	89.80	14.42				
	LB3	90.01	15.29				
	LB4	89.63	16.44				
	Total	91.25	15.08				
	LB1	90.05	15.15				

Tabular values indicates that there is a significant difference in the online teaching performance per learning block based on the evaluation of the students as noted from the p-values which are less than 0.05 level of significance. As presented in the post hoc results, a significant difference in the teaching performance is found between and among the learning blocks where teaching performance during the learning block 4 is significantly the highest among the 4 learning blocks. This could be the results of improving the courses uploaded in the CEU LEAPS based on the evaluation, comments, and suggestions of the students. Furthermore, teachers training on improving teaching online including methodologies that could be employed on online classes has been continuously provided for the teachers. A constant reminder from the dean, department head and even the President and the VP for Academic Affairs for teachers to continuously improved professional and personal attributes that affect their teaching performance could have contributed to this improvement.

According to the Type of Course Handled

Table 7. Comparison of the Evaluation of Online Teaching Performance of the Teachers when they are Grouped According to Type of Course Handled

Student Evaluation of Online Teaching (SEoOT) in Higher Education Institution During COVID-19 Pandemic: Basis for Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

		Mean	S. D.	F-value	p-value	Sig	Remarks (Post Hoc)
Managerial	Core (C)	3.66	0.57	138.467	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	C VS P PC VS P
	Prof Core (PC)	3.66	0.58				
	Prof (P)	3.56	0.64				
	Total	3.63	0.60				
Content	Core (C)	3.64	0.68	131.537	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	C VS P PC VS P
	Prof Core (PC)	3.65	0.68				
	Prof (P)	3.54	0.76				
	Total	3.61	0.70				
Pedagogical	Core (C)	3.57	0.65	210.979	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	C VS P PC VS P
	Prof Core (PC)	3.58	0.66				
	Prof (P)	3.45	0.73				
	Total	3.54	0.68				
Social	Core (C)	3.65	0.62	153.699	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	C VS P PC VS P
	Prof Core (PC)	3.64	0.64				
	Prof (P)	3.54	0.70				
	Total	3.62	0.65				
Technical	Core (C)	3.64	0.66	139.454	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	C VS P PC VS P
	Prof Core (PC)	3.64	0.66				
	Prof (P)	3.53	0.74				
	Total	3.61	0.68				
Overall	Core (C)	90.81	14.36	183.925	P = 0.000 < 0.05	S	C VS P PC VS P
	Prof Core (PC)	90.82	14.86				
	Prof (P)	88.07	16.26				
	Total	90.05	15.15				

Courses offered per program in CEU are classified as core courses, professional core courses (prof. core), and professional courses.

The comparison of the teaching performance per type of course lead to a significant difference between the teaching performance in professional courses with core and professional core courses where teachers of professional courses obtained a lower mean performance rating than those teaching core and professional core courses.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions are drawn.

Teachers showed exceptional performance and exceeded performance expectations.

Teachers whose highest educational attainment is bachelor's degree were rated outstanding and found significantly different with the teaching performance of faculty with master's and Doctorate degree whose teaching performance was superior.

Probationary and Fixed term faculty performed better than the permanent faculty members.

Teachers who have been teaching with Centro Escolar University for 20 years and below significantly performed better than teachers who have been teaching for more than 20 years.

Male teachers performed significantly higher than the female teachers.

Gen Z, Gen Y and Xennials teachers were rated outstanding, while the Gen X and Baby Boomers were rated superior.

Teachers keep on improving and have significantly higher evaluation ratings in Learning Block 4 (outstanding), while LB1 to LB3 were rated superior.

Core and Professional Core teachers got a higher teaching performance as compared to the teaching performance of faculty handling professional courses.

REFERENCES

- Basilaia, G., & Kvavadze, D. (2020). Transition to online education in schools during a SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in Georgia. *Pedagogical Research*, 5(4).
- Bhamani, S., Makhdoom, A. Z., Bharuchi, V., Ali, N., Kaleem, S., & Ahmed, D. (2020). Home learning in times of COVID: Experiences of parents. *Journal of education and educational development*, 7(1), 9-26.
- Boysen, G. A. (2020). Student evaluations of teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*.
- Cheng, X. (2020). Challenges of 'school's out, but class's on 'to school education: Practical exploration of Chinese schools during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Sci Insight Edu Front*, 5(2), 501-516.
- Love, L. (2020, April 9). Course evaluations process evolves in response to COVID-19. *The University Record*. <https://record.umich.edu/articles/course-evaluation-process-evolvesin-response-to-covid-19/>
- Mailizar, A., Abdulsalam, M., & Suci, B. (2020). Secondary school mathematics teachers' views on e-learning implementation barriers during the COVID-19 pandemic: The case of Indonesia. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 1-9.
- Malone, H. I. (2020, April 3). Student evaluations of instruction (SEIs) for Spring 2020. <https://oaa.osu.edu/student-evaluations-instruction-seis-spring-2020>
- Johnson, N., Seaman, J., & Veletsianos, G. (2021). *Teaching during a Pandemic: Spring Transition, Fall Continuation, Winter Evaluation*. Bay View Analytics.
- Richmond, A. S., Boysen, G. A., Gurung, R. A., Tazeau, Y. N., Meyers, S. A., & Sciutto, M. J. (2014). Aspirational model teaching criteria for psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 41(4), 281-295.
- Stukalina, Y. (2012). Addressing service quality issues in higher education: the educational environment evaluation from the students' perspective. *Technological and economic development of economy*, 18(1), 84-98.
- Sun, L., Tang, Y., & Zuo, W. (2020). Coronavirus pushes education online. *Nature Materials*, 19(6), 687-687.
- Szopiński, T., & Bachnik, K. (2022). Student evaluation of online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 174, 121203.
- Tukan, F. M. E. (2020). Challenges and strategies using application in teaching online classroom during pandemic Covid-19. *Elite Journal*, 2(2), 155-172.
- Wake Forest University. (2020). Recommendations on spring 2020 student evaluations of teaching. <https://college.wfu.edu/about-us/college-news/covid-19-collegecommunications/spring-2020-student-evaluations-of-teaching/>
- Zaheer, S., Butt, S. M., Anatolyevna, G. V., & Salmani, H. (2018). Do mobile technology in the classroom really improve learning outcomes?. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 7(3), 188-193.
- Zhang, W., Wang, Y., Yang, L., & Wang, C. (2020). Suspending classes without stopping learning: China's education emergency management policy in the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of Risk and financial management*, 13(3), 55.
- Zhao, N., Zhou, X., Liu, B., & Liu, W. (2020). Guiding teaching strategies with the education platform during the COVID-19 epidemic: Taking Guiyang No. 1 Middle School teaching practice as an example. *Sci Insight Edu Front*, 5(2), 531-539.