Faculty Performance in Delivering the Flexible Learning Development Plan: Basis for an Improvement Plan

Ryan C. dela Peña,Ph.D., Maricris A Malto, MBA, Angeleca SJ. Villena, DBA (c), Jennifer B. Zabala, MBA Roma Elaine D. dela Cruz, MBA, Hernani S. Saluna,Jr., MBA(c)

College of Accountancy and Business Administration, Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Valenzuela, Valenzuela City, Philippines

Abstract: The creation of comprehensive flexible learning programs tailor-fit to modality adjustments, was one of the primary educational landscape challenges posed by the ongoing pandemic. In line with the CHED Memo 4 s. 2020 that outlined the necessary features of programs for flexible learning, the College of Accountancy and Business Administration (CABA) at Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Valenzuela (PLV), implemented the Flexible Learning Development Plan (FLDP). This study gauged the performance of the faculty members involved in its execution during the first semester of the Academic Year 2020–2021 as a factor in a proposed improvement plan meant to enhance best practices and professional development. A descriptive quantitative design that utilized the Weighted Mean, ANOVA, and Tukey's HSD test was used to answer critical questions pertaining to faculty performance in terms of: (1) personal, student, and supervisor evaluations in delivering the FLDP; (2) significant difference between the evaluations; and (3) areas that may be interpreted as strengths and weaknesses. After the rigorous testing and subsequent analysis, the results suggest that the FLDP is more than effective, since the grand weighted means of all eight key areas (i.e. communication, reaching out to every student, experience of learning provided to students, assessment, time management, interaction between and among students, viable plans for every student's active participation, and essential deliverables) are highly satisfactory. Despite this, there are key areas in the FLDP that must be preserved, sustained, or improved; all of which will be accomplished by the strategies suggested in this study.

Keywords: open learning, adaptive teaching, educational enhancement, educational management, professional development

I. INTRODUCTION

The present health challenge brought about a lot of changes in the landscape of many entities. Profound effects were seen in the political, social, cultural, and economic settings of the global community. Industries were affected; jobs losses are prevalent, businesses are constrained to temporarily close, worst is, some were forced to permanently stop their operations. It seems that there is no immunity in the unprecedented effects of the pandemic to the different sectors. The business as usual has become the business unusual. Pak et al. (2020) elicited that COVID-19 is not only a global pandemic and public health crisis; it has also severely affected the global economy and financial markets.

In the Philippines, Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) had to adjust from the usual face to face to remote learning modality. Simbulan (2020) pointed out that, "HEIs, both public and private, have also had to adjust to the new situation where face-to-face interaction and mass gatherings are prohibited. Part of the adjustments are the actual teaching-learning environments where both lecturers and students were constrained to adapt to. Even administrators were also obliged to adapt to the same to be able to deliver services for the different stakeholders." In the same study, the author all the more expounded that "from the confines of their homes, teachers and administrators were put to the task of revising and adapting course syllabi and requirements as they shifted to alternative or remote teaching modalities, both synchronous and asynchronous. Where students and teachers had access to electronic devices and reliable internet connections, learning managements systems such as Canvas, Moodle, Blackboard, and applications like Google Hangouts, Zoom and Skype, were used."

With the advent of these learning management systems, as being used by different HEIs, it is but equitable to also focus on their effectiveness through an assessment. This is for the reason that these learning management systems may also vary in the way users-such as teachers and students use them. Such was provided by the investigation made by Lee and Tang (2018) where they accentuated that "Learning Management Systems (LMSs) may provide learners with resources in various formats, such as videos, quizzes, and forum discussions to support their learning, but having access to an LMS does not necessarily mean that learning has occurred effectively. Despite its apparent usefulness, whether the use of the LMS can indeed help learners learn more effectively remains an interesting matter for course providers, LMS vendors, and learners. It is all the more that in this sense, online flexible learning be assessed to be able to clearly understand its usefulness."

Hence, challenges in terms of tailor-fitting and creation of comprehensive flexible learning programs are also looming. Bendici (2020) "there are various flavors of LMS and SIS systems, so the challenge for educators is finding the one that best fits their school and district goals. He also made mention that once platforms and software have been vetted, selected, and piloted, the challenge then becomes to create a comprehensive blended learning program."

Subsequently, a need for faculty members to become technology integrationists has become more impending. To be able to grow well in these trying times, educators should cultivate skills that are required by the current situation to be applied in the actual learning environment. Digital knowhow and competencies must have to be taken into account to be able thrive and adapt to the modifications brought about by the pandemic.

The foregoing argument is anchored and has been underscored in the TPACK Framework. This framework is used for considering the various kinds of knowledge that educators possess regarding the subjects they teach, the methods they employ to deliver the material, and the resources they employ to assist in their teaching. The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge framework, also known as TPACK, is essentially a guide that aids educators in incorporating technology into the classroom. Adams (2019) underscored that the TPACK model is an ideal situation yet crucial and the criteria for integration must be reachable if a classroom is to fulfill this dream or even near to it. This may be being one of the reasons that even if instructional technology is used in classrooms in some capacity, it's not always current or applied properly (Pappas, 2023).

In cognizant of the foregoing statements, it can be concluded that there is really a need for HEIs to conform with the CHED Memo 4 s. 2020 particularly with regard to their Learning Continuity Plan (LCP). This is also in response to the CHED Advisory no.3 guidelines which proposes deploying available distance learning, e-learning, and other alternative modes of delivery in lieu of residential learning.

Congruently, the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Valenzuela considered a flexible learning delivery platform to guarantee the perpetuation of learning. Substantial features in carrying out the flexible learning were underscored and well-thought-out to follow the CHED Memo 4 s. 2020. The City Government of Valenzuela was also very prompt to respond to avoid disruptions of classes and extended help to PLV in order to avail a learning management system (LMS) called Canvas that is used by learning institutions, educators, and students to access and manage online course learning materials and communicate about skill development and learning achievement. This LMS includes a variety of customizable course creation and management tools, course and user analytics and statistics, and internal communication tools. Furthermore, although there are potential benefits and risks to deploying technology in learning environments (Mohammed, 2019), this did not hamper PLVs goal to achieve the anticipated end result of learnings. Synchronous and asynchronous classes were held following the redesigned course outlines. And so "while teachers are expected to integrate technology into the classroom, the reality can be very different. Many teachers have struggled with disruptions that devices can bring, had their work negatively impacted or have not used technologies effectively" (Hyndman, 2018). To address this challenge, a series of orientations and trainings for students and faculty members, in the use of technology, particularly the Canvas LMS, were provided by PLV to ensure the smooth transition from the face-to-face set up to the flexible learning modality.

As a response to the challenges posed by the changing educational landscape, this research is crucial to the university's competitiveness and to the significant progress that may be made as regards to development and reform. Specifically, it aimed to determine the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Valenzuela (PLV) College of Accountancy and Business Administration's (CABA) faculty performance in delivering PLV Flexible Learning

Development Plan (FLDP) the during the first semester of the calendar years 2020-2021 as input in preparing an improvement plan. Specifically, it sought after answers to the following questions:

1. How may the faculty performance in delivering the FLDP be described in terms of:
   1.1 Communication,
   1.2 Reaching out every student,
   1.3 Experience of learning provided to students,
   1.4 Assessment,
   1.5 Time management,
   1.6 Interaction between and among students,
   1.7 Viable plans for every student's active participation, and
   1.8 Essential deliverables?
2. Is there a significant difference in the faculty performance based on their self-evaluation, student evaluation, and supervisor?
3. What areas of the faculty performance that can be interpreted as their:
   3.1 Strengths,
   3.2 Weaknesses?
4. What appropriate improvement plan for PLV-FLDP may be proposed based on the result of the study?

II. METHODS

This study utilized a quantitative research design which, according to Allen (2017), focuses on a way to learn about a particular group of people, known as a sample population. Using scientific inquiry, quantitative research relies on data that are observed or measured to examine questions about the sample population. It is also about gathering numerical data and generalizing it across groups of people or to explain a particular phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). This is concentrated on finding out how many people have a particular thought, behavior, or emotion is the goal of quantitative study design. In quantitative initiatives, high sample sizes are used, with a focus on the volume of replies.

The investigation precisely utilized descriptive research method that according to the definition of Calderon et al (2017), "descriptive research is the conditions of relationships that exist, practices that prevail, beliefs, processes that are going on, effects that are being felt or trends that are developing. It involves the elements or interpretation of the meaning or significance of what is described. Thus; description is often combined with comparison and contrast involving measurements, classifications, interpretation and evaluation. involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study."

Henceforth, according to McCombes (2022), "the goal of descriptive research is to precisely and methodically describe a population, circumstance, or phenomena. It can respond to inquiries about what, where, when, and how, but not why. To explore one or more variables, a descriptive research design might employ a wide range of research techniques."

Since faculty members can enhance their practices by using the knowledge they learn from evaluation, which also serves as a springboard for professional development, it is deemed necessary to undertake this investigation. All the more, evaluation also espouses culpability when the results are utilized to drive human resource-related actions.

In view of that, this study depicted the faculty evaluation results founded on the evaluation of student, department chairpersons, pertained as supervisors and faculty members' self-evaluation during the 2nd semester of Academic Year 2020-2021. In order to determine whether there are any major differences between the three evaluation results, assessment results were also examined and analyzed. Even more, the study gave the researchers the chance to look at the outcomes of the PLV - CABA faculty performance evaluation, which was given to faculty members, supervisors, and students. As part of the CHED's Project's Capability Building Activities for HEIs held on July 15, 2020, the faculty performance was assessed using the current Faculty Evaluation Tool, which is based on "Faculty Performance in Flexible Class Environment." The aforementioned evaluation instrument is divided into eight main categories, including *communication; reaching out every student; experience of learning provided to students; assessment; time*

management, interaction between and among students; viable plans for every student's active participation, and essential deliverables. The following weighbridge was used to gauge the faculty's performance centered on the eight key areas.

Additionally, the data were gathered using the purposive sample method and comprised 41 faculty members from the PLV- CABA during the 2nd semester of the academic year 2020–2021. The researchers concentrated their efforts on compiling the outcomes of their performance evaluation, which were obtained from the PLV-Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, as a result of the data generated by the Information and Technology (IT) Office of the aforementioned institution. It should be emphasized that only the totaled scores and values from the actual evaluation were applied to the study. Lastly, in dealing with this study, classifying information, and interpretations from the evaluators were not solicited.

To guarantee the validity of the study's findings, pertinent data were therefore put to statistical analysis methods. The following statistical tools were used in this investigation:

Weighted Mean. This tool was used to evaluate the eight major categories as bases for the faculty performance.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to ascertain whether there are any notable differences in the assessment scores of the faculty as determined by the students, the immediate academic head, and the faculty members themselves. The difference in the responses of the three groups of respondents is computed using the SPSS program.

Tukey Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test. This post-hoc tool was used to determine where in particular the statistically significant differences lie among the evaluation of the 3 groups of respondents.

III. RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

The data collected to characterize the CABA faculty performance evaluation in the FLDP as evaluated by the students, supervisors, and faculty members themselves are analyzed on this part to provide the conclusions. The results were used to determine the significant difference among the findings of the evaluation in the eight key areas.

The primary study findings are described in the results part of this investigation, whereas the discussion section analyses the outcomes and discusses the implications of the findings for the reader and places them in the context of the entire study.

Moreover, the results were used to craft an improvement plan to foster progression of the faculty performance in delivering PLV FLDP as the institution commits itself to embrace the hybrid modality of teaching and learning.

Research Question 1: How may the faculty performance in delivering FLDP be described in terms of: 1.1. self-evaluation; 1.2. student evaluation; 1.3. supervisor evaluation?

Table 1. Description of Faculty Performance in Delivering FLDP

Key Area	Self-Evaluation	Verbal Interpretation	Student Evaluation	Verbal Interpretation	Supervisor Evaluation	Verbal Interpretation	Weighted Mean
	Mean		Mean		Mean		
Communication	2.83	Highly Satisfactory	2.74	Highly Satisfactory	2.88	Highly Satisfactory	**2.82**
Reaching out to every student	2.73	Highly Satisfactory	2.58	Highly Satisfactory	2.98	Highly Satisfactory	**2.76**

Experience of learning provided to students	2.73	Highly Satisfactory	2.62	Highly Satisfactory	2.95	Highly Satisfactory	**2.77**	
Assessment	2.61	Highly Satisfactory	2.60	Highly Satisfactory	2.78	Highly Satisfactory	**2.66**	
Time management	2.66	Highly Satisfactory	2.58	Highly Satisfactory	2.73	Highly Satisfactory	**2.66**	
Interaction between and among students	2.59	Highly Satisfactory	2.53	Highly Satisfactory	2.95	Highly Satisfactory	**2.69**	
Viable plans for every student's active participation	2.76	Highly Satisfactory	2.66	Highly Satisfactory	2.98	Highly Satisfactory	**2.80**	
Essential deliverables	2.76	Highly Satisfactory	2.69	Highly Satisfactory	3.00	Highly Satisfactory	**2.82**	
Grand Weighted Mean	**2.71**	Highly Satisfactory	**2.63**	Highly Satisfactory	**2.91**	Highly Satisfactory	**2.75**	

It can be deduced from the findings that faculty performance in delivering the FLDP is highly satisfactory. Although, sustaining the depiction of the table, among all the eight key areas/categories, assessment and time management are the key areas/categories with the lowest general weighted means. With assessment and time management having the lowest general weighted means in the aforementioned key areas/categories, it can also be construed that there is really a big adjustment being made by faculty members with regard to attending their classes using the online platform. This is somehow evident in the findings of Naidu (2018) citing that "entities involved are being distracted by preferences for mode of learning, learning styles and approaches to learning of student cohorts, when they are ought to be designing educational transactions to tap into, and nurture the development of learning styles and approaches to learning that can lead to productive learning experiences." Likewise, with highly satisfactory interpretation, it can also be understood that faculty members are willing to adapt to the changes in the landscape of teaching and learning.

Among all the eight key areas/categories, according to the faculty members and students, communication is the first's positive aspect as it garnered the highest mean score from the aforementioned two groups of respondents. The same is true in the area that need development, the same two groups of respondents theorized low evaluation mean score on interaction between and among students. This in contrast to the result garnered from the supervisors, wherein, essential deliverables category is the positive aspect for faculty members and time management is the area for improvement. It can also be concluded that the sudden shift in the landscape of teaching and learning have something to do with the gathered results. This can also be observed in the study by Mirriahi, et al (2015), stating that "the growing desire in open and online learning around the world is combined with the numerous obstacles higher education institutions must overcome in order to offer flexible learning possibilities outside of the traditional brick and mortar classroom."

Conversely, among the three groups of respondents, faculty members' self-evaluation posited a mean in between the means of students' evaluation and supervisor's evaluation which implies that faculty members are straightforward in evaluating themselves with regard to the delivery the FLDP.

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in the faculty performance based on their self-evaluation, student evaluation, and supervisor evaluation?

Table 2. Significant Difference in The Faculty Performance Based on Their Self-Evaluation, Student Evaluation, and Supervisor Evaluation

Result Details

Source	SS	df	MS	F -Stat	Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
Between treatments	0.3337	2	0.1668				
Within treatments	0.01507	21	0.0072	23.2515	0.00001	Reject H0	Significant
Total	0.4843	23					

Statistical analysis shows that the responses of one group are statistically significantly different from those of the other group. The figures, likewise, are confirmed to be consistently different.

The null hypothesis is rejected because, as shown in Table 2, the F-stat computed value of 23.25145 is higher than the F-tabular value of .00001 at.05 level of significance with corresponding 2 and 21 degrees of freedom. This indicates that there is a significant difference among the results of the faculty performance evaluation in delivering the FLDP as assessed by the faculty members themselves, their students, and their supervisors.

Since the results showed significant difference in the responses of the three groups of respondents, the ANOVA was supplemented with a post hoc tool to see exactly where the significant difference lies.

Hence, pairwise comparisons within the ANOVA data were made easier by the utilization of the Tukey HSD post assessment tool. With this instrument, it was possible to ascertain whether there is a general disparity between the sample means and while limiting the likelihood of making one or more Type I mistakes, the Tukey's HSD test examines all pairwise differences.

Table 3. Significant Difference in The Faculty Performance Based on Their Self-Evaluation, Student Evaluation, and Supervisor Evaluation

Pairwise Comparisons		$HSD_{.05} = 0.1068$ $HSD_{.05} = 0.1381$	$Q_{.05} = 3.5646$ $Q_{.01} = 4.6122$
T_1:T_2	$M_1 = 2.71$ $M_2 = 2.63$	0.08	$Q = 2.80$ ($p = .14226$)
T_1:T_3	$M_1 = 2.71$ $M_3 = 2.91$	0.20	$Q = 6.59$ ($p = .00038$)
T_2:T_3	$M_2 = 2.63$ $M_3 = 2.91$	0.28	$Q = 9.39$ ($p = .00000$)

Looking closely at the pairwise comparison results, Table 4 shows that at the 0.05 level of significance, there is a statistically significant difference between the responses of one group and the other. The p values between treatments are higher than the different pairs of mean results, as the results demonstrate. Furthermore, this table shows that there are several categories in which the group of respondents have different viewpoints regarding the aforementioned primary evaluation classifications.

Research Question 3: What areas of the faculty performance that can be interpreted as their: 3.1 Strengths, 3.2 Weaknesses?

Table 4. Strong and Weak Areas of Faculty Members in terms of Faculty Performance

Key Area	Self-Evaluation	Student Evaluation	Supervisor Evaluation	Verbal Interpretation	Weighted Mean
	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Communication	**2.83**	**2.74**	**2.88**	**Highly Satisfactory**	**2.82**
Reaching out to every student	2.73	2.58	2.98	Highly Satisfactory	**2.76**
Experience of learning provided to students	2.73	2.62	2.95	Highly Satisfactory	**2.77**
Assessment	**2.61**	**2.60**	**2.78**	**Highly Satisfactory**	**2.66**
Time management	**2.66**	**2.58**	**2.73**	**Highly Satisfactory**	**2.66**
Interaction between and among students	2.59	2.53	2.95	Highly Satisfactory	**2.69**
Viable plans for every student's active participation	2.76	2.66	2.98	Highly Satisfactory	**2.80**
Essential deliverables	**2.76**	**2.69**	**3.00**	**Highly Satisfactory**	**2.82**
Grand Weighted Mean	**2.71**	**2.63**	**2.91**	Highly Satisfactory	**2.75**

Table above illustrates that among the eight key areas/categories, two can be considered as the faculty members' strongest attributes. These qualities are communication and essential deliverables. Likewise, two can also be recognized as their weakest traits and these are as regards to assessment and time management.

It can also be perceived that both the strong attributes have the same weighted mean, 2.82 with highly satisfactory as their verbal interpretation. At this juncture, it can be concluded that the faculty members are proficient in terms of communication and that students clearly understood the lectures delivered by the lecturers and this someway fostered independence among them. This is evidently supported by the study made by Kariippanon et. al (2018), mentioning that "when designed and used effectively, flexible learning spaces provide learning environments where students can experience increased autonomy to make a variety of choices about their learning in a way that fosters self-regulation, collaboration and interaction, whilst ensuring their wellbeing."

eSimilarly, faculty members are able to provide the students with projects and course requirements critical for student learning even if a new platform in the teaching and learning is employed. It is evident in the weighted mean and verbal interpretation of the key area essential deliverables. Hence, this is evidently discussed by Bendici (2020) in his study when he clearly expounded that "all content should also be able to run on whatever devices the teachers and students are currently using or planning on purchasing. Think about what the institution has in its curriculum repository and concentrate on filling the gaps going forward."

Consequently, it may be viewed that continuing professional development helps in equipping faculty members with proficiencies for their role as sources of knowledge for learners. Additionally, faculty members become updated with knowledge about the latest trend in teaching and learning. This was thoroughly discussed by Seema et. al (2021), avowing that "a consistent continuing professional development is requisite to equip teachers with the indispensable proficiencies for their new role as well as to keep them up to date in their field." The same was even underscored in the research made by Tuga et. al (2021) as they underscored that "these flexible learning arrangements needed new learning management systems, capacity-building or training of faculty members, and repositories for flexible learning resources."

It can also be ascertained that assessment and time management have the same weighted mean, 2.66 with a verbal interpretation of highly satisfactory. With the lowest mean scores among the eight key areas/categories, it can be contemplated that in assessing whether or not educational goals are being reached, faculty members occasionally fell short, and this has a significant impact on decisions about grades, instructional requirements, and curriculum. As regards to time management, it can be recognized that there are times when faculty members are unsure of how to use their time most effectively, which in a way, may have a significant impact on their concentration and productivity. Furthermore, one of the major effects of inadequate time management is that it makes it more difficult to accomplish more significant objectives for the advancement of knowledge and learning. This is conspicuous in the study made by Ermeling (2018) that cited "one obstacle faculty members and students face was running out of time or attempting to overload one lesson with too many strategies." He continued that "despite hard work and best intentions, they implemented an unfinished lesson or one that lacked sufficient preparation, particularly for the most critical lesson segments."

Besides, these looming shortcomings of faculty members may be attributed to their skills in the use of technology and some may be skeptical to embrace changes. In the new teaching and learning environment, it is also essential that the key players are well-versed in the requisites of the new landscape. According to Cheung et. al (2021) "embracing a variety of concepts, including personalized learning, flexible learning, intelligent tutoring, adaptive learning, blended learning, collaborative learning and open online learning" are some of the necessities to thrive in the new set up of teaching and learning."

Research Question 4: What appropriate improvement plan for PLV-FLDP may be proposed based on the results of the study?

For PLV-CABA FLDP, a program improvement plan is suggested in light of the study's findings. The Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) lays forth the standards by which each program is evaluated in relation to a particular improvement target (Program Improvement Plan | Office of the Provost, n.d.).

Table 5 represents the PIP specifically addressing the challenges in the PLV-CABA faculty members' delivery of the FLDP. The table, furthermore, suggests strategies to be undertaken for the purpose of improving the provision of the FLDP. Resources needed, concerned entities as well as success indicator were laid down for the purpose of direction and control in the implementation of the PIP.

Table 5. Proposed Program Improvement Plan for PLV-FLDP

Areas of Concern	Strategies/Responses	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Success Indicator	Resources Needed
FLDP Content, Component,	Identify the area/s with needed support and actions considering the	VPAA College Deans	February 1-15, 2022	Improved faculty members' performance.	Budget for collaboration References

Context, and Continuity	factors directly affecting the essentiality, characteristics, elements, and furtherance of the FLDP – teachers, learners, supervisors.	PLV Chairpersons Faculty Members		Sound FLDP	needed: FLDP Existing program and guidelines CHED Existing curriculum
	Seminar/Training/ Workshop on FLD for faculty members.	PLV Admin VPAA College Deans PLV Chairpersons Faculty Members	April 1-30, 2022	Improved faculty members' performance. Enhanced teaching and learning process. Sound FLDP	Budget for seminars/ training/ workshops References needed: FLDP Existing program and guidelines CHED Existing curriculum
	Build up a shared understanding and appreciation of the subject matter between the faculty members, students, and supervisors.	College Deans PLV Chairpersons Faculty Members	April 1-30, 2022	Faculty members, students, and supervisors who are committed and contributing to the attainment of the objectives of the FLDP Sound FLDP	Budget for collaboration References needed: FLDP Existing program and guidelines CHED Existing curriculum
	Strengthen the area/s with the required assistance and by taking appropriate measures that highlight the variables that significantly impact the FLDP's component/s	VPAA College Deans PLV Chairpersons Faculty Members	March 1-31-2022	Faculty members who work productively and more successfully with students and supervisors.	Budget for collaboration References needed: FLDP Existing program and guidelines CHED Existing curriculum
	Further exploration and research to follow a range of flexible learning methodologies and key components.	PLV Admin VPAA College Deans PLV Chairpersons	February 1 – May 31, 2022	Applicability, continuity, and responsiveness of the program created for this goal. More innovative delivery methods and a more	Budget for research References needed: FLDP Existing program and guidelines

		Faculty Members		expansive, adaptable curriculum	CHED Existing curriculum International and local researches on flexible learning Relevant Memoranda, Mandates and Directives
FLDP Monitoring and Evaluation Instrument Enhancement	Creation of a research-based FLDP evaluation instrument.	VPAA College Deans PLV Chairpersons Faculty Members	May 1-31, 2022	Framework for institutional monitoring and evaluation for an effective process of FLDP implementa-tion. Plan that is progressive, focused, clear, and specific.	Budget for collaboration References needed: International and local researches on flexible learning Relevant Memoranda, Mandates and Directives
	Seminar/Training/ Workshop on the suitable implementation of the enhanced tool.	PLV Admin VPAA College Deans PLV Chairpersons Faculty Members	June 11-15, 2022	Improved faculty members' performance. Enhanced teaching and learning process.	Budget for collaboration References needed: Enhanced evaluation tool
	Track and assess the results of the enhanced FLDP	VPAA College Deans PLV Chairpersons Faculty Members	September 1-15, 2022	Improved decision-making, resource efficiency, increased transparency and accountability, and replication of the most successful strategies.	Budget for tracking and assessment References needed: Enhanced evaluation tool

Summary

The College of Accountancy and Business Administration faculty performance evaluation in the FLDP, as assessed by the faculty members themselves, students, and supervisors, was found to be highly satisfactory based on the findings of this study. In the same way, the eight key areas/categories examined, specifically: communication;

reaching out to every student; experience of learning provided to students; assessment; time management; interaction between and among students; viable plans for every student's active participation; and essential deliverables, received weighted mean scores that ranged from 2.34 to 3.00.

In the investigation conducted, the area of communication and essential deliverables both received a general weighted mean score of 2.82, were evaluated as the highest among the eight key areas/categories of faculty performance in delivering the FLDP. The faculty members themselves, students, and supervisors assessed the faculty performance as highly satisfactory. It is understandable that when new ideas, methods, techniques, and technologies advance, there are always fresh opportunities to enhance learning environments from a methodological and scientific standpoint. This outcome may also indicate that the faculty members 'highly satisfactory performance in these key areas has been aided by the internal orientations that have been held prior to the implementation of the flexible learning modality.

However, even if verbal interpretation places these categories in the highly satisfactory range, assessment and time management were determined to have the lowest grand weighted mean, 2.66. It is noteworthy that, out of the eight variables indicated above, these crucial areas/categories are where faculty members are struggling to keep up. In fact, assessment and recommendations to educators are required since these methods support educational administrators in enhancing their capacity for instruction. Effective time management, likewise, is critical and can have a real impact on an individual's performance and accomplishments.

Surprisingly, there was a connection or influence seen between the variables under investigation. since the performance evaluation results between the faculty members' self-evaluation and student, faculty members' self-evaluation and supervisor, and student and supervisor posited a significant difference. This important discrepancy was brought about by the variations in how the three groups of respondents espoused each area and indicator included in the evaluation tool, which resulted in variations in perception and evaluation. This therefore connotes additional research on assessing the tool in and of itself. It also produced a new study opportunity to pinpoint the factors to consider for enhancing and maintaining the FLDP's exceptional level of quality of delivery. Moreover, understanding the depth and breadth of learning undertaken helps faculty members, students, and supervisors so that progress and succeeding steps can be evaluated and anticipated. Congruently, it follows that planning for time and students as well as developing activities, organizing instruction, and creating measuring instruments are all essential.

Conclusion

For the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Valenzuela's College of Accountancy and Business Administration and other colleges planning to use faculty performance evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the flexible learning program, this study has produced essential conclusions.

1. The FLDP that was utilized is highly satisfactory since the eight key areas that is: communication; reaching out to every student; experience of learning provided to students; assessment; time management; interaction between and among students; viable plans for every student's active participation; and essential deliverables garnered grand weighted means within the range falling under the aforementioned verbal interpretation.

2. To sustain the quality of the delivery, augmentations and support strategies to ensure that students have a meaningful learning experience. It is still difficult to make the most out of technology in education as the future gears towards technologization.

3. Faculty members' roles are crucial to the success of flexible learning delivery programs especially with regard to assessment and time management. Additionally, the fact that the evaluation of the FLDP's implementation obtained a highly satisfactory rating overall further proves that the faculty members are adhering to the standards and guidelines established by the academic institution.

4. PLV-CABA faculty members are highly clear about the importance of establishing clear and open communication between students and themselves and they are prepared in terms of the essentials deliverables in utilizing flexible learning.

5. The effectiveness of results and discernments pertinent to the FLDP can be clearly seen to reflect and be influenced by faculty member performance. Therefore, it is advised to investigate the variables influencing not only the performance of the faculty members but also the implementation of FLDP across all instructional issues since flexible learning in teaching and learning space helps to promote quality education.

6. More study should be conducted on the best instructional strategies that raise student performance and engagement in the modern learning modalities. The teacher's points of view, proficiencies, and sentiments related to the FLDP's content, component, context, and continuity should also be carefully underscored for the furtherance and future success in delivering flexible learning.

7. The three groups of respondents assimilate the areas and indicators in the evaluation tool significantly different which results to a recommendation that the evaluation tool be improved in terms of substance and context to foster validity, reliability, and flexibility.

8. Using a single instrument to collect data from the participants may hinder the assessment from achieving the FLDP goals. A need to craft different evaluation tools for students, supervisors and faculty members is necessary.

9. Henceforth, in order to promote, protect, and preserve the quality of providing the flexible learning program, improvement strategies might therefore be developed. The proposed strategies herein encompass the areas of concern, those participating in the development program, entailment of budget/funding, success indicators, time frame, and resources needed.

10. Making reference to the theory employed in this study, the TPACK Framework, it can be deduced and concluded that the challenged areas cover both the substance and instruction because some variables may even have a verbal interpretation that is "Highly satisfactory" but have posited the lowest mean scores out of all the areas listed. To a greater extent or degree, faculty members must develop behavioral intents and perception in carrying out their duties; with focus on assessment of tasks submitted by the students. Tantamount to this is the management of time of faculty members in attending to all the requirements in conducting their classes. As regards to technological, pedagogical, content and knowledge it can also be recognized that faculty members are aware and are knowledgeable of its function, at a certain level, which can help them become more conversant in conducting the flexible learning modality.

11. The findings fostered a deeper comprehension of the ways in which instructional approaches and students' educational experiences might be enhanced by technology. The investigation, furthermore sheds light to clarify the mechanisms underlying the adoption of technology by PLV-CABA faculty members.

12. Finally, this study will help administrators as regards to forecasting the performance and offer a theoretical justification for the effective application of technology not only in CABA but the whole PLV.

References:

1. Alhaj, Mohammad & Hassan, Mohammad & Al-Refai, Abdullah. (2020). A New Approach for Multi-Level Evaluation of Strategic Educational Goals. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications. 11. 10.14569/IJACSA.2020.0110336.
2. Almoslamani, Y. (2018). Effectiveness of student engagement using learning management system in the blended learning environment at Saudi Electronic University.
3. Bendici, R. (2020). Closing the digital divide: Educators work to ensure digital equity for all students by shifting mindsets and improving professional development. District Administration, 56(1), 40-44.
4. Cheung, S. K. S., Wang, F. L., & Kwok, L. F. (2021). The Continuous Pursuit of Smart Learning. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 37(2), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7207
5. Ermeling, B. A. E. (2018). Pivotal Moments in Teaching. https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pivotal-moments-in-teaching.pdf. Francisco, C. DC., & Barcelona, M. C. (2020). Effectiveness of an Online Classroom for Flexible Learning. International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research (IJAMR). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED607990.pdfGolestan, & Golsha, Roghieh & Sheykholeslami, Amene & Charnaei, Tahereh & Safarnezhad, Zohre &., Jcbr. (2020).

Educational Performance of Faculty Members from the Students and Faculty Members' Point of View in. 4. 7-13.

6. Gonzalez Escobar, Ignacio. (2019). School improvement plans, a tool to improve the quality of education. New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences. 6. 440-450. 10.18844/prosoc.v6i1.4197.

7. Joaquin, J. J. B., Biana, H. T., & Dacela, M. A. (2020, October). The Philippine higher education sector in the time of COVID-19. In Frontiers in Education (Vol. 5, p. 208). Frontiers.

8. Karakaya, F. K., & Yilmaz, M. Y. (2025). Teachers' views on assessment and evaluation methods in STEM education: A science course example. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1339685.pdf

9. Kariippanon, K.E., Cliff, D.P., Lancaster, S.L. et al. Perceived interplay between flexible learning spaces and teaching, learning and student wellbeing. Learning Environ Res 21, 301–320 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-017-9254-9

10. Khan, M. S. K., & Nasrullah, S. N. (2017). The Impact of Time Management on the Students' Academic Achievements.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313768789_The_Impact_of_Time_Management_on_the_Students'_Academic_Achievements

11. Masuku, M. M., Jili, N. N., & Sabela, P. T. (2021). Assessment as A Pedagogy and Measuring Tool in Promoting Deep Learning in Institutions of Higher Learning. International Journal of Higher Education. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1285666.pdf

12. Mirriahi, N., Alonzo, D., & Fox, B. (2015). A blended learning framework for curriculum design and professional development. Research in Learning Technology, 23.

13. Muhammad, G., Shorfuzzaman, M., Hossain, M. S., Nazir, A., & Alamri, A. (2019). Harnessing the power of big data analytics in the cloud to support learning analytics in mobile learning environment. Computers in Human behavior, 92, 578-588.

14. Naidu, S., Posner, E. A., & Weyl, G. (2018). Antitrust remedies for labor market power. Harvard law review, 132(2), 536-601.

15. Oztok, M., Zingaro, D., Brett, C., & Hewitt, J. (2013). Exploring asynchronous and synchronous tool use in online courses. Computers & Education, 60(1), 87-94.

16. Pak, A., Adegboye, O. A., Adekunle, A. I., Rahman, K. M., McBryde, E. S., & Eisen, D. P. (2020). Economic consequences of the COVID-19 outbreak: the need for epidemic preparedness. Frontiers in public health, 8, 241.

17. Pappas, C. (2023, May 3). TPACK: Using The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge Framework in Classrooms. ELearning Industry. https://elearningindustry.com/tpack-using-technological-pedagogical-content-knowledge-framework-classrooms

18. Program Improvement Plan | Office of the Provost. (n.d.). https://provost.jhu.edu/education/institutional-assessment/assessment-at-jhu/assessment-cycle/program-improvement-plan/#:~:text=Purpose%3A,toward%20a%20certain%20improvement%20goal.

19. Seema, S. S., Bibi, W. B., & Faizi, W. U. N. F. (2021). Implementation of Assessment for Learning and The Need for Teachers Refreshing Trainings. http://ilkogretim-online.org/. https://www.ilkogretim-online.org/fulltext/218-1612583663.pdf

20. Simbulan, N. P. S. (2020). The Philippines – COVID-19 and Its Impact on Higher Education in the Philippines. The Head Foundation. https://headfoundation.org/2020/06/04/covid-19-and-its-impact-on-higher-education-in-the-philippines/

21. Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational researcher, 15(2), 4-14.

22. Tuga, B. J., Jocson, J. V., & Mabunga, R. A. S. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on a Philippine university: Challenges and responses towards a new normal in education. AsTEN Journal of Teacher Education, 4, 8-13.

23. Zambas, J. (2021, August 4). The Importance of Effective Communication in the Workplace. careeraddict.com.https://www.careeraddict.com/the-importance-of-effective-communication-in-the-workplace