Retrospective Analysis of Student Evaluation of Faculty Using Main Management Information System

Jowie Espaldon, Lord Edgardian Tavu, Catherine Lagadia, Steven Jocson, Erika Joy Lagos, Rosemarie Arcilla and Maria Aileen Candelaza
National University Dasmariñas, 4114 Dasmariñas, Philippines
jgespaldon@nu-dasm.edu.ph, lejtavu@nu-dasma.edu.ph, cdlagadia@nu-dasma.edu.ph, scjocson@nu-dasma.edu.ph, ejflagos@nu-dasma.edu.ph, raarcilla@nu-dasma.edu.ph, mancandelaza@nu-dasma.edu.ph

Keywords: Faculty, Retrospective, Main Management System, Student Evaluation.

Abstract: The evaluation of teaching effectiveness through Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) remains a critical measure in enhancing instructional quality and guiding faculty development. Despite widespread implementation, most studies focus on isolated term analyses, neglecting longitudinal patterns and contextual insights. This study addressed this gap by investigating faculty performance trends from Academic Years 2021–2022 to 2023–2024 using student evaluations stored in the Main Management Information System (MMIS). Specifically, it aimed to determine the level of faculty performance, identify trends and patterns in student evaluations, explore strengths and areas for improvement, and recommend actionable strategies for faculty development. Employing an explanatory sequential design, the study analyzed quantitative data from over 49,000 student evaluations across six domains: learning process, instructional delivery, assessment, learning environment, classroom management, and teacher qualities. This was complemented by thematic analysis of qualitative feedback through text mining. Descriptive and trend analyses revealed an overall "Excellent" faculty performance across all years, with a slight decline in 2022–2023, followed by improvement in 2023–2024. Notably, the learning process and instructional delivery indicators showed fluctuations that mirrored post-pandemic instructional adjustments. Qualitative feedback highlighted strengths such as compassion, clarity, and responsiveness, as well as areas needing improvement, including technological proficiency and emotional sensitivity. These findings suggest that while instructional quality remained high, evolving student needs and rapid shifts in teaching modalities affected performance consistency. The study underscores the value of integrating digital analytics with student narratives to inform evidence-based interventions. It recommends targeted faculty development programs focusing on digital pedagogy, student engagement, and assessment literacy. Ultimately, this study contributes to strengthening institutional capacity for reflective teaching, data-informed decision-making, and sustainable educational excellence in dynamic learning environments.

1 INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness remains a cornerstone of quality assurance and faculty development in higher education. Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) is widely used as both a performance measure and a tool for instructional improvement [1]. Over time, SET has evolved from a summative appraisal to a formative mechanism that promotes reflective teaching. In the post-pandemic academic landscape, where instructional modalities rapidly shifted from remote to hybrid and in-person formats [2], examining the validity and developmental implications of SET data over time has become crucial. However, most institutional analyses remain limited to single-term evaluations, which overlook evolving instructional dynamics and student expectations. Without temporal analysis, SET scores risk being misinterpreted or disconnected from actual teaching transformations [3]. In developing contexts, underutilized digital systems such as the MMIS further limit the potential to harness analytics for faculty development [4].

Globally, institutions are integrating learning analytics to enhance evidence-based teaching evaluations [5], yet the human interpretive element students lived experiences and feedback remains underexplored [6]. This study employed an

explanatory sequential design to analyze MMIS-stored evaluations from 2021 to 2024, identifying statistical trends and exploring their underlying causes. Specifically, it examines faculty performance levels, trends and patterns in evaluations, key strengths and gaps, and strategies to enhance faculty development programs using MMIS data across six instructional domains.

2 METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

This study employed an explanatory sequential and retrospective design to investigate faculty performance based on student evaluations retrieved from the Main Management Information System (MMIS) from Academic Years 2021–2022 to 2023–2024. The quantitative phase involved analyzing student evaluation scores across six key domains: learning process, instructional delivery, assessment, learning environment, classroom management, and teacher qualities as reflected in the instrument. Data were derived from the MMIS answered by the enrolled students from academic years 2021-2024 which varies by number who completed the Student Evaluation for Teachers (SET) instrument in all courses they took handled by the professors during the three academic years, which included three semesters each which include data from different programs such as information technology, computer science, architecture, civil engineering, computer engineering, accountancy, management accounting, business administration, tourism management, hospitality management, physical education, communication, psychology, general education, and senior high school. The instrument utilized was the standardized SET evaluation tool of the university being used both for onsite and online classes. a 7-point scale ranging from "Very Unsatisfactory" to "Truly Exceptional," and ratings were analyzed using descriptive statistics and trend analysis to identify patterns in faculty performance over time.

In the qualitative phase, student narrative feedback from the MMIS was thematically analyzed to identify strengths and areas for improvement in faculty performance. This phase provided contextual insights to supplement the quantitative results and inform relevant faculty development recommendations. Ethical approval was obtained from the university's ethics review board and management. All data were anonymized and aggregated, ensuring compliance with institutional and national data privacy regulations. The limitation of this study was the data which focused only in the SET which excluded the faculty evaluation to students and the data was limited up AY 2024-2025 as SET is administered per Terms, meaning the data from AY 2025-2026 was not yet available.

3 LEVEL OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE BASED ON STUDENT EVALUATION

The evaluation data from A.Y. 2021 to 2024 consistently shows high ratings in the Learning Process component, with overall means ranging from 6.02 to 6.30 (Excellent). Deep and critical thinking scored highest, notably 6.35 in A.Y. 2021–2022 and remained above $\bar{x}$ =6.10 thereafter. A decline in A.Y. 2022–2023, especially in reflection ($\bar{x}$ =6.00), suggests post-pandemic instructional adjustments. Comments such as *"She was able to fully adjust in the finals..."* and *"explains the lessons in a way we're able to understand"* affirm the value of clarity, patience, and scaffolding as summarized in Table 1.

Meanwhile, negative remarks like *"no learning process, no instructional deliveries"* align with lower scores, highlighting inconsistencies. These trends support findings by [7] and [8] that structured communication, collaboration, and reflection shape student perceptions. This underscores the need for continuous faculty training in reflective, student-centered, and flexible pedagogy [9], [10].

Student evaluation data on instructional delivery from A.Y. 2021–2024 showed consistently "Excellent" performance across all indicators, as summarized in Table 2. However, the overall mean slightly declined from 6.28 in 2021–2022 to $\bar{x}$ = 6.00 in 2022–2023, then recovered to $\bar{x}$ = 6.11 in 2023–2024. The dip corresponds with pandemic-related instructional shifts.

Notably, Alignment ($\bar{x}$ = 6.34 → 6.06 → 6.11) and Technology Integration ($\bar{x}$ = 6.33 → 6.01 → 6.11) saw marked decreases in the second year, signaling challenges in maintaining engagement during extended flexible learning. Students remarked, *"Please avoid just reading what was in the presentation,"* and *"All lessons are recorded and students can't even ask questions,"* highlighting reduced interaction and professor presence.

Overall, while instructional standards remained high, real-time engagement and clarity suffered when teaching relied heavily on asynchronous and recorded formats. This aligns with [11], which emphasizes students' need for authentic interaction and timely

feedback in online learning environments. The slight rebound in 2023–2024 suggests adaptation, supported by comments like *"The professor did an excellent job of sparking my interest,"* and *"The professor makes this stressful subject seem like a great intro to programming."*

Table 3 indicates consistently excellent performance across all indicators, with minor fluctuations pointing to areas for improvement. The overall mean declined from 6.26 in A.Y. 2021–2022 to 5.97 in 2022–2023, then rose to 6.10 in 2023–2024, reflecting transitional challenges during the shift to post-pandemic hybrid learning.

Performance-based Assessment remained highest, supported by feedback such as, *"The professors always give us activities to practice communication and teamwork."* In contrast, Feedback showed lower means ($\bar{x}$ = 6.22 → 5.93 → 6.09), with students noting, *"No feedback for students to learn because our papers and quizzes can't get returned in time,"* underscoring the need for more timely and transparent grading.

Qualitative data also pointed to a demand for clearer instructions and assessment transparency. Diagnostic Assessment maintained strong ratings ($\bar{x}$ = 6.28 → 6.01 → 6.10), with students highlighting, "May pre-test and post-test to evaluate learnings." These findings align with [12], [13], emphasizing the value of authentic and diversified assessments.

Meanwhile, declines in enrichment scores and concerns over workload suggest pacing and fairness issues. As [14] notes, effective feedback and fair assessments enhance learner agency, highlighting the need to recalibrate assessment strategies to remain rigorous, transparent, and student-centered, as summarized in Table 4.

Table 1: Distribution of Mean along with Learning Process from 2021-2024.

Indicator	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 23-24	M	Description
	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$		
Deep Thinking	6.35	6.05	6.13	6.18	Excellent
Creativity	6.30	6.03	6.11	6.15	Excellent
Collaboration	6.19	5.95	6.1	6.08	Excellent
Critical Thinking	6.35	6.07	6.11	6.18	Excellent
Communication	6.31	6.03	6.11	6.15	Excellent
Reflection	6.28	6.00	6.11	6.13	Excellent
Overall Mean	6.30	6.02	6.11	6.14	Excellent

n A.Y 2021-2022 = 3010
n A.Y. 2022-2023 = 5201
n A.Y. 2023-2024 = 6926

Table 2: Distribution of Mean along with Instructional Deliveries from 2021-2024.

Indicator	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 23-24	M	Description
	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$		
Learning Outcomes	6.31	6.02	6.12	6.15	Excellent
Alignment	6.34	6.06	6.11	6.17	Excellent
Real-life Connection	6.32	6.03	6.14	6.16	Excellent
Differentiation	6.22	5.96	6.08	6.09	Excellent
Flexibility	6.29	6.02	6.09	6.13	Excellent
Critical Thinking	6.26	5.98	6.12	6.12	Excellent
Learning Resources	6.31	6.02	6.11	6.15	Excellent
Technology Integration	6.33	6.01	6.11	6.15	Excellent
Technology Delivery	6.29	6.02	6.1	6.14	Excellent
Syllabus Adaptation	6.25	5.95	6.1	6.10	Excellent
Simplification	6.27	5.96	6.1	6.11	Excellent
Accessibility	6.22	6.01	6.12	6.12	Excellent
Overall Mean	6.28	6.00	6.11	6.13	Excellent

n A.Y 2021-2022 = 3010
n A.Y. 2022-2023 = 5201
n A.Y. 2023-2024 = 6926

Table 3: Distribution of Mean along with Assessment from 2021-2024.

Indicator	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 23-24	M	Description
	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$		
Integrative Assessment	6.25	6.04	6.12	6.14	Excellent
Real-life Assessment	6.2	5.93	6.12	6.08	Excellent
Diagnostic Assessment	6.28	6.01	6.1	6.13	Excellent
Performance-based Assessment	6.32	6.05	6.1	6.16	Excellent
Flexible Assessment	6.28	5.96	6.09	6.11	Excellent
Enrichment	6.22	5.9	6.1	6.07	Excellent
Feedback	6.22	5.93	6.09	6.08	Excellent
Technology-based Assessment	6.27	5.91	6.1	6.09	Excellent
Overall Mean	6.26	5.97	6.10	6.11	Excellent

n A.Y 2021-2022 = 3010
n A.Y. 2022-2023 = 5201
n A.Y. 2023-2024 = 6926

Table 4: Distribution of Mean along with Learning Environment from 2021-2024.

Indicator	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 23-24	M	Description
	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$		
Cooperative and Supportive Environment	6.31	6.00	6.12	6.14	Excellent
Open Communication	6.30	6.01	6.10	6.14	Excellent
Technology Availability	6.24	6.00	6.11	6.12	Excellent
Interest and Enthusiasm in Learning	6.28	5.96	6.09	6.11	Excellent
Relaxed and Comfortable Environment	6.20	5.92	6.09	6.07	Excellent
Minimized Distractions	6.40	5.92	6.08	6.13	Excellent
Overall Mean	6.29	5.97	6.10	6.12	Excellent

n A.Y 2021-2022 = 3010
n A.Y. 2022-2023 = 5201
n A.Y. 2023-2024 = 6926

The learning environment from A.Y. 2021–2022 to 2023–2024 maintained excellent ratings overall, with a dip in 2022–2023 followed by recovery in 2023–2024. Minimized Distractions scored highest in 2021–2022 ($\bar{x}$ = 6.40) but fell to 5.92 in 2022–2023, indicating difficulties in sustaining focused learning, likely due to digital fatigue and online interaction issues.

Cooperative and Supportive Environment and Open Communication also declined during 2022–2023, reflecting weaker student–teacher dynamics. Students shared, *"Medyo terror po kayo and intimidating"* and *"Always galit tuwing synchronous class,"* contrasting with remarks like *"safe place for us to learn"* and *"interactive approach."* This mix of experiences points to variability in faculty engagement, which affects academic and emotional well-being [15].

Scores improved in 2023–2024, notably in Relaxed and Comfortable Environment and "Interest and Enthusiasm in Learning" ($\bar{x}$ = 6.09), suggesting faculty adaptation and growing use of student-centered pedagogies, aligning with [16], [17], as summarized in Table 5. However, ongoing concerns about unreturned assessments, unclear communication, and classroom atmosphere highlight the need for targeted training in inclusive and empathetic teaching strategies to sustain equitable learning environments.

The results from 2021 to 2024 show a consistent "Excellent" rating in classroom management across all indicators, with a slight dip in the overall mean from 6.23 in A.Y. 2021–2022 to 5.99 in 2022–2023, followed by a modest rise to 6.13 in 2023–2024. Indicators like Class Routines and Session Conduct dropped in the second year, reflecting post-pandemic

adjustments and issues in maintaining regular class schedules, as echoed in student feedback citing irregular meetings and scheduling conflicts. A rebound in 2023–2024 suggests improved structure and delivery, supported by positive student comments. However, lower means in Attention and Engagement and Smooth Activities indicate ongoing challenges with time management and classroom continuity. These findings align with [18], emphasizing the importance of consistency and engagement in classroom management, as summarized in Table 6. Overall, while ratings remain strong, sustained improvement in communication, scheduling, and student interaction remains crucial to maintaining excellence.

A retrospective analysis of faculty evaluations from A.Y. 2021–2022 to 2023–2024 shows consistently excellent ratings across all Teacher Qualities: Subject Knowledge ($\bar{x}$ = 6.22), Communication Skills ($\bar{x}$ = 6.14), Professional Appearance ($\bar{x}$ = 6.23), Positive Attitude ($\bar{x}$ = 6.15), and Technical Skills ($\bar{x}$ = 6.19). A slight improvement in 2023–2024, especially in Subject Knowledge (6.18 → 6.25) and Communication Skills (6.09 → 6.19), suggests gains in teaching competence and relational capacity.

Student feedback supports this trend: *"You always had the patience for my questions and knew just how to explain the answers"* and *"Very nurturing and considerate. She knows what she is doing."* These highlight faculty expertise and student-centered approaches, consistent with literature on engagement and academic success [19], [20].

However, some remarks reveal gaps *"He's a good prof but doesn't communicate well"* and *"She is not techy"* indicating areas for targeted development in communication and digital skills. As [21] notes, professional learning communities and regular feedback loops are essential to address such disparities and sustain pedagogical excellence.

Table 7 shows consistently excellent ratings across six instructional indicators Learning Process, Instructional Deliveries, Assessment, Learning Environment, Classroom Management, and Teacher Qualities with a grand mean of 6.13. The highest scores were in A.Y. 2021–2022, led by Learning Process ($\bar{x}$ = 6.30), Instructional Deliveries ($\bar{x}$ = 6.28), and Learning Environment ($\bar{x}$ = 6.29). A notable dip appeared in 2022–2023, especially in Assessment ($\bar{x}$ = 5.97), likely due to post-pandemic instructional transitions and rising student expectations in hybrid learning.

A modest rebound followed in 2023–2024, particularly in Classroom Management ($\bar{x}$ = 5.99 → 6.13), reflecting improved faculty engagement. Student feedback supports this mix of strengths "He always made sure that everyone of us would learn," "very nurturing and considerate" and areas for growth "Insensitive… nanghihingi pa ng picture ng baha na kasama kami," "She is not techy." These point to the importance of both compassion and technological adaptability.

The fluctuations mirror shifting pedagogical demands and varying faculty readiness, aligning with literature emphasizing ongoing faculty development in digital pedagogy, student well-being, and assessment literacy [22] - [24]. These findings underscore the need for institutional support through targeted training, feedback-driven evaluations, and responsive leadership to sustain instructional quality in evolving learning environments.

Table 5: Distribution of Mean with Classroom Management from 2021-2024.

Indicator	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 23-24	M	Description
	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$		
Class Routines	6.35	6.06	6.16	6.19	Excellent
Session Conduct	6.39	5.98	6.14	6.17	Excellent
Proper Behavior in the Classroom	6.35	6.03	6.15	6.18	Excellent
Learner recognition	6.37	5.98	6.12	6.16	Excellent
Attention and Engagement	6.04	5.97	6.11	6.04	Excellent
Clear Instruction	6.05	5.98	6.11	6.05	Excellent
Smooth Activities	6.03	5.96	6.1	6.03	Excellent
Overall Mean	6.23	5.99	6.13	6.12	Excellent

n A.Y 2021-2022 = 3010
n A.Y. 2022-2023 = 5201
n A.Y. 2023-2024 = 6926

Table 6: Distribution of Mean along with Teacher Qualities from 2021-2024.

Indicator	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 23-24	M	Description
	x̄	x̄	x̄		
Subject Knowledge	6.22	6.18	6.25	6.22	Excellent
Communication Skills	6.14	6.09	6.19	6.14	Excellent
Professional Appearance	6.23	6.19	6.26	6.23	Excellent
Positive Attitude	6.15	6.08	6.21	6.15	Excellent
Technical Skills	6.19	6.15	6.22	6.19	Excellent
Overall Mean	6.22	6.18	6.25	6.22	Excellent

n A.Y 2021-2022 = 3010
n A.Y. 2022-2023 = 5201
n A.Y. 2023-2024 = 6926

Table 7: Summary Distribution of the Teachers' Evaluation from 2021-2024.

Indicator	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 23-24	M	Description
	x̄	x̄	x̄		
Learning Process	6.30e	6.02e	6.11e	6.14	Excellent
Instructional Deliveries	6.28e	6.00e	6.11e	6.13	Excellent
Assessment	6.26e	5.97ee	6.10e	6.11	Excellent
Learning Environment	6.29e	5.97ee	6.10e	6.12	Excellent
Classroom Management	6.23e	5.99ee	6.13e	6.12	Excellent
Teacher Qualities	6.19e	6.14e	6.23e	6.18	Excellent
GRAND MEAN	6.26	6.02	6.13	6.13	Excellent

n A.Y 2021-2022 = 3010
n A.Y. 2022-2023 = 5201
n A.Y. 2023-2024 = 6926

4 TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN STUDENT EVALUATION USING THE MAIN MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

4.1 Learning Process

The learning process evolved from Application-Oriented Deep Learning in 2021–2022 to Fragmented Learning in 2022–2023, and eventually to Instructional Coherence and Learning Continuity in 2023–2024. The initial emphasis on hands-on learning was disrupted by unstructured content delivery, leading to demotivation and shallow engagement, which was later restored by streamlined instruction. This pattern indicates that continuity and coherence are essential to sustain deep learning. Recent studies affirm that a coherent curriculum and active engagement strategies significantly influence student motivation and higher-order thinking [25], [26]. Thus, maintaining structured, application-driven learning is crucial for fostering cognitive development and motivation.

4.2 Instructional Deliveries

Instructional delivery was initially marked by Interactive and Strategic Facilitation in 2021–2022, regressed to Lack of Interactive Pedagogy in 2022–2023, and then improved to Interactive Delivery and Content Accessibility by 2023–2024. The dip in interaction and content variation negatively impacted conceptual understanding, which was later mitigated by reintroducing dynamic tools and teaching methods. This progression indicates that active learning strategies are central to maintaining student attention and comprehension. Research by [16][9] demonstrates that interactivity in both face-to-face and digital settings enhances learner satisfaction and knowledge retention. Consequently, educators must prioritize diverse, student-centered delivery formats to promote engagement.

4.3 Assessment

Assessment practices transitioned from Aligned and Developmental in 2021–2022 to Rigid and Unconstructive in 2022–2023, before improving to Transparent and Formative Evaluation in 2023–2024. The absence of timely feedback and flexibility hindered students' ability to improve during the rigid phase. Recovery was marked by the reintroduction of formative and transparent practices that supported learning autonomy. This reflects the importance of feedback-rich and learner-aligned assessment systems. According to [27], [28], transparent and formative assessment practices promote reflective learning and drive academic success. Institutions should thus embed clear evaluation mechanisms to empower student growth and performance, as summarized in Table 8 and 9.

4.4 Learning Environment

The learning environment shifted from an Inclusive and Psychologically Safe Space (2021–2022), to Disjointed Instructional Design (2022–2023), and rebounded to an Inclusive Supportive Ecosystem (2023–2024). Psychological safety gave way to detachment and low participation when the learning design lacked alignment and support structures. The restoration of inclusive strategies in the final year, such as clearer communication and access to resources, re-established student engagement. This evolution underscores the importance of emotionally and academically supportive environments. Scholars like [29], [30] stress that inclusive learning climates promote belongingness and resilience, especially in times of uncertainty. Hence, inclusive designs should be an ongoing priority in learning environments.

4.5 Classroom Management

Classroom management reflected a progression from Empathetic and Structured (2021–2022), to Ineffective and Insensitive (2022–2023), and back to Structured and Responsive Facilitation (2023–2024). Students initially felt secure with consistent routines, but the loss of structure and emotional awareness disrupted their well-being and focus. By reinstating consistency and empathy in the final year, instructors rebuilt trust and learning efficiency. This variation reveals how crucial adaptive and student-aware

Table 8: Trends and Patterns of Student Evaluations.

Component	A.Y. 21-22	A.Y. 22-23	A.Y. 2023-2024
1. Learning Process	Application-Oriented Deep Learning	Fragmented Learning Undermines Motivation and Cognitive Engagement	Instructional Coherence and Learning Continuity
2. Instructional Deliveries	Interactive and Strategic Facilitation	Lack of Interactive Pedagogy Hinders Clarity and Conceptual Understanding	Interactive Delivery and Content Accessibility
3. Assessment	Aligned and Developmental Evaluation	Rigid and Unconstructive Assessment Limits Student Growth	Transparent and Formative Evaluation
4. Learning Environment	Inclusive and Psychologically Safe Space	Disjointed Instructional Design Reduces Engagement and Inclusivity	Inclusive Supportive Learning Ecosystem
5. Classroom Management	Empathetic and Structured Management	Ineffective Time Management and Insensitivity Affect Student Wellbeing	Structured and Responsive Facilitation
6. Teacher Qualities	Compassionate Professionalism	Teacher Approachability and Competence Drive Student Trust and Learning	Professional Presence and Student-Centered Ethos

Table 9: Strengths and Areas for Improvement in Student Evaluations.

Component	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Learning Process	Contextualized and Student-Centered Concept Delivery	Inconsistent Instructional Continuity and Cognitive Scaffolding
Instructional Delivery	Engaging, Structured, and Multi-Modal Pedagogy	Disjointed Delivery and Lack of Instructional Depth
Assessment	Fair, Formative, and Supportive Evaluation Practices	Opaque, Misaligned, and Infrequent Feedback Mechanisms
Learning Environment	Supportive, Inclusive, and Application-Oriented Learning Space	Deficient Resource Accessibility and Learning Material Integration
Classroom Management	Structured, Respectful, and Motivational Class Culture	Disorganized Scheduling and Communication Inefficiencies
Teacher Qualities	Empathetic, Passionate, and Professionally Relational Instructors	Inconsistent Presence, Bias Perception, and Emotional Disengagement

management strategies are to academic success. Research by [31] highlights that effective classroom management, grounded in emotional intelligence, directly impacts engagement and behaviour. Therefore, responsive facilitation and structure are essential for maintaining productive classrooms.

4.6 Teacher Qualities

Teacher qualities advanced from Compassionate Professionalism (2021–2022), through Approachability and Competence (2022–2023), to a balanced Professional Presence and Student-Centered Ethos (2023–2024). Students valued empathy and clarity, particularly during challenging periods, but increasingly demanded professionalism and instructional mastery. The final theme reflects a convergence of approachability, fairness, and expertise. This pattern confirms that teacher credibility and interpersonal skills are both vital to effective instruction. According to [32], [33], students respond positively to instructors who exhibit relational competence alongside academic rigor. The implication is that continuous development in both pedagogical knowledge and relational engagement should be central to faculty performance standards.

5 STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN FACULTY PERFORMANCE BASED ON STUDENT FEEDBACK

5.1 Strengths

Student feedback highlights clear strengths in faculty performance, particularly in fostering a student-centered learning process. Many appreciated instructors who made lessons accessible, noting, *"He makes sure that we understand the topic in an easy way,"* and *"Sir explains the lessons in a way where we're able to understand it little by little."* Such feedback shows how contextualized instruction enhances comprehension and engagement [34].

Instructional delivery was also praised for its multi-modal approaches combining videos, live discussions, and demonstrations. Students described methods as *"clear and concise"* and valued explanations offered in *"more than one way,"* affirming that varied teaching strategies improve learning effectiveness [19].

5.2 Areas for Improvement

Despite these strengths, several areas for improvement were identified in the feedback. A recurring issue in the learning process was the inconsistency in instructional continuity, with students noting that *"At first in his subject I had a hard time but eventually I cope with it,"* or *"We wish we had more synchronous classes to truly understand concepts."* This indicates that a lack of regular, live, interactive instruction leaves gaps in students' understanding. Moreover, some students expressed frustration with the instructional delivery being overly reliant on recorded videos or PowerPoint slides. As one student noted, *"He always uses video presentations in lessons rather than teaching only by himself,"* which suggests according to [35] a need for instructors to engage more actively with the students during live sessions, rather than relying too heavily on passive learning methods.

Another notable area for improvement was assessment practices. While some students appreciated the feedback they received, there were significant concerns about the transparency and fairness of grading. For example, feedback such as *"Not transparent about how he calculates our marks" and "Unfair grading, unreasonable pag ggrade nya"* indicate that inconsistencies in grading and a lack of clarity in assessment criteria are major concerns [36]. Students also expressed dissatisfaction with the timing and frequency of feedback, with one stating, *"No feedback for students to learn because our papers and quizzes can't get returned in time."* Such feedback points were noted by [37] to the need for clearer communication regarding assessment expectations, more timely feedback, and better alignment between assessments and learning outcomes. Finally, in the learning environment, students reported feelings of intimidation or discomfort, with some commenting, *"Medyo terror po kayo and intimidating,"* suggesting that while some professors create supportive spaces, others may unintentionally contribute to an environment that hinders open communication and student participation [38].

6 CONCLUSIONS

The longitudinal analysis of student evaluations from A.Y. 2021–2024 across six pedagogical domains revealed consistently excellent faculty performance, with minor fluctuations during the post-pandemic transition. These shifts highlight certain gaps in flexible learning, engagement, and assessment

practices. However, the improvement observed by A.Y. 2023–2024 reflects faculty adaptability and the gradual strengthening of pedagogical approaches.

Overall, the findings indicate that faculty members maintained a high level of instructional effectiveness despite the challenges associated with the transition from pandemic-related learning conditions. Continuous monitoring of teaching performance through structured evaluations provides valuable insights for improving teaching practices and maintaining high educational standards.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

To sustain instructional excellence, institutions should implement targeted and data-informed faculty development programs focusing on reflective teaching, inclusive communication, responsive assessment, and effective classroom management. Regular evaluations accompanied by actionable feedback can support continuous improvement in teaching practices.

Training initiatives that emphasize emotional intelligence, digital pedagogy, and flexible instructional approaches may further enhance teaching quality and student engagement across different learning modalities.

Future research may focus on longitudinal validation of SET data across institutions, integration of learning analytics within MMIS for predictive insights, and exploration of hybrid evaluation models combining quantitative metrics with qualitative student feedback. Additionally, investigating the impact of faculty development interventions on student learning outcomes would further strengthen evidence-based educational practices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their sincere appreciation to the study participants for their invaluable contributions. Equal recognition is extended to National University Philippines for its unwavering support and collaboration throughout the conduct and completion of this study.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Boring, K. Ottoboni, and P. B. Stark, “Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness,” ScienceOpen Research, 2020.

[2] P. Spooren, B. Brockx, and D. Mortelmans, “On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art,” Review of Educational Research, vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 112-145, 2021.

[3] B. Uttl, D. Smibert, and C. Morrison, “Student evaluations of teaching: Teaching and learning research perspectives,” Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 577-594, 2021.

[4] C. M. Tan, G. Subramaniam, and S. M. Jalil, “Institutional analytics and teaching effectiveness: A systematic review,” International Journal of Educational Management, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 522-538, 2023.

[5] D. Ifenthaler and J. Y. Yau, “Utilising learning analytics for study success: Reflections on current empirical findings,” Journal of Research on Technology in Education, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 1-17, 2020.

[6] R. A. Berk, “Top 20 strategies to improve the evaluation of teaching,” Journal of Faculty Development, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 45-58, 2019.

[7] M. Khalil and M. Ebner, “Exploring students’ perception of video-based learning in higher education: An empirical study,” Smart Learning Environments, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1-16, 2020.

[8] W. Bao, “COVID-19 and online teaching in higher education: A case study of Peking University,” Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 113-115, 2020.

[9] F. Martin and D. U. Bolliger, “Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment,” Online Learning, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 1-24, 2019.

[10] Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, and S. Qin, “Enhancing student engagement in online learning: The effects of innovative instructional strategies,” Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-18, 2021.

[11] T. Trust and J. Whalen, “Should Teachers Be Trained in Emergency Remote Teaching? Lessons Learned from the COVID-19 Pandemic,” Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 189-199, 2020.

[12] A. C. Alonzo and J. Kim, “Formative assessment practices and their impact on learning: A meta-analysis,” Educational Assessment, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1-20, 2022.

[13] L. R. Kearns and R. M. Reardon, “Flexible assessment in online learning: A narrative review of best practices,” Online Learning Journal, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 120-137, 2021.

[14] D. Carless and N. E. Winstone, “Teacher feedback: A framework and typology of practices,” Educational Review, vol. 72, no. 5, pp. 527-546, 2020.

[15] M. Fawaz and A. Samaha, “E-learning: Depression, anxiety, and stress symptomatology among Lebanese university students during COVID-19 quarantine,” Nursing Forum, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 52-57, 2021.

[16] M. Bond, S. Bedenlier, V. I. Marín, and M. Händel, “Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester,” International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1-24, 2020.

[17] E. Alqurashi, "Predicting student satisfaction and perceived learning within online learning environments," Distance Education, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 133-148, 2019.

[18] S. Aydin and E. Kaya, "Effective classroom management strategies in the digital age: A systematic review," Education and Information Technologies, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 2483-2505, 2022.

[19] L. Darling-Hammond, L. Flook, C. Cook-Harvey, B. Barron, and D. Osher, "Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development," Applied Developmental Science, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 97-140, 2019.

[20] J. M. Salazar, R. P. Sarmiento, and J. D. Ledesma, "Faculty competencies in the digital era: A grounded theory study," International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 128-144, 2021.

[21] M. M. Rahman, F. D. Yusop, and A. Yacob, "Professional development and pedagogical strategies: A model for higher education teachers," Journal of Education and Learning, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 152-165, 2023.

[22] F. M. Jamil, B. K. Hamre, and R. C. Pianta, "Teachers' responsiveness to student needs: A developmental systems perspective," Teaching and Teacher Education, vol. 110, 103577, 2022.

[23] L. E. Kim and K. Asbury, "'Like a rug had been pulled from under you': The impact of COVID-19 on teachers in England during the first six weeks of the UK lockdown," British Journal of Educational Psychology, vol. 90, no. 4, pp. 1062-1083, 2020.

[24] E. P. Marpa, "Technology in the teaching of mathematics:
An analysis of teachers' attitudes during the COVID-19 pandemic," International Journal on Studies in Education (IJonSE), vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 92-102, 2021.

[25] K. D. Könings, T. Seidel, and J. J. G. van Merriënboer, "Participatory design in education: A review of the literature and future directions," Educational Research Review, vol. 33, 100387, 2021.

[26] A. D. Dumford and A. L. Miller, "Online learning in higher education: Exploring advantages and disadvantages for engagement," Journal of Computing in Higher Education, vol. 32, pp. 3-22, 2020.

[27] R. Ajjawi, M. Bearman, and D. Boud, "Reframing feedback to support students' learning," Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 1105-1111, 2019.

[28] V. M. López-Pastor, A. Sicilia-Camacho, and Á. Pérez-Pueyo, "Formative and shared assessment in higher education: A systematic review," Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 387-404, 2022.

[29] C. L. Turner, M. Jensen, and I. Helleve, "Creating inclusive classrooms: Reflections from the transition to digital learning during COVID-19," Teaching and Teacher Education, vol. 103, 103338, 2021.

[30] M. Bond, "Schools and emergency remote education during the COVID-19 pandemic: A living rapid systematic review," Asian Journal of Distance Education, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 191-247, 2021.

[31] C. M. Schaffer, M. Chen, and M. Zhu, "The role of teacher emotional support in students' academic performance:
A meta-analytic review," Educational Psychology Review, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 629-664, 2021.

[32] I. Jung and C. N. Gunawardena, "Developing relational competencies in online instruction: Best practices and future directions," Distance Education, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 327-343, 2021.

[33] K. Sheridan and M. A. Kelly, "Developing teacher presence in online learning environments: A systematic review," Online Learning, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 1-20, 2020.

[34] M. Freeman and S. Hamson, Pedagogical methods for modern learning environments, Springer, 2019.

[35] K. Tobin, "Research on the effectiveness of multi-modal pedagogy in higher education," Higher Education Journal, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 56-72, 2021.

[36] D. Boud and N. Falchikov, Principles and practice of assessment in higher education, Routledge, 2020.

[37] G. Wiggins, "Fair assessment practices in modern classrooms," Educational Leadership, vol. 77, no. 6, pp. 15-20, 2020.

[38] S. A. Ambrose, M. W. Bridges, M. C. DiPietro, M. C. Lovett, and M. K. Norman, How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching, John Wiley & Sons, 2020.