International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Student Feedback, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Learning Outcomes at UPHSL Jonelta Campus

Teresita E Saide [1*], Remedios M. Dela Rosa [2]
[1-2] University of Perpetual Help System Laguna, Philippines

* Corresponding Author: **Teresita E. Saide**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 06
Issue: 02
March-April 2025
Received: 19-02-2025
Accepted: 22-03-2025
Page No: 1614-1623

Abstract
This study investigated the relationship between student feedback, faculty teaching effectiveness, and student learning outcomes at UPHS Jonelta campuses. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from 372 students across different campuses through standardized and researcher-made survey instruments. Results showed that student feedback on teacher performance, teaching-learning processes, and classroom management was rated as excellent (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.973$). Faculty teaching effectiveness, assessed through engagement, clarity, and adaptability, was found to be very high (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.770$). Similarly, student learning outcomes in terms of achievement, retention, competency, and application were very high (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.984$). Correlation analysis revealed a moderate correlation between student feedback and teaching effectiveness ($r = 0.743$, $p = 0.000$), as well as between student feedback and student learning outcomes ($r = 0.702$, $p = 0.000$). Moreover, a high correlation was found between teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes ($r = 0.808$, $p = 0.000$). Regression analysis indicated that student feedback on the teaching-learning process significantly predicted student learning outcomes ($\beta = 0.538$, $p = 0.000$), whereas teaching effectiveness had a weaker predictive value ($\beta = 0.267$, $p = 0.000$).** Based on these findings, the TULAY (Transforming University Learning and Advancement for the Youth) Action Plan was developed to enhance faculty development, instructional innovations, student engagement, and technology integration.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2025.6.2.1614-1623

Keywords: Student Feedback, Teaching Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcomes, Faculty Development, Higher Education

1. Introduction

The evaluation of faculty instruction is a crucial aspect of maintaining and improving the quality of education in higher education institutions (Constantinou *et al*., 2022). Teaching effectiveness directly impacts student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement, making it an essential area of focus for educational institutions (Dr. R. Satish *et al*., 2023) [72]. Student evaluations of teaching (SET) have been widely recognized as a vital mechanism for assessing instructional quality, capturing students' perceptions and satisfaction with faculty performance (Ajmal *et al*., 2024) [4]. Moreover, structured and appropriately utilized student feedback can serve as a powerful tool for refining pedagogical approaches and fostering continuous professional development among educators (Dubey *et al*., 2023).

Despite the widespread adoption of student evaluations and feedback mechanisms, challenges remain in effectively integrating these discernments into faculty development initiatives. While many studies emphasize the positive correlation between student feedback and improved instructional practices (Dubey *et al*., 2023), there is a need for a more designed approach that aligns faculty development with student learning outcomes. One of the persistent challenges in higher education is ensuring that feedback mechanisms are not only collected but also systematically analyzed and applied to enhance teaching effectiveness (Pitt

& Quinlan, 2022). Furthermore, the increasing marketization of university education and the growing trend of students challenging academic judgments add complexity to faculty evaluation processes (del Cerro Santamaría, 2020; Horne *et al*., 2021). Given these considerations, this study aims to explore the relationship between student feedback, teaching effectiveness, and student learning outcomes at UPHSL Jonelta Campus. The research seeks to understand how student evaluations and feedback contribute to faculty teaching effectiveness and how these improvements translate into enhanced student performance. Through examining the frequency, regularity, and alignment of feedback with course objectives, this study aims to provide discernments into best practices for advancing meaningful academic advancements (Gurkirpal Singh *et al*., 2023). Additionally, the study will analyze how feedback mechanisms contribute to a sustainable academic community by promoting transparency, accountability, and innovation in education (Tuca *et al*., 2024).

Ultimately, this research has contributed to the growing body of knowledge on faculty development by identifying effective strategies for integrating student feedback into pedagogical improvement plans.

2. Methods

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between teaching effectiveness, faculty development, and student learning outcomes among students. This design was appropriate as it allows the researcher to describe existing conditions and analyze the extent to which variables are associated without manipulating them. A descriptive-correlational design involves systematically describing phenomena and determining relationships among variables, providing awareness into trends and associations without establishing causal links (Creswell & Creswell, 2021) [24]. Through utilizing this approach, the study aims to collect quantitative data through surveys and assessments, ensuring an objective analysis of the connections between instructional strategies, faculty initiatives, and student performance.

This study focused on three key variables: student feedback, teaching effectiveness, and student learning outcomes, which were essential in assessing and improving the quality of education. The respondents of the study consisted of students from various campuses of the University of Perpetual Help System (UPH) and Perpetual Help Colleges (PHC) for the school year 2024-2025. Specifically, the study included 128 students from UPH-Biñan, 31 from UPH-GMA, 60 from UPH-Isabela, and 13 from UPH-Pueblo. Additionally, PHC-Manila had 34 students, while PHC-Pangasinan had 106 students, bringing the total student respondents under consideration to 372.

To ensure a representative sample from the total population of 11,728 students. The Raosoft sample size calculator was used to determine the appropriate sample size, considering a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level, resulting in a computed sample size of 372 students. The study employed a stratified random sampling technique. Stratified sampling was used to ensure that students from each campus were proportionally represented, allowing for a more accurate and balanced analysis of teaching effectiveness, faculty development, and student learning outcomes.

The instrument used in this study was a combination of a standardized questionnaire from the Student Personnel Services (SPS) Office of the specified locale (for student feedback) and a researcher-developed survey designed to measure teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes using a 4-point Likert scale. It consisted of three parts: Part 1 was the adopted standardized questionnaire assessing student feedback across three components—teacher, teaching-learning process, and classroom management. Part 2 evaluated teaching effectiveness in terms of engagement, clarity, feedback, and adaptability. Part 3 measured student learning outcomes, focusing on achievement, retention, competency, and application.

To ensure validity and reliability, Parts 2 and 3 of the instrument underwent face validity through expert evaluation, ensuring clarity, relevance, and appropriateness. A pilot test was conducted to refine the questionnaire based on initial responses. Internal consistency and reliability were assessed using Cronbach's Alpha before full implementation. The reliability coefficients indicated strong internal consistency: student feedback ($\alpha = 0.973$), teaching effectiveness ($\alpha = 0.770$), and student learning outcomes ($\alpha = 0.984$). These results confirmed that the instrument was highly reliable for measuring the intended constructs.

Table 1: For student feedback towards the faculty, the following measures were used:

Numerical Rating	Mean Ranges	Categorical Response	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Strongly Agree	Excellent
4	3.40 - 4.19	Agree	Very Good
3	2.61- 3.39	Moderately Agree	Good
2	1.80- 2.59	Disagree	Fair
1	1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Disagree	Poor

Table 2: To assess the teaching effectiveness, and student learning outcomes, the following measures were used:

Numerical Rating	Mean Ranges	Categorical Response	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.26 - 4.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3	2.51- 3.25	Agree	High
2	1.76 - 2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

The data-gathering process began with securing approval from the Chief Executive Directors (CEDs) of each campus to administer the survey. Once approval is obtained, the questionnaire were distributed via Google Forms, ensuring accessibility for all respondents across the campuses.

To uphold data privacy and confidentiality, respondents were informed that participation is voluntary, and their responses will remain anonymous. Data was securely stored and used

solely for research purposes. Upon collection, responses were analyzed and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools to determine correlations between teaching effectiveness, faculty development, and student learning outcomes.

3. Results and Discussions

Table 3: Level of Student Feedback among the Faculty Members of UPHSL Jonelta

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Teacher	4.52	Excellent	1
2. Teaching-learning process	4.44	Excellent	2
3. Classroom management	4.32	Excellent	3
Overall Weighted Mean	4.43	Excellent	

Table 3 presents the student feedback on faculty members of UPHSL Jonelta across three key indicators: Teacher, Teaching-Learning Process, and Classroom Management. Among these, the highest-rated category is Teacher, with a weighted mean of 4.52, ranking first. This suggests that students highly appreciate faculty members' composure, appearance, communication skills, and punctuality. The Teaching-Learning Process follows with a mean of 4.44, indicating that faculty members are perceived as excellent in organizing subject matter, stimulating critical thinking, and employing appropriate teaching aids. Lastly, Classroom Management ranks third with a weighted mean of 4.32, still falling within the "Excellent" category, reflecting the faculty's ability to maintain instructional momentum and a structured learning environment.

In conclusion, the findings suggest that students perceive their faculty members at UPHSL Jonelta as highly effective educators, with an Overall Weighted Mean of 4.43, categorized as Excellent. This indicates that while all aspects of teaching performance are well-regarded, students place the highest importance on teacher-related attributes, such as professionalism, communication, and engagement. The somewhat lower scores in classroom management imply that while instructional effectiveness is strong, there may be room for improvement in enforcing policies and ensuring a more structured classroom environment.

These results verify the findings of Constantinou and Wijnen-Meijer (2022), which signified that student evaluations of teaching provide valuable insights into instructional effectiveness, guiding faculty development and institutional policies. Their study emphasized that while teaching competence is crucial, factors such as student engagement, organization, and classroom management also play a vital role in academic success. The findings from UPHSL Jonelta align with this perspective, reinforcing the importance of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system that includes not only student feedback but also peer reviews and self-assessments. This multi-dimensional approach can help institutions refining their teaching strategies, enhance faculty performance, and ultimately improve student learning experiences.

Table 4: Level of Teaching Effectiveness among the Faculty Members of UPHSL Jonelta based on Students' Feedback

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Engagement	3.53	Very High	1
Clarity	3.51	Very High	2.5
Adaptability	3.51	Very High	2.5
Overall Weighted Mean	3.51	Very High	

Table 4 exhibits the level of teaching effectiveness among the faculty members of UPHSL Jonelta based on student feedback. Engagement received the highest rating, with a weighted mean of 3.53, ranking first. Clarity and adaptability both received a weighted mean of 3.51, sharing the second-place ranking. These indicators highlight key aspects of teaching effectiveness, focusing on how well instructors engage students, communicate concepts clearly, and adapt to various learning needs.

The overall weighted mean of 3.51, categorized as very high, indicates that students perceive their instructors as highly effective in engaging them, delivering clear instruction, and adjusting their teaching methods. The highest rating for engagement suggests that instructors successfully encourage active participation and maintain student interest. Clarity and adaptability being equally rated show that while instructors communicate effectively and demonstrate flexibility, there is still room for enhancement in these areas to ensure optimal learning experiences. Strengthening instructional strategies and refining adaptive teaching methods could further improve teaching effectiveness.

These findings align with research on teaching effectiveness. Cinches *et al*. (2017) [23] emphasized that engagement plays a crucial role in student success, with teaching clarity and adaptability being strong predictors of learning outcomes. Harbour *et al*. (2014) [36] highlighted that effective teaching strategies, including clear instruction and responsiveness to student needs, foster a positive and interactive learning environment. Fernández-García *et al*. (2021) [32] found that structured lessons, interactive teaching approaches, and adaptability contribute to improved student comprehension and engagement. These studies reinforce the importance of continuously refining teaching practices to maintain high levels of effectiveness.

Table 5: Level of Attainment of Student Learning Outcomes

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Achievement	3.46	Very High	4
Retention	3.47	Very High	2.5
Competency	3.47	Very High	2.5
Application	3.48	Very High	1
Overall Weighted Mean	3.47	Very High	

The table presents the level of attainment of student learning outcomes based on four key indicators: achievement, retention, competency, and application. Each indicator received a weighted mean above 3.46, with all being interpreted as "Very High." Among these, application ranked the highest with a mean of 3.48, while achievement ranked the lowest at 3.46. Retention and competency shared the same mean of 3.47, placing them in second rank.

The overall weighted mean of 3.47 indicates that student learning outcomes are generally at a very high level, reflecting strong performance across all measured areas. The results suggest that students have successfully achieved high levels of learning outcomes, particularly in applying their knowledge in real-world contexts. This implies that instructional methods and faculty support are effective in enhancing student performance.

Research supports the strong correlation between teacher competence, instructional quality, and student learning outcomes. Perceived teacher support significantly influences academic achievement, particularly through emotional and academic support (Tao *et al*., 2022) [75] Additionally, teacher-student relationships and parental involvement contribute to improved learning performance, particularly in primary education (Ma *et al*., 2021) [53]. Effective instructional strategies and faculty competence also play a crucial role, as high-quality teaching practices directly impact student retention, competency, and application of knowledge (Blömeke *et al*., 2022) [11]. Furthermore, pedagogical expertise and classroom management skills have been linked to higher student engagement and achievement (König *et al*., 2021) [46]. These findings emphasize the need for ongoing faculty training and innovative teaching approaches to sustain high levels of student learning outcomes.

Table 6: Relationship between the Level of Student Feedback and Level of Teaching Effectiveness

Student Feedback	Teaching Effectiveness		
	Engagement	Clarity	Adaptability
Teacher	r=0.671** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.647** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.745** Moderate correlation p=0.000
Teaching-learning process	r=0.655** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.622** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.742** Moderate correlation p=0.000
Classroom management	r=0.676** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.646** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.720** Moderate correlation p=0.000

**Significant @ 0.01

Table 6 depicts the relationship between the level of student feedback and the level of teaching effectiveness among faculty members of UPHSL Jonelta. The results indicate a moderate correlation between student feedback and all aspects of teaching effectiveness, with correlation values ranging from 0.622 to 0.745. The highest correlation is between the teacher and adaptability (r=0.745, p=0.000), suggesting that students perceive adaptability as a key factor in teacher effectiveness. Similarly, the teaching-learning process and adaptability show a strong connection (r=0.742, p=0.000), highlighting the importance of flexibility in instruction. Classroom management also has a moderate correlation with engagement (r=0.676, p=0.000), clarity (r=0.646, p=0.000), and adaptability (r=0.720, p=0.000), reinforcing the significance of structured and responsive classroom environments in teaching effectiveness.

The overall findings suggest that student feedback is significantly linked to teaching effectiveness, emphasizing the importance of continuous assessment and improvement in instructional practices. The moderate correlations across all dimensions indicate that while teaching effectiveness is influenced by student perceptions, other factors such as institutional support and faculty development also play a role. The strong association between adaptability and student feedback implies that teachers who can adjust their strategies to meet student needs tend to receive higher ratings. These results highlight the need for ongoing professional development programs that focus on adaptability, engagement, and clarity to enhance overall teaching effectiveness.

Zhang *et al*. (2021) [87] emphasize that teachers' motivation for continuous professional development significantly influences their effectiveness, with self-efficacy and institutional support playing key roles. Similarly, Bragg *et al*. (2021) [14] highlight that well-structured professional development programs, including online learning opportunities, enhance both content knowledge and instructional strategies, leading to improved student outcomes. Bowman *et al*. (2020) [13] further stress that technology-integrated professional development helps teachers refine their teaching practices, making instruction more engaging and effective. Additionally, Hennessy *et al*. (2022) [38] suggest that social media and blended learning approaches can support teacher training, particularly in resource-limited environments. These findings reinforce the need for institutions to invest in faculty training programs that address adaptability, engagement, and clarity, ensuring that student feedback is effectively utilized to improve teaching effectiveness.

The higher the level of student feedback on engagement, clarity, and adaptability, the higher the perceived teaching effectiveness.

Higher levels of student feedback on engagement, clarity, and adaptability are associated with higher teaching

effectiveness, as evidenced by the significant moderate correlations found in the study.

Table 7: Relationship between the Level of Student Feedback and Level of Attainment of Student Learning Outcomes

Student Feedback	Student Learning Outcomes			
	Achievement	Retention	Competency	Application
Teacher	r=0.653** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.575** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.564** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.565** Moderate correlation p=0.000
Teaching-learning process	r=0.743** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.651** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.664** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.690** Moderate correlation p=0.000
Classroom management	r=0.702** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.599** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.628** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.646** Moderate correlation p=0.000

**Significant @ 0.01

The table above indicates the relationship between the level of student feedback and the attainment of student learning outcomes. The teaching-learning process shows the highest correlation with achievement (r=0.743, p=0.000) and application (r=0.690, p=0.000), suggesting that effective instructional methods significantly enhance student success and the ability to apply knowledge. Classroom management also demonstrates a strong correlation with achievement (r=0.702, p=0.000), reinforcing the idea that a well-managed learning environment contributes to better student performance. Meanwhile, teacher-related factors exhibit moderate correlations with all learning outcomes, with the highest being with achievement (r=0.653, p=0.000), indicating that teacher effectiveness directly influences student success.

Higher levels of positive student feedback on teaching effectiveness are associated with higher attainment of student learning outcomes.

The findings suggest that student feedback is crucial in determining the attainment of learning outcomes, as it provides insights into teaching effectiveness and areas for improvement. The moderate correlations imply that while student feedback plays a role in academic achievement, retention, competency, and application, other factors such as curriculum design, institutional support, and student motivation also contribute. The strong relationship between the teaching-learning process and achievement highlights the importance of well-structured lessons and interactive teaching strategies in enhancing student success. These results emphasize the need for continuous instructional refinement based on student feedback to optimize learning experiences and outcomes.

Existing literature supports the relationship between student feedback and learning outcomes. Zhang *et al.* (2021) [87] stress that effective teaching strategies, influenced by feedback, lead to improved student achievement and competency development. Bragg *et al.* (2021) [14] further highlight that structured professional development programs enhance teachers' pedagogical skills, positively affecting student retention and application of knowledge. Bowman *et al.* (2020) [13] emphasize the role of technology integration in instruction, demonstrating that well-trained teachers who adapt to digital tools improve student engagement and comprehension. Additionally, Hennessy *et al.* (2022) [38] suggest that blended learning approaches, supported by student feedback, enhance both classroom management and overall learning outcomes. These studies reinforce the importance of leveraging student feedback to refine teaching practices and create effective learning environments.

Table 8: Relationship between the Level of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness and Level of Student Learning Outcomes

Faculty teaching effectiveness	Student Learning Outcomes			
	Achievement	Retention	Competency	Application
Engagement	r=0.808** High correlation p=0.000	r=0.740** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.725** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.615** Moderate correlation p=0.000
Clarity	r=0.767** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.708** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.661** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.624** Moderate correlation p=0.000
Adaptability	r=0.774** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.708** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.697** Moderate correlation p=0.000	r=0.667** Moderate correlation p=0.000

**Significant @ 0.01

Table 8 illustrates the relationship between faculty teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes, emphasizing the influence of engagement, clarity, and adaptability on achievement, retention, competency, and application. The results indicate a strong correlation between engagement and achievement (r=0.808, p=0.000), suggesting that faculty who actively engage students significantly enhance their academic success. Meanwhile, clarity and adaptability exhibit moderate correlations with all learning outcomes, with the highest correlations observed between clarity and achievement (r=0.767, p=0.000) and between adaptability and achievement (r=0.774, p=0.000). These findings underscore the essential role of instructional clarity and the ability to adjust teaching strategies in fostering students' academic growth and skill acquisition.

Higher faculty teaching effectiveness leads to better student learning outcomes. The findings suggest that faculty teaching effectiveness plays a crucial role in shaping student learning

outcomes, with engagement emerging as the most influential factor in academic achievement. While clarity and adaptability contribute meaningfully to retention, competency, and application, engagement demonstrates the strongest impact on student success. These results highlight the need for educational institutions to invest in faculty development programs that enhance engagement techniques, improve instructional clarity, and promote adaptability in teaching strategies. Strengthening these areas can lead to improved student performance, deeper retention of knowledge, and greater practical application of learned concepts.

These results are consistent with prior research on faculty effectiveness and student learning outcomes. Zhang *et al*. (2021) [87] emphasize that interactive and engaging teaching approaches significantly enhance student achievement and competency. Bragg *et al*. (2021) [14] highlight that clear and well-structured instruction improves knowledge retention. Additionally, Bowman *et al*. (2020) [13] emphasize that adaptability in teaching methodologies, particularly through technology integration, supports the application of knowledge in practical settings. Hennessy *et al*. (2022) [38] further argue that faculty professional development focused on engagement and instructional clarity leads to enhanced student performance and overall learning effectiveness. These studies reinforce the importance of cultivating effective teaching strategies to maximize student learning and academic success.

Table 9: Regression Analysis of the Level of Student Feedback and Teaching Effectiveness taken Singly or in Combination of the Level of Student Learning Outcomes

Predictor	Dependent Variable	R^2	F	p-value	β	t	p-value
Teaching-learning process	Student learning outcomes (overall)	0.662	362.109	0.000	0.538	12.544	0.000
Overall teaching effectiveness					0.267	8.134	0.000

*Significant @ 0.01

As reflected, teaching-learning process and overall teaching effectiveness accounted for 66.20 % (F=362.109, p=0.000) of the variability of the dependent variable, student learning outcomes with the remaining 33.80% for other factors. Results showed that for every one unit increase in teaching-learning process, there is 0.538 increase in the student learning outcomes. Likewise, for one unit increase in overall teaching effectiveness, there is 0.267 increase in student learning outcomes. The probability values were all less than the 0.01 significance level suggesting that there is enough statistical evidence to conclude that teaching-learning process and overall teaching effectiveness significantly predict student learning outcomes.

Furthermore, the significance of both predictors at $p < 0.01$ stresses the necessity of advancing high-quality teaching practices through continuous professional development and institutional support. The results indicate that while faculty effectiveness remains an essential factor, the broader teaching-learning environment—including curriculum design, student engagement, and instructional delivery—plays a more dominant role in determining learning success. Therefore, institutions should focus on refining teaching methodologies, encouraging dynamic classroom interactions, and integrating student feedback mechanisms to optimize learning outcomes.

These findings align with previous research emphasizing the influence of teaching effectiveness and learning environments on academic success. Zhang *et al*. (2021) [87] assert that a well-structured and engaging teaching process significantly enhances student achievement and knowledge retention. Similarly, Bragg *et al*. (2021) [14] highlight that clear instructional delivery and adaptability in teaching approaches contribute to improved competency and application of learned concepts. Moreover, Bowman *et al*. (2020) [13] emphasize that professional development programs focusing on pedagogical innovation and engagement strategies lead to better student outcomes. Collectively, these studies reinforce the importance of fostering a robust teaching-learning process to maximize student learning and academic performance.

Proposed action plan

Tulay action plan: transforming university learning and advancement for the youth

Education serves as the bridge ("TULAY" in Filipino) that connects students to knowledge, skills, and future opportunities. To strengthen this bridge, institutions must continuously enhance teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes. This action plan—TULAY (Transforming University Learning and Advancement for the Youth)—focuses on faculty development, instructional innovations, feedback mechanisms, student engagement, and technology integration. By implementing targeted interventions, this plan aims to create a dynamic, student-centered learning environment that fosters academic excellence and holistic growth.

Table 10: TULAY Action Plan Matrix

Key Areas (TULAY Pillars)	Activities	Objectives	Persons Involved	Timeline	Budget/Resources Needed	Expected Outcomes (%)
T - Teacher Training and Development	Conduct pedagogical enhancement workshops on student engagement, assessment strategies, and active learning	Improve faculty instructional skills and student interaction	Faculty, Academic Heads, External Experts	Quarterly	Training materials, Speaker fees, Venue, ICT equipment	80% of faculty show improvement in teaching evaluations
U - Upgrading Instructional Strategies	Develop and integrate active learning approaches (e.g., case studies, problem-based learning, flipped classrooms)	Enhance student critical thinking and real-world application of lessons	Faculty, Curriculum Developers	Every Semester	Learning modules, Online platforms	85% of students demonstrate improved concept application

L - Listening to Student Feedback	Implement real-time student feedback systems (e.g., online feedback forms, learning analytics)	Allow timely adjustments to improve instructional delivery	Students, Faculty, IT Support	Every Term	Online survey tools, IT support	90% of faculty actively use feedback to improve teaching
A - Advancing Student Engagement and Support	Establish peer tutoring and academic learning communities	Provide academic support for struggling students	Student leaders, Faculty mentors	Ongoing	Study spaces, Learning materials	75% of tutored students show improved academic performance
Y - Yielding Results through Technology Integration	Optimize the use of Learning Management Systems (LMS) and digital tools	Increase accessibility and engagement through tech-driven learning	IT Department, Faculty	Continuous	LMS subscriptions, IT support	85% of students report positive impact of digital learning tools

4. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The level of student feedback among faculty members of UPHS Jonelta campuses in terms of the teacher, teaching-learning process, and classroom management is excellent.
2. The teaching effectiveness with respect to engagement, clarity, and adaptability of faculty members of UPHSL Jonelta is very high.
3. Student learning outcomes in terms of achievement, retention, competency, and application has attained very high as perceived by students at UPHS Jonelta.
4. There is a significant moderate correlation between student feedback and all teaching effectiveness.
5. There is a significant moderate correlation between student feedback and attainment of student learning outcomes.
6. There is a significant high correlation between level of teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes.
7. Student feedback specifically on the teaching-learning process, is a strong predictor of student learning outcomes while teaching effectiveness is a predictor but weaker as compared to the former.
8. TULAY (Transforming University Learning and Advancement for the Youth) Action Plan was designed to bridge student feedback in improving faculty development, instructional innovations, feedback mechanisms, student engagement, and technology integration.

5. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were made:

1. Faculty members of UPHSL Jonelta should Utilize student feedback mechanisms as a self-reflection tool to continuously refine teaching approaches and ensure alignment with students' learning needs.
2. Students of UPHSL Jonelta should participate actively in feedback mechanisms and focus group discussions to help faculty members gain deeper insights into student learning challenges and preferences.
3. Administrators and policy makers of the school should examine the instrument for teachers' evaluation for further improvement for the betterment of teaching-learning process.
4. Academic Administrators of UPHSL Jonelta should utilize the TULAY (Transforming University Learning and Advancement for the Youth) Action Plan as a structured intervention program to systematically improve faculty development, instructional innovations, student engagement, and technology integration.
5. The researcher should communicate the results of this study to the school administrators of the UPHSL Jonelta Campuses specifically the directors of student services to improve the services given to the students and other stakeholders.
6. Future researchers should explore longitudinal studies to assess the sustained impact of student feedback and teaching effectiveness on learning outcomes over an extended period.

6. References

1. Adarkwah MA. The power of assessment feedback in teaching and learning: A narrative review and synthesis of the literature. SN Social Sciences 2021;1(75).
2. Aithal PS, Aithal S. How to Empower Educators through Digital Pedagogies and Faculty Development Strategies. International Journal of Applied Engineering and Management Letters (IJAEML) 2024;7(4):139–183.
3. AITSL. Reframing feedback to improve teaching and learning. 2017. Available from: https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/research-evidence/spotlight/feedback.pdf?sfvrsn=cb2eec3c_14
4. Ajmal M, Basit I, Sadaf S. Evaluating the Role of Students' Feedback in Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness. Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences 2024.
5. Alexandraki I, Rosasco RE, Mooradian AD. An evaluation of faculty development programs for clinician–educators: A scoping review. Academic Medicine 2021;96(4):599–606. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003813
6. Anton JD, Sengottuvel NA, Kumar S. Perception of Students Toward Traditional Teaching and Online Teaching Methods During 2nd Year MBBS. Journal of Indian Academy of Forensic Medicine 2025;09710973251316361.
7. Bardach L, Klassen RM, Perry NE. Teachers' Psychological Characteristics: Do They Matter for Teacher Effectiveness, Teachers' Well-being, Retention, and Interpersonal Relations? Educational Psychology Review 2022;34(2):259–300. doi:10.1007/s10648-021-09609-7
8. Beran T, Violato C. Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness: Student Engagement and Course Characteristics. Canadian Journal of Higher Education 2009;39(1):1–13.
9. Berry B, Bastian KC, Darling-Hammond L, Kini T. The Importance of Teaching and Learning Conditions: Influences on Teacher Retention and School

Performance in North Carolina. Learning Policy Institute 2019. Available from: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org
10. Bettinger E, Loeb S, Taylor E. Measuring student learning outcomes: Challenges and opportunities. Educational Researcher 2023;52(1):45–57. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465432211000
11. Blömeke S, Jentsch A, Ross N, Kaiser G, König J. Opening up the black box: Teacher competence, instructional quality, and students' learning progress. Learning and Instruction 2022;79:101600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101600
12. Boud D, Dawson P. What feedback literate teachers do: An empirically-derived competency framework. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2021;48(2):158–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928
13. Bowman MA, Vongkulluksn VW, Jiang Z, Xie K. Teachers' exposure to professional development and the quality of their instructional technology use: The mediating role of teachers' value and ability beliefs. Journal of Research on Technology in Education 2020;54(2):188–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2020.1830895
14. Bragg LA, Walsh C, Heyeres M. Successful design and delivery of online professional development for teachers: A systematic review of the literature. Computers & Education 2021;166:104158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104158
15. Brew A, Lucas L. The changing role of research in higher education: Challenges and perspectives. Studies in Higher Education 2020;45(3):567–582. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1736547
16. Bryant BH, Anderson SR, Brissette M, Childs JM, Gratzinger D, Johnson K, *et al*. Leveraging faculty development to support validation of entrustable professional activities assessment tools in anatomic and clinical pathology training. Academic Pathology 2024;11(2):100111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acpath.2024.100111
17. Çaliskan A, Zhu C. Organizational Culture Barriers and Facilitators for Instructional Innovations at the Faculty of Education. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 2021;92:137–166.
18. Carless D, Boud D. The impact of feedback on student learning: A systematic review. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2021;46(4):654–671. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1895912
19. Carless D, Winstone N. Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. Teaching in Higher Education 2020;28(1):150–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372
20. Carlson ER, Britt LD. Mentorship in academic surgery: Revisiting the essence of faculty development. Journal of the American College of Surgeons 2025. doi:10.1097/XCS.0000000000001366
21. Chan CKY, Luo J. Exploring teacher perceptions of different types of 'feedback practices' in higher education: Implications for teacher feedback literacy. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2021;47(1):61–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888074
22. Chen X, Lu L. How classroom management and instructional clarity relate to students' academic emotions in Hong Kong and England: A multi-group analysis based on the control-value theory. Learning and Individual Differences 2022;98:102183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2022.102183
23. Cinches MFC, Russell RLV, Chavez JC, Ortiz RO. Student Engagement: Defining Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Engagement. Journal of Institutional Research in South East Asia 2017;15(1):5.
24. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. 5th ed. Sage Publications; 2021.
25. de Kleijn RAM. Supporting student and teacher feedback literacy: An instructional model for student feedback processes. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2021;48(2):186–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1967283
26. Demir EK. The role of social capital for teacher professional learning and student achievement: A systematic literature review. Educational Research Review 2021;33:100391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100391
27. Donaldson JP, Bowhay C, Dunlap K, Joseph M, Chowdhury M. Development of a Faculty Community of Practice for Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. In: *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference of the Learning Sciences-ICLS 2021*. International Society of the Learning Sciences; 2021.
28. Education and Science (IJRES) 2021;10(2):473–501. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.3404
29. Eradze M, White S, Urrutia ML, De Martino D, Tinterri A, Dipace A. Faculty development model to promote digital educational transformation. In: *Proceedings of Innovating Higher Education Conference 2022, 19-21 October 2022 Athens, Greece*; 2022.
30. Evaluation of the challenges and best practice. International Journal of Research in
31. Fan S, Yu Z, Zheng X, Gao C. Relationship between psychological adaptability and work engagement of college teachers within smart teaching environments: The mediating role of digital information literacy self-efficacy. Frontiers in Psychology 2023;14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1057158
32. Fernández-García CM, Rodríguez-Álvarez M, Viñuela-Hernández MP. University students and their perception of teaching effectiveness. Revista de Psicodidáctica 2021;26(1):62–69.
33. Fischer F, Kollar I, Stegmann K, Wecker C. The role of application in student learning outcomes. Instructional Science 2020;48(5):623–641. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-020-09522-4
34. Fleming M, House S, Duvall K. The impact of mentorship on faculty development and career progression. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management 2023;45(2):198–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2023.1936549
35. Ghosh R, Singh A. Faculty Category: Medical Education Technology. 2024.
36. Harbour KE, Evanovich LL, Sweigart CA, Hughes LE. A Brief Review of Effective Teaching Practices That Maximize Student Engagement. Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and

Youth 2014;58(1):5–13.
37. Hattie J, Zierer K. Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on student achievement. Routledge; 2020.
38. Hennessy S, D'Angelo S, McIntyre N, Koomar S, Kreimeia A, Cao L, *et al*. Technology Use for Teacher Professional Development in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A systematic review. Computers and Education Open 2022;3:100080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2022.100080
39. Holmes AGD, Polman Tuin M, Turner SL. Competence and competency in higher education, simple terms yet with complex meanings: Theoretical and practical issues for university teachers and assessors implementing Competency-Based Education (CBE). Educational Process: International Journal 2021;10(3):39–52. https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2021.103.3
40. Inda-Caro M, Maulana R, Fernández-García CM, Peña-Calvo JV, Rodríguez-Menéndez MC, Helms-Lorenz M. Validating a model of effective teaching behaviour and student engagement. Learning Environments Research 2019;22(2):229–251.
41. Káplár-Kodácsy K, Dorner H. Rebuilding faculty capacities in higher education: An alternative for relational mentoring. Innovations in Education and Teaching International 2020;59(3):359–369. doi:10.1080/14703297.2020.1850318
42. Khan A, Ud Din T, Ahmed I, Khan G, Ul Haq N. Faculty Perceptions Regarding a Newly Initiated Faculty Development Program in a Public Sector University: Success Stories and Challenges. ScienceOpen Preprints 2022.
43. Khedda H. Feedback in education: Definition, types, pros and cons. 2023. Available from: https://www.teacherkhedda.com/2023/01/what-is-feedback.html
44. Khozaei SA, Zare NV, Moneghi HK, Sadeghi T, Taraghdar MM. Effects of quantum-learning and conventional teaching methods on learning achievement. Smart Learning Environments 2022;9(18). doi:10.1186/s40561-022-00186-1
45. Kohan M, Changiz T, Yamani N. A systematic review of faculty development programs based on the Harden teacher's role framework model. BMC Medical Education 2023;23(910).
46. König J, Blömeke S, Jentsch A, Schlesinger L, Felske C, Musekamp F. The links between pedagogical competence, instructional quality, and mathematics achievement in the lower secondary classroom. Educational Studies in Mathematics 2021;107(2):189–212. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-021-10026-5
47. Lauermann F, ten Hagen I. Do teachers' perceived teaching competence and self-efficacy affect students' academic outcomes? Educational Psychologist 2021;56(4):265–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1991355
48. Leal T, Pinto J, Costa P. Competency-based learning in higher education: A systematic review. Higher Education Research & Development 2023;42(3):432–450. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2056789
49. Li M, Palaroan RM, Zhou Q, Lin P, Yu Y, Cui C. Examining Student-Perceived Attributes in Rating Professors: A Course Evaluation Approach. ACEID Official Conference Proceedings 2024.
50. Li Z, Lou X, Chen M, Li S, Lv C, Song S, Li L. Students' online learning adaptability and their continuous usage intention across different disciplines. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications 2023;10(838). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01582-0
51. Liu Y, Zhao L, Su YS. The impact of teacher competence in online teaching on perceived online learning outcomes during the COVID-19 outbreak. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2022;19(10):6282. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19106282
52. Lucas M, Bem-Haja P, Siddiq F, Moreira A, Redecker C. The relation between in-service teachers' digital competence and personal and contextual factors. Computers & Education 2021;160:104052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104052
53. Ma L, Liu J, Li B. The association between teacher-student relationship and academic achievement: The moderating effect of parental involvement. Psychology in the Schools 2021;58(10):1–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22608
54. Mallillin LLD. Teacher theory and adaptable model: An application to teaching profession. European Journal of Education Studies 2021;8(12).
55. Mallillin LLD. Teaching and learning intervention in the educational setting: Adapting the teacher theory model. International Journal of Educational Innovation and Research 2022;1(2):99–121. https://doi.org/10.31949/ijeir.v1i2.2493
56. Mandouit L. Using student feedback to improve teaching. Educational Action Research 2018;26:1–15. doi:10.1080/09650792.2018.1426470
57. Martin AJ, Nejad H, Colmar S, Liem G. Adaptability and its role in academic success: A meta-analytic review. Review of Educational Research 2020;90(1):1–33. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320909793
58. Marzano RJ. Robert J. Marzano. In: Wikipedia; 2023. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_J._Marzano
59. Mashan N, Chegenizadeh A. Learning, teaching and assessment in engineering education. 2021.
60. Mastrokoukou S, Kaliris A, Donche V, Chauliac M, Karagiannopoulou E, Christodoulides P. Rediscovering Teaching in University: A Scoping Review of Teacher Effectiveness in Higher Education. Frontiers in Education 2022;7:Article 861458. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.861458
61. Minor S, Berry A, Luhanga U, Chen W, Drowos J, Rudd M, *et al*. Faculty Development Advancements–Lessons Learned in a Time of Change. Medical Science Educator 2022;32:511–515.
62. Misky GJ, Sharpe B, Weaver AC, Niranjan-Azadi A, Gupta A, Rennke S, *et al*. Faculty Development in Academic Hospital Medicine: a Scoping Review. Journal of General Internal Medicine 2023;38:1955–1961.
63. Newsome AS, Ku PM, Murray B, Smith SE, Powell RM, Hawkins WA, *et al*. Kindling the fire: The power of mentorship. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy 2021;78(24):2271–2276.

doi:10.1093/ajhp/zxab295
64. Nguyen TD. Linking school organizational characteristics and teacher retention: Evidence from repeated cross-sectional national data. Teaching and Teacher Education. 2021;97:103220. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2020.103220
65. Park B, Cho J. How does grade inflation affect student evaluation of teaching? Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 2022;48(5):723–735. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2126429
66. Pedler M, Hudson S, Yeigh T. The Teachers' Role in Student Engagement: A Review. Australian Journal of Teacher Education 2020;45(3).
67. Petrenko M. Innovative pedagogy: Key to future teacher training excellence. Frontline Social Sciences and History Journal 2024;4(02):01–08.
68. Pitt E, Quinlan KM. Impacts of higher education assessment and feedback policy and practice on students: A review of the literature 2016-2021.
69. Răducu C-M, Stănculescu E. Adaptability to online teaching during Covid-19 pandemic: A multiple mediation analysis based on Kolb's theory. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2021;18(15):8032. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18158032
70. Romijn BR, Slot PL, Leseman PPM. Increasing teachers' intercultural competences in teacher preparation programs and through professional development: A review. Teaching and Teacher Education 2021;98:103236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103236
71. Sancar R, Atal D, Deryakulu D. A new framework for teachers' professional development. Teaching and Teacher Education 2021;101:103305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103305
72. Satish RB. Assessing Awareness & Perceptions of Fresher Medical Students Before and After An Interactive Educational Session on Vaccination–A Cross-Sectional Study. 2023.
73. Steinemann S, Korndorffer J, Dent D, Rucinski J, Newman RW, Blair P, *et al*. Defining the need for faculty development in assessment. The American Journal of Surgery 2021;222(4):679–684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2021.06.010
74. Stephenson CR, Bonnes SL, Sawatsky AP, Richards LW, Schleck CD, Mandrekar JN, *et al*. The relationship between learner engagement and teaching effectiveness: A novel assessment of student engagement in continuing medical education. BMC Medical Education 2020;20:403.
75. Tao Y, Meng Y, Gao Z, Yang X. Perceived teacher support, student engagement, and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology 2022;42(4):401–420. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2022.2033168
76. Tinto V. Student retention and success in higher education. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice 2021;22(4):567–589. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025120986543
77. Tran Y. Equity into action: Examining the role of a mentorship program for Faculty of Color. The Journal of Faculty Development 2022;36(1):59–70.
78. Van den Borre L, Spruyt B, Van Droogenbroeck F. Early career teacher retention intention: Individual, school, and country characteristics. Teaching and Teacher Education. 2021;105:103427. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2021.103427
79. Van Schalkwyk S, Amaral E, Anakin M, Chen R, Dolmans D, Findyartini A. Disentangling faculty development: A scoping review towards a rich description of the concept and its practice. Medical Teacher 2024. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2024.2429612
80. Williams A. Delivering effective student feedback in higher education: An evaluation of the challenges and best practice. International Journal of Research in
81. Williams JS, Walker RJ, Burgess KM, Shay LA, Schmidt S, Tsevat J, *et al*. Mentoring strategies to support diversity in research-focused junior faculty: A scoping review. Journal of Clinical and Translational Science 2022;7(1). doi:10.1017/cts.2022.305
82. Yagan SA. The relationships between instructional clarity, classroom management and mathematics achievement: Mediator role of attitudes towards mathematics. In: James WB, Cobanoglu C, Cavusoglu M, editors. Advances in Global Education and Research. Vol. 4. USF M3 Publishing; 2021. p. 1–11. https://doi.org/10.5038/9781955833042
83. Yang X, Kaiser G. The impact of mathematics teachers' professional competence on instructional quality and students' mathematics learning outcomes. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences 2022;48:101225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2022.101225
84. Zada M, Khan J, Saeed I, Zada S, Jun ZY. Linking public leadership with project management effectiveness: Mediating role of goal clarity and moderating role of top management support. Heliyon 2023;9(5):e15543.
85. Zalsos E, Corpuz GG. Academic management and instructional practices of higher education institutions in Lanao del Norte: Basis for faculty development plan. American Journal of Arts and Human Science 2024;3(2). https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i2.2649
86. Zemliansky P. Faculty development training in online instruction at a Norwegian university: An experience report. IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication 2021;64(1).
87. Zhang X, Admiraal W, Saab N. Teachers' motivation to participate in continuous professional development: Relationship with factors at the personal and school level. Journal of Education for Teaching 2021;47(5):714–731. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2021.1942804
88. Zheng J. A Functional Review of Research on Clarity, Immediacy, and Credibility of Teachers and Their Impacts on Motivation and Engagement of Students. Frontiers in Psychology 2021;12:Article 712419. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.712419