

Organizational, Teacher, and Administrative Determinants of Quality Improvement Implementation during COVID-19 Pandemic: Insights from a Higher Education Institution in Iligan City, Philippines

Royce Torres, Mark Alipio *, Rogel Equirne Sudaria

Iligan Medical Center College, Iligan City, Lanao del Norte, Philippines;
royce.torres@imcc.edu.ph (R.T.); rogel.sudaria@imcc.edu.ph (R.E.S.)

* Correspondence: mark.alipio@imcc.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic has challenged higher education institutions worldwide to deliver quality education. To remain buoyant during times of significant change, higher education institutions and school leaders have become more interested in knowing what factors influence the implementation of continuous quality improvement in the lens of students. Therefore, this study was conducted to explore the significant determinants of quality improvement implementation in one higher education institution in Iligan City, Philippines, based on organizational, teacher, and administrative factors. A cross-sectional, online survey of 386 students was conducted to assess the relationship between quality improvement implementation and organizational, teacher, and administrative factors. Results indicate that collaborative time to discuss curriculum, rigorous and consistent curriculum, assessment of data to monitor progress, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, and the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, significantly predicted quality improvement implementation. These findings highlight the importance of organizational, teacher, and administrative factors in fostering quality improvement implementation in higher education institution.

KEYWORDS: administration; COVID-19; organization; quality; teacher

ARTICLE INFO: Received: 10 October 2021; Accepted: 7 November 2021; Volume: 01; Issue: Special; Type: Original Article

1. Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has caused most higher education institutions (HEIs) worldwide to precipitously close in late March 2020 to avoid its transmission [1]. Because of this closure, flexible learning approaches have been adopted, instruction delivery to students has been greatly reshaped, and school management and governance have been impacted [2]. With the abrupt transition, HEIs were challenged to remain afloat by continuously implementing quality improvement measures in the aspect of leadership, quality planning involvement of teachers and

students, and student satisfaction [3]. Consequently, HEIs were confronted with considerable challenges in maintaining quality during the times of change.

Within the COVID-19 educational landscape, school leadership practices have changed substantially [1]. For school leaders working in these demanding and chaotic circumstances, the pressure was relentless, the options were limited, and the sleepless nights were frequent [4]. School leaders were caught in the unfavorable position of being the pinch point in the system. They were reliant on guidance about COVID-19 responses, processes, procedures, and protocols from above. These can change, almost overnight, depending on how the virus develops. Simultaneously, school leaders were dealing with fluid and changing staffing situations [5]. The social distancing of staff and students means extra work and extra pressure on those staff who can return to work. Every expectation either from above or below asked more of school leaders professionally and personally. By now, it is evident that the global pandemic has created an unprecedented challenge for school leaders and illustrated the deficiencies of the educational systems and the lack of administrator preparation regarding crisis leadership [4].

Given the restrictions in conducting face-to-face meetings, the involvement of teachers and students in continuous quality planning has been immensely hampered. Although remote meetings can be done through online platforms, several teachers and students in the far-flung areas cannot participate due to poor Internet connection and lack of access to information technology devices such as computer and mobile phones [6,7]. The knowledge and know-how of teachers and students to discover, implement, and spread evidence-based changes may be limited due to low level of engagement [8]. Therefore, school leaders may not capture the whole picture in creating quality-promoting policies and strategies. As a result, the continuous quality approach to improve processes and systems during COVID-19 may not produce positive outcomes for both teachers and students [6].

Another source of concern during COVID-19 was the low satisfaction of students towards the school administration, teachers, and teaching-learning strategies [9]. As a result, students decided to drop out of school and were reluctant to continue [10]. Studies showed that during COVID-19, dropout rates in HEIs have been increasing while retention rates were decreasing, especially in less economically developed countries, such as the Philippines [11,12]. Existing evidence indicated that COVID-19 has led to a large number of students delaying graduation, withdrawing from classes, and intending to change majors [13]. Moreover, nearly one-half separately reported a decrease in study hours and academic performance [13]. In the mentioned outcomes, student satisfaction is a key factor and one important indicator in the quality of education [14].

Considering the challenges faced by HEIs to implement quality improvement measures during COVID-19, several studies have been conducted to explore the factors influencing quality improvement implementation [15-17]. In the pre-pandemic period, school level support, interdisciplinary teaching and learning teams, rigorous and relevant curriculum, inclusive programs and practices, and program involvement have influenced the implementation of quality improvement measures in HEIs [18-21]. Teacher factors such as their ability to plan and design classroom instruction, to create

a supportive learning environment, and to deliver accurate and clear instruction, and their enthusiasm to continually grow and strive to learn new information also contributed to the attainment of quality education [22-26]. Prior research showed that school facilities, teachers' motivation, school financial resources, and teaching and learning resources were strongly associated with quality improvement implementation [26-28]. Despite the handful of studies on the factors affecting quality improvement implementation, there is a scarcity of studies investigating the mechanisms of interaction among the variables in the context of COVID-19. Hence, the extension of the existing research is needed.

COVID-19 has become a global health crisis, affecting billions of learners worldwide. Among this number are millions of Filipino higher education students who were enrolled to continue education despite the physical closure of educational institutions. Responding to the needs of the students, the Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) implemented proactive policies to fulfil the HEIs' three-pronged tasks of education, research, and service, while preventing, controlling, and mitigating the spread of COVID-19. Accordingly, HEIs attempted to concretize the government's stance to continue learning despite the pandemic by pivoting to modified forms of learning and ensuring that educational quality improvement measures are still enforced. As quality improvement implementation reflects the effectiveness of HEIs in delivering service to students [29,30], it has become very important to understand how factors related to organization, teacher, and administration impact the quality improvement implementation, especially during the pandemic when the education around the world has moved to flexible learning. However, the literature is not exhaustive on how these factors impacted quality improvement implementation during the pandemic. It is particularly scarce in the context of developing countries, as in the case with Philippines. Thus, the current study offers some new insights on HEIs by investigating the mechanism behind the relationship between organizational, teacher, and administration factors and quality improvement implementation from students' perspectives during the pandemic. Ultimately, the study holds significance in opening a new perspective for school leaders, teachers, and policymakers on how to effectively plan for the implementation of quality improvement in any situation in the future.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Design

This study utilized a cross-sectional, online survey-based research design to investigate the relationship between organizational, teacher, and administration factors and quality improvement implementation among students in a higher education institution (HEI) in Iligan City, Philippines. The HEI is a government-recognized private institution in Iligan City, Philippines. It has nine colleges: College of Nursing and Midwifery, College of Medical Technology, College of Radiologic Technology, College of Criminology, College of Hospitality and Tourism Management, College of Education, College of Computer Studies, College of Business Administration, and College of Arts and Sciences.

2.2 Participants

An online survey was conducted among students from August to September 2021 using Google Form platform. The Google Form link was shared to the students through various social-networking sites such as Facebook and Messenger. Students were selected to participate using the following inclusion criteria: (1) students should be officially enrolled, (2) students should have at least one year of experience in attending classes during the COVID-19 pandemic in the HEI under study, (3) students should be taking undergraduate programs, and (4) students should agree to participate in the study by electronically signing the informed consent. Of the 2,221 currently enrolled students in the HEI under study, only 1,078 have fulfilled the inclusion criteria. Using the convenient sampling technique, the questionnaires were distributed through online means and a sample of 386 usable responses was obtained from students under different undergraduate programs, resulting in an overall response rate of 35.8%. The sample of this study consisted of 132 males (34.2%) and 254 females (65.8%) with a mean age of 20.24 years ($SD=3.22$). Participants were from various undergraduate programs including Nursing, Medical Technology, Radiologic Technology, Social Work, Criminology, and Education.

2.3 Research Instrument

In order to determine the organizational, teacher, and administrative factors influencing the quality improvement implementation of the HEI under study, a survey questionnaire was used. The organizational and teacher factors were measured by adapting the 33 item-scale developed by VandeWiele [21]. For the purpose of this study, minor modifications were made to the questionnaire. The participants were asked about the impact of each item in the questionnaire on their transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. They responded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (no impact) to 5 (significant impact).

Administrative factors were assessed by adapting the questionnaire developed by Asiago [27]. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: Part I sought to determine the participants' assessment on the school's financial resources, Part II determined the motivation of teachers, and Part III assessed the teaching and learning resources offered by the school. To fit with the context of the study, minor modifications were made to the tool. For instance, several items were added in Part III based on the CHED-suggested components of the various flexible learning modalities, that are outlined in CHED Memorandum Order No. 04, series of 2020. The participants were asked about the extent to which the item was applied in the school during the COVID-19 pandemic. They were asked to respond on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very large extent).

Questions were developed to determine the level of quality improvement implementation using research collected in the review of literature. Construction of each question was carefully considered to eliminate jargon, unclear questions, or overly technical language. The questionnaire sought to assess the quality improvement implementation of the HEI under study in terms of school leadership, students' quality planning involvement, and students' satisfaction as perceived by the students. The 27-

item questionnaire was rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

An expert review panel, consisting of five individuals, was asked to review the survey to establish content validity. Participants were asked about clarity and readability and asked to provide written comments on the issues table included in the expert review packet. A pilot survey was conducted to 30 students to determine face validity and logical ordering of the items. This process was also used to determine if any items had been overrepresented or omitted in the data collection process. Changes were made to the survey based on the expert panel review and the pilot survey. In addition, the pilot survey process was conducted to determine the instrument reliability of the survey. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to estimate the consistency of scores in the instrument. Cronbach alpha score of 0.7 and above was considered high to declare that the research instrument is reliable. Results indicated a Cronbach alpha of 0.85; therefore, the instrument was considered reliable. Final approval for use of the survey with human subjects was obtained through the Institutional Review Board of the HEI under study.

2.4 Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 21 software. Descriptive and inferential statistical tools were used to analyze the variables. Descriptive statistical tools used include mean (M) and standard deviation (SD). Descriptive statistical tools were utilized to describe organization, teacher, and administrative factors, and quality improvement implementation among students. Inferential statistical tools used include Pearson r-correlation and simple and linear regression. All independent variables explored in the simple linear regression analysis were taken forward into the multiple linear regression analysis. Simple linear regression estimated unadjusted coefficients that were used to determine the strength of influence of each independent variable to quality improvement implementation. Adjusted coefficients were estimated from multiple linear regression analysis. These coefficients described the strength of association between each independent variable and quality improvement implementation after adding all independent variables to the multiple linear regression model. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered significant.

3. Results and Discussion

The descriptive statistics of organizational factors, correlation, and simple linear regression with quality improvement implementation is shown in Table 1. The least impact of the organizational factors contributing to student's transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic was reported in upperclassmen mentors, while the highest degree of impact was reported in freshman orientation. Collaborative time to discuss curriculum and close monitoring of student progress were the second and third highest ranking items. Both had high to significant impact on student's transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Remediation for struggling students and organization to academies were the second and third lowest

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of organizational factors, correlation, and simple linear regression with quality improvement implementation.

Variables/Items	M	SD	r	β
Quality improvement implementation	3.90	0.98	-	-
Organization to academies	3.12	1.25	0.15	0.02
Heterogeneous grouping	4.02	0.69	0.74**	0.55*
Collaborative time to discuss curriculum	4.28	1.07	0.93**	0.86**
Collaborative time to discuss students	4.10	0.23	0.15	0.02
Inclusive programs	4.07	0.92	0.21	0.04
Tutorials conducted within the day	3.36	0.98	0.20	0.04
Tutorials conducted outside the day	3.54	0.47	0.49*	0.24
Upperclassmen mentors	3.09	0.76	0.66**	0.44*
Remediation for struggling students	3.10	0.97	0.26	0.07
Flexible schedules	3.13	0.56	0.29*	0.08
Freshman orientation	4.38	1.29	0.42*	0.18
Counselor involvement	4.10	0.31	0.31*	0.10
Monitoring of emotional needs	3.42	0.95	0.53**	0.28*
Reduction in class size	3.93	0.76	0.38*	0.14
Close monitoring of student progress	4.25	0.32	0.26*	0.07
Homeroom or advisory	3.47	0.16	0.54**	0.29*
Adult advocate	3.85	0.15	0.42*	0.18
Data folders	3.99	0.58	0.07	0.00

Note: *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

ranking items. Both had moderate to high impact on student’s transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Standard deviation provides information regarding the average spread of scores in the distribution. Highest standard deviation was reported in freshmen orientation while lowest standard deviation was reported for adult advocate. The small standard deviation indicates a high level of agreement among students regarding adult advocate and less agreement regarding freshmen orientation programs.

Results of correlation analysis revealed that heterogeneous grouping, collaborative time to discuss curriculum, upperclassmen mentors, monitoring of emotional needs, tutorials conducted outside the day, flexible schedules, freshman orientation, counselor involvement, monitoring of emotional needs, reduction in class size, close monitoring of student progress, homeroom or advisory, and adult advocate were significantly related to quality improvement implementation. However, no significant relationship was reported between quality improvement implementation and organization to academies, collaborative time to discuss students, inclusive programs, tutorials conducted within the day, remediation for struggling students, and data folders.

Simple linear regression analysis reported that heterogeneous grouping, collaborative time to discuss curriculum, upperclassmen mentors, monitoring of emotional needs, and homeroom or advisory significantly predicted quality

improvement implementation. For every one-unit increase in heterogeneous grouping, collaborative time to discuss curriculum, upperclassmen mentors, monitoring of emotional needs and homeroom or advisory, quality improvement implementation increases by 0.55, 0.86, 0.44, 0.28, and 0.29, respectively. As perceived by students, the practice of heterogeneous grouping, upperclassmen mentoring, emotional need monitoring, and homeroom or advisory, increased implementation of quality improvement in school. In addition, as the collaborative time to discuss curriculum increases, quality improvement implementation also increases. Based on their coefficients, the organizational factor which contributed the greatest impact on quality improvement implementation was collaborative time to discuss curriculum, followed by heterogeneous grouping, upperclassmen mentors, homeroom or advisory, and monitoring of emotional needs.

The descriptive statistics of teacher factors, correlation, and simple linear regression with quality improvement implementation is shown in Table 2. The highest impact contributing to student's transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic was teacher's personal learning goals. Second and third highest ratings were doing whatever it takes and motivating students. Both had high to significant impact on student's transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Consistent discipline policies and celebrating student success were reported as having the least impact on student's transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Both had moderate to high impact on student's transition to flexible learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Highest standard deviation was reported in the belief that all students can learn while lowest standard deviation was reported for rigorous and consistent curriculum. The small standard deviation indicates a high level of agreement among students regarding rigorous and consistent curriculum and less agreement regarding the teachers' belief that all students can learn.

Results of correlation analysis revealed that teacher collaboration, personal learning goals, high expectations, rigorous and consistent curriculum, belief that all students can learn, celebrating student success, doing whatever it takes, motivating students, assessing data to monitor progress, and experienced staff were significantly related to quality improvement implementation. However, no significant relationship was reported between quality improvement implementation and parental contacts with teachers, individualized instructional strategies, consistent discipline policies, positive relationships, and active student engagement.

Simple linear regression analysis reported that teacher collaboration, personal learning goals, high expectations, rigorous and consistent curriculum, doing whatever it takes, and assessing data to monitor progress significantly predicted quality improvement implementation. For every one-unit increase in teacher collaboration, personal learning goals, high expectations, rigorous and consistent curriculum, doing whatever it takes, and assessing data to monitor progress, quality improvement implementation increases by 0.56, 0.53, 0.30, 0.92, 0.38, and 0.64, respectively. As perceived by students, when teachers are collaborating with the students during the class, have established personal learning goals, have high expectations, implement rigorous and consistent curriculum, do whatever it takes, and continuously assess data

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of teacher factors, correlation, and simple linear regression with quality improvement implementation.

Variables/Items	M	SD	r	β
Quality improvement implementation	3.90	0.98	-	-
Teacher collaboration	4.10	0.54	0.75**	0.56**
Personal learning goals	4.32	0.94	0.73**	0.53**
Parental contacts	3.37	0.33	0.03	0.00
Individualized instructional strategies	3.98	0.75	0.06	0.00
Consistent discipline policies	3.23	0.41	0.18	0.03
High expectations	4.12	0.31	0.55**	0.30*
Rigorous and consistent curriculum	3.34	0.14	0.96**	0.92**
Positive relationships	3.82	1.25	0.03	0.00
Belief that all students can learn	4.10	1.26	0.34*	0.12
Celebrate student success	3.18	0.31	0.51**	0.26
Do whatever it takes	4.25	0.71	0.62**	0.38*
Motivate students	4.21	0.99	0.42*	0.18
Assess data to monitor progress	3.55	0.39	0.80**	0.64**
Active student engagement	3.91	0.22	0.11	0.01
Experienced staff	3.87	0.25	0.31*	0.10

Note: *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

to monitor students’ progress, quality improvement implementation increases. Based on their coefficients, the teacher factor which contributed the greatest impact on quality improvement implementation was their implementation of rigorous and consistent curriculum, followed by assessment of data to monitor progress, teacher collaboration, personal learning goals, doing whatever it takes, and having high expectations.

The descriptive statistics of administrative factors, correlation, and simple linear regression with quality improvement implementation is shown in Table 3. The use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, was the administrative factor that scored the highest. The students believed that the school administration applied various flexible learning technology tools during the COVID-19 pandemic to a large extent. Adequacy of the government grants received by the school was the administrative factor that scored the lowest. The students believed that the school received grants from the government to a moderate extent. Awarding of high performing teachers by the school and sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars were the second and third highest ranking items. The students believed that the school administration conducted an awarding of high performing teachers to a large extent. They also believed that the school administration sponsored teachers for INSET seminars to a large extent. Adequate funds from various income-generating activities and teachers are held with high status were the second and third lowest ranking items. This means that the students believed that the school received funds from various income-generating activities to a moderate extent. They also observed that teachers were held with high status by the school to a moderate extent. Highest standard deviation was reported in the adequacy of payment system while lowest standard

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of administrative factors, correlation, and simple linear regression with quality improvement implementation.

Variables/Items	M	SD	r	β
Quality improvement implementation	3.90	0.98	-	-
Adequate government grants received by the school	3.00	0.68	0.16	0.03
Adequate funds from various income-generating activities	3.14	0.62	0.27	0.07
Adequate budgetary support from alumni contribution received by school	3.69	0.47	0.07	0.00
Adequate parents' contributions	3.98	1.00	0.69**	0.48*
Support from financial sponsor	3.62	0.95	0.12	0.01
Donations from other well wishes	3.25	0.98	0.21	0.04
Recognition of teachers' role	3.98	0.68	0.37*	0.14
Teachers are held with high status	3.13	0.87	0.14	0.02
Awarding of high performing teachers by the school	4.13	1.19	0.66**	0.44*
Sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars	4.02	0.67	0.88**	0.77**
Supporting teachers for social welfare initiatives	3.76	1.06	0.64**	0.41*
Use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS	4.29	0.96	0.80**	0.64**
Adequate library support services	3.22	0.97	0.23	0.05
Adequate guidance and counselling support services	3.52	1.16	0.55**	0.30*
Adequate health and psychological support services	3.91	0.10	0.14	0.02
Adequate enrollment services	3.42	0.18	0.58**	0.34*
Adequate assessment and grade services	3.22	0.76	0.58**	0.34*
Adequate payment system	3.27	1.25	0.24	0.06

Note: *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

deviation was reported for the adequacy of health and psychological support services. The small standard deviation indicates a high level of agreement among students regarding the adequacy of health and psychological support services and less agreement regarding the adequacy of payment system.

Results of correlation analysis revealed that adequacy of parents' contributions, recognition of teachers' role, awarding of high performing teachers by the school, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, supporting teachers for social welfare initiatives, the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, adequacy of guidance and counselling support services, adequacy of enrollment services, and adequacy of assessment and grade services, were significantly related to quality improvement implementation. However, no significant relationship was reported between quality improvement implementation and adequacy of government grants received by the school, adequacy of funds from various income-

generating activities, adequacy of budgetary support from alumni contribution received by school, support from financial sponsor, donations from other well wishes, acknowledging teachers with high status, adequacy of health and psychological support services, and adequacy of payment system.

Simple linear regression analysis reported that adequacy of parents' contributions, awarding of high performing teachers by the school, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, supporting teachers for social welfare initiatives, the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, adequacy of guidance and counselling support services, adequacy of enrollment services, and adequacy of assessment and grade services, significantly predicted quality improvement implementation. For every one-unit increase in adequacy of parents' contributions, awarding of high performing teachers by the school, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, supporting teachers for social welfare initiatives, the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, adequacy of guidance and counselling support services, adequacy of enrollment services, and adequacy of assessment and grade services, quality improvement implementation increases by 0.48, 0.44, 0.77, 0.41, 0.64, 0.30, 0.34, and 0.34, respectively. As perceived by students, when parents' contributions, guidance and counselling support services, enrollment services, and assessment and grade services are adequate, quality improvement measures are highly implemented in school. In addition, practices such as awarding of high performing teachers by the school, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, supporting teachers for social welfare initiatives will increase the quality improvement implementation. Finally, the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, would increase the implementation of quality improvement measures. Based on their coefficients, the administrative factor which contributed the greatest impact on quality improvement implementation was sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, followed by the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules and adequacy of parents' contributions.

Multiple linear regression results were shown in Table 4. When all of the organizational, teacher, and administrative factors were taken into consideration in the multiple linear regression analysis, only collaborative time to discuss curriculum, rigorous and consistent curriculum, assessment of data to monitor progress, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, and the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, significantly predicted quality improvement implementation. For every one-unit increase in collaborative time to discuss curriculum, rigorous and consistent curriculum, assessment of data to monitor progress, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, and the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, quality improvement implementation increases by 0.76, 1.48, 0.19, 0.33, and 0.21, respectively. The results indicate that the higher the collaborative time is provided to discuss the curriculum, the higher also is the quality improvement implementation in the school community. In addition, when the organization applies rigorous and consistent curriculum, the school is implementing quality improvement measures. Continuous assessment of data to monitor students' progress is the only teacher factor that yielded a significant result.

Table 4. Multiple linear regression predicting quality improvement implementation.

Significant Variables/Items	B
Collaborative time to discuss curriculum	0.76**
Rigorous and consistent curriculum	1.48**
Assess data to monitor progress	0.19*
Sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars	0.33*
Use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS	0.21*

Note: R-square=0.423; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

The result indicates that in order to continuously implement quality improvement in the school, students’ data should always be assessed by the teachers to monitor progress of the students. Administrative factors such as sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars and the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, have significantly influenced implement quality improvement implementation. The findings implied that when teachers are continuously sponsored by the school for INSET seminars, quality improvement implementation will increase. The use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, would increase the implementation of quality improvement measures. Based on their coefficients, the factor which contributed the greatest impact on quality improvement implementation was implementation of rigorous and consistent curriculum, followed by collaborative time to discuss curriculum and sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars.

The R-square value of 0.423 indicated that collaborative time to discuss curriculum, rigorous and consistent curriculum, assessment of data to monitor progress, sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars, and the use of flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, explained 42.3% of the variability in the quality improvement implementation, leaving 57.7% unaccounted.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The present study concludes that quality improvement implementation in the HEI under study during the COVID-19 pandemic can be predicted by organizational, teacher, and administrative factors based on the students’ perception. In the school organization, the creation of rigorous and consistent curriculum and provision of increased collaborative time to discuss curriculum among school leaders, teachers, and students, would strengthen the implementation of continuous quality improvement. Teachers can be a key factor in increasing the culture of quality improvement implementation in the school by assessing continuously students’ data to monitor progress. The school leaders can help in enhancing quality improvement implementation by sponsoring teachers for INSET seminars and using flexible learning

technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, in the delivery of instruction to students.

To foster quality improvement implementation, the following recommendations are created:

- In the school organization level, the curriculum of the offered programs by the HEI under study should be revisited and executed rigorously and consistently. Continuous efforts to revise, update, improve, and make available new and more diverse curricular materials should be made by the school leaders, teachers, and students. The scientific, industrial, and scholarly societies should be tapped to further enhance the curriculum.
- Teachers should always use students' data to help identify students who are at risk academically and adjust instructional strategies to better meet the students' needs. Teachers should always be reminded that student progress monitoring is a very important tool to continually evaluate the effectiveness of teaching and make more informed instructional decisions.
- School leaders should provide continuous support to teachers for INSET seminars by funding interested participants. Reward mechanisms may be created to increase the number attendees for the said seminars. School leaders may also conduct school organization level INSET seminars to provide an avenue to propose relevant and realistic innovations for quality learning outcomes in the different disciplines.
- School leaders should continuously utilize flexible learning technology such as printed modules, learning packets, and LMS, and create trainings to teachers and students who are the end-users of the learning technology. The school leaders may innovate more effective flexible learning tools and invest in teachers' capability training and acquisition of new and evolving educational technologies.

Acknowledgment

Gratitude is directed to the two anonymous reviewers for the valuable suggestions that greatly improved this manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions: All authors contributed equally. They have approved the final version of this manuscript.

References

1. Burki, T.K. COVID-19: Consequences for higher education. *Lancet Oncol* 2020, 21, 758.
2. Beauchamp, G.; Hulme, M.; Clarke, L.; Hamilton, L.; Harvey, J.A. 'People miss people': A study of school leadership and management in the four nations of the

- United Kingdom in the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Educ Manag Adm Lea* **2021**, *49*, 375-392.
3. Iyengar, R. Education as the path to a sustainable recovery from COVID-19. *Prospects* **2020**, *49*,77-80.
 4. Harris, A.; Jones, M. COVID 19–school leadership in disruptive times. *Sch Leadersh Manag* **2020** 243-247.
 5. McLeod, S.; Dulsky, S. Resilience, Reorientation, and Reinvention: School Leadership During the Early Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Front Educ* **2021**, *6*, 70.
 6. Gandolfi, A. Planning of school teaching during Covid-19. *Physica D* **2021**, *415*.
 7. Karalis, T. Planning and evaluation during educational disruption: Lessons learned from Covid-19 pandemic for treatment of emergencies in education. *Eur J Educ* **2020**.
 8. Thomas, M.A.; Norgaard, M.; Stambaugh, L.A.; Atkins, R.L.; Kumar, A.B.; Farley, A.L. Online Involvement for Georgia Student Teachers During Covid-19. *Front Psychol* **2021**, *12*.
 9. Yekefallah, L.; Namdar, P.; Panahi, R.; Dehghankar, L. Factors related to students' satisfaction with holding e-learning during the Covid-19 pandemic based on the dimensions of e-learning. *Heliyon* **2021**, *7*.
 10. Prenkaj, B.; Stilo, G.; Madeddu, L. Challenges and solutions to the student dropout prediction problem in online courses. In Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management; 2020; 3513-3514.
 11. Almendingen, K.; Morseth, M.S.; Gjølstad, E.; Brevik, A.; Tørris, C. Student's experiences with online teaching following COVID-19 lockdown: A mixed methods explorative study. *PLoS One* **2021**, *16*.
 12. Shuja, A.; Ali, P.; Khan, S.; Burki, S.B.; Buki, S.B. Factors Affecting Students' Dropout Rate During COVID-19. *SAGE Open* **2021**.
 13. Aucejo, E.M.; French, J.; Araya, M. P.; Zafar, B. The impact of COVID-19 on student experiences and expectations: Evidence from a survey. *J Public Econ* **2020**,*191*.
 14. Poortavakoli, A.; Alinejad, M.; Daneshmand, B. Designing a pattern for e-content development based on the factors affecting satisfaction in e-learning. *J. Educ. Technol.* **2020**, *15*, 119-138.
 15. Okyere Boadu, R.; Adzakupah, G.; Agyei-Baffour, P. The Role of Quality Improvement Process in Improving the Culture of Information among Health Staff in Ghana. *Adv. public health* **2019**.
 16. Simamora, R.H.; Fathi, A. The Influence of Training Handover based SBAR Communication for Improving Patients Safety. *Indian J Public Health Res Dev* **2019**, *10*.
 17. Wells, S.; Tamir, O.; Gray, J.; Naidoo, D.; Bekhit, M.; Goldmann, D. Are quality improvement collaboratives effective? A systematic review. *BMJ Qual Saf* **2018**, *27*, 226-240.

18. Leontev, M. Impact of organizational culture, satisfaction of employees and students on the quality of education in University of Civil Engineering. *MATEC Web Conf* **2017**,106, 9005.
19. Nugroho, Y.A.; Putra, F.; Novitasari, D.; Asbari, M.; Purwanto, A. Developing Innovation Capability: Between Individual and Organizational Factors. *Int j of soc sci manag* **2020**, 1, 74-88.
20. Stoel, M.D.; Havelka, D. Information technology audit quality: an investigation of the impact of individual and organizational factors. *J Inf Syst* **2021**, 35, 135-154.
21. VandeWiele, T.S. Organizational, teacher, and administrative factors that impact ninth grade attendance, discipline, and student achievement. *West Ill Reg Stud* **2008**.
22. Abuom, P.O.; Gudo, C.O.; Nyatuka, B.O. Teacher factors in the management of early childhood development and education for quality education in Kenya. *Int J Educ Res* **2018** 6, 482.
23. Iwu, C.G.; Ezeudujii, I.O.; Iwu, I.C.; Ikebuaku, K.; Tengeh, R.K. Achieving quality education by understanding teacher job satisfaction determinants. *Soc Sci Stud J* **2018**, 7, 25.
24. Strøm, B.; Falch, T. The role of teacher quality in education production. *Econ* **2020**, 307-319.
25. Tatto, M.T. The role of research in the policy and practice of quality teacher education: An international review. *Oxf Rev Educ* **2015**, 41, 171-201.
26. Suvannachai, Y. Administrative factors affecting educational quality assurance in Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University. *ThaiJo* **2015**, 15, 66-73.
27. Asiago, D. Administrative factors influencing quality of education in public secondary schools in Kitui, Kisii and Nairobi counties, Kenya. Doctoral, University of Nairobi, 2018.
28. Ndambuki, B.K. Administrative factors influencing the implementation of free secondary school education in public secondary schools in Makindu sub-county, Makueni County, Kenya. Doctoral, 2016.
29. Harris, A.; Adams, D.; Jones, M.; Muniandy, V. System effectiveness and improvement: the importance of theory and context. *Sch Eff Sch Improv* **2015**, 26,1-3.
30. Valiandes, S. Evaluating the impact of differentiated instruction on literacy and reading in mixed ability classrooms: Quality and equity dimensions of education effectiveness. *Stud. Educ. Evaluation* **2015**, 45, 17-26.

Publisher's Note: IMCC stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright of this article belongs to the journal and the Iligan Medical Center College. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).