

Professional Competencies, Technical And Pedagogical Readiness For The New Normal Of Faculty Members In The University Of Eastern Philippines

Analyn M. Banagbanag ¹, Rogelio A. Banagbanag ²

¹Faculty, College of Business Administration,
University of Eastern Philippines
analynbanagbanag@gmail.com

²Faculty, College of Arts and Communication,
University of Eastern Philippines

Abstract

The educational system has undergone numerous changes due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Teachers were caught unprepared to face this big challenge. This study was conducted among the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines utilizing the descriptive-correlational design. There were 85 faculty-respondents participated in the survey using the online format and six (6) using the traditional survey questionnaire. Results revealed that the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines had a high degree of professional competence. They had a high level of technological and pedagogical readiness. The profile of the respondents like age, sex, highest degree earned, the campus where they are teaching at present, academic rank, number of year in service had no significant relationship with the dependent variables of professional competence, technological readiness and pedagogical readiness. Professional competence was found to have significant relationship with the respondents' technological readiness and pedagogical readiness. The respondents' technological readiness was found to have significant relationship with their pedagogical readiness.

Keywords: professional competencies, technical readiness, pedagogical readiness, new normal.

Introduction

The pandemic caused by COVID-19 has done a drastic change in the educational landscape. It caught everyone unprepared for the challenges

of what was thought to be the thing of the future. This disruption presents an opportunity to imagine a different future for the teachers and the students of the 21st century.

Due to the pandemic, the emergence of the new normal brings forth a new era of online education, leading to a gradual transition of faculty members and students from conventional classrooms to the realm of cyber-learning. The burden falls heavily on faculty members, who now not only need expertise in their respective subjects but must also possess competencies in both pedagogy and technology.

A competency refers to the knowledge, skill, or ability that empowers an individual to effectively carry out the tasks associated with a specific occupation or role, meeting the expected standards of employment (Richey, Fields, & Foxon, 2001, p. 26). Online researchers have explored competencies related to online technologies (Guasch, Alvarez, & Espasa, 2010). In the study conducted by Berge (1995), successful online teaching was examined, and four categories of competency were identified: pedagogical, social, managerial, and technical. Williams (2003) outlines four broad categories that encompass faculty competencies in higher education: learning and instruction, communication and interaction, management and administration, and technology.

Teachers in the "new normal" are expected to possess the necessary competencies to effectively tackle the challenges of the 21st-century learning environment. These competencies encompass the skills and knowledge that enable teachers to achieve success. To ensure maximum student learning, teachers must be well-versed in a diverse range of competencies within a complex environment where numerous critical decisions are made daily (Jackson, 1990). Consequently, online teaching and learning have become essential not just as a trend but as a requirement in nearly all schools nationwide. The shift from traditional to online teaching necessitates thorough preparation for faculty members to adapt to this new paradigm. While online teaching has gained popularity worldwide over the past two decades, it remains unfamiliar to teachers at the University of Eastern Philippines.

Technological advancements necessitate faculty members to adapt their teaching approaches and methodologies for online education, encompassing novel methods of preparation, organization, delivery, and evaluation of courses and learning materials (Pagliari, Batts, & McFadden, 2009). While Bawane and Spector (2009) argue that the skills required for online teaching are not significantly distinct from traditional face-to-face instruction, some researchers, such as Ko and Rossen (2017) and Wray et al. (2008), hold contrasting viewpoints. They contend that online teaching differs from classroom teaching, emphasizing the distinct role of online faculty members. In this context, teaching online necessitates a focus on instructional time and space, virtual management techniques, and the

ability to effectively engage students through virtual communication (Easton, 2003).

Easton (2003, p.103) ethnographic case study on the role of online distance learning instructors determined that successful online instructors must blend various roles, encompassing both communication skills and a paradigm shift. The necessary communication skills mirror those essential for effective classroom teaching, while the paradigm shift entails rethinking instructional time and space, adopting virtual management techniques, and mastering the art of engaging students through virtual communication (Easton, 2003).

To ensure successful online teaching, faculty members must embrace new pedagogical practices that prioritize facilitation over traditional instructional models, as stated by Palloff and Pratt (2000). In the realm of online distance education, the establishment of a strong sense of community among participants is crucial for effective learning, according to Palloff and Pratt (2000). To facilitate a smooth transition to the online classroom, key areas of focus should include ensuring access to and familiarity with technology, developing guidelines and procedures with input from participants, promoting collaborative learning, and incorporating reflection loops into the learning process. As Simonson et al. (2012) suggest, successful faculty in online environments must think innovatively and depart from conventional teacher-centered instructional approaches.

The question now is “Are the teachers ready to go online?” Technically, readiness is defined by Psychology Dictionary as the level of preparation for a given task sufficient to result in meaningful learning. The concept of e-learning readiness pertains to the psychological and practical preparations made by an organization to engage in e-teaching, as stated by Borotis and Poulymenakou (2004). According to Kaur and Abas (2004), the utilization of e-learning readiness assessments assists educational institutions in devising effective e-teaching strategies and successfully attaining their Information Communication Technology objectives. E-readiness is widely acknowledged as a critical factor in the successful implementation of e-learning initiatives in higher education, as highlighted by Rohayani (2015) and Gay and Dringus (2012).

The failure of e-learning often stems from the tendency of teachers to transfer traditional classroom styles to new media instead of developing pedagogies that optimize the use of technology (Bates and Poold 2003, as cited in Ncube, Dube & Ngulube, 2014, p. 359). The readiness of teachers/instructors for e-learning implementation is significantly influenced by their attitudes and lifestyle. Additionally, technical skills play a vital role in teacher e-readiness, with Phan and Dang (2017) asserting that teachers who possess familiarity with technology (such as computers, the internet, and media tools) are better prepared for online teaching. Phan and Dang (2017) define teacher e-readiness as

encompassing willingness, proficiency in basic technical and communication skills, and training in new teaching methodologies for e-learning.

Palloff and Pratt (2011) center their attention on the preparedness of online instructors, utilizing a set of criteria to identify exceptional qualities in online teaching, such as visibility, compassion, communication, commitment, and organization. However, the criteria presented lack quantifiable elements to measure readiness. Furthermore, neither of these studies approached the assessment of faculty online readiness from the perspective we aim to explore, specifically emphasizing the significance and effectiveness of course design, course communication, time management, and technical skills. Consequently, there exists a distinct need for conducting this study.

This study examined how the faculty members of a state university like the University of Eastern Philippines, adapt to the new normal. Specifically, it tried to determine their professional competencies and their technological and pedagogical readiness for the new normal.

Objectives of the Study

This study tried to determine the professional competencies, technical and pedagogical readiness for the new normal of the faculty of the University of Eastern Philippines.

Specifically it tried to:

1. determine the socio-demographic profile of respondents;
2. find out the professional competencies of teachers in the University of Eastern Philippines;
3. ascertain the technological readiness of teachers for the new normal;
4. ascertain the pedagogical readiness of teachers for the new normal;
5. determine if there is a significant relationship between profile of the respondents and their professional competencies;
6. determine if there is a significant relationship between profile of the respondents and their technical readiness;
7. determine if there is a significant relationship between profile of the respondents and their pedagogical readiness for the new normal;
8. determine if there is a significant relationship between professional competencies of teachers and their technological readiness;
9. determine if there is a significant relationship between professional competencies of teachers and their pedagogical readiness; and
10. determine if there is a significant relationship between technological and pedagogical readiness of the respondents.

Methodology

This study used the descriptive-correlational method of research. The instrument used to gather the data was a survey questionnaire adapted from various researches. The instrument was divided into four (4) parts: socio-demographic profile of the respondents; professional competencies questionnaire composed of 50 items; technological readiness questionnaire with 22 items; and the pedagogical readiness questionnaire with 17 items. The three questionnaires used the 5-point Likert scale. Modifications were made to suit the context of the present study.

Questionnaires were distributed using the google form forwarded to the messenger group chat of the faculty per college. Few hard copies of the questionnaires were also sent to faculty members assigned in the external campuses of Catubig and Laoang, Northern Samar, Philippines.

The respondents of the study were the faculty members of the three campuses of the University of Eastern Philippines who were chosen using random sampling technique. From a total population of 417 regular faculty from the three campuses, 196 was supposedly the respondents of the study. This computation is based on Morgan's Table for Determining Sample Size. However, during the actual conduct of the survey using the google format only 85 faculty members participated in the online survey and another 6 participated using the printed questionnaire.

The data analysis involved the use of descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, and means to summarize the data. Additionally, regression analysis was employed to examine relationships between variables.

Results and Discussion

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of faculty respondents. A majority of the respondents were faculty members from the main campus of the University of Eastern Philippines with a total respondents of 74 or 81.3 %, while only 10 or 11% were from the external campus in Laoang, and another seven (7) or 7.7% participated from the external campus in Catubig.

The table also shows that a majority of those who participated in the research were females with a frequency of 63 or 69% while the males were only 28 or 30.8%. The youngest among them was 23 years old and the oldest was 63 years old. Most of them had an age range of 31-40 with a frequency of 28 or 30.8%, this is followed by those who belong the age range of 41-50 and 51 – 60 with 26 each or 28.6 %. Those whose age range is from 61-63 were seven (7) or 7.7% and those who belong to 23-30 age range were four (4) or 4.4 %.

Regarding the educational qualification of the respondents, 38 or 41.8% had their doctorate degrees, 20 or 22% had earned units leading a

doctorate degree, 22 or 24.2% were graduates of a master's degree and 11 or 12.1% had only earned units leading to a master's degree.

Most of the respondents were holding a rank of Associate Professor with 33 or 36.3%, 31 or 34.1% were Assistant Professors, 24 or 26.4% were holding a rank of Instructor and only 3 or 3.3% were full Professors.

As to the number of years the respondents were in service, the biggest number of the respondents (19 or 20.9%) had been in the service to the University for 6 – 10 years, this was followed by those whose service was 26 – 30 years with a frequency of 17 or 18.7%, 12 respondents or 13.2% for those who had been in the service for 11 – 15 years and 2 – 5 years. There were 11 or 12.1% were in the service for 21 – 25 years, nine (9) or 9.9% for those with 16 – 20 years of service, eight (8) or 8.8% for those who had been in the service for 31 – 35 years. There were three (3) or 3.3% of the respondents who had served the university for 36 – 39 years.

Table 1. Demographic profile of the respondents

Campus	Frequency	Percentage
Main Campus (Catarman)	74	81.3
UEP Catubig	7	7.7
UEP Laoang	10	11.0
Total	91	100.0
Sex		
Male	28	30.8
Female	63	69.2
Total	91	100.0
Age		
23-30	4	4.4
31-40	28	30.8
41-50	26	28.6
51-60	26	28.6
61-63	7	7.7
Total	91	100.0
Highest Degree Earned		
Doctorate degree	38	41.8
Units leading to a doctorate degree	20	22.0

Master's degree	22	24.2
Units leading to a master's degree	11	12.1
Total	91	100.0
Academic Rank		
Professors	3	3.3
Associate Professors	33	36.3
Assistant Professors	31	34.1
Instructors	24	26.4
Total	91	100.0
Years of Service		
2-5	12	13.2
6-10	19	20.9
11-15	12	13.2
16-20	9	9.9
21-25	11	12.1
26-30	17	18.7
31-35	8	8.8
36-39	3	3.3
Total	91	100.0

Professional Competencies of the Faculty Members

Table 2 presents the professional competence of the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines. Professional competencies of the faculty members include personality factors, interpersonal factors, professional factors, factors related to teaching materials, learner factors and assessment factors. The table shows the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines had a high degree of professional competence with a grand mean of 4.37. It can be noted that of all the factors related to professional competence, it is on learner factors that the respondents had the very high degree of competence. All the other factors – personality, interpersonal, professional, those related to teaching materials, and assessment factors, they had a high degree of competence.

Under the personality factors, the faculty members had the very high degree of competence on their commitment to the teaching profession with a mean of 4.86. However, they had the lowest mean (3.56 and 3.36) on the statements "I like conducting classes online" and "I like the modular approach of teaching more than conducting online classes", respectively. This only means that the faculty of the University of Eastern

Philippines are committed to their teaching profession however they do not like the manner of holding classes during the time of the pandemic. To them, they still would prefer the traditional way of delivering instruction, where they see the students face to face.

On interpersonal factors, the respondents had a very high degree of competence on maintaining good interpersonal relationship with their co-teachers, with a mean of 4.64. This was followed by a mean of 4.54 (very high degree of competence) on communicating ideas well to students and other persons. The lowest mean of 4.25 or high degree of competence was on mastering certain social qualities like participation in group-oriented activities even online. The data mean that the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippine had a high degree of competence in dealing with other people, like the students, their peers or to anyone – a good sign of professional competence among university mentors.

As regards the professional factors related to the professional competencies of the faculty of the University, the faculty had a very high degree of competence on five (5) indicators; complying with ethical standards and fairness through all stages of professional decision making with a mean of 4.69, managing the teaching and learning processes through planning and preparation with a mean of 4.59, having and in-depth knowledge of the subject matter being taught with a mean of 4.58, being a competent lifelong learner and continually developing the profession with a mean of 4.58, and doing reflection of their teaching with a mean of 4.53. It is surprising however that the indicator on showing interest in doing classroom research had a mean of 4.09, which is second to the lowest in the ranking, while liking to be an autonomous teacher ranked last with a mean of 3.90. This implies that the faculty of the University of Eastern Philippines, although they are professionally competent, still lack interest on doing things mandated of them like conducting classroom research. Moreover, with the lowest mean of 3.9, on liking to be autonomous teacher, this implies that the faculty would still want their performance to be monitored by their supervisors.

On factors related to teaching materials, faculty members had a very high degree of competence on studying the contents to be taught to ensure its thoroughness with a mean of 4.58. The indicator with the lowest mean was on conducting innovative activities by the use of new educational technologies available both online and offline with a mean of 4.29 or high degree of competence.

Faculty members in the University of Eastern Philippines had a very high degree of professional competence on the learner factors with a mean of 4.52. Seven (7) indicators had means above 4.5 or very high degree of competence, and these are: treating all students in the same way regardless of their beliefs, gender, etc. (4.71); giving considerations to students submitting their requirements beyond the deadline (4.66);

motivating learners to do good in their classes (4.65); encouraging learners to be actively involved in the learning process (4.65); encouraging learners to explore and analyze the lesson by themselves (4.63); helping learners gain autonomy to self-direct their own learning (4.58); and considering the learners' individual differences such as their level of intelligence, learning styles and background (4.55). This finding implies that the faculty members of the university have direct concern with their students especially during the time of the pandemic. The indicator with the lowest mean was monitoring and controlling learners' behaviors (4.12). This is understandable given the fact that it is hard to have direct supervision of the learners considering that they have no contact with them.

On assessment factors, in all of the indicators, the faculty members had a high degree of competence. The highest mean was on clarifying and articulating the expected performance outcomes to students (4.38) and monitoring learner progress toward instructional goals (4.38). Lowest mean of 4.29 was on providing continuous assessment both online and offline, however this is interpreted to be higher degree of competence for the teachers.

Table 2. Professional Competencies of the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines

Competencies	Mean	Interpretation
Personality Factors	4.12	High degree of competence
Interpersonal Factors	4.43	High degree of competence
Professional Factors	4.39	High degree of competence
Factors Related to Teaching Materials	4.42	High degree of competence
Learner Factors	4.52	Very High degree of competence
Assessment Factors	4.33	High degree of competence
Grand Mean	4.37	High degree of competence

4.5 - 5 Very high degree of competence; 3.5 – 4.49 High degree of competence; 2.5 – 3.49 Moderately high degree of competence; 1.5 – 2.49 Moderately low degree of competence; 1.0 – 1.49 Very low degree of competence

Technical Readiness of the Faculty Members

Table 3 presents the technical readiness of the faculty member of the University of Eastern Philippines. It can be gleaned from the table that the respondents had a high level of technical readiness with a grand mean of 3.97.

The data also show that the faculty members had a very high level of technical readiness considering that they have the necessary gadgets like laptop, desktop, mobile phone that can be used in online instruction and that they can use the social media like twitter, Instagram, and Facebook messenger to communicate with students or even use in online instruction with a mean of 4.74 and 4.57, respectively.

Also worth noting on the data are the items wherein the faculty members only had a moderately high level of readiness. Their ability to publish lessons and classroom activities on the web had a mean of 3.37, familiarity with and the ability to create a blog had a mean of 3.34. This means that doing these tasks need special skills and trainings. Uploading, downloading materials on the UEP Learning Management System (LMS) and using the LMS had the mean of 3.29 and 3.14, respectively. Realistically, no faculty member uses the system in their actual classes. Most often than not, teachers would rather prefer using the google meet, google classroom and zoom in their classes. The lowest mean was 2.81 and this is on the familiarity of the faculty in creating Web sites. Also this is not surprising, because a higher level of expertise is needed in order for one to create a website.

Table 3. Technical Readiness of the faculty of Eastern Philippines

Technical Readiness	Mean	Interpretation
Have gadgets like laptop, desktop, mobile phone that can be used in online learning.*	4.74	Very high level of readiness
Can use social media (Twitter, Instagram, FB messenger) to communicate with students.	4.57	Very high level of readiness
Competent in using e-mail.	4.48	High level of readiness
Able to download files from the Internet and upload files to the e-mail.	4.43	High level of readiness
Competent in using word processing software.	4.36	High level of readiness
Competent in using presentation software such as PowerPoint.	4.35	High level of readiness
Able to use online discussions and teaching in classes.	4.34	High level of readiness
Able to use chat in teaching classes.	4.31	High level of readiness
Feel comfortable using online applications like zoom and google meet in conducting online classes.*	4.27	High level of readiness
Take with them a mobile device connected to the internet everywhere they go.	4.27	High level of readiness

Can switch from offline to online learning environments.*	4.26	High level of readiness
Able to design online quizzes and use them in teaching classes.	4.15	High level of readiness
Familiar with learning management systems.	4.09	High level of readiness
Able to convert the printed content and activities in the curriculum to the digital form.	3.88	High level of readiness
Can develop electronic learning activities that encourage students to be critical thinkers.	3.79	High level of readiness
Have internet connectivity at home.*	3.59	High level of readiness
Trained on the use of ICT as a teaching resource.*	3.57	High level of readiness
Able to publish lessons and classroom activities on the web.	3.37	Moderately high level of readiness
Familiar with and can create a blog.	3.34	Moderately high level of readiness
Can upload and download materials using the UEP Learning Management System (LMS).	3.29	Moderately high level of readiness
Comfortable using the Learning Management System (LMS) of UEP.*	3.14	Moderately high level of readiness
Familiar with and can create Web sites.	2.81	Moderately high level of readiness
Grand Mean	3.97	High level of readiness

4.5 - 5 Very high level of readiness; 3.5 – 4.49 High level of readiness; 2.5 – 3.49 Moderately high level of readiness; 1.5 – 2.49 Moderately low level of readiness; 1.0 – 1.49 Very low level of readiness

Pedagogical Readiness of the Faculty

Table 4 presents the pedagogical readiness of the faculty of University of Eastern Philippines. The data show that the faculty had a high level of pedagogical readiness with a grand mean of 3.90.

The data also revealed that the faculty had a high level of pedagogical readiness on being flexible in dealing with students on issues as due dates, absences and makeup assignment. It had the highest mean which is 4.29. Preparing modules for all subject assignments, and using technologies to support teaching methods all had a mean of 4.27.

In using the UEP LMS for all class activities, and in believing that high quality learning experiences can occur without interacting with students face-to-face, the faculty had a high level of pedagogical readiness to accept these with a mean of 3.00 and 2.91, respectively. This finding implies that the faculty are not comfortable using the UEP LMS and teaching the students without them being present in the classroom. For them quality learning can only occur when they interact with the students face-to-face inside the traditional classroom.

Table 4. Pedagogical readiness of the faculty of Eastern Philippines

Pedagogical Readiness	Mean	Interpretation
Flexible in dealing with students on such issues as due dates, absences, and makeup assignments.	4.29	High level of readiness
Prepared modules for all his/her subjects.	4.27	High level of readiness
Use new technologies to support teaching methods.	4.27	High level of readiness
Encourage students to bring life experiences into the online classroom and create activities based on those experiences.	4.15	High level of readiness
Emotionally well-prepared to face students on online classes.	4.13	High level of readiness
Fairly organized and tend to plan ahead in technology-based teaching.	4.13	High level of readiness
Recognize that community building is an important component of digital curriculum.	4.10	High level of readiness
Able to convey message in writing using new technologies available.	4.01	High level of readiness
Can manage and control students learning in a technology-enriched classroom.	3.99	High level of readiness
Support online collaborative activity as a means of teaching and learning.	3.97	High level of readiness
Believe that digital curriculum is as rigorous as printed curriculum.	3.95	High level of readiness
Familiar with the ways of integrating technology into curriculum.	3.92	High level of readiness
Feel comfortable communicating online.	3.91	High level of readiness
Support the interaction among students as a means of teaching and learning.	3.85	High level of readiness
Able to manage time well in a technology-enriched online classroom.	3.81	High level of readiness

Use the UEP LMS for all class activities.	3.00	Moderately high level of readiness
Believe that high quality learning experiences can occur without interacting with students face-to-face.	2.91	Moderately high level of readiness
Grand Mean	3.90	High level of readiness

4.5 - 5 Very high level of readiness; 3.5 – 4.49 High level of readiness; 2.5 – 3.49 Moderately high level of readiness; 1.5 – 2.49 Moderately low level of readiness; 1.0 – 1.49 Very low level of readiness

Tests of Relationships

Relationship between the profile of the respondents and their professional competencies

Table 5 presents the relationship between the profile of the respondents and their professional competencies. The result shows that the computed values of all the profile variables against the respondents' professional competencies, are higher than the alpha level of .05. This means that the profile variables like age, sex, highest degree earned, the campus where they are teaching, academic rank and the number of years that they are in the service were not found to be significant to the dependent variable professional competencies.

Table 5. Relationship between Profile of Respondents and their Professional Competencies

Profile	Parameters	Professional Competencies
Age	Beta	0.157
	Sig.	0.373
	Interpretation	Not significant
Sex	Beta	-0.163
	Sig.	0.178
	Interpretation	Not significant
Highest Degree Earned	Beta	-0.186
	Sig.	0.258
	Interpretation	Not significant
Campus	Beta	0.149
	Sig.	0.172
	Interpretation	Not significant
Academic Rank	Beta	0.267
	Sig.	0.207
	Interpretation	Not significant
Years in Service	Beta	0.057

	Sig. Interpretation	0.794 Not significant
--	------------------------	--------------------------

Relationship between the profile of the respondents and their technical readiness

Table 6 presents the relationship between the profile of the respondents and their technical readiness for the new normal. The result shows that the computed values of all the profile variables against the technical readiness of the respondents are higher than the alpha level of .05. This means that the profile variables like age, sex, highest degree earned, the campus where they are teaching, academic rank and the number of years that they are in the service were not found to be significant to the dependent variable which is technical readiness for the new normal. This implies that the faculty of the University of Eastern Philippines are technically ready regardless of their age, sex, highest degree earned, the campus where they are teaching, their academic rank and the number of years that they have been teaching in the university.

Table 6. Relationship between Profile of Respondents and their Technical Readiness

Profile	Parameters	Technical Readiness
Age	Beta Sig. Interpretation	-0.219 0.221 Not significant
Sex	Beta Sig. Interpretation	0.064 0.602 Not significant
Highest Degree Earned	Beta Sig. Interpretation	0.089 0.592 Not significant
Campus	Beta Sig. Interpretation	-0.042 0.705 Not significant
Academic Rank	Beta Sig. Interpretation	-0.063 0.769 Not significant
Years in Service	Beta Sig. Interpretation	0.021 0.923 Not significant

Relationship between the profile of the respondents and their pedagogical readiness

Table 7 presents the relationship between the profile of the respondents and their pedagogical readiness. The result shows that the computed

values of all the profile variables against the pedagogical readiness of the respondents are higher than the alpha level of .05. This means that the profile variables like age, sex, highest degree earned, the campus where they are teaching, academic rank and the number of years that they are in the service were not found to be significant to the dependent variable which is pedagogical readiness. This implies that the faculty of the University of Eastern Philippines are pedagogically ready to face the new normal regardless of their age, sex, highest degree earned, the campus where they are teaching, their academic rank, and the number of years that they are in the service.

Table 7. Relationship between Profile of Respondents and their Pedagogical Readiness

Profile	Parameters	Pedagogical Readiness
Age	Beta Sig. Interpretation	0.044 0.805 Not significant
Sex	Beta Sig. Interpretation	0.074 0.541 Not significant
Highest Degree Earned	Beta Sig. Interpretation	0.199 0.226 Not significant
Campus	Beta Sig. Interpretation	0.148 0.175 Not significant
Academic Rank	Beta Sig. Interpretation	-0.051 0.809 Not significant
Years in Service	Beta Sig. Interpretation	-0.118 0.588 Not significant

Relationship between professional competencies of respondents and their technological readiness for the new normal

Table 8 presents the relationship between the professional competencies of the respondents and their technological readiness for the new normal. The data reveal that the computed value of .020 is smaller than the alpha of .05. This means that professional competence was found significant with the technological readiness of the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines to face the challenges in the new normal. This further means that professional competence has something to do with the technological readiness of the teachers in facing the new normal. This

implies that the faculty of the University of Eastern Philippines are technologically ready to face the new normal because they possess a high level of professional competence.

Table 8. Professional Competence and Technological Readiness

	Parameters	Professional Competence
Technological Readiness	Beta	0.252
	Sig.	0.020
	Interpretation	Significant

Relationship between professional competencies of the respondents and their pedagogical readiness

Table 9 presents the relationship between the professional competencies of the respondents and their pedagogical readiness for the new normal. The data reveal that the computed value of .000 is smaller than the alpha of .05. This means that professional competence was found to have a significant relationship with the pedagogical readiness of the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines to face the challenges in the new normal. This implies that the faculty of the University of Eastern Philippines are pedagogically ready to face the new normal because they have a high level of professional competence.

Table 9. Professional Competence and Pedagogical Readiness

	Parameters	Professional Competence
Pedagogical Readiness	Beta	0.486
	Sig.	0.000
	Interpretation	Significant

Relationship between technological and pedagogical readiness of the respondents

Table 10 presents the relationship between the technical readiness of the respondents and their pedagogical readiness for the new normal. The data reveal that the computed value of .000 is smaller than the alpha of .05. This means that technical readiness of the respondents was found to have a significant relationship with the pedagogical readiness of the faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines to face the challenges in the new normal.

Table 10. Technical Readiness and Pedagogical Readiness

	Parameters	Technical Readiness
Pedagogical Readiness	Beta	0.682

	Sig. Interpretation	0.020 Significant
--	------------------------	----------------------

Conclusions

The Covid-19 pandemic has forced teachers, especially in the tertiary level, to adapt the paradigm shift in education. The new normal is something that teachers have to embrace to become relevant in this uncertain times. Professional competence of the teachers together with their technological readiness and pedagogical readiness are of prime importance for them to survive.

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines had a high level of professional competence, technological and pedagogical readiness. In the new normal, these teachers are ready to face the new challenges they would be facing.
2. Faculty members can be professionally competent, technologically and pedagogically ready regardless of their age, sex, highest degree earned, the campus of assignment, their academic rank, and the number of years that they are in the service of teaching.
3. Professional competence is an important indicator for the technological readiness and pedagogical readiness of the faculty members. Professional preparation contributes a lot in making a faculty member ready to face the new normal with its high demand of technological and pedagogical expertise.
4. The technological readiness of the faculty members had a bearing on their pedagogical readiness. Faculty members who are adept in using the technology are very much ready to deliver instruction online using the modern technologies.

Acknowledgment

The researchers recognize the support extended by the University of Eastern Philippines, especially the administration for the completion of this study.

Bibliography

1. Bawane, J., & Spector, J. M. (2009). Prioritization of online instructor roles: Implications for competency-based teacher education programs. *Distance Education*, 30(3), 383–397.
2. Berge, Z. (1995). The Role of the Online Instructor/Facilitator. *Educational Technology*. 35. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238348806_The_Role_of_the_Online_InstructorFacilitator/citation/download
3. Borotis, S. and Poulymenakou, A. (2004). e-Learning Readiness Components: Key Issues to Consider Before Adopting e-Learning Interventions. Retrieved from http://www.eltrun.gr/papers/eLReadiness_ELEARN2004.pdf

4. Easton, S. S. (2003). Clarifying the instructor's role in online distance learning. *Communication Education*, 52(2), 87-105.
5. Gay, G. and Dringus, L. (2012). Measuring technological e-learning readiness and effectiveness in the online learning environment. *CCE Faculty Proceedings, Presentations, Speeches and Lectures*. https://nsuworks.nova.edu/gscis_facpres/126.
6. Guasch, T., Alvarez, I., & Espasa, A. (2010). University teacher competencies in a virtual teaching/learning environment: Analysis of a teacher training experience. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(2), 199–206.
7. Jackson, P. W. (1990). *Life in classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Retrieved from <https://www.winginstitute.org/quality-teachers-competencies>
8. Kaur, K. and Abas, Z. (2004). An assessment of e-learning readiness at the Open University Malaysia. Paper presented at the International Conference on Computers in Education (ICCE2004), Melbourne, Australia.
9. Ko, S., & Rossen, S. (2017). *Teaching online: A practical guide*. Oxon: Routledge.
10. Ncube, S., Dube, L., & Ngulube, P. (2014). E-learning readiness among academic staff in the Department of Information Science at the University of South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(16), 357.
11. Pagliari, L., Batts, D., & McFadden, C. (2009). Desired versus actual training for online instructors in community colleges. Retrieved from <http://thescholarship.ecu.edu/handle/10342/2176>
12. Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2000). Making the transition: Helping teachers to teach online. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/asp/doelib/abstract.asp?ID=EDU0006.html> Penna, M. P., Stara, V., & De Rose, M. (2009). The failure of e-learning: why should we use a learner centred design. *Journal of e-Learning and Knowledge Society*, 3(2).
13. Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2011). *The excellent online instructor: Strategies for professional development*. John Wiley & Sons.
14. Phan, T. T. N. and Dang, L. T. T. Teacher readiness for online teaching: A critical review. *IJODEL*, Vol. 3, No. 1, (June 2017).
15. Psychology Dictionary Professional Reference. psychologydictionary.org/readiness/
16. Richey, R. C., Fields, D. C., & Foxon, M. (2001). *Instructional design competencies: The standards* (3rd ed.). Syracuse, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology.
17. Rohayani, A. H. (2015). A literature review: Readiness factors to measuring e-learning readiness in higher education. *Procedia Computer Science*, 59, 230-234.
18. Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., & Zvacek, S. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education*. IAP.
19. Tanhueco-Tumapon, T. "Education and the 'new normal' ". *The Manila Times*. June 4, 2020. <https://www.manilatimes.net/2020/06/04/campus-press/education-and-the-new-normal/729288>
20. Williams, P. E. (2003). Roles and competencies for distance education programs in higher education institutions. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 17(1), 45–57.
21. Wray, M., Lowenthal, P. R., Bates, B., & Stevens, E. (2008). Investigating perceptions of teaching online & f2f. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 12(4), 243–248.