JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES

ISSN Print: 2984-8288, ISSN Online: 2984-8385
Vol. 3 No. 10, pp. 83-100, October 2025

Evaluation of the Quality Assurance Practices of the College of Education Programs of a Philippine Local University

Ramona A. Prado
Caloocan City, Metro Manila, Philippines

Author Email: ramonaaguilarp@ucc-caloocan.edu.ph

Date received: July 31, 2025
Date revised: August 17, 2025
Date accepted: September 3, 2025

Originality: 98%
Grammarly Score: 99%
Similarity: 2%

Recommended citation:
Prado, R. (2025). Evaluation of the quality assurance practices of the College of Education programs of a Philippine local university. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *3*(10), 83-100.
https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.608

Abstract. This study investigates the quality assurance practices in teacher education programs at a Philippine locally funded university, focusing on strategies to improve program delivery and align curricular offerings with national and global benchmarks. Despite ongoing efforts guided by accreditation standards, gaps persist in ensuring comprehensive quality assurance. Using a descriptive-evaluative method, data were gathered from institutional records, assessments, and observations involving students, faculty, and administrators in the Bachelor of Secondary Education and Bachelor of Elementary Education programs. Findings revealed that the College of Education has satisfactorily complied with standards in curriculum and instruction, faculty qualifications, institutional vision and mission, program objectives, student development services, and graduate employability and entrepreneurship. However, several areas were identified as barriers to full quality assurance, particularly student support services, funding, research productivity, instructional facilities, and community engagement. These challenges highlight the need for strategic and targeted interventions to strengthen program effectiveness. To achieve full quality assurance, long-term development planning and curricular alignment with national and international standards are essential, supported by strategic resource allocation and enhanced student services. Addressing these gaps through systematic planning and continuous improvement will ensure sustainable academic excellence and institutional effectiveness. Strengthened collaboration with accrediting bodies will also support compliance with evolving standards. Overall, the study underscores the importance of periodic evaluation, responsive policy reform, and sustained investment in teacher education to produce competent graduates who can meet the dynamic demands of the education sector.

Keywords: Quality assurance; Accreditation; Teacher education; Higher education; Program evaluation.

1.0 Introduction

Education services are foundational to societal progress, and the standardization of academic practices has become a cornerstone of ensuring that students are equipped to thrive in an increasingly competitive global environment. As educational institutions face mounting expectations to produce competent and adaptable graduates, the implementation of quality assurance (QA) systems has gained critical importance. As highlighted in the UNESCO report A New Generation of External Quality Assurance: Dynamics of Change and Innovative Approaches, QA is defined as an all-encompassing and continuous process of evaluating the quality of a higher education system, its institutions, or academic programs. As a regulatory mechanism, QA serves a dual purpose—ensuring both accountability and continuous improvement. This is achieved by generating reliable information and judgments

based on a consistent process and established criteria. Furthermore, the report emphasizes that quality control is primarily the responsibility of the government, which must ensure that minimum quality standards are met across the higher education sector (UNESCO, 2021). Similarly, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED, 2012) stressed that QA involves establishing mechanisms, procedures, and processes to ensure that desired quality standards are consistently met.

Quality assurance in higher education is indispensable, as it shapes institutional frameworks and establishes the standards by which academic programs are developed, delivered, and assessed. This is especially critical for locally funded universities in the Philippines, where continuous improvement and institutional accountability are essential to achieving educational excellence. For teacher education institutions, the stakes are even higher, as they are responsible for preparing future educators. Accreditation plays a crucial role in ensuring that academic programs meet the standards set by educational authorities. In the case of local colleges and universities, the Association of Local Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (ALCU-COA) serves a vital function. As an accrediting body, ALCU-COA evaluates, monitors, and supports the continuous development of academic programs to ensure alignment with national standards and to enhance the preparedness of graduates for the teaching profession.

However, despite the presence of robust QA mechanisms, teacher education programs continue to face persistent challenges—particularly in preparing globally competent graduates and ensuring strong performance in national licensure examinations. A recent study by Balinario, Ofqueria, and Arca (2023) identified multiple academic and institutional factors that influence licensure outcomes, highlighting enduring gaps in pre-service preparation that remain unresolved despite accreditation efforts. The authors emphasized that even among accredited institutions, licensure performance varies significantly, suggesting a disconnect between institutional quality indicators and the actual competence of graduates.

This concern is echoed internationally. Aburizaizah (2022), in examining Saudi higher education institutions, found that while QA and accreditation structures are firmly established, their actual impact on student learning outcomes remains unclear. QA practices were often reduced to compliance and documentation rather than fostering genuine improvements in teaching and learning. Critical barriers such as inadequate funding, weak student support services, and limited research productivity hindered the realization of full QA effectiveness. These findings parallel the challenges faced by Philippine locally funded universities, where accreditation does not always translate into improved graduate performance.

Similarly, Kayyali (2023) underscored that quality assurance in higher education must extend beyond regulatory compliance to embrace benchmarking, accreditation, and continuous improvement as interlinked processes that enhance both accountability and student learning. His review highlighted global frameworks such as the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG), the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in the UK, and the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award in the US, all of which stress student-centered approaches, stakeholder participation, and systematic institutional evaluation. However, while these frameworks provide comprehensive models, their direct application in developing-country contexts like the Philippines remains underexplored, creating a gap in the literature on how localized QA systems adapt to global standards amid resource constraints.

At the same time, broader international discourse on educational quality stresses the need for sustainable, future-oriented strategies. Ghamrawi, Abu-Tineh, and Shal (2023) argue that achieving education quality requires not only systemic evaluation but also transformational leadership and policy coherence. Their findings highlight how sustainable educational reforms must be embedded across all levels of institutional planning, going beyond surface-level compliance with accreditation to address foundational issues in program design and implementation.

This tension between accreditation outcomes and actual graduate performance reveals a critical research gap: while QA systems such as those administered by ALCU-COA help standardize instruction and governance in Local Universities and Colleges (LUCs), they may not fully capture or remedy deficiencies in teacher readiness for licensure and practice. The works of Aburizaizah (2022) and Kayyali (2023) reinforce this concern by showing how QA globally often struggles to move from compliance to real educational impact. Bridging this gap demands a re-examination of how QA frameworks interface with the realities of teacher preparation, especially in community-based institutions where resource constraints and localized curricula pose unique challenges.

Ultimately, quality assurance systems—especially accreditation—serve not only to maintain academic standards but also to safeguard stakeholder interests by evaluating program effectiveness and driving continuous improvement. However, the literature suggests that unless QA is coupled with resource allocation, continuous improvement, and contextual responsiveness, its potential to transform teacher education remains unrealized.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study assessed the implementation of the College of Education programs' quality assurance at a local university. A descriptive research design was employed, integrating both quantitative (survey) and qualitative (interview) approaches. A revised ALCUCOA survey tool served as the primary instrument, aligned with the standards set by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) through the Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA). Following Paler-Calmorin (2010), the study sought to describe existing conditions and provide a factual basis for decision-making. As emphasized by Estolas and Boquiren, descriptive research helps uncover relationships, beliefs, practices, and trends.

To improve the depth and validity of the findings, triangulation was applied through the use of secondary sources such as accreditation feedback and field observations, consistent with Creswell and Creswell's (2018) emphasis on combining multiple data sources to enhance credibility. Qualitative interview responses were subjected to thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), enabling richer insights into the challenges and successes in the implementation of quality assurance practices.

2.2 Research Participants

The study involved fifteen (15) administrators, sixty-four (64) professors, and one hundred ninety-four (194) graduating students from a local university. This institution offers three teacher education programs: Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Technology and Livelihood Education (BSE-TLE), Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Science (BSE-Science), and Bachelor of Elementary Education major in Preschool Education (BEEd). Participants were selected using purposive sampling. Inclusion criteria required administrators to hold leadership roles directly connected to teacher education programs, professors to have at least one year of teaching experience in the College of Education, and students to be graduating candidates enrolled in the teacher education programs. The diversity of participants ensured representation across administrative, instructional, and student perspectives.

2.3 Research Instrument

The primary data-gathering tool was a survey adapted from the standard ALCUCOA evaluation instrument, refined to suit the local context. Prior to its administration, formal permission was obtained from the proper authorities. To ensure validity, the instrument was subjected to expert review by at least five (5) specialists in education and quality assurance. Revisions were made to enhance clarity, relevance, and alignment with program objectives. Reliability was established through a pilot test with a small group of respondents who were not part of the main sample. The internal consistency of the instrument was measured using Cronbach's alpha, with interpretation guided by George and Mallery (2019), which confirmed the reliability of the survey items.

The final instrument comprised three major parts:
a. Part I collected the demographic profile of respondents.
b. Part II assessed the status of quality assurance implementation across domains: Vision and Mission, Objectives, Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty, Governance and Administration, Student Development and Services, Library, Entrepreneurship and Employability, Community Extension Services, Research, Laboratories, and Physical Plant.
c. Part III identified the extent of problems encountered in implementing quality assurance practices within the College of Education programs.

The survey employed a five-point Likert scale, with items presented in statement form. To supplement survey data and verify information not captured by the instrument, informal interviews were conducted with selected personnel. These interviews provided additional insights and clarifications, enriching the data. A desk review of institutional performance reports and accreditation documents was also conducted for validation and triangulation.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

Formal approval from the school administrators was secured through a written request that was personally delivered and discussed. Following approval, the researcher coordinated directly with department heads to explain the purpose of the study and sought their assistance in distributing the research instrument. A schedule was established for the retrieval of completed questionnaires to ensure an organized and timely collection process, including interviews with selected key participants. Quantitative data were processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were computed to describe demographic profiles and the status of quality assurance implementation. The level of problems encountered was also analyzed using weighted mean and rank order.

Qualitative data from interviews were analyzed thematically. Following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework, responses were transcribed, coded, categorized, and refined into themes that reflected recurring issues and patterns related to QA practices. These themes were then compared with survey results for convergence or divergence. Data from institutional documents and accreditation reports were reviewed and cross-checked against survey and interview findings. This triangulation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) enhanced the validity of results and provided a comprehensive understanding of QA implementation in the College of Education.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

This study strictly adhered to ethical research standards. All respondents participated voluntarily, and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any stage without penalty. All personal and institutional data were treated with confidentiality and anonymity, stored securely, and used solely for academic research purposes. These measures ensured the protection of participants and the integrity of the research process.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of Faculty and Administrators

Academic Qualifications of Faculty and Administrators

Table 1 displays the academic qualifications of faculty and administrator respondents. Among faculty members, 13 (20.31%) hold doctoral degrees, 24 (37.50%) are pursuing doctoral studies, 1 (1.56%) has completed a master's degree, and 26 (40.63%) are currently enrolled in master's programs. Among administrators, 7 (46.67%) hold doctoral degrees, 6 (40%) hold master's degrees, and 2 (13.33%) are pursuing their master's degrees.

Table 1. *Distribution of academic qualifications of faculty and administrators*

Academic Qualification	Faculty		Admin		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Doctoral Degree	13	20.31	7	46.67	20	25.32
Master's Degree with Doctoral units	24	37.50	0	0.00	24	30.38
Master's Degree	1	1.56	6	40.00	7	8.86
Bachelor's Degree with MA units	26	40.63	2	13.33	28	35.44

This distribution highlights a strong alignment with the standards set by CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 40, s. 2008, which underscores the requirement for academic staff and administrators in higher education to hold graduate degrees to ensure effective leadership and educational delivery. The ongoing graduate studies pursued by faculty reflect the institution's commitment to continuing professional development, in alignment with Section 35 of CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 40, series of 2008. This is also a key requirement in accreditation standards set not only by the ALCU-COA but also by CHED's Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA).

Moreover, the qualifications suggest institutional preparedness for accreditation and program evaluation. However, this data may not fully capture the actual competence or quality of instruction, nor does it account for ongoing certifications or specialized training. As emphasized in multiple CHED memorandum issuances, credentials must be aligned with measurable performance standards and outcomes.

Work Experience of Faculty and Administrators

Table 2 illustrates the respondents' work experience. Among faculty, 18 (28.13%) have served 6–10 years, 15 (23.44%) for 11–15 years, 8 (12.50%) for 21–25 years, and 8 (12.50%) for 5 years or less. Additionally, 7 (10.94%) have 16–20 years, 7 have 31 years or more, and 1 (1.56%) has 26–30 years in the profession.

Table 2. *Distribution of Work Experience of Faculty and Administrators*

Work Experience (Years)	Faculty		Admin		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
> 30	7	10.94	2	13.33	9	11.39
26 – 30	1	1.56	0	0.00	1	1.27
21 – 25	8	12.50	3	20.00	11	13.92
16 – 20	7	10.94	6	40.00	13	16.46
11 – 15	15	23.44	2	13.33	17	21.52
6 – 10	18	28.13	1	6.67	19	24.05
< 6	8	12.50	1	6.67	9	11.39

Among administrators, 6 (40%) have 16–20 years of experience, 3 (20%) have 21–25 years, 2 (13.33%) have 31 years or more, 2 have 11–15 years, and the remaining two respondents have fewer than 10 years of experience.

The length of service reflected here implies a pool of an experienced workforce, which is critical for institutional continuity, mentorship, and policy implementation. This is aligned with CHED's emphasis on leadership experience as stipulated in CMO No. 40, s. 2008, particularly about Section 37, which outlines qualifications for academic and administrative leaders in higher education. Nevertheless, experience alone does not guarantee instructional effectiveness. The current study does not assess teaching competencies, leadership performance, or the outcomes associated with this tenure. For future institutional planning, mechanisms for periodic faculty and administrator evaluation (as recommended in CHED quality assurance frameworks) should be reinforced to ensure that experience translates into quality outcomes.

3.2 Evaluation of the Education Programs

This section presents the Evaluations of the administrators, faculty members, and students on the status of the education programs offered at the local university based on the ALCU-COA instrument.

Vision and Mission Statement

Table 3 presents the evaluations of the education program's vision and mission statements.

Table 3. *Evaluation of the Vision and Mission Statement*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	The vision and mission of the Institution are clearly stated.	4.47	VG	4.20	VG	4.25	VG	4.30	VG
2.	The goals and objectives of the Institution are anchored on the Vision and Mission.	4.40	VG	4.12	VG	4.34	VG	4.29	VG
3.	Provisions for institutional planning include Short, Medium, and Long Range.	3.87	VG	3.77	VG	3.92	VG	3.85	VG
4.	They are adapted to the educational needs of the local, regional, and national community.	3.87	VG	3.90	VG	4.17	VG	3.98	VG
5.	The Institution includes among its objectives a specific program for the development of its students' moral character and personal discipline, which is properly integrated with the academic program.	4.27	VG	4.05	VG	4.14	VG	4.15	VG
6.	The Institution provides opportunities and resources to guide its students toward discovering a satisfying and community-oriented vocation in life.	4.00	VG	3.92	VG	3.91	VG	3.94	VG
7.	The institution is responsive to current social needs.	4.27	VG	3.77	VG	3.86	VG	3.96	VG
8.	The institution provides opportunities for the alumni to pursue continuing personal and professional growth and development.	4.07	VG	4.02	VG	3.70	VG	3.93	VG
9.	The bulletin information is up to date and accessible.	3.07	G	3.59	VG	3.44	G	3.36	G
Overall Mean		**4.03**	**VG**	**3.92**	**VG**	**3.97**	**VG**	**3.97**	**VG**

Faculty respondents rated all items under this component as Very Good, with mean scores ranging from 3.59 to 4.20 and an overall mean of 3.92. Students and administrators also gave Very Good ratings, except for Item 9, "The bulletin information is up to date and accessible," which received Good ratings (3.07 for students; 3.44 for administrators). Top-rated items across all respondent groups include the clarity of the institution's vision and mission, the alignment of goals and objectives with these guiding statements, and the integration of moral and disciplinary development into academic programs. These findings address the research question regarding the extent to which the institution's vision and mission are reflected in its programs and services. On the other hand, the lower scores related to institutional communication suggest a need to enhance digital platforms and ensure the consistent dissemination of updates.

A higher education institution, in order to give direction in achieving its purpose, must adhere to a workable Vision, Mission, and Objectives (VMO). This is stipulated in various CHED memorandums, specifically CHED Memorandum Order No. 52, s. 2007, which emphasizes competent leadership and institutional coherence, and CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012, which defines quality as the alignment and consistency of the learning environment with the institution's vision, mission, and goals, as demonstrated by exceptional learning and service outcomes and the development of a culture of quality. Dimmock and Walker (2005) noted that clear institutional visions positively impact organizational behavior, though gaps in implementation—like poor communication channels—can weaken these benefits.

However, these results warrant careful consideration. Given the self-reported nature of the data, participants may have responded in a socially acceptable manner, influenced by their familiarity with the institution's goals. It is recommended that the institution review and upgrade its communication platforms and explore external validation mechanisms (e.g., alumni and employer feedback) to ensure that the institutional vision is not only understood but also actively experienced and put into practice to achieve the desired outcomes.

Objectives

Table 4 presents the Evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the College of Education's objectives.

Table 4. *Evaluation of Objectives*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**
1.	The goals and objectives of the College of Education are anchored on the Vision and Mission.	4.53	E	4.24	VG	4.39	VG	4.39	VG
2.	Provisions are made for the College of Education planning, such as Short, Medium, and Long Range.	3.73	VG	3.86	VG	4.02	VG	3.87	VG
3.	The goals and objectives align with the national goals and desirable Filipino cultural values.	3.87	VG	4.11	VG	4.16	VG	4.05	VG
4.	They are adapted to the educational needs of the local, regional, and national community.	3.93	VG	3.97	VG	4.06	VG	3.99	VG
5.	The College of Education includes among its objectives a specific program for the development of moral character and personal discipline of its students that is appropriately integrated with the academic programs	4.13	VG	4.14	VG	4.22	VG	4.16	VG
6.	The College of Education provides opportunities and resources to guide its students in discovering a satisfying and community-oriented vocational path.	3.93	VG	4.11	VG	4.13	VG	4.06	VG
7.	The College of Education is responsive to the current social needs.	4.07	VG	4.06	VG	3.95	VG	4.03	VG
8.	The College of Education provides opportunities for alumni to pursue continuing personal and professional growth and development.	3.80	VG	4.11	VG	4.16	VG	4.02	VG
Overall Mean		**4.00**	**VG**	**4.08**	**VG**	**4.13**	**VG**	**4.07**	**VG**

Table 4 shows that students rated all items related to the College of Education's objectives as Very Good, except for Item 1—"The goals and objectives are anchored on the Vision and Mission"—which was rated Excellent (mean = 4.00). Faculty and administrator ratings were similarly high, with overall means of 4.08 and 4.13, respectively. Highest-rated items reflect the institution's emphasis on moral instruction, alignment with vision and mission, and readiness for community-based practice. These reinforce CHED Memorandum Order No. 30, s—2004, which calls for defined institutional and program objectives that support national development. However, lower-rated items—such as responsiveness to current social needs and the college's short, medium, and long-range planning—indicate room for strengthening outreach and feedback mechanisms from various stakeholders such as the alumni, industry partners, and experts in the field.

The findings are limited to the perspectives of internal stakeholders, excluding valuable insights from alums and external partners who could shed light on the long-term relevance and impact of the institution's goals. Moreover, the reliance on quantitative data overlooks the depth and nuance that qualitative narratives could provide, capturing the lived experiences and meaningful contributions of these key groups. Thus, it is recommended that future studies incorporate stakeholder interviews and longitudinal alums tracking to assess whether the institution's goals are being realized in practice. These results also suggest a need for the College to proactively engage alums and community stakeholders to close the gap between academic objectives and real-world demands.

Governance and Administration

Table 5 below presents the Evaluations of the three groups of respondents on the governance and administration of the College of Education.

Table 5. *Evaluation of Governance and Administration*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	The educational institution has a governing body that will be responsible for formulating the general policies of the institution. (Board of Regents)	4.53	E	3.94	VG	4.11	VG	4.20	VG
2.	The administrative staff is composed of the Vice President, Finance/Budget/Accountant, HRD, Registrar, and Maintenance and General Services employees who have earned appropriate degrees.	4.07	VG	4.26	VG	4.20	VG	4.18	VG
3.	The academic personnel (Deans, Area Heads, and Faculty) are academically qualified.	4.27	VG	4.38	VG	4.13	VG	4.26	VG
4.	The Administration is supported by adequately qualified non-academic personnel with specific roles. (Librarian, Dean of Student Affairs, etc.)	3.60	VG	4.21	VG	3.97	VG	3.92	VG
5.	The institutions' fiscal administration (finance, budget, and accounting office) is well organized and managed by qualified and competent personnel with specific roles.	3.20	G	4.01	VG	3.67	VG	3.63	VG
6.	The Supply Management includes the listing of the total requirements of the institution, conducting periodic inventories, functional distribution systems and record keeping of inventories.	3.00	G	3.86	VG	3.45	G	3.44	G
7.	A system of record keeping is placed for easy retrieval and references. (Minutes of the meeting, enrolment, psychological testing and other school requirements submitted and computer systems for record management.)	3.00	G	3.82	VG	3.63	VG	3.48	G
8.	A sound institutional planning and subsequent development is implemented considering the following: vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the school, awareness of national, regional, and local needs, as well as community involvement	3.60	VG	3.82	VG	3.78	VG	3.74	VG
9.	The institution has an office responsible for linkages with communities, CHED, TESDA, and the like.	3.13	G	3.74	VG	3.69	VG	3.52	VG
Overall Mean		**3.60**	**VG**	**4.00**	**VG**	**3.85**	**VG**	**3.82**	**VG**

According to Table 5, students rated "The educational institution has a governing body responsible for formulating policies (Board of Regents)" as Excellent (mean = 4.53). Items related to qualified administrative officials, academic personnel, and institutional planning were rated Very Good, with mean values ranging from 3.60 to 4.27. Other items received Good ratings, resulting in an overall mean of 3.60. The faculty rated all governance and administration items Very Good (mean = 4.00). Administrators echoed this, except for supply management, which was rated Good, yielding an overall mean of 3.85. Top-rated items included the qualifications of academic personnel, the governing body's role, and the effectiveness of leadership. Conversely, weaker areas such as supply management, record-keeping, and institutional linkages suggest that operational systems require greater efficiency and modernization. These findings align with the work of Daza et al. (2021), who emphasized the importance of inclusive and collaborative governance models in higher education, especially within teacher education programs.

Local universities are established and funded by local government units. They are governed by the Board of Regents, which serves as the highest policy-making body responsible for setting policies, budgets, and overall direction. While the Board of Regents provides a formal governance structure, there remains a need to improve processes related to quality assurance. The internal nature of this study may introduce partiality in the responses, as participants' subjectivity could affect their objectivity. Given that the participants are internal stakeholders evaluating their administrative structure, potential bias is likely. Additionally, the study lacks a comparative assessment of governance practices against those of other institutions.

To address these gaps, the institution should benchmark governance practices among peer colleges and include external evaluators in future assessments. The consistently high scores suggest general satisfaction, but the operational concerns flagged by students and administrators call for reforms in logistics, IT infrastructure, supply management system, and administrative support for services and human resources. These are essential to sustain the institution's overall quality.

Faculty

Table 6 presents the Evaluations of the three groups of respondents on the faculty of the College of Education.

Table 6. *Evaluation of Faculty*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	The educational background of faculty members conforms to the CHED standard for teaching at the college level.	4.20	VG	4.21	VG	4.13	VG	4.18	VG
2.	The faculty has college teaching experiences in his/her area of specialization and/or related field/discipline and is teaching subjects in his/ her area of specialization.	4.20	VG	4.23	VG	4.17	VG	4.20	VG
3.	The minimum requirements of the Civil Service Commission and the University criteria/standard are considered in recruiting, selecting, and hiring faculty members.	4.20	VG	4.05	VG	4.19	VG	4.15	VG
4.	The college has a well-defined ranking system which considers tenure, teaching ability, published research, special services, and community involvement that is clearly described in the Faculty Handbook/manual or University Code	3.40	G	4.03	VG	3.83	VG	3.75	VG
5.	The faculty selection process is participated in by the proper authorities, and it considers academic qualification, professional experience, required license, teaching ability, and other necessary standards.	3.67	VG	4.10	VG	3.92	VG	3.90	VG
6.	A required number of faculty members is assigned appropriate loads and given class schedules conducive to efficient teaching, as per the CHED memo.	3.47	G	3.84	VG	3.75	VG	3.69	VG
7.	There is a regular performance evaluation of faculty using a standardized instrument, duly understood by the faculty, that includes teaching competencies and community involvement.	4.27	VG	3.89	VG	4.11	VG	4.09	VG
8.	There is adequate support for faculty members for research and journal publication.	3.07	G	3.66	VG	3.25	G	3.33	G
9.	The college has a long-term Faculty development Program that considers provisions for scholarships, leaves of absence, research grants, seminars and training, and other activities for professional growth and advancement.	3.20	G	3.90	VG	3.48	G	3.53	VG
10.	The faculty observes professionalism, exercises academic freedom, and is given opportunities for faculty—administration dialogues.	3.60	VG	4.03	VG	3.83	VG	3.82	VG
11.	The college has an atmosphere of professionalism, camaraderie, congeniality, and intellectual sharing.	3.80	VG	3.96	VG	4.03	VG	3.93	VG
Overall Mean		**3.73**	**VG**	**3.99**	**VG**	**3.88**	**VG**	**3.87**	**VG**

Table 6 shows that students rated Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, and 11 as Very Good, with mean values ranging from 3.60 to 4.27. These include faculty qualifications, teaching experience, recruitment standards, performance evaluations, professionalism, and faculty–administration relations. Other items received Good ratings, leading to an overall mean of 3.73. Faculty gave Very Good ratings across the board (mean = 3.99), and administrators rated most items similarly, except for faculty development and research support, which they rated Good (mean = 3.88). The highest-rated areas confirm that faculty members are seen as competent and professionally prepared. However, lower ratings for workload management, development programs, and research support suggest that while faculty have strong credentials, institutional support for growth and scholarship is lacking. These findings align with Zhang, Admiraal, and Saab (2021), who observed that institutional factors—such as time, recognition, and support—are pivotal to faculty engagement in continuous professional development (CPD).

A more verified result may have been achieved through triangulation. It is unclear whether performance evaluations and faculty development efforts translate into measurable teaching outcomes. Also, the study did not capture how differences in faculty rank, tenure, or specialization might influence perceptions. To move forward, institutions may prioritize investments in research grants, capability enhancement programs, and workload rebalancing, as these have been shown to impact faculty morale and instructional effectiveness. Future studies may benefit from mixed-methods approaches, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of the faculty members' lived experiences and providing deeper insights into the barriers hindering their professional growth.

Curriculum and Instruction

Table 7 presents the Evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the curriculum and instruction of the College of Education. Table 7 shows that all three respondent groups rated the College of Education's curriculum and instruction as Very Good, with mean values ranging from 3.53 to 4.20 for students, 3.63 to 4.10 for faculty, and 3.73 to 4.16 for administrators, yielding overall means of 3.91, 3.89, and 3.96, respectively. The highest-ranked

items were logical curriculum design, practical instructional supervision, recognition for exceptional students, and effective academic counseling. The lowest-ranked items involved the selection of textbooks, lab equipment, and instructional materials.

Table 7. *Evaluation of Curriculum and Instruction*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	The requirement for the program of studies is in congruence with the school's and the college's specific objectives and provides an interdepartmental relationship on the curriculum level.	3.87	VG	4.03	VG	4.03	VG	3.97	VG
2.	The curriculum's subjects/syllabi are logical and realistic, considering prerequisites, field experience, activities, and appropriate instructional materials.	4.07	VG	4.10	VG	4.16	VG	4.11	VG
3.	The methods used in imparting are employed to guide the students' self-realization through developing their analytical and critical judgments and stimulating their social awareness.	3.87	VG	3.98	VG	4.00	VG	3.95	VG
4.	The instruction processes are adapted to the subject matter, student capacity, situational needs, and college-level instruction, and appropriate tests and examinations are used to evaluate student performance.	3.87	VG	3.98	VG	4.02	VG	3.96	VG
5.	The rules and practices relating to classroom management are conducive to effective instruction. They are carefully observed in terms of punctuality, keeping of students' records, quizzes, recitation class (40 students), maximum laboratory class (25 students), and are evident in wide student participation.	3.67	VG	3.67	VG	3.75	VG	3.70	VG
6.	There is provision for recognition of exceptional students (dean's list, honors) and encouragement of slow but deserving students to reduce their academic load, recommend a change of course, provide academic counseling, etc.	4.00	VG	4.04	VG	4.14	VG	4.06	VG
7.	Supervision of instruction includes practical measures such as requiring syllabi, visiting classes, informal dialogues with faculty and students, and evaluating tests and examinations.	4.20	VG	3.97	VG	4.05	VG	4.07	VG
8.	Academic/guidance counseling is available to students and is provided by the proper authorities' faculty, deans, and chairperson/guidance counselor.	4.00	VG	3.75	VG	3.73	VG	3.83	VG
9.	The principal Administrator exercises sound judgment in developing and managing the curriculum by holding dialogues with stakeholders, requiring a syllabus for each subject, and promoting instruction through a faculty development program.	4.13	VG	3.73	VG	3.94	VG	3.93	VG
10.	The Academic administrator supervised the selection of textbooks, laboratory equipment, and other instructional materials.	3.53	VG	3.63	VG	3.81	VG	3.66	VG
11.	Information regarding college requirements, systems of students' transferees, research projects/practicum, and other information needed for students' graduation is discussed at the program's start.	3.80	VG	3.85	VG	3.94	VG	3.86	VG
Overall Mean		3.91	VG	3.89	VG	3.96	VG	3.92	VG

These results suggest that the College's curriculum meets CHED's minimum standards and is regularly updated to meet evolving educational demands. Teacher education programs are now being reshaped to address contemporary challenges, including sustainability, interdisciplinarity, and digital innovation. Fischer et al. (2022) underscore the importance of teacher education for sustainable development (TESD), promoting experimental, interdisciplinary learning to foster critical thinking. Likewise, Trust et al. (2023) advocate for integrating emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, into curricula to prepare educators for digital-age teaching.

However, this analysis must acknowledge some limitations. First, the study relied on perceptual ratings, which may not capture the effectiveness of the curriculum. Respondents may also lack full awareness of curriculum development processes, which may affect their evaluations. Therefore, it is recommended that the institution conduct regular curriculum audits, involving both internal and external stakeholders, to align instructional materials and design with 21st-century competencies and priorities. Enhanced investment in instructional tools and continuous review of textbook relevance and equipment standards will ensure curricular responsiveness to local and global educational trends.

Student Development and Service

Table 8 presents the Evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the student development and service of the College of Education.

Table 8. *Evaluation of Student Development and Service*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**
1.	The Student Development and Service Program (SDSP) is headed by qualified personnel, responsive to the welfare and needs of the students, and anchored in the University's vision, mission, and objectives.	3.47	G	3.92	VG	3.77	VG	3.72	VG
2.	The college admission program provides proper selection and direction of prospective students, such as entrance examination, interview submission, and the dissemination of appropriate documents through the Bulletin of Information and other printed materials.	3.87	VG	4.12	VG	3.98	VG	3.99	VG
3.	The college has a program designed to orient new and old students to the general philosophy and the institution's characteristic values.	3.87	VG	3.99	VG	4.05	VG	3.97	VG
4.	The institution provides a variety of suitable co-curricular activities, such as a Sports development program and socio-cultural development activities, that contribute to student development and support the institution's objectives.	3.47	G	3.87	VG	3.86	VG	3.73	VG
5.	The school supports the student publication, which is required to publish at least one issue per semester highlighting and documenting students' achievements, activities, and performance in academic and non-academic endeavors.	3.73	VG	4.01	VG	4.11	VG	3.95	VG
6.	The student organizations are governed by clear and well-defined policies and guidelines, which provide for a workable action plan containing a variety of relevant curricular and co-curricular activities to meet the varied needs, interests, talents, and potentials of students.	3.80	VG	3.90	VG	4.03	VG	3.91	VG
7.	The influence of the college/university extends beyond its walls through its alumni.	3.07	G	3.85	VG	3.63	VG	3.51	VG
8.	The school provides well-equipped medical and dental services undertaken by professionally qualified and trained personnel who provide a continuing follow-up or referral program and are available during class hours and emergencies.	2.87	G	3.32	G	3.27	G	3.15	G
9.	The school provides clean and spacious food service that conforms to the required sanitary practices. It offers nutritious and well-balanced food items at reasonable prices.	3.13	G	3.11	G	2.81	G	3.02	G
10.	The student assistance program, which includes financial assistance and scholarship grants, is headed by qualified personnel and governed by clear policies and guidelines regarding the selection and retention of academic scholars.	3.33	G	3.88	VG	3.61	VG	3.61	VG
11.	The guidance program is headed by licensed guidance counselors and qualified staff who perform various guidance functions and services such as student inventory, testing program, counseling, placement, and follow-up services, and orientation programs.	3.00	G	3.73	VG	3.50	VG	3.41	G
Overall Mean		**3.42**	**G**	**3.79**	**VG**	**3.69**	**VG**	**3.63**	VG

Table 8 reveals that students generally rated most student development and service items as Good, with top-rated areas including the admission program, student orientation, student publication, and student organizations, with mean values of 3.87, 3.87, 3.73, and 3.80, respectively, and an overall mean of 3.42. Faculty and administrators rated most items Very Good, except for medical and food services, which they rated Good, with overall means of 3.79 and 3.69, respectively. The lowest-rated items across groups pertain to health and nutrition services.

These findings suggest that while core student services are functioning well, particularly in student support and information dissemination, some basic services like healthcare and food provision require urgent improvement. The integration of holistic and inclusive student support systems is increasingly emphasized in the literature. Daza et al. (2021) underscore the value of "third spaces" where student identity and peer collaboration flourish. Fischer et al. (2022) highlight TESD's role in building problem-solving and global citizenship. Trust et al. (2023) suggest that AI tools, when used ethically, can complement student learning and support.mus

Nonetheless, these conclusions should be considered within the study's limitations. Responses were based on user perception and may not fully reflect service delivery quality, especially among non-frequent users of services like clinics or cafeterias. To address this, institutions should conduct service-specific evaluations and satisfaction audits. Furthermore, incorporating participatory consultations and inclusive assessments to address hidden or underrepresented student needs is essential, as it promotes a holistic approach to student services and enhances both the educational environment and student outcomes.

Entrepreneurship and Employability

Table 9 presents the Evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the entrepreneurship and employability of the College of Education.

Table 9. *Evaluation of Entrepreneurship and Employability*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	Practitioners and other stakeholders in different fields are involved in developing a relevant curriculum that is responsive to the needs of the time.	3.53	VG	3.74	VG	3.64	VG	3.64	VG
2.	The partner training institutions provide well-defined training programs in accordance with the school's objectives, evident in the students' theoretical knowledge in professional subjects.	3.47	G	3.80	VG	3.52	VG	3.60	VG
3.	The school is tied to an existing Memorandum Agreement with a participating industry partner that provides protection and safety for the trainee.	3.60	VG	3.72	VG	3.67	VG	3.66	VG
4.	The school and industry share facilities and equipment, and is evident by this MOA	3.20	G	3.54	VG	3.36	G	3.37	G
5.	An alumni and placement office, as well as the LCU/LGU Industry Employment coordinator, is made available to assist graduates and monitor graduates' progress	2.53	G	3.51	VG	3.36	G	3.13	G
6.	School heads are vigilant in sending letters to industries for on-the-job training of students and conducting visits to schools and industries for possible linkages.	3.60	VG	4.02	VG	3.75	VG	3.79	VG
Overall Mean		**3.32**	**G**	**3.72**	**VG**	**3.55**	**VG**	**3.53**	VG

The data indicate that faculty rated all items on entrepreneurship and employability as Very Good (overall mean = 3.72). Administrators shared this sentiment, except for shared facilities and alums placement support, which they rated Good (mean = 3.55). Students rated curriculum development, industry partnerships, and training safety as Very Good, while training programs and alum services were rated Good, with an overall mean of 3.32. The most highly rated items included the school's collaboration with industry, safety protocols during training, and stakeholder participation in curriculum planning. Conversely, lower scores point to concerns about alum support, shared facilities, and practical training opportunities.

These results suggest the College fosters effective industry linkages that enhance students' real-world readiness. Such linkages are vital in addressing employability gaps and supporting career transitions. According to Fischer et al. (2022), TESD equips pre-service teachers with entrepreneurial and adaptive competencies, such as innovation, systems thinking, and resilience—essential traits for employability in rapidly changing contexts. However, the findings must be interpreted in light of certain limitations. Students' limited exposure to actual employment or entrepreneurial outcomes may lead to speculative or less informed ratings. Additionally, the study did not measure employment tracking or outcomes directly. To strengthen this area, future studies should include tracer studies and employer feedback to assess graduates' preparedness. It is also recommended that the College improve alum support systems, enhance training infrastructure, and foster innovation-driven programs that link learning directly with community and industry engagement.

Community Extension Service

Table 10 presents the Evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the College of Education's community extension service. Table 10 shows that faculty rated all items on community extension as Very Good, except for the item regarding the presence of a dedicated Extension Service Office, which was rated Good (mean = 3.45), resulting in an overall mean of 3.70. Administrators gave mostly Very Good ratings, with Good scores for outreach funding and program reach (mean = 3.42). Students provided Good ratings overall (mean = 3.33), though items related to NSTP projects and community engagement received higher ratings.

The top-rated items were sustainable NSTP projects, the college's outreach philosophy, and partnerships with community sectors. Lower-rated aspects included financial resources, logistical support, and lack of a permanent Extension Office. These results highlight the institution's strong commitment to extension activities, despite ongoing struggles with structural and resource limitations. Magnaye and Ylagan (2021) noted similar patterns in Philippine higher education, where the impact of extension initiatives is often constrained by limited funding, lack of space, and fragmented program coordination.

Table 10. *Evaluation of Community Extension Service*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	The college establishes and maintains satisfactory relation/linkage with different community sectors.	3.40	G	3.80	VG	3.61	VG	3.60	VG
2.	The college's educational philosophy, policies, programs, and services are made known to the community through announcements, meetings, and to interested individuals.	3.73	VG	3.77	VG	3.59	VG	3.70	VG
3.	The college provides the entire college community with adequate opportunities and motivation to know the conditions and needs of the outside community.	3.40	G	3.75	VG	3.50	VG	3.55	VG
4.	Whenever possible, the college shares its resources with the community.	3.33	G	3.65	VG	3.56	VG	3.52	VG
5.	The college outreach programs and projects are implemented locally, nationally, and regionally.	3.67	VG	3.63	VG	3.42	G	3.57	VG
6.	The college provides financial aid, budget for extension programs, participates in educational, civic, cultural, and religious activities, and undertakes community service projects that involve all sectors of the college community in such services (administration, faculty, students, and alumni)	2.80	G	3.60	VG	3.16	G	3.19	G
7.	The college has sustainable NSTP Projects that benefit immediate communities where it is located.	3.60	VG	3.93	VG	3.72	VG	3.75	VG
8.	The college has a separate Extension Service Office.	2.73	G	3.45	G	2.78	G	2.99	G
Overall Mean		**3.33**	**G**	**3.70**	**VG**	**3.42**	**G**	**3.48**	G

While the findings demonstrate the institution's strong commitment to extension activities, interpretation must be tempered by certain limitations. The absence of direct beneficiary feedback restricts the evaluation of real community impact. Furthermore, respondents may lack complete knowledge of extension operations beyond their involvement. In light of this, future research should include community-based assessments and impact evaluation tools. To maximize effectiveness, the College should prioritize the institutionalization of its extension unit, allocate stable funding, and collaborate with LGUs and NGOs. Structuring programs around long-term, needs-based, and participatory frameworks will enhance relevance, sustainability, and social responsiveness.

Research

Table 11 presents the Evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the College of Education's research.

Table 11. *Evaluation of Research*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	The Research and Development Center is being managed by a Director and staff who are educationally qualified (Ph.D./Ed.D. / Relevant Master's Degree with Thesis Background) and are competent.	3.27	G	3.91	VG	3.33	G	3.50	VG
2.	The institution's research programs are in line with the college/department goals and objectives and are produced at least once a year.	2.93	G	3.88	VG	3.23	G	3.35	G
3.	A specified budget and support for facilities and equipment to encourage research are provided.	3.00	G	3.53	VG	2.83	G	3.12	G
4.	The research is of good quality, follows specific guidelines and format, and contributes innovative ideas to improve the quality and existing conditions of the school, local community, and local government.	2.80	G	3.88	VG	2.98	G	3.22	G
5.	Research output is properly documented, reviewed by a panel before publication, and disseminated to the proper forum to ensure integrity.	3.00	G	3.88	VG	3.05	G	3.31	G
6.	Evidences of improved community brought about by the research findings are fully documented.	3.00	G	3.74	VG	2.94	G	3.23	G
7.	A memorandum of agreement between the Local Government Unit and the Local College is required and signed in recognition of LCU as the research arm of LGU	3.07	G	3.70	VG	3.03	G	3.26	G
8.	Evaluation materials are provided to measure the research's contribution in improving the industry's conditions.	2.93	G	3.61	VG	3.00	G	3.18	G
Overall Mean		**3.00**	**G**	**3.77**	**VG**	**3.05**	**G**	**3.27**	G

In the area of research, faculty rated all items perfect, with an overall mean of 3.77. Students and administrators rated all items good, with overall means of 3.00 and 3.05, respectively. The Research and Development Center is operated by qualified staff and aligns with institutional goals, regularly disseminating outputs. Top-rated indicators were goal alignment and integrity, while bottom-tier items included research quality, community

impact, and availability of funding and facilities.

These results point to a disparity in perceptions between faculty and other stakeholders, indicating potential gaps in visibility or impact. Fischer et al. (2022) emphasize research as a driver of innovation and reflective practice in teacher education. Bridging theory and classroom realities through research improves long-term outcomes for learners and communities. The results may have been influenced by the respondents' exposure to the research requirements of higher education institutions. Although students may have completed research courses and faculty members may have taught research, this does not necessarily reflect the overall effectiveness of research within the university. To address this, there is a need to institutionalize research mentorship, increase publication incentives, and actively integrate student involvement in order to enhance research literacy and foster collaboration across all academic levels.

Library

Table 12 presents the Evaluations of the three groups of respondents on the College of Education library.

Table 12. *Evaluation of the Library*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**
1.	The college/university library has an organizational structure suitable to the institution's needs. It is headed by a qualified chief librarian who directs and supervises the library's total operation and is responsible for the efficient and effective administration of its resources and services.	2.80	G	3.80	VG	2.86	G	3.15	G
2.	The chief librarian holds academic status and participates in the academic decision-making and is responsible for preparing, defending, and administering the library budget.	3.00	G	3.69	VG	2.98	G	3.22	G
3.	The library maintains written policies and procedures covering internal administration and operational activities, and meets the required number of librarians participating in faculty activities.	3.13	G	3.79	VG	2.86	G	3.26	G
4.	A year-round, carefully planned program of selecting and procuring library materials supports the institution's vision, mission, goals, and objectives.	2.80	G	3.69	VG	2.80	G	3.10	G
5.	The college library serves as the intellectual resource of the academic community, providing sufficient research books and a core collection of the required number of books to support educational research and other programs of the institution and conforming to the standard set for a particular program.	2.73	G	3.71	VG	2.75	G	3.06	G
6.	The college provides a library that is conducive, accessible, has adequate space, and has appropriate facilities/equipment for students and faculty.	2.87	G	3.67	VG	2.59	G	3.04	G
7.	The library has sufficient hardware and equipment to provide periodicals, other instructional materials, and non-print, digital, and electronic resources.	2.87	G	3.49	G	2.55	G	2.97	G
8.	The library has an organized accepted classification scheme and standard code cataloging (author, subject cards, and up-to-date entries).	2.93	G	3.69	VG	2.75	G	3.12	G
9.	The local government allocates a regular library resource maintenance and administration budget.	2.53	G	3.42	G	2.36	F	2.77	G
Overall Mean		**2.85**	**G**	**3.66**	**VG**	**2.72**	**G**	**3.08**	G

The faculty rated most library items very good, though items concerning local government budget support and digital resource infrastructure were only rated good. Students rated all items good, with a mean of 2.85, and administrators rated most items good, except for budget allocation, which was rated fair (mean = 2.72). Strengths included clear policies, capable library management, and organizational setup. Weaknesses included library space, digital infrastructure, and budget reliability. Ullah & Usman (2023) stress that modern libraries are crucial in supporting research and academic performance. These results, however, suggest underfunding and underutilization, which may compromise academic development, especially in research-intensive environments.

The results indicate that both students and administrators share similar perceptions, likely due to their direct experience and knowledge of the library. However, the lack of qualitative data on student library use and accessibility limits the depth of the evaluation. Future research should incorporate usage analytics and user satisfaction surveys to gather more specific and actionable information. Based on these insights, institutions should prioritize budget realignment, digital resource expansion, and the development of collaborative learning spaces. These measures are essential to improving library accessibility, enhancing student outcomes, and ensuring quality education.

Laboratories

Table 13 presents the Evaluation of the three respondent groups on the College of Education laboratories.

Table 13. *Evaluation of the Laboratories*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	Science lecture rooms are spacious, well ventilated, well lighted, safe, and equipped with sinks, water, electrical outlets, and audiovisual equipment.	2.53	G	3.26	G	2.65	G	2.81	G
2.	Specific laboratory rooms are made available for Physics, Chemistry, and Biology. Their layout conforms to acceptable standards and particular needs regarding class size, separate storage, furniture, and equipment.	2.73	G	3.25	G	2.69	G	2.89	G
3.	The computer laboratory is adequately equipped for class work to accommodate a ratio of 1:1.	2.67	G	2.88	G	2.43	F	2.66	G
4.	The college provides adequate equipment and supplies for each laboratory course so that students can work in small groups.	2.53	G	3.18	G	2.52	G	2.74	G
5.	The college laboratories are maintained, equipment is stored and labeled correctly, and a systematic and efficient requisition and inventory system is used.	2.53	G	3.25	G	2.50	G	2.76	G
6.	The laboratories are provided with safety measures, such as non-skid floors, appropriate signage, an accessible first aid kit, charts, neutralizing solutions, gowns and safety goggles, properly trained personnel, adequate safety supplies, and fire extinguishers.	2.60	G	3.34	G	2.48	F	2.81	G
7.	The laboratories have clearly defined procedures and are periodically checked, maintained, and updated accordingly.	2.73	G	3.31	G	2.56	G	2.87	G
Overall Mean		**2.62**	**G**	**3.21**	**G**	**2.55**	**G**	**2.79**	G

Teachers and students rated laboratory facilities as good, with mean values of 3.21 and 2.62, respectively. Administrators had similar sentiments, though specific concerns regarding computer labs and safety protocols were rated fair, yielding an overall mean of 2.55. Top-rated aspects were science lab equipment and safety investments. Issues included inventory, labeling, maintenance, and equipment ratios. These findings show that while labs contribute to instructional quality, infrastructure and operational systems require upgrading. Consistent with accreditation requirements, proper laboratories are essential for achieving competence in teaching laboratory, science, and technology courses. While laboratory equipment plays a vital role in enhancing students' competitiveness, the teaching performance of students is being recognized by partner schools. However, regular upgrading, proper maintenance, and strict adherence to safety protocols must also be prioritized. These aspects should be incorporated into the university's long-term development plan, which will provide a clear direction for the institution's continuous growth and improvement.

Physical Plant

Table 14 presents the Evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the physical plant of the College of Education. Faculty gave physical plant items a good rating (mean = 3.17). Students gave a slightly lower rating (mean = 2.67), with fair marks on building design, janitorial, and food services. Administrators gave mostly fair ratings, except for athletic and bulletin board facilities. Strengths included accessible sports facilities and appropriate signage. Challenges included outdated building layouts, limited food service, and inadequate disability accommodations.

These findings reveal that while the campus infrastructure adequately supports certain functions, it lacks sufficient facilities for student services. According to CHED and ALCU-COA, the recognized quality assurance bodies for locally funded universities, the physical plant must be adequately provided to meet quality standards. Ensuring proper infrastructure is essential for maintaining stability and supporting the overall educational environment.

A key limitation of this study is its focus on user perceptions rather than objective assessments of facilities. Future research should incorporate structural evaluations, environmental audits, and analysis of architectural plans to support inclusive redesign efforts. Findings highlight the need for facility upgrades and accessibility improvements aligned with universal design principles, ensuring environments are inclusive and functional for all users.

Table 14. *Evaluation of Physical Plant*

	Criteria	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.	The school site is in a wholesome environment conducive to educational activity, accessible and safe from traffic and transportation hazards, sufficiently free from noise, dust, odors, smoke, and other undesirable elements.	2.80	G	3.25	G	2.45	F	2.84	G
2.	The campus is well planned with covered pathways, provides sufficient facilities for social, physical, cultural, and spiritual activities, and is supported by a systematic development plan.	2.80	G	3.25	G	2.23	F	2.76	G
3.	The buildings are functionally designed, constructed of strong, durable materials, and equipped to withstand earthquakes, typhoons, and fire hazards.	2.53	G	3.08	G	2.16	F	2.59	G
4.	The buildings are well planned and have provisions for appropriate corridors, doorways, sanitized water facilities, well-distributed portable drinking water, accessible entrances and exits with enough toilets, and consideration of persons with disabilities.	2.47	F	3.08	G	2.23	F	2.59	G
5.	Bulletins of information, display boards, and waste disposal containers are strategically located.	2.60	G	3.49	G	2.80	G	2.96	G
6.	Janitorial and security services are enough and functional.	2.47	F	3.21	G	2.58	G	2.75	G
7.	The size and number of classrooms can accommodate the student population and conform to standards.	2.53	G	2.99	G	2.45	F	2.66	G
8.	The offices, including faculty rooms, equipment, location, waiting areas, function rooms, and similar areas, are made convenient and accessible to faculty and students.	2.67	G	3.39	G	2.64	G	2.90	G
9.	The athletic facilities are accessible to the student population and sufficient in number and variety to meet the school's requirements.	3.07	G	3.14	G	2.52	G	2.91	G
10.	An infirmary and a school clinic for physical and dental examinations are adequately equipped to serve the school population.	2.60	G	3.06	G	2.52	G	2.72	G
11.	The food service area/canteen is sufficient, creates a cordial atmosphere for the school population, serves appropriate and balanced meals reasonably priced, and is sanitized and supervised by qualified staff with proper health certificates.	2.47	F	2.91	G	2.30	F	2.56	G
12.	An accessible student center is provided with relevant updated documents properly arranged and labeled, where students can meet and discuss issues and use as a work area.	3.07	G	3.23	G	2.36	F	2.88	G
Overall Mean		**2.67**	**G**	**3.17**	**G**	**2.44**	**F**	**2.76**	**G**

3.3 Difference in the Respondents' Evaluation of the Teacher Education Program

Table 15 compares the Evaluations of the students, faculty, and administrators on the status of the Education programs.

Table 15. *Comparison of the Evaluation of the Respondents on the Status of the Teacher Education Program*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	CV	P-value	Decision
1. Vision and Mission Statement							
Between	0.01	2	0.00	**3.24**	3.40	NS	Accept Ho
Within	0.05	24	0.00				
2. Objectives of the College of Education							
Between	0.07	2	0.03	**1.15**	3.47	NS	Accept Ho
Within	0.66	21	0.03				
3. Curriculum and Instruction							
Between	3.59	2	1.79	**1.35**	3.47	NS	Accept Ho
Within	27.88	21	1.32				
4. Faculty							
Between	0.36	2	0.18	**1.81**	3.32	NS	Accept Ho
Within	3.04	30	0.10				
5. Governance and Administration							
Between	0.031	2	0.01	**0.55**	3.32	NS	Accept Ho
Within	0.87	30	0.02				
6. Student Development and Service							
Between	0.81	2	0.40	**3.22**	3.32	NS	Accept Ho
Within	3.80	30	0.12				
7. Entrepreneurship and Employability							
Between	0.48	2	0.24	**3.10**	3.86	NS	Accept Ho
Within	1.16	15	0.07				
8. Community Extension Service							
Between	0.58	2	0.29	**3.39**	3.47	NS	Accept Ho
Within	1.80	21	0.08				

9. Research							
Between	0.45	2	0.22	**1.61**	3.47	NS	Accept Ho
Within	2.94	21	0.14				
10. Library							
Between	0.64	2	0.32	**1.46**	3.47	NS	Accept Ho
Within	4.65	21	0.22				
11. Laboratories							
Between	0.24	2	0.12	**1.19**	3.56	NS	Accept Ho
Within	1.85	18	0.10				
12. Physical Plant							
Between	0.20	2	0.10	**0.99**	3.29	NS	Accept Ho
Within	3.39	33	0.10				

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicates that the F-values for all assessed dimensions—Vision and Mission, Objectives, Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty, Governance, Student Development, Entrepreneurship, Community Extension, Research, Library, Laboratories, and Physical Plant—are below their respective F-critical (tabular) values. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted for each dimension, signifying no statistically significant differences in the ratings among the three respondent groups. This consistency is particularly evident in the areas of Vision and Mission, Objectives, Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty, Governance, Laboratories, and Physical Plant. These findings suggest a shared perception among students, faculty, and administrators regarding key components of the teacher education program at the local university.

3.5 Challenges Encountered

Table 16 presents the problems encountered in implementing the Education program. Likewise, the proposed strategic plan presents solutions.

Table 16. *Problems Encountered in the Implementation of the College of Education Program*

	Problems	Students		Faculty		Administrators		Composite	
		WM	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**	**WM**	**VI**
1.	Lack of the required laboratory facilities, equipment, supplies, and materials for instruction.	4.58	HO	4.43	O	4.53	HO	4.51	HO
2.	Classroom and laboratory rooms are not properly ventilated and lighted,	3.78	O	3.80	O	4.61	HO	4.06	O
3.	Insufficient classroom for learning.	3.98	O	4.75	HO	4.65	HO	4.46	O
4.	No funding to conduct a community outreach program	3.75	O	4.10	O	4.75	HO	4.20	O
5.	Poor sanitation and maintenance of the comfort rooms/buildings.	3.03	MO	4.05	O	3.63	O	3.57	O
6.	Inadequate comfort rooms to serve the students, visitors, and faculty.	3.50	O	3.01	MO	4.50	HO	3.67	O
7.	Lack of instructional materials as a support system for instruction.	3.02	MO	3.80	O	4.60	HO	3.81	O
8.	Inadequate library space and personnel.	3.75	O	4.03	O	4.63	HO	4.14	O
9.	Lack of books and other reference materials.	3.10	MO	4.80	HO	4.50	HO	4.13	O
10.	Insufficient funds for research and development.	3.58	O	4.52	HO	4.58	HO	4.23	O
11.	No provision for educational technology facilities	3.75	O	4.53	HO	4.90	HO	4.06	O
12.	Insufficient linkages, networking, and a signed memorandum of agreement with the different public and private entities.	2.30	SO	4.10	O	4.80	HO	3.73	O
13.	Lack of interest in school personnel/faculty to conduct community immersion.	2.10	SO	4.05	O	4.25	O	3.46	MO
14.	No provision for a research and development center (RDC) as an established unit in the university.	2.78	MO	4.00	O	4.18	O	3.65	O
15.	No research output relevant to the needs of the institute and community.	2.03	SO	4.03	O	4.80	HO	3.62	O
16.	Insufficient funds for the operation of the entire university.	3.50	O	4.53	HO	4.90	HO	4.31	O
17.	Inadequate funds to support student activities.	3.23	MO	4.58	HO	4.58	HO	3.73	O
18.	Rampant absenteeism and tardiness of the faculty	2.35	SO	4.10	O	4.85	HO	3.77	O
19.	Insufficient school medical/dental clinic to meet the needs of the students.	2.18	SO	4.80	HO	4.53	HO	3.84	O
20.	Insufficient Canteen/cafeteria to accommodate the needs of the students.	2.01	SO	4.53	HO	4.55	HO	3.70	O
21.	No provision for Placement Office/Services.	2.25	SO	3.83	O	4.78	HO	3.62	O
22.	Lack of academic qualifications and teaching experience to teach in the field of specialization.	2.78	MO	3.80	O	4.18	O	3.58	O
23.	Lack of in-service training of faculty to enhance competency in teaching.	2.10	SO	3.73	O	3.23	MO	3.77	O
24.	Lack of monitoring and evaluation of faculty performance.	2.20	SO	3.75	O	3.83	O	3.26	MO
Overall Mean		**3.73**	**O**	**3.99**	**O**	**3.88**	**O**	**3.87**	**O**

The top five problems identified by the three respondent groups regarding the education program's

implementation include: lack of necessary laboratory facilities, equipment, and materials (mean = 4.51); insufficient classroom for learning (4.46); inadequate operational funding (4.31); Insufficient funds for research and development (4.23); and no funding to conduct a community outreach program (4.20). These results are critical gaps that could undermine the program's effectiveness in producing globally competent future educators. Conversely, the lowest-ranked issues—such as lack of monitoring and evaluation of faculty performance, lack of academic qualifications for specialization courses, disinterest in community immersion, poor sanitation of comfort rooms, provision for placement office, and research output—received means ranging from 3.62 to 3.26. The overall weighted mean of 3.87 indicates that while the education program is functioning at a very good level, several core issues persist.

While the education program is generally viewed in a positive light and its graduates are commended by cooperating schools for their local competitiveness, critical limitations remain—particularly in terms of financial resources and student services, both of which are essential for producing globally competent educators. The findings suggest a potential imbalance in the overall assessment due to an overreliance on perceptual data. Although the study provides valuable insights, it lacks key indicators of program effectiveness, such as achievement data, graduation rates, and employment outcomes. Furthermore, it does not account for external factors affecting program delivery, including the role of local government. The relatively small and limited participant pool also raises concerns about the representativeness of the findings, as it may not fully capture the perspectives of the broader academic community.

Nonetheless, the implications are clear: prioritizing modern equipment acquisition and enhanced funding support is essential. Future institutional efforts should explore collaborative partnerships with government bodies and private stakeholders to mobilize resources for long-term improvements. These results also signal the need for expanded evaluative tools beyond perception-based surveys, such as objective facility audits or digital system assessments, which can offer more data-driven insights. Further research may focus on the correlation between resource limitations and student outcomes, and on how strategic investments could mitigate learning inequities across campuses.

4.0 Conclusion

Based on the findings, the College of Education demonstrates effective implementation in key areas such as its vision, mission, objectives, curriculum delivery, faculty competence, and governance. However, notable gaps persist in community and extension services, research initiatives, library resources, laboratory facilities, and the physical plant. Although respondents view certain key areas as generally very satisfactory, they also acknowledge significant constraints that hinder quality assurance—particularly in student support services, funding, research activities, instructional facilities, and community engagement. These challenges highlight the need for targeted and strategic interventions to address existing gaps and enhance overall program effectiveness.

To address these concerns, the College should implement a set of prioritized and actionable steps. These must include enhanced research engagement concerning teaching practice innovation and community improvement initiatives involving students, faculty, and academic staff, which will reinforce the College's commitment to holistic and socially responsive education. Collaborative partnerships with stakeholders for resource management and improvement of the learning environment are likewise essential. This can be achieved through strategic linkages with education stakeholders, partnerships, and consortia that provide additional support and resources. Conducting periodic curricular reviews and benchmarking with Teacher Education Centers of Excellence, national agencies such as CHED and SEAMEO, and accrediting bodies like ALCU-COA and ISO will further strengthen the relevance, quality, and global competitiveness of the curriculum.

Finally, the formulation of a phased development plan—outlining short-term (1–2 years) and long-term (3–5 years) goals—is essential to ensure systematic and sustainable improvements across key areas of the College of Education. In addition to institutional strategies, future research should incorporate student and alums perspectives through qualitative or mixed-method studies focusing on quality assurance mechanisms, academic support services, and graduate employability. Similar to the findings of Aburizaizah (2022), who noted that QA processes often emphasize compliance more than learning outcomes, such research could illuminate how stakeholder feedback enhances institutional effectiveness. Likewise, Kayyali (2023) underscored the importance of aligning QA frameworks with employability and student-centered outcomes, reinforcing the need to examine how local teacher education programs adapt to global expectations. These approaches will provide a more in-

depth analysis of institutional effectiveness and stakeholder satisfaction, offering valuable insights for evidence-based policy formulation and continuous quality improvement. Such studies will not only strengthen internal quality assurance frameworks but also support the College's positioning in producing globally competitive, future-ready educators who can thrive in an increasingly dynamic and complex educational landscape.

5.0 Contribution of Authors

Ramona A. Prado – editing, writing, supervising, BA – data analysis, encoding, etc.

6.0 Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, or publication of this article

7.0 Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declare no conflict of interest.

8.0 Acknowledgment

Many individuals have inspired me throughout the realization of my aspirations, and the unwavering support I received motivated me to complete this important endeavor. I am deeply grateful to my children, Kris An Llywi and Mon Fred Carlo, for their understanding during challenging times; ; my former student Joshua Jay Eden for the assistance; my mentors Dr. Lilian B. Enriquez and Prof. Robert Torrecampo for their guidance; the school administrators, faculty, and students for their cooperation; my secretary Mikaela Ubas; my adviser Dr. Eledio Acibar for his guidance; the Panel Committee for their valuable insights; and lastly, to the Lord for His unconditional love, wisdom, and guidance, which made this achievement possible.

9.0 References

Aburizaizah, S. J. (2022). The role of quality assurance in Saudi higher education institutions. English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666374022000061

Balinario, J. C., Ofqueria, M. G. M., & Arca, L. B. (2023). Predictors of licensure examination for teachers' performance. HAL Open Science. https://hal.science/hal-04626652/

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://tinyurl.com/yc7mkp96

Commission on Higher Education. (2004). CHED Memorandum Order No. 30, s. 2004: Revised policies and standards for undergraduate teacher education curriculum. https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.30-s2004.pdf

Commission on Higher Education. (2007). CHED Memorandum Order No. 52, s. 2007: Policies and standards for graduate programs in education. https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.52-s2007.pdf

Commission on Higher Education. (2008). CHED Memorandum Order No. 40, s. 2008: Manual of regulations for private higher education (MORPHE). https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.40-s2008.pdf

Commission on Higher Education. (2012). CHED Memorandum No. 46, s. 2012: Policy-Standard to enhance Quality Assurance (QA) in the Philippine Higher Education through Outcomes-Based and Typology-Based QA. https://www.pacu.org.ph/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/CMO-No.46-s2012.pdf

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://tinyurl.com/39zddsex

Daza, V., Gudmundsdottir, G. B., & Lund, A. (2021). Partnerships as third spaces for professional practice in initial teacher education: A scoping review. Teaching and Teacher Education, 102, 103338. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X21000627

Estolas, J. S., & Boquiren, R. (n.d.). Introduction to research. https://library.tip.edu.ph/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=10

Fischer, D., King, J., Rieckmann, M., Barth, M., Büssing, A., Hemmer, I., & Lindau-Bank, D. (2022). Teacher education for sustainable development: A review of an emerging research field. Journal of Teacher Education, 73(5), 509–524. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00224871221105784

Generalao, I. N., Ducanes, G., Yee, K. M., & David, C. C. (2022). Teacher education in the Philippines: Are we meeting the demand for quality? Philippine Journal of Public Policy: Interdisciplinary Development Perspectives, 44(1), 1–28. https://tinyurl.com/yc4amm24

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference (16th ed.). Routledge. https://tinyurl.com/mskz2hzn

Ghamrawi, N., Abu-Tineh, A., & Shal, T. (2023). Teaching licensure and education quality: Teachers' perceptions. Sustainability, 15(14), 10886. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/14/10886

Kayyali, M. (2023). An overview of quality assurance in higher education: Concepts and frameworks. Higher Education Quality and Assessment Council (HEQAC). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4497492

Magnaye, R. P., & Ylagan, A. P. (2021). Effectiveness and impact of community extension program of one Philippine higher education institution as basis for sustainability. Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Research in Business Administration, 7(1), 7–13. https://tinyurl.com/mu2t87fx

Paler-Calmorin, L. (2010). Research and statistics with computer. National Bookstore.

Trust, T., Whalen, J., & Mouza, C. (2023). CHATGPT: Challenges, opportunities, and implications for teacher education. Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 23(1), 1–23. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/222408/?nl=1

Ullah, A., & Usman, M. (2023). Role of libraries in ensuring quality education at higher education institutions: A perspective of Pakistan. Inverge Journal of Social Sciences, 5(2), 34–45. https://tinyurl.com/5cv4xav5

UNESCO. (2021). A new generation of external quality assurance: Dynamics of change and innovative approaches (New trends in higher education). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377497

Zhang, X., Admiraal, W., & Saab, N. (2021). Teachers' motivation to participate in continuous professional development: Relationship with factors at the personal and school level. Journal of Education for Teaching, 47(4), 567–583. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02607476.2021.1942804