



Higher Educational Institution Assessment as the Basis for Sustainable Educational Quality

Ma. Magdalena V. Gatdula

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (5)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 19 May 2023

Date of revision: 06 June 2023

Date of acceptance: 14 July 2023

Ma. Magdalena V. Gatdula (2023). Higher Educational Institution Assessment as the Basis for Sustainable Educational Quality. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 14(5). 477-489

¹Faculty member, Bulacan State University, Philippines



Higher Educational Institution Assessment as the Basis for Sustainable Educational Quality

Ma. Magdalena V. Gatdula

Faculty member, Bulacan State University, Philippines

Email: magdalena.gatdula101@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the quality assurance status of Philippine higher education institutions using the Institutional Sustainability Assessment Standards. The research collected data from university administrators, faculty, students, researchers, and community extension and linkages officers in the Philippines. Descriptive research methods were employed to analyze the data and assess the status of higher education institutions. The results showed that the quality assurance categories, including Government and Management, Quality of Teaching and Learning, Support for Students, and Relationship with the Community, were strong, while Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Works were identified as a weakness. The study's recommendations can help guide Philippine higher education institutions in their continuous efforts to improve their quality of education.

Keywords: Quality assurance, Philippine higher education, Institutional Sustainability Assessment Standards, Government and Management, Professional Exposure.

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions play a significant part in the production of knowledgeable graduates who are able to contribute to the growth of society by providing the required knowledge, skills, and attitudes to their students. Yet, in order to guarantee the high standard of education offered by these institutions, it is vital to have an evaluation procedure in place (Dotong&Laguador, 2015). Quality assurance procedures contribute to the upkeep and improvement of educational standards, guaranteeing that the education offered by HEIs is of a quality that is equal to or higher than that which is anticipated (Koslowski, 2006).

In order to assist higher education institutions in the Philippines in maintaining a high level of quality, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has implemented the Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA) methodology. This framework consists of five key performance categories, and each of those key performance areas contains indicators that apply to institutions based on the stage of development they are now in (Lumagsao&Dellosa, 2019). Establishing internal quality assurance systems, adopting international standards and frameworks, and developing strong industry-academia partnerships are all essential for higher education institutions (HEIs) to do in order to facilitate harmonization, integration with ASEAN, and internationalization (Dotong&Laguador, 2015; Mori, 2010).

A quality assurance framework that was developed by the Council of Quality Assurance is utilized by the universities in Ontario. The framework can be implemented in three different ways: in a way that is suitable for the purpose, in an unusual manner, or in a value-added manner. Quality can be defined as either excellence or a limited supply, and one of the evaluating criteria for new undergraduate and graduate programs is whether or not they are consistent with the mission and academic plans of the institution, as well as whether or not the associated learning outcomes are clear and appropriate (Mori, 2010).

According to Ruiz and Sabio (2012), quality assurance is the process of confirming whether or not a product or service satisfies or exceeds the expectations of the client. It is a method that is driven by a process and consists of precise steps to assist in defining and achieving goals. There are several different approaches to quality control that are employed in the Philippines. In addition, it is important to understand how to make the most efficient use of their resources, both natural and human.

It is imperative that quality assurance become an integral element of the management and planning of institutions. The tertiary education system is undergoing transformation, and quality assurance procedures need to adapt along with it or risk becoming obsolete. This is a process that requires a lot of time. Educating oneself to have faith in higher education institutions and assisting those institutions in becoming better must be done (Lemaitre,2009).

Higher education institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines are often organized into public or private categories, depending on whether or not they are colleges or universities. There are two possible classifications for private educational institutions: "sectarian" and "non-sectarian." All public higher education institutions are non-

sectarian in nature, and they are further categorized as either local colleges and universities (LCU) or state universities and colleges (SUC). The national government provides complete funding for state universities and colleges (SUCs), as mandated by the Philippine Congress. On the other side, local government units are in charge of running LCUs.

In addition to this, CHED Memorandum Order No. 01 series of 2005 - Updated Policies and Guideline was issued. It is stated that the Accreditation provided on a voluntary basis to help achieve quality and excellence in Higher Education. Moreover, the process of analyzing and improving the educational quality of higher education institutions and programs through the use of self-evaluation and peer judgment is referred to as accreditation. It results in the accreditation status from an accrediting agency and offers public recognition as well as information on the educational quality of the institution. CHED has a policy that states it will support and assist higher education institutions (HEIs) that have the goal of achieving quality standards that are higher than the minimal requirements. The Policies, Standards, and Guidelines (PSG) document that was distributed by CHED as part of the curricular program defines the minimum standards.

Higher education in the Philippines is overseen by a total of five (5) different certifying agencies, which can be broken down into two different federations in order to receive an accreditation status that are under the umbrella of the Federation of Accrediting Agencies in the Philippines (FAAP).

1. Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU)
2. Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACU-COA)
3. Association of Christian Schools, Colleges and Universities Accrediting Agency, Inc. (ACSCU-AAI) National Network of Quality Accrediting Agencies (NNQAA)
4. Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP)
5. Association of Local Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (ALCU-COA)
6. AACCUP, as well as PAASCU are active members of the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies for Higher Education, (INQAAHE), and both are members of the Asia Pacific Quality. All accrediting agencies are helping CHED in the promotion of quality improvement in the HEI's.

Both the AACCUP and the PAASCU are members of the Asia Pacific Quality, in addition to being active members of the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies for Higher Education (INQAAHE). CHED is receiving assistance from all of the accrediting agencies in its efforts to promote quality improvement in higher education institutions.

The purpose of the research that Dotong and Laguador (2015) conducted was to investigate the importance of obtaining local accreditations and certifications in order to achieve a worldwide level of specialist accreditation and recognition from foreign regulating agencies. In particular, it offers an analysis of quality assurance procedures at both the national and international levels. According to the findings of the research, it is recommended that accreditation bodies in the Philippines should consider including and identifying some aspects of internationalization in their instruments in order to really set some initiatives of the HEIs in that direction and not just as a part of innovation or add on activities but as a part of the assessment criteria. This would be the case in order to really move some initiatives of the HEIs towards that direction. Research fields are obliged to publish their findings and present them at international conferences, but working with authors from other countries is also something that should be addressed. There is a possibility that the accrediting authorities will take into consideration the fact that the faculty members' works have been published in respected journals.

A further technique that is required to publish excellent papers that could someday be submitted to reputed journal publishing for Evaluation is to maintain university research journals in compliance with the prescribed accreditation from CHED. It is beneficial to get one from the institution because publication costs from respectable, index-compliant journals can be quite pricey. In a worldwide economy, accreditation is essential for the mutual acceptance of credentials, which enables students to move between institutions on a regional, national, and even international scale (depending on the scope of the accreditation) (Sanyal & Martin, 2007).

Student and Faculty Mobility have only shared 10 percent of the Quality Standard (QS) World University (WU) Ranking, and higher education institutions (HEIs) that have only a small number of students from other countries can nevertheless move up in the rankings. They simply strengthen the profile of their local academic workforce in order to have more publications in the Scopus indexed journals as this is one of the requirements of QS WU Rankings in rating the Citation per paper and paper per faculty member. Since Philippine higher education institutions are unable to hire more international faculty members due to the high demand in compensation for paying their professional qualifications and experience, they are unable to hire more international faculty members.

Applications for the QS WU Ranking by Subject can be submitted by Degree Programs that have received Level IV accreditation from any of the Philippine accrediting bodies. This will elevate the recognition of the institutions' ability to demonstrate excellence in a variety of disciplines to an international level. Along with the accreditations, this recognition would also help the HEI boost their chances of obtaining a higher rating when they apply to QS Stars in the criterion of Specialist Rating. So, the marketing approach of the university can concentrate on selling the merits of the degree program rather than the university itself (Hobsons, 2014).

Applicants from higher education institutions in the Philippines may also take into account joining the Global Certification Institute as a member organization. It is still difficult for school administrators, particularly those working in private institutions, to quantify the effect of various accreditations on the number of students enrolled in higher education institutions (HEIs). This impact is directly related to the attractiveness of the institution in question to potential students and their parents (Cueto et al., 2006).

Quality assurance, often known as QA, is an essential component in ensuring that higher education institutions, also known as HEIs, provide students with an excellent education. As the demand for high-quality education rises and efforts are made to bring it in line with international benchmarks, the Philippines have come to the realization that they want quality assurance in their educational system. Many studies have been conducted to evaluate the current level of quality assurance (QA) in higher education institutions in the Philippines and to offer frameworks for improving QA practices.

Koslowski (2006) investigated the idea of quality in higher education and suggested that it should not be confined to inputs and outputs but should also encompass the processes that are involved in delivering education. Koslowski's research can be found here. The author stressed how important it is to involve stakeholders in the quality assurance process, such as students, teachers, and industry partners, in order to guarantee that the education that is offered is applicable to the stakeholders' circumstances and satisfies their requirements.

An institutional sustainability assessment of higher education institutions in the Philippines was carried out by Lumagsao and Dellosa (2019). According to the findings of the study, higher education institutions (HEIs) must safeguard their long-term survival by integrating sustainability practices into their quality assurance (QA) frameworks. The writers also emphasized how essential it is to involve stakeholders in the process of promoting sustainable development, citing examples such as the local community and industry partners.

Mori (2010) carried a research on the quality assurance of higher education in Canada. He concluded that a strong quality assurance system is essential to ensuring that higher education institutions (HEIs) cater to the requirements of both students and society. The author of the piece suggested that quality assurance should be built on a concept of continuous improvement, in which organizations continually assess and improve their methods.

Defensor (2009) examined the developments that have taken place as well as the issues that have arisen in quality assurance in Filipino HEIs. The research pointed out how important it is to have a quality assurance system that is all-encompassing and addresses concerns regarding the governance, administration, professors, students, and resources of the institution. The author also stressed how important it is for higher education institutions to cultivate a culture of quality and ongoing development.

Doromal (2010) presented a general summary of the Philippine higher education system and examined the difficulties and opportunities involved in putting quality assurance procedures into effect. The author emphasized how important it is to have a comprehensive quality assurance framework that takes into account the wide variety of HEIs across the nation.

Another study on the quality assurance methods of higher education institutions (HEIs) in Region IV-A was carried out and ISO standards were proposed for quality assurance in Filipino HEIs by Lumagsao and Dellosa (2019). The authors stressed how critical it is to standardize quality assurance processes across all institutions in order to maintain quality and consistency.

The quality assurance practices of five Philippine universities were evaluated by Mazalan and Ambal (2021) in five different categories: governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, quality of research and creative work, support for students, and relations with the community. According to the findings of the study, the areas of strength include governance and management, the quality of teaching and learning, support for students, and relations with the community. On the other hand, the areas of weakness include the quality of professional exposure, research, and creative works.

The examined papers show the significance of quality assurance (QA) in assuring the provision of high-quality education in Filipino higher education institutions (HEIs). These studies highlight the necessity of a comprehensive quality assurance structure that encompasses all facets of the institution, incorporates all relevant stakeholders, and encourages a culture of quality and ongoing improvement. Both the suggested institutional quality assurance framework and the ISO standards can operate as helpful guides for higher education institutions (HEIs) as they work to create their own quality assurance methods and improve the education, they offer their students. In order to ensure that higher education institutions (HEIs) continue to fulfill the ever-evolving requirements of students, society, and the global market, QA processes should be regularly assessed.

Future research should concentrate on other aspects of quality assurance and evaluate potential educational quality assurance frameworks for a broader scope beyond the regional setting. Studies have provided substantial information on the importance of establishing internal quality assurance systems, translating accepted knowledge, skills, and attitudes to meet the current demands of quality education, and evaluating quality assurance mechanisms. This is despite the fact that studies have provided substantial information on the

importance of establishing internal quality assurance systems (Dotong&Laguador, 2015; Lumagsao&Dellosa, 2019).

The literature mentioned suggests that further studies should be conducted to determine if accreditation whether conducted by CHED or independent agencies are necessary to educational institutions. It will also test whether this initiative has an impact on the conversion of prospective students into actual clients. This implies that accreditation, which is a formal recognition of an institution's quality, may affect the decision-making process of potential foreign students when choosing where to study. However, there is also a need for the institutions to undergo self-assessment which the ISA comes in.

In the instrument of ISA, the importance of customer satisfaction, as a crucial component same as the ISO - Quality Management System (QMS) for continual improvement. This means that the accreditation process must not only focus on the quality of education but also on ensuring that students are given adequate attention and reasonable satisfaction. This is crucial because, as noted by Howe (2009), internationalization can have unforeseen consequences if returnees spread negative stories about their experiences of isolation, misery, and discontent.

The literature serves as baseline data of the research that it emphasizes is the importance of self-assessment in ensuring quality education and customer satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY

This study is based on the ISA Framework, which identifies five key areas for assessing quality assurance in higher education institutions: governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, and student support and community relations. Quality assurance refers to the explicit commitment and practices of higher education institutions to develop an institutional culture that recognizes the importance of quality and the continuous improvement of service quality (Defensor, 2009; Doromal, 2010). The study surveyed 426 respondents, including administrators, deans, coordinators, faculty members, and students from selected HEIs in the Philippines, using the ISA Standards Tools and Monitoring and Evaluation Instrument. The variables of the study to be assess are the following:

Governance and management

Systems that represent the governing body's power and decision-making principles. Institutional governance should exhibit probity, strategic vision, accountability, risk management, and performance monitoring. The VMG should reflect the HEI's context before governance begins. HEI policy should be determined through a transparent governance framework (including structure and processes). These should be communicated to stakeholders. Management is the institution's operating systems and processes. The institution's management, financial control, and quality assurance are adequate for managing operations and adapting to change. Effective governance and management require enablers. These institutional initiatives improve community efficiency, productivity, and quality.

Quality of teaching and learning

Clear program standards improve teaching and learning. Transparent approval, implementation, monitoring, and review achieve this. These approaches should help HEIs improve their programs. Teaching-learning systems should consider program approval and implementation, monitoring and review, and strengthening programs.

Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Works

Systems should be designed based on HEI Type (Professional Exposure, Research, Creative Work) to strengthen its quality culture. Professional institutions are expected to have programs that allow students to practice their newly acquired skills in preparation for future careers, such as practicum, internship, and on-the-job training (OJT). Faculty members should guide the mechanisms and processes that allow students to access these programs. Colleges should encourage creative work and/or innovation in the arts and humanities, science and technology, social sciences, and/or management science. There should be mechanisms and processes in place that allow faculty and students to engage in creative work and innovation, regardless of their field of study. Such creative work and innovation, in particular, should be relevant to the communities served by these colleges. Universities are expected to establish a research community of faculty, graduate students, and post-doctoral research associates that fosters and supports creative research and other advanced scholarly activity. Mechanisms and processes should be in place to allow faculty and students to actively participate in these scholarly activities.

Support for Students

This variable should inform system design to promote quality culture. Professional universities should offer programs like practicum, internship, and on-the-job training to help students exercise their newly gained abilities (OJT). Faculty should guide access to these programs. Colleges should stimulate creativity and

innovation in the arts, humanities, sciences, social sciences, and management science. Whatever their topic of study, instructors and students should have ways to be creative and innovate. Creative work and innovation should be relevant to these colleges' communities. Universities are required to promote a research community of faculty, graduate students, and post-doctoral research fellows. Faculty and students should have ways to participate in intellectual activities.

Relationship with the Community

Community relationships are the third education pillar. The extension reflects the company's industry affiliations. Different sorts of HEI-community interactions exist. Promoting local, regional, and national development is one link. Partner institutions are another factor. A third sort of interaction responds directly to local needs. As reflected in the HEI's VMG and taking into account the country's need to compete effectively in global markets, mechanisms and processes should be in place to implement programs that promote the country's social, cultural, economic, and/or developmental needs at the local, regional, and/or national levels. Networking and links show the HEI's repute. Structures and mechanisms that promote and facilitate collaboration with other institutions are essential. Structures and processes that encourage appropriate and responsive extension initiatives, especially for empowerment and self-reliance, should be in place.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The proponent used the Institutional Sustainability Assessment Self Evaluation Document to conduct a survey of 11 universities in the Philippines, with a total of 426 respondents consisting of Administrators, Deans, Coordinators, Faculty Members, and Students. The survey instrument is composed of three parts: respondents' profiles, institution profiles, and perception on the statement.

The first part of the survey, respondents' profiles, gathers information about the name, gender, and profession of the respondents. This information is essential to determine the demographics of the survey respondents and to analyze their answers based on their background.

The second part of the survey, institution profiles, collects basic information about the universities, such as the recognized and phased-out programs, levels of accreditation, and quality assurance mechanisms. This information is crucial to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the institutions and to compare their performance based on the given criteria.

The third part of the survey, perception statement, determines the respondents' perception on the ISA criteria, which are composed of government and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, support to students, and relations with the community. The respondents rate each criterion based on their level of agreement or disagreement with the given statements.

All of the universities surveyed offer college degree programs in various fields, such as engineering, allied medicine, culinary, tourism and hotel and restaurant management, information technology education, elementary and secondary education, Business Management, and criminology programs.

The results of the study is presented to elaborate the motivations of the researcher. The survey results can help identify the strengths and weaknesses of the universities based on the ISA criteria and provide insights on how to improve the quality of education and services offered by the institutions. The following presented the results.

Quality Assurance Status of selected Higher Education Institutions

The following tables present the weighted mean, composite mean and the verbal interpretations of observed practices.

Table 1: Assessment on Governance and Management

Governance And Management	Observed (Weighted Mean)	Interpretation
A. Governance		
Probity	3.89	High
Strategic vision	3.97	High
Accountability	3.89	High
Awareness and management of risk	3.98	High
Effective monitoring of performance	3.99	High
B. Management		
Quality assurance arrangement	3.99	High
C. Enabling features		
Use of information and communication technology in management	3.98	High
Resource generation strategies	3.75	Average

Other enabling features	3.75	High
Over-all Composite Mean	3.91	High

Where: Scale: Very High -4.20-5.00 High – 3.40-4.19 Average – 2.60-3.39 Low – 1.80-2.59 Very Low -1.00-1.79

Based on the weighted mean scores, the governance and management of the organization being assessed are generally rated as high, with an overall composite mean of 3.91.

In terms of governance, the organization performs well in terms of probity, strategic vision, accountability, awareness and management of risk, and effective monitoring of performance, with scores ranging from 3.89 to 3.99, all rated as high.

For management, the organization has a strong quality assurance arrangement, which is rated as high with a score of 3.99. In terms of enabling features, the organization makes effective use of information and communication technology in management, with a high score of 3.98.

Other enabling features also received a high rating of 3.75. The only area for improvement seems to be resource generation strategies, which were rated as average with a score of 3.75.

The high ratings in governance and management observed in this assessment align with previous research on the importance of effective governance and management in achieving organizational success.

One study by Wainwright et al. (2018) found that effective governance structures and processes are key to ensuring accountability, transparency, and risk management in organizations. This is consistent with the high scores in probity, accountability, awareness and management of risk, and effective monitoring of performance in this assessment.

Similarly, the high score in quality assurance arrangement aligns with research by Parry and Proctor-Thomson (2018), who identified quality assurance as a key aspect of effective management in organizations.

The high score in the use of information and communication technology in management is also consistent with research by Al-Qirim (2018), who argued that effective use of technology is critical to enhancing organizational performance.

However, the average score in resource generation strategies suggests that there may be room for improvement in this area. Research by Liu and Ko (2018) highlights the importance of effective resource management in achieving organizational success. This could involve developing effective fundraising strategies, exploring new revenue streams, or improving financial management processes.

In summary, the high ratings in governance, management, and enabling features observed in this assessment are consistent with previous research on the importance of these factors in achieving organizational success. The only area for improvement is in resource generation strategies, which could be addressed through a focus on effective resource management.

Table 2: Assessment of Quality of Teaching and Learning

Quality Of Teaching And Learning	Observed (Weighted Mean)	Interpretation
A. Setting and achieving program standards		
Program approval	3.45	High
Setting of objectives and learning outcomes	3.55	High
Mechanism for effective delivery of programs	3.67	High
Matching of abilities and aptitudes	3.76	High
Academic Support	3.95	High
Monitoring and Review	3.98	High
Action to Strengthen Program	3.89	High
B. Faculty Profile		
System for faculty hiring, evaluation and development	3.55	High
Teaching expertise and competence	3.87	High
C. Use of ICT and Learning Resources		
Library Resources	3.67	High
Laboratories, Equipment and facilities	3.55	High
Use of ICT	3.75	High
Over-all Composite Mean	3.72	High

Where: Scale: Very High -4.20-5.00 High – 3.40-4.19 Average – 2.60-3.39 Low – 1.80-2.59 Very Low -1.00-1.79

Based on the weighted mean scores, the quality of teaching and learning in the organization being assessed is generally rated as high, with an overall composite mean of 3.72.

In terms of setting and achieving program standards, the organization performs well in program approval, setting objectives and learning outcomes, mechanism for effective delivery of programs, matching of abilities and aptitudes, academic support, monitoring and review, and action to strengthen program, with scores ranging from 3.45 to 3.98, all rated as high.

For faculty profile, the organization has a strong system for faculty hiring, evaluation and development, and teaching expertise and competence, with high scores of 3.55 and 3.87, respectively.

In terms of use of ICT and learning resources, the organization makes effective use of library resources and laboratories, equipment and facilities, with high scores of 3.67 and 3.55, respectively.

The use of ICT also received a high rating of 3.75. Overall, the organization has effective teaching and learning practices with a focus on setting and achieving program standards, faculty profile, and use of ICT and learning resources.

There are several areas where this assessment aligns with previous research on effective teaching and learning practices. For example, research by Mazzolini and Maddison (2007) identified the importance of effective use of ICT in enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. The high score in use of ICT in this assessment is consistent with this finding.

Similarly, research by Tuckman and Kennedy (2011) identified the importance of matching student abilities and aptitudes with program requirements in order to enhance student learning outcomes. The high score in matching of abilities and aptitudes in this assessment is consistent with this finding.

However, the relatively lower score in program approval suggests that there may be room for improvement in this area. Research by Altbach and Knight (2007) highlights the importance of effective program approval processes in ensuring the quality of teaching and learning. This could involve developing clear guidelines and standards for program approval, as well as ensuring effective communication and consultation with relevant stakeholders.

In summary, the high ratings in the quality of teaching and learning observed in this assessment are consistent with previous research on effective teaching and learning practices. The organization's focus on faculty profile and use of ICT and learning resources is particularly noteworthy. However, there may be room for improvement in program approval processes.

Table 3: Assessment of Professional Exposure

Quality Of Professional Exposure, Research, And Creative Work	Observed (Weighted Mean)	Interpretation
A. Professional Exposure		
Professional Exposure	3.56	High
B. Research Capability		
Research strategies and capacity	3.58	High
C. Creative Work and/or Innovation		
Creative work and/or innovation	3.88	High
Over-all Composite Mean	3.67	High

Where: Scale: Very High -4.20-5.00 High – 3.40-4.19 Average – 2.60-3.39 Low – 1.80-2.59 Very Low -1.00-1.79

Based on the weighted mean scores, the quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work in the organization being assessed is generally rated as high, with an overall composite mean of 3.67.

In terms of professional exposure, the organization performs well with a high score of 3.56, indicating that employees have opportunities to engage with industry professionals and stay up-to-date with industry trends and practices.

For research capability, the organization has effective research strategies and capacity, with a high score of 3.58. This suggests that the organization is able to conduct research and produce high-quality research outputs.

In terms of creative work and/or innovation, the organization excels with a high score of 3.88. This suggests that the organization encourages and supports employees to engage in creative and innovative work, which can lead to new ideas, products, and services. Overall, the organization has effective professional exposure, research, and creative work practices.

There are several areas where this assessment aligns with previous research on effective professional exposure, research, and creative work practices. For example, research by Brown and Katz (2011) identified the

importance of creative and innovative work in driving organizational success. The high score in creative work and/or innovation in this assessment is consistent with this finding.

Similarly, research by Blumenthal and Campbell (2012) identified the importance of research in driving innovation and improving organizational performance. The high score in research capability in this assessment is consistent with this finding.

However, the relatively lower score in professional exposure suggests that there may be room for improvement in this area. Research by Eng and Lee (2011) highlights the importance of professional exposure in enhancing employees' knowledge and skills, as well as promoting career development. This could involve developing more opportunities for employees to interact with industry professionals, attend conferences and workshops, and participate in other professional development activities.

In summary, the high ratings in the quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work observed in this assessment are consistent with previous research on effective professional exposure, research, and creative work practices. The organization's focus on creative work and/or innovation is particularly noteworthy. However, there may be room for improvement in professional exposure practices.

Table 4: Assessment of Support for Students

IV. Support For Students	Observed (Weighted Mean)	Interpretation
A. Equity and Access		
Recruitment, admission and academic support	3.48	High
B. Student Services		
Non-Academic Support	4.25	High
Over-all Composite Mean	3.87	High

Where: Scale: Very High -4.20-5.00 High – 3.40-4.19 Average – 2.60-3.39 Low – 1.80-2.59 Very Low -1.00-1.79

Based on the weighted mean scores, the organization being assessed provides high levels of support for students, with an overall composite mean of 3.87.

In terms of equity and access, the organization performs well, with a high score of 3.48. This suggests that the organization has effective recruitment and admission policies in place, as well as providing academic support to ensure that all students have equal opportunities to succeed.

In terms of student services, the organization performs very well, with a high score of 4.25 in non-academic support. This suggests that the organization provides a wide range of services to support students' well-being and personal development, such as counseling, health services, career services, and extracurricular activities.

Overall, the organization provides high levels of support for students, with a particular strength in non-academic support services.

Previous research has identified the importance of providing comprehensive support services to students in order to enhance their academic and personal success. For example, research by Kuh et al. (2010) found that effective support services can improve students' academic performance, engagement, and retention. The high score in non-academic support in this assessment is consistent with this finding.

In terms of equity and access, research has highlighted the importance of ensuring that all students have equal opportunities to succeed, regardless of their background or circumstances. For example, research by St. John et al. (2014) found that effective recruitment and admission policies can help to increase access to higher education for disadvantaged students. The high score in this area in this assessment is consistent with this finding.

In summary, the high ratings in support for students observed in this assessment are consistent with previous research on effective student support practices. The organization's focus on non-academic support services is particularly noteworthy. However, there may be room for further improvement in ensuring equity and access for all students.

Table 5: Assessment of Relevance of Program

V. Relations With The Community	Observed (Weighted Mean)	Interpretation
A. Relevance of programs		
Determining and promoting relevance	3.21	High
B. Networking and linkages		
Networking and linkages	3.78	High
C. Extension Programs		
Extension and Outreach	3.67	High
Over-all Composite Mean	3.55	High

Where: Scale: Very High -4.20-5.00 High – 3.40-4.19 Average – 2.60-3.39 Low – 1.80-2.59 Very Low -1.00-1.79

Based on the data provided, the organization or program being evaluated scored high in terms of their relations with the community.

For the category of "Relevance of programs," the organization received a weighted mean score of 3.21, which is also considered high. This means that the organization is able to determine and promote programs that are relevant to the needs of the community they serve.

In terms of "Networking and linkages," the organization received a higher score of 3.78. This indicates that they are able to establish and maintain connections with other organizations or stakeholders that could help them achieve their goals.

For "Extension Programs," the organization received a score of 3.67, which also falls under the high category. This means that they are able to extend their services and programs to reach more members of the community, especially those who are in need.

A study by Brown, et al. (2019) found that strong community relationships are essential for the success of community-based health programs. They found that effective communication, trust-building, and collaboration with community members are critical components of building strong relationships.

Another study by Hansen and colleagues (2016) examined the importance of networking and linkages for community-based organizations. They found that organizations that were able to establish and maintain connections with other organizations and stakeholders were more likely to be successful in achieving their goals.

A study by Phillips and colleagues (2018) explored the role of extension programs in promoting community development. They found that extension programs can be an effective way to engage with community members, identify their needs and priorities, and develop programs that are tailored to their specific needs.

Overall, the organization received a composite mean score of 3.55, which is considered high. This suggests that the organization has a strong relationship with the community, and is able to effectively serve their needs through relevant programs, networking and linkages, and extension programs.

Table 6: Summary of Quality Assurance Status According to Five Areas

AREA	Composite Mean	Interpretation
1. Government and Management	3.91	High
2. Quality of Teaching and Learning	3.72	High
3. Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Works	3.67	High
4. Support for Students	3.87	High
5. Relationship with the Community	3.55	High
Over-all Composite Mean	3.74	High

Where: Scale: Very High -4.20-5.00 High – 3.40-4.19 Average – 2.60-3.39 Low – 1.80-2.59 Very Low -1.00-1.79

Based on the data provided, the organization or program being evaluated scored high in all areas of assessment.

For the area of "Government and Management," the organization received a composite mean score of 3.91, which is considered high. This means that the organization has effective government and management practices in place.

In terms of "Quality of Teaching and Learning," the organization received a composite mean score of 3.72, which is also considered high. This indicates that the organization provides quality teaching and learning experiences for its students.

For "Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Works," the organization received a score of 3.67, which falls under the high category. This means that the organization is able to provide opportunities for professional exposure, research, and creative works for its students.

In terms of "Support for Students," the organization received a composite mean score of 3.87, which is considered high. This suggests that the organization provides adequate support for its students, such as through mentoring, counseling, and other forms of assistance.

For "Relationship with the Community," the organization received a composite mean score of 3.55, which is also considered high. This means that the organization has a strong relationship with the community it serves.

A study by Densten and Gray (2018) found that effective government and management practices are essential for organizational success. They found that organizations with strong leadership, clear communication, and effective decision-making processes were more likely to be successful in achieving their goals.

Another study by Bleske-Rechek, et al. (2016) explored the factors that contribute to the quality of teaching and learning in higher education. They found that factors such as faculty-student interactions, student engagement, and active learning strategies were important predictors of student success.

A study by Moriana, et al. (2019) examined the impact of professional exposure on student learning outcomes. They found that students who participated in professional exposure activities, such as internships or research projects, were more likely to have higher levels of academic achievement and career success.

A study by Ahmad, et al. (2019) explored the importance of support services for student success. They found that support services, such as academic advising, tutoring, and counseling, were critical for helping students overcome academic and personal challenges and achieve their goals.

A study by O'Neill, et al. (2017) investigated the relationship between universities and their communities. They found that universities that were actively engaged with their communities, such as through partnerships with local organizations or community service programs, were more likely to have positive reputations and contribute to local economic development.

Overall, the organization received an over-all composite mean score of 3.74, which is considered high. This indicates that the organization is performing well in all areas of assessment, and is able to provide quality education and support to its students, while maintaining strong relationships with the community and effective management practices.

Suggested Sustainable Development Plan to Sustain Quality

Based on the findings of the study, here are some steps to develop a sustainable development plan:

Develop a mission statement

Develop a mission statement that reflects the organization's commitment to sustainable development and its goals in each of the areas assessed.

Identify goals and objectives

Based on the assessment findings, identify specific goals and objectives for each of the five areas assessed, including government and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research, and creative works, support for students, and relationship with the community.

Develop strategies and action plans

Develop strategies and action plans for achieving each of the goals and objectives identified. These strategies should be based on the strengths of the organization in each area assessed and should address any areas where improvement is needed.

Monitor and evaluate progress

Monitor and evaluate progress toward achieving the goals and objectives identified, and adjust strategies and action plans as needed.

Engage stakeholders

Engage stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, and the community, in the sustainable development planning process and seek their input and feedback.

Continuously improve

Continuously improve the sustainable development plan based on feedback, new data, and changing needs and goals of the organization and its stakeholders.

D. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

Quality assurance in the Philippines is an important issue, particularly in the higher education sector. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has implemented various measures to improve the quality of education in the country. One way that the quality of education in HEIs is measured is through the assessment of five key areas: governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, support for students, and relations with the community. A study by Lumagsao and Dellosa (2019) found that four of the five areas were strengths, namely government and management, quality of teaching and learning, support for students, and relationship with the community. However, the quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work was considered a weakness. This study served as the baseline data of this research endeavor.

Therefore, it is crucial to identify ways to improve the quality of research and creative work in HEIs. One possible solution is to implement a quality assurance system that involves the participation of all stakeholders in the academic community, including students, faculty members, administrators, and external partners. This

approach ensures that all perspectives are taken into consideration and that everyone is involved in the process of improving the quality of education.

In the future, several areas could be further improved in the Philippines. First, there is a need for more comprehensive and standardized quality assurance systems across all HEIs in the country. This would involve the establishment of clear guidelines and benchmarks for assessing the quality of education, as well as regular monitoring and evaluation to ensure that these standards are being met.

Second, there is a need for greater emphasis on the quality of research and creative work in HEIs. This can be achieved through the provision of more resources and funding for research, as well as the development of programs that encourage faculty members and students to engage in research and creative work.

Third, there is a need for greater collaboration between HEIs and external partners, such as industry and government agencies. This can help to ensure that the education being provided is relevant and up-to-date with the needs of the industry and society, and that students are being prepared for the job market.

Finally, there is a need to promote greater transparency and accountability in the quality assurance process. This can be achieved through the regular publication of quality assurance reports and data, as well as the involvement of external auditors and accreditation bodies to ensure that the quality assurance process is fair and objective.

Quality assurance is essential to improving the quality of education in the Philippines, particularly in the higher education sector. The use of key areas such as governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, support for students, and relations with the community in assessing the quality of HEIs is vital. However, there is a need for further improvement in quality assurance through comprehensive and standardized systems, greater emphasis on research and creative work, collaboration with external partners, and greater transparency and accountability.

Overall, by addressing these issues, quality assurance in the Philippines can be strengthened and the quality of education in the country can be further improved using the suggested sustainable development plan.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, A. R., Ibrahim, N. A., Zakaria, N. A., & Razak, R. A. (2019). The impact of support services on students' academic and personal development: A review of the literature. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(4), 39-49.
2. Al-Qirim, N. A. Y. (2018). The impact of information technology on organizational performance: An exploration in developing countries. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 31(2), 208-221.
3. Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
4. Bleske-Rechek, A., Anderson, K. G., & Hsu, T. C. (2016). Predictors of teaching effectiveness in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 87(2), 249-278.
5. Blumenthal, D., & Campbell, E. G. (2012). Academic-industry collaborations in the life sciences. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 366(20), 1955-1964.
6. Brown, J. S., & Katz, R. (2011). Change by design. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 28(3), 381-383.
7. Brown, M., O'Connor, M., Kardamanidis, K., McLaughlin, H., & Goldsmith, M. (2019). Establishing community relationships to improve community-based health programs: A scoping review. *Health Education & Behavior*, 46(6), 937-947.
8. Defensor, M. R. M. (2009). Quality assurance in Philippine higher education: developments and challenges. In S. Gaur, S. Sharma, & K. Ramachandran (Eds.), *Quality assurance in higher education: An Indian perspective* (pp. 241-250). Sage Publications.
9. Densten, I. L., & Gray, J. H. (2018). The role of effective government and management practices in organizational success. *Public Administration Review*, 78(1), 55-64.
10. Doromal, J. D. (2010). The Philippine higher education system: An overview. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-009-9055-5>
11. Dotong, R. F., & Laguardor, J. M. (2015). Internal quality assurance systems of higher education institutions: basis for the development of a proposed institutional quality assurance framework. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(4), 13-23.
12. Eng, W., & Lee, S. (2011). Professional development and work performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 30(3), 263-276.
13. Hansen, A. L., Johnson, J. A., Koschmann, M. A., & Lammers, J. C. (2016). Networking and linkages as critical success factors for community-based organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 26(1), 5-19.

14. Koslowski, M. (2006). The concept of quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), 3-16.
15. Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2010). What matters to student success: A review of the literature. National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.
16. Liu, K. S., & Ko, C. H. (2018). The influence of resource management on organizational performance: A case study of nonprofit organizations. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 9(3), 87-92.
17. Lumagsao, A. S. A., & Dellosa, M. A. (2019). Institutional sustainability assessment of higher education institutions in the Philippines. *Sustainability*, 11(1), 179. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010179>
18. Lumagsao, J. C., & Dellosa, R. G. (2019). Quality assurance practices in higher education institutions in Region IV-A: Basis for proposed ISO standards. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(4), 106-116. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n4p106>
19. Mazzolini, M., & Maddison, S. (2007). When to jump in: The role of the instructor in online discussion forums. *Computers & Education*, 49(2), 193-213.
20. Mori, H. (2010). Quality assurance of higher education in Canada: Evolution, operation, and implications. *Higher Education*, 59(5), 597-613. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9266-2>
21. Moriana, J. A., Gutiérrez-Santiuste, E., de la Fuente Arias, J., & Núñez, J. L. (2019). The impact of professional exposure on academic achievement and career success: Evidence from a field experiment. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(4), 737-750.
22. O'Neill, T. A., Rogers, R., & Dodds, R. (2017). University-community engagement: A review of the literature. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 47(2), 1-23.
23. Parry, S., & Proctor-Thomson, S. (2018). Effective management of social purpose organizations: Lessons from the literature. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*, 8(1), 50-67.
24. Phillips, R. L., Guerrero, M., Herbig, M., & Settle, Q. (2018). Extension education as a tool for community development: A review of the literature. *Journal of Extension*, 56(5), Article 5RIB2.
25. St. John, E. P., Hu, S., & Fisher, D. (2014). Equity in higher education: A review of the literature since 1990. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55(8), 777-797.
26. Tuckman, B. W., & Kennedy, G. J. (2011). *Teaching and learning communication skills in medicine* (2nd ed.). CRC Press.
27. Wainwright, T., Kibler, E., Kautonen, T., & Blackburn, R. (2018). Governance, accountability and organisational performance: A systematic review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(4), 931-955.