

Perception on Program Accreditation and Institutional Practice in the Quality Assurance of State Universities and Colleges

Maria Joan P. Reyes

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract— In higher education, quality assurance (QA) supports an institution's development, learning achievements, and accountability to stakeholders. The impact of institutional accreditation and internal regulations on the quality of education in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in CALABARZON was the subject of this research. The focus was to assess the perceived extent of program accreditation and institutional practices and their relationship to various QA indicators, including student performance, stakeholder perception, institutional image, operational productivity, and ongoing enhancement. It utilized a descriptive quantitative approach, employing a researcher-created questionnaire administered to quality assurance personnel and teaching staff in five SUCs in CALABARZON, which have Level III accredited College of Arts and Sciences programs. Participants' perceptions of the items were evaluated using a 7-point Likert scale. Various analysis methods were applied, including Mean, Standard Deviation, and Multiple Regression. The primary findings indicated that accreditation and institutional practices are widely implemented and positively perceived, with internal management receiving particularly high ratings. The gap implies that no single element of accreditation or practice is solely responsible for successful quality assurance; mere implementation is insufficient—it requires intentional design aligned with strategy. The assurance of quality processes appears essential to meeting the demands of accreditation practices and institutional operations, although their interplay is complex. Attention to faculty qualifications, support mechanisms, and self-regulation functions holds significant importance. The assumption was disproved by the strong correlation between program accreditation and quality assurance. This indicates that State Universities' standing is positively impacted by program accreditation. For the level of perception in Institutional practice of State Universities to the quality assurance the hypothesis was rejected because there was a relationship between institutional practices and quality assurance. The study recommends that such findings be examined in other contexts and locations, particularly in other higher education institutions, to better inform policy and enhance education quality as part of more comprehensive future research.

Keywords— Accreditation, Quality Assurance, Perception, Institutional Practices, and Internal Management.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Education Act of 1982 (Batas Pambansa Blg. 232) establishes a comprehensive framework for the Philippine educational system. This act emphasizes an integrated system that promotes high-quality education, equitable access, and relevance to national development. It also defines the rights

and responsibilities of every member of the education community.

CMO No. 46, Series of 2012, a policy standard released by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), seeks to improve quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA system tailored to the type of higher education institution.

In higher education, quality assurance (QA) is a systematic process of evaluating and enhancing educational standards to ensure that institutions meet established criteria for excellence. It encompasses guidelines, practices, and systems designed to maintain and improve the quality of academic offerings, faculty qualifications, student services, research outcomes, and institutional governance.

Quality assurance techniques encompass systematic processes and procedures designed to evaluate and enhance the quality of instruction and services offered by institutions of higher education. Examples of these procedures include internal evaluations, external reviews, ongoing development initiatives, and adherence to accreditation standards. Quality assurance contributes to maintaining high academic performance standards, meeting stakeholder expectations, and adapting to evolving educational environments. It ensures both academic quality and institutional legitimacy, fosters transparency and accountability in higher education, improves employability by aligning industry needs with the curriculum, and boosts graduates' mobility and recognition on a global scale.

A country's academic and professional landscape is greatly influenced by its higher education institutions. State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) are essential since they offer a wide range of students an affordable, high-quality education. Accreditation is a crucial component of a strong quality assurance system that guarantees that these institutions uphold high standards of instruction and institutional effectiveness.

The ministry encourages programs for voluntary accreditation for institutions that wish to fulfill quality requirements beyond those needed for state recognition. The official accreditation process assesses whether an academic program or institution satisfies predetermined quality requirements. It affects institutional performance by guaranteeing adherence to legal requirements, encouraging ongoing development, and boosting legitimacy. In this regard, SUCs' profiles and program accrediting credentials become

crucial determinants of their overall efficacy. A program's accreditation status can affect curriculum development, faculty growth, financing opportunities, and student outcomes.

A recognized program is assigned a Level I, II, III, or IV accreditation.

Higher accreditation levels offers more advantages. Educational institutions no longer need to apply for a SO number from CHED for their study program, for instance, starting with accreditation level 1 (Level I). The accreditation process is outlined in the accreditation procedures, which also serve as the foundation for the Board's decision-making and actions.

The perception of institutional practice and program accreditation in the state's quality assurance is examined in this study.

This study explores how accreditation rules impact educational outcomes and institutional success, as well as how accreditation fosters academic achievement in universities and colleges. The findings will enhance discussions about improving higher education accreditation processes and quality control measures.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study aimed to determine program accreditation standards and institutional practices and their influence on campus quality assurance in higher education.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions;

1. What is the level of perception for program accreditation of State University and College's in terms of:
 - 1.1 Academic preparation of graduates;
 - 1.2 Faculty credentials;
 - 1.3 Access to robust support resources;
 - 1.4 Transparent and fair recruitment;
 - 1.5 Fiscal stability and administrative capability; and
 - 1.6 Compliance with the standard outlined.
2. What is the level of perception in the institutional practices of State University and College's in terms of:
 - 2.1 Public information and accountability;
 - 2.2 Monitoring national policy objectives;
 - 2.3 Management and resource allocation;
 - 2.4 International comparison and benchmarking;
 - 2.5 Internal management.
3. What is the level of quality assurance of State University and College's in terms of:
 - 3.1 Students learning outcomes;
 - 3.2 Stakeholders' satisfaction;
 - 3.3 Instructional reputation and rankings;
 - 3.4 Institutional improvements;
 - 3.5 Effective services to stakeholders
4. Does perception level for program accreditation have a significant relationship on the quality assurance of State University and College's.
5. Does the perception level in the Institutional practices have a significant relationship on the Quality Assurance of the State University and College's?

II. METHODOLOGY

It utilized a descriptive quantitative approach, employing a researcher-created questionnaire administered to quality assurance personnel and teaching staff in five SUCs in CALABARZON, which have Level III accredited College of Arts and Sciences programs. Participants' perceptions of the items were evaluated using a 7-point Likert scale. Various analysis methods were applied, including Mean, Standard Deviation, and Multiple Regression.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the different results and discusses the findings from analyzing the data gathered in this study. All specific questions under the problem statement in Chapter I were answered in this chapter, supported by tables.

The level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC's in terms of Academic preparation of graduates

As shown in Table 1, the statement that "The Dean or office concerned approve the updated syllabus for each subject" has the highest mean of (5.97; 0.80). This is followed by the statement "Teaching strategies simulate the development of the student's higher order thinking skills such as critical thinking, analytical thinking, creative thinking, and problem solving," which has a mean of (5.56; 0.74). Also, the statement "The faculty distribute a copy of the syllabus to each student" has a mean of (5.5; 0.82). Additionally, the statements "The faculty prepares syllabus with comprehensive contents" and "The faculty revise and enhance the syllabi preferably every two years and as needed" both have the same mean of 5.37, with standard deviations of 0.85 and 0.87, respectively, all marked as Agree.

Table 1 presents the level of qualification for program accreditation of selected SUCs in terms of the academic preparation of graduates. The data revealed that the level of qualification for program accreditation of the selected SUCs regarding the academic preparation of graduates had a weighted mean of 5.55 with a standard deviation of 0.84, which is verbally interpreted as high.

TABLE 1. The level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC's in terms of Academic preparation of graduates

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Dean or the office concerned approves the updated syllabus for each subject	5.97	0.80	Agree
The faculty prepares a syllabus with comprehensive content	5.37	0.85	Agree
The faculty revise and enhance the syllabi, preferably every two years and as needed	5.37	0.87	Agree
The faculty distributes a copy of the syllabus to each student	5.5	0.82	Agree
Teaching strategies simulate the development of the student's higher-order thinking skills such as critical thinking, analytical thinking, creative thinking, and problem solving	5.56	0.74	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.55		
SD	0.84		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Graduate employability is a major concern in higher education, and it is frequently measured using employment

rates, despite being distinct from actual employment (Cheng et al., 2022).

Higher education institutions have mainly been responsible for employability, although it should be a collaborative effort between universities, students, employers, and the government. There is a mismatch between company expectations and government policies, hindering efforts to educate graduates for the job successfully. Furthermore, over-reliance on job numbers as a measure of success risks reducing higher education to a solely vocational pursuit, thus hurting knowledge generation and academic growth.

Table 2 shows the level of qualification for program accreditation of selected SUCs in terms of faculty credentials. The first statement “The required number of faculty possess graduates appropriate and relevant to the program or any of the allied fields” has the highest mean (6.07; 0.77), followed by “The faculty demonstrate professional competence and are engage in any of the following; instruction, research, extension, production, consultancy and expert service, publication, creativity and scholarly works” (5.88; 0.79).

TABLE 2. The level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC’s in terms of Faculty Credentials

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The required number of faculty members possess graduates appropriate and relevant to the program or any of the allied fields	6.07	0.77	Agree
Qualifications such as licensure, specialization, technical/pedagogical skills, competence, and special abilities, computer literacy, research productivity are considered	5.52	0.67	Agree
Faculty are advised to pursue graduate degrees related to the program and /or allied fields from reputable institutions	5.44	0.72	Agree
Faculty handling OJT/practicum courses have had at least three years of teaching and industry-based experience in the field, if applicable	5.56	0.59	Agree
The faculty demonstrate professional competence and are engage in any of the following; instruction, research, extension, production, consultancy and expert service, publication, creativity and scholarly works	5.88	0.79	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.69		
SD	0.75		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Faculty handling OJT/practicum courses have had at least three years of teaching and industry-based experience in the field, if applicable with a mean (5.56;0.59) also statements “Faculty are advised to pursue graduate degrees related to the program and /or allied fields from reputable institutions” and “Qualification such as licensure, specialization, technical/pedagogical skills and competence and special abilities, computer literacy research productivity are considered” with a mean (5.44;0.72),(5.52;0.67) respectively. All with a remark of Agree.

The data revealed that the selected SUCs' Level of Qualification for Program Accreditation in terms of Faculty credentials had a weighted mean of (5.69;0.79), which was verbally interpreted as High.

Faculty credentials are vital for academic program certification and curriculum development. Reed et al. (2024) argued that teachers prioritized credential design above learning assessment, indicating a change in responsibility. While professors have typically concentrated on curriculum and student results, they are increasingly considering labor demands and corporate expectations. According to the findings, credentialing choices frequently go beyond specific courses, combining instructional and administrative responsibilities. Faculty members have varied degrees of engagement in credential-related decisions, with senior professors and administrators having a more decisive say.

Table 3 illustrates the Qualification for Program Accreditation level of the selected SUC's in terms of Access to Robust Support resources. It can be observe that the statement “The medical and dental clinic has basic facilities such as: reception area, records section, examination/treatment room and toilets” has the highest (5.94;0.96) mean ,followed by statement “Laboratory operations manual for the faculty and students are provided in each laboratory with a mean of 5.79 and standard deviation of 0.92.also statement “The equipment supplies and materials are available in the laboratories and shops” with (5.68;0.71}and statement “Function rooms for holding meetings, conferences, convocation and similar activities are sufficient” and “There are offices for student’s leaders, the editorial staff of the student publication and the officers of the students’ organizations” had a mean and standard deviation (5.67;0.73),(5.52;0.80) respectively—all with remarked as Agree.

TABLE 3. The level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC’s in terms of Access to Robust Support resources

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Laboratory operations manual for the faculty and students are provided in each laboratory	5.79	0.92	Agree
The equipment supplies and materials are available in the laboratories and shops	5.68	0.71	Agree
There are offices for student’s leaders, the editorial staff of the student publication and the officers of the students’ organizations	5.52	0.80	Agree
Function rooms for holding meetings, conferences, convocation and similar activities are sufficient	5.67	0.73	Agree
The medical and dental clinic has basic facilities such as: reception area, records section, examination/treatment room and toilets	5.94	0.96	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.72		
SD	0.84		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The data indicated that the Level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC’S in terms of Access to robust support resources had a weighted mean and standard deviation of (5.72;0.84) verbally interpreted as High.

Udas (2019) contends that colleges must incorporate digital technologies to provide robust support resources, particularly when faced with financial constraints and the need to increase student achievement. Fragmented digital ecosystems prevent smooth user experiences and restrict access to critical support data. The author argue adopting modular, API-driven integration options over traditional monolithic systems because they provide better flexibility and

adaptability, which is critical for delivering reliable support. Consequently, colleges should create robust integration that is transparent to users, ensuring smooth access to critical support services.

TABLE 4. The level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC'S in terms Transparent and Fair Recruitment

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
There is an Institutional Human Resource Development plan/Program designed for faculty development	5.95	0.78	Agree
Recruitment and selection of faculty are processed by the Faculty Selection Board	5.75	0.66	Agree
The hiring system adopts an open competitive selection, based on the CSC-approved Merit System and Promotion Plan of the instruction, published and well-disseminated through various means of communication	5.59	0.74	Agree
The screening Committee selects and recommends the best and most qualified applications	5.71	0.88	Agree
Measures to avoid professional inbreeding are observed	5.75	0.88	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.75		
SD	0.80		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 4 shows the level of qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUCs in terms of transparent and fair recruitment. It includes the statement, "There is an Institutional Human Resource Development plan/Program designed for faculty development," which has the highest mean and standard deviation (5.95;0.78). This is followed by the statements "Measures to avoid professional in-breeding are observed" and "Recruitment and selection of faculty is processed by the Faculty Selection Board," with means and standard deviations of (5.75, 5.75,0.88) and (5.75, 5.75,0.66) respectively, both verbally interpreted as High.

TABLE 5. The level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC'S in terms of Fiscal stability and administrative capability

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The institution has an approved and adequate budget for research	5.95	0.76	Agree
The institution has provisions for the facilities and equipment, such as internet, statistical software, and other ICT resources.	5.79	0.67	Agree
There is an approved and adequate budget for the extension.	5.64	0.63	Agree
The institution has a regular budget for the library	5.64	0.75	Agree
The financial support from the fiduciary, supplemental funds for library, is a dequate.	5.84	0.71	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.77		
SD	0.71		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 5 illustrates the level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUCs in terms of fiscal stability and administrative capability. It shows that the statement "The institution has an approved and adequate budget for research" has the highest agreement with a mean and standard deviation of (5.95;076). Next are the statements "The financial support from fiduciary, supplemental funds for the library is adequate " and "The institution has provisions for the facilities and equipment such as internet, statistical software, and other ICT

resources" with means and standard deviations of (5.84;0.71) and (5.79; 0.67) respectively, both remarked as Agree. Lastly, the statements " There is an approved and adequate budget for extension " and " The institution has a regular budget for the library " had means and standard deviations of (5.79; 0.63) and (5.64; 0.75) respectively, both also remarked as Agree. The data gathered revealed that the level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUCs in terms of fiscal stability and administrative capability is high, with a weighted mean and standard deviation of (5.77;0.71).

In order to improve capability-building in education, research, and public service, the University of the Philippines (UP) and the Philippine Public Safety College (PPSC) established a cooperative relationship through a Memorandum of relationship (MOA), as reported by Llaneta (2024). Innovative program development, graduate-level collaboration, researcher exchange, and institutional research capacities were the main goals of this alliance. In substance, the MOA aimed to strengthen public safety research and education by utilizing the capabilities of both universities, especially through collaborative training and academic development initiatives within the Philippine public safety sector.

Table 6 shows the level of qualification for program accreditation of the selected SUCs in terms of compliance with the outlined standards. Statement "The curriculum/program of study meets the requirements and standards of CHED" got the highest agreement amongst the list with a mean and standard deviation (6.31;0.80) remarked as Strongly Agree, followed by statements "The subjects are logically sequenced and prerequisite courses are identified" and "Opportunities for participation in hands-on activities, such as immersion/practical training and field study are maintained in the curriculum" with a mean and standard deviation (5.85;0.70),(5.85;0.85) respectively, both remarked as Agree.

TABLE 6. The level of Qualification for Program Accreditation of the selected SUC'S in terms of Compliance with standard Outlined

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The curriculum/program of study meets the requirements and standards of CHED	6.31	0.80	Strongly Agree
The subjects are logically sequenced and prerequisite courses are identified	5.95	0.69	Agree
The curricular content is responsive to the needs of the country and recent development in the profession	5.85	0.70	Agree
The curricular content covers the extent of the professional and technical preparations required of its graduates	5.77	0.74	Agree
Opportunities for participation in hand -on activities, such as immersion/practical training and field study are maintained in the curriculum	5.85	0.82	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.95		
SD	0.77		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The data indicated that the level of qualification for program accreditation of the selected SUCs, in terms of compliance with the outlined standards, had a weighted mean

and standard deviation of (5.95; 0.77), which is verbally interpreted as high.

In accordance with Rose-Collins (2024), compliance is a fundamental component of maintaining integrity and efficacy in educational institutions rather than just a regulatory burden. In addition to state and institutional laws, compliance with federal standards such as IDEA and ESSA creates a regulated atmosphere that protects employees and children. Fundamentally, upholding compliance—from safety procedures to academic integrity—maintains educational standards and ensures a safe learning environment, which benefits the institution's overall performance and standing.

TABLE 7. The level of SUC's Institutional Practices in terms of Public Information and Accountability

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The institution/college conducts a review of the statements of the Vision and Mission, as well as its Goal and program objectives, for the approval of the authorities concerned	6.59	0.70	Strongly Agree
The Mission reflects the institution's legal and other statutory mandates	6	0.78	Agree
The college/Academic Unit follows a system of formulating its goals and the objectives of the program	5.79	0.89	Agree
The college/Academic unit's faculty, personal, students and other stakeholders (cooperating agencies, linkages, alumni, industry sector and other concerned groups) participate in the formulation. review and/or revision of the VMGO	5.89	0.94	Agree
A system of dissemination and acceptability of the VMGO is enforced	6.44	0.83	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.14		
SD	0.89		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The findings show that the level of SUC's Institutional Practices in terms of Public Information and Accountability has a weighted mean of 6.14 with a standard deviation of 0.89, which is verbally interpreted as Very High.

In the context of higher education, public information is the data and information made available to inform the public. It enables prospective students and staff to judge applications, provides a degree of public accountability, helps employers to determine appropriate links with universities or colleges, and provides additional material to prospective donors or other funders (Harvey, 2025).

It can be observed that statements “The institution/college conduct a review on the statements of the Vision and Mission as well as its Goal and program objectives for the approval of authorities concerned” and “A system of dissemination and acceptability of the VMGO is enforced” had the highest Agreement which is Strongly Agree with a mean and standard deviation (6.59;0.70),(5.00;0.78) respectively, followed by statement “The college/Academic unit's faculty, personal, students and other stakeholders (cooperating agencies, linkages, alumni, industry sector and other concerned groups) participate in the formulation. review and/or revision of the VMGO” and “The college/Academic Unit follows a system of formulating its goals and the objectives of the program” with mean and standard deviation (5.89;0.94) (5.79;0.89)

respectively, remarked as Agree, while statement “A system of dissemination and acceptability of the VMGO is enforced” has the lowest mean of 6.44 with standard deviation of 0.83 also with a remarked of Agree.

TABLE 8. The level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of Monitoring National Policy Objectives

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Develop and verify innovative and high-quality technologies for the academe, industry, and the community and generate new knowledge for technological development and policy making	6.51	0.80	Agree
Strengthen R&D units in all colleges as the basic implementing arm of the Office of Research and Development	6.19	0.78	Strongly Agree
Apply and secure for membership in research networks and establish linkages with other national and international research institutions and organizations	5.82	0.91	Agree
Establish sustainable government-academe-industry network, partnerships, and linkages responsive to the human resource needs locally and internationally	5.95	0.97	Agree
Conduct a periodic faculty and staff performance evaluation system	6.54	0.81	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean		6.20	
SD		0.90	
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 8 shows the level of selected SUC's Institutional Practices in terms of monitoring National Policy Objectives. It can be seen that statements “Conduct a periodic faculty and staff performance evaluation system,” “Develop and verify innovative and high-quality technologies for the academe, industry, and the community and generate new knowledge for technological development and policy making,” and “Strengthen R&D units in all colleges as the basic implementing arm of the Office of Research and Development” had the highest level of agreement among the list, which is Strongly Agree with means and standard deviations of (6.54; 0.81), (6.51; 0.80), and (6.19; 0.78) respectively, followed by statements “Establish sustainable government-academe-industry network, partnerships, and linkages responsive to the human resource needs locally and internationally” and “Apply and secure for membership in research networks and establish linkages with other national and international research institutions and organizations” with means and standard deviations of (5.95; 0.97) and (5.82; 0.91) respectively, with a response of Agree. The findings show that the level of SUC's Institutional Practices in terms of monitoring National Policy Objectives has a weighted mean of 6.20 with a standard deviation of 0.90, verbally interpreted as Very High.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is an ongoing management process that tracks the achievement of community engagement (CE) objectives. It serves as a tool to evaluate the responsiveness of HEIs to current and future social, environmental, and economic challenges tied to the developmental agenda. M&E examines CE performance, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and the broader impact on both internal and external communities. To ensure effectiveness, CE activities,

outputs, and outcomes must adhere to specific standards, which are assessed through well-defined indicators. These indicators help determine whether CE initiatives meet their established goals and contribute to meaningful engagement and development (Nkonki-Mandleni, 2021).

Shown on Table 9 is the level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of Management and Resources Allocation. Observed that statements "The institution implements the system of promotion in rank and salary based on existing policies and issuances. (e.g. NBC 46)" and "The probationary period or temporary status required before the grant of permanent status to the faculty is by Civil Service and institutional policies "got the highest level of agreement which is Strongly Agree with a mean and standard deviation of (6.30;0.89) and (6.51;0.81) respectively.

Followed by statements "Retirement separation or termination benefits are implemented in accordance with institutional and government policies and guidance (CSC, GSIS/DBM)" and "The institution implement a CSC approved Strategic performance Management System (SPMS), which emphasizes quality teaching performance, research, creative works extension, production services" with a mean and standard deviation of (6.07;0.87) and (5.95;0.94) respectively, with a remarked of Agree while stamen "The faculty concerned is officially informed of their rank and tenure after evaluation of the credentials and performance" has a mean of 5.75 with standard deviation of 0.89 remarked as Agree.

The data gathered revealed that the level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of Management and Resources Allocation has a mean and standard deviation of (6.12;0.92) interpreted as High.

TABLE 9. The level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of Management and Resources Allocation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The institution implements the system of promotion in rank and salary based on existing policies and issuances. (e.g., NBC 461).	6.30	0.89	Strongly Agree
Retirement separation or termination benefits are implemented by institutional and government policies and guidance (CSC, GSIS/DBM).	6.07	0.87	Agree
The faculty concerned is officially informed of their rank and tenure after evaluation of their credentials and performance.	5.75	0.89	Agree
The institution implements a CSC-approved Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS), emphasizing quality teaching performance, research, creative works extension, and production services.	5.95	0.94	Agree
The probationary period or temporary status required before the faculty is granted permanent status is determined by civil service and institutional policies.	6.51	0.81	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.12		
SD	0.92		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Waldron (2024) defined resource allocation as the process of sourcing and distributing resources during a project. It's a continuous process in project management, as project managers need to oversee the utilization of every resource to

minimize waste, improve performance, avoid cost overruns, and achieve project goals using the allocated resources.

Table 10 illustrate the level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of international comparison and benchmarking. It can be observe clearly that statements "Increase and intensify linkages with partner institution, community, stakeholders and industries abroad for faculty and students exchange" and "Enhance collaboration to the local government units, civil society, people, and non-governmental organization to promote the university has the highest level of agreement amongst the list which is Strongly Agree with a mean and standard deviation of (6.53;0.78), while statements, followed by statements "Have positive sustainable relationship in its communities with key individuals, groups, and organizations" and "Enhance existing relations with community and international partners by engaging in research activities and exchange programs" has a mean and standard deviation of (6.04;0.78) and (5.78;0.93) respectively with a remarked of Agree.

TABLE 10. The level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of international comparison and benchmarking

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Increase and intensify linkages with partner institution, community, stakeholders and industries abroad for faculty and students exchange	6.57	0.73	Strongly Agree
Have positive sustainable relationship in its communities with key individuals, groups, and organizations	6.04	0.78	Agree
Increase joint venture and collaboration projects with the private sectors	5.65	0.87	Agree
Enhance existing relations with community and international partners by engaging in research activities and exchange programs	5.78	0.93	Agree
Enhance collaboration to the local government units, civil society, people, and non-governmental organization to promote the university	6.53	0.78	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.11		
SD	0.9		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

while statement "Increase joint venture and collaboration projects with the private sectors' got the lowest mean of 5.65 with standard deviation of 0.87. Also remarked as Agree. The data gathered shows that the level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of international comparison and benchmarking was High with a mean and standard deviation of (6.11;0.09).

Geeks for Geeks (2024) describes benchmarking as a strategic management method that helps organizations achieve a competitive advantage by assessing their practices, processes, and performance metrics against those of industry leaders or top-performing counterparts. International benchmarking extends to comparisons across international boundaries, enabling organizations to draw insights from global leaders, tailor successful practices to their unique cultural and operational environments, and gain a comprehensive understanding of industry trends and best practices.

Table 11. Shown the level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of Internal management. It was presented by statements "Boost and accelerate the implementation of the extension programs and initiatives to the intended community clientele and stakeholders" and "Strengthen existing programs that are responsive and relevant to the needs of the community, region, and nations" also by statements "Establish sustainable academe-industry networks, partnership, and linkages, "responsive to the human resource needs locally and internationally "and "Promote strong support for student holistic development and welfare and improve employability of graduates" Whose mean and standard deviation are (6.31,0.85),(6.29,0.84),(6.28,0.71)and (6.19,0.85) respectively with all remarked as Strongly Agree, while statement "Intensify research productivity, provide infrastructure and continuously develop institutionalize research center "got a relatively high mean and standard deviation of (6.11,0.87) remarked as Agree.

TABLE 11. The level of selected SUC'S Performance in terms of Internal Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Strengthen existing programs that are responsive and relevant to the needs of the community, region, and nations	6.29	0.84	Strongly Agree
Establish sustainable academe-industry networks, partnership, and linkages, responsive to the human resource needs locally and internationally	6.28	0.71	Strongly Agree
Promote strong support for student holistic development and welfare and improve employability of graduates	6.19	0.85	Strongly Agree
Intensify research productivity, provide infrastructure and continuously develop institutionalize research center	6.11	0.87	Agree
Boost and accelerate the implementation of the extension programs and initiatives to the intended community clientele and stakeholders	6.31	0.85	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.24		
SD	0.82		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The data gathered as shown in Table 11, revealed that the level of selected SUC'S Institutional Practices in terms of Internal management was Very High with a mean and standard deviation (6.24,0.82) Agrawal (2023) highlighted that internal education management focuses on the leadership and decision-making roles within the educational institution. It grants schools or colleges greater autonomy over their operations, including curriculum development and teaching methods. Internal management encourages a sense of ownership and fosters an environment that aligns with the institution's vision and values. However, it demands robust leadership and accountability systems to ensure quality standards are upheld and to minimize the risk of biases.

Table 12 illustrates the selected SUC'S Quality Assurance level in terms of Student Learning Outcomes. It was presented by statement "SLOs are relevant to the discipline, field of study, and career preparation, ensuring that students acquire skills and knowledge applicable to real-world situations" and statement "SLOs include criteria for assessment, allowing instructors to evaluate whether students have achieved the

intended outcomes through various methods such as tests, projects, presentations, or portfolios" with highest agreement amongst the list which is Strongly Agree, followed by statements "SLOs reflect the students' perspective, emphasizing what they will be able to do or understand rather than what the instructor will teach" and "SLOs are align with the overall curriculum and course objectives, ensuring that all educational activities support the achievement of these outcomes" with a mean and standard deviation of (5.96,0.83) and (5.93,0.92) with both have a remarked of Agree, while statement "Student learning outcomes are observable and measurable behaviors, skills, or knowledge that students can demonstrate upon completion" got the lowest mean of 6.5 and standard deviation of 0.75 remarked also as Agree.

TABLE 12. The level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Student Learning Outcomes

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Student learning outcomes are observable and measurable behaviors, skills, or knowledge that students can demonstrate upon completion	6.5	0.75	Agree
SLOs include criteria for assessment, allowing instructors to evaluate whether students have achieved the intended outcomes through various methods such as tests, projects, presentations, or portfolios	6.19	0.77	Strongly Agree
SLOs are align with the overall curriculum and course objectives, ensuring that all educational activities support the achievement of these outcomes	5.93	0.92	Agree
SLOs reflect the students' perspective, emphasizing what they will be able to do or understand rather than what the instructor will teach	5.96	0.83	Agree
SLOs are relevant to the discipline, field of study, and career preparation, ensuring that students acquire skills and knowledge applicable to real-world situations.	6.51	0.82	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.22		
SD	0.86		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The gathered data shown that the level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Student Learning Outcomes was very High with a mean and standard deviation of (6.22,0.86).

Table 13 shows the level of selected SUC's Quality Assurance in terms of stakeholders' satisfaction. Statements "Opportunities for stakeholders to engage in decision-making processes, program development, and feedback mechanisms contribute to a sense of ownership and satisfaction" and "Regular surveys, focus groups, and forums allow stakeholders to voice their opinions, leading to a more responsive and adaptive institution" had the highest agreement of Strongly Agree, with means and standard deviations of (6.48, 6.48,0.76) and (6.26,0.82, 0.82) respectively. This is followed by the statements "The availability of academic advising, mental health services, career counseling, and other support services significantly influences stakeholder satisfaction" and "The perceived quality and relevance of educational programs, services, and resources directly impact stakeholder satisfaction," which have means and standard

deviations of (6.12, 6.12,0.91) and (6.06, 6.06,0.87) respectively, both rated as Agree.

TABLE 13. The level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Stakeholders satisfaction

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Opportunities for stakeholders to engage in decision-making processes, program development, and feedback mechanisms contribute to a sense of ownership and satisfaction.	6.48	0.76	Strongly Agree
Regular surveys, focus groups, and forums allow stakeholders to voice their opinions, leading to a more responsive and adaptive institution	6.26	0.82	Strongly Agree
The perceived quality and relevance of educational programs, services, and resources directly impact stakeholder satisfaction	6.06	0.87	Agree
Clear, consistent, and timely communication regarding policies, programs, and institutional changes helps build trust and satisfaction among stakeholders.	5.89	0.86	Agree
The availability of academic advising, mental health services, career counseling, and other support services significantly influences stakeholder satisfaction	6.12	0.91	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.16		
SD	0.86		
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Meanwhile, the statement “Clear, consistent, and timely communication regarding policies, programs, and institutional changes helps build trust and satisfaction among stakeholders” received the lowest mean of 5.89 and standard deviation of 0.86, also rated as Agree.

The collected data indicated that the level of selected SUC's Quality Assurance in terms of stakeholders' satisfaction was Very High, with a mean and standard deviation of (6.16,0.86).

Table 14 shows the selected SUC's Quality Assurance level in terms of institutional reputation and rankings. It is presented by the statements: “The Institution have volumes of research publications that contribute significantly to an institution’s reputation, particularly in research-focused universities,” “ The institution has strong employment rates for graduates, particularly in relevant fields, reflect the institution's ability to prepare students for the workforce, ”” High graduation and retention rates indicate student satisfaction and institutional effectiveness, contributing positively to reputation, ” and “The institution fostering an inclusive and supportive campus culture that contributes to the overall institutional reputation. “All received the highest agreement of Strongly Agree, with means and standard deviations of (6.54, 6.54,0.72),(6.35, 6.35,0.76),(6.23, 6.23,0.79), and (6.21, 6.21,0.87), respectively.

Meanwhile, the statement “The institutions have Accreditation by reputable accrediting agencies, which is a key indicator of quality and can significantly enhance an institution's reputation’ received the lowest mean of 5.94 and a standard deviation of 0.80, noted as Agree.

The findings indicate that the level of selected SUC's Quality Assurance regarding institutional improvements has a weighted mean of 6.20 and a standard deviation of 0.79, which is verbally interpreted as Very High.

Shown on Table 14 is the level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional reputations and rankings, it is presented by statements “The Institution have volumes of research publications that contribute significantly to an institution’s reputation, particularly in research-focused universities” ; “ The institution has strong employment rates for graduates, particularly in relevant fields, reflect the institution's ability to prepare students for the workforce”, ” High graduation and retention rates indicate student satisfaction and institutional effectiveness, contributing positively to reputation”, and “The institution fostering an inclusive and supportive campus culture that contributes to the overall institutional reputation “all got the highest agreement of Strongly Agree With a mean and standard deviation of (6.54,0.72),(6.35,0.76),(6.23,0.79), and (6.21,0.87) respectively.

The statement, “The institutions have Accreditation by reputable accrediting agencies which is a key indicator of quality and can significantly enhance an institution's reputation’ got the lowest mean of 5.94 and standard deviation of 0.80 remarked as Agree.

The data revealed that the level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional reputations and rankings was Very High with a mean and standard deviation of (6.25,0.81).

TABLE 14. The level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional reputations and rankings

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Institution have volumes of research publications that contribute significantly to an institution’s reputation, particularly in research-focused universities	6.54	0.72	Strongly Agree
High graduation and retention rates indicate student satisfaction and institutional effectiveness, contributing positively to reputation	6.23	0.79	Strongly Agree
The institution has strong employment rates for graduates, particularly in relevant fields, reflect the institution's ability to prepare students for the workforce.	6.35	0.76	Strongly Agree
The institutions have Accreditation by reputable accrediting agencies which is a key indicator of quality and can significantly enhance an institution's reputation	5.94	0.80	Agree
The institution fostering an inclusive and supportive campus culture that contributes to the overall institutional reputation.	6.21	0.87	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.25		
SD	0.81		
Verbal Interpretation		Very High	

Eriksson (2024) contends that higher education institutions should shift their attention from pursuing rankings to creating a strong fundamental reputation, which is critical for recruiting stakeholders and guaranteeing long-term viability. The author questions the reliability of traditional rankings, claiming they may be skewed and manipulated, and instead calls for a return to "reputation basics," which include providing quality

education and generating pleasant stakeholder experiences. Institutional reputation, defined by capacity and character, is impacted by a variety of interactions and media, notably social media, requiring proactive management. Eriksson offers practical reputation management solutions, including as constant monitoring, stakeholder participation, transparency, crisis readiness, and an emphasis on fundamental values. The article underlines that a well-managed reputation, based on authenticity and solid stakeholder connections, is more important than temporary ranking positions.

McLaughlin et al. (2017) shift the discussion to the practical consequences of institutional reputation and rankings, highlighting the need of considering how stakeholders use these rankings and whether they are reliable. They draw attention to the widespread use of rankings in higher education marketing and branding, raising questions regarding source validity, data quality, and methodology. Furthermore, the chapter discusses the particular issues of rating professional schools and highlights the International rating Expert Group's attempts to provide a framework for trustworthy HEI ranking creation and evaluation. This viewpoint emphasizes the significance of conducting a rigorous examination before utilizing rankings to inform choices, particularly in terms of stakeholder impact and the trustworthiness of ranking systems.

Table 15. Shows the level of selected SUC's Quality Assurance in terms of institutional improvements. The statement "Accreditation outcomes often lead to improved academic standards and educational quality, ensuring that institutions meet or exceed established benchmarks" received the highest mean of 6.48 with a standard deviation of 0.78, followed by the statements "Accreditation provides a transparent evaluation process, helping stakeholders understand how institutions measure up against established standards" and "Accreditation outcomes often lead to curriculum improvements that align with industry standards, ensuring that graduates are well-prepared for their careers," which had means and standard deviations of (6.30, 6.30,0.72) and (6.25, 6.25,0.72) respectively, all noted as Strongly Agree. Meanwhile, the statements "Institutions typically use accreditation outcomes as a basis for ongoing self-assessment and quality enhancement, leading to better programs and services" and "Accreditation outcomes help build trust among stakeholders by providing evidence of the institution's commitment to quality education and continuous improvement" had means and standard deviations of (6.08, 6.08,0.79) and (5.89, 5.89,0.74) respectively with a remarked of Agree.

Table 16 shows the level of selected SUC's Quality Assurance in terms of effective services to stakeholders. The statement "The institutions. Has effective advising and counseling services that significantly improve retention rates by helping students navigate academic challenges and personal issues" received the highest agreement among the list, with a mean and standard deviation of (6.2, 0.79), marked as Strongly Agree, followed by the statement "Mentorship programs of the institution connect underrepresented students

with faculty or peer mentors effectively provide guidance, encouragement, and a sense of belonging.

TABLE 15. The level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional improvements

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Accreditation outcomes often lead to improved academic standards and educational quality, ensuring that institutions meet or exceed established benchmarks	6.48	0.78	Strongly Agree
Institutions typically use accreditation outcomes as a basis for ongoing self-assessment and quality enhancement, leading to better programs and services.	6.08	0.79	Agree
Accreditation provides a transparent evaluation process, helping stakeholders understand how institutions measure up against established standards.	6.3	0.72	Strongly Agree
Accreditation outcomes help build trust among stakeholders by providing evidence of the institution's commitment to quality education and continuous improvement	5.89	0.74	Agree
Accreditation outcomes often lead to curriculum improvements that align with industry standards, ensuring that graduates are well-prepared for their careers.	6.25	0.82	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.2		
SD	0.79		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

TABLE 16. The level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The institutions. Has effective advising and counseling services that significantly improve retention rates by helping students navigate academic challenges and personal issues	6.2	0.79	Strongly Agree
Mentorship programs of the institution connect underrepresented students with faculty or peer mentors effectively provide guidance, encouragement, and a sense of belonging	6.07	0.74	Agree
Students have access to tutoring services and academic workshops to enhance academic performance and confidence among underrepresented students, positively affecting retention and graduation rates.	6.01	0.73	Agree
The institution has a welcoming and inclusive campus climate that values diversity and improve retention rates among underrepresented groups by fostering a sense of belonging and acceptance	6.03	0.78	Agree
The institution provides training for faculty and staff on cultural competence and bias to help create a more supportive environment for underrepresented students	5.97	0.86	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.06		
SD	0.78		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Effective service delivery to stakeholders is dependent on strong engagement strategies, which require recognizing, understanding, and actively involving individuals who are involved in an organization's outcomes. This approach, as described, entails mapping and prioritizing stakeholders to promote focused communication and resource allocation. Stakeholder involvement is essential for establishing trust, creating buy-in, and managing possible risks like discontent or resistance to change. Engaging important stakeholders, particularly in strategic planning, fosters alignment with the

organization's vision and capitalizes on their unique views. Organizations may improve their impact and sustainability by considering the different requirements and aspirations of stakeholders, including as shareholders, employees, and consumers (Sedmak, 2023).

The institution has a welcoming and inclusive campus climate that values diversity and improves retention rates among underrepresented groups by fostering a sense of belonging and acceptance. Students have access to tutoring services and academic workshops to enhance academic performance and confidence among underrepresented students, positively affecting retention and graduation rates, with means and standard deviations of (6.07, 6.07, 0.74), (6.03, 6.03, 0.78), and (6.01, 6.01, 0.73) respectively, all marked as Agree. Meanwhile, the statement, "The institution provides training for faculty and staff on cultural competence and bias to help create a more supportive environment for underrepresented students," received the lowest mean of 5.97, with a standard deviation of 0.86, and was also marked as Agree.

The gathered data revealed that the level of selected SUC'S Quality Assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders was High with a mean and standard deviation of (6.06, 0.78).

Relationship between Program Accreditation and Quality Assurance of Selected State University and Colleges

This research is conducted to determine if Academic preparation of graduates, Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, Fiscal stability, and administrative capability; and Compliance with the standard outlined predict Quality Assurance in terms of Students Learning Outcomes. Results shows that 75% of the variance is explained by the six predictors, Specifically, Academic preparation of graduates, Fiscal stability and administrative capability, Compliance with the standard outlined, Access to robust support resources, and Transparent and fair recruitment, are positively associated with Quality assurance but shows no significant relationship. On the other hand, Faculty credentials, is not significantly related to the outcome variables. This suggests that Qualification for Program Accreditation such as Academic preparation of graduate, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, Fiscal stability and administrative capability, and Compliance with the standard outlined, are related to Quality Assurance specifically to Students learning outcomes but shows no significant relationship, the same is true to the Faculty credentials that shows no significant relationship to the outcome variables.

Adeniyi et al. (2024) comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of various educational changes throughout African nations, focusing on student learning outcomes as measured by test scores and graduation rates. It argues the necessity of looking beyond policy execution to assess the practical consequences on students, taking into account contextual issues such as socioeconomic inequities and infrastructure constraints that influence reform effectiveness. The primary goal of the research is to influence future

educational efforts aimed at creating equal and effective learning environments for children throughout the continent.

TABLE 17. Regression model for relationship between Program Accreditation and Quality Assurance and Program Accreditation with Quality assurance in terms of Students learning outcomes as Outcome Variable

Model fit measures						
Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.87	0.75	6.54	6	13	0.0023
PREDICTOR						
	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	0.061	1.642	0.038	0.971		
Academic preparation of graduates	0.31	0.38	0.80	0.4362		
Faculty credentials	-0.07	0.21	-0.34	0.7417		
Access to robust support resources	0.16	0.17	0.94	0.3620		
Transparent and fair recruitment	0.08	0.36	0.22	0.8278		
Fiscal stability and administrative capability	0.28	0.18	1.57	0.1409		
Compliance with the standard outlined.	0.21	0.19	1.07	0.3032		

TABLE 18. Regression model for relationship between Program Accreditation and Quality Assurance and Program Accreditation with Quality assurance in terms Stakeholders as Outcome Variable

Model fit measures						
Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.94	0.87	15.10	6	13	3.5E-05
PREDICTOR						
	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	-0.003	1.12	-0.002	0.9981		
Academic preparation of graduates	-0.52	0.26	-1.996	0.0673		
Faculty credentials	0.56	0.15	3.88	0.0019		
Access to robust support resources	0.29	0.12	2.45	0.0290		
Transparent and fair recruitment	0.52	0.25	2.08	0.0576		
Fiscal stability and administrative capability	-0.20	0.12	-1.64	0.1257		
Compliance with the standard outlined.	0.31	0.13	2.32	0.0368		

This research is conducted to determine if Academic preparation of graduates, Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, Fiscal stability, and administrative capability; and Compliance with the standard outlined predict Quality Assurance in terms of Stakeholders satisfaction. Results shows that 87% of the variance is explained by the six predictors. Specifically, Faculty credentials, Transparent and fair recruitment, Compliance with the standard outlined, and Access to robust support resources, are all positively related to Quality assurance. On the other hand, Academic preparation of graduates, and Fiscal stability and administrative capability, is not significantly related to the outcome variables. This suggest that Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources and compliance with the standard outlined has significant influence to the Stakeholders' satisfaction.

The subtle importance of interpersonal connection in student happiness is emphasized by Wong and Chapman (2023), who show that informal student-to-student interaction has a significant impact on academic, institutional, and university life satisfaction. They also point out that formal

interaction between students and instructors predicts instructional satisfaction, whereas formal interaction between students predicts institutional support satisfaction. It also addresses the complimentary nature of these interactions, adding complexity to our knowledge of student happiness by distinguishing between interaction kinds and satisfaction features, which was typically missed in prior studies.

This research is conducted to determine if Academic preparation of graduates, Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, Fiscal stability, and administrative capability; and Compliance with the standard outlined predict Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional reputation and rankings.

Results shows that 90% of the variance is explained by the six predictors. Specifically, Academic preparation of graduates, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, and Compliance with the standard outlined, are all positively related to Quality assurance. While Fiscal stability and administrative capability, and Faculty credentials is not significantly related to the outcome variables. This suggest that the Access to robust support resources has significant influence to the Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional reputation and rankings.

TABLE 19. Regression model for relationship between Program Accreditation and Quality Assurance and Program Accreditation with Quality assurance in terms of Institutional reputation and rankings as Outcome Variable.

Model fit measures						
Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.95	0.90	20.08	6	13	7.12E-06
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	-	-	-	-		
Academic preparation of graduates	0.31	1.16	-1.13	0.2777		
Faculty credentials	0.12	0.27	0.45	0.6628		
Access to robust support resources	0.08	0.15	-0.51	0.6217		
Transparent and fair recruitment	0.36	0.12	2.90	0.0125		
Fiscal stability and administrative capability	0.51	0.26	1.98	0.0691		
Compliance with the standard outlined.	0.12	0.13	0.93	0.3676		
	0.16	0.14	1.19	0.2553		

Massucci and Docampo (2019) add to the continuing discussion over institutional reputation and rankings by offering a quantitative way to evaluating academic renown that goes beyond traditional, possibly biased polls. They use the PageRank method to analyze citation networks from five Web of Science Subject Categories, claiming that citation patterns represent institutional reputation.

They admit that quantifying academic reputation is inherently challenging, whether through surveys or performance proxies, but they underline the importance of research performance as the major measurable source, given the severity of peer review in scientific development. They

now strive to produce a more objective and statistically robust measure of prestige, combining qualitative judgments with quantitative data and perhaps improving on existing ranking methods.

TABLE 20. Regression model for relationship between Program Accreditation and Quality Assurance and Program Accreditation with Quality assurance in terms of Intuitional improvements as Outcome Variable

Model fit measures						
Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.43	0.19	0.50	6	13	0.7970
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	3.76	2.38	1.58	0.1377		
Academic preparation of graduates	0.35	0.55	0.63	0.5389		
Faculty credentials	-0.21	0.31	0.67	0.5141		
Access to robust support resources	-0.16	0.25	0.63	0.5348		
Transparent and fair recruitment	0.29	0.53	0.56	0.5870		
Fiscal stability and administrative capability	-0.10	0.26	0.36	0.7214		
Compliance with the standard outlined.	0.16	0.28	0.55	0.5906		

This research is conducted to determine if Academic preparation of graduates, Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, Fiscal stability, and administrative capability; and Compliance with the standard outlined predict Quality Assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders. Results shows that 54% of the variance is explained by the six predictors, F (6,13) = 2.59, p < 0.0708). Specifically, Compliance with the standard outlined, (B= 0.33, t=1.28, p < 0.2235), Access to robust support resources, (B= 0.16,t=0.70, p < 0.4969), Academic preparation of graduates, (B= 0.16,t=0.33, p < 0.7487), Fiscal stability and administrative capability, (B= 0.07, t=-0.31, p < 0.7583), Transparent and fair recruitment, (B= 0.04, t=-0.08, p < 0.9315), and Faculty credentials, (B= 0.04, t=-0.15, p < 0.8841), are all positively associated to Quality assurance but not significantly related..

This research is conducted to determine if Academic preparation of graduates, Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, Fiscal stability, and administrative capability; and Compliance with the standard outlined predict Quality Assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders. Results shows that 54% of the variance is explained by the six predictors. Specifically, Compliance with the standard outlined, Access to robust support resources, Academic preparation of graduates, Fiscal stability and administrative capability, Transparent and fair recruitment, and Faculty credentials, are all positively associated to Quality assurance but not significantly related.

This indicates that Academic preparation of graduates, Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources, Transparent and fair recruitment, Fiscal stability, and administrative capability; and Compliance with the standard outlined has no significant relationship to the Quality Assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders.

TABLE 21. Regression model for relationship between Program Accreditation and Quality Assurance Program Accreditation with Quality assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders as Outcome Variable
Model fit measures

Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.74	0.54	2.59	6	13	0.0708
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	0.96	2.16	0.45	0.66		
Academic preparation of graduates	0.16	0.50	0.33	0.7487		
Faculty credentials	0.04	0.28	0.15	0.8841		
Access to robust support resources	0.16	0.23	0.70	0.4969		
Transparent and fair recruitment	0.04	0.48	0.08	0.9315		
Fiscal stability and administrative capability	0.07	0.24	0.31	0.7583		
Compliance with the standard outlined.	0.33	0.26	1.28	0.2235		

Relationship between Institutional practices and Quality Assurances of the Selected State University and Colleges

Untalan (2023) reports on a World Bank-funded \$110-million project, TEACEP, designed to improve student learning outcomes in Mindanao, Philippines, focusing on nearly two million elementary students and over 60,000 educators. The project addresses learning deficits through digital and physical resources, including tablets and radio-based instruction for remote areas, alongside comprehensive teacher professional development and leadership training. These interventions target regions with high dropout rates and low academic performance, aiming to strengthen foundational literacy and numeracy, aligning with the Department of Education’s learning recovery efforts and the Basic Education Report 2023. The project acknowledges the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning outcomes and seeks to leverage targeted educational interventions to improve student achievement in disadvantaged areas.

TABLE 22. Regression model for relationship between Institutional Practices and Quality Assurance and Institutional Practices with Quality assurance in terms of Students learning outcomes as Outcome Variable
Model fit measures

Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.87	0.75	8.60	5	14	0.0007
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	0.39	0.99	0.40	0.6953		
Public information and accountability	0.02	0.11	0.14	0.8895		
Monitoring national policy objectives	0.31	0.17	1.82	0.0894		
Management and resource allocation	0.04	0.22	0.17	0.8712		
International comparison and benchmarking	0.27	0.18	1.53	0.1483		
Internal management	0.32	0.25	1.27	0.2247		

This research is conducted to determine if Public information and accountability, monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, international comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management predict Quality Assurance in terms of Student learning outcomes. Results shows that 75% of the variance is explained

by the five predictors, Specifically, Internal management, monitoring national policy objectives, International comparison and benchmarking, and Management and resource allocation, are all positively related to Quality Assurance while Public information and accountability, is not significantly related to the outcome variable. The result shows that Public information and accountability, monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, international comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management can’t predict Quality Assurance in terms of Student learning outcomes.

TABLE 23. Regression model for relationship between Institutional Practices and Quality Assurance and Institutional Practices with Quality assurance in terms of Stakeholders’ satisfaction as Outcome Variable
Model fit measures

Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.89	0.79	10.65	5	14	0.0002
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	0.18	0.87	0.21	0.8364		
Public information and accountability	0.17	0.09	1.80	0.0935		
Monitoring national policy objectives	0.17	0.15	1.12	0.2820		
Management and resource allocation	-0.09	0.20	-0.48	0.6418		
International comparison and benchmarking	-0.02	0.16	-0.11	0.9171		
Internal management	0.74	0.22	3.28	0.0055		

This research is conducted to determine if Public information and accountability, monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, International comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management predict Quality Assurance in terms of Stake holders’ satisfaction. Results shows that 79% of the variance is explained by the five predictor, Specifically, Internal management, Public information and accountability, Monitoring national policy objectives, are all positively associated to Quality assurance. While. Management and resource allocation, and International comparison and benchmarking, are not significantly related to the outcome variable. The result shows that Internal management has a significant relationship with the Quality Assurance in terms of Stakeholders satisfaction.

Falola et al. (2020) determined the effect of institutional support measures on the effectiveness of faculty core job tasks in selected Nigerian public institutions. Using a survey research methodology and stratified sampling, the study disseminated questionnaires to 600 respondents from various university schools and faculties, achieving a response rate of 71.5%. The data was analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (AMOS 22), which revealed that research support, instructional support, and technical support all strongly impact faculty response in areas including quality research output, information sharing, and administrative efficiency. This shows the importance of constantly examining and changing institutional support systems to guarantee their relevance and appropriateness.

This research is conducted to determine if Public information and accountability, Monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, International comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management predict Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional reputation and rankings. Results shows that 91% of the variance is explained by the five predictors, Specifically, Internal management, Management and resource allocation, International comparison and benchmarking, Public information and accountability, and Monitoring national policy objectives are all positively associated to Quality assurance. The result shows that Internal management has a significant relationship to Quality assurance in terms of Institutional reputation and rankings.

TABLE 24. Regression model for relationship between Institutional Practices and Quality Assurance and Institutional Practices with Quality assurance in terms of Institutional reputation and rankings as Outcome Variable

Model fit measures						
Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.95	0.91	26.76	5	14	1.07E-06
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	-0.9	0.69	-1.3	0.2151		
Public information and accountability	0.11	0.07	1.48	0.1608		
Monitoring national policy objectives	0.08	0.12	0.69	0.5004		
Management and resource allocation	0.26	0.16	1.62	0.1278		
International comparison and benchmarking	0.24	0.13	1.92	0.0752		
Internal management	0.48	0.18	2.68	0.0181		

Eriksson (2024) contends that higher education institutions should shift their attention from pursuing rankings to creating a strong fundamental reputation, which is critical for recruiting stakeholders and guaranteeing long-term viability. The author questions the reliability of traditional rankings, claiming they may be skewed and manipulated, and instead calls for a return to "reputation basics," which include providing quality education and generating pleasant stakeholder experiences. Institutional reputation, defined by capacity and character, is impacted by a variety of interactions and media, notably social media, requiring proactive management. Eriksson offers practical reputation management solutions, including as constant monitoring, stakeholder participation, transparency, crisis readiness, and an emphasis on fundamental values. The article underlines that a well-managed reputation, based on authenticity and solid stakeholder connections, is more important than temporary ranking positions.

This research is conducted to determine if Public information and accountability, Monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, International comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management predict Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional improvements. Results shows that 18% of the variance is explained by the five predictors. Specifically, Monitoring national policy objectives, International comparison and

benchmarking, are both positively related to Quality assurance, while Public information and accountability, and Management and resource allocation, and internal management has no significant relationship to the outcome variable. The result shows that Public information and accountability, monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, International comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management can't predict Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional improvements.

TABLE 25. Regression model for relationship between Institutional Practices and Quality Assurance and Institutional Practices with Quality assurance in terms of Institutional improvements as Outcome Variable

Model fit measures						
Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.42	0.18	0.60	5	14	0.7012
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	4.49	1.45	3.10	0.0078		
Public information and accountability	-0.03	0.16	-0.21	0.8394		
Monitoring national policy objectives	0.28	0.25	1.10	0.2912		
Management and resource allocation	-0.16	0.33	-0.48	0.6393		
International comparison and benchmarking	0.28	0.26	1.05	0.3116		
Internal management	-0.11	0.37	-0.30	0.7685		

Torres et al. (2021) reviewed the determinants of continuous quality improvement in a Philippine higher education institution during the COVID-19 epidemic, emphasizing student perceptions. Recognizing the pandemic's impact on the quality of education delivery, the study sought to identify critical variables impacting improved implementation. An online survey of 386 students revealed that organizational factors such as collaborative curriculum discussions, rigorous assessment, teacher development through INSET seminars, and the use of flexible learning technologies (printed modules, learning packets, and LMS) all significantly predicted quality improvement. It is equally critical to recognize the importance of organizational, teacher, and administrative elements in sustaining and improving educational quality during times of considerable change.

TABLE 26. Regression model for relationship between Institutional Practices and Quality Assurance and Institutional Practices with Quality assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders as Outcome Variable

Model fit measures						
Model	R	R ²	Overall Model Test			
			F	df1	df2	p
1	0.76	0.58	3.88	5	14	0.0205
PREDICTOR	B	SE	t	p		
Intercept	1.40	1.25	1.11	0.2843		
Public information and accountability	-0.07	0.14	-0.53	0.6035		
Monitoring national policy objectives	0.14	0.22	0.62	0.5423		
Management and resource allocation	0.16	0.29	0.57	0.5770		
International comparison and benchmarking	0.22	0.23	0.97	0.3477		
Internal management	0.31	0.32	0.95	0.3606		

Falola et al. (2020) assessed the effect of institutional support measures on the effectiveness of core faculty job tasks in selected Nigerian public institutions. Utilizing a survey research methodology and stratified sampling, the study

distributed questionnaires to 600 respondents from various university schools and faculties, achieving a response rate of 71.5%. The data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (AMOS 22), which revealed that research support, instructional support, and technical support significantly impact faculty responses in areas including quality research output, information sharing, and administrative efficiency. This underscores the importance of continually examining and adapting institutional support systems to ensure their relevance and suitability.

This research is conducted to determine if Public information and accountability, monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, International comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management predict Quality Assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders. Results shows that 58% of the variance is explained by the five predictors, Specifically, International management, International comparison and benchmarking, Management and resource allocation, and Monitoring national policy objectives, are positively related to Quality assurance, while Public information and accountability, has no significant relationship to the outcome variable. The result shows that Public information and accountability, monitoring national policy objectives, Management and resource allocation, International comparison and benchmarking, and Internal management can't predict Quality Assurance in terms of Effective services to stakeholders.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The level of perception for Program Accreditation such as the Faculty credentials, Access to robust support resources and compliance with the standard outlined has Significant relationship to the selected State Universities Quality Assurance specifically to the Stakeholders satisfaction, while the perception level for Program Accreditation such as Access to robust support resources has relationship to the selected State Universities Quality Assurance in terms of Institutional reputation and rankings. Leading to the rejection of the hypothesis. This means that the hypothesis was rejected. It implies that institutional Program accreditation influenced their Quality assurance status

The level of perception in the Institutional practice of State Universities in terms Internal management has a significant relationship with the Quality assurance in terms of Stakeholders satisfaction and Institutional reputation and rankings. The hypothesis therefore was rejected showing that institutional practices are related to the Quality Assurance status of State universities.

Based from the conclusion drawn from the study, the following were recommended:

Quality Assurance offices/personnel may consider the importance of levelling up the Program Accreditation specifically faculty credential, access to robust support resources, and compliance with the standard outlined

Quality Assurance offices/personnel may review and focus on their Institutional Practices specifically areas that may affect the students learning outcomes, Institutional improvement, and Effective services to stakeholders

State Universities in the CALABARZON Area may consider the importance of Program Accreditation and Institutional practices for it may influence their Quality Assurance status or level

The study was confined only in selected SUC'S in CALABARZON area, future researcher may conduct related study with the other part/region with a bigger population to acquire more accurate result.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Adeniyi, I. S., Al Hamad, N. M., Adewusi, O. E., Unachukwu, C. C., Osawaru, B., Onyebuchi, C. N., ... & David, I. O. (2024). Educational reforms and their impact on student performance: A review in African Countries. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 21(2), 750-762.
- [2]. Agrawal, S. (2023, August 23). A Comprehensive Overview of Four Types of Educational Management. *Asian College of Teachers*. <https://www.educationmanagementdiploma.com/blogs/1623-A-Comprehensive-Overview-of-Four-Types-of-Educational-Management-blog.php>
- [3]. Cheng, M., Adekola, O., Albia, J., & Cai, S. (2021). Employability in higher education: a review of key stakeholders' perspectives. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 16(1), 16–31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/heed-03-2021-0025> in *Higher Education*, 9(3), 245.
- [4]. Eriksson, R. (2024, October 1). Forget Higher Ed Rankings: It's Time to Get Back to Reputation Basics. *Keystone Education Group*. <https://www.keg.com/news/forget-higher-ed-rankings-time-to-get-back-to-reputation-basics>
- [5]. Falola, H. O., Adeniji, A. A., Adeyeye, J. O., Igbinnoba, E. E., & Atolagbe, T. O. (2020). Measuring institutional support strategies and faculty job effectiveness. *Heliyon*, 6(3).
- [6]. GeeksforGeeks. (2024, May 7). Benchmarking: meaning, steps and types. *GeeksforGeeks*. <https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/benchmarking-steps-and-types/>
- [7]. Harvey, L. (2025). Public information. *Quality Research International*. <https://www.qualityresearchinternational.com/glossary/publicinformation.html>
- [8]. Llaneta, C. (2024). UP and PPSC ink agreement to collaborate for capability-building in education, research and public service - University of the Philippines. *University of the Philippines* -. <https://up.edu.ph/up-and-ppsc-ink-agreement-to-collaborate-for-capability-building-in-education-research-and-public-service/>
- [9]. Massucci, F. A., & Docampo, D. (2019). Measuring the academic reputation through citation networks via PageRank. *Journal of Informetrics*, 13(1), 185-201.
- [10]. Nkonki-Mandleni, B. (2021). Monitoring and evaluation of university-community impact in driving transformation agenda. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.20853/37-1-5679>
- [11]. Reed, A., Kong, Y., & Abramovich, S. (2024). Assessment, credential, or both? Higher education faculty's design principles for micro-credentials. *Discover Education*, 3(1), 16.
- [12]. Rose-Collins, F. (2024). The importance of compliance for educational institutions. *Rank Tracker*. <https://www.ranktracker.com/blog/the-importance-of-compliance-for-educational-institutions/>
- [13]. Sedmak, J. (2023, May 18). What is Stakeholder Engagement, and Why is it Important for Strategic Planning? *SME*. <https://www.smestrategy.net/blog/stakeholder-engagement-management-for-strategic-planning>
- [14]. Udas, K. (2019). Robust Integrations: Uncorking Quality, Flexibility and Value. *The Evolution*. <https://evollution.com/technology/infrastructure/robust-integrations-uncorking-quality-flexibility-and-value>
- [15]. Untalan, S. (2023, June 24). World Bank allots \$110M to improve learning outcomes for Mindanao students. *GMA News Online*. <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/topstories/nation/873892/world-bank-allots-110m-to-improve-learning-outcomes-for-mindanao-students/story/>
- [16]. Waldron, R. (2024, March 14). Resource Allocation: Defining its Importance, Benefits, and Impact. *Quickbase*.



<https://www.quickbase.com/blog/resource-allocation-defining-its-importance-benefits-and-impact>

[17]. Wong, W.H., Chapman, E. Student satisfaction and interaction in higher education. *High Educ* 85, 957–978 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00874-0>