

INITIATIVES AND INNOVATIONS IN A PHILIPPINE PRIVATE SCHOOL: IMPACT ON STUDENT OUTCOMES AND INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18678163

Atty. Grace Isanor G. Laron, DPA

Executive Secretary to the President, Valencia Colleges (Bukidnon), Inc.

Abstract

This mixed-methods study examined the effectiveness of institutional initiatives implemented at Valencia Colleges (Bukidnon), Inc. (VCI) during School Year 2024-2025 across seven domains: administrative efficiency, safety and security, student support services, curriculum and instruction, faculty development, technology integration, and infrastructure and facilities. Data were collected from 458 respondents (417 students and 41 faculty/staff) through surveys and interviews. Results revealed varying levels of awareness, engagement, and satisfaction across stakeholder groups. Infrastructure improvements garnered the highest student awareness (68.1%), while administrative efficiency showed the lowest (46.3%). Teachers consistently reported higher clarity, engagement, and satisfaction than students across all domains, with statistically significant differences in technology integration ($p = .001$) and student support services ($p = .024$). The findings demonstrate that while VCI has made substantial progress in implementing innovations, significant communication gaps exist between administrators and students. The study offers evidence-based recommendations for enhancing stakeholder engagement and program effectiveness in Philippine private higher education.

Keywords: educational innovation, program evaluation, stakeholder perceptions, Philippine private higher education, institutional effectiveness

Rationale

Valencia Colleges (Bukidnon), Inc. (VCI) stands as a premier educational institution in Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines, committed to providing quality education and fostering holistic student development. In an era of rapid educational transformation, evaluating the effectiveness of institutional initiatives has become essential to ensure continued relevance and responsiveness to stakeholder needs.

The increasing emphasis on educational quality and innovation in higher education cannot be overstated. VCI has implemented various initiatives to enhance student learning experiences and outcomes, particularly in response to pandemic-induced challenges. These initiatives span administrative processes, campus safety, student support services, curriculum development, faculty professional growth, technology adoption, and physical infrastructure improvement.

Despite these efforts, comprehensive analysis of initiative effectiveness has been lacking. This study addressed this gap by systematically evaluating stakeholder perceptions across multiple domains, identifying strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. The findings contribute to evidence-based decision-making and support VCI's ongoing efforts to enhance educational offerings and institutional performance.

Literature Review

Educational Innovations in Higher Education: Technology integration has transcended mere adoption of digital tools to encompass holistic reimagining of learning environments (Akintayo et al., 2024). In the Philippines, the pandemic catalyzed digital transformation while exposing persistent inequalities in access and capacity (World Bank, 2022). Project-based learning and interdisciplinary approaches have shown promise in developing critical thinking and practical skills among Filipino students (Del Mundo & Reyes, 2023).

Effectiveness of Educational Initiatives: Research demonstrates that targeted initiatives significantly impact student success (Tinto, 2012; Astin, 1993). In the Philippine context, CHED Memorandum Orders No. 46 (2012) and No. 15 (2023) provide frameworks for student support services, faculty development, and digital transformation. Faculty development emerges as a critical determinant of educational quality (Lopez & Dela Cruz, 2023).

Assessment Methods: Mixed-methods approaches combining quantitative and qualitative measures enhance program evaluation validity (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Effectiveness-based approaches emphasize establishing clear objectives and measurable outcomes from initiative outset (McDavid, Huse, & Hawthorn, 2018).

Contextual Factors: Institutional culture, leadership, and organizational support play pivotal roles in innovation success (Baker et al., 2016). Philippine higher education operates within ASEAN Qualifications Framework requirements and CHED quality assurance mechanisms, shaping institutional priorities and resource allocation (Bayudan-Dacuycuy, Orbeta Jr., & Ortiz, 2023).

Statement of the Problem

This study addressed the lack of empirical evidence regarding VCI initiative effectiveness. Specifically, it answered:

1. What is the profile of respondents?
2. What initiatives have been implemented across seven domains?
3. How well are initiatives communicated in terms of clarity and engagement?
4. How have initiatives impacted teaching and learning?
5. How have initiatives impacted professional development?
6. How have initiatives affected school culture?
7. What is the overall satisfaction with initiatives?

Research Methodology

Research Design: This study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews and document analysis.

Population and Sample: From 2,257 third- and fourth-year students, Slovin's formula with 5% margin of error yielded 340 students. An additional 12% was oversampled for non-responses. Using Probability Proportionate to Size, 458 participants were included: 417 students and 41 teachers.

Data Collection: Structured surveys assessed perceptions of initiative effectiveness, satisfaction, and impacts. Semi-structured interviews with faculty and staff provided qualitative insights. Document analysis of institutional records provided contextual data.

Data Analysis: Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, chi-square tests, and independent samples t-tests. Qualitative data were thematically analyzed.

Ethical Considerations: The study adhered to international and national ethical guidelines (45 CFR 46.116, Declaration of Helsinki, Philippine National Ethical Guidelines). Informed consent was obtained, confidentiality maintained, and IRB approval secured (Protocol No. IRB-2026-001).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of Respondents
Table 1: Type of Respondents

Respondents	Number
Students	417
Criminology	198

Liberal Arts	35
BSBA	89
BEED	59
BSED	36
Teachers	41
Total	458

The College of Criminology predominated, reflecting its largest enrollment. This dual composition—students and teachers—provides multifaceted perspectives on the educational environment.

Improvements and Innovations Implemented

VCI initiated innovations during the pandemic, including: organizational restructuring; revised vision, mission, and goals; hired licensed security guards with campus-wide CCTV; reorganized Student Affairs Services with dedicated offices and budgets; institutionalized faculty development with scholarships and seminar sponsorships; implemented online enrollment, Learning Management System, and Document Management System; and constructed additional classrooms and multi-storey buildings.

Awareness of Improvements
Table 2: Awareness of Improvements by Area

Area	Students (% Yes)	Teachers (% Yes)
Administrative Efficiency	46.3%	65.9%
Safety & Security	76.7%	63.4%
Student Support Services	60.4%	60.0%
Curriculum & Instruction	53.7%	70.7%
Faculty Development	67.9%	78.0%
Technology Integration	52.3%	75.6%
Infrastructure & Facilities	68.1%	73.2%

Infrastructure improvements garnered highest student awareness (68.1%), reflecting visible construction projects. Safety and security showed strong awareness (76.7%), indicating effective communication of campus safety measures. Administrative efficiency showed lowest student awareness (46.3%), with 51.8% unaware. This aligns with World Bank (2022) observations that information about administrative innovations often inadequately reaches students.

Technology integration revealed narrow awareness margin (52.3% aware), suggesting challenges in fully embedding technology into academic operations. This leapfrogging from pre-pandemic to pandemic modalities exposed gaps in infrastructure, digital literacy, and stakeholder readiness.

Teacher awareness was consistently higher across most domains, particularly faculty development (78.0%) and technology integration (75.6%), reflecting direct impact on teachers' professional lives.

Clarity of Communication

Table 3: Clarity of Objectives by Area

Area	Students (% Clear)	Teachers (% Clear)	Difference
Administrative Efficiency	70.3%	82.9%	+12.6
Safety & Security	87.1%	87.8%	+0.7
Student Support Services	71.5%	92.7%	+21.2
Curriculum & Instruction	74.1%	92.7%	+18.6
Faculty Development	81.5%	95.1%	+13.6
Technology Integration	56.1%	92.7%	+36.6
Infrastructure & Facilities	80.6%	90.2%	+9.6

Teachers consistently rated communication clarity higher than students across all domains, with the largest gap in technology integration (+36.6%). Safety and security showed near parity, with both groups expressing high clarity (above 87%). These findings reveal significant communication gaps between institutional messaging and student reception.

Participation and Engagement

Table 4: Participation in Initiatives by Area

Area	Students (% Participated)	Teachers (% Participated)
Administrative Efficiency	64.0%	78.0%
Safety & Security	78.4%	75.6%
Student Support Services	71.2%	87.8%
Curriculum & Instruction	69.5%	92.7%
Faculty Development	67.6%	92.7%
Technology Integration	57.3%	87.8%
Infrastructure & Facilities	70.3%	78.0%

Safety and security saw highest student participation (78.4%); technology integration lowest (57.3%). Teachers showed remarkably high participation, particularly in curriculum and instruction (92.7%) and faculty development (92.7%). The largest participation gaps were in technology integration (+30.5%) and faculty development (+25.1%).

Table 5: T-Test Results on Engagement Levels

Area	Mean (Teachers)	Mean (Students)	t-value	p-value
Administrative Efficiency	1.74	2.15	-2.168	.031*
Student Support Services	1.64	2.09	-2.450	.015*
Curriculum & Instruction	1.44	2.10	-3.821	.000*
Faculty Development	1.43	2.05	-3.419	.001*
Technology Integration	1.63	2.40	-3.999	.000*
Infrastructure & Facilities	1.67	2.08	-2.499	.013*

*Note: Lower mean = higher engagement (1.00-1.80 = Highly engaged; 1.81-2.60 = Moderately engaged). $p < .05$
Statistically significant differences emerged in six of seven domains, confirming teachers perceive themselves as substantially more engaged than students.

Impact on Teaching and Learning

Table 6: Impact on Teaching and Learning (% Positive)

Area	Students	Teachers
Administrative Efficiency	76.5%	85.3%
Safety & Security	81.0%	82.9%
Student Support Services	76.5%	80.5%
Curriculum & Instruction	81.1%	95.1%
Faculty Development	80.6%	95.1%
Technology Integration	63.6%	90.2%
Infrastructure & Facilities	76.5%	90.2%

Curriculum and instruction (81.1%) and safety and security (81.0%) received highest student impact ratings. Technology integration showed lowest (63.6%). Teachers rated impact exceptionally highly, with five domains exceeding 90% positive. Only technology integration showed statistically significant difference between groups ($p = .001$).

Impact on Professional Development

Table 7: Contribution to Professional Development (% Significant/Moderate)

Area	Students	Teachers
Administrative Efficiency	92.8%	90.3%
Safety & Security	96.9%	90.2%
Student Support Services	92.4%	90.3%
Curriculum & Instruction	93.7%	97.6%
Faculty Development	95.7%	97.5%
Technology Integration	84.6%	95.1%
Infrastructure & Facilities	96.2%	97.6%

Both groups recognized substantial contributions to professional development. Faculty development received strongest teacher endorsement (97.5%). Technology integration showed largest gap (84.6% students vs. 95.1% teachers).

Qualitative findings revealed that "train-the-trainer" workshops enhanced pedagogical skills and digital literacy. Teachers reported renewed professional purpose and reduced burnout from sustained institutional support.

Effects on School Culture

Table 8: Influence on School Culture (% Positive)

Area	Students	Teachers
Administrative Efficiency	78.4%	88.0%
Safety & Security	83.0%	92.7%
Student Support Services	73.1%	92.7%
Curriculum & Instruction	77.7%	97.5%
Faculty Development	81.8%	97.5%
Technology Integration	63.8%	95.1%
Infrastructure & Facilities	78.2%	95.1%

Students perceived strongest positive influence on safety and security (83.0%) and faculty development (81.8%). Technology integration again showed lowest (63.8%). Teachers rated effects more positively across all domains, with statistically significant differences in student support services ($p = .024$) and technology integration ($p = .002$).

Overall Satisfaction

Table 9: Overall Satisfaction with School Initiatives

Satisfaction Level	Students	Teachers
Extremely Satisfied	11.0%	12.2%
Satisfied	49.9%	78.0%
Neutral	16.3%	0%
Dissatisfied	2.6%	0%
Extremely Dissatisfied	0.5%	0%
No Response	19.7%	9.8%
Average Score	2.15 (Satisfied)	1.86 (Satisfied)

Teachers demonstrated substantially higher satisfaction (78% satisfied) than students (49.9% satisfied). Nearly 20% of students provided no response, suggesting possible disengagement or survey fatigue.

Table 10: Comparison of Satisfaction Scores Across Areas

Area	Students (Avg)	Teachers (Avg)
Administrative Efficiency	1.97 (Satisfied)	1.88 (Extremely Satisfied)
Safety & Security	1.80 (Extremely Satisfied)	1.78 (Extremely Satisfied)

Student Support Services	1.99 (Satisfied)	1.78 (Extremely Satisfied)
Curriculum & Instruction	1.90 (Satisfied)	1.73 (Extremely Satisfied)
Faculty Development	1.84 (Satisfied)	1.73 (Extremely Satisfied)
Technology Integration	2.23 (Satisfied)	1.78 (Extremely Satisfied)
Infrastructure & Facilities	1.90 (Satisfied)	1.75 (Extremely Satisfied)

Teachers consistently reported higher satisfaction than students, with technology integration showing largest gap. Safety and security was the only domain where both groups reported "Extremely satisfied" ratings with minimal difference.

CONCLUSIONS

- Stakeholder Representation Provides Balanced Perspective:** The dual perspective reveals significant differences in how initiatives are experienced across groups, highlighting complexity of innovation implementation in Philippine private higher education.
- Awareness Gaps Require Strategic Communication:** Student awareness varies substantially (46.3% to 76.7%), with Criminology students showing consistently lower awareness. College-specific communication strategies are needed.
- Teacher-Student Perception Disparities Reveal Implementation Challenges:** Teachers consistently report higher awareness, clarity, engagement, and satisfaction, with largest gaps in technology integration (+36.6%) and faculty development.
- Technology Integration Emerges as Critical Challenge:** Across all measures, technology integration receives lowest student ratings, indicating institutional investments are not effectively reaching or engaging students.
- Safety and Security Demonstrate Consistent Strength:** This domain shows strongest, most consistent positive ratings across both groups, reflecting successful implementation and foundational trust.
- Faculty Development Recognized but Under-communicated to Students:** While strongly endorsed by teachers, students may not fully appreciate how enhanced teacher capabilities translate to improved instruction.
- Engagement Levels Indicate Need for Deeper Involvement:** Stakeholder participation remains at surface level rather than deep, sustained engagement.
- Overall Satisfaction Positive but with Notable Gaps:** Teacher satisfaction (78%) substantially exceeds student satisfaction (49.9%), with 19.7% student non-response indicating uncertainty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Enhance Communication Strategies for Students

Develop targeted, multi-channel communication using platforms students frequent. Create college-specific plans addressing varying awareness levels. Develop student-friendly materials explaining initiative objectives and benefits.

2. Maximize Technology Integration for Student Benefit

Conduct comprehensive student training on available technological resources. Integrate technology use systematically into coursework. Gather student input on technology needs. Implement peer tutoring for technology adoption.

3. Bridge Faculty Development-Student Experience Connection

Communicate faculty development activities to students. Involve students in evaluating classroom impacts. Share faculty success stories with student body.

4. Deepen Stakeholder Engagement

Prominently display institutional vision, mission, and core values. Create structured opportunities for student input. Develop ethical culture anchored on core values. Implement participative engagement mechanisms.

5. Strengthen Student-Centered Program Design

Involve students in planning and feedback. Ensure program benefits are clearly communicated and demonstrably felt. Conduct regular satisfaction surveys with follow-up action.

6. Sustain and Build on Safety and Security Strengths

Maintain and regularly update safety protocols. Continue visible communication. Extend successful safety communication strategies to other domains.

7. Address Technology Integration as Institutional Priority

Designate technology integration as strategic priority with dedicated resources. Conduct comprehensive audit of technology utilization. Develop student-centered training programs. Create incentives for faculty innovation.

8. Implement Regular, Systematic Program Evaluation

Establish regular evaluation cycles for all initiatives. Include quantitative and qualitative measures. Ensure stakeholder feedback directly informs program adjustments.

REFERENCES

- Akintayo, et al. (2024). Evaluating the impact of educational technology on learning outcomes in higher education.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. Jossey-Bass.
- Baker, D. P., et al. (2016). Educational attainment in global perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*.
- Bayudan-Dacuycuy, C. G., Orbeta Jr., A. C., & Ortiz, M. K. P. (2023). The quest for quality and equity in the Philippine higher education. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*.
- CHED. (2012). *Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012*. Commission on Higher Education.
- CHED. (2023). *Memorandum Order No. 15, s. 2023*. Commission on Higher Education.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Del Mundo, R. M., & Reyes, L. P. (2023). Bridging the digital divide. *Philippine Journal of Educational Technology*, 14(1), 45-62.
- Lopez, C. G., & Dela Cruz, A. M. (2023). Impact of faculty development on teaching effectiveness. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education*, 37(3), 150-168.
- McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. (2018). *Program evaluation and performance measurement* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action*. University of Chicago Press.
- World Bank. (2022). *Digital transformation of Philippine higher education*. Washington, DC.