



Aligning the Bachelor of Elementary Education Program with Accreditation Standards: A Discrepancy-Based Benchmarking Study

Rey S. Pepito

JH Cerilles State College, Philippines

Ruther D. Bianan

JH Cerilles State College, Philippines

Abstract

This study utilized Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM) to assess the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program of J.H. Cerilles State College in alignment with academic accreditation standards outlined in CHED Memorandum Order No. 74, series of 2017. The evaluation covered four stages: design, installation, process, and product. Using a concurrent triangulation mixed-methods design, the study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire to gather quantitative data as well as semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis to obtain qualitative insights. Results revealed that while the program adheres to most minimum standards, several critical discrepancies were identified, including curriculum congestion, unqualified administrative assignments, faculty workload issues, inadequacies in library resources, lack of laboratory and physical facilities, inconsistent retention policy implementation, and underperformance in licensure examination. Despite these challenges, the institution demonstrates a strong commitment to continuous improvement through initiatives to align the program with accreditation standards. The study underscores the importance of strategic interventions, including curriculum decongestion, faculty development, resource enhancement, and strict policy enforcement, to enhance program implementation and student success.

Article Info

Article History:

Received:

May 16, 2025

Accepted:

July 28, 2025

Keywords:

*Program evaluation,
Bachelor of Elementary Education,
discrepancy evaluation model,
curriculum development, higher education, quality assurance.*



*Corresponding author

E-mail: reypepito199522@gmail.com

Cite as:

Pepito, R. S. & Bianan, R.D., (2025). Aligning Bachelor of Elementary Education Program with Accreditation Standards: A Discrepancy-Based Benchmarking Study, *Journal of Education and Language Studies*, 2 (1), 1-26.
<https://wmsu.edu.ph/jels/articles.html>



Introduction

In the 21st century, globalization has emerged as a transformative force reshaping the educational landscape. It has intensified the interconnectedness of nations, economies, and cultures, compelling higher education institutions (HEIs) to produce graduates who are not only locally competent but globally competitive (Petricevic & Teece, 2019; Alkharafi & Alsabah, 2025). This global shift demands that HEIs transcend traditional boundaries and align their programs with international standards, fostering mobility, recognition, and relevance in a rapidly evolving knowledge economy (Zalli, 2024; Vålímáa, Uljens, & Elo, 2024; Adiatma, Mahriadi, & Suteki, 2022).

Amid this global convergence, accreditation has become a cornerstone of quality assurance and institutional legitimacy. It serves as a formal mechanism through which HEIs validate their academic offerings, governance structures, and operational integrity against established benchmarks (AACCUP, 2017; Al-Azmi, Al-Ta'ani, & Bani Irshaid, 2021; Kayyali, 2024). Accreditation is not merely a compliance exercise—it is a strategic tool that fosters continuous improvement, cultivates a culture of excellence, and enhances institutional credibility in both national and international arenas (Signo, 2025; QAHE, 2024).

The synergy between globalization and accreditation is particularly evident in the pursuit of international recognition. As educational markets become increasingly borderless, institutions must demonstrate that their programs meet global expectations for quality, relevance, and innovation (Aithal & Kumar, 2020; Adiatma et al., 2022). From this perspective, educational evaluation remains a foundational pillar of effective academic systems, enabling evidence-based decision-making and fostering continuous institutional improvement (Ganagalla, 2023). Maintaining institutional alignment with established standards while staying attuned to the evolving demands of the labor market presents a formidable challenge (Conchada & Tiongco, 2015). Nevertheless, many institutions voluntarily pursue accreditation as a strategic commitment to quality assurance and continuous improvement (Duarte & Vardasca, 2023).



In the Philippine context, the legal and policy frameworks—anchored in the 1987 Constitution, Republic Act No. 7722, and CHED Memorandum Orders—affirm the centrality of education in national development. These instruments mandate HEIs to uphold access, equity, and quality while exercising academic freedom within a framework of accountability (Carillo, 2017; Conchada & Tiongco, 2015). The Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program, guided by CHED CMO No. 74, s. 2017, exemplifies this mandate by aligning its curriculum with transformative national frameworks such as the K to 12 Enhanced Curriculum, the Philippine Qualifications Framework, and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers.

As J.H. Cerilles State College’s BEEd program enters its Level III Re-Accreditation phase, it faces the dual imperative of maintaining compliance with CHED standards and demonstrating responsiveness to global educational trends. This study thus aims to assess the program’s alignment with accreditation benchmarks, using them as both a diagnostic lens and a developmental tool. By identifying strengths, gaps, and opportunities for enhancement, the evaluation seeks to ensure that the program remains relevant, rigorous, and resilient in the face of globalization’s demands.

In the 21st century, globalization has emerged as a transformative force reshaping the educational landscape. It has intensified the interconnectedness of nations, economies, and cultures, compelling higher education institutions (HEIs) to produce graduates who are not only locally competent but globally competitive (Petricevic & Teece, 2019; Alkharafi & Alsabah, 2025). This global shift demands that HEIs transcend traditional boundaries and align their programs with international standards, fostering mobility, recognition, and relevance in a rapidly evolving knowledge economy (Zalli, 2024; Välimaa, Uljens, & Elo, 2024; Adiatma, Mahriadi, & Suteki, 2022).

Amid this global convergence, accreditation has become a cornerstone of quality assurance and institutional legitimacy. It serves as a formal mechanism through which HEIs validate their academic offerings, governance structures, and operational integrity against established



benchmarks (AACUP, 2017; Al-Azmi, Al-Ta'ani, & Bani Irshaid, 2021; Kayyali, 2024). Accreditation is not merely a compliance exercise—it is a strategic tool that fosters continuous improvement, cultivates a culture of excellence, and enhances institutional credibility in both national and international arenas (Signo, 2025; QAHE, 2024).

The synergy between globalization and accreditation is particularly evident in the pursuit of international recognition. As educational markets become increasingly borderless, institutions must demonstrate that their programs meet global expectations for quality, relevance, and innovation (Aithal & Kumar, 2020; Adiatma et al., 2022). From this perspective, educational evaluation remains a foundational pillar of effective academic systems, enabling evidence-based decision-making and fostering continuous institutional improvement (Ganagalla, 2023). Maintaining institutional alignment with established standards while staying attuned to the evolving demands of the labor market presents a formidable challenge (Conchada & Tiongco, 2015). Nevertheless, many institutions voluntarily pursue accreditation as a strategic commitment to quality assurance and continuous improvement (Duarte & Vardasca, 2023).

In the Philippine context, the legal and policy frameworks—anchored in the 1987 Constitution, Republic Act No. 7722, and CHED Memorandum Orders—affirm the centrality of education in national development. These instruments mandate HEIs to uphold access, equity, and quality while exercising academic freedom within a framework of accountability (Carillo, 2017; Conchada & Tiongco, 2015). The Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program, guided by CHED CMO No. 74, s. 2017, exemplifies this mandate by aligning its curriculum with transformative national frameworks such as the K to 12 Enhanced Curriculum, the Philippine Qualifications Framework, and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers.

As J.H. Cerilles State College's BEEd program enters its Level III Re-Accreditation phase, it faces the dual imperative of maintaining compliance with CHED standards and demonstrating responsiveness to global educational trends. This study thus aims to assess the program's alignment with accreditation benchmarks, using them as



both a diagnostic lens and a developmental tool. By identifying strengths, gaps, and opportunities for enhancement, the evaluation seeks to ensure that the program remains relevant, rigorous, and resilient in the face of globalization's demands.

In the 21st century, globalization has emerged as a transformative force reshaping the educational landscape. It has intensified the interconnectedness of nations, economies, and cultures, compelling higher education institutions (HEIs) to produce graduates who are not only locally competent but globally competitive (Petricevic & Teece, 2019; Alkharafi & Alsabah, 2025). This global shift demands that HEIs transcend traditional boundaries and align their programs with international standards, fostering mobility, recognition, and relevance in a rapidly evolving knowledge economy (Zalli, 2024; Välimaa, Uljens, & Elo, 2024; Adiatma, Mahriadi, & Suteki, 2022).

Amid this global convergence, accreditation has become a cornerstone of quality assurance and institutional legitimacy. It serves as a formal mechanism through which HEIs validate their academic offerings, governance structures, and operational integrity against established benchmarks (AACCUP, 2017; Al-Azmi, Al-Ta'ani, & Bani Irshaid, 2021; Kayyali, 2024). Accreditation is not merely a compliance exercise—it is a strategic tool that fosters continuous improvement, cultivates a culture of excellence, and enhances institutional credibility in both national and international arenas (Signo, 2025; QAHE, 2024).

The synergy between globalization and accreditation is particularly evident in the pursuit of international recognition. As educational markets become increasingly borderless, institutions must demonstrate that their programs meet global expectations for quality, relevance, and innovation (Adiatma et al., 2022; Aithal & Kumar, 2020). From this perspective, educational evaluation remains a foundational pillar of effective academic systems, enabling evidence-based decision-making and fostering continuous institutional improvement (Ganagalla, 2023). Maintaining institutional alignment with established standards while staying attuned to the evolving demands of the labor market presents a formidable challenge (Conchada &



Tiongco, 2015). Nevertheless, many institutions voluntarily pursue accreditation as a strategic commitment to quality assurance and continuous improvement (Duarte & Vardasca, 2023).

In the Philippine context, the legal and policy frameworks—anchored in the 1987 Constitution, Republic Act No. 7722, and CHED Memorandum Orders—affirm the centrality of education in national development. These instruments mandate HEIs to uphold access, equity, and quality while exercising academic freedom within a framework of accountability (Carillo, 2017; Conchada & Tiongco, 2015). The Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program, guided by CHED CMO No. 74, s. 2017, exemplifies this mandate by aligning its curriculum with transformative national frameworks such as the K to 12 Enhanced Curriculum, the Philippine Qualifications Framework, and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers.

As J.H. Cerilles State College's BEEd program enters its Level III Re-Accreditation phase, it faces the dual imperative of maintaining compliance with CHED standards and demonstrating responsiveness to global educational trends. This study thus aims to assess the program's alignment with accreditation benchmarks, using them as both a diagnostic lens and a developmental tool. By identifying strengths, gaps, and opportunities for enhancement, the evaluation seeks to ensure that the program remains relevant, rigorous, and resilient in the face of globalization's demands.

Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to evaluate the status of the Bachelor of Elementary Education program based on its conformity with academic accreditation standards.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent does the degree program conform with the academic accreditation standards?
2. What are the major discrepancies between the standards for the design of the degree program and its actual performance?



3. What strategic recommendations can be formulated from the findings to ensure sustained program compliance with accreditation standards?

Theoretical Framework

The research questions were answered using an objectives-oriented, quantitative evaluation study, based on an adaptation of Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM) (Provus, 1971). Malcolm Provus developed this model to be put in place as the new programs were designed and implemented in the Pittsburgh public schools. A systems approach was used to determine whether program performance met accepted program standards.

Provus (1971) conceptualized a three-step process of program evaluation: (a) defining program standards, (b) determining whether a discrepancy exists between some aspect of program performance and the standards governing that aspect of the program, and (c) using discrepancy information either to change performance or to change program standards. According to Provus, this operational definition of program evaluation leads to four possible alternatives: (a) the program can be terminated, (b) the program can proceed unaltered, (c) the performance of the program can be altered, or (d) the standards governing the program can be altered (Popham, 1975 as cited in Sampong, 2020).

The Discrepancy Model has five stages: (a) design; (b) installation; (c) process; (d) product; and (e) program comparison. Provus (1971) noted that at each stage, a systematic comparison is made between actual conditions and a predefined set of standards to determine the extent of alignment. Notably, the first four stages—design, installation, process, and product—are developmental in nature, focusing on the internal evaluation of a single program's structure and implementation. In contrast, the fifth stage, known as program comparison, serves an optional yet strategic purpose; it facilitates external benchmarking by comparing the evaluated program against alternative models.



In Provus' original model, the evaluator is involved in the design of the program as well as the standards for assessment, in consultation with stakeholders. With the design and standards in hand, he evaluates each of the five stages of the program, namely design, installation, process, product, and cost, by comparing the standards with the performance. The comparison often shows differences between standard and performance (i.e., expected and actual); this difference is called discrepancy. Discrepancy information is provided to the program staff, giving them a rational basis on which to make adjustments in their program (Provus, 1971).

Methods

Design

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, integrating both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures to evaluate the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program of J.H. Cerilles State College. The evaluation was guided primarily by Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM), which systematically compares actual program performance against established standards across four developmental stages: design, installation, process, and product (Provus, 1971; Cutamora, Leonardo, & Lagria, 2025). To ensure methodological rigor and data validation, the study adopted a concurrent triangulation design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Bell, Warren & Schmidt, 2022). In this design, quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously, analyzed independently, and then merged during the interpretation phase to cross-validate findings and provide a comprehensive understanding of the program's status.

The concurrent triangulation design is particularly effective in the current study since quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures are implemented to validate and crosscheck the findings of each data collection and analysis methods. Creswell (1999) identifies this approach as the most widely recognized mixed-methods design, wherein both quantitative and qualitative data are collected and analyzed simultaneously. Each method is typically given equal weight to ensure balanced insights. The results from one data source are cross validated with those from the other, enhancing the depth and clarity of the findings.



Ultimately, the integration of both datasets occurs during the interpretation phase, facilitating a comprehensive understanding of the research questions (Creswell, Fetters, & Ivankova, 2004; Ipek & Mutlu, 2021; Malau-Aduli & Alele, 2020).

Research Locale

The study was conducted at J.H. Cerilles State College-Dumingag Campus, Caridad, Dumingag, Zamboanga del Sur, Academic Year 2021-2022. JHCSC is the only state college in the province offering various programs in teacher education, arts and sciences, agriculture, engineering and technology, among others. Currently, the institution holds a SUC Level II status and is preparing for University hood. The College also institutionalized efforts to accredit its programs under the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP), Inc. and has started working to be ISO accredited.

Research Participants and Sampling

The study utilized 17 participants which comprised 8 core faculty members, and 9 student leaders. They were identified using purposive sampling method. The faculty members were selected based on the following criteria: 1) teaching either content, theoretical, or major courses in the BEEd program; and 2) have taught for at least three years in the program. The program chairperson was grouped under faculty because she also handles courses in the program. Meanwhile, student leaders were chosen considering the following criteria: 1) those elected in the Supreme Student Council, College Student Board, and class mayors; and 2) are officially enrolled in the program.

Research Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire-checklist in collecting the necessary data. In the formulation of this questionnaire-checklist, the researcher based the benchmark statements from the Preliminary Survey Instrument (PSI) and Policies, Standards, and Guidelines for Bachelor of Elementary Education (CMO 74 s. 2017). The PSI is a standardized instrument from the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and



Universities in the Philippines (AACCUP), Inc. The decision to use the PSI is grounded in the belief that it is better aligned and more relevant for evaluating whether the program has successfully met its foundational requirements.

Areas from the PSI which were considered in the evaluation comprised the following:

Area II. Statements included primarily on the qualifications of faculty members as well as the faculty development plan of the program;

Area III. Statements focused on the program's compliance to minimum requirements of curricular offerings, and the establishment of certain instructional processes, methodologies, and learning opportunities;

Area IV. Statements concentrated largely on the admission and retention policies of the institution;

-Area VII. Statements centered on the collection of updated and appropriate/suitable textbooks and references, administration and personnel, and the provision of services;

Area VIII. Statements delved on the provision and access of clienteles to various laboratories and facilities; and

Area X. Statements dealt on the qualification and experiences of the program chair on the administration and supervision of the program.

Table 1 *Criteria for Evaluating the Program Compliance based on Accreditation Standards*

Scale	Weight		Description	Interpretation	Code
	Continuum				
5	4.21-5.00		Excellent	Very High Complied	VHC
4	3.41-4.20		Very Satisfactory	Highly Complied	HC
3	2.61-3.40		Satisfactory	Moderately Complied	MoC
2	1.81-2.60		Fair	Minimally Complied	MiC
1	1.00-1.80		Poor	Not Complied	NC

A five-point Likert scale was used in categorizing the responses of the participants on the program's compliance to accreditation standards. To



determine the extent to which the program complies to these standards, the following scale above was employed.

Meanwhile, for the qualitative aspect of the study, interview and documentary analysis were utilized as data collection techniques. A semi-structured interview was conducted to gain participants' insights on the program implementation which were then used to validate their responses in the questionnaire-checklists. On the other hand, documentary analysis was employed to gather data on the program profile and cohort survival rate of students.

Data Gathering Procedure

Pertinent communications were secured prior to the administration of the questionnaire- checklist. Upon approval, the researcher set an appointment with the participants and informed them what the study is all about and the importance of their participation. Then, they were asked to accomplish the informed consent forms to conform to ethical protocols. During the administration of questionnaire-checklists, the researcher entertained questions or clarifications from the participants. After the participants had answered, the researcher retrieved the questionnaire-checklists and proceeded to tallying and initial analysis of the participants' responses.

After the initial analysis, the researcher then conducted a semi-structured interview with the participants to validate the responses they had indicated on the questionnaire-checklists. The interview was recorded and transcribed for further analysis.

Data Analysis

This study analyzed two sets of data, quantitative and qualitative. For quantitative data, the Weighted Arithmetic Mean (WAM) was used. On the other hand, content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data. Both data for each of the four stages (design, installation, process, and product) were then further analyzed following Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model. Based on the analyses, the researcher decided on the consequence of the degree program in the last stage. Data concerning Stage 1-4 were analyzed except at stage 5 since the data did not include any cost benefit.



Ethical Considerations

In compliance with research ethics protocols, the researcher observed anonymity, confidentiality, and informed consent while carrying out the study (Mohd Arifin, 2018; Richards & Schwartz, 2002; Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A., 2012). The ethical approval was sought from the Ethical Review Committee of the University where the researcher is taking his doctorate degree. The informed consent from the informants stipulating their awareness to the purpose of the study, their agreement to participate, the possible risks and benefits they may experience, and their freedom not to continue if they feel uncomfortable with the questions were formulated and approved by the ERC. The approved informed consent form was accomplished by the participants prior to the conduct of the study. Further, the anonymity and confidentiality of the informants were maintained by the use of coding of the participants in the data collection, analysis and reporting of the study findings to avoid revealing their identities.

Results and Discussion

General description of the program (Stage 1. Design)

The Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) is a four-year program aimed at equipping graduates with the competencies to meet the demands of elementary education. To attain quality, the Commission on Higher Education issued CMO No. 74 series of 2017 which provides policies, standards, and guidelines for the offering of BEEd as a program. Such policies, standards, and guidelines require Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), particularly Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs), to follow minimum requirements on design and administration before offering the program.

Program design

The comparative analysis of the program designs reflected on CMO 74 s. 2017 and the institution's BOT-approved program of study is shown above. There are notable discrepancies between the two frameworks in the structuring of academic courses. The institution's program exceeds the recommended 36 units in GE courses, offering 39 units, a difference of 3 additional units. Also, a significant discrepancy is observed in the



professional education category, with the program including 51 units compared to the recommended 42, a surplus of 9 units. In addition to, the institution offers 60 specialization courses, surpassing the recommended 57 by 3 units. Moreover, while there is no variation in the number of elective courses offered and that of PE and NSTP, there is a notable inclusion of 15-unit institutional courses, which are absent in the CMO recommendations.

Taken as a whole, the minimum number of units recommended by CHED is only 152; however, the institution has added 30 units which it believes necessary to address problems on low performance of graduates in LET. These courses include the Continuing Education and Enhancement on Professional Education (CEEPED)/review courses, foundational content knowledge (The Entrepreneurial Mind), and pedagogical skills (Principles of Teaching and Learning and Developmental Reading 1&2), and continuity of learning tasks (Research 2). While adding these units is not restricted by CHED for Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs), the expanded curriculum poses challenges for students who are already managing substantial academic workloads. The additional 15 units of CEEPED courses, in particular, require an entire semester for completion, making them less practical. Their high demand in terms of time and effort lacks strong evidence of efficacy. Moreover, the unavailability of qualified faculty to deliver these courses further complicates their feasibility. Notably, the program chair, during an interview, expressed a preference for abolishing the CEEPED courses due to their impracticality and resource constraints.

Dissemination of any curricular program to stakeholders is a process that must be undertaken by TEIs planning to offer a particular program. Table 2 displays the activities undertaken by the College in disseminating information about the offering of the new program to the stakeholders. As presented in the table, the conduct of consultative and career guidance activities, and the use of communication media (e.g., print, broadcast, and social media) have been undertaken regularly to ensure awareness of stakeholders of the status of the program even during the CoViD-19 pandemic. During the conduct of the consultative activities, various stakeholders including students, parents, alumni, community officials, and industry partners were invited to take part in the crafting and revising of the curriculum.



Program administration

Administration of any curricular program to be offered involves stringent selection and hiring of selection of qualified personnel, establishment of systematic admission and retention policies, and provision of facilities and services. The minimum requirements on the qualifications of personnel, admission and retention policies, and availability of facilities and services are shown above.

A significant discrepancy in program management is the appointment of a program chair who does not meet the prescribed qualifications. Specifically, the current chair holds only a master's degree and lacks administrative experience, which runs contrary to the CMO's recommendation that the dean or program chair should possess a doctoral degree along with relevant leadership experience. Although there is a dean who oversees all teacher education programs, the management of the BEEd program is compromised as it is offered in a separate and remote campus, reducing strategic oversight and efficiency. However, the program's faculty remains a key strength. The core teaching workforce consists of six faculty members, all of whom hold master's degrees, ensuring a solid foundation of expertise. Furthermore, the faculty members teaching general and professional education subjects are equally qualified, as they possess master's degrees, relevant licenses, and substantial teaching experience. This reflects the institution's commitment to maintaining a high level of competence and professionalism among its educators, despite challenges in administrative alignment.

Policies have been implemented to uphold the quality of student admission and retention within the program. The institution has established and adhered to systematic admission processes, which include administering entrance examinations and conducting personal interviews to ensure the selection of qualified candidates. However, while retention policies are in place, they have not been consistently enforced by the institution, resulting in a notable discrepancy. This lack of full compliance undermines the intended purpose of these policies and could potentially affect program outcomes.

In conjunction with offering the program, the institution provides facilities and services such as libraries, laboratories, and other essential infrastructure. While the library is managed by qualified personnel, it lacks



sufficient print, electronic, and other resources. Ideally, each department should be equipped with its own library. However, the current setup relies solely on the main library, which serves over a thousand students and faculty members, including those from extension campuses. This limitation in resources and services represents a significant discrepancy. Furthermore, the inadequacy and unavailability of facilities, such as classrooms, speech laboratory, and an educational technology laboratory, further highlight gaps in infrastructure. Despite these shortcomings, the College has taken proactive measures by partnering with the local government unit and private institutions to allow free and shared use of their facilities and services. While these agreements mitigate the issue to some extent, they do not fully address the need for sufficient on- campus resources to support the program effectively.

Assessments of Faculty and Students on Program Implementation (Stage 2. Installation)

The extent of compliance of the program to accreditation standards was evaluated by faculty members and students using benchmark statements. Faculty members rated all the components; however, students were not asked to rate the statements pertaining to faculty as these mainly focused on qualifications, workload assignments, and professional development efforts.

Comparative assessments of faculty members and students on curriculum and instruction

The comparative assessments of faculty members and students on Curriculum and Instruction is presented above. Faculty members have assessed the institution's compliance to minimum requirements as highly complied especially in conducting periodic review and updating of curricula, using effective teaching strategies, and employing outcomes-based and hands-on activities ($M=4.13$). On the other hand, students have rated the institution to have very highly complied as to its compliance with the minimum requirements for curriculum and instruction. Analysis of the findings reveals that students and faculty members have varied assessments as reflected on the overall means of 4.80 and 3.98, respectively. The results



further imply that the institution has complied both the curricular and instructional requirements above the minimum standards.

Based on the interview with student-leaders, one student-participant (S4) shared that he finds the BEEd curriculum logically sequenced and relevant, and was able to join the stakeholders' consultation where the curriculum was reviewed. In a separate interview with faculty members, one interviewee (F1) attested that offering CEEPED courses becomes problematic as she could not handle all the clusters of courses on her own given her qualification.

For faculty members, they have rated the minimum qualification and experience of the program chair (M=4.00), including her collaboration with faculty members and students in developing plans and programs (M=3.88), and in setting standards (M=3.63), as highly complied. However, as to preparing and implementing guidelines collaboratively on the proper use and maintenance of facilities (M=3.00) and in establishing linkages (M=2.88), the faculty members have rated them as moderately complied. For students, they have considered the minimum qualification and experience of the program chair (M=4.78) as very highly complied, yet they have rated team and collaborative effort in establishing linkages (M=3.25), as moderately complied. Analysis of the findings reveals that both faculty members and students consider the minimum standards for program administration to have been highly complied by the institution as supported by the component means of 3.48 and 4.04, respectively. The findings entail that the institution has complied the requirements above the minimum standards needed for the effective administration of the program.

It is interesting to note that although both faculty and students have high assessment on the qualification and experience of the program chair, an interview with the designated chair at the same time a faculty of the program, reveals that she lacks the qualification and relevant administrative experience. She reported that she is not a doctorate degree holder and had not been designated to any administrative position in the past prior to becoming a program chair in her present workstation. She also attested that the program has only established partnerships and linkages with local stakeholders particularly in the conduct of community extension services. Separate interviews with faculty members and students corroborated with the previous claim of the program chair about the institution's non-establishment of partnerships and linkages for the program.



Peer assessment on faculty

The faculty members have assessed the institution's adherence to the minimum qualifications of core faculty members (M=4.25), faculty handling general education courses (M=4.75), and faculty teaching professional education courses (M=4.50), as very highly complied. Similar assessment has been given by faculty members on the institution's program for their professional growth (M=4.25). However, they have only rated the institution's provision of equitable workload assignments to faculty members (M=3.00) as moderately complied. Analysis of the findings shows that the institution highly conforms to the minimum requirements set for faculty handling courses in the program (M=4.06). The findings further indicate that the institution has complied the requirements above the minimum standards.

Interviews with several core faculty members disclose that there has been a recurring problem regarding overload which hampers them to perform duties and other responsibilities satisfactorily. They even reveal that the primary reason for the overload is the failure of the institution to hire additional faculty members due to dearth of qualified applicants. Another interesting point noted by one faculty member is that she was given a teaching load inconsistent with her line of expertise but she was forced to accept it because her workload did not reach the units required among faculty members.

Comparative assessments of faculty members and students on library

Both faculty members and students have assessed that the institution's library has very highly complied with the minimum requirements on the provision of library resources and services (M1=4.25, M2=4.67). The findings elucidate that the institution has complied the requirements on the provision of library resources and services above the minimum standards. Surprisingly, although both groups have similar and highly favorable assessments on library resources and services, interviews with some faculty members disclose that there is scarcity of resources especially reference and non-print materials.

Comparative assessments of faculty members and students on laboratory and other facilities



comparative assessments of faculty members and students on Laboratory and Other Facilities. For faculty members, they have rated the institution to have highly complied the use of cooperating schools for field study and practicum courses ($M=3.75$). However, provision of policies and guidelines on proper utilization, maintenance and repair, and safety ($M=2.88$), adequacy of classrooms ($M=2.75$), and availability of science and educational technology laboratories (2.63) are only rated moderately complied. Other physical facilities intended for athletics, sports, cultural activities, and military training activities ($M=1.75$) have been rated not complied due to their unavailability. Meanwhile, students assessed the institution's laboratories and other facilities as both highly complied and very highly complied. Analysis of the findings reveals that faculty members have rated the institution's provision of laboratory and other facilities as moderately complied, which is lower than the students' rating of highly complied. The findings further suggest that the institution has met only the minimum requirements based on faculty members' assessment while it has complied the requirements above the minimum standards from the students' standpoint.

Separate interviews indicate similar observations of faculty members and students on the unavailability of laboratories and other facilities. However, it can be noted that faculty members believe that the institution still has to provide lacking facilities instead of using others' facilities through executing memoranda of agreement. From the students' perspective, utilizing available facilities from other departments or institutions serves as the most practical temporary solution to address the lack of their own resources.

Comparative assessments of faculty members and students on admission and retention policy

Faculty members have assessed that the institution have moderately complied the minimum requirements especially on instituting intervention programs and policies for struggling students ($M=3.38$), regularly informing students about their academic status ($M=3.25$), and keeping of student admission and retention records ($M=3.13$). On the other hand, students have rated the institution to have very highly complied the minimum requirements for admission and retention of students. Analysis of the findings reveals that faculty members and students have varied assessments as reflected on the overall means of 3.45 and 4.60, respectively. The results further imply that the institution has complied the admission and retention requirements above the minimum standards.



Interviews with several faculty members reveal that they are aware that the institution has established admission and retention policies but only the admission policies have been properly instituted. They further state that the institution does not strictly reinforce its retention policies which leads to faculty members following their own manner of retaining students.

Performance Data of Students (Stage 3 & 4: Process and Product)

The performance of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) graduates in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) over the past four years (2017, 2018, 2019–2021) was analyzed as part of the study's assessment of process and product outcomes. While graduate employability was also considered, the lack of tracer study data for the specified years was identified as a limitation of the study.

BEEd graduates' performance in Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) (March 2017 to September 2021 except 2020 due to COVID-19)

The performance of BEEd graduates in the LET during the observed periods demonstrates consistent institutional underperformance relative to national benchmarks, especially among repeater examinees. Within four years from 2017 to 2021, the overall institutional passing rate ranged from as low as 1.47% to a peak of 29.41%, reflecting a modest upward trend post-pandemic.

A disaggregated analysis reveals that repeater examinees consistently struggled, with institutional passing rates frequently falling well below national averages. For instance, in September 2018, only 2.70% of repeaters passed, compared to the national average of 20.29%—a nearly 18 percentage points gap. On the other hand, first-time examinees generally fared better and occasionally surpassed national standards. A notable example occurred in March 2018, where the institutional passing rate among first-timers reached 27.27%, exceeding the national rate of 23.62% by 3.65 percentage points. However, such successes were exceptions rather than the rule, as most examination cycles saw institutional performance fall short of national standards.

Overall, while incremental progress is evident—particularly post-pandemic—the data point to an enduring gap between institutional outcomes and national expectations. These findings collectively suggest the need for targeted interventions to improve the performance of BEEd



graduates in LET, especially during and post-pandemic times. The Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) reported disruptions in their licensure examinations due to pandemic-related restrictions (Summit, 2021). While examinations resumed in 2021, the irregular schedule may have adversely affected the consistency and preparedness of examinees.

Discrepancies

Several discrepancies have been noted in each area considered for evaluation. These discrepancies are observed in all stages. Among these discrepancies include the highly congested curriculum where review courses having 15 units are offered in a single semester. The designated program chair is not qualified since she is not yet a full-fledged doctor and did not have any relevant administrative experience prior to her designation. Workload assignments given to faculty members exceed the institutional minimum number of 18 units. There are some cases where faculty members are teaching courses not aligned with their areas of specialization. The institution's library lacks both print and non-print resources. The institution also lacks other required laboratories and physical facilities such as classroom, playing courts, auditorium, among others. In addition to, retention policies have not been properly established. Furthermore, notable discrepancies are evident in the performance of the graduates in the Licensure Examination for Teachers. The consistently low passing rates, particularly among repeaters, signal potential issues in academic preparation, curriculum delivery, and review programs.

Conclusion

Offering any curricular program necessitates full compliance with the minimum requirements to ensure effective and efficient implementation. In the case of the BEEd program, assessments by faculty members and students, supported by the researcher's personal observations and documentary analysis, reveal that the program generally adheres to the minimum requirements set by CHED under CMO No. 74, series of 2017.

However, several critical discrepancies were identified, including curriculum congestion, faculty workload concerns, resource inadequacies, gaps in facility provision, and poor licensure examination performance. These findings underscore specific operational and academic areas that require targeted attention and strategic intervention—not merely to rectify deficiencies, but to promote sustainable quality improvements across the program's core components. Despite these challenges, the institution has demonstrated a strong commitment to addressing these issues through



various initiatives and strategies. Moving forward, sustained efforts to enhance program implementation and align fully with CHED standards will be crucial. Such continuous improvement measures will not only ensure compliance but also enrich the overall learning experience of students and support their success.

Recommendations

That the institution establish and follow formal guidelines for designating faculty members to administrative positions; expedite the hiring of additional teaching faculty to alleviate current overloads; strictly enforce existing student-retention policies; augment library holdings and recruit additional library personnel; design and launch a graduate tracking system; establish a faculty-development initiative that provides funding, study-leave provisions, and mentorship; and prioritize the construction of additional academic buildings and other necessary facilities and laboratories to support the program's effective delivery.

That the BEEd program conduct a participatory curriculum review to decongest and revise the curriculum for responsiveness to learner and societal needs.

That future research be conducted to explore alternative methodologies, such as focus group discussions (FGDs) and ethnographic studies, to obtain more in-depth and conclusive findings. Moreover, similar studies could be conducted to include data on graduates' employability and job performance.

References

- AACCUP, Inc. (2017). *The agency of accreditation*.
<http://www.aaccupqa.org.ph/index.php/about-aaccup>
- Adiatma, T., Mahriadi, N., & Suteki, M. (2022). Importance of international accreditation for global recognition for higher education. *Journal of Digital Learning and Distance Education*, 1(5), 193-200. <https://doi.org/10.56778/jdlde.v1i5.53>
- Aithal, P. S., & Kumar, S. P. M. (2020). Global ranking and its implications in higher education. *Scholedge International Journal of Business Policy & Governance*, 7(3), 25–47. <https://doi.org/10.19085/sijbpg070301>



- Al-Azmi, I.F.D., Al-Ta'ani, W.M.M., & Bani Irshaid, M.N.H. (2021). Evaluation of the educational administration program in light of the academic accreditation standards. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 16(2), 487-498. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5626>
- Alkharafi, N. & Alsabah, M. (2025). Globalization: An overview of its main characteristics and types, and an exploration of its impacts on individuals, firms, and nations. *Economies*, 13(4), 91. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies13040091>
- Bell, R., Warren, V., & Schmidt, R. (2022). The application of concurrent or sequential mixed methods research designs and their methodological implications: Investigating tacit knowledge, its use, and application in automotive development. *SAGE Research Methods Cases*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529604474>
- Carillo, C.D. (2017, October). Higher education in the philippines: In transition. *QS Wow News*. <https://qswownews.com/higher-education-philippines-transition/>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2017, November 2). *Policies, standards, and guidelines for Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) [CMO No. 74, s. 2017]*. <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CMO-No.-74-s.-2017.pdf>
- Conchada, M. & Tiongco, M. (2015). A review of the accreditation system for Philippine Higher Education Institutions. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*, 2015(30). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280918280>
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). *Mixed-method research: Introduction and application*. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455–472). Academic Press.
- Creswell, J. W., Fetters, M. D., & Ivankova, N. V. (2004). Designing a mixed methods study in primary care. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 2(1), 7–12. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.104>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Cutamora, U., Leonardo, G., & Lagria, M. M. (2025). Evaluating a community-based rehabilitation program using Provus discrepancy evaluation model. *Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 1(Special Issue), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj25si.t2416>
- Duarte, N., & Vardasca, R. (2023). Literature review of accreditation systems in higher education. *Education Sciences*, 13(6), 582. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13060582>
- Ganagalla, S. (2023). The importance of educational evaluation in ensuring quality teaching. *Research & Reviews: Research Journal of*



- Educational Studies*, 9(2), 7 – 9. DOI: 10.4172/JES.9.2.004.
- International Association for Quality Assurance in Pre-Tertiary and Higher Education. (2024). *QAHE work report 2024*. <https://www.qahe.org/qahe-work-report-2024/>
- Ipek, O. F., & Mutlu, H. T. (2021). English outside the classroom in the age of technology: A concurrent triangulation mixed method study. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 8(1), 104–122. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1327761>
- Kayyali, M. (2024). Exploring accreditation standards and processes. In *Quality assurance and accreditation in higher education* (pp. 1–60). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66623-0_1
- Malau-Aduli, B. S., & Alele, F. O. (2020). *An introduction to research methods for undergraduate health profession students*. James Cook University. <https://jcu.pressbooks.pub/intro-res-methods-health/>
- Mohd Arifin, S. R. (2018). Ethical considerations in qualitative study. <https://journals.iium.edu.my/ijcs/index.php/ijcs/article/view/82>
- Petricevic, O. & Teece, D.J. (2019). The structural reshaping of globalization: Implications for strategic sectors, profiting from innovation, and the multinational enterprise. *J Int Bus Stud* 50, 1487–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-019-00269-x>
- Provus, M. (1971). *Discrepancy evaluation for education program improvement and assessment*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Republic Act No. 7722. (1994, May 18). *Higher Education Act of 1994*. Lawphil Project. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1994/ra_7722_1994.html
- Richards, H. M., & Schwartz, L. J. (2002). Ethics of qualitative research: Are there special issues for health services research?. *Family practice*, 19(2), 135–139. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/19.2.135>
- Sampong, K. (2020). An evaluative study of a distance teacher education program in a university in Ghana. *Central University College, Ghana*. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v10i4.725>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students*. 6th edition, Pearson Education Limited.
- Signo, C.M. (2025). Revisiting program accreditation and its implication to quality assurance management culture of a higher education institution. *Diversitas Journal*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v10i2.3232>
- The Summit Express. (2021, February 28). *List: 2021 postponed PRC board exams, new schedule*. <https://www.thesummitexpress.com/2021/02/list-2021-postponed-prc-board-exams-new-new-schedule.html>



- Välilmaa, J., Uljens, M., & Elo, J. (2024). Understanding higher education decision-making and educational practice as interrelated and historically framed phenomena—A non-affirmative take. In J. Elo & M. Uljens (Eds.), *Multilevel pedagogical leadership in higher education* (Vol. 25). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-55116-1_5
- Zalli, E. (2024). Globalization and education: Exploring the exchange of ideas, values, and traditions in promoting cultural understanding and global citizenship. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development*, 11(1), 55 – 62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv11n1s109>

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the unwavering support, encouragement, and understanding of my loved ones, friends, and colleagues, who contributed to the successful completion of this research.

About the authors:

Dr. Rey S. Pepito is an Assistant Professor II at JH Cerilles State College, Dumingag Campus, with nearly eight years of teaching experience. He holds a Doctor of Education degree, majoring in Educational Administration, from Western Mindanao State University, Zamboanga City. Passionate about education, Dr. Pepito actively conducts research in educational leadership, policies, and teaching strategies, while also participating in community extension programs.

E-mail: reypepito199522@gmail.com

Ruther D. Bianan is Assistant Professor III at Josefina H. Cerilles State College, Dumingag, Zamboanga del Sur where he teaches Professional Education, Research, and BEEd major subjects. He earned his BEEd and M.A. in Educational Administration from the same college and is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Education (Research and Evaluation) at Cebu Normal University. His scholarly interests include teacher education, curriculum design, and educational research.

E-mail: rdelatorrebianan@gmail.com

