Assessment of Teacher Education Program in Local Universities and Colleges

Ryan C. dela Peña

[a] *official email address ryandelapena814@gmail.com*
[a]First affiliation, Address, City and Postcode, Country Pamantasang ng Lungsod ng Valenzuela,Tongco St., Maysan, Valenzuela City, 1440, Philippines
[b]Second affiliation, Address, City and Postcode, Country

Abstract

 Abstract - This study was conducted for the purpose of describing the local universities and colleges (LUCs) according to level of accreditation of Teacher Education Program and government recognition, performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers, and rank per category in Higher Education Institution performance. Moreover, the study aimed to describe the LUCs according to key result areas such as governance, management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, support for students, and relations with the community. Finally, the study sought to identify the strengths and weaknesses of these LUCs, the opportunities and threats perceive, how strengths and opportunities are maximized and to what extent they are maximized and how weaknesses and threats are resolved and to what extent they are resolved.

The results of this study may be significant future and potential municipalities/cities that would like to subsidize education and offer the same programs to for their constituents, local government officials as this subsequently, provides information on the rudiments of leading and managing a locally funded university, university administrators since this gives direction on where the organization is leading to, faculty members to improve their craft and utilize the most up-to-date teaching styles and techniques and methodologies in order to increase the capability of their educational institutions in achieving higher ranks and accreditation levels, and to future researchers who would like to look into other variables that may facilitate planning for Center of Development and improve their research capabilities.

Descriptive evaluative method of research through qualitative and quantitative approaches provide information useful for decisions, and assessment of policies, programs or institutional frameworks. The researcher took all the LUCs with Teacher Education Program in NCR as the research environment.

Based on the findings from this study, the researcher concluded that accreditation level of LUCs in Teacher Education Program differ. LUCs vary regarding Government Recognition. These HEIs also differ with regard to the result in the Licensure Examination for Teachers in the last five years. LUCs strive to provide quality education specifically when it comes to their Teacher Education Programs since 5 out of 11 have maintained their ranks per category in the HEI performance. LUCs, although they vary in different key result areas such as governance, management, quality of learning and teaching, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work and support for students are able to practice the indicators from each key result area on a moderate to very often extent.

The researcher encourages university administrators to lead and manage the LUCs to keep themselves in check with standards and efficiently and effectively manage the LUC.

Finally, the necessary to future researchers to conduct further studies on how LUCs have improved in terms of accreditation level in their Teacher Education programs, ranking in the HEI performance, and their performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers, conduct an exhaustive study on how the LUCs have progressed with regard to their governance, management, quality in teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, and support for students.

1. Main text

   This study aimed to determine the status and the intent of LUCs for accreditation to Center of Development (COD) in their Teacher Education Program during the calendar years 2016-2017 as input in preparing a quality mechanism.

Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and Local Universities and Colleges (LUCs) in the National Capital Region (NCR) gave evidence that only a few have had their Teacher Education Programs recognize by the government and attained some levels of accreditation. To provide the best quality education, these LUCs should have to adhere to the standards set by the different accrediting agencies and the CHED to ensure that what the constituents get is the best quality education indeed. That is why initially they try to focus on a more important mechanism to be able to make these institutions suitable for learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Even there are lots of local universities and colleges (LUCs) put up by local government units that are already operating at present, the status of these LUCs remained to be a question that needs an answer. Many of these LUCs, specifically in the National Capital Region (NCR) have been in existence for decades but when it comes to adhering to standards such as program recognition and level of accreditation many are still falling far short in terms of quality assurance.

These local schools encompass the basic education to the higher education programs to cater a tailored-fit solution to educational incapacity of people, specifically the marginalized sector, in the municipality or city and to assure that nobody in the same municipality or city will not be left behind in terms of education.

Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and Local Universities and Colleges (LUCs) in the National Capital Region (NCR) gave evidence that only a few have had their Teacher Education Programs recognize by the government and attained some levels of accreditation.

Hence, based on respondents of this study, some LUCS are still on the process of attaining government recognition and levels of accreditation. All the more, there are also features of the LUCs which can be assessed as their strengths and weaknesses, based on the key result areas such as: governance, management, quality of teaching, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work and support for students.

Underscoring these reasons; they would also ask themselves how these locally established schools; specifically, locally funded universities stay afloat in the midst of so many political problems encountered by each local government unit? The question of perpetuity also comes into the picture. Furthermore, in order to provide the best quality education, these LUCs should have to adhere to the standards set by the different accrediting agencies and the CHED to ensure that what the constituents get is the best quality education indeed. That is why initially they try to focus on a more important mechanism to be able to make these institutions suitable for learning.

One of these important mechanisms which serve as a springboard for the local universities and colleges is a road map that spells out where the institutions are going in the next how many years of operation and what measures and actions should these institutions undertake to get there. Ylijoki, (2014) underscored that in order to come up with the soundest plan, an institution is required to explore structural reforms between and within universities from a micro-level perspective by investigating how academics make sense of and respond to the structural reforms, and how these reforms shape academic cultures, work practices and identities.

Tantamount, a standard also helps in building an organization's competitive advantage, proper allocation and management of budget and provides focus and direction to move from plan to action. Langha and Fofilt (2014) in their study about connecting institutional goals with measurable outcomes, reiterated that: according to Dooris (20022003), the shift toward strategic planning by institutions of higher education was due to a combination of factors prevalent today: (a) higher costs, (b) weakened public support, and (c) challenging demographic, economic, and technological changes.

Aside from the prevalent problems stated such as higher costs, weakened public support, challenging demographic, economic, and technological changes, many LUCs tend to just open programs without seeking any permission from CHED. All the more, a status quo after opening a program is also ubiquitous in the LUCs, since the volition of these LUCs to submit to accreditation zeroed-in to oblivion.

Apart from these looming problems, with the formal launching of the ASEAN Integration in December 2015, the need for the conformation of the education sector to international standards is deemed important. The Philippines is compelled to produce graduates who are globally competitive and highly lucrative to international and global markets. Tantamount is the devising of a model or blueprint for HEIs, specifically LUCs, to provide quality education and yield graduates that are globally prepared and competitive. ASEAN University Network – Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) came up with a manual for the implementation of its guidelines which they consider a road map for what the AUN-QA calls "the Journey to Uplift the Quality of Higher Education in ASEAN Universities" (www.aunsec.org). With all of these being underscored, a radical change in the way administrators lead and run the LUCs is required, for them to be able to produce equally competitive and highly competent graduates.

Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 26, series of 2007 otherwise known as "Criteria and Implementing Guidelines for the identification, Support and Development of Centers of Excellence (COEs) and Centers of Development (CODs) for Teacher Education Program" provides that Republic Act No. 7722. Otherwise known as the Higher Education Act of 1994", the CHED's policies and standards on the Centers of Excellence and Centers of Development (COEs/CODs) that will serve potent catalysts towards the development of a world-class program in Teacher Education.

The implementation of the COE/COD project is pursuant to Section 8 (f) of Republic Act No. 7722, which provides that CHED shall "identify, support and develop potential centers of excellence in program areas needed for the development of world-class scholarship, nation building and national development". Thus, it became the policy of the Commission to promote quality and excellence in higher education by identifying, supporting and/or developing COEs and CODs for specific programs in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Center of Development (COD) refers to a teacher education program under a college or department within a higher education institution, which demonstrates the potential to become a Center of Excellence in the future. To qualify for the selection of COD, the teacher education program should have passed the initial screening. The initial screening includes Level II accreditation, Very Good rating on EGEP and should be at the top 11 – 20 per category of high performing TEIs. To be considered a COD, the total score for the different parameters in the Criteria should at least be 50%. The status of being a Center of Excellence or a Center of Development in Teacher Education should not be misconstrued that such status applies to other programs offered by an institution.

This study aimed to determine the status and the intent of LUCs for accreditation to Center of Development (COD) in their Teacher Education Program during the calendar years 2016-2017 as input in preparing a quality mechanism. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1.   How may the sampled local universities and colleges in NCR be described according to:
   1.1 level of accreditation of Teacher Education Program and government recognition,
   1.2 performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers, and
   1.3 rank per category in Higher Education Institution (HEI) performance?
2.   How were the teacher education programs of the LUCs described in terms of the following key result areas?
   2.1 governance,
   2.2 management,
   2.3 quality of teaching and learning,
   2.4 quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, and
   2.5 support for students
3.   What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of these locally funded universities in aspiring to be a Center of Development in Teacher Education program?
4.   How are the strengths and opportunities maximized and the weaknesses and threats resolved?
5.   How may the findings of the study be utilized in proposing quality mechanism for Center of Development in Teacher Education program for LUCs?

The researcher posited the following assumptions:

The information provided and the data obtained are reliable and valid.

The sampled LUCs differ in their description in terms of level of accreditation per program, rank per category in Higher Education Institution (HEI) performance, and performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers.

The sample LUCs vary in their indicators such as: governance, management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional work, research and creative work, and support for students.

There are various problems encountered by the aforementioned LUCs in planning accreditation to be a Center of Development.

These problems are resolved in different ways to a moderate extent and some are not resolved.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Peji (2012), reiterated that quality of education has always been an utmost concern especially when educational providers and institutions come to arrive in gargantuan. Education is seen as a pivotal instrument in nation-building and advancement. Higher education institutions throughout the world are becoming more diverse and complex.

Same is true when Ruiz and Junio – Sabio (2012,) pointed out that Quality Assurance must become an essential part of institutional management and planning. Tertiary education is changing, and quality assurance processes must change with it, or become irrelevant.

According to this study of Peji and Ruiz and Junio – Sabio, one of the most important things to consider in providing quality education is through program accreditation. It helps in assuring the stakeholders of an educational institution the value of education they would relish, most especially when the institution conforms with the set standards.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The researcher used descriptive evaluative method of research through qualitative and quantitative approaches, which according to Wollman (2004) is designed so that the findings will provide information useful for decisions about public policy or private issues. It is concerned with the assessment of policies, programs or institutional frameworks. This method asks questions on measurement or performance like "how much", "how well", or outcome questions pertaining to impact or results. Therefore, descriptive evaluative research is used when the objective is to scale or calculate, measure characteristics, growth, or performance and to provide a systematic description that is as factual and as accurate as possible which is the focus of this study. This method is deemed most appropriate.

The researcher designed the study according to the theoretical framework which is the Discrepancy Evaluation Model. The design is expected to define in details the actual findings of the study versus the expected result. The research was all the more undertaken in accordance with the conceptual framework which is to analyze the gap or the difference between the standard and the findings and create strategies tailored-fit to LUCs.

3.2 Population and Sampling

The researcher took all the LUCs with Teacher Education Program in NCR as the research environment. Out of 13 LUCs in NCR; 11 responded, 1 did not respond, and 1 disapproved the request to undertake research. Eighty-four point sixty-two (84.62%) percent of the LUCs served as the research setting.

The respondents were initially categorized. They are composed of administrators, deans, department coordinators/chairpersons, and faculty members chosen randomly from locally funded universities.

There are 4 types of respondents in this study. The first set includes two

(2) Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs while the second set includes a Dean. The next sets of respondents include eight (8) program chairpersons and two hundred twenty-six (226) faculty members.

3.3 Source of Data

In order for the researcher to accumulate necessary data for the study, the sources of data were questionnaire, interview and documentary analysis.

3.4 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was composed of several parts underscoring encompassing indicators in coming up with the appropriate template for COD in Teacher Education Program in LUCs. They are enumerated as: governance, management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, and support for students.

It was administered to all respondents. The instrument elicited the profile of the respondents and solicited the information on the name of the respondents, age, position, and length of service, LUC's name and division in NCR. Hence, the following information are on an optional basis.

The researcher used an existing standardized instrument, which is the Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA) by CHED which no longer require validity and reliability testing with regard to its veracity. The instrument was divided into 6 parts describing the attributes of the LUC with regard to governance, management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, support to student and relations with the community. The instrument is comprised of 90 questions eliciting the abovementioned description of the LUCs.

3.5 Interview

Unstructured interviews were made by the researcher with some of the school administrators, deans, department coordinators or chairpersons, and faculty members. These were undertaken to obtain information on the opportunities and threats of the LUCs and to personally validate if the answers obtained from the questionnaire were true and correct. The interviews usually took place after the respondents have answered the questionnaires. The interviews were done spontaneously as respondents were pleased to provide the information needed by the researcher.

To strengthen and supplement the data gathered, the researcher also went through different available documents. The documents analyzed were results of the Licensure Examination from 2012 to 2016 from the Philippine Regulations Commission and LUCs' program recognition from CHED.

3.6 Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher personally administered the questionnaire to the respondents who were engaged in LUCs. After the respondents have completely answered the questions in the questionnaires, the researcher collected the questionnaires in a specified time of retrieval.

The researcher used the following statistical tools in interpreting the results:

1.   Mean. Otherwise known as the arithmetic average (because the respondent/option of a particular group is averaged) this is a measure of the central tendency of the data. This was used to present the weighted observations of the Respondents in describing the governance, management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, support for student and relations with community of the LUCs.

2.   Likert Scale which represents the interpretation of the weighted mean that was obtained which served as the basis in determining values.

IV.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The corresponding data analysis was applied by the researcher in order to analyze the information and to obtain results of the study.

1.   How may the sampled local universities and colleges in NCR be described according to:
   1.1. level of accreditation of Teacher Education Program,
   1.2. performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers,

Table 1. Level of Accreditation of Teacher Education Program of LUCs

LUC	Program	Level of Accreditation	Government Recognition (GR)
A	Bachelor in Elementary Education		C-040 s. 1990 DRO
	Bachelor in Secondary Education		C-041 s. 1990 DRO
B	Bachelor in Elementary Education		
	Bachelor in Secondary Education		
C	Bachelor in Elementary Education		
	Bachelor in Secondary Education		
D	Bachelor in Elementary Education		
	Bachelor in Secondary Education		
E	Bachelor in Elementary Education	Level I	in process
	Bachelor in Secondary Education	Level I	in process
F	Bachelor in Elementary Education		in process
	Bachelor in Secondary Education		in process
G	Bachelor in Elementary Education	Level II	049 s. 1990 DRO
	Bachelor in Secondary Education	Level II	043 s. 1990 DRO
H	Bachelor in Elementary Education		
	Bachelor in Secondary Education		
I	Bachelor of Elementary Education	in process	073 s. 2016 CRO
	Bachelor of Secondary Education	in process	072 s. 2016 CRO
J	Bachelor in Elementary Education	in process	C-473 s. 1994 CRO
	Bachelor in Secondary Education	in process	C-474 s. 1994 CRO
K	Bachelor in Elementary Education	Level II	C-042 s. 1991 CRO
	Bachelor in Secondary Education	Level II	C-040 s. 1991 CRO

1.3. rank per category in Higher Education Institution (HEI) performance.

Documents uncovered a description of the LUCs as follows:

Three out of 11 LUCs in NCR already had their Teacher Education Programs (Elementary, Secondary) accredited (Level I, Level II), 2 are in process while others still have not attained accreditation. Hence, with regard to Government Recognition, 4 from these LUCs have already made their Teacher Education Programs accredited. On the other hand, 2 are still in process and 3 have not made their Teacher Education Programs accredited yet. There was a "see-saw" trend in the Licensure Examination for Teachers in the last five years. Although there is an erratic trend, majority of the LUCs surpassed the national passing rate. A looming evidence of this trend was also observed due to an erratic movement in the national passing rate.

Majority of the LUCs maintained their ranks per category while others did not.

2. How were the teacher education programs of the LUCs described in terms of the following key result areas: governance, management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work, and support for students.

Table 2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OF LUCs

Indicator	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	TOTAL
Governance	3.87	3.39	3.53	3.27	3.87	3.72	3.59	3.94	3.42	3.62	3.78	**3.64**
Management	3.61	3.34	3.30	2.96	3.82	3.74	3.41	3.63	3.33	3.40	3.63	**3.47**
Quality of Teaching and Learning	3.63	3.56	3.53	3.08	3.78	3.87	3.40	3.52	3.43	3.54	3.57	**3.54**
Quality of Professional Exposure. Research and Creative Work	3.33	3.65	2.93	2.87	3.82	3.66	3.43	3.28	3.78	3.43	3.42	**3.42**
Support for Student	3.70	3.62	3.42	3.00	3.84	3.67	3.42	3.66	3.27	3.42	3.85	**3.53**
GRAND MEAN	**3.63**	**3.51**	**3.34**	**3.04**	**3.83**	**3.63**	**3.43**	**3.60**	**3.45**	**3.48**	**3.65**	3.51
Adjective Rating	VOP	VOP	MP	MP	VOP	VOP	MP	VOP	MP	MP	VOP	VOP

The respondents described the Teacher Education Programs of the LUCs as follows:

LUCs practice governance from moderate (MP) to very often (VOP) extent as reflected from the mean scores ranging from 3.27 to 3.94. Management is practiced by LUCs from moderate (MP) to very often (VOP) extent as they posited a grand mean from 2.96 to 3.82. With regard to quality of learning and teaching, LUCs accumulated mean scores extended between 3.08 to 3.87, which is equated to moderate (MP) to very often practiced (VOP). LUCs practice quality of professional exposure, research and creative work at a moderate (MP) to very often (VOP) level as they exhibited a grand mean ranging from 2.87 to 3.82. Support for students indicates moderate (MP) extent to very often practiced (VOP) as the mean scores ranged from 3.00 to 3.85.

3. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of these locally funded universities in aspiring to be a Center of Development in Teacher Education program?

Governance

The way HEIs establish policies and constantly monitor the implementation of such policies are some of the pertinent factors to underscore in leading and managing the institution. The strengths of LUCs with regard to Governance, with mean scores 3.50 and higher, which can be interpreted to Very Often Practiced and Always Practiced, include the following: demonstrating integrity and objectivity; stakeholders' express satisfaction; strategic plan of the institution; articulates the mean to reach the goals; there is a culture of quality and accountability; funds provided by agencies and individuals are used for the intended purposes; the governing body ensures proper use and monitoring outcomes; there is an appropriate systems and structures that safeguard the HEIs' assets; there is an effective and efficient fiscal management of persons/ teams; there is an implementation of financial strategy; there is an annual operating plans, and budgets through well-defined processes and structures; there is a culture of quality; they keep their programs current and relevant; there are arrangements for consideration of students; and there are procedures to safeguard the health and safety of employees, students, and other individuals while they are on the institution's premises.

Management

Planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling are the functions of management that cannot be discounted to take into account in running an organization or an institution. In terms of Management, the following are the strengths of the LUCs in NCR.

Operations are efficient, effective and responsive to challenges and changes; policies and system are designed to help the HEI meet its goals; they are developed and implemented in a manner that involves administrators, faculty and where appropriate, students; the institution is responsive to national policies and international developments; the institution is able to communicate with the stakeholders; implementation of policies and the performance of programs are monitored; and the HEI implements its development plans; supported by viable, sustainable and appropriate resource generation strategies.

Quality of Teaching and Learning

Quality of teaching and learning, as what was discussed in the previous chapter plays a very important role on how HEIs would thrive and stay afloat. With regard to this indicator, LUCs demonstrate the following strengths.

There is a system for approving academic program; academic programs have clearly defined objectives and learning outcomes; degree programs meet the subject-specific outcomes and standards promulgated by CHED; the institution establishes and maintains comparability of standards with other providers; academic and non-academic programs are implemented based on strategic and action plans; there is a student performance is enhanced by regular evaluation and appropriate feedback; faculty performance is enhanced by regular feedback from student, peer and supervisor's evaluation; self-evaluation programs result in program enhancement; students develop within their programs of study due to the academic support and counselling; students develop within their programs of study due to the timely and effective feedback; the HEI implements improvements that address the formation of their ideal graduate; there are mechanisms for disseminating good practice throughout the institution; weaknesses in student performance are identified and acted upon; documents show clear criteria for hiring, retention, and promotion; teachers improve their performance because of feedback from regular evaluation; the faculty development program has helped improve the quality of teaching their faculty competence is assured; and faculty members accept willingly the full range of responsibilities of a higher education teacher to promote and facilitate the learning of students.

Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work

One of the attributes of an HEI to become globally prepared and competitive is about how professional exposure, research, and creative work are being promoted, practiced and become part of the institution's culture cascaded to faculty members and students. According to the result, the strengths of the LUCs on Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work are the following: students practice competencies in real settings; the institution's professional exposure programs (e.g. OJT, practicum. Internship) develop competencies relevant to workplace needs; faculty members have professional experiences that contribute to the exposure of the students; the institution contributes to the discovery of new knowledge; and faculty members have the competencies to guide students in creative work and innovation.

Support for Students

Relative to Support for Students, one of the impending indicator why learners become successful is about institutions being able to provide a range of high quality and flexible support services to learners. In terms of Support for Student, the following are the strengths of the LUCs.

The institution recruits and select students based on clear policies and operational guidelines; the institution provides counseling and academic support for students; deserving students get an education through the institution's scholarship program; beneficiaries gain maximum benefit from the scholarship they receive; students can improve their performance because they can avail of guidance to support them; there are structures that address immediate and emergency health concerns of students; the special programs help enhance the students' development; the institution promotes students' welfare through opportunities; and students are able to plan their career/ future through career orientation and job placement programs.

LUCs also have areas that they need to improve on. These are indicators with mean scores of 2.50 to 3.49.

Governance

The following are the weaknesses of the LUCs on Governance based on the findings of this study. They are: institutional sustainability is not promoted through the strategic management of the institution's land, buildings and facilities and institutional sustainability is not promoted through the institution's employment policies.

Management

In terms of Management, the study divulged the subsequent weaknesses. Members of the organization cannot explain the mission, and subscribe to the associated policies, systems and procedures; stakeholders are not satisfied with the governing bodies and management's implementation of their commitments; the institution does not make effective use of information and communications technology to manage its operations and academic affairs; staff, faculty, and administrators are not proficient in ICT; there is no responsive link between ICT systems of administrative and academic officers to ensure optimal communication and use of information; the resources generation initiative is not sustainable, with

the HEI taking a prudent attitude toward the management of risk; the HEIs do not avail of resources through its links with government agencies in the Philippines and overseas; the monitoring and evaluation of resource generation activities do not enable the HEIs to enhance further initiatives; and the HEIs has no other features that enable it to achieve its goals.

Quality of Teaching and Learning

LUCs also displayed the following weaknesses with regard to Quality of Teaching and Learning.

There is lack of matching of the abilities and aptitudes of students to the demands of the programs; there is no periodic program monitoring and review by the HEIs; there are no incentives for faculty to undergo professional development; students and faculty productivity is not improved because of lack of access to laboratories, equipment and facilities; the institutions do not see to it that ICT resources are properly allocated; the institutions have not achieved its intentions of using ICT to support students learning; training for the use of ICT to support learning is not made available to faculty; training for the use of ICT to support leaning is not made available to students; and there is no good ratio of students to terminals and other equipment.

Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work

In terms of Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work, the following manifest as the LUCs weaknesses.

The institutions are not successful in securing financial support its research activities; faculty members do not have research experience in other universities/ research institutions in the Philippines and/ or abroad; there is no support for graduate research students; the research does not contribute to the nation/ community; the institutions do not contribute to creative work and innovation through its programs; and other bodies and institutions do not recognize product of the creative work and innovation programs.

Support for students

Concerning Support for Students, the following are the weaknesses of the LUCs.

The institution does not encourage application from special groups (e.g. financially disadvantage, tribal groups, physically challenged); the institutions do not have system to identify the special learning needs of students; and there are no clear policies and operational guidelines on the recruitment of and support for foreign students.

There are also possibilities of growth that HEIs take into account in leading and managing their institution. The opportunities seen by of LUCs in aspiring to be a Center of Development in Teacher Education Program are the following:

A technological advancement of the educational institutions; high enrollment rate through new enrollment and returning students; extensive linkage as a result of employability of graduates; recognition of the institution, its students, and graduates in different fields of specialization; both local and abroad; further recognition of programs by the different government and non-government organizations; more programs to be opened and recognized; ASEAN Integration; and development in the quality of teaching and learning through the help of new technology.

On the other hand, there are also challenges that HEIs face in leading and managing their respective institutions. Threats perceived by of LUCs in aspiring to be a Center of Development in Teacher Education Program include the following:

Stiff competition with other universities and colleges. Turnover of best faculty for better opportunities in other universities; local and abroad; increase in the number of schools in the area, both formal and non-formal; new government policies on K-12 and free education; wide array of courses offered by other educational institutions; lack of funding; less investment in higher education by different stakeholders; competition with local private and universities in the neighboring countries; and international and global standards and competition.

4. How are the strengths and opportunities maximized and the weaknesses and threats resolved?

The researcher congregated the following statements on how LUCs maximize their strengths and opportunities.

Governance

Deliver highest integrity and objectivity in accepting new enrollees and returning students; intensify satisfaction of stakeholders with the openness and transparency in the dissemination of the governing body's decision; constant review and improvement of existing strategic plans of the institution with regard to opening of programs, government recognition and level of accreditation; achieve more recognition of the institution, its students, and graduates in different fields of specialization; provide more funds on efforts to further develop quality of teaching and learning; regularly monitor

performance of the HET against planned strategies and operational targets; and keep the programs current and relevant to ensure competitiveness of graduates in both local and international environments.

Management

Efficient, effective and responsive operations to changes and challenges by utilizing the most up-to-date technological tools and the most current program offerings; constant development and implementation of policies and system involving, administrators, faculty, and students; open more relevant programs to respond to national policies and international developments in higher education; and communicate with stakeholders to ensure employability of graduates and cover an extensive network and linkage with the community.

Quality of Teaching and Learning

Develop the most lucrative system in approving academic programs; to attain more recognition of the institution, its students, and graduates in different fields of specialization, both local and abroad; clearly define objectives and learning outcomes of academic programs to increase enrollment rate and cater to the community's needs with regard to programs offered; continuous enhancement of programs and mechanisms for disseminating good practice throughout the institution to achieve recognition and adhere with standards; utilize advanced technology in performance evaluation of faculty; initiate faculty development programs relevant in uplifting quality of teaching and learning to foster production of more competitive graduates local and abroad; and improve criteria for hiring, promotion and retention of faculty members to promote quality of teaching and learning and develop within the institution the culture of constantly adhering to standards.

Quality of Professional Exposure, Research and Creative Work

Continuously encourage students to practice competencies in real settings through the institutions overall strategy for their professional exposure through extensive network and linkage the institution itself is continuously establishing; utilize employability of graduates as one of the means to improve the institution's professional exposure programs (e.g. OJT, practicum, internship) in developing students' competency relevant to workplace needs; integrate the most contemporary technology in developing the institution's research outputs and the discovery of new knowledge; and develop competencies among faculty through professional exposure, local and abroad, to guide students in creative work and innovation.

Support for Students

Develop more clear policies and operational guidelines in recruiting and selecting students not just to increase enrollment rate but also to encourage quality assurance in type of students accepted by the institution; open and offer more programs relevant to community needs, which include various and special groups, and to provide deserving students tertiary education and scholarship grants; stimulate quality of teaching and learning by promoting students' welfare through opportunities for participating in program planning and policy formulation; and assist students plan their career/future through career orientation and job placement programs through the institution's extensive network and linkage and partner industries.

LUCs resolve their weaknesses and threats by the following strategies:

Governance

Promote institutional stability through the strategic management of the institution's land, buildings and facilities to minimize the effect of competition and indorse institutional sustainability through the institution's employment policies to prevent high turnover rate of best faculty and employees.

Management

Encourage members of the organization to clearly understand and define its mission, subscribe to the associated policies, systems and procedures to avert members from moving out of the organization; effectively and efficiently use information and communication technology in managing the institution's operation and academic affairs to encourage more investment from stakeholders, offer wide array of courses and abate competition; insure that the resource generation initiative is sustainable to encourage stakeholders engage in different institution's activity and that the institution takes prudent attitude toward the management of risk; avail of resources through the institution's links with government agencies in the Philippines and abroad to encourage faculty development and prevent turnover of faculty for better opportunities in other universities; local and abroad; and constant monitoring and evaluation of resource generation activities of institutions to maximize and optimize its human, physical, and financial resources.

Quality of Teaching and Learning

Develop policies and processes that match the abilities and aptitude of students to the demands of the programs to which they are recruited to encourage high enrollment rate and become a priority among universities of choice in the community; review and monitor programs on a periodic basis to be able to identify an array of courses and programs to be offered to students in accordance with the needs of the community; provide incentives for faculty to undergo professional development to improve their competencies and prevent them from leaving the institution; and properly allocate ICT resources to develop the overall capabilities of the institution in the use of new technology and for the institution to be able to adhere to international and global standards in education.

Quality of Professional Exposure, Research and Creative Work

Secure financial support in the institution's research activities to promote university's competency in research and professional exposure of faculty and students' creative works local and abroad; conform to international and global standards of research by contributing to creative work and innovation through the institution's programs; and minimize competition by making researches, innovations, and creative works recognize by other bodies and institutions.

Support for Students

Lessen the effect of competition by encouraging application from special groups (e.g. financially disadvantaged, tribal groups, physically challenged); encourage internationalization by making clear policies on the recruitment of and support for foreign students; and identify and implement the institution's system in the special learning needs of students to increase enrollment rate and reduce the effect of rivalry among colleges and universities.

Discrepancy Evaluation

LUCs in NCR need to focus on the succeeding indicators since they have not just fallen under the weakness category in the SWOT Analysis, these indicators also were the items that have accrued the biggest gap per category.

Governance

Institutional sustainability is promoted through the strategic management of the institution's land, buildings and facilities.

Management

Staff, faculty, and administrators are proficient in ICT, with the HEI providing and/or support.

Quality of Teaching and Learning

There is a periodic program monitoring and review by the HEIs.

Quality of Professional Exposure, Research and Creative Work

The institution contributes to creative work and innovation through its programs.

Support for Students

The institution encourages application from special groups (e.g. financially disadvantage, tribal groups, physically challenged) and ensures that they are given fair consideration.

5. How may the findings of the study be utilized in proposing quality mechanism   for Center of Development in Teacher Education program for LUCs?

The findings served as a baseline information in proposing quality mechanism for Center of Development in Teacher Education Program of LUCs. These would help LUCs acknowledge the importance of accreditation, rank per category, and their performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers and what it brings about to the overall performance of their respective institution.

Hence, the findings may be utilized as reference point in developing, improving, and maintaining the institution's or the department's operational system in terms of governance, management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, researches, and creative work, and support for students.

All the more, the findings served as a reference point for identifying more strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the LUCs.

Finally, the findings served as springboard to identify more indicators that would help improve overall performance of the LUCs in attaining certain levels of accreditation.

V. CONCLUSION

In the light of the above findings, the following conclusions ae drawn:

1. Accreditation level of LUCs in Teacher Education Program differ, as some have attained Level I and Level II already. While others are in process of obtaining program accreditation, some have not attained any level of accreditation yet.

They also vary with regard to Government recognition, while some were granted recognition, several are still in process and others have not applied yet.

They also differ with regard to the result in the Licensure Examination for Teachers in the last five years. Aside from the "see-saw" trend in the individual ratings, an immense difference is observed among the results which is also relative to varying results in the National Passing Rates. LUCs strive to provide quality education specifically when it comes to their Teacher Education Programs since 5 out of 11 have maintained their ranks per category in the HEI performance.

2. LUCs, although they vary in different key result areas, are able to govern their specific institutions with integrity and objectivity in ways that institutional frameworks are properly utilized such as transparency, strategic plan, human, physical and financial resources. They also foster a culture of quality and accountability and furthermore, they are financially stable and sustainable because of appropriate systems and structures that safeguard their assets. Programs are current and relevant because the governing body is involved in their approval, performance and monitoring.

3. Finally, LUCs are prepared in some challenges and changes brought about by the different internal and external factors. People comprising the organization are somehow well-equipped with knowledge, skills and behaviors as to what challenges and changes brings about. These are imminent because of the strong points underscored by the result of the study. But aside from these looming positive attributes, there also areas that need to be improved by LUCs in order for them to be able to adhere to standards and assure quality in leading and managing their respective institutions.

Recommendation

Based on the conclusions of this study, the following are being recommended:

a. For Future and Potential Municipalities/Cities

The researcher recommends to future and potential municipalities/cities that would like to subsidize education and offer Elementary and Secondary Programs for your constituents, that: Comply with standards. since the exact purpose of putting up these LUCs is to provide the highest quality education possible, it is deemed important to adhere to standards.

Increase the budget of LUCs so that the HEIs may capitalize on their human, physical and financial resources. Investing in such would result to strengthening of the LUCs' quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research and creative work and support for students.

b. For Local Government Officials

The researcher recommends that in leading and managing a locally funded university, local government officials to: Initiate efforts in promoting quality education by constantly monitoring not just the increase in the number of enrollees but also how you can provide such in terms of regularly tracking the total well-being of the LUC. You should also appoint education leaders and administrators who can regularly conduct valid SWOT Analyses and other evaluative measures.

c. For the University Administrators

Furthermore, the researcher encourages university administrators to lead and manage the LUCs with the following recommendations:

Keep yourselves in check with standards. Competition is all over and the need to survive is one of the best weapons in winning. With the fast-paced internalization and globalization in the education sector, LUCs cannot discount the fact that rivalry is everywhere. Accreditation is one of the means to keep abreast with standards and this can also be one of the

guarantees to maintain competitiveness and competencies of graduates. Efficiently and effectively manage the LUCs, as it is apparent in the findings that this is important. This may also result to the mitigation of abovementioned weaknesses and threats. Concentrate on quality of professional exposure, research and creative work of faculty and students. Such can be undertaken by making their faculty and students attend seminars, workshops, conferences, symposia, colloquia, and events on research capabilities and actual research undertakings.

d. For the Faculty Members

Hence, the researcher recommends the following to faculty members who are and who wish to serve the LUCs: Deliver professional services in accordance with the set standards. Always practice professionalism and uphold standards, whether in a per student or classroom level. Attend continuing professional development seminars, trainings, and workshops. Engage yourselves in different seminars, workshops, conferences, symposia, colloquia, and events on research, relations with the community, effective classroom management and delivering the most tailored-fit professional services for their clients-the students.

REFERENCES

Dess, Gregory G., Lumpkin, G.T., and Eisner, Alan B. Strategic Management Text and Cases 5e (New York, McGraw-Hill Irwin 2010) pp. 9-11 and 13

Jones, Gareth R. and George, Jennifer M., Contemporary Management 6e, (New York, McGraw-Hill Irwin 2009) pp. 8-10

Krishna, Venni V., Case Study India Center of Excellence as a Tool for Capacity Building Programme on Innovation, Higher Education and Research for Development (IHERD)

Montenegro, Ruel A., The Management Function of Organizing Applied to School Setting (Philippines, 2003) pp.3-5

Pereda, Pedrito R. and Pereda, Purisima P., Human Resource Management, (Philippines, Mindshapers Co., Inc. 2008) pp. 32 and 34

Tizon, Jocelyn P. A Handbook on How to Develop an Effective Performance Management System (Philippines, AASHPI Secretariat 2013) pp.15-16

Van Waes, Sara, Van den Bossche, Piet, Moolenaar, Nienke M., Stes, Ann and Petegem, Peter Van, Uncovering Changes in University Teachers' Professional Networks During an Instructional Development Program Studies in Educational Evaluation. 46 (Sept. 2015): p11. From Academic OneFile

Vidyarthi, Kavya, Top 15 Reasons Why Education is Extremely Important, Listsurge

Ylijoki, Oili-Helena, University Under Structural Reform: A Micro-Level Perspective, Springer, Minerva: A Review of Science, Learning and Policy. 52.1 (Mar. 2014): p55. From Academic OneFile

Langha, Abbygail T. and Fifolt, Matthew, Connecting Institutional Goals with Measurable Outcomes: lessons from an Academic Realignment Initiative, COPYRIGHT 2014 Society for College and University Planning, Planning for Higher Education. 42.4 (July-September 2014): p13. From Academic OneFil

dela Peña, Ryan C. Ph.D., Dean, Graduate Studies, Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Valenzuela, Philippines.