

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A STAKEHOLDER EVALUATION ACROSS OECD-DAC DIMENSIONS

MARÍA LUZ P. VILLARANTE 

Planning, Quality Assurance, and Development, University of
Bohol, Tagbilaran City, Philippines

Corresponding Author: mlvillarante@gmail

ABSTRACT

Article History

Submission: February 19, 2025

Revised: April 8, 2025

Accepted: August 15, 2025

Publication: September 5, 2025

Keywords— Program evaluation; Quality assurance; OECD-DAC criteria; CIPP model; Outcomes-based education; Higher education; Stakeholder perception; Descriptive-comparative design; Weighted mean; Composite mean; Shapiro-Wilk test; Kruskal-Wallis H test; Dunn's post hoc test; Bonferroni adjustment; Tagbilaran City, Philippines

This study evaluated selected academic programs at the University of Bohol during the first semester of the 2024–2025 academic year using internationally recognized quality assurance frameworks. The study examined stakeholder perceptions across five domains: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability, based on the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) standards, the CIPP assessment methodology, and principles of outcomes-based education. A self-constructed four-point Likert scale was used to collect data from 321 stakeholders, including students, instructors, and administrative personnel. A descriptive-comparative methodology was utilized for data collection. The



© Villarante, M. L. P. (2025). Open Access. This article published by University of Bohol Multidisciplinary Research Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material). Under the following terms, you must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not use the material for commercial purposes. To view a copy of this license, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

descriptive data revealed that the programs achieved a composite mean score of 3.391, signifying commendable performance in all domains. The Kruskal-Wallis H test revealed statistically significant differences in evaluation scores across stakeholder groups in most domains, except efficiency. For post hoc analysis, Dunn's test with Bonferroni adjustment was utilized. The findings indicated that faculty members regularly evaluated the program's utility and influence more favorably than students. The institution exhibits systemic excellence and alignment with strategic objectives; however, there is scope for improvement in administrative efficiency and curriculum responsiveness. The study emphasizes the importance of stakeholder-driven evaluation by facilitating evidence-based decision-making, enhancing quality assurance mechanisms, and promoting ongoing institutional improvement in higher education.

INTRODUCTION

Quality assurance in higher education has shifted from a compliance-oriented process to a strategic, evidence-based mechanism that drives institutional transformation. Program evaluation is central to this shift, as it enables universities to systematically assess whether their academic offerings remain relevant, effective, efficient, influential, and sustainable. These dimensions encompass more than administrative metrics; they reflect the institution's ability to fulfill its academic mandate, meet stakeholder expectations, and contribute to societal development (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has identified relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact, and sustainability as essential evaluation criteria in its revised Development Assistance Committee (DAC) framework (OECD, 2019). Although these criteria were originally developed for use in development projects, they have been widely adopted across government sectors and institutional performance systems, including higher education. Employing these criteria in academic contexts provides a systematic framework for evaluating how well institutional resources, instructional methods, and program outcomes align with strategic objectives and long-term sustainability.

Within universities, program evaluation is closely intertwined with outcomes-based education (OBE), emphasizing measurable learning outcomes, constructive alignment, and accountability for student achievement (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Recognizing the importance of stakeholder engagement, including students and faculty, can foster a sense of value and respect for their insights into academic quality and institutional performance (Kuh et al., 2005; Tinto, 2012).

In the Philippine context, the Higher Education Act of 1994 (Republic Act No. 7722) mandates the promotion of quality and excellence in higher

education institutions. Complementing this legislative framework, CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012 institutionalizes an outcomes-based and typology-based quality assurance system, emphasizing stakeholder alignment, sustainability, and evidence-based institutional planning. These national directives underscore the vital role of systematic program evaluation in fostering institutional accountability and strategic growth, inspiring confidence in continuous improvement.

Anchored in these international and national frameworks, the present study evaluates the academic programs of the Teachers College, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Business and Accountancy at the University of Bohol for Academic Year 2024–2025. By assessing stakeholder perceptions across five core evaluation dimensions—relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability—this study highlights the evaluation criteria's relevance to inform institutional enhancement, accreditation readiness, and long-term strategic planning.

Objectives. Here is your revised version converted into clear research objectives (general and specific), written in formal academic style suitable for publication:

General Objective. The study aims to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of selected academic programs at the University of Bohol during the first semester of Academic Year 2024–2025, focusing on stakeholder perceptions across the dimensions of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

Specific Objectives. Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. Describe the demographic profile of participating stakeholders, including students, faculty members, and administrative personnel.
2. Assess stakeholder perceptions of program performance across relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability;
3. Determine whether statistically significant differences exist in program evaluation ratings among stakeholder groups.
4. Identify priority areas for strategic improvement based on collective stakeholder feedback across the five evaluation dimensions.
5. Generate evidence-based recommendations to support institutional decision-making and continuous quality enhancement initiatives.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Design. This study used a descriptive-comparative design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Stakeholder perceptions of program quality were assessed through the quantitative component.

Three complementary viewpoints served as the theoretical foundation for the evaluation methodology: outcomes-based education principles (Biggs & Tang, 2011), the CIPP (Context-Input-Process-Product) evaluation model

(Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007), and the OECD DAC evaluation standards (OECD, 2019). The operationalization of five fundamental dimensions—relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability—was guided by these frameworks taken together.

Respondents. Students, instructors, deans, program chairs, and area coordinators from the Teachers College, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Business and Accountancy were among the 321 stakeholders who participated in the study. Three categories of respondents were used for inferential analysis: academic staff, administrative staff, and students. This classification shows the significance of stakeholder perceptions in influencing program quality and institutional success.

Data Gathering Procedure. To investigate stakeholder views across the five assessment aspects, data were collected using a self-constructed questionnaire based on the OECD framework. Items were created in accordance with institutional quality-assurance criteria and informed by the body of research on higher-education evaluation. To reduce central-tendency bias and encourage more detailed evaluation responses, a four-point Likert scale was used.

Statistical Analysis. To summarize responses, descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, weighted means, and composite means, were computed. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to evaluate the normalcy assumption before inferential testing. The findings showed that the majority of the data were not normally distributed across several dimensions. Consequently, non-parametric statistical techniques were applied.

To determine whether there were statistically significant differences in evaluation scores among stakeholder groups, the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used. Dunn's paired tests with Bonferroni adjustment were used to pinpoint individual group differences. A significance threshold of 0.05 was used for all statistical analyses. By using this methodological approach, the study achieved analytical rigor while remaining attentive to stakeholder viewpoints, facilitating institutional decision-making grounded in facts and offering stakeholders clear, actionable insights for strategic application.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents. 321 respondents participated in the assessment. The majority of people were students (84.7%), followed by instructors (10.9%) and administrators (4.4%). Participation among institutions was fairly even, with the College of Business and Accountancy (39%) just ahead of the College of Arts and Sciences (30.9%) and Teachers College (30.1%). Most of the people who answered were first- or second-year students (72.4%), mostly women (76%), not married (86.9%), and aged 17-24.

This demographic makeup aligns with typical characteristics of undergraduate institutions in higher education (Kuh et al., 2005; Tinto, 2012),

where student opinions often dominate program-level quality evaluations.

Overall performance of the program across all areas. The evaluation findings show that the main programs at the Teachers College, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Business and Accountancy had an overall composite mean of 3.391, which is considered “Excellent.” It was determined that all five dimensions—relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability—received scores greater than 3.25, indicating that the institution has demonstrated strong performance across all quality areas. With a mean score of 3.45, effectiveness secured the highest possible score, followed by sustainability and impact, both at 3.41. The efficiency dimension ranked lowest among the dimensions, though it was still impressive ($M = 3.29$). The relatively narrow score range (3.29–3.45) suggests that the strength is consistent across all tested categories. (Council for Higher Education Accreditation [CHEA], 2020; OECD, 2018) The conclusion that the program’s overall quality is satisfactory is supported by quality assurance procedures that evaluate not only teaching but also operations and strategy.

Variance in Program Evaluation Among Stakeholders. The Kruskal–Wallis H test was used to determine whether evaluation scores differed across stakeholder categories. There were significant disparities across overall evaluation, relevance, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability, but not in efficiency.

Table 1. *Results of the Kruskal–Wallis H Test for Variance in Program Evaluation Across Stakeholder Groups*

Dimension	H	df	p
Overall Evaluation	11.399	2	.003
Relevance	11.716	2	.003
Effectiveness	14.930	2	.001
Efficiency	1.325	2	.516
Impact	12.627	2	.002
Sustainability	11.396	2	.003

Note. $df = k - 1$ (three stakeholder groups). Significant at $\alpha = .05$.

The statistically significant results affirm that program evaluation is subjective and influenced by institutional roles. Faculty consistently evaluated programs more favorably than students across various characteristics, but perceptions of efficiency remained statistically stable.

Program Relevance: Career Orientation and Alignment. The program’s relevance ($M = 3.39$) is closely aligned with the school’s and students’ aims. The highest assessments were for career preparation ($M = 3.43$) and alignment with institutional goals ($M = 3.44$). This suggests that students see a strong connection between being ready for school and finding a job.

Engagement theory asserts that perceived academic relevance augments

motivation and perseverance (Kuh et al., 2011; Tinto, 2012). The results show that curriculum design and the institution’s location are effective means of communicating the program’s goals. Changes to the curriculum (M = 3.33) received the lowest grade in this area, indicating that the curriculum review process needs to be more accessible. The College of Business and Accountancy may be better aligned with industry standards, given its higher grades compared to other colleges.

Program Effectiveness: Instructional Quality and Support Systems. Effectiveness (M = 3.45) was the most important dimension, and support services (M = 3.49) got the highest item-level rating. Academic advising and tutoring are recognized as correlated with student success (Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), demonstrating the school’s effectiveness in supporting students.

Skill development (M = 3.45) and learning outcomes (M = 3.44) received high ratings, indicating that teaching and assessment were in sync (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Post hoc analysis revealed that faculty members rated the effectiveness significantly higher than students did.

Table 2. *Significant Pairwise Comparisons Using Dunn’s Test with Bonferroni Adjustment*

Comparison	Dimension	Adjusted p
Faculty vs. Students	Effectiveness	< .05
Faculty vs. Students	Impact	< .05

Note. Only statistically significant pairwise comparisons are displayed.

The divergence in effectiveness ratings aligns with the literature, which indicates that faculty often evaluate instructional processes more favorably because of their insider understanding of curricular design (Harvey, 2011). The Teachers College’s consistently strong ratings suggest particularly robust professional integration.

Program Efficiency: Operational Performance. The composite mean for efficiency was the lowest (M = 3.29), yet it remained within the very efficient range. People trust the institution to deliver value because resource utilization (M = 3.39) and cost-effectiveness (M = 3.33) were both very good. The administrative processes (M = 3.20) and class size (M = 3.24) were both lower than expected, indicating room for improvement. Administrators’ performance has a major impact on student satisfaction (Douglas et al., 2006). Importantly, efficiency did not differ significantly across stakeholder groups (see Table 1), suggesting convergence in views of operational realities. The fact that the outcomes are so similar shows that there are ways to improve the system, notably by optimizing digital processes and adjusting the number of classes.

Program Impact: Developmental and Societal Outcomes. Impact (M = 3.41) measures how much the school helps students grow and get ready for society. Personal growth (M = 3.51) was the most important, consistent with

developmental theories that emphasize how higher education can change people (Astin, 1993). Faculty members gave impact a very high score ($M = 3.697$), notably for social contribution ($M = 3.80$). Students also said it had a significant effect, especially at Teachers College. Table 1 shows large variances between groups, indicating that how people interpret the influence depends on their job and on how close they are to long-term outcomes.

The program's long-term success depends on keeping things going and changing as needed. People who care about the institution believe it can recover, as evidenced by its sustainability score of 3.41. The long-term vision ($M = 3.49$) received the highest score, indicating that people trust the strategic direction. The faculty and area coordinators awarded sustainability a very high ranking, especially for its flexibility and environmental awareness. The literature on governance emphasizes the significance of foresight and adaptive capacity for the sustainability of institutions (Barnett, 2000). Deans and program chairs may assign lower scores because they are aware of the financial and regulatory issues that can arise.

The statistically significant differences across most areas (except efficiency) indicate that it is safe to evaluate several stakeholders. These differences do not mean that institutions are failing; instead, they provide additional information that could help us improve our plans (Chen, 2015). Overall, the programs demonstrate systemic quality, with opportunities for incremental operational improvement rather than structural reform.

CONCLUSION

This thorough examination of the Teachers College, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Business and Accounting shows that all three perform well across five key areas: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The findings show a significant link between institutional goals, stakeholder expectations, and program delivery achievements, with an overall composite mean of 3.391 (Excellent).

Effectiveness was the institution's most prominent strength, demonstrating strong teaching, high student participation, and well-established academic support services. High-impact scores back up the programs' claims that they help people grow as individuals, advance in their careers, and become more responsible in their communities. Sustainability measures indicate that people trust the institution's long-term vision and its ability to adapt to societal changes. Relevance studies show that programs are closely aligned with the institution's mission and job-preparation pathways. However, the relatively low ratings for curriculum updates suggest that there needs to be greater transparency and exposure into the process of curriculum change. Efficiency was always the least important of the five criteria, even if it was highly valued. It was decided that the way things were run and the size of the classes needed improvement. The absence of notable efficiency discrepancies across stakeholders indicates consensus on

procedural constraints, underscoring the need for further administrative changes. The statistically significant differences in overall appraisal, relevance, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability among stakeholder groups illustrate the subjective character of institutional assessment. Faculty usually performed better on program performance measures than students, indicating that the discrepancies lay in how they were evaluated, not in how the institution was set up.

In general, the results demonstrate that the institutions are mature and the systems are of high quality. The programs do not require major changes to remain relevant and effective; rather, they would benefit from more targeted operational improvements and greater stakeholder participation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the empirical findings and statistical analysis, the following strategic recommendations are proposed:

1. Increase both the responsiveness and transparency of the existing curriculum. Although the program's relevance was evaluated positively, the curriculum updates received relatively low scores. That the university ought to:

- Provide recorded curriculum review cycles that are institutionalized and include input from industry, alums, and other stakeholders. It is important to make sure that pupils are aware of any changes to the curriculum. Enhance learning opportunities through hands-on experience and industry integration.

By taking these steps, alignment with professional norms and evolving labor-market trends will be strengthened.

2. Through the optimization of processes, improve the efficiency of administrative operations. Considering that the university's administrative procedures obtained mediocre scores and that efficiency was the facet that received the lowest ranking, the university should:
 - Take on the responsibility for conducting workflow audits of the scheduling, grading, and registration systems.
 - Increase the use of digital automation and integrated information systems in academic institutions.
 - In high-enrollment programs, it is important to review the class size allocations to maximize the amount of interaction and instructional support. Because the views on efficiency were statistically

consistent across all stakeholder groups, improvements in this area will likely benefit the entire institution.

3. **Ensure the Maintenance of Instructional Excellence Through the Development of Faculty.** In light of the strong ratings they received for efficacy, constant instructional innovation is essential to sustain the momentum. The university can invest in training faculty members in active learning methodologies and outcomes-based assessment. Pedagogical benchmarking across different colleges should be encouraged. In the areas of student engagement and support services, it is important to acknowledge and spread the best practices. Ongoing faculty development will strengthen the quality factor, which is considered the institution's most important.
4. **Strengthen an Institutionalized Quality Assurance Cycle.** Data driven that The university should support continuous improvement cycle by incorporating the findings of the annual program review into the strategic planning process.
 - Integrate graduate tracer studies, performance indicators, and perception-based evaluations into your overall assessment process. It is recommended to establish structured debate platforms for stakeholders to align evaluative perspectives. Evidence-based governance and accountability will be improved through the implementation of a systematic quality cycle.
5. **Increase the number of alumni and community partnerships to expand the impact.** Given the university's high scores in terms of effect and sustainability, the institution ought to:
 - Establish formal mentorship networks for alums. Increase the number of partnerships that involve community-based learning and internships.
 - Create quantitative indicators for the employability of graduates and their participation in civic life activities. The observed impact will be documented as long-term outcomes through the implementation of these activities.
6. **Create a structural framework for the integration of sustainability** The university can further institutionalize resilience via the following means, even though sustainability scores were high:
 - Incorporating sustainability concerns into the strategic plans of educational institutions.
 - Coordinating the forecasts of enrollment and program growth with the resource forecasting to ensure accuracy.
 - Integrating topics related to social and environmental sustainability into all aspects of the curriculum. Both long-term adaptation and institutional continuity will be strengthened as a result.

REFERENCES CITED

- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. Jossey-Bass.
- Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of super complexity*. Open University Press.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education / Open University Press.
- Chen, H. T. (2015). *Practical program evaluation: Theory-driven evaluation and the integrated evaluation perspective* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2012). *CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012: Policy standard to enhance quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA*. Commission on Higher Education.
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2020). *CHEA annual report 2019–2020*. CHEA.
- Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(3), 251–267. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880610678568>
- Harvey, L. (2011). The nexus of feedback and improvement. *Quality in Higher Education*, 17(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2011.554637>
- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1), 9–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102>
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. Jossey-Bass.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019a). *Benchmarking higher education system performance*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/be5514d7-en>
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019b). *Evaluation criteria: Adapted definitions and principles for use*. OECD. [https://one.oecd.org/document/DCE/DAC\(2019\)58/FINAL/en/pdf](https://one.oecd.org/document/DCE/DAC(2019)58/FINAL/en/pdf)

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). Jossey-Bass.

Republic Act No. 7722. (1994). *Higher Education Act of 1994*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.

Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action*. University of Chicago Press.