

AWARENESS, ACCEPTABILITY, CONSISTENCY AND CLARITY OF THE VISION, MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF CENTRAL MINDANAO UNIVERSITY AND ITS CONGRUENCE TO OUTCOMES-BASED INSTRUCTION: A PRELIMINARY RESULT

Tan, Denis A.¹; Borres, Teresita H.²

Professional Education Department, Central Mindanao University^{1,2},
University Town, Musuan, Bukidnon, 8710 Philippines

Correspondence Tel.: +639177103100, Email: denistan@cmu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT: *This study is one of the five (5) studies under the project entitled, “Sustaining the Culture of Quality: Approaches and Best Practices of Central Mindanao University”. It aims to determine the awareness, acceptability, consistency and clarity of the vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO) of Central Mindanao University (CMU) and its congruence to the outcomes-based instruction (OBI). It is a qualitative-quantitative research design that utilized a descriptive type of research using survey approach, to be followed by semi-structured interview. Preliminary results using the survey method showed that the stakeholders are generally aware, they understand and accept the VMGO. The VMGO are widely disseminated. Quantitative findings revealed that the stakeholders strongly agree that CMU's VMGO are clear, consistent and congruent to OBI. Descriptive statistics also showed that stakeholders are highly aware of CMU's VMGO in which they greatly accept and perceive that these are highly congruent to the OBI.*

Keywords: *Vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO); awareness, acceptability, congruence; outcomes-based instruction*

1. INTRODUCTION

The vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO) of any organization is very vital to its existence and direction. Like state universities and colleges (SUCs), each has its unique VMGO that will direct the course of action of the entire system in all its strategic plans, programs and activities and all its operations. During accreditation conducted by the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, Inc. (AACCUP), VMGO is one of the ten (10) areas to be surveyed which is very fundamental among all areas and even programs to be accredited. Indeed, everything in the university or college is justified only to the extent that it realizes its VMGO [1].

Central Mindanao University as one of the chartered universities in the country submit itself for AACCUP Accreditation was created through Republic Act 4498 from Mindanao Agricultural College in June 19, 1965. From its humble beginning in 1910 as Mailag Agricultural School to Mindanao Agricultural College by virtue of RA 807 in 1946 [2], now CMU envisions to become *“a leading ASEAN university actively committed to the total development of people for a globally sustainable environment and humane society”* (CMU Code, 2015). Its mission is to *“advance the frontiers of knowledge through internationalization of education and equitable access to quality instruction, research, extension, and production for economic prosperity, moral integrity, social and cultural sensitivity and environmental consciousness”* [3]. As it turns 110 next year, it is committed to go through change, accreditation and certification in order to become better and relevant through the changing times.

CMU has nine (9) colleges and a laboratory high school. It offers 33 undergraduate, 28 masters and 11 doctoral degree programs. With the undergraduate programs offered, one (1) is Level I accredited, ten (10) are Level II, fifteen (15) are Level III and two (2) are Level IV. On the graduate programs offered, seven (7) are Level I accredited, one (1) is Level II, and twenty-three (23) Level III accredited. CMU is granted by AACCUP Level II institutional accreditation status.

With the aforementioned recognition given to the institution, CMU continuously update herself and have her programs evaluated and accredited by national and the international accrediting and evaluating agencies. At present, it endeavors to be ISO certified and submits herself for QS international ratings which is funded by CHED with 1.45M grants. And every year, CMU submits its program for AACCUP accreditation.

Program accreditation by AACCUP is an essential element of every journey by SUC in the country for quality assurance. For every program accreditation, there are ten (10) areas to be evaluated using an OBE instrument. These ten (10) areas include: Area I (VMGO), Area II (Faculty), Area III (Curriculum and Instruction), Area IV (Support to Students), Area V (Research), Area VI (Extension and Community Involvement), Area VII (Library), Area VIII (Physical Facilities), Area IX (Laboratories) and Area X (Administration) [4]. Among these areas, Area I, which is VMGO, is one of the elements that cut across the programs or discipline. As a prime mover of the other areas, VMGO is consider to be the most important area in which the operations, education practices and activities of the university are anchored on [5].

VMGO though very essential receives less attention to researchers especially that it has no weight in the program accreditation. This is the reason why there are only limited number of researches conducted on this topic. This is the very reason why the researchers felt the need to investigate, using the OBE instrument of AACCUP, the stakeholders' awareness, acceptability, consistency and clarity of the VMGO of CMU and its congruence to the OBE instruction. Specifically, it aimed to: determine the awareness of the stakeholders of the CMU's VMGO; establish the stakeholders' understanding and acceptance of CMU's VMGO; ascertain the awareness of the stakeholders on the dissemination of the VMGO; identify the perception of the stakeholders on the clarity and consistency of the VMGO and its congruence to the OBI; and compare the responses of the stakeholders on the parameters under study.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is one of the five (5) research studies under the project entitled, “Sustaining the Culture of Quality: Approaches and Best Practices of Central Mindanao University”. It utilized the quantitative-qualitative type of research design. It utilizes an online survey questionnaire to gather the necessary data to answer the questions set for this investigation. An interview with select stakeholders will be conducted after the quantitative data has been gathered. For the preliminary findings, only the quantitative part can be presented since data collection is still on-going.

The instrument of this study was composed of the items regarding awareness, acceptance and congruence of CMU’s VMGO to the OBE instruction which were adopted from the revised instrument developed by the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, Inc. (AACUP) in 2010. Data collection started last June 2019, and at present there were only 209 responses gathered by the researchers.

The respondents of the study for this preliminary findings were only 209 stakeholders with 126 and 83 internal and external stakeholders, respectively. Stakeholders composed of faculty, alumni, administrators, parents, heads of agencies, SUCs and partner institutions and organizations.

The gathering of data was done via google form online. The survey form was posted via website of the institution and in the official page of the Office of Admissions, Scholarships and Placement (OASP). Other way of data collection like floating of the questionnaire during OJT and company visit will be conducted on the succeeding semester.

The preliminary data collected were tabulated and analyzed using appropriate statistical tool using a statistical software. Descriptive statistics like mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage were used to answer the questions on the descriptive levels. The t-test for difference of mean was used to determine if there is a significant difference in the mean responses of the stakeholders in the different parameters under investigation.

The following rating scale was used to better understand the quantitative data:

Response	Mean	Awareness	Acceptance
4	3.5 – 4.0	Highly Aware	Greatly Accept
3	2.5 – 3.49	Aware	Accept
2	1.5 – 2.49	Least Aware	Slightly Accept
1	1.0 – 1.49	Not Aware	Did Not Accept
Response	Mean	Consistency & Clarity	Congruence
4	3.5 – 4.0	Strongly Agree	Highly Congruent
3	2.5 – 3.49	Agree	Congruent
2	1.5 – 2.49	Slightly Agree	Slight Congruent
1	1.0 – 1.49	Disagree	Not Congruent

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the results and discussions of the preliminary findings of this study. The presentation is arranged in accordance to the order of the statement of objectives.

Table 1 presents the respondents of this investigation. Initially, there were 209 respondents with 126 (60.3%) internal stakeholders and 83 (39.7%) external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders include 92 students, 21 faculty, 13 staff and administrator. On the other hand, external stakeholders compose of 78 alumni and 5 partner agencies and institutions.

Taking into account the Slovin’s formula to determine respondents of a 10,000 population, 209 is already 54.29% of the 385 target samples for this study. Indeed, a good number already to present preliminary findings of the research questions.

Table 1. Number of Respondents

Stakeholders	Frequency	Percentage
Internal	126	60.3
External	83	39.7
Total	209	100.0

Awareness of the stakeholders regarding the VMGO of CMU
 The VMGO of CMU is continually evolving as it adapts to the demands of the present generation and to the needs of time. The current VMGO was approved by the CMU Board of Regents (BOR) in 2015 through BOR Res. No. 09, s. 2015. Since then, these VMGO become the sole bases of the University on its plans and other endeavors.

Table 2. Awareness of the VMGO

Indicators	Stakeholder	Mean	s.d.	Adjectival Rating
I am aware of the Vision and Mission of CMU	Internal	3.80	0.490	HA
	External	3.78	0.443	HA
I am aware of the Goals of the Colleges (or the college I belong)	Internal	3.56	0.664	HA
	External	3.60	0.661	HA
I am aware of the Objectives of the Programs (or Program where I belong)	Internal	3.60	0.633	HA
	External	3.59	0.663	HA
MEAN	Internal	3.65	0.509	HA
	External	3.66	0.497	HA

Legend:

Response	Mean	Awareness
4	3.5 – 4.0	Highly Aware (HA)
3	2.5 – 3.49	Aware (A)
2	1.5 – 2.49	Least Aware (LA)
1	1.0 – 1.49	Not Aware (NA)

Table 2 presents the level of awareness of the stakeholders of the CMU’s VMGO. As shown in the table, all stakeholders, both the internal and external, are highly aware of the VMGO of CMU. They are also highly aware of the goals of the colleges (college where they belong) and the objectives of the programs (or program where they belong). This implies that CMU’s VMGO is being discussed to stakeholders even in the department levels. It is an outcome of the annual orientation program that the university is conducting for incoming freshmen students with their parents or guardians.

This finding is supported by the study of Castillo (2014b) when he found that the alumni of their university are highly aware of their VMGO [6]. Although in his study, the internal stakeholders, specifically the staff are more or less highly aware while others are simply aware about their VMGO.

Awareness of the Stakeholders regarding the Dissemination of the VMGO of CMU

Table 3 shows the initial findings on the awareness of the stakeholders in the dissemination of the VMGO of CMU. As reflected, both internal and external stakeholder are highly aware of all indicators except for the last items. This results indicates that the participants were generally aware on the dissemination of the VMGO to the other agencies, industry sector and the community as a whole. Although, both claims that they were highly aware that the VMGO were displayed in the bulletin boards (with highest mean); printed in catalogs, manuals, and other materials; broadcasts

in the media/and/or internet or website. The above findings suggest that the university utilized different means and mediums to disseminate the VMGO. Doing so, made most of the stakeholders being mindful of its VMGO. The study of Castillo (2014b) confirms the above findings. In his study, all groups have highest mean on the awareness that VMGO are displayed in the bulletin boards and the lowest mean is on the awareness of dissemination to other agencies, industries and community.

Table 3. Awareness of the Dissemination of the VMGO

Indicators	Stakeholder	Mean	s.d.	Adjectival Rating
I am aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards	Internal	3.67	0.632	HA
	External	3.67	0.543	HA
I am aware that the VMGO are printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials	Internal	3.54	0.755	HA
	External	3.54	0.668	HA
I am aware that the VMGO are broadcast in media and/or internet / website	Internal	3.53	0.734	HA
	External	3.54	0.686	HA
I am aware that the VMGO are widely disseminated to the different agencies, institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole	Internal	3.33	0.829	A
	External	3.30	0.761	A
MEAN	Internal	3.52	0.629	HA
	External	3.52	0.339	HA

Legend:
 Response Mean Awareness
 4 3.5 – 4.0 Highly Aware (HA)
 3 2.5 – 3.49 Aware (A)
 2 1.5 – 2.49 Least Aware (LA)
 1 1.0 – 1.49 Not Aware (NA)

Generally, all groups are highly aware that the VMGO of CMU are disseminated to the public. This result indicates that CMU’s direction and purpose are known by all its stakeholders because they are conscious on its dissemination.

Understanding and Acceptance of the Stakeholders regarding the VMGO of CMU

The succeeding presentation contains the responses of the stakeholders on their understanding and acceptance of CMU’s VMGO. It directly shows the indicators with the mean and standard deviation alongside the adjectival ratings.

With regards to the understanding and acceptance of the VMGO of CMU, table 4 reflects the stakeholders’ perception. As presented, all stakeholders understand and greatly accept the vision and mission of CMU. They also understand and greatly accept the goals of the colleges as

well as the objectives of the programs and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in their own capacity.

All groups understand and greatly accept the VMGO of CMU. Among the indicators, the highest mean is on the understanding and acceptance of the vision and mission of the university while the lowest mean falls on the understanding and acceptance of the program objectives. Similar to the study of Castillo (2014b), these two indicators also got the highest and lowest mean as indicated by both the internal and external stakeholders.

The results imply further that the university has strongly implemented wide dissemination and orientation of its VMGO as evident by the stakeholders’ high level of understanding and acceptance.

Table 4. Understanding and Acceptance of the VMGO

Indicators	Stakeholder	Mean	s.d.	Adjectival Rating
I understand and accept the Vision and Mission of CMU	Internal	3.85	0.401	GA
	External	3.86	0.354	GA
I understand and accept the Goals of the colleges	Internal	3.75	0.565	GA
	External	3.75	0.490	GA
I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program/Course/Diploma /Certificate which I enrolled and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in my own capacity	Internal	3.71	0.538	GA
	External	3.73	0.471	GA
MEAN	Internal	3.78	0.395	GA
	External	3.79	0.339	GA

Legend
 Response Mean Acceptance
 4 3.5 – 4.0 Greatly Accept (GA)
 3 2.5 – 3.49 Accept (A)
 2 1.5 – 2.49 Slightly Accept (SA)
 1 1.0 – 1.49 Did Not Accept (DA)

Consistency and Clarity of CMU’s VMGO as perceived by the Stakeholders

This part displays the perception of the internal and external stakeholders on the consistency and clarity of CMU’s VMGO. It includes the coherence of the VMGO to the future directions of the university, to the program objectives alignment and the expected outcomes.

Table 5 displays the stakeholders’ responses on the consistency and clarity of the VMGO of CMU. As shown, the stakeholders strongly agree that CMU’s VMGO are consistent and clear. The highest mean is on the clarity of the vision that reflects what CMU hopes to become in the future, while the lowest mean is on the clarity of the program objectives on its expected outcomes in terms of aesthetics and cultural values.

Table 5. Consistency and Clarity of the VMGO

Indicators	Stakeholder	Mean	s.d.	Adjec-tival Rating
The Vision clearly reflects what CMU hopes to become in the future.	Internal	3.83	0.381	SA
	External	3.82	0.387	SA
The Mission clearly reflects CMU’s legal and educational mandate.	Internal	3.79	0.467	SA
	External	3.77	0.451	SA
The Goals of the colleges are clearly stated and are consistent with the Mission of CMU.	Internal	3.67	0.607	SA
	External	3.65	0.614	SA
The Program Objectives are consistent with the Goals of the colleges.	Internal	3.71	0.504	SA
	External	3.73	0.471	SA
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of competencies or technical skills of students and graduates.	Internal	3.68	0.546	SA
	External	3.72	0.477	SA
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of research and extension capabilities of students and graduates.	Internal	3.66	0.524	SA
	External	3.63	0.578	SA
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of students’ own ideas, desirable attitudes and personal discipline.	Internal	3.58	0.649	SA
	External	3.64	0.575	SA
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of moral character.	Internal	3.66	0.568	SA
	External	3.60	0.540	SA
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of critical thinking skills.	Internal	3.71	0.507	SA
	External	3.60	0.562	SA
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of aesthetic and cultural values.	Internal	3.64	0.529	SA
	External	3.58	0.544	SA
MEAN	Internal	3.69	0.487	SA
	External	3.67	0.468	SA

Legend		
Response	Mean	Consistency & Clarity
4	3.5 – 4.0	Strongly Agree
3	2.5 – 3.49	Agree
2	1.5 – 2.49	Slightly Agree
1	1.0 – 1.49	Disagree

Typically, both groups strongly agree that: CMU’s vision clearly reflects what it hopes to become in the future; the mission clearly reflects CMU’s legal and educational mandate; the goals of the colleges are clearly stated and are consistent with the mission of CMU; the program objectives (POs) are consistent with the goals of the colleges; the POs clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of competencies or technical skills of students and graduates; the POs clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of research and extension capabilities of students and graduates; the POs clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of students’ own ideas, desirable attitudes and personal discipline; the POs clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of moral character; the POs clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of critical thinking skills; and the POs clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of aesthetic and cultural values. However, both internal and external stakeholders only agree on the clarity and consistency of their institutions’ VMGO [6]. In this case, CMU’s VMGO are intensely believe by all its stakeholders to be clear and consistent.

Congruency of the CMU’s to OBE Instruction

This section presents the responses of the stakeholders on the congruency of the CMU’s VMGO to OBE instruction. It also includes the perception of the respondents on the

program outcome and the holistic role of the VMGO to CMU’s operation.

In terms of congruency of the VMGO to the OBE instruction, table 6 presents the responses of the stakeholders. As shown, the stakeholders generally believe that the VMGO of CMU is highly congruent to the OBE instruction. As presented, both the internal and external stakeholders find the VMGO of CMU to be highly congruent to the OBE instruction. It indicates that actual practices and activities are congruent to CMU’s mission, goals of the colleges, and the program objective. It also points out that the projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards achievement of the program outcomes. Moreover, the VMGO are the bases of CMU’s operations [7].

Among the indicators, both stakeholders rate, “The VMGO to be the bases of all CMU’s operations”, with the highest mean while the indicator, “The projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of the program outcomes” as the lowest. The findings of Castillo (2014) were almost exactly similar to the present study. Both the external stakeholders rated the same indicator as the highest mean. Nevertheless, in their institution, the indicator with the lowest mean is different from the preliminary finding of this study. For their external stakeholders, the congruency of the educational practices and activities to the program objectives got the lowest mean.

Table 6. Congruency of the VMGO to OBI

Indicators	Stakeholder	Mean	s.d.	Adjec-tival Rating
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Mission of CMU.	Internal	3.62	0.591	HC
	External	3.67	0.565	HC
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Goals of the colleges.	Internal	3.58	0.624	HC
	External	3.66	0.590	HC
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Objectives of the Program where I belong	Internal	3.60	0.553	HC
	External	3.70	0.487	HC
The projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of the program outcomes.	Internal	3.58	0.624	HC
	External	3.57	0.588	
The VMGO are the bases of all CMU’s operations.	Internal	3.63	0.616	HC
	External	3.69	0.516	HC
MEAN	Internal	3.60	0.532	HC
	External	3.66	0.462	HC

Legend
 Response Mean
 4 3.5 – 4.0
 3 2.5 – 3.49
 2 1.5 – 2.49
 1 1.0 – 1.49

Congruence
 Highly Congruent (HC)
 Congruent (C)
 Slight Congruent (SC)
 Not Congruent (NC)

On the other hand, the two studies converge its findings on the external stakeholders’ response that the institutions’ VMGO are the bases of its operation. This finding translate the outcomes of an institutional strategic planning conducted and implemented by each university or college.

Differences on the Responses of the stakeholders

This portion clarifies the similarities or differences of the responses of the internal and external stakeholders on the different parameters or variables under investigation. It also includes the statistical analysis on the difference of the means.

Table 7 presents the test for difference on the means of the responses of the internal and external stakeholders in each of the parameters under study. As presented, the internal and external stakeholders rate the different parameters with less disparity or none at all. Like for example, on the awareness of the dissemination of the VMGO, both rated this indicator with mean 3.52 while the rest has only a slight difference ranging from 0.01 to 11.

Table 7. T-test for Difference on the Parameters: Internal vs. External Stakeholders

Parameters	Stakeholder	Mean	t	p-value
Awareness of the VMGO	Internal	3.65	-	0.941
	External	3.66	0.074	
Awareness of the Dissemination of the VMGO	Internal	3.52	0.034	0.973
	External	3.52		
Understanding and Acceptance of the VMGO	Internal	3.78	-	0.889
	External	3.79	0.140	
Consistency and Clarity of the VMGO	Internal	3.69	0.042	0.966
	External	3.67		
Congruency of the VMGO to OBE Instruction	Internal	3.60	-	0.432
	External	3.66	0.787	

*significance at 0.05 level

As an evidence of the above indicated very minute disparity, the t-test for difference signifies that the internal and external

stakeholders do not differ on their responses to all parameters reflected on table 7 with p-values greater than 0.05. This implies further that all groups have similar levels of awareness, understanding, and perception on the consistency, clarity of CMU’s VMGO and its congruence to the OBI.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings, the conclusion were drawn as follows:

The stakeholders are highly aware of the existence and dissemination of the VMGO of CMU. They understand and highly accept them and they find these clearly stated and consistent to all the programs, educational practices, activities and plans of the university. Moreover, the respondents find the VMGO highly congruent to the OBI.

Based on the aforementioned conclusion, the university is encouraged to sustain its practices in the dissemination of the VMGO of the university. It suggests that more efforts will be given to the dissemination of these VMGO to different agencies, industries and community. More so, an evaluation and monitoring of these VMGO and its actual outcomes of CMU’s operation may be given an attention.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: This study is funded by Central Mindanao University headed by Dr. Jesus Antonio G. Derije, the University President.

5. REFERENCES:

[1] Castillo, R.C. (2014a). A paradigm shift to outcomes-based higher education: policies, principles, preparations. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*. [Online]. 14(1), pp. 174-186. Available: <http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=1809AA> CCUP Revised Instrument. The Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, Inc. 2010.

- [2] Central Mindanao University Laboratory High School Student Handbook 2014 Edition. Central Mindanao University. University Town, Musuan, 8710 Bukidnon.
- [3] Central Mindanao University Code Revised 2015. Central Mindanao University. University Town, Musuan, 8710 Bukidnon.
- [4] Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACUP) Areas of Program Accreditation.
- [5] CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 37, Series of 2012.
- [6] Castillo, R.C. (2014b). Awareness, Acceptance and Perception of Batangas State University Stakeholders towards its Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*. [Online]. 14(1), pp. 546-563.
- [7] Central Mindanao University Strategic Plan 2016-2020. Central Mindanao University. University Town, Musuan, 8710 Bukidnon.