

## Evaluating Organizational Outcomes (Oos) of One State University in the Philippines: Basis for Policy Recommendation and Adoption

**Adriel G. Roman**

Associate Professor V College of Teacher Education Laguna State Polytechnic University

---

**ABSTRACT:** Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines are mandated to perform three major functions-Instruction, Research, and Extension while ensuring their sustainability through a sound Management of Resources. This study presents the Organizational Outcome (OOs) of one state university in the Philippines in the past three years (2020-2022) during the onslaught of the COVID-19 pandemic. It was hypothesized in the study that the performances of the university differ from 2020-2022. Using descriptive evaluative design and document analysis techniques, the study collected data and documents from the website of the university. Verification of gathered data was done through an interview with the heads of the units directly involved in the indicators per parameter. Based on the results, the university has surpassed all the targets for each parameter in the Organizational Outcome (OOs) and no significant difference was found in the parameters from 2020-2022. Finally, the study provides recommendations such as policy interventions on the performance indicators which were found in the critical region of accomplishments.

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines are mandated to provide quality education, together with producing distinctive research outputs, and extension services to the community and other stakeholders. These three-fold functions later were expanded into four as the HEIs are needed to generate resources to sustain and supplement the programs, projects, and initiatives responding to these mandates. To determine the status of attainment or non-attainment of these mandates, each HEI is measured through its Organizational Outcomes (OOs). For every fiscal year, each HEI is assessed and evaluated based on its Organizational Outcomes (OOs) vis-à-vis its annual Physical and Financial targets together with some agency accountabilities (MC 2022-1).

Each mandate of the HEI has a corresponding OOs indicator. These indicators include the following: performance in the licensure examinations; program accreditation; enrolled students in the priority programs of the region, the higher education sector, and research degree programs; employment rates; research outputs completed, presented, published, and utilized; extension programs organized, number of beneficiaries of the training/services provided, and satisfaction of these beneficiaries of the training/services they received; custodial care programs; and hospital care programs (PREXC, 2022).

These indicators of performance are translated into each employee's individual commitment which serves as the inputs for the office performance commitment and eventually the organization's target aligned with its objectives set in the strategic development plan (SDP). This practice is attributed to the impacts of the implementation of strategic performance management system in the government agencies. However, despite these well-defined performance indicators and processes, not all higher education institutions were qualified to receive the Performance-Based Bonus (PBB). According to Albert and colleagues (2021), the primary reason for not receiving the PBB in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) is due to non-attainment of the requirements set in the PBB guidelines. Some of these requirements include financial performance, quality management system certification, freedom of information and compliance to audit findings.

Though PBB is one initiative of the government to encourage HEIs to monitor and continuously promote quality and efficiency in work, it is not the sole determinant. On the contrary, since PBB includes the four-fold functions of the HEIs, receiving or non-receiving has an implication for the management and operations of the HEIs. For these reasons, HEIs strive to participate in this challenge.

Studies show the positive effects of incentives to work performance and productivity of employees (Alam, Ridjal, Jumady, & Idris, 2023; Daniel, 2019) alongside compensation (Kadir, AlHosani, Ismail, and Sehan, 2019; Sitopu, Sitinjak, & Marpaung, 2021). If employees are motivated and productive, the attainment of organizational targets would be ensured. This

# Evaluating Organizational Outcomes (Oos) of One State University in the Philippines: Basis for Policy Recommendation and Adoption

## II. OBJECTIVES

The main objective of this study is to determine the performances of one higher education institution in Instruction, Research, and Extension for the fiscal years 2020-2022 and determine if there is a significant difference in the performances of the institution in instruction, research, and extension for the fiscal years 2020-2022.

## III. METHODOLOGY

This study uses a document analysis technique in order to gather pertinent data from the university's strategic plan, the general appropriation act section intended for the university (GAA), and annual reports. In this process, the three-year Physical targets and accomplishments (FYs 2020-2022) of one state university were gathered and analyzed. The past three years' performances of the university were included in the analysis since in these fiscal years, the university's operations have been hampered by the onslaught of the COVID-19 pandemic. With these data, the university can make necessary actions on its targets to perform its mandates while ensuring the welfare of employees. Data sources include the transparency website of the university as well as the Major Final Output Accountability Report Cards (MARC) posted on the same website. Statistical treatments such as Weighted Mean, percentages, and Kruskal-Wallis H-Test were used in order to treat the data. After the analysis, the researcher conducted an interview with the heads of the offices responsible for the performance results while a focus group discussion on the results was done together with the Senior Officials of the Higher Education Institution.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Performances of the University in Higher Education Program, Research Program, Services to the Community Program

Table 1 shows the performances of the SUC in the Higher Education Program, Research Program, and Technical Advisory and Extension Program. Results show that each performance target for the Higher Education program has been recorded as surpassing a 100% accomplishment rate from 2020 to 2022 in which the percentage of the undergraduate student population enrolled in CHED-identified and RDC-identified priority programs obtained the highest mean rate. This result denotes that the increase in enrollment of the university is attributed to the students who enrolled in the CHED-identified and RDC-identified priority programs implicating the responsiveness of the university to the regional development track. Moreover, the target of the university of the percentage of 1<sup>st</sup> time licensure exam takers that pass the licensure exams have been met for the three consecutive years with an average rate of 116.87%. Employed graduates and undergraduate program accreditation accomplishments both show increasing trends from 2020-2022.

The results denote that while the university ensures that the programs it offers comply the standards, it also takes actions in order to ensure that graduates are employable. Graduate employability is one of the manifestations that the program offered in the HEI is responsive to the demands of the industry/community. The result of the present study is parallel to the status of other universities in the Philippines in terms of the employability of graduates (Kalaw, 2019; Rogayan, 2019; Albina & Sumagaysay, 2020). Results of tracer studies about the employment of graduates create an avenue for the HEI to identify its best practices and improve (if necessary) the program offerings (Cuadra, Aure, & Gonzaga, 2019; Roman, 2023). In order to produce quality graduates, the curriculum should be responsive to the present and future demands of the community.

With regard to the research program of the university, table shows that the three indicators are being satisfied by the university from 2020-2022 giving emphasis on the number of research outputs completed and published showing an increasing trend from 100% to 120.44% (for completed research) and 107.25% to 225.65% (for published research). Research publications are measured in terms of number of research outputs published within the fiscal year divided by the sum of the research outputs completed within the year and the two preceding years net of published paper in the current year.

The result can be attributed to the strategies imposed by the university such as including research in the number of hours in loads of the faculty, provision of funding to research, and the implementation of an incentive system.

On the other hand, there is a decreasing rate in terms of the number of research outputs utilized by the beneficiaries from 300% in 2020, which reduces to 150.00% in 2022. This decreasing trend is due to the increase in the target of the university from 2020 to 2022. The research performance of the university in the past three manifests the strong commitment and direction of the university administration in research. Similar to what Quitaras and Abuso (2021) found in three select universities in the Philippines, the manifestation of academic leaders' focus on elevating the culture of research to the next level is reflective in the various R&D programs and projects they have. The present study is found different from the level of research productivity in select universities in the country which showed very low research productivity after the assessment using the SUC Levelling Instrument (Gamusa & Pacolor, 2019).

With respect to the performance of the university on the technical advisory extension program, there is a consistent above-physical target rate of the performance from 2020 to 2022. The result shows that the number of extension programs organized and conducted by the university as well as the partnership established satisfy the beneficiaries in terms of quality and relevance. The result signifies

## Evaluating Organizational Outcomes (Oos) of One State University in the Philippines: Basis for Policy Recommendation and Adoption

the strong awareness and commitment of the faculty and administration in providing extension and training services to the community and stakeholders which is similar to what Gannapao (2020) found that there is a positive significant relationship between the level of awareness and participation of the faculty in extension programs. In addition, the success of extension programs would not be possible without the eagerness and strong commitment of the beneficiaries to participate in the program. Thus, the attribution of success can be given as well to the beneficiaries of the extension programs in which according to Llenares and Deocar (2018) the sustainability of community extension program is dependent on the responsiveness of the community and stakeholders who are the benefactors of the programs and projects.

While the university showed positive results in terms of attaining the expected outcomes, some of the indicators should be given additional attention. For instance, the percentage of graduates (2 years prior) that are employed showed an average of 104.72% which is only 5% above the expected target. In addition, the percentage of undergraduate programs with accreditation needs to be maintained as it only shows 4.7% above the 100% targets. These two indicators of higher education program parameter could be considered as the two critical indicators that need to be given special attention.

As to research productivity, the number of research outputs completed within a year should be given focus as it is the starting point and basis of the two other indicators (publication and utilization). Meanwhile, the number of active partnership in LGUs, Industries, NGOs, NGAs, SMEs, and other stakeholders as a result of extension activities should be given special attention also as well as the provision of training to the beneficiaries that make them satisfied or highly satisfied as these two indicators show values nearest to the critical value of 100%.

**Table 1. Performance of the University per Parameter and Indicator of Organizational Outcome**

| Organizational Outcomes   | Performance (Accomplishment/Target) |         |         |         |      |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|------|
|   | 2020                                | 2021    | 2022    | Mean    | SD   |
| <b>HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM</b>   |                                     |         |         |         |      |
| 1. Percentage of 1st Time licensure exam takers that pass the licensure exams   | 142.37%                             | 100.18% | 108.07% | 116.87% | 0.22 |
| 2. Percentage of graduates (2 years prior) that are employed  | 101.18%                             | 105.29% | 107.70% | 104.72% | 0.03 |
| 3. Percentage of undergraduate student population enrolled in CHED-identified and RDC-identified priority programs                              | 168.96%                             | 135.74% | 105.16% | 136.62% | 0.32 |
| 4. Percentage of undergraduate programs with Accreditation  | 102.41%                             | 104.17% | 107.53% | 104.70% | 0.03 |
| <b>RESEARCH PROGRAM</b>   |                                     |         |         |         |      |
| 1. Number of Research output in the last three years utilized by the industry or by other beneficiaries   | 300.00%                             | 216.67% | 150.00% | 222.22% | 0.75 |
| 2. Number of research outputs completed within a year   | 100.00%                             | 112.59% | 120.44% | 111.01% | 0.10 |
| 3. Percentage of research outputs published in internationally- refereed or CHED-recognized journals within the year                            | 107.25%                             | 191.70% | 225.65% | 174.87% | 0.61 |
| <b>TECHNICAL ADVISORY EXTENSION PROGRAM</b>   |                                     |         |         |         |      |
| 1. Number of active partnership with LGUs, Industries, NGOs, NGAs, SMEs, and other stakeholders as a result of extension activities             | 105.14%                             | 101.14% | 104.57% | 103.62% | 0.02 |
| 2. Number of trainees weighted by the length of training  | 175.15%                             | 137.04% | 156.41% | 156.20% | 0.19 |
| 3. Number of extension programs organized and supported consistent with the SUCs mandated and priority programs                                 | 106.38%                             | 389.36% | 357.45% | 284.40% | 1.55 |
| 4. Percentage of beneficiaries who rate the training course/s and advisory services as satisfactory or higher in terms of quality and relevance | 100.00%                             | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 0.00 |

### Summary of Performance of the University per Parameter of Organizational Outcome

Based on the data presented in the table, the overall performance of the university for the fiscal year 2020 exceeded 100% by 39.83%. Similarly, the performance for FY 2021 and 2022 exceeded the expected target by more than 50%. The data also revealed that in 2020-2021, the research performances of the university ranked first while in 2022, the extension performances of the university ranked first. While the higher education performance (instruction) ranked third in the three consecutive fiscal years, the performances surpassed the targeted 100% accomplishment in all its indicators. Results show the attention given by the university in research development and extension (RDE) which provides a large and significant contribution to the attainment of the overall organizational outcomes of the university. Based on the data also, the university has obtained an overall performance that is almost 50% of its targets for the three fiscal years.

# Evaluating Organizational Outcomes (Oos) of One State University in the Philippines: Basis for Policy Recommendation and Adoption

**Table 2. Summary of Performance of the University per Parameter of Organizational Outcome**

| Organizational Outcomes                     | Performance (Accomplishment/Target) |         |         |         |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
|   | FY 2020                             | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Average |
| <b>HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM</b>             | 128.73%                             | 111.35% | 107.12% | 115.73% |
| <b>RESEARCH PROGRAM</b>                     | 169.08%                             | 173.65% | 165.36% | 169.36% |
| <b>TECHNICAL ADVISORY EXTENSION PROGRAM</b> | 121.67%                             | 181.89% | 179.61% | 161.06% |
| <b>Overall</b>                              | 139.83%                             | 155.63% | 150.69% | 148.72% |

## Test of Difference on the Performances of the University from 2020 to 2022

Differences on the performances of the university from 2020-2022 using one-way analysis of variance (Anova). Results show that the performances of the university in all its organizational outcome indicators have been the same from 2020 up to 2022. This result reveals the consistent performances of the university from 2020-2022 given the scenario that COVID-19 struck the country in the first quarter of 2020. The findings also reveal that despite challenges in performing its mandates, the university was able to show its resiliency by surpassing its annual target (as reflected in the GAA). As to document analysis, the university was awarded as the recipient of the Performance-Based Bonus (PBB 2020) given the situation that the COVID-19 pandemic has affected a large portion of the education sector. The Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) is one of the results that a certain organization has met its performance targets. While some higher education institutions consider the pandemic as a huge barrier to the sustainability of their performances, the university where the study was conducted, has shown its resiliency amidst adversity.

**Table 3. Test of Difference on the Performances of the University from 2020 to 2022**

| Groups | Average | Variance | F-value | p-value | Difference      |
|--------|---------|----------|---------|---------|-----------------|
| 2020   | 1.372   | 0.371    | 0.142   | 0.86    | Not Significant |
| 2021   | 1.540   | 0.765    |         |         |                 |
| 2022   | 1.494   | 0.616    |         |         |                 |

## DISCUSSIONS

### V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The university has shown remarkable performances from 2020-2022 as reflected on the reports in higher education program (instruction), research program, and extension program in which for the past three years, the university strived more on research capability and outputs. There are some areas in the three major programs of the university that need to be provided with special attention as these are part of the critical area where if overlooked, may cause non-achievement of the overall organizational outcomes of the university. Given the scenario, the university may provide special attention to the following by implementing policy interventions: employment of graduates; accreditation of undergraduate programs; completed research outputs; partnerships, and satisfaction of beneficiaries on the training course/s provided by the university.

## REFERENCES

- 1) Alam, S., Ridjal, S., Jumady, E., & Idris, A. (2023). Does Incentives and Job Satisfaction Improve Employee Performance?. *Enrichment: Journal of Management*, 12(6), 5161-5168.
- 2) Albina, A. C., & Sumagaysay, L. P. (2020). Employability tracer study of Information Technology Education graduates from a state university in the Philippines. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 2(1), 100055.
- 3) Cuadra, L. J., Aure, M. R. K. L., & Gonzaga, G. L. (2019). The use of tracer study in improving undergraduate programs in the university. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal (APHERJ)*, 6(1).
- 4) Daniel, C. O. (2019). Effects of incentives on employees productivity. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management*, 4(1).
- 5) Gamuza, E. V., & Pacolor, E. T. (2019). Research productivity of SUC managers in Eastern Visayas, Philippines, and their leadership orientation. *Journal of Academic Research*, 4(3), 23-30.
- 6) GANNAPAO, J. S. (2020). Rationalizing the Extension Programs of Abra State Institute of Sciences and Technology. *IAMURE International Journal of Ecology and Conservation*, 31(1), 1-1.
- 7) Kadir, A., AlHosani, A. H., Ismail, F., & Sehan, N. (2019, September). The effect of compensation and benefits towards employee performance. In *Proceedings of the 1st Asian Conference on Humanities, Industry, and Technology for Society, ACHITS 2019, 30-31 July 2019, Surabaya, Indonesia*.
- 8) Kalaw, M. T. B. (2019). Tracer Study of Bachelor of Science in Mathematics. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 8(3), 537-548.

## Evaluating Organizational Outcomes (Oos) of One State University in the Philippines: Basis for Policy Recommendation and Adoption

- 9) Llenares, I. I., & Deocarlis, C. C. (2018). Measuring the impact of a community extension program in the Philippines. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 15(1), 35-55.
- 10) Memorandum Circular No. 2022-1. Guidelines on the Grant of the Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) for Fiscal Year 2022 Under Executive Order (EO) No. 80, S. 2021 and EO No. 201, s. 2016 (March 24, 2022)
- 11) Quitaras, M. C. L., & Abuso, J. E. (2021). Best Practices of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) for the Development of Research Culture in the Philippines. *Pedagogical Research*, 6(1).
- 12) Robinson, K. L. (2004). *The impact of individual differences on the relationship between employee perceptions of organizational justice and organizational outcome variables*. Alliant International University, San Diego.
- 13) Rogayan, D. V. (2019). Retrospective Evaluation of the Science Education Program in a Philippine State University. *Online Submission*, 8(7), 352-369.
- 14) Roman, A.G.& Villanueva, R.U. (2023). Graduate Employment Rate of One State University of the CALABARZON Region in Philippines: A Retrospection. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*. 12(2). doi:10.11591/ijere.v12i2.24795
- 15) Sitopu, Y. B., Sijinjak, K. A., & Marpaung, F. K. (2021). The Influence of Motivation, Work Discipline, and Compensation on Employee Performance. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 1(2), 72-83.