
Awareness, Acceptance and Perception of Batangas State University Stakeholders towards its Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives

Romer C. Castillo, M.Sc.^{a*}

^aFaculty Researcher, Batangas State University, Rizal Avenue, Batangas City 4200, Philippines

^aEmail: romercastillo@rocketmail.com

Abstract

This study determines the awareness of the stakeholders on the vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO) and how these are disseminated; evaluates the stakeholders' understanding and acceptance of the VMGO; and assesses the perceptions of the stakeholders with regards to VMGO's clarity and consistency, congruency to activities, practices, projects and operations, and attainability. It uses a descriptive type of research using survey approach, with a stakeholder survey questionnaire to gather data, and employs the SPSS for the statistical analysis. Results show that the stakeholders are generally aware, understand and accept the VMGO. The study also reveals that the stakeholders generally perceive that the VMGO are clearly stated, consistent with each other, congruent to educational practices or activities, and attainable. It also shows that the internal stakeholders, especially the administrators and faculty members, are much aware, understand and accept the VMGO than the external stakeholders. It further shows that respondents from Business Administration and Tourism Management programs are more aware, understand and accept the VMGO than the respondents from Hotel and Restaurant Management, Customs Administration, Accounting Management and Accountancy programs.

Keywords: vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO); awareness, acceptance and perception; internal stakeholders; external stakeholders; clarity and consistency; congruency; attainability

1. Introduction

The vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO) should be the bases of a state university's operations. If a college or university is seeking accreditation, the area of VMGO is the most fundamental of all the areas to be surveyed. Everything in the university is justified only to the extent that it realizes its VMGO [1].

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +639192591573.
E-mail address: romercastillo@rocketmail.com

Mission and vision are statements on the long-term view of the institution of itself and of the world within which it operates, including the fundamental purpose of its existence, its long-term role and stature, and what it does to achieve this purpose and how it would like to play its role. Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe the career and professional accomplishments that the program is preparing graduates to achieve within three to five years of graduation and these are based on the needs of the program's constituencies [2].

All academic units (i.e., schools and colleges) of a University must have goals that are consistent with the University's vision and mission; and all programs under an academic unit must have objectives that are consistent with the goals of the academic unit. The College of Accountancy, Business, Economics and International Hospitality Management (CABEIHM), one of the biggest colleges of Batangas State University (BatStateU), has its part of fulfilling the mission of the university by producing entrepreneurs and professionals in the field of business, accountancy, hotel and restaurant management, tourism management, customs and public administration. All of its programs aim to produce graduates that can demonstrate competencies in their fields of specialization or chosen careers, and with critical and creative thinking skills, ethical leadership and proper values.

Being at the forefront of outcomes-based education (OBE) in the Philippines, BatStateU's vision and mission statements are outcomes-based, to wit [3]:

Vision: A leading University in the region which shapes a globally competent citizen imbued with moral courage nurtured through values and quality education

Mission: Batangas State University commits to develop productive citizens by providing the highest standard of instruction, research, extension service and production through value-laden learning experiences, community partnerships and internationalization initiatives.

With these vision and mission, BatStateU – CABEIHM is currently shifting into an outcomes-based higher education. Seminar-workshops on outcomes-based approach and consultative meetings as regards various programs' objectives were conducted and participated in by its stakeholders, both internal and external [4].

BatStateU is also continuously seeking accreditation from the Accrediting Agency for Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCUP) for its different programs. Accreditation is a formal recognition of an educational program as possessing certain standards of quality and excellence based upon an analysis of the merits of its educational operation in relation to its VMGO and to its unique role in the community that it serves.

Further, the VMGO needs to be shared in order to be effective and to be attained. And to be shared, it needs to be developed in a collaborative manner [5]. The success of a university depends upon bringing its stakeholders together, both physically and philosophically. The stakeholders need to reconcile differing perspectives, find common ground and create a shared VMGO.

The term *stakeholder* denotes all those individuals or groups who affect, or are affected by an organization and its activities. Stakeholder survey can be very helpful in generating critical information required for performance management and for creating and sustaining organizational change. A stakeholder survey is a questionnaire-based quantitative tool used by organizations to increase their understanding of the knowledge, attitudes, perceptions, interests and experiences of their stakeholders – both internal and external [6].

In view of the foregoing, this research was conducted. Specifically, it sought to:

- determine the awareness of the stakeholders regarding the vision and mission of BatStateU, the goals of CABEIHM, and the objectives of the program where they belong, that is, either BS Business Administration (BSBA), BS Accountancy (BSA), BS Tourism Management (BSTM), BS Hotel and Restaurant Management (BSHRM), BS Customs Administration (BSCA), or BS Accounting Management (BSAM);
- determine the awareness of stakeholders regarding the dissemination of VMGO;

- analyze the stakeholders’ understanding and acceptance of the vision and mission of BatStateU, the goals of CABEIHM, and the objectives of the program where they belong and the responsibilities of realizing such objectives in their own capacities;
- assess the perceptions of the stakeholders with regards to VMGO’s clarity and consistency; its congruency to activities, practices, projects and operations; and its attainability; and
- determine if there are significant differences on the responses of the different groups of stakeholders regarding their awareness on VMGO, understanding and acceptance of the VMGO, and perceptions on VMGO’s attainability.

In this study, the stakeholders are categorized as follows: (a) administrator or faculty member, (b) non-teaching staff, (c) student, (d) parent or guardian, (e) alumni, and (f) from industry, linkage or cooperating agency. They are further clustered into two: internal stakeholders (administrators, faculty members, non-teaching staff, and students) and external stakeholders (parents, guardians, alumni, and those from the industries, linkages and cooperating agencies).

Faculty members, students, parents or guardians, and alumni are also categorized as to what program they generally belong to; but administrators and non-teaching staff are excluded from program categorization since they generally belong to all programs, same as with stakeholders from industries, linkages and cooperating agencies, since they also belong to two or more programs. Although some faculty members are teaching in more than one program, they are categorized as to what program they had most of their teaching loads.

2. Materials and Methods

This study is a descriptive type of research using survey approach. A stakeholder survey questionnaire was used to gather the needed data. The items regarding the awareness, acceptance and perceptions on VMGO included in the survey instrument were based on the 2010 AACUP Revised Instruments [1].

The respondents of the survey are 625 stakeholders broken down as follows: 61 administrators or faculty members, 12 non-teaching staff, 360 students, 82 parents or guardians, 84 alumni, and 26 from industries, linkages or cooperating agencies. The 360 respondent students were equally divided among the six programs: BSBA, BSA, BSTM, BSHRM, BSCA and BSAM. A nonrandom convenience sampling was used; that is, respondents are chosen as to who were readily available. This resulted to 100% responses from internal stakeholders and 91% from external stakeholders.

The gathering of data from the internal stakeholders and some alumni was done by the researcher himself through the help of some colleagues. The distribution and retrieval of survey instruments from the parents or guardians and some alumni was through the students related to them, while those for the industry people was through the on-the-job training (OJT) students and some alumni belonging to a particular company.

The data collected were tabulated and analyzed using SPSS. Appropriate statistical tools were employed in the data analysis. In particular, mean was used to determine the awareness on VMGO, analyze the understanding and acceptance of the VMGO, and assess the perceptions of the stakeholders on VMGO; one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine the differences on the responses of stakeholders when they are grouped according to the type of stakeholders and according to the program where they belong; and independent samples t-test was conducted to determine the differences on the responses of stakeholders when they are grouped according to either internal or external stakeholders. To better understand the quantitative data, the following scale and interpretations were used:

Response	Mean	Awareness	Acceptance	Perception
4	3.50 to 4.00	highly aware	greatly accept	strongly agree
3	2.50 to 3.49	aware	accept	agree
2	1.50 to 2.49	least aware	slightly accept	disagree
1	1.00 to 1.49	not aware	not accept	strongly disagree

3. Results and Discussions

Table 1 shows the number of respondents per category. The researcher believed that the 625 respondents truly represent the population. It was targeted that at least 30% of the respondents are external stakeholders and that all programs have almost equal representations.

Table 1. Number of respondents per category

Category	Frequency	Percent
Internal Stakeholders	433	69.3
External Stakeholders	192	30.7
<i>Total</i>	<i>625</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Administrator / Faculty	61	9.8
Non-teaching Staff	12	1.9
Student	360	57.6
Parent / Guardian	82	13.1
Alumni	84	13.4
Industry / Linkage / Cooperating Agency	26	4.2
<i>Total</i>	<i>625</i>	<i>100.0</i>
BSBA	109	18.6
BSA	96	16.6
BSTM	92	15.7
BSHRM	101	17.3
BSCA	92	15.7
BSAM	95	16.2
<i>Total</i>	<i>585</i>	<i>100.0</i>

3.1. Awareness of the stakeholders regarding the vision, mission, goals and objectives

Table 2 shows that the internal stakeholders are generally aware of the VMGO. The administrators and faculty members are highly aware of the vision and mission of BatStateU and goals of CABEIHM and aware of the objectives of the program where they belong. The non-teaching staffs are highly aware of the vision and mission of BatStateU, the goals of CABEIHM, and the objectives of all programs. The students are also aware of the vision, mission, goals and objectives.

All the three groups of respondents have the highest mean on the awareness on vision and mission. The lowest mean for faculty/administrator is on the awareness of program objectives while the lowest mean for both the non-teaching staff and student is on the awareness on the goals of the college.

Table 2. Awareness on the VMGO of internal stakeholders

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Faculty / Administrator (n = 61)	Non-teaching Staff (n = 12)	Student (n = 360)	
I am aware of the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	3.74	3.75	3.44	3.49
I am aware of the Goals of CABEIHM	3.62	3.50	3.10	3.18
I am aware of the Objectives of the Program where I belong	3.49	3.58	3.11	3.18
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.62</i>	<i>3.61</i>	<i>3.21</i>	<i>3.28</i>

Table 3 shows that the external stakeholders are also generally aware of the vision and mission of BatStateU, the goals of CABEIHM and the objectives of each program. The alumni are highly aware of the vision and mission of the University and aware of the goals of the College and objectives of their programs.

The parents or guardians and the respondents from the industry, linkage or cooperating agency are aware of the vision, mission, goals and objectives with the highest mean on the awareness on vision and mission and the lowest mean on the awareness on program objectives, for both groups. The lowest mean for the alumni is also on the awareness on program objectives.

Table 3. Awareness on the VMGO of external stakeholders

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Parent / Guardian (n = 82)	Alumni (n = 84)	Industry/ Linkage / Cooperating Agency (n = 26)	
I am aware of the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	3.07	3.52	3.19	3.29
I am aware of the Goals of CABEIHM	2.90	3.17	2.88	3.02
I am aware of the Objectives of the Program where I belong	2.87	3.11	2.77	2.96
<i>Overall</i>	2.95	3.27	2.95	3.09

Table 4 shows that the respondents from all programs are generally aware of the vision and mission of BatStateU, the goals of CABEIHM and the objectives of their specific programs. All groups, except BSCA, have their highest means on the awareness on vision and mission and lowest means on the awareness on program objectives. The BSCA group has the highest mean on the awareness on program objectives and the lowest mean on the awareness on the goals of CABEIHM.

On the awareness on vision and mission, the highest mean belongs to BSHRM and the lowest, to BSCA; on the awareness on goals, the highest belongs to BSBA and BSTM and the lowest, to BSA; and on the awareness on program objectives, the highest belongs to BSCA and the lowest, to BSA and BSHRM.

Table 4. Awareness on the VMGO of stakeholders from each program

Statement	Mean						Weighted Mean
	BSBA (n=109)	BSA (n=96)	BSTM (n=92)	BSHRM (n=101)	BSCA (n=92)	BSAM (n=95)	
I am aware of the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	3.52	3.55	3.42	3.57	3.13	3.33	3.43
I am aware of the Goals of CABEIHM	3.20	2.99	3.20	3.19	3.04	3.16	3.13
I am aware of the Objectives of the Program where I belong	3.14	2.94	3.13	2.94	3.45	3.11	3.11
<i>Overall</i>	3.29	3.16	3.25	3.23	3.20	3.20	3.22

3.2. Awareness of the stakeholders regarding the VMGO dissemination

Regarding the dissemination of the vision, mission, goals and objectives, Table 5 shows that the internal stakeholders are generally aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards; printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials; broadcast in media and/or internet or website; and widely disseminated to the different agencies, institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole.

Table 5. Awareness on the VMGO dissemination of internal stakeholders

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Faculty / Administrator (n = 61)	Non-teaching Staff (n = 12)	Student (n = 360)	
I am aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards	3.82	3.92	3.65	3.68
I am aware that the VMGO are printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials	3.69	3.42	3.34	3.39
I am aware that the VMGO are broadcast in media and/or internet / website	3.43	3.17	2.99	3.05
I am aware that the VMGO are widely disseminated to the different agencies, institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole	3.49	2.92	2.77	2.88
<i>Overall</i>	3.61	3.35	3.18	3.25

The highest weighted mean is on the awareness that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards and the lowest is on the awareness that the VMGO are widely disseminated to different agencies, institutions, industry and community.

Table 6 shows that the external stakeholders are also generally aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards; printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials; broadcast in media and/or internet or website; and widely disseminated to the different agencies, institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole. The highest weighted mean is also on the awareness that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards but the lowest is on the awareness that the VMGO are broadcast in media and/or internet or website.

Table 6. Awareness on the VMGO dissemination of external stakeholders

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Parent / Guardian (n = 82)	Alumni (n = 84)	Industry/ Linkage / Cooperating Agency (n = 26)	
I am aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards	3.22	3.79	3.46	3.50
I am aware that the VMGO are printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials	3.11	3.52	3.31	3.32
I am aware that the VMGO are broadcast in media and/or internet / website	2.70	3.00	3.15	2.89
I am aware that the VMGO are widely disseminated to the different agencies, institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole	2.78	3.26	3.12	3.04
<i>Overall</i>	2.95	3.39	3.26	3.19

Table 7 also shows that the stakeholders from each program are generally aware that the VMGO are disseminated in various forms or media. All groups have the highest mean on the awareness that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards and the lowest mean on the awareness that the VMGO are widely disseminated to different agencies, institutions, industries and the community.

Table 7. Awareness on the VMGO dissemination of stakeholders from each program

Statement	Mean						Weighted Mean
	BSBA (n=109)	BSA (n=96)	BSTM (n=92)	BSHRM (n=101)	BSCA (n=92)	BSAM (n=95)	
I am aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards	3.69	3.66	3.79	3.64	3.50	3.45	3.62
I am aware that the VMGO are printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials	3.53	3.15	3.39	3.50	3.22	3.37	3.37
I am aware that the VMGO are broadcast in media and/or internet / website	3.03	2.96	3.08	3.03	2.76	3.07	2.99
I am aware that the VMGO are widely disseminated to the different agencies, Institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole	3.02	2.78	2.92	2.97	2.76	3.00	2.91
<i>Overall</i>	3.32	3.14	3.30	3.29	3.06	3.22	3.22

3.3. Understanding and acceptance of the VMGO by the stakeholders

Table 8 shows that the internal stakeholders generally understand and accept the vision and mission of BatStateU, the goals of CABEIHM and the program objectives, together with the responsibility of realizing such objectives in their own capacities. The faculty members / administrators greatly accept the vision, mission, goals and objectives. The non-teaching staffs greatly accept the vision and mission and accept the goals, the objectives and the responsibility or realizing such objectives. The students also greatly accept the vision and mission and also accept the goals and program objectives. The three groups have their highest means on the acceptance of the vision and mission and the lowest means on the acceptance of the program objectives.

Table 8. Understanding and acceptance of the VMGO by internal stakeholders

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Faculty / Administrator (n = 61)	Non-teaching Staff (n = 12)	Student (n = 360)	
I understand and accept the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	3.77	3.58	3.62	3.64
I understand and accept the Goals of CABEIHM	3.75	3.42	3.34	3.40
I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program where I belong and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in my own capacity	3.69	3.25	3.34	3.39
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.74</i>	<i>3.42</i>	<i>3.44</i>	<i>3.48</i>

Table 9 shows that the external stakeholders, as well, generally understand and accept the vision, mission, goals and objectives. The highest weighted mean is on the acceptance of vision and mission and the lowest, on the acceptance of the program objectives.

Table 9. Understanding and acceptance of the VMGO by external stakeholders

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Parent / Guardian (n = 82)	Alumni (n = 84)	Industry/ Linkage / Cooperating Agency (n = 26)	
I understand and accept the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	3.29	3.69	3.27	3.46
I understand and accept the Goals of CABEIHM	3.07	3.54	2.85	3.24
I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program where I belong and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in my own capacity	3.16	3.39	2.81	3.21
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.17</i>	<i>3.54</i>	<i>2.97</i>	<i>3.31</i>

Stakeholders from the different programs also generally understand and accept the vision, mission, goals and objectives as shown in Table 10. The BSBA respondents greatly accept the vision and mission, as well as, the goals and objectives. The BSA, BSTM and BSHRM respondents greatly accept the vision and mission and accept the goals and objectives. The BSCA and BSAM respondents accept the vision, mission, goals and objectives. The weighted mean is highest on the acceptance of the vision and mission and lowest on the acceptance of program objectives.

Table 10. Understanding and acceptance of the VMGO by stakeholders from each program

Statement	Mean						Weighted Mean
	BSBA (n=109)	BSA (n=96)	BSTM (n=92)	BSHRM (n=101)	BSCA (n=92)	BSAM (n=95)	
I understand and accept the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	3.70	3.69	3.70	3.72	3.36	3.40	3.60
I understand and accept the Goals of CABEIHM	3.64	3.28	3.42	3.41	3.14	3.31	3.37
I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program where I belong and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in my own capacity	3.51	3.31	3.28	3.25	3.47	3.32	3.36
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.62</i>	<i>3.43</i>	<i>3.47</i>	<i>3.46</i>	<i>3.32</i>	<i>3.34</i>	<i>3.44</i>

3.4. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding VMGO’s clarity and consistency; congruency to activities, practices, projects and operations; and attainability

As shown in Table 11, the internal stakeholders generally believe that the vision, mission, goals and objectives are clearly stated and consistent with each other. The faculty members and administrators strongly agree on the clarity

and consistency of the VMGO. The non-teaching staffs also strongly agree on the clarity of the vision and of the goals and its consistency with the mission and agree on the clarity of the mission and of the program objectives and its consistency with the goals.

The faculty members and administrators have the highest mean on the perception that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future and that the program objectives are consistent with the goals of CABEIHM. The non-teaching staffs have the highest mean on the perception that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future and that the goals of CABEIHM are clearly stated and are consistent with the mission of BatStateU. The students have also the highest mean on the perception that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future.

Table 11. Perceptions of internal stakeholders regarding VMGO’s clarity and consistency

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Faculty / Administrator (n = 61)	Non-teaching Staff (n = 12)	Student (n = 360)	
The Vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future	3.79	3.58	3.46	3.51
The Mission clearly reflects BatStateU’s legal and educational mandate	3.77	3.42	3.36	3.42
The Goals of CABEIHM are clearly stated and are consistent with the Mission of BatStateU	3.75	3.58	3.20	3.29
The Program Objectives are consistent with the Goals of CABEIHM	3.79	3.25	3.16	3.25
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of competencies or technical skills of students and graduates	3.64	3.08	3.27	3.32
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of research and extension capabilities of students and graduates	3.72	3.25	3.19	3.27
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of students’ own ideas, desirable attitudes and personal discipline	3.62	3.42	3.22	3.28
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of moral character	3.64	3.25	3.27	3.32
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of critical thinking skills	3.62	3.42	3.19	3.26
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of aesthetic and cultural values	3.66	3.00	3.23	3.28
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.70</i>	<i>3.33</i>	<i>3.26</i>	<i>3.32</i>

Table 12 shows that the external stakeholders generally believe, as well, that the vision, mission, goals and objectives are clearly stated and consistent with each other. The alumni strongly agree that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future and that the mission clearly reflects BatStateU’s legal and educational mandate. They also agree on the clarity of the goals of CABEIHM and its consistency with the mission and on the clarity of the program objectives and its consistency with the goals. The parents or guardians, as well as, the respondents from the industry, linkage or cooperating agency also agree with the clarity and consistency of the vision, mission, goals and objectives.

The next Table 13 shows that the stakeholders from different programs generally believe that the vision, mission, goals and objectives are clearly stated and consistent with each other. All groups have their highest means on the perception that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future.

The BSBA and BSHRM respondents strongly agree that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future and that the mission clearly reflects BatStateU’s legal and educational mandate and agree on the clarity of goals and its consistency with the mission, as well as, on the clarity of the program objectives and its consistency with the goals.

Table 12. Perceptions of external stakeholders regarding VMGO's clarity and consistency

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Parent / Guardian (n = 82)	Alumni (n = 84)	Industry/ Linkage / Cooperating Agency (n = 26)	
The Vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future	3.30	3.50	3.38	3.40
The Mission clearly reflects BatStateU's legal and educational mandate	3.20	3.54	3.38	3.37
The Goals of CABEIHM are clearly stated and are consistent with the Mission of BatStateU	3.05	3.25	3.15	3.15
The Program Objectives are consistent with the Goals of CABEIHM	3.09	3.20	3.04	3.13
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of competencies or technical skills of students and graduates	3.21	3.37	3.23	3.28
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of research and extension capabilities of students and graduates	3.10	3.25	3.12	3.21
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of students' own ideas, desirable attitudes and personal discipline	3.09	3.31	3.08	3.18
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of moral character	3.27	3.40	3.27	3.33
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of critical thinking skills	2.98	3.37	3.04	3.16
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of aesthetic and cultural values	3.04	3.45	2.88	3.20
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.13</i>	<i>3.37</i>	<i>3.16</i>	<i>3.24</i>

All the other groups of respondent from BSA, BSTM, BSCA and BSAM agree on the clarity and consistency of the vision, mission, goals and objectives.

Table 13. Perceptions of stakeholders from each program regarding VMGO's clarity and consistency

Statement	Mean						Weighted Mean
	BSBA (n=109)	BSA (n=96)	BSTM (n=92)	BSHRM (n=101)	BSCA (n=92)	BSAM (n=95)	
The Vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future	3.64	3.49	3.42	3.57	3.36	3.35	3.48
The Mission clearly reflects BatStateU's legal and educational mandate	3.61	3.47	3.33	3.51	3.13	3.32	3.40
The Goals of CABEIHM are clearly stated and are consistent with the Mission of BatStateU	3.48	3.07	3.35	3.27	3.01	3.23	3.24
The Program Objectives are consistent with the Goals of CABEIHM	3.43	3.19	3.26	3.19	3.10	3.11	3.22
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of competencies or technical skills of students and graduates	3.44	3.34	3.25	3.43	3.16	3.21	3.31
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of research and extension capabilities of students and graduates	3.42	3.21	3.28	3.37	3.10	3.11	3.25
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of students' own ideas, desirable attitudes and personal discipline	3.40	3.18	3.23	3.47	3.09	3.13	3.25
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of moral character	3.50	3.25	3.34	3.48	3.18	3.15	3.32
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of critical thinking skills	3.35	3.21	3.23	3.39	3.11	3.07	3.23
The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of aesthetic and cultural values	3.40	3.24	3.32	3.43	3.14	3.11	3.28
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.47</i>	<i>3.26</i>	<i>3.30</i>	<i>3.41</i>	<i>3.14</i>	<i>3.18</i>	<i>3.30</i>

The internal stakeholders, as shown in Table 14, generally perceive that there is congruency between actual educational practices or activities and the mission, goals and objectives. They also believe that the projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of program outcomes and that the VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU’s operations.

Table 14. Perceptions of internal stakeholders regarding VMGO’s congruency with activities, practices, projects and operations

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Faculty / Administrator (n = 61)	Non-teaching Staff (n = 12)	Student (n = 360)	
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Mission of BatStateU	3.48	3.33	3.18	3.23
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Goals of CABEIHM	3.57	3.42	3.18	3.24
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Objectives of the Program where I belong	3.61	3.25	3.29	3.33
The projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of the program outcomes	3.74	3.25	3.31	3.37
The VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU’s operations	3.74	3.58	3.35	3.41
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.63</i>	<i>3.37</i>	<i>3.26</i>	<i>3.32</i>

As shown in Table 15, the external stakeholders also perceive that there is congruency between actual educational practices or activities and the mission, goals and objectives. They further believe that the projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of program outcomes and that the VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU’s operations.

Table 15. Perceptions of external stakeholders regarding VMGO’s congruency with activities, practices, projects and operations

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Parent / Guardian (n = 82)	Alumni (n = 84)	Industry/ Linkage / Cooperating Agency (n = 26)	
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Mission of BatStateU	3.12	3.44	2.96	3.24
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Goals of CABEIHM	3.07	3.24	3.19	3.16
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Objectives of the Program where I belong	2.96	3.24	3.19	3.11
The projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of the program outcomes	3.20	3.64	3.12	3.38
The VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU’s operations	3.30	3.62	3.38	3.45
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.13</i>	<i>3.44</i>	<i>3.17</i>	<i>3.27</i>

Table 16 shows that the stakeholders from the different programs generally perceive that there is congruency between the educational practices or activities and the mission, goals and objectives. They likewise believe that the projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of program outcomes and that the VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU’s operations.

Further, respondents from BSBA strongly agree that the projects and activities carried out by faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of their program outcomes. BSBA and BSHRM respondents also strongly agree that the VMGO are the bases of BatStateU’s operations.

Table 16. Perceptions of stakeholders from each program regarding VMGO’s congruency with activities, practices, projects and operations

Statement	Mean						Weighted Mean
	BSBA (n=109)	BSA (n=96)	BSTM (n=92)	BSHRM (n=101)	BSCA (n=92)	BSAM (n=95)	
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Mission of BatStateU	3.32	3.23	3.24	3.33	3.11	3.19	3.24
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Goals of CABEIHM	3.38	3.09	3.27	3.27	3.10	3.13	3.21
There is congruency between actual educational practices and activities and the Objectives of the Program where I belong	3.36	3.17	3.26	3.31	3.42	3.06	3.26
The projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of the program outcomes	3.60	3.28	3.20	3.46	3.46	3.29	3.39
The VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU’s operations	3.58	3.33	3.37	3.54	3.29	3.36	3.42
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.45</i>	<i>3.22</i>	<i>3.27</i>	<i>3.38</i>	<i>3.28</i>	<i>3.21</i>	<i>3.30</i>

The VMGO are being attained, achieved or realized. This is the general belief of BatStateU stakeholders as shown in Table 17, 18 and 19.

Table 17 shows that the internal stakeholders generally agree that the program objectives are being attained, the goals of CABEIHM are being achieved, and the vision and mission of BatStateU are being realized, with the faculty members and administrators having the highest overall mean and the students having the lowest.

Table 17. Perceptions of internal stakeholders regarding VMGO’s attainability

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Faculty / Administrator (n = 61)	Non-teaching Staff (n = 12)	Student (n = 360)	
The Objectives of the Program where I belong are being attained	3.61	3.58	3.18	3.25
The Goals of CABEIHM are being achieved	3.69	3.42	3.10	3.19
The Vision and Mission of BatStateU are being realized	3.79	3.58	3.33	3.40
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.69</i>	<i>3.53</i>	<i>3.21</i>	<i>3.28</i>

Table 18 shows that the external stakeholders generally agree that the program objectives are being attained, the goals of CABEIHM are being achieved, and the vision and mission of BatStateU are being realized, with the alumni having the highest overall mean and the parents or guardians having the lowest.

Table 18. Perceptions of external stakeholders regarding VMGO’s attainability

Statement	Mean			Weighted Mean
	Parent / Guardian (n = 82)	Alumni (n = 84)	Industry/ Linkage / Cooperating Agency (n = 26)	
The Objectives of the Program where I belong are being attained	3.10	3.33	3.04	3.19
The Goals of CABEIHM are being achieved	3.01	3.37	3.23	3.20
The Vision and Mission of BatStateU are being realized	3.26	3.37	3.35	3.32
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.12</i>	<i>3.36</i>	<i>3.21</i>	<i>3.24</i>

Table 19 shows that the stakeholders from different programs generally agree that the program objectives are being attained, the goals of CABEIHM are being achieved, and the vision and mission of BatStateU are being realized, with the BSBA having the highest overall mean and the BSCA having the lowest. Further, the BSCA has the highest mean on the attainability of program objectives while all the other programs have the highest mean on the realization of the vision and mission.

Table 19. Perceptions of stakeholders from each program regarding VMGO’s attainability

Statement	Mean						Weighted Mean
	BSBA (n=109)	BSA (n=96)	BSTM (n=92)	BSHRM (n=101)	BSCA (n=92)	BSAM (n=95)	
The Objectives of the Program where I belong are being attained	3.30	3.06	3.29	3.27	3.38	3.09	3.23
The Goals of CABEIHM are being achieved	3.39	3.02	3.32	3.27	3.00	3.08	3.18
The Vision and Mission of BatStateU are being realized	3.52	3.53	3.46	3.54	2.91	3.21	3.37
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3.40</i>	<i>3.20</i>	<i>3.36</i>	<i>3.36</i>	<i>3.10</i>	<i>3.13</i>	<i>3.26</i>

3.5. Differences on the stakeholders’ awareness on VMGO, understanding and acceptance of the VMGO, and perceptions on VMGO’s attainability

As shown in Table 20, there is a significant difference between the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their awareness on the vision, mission, goals and objectives. In particular, the internal stakeholders are much aware of the VMGO than the external stakeholders.

Table 20. t-Test on the differences on the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their awareness on VMGO, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Internal / External	n	Mean	t	Sig
I am aware of the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	Internal	433	3.49	3.820	.000
	External	192	3.29		
I am aware of the Goals of CABEIHM	Internal	433	3.18	3.325	.001
	External	192	3.02		
I am aware of the Objectives of the Program where I belong	Internal	433	3.18	3.803	.000
	External	192	2.96		
<i>Overall</i>	Internal	433	3.28	4.715	.000
	External	192	3.09		

Table 21 shows that there is also a significant difference among the responses of the different stakeholders categorized as to either they are faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff, students, parents or guardians, alumni, or from industry, linkage or cooperating agency regarding the awareness on the vision, mission, goals and objectives. Looking back at Table 2 and Table 3, the faculty members and administrators are very much aware than the parents or guardians and the industry people. The order from highest to lowest overall mean is as follows: faculty/administrator (3.62), non-teaching staff (3.61), alumni (3.27), students (3.21), parents/guardians (2.95) and industry sector (2.95).

Table 21. ANOVA on the differences on the responses of the different type of stakeholders regarding their awareness on VMGO, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Sources	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig
I am aware of the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	Between Groups	19.655	3.931	10.348	.000
	Within Groups	235.136	.380		
	Total	254.790			
I am aware of the Goals of CABEIHM	Between Groups	22.776	4.555	12.451	.000
	Within Groups	226.465	.366		
	Total	249.242			
I am aware of the Objectives of the Program where I belong	Between Groups	19.489	3.898	8.045	.000
	Within Groups	299.894	.484		
	Total	319.382			
<i>Overall</i>	Between Groups	19.674	3.935	19.000	.000
	Within Groups	128.190	.207		
	Total	147.864			

Table 22 shows that there is no significant difference on the overall mean of the responses of the stakeholders regarding the awareness on the vision, mission, goals and objectives when they are categorized according to what program they generally belong to. However, there is a significant difference on the responses regarding their awareness on vision and mission, as well as, regarding their awareness on their specific program objectives; and there is no significant difference on the responses regarding their awareness on the goals of CABEIHM. Looking back at Table 4, the order from highest to lowest overall mean is as follows: BSBA (3.29), BSTM (3.25), BSHRM (3.23), BSCA (3.20), BSAM (3.20) and BSA (3.16).

Table 22. ANOVA on the differences on the responses of the stakeholders from different programs regarding their awareness on VMGO, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Sources	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig
I am aware of the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	Between Groups	13.751	2.750	6.881	.000
	Within Groups	231.412	.400		
	Total	245.162			
I am aware of the Goals of CABEIHM	Between Groups	3.954	.791	1.966	.082
	Within Groups	232.911	.402		
	Total	236.865			
I am aware of the Objectives of the Program where I belong	Between Groups	16.239	3.248	6.522	.000
	Within Groups	288.315	.498		
	Total	304.554			
<i>Overall</i>	Between Groups	1.009	.202	.850	.514
	Within Groups	137.323	.237		
	Total	138.332			

As shown in Table 23, there is also a significant difference between the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO. In particular, the internal stakeholders understand and accept the VMGO more than the external stakeholders.

Table 23. t-Test on the differences on the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Internal / External	n	Mean	t	Sig
I understand and accept the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	Internal	433	3.64	3.360	.001
	External	192	3.46		
I understand and accept the Goals of CABEIHM	Internal	433	3.40	2.869	.004
	External	192	3.24		
I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program where I belong and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in my own capacity	Internal	433	3.39	3.255	.001
	External	192	3.21		
<i>Overall</i>	Internal	433	3.48	4.025	.000
	External	192	3.31		

Likewise, Table 24 shows that there is a significant difference on the responses of stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO when they are grouped according to either they are faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff, students, parents or guardians, alumni, or from industry, linkage or cooperating agency.

Looking back at Table 8 and Table 9, the faculty members and administrators are very much aware than the respondents from industry, linkage or cooperating agency. The order from highest to lowest overall mean is as follows: faculty/administrator (3.74), alumni (3.54), students (3.44), non-teaching staff (3.42), parents/guardians (3.17) and industry sector (2.97).

Table 24. ANOVA on the differences on the responses of the different type of stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Sources	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig
I understand and accept the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	Between Groups	13.060	2.612	8.308	.000
	Within Groups	194.611	.314		
	Total	207.670			
I understand and accept the Goals of CABEIHM	Between Groups	25.790	5.158	13.682	.000
	Within Groups	233.355	.377		
	Total	259.146			
I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program where I belong and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in my own capacity	Between Groups	17.806	3.561	9.435	.000
	Within Groups	233.634	.377		
	Total	251.440			
<i>Overall</i>	Between Groups	17.528	3.506	16.016	.000
	Within Groups	135.485	.219		
	Total	153.013			

As shown in Table 25, there is a significant difference on the responses of the stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO when they are grouped according to the program they generally belong to. Looking back at Table 10, the order from highest to lowest overall mean is as follows: BSBA (3.62), BSTM (3.47), BSHRM (3.46), BSA (3.43), BSAM (3.34) and BSCA (3.32).

Table 25. ANOVA on the differences on the responses of the stakeholders from different programs regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Sources	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig
I understand and accept the Vision and Mission of BatStateU	Between Groups	13.285	2.657	8.580	.000
	Within Groups	179.313	.310		
	Total	192.598			
I understand and accept the Goals of CABEIHM	Between Groups	14.429	2.886	7.374	.000
	Within Groups	226.586	.391		
	Total	241.015			
I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program where I belong and the responsibility of realizing such objectives in my own capacity	Between Groups	5.868	1.174	3.024	.011
	Within Groups	224.747	.388		
	Total	230.615			
<i>Overall</i>	Between Groups	5.769	1.154	5.029	.000
	Within Groups	132.860	.229		
	Total	138.629			

As shown in Table 26, there is no significant difference between the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their perceptions on the attainability of the VMGO. The mean responses of the two groups are almost equal and the two groups of stakeholders both believe that the program objectives are being attained, the goals are being achieved and the vision and mission are being realized.

Table 26. t-Test on the differences on the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their perceptions on VMGO's attainability, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Internal / External	n	Mean	t	Sig
The Objectives of the Program where I belong are being attained	Internal	433	3.25	1.319	.188
	External	192	3.19		
The Goals of CABEIHM are being achieved	Internal	433	3.19	-.118	.906
	External	192	3.20		
The Vision and Mission of BatStateU are being realized	Internal	433	3.40	1.671	.095
	External	192	3.32		
<i>Overall</i>	Internal	433	3.28	1.221	.223
	External	192	3.24		

However, Table 27 shows that there is a significant difference among the responses of the stakeholders regarding their perceptions on the attainability of the VMGO when they are grouped according to either they are faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff, students, parents or guardians, alumni, or from industry, linkage or cooperating agency. As seen in Table 17 and Table 18, the order from highest to lowest overall mean is as follows:

faculty/administrator (3.69), non-teaching staff (3.53), alumni (3.36), students (3.21), industry sector (3.21) and parents/guardians (3.12).

Table 27. ANOVA on the differences on the responses of the different type of stakeholders regarding their perceptions on VMGO's attainability, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Sources	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig
The Objectives of the Program where I belong are being attained	Between Groups	14.204	2.841	9.867	.000
	Within Groups	178.222	.288		
	Total	192.426			
The Goals of CABEIHM are being achieved	Between Groups	24.013	4.803	14.462	.000
	Within Groups	205.561	.332		
	Total	229.574			
The Vision and Mission of BatStateU are being realized	Between Groups	12.764	2.553	7.253	.000
	Within Groups	217.876	.352		
	Total	230.640			
<i>Overall</i>	Between Groups	15.760	3.152	17.367	.000
	Within Groups	112.347	.181		
	Total	128.107			

Table 28 also shows that there is a significant difference among the responses of the stakeholders regarding their perceptions on the attainability of the VMGO when they are grouped according to the program where they belong. Looking back at Table 19, the order from highest to lowest overall mean is as follows: BSBA (3.40), BSTM (3.36), BSHRM (3.36), BSA (3.20), BSAM (3.13) and BSCA (3.10).

Table 28. ANOVA on the differences on the responses of the stakeholders from different programs regarding their perceptions on VMGO's attainability, $\alpha = 0.05$

Statement	Sources	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig
The Objectives of the Program where I belong are being attained	Between Groups	7.592	1.518	5.014	.000
	Within Groups	175.325	.303		
	Total	182.916			
The Goals of CABEIHM are being achieved	Between Groups	13.320	2.664	7.460	.000
	Within Groups	206.742	.357		
	Total	220.062			
The Vision and Mission of BatStateU are being realized	Between Groups	30.438	6.088	18.544	.000
	Within Groups	190.068	.328		
	Total	220.506			
<i>Overall</i>	Between Groups	8.528	1.706	8.772	.000
	Within Groups	112.580	.194		
	Total	121.108			

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

4.1. On the awareness of the stakeholders regarding the VMGO

- The internal stakeholders, i.e., faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff and students, are aware of the VMGO. They are more aware of the vision and mission than of the goals and program objectives.
- The external stakeholders, i.e., parents/guardians, alumni and those from industry, linkage or cooperating agency are aware of the VMGO. They are less aware of program objectives than of the vision, mission and goals.
- All groups of respondents from the six programs are aware of the VMGO. Respondents from BSBA, BSA, BSTM, BSHRM and BSAM are more aware of the vision and mission than of the goals and program objectives. Respondents from BSCA are more aware of their program objectives than of the vision, mission and goals.

4.2. On the awareness of the stakeholders regarding the VMGO dissemination

- The internal stakeholders are aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards; printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials; broadcast in media and/or internet or website; and widely disseminated to the different agencies, institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole. They are more aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards than of other forms of VMGO dissemination and less aware that the VMGO are widely disseminated to the community.
- The external stakeholders are aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards; printed in catalogs, manuals and other materials; broadcast in media and/or internet or website; and widely disseminated to the different agencies, institutions, industry sector and the community as a whole. They are more aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards than of other forms of VMGO dissemination and less aware that the VMGO are broadcast in media and/or internet or website.
- All groups of respondents from the six programs are aware that the VMGO are disseminated in various forms or media. All groups are also more aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards than of other forms of VMGO dissemination and less aware that the VMGO are widely disseminated to the community.

4.3. On the understanding and acceptance of the VMGO by the stakeholders

- The internal stakeholders understand and accept the vision, mission, goals and program objectives, together with the responsibility of realizing such objectives in their own capacities. The vision and mission are more understandable and acceptable to them than the goals and objectives.
- The external stakeholders understand and accept the vision, mission, goals and objectives. The vision and mission are also more understandable and acceptable to them than the goals and objectives.
- All groups of respondents from the six programs understand and accept the vision, mission, goals and objectives. Likewise, the vision and mission are more understandable and acceptable to the six groups than the goals and objectives.

4.4. On the perceptions of stakeholders regarding VMGO's clarity and consistency

- The internal stakeholders believe that the vision, mission, goals and objectives are clearly stated and consistent with each other. The most favorable response by the internal stakeholders is on the perception that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future.
- The external stakeholders believe that the vision, mission, goals and objectives are clearly stated and consistent with each other. The most favorable response by the external stakeholders is also on the perception that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future.
- All groups of respondents from the six programs believe that the vision, mission, goals and objectives are clearly stated and consistent with each other. Likewise, the most favorable response by the six groups is also on the perception that the vision clearly reflects what BatStateU hopes to become in the future.

4.5. On the perceptions of stakeholders regarding VMGO's congruency to activities, practices, projects and operations

- The internal stakeholders perceive that there is congruency between actual educational practices or activities and the mission, goals and objectives. They also believe that the projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of program outcomes and that the VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU's operations.
- The external stakeholders perceive that there is congruency between actual educational practices or activities and the mission, goals and objectives. They further believe that the projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of program outcomes and that the VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU's operations.
- All groups of respondents from the six programs perceive that there is congruency between actual educational practices or activities and the mission, goals and objectives. They likewise believe that the projects and activities carried out by the faculty and students directly contribute towards the achievement of program outcomes and that the VMGO are the bases of all BatStateU's operations.

4.6. On the perceptions of stakeholders regarding VMGO's attainability

- The internal stakeholders agree that the program objectives are being attained, the goals of CABEIHM are being achieved, and the vision and mission of BatStateU are being realized.
- The external stakeholders also agree that the program objectives are being attained, the goals of CABEIHM are being achieved, and the vision and mission of BatStateU are being realized.
- All groups of respondents from the six programs likewise agree that the program objectives are being attained, the goals of CABEIHM are being achieved, and the vision and mission of BatStateU are being realized.

4.7. On the differences on the stakeholders' awareness on VMGO

- There is a significant difference between the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their awareness on the vision, mission, goals and objectives. The internal stakeholders are much aware of the VMGO than the external stakeholders.
- There is a significant difference among the responses of the stakeholders when they are grouped as to either they are faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff, students, parents or guardians, alumni, or from industry, linkage or cooperating agency regarding the awareness on the vision, mission, goals and objectives. The awareness on VMGO of the different type of stakeholders from highest to lowest is as follows: faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff, alumni, students, parents/guardians, and industry sector.
- In general, there is no significant difference among the responses of the stakeholders when they are grouped according to the program where they belong regarding the awareness on the vision, mission, goals and objectives. In particular, however, there is a significant difference on the responses regarding the awareness on vision and mission, as well as, regarding the awareness on program objectives; and there is no significant difference on the responses regarding the awareness on goals. The awareness on VMGO of the stakeholders grouped according to program from highest to lowest is as follows: BSBA, BSTM, BSHRM, BSCA, BSAM and BSA.

4.8. On the differences on the stakeholders' understanding and acceptance of the VMGO

- There is a significant difference between the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO. The internal stakeholders understand and accept the VMGO more than the external stakeholders.
- There is a significant difference among the responses of stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO when they are grouped according to either they are faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff, students, parents or guardians, alumni, or from industry, linkage or cooperating agency. The understanding and acceptance of the VMGO by the different type of stakeholders from highest to lowest is as follows: faculty/administrator, alumni, students, non-teaching staff, parents/guardians, and industry sector.
- There is a significant difference among the responses of the stakeholders regarding their understanding and acceptance of the VMGO when they are grouped according to the program where they belong. The understanding and acceptance of the VMGO by the stakeholders grouped according to program from highest to lowest is as follows: BSBA, BSTM, BSHRM, BSA, BSAM and BSCA.

4.9. On the differences on the stakeholders' perceptions on VMGO's attainability

- There is no significant difference between the responses of internal and external stakeholders regarding their perceptions on the attainability of the VMGO. The two groups of stakeholders both believe that the program objectives are being attained, the goals are being achieved and the vision and mission are being realized.
- There is a significant difference among the responses of the stakeholders regarding their perceptions on the attainability of the VMGO when they are grouped according to either they are faculty/administrators, non-teaching staff, students, parents or guardians, alumni, or from industry, linkage or cooperating agency. The favorable perception on the attainability of the VMGO by the different type of stakeholders from highest to

lowest is as follows: faculty/administrator, non-teaching staff, alumni, students, industry sector and parents/guardians.

- There is a significant difference among the responses of the stakeholders regarding their perceptions on the attainability of the VMGO when they are grouped according to the program where they belong. The favorable perception on the attainability of the VMGO by the stakeholders grouped according to program from highest to lowest is as follows: BSBA, BSTM, BSHRM, BSA, BSAM and BSCA.

In view of the foregoing results and conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

- The University, the College and the Department concerned should continuously work for the awareness and acceptance of the vision and mission, goals, and program objectives, respectively.
- The concerned University officials and personnel should still work for the widest dissemination of the VMGO through various forms of communication media. The social networking sites might also be properly used for the dissemination of the VMGO.
- Should the University or the College find it necessary to revise the vision and mission or the goals and objectives, representatives of all groups of stakeholders should be encouraged to participate.
- The administrators, faculty members, and staff assigned to conduct educational activities should make sure that the students or the community understand that such activities are to be undertaken for the realization or attainment of some goals and objectives.
- Assessment on the awareness and acceptance of the VMGO by the stakeholders should be done periodically.

References

- [1] *AACCUP Revised Instrument*. The Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, Inc., 2010.
- [2] CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 37, Series of 2012.
- [3] Batangas State University Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016.
- [4] R.C. Castillo. (2014, Feb.). “A paradigm shift to outcomes-based higher education: policies, principles and 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=1809>
- [5] *How to Formulate an Executive and Legislative Agenda for Local Governance and Development: A Manual*. Philippines-Canada Local Government Support Program, 2004.
- [6] M. Sadashiva. *Stakeholder Surveys*, 2010. <http://www.pgexchange.org>.