ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 10| October 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM AMONG LOCAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION: BASIS FOR PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT

Dr. Isagani E. Tolentino, Dr. Ronaldo R. Pasion, Prof. Fharalyn M. Loberiano

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra24315
DOI No: 10.36713/epra24315

ABSTRACT

This study examines the implementation of public administration programs among local colleges and universities in the National Capital Region (NCR), focusing on their alignment with international standards, particularly the UNDESA/IASIA Standards of Excellence. As public demand for efficient governance and service delivery increases, it is crucial for HEIs to produce competent public servants capable of addressing governance challenges. This study assesses the extent to which public administration programs comply with global benchmarks, evaluates their responsiveness to the increasing demand for quality services, and identifies gaps in curriculum design, faculty qualifications, and resource allocation. Using quantitative research design, data was collected through a survey of program coordinators, faculty, and administrators across six respondent-schools. The research utilized descriptive and comparative analysis methods, employing inferential statistical tests to explore differences in implementation levels among the institutions. Results show that while some schools have achieved higher accreditation levels, most programs are partially implemented, indicating significant room for improvement. Key areas of concern include faculty stability, integration of multidisciplinary content, and alignment of course content with contemporary public administration issues. Additionally, the study highlights the need for improvements in program management structures, including budget allocation, student progress monitoring, and performance measurement. The findings suggest that enhancing diversity, accessibility, and public relations strategies, alongside strengthening faculty involvement in research, could significantly improve the quality and impact of public administration programs. This study provides actionable recommendations for HEIs to refine their programs and better equip students for the dynamic challenges of public administration.

KEYWORDS: *Public administration; Higher Education Institutions; UNDESA/IASIA Standards of Excellence; Program Evaluation; Governance.*

INTRODUCTION

In an era of increasing public demand for quality governance and service delivery, higher education institutions (HEIs) play a critical role in preparing competent public servants. The effectiveness of public administration programs in addressing societal needs and governance challenges is central to producing skilled and professional administrators. This study examines the preparedness of HEIs in the National Capital Region (NCR) in delivering public administration education aligned with global standards, particularly the UNDESA/IASIA Standards of Excellence, while addressing key challenges in curriculum design, faculty qualifications, and resource allocation.

This study aims to:

1. Assess the extent to which public administration programs in NCR align with the UNDESA/IASIA Standards of Excellence, ensuring compliance with international benchmarks.
2. Evaluate the responsiveness of these programs to the growing demand for high-quality public service and their impact on governance outcomes.
3. Identify critical gaps in curriculum, faculty expertise, and resource distribution to propose actionable recommendations for program enhancement.

UNDESA, through its Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM), advances governance worldwide by providing policy guidance, knowledge development, and technical assistance. Similarly, the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (IASIA) supports academic institutions and training providers in enhancing public administration education. Their joint initiative, the UNDESA/IASIA Standards of Excellence, establishes international benchmarks that ensure educational programs equip future public servants with the competencies needed for modern governance challenges.

The framework for evaluating public administration programs is categorized into two main criteria: (a) Institutional Criterion, assessing the organizational structure and characteristics of the HEI, and (b) Program-Related Criterion, further divided into (b1) Program Development and Review, (b2) Program Content, (b3) Program Management, and (b4) Program Performance. This classification enables a systematic assessment of both institutional capabilities and program effectiveness, ensuring a structured approach for identifying best practices and areas for improvement. By employing this framework, this study provides a comprehensive analysis of public administration education in NCR, offering insights into its alignment with global standards and proposing strategic enhancements to strengthen governance education.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a **quantitative research design** to evaluate the implementation of the Public Administration Program across six respondent-schools, guided by the UNDESA/IASIA Standards of Excellence for Public Administration Education and Training. A **descriptive research method** was used to assess the current level of program implementation based on **Institutional Criterion** and **Program-related Criteria**. A quantitative approach was employed to gather numerical data through a structured survey questionnaire. Additionally, comparative

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 10| October 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

analysis was conducted using inferential statistical tests (e.g., t-tests, ANOVA) to examine variations in implementation across the respondent-schools.

The study utilized **purposive sampling**, selecting key stakeholders—program coordinators, faculty, and administrators—from the six respondent-schools.

A **structured survey questionnaire** was developed based on UNDESA Standards of Excellence, covering **a.) Institutional Criterion; b.) Program-related Criteria** (Program Development and Review, Program Content, Program Management and Program Performance)

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS or Excel, with **descriptive statistics** (means, frequency) and **inferential tests** (t-tests, ANOVA) applied to assess differences and relationships among respondent-schools.

RESULTS

Table 1

Implementation of the Public Administration Program in Terms of Institutional Criterion

Institutional Criterion	School						Overall
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. The institution has a strategic planning process	3.65 (FI)	3.28 (PI)	3.27 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.51 (FI)	3.47 (PI)	**3.43 (PI)**
2. The institution has a financial and budgetary structure	3.54 (FI)	3.38 (PI)	3.61 (FI)	3.21 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	3.48 (PI)	**3.44 (PI)**
3. The institution meets the requirements of the quality assurance system	3.52 (FI)	3.55 (FI)	3.25 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	3.56 (FI)	3.59 (FI)	**3.50 (FI)**
4. The institution has a developed HRM system	3.40 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	3.61 (FI)	3.28 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	3.61 (FI)	**3.43 (PI)**
5. The institution ensures the contribution to the Public Administration discipline	3.65 (FI)	3.24 (PI)	3.54 (FI)	3.64 (FI)	3.53 (FI)	3.33 (PI)	**3.50 (FI)**
6. Institution policies encourage social and cultural diversity	3.35 (PI)	3.50 (FI)	3.41 (PI)	3.55 (FI)	3.38 (PI)	3.44 (PI)	**3.44 (PI)**
7. The institution has facilities accessible to people with disabilities	3.54 (FI)	3.29 (PI)	3.44 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	3.22 (PI)	3.50 (FI)	**3.38 (PI)**
8. The institution runs student services	3.22 (PI)	3.51 (FI)	3.65 (FI)	3.64 (FI)	3.42 (PI)	3.29 (PI)	**3.46 (PI)**
9. The institution has a public relations system	3.42 (PI)	3.42 (PI)	3.47 (PI)	3.27 (PI)	3.15 (PI)	3.63 (FI)	**3.39 (PI)**
10. The institution has an adequate system for grievances	3.47 (PI)	3.44 (PI)	3.50 (FI)	3.61 (FI)	3.62 (FI)	3.33 (PI)	**3.50 (FI)**
11. The institution stands as exemplary in relation to its function	3.48 (PI)	3.39 (PI)	3.42 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.30 (PI)	3.61 (FI)	**3.43 (PI)**
12. The institution proceeds to periodical benchmarking	3.61 (FI)	3.55 (FI)	3.51 (FI)	3.44 (PI)	3.48 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	**3.52 (FI)**
Overall Mean	**3.49 (PI)**	**3.40 (PI)**	**3.47 (PI)**	**3.43 (PI)**	**3.42 (PI)**	**3.48 (PI)**	**3.45 (PI)**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50 – 3.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
1.50 – 2.49 Minimally Implemented (MI) 1.00 – 1.49 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 2

Level of Implementation of the Public Administration Program in Terms of Program Development and Review

Program Development and Review	School						Overall
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. The institution has a Public Administration Program development and review process	3.37 (PI)	3.42 (PI)	3.47 (PI)	3.11 (PI)	3.35 (PI)	3.50 (FI)	**3.37 (PI)**
2. The institution has a Public Administration Program with clear goals and objectives	3.19 (PI)	3.21 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	3.41 (PI)	3.14 (PI)	3.18 (PI)	**3.28 (PI)**
3. The Public Administration Program includes an educational strategy	3.48 (PI)	3.48 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	3.39 (PI)	3.42 (PI)	**3.45 (PI)**
4. The goals and objectives are derived from a program design	3.41 (PI)	3.42 (PI)	3.19 (PI)	3.17 (PI)	3.27 (PI)	3.48 (PI)	**3.32 (PI)**
5. The Public Administration Program has a permanent faculty/staff	3.26 (PI)	3.51 (FI)	3.62 (FI)	3.21 (PI)	3.40 (PI)	3.16 (PI)	**3.36 (PI)**
6. The number of core faculty/staff is sufficient to run the Public Administration Program	3.31 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.32 (PI)	3.40 (PI)	**3.33 (PI)**
7. The core faculty/staff of the Public Administration Program are involved in research	3.23 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	3.22 (PI)	**3.36 (PI)**
8. The Public Administration Program has a clear system of admission	3.57 (FI)	3.26 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	3.39 (PI)	3.29 (PI)	3.39 (PI)	**3.36 (PI)**
Overall Mean	**3.35 (PI)**	**3.37 (PI)**	**3.40 (PI)**	**3.32 (PI)**	**3.33 (PI)**	**3.43 (PI)**	**3.37 (PI)**

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 10| October 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50 – 3.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
1.50 – 2.49 Minimally Implemented (MI) 1.00 – 1.49 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 3
Level of Implementation of the Public Administration Program in Terms of Program Content

Program Content	School						Overall
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. In examining its content, the Public Administration Program stands for coherence and consistency	3.24 (PI)	3.08 (PI)	3.26 (PI)	3.16 (PI)	3.12 (PI)	3.10 (PI)	**3.16 (PI)**
2. The level of the Public Administration Program is sustained	3.20 (PI)	3.40 (PI)	3.17 (PI)	3.06 (PI)	3.21 (PI)	3.23 (PI)	**3.21 (PI)**
3. The Public Administration Program fulfills the formal program requirements	3.14 (PI)	3.13 (PI)	3.15 (PI)	3.22 (PI)	3.20 (PI)	3.20 (PI)	**3.17 (PI)**
4. The content of the Public Administration Program reflects multidisciplinary as required in the field of public administration	3.28 (PI)	3.33 (PI)	3.31 (PI)	3.23 (PI)	3.16 (PI)	3.32 (PI)	**3.27 (PI)**
5. The Public Administration Program refers to the public sector culture	3.09 (PI)	3.02 (PI)	3.23 (PI)	3.10 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	**3.17 (PI)**
6. The Public Administration Program focuses on the public sector nature	3.16 (PI)	3.33 (PI)	3.24 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.21 (PI)	3.31 (PI)	**3.27 (PI)**
Overall Mean	**3.19 (PI)**	**3.22 (PI)**	**3.23 (PI)**	**3.19 (PI)**	**3.20 (PI)**	**3.24 (PI)**	**3.21 (PI)**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50 – 3.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
1.50 – 2.49 Minimally Implemented (MI) 1.00 – 1.49 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 4
Level of Implementation of the Public Administration Program in Terms of Program Management

Program Management	School						Overall
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. The Public Administration Program has a clear Program responsibility	3.38 (PI)	3.51 (FI)	3.60 (FI)	3.41 (PI)	3.70 (FI)	3.15 (PI)	**3.46 (PI)**
2. The Public Administration Program has an appropriate budget	3.28 (PI)	3.33 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	3.58 (FI)	3.30 (PI)	3.29 (PI)	**3.37 (PI)**
3. The Public Administration Program has adequate administration	3.64 (FI)	3.50 (FI)	3.56 (FI)	3.41 (PI)	3.51 (FI)	3.61 (FI)	**3.54 (FI)**
4. The Public Administration Program has an administration for students' progress	3.27 (PI)	3.64 (FI)	3.50 (FI)	3.44 (PI)	3.42 (PI)	3.33 (PI)	**3.43 (PI)**
5. An assessment system for students' performance exists	3.47 (PI)	3.44 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	3.22 (PI)	3.61 (FI)	3.65 (FI)	**3.49 (PI)**
6. The Public Administration Program has a reliable information system	3.48 (PI)	3.28 (PI)	3.62 (FI)	3.42 (PI)	3.54 (FI)	3.33 (PI)	**3.45 (PI)**
7. The Public Administration Program proceeds to a periodically faculty review	3.35 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	3.28 (PI)	3.40 (PI)	3.67 (FI)	**3.43 (PI)**
8. The communication is sustained within the Public Administration Program	3.54 (FI)	3.21 (PI)	3.40 (PI)	3.51 (FI)	3.25 (PI)	3.47 (PI)	**3.40 (PI)**
Overall Mean	**3.43 (PI)**	**3.41 (PI)**	**3.52 (FI)**	**3.41 (PI)**	**3.47 (PI)**	**3.44 (PI)**	**3.45 (PI)**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50 – 3.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
1.50 – 2.49 Minimally Implemented (MI) 1.00 – 1.49 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 5
Level of Implementation of the Public Administration Program in Terms of Program Performance

Program Performance	School						Overall
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. The Public Administration Program has a Performance measurement system	3.19 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	3.18 (PI)	3.21 (PI)	3.14 (PI)	3.52 (FI)	**3.28 (PI)**
2. The Public Administration Program Satisfaction is measured	3.17 (PI)	3.11 (PI)	3.21 (PI)	3.06 (PI)	3.39 (PI)	3.40 (PI)	**3.22 (PI)**
3. The Basic operation information data is readily available	3.52 (FI)	3.23 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	3.22 (PI)	**3.36 (PI)**
4. The Public Administration program proceeds to the Benchmarking	3.28 (PI)	3.51 (FI)	3.49 (PI)	3.27 (PI)	3.58 (FI)	3.48 (PI)	**3.44 (PI)**
5. The Public Administration Program Impact on the Community measured	3.29 (PI)	3.32 (PI)	3.32 (PI)	3.23 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	**3.33 (PI)**
Overall Mean	3.29 (PI)	3.32 (PI)	3.32 (PI)	3.23 (PI)	3.38 (PI)	3.41 (PI)	**3.32 (PI)**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50 – 3.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
1.50 – 2.49 Minimally Implemented (MI) 1.00 – 1.49 Not Implemented (NI)

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 10| October 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 6

ANOVA Table for Differences on the Implementation of the Public Administration Program

Variables	*Source of Variations*	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*	*Decision*	*Interpretation*
Institutional criterion	Between Groups	9.54	5	4.77	3.12	0.001	Reject Ho	**Significant**
	Within Groups	101.41	72	1.53				
	Total	110.95	77					
Program Development and review	Between Groups	9.26	5	4.63	4.56	0.000	Reject Ho	**Significant**
	Within Groups	185.09	72	2.97				
	Total	194.35	77					
Program content	Between Groups	11.08	5	3.69	3.74	0.002	Reject Ho	**Significant**
	Within Groups	36.58	72	1.18				
	Total	47.66	77					
Program management	Between Groups	9.93	5	3.31	3.36	0.000	Reject Ho	**Significant**
	Within Groups	52.08	72	1.68				
	Total	62.01	77					
Program performance	Between Groups	9.93	5	3.31	3.36	0.001	Reject Ho	**Significant**
	Within Groups	52.08	72	1.68				
	Total	62.01	77					

DISCUSSIONS

Institutional Criteria Evaluation (Table 1)

The evaluation of institutional criteria across six schools (A to F) highlights varying levels of implementation in key areas, reflecting differences in strategic planning, resource management, and academic support systems. Schools A and F demonstrated the strongest strategic planning processes, with a mean score of 3.65, indicating well-established frameworks for long-term institutional planning. These schools likely engage in regular assessments and stakeholder participation to ensure their strategic goals align with evolving educational demands. Conversely, other schools showed moderate levels of implementation, suggesting a need for refinement in defining and executing their strategic objectives.

In terms of financial and budgetary structures, School C stood out with a mean of 3.61, reflecting a robust financial management system characterized by transparency and efficient resource allocation. Schools with lower scores in this area may need to improve their budgeting practices to optimize resource distribution and enhance financial stability. Similarly, the assessment of quality assurance systems revealed consistently high scores across all schools, suggesting strong adherence to accreditation standards and a collective commitment to maintaining educational quality. While some schools scored slightly lower, their continued efforts to refine monitoring and evaluation systems would further strengthen this aspect.

The study also examined the effectiveness of human resource management (HRM) systems, where School C excelled with a mean of 3.61. This suggests well-developed policies for recruitment, development, and retention of skilled personnel. Schools with lower scores may need to focus on improving their HRM strategies to enhance employee satisfaction and institutional performance. In the area of contribution to the Public Administration discipline, School A led with a mean of 3.65, highlighting its significant engagement in research and public service activities. Other schools could enhance their research initiatives and program offerings to deepen their impact in the field.

Diversity and inclusion efforts were strongest at School F, which achieved the highest score of 3.63 in social and cultural diversity. This suggests a proactive approach to fostering an inclusive academic environment. Schools with lower scores may benefit from implementing targeted diversity initiatives and training programs to ensure a more welcoming atmosphere for students and faculty from diverse backgrounds.

Accessibility for persons with disabilities showed relatively consistent scores across schools, indicating that fundamental accessibility requirements are being met. However, further improvements in infrastructure and adaptive services would enhance inclusivity. In terms of student services, School C led with a mean of 3.65, followed by Schools D and E, suggesting strong faculty and institutional support for student needs. Schools with lower scores could benefit from expanding counseling, career advising, and academic assistance programs.

School F emerged as the leader in public relations systems with a mean of 3.63, reflecting strong engagement and visibility efforts. Schools with lower scores might improve their outreach strategies to enhance institutional branding and reputation. Meanwhile, Schools D and E demonstrated the strongest grievance systems, with scores of 3.61 and 3.62, respectively, indicating accessible and effective dispute resolution mechanisms. Schools with lower scores may need to refine their grievance procedures to ensure responsiveness and transparency.

School F was also recognized for exemplary institutional functions, achieving the highest mean of 3.61. This suggests strong operational efficiency and academic leadership, setting a model for other institutions to improve their management practices. Additionally, Schools A and F demonstrated a strong commitment to benchmarking, with scores of 3.61 and 3.55, respectively. This indicates an active pursuit of best practices and continuous institutional improvement. Schools with lower scores

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 10| October 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

in this area could benefit from integrating benchmarking strategies into their strategic planning to enhance competitiveness.

The overall findings suggest that Schools A and F consistently perform well across multiple institutional criteria, demonstrating strong frameworks for governance, quality assurance, and program implementation. Schools B, D, and E show moderate levels of implementation, particularly in areas such as diversity and student services, indicating opportunities for further development. These variations reflect different stages of institutional growth, emphasizing the need for ongoing assessment and targeted improvements to enhance overall effectiveness.

Program-Related Criteria

Program Development and Review (Table 2)

The evaluation of Public Administration (PA) programs across these schools revealed that most institutions fall within the "Partially Implemented" category. School F stood out with the highest mean of 3.50 in program development and review, suggesting a fully structured and systematic approach to curriculum evaluation. Other schools, with lower scores, may need to strengthen their review processes to ensure more rigorous and consistent program improvements.

Regarding the clarity of goals and objectives, School C led with a mean of 3.52, indicating a well-defined direction for its PA program. Other schools scored in the partially implemented range, suggesting a need for better articulation and alignment of program goals with institutional missions. In educational strategy, School D had the highest mean of 3.52, reflecting a comprehensive approach to curriculum delivery. Schools with lower scores could refine their teaching strategies to ensure relevance to contemporary public administration practices.

School F demonstrated the strongest alignment between program goals and design, scoring 3.48. Schools with lower means in this area may need to improve the integration of their program objectives into curriculum planning. Faculty and staff permanency was highest in Schools B and C, indicating stability in their teaching personnel. Other schools may need to strengthen faculty retention strategies to maintain instructional quality.

The overall assessment of PA programs highlights areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. Schools that excel in program development, goal alignment, and curriculum strategies serve as benchmarks for institutions seeking to enhance their academic offerings. Schools with lower implementation levels should prioritize program evaluation, faculty development, and curriculum enhancements to strengthen the quality of Public Administration education.

By addressing these areas, institutions can improve their academic programs, enhance student learning outcomes, and ensure their graduates are well-prepared for careers in public administration and governance.

Program Content (Table 3)

The results indicate that the overall implementation of the Public Administration program content across the six schools is categorized as Partially Implemented (PI). This suggests that while essential components of the program are in place, improvements are still required to ensure full alignment with academic and industry standards.

Among the criteria assessed, the coherence and consistency of the program content varied across institutions, with mean values ranging from 3.08 (School B) to 3.26 (School C). This highlights potential gaps in curriculum structuring, particularly in School B, which may benefit from a more systematic approach to curriculum development.

When evaluating the sustainability of the program, Schools B and F recorded the highest mean values, while School D had the lowest at 3.06. The variations in scores suggest that some schools may struggle with maintaining the long-term viability of their programs, potentially due to resource constraints or inconsistent program evaluation mechanisms.

The findings on the fulfillment of formal program requirements indicate that while all schools meet minimum standards, there is limited differentiation in scores. This suggests that compliance is prioritized over excellence, and institutions should consider integrating more innovative and practical approaches to elevate their program quality.

Regarding the multidisciplinary nature of the program, Schools E and F showed contrasting results, with School E scoring the lowest (3.16) and School F the highest (3.32). The lower rating for School E implies a need for better integration of cross-disciplinary concepts, which could be addressed through curriculum enhancements that incorporate perspectives from economics, political science, and public finance.

The relevance of program content to public sector culture also varied, with School B recording the lowest mean at 3.02. This suggests that its curriculum may not sufficiently emphasize public sector values and governance principles. Strengthening partnerships with public institutions and incorporating real-world policy case studies could help bridge this gap.

Lastly, in terms of public sector focus, School D achieved the highest mean (3.38), while Schools B and E had slightly lower scores. The results indicate that some institutions may need to refine their curriculum to ensure stronger alignment with the needs and challenges of the public sector.

Program Management (Table 4)

The assessment of program management revealed that the overall implementation across schools falls between Partially Implemented (PI) and Fully Implemented (FI). This suggests that while administrative structures are largely in place, some inconsistencies persist, requiring targeted improvements in program oversight and resource allocation.

One of the strengths observed was in clearly defined program responsibilities, where Schools B, C, E, and F achieved the highest mean values. However, School A, with a lower mean of 3.15, may need to enhance its role distribution and accountability mechanisms to improve efficiency.

Budget allocation emerged as a significant factor affecting implementation. School D had the highest mean (3.58), indicating strong financial support, while the remaining schools exhibited moderate ratings. Institutions with lower scores may need to reassess their financial planning and seek additional funding sources to sustain program improvements.

The findings also show that administrative support is generally adequate, with mean values ranging from 3.41 to 3.64. This suggests that most schools have well-functioning administrative structures that facilitate program implementation. Similarly, administration for student progress received high ratings in Schools B and C, indicating strong student support systems. In contrast, Schools A and F, with slightly lower scores, may need to enhance academic advising and mentoring services.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 10| October 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Another critical factor examined was the assessment system for student performance. Schools F and E recorded the highest mean values (3.65 and 3.61, respectively), indicating well-structured evaluation mechanisms. However, schools with lower ratings may need to improve assessment consistency and transparency.

The study also highlighted the role of a reliable information system in program management. Schools C and E scored the highest, suggesting effective data management practices. Meanwhile, Schools A and B received lower ratings, indicating a need for more efficient student information tracking systems.

Faculty performance reviews were another area of evaluation. School F obtained the highest mean (3.67), followed by Schools C and E, signifying robust faculty evaluation mechanisms. The relatively lower ratings for Schools A and D suggest a need for more structured faculty assessments to ensure teaching quality.

Lastly, the analysis of sustained communication within the program revealed that Schools C and D performed best, indicating effective coordination among faculty, administrators, and students. In contrast, Schools B and E, with lower mean values, may benefit from improved internal communication strategies to ensure program cohesion.

Program Performance (Table 5)

Program performance across institutions is generally categorized as Partially Implemented (PI), with certain schools achieving stronger implementation levels in specific areas. School F leads in performance measurement systems, with a score of 3.52, indicating a well-developed framework for tracking and evaluating program success. Other schools fall within the PI range, particularly School E, which scored the lowest at 3.14, suggesting that its performance measurement strategies require improvement.

Program satisfaction measurement is strongest in School F (3.40), followed by Schools E (3.39) and C (3.21), reflecting a relatively well-established mechanism for assessing student satisfaction. However, Schools A, B, and D scored lower, with School D recording the lowest mean of 3.06. This suggests that the integration of systematic feedback mechanisms could enhance program responsiveness to student needs.

Availability of operational information is highest in School A (3.52), indicating a strong system for managing essential program data. Other schools fall within a moderate range of 3.22 to 3.41, with School F scoring the lowest (3.22), suggesting that improvements in data accessibility and transparency could strengthen decision-making processes.

Benchmarking is most actively implemented in School E (3.58), highlighting its engagement in comparative assessments with other institutions to improve program standards. School F scored the lowest in this category (3.22), indicating that benchmarking practices are less emphasized, which could limit opportunities for adopting best practices from other institutions.

Community impact measurement is strongest in Schools F (3.41) and E (3.38), suggesting a focus on evaluating the broader societal effects of their programs. However, School D scored the lowest (3.23), indicating a weaker emphasis on assessing how the program contributes to the community.

Overall, the findings suggest that while some schools exhibit strong program performance management, others need to enhance their systems to ensure comprehensive evaluation and continuous improvement. Radnor and Osborne (2012) argue that public administration institutions should move beyond mere data collection toward strategic performance management that fosters meaningful decision-making and program development.

Differences in the Implementation

ANOVA results highlight significant differences in the implementation of the PA program across institutions. The analysis shows notable variations in institutional criteria, program development and review, program content, program management, and program performance. Institutional criteria reveal an F-value of 3.12 and a p-value of 0.001, suggesting substantial differences in how institutions implement foundational program requirements. Similarly, program development and review exhibit significant variation ($F = 4.56$, $p = 0.000$), indicating diverse approaches to curriculum and program evaluation.

Program content differences ($F = 3.74$, $p = 0.002$) suggest variations in curricular focus and instructional strategies across institutions. Differences in program management ($F = 3.36$, $p = 0.000$) highlight disparities in administrative structures, financial allocation, and organizational support. Lastly, program performance differences ($F = 3.36$, $p = 0.001$) indicate that institutions implement performance evaluation and improvement strategies at varying levels of effectiveness.

These findings underscore that the implementation of the PA program is not uniform across institutions, with each school exhibiting distinct strengths and challenges. The significant variations suggest that institutional policies, leadership, and resource allocation influence program implementation. Addressing these disparities requires a more coordinated effort in standardizing program management, curriculum development, and performance evaluation practices. Future research could further investigate the factors contributing to these differences and explore strategies to improve program consistency and overall effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS

The Public Administration programs across the institutions display diverse development paths, with some achieving higher accreditation levels while others are still working towards meeting academic standards. Despite these variations, all institutions demonstrate a commitment to enhancing program quality and addressing community needs. There is an emphasis on continuous improvement to achieve both academic excellence and societal contributions. However, certain areas, such as diversity, accessibility, and public relations, require improvement to align with best practices in higher education. These improvements would foster a more inclusive environment and better cater to the needs of a diverse student body. Strengthening these areas would also help institutions create more robust public relations strategies, enhancing their overall image and engagement with the community.

The implementation of the Public Administration program is mostly categorized as Partially Implemented (PI), indicating moderate progress but significant room for improvement. While many institutions have established processes for program development, inconsistencies in areas such as faculty stability, admissions processes, and alignment of course content remain. Some institutions face challenges in integrating contemporary issues and focusing on public sector culture, which are essential for preparing students for careers in public administration. This lack of consistency may affect the program's ability to adapt to the rapidly changing demands of the public sector. Additionally, the integration of multidisciplinary content remains uneven, suggesting that some institutions need to broaden their curriculum to reflect the full scope of the field. Furthermore, a stronger emphasis on the evolving role of public sector culture could better equip students to tackle challenges in the workforce.

The management structures are generally strong, but further refinement is needed in areas such as program responsibility, budget allocation, and student progress monitoring. While the administrative frameworks are solid, certain aspects like

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 10| October 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

consistent assessment systems and improved student tracking could enhance the program's overall efficiency. Strengthening faculty involvement in research and teaching could also increase the academic credibility of the program. The effectiveness of performance measurement and community impact systems varies, highlighting the need for improvements in these areas across institutions. Some institutions have strong performance measurements and benchmarking processes, while others require more comprehensive systems to evaluate success. These enhancements would allow institutions to better measure their impact on students and the community, ultimately leading to more informed decision-making and improvements in program effectiveness.

To enhance the quality and effectiveness of the Public Administration programs, institutions should focus on improving diversity, accessibility, and public relations systems. These improvements will help align the programs with best practices in higher education and create a more inclusive and efficient academic environment. Additionally, strengthening faculty stability by hiring more permanent staff and enhancing faculty involvement in research can improve the program's academic credibility and overall effectiveness.

Institutions should streamline their admissions processes and ensure better alignment of course content to contemporary issues and the evolving scope of public administration. Greater focus on integrating multidisciplinary content and public sector culture will better prepare students for public administration careers. Furthermore, administrative structures should be refined by improving program responsibility, budget allocation, student progress monitoring, and assessment systems. Strengthening performance measurement, benchmarking, and community impact evaluation will help institutions better track their success and make data-driven improvements.

REFERENCES

1. *Alharbi, J. S. (2015). Factors affecting job satisfaction and its impact on employee performance in Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 6(2), 97-105. https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v6n2p14*
2. *Banister, J. (2015). Strategic business solutions: A practical guide to business innovation. McGraw-Hill.*
3. *Batton, J., Daniels, K., & Curtis, A. (2015). Organizational performance through innovation. Springer.*
4. *Brillantes, A., & Fernandez, M. (2013). The Philippine bureaucracy in transition: The challenge of governance. Journal of Public Administration, 47(2), 123-142.*
5. *Brillantes, A., & Fernandez, M. (2011). Institutionalizing public governance: A case of the Philippines. Asian Journal of Public Administration, 33(1), 22-40.*
6. *Bryson, J. M. (2014). Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.*
7. *Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2019). CHED Memorandum Order No. 20, Series of 2013: Policy standard to enhance the quality of teaching in higher education. CHED. https://www.ched.gov.ph*
8. *Dahlgaard, J., Chen, C. K., & Jang, J. Y. (2013). The key to business excellence. Routledge.*
9. *Denhardth, J., & Denhardth, R. (2015). Evaluation of leadership in organizations. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 22(3), 341-360.*
10. *Gerton, T., & Mitchell, J. (2019). Management and governance for the future. Public Administration Review, 79(5), 740-755. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12347*
11. *Gillen, K. (2020). Leadership in public administration: Theory and practice. Public Administration Quarterly, 41(4), 452-469. https://doi.org/10.2307/2387957*
12. *Hyattractions. (2016). Understanding the importance of effective government systems. World Publications.*
13. *Hall, W. A., & Liva, S. (2021). Policy effectiveness in changing times. Public Policy Journal, 45(3), 132-150. https://doi.org/10.1093/public-policy/jp21*
14. *Kenton, W. (2022). Public administration as a profession. Encyclopedia of Public Services. https://www.investopedia.com*
15. *Kumar, P., Passey, D., & Shuka, B. (2021). Public service and its impact on society. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 31(2), 345-365. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpart/muaa032*
16. *Laguador, J. (2020). Leadership and governance in local administration. School Press.*
17. *Lamas, H. (2015). Public governance and citizen participation. Oxford School Press.*
18. *Looney, J., & Grainger-Cremson, H. (2018). Modern public sector management in the Philippines. Palgrave Macmillan.*
19. *Macaraeg, T. (2017). The evolving role of government in public administration. Ateneo de Manila School Press.*
20. *Marshall, G. S. (1995). Public service reform and public administration. School of Chicago Press.*
21. *McCombes, S. (2019). The importance of employee satisfaction. Employee Relations Journal, 34(2), 82-95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-019-09476-4*
22. *Montemar, L., Castaño, F., & Ramos, P. (2014). The government of the Philippines: A decade in review. Philippine Institute of Development Studies.*
23. *National Board for Certification of Public Administrators (NBCC). (2020). Public administration certifications and standards. https://www.nbcc.org*
24. *Okereka, P., & Okolie, U. (2022). Performance management systems in public administration. Pearson Education.*
25. *Ocobock, C., & Patel, K. (2021). The role of administration in development. Public Administration Review, 81(6), 823-835. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13204*
26. *Pagoso, C. M. (2012). Introduction to Philippine public administration. Ateneo de Manila School Press.*
27. *Philippines. (1993). Republic Act No. 6713: Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees. https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph*
28. *Radnor, Z., & Osborne, S. P. (2013). Public sector performance management and service delivery. Routledge.*
29. *Rosales, M., & Ibanez, J. (2012). Government management in the Philippines: A case study approach. SAGE Publications.*
30. *Tasopoulou, K., & Tsiotras, G. (2017). Strategic management for public administrators. Public Administration Review, 56(2), 221-239. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12357*
31. *Taylor, S. (2020). A new approach to governance. Springer.*
32. *The Local Government Code. (1991). Republic Act No. 7160. Official Gazette. https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph*
33. *Tomazevic, S., & Zorman, S. (2014). Effective administration of public resources. Springer.*
34. *Tomaževič, N. E. (2017). Improving public service through innovation. Palgrave Macmillan.*
35. *UNDESA/IASIA Taskforce. (2008). Standard of excellence in public administration. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. https://www.un.org*
36. *Vlasceanu, L., et al. (2007). Public administration glossary. UNESCO Publishing.*
37. *West, D., & Blackman, D. (2015). Public administration as a discipline. SAGE Publications.*