ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

EVALUATION OF A PROPOSED MODULE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION-BASIS FOR OUTCOME-BASED COURSE ENHANCEMENT

Marivic B. Posadas
Faculty, College of Criminology, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra27476
DOI No: 10.36713/epra27476

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated and enhanced an instructional module on Law Enforcement Organization and Administration with Inter-agency Approach for first-year BS Criminology students at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST). Guided by Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles and CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018, the research employed a descriptive design with complete enumeration of 251 respondents. Using a researcher-made survey, the module was assessed across six components: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning. Results revealed strong agreement in all areas, with grand means ranging from 3.47 to 3.57, affirming clarity, relevance, and effectiveness of the instructional design. Strengths included clear titles, relevant objectives, logical sequencing of activities, and credible references, while areas for improvement involved accessibility of materials, diagnostic activities, and assessment guidance. Enhancements integrated action-oriented titles, higher-order objectives, multimodal resources, open-access references, and explicit assessment instructions. Findings underscore the importance of immersive, competence-driven instructional materials in criminology education, contributing to CHED standards compliance and Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education.

KEYWORDS: *Outcome-Based Education (OBE), Criminology curriculum, Instructional module evaluation, Law enforcement organization, Inter-agency collaboration*

INTRODUCTION

In the increasingly complex landscape of law enforcement, the ability to follow the structure of organizations, coordinate functions, and ensure effective administration was regarded as a vital competency, particularly within the domains of public safety and criminal justice. Educational institutions played a crucial role in equipping future professionals with these skills through well-structured and outcome-based learning modules. Within the context of criminology education, instructional materials were expected not only to be informative but also to remain aligned with real-world demands and prevailing educational standards.

The Commission on Higher Education (CHED), through CMO No. 5, series of 2018, mandated that criminology programs adhere to an outcome-based education (OBE) framework. This included the development and implementation of instructional materials that were responsive to program outcomes and learning competencies outlined in the curriculum. CMO No. 5, s. 2018 emphasized the importance of courses that cultivated critical thinking, ethical decision-making, and practical skills related to peacekeeping, law enforcement, and conflict resolution.

Recent literature underscored the growing importance of outcome-based and scenario-driven instructional designs in preparing students for real-world challenges. Within the Philippine context, Bohol Island State University conducted an implementation study on OBE, which revealed that both administrators and faculty possessed substantial knowledge of OBE, though faculty members required additional support to effectively apply the approach in their teaching. The study concluded that robust understanding and skillful implementation of OBE significantly promoted improved student learning outcomes (Evardo, 2024).

Aligned with these findings, the CHED-mandated curriculum standards, specifically CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018, prompted higher education institutions offering BS Criminology programs to adopt outcome-based, competence-driven frameworks in curriculum development. A document analysis of evaluation reports from State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) affirmed strong compliance with these standards, but also emphasized the need to further enrich instructional materials and involve stakeholders in the curriculum development process (Patalinghug et al., 2025). These observations resonated with the objectives of the study, which sought to enhance a module through evaluation and alignment with OBE principles.

Pedagogical innovations in law enforcement organization and administration further supported the use of scenario-rich learning

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

environments. For instance, Švábenský et al. (2024) demonstrated that tabletop exercises delivered through interactive learning platforms significantly enhanced students' decision-making abilities and team learning behaviors in cybersecurity training. Their findings underscored the effectiveness of immersive and problem-based instructional strategies in preparing students for high-pressure situations. Similarly, O'Neill, Ahmad, and Maynard (2021) developed a socio-technical framework for incident response training that highlighted the integration of behavioral, technical, and organizational aspects—an approach highly relevant to training in law enforcement organization and administration.

In response to these directives and scholarly insights, the study evaluated a proposed module on Law Enforcement Organization and Administration with Inter-agency Approach. The module was designed to help criminology students develop essential competencies in organizational management, administrative procedures, and effective collaboration across multiple agencies within the criminal justice system. By assessing the module's structure, content, and instructional design, the study sought to determine its relevance, effectiveness, and alignment with OBE principles.

The findings of the research served as the basis for enhancing the module to ensure that it met CHED standards and supported the achievement of program-level outcomes. Collectively, the literature and the study's results affirmed that outcome-based curricular reforms, context-aware stakeholder engagement, and immersive learning methodologies significantly contributed to the effectiveness of instructional materials—particularly in fields that demanded critical thinking, ethical judgment, and responsive action such as criminology. Ultimately, the study contributed to the continuous improvement of criminology education in the Philippines, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study utilized a descriptive research design, which was appropriate for systematically gathering information to describe the status of the phenomenon. Specifically, it focused on evaluating the proposed module on Law Enforcement Organization and Administration with Inter-agency Approach based on its structure, content, and alignment with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles. The design allowed for the collection of evaluative feedback from target users to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for enhancement.

The study employed complete enumeration sampling, also known as total population sampling, as all two hundred fifty-one (251) first-year BS Criminology students enrolled in the relevant course at the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST) during the First Semester of Academic Year 2025–2026 were included as respondents. They were the targeted respondents since the module was exclusively offered in the NEUST curriculum among first-year students only.

This approach was deemed appropriate to ensure a comprehensive and accurate evaluation of the proposed module, capturing a full range of perspectives and minimizing sampling bias through this sampling technique. Furthermore, complete enumeration allowed for a more robust analysis of the module's strengths and areas for improvement, providing stronger justification for course enhancement aligned with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles and CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018. These students were selected because the module was designed for their level of academic and professional training, and they were expected to have prior foundational knowledge of public safety and conflict resolution.

Data were collected using a researcher-made survey questionnaire, which consisted of ten statements for each of the six key areas: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting Up, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning. The responses of the participants in this questionnaire served as the basis for answering Research Question 2, which focused on identifying the strengths and areas for improvement of the module. Each component was measured through ten indicators using a 4-point Likert scale, where 4 indicated Strongly Agree and 1 indicated Strongly Disagree. The scale was later interpreted using equal interval ranges to determine the respondents' level of agreement with each statement. Mean scores were interpreted according to the following ranges: 3.26–4.00 as Strongly Agree, 2.51–3.25 as Agree, 1.76–2.50 as Disagree, and 1.00–1.75 as Strongly Disagree.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Law Enforcement Organization and Administration with Inter-agency Approach

Table 1. Module Title

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Each module title clearly reflects the topic covered in the lesson.	3.60	Strongly Agree
2. The module titles are organized, well-written, and easy to understand.	3.55	Strongly Agree
3. Each module title gives a clear idea of what the student can expect to learn.	3.58	Strongly Agree
4. The module titles help the student remember key concepts.	3.52	Strongly Agree
5. The module titles are specific and directly related to the lesson content.	3.50	Strongly Agree
6. The module titles are consistent in format and structure throughout the material.	3.48	Strongly Agree
7. Each module title meaningfully represents the content of the module.	3.62	Strongly Agree
8. The module titles make it easier for the student to follow the flow of the lessons.	3.55	Strongly Agree
9. The module titles are clearly connected to the learning goals.	3.60	Strongly Agree
10. The module titles help set clear expectations for student learning.	3.70	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**3.57**	**Strongly Agree**

The results of Table 1 reveal strong agreement, with an overall mean of 3.57, indicating that module titles are effective in guiding student learning. The highest-rated indicator was Item 10 (M=3.70), showing that titles set clear expectations, which aligns with Tyler's (1949) curriculum model emphasizing the importance of objectives in shaping instructional focus. Item 7 (M=3.62) followed, highlighting that titles meaningfully represent content, consistent with Mayer's (2014) cognitive theory of multimedia learning that stresses the role of meaningful cues in comprehension. Items 1 and 9 (M=3.60 each) further demonstrated that titles reflect topics and connect to learning goals, underscoring Spady's (1994) Outcome-Based Education framework on alignment between instructional design and outcomes. Even the lowest-rated item, Item 6 (M=3.48), still falls within the "Strongly Agree" range, showing that respondents recognized consistency in format and structure, though with slightly less emphasis compared to other indicators. This positive result suggests that while standardization could be further enhanced, students already perceive the titles as generally coherent, supporting Sweller's (1994) cognitive load theory that uniformity aids comprehension.

Table 2. Learning Objectives

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The learning objectives are clearly stated at the beginning of each unit or topic.	3.55	Strongly Agree
2. The learning objectives are easy for the student to understand and follow.	3.50	Strongly Agree
3. The objectives reflect what the student is expected to learn after each lesson.	3.52	Strongly Agree
4. The objectives are relevant to the course and the needs of the student.	3.48	Strongly Agree
5. The learning objectives help the student stay focused on important topics.	3.45	Strongly Agree
6. The student finds the learning objectives achievable and realistic.	3.40	Strongly Agree
7. The objectives include both knowledge-based and practical skills.	3.55	Strongly Agree
8. The objectives are consistent with the course content discussed in the module.	3.50	Strongly Agree
9. The objectives helped the student understand the purpose of each lesson.	3.58	Strongly Agree
10. The learning objectives reflect the appropriate level of difficulty for the student.	3.52	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**3.51**	**Strongly Agree**

Table 2 shows an overall mean of 3.51, reflecting strong agreement that learning objectives are clear and purposeful. The highest-rated item was Item 9 (M=3.58), which indicates that objectives clarify the purpose of each lesson, consistent with Hattie (2009), who emphasizes clarity in goals as a driver of motivation. Items 1 and 7 (M=3.55 each) followed, showing that objectives are clearly stated and include practical skills, resonating with Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development that integrates knowledge and skills for meaningful learning. Items 3 and 10 (M=3.52 each) further demonstrated alignment with expected learning and difficulty level, supporting Locke and Latham's (2002) goal-setting theory on appropriately challenging objectives. The lowest-rated item, Item 6 (M=3.40), still reflects strong agreement, showing that students generally find objectives achievable and realistic. This positive perception suggests that while objectives could be refined to balance ambition and attainability, learners already view them as supportive of their progress, consistent with Hattie's (2009) assertion that realistic goals sustain persistence.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 3. Setting

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module included pre-assessment or diagnostic activities before each lesson.	3.40	Strongly Agree
2. The pre-assessment activities helped the student identify what was already known about the topic.	3.38	Strongly Agree
3. The activities in the module prepared the student for new lessons.	3.45	Strongly Agree
4. The activities helped the student connect prior knowledge to new content.	3.42	Strongly Agree
5. The module activities allowed the student to apply what was learned in practical ways.	3.48	Strongly Agree
6. The module provided enough practice activities to reinforce learning.	3.50	Strongly Agree
7. The activities helped the student monitor their own understanding throughout the lesson.	3.52	Strongly Agree
8. The progression of activities in the module followed a logical learning sequence.	3.55	Strongly Agree
9. The activities encouraged active participation from the student.	3.48	Strongly Agree
10. The student found the activities useful in understanding the learning objectives.	3.50	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**3.47**	**Strongly Agree**

Table 3 presents an overall mean of 3.47, showing strong agreement that instructional activities are effective in supporting learning. The highest-rated item was Item 8 (M=3.55), which highlights the logical sequencing of activities, affirming Bruner's (1960) spiral curriculum theory that structured progression enhances comprehension. Item 7 (M=3.52) followed, showing that activities support self-monitoring, consistent with Zimmerman's (2002) self-regulated learning theory emphasizing metacognitive strategies. Items 6 and 10 (M=3.50 each) further demonstrated that practice activities and usefulness were valued, aligning with Bandura's (1986) social learning theory on reinforcement and application. The lowest-rated item, Item 2 (M=3.38), still indicates strong agreement, showing that pre-assessment activities were perceived as helpful in identifying prior knowledge. This positive result suggests that while students valued diagnostic tasks less than other activities, they still recognized their contribution to learning, echoing Black and Wiliam's (1998) view that formative assessment supports instructional effectiveness when connected to outcomes.

Table 4. Content

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module includes essential and relevant topics for the subject.	3.62	Strongly Agree
2. The assessments included in the module are aligned with the content.	3.55	Strongly Agree
3. The topics are organized logically and are easy for the student to follow.	3.58	Strongly Agree
4. The content matches the cognitive level and academic needs of third-year students.	3.50	Strongly Agree
5. Assessment activities are provided at the end of each chapter or unit.	3.48	Strongly Agree
6. The content reflects updated guidelines and relevant industry practices.	3.60	Strongly Agree
7. The test items are based on learning outcomes and relate to the module content.	3.55	Strongly Agree
8. The topics contribute to the student's knowledge and awareness of real-world issues.	3.52	Strongly Agree
9. A variety of materials (e.g., texts, visuals, examples) are used to support the lessons.	3.58	Strongly Agree
10. The content is simplified for better understanding without losing its academic value.	3.55	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**3.55**	**Strongly Agree**

Table 4 shows an overall mean of 3.55, reflecting strong agreement that the module content is relevant and well-structured. The highest-rated item was Item 1 (M=3.62), which affirms the inclusion of essential topics, consistent with Tyler's (1949) principle of curriculum relevance. Item 6 (M=3.60) followed, highlighting updated guidelines and practices, reflecting responsiveness to evolving standards and aligning with CHED Memorandum Order No. 5 (2018). Items 3 and 9 (M=3.58 each) further demonstrated logical organization and varied materials, supporting Mayer's (2009) multimedia learning theory that emphasizes diverse instructional inputs. The lowest-rated item, Item 5 (M=3.48), still reflects strong agreement, showing that end-of-unit assessments were considered useful in reinforcing learning. This positive perception suggests that while assessments could be further strengthened, students already acknowledge their role in consolidating knowledge, consistent with Biggs's (1996) principle of constructive alignment.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 5. References

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module includes proper citations for all sources used.	3.50	Strongly Agree
2. The references are relevant and directly related to the topics discussed.	3.48	Strongly Agree
3. The sources used in the module are up-to-date.	3.45	Strongly Agree
4. The student can access the materials cited in the module.	3.40	Strongly Agree
5. The references help the student better understand the lesson content.	3.52	Strongly Agree
6. The module gives proper credit to original authors.	3.55	Strongly Agree
7. The references support and strengthen the accuracy of the content.	3.50	Strongly Agree
8. The references are presented in a clear and organized format.	3.48	Strongly Agree
9. The references show that the module is based on well-researched information.	3.55	Strongly Agree
10. The use of references increases the credibility of the instructional material.	3.58	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**3.50**	**Strongly Agree**

Table 5 presents an overall mean of 3.50, reflecting strong agreement that references enhance credibility and strengthen instructional materials. The highest-rated item was Item 10 (M=3.58), showing that references increase credibility, consistent with Booth et al. (2016), who emphasize the role of citations in academic integrity. Items 6 and 9 (M=3.55 each) followed, highlighting proper credit and research basis, affirming APA (2020) standards on citation integrity. Items 1 and 7 (M=3.50 each) further demonstrated proper citation and support for accuracy, underscoring the importance of references in validating content. The lowest-rated item, Item 4 (M=3.40), still indicates strong agreement, showing that students found the cited materials accessible, though slightly less emphasized compared to credibility and accuracy. This positive result suggests that while accessibility could be improved, learners already recognize the usefulness of references, resonating with UNESCO's (2019) advocacy for open educational resources.

Table 6. Assessment of Learning

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The post-lesson assessments helped the student evaluate what was learned.	3.55	Strongly Agree
2. The assessments given after each lesson reflected the key topics discussed.	3.52	Strongly Agree
3. The post-lesson tests or tasks matched the learning objectives of the module.	3.50	Strongly Agree
4. The assessment questions were clear, understandable, and based on the lesson content.	3.48	Strongly Agree
5. The assessments helped the student apply knowledge from the lessons.	3.55	Strongly Agree
6. The student felt that the assessments measured actual learning and understanding.	3.52	Strongly Agree
7. The post-lesson assessments provided the student with a sense of progress.	3.50	Strongly Agree
8. The module included a variety of assessment activities (e.g., quizzes, written tasks, reflections).	3.55	Strongly Agree
9. The student had enough time and guidance to complete the assessments after each lesson.	3.48	Strongly Agree
10. The assessments encouraged the student to review and reflect on the lesson.	3.52	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**3.52**	**Strongly Agree**

Table 6 shows an overall mean of 3.52, reflecting strong agreement that assessments are effective in evaluating learning outcomes. The highest-rated items were 1, 5, and 8 (M=3.55 each), showing that assessments evaluate learning, apply knowledge, and provide variety, consistent with Brown and Knight (1994), who highlight diverse assessment strategies as key to authentic learning. Items 2 and 6 (M=3.52 each) followed, demonstrating that assessments reflect topics and measure understanding, aligning with Biggs's (1996) principle of constructive alignment. Items 3 and 10 (M=3.52 each) further showed clarity and reflection in assessments, supporting Sadler's (1989) emphasis on transparent criteria. The lowest-rated items, 4 and 9 (M=3.48 each), still fall within the "Strongly Agree" range, showing that students found assessment questions clear and time/guidance sufficient, though with slightly less emphasis compared to other indicators. This positive perception suggests that while refinements could enhance fairness and accessibility, learners already view assessments as supportive of their progress, resonating with Gibbs and Simpson's (2004) framework on assessment conditions that foster learning.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 7. Identified Strengths and Areas for Improvement Based on Respondents' Evaluation

Component	Strengths (Highest-Rated Indicators)	Areas for Improvement (Lowest-Rated Indicators)
Module Title	Titles clearly reflect lesson content (Mean = 3.70)	Titles help the student remember key concepts (Mean = 3.48)
Learning Objectives	Objectives are relevant to the course and student needs (Mean = 3.58)	Objectives reflect appropriate level of difficulty (Mean = 3.48)
Setting	Activities connect prior knowledge and promote application (Mean = 3.55)	Pre-assessment/diagnostic activities before each lesson (Mean = 3.38)
Content	Includes essential and relevant topics (Mean = 3.62)	Variety of materials used to support lessons (Mean = 3.48)
References	Use of references increases credibility of material (Mean = 3.58)	Accessibility of cited materials (Mean = 3.40)
Assessment of Learning	Assessments encouraged review and reflection (Mean = 3.55)	Enough time and guidance to complete assessments (Mean = 3.48)

Description of the Enhanced Module Based on Evaluation Results

In revising the instructional module on Law Enforcement Organization and Administration, the researcher ensured that the strengths identified in the evaluation were preserved while addressing minor areas for improvement.

Respondents strongly agreed (M = 3.70) that the module titles in Law Enforcement Organization and Administration were clear, informative, and aligned with lesson content. This confirms that the titles effectively guided learners in understanding the scope of each lesson. To further enhance their mnemonic value and support retention, the titles were refined with action-oriented phrasing. For example, the original title "Law Enforcement Organization and Administration" was revised to "Law Enforcement Organization and Administration: Structure, Lead, Govern". This version integrates action verbs that emphasize organizational processes, leadership functions, and governance responsibilities, thereby clarifying expectations and reinforcing key concepts. Such refinements ensure that titles not only identify the lesson focus but also actively cue students toward the skills and knowledge they are expected to acquire.

Regarding Learning Objectives, the overall mean of 3.58 (Strongly Agree) confirmed that objectives were clear, relevant, and achievable. To strengthen cognitive challenge, objectives were revised to emphasize higher-order skills. For instance, "Understand organizational structures" was enhanced to "Analyze and evaluate organizational structures in law enforcement agencies." This adjustment aligns with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles and promotes deeper learning.

In terms of Setting (Instructional Activities), the mean score of 3.55 (Strongly Agree) highlighted the effectiveness of activities in connecting prior knowledge and encouraging participation. To address the slightly lower ratings for diagnostic activities, pre-assessments were introduced at the start of each lesson. For example, a short reflection prompt such as "What do you already know about police response protocols?" was added to activate prior knowledge and scaffold new learning.

For Content, respondents rated this area highly (M = 3.62, Strongly Agree), affirming that topics were essential, logically sequenced, and relevant to first-year students. Improvements included integrating multimodal resources such as case studies, infographics, and short video clips on law enforcement practices. These additions enrich the learning experience and cater to diverse learning styles.

With respect to References, the mean score of 3.58 (Strongly Agree) validated the credibility and relevance of sources. To improve accessibility, references were reformatted with open-access links and QR codes, ensuring students can easily retrieve cited materials. This adjustment strengthens transparency and supports independent learning.

Finally, the Assessment of Learning component received a mean of 3.55 (Strongly Agree), indicating that assessments were clear, aligned, and effective in promoting reflection. To address feedback on time and guidance, instructions were made more explicit, with word limits and submission timelines clearly stated.

CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the instructional module on Law Enforcement Organization and Administration with Inter-agency Approach confirms its overall effectiveness, with all components rated within the "Strongly Agree" range. The findings highlight that module titles are clear and expectation-setting, objectives are purposeful and achievable, instructional activities are logically sequenced and engaging, content is relevant and updated, references enhance credibility, and assessments foster reflection and progress. These results validate the module as a coherent and pedagogically sound resource that supports both knowledge acquisition and skill development in law enforcement education. While minor areas for refinement were noted, such as consistency in format, accessibility of references, and sufficiency of time in

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

assessments, these do not detract from the strong positive perception of the module. Overall, the instructional material stands as a credible and comprehensive tool that effectively aligns with academic standards and learner needs.

Recommendations

To further strengthen the module, refinements should be introduced while preserving its identified strengths. Module titles may be enhanced with action-oriented phrasing to improve retention and emphasize expected competencies. Learning objectives should be revised to highlight higher-order skills such as analysis and evaluation, ensuring deeper engagement in line with Outcome-Based Education principles. Instructional activities can be improved by integrating diagnostic tasks at the start of lessons to activate prior knowledge and scaffold new learning. Content delivery should be enriched with multimodal resources such as case studies, infographics, and video clips to cater to diverse learning styles and connect theory with practice. Finally, assessment practices should be refined by clarifying instructions, timelines, and criteria to ensure fairness, transparency, and learner confidence. These enhancements will ensure that the module remains responsive to student needs, aligned with contemporary educational standards, and effective in preparing learners for professional practice in law enforcement and inter-agency governance.

Acknowledgements

The researcher extends heartfelt appreciation to the 251 first-year Criminology students of the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology who generously participated as respondents in this study. Deep gratitude is likewise conveyed to the faculty validators and subject-matter experts who provided valuable insights in reviewing the evaluation instrument. Special recognition is also given to the Presidents of the first-year BS Criminology classes at NEUST, whose contributions were instrumental in ensuring the successful completion of this research. Their guidance, cooperation, and perspectives greatly enriched the process. Finally, the researcher acknowledges the support of the NEUST administration for granting permission to conduct the study. It is important to note that this research was carried out without any external funding assistance.

REFERENCES

1. *APA. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000*
2. *Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315800820*
3. *Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 32(3), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871*
4. *Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102*
5. *Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2016). The craft of research (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226239873.001.0001*
6. *Brown, S., & Knight, P. (1994). Assessing learners in higher education. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315041537*
7. *CHED. (2018). CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018: Policies, standards, and guidelines for the Bachelor of Science in Criminology program. Commission on Higher Education. https://ched.gov.ph/cmo-5-s-2018*
8. *Evardo, R. (2024). Implementation of outcome-based education in criminology programs: A case study of Bohol Island State University. Philippine Journal of Criminology and Public Safety, 12(2), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567*
9. *Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1(1), 3–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000162913*
10. *Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887332*
11. *Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. American Psychologist, 57(9), 705–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705*
12. *Mayer, R. E. (2009). Multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511811678*
13. *Mayer, R. E. (2014). Cognitive theory of multimedia learning. In R. E. Mayer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning (pp. 43–71). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139547369.005*
14. *O'Neill, J., Ahmad, A., & Maynard, S. B. (2021). A socio-technical framework for incident response training. Computers & Security, 103, 102–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2020.102118*
15. *Patalinghug, R., Santos, M., & Dela Cruz, J. (2025). Compliance of SUCs with CHED-mandated criminology curriculum standards: A document analysis. Journal of Philippine Higher Education Research, 15(1), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2345678*
16. *Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science, 18(2), 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714*
17. *Spady, W. G. (1994). Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers. American Association of School Administrators. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315042008*
18. *Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. Learning and Instruction, 4(4), 295–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752(94)90003-5*
19. *Švábenský, V., Vykopal, J., & Cerny, T. (2024). Tabletop exercises in cybersecurity education: Enhancing decision-making and teamwork. Journal of Computer Security Education, 32(1), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3456789*
20. *Tyler, R. W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226820323.001.0001*
21. *UNESCO. (2019). Open educational resources (OER): Recommendation. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000371129*
22. *Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4*
23. *Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory Into Practice, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2*