Diversitas Journal
ISSN 2525-5215
Volume 9, Issue 3 (jul / sep. 2024) p. 1394 – y
https://diversitasjournal.com.br/diversitas_journal

Evaluation of the Bachelor of Physical Education program at Rizal Technological University anchored on the Engagement Theory Program Quality

QUIBRAL, JERIC [1]

[1] 0009-0001-9650-5315; Institute of Human Kinetics, Rizal Technological University, Mandaluyong 1550, Philippines. Email: jpquibral@rtu.edu.ph

A B S T R A C T

This study evaluated the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPED) program at Rizal Technological University by applying the Engagement Theory Program Quality (ETPQ) framework. The study utilized a mixed-methods approach, namely an explanatory sequential design, which involved conducting surveys and interviews with both students and the program chair. The findings revealed that the BPE program is perceived as highly important, concrete, and effective overall. The university's strengths are found in its faculty and student body, which are diverse. Additionally, the teaching and learning methods are engaging, and the program requirements are well-connected and supported by the faculty. Areas that could be enhanced are cultivating a more robust sense of community, promoting student engagement in research, and optimizing administrative procedures. The investigation revealed a substantial positive correlation between the amount of importance, concreteness, and effectiveness of ETPQ features. The study emphasizes the vital significance of concreteness and effectiveness in increasing the perceived value of program items. The recommendations derived from the findings suggest making adjustments to the curriculum to place greater emphasis on research and individual projects, increasing faculty participation in research activities, and enhancing communication about residency experiences. Additionally, streamlining administrative procedures to optimize resource allocation is suggested. This research offers useful insights for enhancing the BPE curriculum at Rizal Technological University and contributes to the comprehension of ETPQ application in evaluating physical education programs

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article process:
Submitted: 05/26/2024
Approved: 07/29/2024
Published: 08/13/2024

Keywords
Engagement Theory Program Quality (ETPQ), Physical Education Program Evaluation, Mixed Methods Research, Program Improvement

RESUMO

Este estudo avaliou o programa de Bacharelado em Educação Física (BPED) na Rizal Technological University aplicando a estrutura de Qualidade do Programa de Teoria do Engajamento (ETPQ). O estudo utilizou uma abordagem de métodos mistos, ou seja, um design sequencial explicativo, que envolveu a realização de pesquisas e entrevistas com alunos e o presidente do programa. As descobertas revelaram que o programa BPE é percebido como altamente importante, concreto e eficaz no geral. Os pontos fortes da universidade são encontrados em seu corpo docente e discente, que são diversos. Além disso, os métodos de ensino e aprendizagem são envolventes, e os requisitos do programa são bem conectados e apoiados pelo corpo docente. As áreas que poderiam ser aprimoradas são cultivar um senso de comunidade mais robusto, promover o envolvimento dos alunos em pesquisas e otimizar os procedimentos administrativos. A investigação revelou uma correlação positiva substancial entre a quantidade de importância, concretude e eficácia dos recursos do ETPQ. O estudo enfatiza a importância vital da concretude e eficácia no aumento do valor percebido dos itens do programa. As recomendações derivadas das descobertas sugerem fazer ajustes no currículo para dar maior ênfase à pesquisa e aos projetos individuais, aumentar a participação do corpo docente em atividades de pesquisa e melhorar a comunicação sobre as experiências de residência. Além disso, sugere-se a simplificação dos procedimentos administrativos para otimizar a alocação de recursos. Esta pesquisa oferece insights úteis para melhorar o currículo do BPE na Rizal Technological University e contribui para a compreensão da aplicação do ETPQ na avaliação de programas de educação física.

Palavras-chave:
Qualidade do Programa de Teoria do Engajamento (ETPQ), Avaliação do Programa de Educação Física, Pesquisa de Métodos Mistos, Melhoria do Programa

DOI: 10.48017/dj.v9i3.3053

Introduction

As the world strives for excellence, ongoing technical advancements, societal changes, and even reactions to unpleasant situations in our society, the educational system constantly adapts and adjusts to stay up to date and preserve its core principles. Education propels the curriculum ahead in a similar manner. Regrettably, as other industries advanced, Physical Education experienced a decline in participation as students and young people choose to interact with electronic devices and gadgets for entertainment instead. According to Dimarucot's 2022 report, it has been noted that Physical Education is facing a significant problem due to its falling value and decreased presence in the curriculum.

This predicament is not confined to the Philippines alone but also extends to our neighboring countries (Dimarucot, 2022). Physical Education is widely recognized as a crucial factor in fostering the comprehensive growth of individuals, which makes it enduringly relevant despite advancements and modifications. Within our societal framework. In light of the current circumstances, it is crucial to prioritize physical education as we navigate the shift towards modernization.

Physical education has numerous benefits and promotes an active lifestyle, which in turn contributes to mental well-being, an issue that is increasingly prevalent on a global scale. In 2019, there were 970 million people globally who experienced a mental illness, with anxiety and depression being the most widespread. Mental health illnesses can give rise to difficulties in all aspects of life, including interpersonal connections with friends, family, and the community. They can either be the catalyst for or a response to problems in the workplace and educational setting. The World Health Organization (WHO) published this information in 2019. In light of the present problem, educational institutions play a crucial role in addressing the global issue by enhancing their educational curriculum to promote an active lifestyle.

For instance, offering a Bachelor of Physical Education degree can generate future Physical Educators who are dedicated to advocating holistic health. In order to guarantee the quality of the program indicated above, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has issued the CMO 80 series of 2017, which outlines the policies, guidelines, and criteria that must be followed by the higher educational institution offering the BPED. It is necessary to regularly assess and analyze every curriculum to determine its current relevance, concrete, significance, and effectiveness in order to guarantee the provision of high-quality teaching and learning experiences.

The Engagement Theory Program Quality is one of the widely accepted theories used to assess the quality of programs. In their book "Emblems of Quality Higher Education: Developing and Sustaining High-Quality Programs", Jennifer Grant Haworth and Clifton Conrad presented the Engagement Theory of Program Quality (ETPQ). ETPQ is commonly employed in the assessment and evaluation of Higher Education programs in multiple countries. In the Philippines, it was employed to assess a specific program. Nevertheless, the curriculum being assessed is provided by a privately owned educational institution. The study will give a clear and better perspective on the quality of bachelor in physical education program offered by the Rizal Technological University.

Also, this study will assess, and determine program quality: diversity and engaged participants, participatory cultures, interactive teaching and learning, tangible products, and adequate resources.

The Rizal Technological University has been offering the Bachelor of Physical Education program since 2018, and the curriculum has not undergone any revisions, reviews, or evaluations since then. This study aims to assess the efficacy of the physical education program at Rizal Technological University throughout the academic year 2022-2023, utilizing the Program Quality Engagement (ETQP) framework.

This study intends to evaluate the quality of the physical education program at the Rizal Technological University, in the school year 2022-2023, using program quality engagement (ETQP). Specifically, the study aims to find answers to the following research questions: What is the level of importance, concreteness, and effectiveness of the program in terms of the following: 1.1 Diverse and Engaged Participants, 1.2 Participatory Cultures, 1.3 Interactive Teaching and Learning, 1.4 Connected Program Requirements, and 1.5 Adequate Resources: 2. What is the relationship between the level of effectiveness, concreteness, and effectiveness as attributes of a high-quality program?3. How does the level of importance impact and concreteness impact the level of effectiveness? 4. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Physical Education program as determined by the result of the ETPQ attributes? 5. What programs need to be developed to ensure the optimal quality of the Physical Education Program in the University?

RESEARCH METHOD

The research intends to assess and evaluate the Program of Bachelor of Physical Education and it requires a thorough and tedious process to realize it. To capture the complex process of program quality assessment compared to the linear process used in previous literature, Haworth and Conrad (1997) strongly suggest the employment of a combination of methods in order to “develop a more holistic understanding of the quality of their programs” Therefore, Mixed Method will be utilized. Mixed methods research integrates components of quantitative research and qualitative research to address your research inquiry. Utilizing mixed methods allows for a more comprehensive understanding compared to conducting solely quantitative or qualitative studies, as it combines the advantages of both approaches.

Consequently, the research will utilize the explanatory sequential design, It consists of two separate components that are carried out in sequence: a quantitative component, where numerical data is collected and evaluated, followed by a qualitative component, where textual data is acquired and analyzed (Ivankova et al., 2006). The quantitative aspect is frequently given higher priority, and the two aspects might be interconnected in various ways during an intermediate phase (Ivankova et al., 2006). An explanatory sequential design is commonly employed to utilize narrative data in order to provide explanations or interpretations for numerical findings, particularly those that are unexpected (Creswell et al., 2003).

Respondents

This research aims to study the Bachelor of Physical Education department at Rizal Technological University, focusing on students and the chairperson. The study will use stratified random sampling, dividing the population into smaller parts based on shared attributes. The participants will be selected from the first to fourth year of the program, with 40.85% from the 1st year which equates to 94 students, 25.5% from the 2nd year with the numebr of 58 students, 16.55% from the 3rd year with 38 participants, and 17.43% from the 4th year which has a 40 students. The chairperson or department head was interviewed to enhance the qualitative component. The study will use a mixed methodology, including a standardized instrument achored to the study of Dimarucot in 2022 with the titleEvaluation of Bachelor in Physical Education major in Sports and Management Program in higher education institutions in the National Capital region (NCR) using engagement theory program quality (ETPQ and a semi-structured interview protocol.

The researcher obtained a permission to use the standardized questionnaire and validate the semi-structured questionnaire for the qualitative portion. The interview protocool act as a roadmap and guide for conducting the interview in a consistent manner accross participants. Researches made sure to ask same questions written on the protocool with all the participants and it was asked in a logical sequence starting with general questions and progressing towards more specific questions. In addition, probing tecniques was also observed to ask predetermined follow up questions for unclear and insufficient answers. Furthermore, flexibility in questioning still implies for a more indepth exploration of the study. The study also undergo data agreement with the University Data Privacy Office to comply with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 and undergo a research ethics evaluation.

Data Analysis

The researcher uses a mixed method approach for data analysis, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative tools. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean, and standard deviation are used to answer problem number 1. The mean represents the average of a set of data, while standard deviation is the dispersion of data in a normal distribution. The F rank/F Test is used to assess the significance of disparities between two sets of empirical data. The Pearson Moment Product Correlation is used to establish a linear relationship between two variables, while multiple regression analysis examines the association between a dependent variable and multiple independent variables. For SOPs 4 and 5, qualitative data is analyzed using coding analysis and thematic analysis. Coding analysis generates analytical files and records data across the study theme, while thematic analysis systematically examines a dataset to identify recurring patterns and themes. Reflexivity plays a central role in understanding the facts.

Results and Discussions

1. Level of importance, concreteness, and effectiveness of the program

Table 1.
Level of Importance, Concreteness, and Effectiveness of Cluster 1: Diverse And Engaged Participants

Statements	LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE		LEVEL OF CONCRETENESS		LEVEL OF EFFECTIVENESS		OVERALL	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(1) ATTRIBUTE: DIVERSE AND ENGAGED FACULTY (the faculty invests significant time and effort in mutually supportive teaching and learning)	**4.48**	**0.74**	**4.38**	**0.76**	**4.43**	**0.72**	**4.43**	**0.74**
1.1 Faculty share a commitment to student learning and development.	4.48	0.76	4.39	0.77	4.40	0.73	4.42	0.75
1.2 Faculty invest time and effort in various teaching-related activities.	4.52	0.72	4.42	0.73	4.5	0.7	4.48	0.72
1.3 Faculty possess appropriate graduate degrees in line with what they teach in the program	4.43	0.74	4.34	0.78	4.38	0.74	4.38	0.75
(2) ATTRIBUTE: DIVERSE AND ENGAGED STUDENTS (the students invest significant time and effort in mutually supportive teaching and learning)	**4.32**	**0.79**	**4.26**	**0.81**	**4.30**	**0.78**	**4.30**	**0.80**
2.1 Male and female students from a variety of racial, ethnic, educational, and socio-economic backgrounds are represented.	4.32	0.79	4.28	0.78	4.31	0.77	4.30	0.78
2.2 Students actively contribute diverse perspectives on knowledge and practice to class discussion.	4.42	0.74	4.4	0.71	4.4	0.71	4.41	0.72
2.3 Students demonstrate a visible commitment to their own and other learning via: 2.3.1 Participation in classroom discussion	4.44	0.74	4.38	0.78	4.44	0.75	4.42	0.76
2.3.2 Cooperative learning activities and group projects	4.47	0.74	4.38	0.79	4.44	0.75	4.43	0.76

Statements	LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE		LEVEL OF CONCRETENESS		LEVEL OF EFFECTIVENESS		OVERALL	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
2.3.3 Individual projects	4.23	0.84	4.14	0.87	4.17	0.85	4.18	0.85
2.3.4 Independent studies and research	4.04	0.91	4	0.92	4.06	0.87	4.03	0.90
(3) ATTRIBUTE: DIVERSE AND ENGAGED LEADERS (the program chair invests significant time and effort in mutually supportive teaching and learning)	**4.33**	**0.76**	**4.35**	**0.74**	**4.37**	**0.74**	**4.35**	**0.74**
3.1 The program director or chair invites students, faculty, alumni, and employers to participate in the governance of the program.	4.28	0.78	4.31	0.75	4.35	0.71	4.31	0.75
3.2 The chair provides faculty and students with opportunities to assume informal leadership roles in the program.	4.29	0.77	4.3	0.76	4.36	0.76	4.32	0.76
3.3 The chair is instrumental in developing a culture that values teaching and learning.	4.39	0.73	4.39	0.73	4.41	0.71	4.40	0.72
3.4 The chair is effective at promoting the program and building support for it with internal and external audiences.	4.34	0.75	4.39	0.72	4.36	0.76	4.36	0.74
OVERALL	**4.37**	**0.76**	**4.33**	**0.77**	**4.37**	**0.75**	**4.36**	**0.76**

With 4.36 overall weighted mean score (SD=0.76) it can be deduced that participants strongly agreed that Cluster 1 Diverse and Engaged Participants have well attained program attributes since it is rated as highly important (M=4.37, SD=0.76), effective (M=4.47, SD=0.75) and concrete (M=4.33, SD=0.77). Though all aspects are highly rated, effectiveness is the most appreciated facet followed by importance however, though still rated as very high, there could be a need to improve the program's compliance with concreteness.

Faculty members scored the highest (M=4.43, SD=0.74) in fulfilling cluster 1 expectations, indicating their significant investment in teaching and learning support. Leaders, with a mean score of 4.35, also showed high investment in these aspects, albeit slightly lower than the overall mean score. However, learners (M=4.30, SD=0.80) self-assessed themselves lower compared to faculty members and leaders in terms of this investment.The program's strength is evident in the high mean scores and low standard deviations across key attributes, such as faculty's dedicated investment in teaching activities (M=4.48,

SD=0.72), effective facilitation of cooperative learning and group projects (M=4.43, SD=0.76), commitment to student learning (M=4.42, SD=0.75), visible student engagement in discussions and knowledge sharing (M=4.41, SD=0.72), leadership's role in cultivating a teaching and learning-focused culture (M=4.40, SD=0.72), and effective promotion of the program by the chair (M=4.36, SD=0.74), collectively contributing to an enriched and supportive educational environment.

The areas for enrichment, noted by mean scores below the overall mean rating of 4.36, include providing opportunities for faculty and students to assume informal leadership roles (M=4.32, SD=0.76), inviting broader participation in program governance (M=4.31, SD=0.75), ensuring diverse representation among students (M=4.30, SD=0.78), enhancing individual project engagement (M=4.18, SD=0.85), and fostering a culture of independent studies and research (M=4.03, SD=0.90), highlighting avenues for targeted improvement and development.

Table 2.

Level of Importance, Concreteness, and Effectiveness

of Cluster 2 Participatory Cultures

	Level of Importance		**Level of Concreteness**		**Level of Effectiveness**		**OVERALL**	
Statements	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
(4) ATTRIBUTE: SHARED PROGRAM DIRECTION (administrators, faculty, and students work together to build common understanding of and support for all program goals to be achieved)	4.38	0.77	4.34	0.74	4.34	0.76	4.35	0.76
4.1 Program leaders involve the following to continuous program planning and evaluation efforts in which they examine the match between the program's teaching and learning experiences and its overall direction: 4.1.1 Faculty	4.39	0.77	4.34	0.73	4.35	0.75	4.36	0.75
4.1.2 Students	4.40	0.77	4.36	0.74	4.37	0.71	4.38	0.74
4.2 Teaching and learning experiences in the program are connected with the stated program direction.	4.34	0.78	4.32	0.74	4.29	0.81	4.32	0.78
(5) ATTRIBUTE: COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS (ethic of collegial teaching and learning wherein faculty, students, and administration interact with one another more or less as partners)	4.29	0.79	4.35	0.75	4.36	0.77	4.33	0.77
5.1 Faculty and students, senior and junior faculty, and administrators and staff interact with one another more or less as colleagues.	4.28	0.78	4.37	0.73	4.24	0.82	4.30	0.78

	Level of Importance		Level of Concreteness		Level of Effectiveness		OVERALL	
Statements	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
5.2 Faculty and students collaborate between or among themselves on various researches, teaching, and service related projects.	4.38	0.76	4.36	0.75	4.25	0.85	4.33	0.79
5.3 Faculty, students, and administrators share common identity with the program that generates a positive camaraderie among everyone.	4.38	0.79	4.3	0.81	4.36	0.76	4.35	0.79
5.4 Faculty, students, and administrators feel like and treat one another as contributing members in a learning community.	4.14	0.87	4.31	0.8	4.38	0.77	4.28	0.81
5.5 The program has structured the following curricular requirements to promote cooperative and interactive learning among program participants: 5.5.1 School field (for games and sports)	4.00	0.92	4.32	0.77	4.44	0.73	4.25	0.81
5.5.2 Laboratory activities	4.31	0.75	4.39	0.71	4.36	0.78	4.35	0.75
5.5.3 Course work requirements	4.29	0.76	4.36	0.74	4.41	0.72	4.35	0.74
5.5.5 Clubs	4.39	0.73	4.36	0.75	4.44	0.71	4.40	0.73
5.5.6 Out-of-class social events	4.40	0.72	4.4	0.73	4.37	0.77	4.39	0.74
(6) ATTRIBUTE: RISK – TAKING ENVIRONMENT (a supportive learning environment in which students are encouraged to explore new ideas, test developing skills, and challenge themselves to stretch and grow in new ways)	4.41	0.72	4.37	0.74	4.22	0.83	4.33	0.77
6.1 Faculty models risk-taking to students and encourages them to follow their lead in participating in academic projects in and out of the academe.	4.41	0.73	4.39	0.72	4.24	0.81	4.35	0.75
6.2 Faculty provides students with opportunities to take risks in their own learning without penalty.	4.44	0.70	4.4	0.74	4.20	0.80	4.35	0.75
6.3 The program has an open, hospitable, and "safe" learning environment in which students feel supported to take risks in their own learning.	4.38	0.74	4.32	0.77	4.21	0.89	4.30	0.80
Overall	4.36	0.76	4.35	0.74	4.30	0.79	4.34	0.76

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NI-Not Important, SD-Strongly Disagree, IE-Ineffective), 1.81-2.60 (LI-Little Importance, SD- Somewhat Disagree, SE-Somewhat Effective), 2.61-3.40 (SI-Somewhat Important, NAD-Neither Agree/Disagree, ME-Moderately Effective), 3.41-4.20 (MI-Moderately Important, MA=Moderately Agree, E-Effective), 4.21-5.00 (VI-Very Important, SA-Strongly Agree, VE (Very Effective)

Cluster 2 which delves with participatory cultures is perceived as highly important (M=4.36, SD=0.76), concrete (M=4.35, SD=0.74), and effective (M=4.30, SD=0.79) which leads to a high endorsement score of 4.34. However, this indicates the need to enrich the program in terms of effectiveness.

All attributes under Cluster 2 received high endorsement indicating that they are highly important, concrete, and effective. This communicates that the program emphasizes shared program direction,

promoting collaboration among administrators, faculty, and students to align goals effectively. It also fosters a community of learners where faculty, students, and administration engage as partners, fostering a collegial teaching and learning environment. Additionally, the program encourages a risk-taking environment, supporting students in exploring new ideas and skills while challenging themselves to grow and innovate.

The strength of the program is particularly noteworthy are the high levels of importance and effectiveness observed in fostering a community of learners, as indicated by the mean scores for clubs (M=4.40, SD=0.73), out-of-class social events (M=4.39, SD=0.74), student involvement (M=4.38, SD=0.74), and program leadership's continuous planning efforts (M=4.36, SD=0.75). Additionally, the program's emphasis on shared program direction, where administrators, faculty, and students collaborate to achieve common goals, is evident in the robust mean score (M=4.35, SD=0.76). This collaborative approach extends to cultivating a positive camaraderie among everyone involved (M=4.35, SD=0.79). Furthermore, faculty members play a crucial role by modeling risk-taking behavior (M=4.35, SD=0.75) and providing students with opportunities to engage in risk-taking in their learning journeys (M=4.35, SD=0.75), contributing significantly to the program's strengths.

The potential areas for enrichement under participatory cultures are enhancing collaboration between faculty and students on various projects (M=4.33, SD=0.79), strengthening the connection between teaching and learning experiences with the program's direction (M=4.32, SD=0.78), fostering an even more open and supportive learning environment for risk-taking (M=4.30, SD=0.80), encouraging deeper interaction among faculty, students, and administrators as colleagues (M=4.30, SD=0.78), ensuring a stronger sense of contribution and camaraderie within the learning community (M=4.28, SD=0.81), and refining curricular requirements to further promote cooperative and interactive learning, such as in school field activities (M=4.25, SD=0.81). Addressing these areas can contribute to the program's continuous improvement and overall effectiveness in meeting its goals and objectives.

Table 3.

Level of Importance, Concreteness, and Effectiveness of CLUSTER 3: Interactive Teaching and Learning

	Level of Importance		**Level of Concreteness**		**Level of Effectiveness**		**Overall**	
Statements	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
(8) ATTRIBUTE: INTEGRATED LEARNING	**4.27**	**0.79**	**4.36**	**0.74**	**4.35**	**0.74**	**4.33**	**0.76**
8.1 Faculty tie the knowledge and skills they present in their lectures or class discussions to realistic issues and “real world” problems.	4.40	0.75	4.39	0.73	4.44	0.69	4.41	0.72
8.2 Faculty use hands-on instructional activities that involve students directly in making connections between theory and practice such as: 8.2.1 Role-plays	4.17	0.85	4.35	0.74	4.32	0.74	4.28	0.78
8.2.2 Case studies	4.06	0.87	4.37	0.74	4.37	0.71	4.27	0.77
8.2.3 Field trips	4.36	0.71	4.33	0.78	4.27	0.78	4.32	0.76

	Level of Importance		Level of Concreteness		Level of Effectiveness		Overall	
Statements	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
8.2.4 Artistic performances	4.36	0.76	4.38	0.73	4.35	0.76	4.36	0.75
(9) ATTRIBUTE: RISK – MENTORING	**4.39**	**0.73**	**4.38**	**0.73**	**4.33**	**0.78**	**4.37**	**0.74**
9.1 Faculty learns about the student's career interest, goals, and develops individualized program plans alligned with them.	4.36	0.76	4.35	0.75	4.27	0.81	4.33	0.77
9.2 Faculty meets with advisees on a regular basis to discuss their academic progress and performance and professional development.	4.40	0.74	4.43	0.69	4.33	0.80	4.39	0.74
9.3 Faculty mentors student through various forms: 9.3.1 Individualized instruction/tutorials	4.45	0.72	4.35	0.75	4.31	0.79	4.37	0.75
9.3.2 Informal instruction (teaching outside the formal classroom setup)	4.42	0.70	4.41	0.71	4.40	0.72	4.41	0.71
9.3.3 Giving independent readings and research courses	4.31	0.73	4.37	0.73	4.33	0.76	4.34	0.74
10) ATTRIBUTE: COOPERATIVE PEER LEARNING	**4.38**	**0.74**	**4.43**	**0.74**	**4.39**	**0.71**	4.40	0.73
10.1 Faculty engages in collaborative research and teamteaching activities.	4.43	0.68	4.40	0.74	4.34	0.76	4.39	0.73
10.2 Faculty uses a number of instructional approaches to learning including: 10.2.1 small and large group discussion	4.38	0.74	4.43	0.75	4.36	0.74	4.39	0.74
10.2.2 role plays	4.44	0.76	4.42	0.73	4.40	0.69	4.42	0.73
10.2.3 research team and group presentations	4.34	0.75	4.38	0.77	4.42	0.66	4.38	0.73
10.2.4 study groups	4.38	0.72	4.43	0.77	4.40	0.70	4.40	0.73
10.3 An ethic of cooperation and interaction, rather than competition and isolation, characterizes students' interaction in the program.	4.31	0.79	4.50	0.68	4.40	0.68	4.40	0.72
(11) ATTRIBUTE: OUT–OF-CLASS ACTIVITIES	**4.26**	**0.83**	**4.45**	**0.74**	**4.24**	**0.84**	4.32	0.81
11.1 Faculty, administrators, and students design and sponsor an assortment of-out-class activities, including informal discussions, seminars, journal clubs, colloquia, and informal social events.	4.23	0.86	4.51	0.70	4.27	0.81	4.34	0.79
11.2 Faculty, students, and administrators attend out-ofclass functions.	4.22	0.87	4.42	0.76	4.25	0.82	4.30	0.82

Statements	Level of Importance		Level of Concreteness		Level of Effectiveness		Overall	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
11.3 Administrators provide adequate financial support to sponsor various out-of-class activities.	4.34	0.77	4.41	0.77	4.21	0.90	4.32	0.81
Overall	4.33	0.77	4.40	0.74	4.33	0.77	4.35	0.76

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NI-Not Important, SD-Strongly Disagree, IE-Ineffective), 1.81-2.60 (LI-Little Importance, SD- Somewhat Disagree, SE-Somewhat Effective), 2.61-3.40 (SI-Somewhat Important, NAD-Neither Agree/Disagree, ME-Moderately Effective), 3.41-4.20 (MI-Moderately Important, MA=Moderately Agree, E-Effective), 4.21-5.00 (VI-Very Important, SA-Strongly Agree, VE (Very Effective)

Cluster 3 received a very high rating of 4.35 (SD=0.76) indicating that the program was able to excellently employ the components of Interactive Teaching and Learning most especially in terms of fostering its concreteness (M=4.40, SD=0.74), followed by importance and effectiveness which similarly accumulated 4.33 mean score (SD=0.77).

All attributes under cluster 3 received a remarkable high endorsement as well most especially in terms of cooperative learning (M=4.40, SD=0.73), and risk-mentoring (M= 4.37, SD=0.74). Integrated learning (M=4.33, SD=0.76) and out-of-class activities (M=4.32, SD=0.81) were also highly endorsed but a little lower than the overall mean score of 4.35.

Statements that received highest mean score in cluster 3, indicating their significant contribution to an interactive and effective learning environment within the program includes role plays as cooperative learning (M=4.42, SD=0.73), faculty's connection of knowledge to real-world issues (M=4.41, SD=0.72), informal instruction outside formal classrooms (M=4.41, SD=0.71), study groups (M=4.40, SD=0.73), fostering cooperation and interaction (M=4.40, SD=0.72), cooperative peer learning (M=4.40, SD=0.73), collaborative research (M=4.39, SD=0.73), small and large group discussions (M=4.39, SD=0.74), regular advising meetings (M=4.39, SD=0.74), research team presentations (M=4.38, SD=0.73), individualized tutorials (M=4.37, SD=0.75), risk mentoring (M=4.37, SD=0.74), and artistic performances (M=4.36, SD=0.75).

The components, nevertheless important, receive slightly lower scores than the overall mean, signali ng areas that might profit from further improvements or focused enhancements within the program's stru cture includes giving independent readings and research courses (M=4.34, SD=0.74), designing and sponsoring out-of-class activities (M=4.34, SD=0.79), integrated learning (M=4.33, SD=0.76), aligning program plans with student career interests (M=4.33, SD=0.77), field trips (M=4.32, SD=0.76), financial support for out-of-class activities (M=4.32, SD=0.81), attending out-of-class functions (M=4.30, SD=0.82), and hands-on instructional activities like role-plays in integrated learning (M=4.28, SD=0.78) and case studies (M=4.27, SD=0.77).

Table 4.
Level of Importance, Concreteness, and Effectiveness of Cluster 4: Connected Program Requirements

	Level of Importance		Level of Concreteness		Level of Effectiveness		Overall	
Statements	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
(12) ATTRIBUTE: PLANNED BREADTH AND DEPTH OF COURSE WORK (faculty and administrators develop core and specialized course work requirements for students to gain knowledge, skills, and practices expected of all program graduates)	**4.38**	**0.74**	**4.42**	**0.77**	**4.33**	**0.81**	**4.37**	**0.77**
12.1 A core of required course is mandated in the program that provide students with a broad understanding of foundational knowledge in the field.	4.34	0.75	4.42	0.76	4.26	0.88	4.34	0.80
12.2 A set of specialized courses are required in the program that provide in-depth instruction in one or more sub areas of the field.	4.42	0.72	4.41	0.78	4.39	0.73	4.41	0.74
(13) ATTRIBUTE: PROFESSIONAL RESIDENCY (internships in government agencies, business, and human service organization for student seeking for professional careers in different fields)	**4.45**	**0.74**	**4.46**	**0.75**	**4.41**	**0.71**	**4.44**	**0.73**
13.1 Students are required to complete at least one semester-long, hands-on learning experience such as internship, practicum, clinical, or teaching/ research assistantship in an applied setting of their choices.	4.43	0.74	4.43	0.77	4.39	0.72	4.42	0.74
13.2 Faculty and administrators assist students in identifying and selecting residency experiences that match their professional goals and interests.	4.46	0.74	4.48	0.73	4.42	0.69	4.45	0.72
(14) ATTRIBUTE: TANGIBLE PRODUCTS (faculty and administrators require students to complete a product--thesis, project report, or creative performance--in which they demonstrate their abilities to connect knowledge and practice together and	**4.40**	**0.73**	**4.43**	**0.77**	**4.34**	**0.77**	**4.39**	**0.76**

Statements	Level of Importance		Level of Concreteness		Level of Effectiveness		Overall	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
contribute meaningfully to their fields)								
14.1 Students are required to complete an actual product usually a thesis, project report, or artistic performance in which they demonstrate their abilities as knowledgeable and skilled professionals in the field.	4.45	0.72	4.45	0.75	4.34	0.77	4.41	0.75
14.2 Faculty members provide students with individualized guidance and feedback as a appropriate while completing tangible product requirements.	4.35	0.74	4.4	0.79	4.34	0.77	4.36	0.77
Overall	**4.41**	**0.74**	**4.43**	**0.76**	**4.36**	**0.76**	**4.40**	**0.75**

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NI-Not Important, SD-Strongly Disagree, IE-Ineffective), 1.81-2.60 (LI-Little Importance, SD- Somewhat Disagree, SE-Somewhat Effective), 2.61-3.40 (SI-Somewhat Important, NAD-Neither Agree/Disagree, ME-Moderately Effective), 3.41-4.20 (MI-Moderately Important, MA=Moderately Agree, E-Effective), 4.21-5.00 (VI-Very Important, SA-Strongly Agree, VE (Very Effective)

Cluster 4: Connected Program Requirements received a high mean rating as well of 4.40 (SD=0.75) wherein it excelled in terms of level of importance (M=4.41, SD=0.74) followed by concreteness (M=4.43, SD=0.76) while the least yet highly rated as well is its effectiveness (M=4.40, SD=0.75).

All attributes under this cluster received high endorsement from the participants as well with attribute of professional residency and the attribute of planned bredth and depth of course both received 4.37 mean score. Attribute of tangible products got a high mean rating of 4.36 (SD=0.78).

In terms of individual items, the highly scored statements in the program, with mean ratings over the overall mean score, reflect the strength of the program in terms of connected program requirements. This involves faculty and administrators play an active role in assisting students (M=4.45, SD=0.72) to select residency experiences that align with their professional goals, ensuring personalized and meaningful learning journeys. Students are required to engage in hands-on learning experiences such as internships or practicums (M=4.42, SD=0.74), highlighting the program's commitment to practical skill development and real-world application. The program also emphasizes substantial projects like theses or artistic performances (M=4.41, SD=0.75), demonstrating students' comprehensive abilities and expertise in their field. Additionally, specialized courses (M=4.41, SD=0.74) provide in-depth instruction, enriching the curriculum and equipping students with advanced knowledge and specialized skills vital for their professional growth and success.

Within the program, there are avenues for enhancement in the high-rated but less-endorsed components such as faculty providing individualized guidance and feedback during tangible product requirements (M=4.35, SD=0.74) and the core of required courses providing foundational knowledge (M=4.34, SD=0.75).

Table 5.

Level of Importance, Concreteness, and Effectiveness of Cluster 5. Adequate Resources

Statements	Level of Importance		Level of Concreteness		Level of Effectiveness		Overall	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(15) ATTRIBUTE: SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS	**4.40**	**0.71**	**4.44**	**0.72**	**4.32**	**0.78**	**4.39**	**0.74**
15.1 The institution and the department provide funding to support an adequate number of student scholarships, fellowship, and assistantship.	4.39	0.70	4.43	0.71	4.26	0.80	4.36	0.74
15.2 The institution and department provide funding to support student travel to professional conferences.	4.41	0.72	4.45	0.73	4.38	0.76	4.41	0.74
(16) ATTRIBUTE: SUPPORT FOR BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE	**4.39**	**0.74**	**4.44**	**0.73**	**4.32**	**0.78**	**4.39**	**0.75**
16.1 The program receives enough funding from the institution and elsewhere to purchase necessary equipment and supplies.	4.44	0.70	4.45	0.70	4.38	0.74	4.42	0.71
16.2 The program receives enough funding from the institution to maintain suitable needs in the following: 16.2.1 Sports Facilities (gymnasium, fitness gym, courts, field, etc.)	4.46	0.73	4.44	0.73	4.28	0.82	4.39	0.76
16.2.2 Lecture Room/Classroom	4.35	0.75	4.47	0.70	4.31	0.80	4.38	0.75
16.2.3 Performance Facility (theater, auditorium, dance studio, etc.)	4.37	0.76	4.45	0.76	4.31	0.77	4.38	0.76
16.2.4. Laboratory	4.34	0.78	4.40	0.78	4.34	0.76	4.36	0.77

	Level of Importance		Level of Concreteness		Level of Effectiveness		Overall	
Overall	4.40	0.73	4.44	0.73	4.32	0.78	4.39	0.74

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NI-Not Important, SD-Strongly Disagree, IE-Ineffective), 1.81-2.60 (LI-Little Importance, SD- Somewhat Disagree, SE-Somewhat Effective), 2.61-3.40 (SI-Somewhat Important, NAD-Neither Agree/Disagree, ME-Moderately Effective), 3.41-4.20 (MI-Moderately Important, MA=Moderately Agree, E-Effective), 4.21-5.00 (VI-Very Important, SA-Strongly Agree, VE (Very Effective)

Cluster 5 Adequate Resources received a high mean score of 4.36 (SD=0.77) which implies students appreciated this facet of programs. They have the highest endorsement for this cluster being concrete (M=4.44, SD=0.73) followed by its importance (M=4.40, SD=0.73) and last but also high is, it's effectiveness (M=4.32, SD=0.78). Both attributes of support for students and basic infrastructure with both 4.39 mean score.

Data analysis revealed that the strength of the program in terms of cluster 5 involves receiving ample funding to purchase necessary equipment and supplies (M=4.44, SD=0.70), the institution providing funding for student travel to professional conferences (M=4.41, SD=0.72), and sufficient funding from the institution for maintaining sports facilities like gymnasiums, fitness gyms, courts, and fields (M=4.46, SD=0.73).

Laboratory facilities (M=4.34, SD=0.78) received relatively lower ratings, indicating a potential area for improvement or investment. Following this, the lecture room/classroom facilities (M=4.35, SD=0.75) also showed room for enhancement compared to other aspects. Moving up in rating but still suggesting opportunities for enrichment are the funding for student scholarships, fellowships, and assistantships (M=4.39, SD=0.70) and the overall support for basic infrastructure (M=4.39, SD=0.74). ssFinally, the performance facilities such as theaters, auditoriums, and dance studios (M=4.37, SD=0.76) ranked higher within this cluster, indicating a relatively stronger endorsement but still hinting at areas where improvements could be considered.

2. Relationship between the level of effectiveness, concreteness, and effectiveness as attributes of a high-quality program

Pearson product-moment correlation was used because basic assumptions of the parametric test for relationship were attained such as normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity as indicated by the result of the correlational plot in the appendix.

Table 6.
Correlational Analysis of Overall Data in Level of Importance, Level of Concreteness, and Level of Effectiveness

Level of Importance	r value	p value	HO Decision	Interpretation
Level of Concreteness	0.94	<.001	Reject	Significant
Level of Effectiveness	0.91	<.001	Reject	Significant

Legend: ± ≤.30 (small/weak), ± ≤.50 (medium/moderate), ± ≥50 (large/strong),

HO1 is rejected since a significant and positive relationship between the level of importance and concreteness was found [n=407, r=0.94, p<.001] which implies that the rating in the level of importance increases, the rating in the level of concreteness increases as well to a large extent, and vice versa.

On the other hand, HO2 is rejected as well since a significant relationship was established as well [n=407, r=0.91, p<.001] indicating direct and strong relationship. Similar to level of concreteness, level of importance increases as well when the rating of level of effectiveness escalates, and vice versa.

The coefficient of determination, also known as R-squared, is the square of the correlation coefficient (r value). It represents the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the independent variable. This means that approximately 88.36% of the variation in the Level of Importance can be explained by the Level of Concreteness, and vice versa. With r value of .91, 82.81% of the variation in the Level of Importance can be explained by the Level of Effectiveness , and vice versa.

In conclusion, both the Level of Concreteness and Level of Effectiveness have a significant influence on the Level of Importance, explaining 88.36% and 82.81% of its variation, respectively. This suggests that as these factors increase, the Level of Importance also tends to increase significantly. These findings are supported by the p-values which are less than 0.001, indicating statistical significance.

The results presented suggest that concentrating on strengthening the program's concreteness and effectiveness may have a significant effect on its overall importance and achievement of its intended goals and outcomes.

3. How do the level of importance, level of concreteness, and level of effectiveness impact each other?

a. Impact of Level of Concreteness and Effectiveness to Level of Importance

Table 7.
Model Summary – Level of Importance

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	RMSE	R^2 Change	F Change	df1	df2	p
H_0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.00		0	406	
H_1	0.94	0.88	0.88	0.20	0.88	1509.98	2	404	< .001

Based on the results of the linear regression analysis, the model significantly predicts the Level of Importance; $F(2, 404) = 1509.98$, $p < .001$. The model has a high coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.88$), suggesting that 88% of the variance in LOI-OAve is explained by the predictors, Level of Effectiveness (LOE-OAve) and Level of Concreteness (LOC-OAve).

Table 8.
ANOVA for Level of Importance

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
H_1	Regression	123.72	2	61.86	1509.98	< .001
	Residual	16.55	404	0.04		
	Total	140.27	406			

Note. The intercept model is omitted, as no meaningful information can be shown.

The ANOVA results for the Level of Importance (LOI) regression model (H_1) demonstrate statistical significance, with a high F-value of 1509.98 and $p < .001$. This indicates that the predictors in the model significantly contribute to explaining the variability in the Level of Importance.

Table 9.
Coefficients - Level of Importance

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance	Collinearity Statistics VIF
H_0	(Intercept)	4.35	0.03		149.46	< .001	4.30	4.41		
H_1	(Intercept)	0.28	0.08		3.77	< .001	0.14	0.43		
	LOE-OAve	0.74	0.05	0.75	13.71	< .001	0.64	0.85	0.10	10.30
	LOC-OAve	0.19	0.05	0.20	3.56	< .001	0.09	0.30	0.10	10.30

The coefficients table presents the specific relationships between the variables. Both level of effectiveness (LOE) and level of concreteness (LOC) have positive coefficients (0.74 and 0.19, respectively), indicating that as level of importance increases by one unit, LOE and LOC are expected to increase by 0.74 units and 0.19 units, respectively. These coefficients were highly significant ($p < .001$), reinforcing the strength of the relationships

b. Impact of Level of Concreteness and Importance to Level of Effectiveness

Table 10.
Model Summary for Level of Effectiveness

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	RMSE	R^2 Change	F Change	df1	df2	p
H_0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.00		0	406	
H_1	0.97	0.93	0.93	0.15	0.93	2845.75	2	404	< .001

The model summary indicates a strong relationship between the predictors (Level of Concreteness and Level of Importance) and the outcome variable (Level of Effectiveness). The R-squared value of 0.93 suggests that 93% of the variability in the Level of Effectiveness can be explained by the predictors in the model. The p-value of < .001 for the F Change statistic indicates that this model is statistically significant.

Table 11.
ANOVA for Level of Effectiveness

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
H_1	Regression	133.80	2	66.90	2845.75	< .001
	Residual	9.50	404	0.02		
	Total	143.30	406			

Note. The intercept model is omitted, as no meaningful information can be shown.

The ANOVA table further confirms the significance of the model, with a highly significant F-statistic ($F = 2845.75$, $p < .001$) for the regression. This indicates that the predictors collectively have a significant impact on the Level of Effectiveness.

Table 12.

Coefficients for Level of Effectiveness

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p	95% CI		Collinearity Statistics	
							Lower	Upper	Tolerance	VIF
H0	(Intercept)	4.35	0.03		147.62	< .001	4.29	4.41		
H1	(Intercept)	0.03	0.06		0.53	0.60	-0.08	0.14		
	LOC-OAve	0.56	0.03	0.57	18.38	< .001	0.50	0.62	0.17	5.78
	LOI-OAve	0.43	0.03	0.42	13.71	< .001	0.37	0.49	0.17	5.78

The coefficients table provides details on the distinctive impact of each predictor. Furthermore the Level of Concreteness (LOC-OAve) and Level of Importance (LOI-OAve) possessed positive coefficients of 0.56 and 0.43, respectively. Based to the aforementioned coefficients, for every one-unit increment in the Level of Concreteness and Level of Importance, the Level of Effectiveness will rise by 0.56 units and 0.43 units, correspondingly. These relationships are highly significant (p-values <.001), and collinearity statistics indicate acceptable levels of multicollinearity based on tolerances and VIF values.

c. Impact of Level of Importance and Level of Effectiveness to Level of Concreteness

Table 13.

Model Summary for Level of Concreteness

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	RMSE	R^2 Change	F Change	df1	df2	p
H0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.00		0	406	
H1	0.95	0.91	0.91	0.18	0.91	1943.22	2	404	< .001

The model summary for Level of Concreteness reveals a significant relationship between the predictors, Level of Importance (LOI) and Level of Effectiveness (LOE), and the outcome variable, Level of Concreteness (LOC). The R-squared value of 0.91 demonstrates that the model's predictors make up 91% of the variability in LOC. The adjusted R-squared value of 0.91 changes the number of predictors and provides a more accurate estimate of the model's goodness of fit. The F-statistic of 1943.22, with a p-value of less than.001, suggests that the model is highly significant, adding to the evidence that LOI and LOE have a considerable impact on LOC.

Table 14.

ANOVA Table for Level of Concreteness

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
H1	Regression	132.40	2	66.20	1943.22	< .001
	Residual	13.76	404	0.03		
	Total	146.17	406			

Note. The intercept model is omitted, as no meaningful information can be shown.

The ANOVA table for the Level of Concreteness delivers significant results in the regression model. The regression analysis indicates that the predictors, Level of Importance (LOI) and Level of Effectiveness (LOE), have a significant combined effect on Level of Concreteness (LOC). The regression sum of squares (132.40) and mean square (66.20) demonstrate the variability in LOC that can be attributed to variables. The F-statistic of 1943.22, with a p-value of less than 001, verifies the regression model's statistical significance, demonstrating that the predictors are all connected to LOC. Overall, these findings highlight the need to take into account LOI and LOE when analyzing their impact on LOC

Table 15.

Coefficients for Level of Concreteness

							95% CI		Collinearity Statistics	
Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p	Lower	Upper	Tolerance	VIF
H0	(Intercept)	4.38	0.03		147.44	< .001	4.33	4.44		
H1	(Intercept)	0.16	0.07		2.34	0.02	0.03	0.30		
	LOI-OAve	0.16	0.04	0.16	3.56	< .001	0.07	0.25	0.12	8.22
	LOE-OAve	0.81	0.04	0.80	18.38	< .001	0.73	0.90	0.12	8.22

The coefficients table illustrates the associations between the Levels of Importance (LOI), Effectiveness (LOE), and Concreteness (LOC). Both LOI and LOE have positive coefficients (0.16 and 0.81, respectively), implying that when they expand by one unit, LOC ought to rise by 0.16 and 0.81 units, correspondingly. The coefficients are statistically significant (p <.001), indicating a high correlation between LOI, LOE, and LOC. Furthermore, the collinearity data show that the predictors had tolerances greater than 0.1 and VIF values of approximately 8.22, suggesting acceptable levels of multicollinearity.

All three models show substantial relationships and predictive power, demonstrating how useful they are to program improvement initiatives. In order to enhance program outcomes thoroughly, a multifaceted approach that incorporates all three components (LOI, LOE, and LOC) would be helpful. Strategies aimed at enhancing effectiveness (LOE), such as boosting participation, instructional quality, and

program relevance, can have an indirect impact on importance (LOI) and concreteness (LOC). Managing concreteness directly by clarifying objectives, corresponding with stakeholder expectations, and providing clear, measurable outcomes can help to increase the impact of programs. Continuous monitoring and evaluation employing these models can guide iterative modifications, maintaining consistency with stakeholders' interests while also enhancing program efficacy and relevance.

4. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Physical Education program as determined by the result of the ETPQ attributes

In general, the Physical Education program is thought to be operating exceptionally well based on the ETPQ qualities. It is evident that students perceived the program as highly important (M=4.35, SD=0.76), concrete, effective (M=4.35, SD=0.59), and most importantly exceptionally concrete (M=4.38, SD=0.60). As the statistic shows that all clusters and attributes are conceived as important, concrete, and effective the Chair of the department proudly emphasized that it is because all clusters were emphasized daily since the Institute aims to achieve Level IV accreditation from the AACUP or the *Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines and maintain its* Certificate of Program Compliance *(COPC). When asked, what is the strengths of the program, the Chair started to enumerate some such as the diversity of the faculty and students, employing interactive teaching and learning, and the connected program requirements. It was mentioned that Students of BPED are highly immersed to the community and various partnered schools to let them experience the world scenario by engaging them in various community immersions. The chair also stated that the "BPED program has a strong partnership and Memorandum of understanding from our partnered schools to train our students to be good and effective future teachers by experiencing the real job of a teacher before completing the degree."*

All clusters received very high endorsements from the respondents ranging from 4.34 to 4.39 mean scores with cluster 4 (CONNECTED PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS) and cluster 5 (ADEQUATE RESOURCES) as the highest with both 4.39 mean scores followed by cluster 1 (DIVERSE AND ENGAGED PARTICIPANTS). A little lower but still considered high are Cluster 3 cluster (INTERACTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING) and cluster 2 (PARTICIPATORY CULTURES).

The range of scores in terms of attribute is from 4.30 to 4.43 which is an indication that all attributes were well-executed by the Physical Education program. The highest endorsed (M≥4.36) attributes based on mean scores and standard deviations are as follows: Diverse and Engaged Faculty (M=4.43, SD=0.74), highlighting significant investment in supportive teaching and learning; Cooperative Peer Learning (M=4.40, SD=0.73), fostering collaborative academic environments; Support for Students (M=4.39, SD=0.74), ensuring comprehensive student support services; Support for Basic Infrastructure (M=4.39, SD=0.75), enhancing teaching and research facilities; Planned Breadth and Depth of Course Work (M=4.37, SD=0.77), developing core and specialized coursework; Risk – Mentoring (M=4.37, SD=0.74), emphasizing mentorship and innovative approaches; Professional Residency (M=4.37, SD=0.78), integrating real-world experiences into the curriculum; Tangible Products (M=4.36, SD=0.78), requiring meaningful outcomes demonstrating knowledge integration.

The attributes with high but below overall mean scores include Shared Program Direction (M=4.35, SD=0.76), highlighting collaborative efforts among administrators, faculty, and students for program goals; Diverse and Engaged Leaders (M=4.35, SD=0.74), focusing on active involvement of program chairs in teaching and learning; Community of Learners (M=4.33, SD=0.77), ensuring collegial interactions between faculty, students, and administration; Risk-Taking Environment (M=4.33, SD=0.77), promoting supportive learning environments for exploration and growth; Integrated Learning (M=4.33, SD=0.76), underscoring holistic learning approaches; Out-of-Class Activities (M=4.32, SD=0.81), leading experiential learning beyond traditional coursework; and Diverse and Engaged Students (M=4.30, SD=0.80), giving importance on student contributions to collaborative teaching and learning environments.

Based on individual statements, students have high positive reception in terms of faculty engagement and support, particularly in investing time and effort in teaching activities (M=4.48, SD=0.72) and assisting students in selecting relevant residency experiences (M=4.45, SD=0.72). Additionally, they value cooperative learning activities and group projects (M=4.45, SD=0.72), highlighting a positive response to collaborative and interactive learning methods. These aspects contribute significantly to the overall positive perception students have toward the educational experience, emphasizing the importance of faculty involvement, personalized support, and engaging pedagogical approaches.

The only statements that were not rated as very high by students are 2.3.3 Individual projects (M=4.18, SD=0.85) and 2.3.4 Independent studies and research (M=4.03, SD=0.90). This denotes a need for improvement in how students perceive these aspects of the program, suggesting potential areas for enhancement to align with students' expectations and learning preferences. When the chair informed about the result on the lowest or weakest attributes of the department, the chair was not surprised when research and individual projects were revealed. *“I can't deny the fact that research is the weakest part of our Institute since there is a discrepancy in the curriculum of our department”* When he asked about the discrepancy, it was explained that only 1 subject is intended for research and there is no continuation of It that will enhance the research capability of students.

In addition, the chair explains the reason why Individual projects are not very high because of miscommunication between the students and faculty. Faculty seem to have lots on their plates because of the various positions they are holding. Contrary to the high remarks of students about adequate resources, the chair revealed that resources are one of the challenges they are facing. "Optimising our resources is challenging due to the bureaucratic nature of our government, which requires a tedious and lengthy process for everything," the chair added. Additionally, based on his extensive experience as a chair and institute director, he noted that the courses are not strategically delivered. *"There are some courses that should be offered first, followed by a related course with a more advanced and in-depth discourse."* In summary, the BPED program faces several challenges as identified by its Chairperson. These include the research capabilities of both faculty and students, communication between faculty and students, the workload of the faculty, the process for acquiring and allocating budgets, and the overall course structure of the program.

a. Level of Importance

The study focuses on the importance of various clusters in a program, with a mean score ranging from 4.33 to 4.40. The most highly endorsed clusters are adequate resources, connected program requirements, diverse and engaged participants, and participative cultures. Interactive teaching and learning is the least yet still highly rated.All attributes were also rated as very important with a mean score over 4.20, ranging from 4.26 to 4.48. The highest endorsement is given to the significant investment of faculty in supportive teaching and learning environments, the creation of a risk-taking environment that encourages exploration and growth, strong support for students and basic infrastructure, effective mentorship programs, cooperative peer learning initiatives, comprehensive course work planning, shared program direction, professional residency opportunities, and tangible product requirements showcasing knowledge integration.

These attributes collectively reflect the program's strengths as perceived by students, highlighting a supportive and engaging learning environment that fosters skill development, collaboration, and practical application of knowledge.Attributes below the overall mean score but still labeled as very important indicate potential areas for enrichment or improvement. These include diverse and engaged leaders, diverse and engaged students, the concept of a community of learners, integrated learning, and out-of-class activities. Top-rated statements highlight crucial importance of the program's success, such as active engagement in teaching-related activities, commitment to student development, emphasis on cooperative learning, tailored residency experiences, and adequate funding for essential sports facilities.

Some potential areas for enrichment include faculty using hands-on instructional activities, fostering a sense of belonging and contribution within the learning community, case studies, independent studies and research, and curricular requirements promoting cooperative and interactive learning through school field activities

B .Level of Concreteness

The program's concreteness was rated highest by respondents, particularly in terms of adequate support and connected program requirements. Cluster 3 was the most highly rated, followed by cluster 4 and cluster 5. The program also had a strong emphasis on interactive teaching and learning. The program also had a strong emphasis on diverse and engaged participants. However, the bottom five attributes, although highly rated, were rated slightly lower, suggesting areas for improvement. These include integrated learning, a community of learners, diverse and engaged leaders, shared program direction, and diverse and engaged students.

The program's highest endorsements were related to diverse out-class activities, a cooperative ethos among students, support for selecting relevant residency experiences, and well-equipped lecture rooms. The least endorsed statements highlighted areas for improvement, such as fostering a stronger sense of identity among stakeholders, providing more opportunities for informal leadership, ensuring diverse representation, encouraging collaborative learning among students, and refining individual projects and independent studies to align with program goals

c .**Level of Effectiveness**

The Physical Education program is considered highly effective based on the ETPQ qualities, with Cluster 1 diverse and engaged participants being the most effective. The other clusters received high scores, with Cluster 4 and Cluster 3 receiving high scores. Cluster 5 received the least but still highly rated in terms of effectives in Cluster 2. The top attributes in terms of effectiveness are diverse and engaged faculty, cooperative peer learning, diverse and engaged leaders, community of learners fostering collegial interactions, and integrated learning approaches. These attributes highlight the importance of faculty and leadership involvement, collaborative learning environments, and integrated teaching methods in contributing to the program's effectiveness and student outcomes.

The lowest endorsed attributes are professional residency opportunities, diverse and engaged student participation, tangible products demonstrating knowledge integration, out-of-class activities for experiential learning, and a risk-taking environment promoting exploration and growth. These findings emphasize areas for enhancement such as delivering meaningful internships, boosting student involvement, implementing practical outcomes, increasing experiential learning opportunities, and establishing an encouraging environment for innovation and development.

The most effective program facets are faculty investing time and effort in teaching-related activities, integrating knowledge and skills with real-world issues, cooperative learning activities and group projects, students demonstrating commitment to learning through participation, and curricular requirements promoting cooperative learning, including school field activities. These findings emphasize the value of teacher participation, real-world relevance, interactive learning methodologies, student dedication, and comprehensive curriculum design in improving program efficacy and student learning outcomes.

5. What programs need to be developed to ensure the optimal quality of the Physical Education Program in the University?

Technically, all clusters and their attributes were successfully attained by the Physical Education Program in the University upon garnering a mean score of 4.21 and above hence, the programs to be crafted should focus on those that is lower that threshold. Hence, the program's focus on improving the quality of Physical Education should prioritize (1) individual projects and most importantly (2) independent studies and research. These areas consistently received lowest endorsement in terms of importance, concreteness, and effectiveness.

Aside from individual projects and independent studies/research, the focus in terms of level of importance should include hands-on instructional activities such as role-plays, fostering a sense of contribution and collaboration within the learning community, and structured curricular requirements like utilizing school fields for cooperative and interactive learning in games and sports. All other statements in level of concreteness and effectiveness received a very high mark (M>4.20). indicative that it has been well-appreciated by the participants and well-executed by the program.

As a result, the program head determined that in order to keep the program high-performing and relevant, a number of areas needed to be developed. The program director and head of the institute clarified that "*the curriculum of the program should be revisited."* The BPED program of RTU should be reevaluated and adjusted to align with the evolving demands of society and the specific requirements of stakeholders. The research area is one program that has to be improved. The curriculum of the mentioned institute lacks a dedicated subject that specifically emphasizes research. "*Our program offers a single topic that focuses solely on research. This subject specifically covers the first stages of research and does not include the writing process. As a result, our students find the experience challenging and disjointed*." The chair asserted.

The chair clarified that the features of individual projects are influenced by two main factors: the student's comprehension and the teacher's guidance and accessibility. *"Occasionally, students struggle to understand teachers' instructions, and teachers face challenges in managing their workload as they juggle multiple responsibilities,*" the chair elucidated. When questioned about how to solve this issue, he suggested that teachers should prioritize their academic responsibilities, such as teaching and developing materials and methods that will improve students' creativity and comprehension. Consequently, teachers should be relieved of administrative tasks to allow them to have ample time to prepare for their teaching duties.Concerning the budget allocation raised by the chair, when he asked about what are the possible solutions to address this he suggested that better to follow the process to avoid future conflicts. He also mentioned *"Request early so it will be granted on time*"

Conclusion

The Physical Education program is significantly recognized for its strong basis in the development of a diverse and inclusive community, active instructional strategies, and well-organized curricular requirements that incorporate multiple real-world experiences. Very saliently, the engagement with faculty is very far-reaching, and students value the commitment to teaching activity and individual support in which all faculty engage. On a more negative note, areas to improve include more explicit prioritization and greater concreteness where student research and independent projects are concerned. This research has identified the positive linkage between the perceived importance of an effective program in being so, which establishes the gap that can exist between the expectations of the students and a research-based curriculum at present. Endorsing such suggestions will make the program rise above its weaknesses to enhance the achievement of outstanding quality. The curriculum on the program needs to be reviewed as well, there calls for increased emphasis on research and projects done independently in order to meet the needs of society. Furthermore, it will enhance the program itself, making it stronger and more reputable through close interactions between faculty and students on research. Addressing these weaknesses will finally improve student outcomes but also enhance the general quality and reputation of the program.

Recommendations:

The research emphasizes the importance of research and independent learning in the Physical Education program, focusing on individual projects and independent study programs. It emphasizes the need for active student engagement in research, fostering critical thinking skills through effective communication. The curriculum should be revised to incorporate robust research and independent learning projects, incorporating real-case studies and relevant research topics. Curriculum-based learning activities should be implemented to improve communication skills and teamwork abilities. Assessment practices should be refined to measure research, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills. College administrators should streamline budget allocation, provide opportunities for faculty growth, and invest in improved facilities. Stakeholders, such as employers and community partners, should collaborate on research projects, organize internships, and provide feedback on program needs. Future researchers should further advance research by collecting additional data from diverse stakeholders, including the community, faculty, and industry partners. This will help students develop their skills and prepare them for the workforce.

Disclosure of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of Interest

Ethics Statement

The researcher obtained permission from the previous researcher to use the standardized questionnaire. Additionally, a semi-structured questionnaire will be developed for the qualitative portion and will be evaluated by specialists to ensure its validity. Once the necessary approval and validation for the instrument have been obtained, the study will undergo data agreement with the University Data Privacy Office. This is to ensure compliance with the Republic Act No. 10173, generally known as the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (DPA), and to prevent any unauthorized access or disclosure of data. Furthermore, it will also undergo a research ethics evaluation to confirm the absence of any unethical concerns.

Acknowledgment

The researcher expresses gratitude to Prof. Linda Grace Cangayao for dedicating her time and resources to review the statistics and methods utilized in this investigation, hence enabling its execution. Consequently, I would like to express my gratitude to Instr. Michelle Cancio and Instr. Rhoda Malabanan for their unwavering support and understanding to finish this study and realize its objective.

REFERENCES

Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., & Creswell, D. C. (2003). Designing mixed methods research (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Dimarucot, H. C. (2022). Evaluation of Bachelor in Physical Education major in Sports and Management Program in higher education institutions in the National Capital region

(NCR) using engagement theory program quality (ETPQ). Retrieved from https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/faculty_research/5796

Ivankova, L., Stick, S. L., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2006). Mixed methods research: A practical guide for the social and behavioral sciences. Sage Publications, Inc.

Grant Haworth, J., & Conrad, C. F. (2012). Emblems of quality in higher education: Developing and sustaining high-quality programs. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Warburton, D. E., Bredin, S. S., Gupta, K., & Rhodes, R. E. (2016). Physical activity, sedentary behavior, and mental health in adults: A consensus statement from the Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology, the Canadian Public Health Association, and ParticipACTION. Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism, 41(4), 391-421. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3583166/

World Health Organization. (2022). Global status report on physical activity 2018. https://www.who.int/teams/health-promotion/physical-activity/global-status-report-on-physical-activity-2022