



# Stakeholders Awareness and Acceptability on the VMGO and Grading System of Bohol Island State University-Clarín Campus

Dearyl Mae C. Batan\*, Sheila Mae N. Bojos, Romar B. Dinoy, Menchie A. Labrigas

\*College of Teacher Education, Bohol Island State University Clarín Campus, Poblacion Norte, Clarín, Bohol, Philippines

Received: 05 Dec 2022; Received in revised form: 03 Jan 2023; Accepted: 14 Jan 2023; Available online: 21 Jan 2023  
©2022 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Abstract**— A survey was done among 314 respondents from Bohol Island State University (BISU) Clarín Campus. Students, faculty, staff, and parents/guardians answered the survey questionnaire to examine the awareness and acceptability of the BISU vision, mission, goals, objectives, and grading system of the undergraduate and graduate programs. The researchers utilized descriptive survey design with the use of questionnaire as the main tool for data gathering. The study found out that the stakeholders are aware of the university's vision, mission, goals, as well as of the objectives and grading system of BEEd, BSEd-Mathematics, and MAEd programs. Also, the vision, mission, goals, objectives and grading system were considered to be acceptable to the stakeholders. Hence, a parallel study may be conducted yearly to assess and monitor the stakeholders' awareness and acceptability of the VMGO and grading system of the different programs that the university offers.

**Keywords**—awareness, acceptability, stakeholder, mission, vision, goals.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The vision, mission, goals, and objectives (VMGO) of any organization are vital to its existence and direction. Like state universities and colleges (SUCs), each has its unique VMGO that will direct the course of action of the entire system in all its strategic plans, programs and activities and all its operations. During accreditation conducted by the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, Inc. (AACUP), VMGO is one of the ten (10) areas to be surveyed which is very fundamental among all areas and even programs to be accredited. Indeed, everything in the university or college is justified only to the extent that it realizes its VMGO.

The effectiveness of the VMGO lies in its structure and dissemination. In order to attain this, the constituents of an educational institution have to be aware of its VMGO and fully comprehend the implication of such (Lacaba and Pelicano, 2016). It has been strengthened by the idea of Robbins, Coulter, and Stuart-Kotze, (2003), in which

vision, mission, goals, and objectives statements are the fundamental guides for the future of the institution and its academic programs.

One of the primary steps a school leader must take is to set a vision for the school. A vision statement grounds for a forward-looking statement that describes the ideal state of an institution in the future (Spallina, 2004). A clear vision entails an explicit agreement on belief, values, purposes, and goals that guides the desired behavioral attainment (Conley, Dunlap, & Goldman, 1992). Further, a mission statement is a public declaration that schools or other educational organizations use to describe the founding purpose and major organizational commitments (Glossary of Education Reform, 2015). The content of the mission can be utilized to maximize effectiveness of the institution. The program educational objectives are broad statements that describe the career and professional accomplishments that the program is preparing graduates to achieve within three (3) to five (5) years of graduation. These objectives are based on the needs of the program's constituencies

(CHED Memorandum, No. 37, Series of 2012). Besides, goals are the aims at the hierarchical structure below the institutional level (Cascolan & Venture, 2016).

Bohol Island State University, as one of the leading educational institutions in Bohol, has its respective vision, mission, goals and objectives. Its vision is to be a premier Science and Technology university for the formation of a world-class and virtual-laden human resource for sustainable development of Bohol and the country. Along with it is the mission to provide quality higher education in the arts and sciences, as well as in the professional and technological fields, undertake research and development and extension services for the sustainable development of Bohol and the country. Also, goals have been set to address the needs of the strategic sector; hence, Bohol Island State University shall pursue faculty and education excellence and strengthen the current viable curricular programs and develop curricular programs that are responsive to the demands of the times both in the industry and the environment; promote quality research outputs that respond to the needs of the local and national communities; develop communities through responsive extension programs; adopt efficient and profitable income generating projects/enterprise for self-sustainability; provide adequate state-of-the-art and accessible infrastructure support facilities for quality education; and promote efficient and effective good governance supportive of high quality education. Moreover, specific educational objectives have been set on the different programs offered by the institution.

Furthermore, VMGO though very essential receives less attention to researchers especially that it has no weight in the program accreditation. This is the reason why there are only limited number of researches conducted on this topic. This is the very reason why the researchers felt the need to investigate, using the OBE instrument of AACUP, the stakeholders' awareness, acceptability, consistency and clarity of the VMGO and its congruence to the OBE instruction. Similarly, grades can be considered arbitrary in the way that the same symbol is used to convey a multitude of different information about a students' learning progress, competency/ achievement, comparison with peers and efforts with no certain consistency across teachers, schools, or even districts (Hendrickson & Gable, 1997).

On the other hand, grading system, according to Grouland (2002), is ultimately hooked up to the scholastic standard set by the school. This standard represents the school's level of expectations of its students. Evidently, grading has been a part of conventional teaching practices for so long that many people, educators and students alike, do not question its usefulness or validity. Using grades to mark

proficiency, progress, and effort, to compare students to their peers, and to assess the success or failure of teachers and schools is commonplace. As emphasized by Cangleon (2002), school heads use grading analysis as a major criterion for determining academic honors, notably in choosing honor students or in awarding scholarships to deserving students. Hence, teachers and students should be familiar with the grading systems of the school. They should understand that the grading system is an important part of the school's instructional management (Busquit & Mejica, 2009). The vision, mission, goals, objectives, and grading system are all reflected in the syllabus for students to be informed of the university's endeavor and be aware of their educational opportunities and responsibilities in and outside of the classroom.

With that, the researchers decided to conduct this study to determine the level of awareness and acceptability of the faculty, staff, students and parents towards the VMGO and grading system of Bohol Island State University- Clarín Campus.

## II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to determine the stakeholders' level of awareness and acceptability on the vision, mission and goals of Bohol Island State University – Clarín Campus, as well as the objectives and grading system of the following programs: Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Mathematics (BSEd-Mathematics), Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) and Master of Arts in Education major in Educational Management (MAEd).

## III. METHODOLOGY

This research undertaking utilized descriptive survey design with an aid of a questionnaire as main tool in gathering data. The stakeholders who took part in the survey were the following: faculty, staff, students, parents and guardians. Faculty and staff were selected using complete enumeration. Students taking undergraduate programs such as BSEd-Mathematics and BEEd, and those taking graduate program MAEd were selected using simple random sampling. Further, parents and guardians were chosen using convenience sampling. There were 43 faculty members, 22 staff, 164 BEEd and BSEd-Mathematics students, 60 MAEd students, and 25 parents and guardians responded in the survey. The respondents expressed their level of awareness and acceptability of the VMGO and grading system using a 5-point Likert scale (5-very much aware/very much acceptable, 4-much aware/much acceptable, 3-moderately aware/moderately acceptable, 2-aware/acceptable, 1-not aware/not

acceptable). The data were statistically treated using frequency count and weighted mean.

**IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

*Table 1. Stakeholders' Level of Awareness on University's Vision, Mission and Goals*

	Students (n=224)		Faculty (n=43)		Staff (n=22)		Parents/ Guardians (n=25)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Vision	4.55	Very much aware	4.91	Very much aware	4.23	Very much aware	4.16	Much Aware	4.54	Very much aware
Mission	4.53	Very much aware	4.93	Very much aware	4.32	Very much aware	4.24	Very much aware	4.55	Very much aware
Goals	4.21	Very much aware	4.86	Very much aware	4.45	Very much aware	4.36	Very much aware	4.33	Very much aware

Table 1 shows that students (BEEEd, BSEd-Mathematics & MAEd), faculty, staff, parents and guardians are very much aware of the vision, mission and goals of the university, with means of 4.54 (Very much aware), 4.55

(Very much aware), and 4.33 (Very much aware), respectively. This suggests that the stakeholders understand well the course that the university is heading to.

*Table 2. Stakeholders' Level of Acceptability on University's Vision, Mission and Goals*

	Students (n=224)		Faculty (n=43)		Staff (n=22)		Parents/ Guardians (n=25)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Vision	4.68	Very much acceptable	4.14	Much acceptable	3.82	Much acceptable	3.76	Much acceptable	4.47	Very much acceptable
Mission	4.75	Very much acceptable	4.16	Much acceptable	3.86	Much acceptable	3.80	Much acceptable	4.53	Very much acceptable
Goals	4.67	Very much acceptable	4.16	Much acceptable	3.95	Much acceptable	3.88	Much acceptable	4.49	Very much acceptable

In Table 2, it can be gleaned that the vision, mission and goals of the university are acceptable to the students (BEEEd, BSEd-Mathematics & MAEd), faculty, staff, parents and guardians with means of 4.47 (Very much acceptable), 4.53 (Very much acceptable) and 4.49 (Very

much acceptable), respectively. Similarly, the result of the study of Lacaba and Pelicano (2016) in which students were properly informed of the VMGO of the university that can be attributed to the practice of integrating the VMGO in the syllabi and lessons on every subject.

*Table 3. Stakeholders' Level of Awareness on the Program Objectives of BEEEd*

	Students (n=142)		Faculty (n=37)		Staff (n=21)		Parents/ Guardians (n=24)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Objectives of BEEEd	3.63	Much Aware	3.92	Much Aware	3.29	Moderately Aware	3.25	Moderately Aware	3.60	Much aware

It is important to note in table 3 and onwards, the researchers only consider the number of respondents who successfully answered the specific question presented in each table. Table 3 presents that students (BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics), faculty, staff, parents and guardians are aware of the program objectives of Bachelor of

Elementary Education with a mean of 3.60 (Much aware). Since the stakeholders are much aware of the program objectives of BEEd program, it would then strengthen the purpose of the program objectives in preparing graduates based on the needs of the program's constituencies (Segismundo, 2018).

Table 4. Stakeholders' Level of Awareness on the Program Objectives of BSEd-Mathematics

	Students (n=164)		Faculty (n=37)		Staff (n=22)		Parents/ Guardians (n=25)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Objectives of BSEd-Math	3.65	Much Aware	3.92	Much Aware	3.36	Moderately Aware	3.32	Moderately Aware	3.63	Much aware

The mean of 3.63 (Much aware) in table 4 indicates that students (BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics), faculty, staff, parents and guardians are unanimously aware of the

program objectives of Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Mathematics.

Table 5. Stakeholders' Level of Awareness on the Program Objectives of MAEd

	Students (n=60)		Faculty (n=35)		Staff (n=21)		Parents/ Guardians (n=24)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Objectives of MAEd	3.90	Much aware	3.49	Much aware	3.05	Moderately aware	3.04	Moderately aware	3.52	Much aware

As presented in table 5, students (MAEd), faculty, staff, parents and guardians responded that they are aware of the program objectives of Master of Arts in Education major

in Educational Management with a mean of 3.52 (Much aware).

Table 6. Stakeholders' Level of Acceptability on the Program Objectives of BEEd

	Students (n=137)		Faculty (n=35)		Staff (n=20)		Parents/ Guardians (n=23)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Objectives of BEEd	4.23	Very much acceptable	3.80	Much acceptable	3.10	Moderately acceptable	3.09	Moderately acceptable	3.93	Much acceptable

In Table 6, the mean of 3.63 (Much acceptable) implies that the program objectives of BEEd are acceptable to

students (BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics), faculty, staff, and parents and guardians.

Table 7. Stakeholders' Level of Acceptability on the Program Objectives of BSEd-Mathematics

	Students (n=159)		Faculty (n=35)		Staff (n=22)		Parents/ Guardians (n=25)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Objectives of BSEd-Math	4.30	Very much acceptable	3.77	Much acceptable	3.23	Moderately acceptable	3.20	Moderately acceptable	4.01	Much acceptable

It can be gleaned from the data in Table 7, the program objectives of BSEd-Mathematics are acceptable to students (BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics), faculty, staff, parents and guardians with a garnered mean of 4.01 (Much acceptable).

Table 8. Stakeholders' Level of Acceptability on the Program Objectives of MAEd

	Students (n=60)		Faculty (n=35)		Staff (n=21)		Parents/ Guardians (n=22)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Objectives of MAEd	4.05	Much acceptable	3.69	Much acceptable	3.16	Moderately acceptable	3.14	Moderately acceptable	3.68	Much acceptable

Also, as presented in table 8, the program objectives of MAEd are acceptable to students (MAEd), faculty, staff, parents and guardians with a mean of 3.68 (Much acceptable).

Table 9. Stakeholders' Level of Awareness on BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics Grading System

	Students (n=161)		Faculty (n=41)		Staff (n=22)		Parents/ Guardians (n=25)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Grading system of BEEd & BSEd-Math	4.53	Very much aware	4.37	Very much aware	3.32	Moderately aware	3.36	Moderately aware	4.28	Very much aware

As to grading system, students (BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics), faculty, staff, parents and guardians are aware of the grading system of BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics programs. This is indicated by the garnered mean of 4.28 (Very much aware).

Table 10. Stakeholders' Level of Awareness on MAEd Grading System

	Students (n=60)		Faculty (n=35)		Staff (n=20)		Parents/ Guardians (n=23)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Grading system of MAEd	3.95	Much aware	3.91	Much aware	3.05	Moderately aware	3.13	Moderately aware	3.67	Much aware

The mean of 3.67 (Much aware) means that the students (MAEd), faculty, staff, parents and guardians are aware of the grading system of MAEd program.

Table 11. Stakeholders' Level of Acceptability on BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics Grading System

	Students (n=164)		Faculty (n=39)		Staff (n=19)		Parents/ Guardians (n=22)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Grading system of BEEd & BSEd-Math	4.51	Very much acceptable	4.26	Very much acceptable	3.89	Much acceptable	3.86	Much acceptable	4.36	Very much acceptable



The students (BEEd & BSEd-Mathematics), faculty, staff, parents and guardians expressed their acceptance on the grading system of BEEd & BSEd Mathematics program, with a mean of 4.36 (Very much acceptable).

Table 12. Stakeholders' Level of Acceptability on MAEd Grading System

	Students (n=60)		Faculty (n=35)		Staff (n=16)		Parents/ Guardians (n=19)		Average	DR
	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR	Mean	DR		
Grading system of MAEd	4.25	Very much acceptable	4.17	Much acceptable	3.88	Much acceptable	3.84	Much acceptable	4.12	Much acceptable

The mean of 4.12 (Much acceptable) implies that the grading system of MAEd program is acceptable to the students (MAEd), faculty, staff, parents and guardians.

### V. CONCLUSION

The stakeholders are aware of the university's vision, mission, goals, as well as of the objectives and grading system of BEEd, BSEd-Mathematics, and MAEd programs. Further, the vision, mission, goals, objectives and grading system are considered to be acceptable to the stakeholders.

### VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

A parallel study may be conducted yearly to assess and monitor stakeholders' awareness and acceptability of the VMGO and grading system of the different programs that the university offers.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Busquit, P. & Mejica, D. (2009) "Grade Analysis and the Grading System of Holy Cross of Davao College (HCDC) Education Program" Education Program. Pamalandong, Vol 4, Issue 1, ISSN (On-line): 1908-2738. Available: <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=6788>
- [2] Cangleon, J.C. (2002). Designing test for evaluating student achievement, New York: Longman Co.
- [3] Cascolan, H. & Venture, M.J. (2016) "Awareness and Acceptability of the Pangasinan State University Vision, Mission, Campus Goals and the Program Objectives" Journal of Education, Management and Social Science, Vol 2, Issue 1, ISSN (On-line): 2599-4670. Available: <http://psurj.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/JEMSS-2019-010.pdf>
- [4] Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 37, s. 2012 (CMO). Revised Policies and Standards for Undergraduate Teacher Education Curriculum
- [5] Conley, David T.; Diane M. Dunlap; and Paul Goldman. "The "Vision Thing" and School Restructuring." OSSC Report 32, 2 (Winter 1992): 1-8. Eugene: Oregon School Study Council. ED 343 246
- [6] Glossary of Education Reform. (2015). Mission and Vision. Retrieved 27 October 2020 from <https://bit.ly/34tkSbn>
- [7] Grouland, N.E. (2002). Improving marking and reporting in classroom instruction. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company
- [8] Lacaba, L. & Pelicano, A. (2016). "Awareness and Acceptability of the Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives of Eastern Samar State University" International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences. Vol 3, Issue 6, ISSN (On-line): 2349-5219. Available: [https://www.ijires.org/administrator/components/com\\_jresearch/files/publications/IJIRES\\_762\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.ijires.org/administrator/components/com_jresearch/files/publications/IJIRES_762_FINAL.pdf)
- [9] Robbins, S., Coulter, M., and Stuart-Kotze, R. (2003). Management. Toronto: Prentice Hall
- [10] Segismundo, M.C. (2018). "Stakeholders' Awareness and Acceptance of Graduate Program's Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objective, SY 2017-2018" International Journal of Advance Research. Vol 5, Issue 11 (On-line): 948-953. Available: [https://www.journalijar.com/uploads/116\\_639\\_IJAR-20819.pdf](https://www.journalijar.com/uploads/116_639_IJAR-20819.pdf)
- [11] Spallina, JM. (2004). Strategic Planning—Getting Started: Mission, Vision, and Values. Journal on Oncology Management. January-February