

## College of Education Curricular Framework towards Adoption of the Outcome-Based Education Approach

Julius L. Meneses, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>, Nilmar I. Moreno, MA<sup>2</sup>, Salvacion J. Pachejo, Ph.D.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Rizal Technological University

<sup>2</sup>Rizal Technological University

<sup>3</sup>Rizal Technological University

\*jlmeneses@rtu.edu.ph

\*nimoreno@rtu.edu.ph

\*sjpachejo@rtu.edu.ph

---

### ABSTRACT

The focus of this research is to determine the licensure examination performance and the present status of the Teacher Education Program in relation to its curricular elements. Specifically, if the RTU-Teacher Education Program curricular components predict singly or in combination with the licensure examination of the RTU-Teacher Education Graduate and what strategy must be proposed in order to improve the curriculum of the College of Education. The study is delimited on describing the general elements and analysis of the curricular framework of the Teacher Education Program and is subject to the evaluation through the use of Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) model of evaluation of Daniel Stufflebeam. For the main finding, it reveals that the RTU – College of Education graduates perform well in the Licensure Examination for Teachers in the past three years as exemplified in the institutional passing rates. However, maintaining proper monitoring and assessment is needed. Therefore, the researchers recommend establishing a Quality Assurance office or committee who will ensure proper implementation of OBE. Moreover, Institutional Support as Input Indicator was determined as significant predictor in the LET. Indeed, Institutional Support plays an important role to continuously support the increase in the quality of Program Graduate Outcomes (PGO's) specifically in attaining high percentage in the licensure examination.

### Keywords

Outcome-based Education, Teacher Education Program, Curriculum, and Assessment

---

### Introduction

Nowadays, due to numerous educational challenges brought by national and global innovations such as K to 12 Basic Education Program, ASEAN 2015, and APEC 2021, the recognition and understanding of curricular issues and curricular innovations become crucial (Pawilen, 2015).

According to Bilbao, Dayagbil, and Corpuz (2014), curriculum designers and educators need to enhance the curriculum and propose curricular innovations to respond to the changing educational landscape in the country as well as in other parts of the globe. There is no substitute for being ready and informed.

Nevertheless, most of the time, teachers rely on their hunches and feelings to tell them if a new curriculum seems promising enough to consider as a replacement for or addition to their own classroom curriculum (Walker & Soltis, 2004). Similarly, in the Philippines, according to Bago (2008), due to the lack of framework of many curricular reforms, the process of curriculum revision is frequently characterized as: hodgepodge, piecemeal, patchwork, lack of focus, vague, gut feel, hunches, patterned from an existing model, by chance, or non-deliberate. But through the issued policies, standards, and guidelines of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), the implementation of different approaches towards curriculum revisions became proper and in order.

In 2012, the Commission on Higher Education

(CHED) initiated an immense paradigm shift which is a shift from an Input-based to an Outcome-based Education system (CMO 37, s. 2012). In this paradigm, as stipulated in CMO 46, Series of 2012, students are made aware of what they out to know, understand, and be able to do after completing a unit of study. Teaching and assessment are subsequently geared towards the acquisition of appropriate knowledge and skills and building of student competencies.

However, the adaption and implementation of Outcome-based Education (OBE) still create confusions in tertiary education. This is the reason why the researchers want to determine the present status of the Teacher Education Program of Rizal Technological University, to have baseline information in improving the Teacher Education Program through the CIPP curriculum components.

### Literature Review

OBE, like most concepts in education, has been interpreted in many different ways. The term is often used quite inappropriately as a label for a great variety of educational practices that pay little more than lip-service to the fundamental principles of OBE. To clarify some of this confusion, you must start by realizing that OBE can be viewed in three different ways—as a theory of education, or as a systemic structure for education, or as classroom practice. Ultimately, we need to align the systemic structure

and the classroom practice with the theory if we are to have genuine outcomes- based education. We can think of OBE as a theory (or philosophy) of education in the sense that it embodies and expresses a certain set of beliefs and assumptions about learning, teaching and the systemic structures within which these activities take place. The most detailed articulation of the theory underpinning OBE is given in Spady (1994, 1998). While Spady is not the only person to have made a significant contribution to OBE, he is regarded by many as the world authority on OBE and it is evident that his ideas have had considerable influence on the approach to OBE that has been taken in Philippines.

In Spady's words: "Outcome-Based Education means clearly focusing and organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for all students to be able to do successfully at the end of their learning experiences. This means starting with a clear picture of what is important for students to be able to do, then organizing the curriculum, instruction, and assessment to make sure this learning ultimately happens" (Spady, 1994:1). Such an approach presupposes that someone can determine what things are "essential for all students to be able to do", and that it is possible to achieve these things through an appropriate organisation of the education system and through appropriate classroom practices.

The main idea behind Spady's definition is that OBE is an approach to planning, delivering and evaluating instruction that requires administrators, teachers and students to focus their attention and efforts on the desired results of education —results that are expressed in terms of individual student learning. Within this broad philosophy, there are two common approaches to OBE. One approach emphasizes student mastery of traditional subject-related academic outcomes (usually with a strong focus on subject-specific content) and some cross-discipline outcomes (such as the ability to solve problems or to work co-operatively). The second approach emphasizes long- term, cross-curricular outcomes that are related directly to students' future life roles (such as being a productive worker or a responsible citizen or a parent). These two approaches correspond to what Spady (1994) calls traditional/transitional OBE and transformational OBE.

## Challenges to OBE Principles and Premises

One of the premises of OBE is that schools (and teachers) control the conditions that determine whether or not students are successful at school learning. Contemporary views of learning as a self-regulated activity argue that students also bear significant responsibility for their learning, so that ultimate responsibility is seen as shared between school-teacher-student and parents/caregivers. However, this locus of responsibility issue provides an example of how different people interpret OBE in different ways. For example, Sue Willis, in support of OBE, argues that both school and students must take responsibility for student s' learning, and further, that part of each school's responsibility is to teach students the self-regulatory skills that will enable them to take on such responsibility.

Spady clearly favours the transformational approach to OBE in which outcomes are "high- quality, culminating demonstrations of significant learning in context" (Spady, 1994:18). For Spady, learning is not significant unless the outcomes reflect the complexities of real life and give prominence to the life-roles that learners will face after they have finished their formal education. This notion of orienting education to the future needs of students, and of society in general, is the underlying principle of the Key Competencies in Australia (Mayer, 1993). In a less formal way, it is behind statements such as "The learning outcomes comprise the knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes that students should acquire to enable them to reach their full potential and lead successful and fulfilling lives as individuals, as of the community and at work" (Northern Territory Board of Studies, 1998:2).

In addition to the idea that outcomes should describe long-term significant learning, OBE is underpinned by three basic premises:

- All students can learn and succeed, but not all in the same time or in the same way.
- Successful learning promotes even more successful learning.
- Schools (and teachers) control the conditions that determine whether or not students are successful at school learning. On to these points we can overlay the philosophical base suggested by Mamary (1991) in his discussion of outcomes-based schools:
- All students have talent and it is the job of schools to develop it.
- The role of schools is to find ways for students to succeed, rather than finding ways for students to fail.
- Mutual trust drives all good outcomes-based schools.
- Excellence is for every child and not just a few.
- By preparing students every day for success the next day, the need for correctives will be reduced.
- Students should collaborate in learning rather than compete.
- As far as possible, no child should be excluded from any activity in a school.
- A positive attitude is essential. (If you believe that you can get every student to learn well then they will.)

The view of the timing of student s' progression in OBE creates an issue for a schooling system. The view underlying OBE principles 3 and 4 that emphasizes the need to make accommodations for all students has been challenged in terms of its practicality. Widespread adoption of individual progression, rather than age related year level progression, has substantial structural implications for schools.

A related issue associated with OBE principle 4 concerns the amount of variation within teaching programs needed for students who are progressing at different rates. Venter sees a system-wide structural problem in schools if OBE is interpreted as requiring complete individualization. On this individualization issue, most systems opt for redundancy as a means of dealing with such variation in levels of students' knowledge. As students' progress from one

calendar year/grade level to the next there is an amount of backtracking built into teaching programs to help students to catch up. Under this current system some students do not catch up, and some students are not extended to achieve their full potential. (Lawson, M. & Williams, H, 2007)

## Using Outcomes to Guide Instructional Planning

In an OBE system, there are three major steps in instructional planning: deciding on the outcomes that students are to achieve, deciding how to assist students to achieve those outcomes (i.e., deciding on content and teaching strategies), and deciding how to determine when students have achieved the outcomes (i.e., deciding on assessment and reporting procedures). For most teachers, these decisions will be made from their perspective as a subject specialist (e.g., a teacher of secondary science). However, if students are to achieve broader outcomes—such as the Key Competencies—learning programmes will have to be organised in an integrated way which draws on elements of all learning areas.

Programs can be for large units of work (such as a four-year course) or for small units of work (such as a section of a subject). Although the details of these programmes will be quite different, their structure can be similar. Each programme should have a rationale (to explain why the programme exists), aims (to explain what the programme will achieve), outcome statements (to indicate what students are to learn), content statements (to indicate what broad areas of content will be used as vehicles for student learning), teaching strategy statements (to indicate how the learning activities will be organized), and assessment guidelines (to indicate how student learning will be assessed and reported). At some stage, all forms of programming address these issues but, by emphasizing different key elements, three basic styles of programming can be used. In content-based programming, the selection of content precedes consideration of outcomes or teaching strategies; in activities-based programming, the selection of learning experiences precedes other decisions; and, in outcomes-based programming the first decision is about what students will learn and be able to do on completion of the program.

Content-based programming is the approach with which most teachers are familiar. It puts an almost exclusive emphasis on “covering the curriculum” by suggesting that teachers should teach a predetermined amount of content in each time period (lesson, term, year, and so on). Very often, the content that is taught will be linked very closely to a subject-based textbook. This approach gives little consideration to how much individual students will learn in the available time, and leads teachers to think that it is acceptable and appropriate for individual students to learn different amounts. Given the differences that we know exist in students' ability, motivation, learning styles, and so on, variations in the amount that students will learn in a fixed time period are inevitable. However, we should recognise this fact (rather than ignore it) and provide additional learning opportunities for those students who need them. The problem of ignoring individual differences is compounded when we use norm-referenced assessment.

Why is it that in many schools the valuable learning time is divided into uniform periods that are jealously allocated to each subject area, and teachers continue to pretend that this is the best way to help students to learn? Some might be tempted to suggest that this is the only way that school can be organised, but is it? (Time- and calendar-dominated programmes would be quite sensible if all students learned at the same rate, developed at the same rate, mastered different subjects at the same rate, and were equally suited to an educational system that is structured for administrative convenience.

Clearly, such assumptions are nonsense and make a mockery of all the claims that schools provide equal learning opportunities for all students or that teachers are really concerned about their students' individual differences.) Should teachers be satisfied with a system that leads students to think that a period is over when the bell rings, rather than to think that the learning experience is over when they have achieved something meaningful? Should teachers be satisfied with a system that encourages students to see each subject as totally unrelated to any other subject, rather than to see each area of study as an integral part of their journey towards significant learning outcomes that will prepare them for life after school? Should teachers be satisfied with providing students with endless activities that, for some students at least, have no clear purpose? Should teachers be satisfied that some lucky students manage to overcome the handicap of an outmoded system of education and succeed in spite of it? Or, should teachers be trying to find a better system in which all content and all student activities can be justified on the basis of how well they help students to learn meaningful things, and in which all students are given equal opportunities to succeed? These questions can be explored through a consideration of outcomes-based programming.

## Outcomes-based Programming

Programming for outcomes means organising teaching to achieve predetermined results. It starts with a clear specification of what students are to know, what they are to be able to do, and what attitudes or values are desirable by the end of the programme. “In outcomes-based education . . . you develop the curriculum from the outcomes you want students to demonstrate, rather than writing objectives for the curriculum you already have.” (Spady, 1988:6). With these outcomes as a guide, the programme is constructed to give all students an equal opportunity to achieve each outcome. Of course, no approach to programming should ignore practical things such as the total amount of time available for teaching or the resources that can reasonably be expected to be available. However, these should be seen as broad constraints rather than as insurmountable barriers to student learning. Outcomes-based programming attempts to focus clearly and deliberately on student learning. Major time constraints are not ignored, but time is seen as a flexible resource rather than as the principal factor that controls access to learning. Quite obviously, the idea that time should be used as a flexible resource is one that will cause concern for many teachers, and rightly so.

We cannot simply ignore the fact that students come to school for a fixed number of days each year, or that teachers are paid to teach for a fixed number of hours each week. However, we can recognize that in any given period of time (whether it be one hour or one year) not all students are capable of learning the same things, particularly if we teach them all in the same way. Therefore, we have to look for practical ways in which individual learners can be helped to make best use of their learning time, and practical ways in which teachers can make best use of their teaching time. However this is done, it will almost certainly mean that some students will have to be given multiple opportunities to learn and that teachers will have to use multiple ways of providing learning opportunities for students (Killen, 1998).

The most important feature of outcomes-based education is that all students are expected to be successful. It is this desire to have students succeed that determines what content is presented to students, what learning experiences are made available to them, how they are tested, how long they engage in learning particular knowledge or skills, and, above all, what is valued in the educational process. The traditional concern for instructional time is replaced with a concern for student learning. This does not mean that the outcomes have to be trivial so that all students can be successful. Quite the opposite: all instructional efforts are directed towards helping students to achieve significant learning outcomes. In practice, this means that programmes have to be flexible so that students can engage in appropriate learning activities at the time that best suits their stage of understanding or mastery. It also means that assessment of student learning should focus on how well students understand rather than on how much they understand. [This issue is explored in great detail in Biggs & Collis, 1982.]

Finally, it means that students must be given multiple opportunities to learn and to demonstrate their achievement of the outcomes. If you are concerned about this point, it is worth considering the consequences of an education system in which all students are not successful. Quite clearly, one of the consequences is that students who

are not successful in the early stages of their education often remain unsuccessful for their entire school career.

In summary, the starting point for outcomes-based programming must be a clear definition of the outcomes that students are to achieve, and some effort must be made to indicate the priority of each of these outcomes. Next the teacher must describe, in detail, the knowledge, skills and dispositions that students must develop in order to achieve these outcomes. Having done that, the prerequisites that students need before they attempt to develop their new knowledge, skills and attitudes should be made explicit. When addressing the issue of teaching methods and learning experiences, teachers must consider alternative ways of helping students to achieve the outcomes, keeping in mind that not all students will learn at the same rate or learn equally well from the same experiences. Planning becomes a process of anticipating possible activities, rather than predetermining specific activities. As a result, content needs to be seen as a support base for addressing and facilitating students' achievement of the outcomes, rather than as an end in itself. These considerations should lead teachers to identifying the relative difficulties that students are likely to have in achieving each outcome, and to a consideration of the interrelatedness of the outcomes. When teachers can state clearly how they will determine whether or not students have achieved each outcome, and to what level of competence these outcomes are to be demonstrated, they will be ready to develop an appropriate system for assessing individual students and reporting their progress.

The above ideas might suggest that outcomes-based programming is a linear operation that progresses in a lock-step fashion from outcomes to content to teaching strategies to assessment. Nothing could be further from the truth. Outcomes-based programming is an iterative process in which considerations of content, teaching methods and assessment are integrated around a common concern for what students will learn. At each step of the process, teachers must reflect on the ways in which the elements of the curriculum influence one another.



## Methods

This study made use of quantitative research design. This research design according to Babbie (2010) focuses on gathering numerical data and generalizing it across groups of people or to explain a particular phenomenon. In observing certain phenomena, descriptive method is clearly the most appropriate method. Descriptive method involves gathering data that describe events and then organizes, tabulates, depicts, and describes the data collection (Glass & Hopkins, 1984).

Moreover, correlation method was used to find the degree of relationship of different variables such as the administrators and faculty members, alumni, students, and curricular components of the school to the performance in the licensure examination for teachers as well as the product evaluation. This method was utilized in determining and/or predicting the relationship the factors (Borg, 1983).

The research also employed the descriptive-normative-survey technique since the study has determined the characteristics and quality of teacher education curriculum.

Further, to obtain the participants of the study from larger pool of potential participants, the probability sampling method particularly the stratified random sampling which involves dividing the population into homogenous subgroups and then taking a sample in each sub-group was utilized. The respondents were composed of Rizal Technological University – College of Education administrators and faculty members, alumni, and students. The respondents were dominated by the students with the highest total sample of 710 or 54.62% followed by the alumni with a total sample of 548 or 42.15% while the administrators and faculty members got the least total sample of 42 or 3.23%.

## Methodology

The researchers conducted survey among the administrators, faculty members, alumni, and students of RTU-College of Education. The researchers used the researcher-made questionnaire to know their profile and assess the characteristics of the Teacher Education Program of Rizal Technological University through specific curricular components.

The researcher-made questionnaire is composed of two parts: the first part focuses of the demographic profile of the respondents while the second part focuses on the assessment of Teacher Education Program through the use of CIPP Model of Evaluation.

The researcher-made questionnaire has undergone face and content validation by five experts to ensure that

general and important details are given attention. The validity and reliability of the researcher-made questionnaire was thoroughly check and determined to continuously improve the questionnaire before the final administration of the questionnaire.

The following statistical tools were used in the analysis, presentation, and interpretation of data.

1. Frequency was used in counting of the gathered demographic data.

2. Percentage was used to determine the relative distribution of the categorical responses and frequency of gathered data.

3. Weighted Mean was used as a numerical index denoting the level of prevalence of the general curricular components and elements.

4. Multiple Regression Correlation was used to make predictions of the performance of the graduates in the LET and Product Indicators/Evaluation. The researchers considered the RTU-CED administrators, faculty members, alumni, students, and specific curricular components as predictors.

**Table 1. Likert Scale**

| Range |      | Verbal Interpretation |
|-------|------|-----------------------|
| 3.50  | 4.00 | Very Great Extent     |
| 2.50  | 3.49 | Great Extent          |
| 1.50  | 2.49 | Little Extent         |
| 1.00  | 1.49 | None at all           |

Likert Scale in 4 point level arbitrary range was used and its corresponding verbal interpretation. For the purpose of providing qualitative description of the computed values and results the following scales for interpretation were used. A statistical package/program for social science was used to assist the researchers in computation of the data.

**Table 2. Institutional Rate of RTU-Teacher Education Graduates and National Passing Rate in the Licensure Examination for Teachers**

| Period of Examination |           | No. of Examinees | No. of Passers | Institutional Passing | National Passing |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 2014                  | September | 119              | 42             | 35.29                 | 34.41            |
|                       | March     | 111              | 71             | 63.96                 | 28.41            |

|      |           |     |     |       |       |
|------|-----------|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| 2015 | September | 152 | 109 | 71.71 | 31.64 |
|      | March     | 256 | 171 | 66.80 | 41.75 |
| 2016 | September | 76  | 49  | 64.47 | 35.43 |
|      | March     | 308 | 202 | 65.58 | 33.78 |

Table 2 indicates the Institutional Rate of RTU-Teacher Education Graduates and the National Passing Rate in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) from 2014 to 2016. The table shows that the highest performance of the RTU- Teacher Education Graduates in the LET was found in the September 2015 examination with an institutional rate of 71.71 against national passing of 31.64 while the table also reveals that the lowest performance was determined during September 2014 examination with an institutional rate of 35.29 against the national passing of 34.41.

**Table 3. Means Obtained by RTU-CED Administrator, Faculty Member, Alumni, and Student along Context Indicators**

| Context Indicators |                                                  | Weighted Mean |      |      | OM   | VI           |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|--------------|
|                    |                                                  | Adm & Fac     | Alu  | Stud |      |              |
| 1                  | Needs, Opportunities and Rationale of Objectives | 3.27          | 3.15 | 3.23 | 3.22 | Great Extent |
| 2                  | General Learning Environment                     | 3.33          | 3.22 | 3.29 | 3.28 | Great Extent |
| Overall Mean       |                                                  | 3.30          | 3.18 | 3.26 | 3.25 | Great Extent |

Legend: (Adm % Fac) -Administrator and Faculty  
(Alu) -Alumni  
(Stud) -Student  
(%) -Percentage  
(OM) -Overall Mean  
(VI) -Verbal Interpretation

Table 3 presents the means obtained by RTU-CED

administrator and faculty member, alumni, and student along Context Indicators. As presented, the general learning environment has the highest mean value of 3.28 and verbally interpreted its prevalence as very great extent while needs, opportunities and rationale of objectives obtained the lowest mean value of 3.22 but still interpreted as great extent.

**Table 4. Means Obtained by RTU-CED Administrators, Faculty Members, Alumni and Student along Input Indicators**

| Input Indicator |                                         | Weighted Mean |      |      | OM   | VI           |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|--------------|
|                 |                                         | Adm & Fac     | Alu  | Stud |      |              |
| 1               | Admission                               | 2.87          | 2.86 | 2.87 | 2.86 | Great Extent |
| 2               | Program Educational Objectives          | 3.43          | 3.22 | 3.35 | 3.33 | Great Extent |
| 3               | Program Graduate Outcomes               | 3.11          | 3.07 | 3.36 | 3.18 | Great Extent |
| 4               | Learning Outcomes                       | 3.27          | 3.27 | 3.36 | 3.30 | Great Extent |
| 5               | Learning Outputs                        | 3.20          | 3.42 | 3.37 | 3.33 | Great Extent |
| 6               | Curriculum Design                       | 3.41          | 3.50 | 3.45 | 3.46 | Great Extent |
| 7               | Teaching and Learning Strategy/Activity | 3.63          | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.39 | Great Extent |
| 8               | Faculty Members                         | 3.56          | 3.26 | 3.30 | 3.37 | Great Extent |
| 9               | Support Staff                           | 3.58          | 3.15 | 3.23 | 3.32 | Great Extent |
| 10              | Staff Development Activities            | 3.73          | 3.16 | 3.27 | 3.39 | Great Extent |
| 11              | Institutional Support                   | 3.48          | 3.50 | 3.48 | 3.49 | Great Extent |

|                     |                               |             |             |             |             |                     |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|
| 12                  | Facilities and Infrastructure | 3.19        | 3.55        | 3.47        | 3.40        | Great Extent        |
| <b>Overall Mean</b> |                               | <b>3.37</b> | <b>3.27</b> | <b>3.31</b> | <b>3.32</b> | <b>Great Extent</b> |

Legend: (Adm & Fac) -Administrator and Faculty  
(Alu) -Alumni

(Stud) -Student

(%) -Percentage

(OM) -Overall Mean

(VI) -Verbal Interpretation

Table 4 reveals the means obtained by RTU-CED administrators and faculty member, alumni, and student along context indicators. As revealed, institutional support was rated with the highest mean of 3.49 and verbally interpreted its prevalence as very great extent. This table also shows that Admission was identified with lowest mean of 2.86.

**Table 5. Means Obtained by RTU-Ced Administrator, Faculty member, Alumni and Student along Process**

| Indicators         |                                                             |               |      |      |      |              |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|--------------|
| Process Indicators |                                                             | Weighted Mean |      |      | OM   | VI           |
|                    |                                                             | Adm & Fac     | Alu  | Stud |      |              |
| 1                  | Quality Assurance                                           | 3.24          | 3.60 | 3.51 | 3.45 | Great Extent |
| 2                  | Student, Assessment, Development, Advice and Support System | 3.21          | 3.25 | 3.27 | 3.24 | Great Extent |
| Overall Mean       |                                                             | 3.22          | 3.43 | 3.39 | 3.35 | Great Extent |

Legend: (Adm % Fac) -Administrator and Faculty  
(Alu) -Alumni

(Stud) -Student

(%) -Percentage

(OM) -Overall Mean

(VI) -Verbal Interpretation

Table 5 indicates the means obtained by RTU-CED administrators and faculty member, alumni, and student along process indicators. It is showcased in the table that the respondents have given quality assurance with highest mean value of 3.45 and is verbally interpreted as very great extent while student assessment, development, advice and support system was rated 3.45 by the respondents with a verbal interpretation of great extent.

**Table 6. Means Obtained by RTU-Ced Administrators and Faculty Member, Alumni, and Student along Product Indicator**

|                     |                | WM          |             |             | OM          | VI                  |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|
|                     |                | Adm & Fac   | Alu         | Stud        |             |                     |
| 1                   | Student Output | 3.23        | 3.25        | 3.26        | 3.25        | Great Extent        |
| <b>Overall Mean</b> |                | <b>3.21</b> | <b>3.25</b> | <b>3.26</b> | <b>3.25</b> | <b>Great Extent</b> |

Legend: (Adm % Fac) -Administrator and Faculty  
(Alu) -Alumni

(Stud) -Student

(%) -Percentage

(OM) -Overall Mean

(VI) -Verbal Interpretation

Table 6 presents the means obtained by RTU-CED administrators and faculty member, alumni, and student along product indicator. As gleaned on the table, student output was rated with a mean and overall value of 3.25 and with verbal interpretation of great extent. This means that the entire RTU community has almost similar views and perspective of the quality and outcomes composition of the student output as product of the

program system however, indicating also that the output underlies at the level by which there is still a need to meet. Also, the outcomes of the students need to be well defined rather than be specified. The outcomes that are specified may hamper the creative aspect of learners since creative outputs are prevalent in schools. Further, assessment of such outcomes needs to be clear to avoid problems (Lawson and Williams, 2007).

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the result of the Licensure Examination for Teachers based on the Quality Assurance (Process) and Institutional Support (Input). A significant regression was found ( $F(2,203) = 5.590, p < .004$ ), with an  $R^2$  of .043.

Alumni-respondents predicted the result of the Licensure Examination for Teachers is equal to  $4.785 - 0.542$  (Quality Assurance)  $+ 0.276$  (Institutional Support) where Quality Assurance and Institutional Support is measured through an arbitrary rate of 1 – 4. The result of the Licensure Examination for Teachers increases and decreases by  $-0.542$  for a unit increase in Quality Assurance and  $0.276$  for a unit increase in Institutional Support. Both Quality Assurance and Institutional Support were significant predictors of the Licensure Examination for Teachers.

This affirms the idea of Spady that in OBE, the students are provided with enough time to accomplish their task, which is the desired outcome of the curriculum. He further argues that in OBE, the learning becomes achievement-based, rather than time-based (Lawson, M. & Williams, H, 2007).

## Results

After data gathering and data analysis, the following summary of findings are hereby presented in consonance with the research problems:

1. Performance of RTU-Teacher Education Graduate in the licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) in the past three years (2014-2016).

The RTU-Teacher Education Graduate's highest performance rate was 71.71 against 31.64 national passing rate while the lowest performance was 35.29 against the national passing rate of 34.41.

2. Current status of the RTU Teacher Education Program along the following elements:

2.1. Context. General Learning Environment has the highest degree of prevalence while Needs, Opportunities and Rationale of Objectives was rated least prevalent. Overall, the context indicators were evaluated and rated

with mean values ranges from 3.22 as the lowest and to 3.28 as the highest resulting to an overall mean of 3.25 and given a verbal interpretation of great extent.

2.2. Input. Institutional Support was rated with the highest level of prevalence while Admission was identified with lowest level of prevalence. Collectively, all Input indicators were given mean rating ranges from 2.86 at the lowest to 3.49 as the highest resulting to an overall mean of 3.32 and determined with verbal interpretation of very great extent.

2.3. Process. The entire respondent have rated Quality Assurance as the highest prevalent indicators of process while Student Assessment, Development, advice and Support system was rated least with mean values ranges from 3.24 as the lowest to 3.45 as the highest resulting to an overall mean of 3.35 which is verbally interpreted as very great extent.

3. Predictor of the Result of the Licensure Examination for Teachers of the RTU-Teacher Education Graduates.

The result of the licensure examination increases by 0.542 for a unit increase in Quality Assurance and 0.276 for a unit increase in Institutional Support. Moreover, Quality Assurance and Institutional Support are significant predictors of the licensure examination for teachers.

This implies that the hypothesis stating that The RTU-Teacher Education Program elements predict singly or in combination the licensure examination of the RTU-Teacher Education Graduate is accepted and sustained.

## Conclusion

1. The RTU-Teacher Education Graduate's performs well in the Licensure Examination for Teachers in past three years as exemplified in the institutional passing rates.

2. Collectively, the RTU-CED Administrator, Faculty member, Alumni and Student have rated the extent of prevalence of the general curricular elements namely Context, Input, Process and Product of RTU-Teacher Education Program as Very Great Extent.

3. Quality Assurance as Process Indicator and Institutional Support as Input Indicator were determined as significant predictors of the result of licensure examination for teachers of Rizal Technological University.

## Limitations and Future Studies

1. The Rizal Technological University-College of Education along with its Administrator and Faculty Members must develop an abrasive and astringent intervention plan of capability and development program in the areas of General Education, Professional Education



and Field of Specialization to harness and equip the students with the right and appropriate skills and knowledge to improve the result of the licensure examination.

2.To enhance the extent of prevalence of the general curricular elements namely Context, Input and Process of RTU-Teacher Education Program, The Rizal Technological University-College of Education along with its Administrator and Faculty Members must develop a thorough monitoring, assessment and evaluation plans/program/instrument to properly revisit and continuously improve the quality of the Teacher Education Program.

3.An establishment of office/committee and systematically yet rigid strategy of Quality Assurance to materialize the Outcomes-Based Assessment (OBA) procedures appropriately and Institutional Support are necessary to continuously support and scaffold the increase in the quality of Program Graduate Outcomes (PGO's) specifically, in attaining high percentage in the licensure examination.

4.To continuously retool and calibrate the Teacher Education Program along with its Program Elements to globally accepted standards of the Outcomes-Based Education (OBE), Outcomes-Based Teaching and Learning (OBTL) and Outcomes-Based Assessment (OBA) systems, the RTU-CED must adopt the proposed 1.) Outcomes-Based Education Framework for RTU-Teacher Education Program, 2.) Phases of Planning and Implementation of OBE, OBTL and OBA (the RTU way), and 3.) CED Outcomes-Based Syllabus and Learning Plan.

5.Future researchers may conduct similar study to specifically address and deal with other program elements and factors that needs enhancement and retooling.

## Acknowledgements

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, alii idque ea usu. Causae perfecto et nec, etiam scriptorem quo ut. Mel ne mentitum reprehendunt, at vix ipsum tempor doming. Ne hinc volumus qui. Pro diam sonet reprimique ne. Mel et quis posse noster. Has ea alia dicat, nominavi efficiendi eam ei.

## References

- [1] Alessi, F. V. (1991). ODDM: The gentle bulldozer. Quality Outcomes-Driven Education, April, 11-18.
- [2] Ames, R. & Ames, C. (1991). Motivation and effective teaching. In L. Idol and B. F. Jones (Eds.). Educational values and cognitive instruction: Implications for reform. (pp.247-271).
- [3] Ames, C. & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Student learning strategies and achievement motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 535-556.
- [4] Babbie, E. R. (2010). The practice of social research. 12th ed. Belmont, CA: SAGE Publications, 2010.
- [5] Biggs, J. B. & Collis, K. F. (1982). Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO taxonomy (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome). New York: Academic Press.
- [6] Bilbao, P., Dayagbil, F., & Corpuz, B. (2014). Curriculum development for teachers. Philippines: Lomimar Publishing Inc.
- [7] Block, J. H. (Ed.). (1971). Mastery learning: Theory and practice. New York: Holt, Rinehardt and Winston.
- [8] Bloom, B. S. (1973). Every kid can: Learning for mastery. Washington, DC: College/University Press.
- [9] Board of Directors, Network for Outcome-Based Schools. (1992). Toward a network description of outcome-based schooling. Successful schooling for all—A primer on outcome-based education and mastery learning. Roseville, MN: Technology and Information Educational Services.
- [10] Brady, L. (1992). Curriculum development (4th ed.). Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- [11] Brophy, J. (1986). Socialising student motivation to learn. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED269384).
- [12] Brown, A. S. (1988). Outcome-based education: A success story. Educational Leadership, 46(2), 12.
- [13] Burns, R. (1987). Models of instructional organization: A casebook on mastery learning and outcome-based education. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED318117).
- [14] Burns, R. & Squires, D. (1987). Curriculum organization in outcome-based education. The OBE Bulletin, 3, 1-9. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED294313).
- [15] Cockburn, P. (1997). Building a brighter future: Curriculum 2005. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- [16] Collier, D. (2000). Assessment based on outcomes of significance. A paper to be presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Evaluation in Education in Southern Africa, Port Elizabeth, South Africa. 26-29 September.
- [17] Closson, D. (1993). Outcome based education. Retrieved from:

<http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/obe.html>

- [18] Eltis, K. (1995). Focusing on learning: Report of the review of outcomes and profiles in New South Wales Schooling. Sydney: University of Sydney, Faculty of Education.
- [19] Glass, G.V. & Hopkins, K.D. (1996). Statistical methods in education and psychology, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. USA: Person
- [20] Hejazi, B. M. (2011). Outcomes-Based Education (OBE): A Transformational Perspective on Quality and Mobility in Higher Education. Community College Leadership Program. OISE/U of T. p1-30. January 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.jfn.ac.lk>.
- [21] Lawson, M. & Williams, H. (2007). Outcomes-Based Education. Association of Independent Schools of SA
- [22] Llanes, C. C., (2014). Adoption of Outcomes-Based Education in the Philippines: The T.I.P. Experience. Technological Institute of the Philippines 938 Aurora Blvd., Cubao, Quezon City, Philippines. Retrieved from <http://conference.ntu.edu.sg>
- [23] Jacobs, J. O. (2006). Bud the teacher: Good questions - standards or seat time. California.
- [24] Pawilen, G. T. (2015). Curriculum development. Philippines: Rex Book Store.
- [25] Spady, W. G. (1981). School effectiveness and classroom management: Outcome-based education, a national perspective. Paper presented at the Regional Forum of the Appalachian Educational Laboratory, Charleston, SC.
- [26] Spady, W. G. (1994). Outcome-based education: critical issues and answers. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators
- [27] <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/education/scope-and-delimitation-of-the-study-education-essay.php>
- [28] <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=12112&context=rtd>