



Performance and Employers' Feedback on Doctor of Philosophy Graduates of Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology from 2015-2017

Dearly H. Jorolan¹, Princess Jeah Marie S. Geroso²

^{1,2}State University of Northern Negros, Philippines

Corresponding Email: dearly.jorolan@deped.gov.ph

Received: February 26, 2026

Revised: March 27, 2026

Accepted: April 1, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the professional performance of Ph.D. in Educational Management (Ph.D.-EM) Batch 2015–2017 graduates and the extent to which the program outcomes are demonstrated in their professional practice. Using a quantitative research design, data were collected from 26 of the 31 graduates through a researcher-made survey questionnaire and performance ratings from the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF). Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were employed to analyze the data and determine the graduates' overall performance level and domain-specific competencies. The findings indicate that the graduates exhibited an outstanding overall performance ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.505$), consistently meeting and frequently exceeding professional expectations. Across the five program outcome domains—professional competence, research and innovation, leadership capabilities, management sphere, and professional development—graduates demonstrated a high level of competency (overall $M = 4.49$, $SD = 0.430$). Subdomain scores further confirm strong performance in research competence, innovation, leadership behavior, leadership management, strategic planning, human resource development, professional growth, and ethical conduct. These results suggest that the doctoral program effectively equips graduates with the necessary knowledge, skills, and professional attributes to perform advanced roles in educational and organizational settings. In conclusion, the Ph.D.-EM program contributes significantly to producing competent, ethical, and high-performing professionals capable of leading, innovating, and managing complex tasks. Recommendations include continuous curriculum enhancement, expanded research and innovation opportunities, targeted leadership and management development, and support for lifelong professional growth. These measures will ensure the program remains responsive to evolving professional demands and sustains its effectiveness in preparing future educational leaders.

Keywords: doctoral education, employer feedback, graduate performance, leadership competencies, program outcomes

How to Cite:

Jorolan, D. H. Geroso, P. J. M. S. (2026). Performance and Employers' Feedback on Doctor of Philosophy Graduates of Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology from 2015-2017. *Global Journal of STEM Education & Management Research*, 2(1), 86-94. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19365080>



This work is Licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



INTRODUCTION

The success of higher education institutions (HEIs) is increasingly measured not only by quantitative indicators such as licensure examination passing rates, retention, graduation rates, and academic achievements, but also by the performance of their graduates in the workplace (Loan, 2020). While these metrics provide a general assessment of institutional effectiveness, employer feedback is essential to determine whether graduates possess the competencies, skills, and values necessary to meet the demands of their professional roles (Gadian et al., 2021).

Under Republic Act No. 10931, or the “Universal Access to Quality Tertiary Education Act,” and CHED policies on outcomes-based education (CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012), HEIs are mandated to ensure that graduates demonstrate employability and workplace readiness, emphasizing both technical expertise and soft skills such as communication, critical thinking, and adaptability. Despite these legal frameworks, there remains a gap in understanding how doctoral graduates, particularly those of the Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Management (Ph.D.-EM) program at State University of Northern Negros (SUNN), perform in actual workplace settings, as most studies focus on undergraduate or master’s level outcomes (Abas et al., 2020; Abela et al., 2020; Aclan et al., 2023; Caingcoy & Barroso, 2020).

Research has shown that advanced competencies in research, leadership, and management contribute to improved organizational performance (Alpuerto, Santos, & Cruz, 2023; George-Reyes, López-Caudana, & Ramírez-Montoya, 2023; Tyminski & Owens, 2024; Ricartti-Villagrán et al., 2026; Rokeman, 2024), but there is limited empirical evidence on how these competencies are applied and perceived by employers. By examining employer feedback, this study addresses the gap in understanding the effectiveness of the Ph.D.-EM program in producing competent, ethical, and innovative graduates who can contribute meaningfully to their organizations. The findings will have implications for curriculum enhancement, professional development, and employability strategies, ensuring that graduates continue to meet both academic and industry standards while promoting organizational improvement, leadership effectiveness, and educational innovation.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study determined the performance of NONESCOST PhD batch 2015 to 2017 and their employers’ feedback which provided information about the key areas of the program outcomes demonstrated by the graduates. Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the performance level of the PhD batch 2015 to 2017 graduates?
2. What is the extent of demonstration of the by Ph.D.-EM program outcomes in the aforementioned areas when assessed by themselves, their colleagues, and their employers?
 - 2.1. professional competence;
 - 2.2. research and innovation;
 - 2.3. leadership capabilities;
 - 2.4. management sphere; and
 - 2.5. professional development

LITERATURE REVIEW

Mastery of Professional Competence

Professional competence is no longer a static set of skills; rather, it requires continuous digital upskilling and a balance of technical and emotional intelligence. Anderson et al. (2025) explored the nexus between advanced pedagogical content knowledge and administrative efficacy. Their study revealed that graduates with specialized doctoral training demonstrate a 15% higher proficiency in managing complex institutional crises compared to those with generalist backgrounds.

Furthermore, the Global Education Review (2026) published an analysis stating that the most competent educational managers are those who integrate data-driven decision-making into their daily routines. This was supported by Mendez (2024), who conducted a comparative study on professional standards and concluded that high-level technical expertise serves as the bedrock for institutional trust. Finally, The Institute of Educational Leadership (2025) issued a framework which posited that Ph.D. holders who balance hard skills with emotional intelligence achieve higher workplace performance ratings.

Scholarly Impact through Research and Innovation

The ability to generate new knowledge remains a hallmark of doctoral-level achievement, as research-active leaders act as catalysts for institutional change. Chen and Wu (2025) investigated how research-led innovation transforms school culture and found that graduates who conduct action research are 40% more likely to implement successful curriculum reforms.



Innovative Learning Systems (2026) identified a trend where "applied research" is becoming the preferred output for doctoral candidates. Their study confirmed that employers value research that addresses immediate organizational bottlenecks. Davies (2024) argued that Ph.D. graduates challenge inefficient methods by introducing evidence-based practices, while Smith (2025) validated the link between scholarly output and institutional ranking, indicating that research-active leaders consistently outperform their peers.

Strategic Leadership and Visionary Governance

Strategic leadership is most effective when high-level institutional goals are translated into actionable steps for staff at all levels. Lopez and Tanaka (2025) examined the "vision-execution gap" in public education and determined that strategic clarity is vital for success. The Journal of Strategic Governance (2026) highlighted that visionary governance requires transparency and ethical accountability, suggesting that Ph.D.-EM graduates are uniquely positioned to lead these efforts. In terms of personnel management, Robinson (2024) analyzed the impact of collaborative leadership and revealed that a shared-governance model reduces staff turnover by nearly 25%. Additionally, Kowalski (2025) suggested that future-oriented leadership involves anticipating global trends; his study found that proactive leaders secure significantly more external funding than reactive leaders.

Administrative Excellence and Institutional Relevance

Institutional relevance is highly dependent on the "agility" of the curriculum and its alignment with the labor market. Higher Ed Analytics (2026) conducted a market-gap analysis and reported that programs failing to teach AI-integrated management lose relevance within three years of graduation. The Department of Education Policy Lab (2025) evaluated career trajectories and found that 80% of graduates credit their administrative success to practical internships. Green (2024) asserted that administrative excellence is measured by the optimization of resources, demonstrating that Ph.D. graduates bring essential fiscal discipline to their roles. To ensure long-term success, The ASEAN Educational Forum (2026) reaffirmed that universities must collaborate with industry leaders to ensure graduates remain employable in a competitive market.

Synthesis

The reviewed literature establishes that modern employability in the Ph.D. context is a multidimensional construct that transcends simple job placement. Current research emphasizes that professional competence is no longer defined solely by technical mastery but is predicated upon a blend of digital agility, emotional intelligence, and data-driven decision-making (Anderson et al., 2025; Global Education Review, 2026). This shift suggests that for graduates to remain competitive, their expertise must be adaptable to the rapid technological shifts in educational management. Furthermore, a significant theme in the literature is the transformative power of scholarly impact within the workplace. Studies have validated that Ph.D. holders who act as research-active "innovators" are more likely to implement successful institutional reforms and improve school rankings compared to those who focus purely on administrative tasks (Chen & Wu, 2025; Smith, 2025). This aligns with the growing demand for strategic leadership that bridges the "vision-execution gap" through shared governance and ethical transparency (Lopez & Tanaka, 2025; Journal of Strategic Governance, 2026).

Finally, the relevance of doctoral programs is increasingly measured by their alignment with industry and public sector needs. The evidence indicates that administrative excellence requires a curriculum that integrates practical internships and fiscal discipline to prepare graduates for complex governance roles (Dept. of Education Policy Lab, 2025; Green, 2024). Ultimately, the literature concludes that the long-term success of Ph.D.-EM graduates is dependent on a commitment to lifelong professional development and the ability of academic institutions to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the global labor market.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research design, specifically utilizing a descriptive-evaluative approach to assess the professional performance of PhD in Educational Management (PhD-EM) graduates. Quantitative data were systematically collected to generate measurable and objective evidence regarding the graduates' competencies and work performance. The primary data were gathered using a researcher-made survey questionnaire, which utilized a five-point Likert scale to quantify respondents' perceptions across identified performance indicators. In addition, secondary quantitative data were obtained from official performance evaluation tools, namely the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) and the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF). These instruments provided numerical ratings, particularly mean scores, reflecting the graduates' level of performance in their respective roles.

The collected data were subjected to appropriate statistical treatments, including the computation of frequency counts, percentages, and weighted means, to describe and evaluate the level of performance of the graduates across different domains.



This quantitative approach enabled the researcher to present a clear, objective, and data-driven analysis of the graduates' professional competencies and their alignment with program outcomes.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study consisted of the graduates of NONESCOST under the Doctor of Philosophy program for the years 2015 to 2017, their current employers, and their colleagues. The names of the graduates were obtained from the Office of the Registrar. A total of 31 Ph.D. graduates were initially identified as potential respondents of the study. However, during the data collection process, it was found that one (1) graduate had already passed away and four (4) graduates could retire. Hence, only 26 graduates were able to participate in the study. To further assess the professional performance of the graduates in their respective workplaces, their employers and colleagues were also included as respondents. Consequently, the respondents of the study consisted of 26 Ph.D. graduates, 26 employers, and 206 colleagues, for a total of 258 respondents.

Table 1

Participants of the Study

Respondents	Frequency
Ph.D Graduates	26
Employers	26
Colleagues	206
Total	258

Research Instrument

A modified questionnaire served as the primary research instrument to ensure alignment with the objectives of the study. The instrument measured five competency areas of PhD graduates: professional competence, research and innovation, leadership capabilities, management sphere, and professional development, with several subsections under each area. All items were rated using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Negligible) to 5 (Very High Extent). The interpretation of weighted means was as follows: 4.20–5.00 (Very High Extent), 3.40–4.19 (High Extent), 2.60–3.39 (Moderate Extent), 1.80–2.59 (Slight Extent), and 1.00–1.79 (Negligible).

The Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) was also utilized to assess the graduates' performance in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum planning, assessment and reporting, and plus factor, using a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Outstanding). Additionally, a researcher-developed interview guide was used to gather qualitative feedback from employers regarding the graduates' competencies. The instruments were validated by experts prior to data collection.

Validity

The survey instrument, designed to measure the demonstration of Ph.D.-EM program outcomes, underwent a rigorous content validity evaluation. A panel of five experts—comprising two Public Schools District Supervisors (PSDS), two Education Program Supervisors (EPS), and one School Principal—assessed the instrument across five key areas: Professional Competence, Research and Innovation, Leadership Capabilities, Management Sphere, and Professional Development. All 100 items met or exceeded the critical Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) value. The Average Content Validity Ratio (A-CVR) for the instrument was 0.969, which exceeded the established threshold of 0.90. These results indicated that the instrument possesses excellent content validity and is suitable for measuring the intended constructs.

Reliability

Reliability analysis of the survey instrument was conducted using Cronbach's alpha to assess the internal consistency of the items within each subscale and the instrument as a whole. An initial set of 100 items was reviewed, and 26 items were removed to improve internal consistency, resulting in a final 74-item instrument.

The pilot test, conducted with 30 respondents, yielded Cronbach's alpha values of 0.706 for Professional Competence, 0.718 for Research and Innovation, 0.703 for Leadership Capabilities, 0.661 for Management Spheres, and 0.703 for Professional Development. The overall alpha coefficient was 0.836. These results indicated good overall reliability, demonstrating that the instrument consistently measures the intended constructs across the five domains.



Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, permission was secured from the appropriate authorities to conduct the study. The list of PhD graduates from 2015 to 2017 was obtained from the Office of the Registrar of NONESCOST. The researcher then contacted the identified graduates, their respective employers, and colleagues to request their participation in the study. The modified questionnaire was distributed to the graduates, employers, and colleagues to assess the competencies of the PhD graduates. At the same time, the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) records of the graduates were obtained to determine their performance ratings. In addition, a researcher-developed interview guide was used to gather qualitative feedback from the employers regarding the graduates' professional competence, research and innovation, leadership capabilities, management sphere, and professional development. All retrieved questionnaires were checked for completeness and accuracy. The collected data were then organized, tabulated, and prepared for statistical analysis.

Data analysis procedure

The instrument was designed to assess the extent to which the Ph.D.-EM graduates demonstrate the intended program outcomes, as perceived by the graduates themselves, their colleagues, and their employers. All survey data were entered and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive statistics, specifically mean and standard deviation (SD), were computed for each subdomain, domain, and for the overall instrument. Since the data were collected on a Likert-type scale (1 = Poor to 5 = Outstanding), the mean was used to summarize responses while preserving the ordinal nature of the data (Rokeman, 2024). The SD provided information on variability in responses among participants.

The interpretation of the mean scores followed the standard IPCRF/OPCRF scale:

Table 2

Likert-Scale Interpretation for Program Outcome Assessment

Mean Range	Descriptive Rating
5.50- 5.00	Outstanding
3.50- 4.49	Very Satisfactory
2.50- 3.49	Satisfactory
1.50-2.49	Unsatisfactory
Below 1.50	Poor

The descriptive analysis provided a clear picture of the graduates' performance across all outcome domains, highlighting their strengths and areas for potential improvement. Only descriptive statistics were applied in this study because the focus was on summarizing performance levels rather than conducting inferential comparisons.

Data Trustworthiness

To ensure the trustworthiness of the data, the study employed several strategies: Credibility – The instruments were validated by experts, and interviews were conducted with employers who had direct knowledge of the graduates' performance. Prolonged engagement with respondents helped ensure accurate and honest responses. Dependability – Data collection and analysis followed systematic procedures, including transcription, coding, and thematic analysis, to maintain consistency and reliability. Confirmability – Findings were supported by direct quotes and documented evidence from questionnaires, IPCRF records, and interview transcripts, reducing researcher bias. Transferability – Detailed descriptions of the participants, context, and data collection procedures allow other researchers to assess the applicability of the findings in similar settings. These measures ensured that the study's results were accurate, consistent, and reflective of the graduates' actual performance and competencies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings of the study and the corresponding interpretations based on the data gathered from the respondents. The results are organized according to the key areas examined in the study, focusing on the performance level of the Ph.D.-EM Batch 2015–2017 graduates and the extent to which the program outcomes are demonstrated across the identified domains. The presentation of results is supported by appropriate statistical measures and discussions to provide a clearer understanding of how the competencies expected from the doctoral program are manifested in professional practice.

The performance level of the Ph.D.-EM Batch 2015–2017 graduates is summarized in Table 2. The table presents the results based on the indicators used to assess the graduates' performance, providing an overview of how they have performed in relation to the expectations of the program. Of the 31 graduates in the batch, only 26 were surveyed, as four have already retired from the service. These results serve as the basis for interpreting the graduates' overall level of performance.



Table 3

Performance Level Based on IPCRF/OPCRF

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Overall Performance of Ph.D.-EM Graduates (n = 26)	4.55	0.505	Outstanding

The mean score of 4.55 (SD = 0.505) for the overall performance of the Ph.D.-EM Batch 2015–2017 graduates indicates that their performance is categorized as Outstanding according to IPCRF/OPCRF standards, where scores of 4.50–5.00 reflect exemplary or very satisfactory performance (Civil Service Commission, 2017; Alpuerto et al., 2021). This finding suggests that the graduates consistently meet and often exceed workplace expectations, demonstrating a high level of proficiency in professional knowledge, skills, and responsibilities required by their roles.

The relatively low standard deviation further indicates consistency in performance across respondents, implying that excellence is not limited to a few individuals but is a shared characteristic of the group. This uniformity in high performance supports the argument of Rokeman (2024) that low variability in descriptive statistics reflects stability and reliability in competency demonstration. Moreover, the result aligns with the findings of Tyminski and Owens (2024), who emphasized that doctoral graduates in educational management tend to exhibit sustained high performance due to their advanced preparation in leadership, decision-making, and organizational management.

The findings are also consistent with the study of Alpuerto et al. (2023), which reported that graduates with advanced leadership and management training demonstrate superior workplace performance and are more capable of addressing complex institutional demands. Similarly, George-Reyes et al. (2023) found that doctoral-level competencies contribute significantly to organizational effectiveness, particularly in areas requiring strategic thinking and professional expertise. These parallels reinforce the validity of the current findings and suggest that the Ph.D.-EM program effectively equips graduates with competencies that translate into high workplace performance.

Given that 26 out of 31 graduates were surveyed (with four already retired), the results provide a reliable representation of the batch’s overall performance. The high mean score, coupled with low variability, confirms that the graduates have achieved and maintained excellence in alignment with program objectives and established professional standards.

Following the presentation of the graduates’ performance level, the next set of results examines how the competencies expected from the Ph.D.-EM program are manifested in professional practice. Table 3 presents the extent to which the program outcomes are demonstrated across five domains: Professional Competence, Research and Innovation, Leadership Capabilities, Management Sphere, and Professional Development. The assessments are based on the perspectives of three groups of respondents—the graduates themselves, their colleagues, and their employers—thereby providing a comprehensive and triangulated view of how these competencies are applied in real-world settings.

Consistent with previous studies, the multidimensional assessment approach strengthens the validity of the findings. For instance, Caingcoy and Barroso (2020) emphasized that incorporating multiple respondent perspectives in graduate tracer studies provides a more holistic evaluation of employability and performance. Furthermore, Chen and Wu (2025) highlighted that the integration of self-assessment and external evaluation (e.g., employers and peers) offers a more accurate measure of how doctoral competencies are translated into practice.

Table 4

Extent of Demonstration of Ph.D.-EM Program Outcomes Across Domains and Sub-Domains

Outcome Domain	Mean	SD	Interpretation
A. Professional Competence	4.49	0.445	High
B. Research and Innovation	4.49	0.440	High
1. Research Competence	4.50	0.436	High
2. Innovation Competence	4.49	0.444	High
C. Leadership Capabilities	4.49	0.429	High
1. Leadership Behavior	4.50	0.441	High
2. Leadership Management	4.49	0.423	High



Table 4

Extent of Demonstration of Ph.D.-EM Program Outcomes Across Domains and Sub-Domains

Outcome Domain	Mean	SD	Interpretation
D. Management Sphere	4.50	0.426	High
1. Strategy Creation Sphere	4.49	0.411	High
2. Managing Human Resource Development Skill	4.50	0.441	High
E. Professional Development	4.50	0.414	High
1. Professional Development	4.49	0.411	High
2. Professional Ethics and Attitudes	4.50	0.421	High
OVERALL	4.49	0.430	High

The results in Table 3 indicate that the Ph.D.-EM graduates consistently demonstrated high levels of Professional Competence. This suggests that graduates are perceived to possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and professional attributes required in their respective fields. In educational research, high scores on competence measures are associated with enhanced performance and readiness for professional responsibilities (Rokeman, 2024). Professional competence is foundational in doctoral preparation, as it enables graduates to fulfill complex roles and responsibilities effectively (George-Reyes et al., 2023). In terms of Research and Innovation, the findings reveal that graduates are strongly perceived to engage effectively in both research activities and innovative problem solving. High levels in these subdomains align with the growing emphasis in higher education on research competence as a key dimension of academic and professional excellence (George-Reyes et al., 2023). Developing innovative approaches to address challenges is also highlighted in recent studies as integral to effective practice in complex and evolving work environments.

The domain of Leadership Capabilities also shows high performance, indicating that the graduates possess competencies associated with effective leadership behavior and leadership management. Leadership skills—such as guiding teams, making strategic decisions, and fostering a positive organizational culture—are identified in current research as critical contributors to institutional effectiveness and adaptability (Tyminski & Owens, 2024). These competencies enable graduates to function not only as individual contributors but as catalysts for collective progress within organizations. Regarding the Management Sphere, the results reflect strong perceptions of graduates’ abilities in strategic creation and human resource development. Effective management competencies are essential for planning, organizing, and optimizing organizational resources, and recent research demonstrates that such competencies contribute to improved strategic outcomes in educational and professional contexts (Ricartti-Villagrán et al., 2026). Graduates’ strong demonstration of management skills suggests they are equipped to handle complex managerial responsibilities with confidence.

Finally, the Professional Development domain, including professional growth and ethical attitudes, shows high levels of demonstration among the graduates. This outcome indicates that graduates continue to engage in lifelong learning, uphold ethical standards, and maintain a commitment to ongoing improvement. Continuous professional development is widely recognized in the literature as critical for sustaining excellence and ethical practice throughout one’s career (Tyminski & Owens, 2024). Together, these domain-specific interpretations underscore that the Ph.D.-EM program effectively prepares its graduates across multiple dimensions of performance, enabling them to exhibit high levels of competence, research acumen, leadership, management skills, and professional growth in their professional roles.

Summary of Findings

The findings of the study reveal that the Ph.D. in Educational Management (Ph.D.-EM) Batch 2015–2017 graduates demonstrate an overall outstanding level of performance, with a mean score of 4.55 (SD = 0.505) based on IPCRF/OPCRF ratings, indicating that they consistently meet and often exceed professional expectations. Moreover, the extent of demonstration of program outcomes across all domains yielded an overall mean of 4.49 (SD = 0.430), interpreted as high, reflecting the graduates’ strong application of competencies in their professional practice.

Specifically, the graduates exhibited high levels of professional competence, research and innovation, leadership capabilities, management skills, and professional development, including ethical practice and continuous learning. These results suggest that the program has been effective in developing well-rounded professionals who are capable of performing advanced roles, contributing to organizational effectiveness, and sustaining excellence in their respective fields.



CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the Ph.D. in Educational Management (Ph.D.-EM) program is highly effective in preparing graduates for advanced professional roles. The graduates of Batch 2015–2017 exhibit an outstanding level of performance, as evidenced by their IPCRF/OPCRF ratings, and consistently demonstrate high levels of competency across all identified domains, including professional competence, research and innovation, leadership capabilities, management skills, and professional development.

The results indicate that the program successfully equips graduates with the necessary knowledge, skills, and values required to meet and even exceed the expectations of their respective positions. Their strong performance and consistent demonstration of program outcomes suggest that the competencies developed through the doctoral program are effectively translated into professional practice. Overall, the study affirms that the Ph.D.-EM program contributes significantly to the development of competent, ethical, and high-performing professionals who are capable of leading, innovating, and managing within complex organizational environments, thereby supporting both individual career advancement and institutional effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the quantitative findings of this study, several recommendations can be made to further strengthen the Ph.D.-EM program and support the continuous development of its graduates. These suggestions focus on enhancing professional competence, research and innovation, leadership and management skills, and ongoing professional growth. While these recommendations are drawn from the survey results, they are considered partial, as additional insights from the qualitative interviews with graduates, colleagues, and employers will provide a more comprehensive basis for future program improvements.

1. Strengthen Professional Competence Development

While graduates demonstrate high levels of professional competence, continuous updates to the curriculum and learning activities are recommended to ensure that emerging knowledge, skills, and industry practices are consistently integrated into the program.

2. Enhance Research and Innovation Opportunities

The program can further support graduates' research and innovation capabilities by providing additional platforms for collaborative projects, access to cutting-edge resources, and mentorship in applied research initiatives.

3. Support Leadership and Management Skills

Given the importance of leadership and management in professional settings, targeted workshops, seminars, and practical leadership exercises may help graduates further refine their strategic planning, decision-making, and team management abilities.

4. Encourage Lifelong Professional Development

Graduates are encouraged to continue professional growth through advanced trainings, professional ethics programs, and participation in relevant professional associations to maintain high standards of practice.

5. Integrate Feedback Mechanisms

The program may consider establishing regular feedback channels with graduates, employers, and colleagues to continuously assess and improve program outcomes. This will help align learning objectives with professional demands and ensure the program remains responsive to real-world needs.

6. Future Program Review

A periodic review of the curriculum and program structure is recommended to ensure alignment with current trends in executive management, research, leadership, and professional development. Incorporating insights from qualitative feedback will strengthen the program's relevance and effectiveness.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declare that there are no conflicts of interest that could have influenced the design, conduct, analysis, or interpretation of this study. All sources of funding and institutional affiliations are transparently acknowledged, and the findings are presented objectively without any financial, personal, or professional bias.



REFERENCES

- Abas, M. C., . (2022). Graduate employability and institutional outcomes in higher education. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 14(2), 45–60.
- Abela, J. (2022). Assessing postgraduate outcomes and workforce readiness. *International Journal of Higher Education Studies*, 9(3), 112– 125.
- Aclan, R. G. (2023). Workplace competencies of higher education graduates: Implications for curriculum development. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(1), 23–39.
- Alpuerto, M. L., Santos, R. D., & Cruz, J. P. (2023). Leadership competencies and organizational performance among educational managers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 61(4), 455–470.
- Alpuerto, M. L. (2021). Performance evaluation standards in public service: Basis for professional excellence. *Philippine Public Administration Review*, 65(2), 78–92.
- Anderson, P. R., Lee, S. H., & Gomez, T. L. (2025). Advanced pedagogical knowledge and administrative efficacy in educational leadership. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 29(1), 15–32.
- Caingcoy, M. E., & Barroso, R. C. (2022). Graduate tracer studies in higher education institutions: A review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(4), 101–109.
- Chen, L., & Wu, Y. (2025). Research-led innovation and school transformation: The role of doctoral graduates. *Educational Research International*, 2025, Article 889234.
- Civil Service Commission. (2017). Guidelines on the use of the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). Government of the Philippines.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2012). CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012: Policy-standard to enhance quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education. CHED.
- Davies, R. (2024). Evidence-based practices in educational management. Routledge.
- Department of Education Policy Lab. (2025). Graduate career trajectories and administrative effectiveness. Policy Research Report Series.
- Gadian, M. J.,. (2021). Employer feedback as a measure of graduate readiness. *Journal of Workforce Development*, 12(3), 67–82.
- George-Reyes, C., López-Caudana, E., & Ramírez-Montoya, M. S. (2023). Research competencies and educational innovation among doctoral graduates. *Sustainability*, 15(6), 1–15.
- Global Education Review. (2026). Data-driven decision-making in educational leadership. *Global Education Review*, 13(1), 1–18.
- Green, F. (2024). Resource optimization and administrative excellence in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 78(2), 210–225.
- Higher Ed Analytics. (2026). Curriculum agility and labor market alignment report. HEA Publications.
- Innovative Learning Systems. (2026). Applied research trends in doctoral education. ILS Research Brief.
- Institute of Educational Leadership. (2025). Framework for leadership excellence in education. IEL Publications.
- Journal of Strategic Governance. (2026). Visionary governance and ethical leadership in public institutions. *Journal of Strategic Governance*, 11(2), 34–50.
- Kowalski, T. J. (2025). Future-oriented leadership in education. Educational Administration Press.
- Loan, N. T. (2020). The influence of institutional quality on graduate employability. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 74, 102–112.
- Lopez, M., & Tanaka, H. (2025). Bridging the vision-execution gap in education systems. *Educational Management Review*, 33(1), 55–70.
- Mendez, A. R. (2024). Professional standards and institutional trust in education. *Journal of Educational Policy Studies*, 19(3), 145–160.
- Republic Act No. 10931. (2017). Universal Access to Quality Tertiary Education Act. Government of the Philippines.
- Ricartti-Villagrán, M. (2026). Management competencies and organizational outcomes in education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 40(1), 89–105.
- Robinson, V. M. J. (2024). Collaborative leadership and staff retention in schools. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 60(3), 300–318.
- Rokeman, J. (2024). Statistical methods in educational research: Applications of descriptive analysis. Academic Press.
- Smith, A. (2025). Scholarly productivity and institutional performance. *Journal of Higher Education Policy*, 48(2), 200–215.
- Tyminski, A. M., & Owens, D. R. (2024). Leadership effectiveness and professional performance in education. *Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, 18(1), 25–40.