Research Article

Institutional Sustainability of Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs) in Region: an Evaluation

Alberto G. Gamboa*

College of Arts and Sciences Don Honorio Ventura State University

ABSTRACT

The study aims to have a comprehensive assessment of the institutional sustainability of the Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs) in Region III. The focus of the evaluative study is on the areas of Governance and Management, Quality of Teaching and Learning, Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work, Support for Students, Relations with the Community, Teaching, and Student's Involvement. 64 respondents for this study evaluated their institutions using the CHEd ISA Tool and the Unit based Sustainability Assessment Tool. Documentary materials and unstructured interview were also utilized to supplement the data gathered through the assessment tools. It was found out that the LCUs in Region III for the Academic Year 2013-2014 are very sustainable. The number of years of operations of the LCUs in Region III does not affect the institutional sustainability assessment in the key results area of Governance and Management, Quality of Teaching and Learning, Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work, Relations with the Community, (USAT) Curriculum, Teaching Approach, Research and Scholarship Activities, Community Engagement, Examination (Assessment) of Sustainability Topics, and Staff Expertise and Willingness to Participate. On the other hand, the number of years of operations of the LCUs in Region affects the institutional sustainability assessment in the key result area of Support for Students and Student's Involvement. That is why the Administrators have plans and strategies that have thought to strengthen the institution's commitment to sustainability.

Keywords: *Sustainability, Institutional Sustainability, Higher Education*

Background

Globally, education is facing vast rapid changes. Various reforms, innovations, and discoveries are being integrated to make the students abreast with changes and be able to adapt in an uncertain environment. However, with the constant rapid changes everywhere, educational systems are not only dealing with the challenge of making theirs globally updated but also making the systems, reforms, policies, and others sustainable to further developments.

The special role of education systems in facilitating, envisioning, and leading change towards sustainability has been the focus of renewed attention (Ryan et. al., 2010). International leaders have declared education as a motor for change, with the United Nations General Assembly implementing the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development from 2005-2014 (UNESCO 2011). Moreover, facilitators of learning are one with such in making education the primary tool to be abreast and adept with changes and make each educational system stand the requirements of time. With these, various universities and colleges are now on their feet in making their institutions surpass such challenge.

According to Bone et. al (2011), there is also a growing public expectation that universities should start focusing on delivering sustainability. Students in particular are starting to place emphasis on sustainability. This emphasis is highlighted by the demands of new students entering the university. Students do not only placed high value on many aspects of sustainability, but also expressed that sustainability concerns are a significant factor in students' university choices. Reality and practicality speak; learners are now dealing with their institution's background. At present, popularity is only secondary. The pivotal concern of students especially the freshmen is the stability of the institution that they are going to consider and whether it has the agility to compete with the demands and competitions.

Indeed, this view directly corresponds with industries uptake of the notion of sustainability in higher education. An overview of the top 100 Universities as listed on the Times Higher Education World University Rankings (TSL Education Ltd., 2012) reveals that 100% of the universities have marketed some sort of sustainability initiative. Some aspects include sustainable programs and curricula, fully functional research centers, research initiatives, student involvement or campus wide plans and policies. Such understanding demonstrates the significance of sustainability and suggests continued interest in the future.

According to Tan (2011), higher education plays a central role in national life and in all sections of the economy. It produces the teachers at all education levels, the bureaucrats of all positions, the professionals in various services and the executives and technical workers in industry. With such worth, careful studies should be done to produce not only quality graduates but also professionals and workers that are globally competitive.

In the Philippines, institutional sustainability has been included in the quality assurance of various higher education institutions. Such move was done to assure that HEIs are preparing and prepared for future needs of the educational market and operating management.

HEIs in the Philippines are divided into two namely: the private institutions and the public institutions. The public institutions are classified as: State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs), other government schools, and Commission on Higher Education (CHED) supervised institutions. The State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) are funded by the national government. CHED-supervised Institutions are directly supervised by the CHED, and their annual budget allocation is integrated in the government budget appropriation for the CHED. Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs) are operated, supported, and maintained by local government units. Other government schools such as military and police academies, which offer degrees and advanced training programs, are supervised and regulated by the Department of National Defense and Philippine National Police (www.ched.gov.ph).

To assure quality and sustainability, various accrediting agencies are present to assess and evaluate the present conditions and accomplishments of the institutions. According to CMO 40 s.2008, the accrediting agencies are

under the Federation of the Accrediting Agency in the Philippines (FAAP). Specifically, these agencies are (1) the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities, (2) The Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation, (3) The Association of Christian Schools, Colleges and Universities Accrediting Agency, Inc. (4) Technical Vocational Education Accrediting Agency of the Philippines, (5) Accrediting Agency for Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, and (6) Association of Local Colleges and Universities -Commission on Accreditation.

With such body ensuring that, HEIs are in geared towards various issues, trends, and challenges, institutions are starting to incorporate these sustainability initiatives in their values, principles, and marketing. There are even efforts to standardize the measurement of sustainability within institutions. The self-reporting assessment method, similar to other methods available, offers a great tool for institutions to develop sustainable practices but falls short of providing a concrete system for comparing institutions.

The researcher was motivated to conduct this study for having a comprehensive assessment of the institutional sustainability of the Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs) in Region III. The researcher assessed the institutional sustainability of the LCUs in Region III based on the areas of Governance and Management, Quality of Teaching and Learning, Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work, Support for Students, Relations with the Community, Teaching, and Student's Involvement. With such assessment, sustainable and non-sustainable areas were identified. With those areas, the administrators thought of plans and strategies in strengthening the institution's commitment to sustainability.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to assess the institutional sustainability of Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs) in Region III for Academic Year 2013-2014.

It sought answers to the following questions:
1. How are the LCUs described in terms of:
    a. Academic Programs,
    b. Enrolment, and
    c. Faculty?
2. What is the institutional sustainability assessment of the LCUs as assessed by the LCU Presidents in terms of:
    a. Governance and Management,
    b. Quality of Teaching and Learning,
    c. Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work,
    d. Support for Students, and
    e. Relations with the Community?
3. What is the institutional sustainability assessment of the LCUs on Teaching as assessed by the Deans/Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives in terms of:
    a. Curriculum,
    b. Teaching Approach,
    c. Research and Scholarship Activities,
    d. Community Engagement,
    e. Examination (Assessment) of Sustainability Topics, and
    f. Staff Expertise and Willingness to Participate?
4. What is the institutional sustainability assessment of the LCUs on Student's Involvement as assessed by the Student Representatives?
5. Which areas and indicators are sustainable and non-sustainable?
6. Is there a significant difference between the institutional sustainability of the LCUs when grouped according to the number of years of operations?

How do the administrators plan and strategize in strengthening the institution's commitment to sustainability?

Methods

This study was confined to the Local Colleges and Universities of Region III for the Academic Year 2013-2014. There were 64 respondents for this study who were the LCU Presidents, 16, Deans/Program Coordinators, 16, Faculty Representatives, 16, and Student Representatives, 16. The respondents were grouped according to the years of operations of their LCUs namely: LCUs with 1-5 years of operations, LCUs with 6-10 years of operations,

LCUs with 11-15 years of operations, and LCUs with 16 and more years of operations.

The study utilized the evaluative type of study. The major instruments used in gathering data were the CHEd ISA Tool and the Unit based Sustainability Assessment Tool. Documentary materials and unstructured interview were also utilized to supplement the data gathered through the assessment tools.

The data gathered through the assessment tools were classified, organized, tallied, and tabulated. These were interpreted through frequency, percentage, and rank distributions. For facilitating the interpretation of the results, the mean and the mode were used as measures of central tendency.

Results and Discussion
Descriptions of LCUs in Region III

The descriptions of the LCUs in Region III dealt with the following dimensions: a. Academic Programs, b. Enrolment, and c. Faculty.

Academic Programs
Table 2. Academic Programs of the LCUs in Region III with 1-5 Years of Operations

Academic Programs	F	%	Rank
Bachelor of Physical Education	1	14.29	13
Bachelor of Science in Accountancy	1	14.29	13
Bachelor of Science in Accounting Technology	3	42.86	1.5
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	2	28.57	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Computer Science	3	42.86	1.5
Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	2	28.57	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship	1	14.29	13
Bachelor of Science in Hotel and Restaurant Management	1	14.29	13
Bachelor of Science in Information Technology	2	28.57	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Public Administration	1	14.29	13
Bachelor of Science in Tourism Management	1	14.29	13
Bachelor of Secondary Education	1	14.29	13
Bachelor of Technical Teacher Education	2	28.57	4.5
Bartending NCII	1	14.29	13
Computer Hardware Servicing	1	14.29	13
Computer Programming	1	14.29	13
Food and Beverage Services NCII	1	14.29	13
Front Office Services NCII	1	14.29	13
Housekeeping NCII	1	14.29	13

The study shows that the LCUs with 1-5 years of operations offer courses mostly on the baccalaureate degree rather that pre-baccalaureate, technical-vocational, and short courses. Moreover, the courses are varied in a way that some are offering TESDA courses while the other LCUs are offering 4-year courses. With such diversity on the curricular offerings, great choices can be offered to the students on the future career that the students want to embark later on.

Table 3. Academic Programs of the LCUs in Region III with 6-10 Years of Operations

Academic Programs	F	%	Rank
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	4	100	1.5
Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	4	100	1.5
Bachelor of Science in Hotel and Restaurant Management	3	75	3.5
Bachelor of Secondary Education	3	75	3.5

The findings clearly show that 99 percent of the courses are under the baccalaureate degree and there is only one (1), which is an associate course. This further qualifies that the focus of the LCUs with 6-10 years of operations are more on the 4-year courses rather than TESDA and short courses.

Table 4. Academic Programs of the LCUs in Region III with 11-15 Years of Operations

Academic Programs	F	%	Rank
Bachelor of Secondary Education	3	100	1
Associate in Computer Technology	2	66.67	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Accountancy	2	66.67	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	2	66.67	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Business Management	2	66.67	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	2	66.67	4.5
Bachelor of Science in Hotel and Restaurant Management	2	66.67	4.5

Based on the findings, it was clearly shown that the course offerings of the LCUs with 11-15 years are varied in a way that they offer short courses, technical vocational courses, pre baccalaureate, baccalaureate programs, and graduate programs. With such, courses in various levels, the clientele can choose on the course that they really want. Moreover, those who want to pursue graduate studies can still avail of the curricular services being offered the LCUs on this cluster.

Table 5. Academic Programs of the LCUs in Region III with 16 and More Years of Operations

Academic Programs	F	%	Rank
Associate in Computer Technology	1	50	7.5
Bachelor of Science in Accountancy	1	50	7.5
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	1	50	7.5
Bachelor of Science in Computer Science	1	50	7.5
Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	1	50	7.5
Bachelor of Science in Information Technology	1	50	7.5
Bachelor of Secondary Education	1	50	7.5
Bachelor of Technical Teacher Education	1	50	7.5
Call Center Management	1	50	7.5
Certificate in Industrial Technology	1	50	7.5
Computer Hardware Servicing	1	50	7.5
Computer Secretariat	1	50	7.5
Dual Training System in Electronics/Electrical/Welding	1	50	7.5
Hotel and Restaurant Service	1	50	7.5

The findings show that LCUs with 16 and more years offer courses that are of various kinds. Despite of the great difference mirrored, still the courses are of variety that good to be considered by the incoming students of these LCUs.

Enrolment

Table 6. Enrolment Data of the LCUs in Region III for the Academic Year 2013-2014

Years of Operations	Male	Female	Total
1-5 years	352	414	766
6-10 years	925	1183	2,108

Years of Operations	Male	Female	Total
11-15 years	537	975	1,512
16- more years	276	817	1,093
Total	**2,090**	**3,389**	**5,479**

The findings clearly show that regardless of the number years of operations the LCUs in Region III have; it is not a guarantee that there is higher enrolment rate compared to those LCUs who are just starting to operate. However, despite of the difference on the enrolment profile of the four groups of LCUs, still it can be said that the LCUs in Region III are offering educative services to vast numbers of students with having an average total enrolees of 5,479 for the entire Region III.

Faculty

The average number of faculty members for the LCUs in Region III with 1-5 years of operations is 37 while for the LCUs with 6-10 years is 97. The LCUs with 11-15 years of operations is 99 and the LCUs with 16 and more years is 122.

Table 7. Faculty Data of the LCUs in Region III for the Academic Year 2013-2014

		LCUs Years of Operations			
		1-5	**6-10**	**11-15**	**16 and more**
Average No. of Faculty Members		37	97	99	122
Status of Employment %	Full Time	9.17	36.79	52.79	60
	Part Time	69.72	33.68	47.21	40
	Others	21.11	29.53	0	0
Tenure of Employment %	Permanent	16.51	13.47	24.37	75
	Probationary	9.17	14.51	0	0
	Casual	0	5.18	1.52	0
	Contractual	74.31	66.84	74.11	25
Faculty Rank %	Instructor	94.50	85.50	83.25	71.28
	Assistant Professor	2.75	4.15	7.62	8.13
	Associate Professor	0	1.04	1.52	2.05
	Professor	0	7.25	0	8.22
	Others	2.75	2.06	7.61	10.23

The findings clearly show that it is not a guarantee that having a high number of faculty members and the older the LCU is can be tantamount to have a high number of full pledge professors. However, the years of operations can be considered in having a high number of percentages in the aspects of number of faculty members and in the percentage of full time and permanent instructors.

Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCUs assessed by the LCU Presidents
Governance and Management
Table 8. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCU Presidents on Governance and Management

		LCUs Years of Operations						
GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT		**1-5**		**6-10**		**11-15**		**16 and more**
		WM	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**
Governance	1. The institution's governance arrangements demon-	3.29	HS	3.25	HS	3.33	HS	2.50	VS

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT		LCUs Years of Operations							
		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
		WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
	strate probity, strategic vision, accountability, awareness and management of risk, and effective monitoring of performance.								
Management	1. The institution's management, financial control, and quality assurance arrangements are sufficient to manage existing operation and to respond to development and change.	3.00	VS	3.5	HS	3.67	HS	2.00	S
Enabling Features	1. The institution has enabling features such as the used of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for more efficient and effective management; and a viable, sustainable and appropriate resources generating strategy to support its development plans.	3.43	HS	3.25	HS	3.33	HS	2.50	VS
Average Weighted Mean		3.24	HS	3.30	HS	3.44	HS	2.33	S
SD		.368		.532		.513		.495	

The findings clearly imply that in terms of governance and management the LCUs in Region III are sustainable if not highly sustainable. This tells that local school boards as well the LGUs are doing the best they can to make their institutions stand the test and need of the present and future times in managing and governing their organizations and further improve it by incorporating ways and means that dictate the need of time. These findings were of emphasis to what mentioned by Glasser & Cadler (2005) that in preparing the students, decision making from the institution and the entire educative community is tough. Decisions that affect the governance and management of the LCUs should be more adept in the rapid, complex, and uncertainties of the future. Moreover, this was also emphasized in the study of Vecchio (2011) that commitment of the institution's leadership is vital in achieving sustainability. This means that sustainable governance and management leads to sustainable institution.

Quality of Teaching and Learning
Table 9. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCU Presidents on Quality of Teaching and Learning

QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING		LCUs Years of Operations							
		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
		WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
Setting and Achieving Program Standards	1. The institution sets the objectives and learning outcomes of its programs	3.43	HS	3.75	HS	3.67	HS	4.00	HS

QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING		LCUs Years of Operations							
		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
		WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
	at appropriate levels, and has effective mechanisms to ensure that its programs achieve those objectives and enable students to achieve the intended outcomes.								
	2. The institution has effective arrangements for monitoring the effectiveness of its programs.	3.29	HS	3.50	HS	2.67	VS	3.50	HS
	3. The institution takes effective action to address weakness, build on strengths, and to enhance performance by the dissemination of good practice.	3.14	VS	3.25	HS	3.33	HS	2.50	VS
Faculty Profile	1. The institution has an adequate number of faculty with the appropriate expertise and competence to teach the courses offered by the institution.	3.43	HS	3.75	HS	3.33	HS	3.50	HS
Appropriate Learning Resources	1. The institution makes effective use of learning resources, such as library resources, laboratories, and information and communications technology, to support student learning.	3.71	HS	3.50	HS	4.00	HS	3.00	VS
Average Weighted Mean		3.40	HS	3.55	HS	3.40	HS	3.30	HS
SD		.383		.346		.347		.424	

The findings identified clearly show that in terms of quality of teaching and learning the LCUs ranged from sustainable to highly sustainable. These further prove that in this key result area sustainability is assured. However, some aspects still have to further improve their sustainability in some LCUs. There are some initiatives being done by the LCUs in continuously making their institutions sustainable on the aspects of teaching and learning. Maragkis and Dobblesteen (2013) agreed on the identified findings. It was said that various methods and aspects of teaching and learning should be continuously reformed and development so that the main core of the educative process can be surely attained and can stand to the challenges of time.

Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work

Table 10. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCU Presidents on Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work

QUALITY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPOSURE, RESEARCH AND CREATIVE WORK		LCUs Years of Operations							
		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
		WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
Professional Exposure	1. The institution has programs that allow students to practice their learned competencies in view of their future careers, such as programs for practicum, internship, on the job training (OJT), and case writing (for graduate HEIs).	3.57	HS	3.50	HS	3.33	HS	3.50	HS
Research Capability	1. The institution has a research community of faculty, students and research workers that fosters and supports creative research and other advanced scholarly activity.	2.86	VS	3.00	VS	3.67	HS	1.50	S
Creative Work and or Innovation	1. The institution has programs that promote creative work in the arts and/or innovation in science and technology.	2.86	VS	2.50	VS	3.00	VS	1.50	S
Average Weighted Mean **SD**		**3.10** **.460**	**VS**	**3.00** **.571**	**VS**	**3.33** **.335**	**HS**	**2.17** **.233**	**S**

Based on the identified results, the LCUs in Region III are sustainable and further in the key result area of quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work. They have sustainable programs, activities, and outputs regarding the area that can cater the future educational market and even the needs of the nearby communities that could of be of great help to the betterment for the quality of life. Such findings are emphasized on the study of Vecchio (2011). It was said that in building a foundation higher education institution incorporating sustainability definition in the institution's policy, setting clear and distinctive objectives for each one of the activity areas of the institutions paying particular attention to education and research. This means that research is of great importance on the foundation and sustainability of the institution. However, sustainability level on this area of the LCUs in Region III can further be improved by further encouragement and motivation to the students, research workers, and faculty in engaging themselves in research activities.

Support for Students

Table 11. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCU Presidents on Support for Students

SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
		WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
Equity and Access	1. The institution is effective in recruiting, admitting, supporting, and graduating students, including those from indigenous groups, the handicapped, low-level income classes, foreign students, and other special groups.	3.43	HS	3.25	HS	3.67	HS	2.00	S
	2. The institution operates effective arrangements to direct scholarships and study grants on merit to support the most able students on programs that develop competencies needed to support the Filipino economy and to enable the country to compete in global labor markets.	3.29	HS	2.50	VS	3.33	HS	1.50	S
Student Services	1. The institution has programs for student services, to support non-academic needs of the students.	3.43	HS	3.00	HS	3.67	HS	3.00	VS
Average Weighted Mean **SD**		3.38 .487	HS	2.92 .315	VS	3.56 .386	HS	2.17 .233	S

Based on the foregoing findings, the LCUs in Region III are sustainable on the programs, services, and regulations regarding support for students. They cater services that are of not only great importance to the mental and competencies of the students but also to the holistic development of each student that the institutions' have. Such findings were clearly identified by De La Salle University (2014) that LCUs are of great support to the students' needs in terms of scholarships, development, and services. These were concretized through allowing non-resident students to enrol in various LCUs in the Philippines. Moreover, they offer minimal amount per unit in terms of their tuition fees. In addition, the LCUs set facilities that are student-friendly.

Relations with the Community

Table 12. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCU Presidents on Relations with the Community

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
		WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
Relevance of the Programs	1. The institution offers programs that take into consideration the social, cultural, economic, and developmental needs of	3.00	VS	3.50	HS	3.67	HS	3.50	HS

	the country at local, regional, and national levels, as well as the need for the country to compete effectively in global markets.								
Networking and Linkages	1. The institution is valued as a partner by other higher education institutions; professional government, and non-government organizations; and industry, within the Philippines and internationally.	2.71	VS	2.25	S	3.00	VS	2.50	VS
Extension Programs	1. The institution is valued by its local community, as providers of extension programs are responsive to the needs of the community for people empowerment and self-reliance.	3.00	VS	2.75	VS	3.00	VS	4.00	HS
	Average Weighted Mean **SD**	**2.90** **.685**	**VS**	**2.83** **.736**	**VS**	**3.22** **.190**	**HS**	**3.33** **.000**	**HS**

Based on the findings mentioned, the relations with the community of the LCUs in Region III are sustainable. Their programs, activities, and partnerships are of great help not on the LCUs operations and management but also to how the LCUs can be used as instrument of change and development to their nearby communities. The importance of the role of the community was also put into weight by the University of Calvary (2011). It was said that participating in community partnership and community initiatives exemplifying great values and practices worth emanating can be of great help on the institution's services and products. However, Vecchio (2011) continued to urge in strengthening institutional community by working in developing networks of resource sharing based on inclusiveness and participation of the various stakeholders related to the institution.

Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCUs in Region III on Teaching as assessed by the Deans/ Programs Coordinators, and Faculty Representatives
Curriculum
Table 13. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the Deans/ Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives on Teaching in terms of Curriculum

USAT TOOL (Teaching)		LCUs Years of Operations							
CURRICULUM		**1-5**		**6-10**		**11-15**		**16 and more**	
	Criteria	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**
1	The extent to which the department offer courses that engage sustainability concerns.	3.36	HS	3.63	HS	3.33	HS	3.25	HS

		WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
2	The level of integration of sustainability topics in courses referred to above.	3.57	HS	3.38	HS	3.00	VS	3.25	HS
3	The degree to which local sustainability issues and challenges form part of the department's teaching programme.	3.00	VS	3.38	HS	2.83	VS	2.75	VS
4	The degree to which global sustainability issues and challenges form part of the department's teaching programme.	3.07	VS	3.13	VS	3.00	VS	2.50	VS
5	The extent to which department enrol students in courses that engage sustainability concerns.	3.29	HS	3.50	HS	3.00	VS	2.75	VS
6	The level of cross faculty collaboration in teaching sustainability programmes.	2.93	VS	3.13	VS	2.33	S	2.75	VS
	Average Weighted Mean **SD**	**3.20** .272	**VS**	**3.35** .461	**HS**	**2.92** .165	**VS**	**2.88** .770	**VS**

Based on the findings, it was clearly showed that LCUs in Region III are sustainable in their curricula as well as the topics, resources, and strategies that concern them. The courses of the LCUs are not being offered for political nor for popularity purposes. The administrators offer courses that of great value to their clientele and of great potentials for future career of their students. These findings were of connection to what Waheed et. al (2011) stated that the connection of the quality of service that the institutions were rendering were mirrored on the accomplishment of the main general objectives - to educate students, to preserve and refine existing knowledge, and to define and assist in finding solutions for problems in society. Such accomplishments can be achieved if curricula are viable and are sustainable.

Teaching Approach
Table 14. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the Deans/ Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives on Teaching in terms of Teaching Approach

USAT TOOL (Teaching)		**LCUs Years of Operations**							
TEACHING APPROACH		**1-5**		**6-10**		**11-15**		**16 and more**	
	Criteria	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**
7	The capacity to make informed decisions.	3.64	HS	3.75	HS	3.00	VS	3.50	HS
8	Critical thinking skills.	3.57	HS	3.50	HS	3.17	VS	3.50	HS
9	A sense of responsibility.	3.64	HS	3.75	HS	3.67	HS	3.50	HS
10	Respect for the opinions of others.	3.79	HS	3.63	HS	3.33	HS	3.25	HS
11	Integrated problem solving skills.	3.64	HS	3.75	HS	3.17	VS	3.25	HS
	Average Weighted Mean **SD**	**3.66** .282	**HS**	**3.68** .377	**HS**	**3.27** .306	**HS**	**3.40** .566	**HS**

The LCUs in Region III are sustainable on using various teaching approaches in developing various skills and values among their students. These further support that varied teaching approaches should be adopted so that the attainment of set objectives can be attained in the assured manner. Continuous utilization of various aspects of public awareness, education, and training help in enhancing teaching approaches that of importance in developing knowledge, skills, perspectives, and values will can of vital instruments for the holistic development of people of all ages (UNESCO, 2005).

Research and Scholarship Activities

Table 15. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the Deans/ Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives on Teaching in terms of Research and Scholarship Activities

USAT TOOL (TEACHING)		LCUs Years of Operations						
RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP ACTIVITIES		**1-5**		**6-10**		**11-15**		**16 and more**
	Criteria	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
12	The extent to which the department (staff and students) is involved in research and scholarship in the area of sustainability.	3.29	HS	3.13	VS	3.33	HS	3.25	HS
13	The degree to which global sustainability issues and challenges form part of the department's research.	2.86	VS	2.63	VS	2.83	VS	2.75	VS
14	The degree to which local sustainability issues and challenges form part of the department's research.	3.21	HS	3.00	VS	3.33	HS	2.75	VS
15	The extent to which the department is collaborating with other faculties, institutions, and stakeholders in pursuit of solutions to sustainability problems.	3.07	VS	3.13	VS	3.17	VS	3.00	VS
16	The extent to which aspects of sustainable development are used in selection/execution of research.	2.93	VS	3.13	VS	3.33	HS	2.75	VS
17	The level to which aspects of sustainable development are reflected in department's research outputs.	2.71	VS	2.88	VS	3.17	VS	2.75	VS
	Average Weighted Mean	**3.01**	**VS**	**2.98**	**VS**	**3.19**	**VS**	**2.88**	**VS**
	SD	.679		.510		.317		.883	

The results show that LCUs in Region III are very much sustainable in the criteria of research and scholarship activities. They are using research in dealing with local and global issues and concerns on sustainability development. However, further improvement and encouragement should be done among the researches and the researchers so that this area can really be addressed to. Research and scholarships are of importance for the continuous enhancement of the quality and services of any institutions. De La Salle University (2014) even mentioned that various LCUs in the Philippines conducted tracer studies regarding the employment of their graduates in order to gauge the relevance and success of their programs.

Community Engagement

Table 16. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the Deans/ Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives on Teaching in terms of Community Engagement

USAT TOOL (TEACHING)		LCUs Years of Operations						
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
	Criteria	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
18	The extent to which the department (staff and students) is involved in community engagement in the area of sustainability.	3.36	HS	3.63	HS	3.67	HS	2.75	VS
19	The level of commitment of the department's resources in sustainability projects in the community.	3.57	HS	3.50	HS	3.33	HS	2.75	VS
20	The degree to which local sustainability issues and challenges form part of the department's community engagement.	3.57	HS	3.00	VS	3.33	HS	2.50	VS
21	The extent to which the department collaborates with other stakeholders in addressing community sustainability challenges.	3.07	VS	2.63	VS	3.33	HS	2.25	VS
22	The extent to which aspects of sustainable development are used in selection/execution of community engagement projects.	3.21	HS	2.88	VS	3.00	VS	2.25	VS
	Average Weighted Mean SD	3.36 .335	HS	3.13 .550	VS	3.33 .305	HS	2.50 .424	VS

The data clearly shows that the LCUs in Region are sustainable and so in the area of community engagement. The involvement that they have in various projects is really evident. Johns et. Al (2008) even mentioned that creating an environmentally sustainable friendly institution begins with the acceptance that the community and the impact of the institution to its community is of great in meeting such goal. However, further improvement can be done so that strong linkages and effect can be assured regarding this area.

Examination (Assessment) of Sustainability Topics

Table 17. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the Deans/ Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives on Teaching in terms of Examination (Assessment) of Sustainability Topics

USAT TOOL (TEACHING)		LCUs Years of Operations						
EXAMINATION (ASSESSMENT) OF SUSTAINABILITY TOPICS		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
	Criteria	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
23	The extent to which sustainability aspects are assessed/examined during course.	3.50	HS	3.75	HS	3.67	HS	3.25	HS
24	The extent to which sustainability aspects are considered in evaluating/ assessing projects.	3.36	HS	3.75	HS	3.50	HS	3.25	HS

USAT TOOL (TEACHING)	LCUs Years of Operations							
EXAMINATION (ASSESSMENT) OF SUSTAINABILITY TOPICS	1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
Criteria	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
25 The extent to which sustainability aspects are assessed in evaluating service learning programmes.	3.43	HS	3.50	HS	2.83	VS	3.25	HS
Average Weighted Mean SD	3.43 .332	HS	3.67 .358	HS	3.33 .577	HS	3.25 .354	HS

The results means that the LCUs in Region III have high assessment in the area of examination of sustainability. Through continuous analysis and evaluation of their various programs, activities, outputs, and courses, sustainability can be attained and assured on. This is the very essence of the CMO 46 s. 2012. Institutional sustainability assessment is incorporated as part of the quality assurance process to assure that various key result areas are sensitive to the horizontal typology and most especially in creating the culture of quality.

Staff Expertise and Willingness to Participate
Table 18. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the Deans/ Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives on Teaching in terms of Staff Expertise and Willingness to Participate

USAT TOOL (TEACHING)	LCUs Years of Operations							
STAFF EXPERTISE AND WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE	1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
Criteria	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
26 The level of expertise of staff members in the area of sustainability.	3.00	VS	3.13	VS	3.17	VS	2.75	VS
27 The extent to which staff members are willing to carry out research and service activities on sustainability aspects/ topics.	3.36	HS	3.25	HS	2.67	VS	2.25	VS
28 The extent to which staff members are willing to teach sustainability topics.	3.50	HS	3.00	VS	3.33	HS	2.75	VS
Average Weighted Mean SD	3.29 .353	HS	3.13 .158	VS	3.06 .587	VS	2.58 .120	VS

The LCUs of Region III have sustainable degree of extent in the aspect of staff expertise and willingness to participate. The findings prove that theories, knowledge, and principles should be put into practice and have to be imparted to really test the extent of the staff expertise. Segovia and Galan (2002) emphasized that collaborations internally and externally should be done and assured of so that sustainability among HEIs will be guaranteed.

Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the LCUs in Region III on Student's Involvement as assessed by the Student Representatives

Table 19. Assessment of Institutional Sustainability of the Student Representatives on Student's Involvement

USAT ISA TOOL (Student's Involvement)		LCUs Years of Operations							
		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
	CRITERIA	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
1	The institution has a Student Environmental Center.	2.57	VS	1.86	S	3.67	HS	3.50	HS
2	Career Counselling focused on work opportunities related to environment and sustainability.	2.86	VS	1.86	S	3.00	VS	4.00	HS
3	The institution provides assistance on the career choices and job placement for the future sustainability of the students' career.	3.00	VS	2.00	S	3.33	HS	3.50	HS
4	Orientation programme(s) on sustainability for students.	2.71	VS	1.86	S	3.00	VS	3.50	HS
5	Sustainable mechanisms and practices have been included and observed on various student activities such as leadership programs, student publication, student organizations, sports development, volunteerism, peer helper programs, etc.	3.00	VS	1.57	S	3.00	VS	3.00	VS
6	The extent to which sustainable aspects are considered in developing and enhancing leadership effectiveness in the personal level and student organizations.	2.86	VS	1.57	S	3.00	VS	3.50	VS
7	There are an existing sustainable procedures, and services in processing of students' entrance and requirements.	3.00	VS	1.71	S	3.00	VS	4.00	HS
8	Sustainable practices in residences and dormitories by students (e.g. recycling).	2.43	VS	1.00	NS	3.33	HS	3.00	VS
9	There is an insurance of available, adequate, safe, and healthful food within the campus and immediate vicinity in accordance with the food, safety, and sanitation guidelines of the Department of Health.	2.43	VS	1.43	S	3.00	VS	3.50	HS
10	The extent to which sustainable aspects are considered on the primary health care and wellness program.	2.71	VS	1.43	S	2.67	VS	3.00	VS

USAT ISA TOOL (Student's Involvement)		LCUs Years of Operations							
		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
	CRITERIA	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR	WM	DR
11	There is a safe, accessible, and secure environment, buildings, and facilities that comply with government standards licensed and competent security personnel who ensure the safety of students and their belongings.	2.86	VS	1.71	S	2.33	S	4.00	HS
12	The extent to which sustainable aspect are considered in various programs for the students such as cultural and arts programs, sports development programs, and social and community involvement program.	2.43	VS	1.71	S	3.00	VS	4.00	HS
13	Student environmental and sustainability awareness programmes.	2.57	VS	1.57	S	2.33	S	3.50	HS
14	Voluntary community service by students related to sustainability issues and concerns.	2.57	VS	1.57	S	2.67	VS	3.00	VS
15	Involvement of student groups across campus in sustainability initiatives.	2.86	VS	1.86	S	3.33	HS	3.00	VS
16	SRC involvement in environmental and sustainability initiatives.	2.43	VS	1.86	S	3.33	HS	2.50	VS
17	Student collaboration with management in the area of environmental and sustainability.	2.57	VS	1.71	S	3.67	HS	2.50	VS
18	Environmental and sustainability activities initiated by students themselves (independent of departments, lecturers, management, etc.)	2.71	VS	1.71	S	3.33	HS	3.50	HS
19	Students' willingness to take responsibility in the environmental and sustainability area.	2.86	VS	1.57	S	3.33	HS	3.50	HS
Average Weighted Mean SD		2.71 .190	VS	1.66 .603	S	3.07 .163	VS	3.37 .127	HS

Based on these findings, it was clearly shown that the LCUs in Region III are sustainable on involving the students in attaining sustainability and to assure that the services due to the students are being given. Even though there are some criteria that still have to be improved, everything is possible since those students are willing and have the initiatives to make their institutions stand and be of strong instruments for the attainment of such goals. The University of Calvary (2011) that student's assessments on the institution that they will enrol with do not only focus on the number of enrolees, distance, or popularity further

proved the findings. Students nowadays are more concern with the status of the institution and in the assurance that the institution has the path to a healthy, just, and sustainable future through preparing students to be community leader in the holistic aspect.

Sustainable and Non Sustainable Areas of LCUs in Region III
Table 20. Sustainable and Non Sustainable Areas of LCUs in Region III

		LCUs Years of Operations							
		1-5		6-10		11-15		16 and more	
ISA Tool	**KRA/ Criteria**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**	**WM**	**DR**
CHED	Governance and Management	3.24	HS	3.30	HS	3.44	HS	2.33	S
	Quality of Teaching and Learning	3.40	HS	3.55	HS	3.40	HS	3.30	HS
	Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work	3.10	VS	3.00	VS	3.33	HS	2.17	S
	Support for Students	3.38	HS	2.92	VS	3.56	HS	2.17	S
	Relations with the Community	2.90	VS	2.83	VS	3.22	HS	3.33	HS
USAT (Teaching)	Curriculum	3.20	VS	3.35	HS	2.92	VS	2.88	VS
	Teaching Approach	3.43	HS	3.67	HS	3.33	HS	3.40	HS
	Research and Scholarship Activities	3.01	VS	2.98	VS	3.19	VS	2.88	VS
	Community Engagement	3.36	HS	3.13	VS	3.33	HS	2.50	VS
	Examination (Assessment) of Sustainability Topics	3.43	HS	3.67	HS	3.33	HS	3.25	HS
	Staff Expertise and Willingness to Participate	3.29	HS	3.13	VS	3.06	VS	2.58	VS
USAT (Student's Involvement)	Student's Involvement	2.71	VS	1.66	S	3.07	VS	3.26	HS
Average Overall Weighted Mean **SD**		3.20 .523	VS	3.08 .460	VS	3.27 .368	HS	2.84 .537	VS

Majority of the LCUs in Region III are sustainable on the various areas that were identified on the two assessment tools. Even though there are minimal least ranked areas, still there are percentage of that such results can be improved or remedied. No group of LCUs in Region III are assessed exactly the same. With such, each LCU in Region III is unique in its attainment of sustainability aspects. Such findings meet the requirements set by Wright (2004) in assessing and assuring institutional sustainability. It was said that sustainable institutions should be rooted in having sustainable physical operations, sustainable research, public outreach, interuniversity cooperation, partnership with government, nongovernmental (NGOs) and industry, ecological literacy, developing interdisciplinary curriculum, and moral obligation.

Difference between the Institutional Sustainability of the LCUs when grouped according to the Number of years of operations

In testing the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the institutional sustainability of the LCUs when grouped according to the number of years of operations, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used.

A one way ANOVA revealed that the LCUs in Region III when grouped according to years of operations is not significantly different with the following key result areas of CHEd ISA tool as assessed by the LCU Presidents: Governance and Management, $F(3,12) = 3.49$, $p = 0.089$; Quality of Teaching and Learning, $F(3,12) = 3.49$, $p = 0.935$; Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work, $F(3,12) = 3.49$, $p = 0.81$; and Relations with the Community, $F(3,12) = 3.49$, $p = 0.632$. Since the test value is lower than the critical value of 3.49, the null hypothesis is accepted. However, a one way ANOVA revealed that the LCUs in Region III when grouped according to years of operations is significantly different on one predictor of CHEd ISA tool which is Support for students, $F(3,12) = 3.49$, $p = 0.11$. Given that, the test value is higher than the critical value of 3.49, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Using USAT as assessed by the Deans/Program Coordinators and Faculty Representatives, a one way ANOVA revealed that the LCUs in Region III when grouped according to years of operations is not significantly different with the following indicators/criteria: Curriculum, $F(3,12) = 3.49$. $p = 0.366$; Teaching approach, $F(3,12) = 3.49$. $p = 0.347$; Research and Scholarship Activities, $F(3,12) = 3.49$. $p = 0.945$; Community Engagement, $F(3,12) = 3.49$. $p = 0.113$; Examination (Assessment) of Sustainability Topics, $F(3,12) = 3.49$. $p = 0.582$; and Staff Expertise and Willingness to Participate, $F(3,12) = 3.49$. $p = 0.107$. The test value is lower than the critical value; therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Using USAT as assessed by the Student Representatives, a one way ANOVA revealed that the LCUs in Region III when grouped according to years of operations is significantly different on Student's Involvement, $F(3,12) = 3.49$, $p = 0.49$. The test value is higher than the critical value; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Administrators' Plans and Strategies in Strengthening the Institution's Commitment to Sustainability

Table 21. Administrators' Plans and Strategies in Strengthening the Institution's Commitment to Sustainability

Plans and Strategies in Strengthening the Institution's Commitment to Sustainability	F	%	Rank
Sourcing additional funding for the operations of the LCUs aside for miscellaneous, tuition fees, and LGUs funds.	15	93.75	1
Offer additional courses that are suited and needed the nearby community.	14	87.5	2
Construction of additional facilities to make the teaching-learning conducive and adept to its clientele.	13	81.25	3.5
Motivating the faculty members to further grow professionally (e.g. Graduate and post graduate studies, seminars, workshops, and trainings)	13	81.25	3.5
Propose a bill to the congress as to the LCUs concerns and issues	7	43.75	5.5
Strengthening linkages among private sector, businesses, and NGOs.	7	43.75	5.5
Conduct dialogues with LGUs officials to avoid communication problems and to have the clarity regarding administrative roles and decisions.	5	31.25	7
Undergo accreditation to ensure quality, access, governance, and sustainability.	4	25	8

Improving the institution's developmental plan to suit the growing education market and be sustainable on the challenges of time.	2	12.5	9
Improving the research aspect so that proper help and improvement can be imparted and shared to the institution's clientele and nearby communities.	1	6.25	11
Seeking support to private sector to solve the problems on funding, linkages, and partnerships.	1	6.25	11
Strengthening the marketing strategies to further introduce the role and services of the LCUs to the community	1	6.25	11

Majority of the respondents, 14 or 87.50% plan to offer additional courses that are suited and needed the nearby community. Even though it was reflected that the LCUs in Region III have high sustainable rate in terms of their academic offerings, still continuous development and innovations are being done by the administrators to really be assured that their services are of top line based on the needs of the community and needs of the present and future demands of the growing education markets.

Majority of the respondents, 13 or 81.25% plan to construct additional facilities to make the teaching-learning conducive and adept to its clientele and to motivate the faculty members to further grow professionally (e.g Graduate and post graduate studies, seminars, workshops, and trainings). To make the teaching and learning process more meaningful and experiential, additional learning resources should be make present and evident among LCUs. Since, there is an evident growing population on the enrolment rate of the LCUs, physical expansion and development should be simultaneous with such reality. With such, the administrators through the help of the LGUs and other partnership they continue to develop their physical plant, facilities, and laboratories.

Majority of the respondents, 7 or 43.75% plan to propose a bill to the congress as to the LCUs concerns and issues and to strengthen linkages among private sector, businesses, and NGOs. National government agencies such as the DILG, CHEd, and TESDA may want to consider this redefinition of the LCU's function, given the desire of many LCU faculties for them to be given assistance by the CHEd, particularly on faculty development activities.

The other plans that were mentioned are to conduct dialogues with LGUs officials to avoid communication problems and to have the clarity regarding administrative roles and decisions, to improve the institution's developmental plan to suit the growing education market and be sustainable on the challenges of time, to improve the research aspect so that proper help and improvement can be imparted and shared to the institution's clientele and nearby communities, to seek support to private sector to solve the problems on funding, linkages, and partnerships, to strengthen the marketing strategies to further introduce the role and services of the LCUs to the community, and to undergo accreditation to ensure quality, access, governance, and sustainability. These plans of great help to really make LCUs stand the requirements and the future requirements of time. As Ruiz and Sabio (2012) stated that tertiary education is always changing and quality assurance processes must change with it, or it becomes irrelevant. It is process that takes time and involves continuous efforts. With that plans and strategies can be further thought of for the betterment of everyone and of the various institutions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The LCUs in Region III for the Academic Year 2013-2014 are very sustainable. The number of years of operations of the LCUs in Region III does not affect the institutional sustainability assessment in the key results area of Governance and Management, Quality of Teaching and Learning, Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work, Relations with the Community, (USAT).

Curriculum, Teaching Approach, Research and Scholarship Activities, Community Engagement, Examination (Assessment) of Sustaina-

bility Topics, and Staff Expertise and Willingness to Participate. On the other hand, the number of years of operations of the LCUs in Region affects the institutional sustainability assessment in the key result area of Support for Students and Student's Involvement. The Administrators have plans and strategies that have thought to strengthen the institution's commitment to sustainability.

In the light of the findings and conclusions drawn, the following are offered for recommendations:a. The plans and strategies thought by the LCUs administrators should be carefully work out on by the other concerned authorities so that such plans can be concretized. b. Faculty's status of employment and tenure of employment should be given priority so that faculty transitions among LCUs can be lessen and quality of teaching and learning can be surely sustain based on faculty profile. C. Student's involvement and other student services should be improved further so that students can view the sustainability on such aspects more confidently. d. LGUs and local school boards of the LCUs should have a clearer collaboration and policies on how the two can be of great partnership to cater accessible, sustainable, and quality education. e. A replication of this study is suggested to be conducted by the researchers in other aspects such of funding and LGUs influence and extent of support or in broader scope such as LCUs in the entire countryybe.

References

AACCUP Accreditation Handbook (2007). AACCUP, Manila

AISHE. (2008). Audit Instrument for Sustainability in Higher Education. London: The Environmental and Sustainability Champion.

Alshuwaikhat, H. M., & Abubakar, I. (2008). An Integrated Approach To Achieving Campus Sustainability: Assessment Of The Current Campus Environmental Management Practices. Journal of Cleaner Production.

Batas Pambansa BLG. 232. Education Act of 1982. An Act Providing For The Establishment And Maintenance Of An Integrated System Of Education.

Blaze, Peter and Wals, Arjen E. J. (eds). Higher Education and the Challenge of Sustainability: Problematics, Promise, and Practice. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bone, E., & Agombar, J. (2011). *First-Year Attitudes Towards, And Skills In, Sustainable Development.* The Higher Education Academy.

CMO 40 s. 2008. Manual of Regulations for Private Higher Education Institutions.

CMO 46 S. 2012. Policy- Standard to Enhance Quality Assurance (QA) in Philippine Higher Education through an Outcome-Based and Typology-Based QA.

Dahl, A. L. (2012). Achievements and Gaps In Indicators For Sustainability, Ecological Indicators. Volume 17, 14-19.

De La Salle University (2014). "Access, Quality, and Governance in Higher Education: Local Colleges and Universities in the Philippines". Philippine Business for Education.

Galan, Angelina (2010). "Environmental Education for Sustainability in Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines". International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, v11 n2 p173-183 2010

Glasser H., Calder W., Fadeeva Z (2005). Definition: Research in Higher Education for Sustainability. Document prepared for the Halifax Consultation. Halifax Nova Scotia.

Greener U (2010). *Higher Ed Sustainability Ratings, Rankings & Reviews*, A GreenerU Guide.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Association of Local_Colleges_and_Universities. Retrieved on December 09, 2013

http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ923079. Retrieved on December 01, 2013

http://sociology.about.com/od/Types-of-S amples/a/Purposive-Sample.htm. Retrieved on January 31, 2014

http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.ht m?articleid=839789. Retrieved on December 10, 2013

http://www.plm.edu.ph/alcu.html retrieved on January 28, 2014

http://www.ulsf.org/programs_saq.html retrieved last 2009

Johns, P., Trier, C. J., & Richards, J. P. (2008). "Embedding Education for Sustainable Development in Higher Education: A Case Study Examining Common Challenges and Opportunities for Undergraduate Programmes."International Journal of Educational Research, 4 7(6), 341-350.

Legacy, Crystal. (2005). "Campus Sustainability: Sustainability Assessment Framework at the University of Waterloo". Waterloo: The Sierra Youth Coalition (SYC).

Lozano, R. (2006). A tool for a Graphical Assessment for Sustainability in Universities (GASU). Journal of Cleaner Production, 14, 963-972.

Maragakis, Antonios and Van den Dobbelsteen, Andy (2013). "Higher Education: Features, Trends and Needs in Relation to Sustainability". Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands.

Mula, Ingrid (2011). "Living and Learning Sustainability in Higher Education: A Research Study on Indicators of Social Learning". International Research Institute in Sustainability (IRIS), at the University of Gloucestershire. Retrieved from www.guninetwork.org/resources/he-articles/living-and-learning-sustainability-in-higher-education-a-research-study-on-indicators-of-social-learning#sthash.GU9TjuRq.dpuf

NJHEPS. (2006). Campus Sustainability Selected Indicators Snapshot and Guide. Retrieved from www.njheps.org/assessment/snapshot_guide_wkt.htm

Oslo (2009). Handbook in Assessment of Institutional Sustainability. Retrieved from http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/publications/publication?key=109345 *on December 09, 2013*

Roorda, N. (2001). Auditing Instrument for Sustainability in Higher Education. Dutch Committee on Sustainable Higher Education (DHO).

Ruiz, Adela and Sabio, Cecilia (2012). "Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the Philippines". Polytechnic University of the Philippines. Retrieved from www.AsianJDE.org

Ryan, A., Tilbury, D., Corcoran, P. B., Abe, O; Nomura, K (2010). "*Sustainability In Higher Education in The Asia-Pacific: Developments, Challenges, and Prospects*, International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education", pg. 106-119.

Saadatian, O., Salleh, E. I., Tahir, O. M., & Dola, a. K. (2009). "Observations of Sustainability Practices in Malaysian Research Universities: Highlighting Particular Strengths". Pertanika Journal of Social Science.

Saadatian, Omidreza et. al. (2011). "Identifying Strength and Weakness of Sustainable Higher Educational Assessment Approaches". Faculty of Design and Architecture, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia.

Segovia, Victoria and Galan, Angelina P. (2002) "Sustainable Development in Higher Education in the Philippines: The case of Miriam College", International

Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, Vol. 3 Iss: 3, pp.288 – 297

Shriberg, Michael. (2002). "Institutional Assessment Tools for Sustainability in Higher Education: Strengths, Weaknesses, and Implications for Practice and Theory". Higher Education Policy.University of Michigan, USA.

Shriberg, M. (2004). Assessing Sustainability: Criteria, Tools and Implications. In P. B. Corcoran and A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), Higher education and the challenge of sustainability (pp.71-86). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sicat, Lolita V. (2009). Worktext in Research Writing. Tarlac State University, Romulo Blvd., Tarlac City.

STARS. (2010). The Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS: Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE).

Tan, Edita A. (2011). "What's Wrong with the Philippines Higher Education". University of the Philippines. School of Economics, Diliman, Quezon City.

Togo, M. and Lotz-Sisitka, H. (2009). Unit Based Sustainability Assessment Tool. A Resource Book to Complement the UNEP Mainstreaming Environment and Sustainability in African Universities Partnership. Howick, Share-Net.

TSL Education Ltd. (2012). *World University Rankings 2012-2013,* retrieved from http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2012-13/world-ranking.

ULSF. (1992). University Leader for Sustainable Future (ULSF) Questionnaire Tool, The Sustainability Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ). Washington DC.

UNESCO Decade of Education for Sustainable Development website, 2005 www.ched.gov.ph. Retrieved on December 09, 2013

UNESCO (1984). Activities of the UNESCO-UNEP International Environmental Education Program (1975–1983). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,Paris.

UNESCO (2012). Draft Toolkit for the Recognition of Foreign Qualifications.

UNESCO (2011). *Education for Sustainable Development.*

University Leaders for a Sustainable Future (1999). Sustainability Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) for Colleges and Universities. Washington, DC: University Leaders for a Sustainable Future.

Vecchio, Tomás Agustín Gómez (2011). "Steps Toward Sustainability in Higher Education Institutions: Management Practices on Focus". Master Thesis –

Master Programme in Global Studies Gothemburg University.

Villar, Cynthia A. (2010). "Institutional Accreditation: Enhancing the Quality of Institutions."

Waheed, B., Khan, F. I., Veitch, B. (2011). "Developing A Quantitative Tool for Sustainability Assessment of HEIs". International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, Vol. 12 Iss: 4, pp.355 – 368.

Weber, S., Bookhart, D., Newman, J. (2009). "Sustainability: The Journal of Record". June, 2(3):173-178.

Wright, Tarah (2004).The Evolution of Sustainability Declaration in Higher Education. Corcoran.

www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading the-international-agenda/education-for-sustainable-development/ Retrieved on December 09, 2013