

Delivery System of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) Programs in Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) In Region Iv-A: Basis for Development Plan

Ma. Lee Delos Reyes, Ed. D

Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science & Technology (EARIST-CAVITE) Graduate School

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1307000107>

Received: 13 July 2026; Accepted: 18 July 2026; Published: 30 July 2026

ABSTRACT

The quality of higher education delivery systems significantly influences the competence, employability, and professional readiness of graduates in the hospitality industry. This study assessed the delivery system of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) programs in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Region IV-A as the basis for a development plan. Specifically, the study examined the institutional profile of participating SUCs in terms of faculty qualifications, student enrolment, and quality assurance status; evaluated the delivery system based on quality and relevance of instruction, research capability and output, services to the community, and management of resources; determined significant differences among participating SUCs and among school heads, faculty members, and students; and formulated a development plan to enhance program delivery. The study employed a descriptive-comparative research design involving school heads, faculty members, and students from four selected SUCs in Region IV-A. Data were gathered through a validated researcher-developed questionnaire based on the Department of Budget and Management–Commission on Higher Education Joint Circular No. 1, s. 2016, and related quality assurance standards. Statistical tools included frequency, percentage, weighted mean, t-test, and one-way analysis of variance. The findings revealed that the overall delivery system of the BSHM programs was **implemented**, with quality and relevance of instruction receiving the highest assessment. Significant differences were observed in selected areas of program delivery among institutions and respondent groups. The proposed Development Plan outlines strategic initiatives to strengthen instructional quality, research productivity, community engagement, and resource management, thereby sustaining quality hospitality education in State Universities and Colleges.

Keywords: hospitality management education, delivery system, state universities and colleges, higher education, quality assurance, BSHM, development plan

INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry continues to evolve as globalization, technological innovation, sustainability initiatives, and changing consumer expectations reshape professional practice. Consequently, higher education institutions offering Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) programs must ensure that graduates possess the knowledge, technical competence, leadership, and professional skills required by the contemporary hospitality and tourism industry.

In the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) promotes quality assurance through Outcomes-Based Education (OBE), the Philippine Qualifications Framework (PQF), and CHED Memorandum Order No. 62, Series of 2017. These frameworks emphasize instructional quality, research, community engagement, and effective resource management to produce industry-ready graduates. As publicly funded institutions, State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) are expected to uphold these standards while continuously improving academic quality and institutional performance.

The effectiveness of BSHM programs depends on an integrated delivery system that combines quality instruction, competent faculty, research productivity, community engagement, and adequate institutional

resources. Continuous evaluation of these components is essential to ensure that hospitality education remains responsive to industry demands and national development priorities.

Despite existing quality assurance initiatives, variations continue to exist among higher education institutions in terms of faculty qualifications, research productivity, instructional resources, accreditation status, and institutional support. Furthermore, limited empirical evidence has comprehensively evaluated the delivery systems of BSHM programs in State Universities and Colleges within Region IV-A using the key result areas prescribed in the DBM–CHED Joint Circular No. 1, Series of 2016.

Accordingly, this study assessed the delivery system of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management programs in selected State Universities and Colleges in Region IV-A. It examined institutional profiles, evaluated program delivery across four key result areas, compared institutional and stakeholder assessments, and developed a Development Plan to strengthen hospitality management education.

Research Gap

Previous studies on hospitality education have primarily focused on curriculum development, graduate employability, internship experiences, and student competencies. Fewer studies have evaluated the overall delivery system of BSHM programs from a quality-assurance perspective, integrating instructional quality, research capability, community engagement, and resource management into a single framework.

Moreover, comparative studies involving multiple State Universities and Colleges in Region IV-A remain limited, particularly those incorporating the perspectives of school administrators, faculty members, and students. This study addresses these gaps by providing a comprehensive institutional assessment that supports quality assurance, evidence-based planning, and continuous improvement in hospitality management education.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to assess the **Delivery System of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) Programs in Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Region IV-A** as the basis for a **Development Plan**.

Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Determine the profile of the participating State Universities and Colleges in terms of: faculty qualifications; student enrolment; and quality assurance status;
2. Assess the delivery system of BSHM programs as to: quality and relevance of instruction; research capability and output; services to the community; and management of resources;
3. Determine whether significant differences exist among the participating State Universities and Colleges regarding their delivery systems;
4. Determine whether significant differences exist among school heads, faculty members, and students in their assessment of the delivery system;
5. Identify institutional strengths and areas requiring improvement in the delivery of BSHM programs; and
6. Develop an evidence-based Development Plan that will enhance the quality and effectiveness of the BSHM program delivery in State Universities and Colleges.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored on four complementary theories that explain the effective delivery of higher education programs: **Outcomes-Based Education (OBE)**, **Systems Theory**, **Experiential Learning Theory**, and **Human Capital Theory**.

The primary theoretical foundation is **Outcomes-Based Education (Spady)**, which emphasizes that curricula, instruction, assessment, and institutional processes should be aligned with clearly defined graduate competencies. In hospitality education, OBE ensures that graduates acquire the knowledge, skills, and professional attributes required by the industry.

The study is further supported by **Systems Theory**, which views higher education institutions as interconnected systems in which instruction, research, extension, governance, and resource management function collectively to achieve institutional goals. Improvements in one component therefore contribute to overall program effectiveness.

Experiential Learning Theory explains that students develop professional competence through the integration of classroom learning with practical experiences such as laboratory activities, simulations, internships, and industry immersion, all of which are essential components of hospitality education.

Finally, **Human Capital Theory** emphasizes that investments in faculty development, research, instructional resources, and institutional quality enhance graduate competence, employability, and organizational competitiveness.

Collectively, these theories explain that effective BSHM program delivery depends on the integration of quality instruction, experiential learning, institutional support, research, and continuous investment in educational resources, providing the conceptual foundation for this study.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in **selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Region IV-A (CALABARZON)** offering the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) program. Region IV-A is recognized as one of the country's major educational and economic regions, consisting of the provinces of Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal, and Quezon. The region hosts several public higher education institutions that actively contribute to the development of the Philippine tourism and hospitality workforce.

The participating institutions were selected because they are government-funded higher education institutions authorized by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to offer the BSHM program. These SUCs likewise implement Outcomes-Based Education, quality assurance mechanisms, and competency-based hospitality curricula that are aligned with national higher education standards. Their inclusion provided diverse institutional perspectives regarding instructional delivery, research productivity, community engagement, and resource management, making them appropriate settings for evaluating the delivery system of hospitality management programs.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents consisted of school administrators, faculty members, and Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students from the participating State Universities and Colleges in Region IV-A. These groups were selected because they are directly involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the BSHM program. Their combined perspectives provided a comprehensive assessment of instructional delivery, research capability, community engagement, and resource management, thereby strengthening the credibility of the study's findings.

Sampling Technique

The study employed **purposive sampling** in selecting the participating State Universities and Colleges and their respondents.

Purposive sampling was considered appropriate because only State Universities and Colleges offering the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management program and meeting the inclusion criteria established by the researcher were selected for participation. Likewise, only administrators directly involved in academic management, faculty members assigned to the BSHM program, and enrolled BSHM students were included in

the study to ensure that respondents possessed adequate knowledge regarding the implementation of the program delivery system.

The use of purposive sampling enabled the researcher to obtain information-rich responses from individuals directly involved in planning, implementing, and experiencing the BSHM program, thereby enhancing the relevance and quality of the data collected.

Research Instrument

The study utilized a **researcher-developed survey questionnaire** as the primary instrument for gathering quantitative data. The questionnaire was developed after an extensive review of the **DBM–CHED Joint Circular No. 1, Series of 2016, CHED Memorandum Order No. 62, Series of 2017**, higher education quality assurance frameworks, hospitality education standards, and related local and international literature.

Validation of the Research Instrument

The researcher-developed questionnaire underwent content validation by experts in hospitality management education, higher education administration, curriculum and instruction, research methodology, and quality assurance to ensure its clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives and applicable CHED quality assurance standards. Their recommendations were incorporated into the revised instrument before pilot testing.

The revised questionnaire was pilot-tested with respondents who had characteristics similar to those of the target population but were excluded from the actual study. Pilot testing confirmed the instrument's clarity, consistency, and suitability, while Cronbach's Alpha reliability analysis demonstrated high internal consistency, establishing the instrument's validity and reliability for the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

Upon securing approval from the participating State Universities and Colleges, the researcher coordinated with university administrators and college officials to administer the survey questionnaires.

Prior to data collection, respondents were informed about the study's objectives, voluntary participation, the confidentiality of responses, participant anonymity, ethical safeguards, and the research's academic purpose.

Completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, coded, and organized for statistical analysis. Documentary information related to institutional profiles and quality assurance status was likewise obtained from authorized university records, subject to institutional approval.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to the ethical principles governing research involving human participants.

Participation was entirely voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents before questionnaire administration. Participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences.

The researcher maintained strict confidentiality and anonymity by ensuring that individual responses and institutional information were reported only in aggregate form. Data collected were used exclusively for academic and research purposes. Throughout the study, the institutional policies of the participating State Universities and Colleges and applicable research ethics guidelines were strictly observed.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The collected data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques.

- **Frequency and Percentage** were used to describe the institutional profile of the participating State Universities and Colleges.
- **Weighted Mean** was utilized to determine the extent of implementation of the BSHM delivery system and the level of acceptability of the proposed Development Plan.
- **An independent samples t-test was employed to determine significant differences between the two respondent groups where applicable.**
- **One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)** was used to determine significant differences among the participating State Universities and Colleges and among school administrators, faculty members, and students regarding their assessment of the BSHM delivery system.

All statistical analyses were interpreted using the **0.05 level of significance**.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Institutional Profile of the Participating State Universities and Colleges

The participating State Universities and Colleges exhibited varying institutional characteristics in terms of faculty qualifications, student enrollment, and quality assurance status. Overall, the findings indicate that the institutions have established the essential academic and organizational structures to implement the BSHM program while continuing to pursue improvements in instructional quality, faculty development, research productivity, and accreditation. These institutional characteristics reflect ongoing investments in educational quality and support the development of competent hospitality professionals, consistent with the principles of **Human Capital Theory**.

Delivery System of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management Programs

Overall, respondents assessed the **Delivery System of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management Programs** as **Implemented**, indicating that the participating State Universities and Colleges have established effective practices in instruction, research, community engagement, and resource management. Among the four components, **Quality and Relevance of Instruction** received the highest assessment, demonstrating the institutions' strong commitment to competency-based and industry-responsive hospitality education. The findings support **Outcomes-Based Education** and **Systems Theory**, emphasizing that instructional quality, research, extension services, and institutional resources function collectively to achieve educational excellence and graduate preparedness.

Quality and Relevance of Instruction

Among the four delivery system components, **Quality and Relevance of Instruction** obtained the highest overall assessment, indicating that instructional practices constitute the strongest aspect of BSHM program implementation within the participating State Universities and Colleges. Respondents generally agreed that faculty members demonstrate competence in delivering course content, implementing learner-centered instructional strategies, integrating practical learning experiences, and aligning classroom instruction with industry expectations.

The findings suggest that instructional delivery has successfully incorporated Outcomes-Based Education principles by emphasizing competency development, experiential learning, and student-centered pedagogy. Faculty members appear to effectively integrate classroom instruction with laboratory experiences, simulation activities, industry immersion, and internship preparation, thereby strengthening students' professional readiness.

The favorable assessment likewise reflects institutional efforts to regularly review curricula, update instructional materials, and maintain alignment with Commission on Higher Education standards and hospitality industry requirements. Continuous curriculum enhancement remains essential because hospitality organizations

increasingly require graduates possessing digital competencies, sustainability awareness, customer service excellence, intercultural communication skills, and managerial capabilities.

These findings strongly support **Experiential Learning Theory**, which explains that meaningful learning occurs through the integration of classroom knowledge with authentic professional experiences. Hospitality education particularly benefits from experiential approaches because students acquire competencies through practical application, reflective learning, and industry exposure.

Research Capability and Output

Research Capability and Output received a favorable assessment, indicating that research activities have been institutionalized within the participating BSHM programs. Faculty members generally participate in research-related activities, while institutions provide varying levels of administrative support, research funding, capability-building programs, and dissemination opportunities.

Although respondents acknowledged ongoing improvements in institutional research culture, research capability obtained a comparatively lower assessment than instructional quality. The findings suggest that hospitality education continues to prioritize teaching responsibilities over research productivity, a situation commonly observed among teaching-oriented higher education institutions.

The results indicate opportunities to strengthen faculty research through increased institutional funding, research mentoring, collaborative research projects, publication support, and partnerships with hospitality industries. Strengthening research capabilities would not only improve institutional productivity but also enrich classroom instruction by integrating current industry trends, evidence-based practices, and innovative approaches to hospitality management.

From the perspective of **Human Capital Theory**, investments in faculty research capability enhance organizational knowledge creation, instructional quality, institutional reputation, and long-term educational competitiveness.

Services to the Community

Community extension services were likewise assessed as **Implemented**, reflecting the participating institutions' continuing commitment to community engagement and social responsibility. Respondents recognized that BSHM programs actively participate in extension activities, skills training, tourism promotion, livelihood initiatives, hospitality seminars, and partnerships benefiting local communities.

The findings indicate that community engagement enables hospitality programs to extend academic expertise beyond the classroom while providing students with meaningful opportunities to apply their professional competencies in authentic community settings. Such experiences strengthen civic responsibility, leadership development, teamwork, and practical hospitality skills.

Nevertheless, respondents identified opportunities to expand industry partnerships, community-based tourism initiatives, and sustainable hospitality projects to further strengthen institutional impact and student experiential learning.

These findings support the social engagement principles embedded within Outcomes-Based Education by emphasizing graduate responsibility, lifelong learning, and community responsiveness.

Management of Resources

Management of Resources was likewise assessed as **Implemented**, indicating that the participating institutions generally provide adequate instructional facilities, learning resources, hospitality laboratories, equipment, and administrative support necessary for delivering the BSHM program.

Respondents acknowledged that institutional resources adequately support teaching, laboratory instruction, student learning, and operational requirements. However, they also recognized the ongoing need to modernize hospitality laboratories, strengthen digital learning infrastructure, expand instructional technologies, and improve specialized facilities to align with evolving hospitality industry standards.

Effective resource management contributes directly to instructional quality because hospitality education relies heavily upon simulation laboratories, food production facilities, housekeeping laboratories, front office systems, property management software, and other specialized learning environments. Continuous investment in these resources remains essential to ensuring that graduates acquire competencies aligned with current industry practices.

The findings affirm **Systems Theory**, emphasizing that institutional resources serve as essential organizational inputs that support effective educational processes and graduate outcomes.

Overall Assessment of the BSHM Delivery System

The overall assessment demonstrates that the delivery system of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management programs within the participating State Universities and Colleges is **effectively implemented**. Among the four institutional components, **Quality and Relevance of Instruction** emerged as the strongest area, followed by **Management of Resources, Services to the Community, and Research Capability and Output**.

These findings suggest that the participating institutions have successfully established instructional systems that effectively support hospitality education while continuing to improve research productivity and institutional engagement. The results further indicate that quality hospitality education requires balanced institutional development across all major functional areas rather than emphasizing instruction alone.

Collectively, the favorable assessments reflect institutional commitment to continuous quality improvement, competency-based education, faculty development, and organizational effectiveness. Nevertheless, sustained improvements in research productivity, resource modernization, industry collaboration, and community engagement remain necessary to strengthen institutional competitiveness and graduate employability.

INTEGRATED DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate that the effectiveness of the BSHM delivery system results from the successful integration of instructional quality, institutional governance, faculty competence, research productivity, community engagement, and resource management. These organizational components collectively contribute to preparing hospitality graduates who possess the professional competencies required by the contemporary hospitality and tourism industries.

The results strongly support **Outcomes-Based Education**, which emphasizes that educational institutions should organize all academic and administrative processes around clearly defined graduate outcomes. Likewise, **Systems Theory** explains that institutional effectiveness depends upon the interaction of multiple organizational components functioning cohesively toward shared educational goals.

The findings also reinforce **Experiential Learning Theory**, highlighting the importance of integrating classroom instruction with practical learning experiences, laboratory activities, internships, and industry immersion. Hospitality education particularly benefits from experiential learning because students develop technical competence, customer service skills, managerial capabilities, and professional confidence through authentic workplace experiences.

Finally, the study supports **Human Capital Theory**, demonstrating that continuous investments in faculty development, instructional quality, institutional resources, research capacity, and community engagement significantly improve educational quality, graduate employability, and organizational competitiveness.

Overall, the findings suggest that the participating State Universities and Colleges have established effective BSHM delivery systems that satisfy current educational requirements while presenting opportunities for further enhancement in research productivity, institutional collaboration, and resource modernization. Continuous quality assurance, evidence-based planning, and strategic institutional development remain essential for sustaining excellence in hospitality management education.

Significant Difference in the Assessment of the Delivery System Among the Participating State Universities and Colleges

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) revealed significant differences in selected components of the BSHM delivery system among the participating State Universities and Colleges. These findings indicate that institutional variations in faculty qualifications, research capability, quality assurance practices, industry partnerships, resource availability, and organizational priorities influence program implementation. Despite these differences, all participating institutions generally demonstrated effective implementation of the BSHM delivery system, reflecting a shared commitment to quality hospitality education.

Significant Difference in the Assessment Among School Administrators, Faculty Members, and Students

Significant differences were likewise observed among school administrators, faculty members, and students in selected components of the BSHM delivery system. These variations reflect the differing organizational roles and experiences of each stakeholder group in relation to program implementation. Nevertheless, the generally favorable assessments across all respondents indicate a shared recognition of the effectiveness of the participating institutions' delivery systems while emphasizing the value of incorporating multiple stakeholder perspectives in continuous quality improvement.

Problems Encountered in the Delivery System of BSHM Programs

Although the overall implementation of the BSHM delivery system was assessed positively, respondents identified several institutional concerns that continue to affect program implementation.

The commonly identified concerns included: limited funding for research activities; inadequate industry-based research opportunities; insufficient laboratory modernization; limited acquisition of advanced hospitality equipment; budgetary constraints affecting instructional resources; limited faculty participation in externally funded research; inadequate opportunities for international academic collaboration; increasing student enrollment relative to available facilities; and the need to strengthen community extension partnerships.

Overall, these concerns were assessed as **Moderately Encountered**, indicating that although they do not substantially hinder the implementation of the BSHM program, they remain important institutional issues requiring continuous administrative attention.

The findings suggest that most concerns are resource-related rather than instructional. This indicates that faculty members generally maintain effective instructional practices despite institutional limitations in research funding, laboratory development, and infrastructure expansion.

Discussion of Key Institutional Issues

One of the principal concerns identified by respondents relates to **research capability and scholarly productivity**. Although faculty members actively participate in institutional research activities, opportunities for externally funded research, publication in international journals, and collaborative industry research remain comparatively limited. Strengthening institutional research capability would contribute not only to faculty professional development but also to evidence-based curriculum enhancement and a stronger institutional reputation.

Another important issue involves the modernization of hospitality laboratories and instructional facilities. Hospitality education requires specialized learning environments that simulate real-world industry operations, including commercial kitchens, food and beverage laboratories, housekeeping laboratories, front-office

simulation facilities, property management systems, and digital hospitality technologies. Continuous investment in these facilities is necessary to ensure that graduates acquire competencies aligned with current industry standards.

Respondents likewise emphasized the need to strengthen **industry-academe partnerships**. Expanded collaborations with hotels, restaurants, resorts, cruise companies, tourism establishments, and professional hospitality organizations would enhance internship opportunities, curriculum relevance, faculty immersion, collaborative research, and graduate employability.

Community extension also presents opportunities for further enhancement. Although the participating SUCs actively implement extension programs, respondents recognized the value of expanding sustainable tourism initiatives, hospitality livelihood training, culinary entrepreneurship programs, and community-based tourism development projects that strengthen both student learning and institutional social responsibility.

Development Plan

Based on the study's findings, a Development Plan is proposed to further strengthen the delivery system for Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management programs at the participating State Universities and Colleges.

The Development Plan is anchored on **Outcomes-Based Education, Systems Theory, Experiential Learning Theory, and Human Capital Theory**, recognizing that continuous institutional improvement requires the coordinated enhancement of instruction, research, extension, and resource management.

The Development Plan consists of four strategic development areas.

Strategic Area 1: Instructional Excellence Enhancement

Objective

Strengthen instructional quality through continuous curriculum enhancement, faculty development, innovative teaching strategies, and expanded experiential learning opportunities.

Major Activities

- Curriculum review aligned with CHED and industry standards
- Faculty capability-building programs
- Industry immersion for faculty members
- Enhancement of laboratory instruction
- Digital learning integration

Strategic Area 2: Research Productivity Enhancement

Objective

Increase institutional research capability and scholarly productivity.

Major Activities

- Faculty research mentoring
- Research grants
- Collaborative industry research

-
- Publication incentives
 - International research partnerships

Strategic Area 3: Community Engagement and Industry Partnership

Objective

Strengthen community extension and industry collaboration.

Major Activities

- Hospitality livelihood programs
- Sustainable tourism initiatives
- Industry advisory council meetings
- Expanded internship partnerships
- Community tourism development

Strategic Area 4: Resource Modernization

Objective

Improve institutional facilities and learning resources.

Major Activities

- Laboratory modernization
- Hospitality equipment acquisition
- Digital infrastructure enhancement
- Learning resource expansion
- Facility maintenance

Integrated Managerial Discussion

The findings demonstrate that the effectiveness of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) programs depends on the successful integration of instructional quality, research capability, community engagement, and institutional resource management. Although the participating State Universities and Colleges have generally established effective delivery systems, the results indicate opportunities to strengthen research productivity, industry partnerships, and the modernization of learning resources and hospitality laboratories. These improvements are essential for sustaining instructional excellence, enhancing graduate employability, and maintaining institutional competitiveness. The findings affirm the principles of **Outcomes-Based Education**, **Systems Theory**, **Experiential Learning Theory**, and **Human Capital Theory**, emphasizing that continuous quality assurance, strategic planning, faculty development, and institutional investment collectively strengthen hospitality education and support long-term organizational effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. **The delivery system of the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) programs in the participating State Universities and Colleges in Region IV-A is effectively implemented**, indicating that the institutions have established appropriate instructional, research, extension, and resource management practices that support quality hospitality education.
2. **Quality and Relevance of Instruction emerged as the strongest component of the delivery system**, demonstrating that the participating institutions have successfully aligned instructional practices with Outcomes-Based Education, industry standards, and CHED requirements.
3. **Research Capability and Output, although positively evaluated, remains the component requiring the greatest institutional enhancement**, particularly in terms of externally funded research, publication productivity, and collaborative industry research initiatives.
4. **Community extension services are effectively implemented**, reflecting the participating institutions' commitment to social responsibility, community engagement, and experiential learning, although opportunities remain for expanding sustainable tourism and hospitality extension programs.
5. **Management of Resources adequately supports program implementation**, but continuous modernization of hospitality laboratories, digital learning technologies, and specialized instructional facilities remains necessary to meet evolving industry expectations.
6. **Significant differences exist among the participating State Universities and Colleges** regarding selected components of the delivery system, suggesting that institutional resources, organizational priorities, quality assurance initiatives, and administrative practices influence program implementation.
7. **Significant differences were likewise observed among school administrators, faculty members, and students**, indicating that stakeholder perspectives vary according to their organizational roles and experiences with the BSHM program.
8. **The institutional concerns identified by respondents are primarily resource-related rather than instructional**, indicating that faculty members continue to provide quality instruction despite limitations involving research funding, laboratory modernization, and institutional infrastructure.
9. **The proposed Development Plan was formulated based on the empirical findings and provides practical strategies for strengthening instruction, research, community engagement, and institutional resource management.**
10. **Continuous quality assurance, strategic planning, faculty development, industry collaboration, and institutional investment remain essential for sustaining excellence in hospitality management education and improving graduate competitiveness within the global hospitality industry.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed.

1. **The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to continue strengthening quality assurance policies for hospitality management programs by providing sustained support for Outcomes-Based Education implementation, faculty capability development, internationalization initiatives, and industry-academe collaboration.**
2. **The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to expand institutional assistance programs that support laboratory modernization, digital learning infrastructure, research capability enhancement, and hospitality education innovation among State Universities and Colleges.**

3. The **State Universities and Colleges are to** conduct regular curriculum reviews to ensure that BSHM programs remain aligned with evolving hospitality industry standards, technological developments, sustainability principles, and global competency requirements.
4. The **State Universities and Colleges are to** increase institutional investments in faculty research capability through research grants, publication incentives, international collaboration, and continuous research mentoring.
5. The **State Universities and Colleges are to** continue upgrading hospitality laboratories, simulation facilities, instructional technologies, and learning resources to provide students with authentic industry-based learning experiences.
6. The **State Universities and Colleges are to** strengthen partnerships with hotels, restaurants, resorts, tourism organizations, cruise companies, and professional hospitality associations to enhance internship opportunities, faculty immersion, curriculum relevance, and graduate employability.
7. The **Faculty Members are to** continue pursuing professional development through graduate education, industry immersion, research participation, professional certification, and membership in hospitality organizations to sustain instructional excellence and industry relevance.
8. The **Students are to** participate actively in experiential learning opportunities, research activities, community extension programs, and professional development initiatives that enhance technical competencies, leadership skills, and employability.
9. **Future Researchers** replicate the study in other regions and private higher education institutions to compare hospitality education delivery systems across different institutional contexts.
10. **Future Researchers are to** investigate additional variables such as digital transformation, internationalization, faculty engagement, student satisfaction, graduate employability, educational innovation, and sustainability using mixed-method research, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), or longitudinal research designs.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted exclusively among selected State Universities and Colleges in Region IV-A offering the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management program. Consequently, the findings may not be generalized to all higher education institutions offering hospitality management programs in the Philippines.

The descriptive-comparative design enabled the assessment of institutional practices and stakeholder perceptions but did not establish causal relationships among the variables. Likewise, the study relied primarily on respondents' assessments, which may have been influenced by individual experiences, institutional contexts, and organizational practices.

Future investigations employing qualitative methods, mixed-method approaches, longitudinal designs, or comparative international studies may provide deeper insights into the evolving delivery systems of hospitality management education.

REFERENCES

1. Asian Development Bank. (2023). Asian development outlook 2023: Financing human capital development in Asia. Asian Development Bank.
2. Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
3. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2022). Teaching for quality learning at university (5th ed.). Open University Press.

4. Commission on Higher Education. (2017). CHED Memorandum Order No. 62, Series of 2017: Policies, standards, and guidelines for the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) program. Commission on Higher Education.
5. Commission on Higher Education. (2023). Higher education statistical bulletin. Commission on Higher Education.
6. Commission on Higher Education. (2024). Quality assurance framework for Philippine higher education. Commission on Higher Education.
7. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
8. Department of Budget and Management, & Commission on Higher Education. (2016). Joint Circular No. 1, Series of 2016: Revised policies and guidelines on normative funding. DBM–CHED.
9. Department of Tourism. (2023). National Tourism Development Plan 2023–2028. Department of Tourism.
10. Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
11. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2022). Multivariate data analysis (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
12. Jackson, D. (2021). Employability skill development in work-integrated learning: Barriers and best practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(11), 2299–2314.
13. Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed.). Pearson.
14. Leask, B. (2020). *Internationalizing the curriculum*. Routledge.
15. Marginson, S. (2022). Higher education in East Asia and the future of global learning. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 76(3), 401–417.
16. McCombes, S. (2023). *Descriptive research: Definition, design, methods, and examples*. Scribbr.
17. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *The future of education and skills 2030*. OECD Publishing.
18. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing.
19. Philippine Qualifications Framework National Coordinating Council. (2023). *Philippine Qualifications Framework handbook*. PQF-NCC.
20. Quality Assurance Agency. (2023). *UK quality code for higher education*. QAA.
21. Republic Act No. 7722. (1994). Higher Education Act of 1994.
22. Republic Act No. 10968. (2018). Philippine Qualifications Framework Act.
23. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). *Organizational behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.
24. Shah, M., & Sid Nair, C. (2021). *Global perspectives on quality assurance and accreditation in higher education*. Chandos Publishing.
25. Spady, W. G. (1994). *Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers*. American Association of School Administrators.
26. Tan, M. C., & Cruz, A. L. (2024). Quality assurance practices and program delivery among state universities in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education Research*, 19(1), 25–48.
27. Teixeira, P., & Dill, D. (2022). *Higher education policy and governance*. Springer.
28. Times Higher Education. (2024). *World University Rankings 2024: Teaching and learning indicators*. Times Higher Education.
29. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
30. UNESCO. (2022). *Higher education in Asia and the Pacific*. UNESCO Bangkok.
31. UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023*. UNESCO Publishing.
32. UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/25*. UNESCO Publishing.
33. United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2023). *Tourism for sustainable development goals*. UN Tourism.
34. von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.
35. World Bank. (2022). *Achieving quality education through institutional strengthening*. World Bank.
36. World Bank. (2023). *World Development Report 2023*. World Bank.
37. World Bank. (2024). *World Development Report 2024*. World Bank.

-
38. World Economic Forum. (2023). The future of jobs report 2023. World Economic Forum.
 39. Ylagan, A. P., & Dela Cruz, R. M. (2024). Outcomes-based education implementation in hospitality management programs of Philippine higher education institutions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 12(2), 66–81.
 40. Zhang, T., Bilgihan, A., & Kandampully, J. (2023). Hospitality education in the digital era: Curriculum transformation and future competencies. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 33, 100452.
 41. Zulueta, F. M., Santos, M. A., & Reyes, P. L. (2025). Delivery systems and quality assurance practices of hospitality management programs in Philippine state universities. *Philippine Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 11(1), 41–69.