Awareness, Acceptability, and Relevance of the Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives of the Programs of Naval State University Graduate School

Susan S. Bentor[a]*, Paul Matthew S. Bentor[b], Claire Theresa S. Bentor[c]

[a]*Dean, Graduate School, Naval State University, Naval, Biliran 6560, Philippines*
[b]*Instructor, CIICT, Naval State University, Naval, Biliran 6560, Philippines*
[c]*Instructor, CAS, Naval State University, Naval, Biliran 6560, Philippines*
[a]*Email: susanbentor@gmail.com*
[b]*Email: p.bentor@gmail.com*
[c]*Email: clairebentor@gmail.com*

Abstract

The study generally aimed to determine the level of awareness, acceptability, and relevance of the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the programs of the NSU graduate school. It utilized the descriptive method of research. The results of the study provide an insight into the awareness, relevance, and acceptance of the students and NSU constituents of the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the graduate programs of the university. The outcome may be beneficial in generating information for the enhancement of the practices of the Graduate school as well as in the dissemination and evaluation of their VMGO. The results revealed that the graduate school students and other respondents of the study were fully aware, fully relevant and fully acceptable of the NSU Vision, and Mission and Graduate School goals and objectives of the different courses. Future research undertakings are conducted similarly to the study in order to increase awareness, relevance, and acceptance especially among newly enrolled graduate students of the university.

----

* Corresponding author.

1. Introduction

Every academic institution aspires for quality and excellence of its academic programs. One way of attaining this is through accreditation. According to the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and University in the Philippines Inc. (AACCUP), accreditation is a formal recognition of an education program as processing certain standards of a quality or excellence based on analysis of the merit of its objectives. It is a means of stimulating and accelerating the institutional growth and development of schools desiring to achieve excellence, relevance, and effectiveness. Through this process, an institution could point out its specific needs for quality education delivery. The authors in [1] account that the vision, mission, goals and objectives statements are the fundamental guides for the future of the institution and its academic programs. They define collective efforts and align the whole organization towards the accomplishment of programs and activities. The vision and mission are statements on the long-term view of the institution of itself and of the world within which it operates, including the fundamental purpose of its existence, its long-term role and stature, and what it does to achieve this purpose and how it would like to play its role. The program educational objectives are broad statements that describe the career and professional accomplishments that the program is preparing graduates to achieve within three to five years of graduation. These objectives are based on the needs of the program's constituencies [2]. The graduate school of Naval State University is heading towards the accreditation of its six programs to determine how well the university has achieved its objectives and its performance, capabilities, strength and weakness so that it can appropriately respond to any challenge. In the accreditation process, there are ten areas to be surveyed and the most fundamental of all area is Area I which is the vision, mission, and objectives. It is fundamental because an SUC is judged by the degree to which its VMGOs are attained or realized [3]. Numerous studies regarding the VMGO have been conducted in recent years. A study has shown that the students of a university are aware of its vision, mission, goals, and objectives and that these students understand and accept these statements, along with the responsibility of realizing such objectives in their own capacities [4]. Another study has similarly concluded that the constituents of a university are aware and keen in knowing the importance of the core principles contained in their VMGOs [5]. The importance of the VMGO to an organization's success is hard to overstate. VMGO statements define collective efforts and align the whole organization towards the accomplishment of programs/projects/activities [6]. It has long been recognized as a key concept in the corporate world as well as in the academe. Vision and mission are components of strategic management [7]. Given this significance, it is important to mention the meaning of these key concepts of vision, mission, and objectives. A vision statement is a forward-looking statement that defines the ideal state of an organization in the future [8]. It gives a picture of what we want to achieve as a group. It gives every member of the organization hope that something can be achieved. It is the guiding star that keeps us going in the right direction. The mission statement provides the necessary guidance for developing strategy, defining critical success factors, searching out key opportunities, making resource allocation choices and pleasing stakeholders. The mission represents the synthesis of what the customers and the employees see as being the core business, what products and services should be realized, who customers are and what values should be delivered to them [9]. Objectives are the ends towards which activity is aimed; they are the results to be achieved. They represent not only the end point of planning but the end toward

which other management functions are aimed. The objectives of the enterprise are the basic plans of the organization. In other words, the VMGO must be unified and must move towards the same direction. This means that the objectives should be formulated and done to reach the goals. As a whole, the VMGO of any institution sets the direction to be pursued by the entire system so much so that all members should aspire for it and must be committed to its realization. This commitment starts with the awareness and acceptability of this VMGO by its stakeholders.

2. Methodology

This study utilized the descriptive method of research. This was conducted at the Main Campus in Naval State University during the school year 2015 – 2016. The respondents of the study were the students of Doctor in Management, Doctor of Education, Master in Education, Master in Public Management and NSU constituents with a total of 189 respondents. A semi-structured questionnaire was constructed by the researcher. The questionnaires were personally distributed to the respondents. The data were analyzed according to the objectives of the study and were tabulated in a series of tables. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, and means were used.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 NSU Vision

Globally competitive state university imbued with positive values contributory to sustainable development and progress. Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents according to the level of awareness of the NSU vision. More than three-fourths of the Ed. D. students or 76.67 percent were fully aware of the NSU vision. On the average, the majority of the respondents 67.72 percent were fully aware.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the NSU Vision

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Aware												
Partially												
Aware	2	3.28					2	6.25	1	3.03	4	2.12
Aware	24	39.34	8	24.24	7	23.33	7	21.88	8	24.24	57	30.16
Fully Aware	35	57.38	25	75.76	23	76.67	23	71.88	24	72.73	128	67.72
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

The student's group shows that the greatest proportion "fully acceptable" or 75.76 percent were the MAED students followed by D.M. students 72.73 percent, MPM 59.38 percent and a lower proportion 56.67 percent were Ed.D. students expressing that they "fully accepted" the NSU vision.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Acceptability on the NSU Vision

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Acceptable												
Partially Acceptable	3	4.92	1	3.03			1	3.13	1	3.03	5	2.65
Acceptable	28	45.90	8	24.24	13	43.33	12	37.50	7	21.21	75	39.68
Fully Acceptable	30	49.18	24	72.73	17	56.67	19	59.38	25	75.76	109	57.67
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

On the NSU constituents, almost half 49.18 percent fully accepted while 45.90 percent were "acceptable". An insignificant number 4.92 percent were "partially acceptable" while nobody answered, "not accepted".

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance on the NSU Vision

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Relevant												
Partially Relevant			1	3.03			1	3.13			2	1.06
Relevant	30	49.18	8	24.24	13	43.33	10	31.25	8	24.24	71	37.57
Fully Relevant	31	50.82	24	72.73	17	56.67	21	65.63	25	75.76	116	61.38
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

As shown in Table 3, 75.76 percent of the MAED students clearly said that NSU vision is fully relevant. On the overall rating, majority 61.38 percent of the respondents claimed that NSU vision is fully relevant.

3.2 NSU Mission

To generate world-class graduate adequately equipped with quality education professional training, and relevant skills in maritime education, engineering, art and sciences, and health-related programs, tourism, education, ICT, criminology, business and entrepreneurship, agriculture, fishery and forestry through instruction, research, extension, and production services.

The distribution of respondents according to the level of awareness of the NSU mission is given in Table 4.

Many of the student respondents in Ed. D. obtained 86.67 percent which means that they are fully aware of the NSU mission followed by D.M. students 75.76 percent, MPM 75 percent and MAED students 66.67 percent. Meanwhile, most of the NSU constituents attained 63.93 percent, 34.43 percent were aware and only 1.64 percent was partially aware.

In general, more than one-half 71.96 percent of the respondents were fully aware of the mission and 26.98 percent were aware of the mission.

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness on the NSU Mission

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Aware												
Partially Aware	1	1.64					1	3.13			2	1.06
Aware	21	34.43	8	24.24	4	13.33	7	21.88	11	33.33	51	26.98
Fully Aware	39	63.93	25	75.76	26	86.67	24	75.00	22	66.67	136	71.96
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Acceptability on the NSU Mission

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Acceptable							1	3.13			1	0.53
Partially Acceptable	3	4.92							1	3.03	4	2.12
Acceptable	24	39.34	8	24.24	14	46.67	9	28.13	14	42.42	69	36.51
Fully Acceptable	34	55.74	25	75.76	16	53.33	22	68.75	18	54.55	115	60.85
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

As gleaned in Table 5, the majority of D.M. students 75.76 percent fully accepted the NSU mission, followed by MPM students 68.75 percent.

While the response of NSU constituents, more than half or 55.74 percent were also fully acceptable, 39.34 percent were acceptable and only 4.92 percent were partially acceptable.

Table 6 presents the distribution of respondents according to the relevance of the NSU mission. Among of the students' respondents, D.M. got 75.76 percent which they claimed that NSU mission is fully relevant while NSU constituents obtained the same percentage of 49.18 in both fully aware and aware.

Table 6: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance on the NSU Mission

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Relevant												
Partially Relevant	1	1.64									1	0.53
Relevant	30	49.18	8	24.24	11	36.67	10	31.25	12	36.36	71	37.57
Fully Relevant	30	49.18	25	75.76	19	63.33	22	68.75	21	63.64	117	61.90
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

3.3 GS Goal

To make NSU a center of human resources development towards quality and equality of life through relevant graduate programs, emphasizing research capabilities of students transforming them into the creator of knowledge not just users of knowledge.

Table 7: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the GS Goal

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Aware	1	1.64									1	0.53
Partially Aware	3	4.92					2	6.25	1	3.03	6	3.17
Aware	28	45.90	6	18.18	15	50.00	7	21.88	8	24.24	64	33.86
Fully Aware	29	47.54	27	81.82	15	50.00	23	71.88	24	72.73	118	62.43
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

Table 7 presents the distribution of respondents according to the level of awareness of the Graduate School goal. Among of the students' respondents, D.M. got 81.82 percent which they claimed that they are fully aware while NSU constituents obtained the percentage of 47.54 in fully aware and 45.90 percent in aware.

Table 8 presents the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the Graduate School goal. Among of the students' respondents, MAED got 75.76 percent which they declared fully acceptable while NSU constituents obtained the percentage of 49.18 in the fully acceptable category.

As shown in Table 9, 75.76 percent both in MAED and D.M. students clearly said that Graduate School goal is fully relevant. On the overall rating, majority 60.85 percent of the respondents claimed that Graduate School goal is fully relevant.

Table 8: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the GS Goal

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed. D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Acceptable												
Partially Acceptable	4	6.56					1	3.13	1	3.03	6	3.17
Acceptable	27	44.26	10	30.30	15	50.00	9	28.13	7	21.21	68	35.98
Fully Acceptable	30	49.18	23	69.70	15	50.00	22	68.75	25	75.76	115	60.85
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

Table 9: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the GS Goal

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Ed.D. Students		MPM Students		MAED Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Relevant												
Partially Relevant	3	4.92					1	3.13			4	2.12
Relevant	29	47.54	8	24.24	15	50.00	10	31.25	8	24.24	70	37.04
Fully Relevant	29	47.54	25	75.76	15	50.00	21	65.63	25	75.76	115	60.85
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	30	100	32	100	33	100	189	100

3.4 Objectives of DM

Objective 1 – To promote executive and leadership capabilities as an instrument for change, productivity, and development.

The first objective is stated as "To promote executive and leadership capabilities as an instrument for change, productivity, and development".

More than one-half of the student respondents 63.64 percent responded that they were fully aware of the first objective of Doctor in Management. Meanwhile, NSU constituents attained 49.18 percent who were fully aware and only 3.28 percent were not aware.

Table 10: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the D.M. Objective One

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.13
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.26
Aware	25	40.98	12	36.3	37	39.36
Fully Aware	30	49.18	21	63.64	51	54.26
TOTAL	61	100	33	100%	94	100

Table 11: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the D.M. Objective One

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	2	3.28			2	2.13
Acceptable	26	42.62	9	27.27%	35	37.23
Fully Acceptable	33	54.10	24	72.73%	57	60.64
TOTAL	61	100	33	100%	94	100

In terms of the acceptability of the first objective, majority 72.73 percent of D.M. students rated fully acceptable and 27.27 percent were acceptable.

More than one-half 54.10 percent of the NSU constituents were fully acceptable, 43.62 percent were acceptable and only 3.28 percent were partially acceptable.

On the average, more than one-half of the total respondents fully acceptable 60.64 percent while 37.23 percent were acceptable and only few 2.13 percent were partially acceptable.

In terms of the relevance of the first objective, most of the D.M. students 75.75 percent rated fully relevant and 24.24 percent were relevant. More than one-half 52.4 percent of the NSU constituents were fully relevant, 42.62 percent were relevant and only 4.92 percent were partially relevant.

On the average, more than one-half of the total respondents fully relevant 60.64 percent while 36.17 percent were relevant and only few 3.19 percent were partially relevant.

Objective 2 – To develop decision-making capabilities by straightening the culture of research, especially on legal and scientific realism for the advancement of the organization.

Table 12: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the D.M. Objective One

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	3	4.92			3	3.19
Relevant	26	42.62	8	24.24	34	36.17
Fully Relevant	32	52.46	25	75.76	57	60.64
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 13: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the D.M. Objective Two

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.13
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.26
Aware	28	45.90	10	30.30	38	40.43
Fully Aware	27	44.26	23	69.70	50	53.19
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

The second objective is "To develop decision-making capabilities by straightening the culture of research especially on legal and scientific realism for the advancement of the organization." More than one-half 69.70 percent of the student respondent responded that they are fully aware with the objective two of Doctor in Management.

A little less than one-third 30.30 percent were aware while nobody in partially aware and not aware respectively.

Table 14: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the D.M. Objective Two

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	3	4.92			3	3.19
Acceptable	23	37.70	12	36.36	35	37.23
Fully Acceptable	35	57.38	21	63.64	56	59.57
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

As illustrated in Table 14, most of the D.M. students 63.64 percent fully accepted while 36.36 percent claimed that they accepted the objective two of the program.

Of all the respondents, more than one-half 59.57 percent were fully acceptable while more than one-third 37.23 percent were acceptable. Only few 3.19 percent were partially acceptable.

Table 15: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the D.M. Objective Two

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	3	4.92			3	3.19
Relevant	27	44.26	10	30.30	37	39.36
Fully Relevant	31	50.82	23	69.70	54	57.45
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 15 shows that most of the D.M. students 69.70 percent said that the second objective was fully relevant while 30.30 percent claimed that it was relevant.

Of all the respondents, more than one-half 57.45 percent were fully relevant while more than one-third 39.37 percent were relevant. Only few 3.19 percent were partially relevant.

Objective 3 – To keep abreast of the trends, problems, and issues in public governance.

Table 16: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the D.M. Objective Three

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.13
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.26
Aware	25	40.98	7	21.21	32	34.04
Fully Aware	30	49.18	26	78.79	56	59.57
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

The third objective of the D.M. program is to keep abreast of the trends, problems, and issues in public governance.

The majority of D.M. students 78.79 percent were fully aware and 49.18 percent of NSU constituents were also fully aware.

On the overall, more than one-half 59.57 percent were fully aware while a little 2.13 percent were not aware.

As illustrated in Table 17, it shows the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the D.M. students of the third objective.

The majority of D.M. students 75.76 percent were fully acceptable and 54.10 percent of NSU constituents were also fully acceptable.

On the overall, more than one-half 61.70 percent were fully acceptable while a little 2.13 percent were not acceptable.

Table 17: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the D.M. Objective Three

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	2	3.28			2	2.13
Acceptable	26	42.62	8	24.24	34	36.17
Fully Acceptable	33	54.10	25	75.76	58	61.70
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 18: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the D.M. Objective Three

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	3	4.92			3	3.19
Relevant	27	44.26	8	24.24	35	37.23
Fully Relevant	31	50.82	25	75.76	56	59.57
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

As presented in Table 18, it shows the distribution of respondents according to the relevance of the D.M. students of the third objective.

The majority of D.M. students 75.76 percent claimed that the third objective was fully relevant while 50.82 percent of NSU constituents were also fully relevant.

On the overall, more than one-half 59.57 percent said fully relevant while a little 3.19 percent were not relevant.

Objective 4 – To instill proper attitude values and ethic towards work for total human development.

Table 19 shows the distribution of respondents according to the level of awareness of the D.M. students of the fourth objective.

The majority of D.M. students 87.88 percent claimed that they were fully aware of the fourth objective while 50.82 percent of NSU constituents were also fully aware.

On the overall, more than one-half 63.83 percent said fully aware while a little 2.13 percent were not aware.

Table 19: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the D.M. Objective Four

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.13
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.26
Aware	24	39.34	4	12.12	28	29.79
Fully Aware	31	50.82	29	87.88	60	63.83
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 20: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the D.M. Objective Four

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	3	4.92			3	3.19
Acceptable	26	42.62	9	27.27	35	37.23
Fully Acceptable	32	52.46	24	72.73	56	59.57
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 20 shows the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the D.M. students of the fourth objective. The majority of D.M. students 72.73 percent stated that they fully accepted with the fourth objective while 52.46 percent of NSU constituents were also fully accepted. On the overall, more than one-half 59.57 percent said fully acceptable while a little 3.19 percent were partially acceptable.

As presented in Table 21, it shows the distribution of respondents according to the relevance of the D.M. students of the fourth objective.

The majority of D.M. students 84.85 percent claimed that the fourth objective was fully relevant while 54.10 percent of NSU constituents were also fully relevant.

On the overall, more than one-half 64.89 percent said fully relevant while a little 4.26 percent were partially relevant.

Table 21: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the D.M. Objective Four

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	4	6.56			4	4.26
Relevant	24	39.34	5	15.15	29	30.85
Fully Relevant	33	54.10	28	84.85	61	64.89
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Objective 5 – To harness graduate students' potentials and abilities for the managerial and administrative position.

Table 22: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the D.M. Objective Five

Awareness	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.13
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.26
Aware	26	42.62	7	21.21	33	35.11
Fully Aware	29	47.54	26	78.79	55	58.51
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 22 shows the distribution of respondents according to the level of awareness of the D.M. students of the fifth objective.

The majority of D.M. students 78.79 percent claimed that they were fully aware of the fifth objective while 47.54 percent of NSU constituents were also fully aware.

On the overall, more than one-half 58.51 percent said fully aware while a little 2.13 percent were not aware.

Table 23 shows the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the D.M. students of the fifth objective.

The majority of D.M. students 84.85 percent stated that they fully accepted with the fifth objective while 52.46 percent of NSU constituents were also fully accepted.

On the overall, more than one-half 63.83 percent said fully acceptable while a little 3.19 percent were partially acceptable.

Table 23: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the D.M. Objective Five

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	3	4.92			3	3.19
Acceptable	26	42.62	5	15.15	31	32.98
Fully Acceptable	32	52.46	28	84.85	60	63.83
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 24: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the D.M. Objective Five

Relevance	NSU Constituents		D.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	4	6.56			4	4.26
Relevant	25	40.98	3	9.09	28	29.79
Fully Relevant	32	52.46	30	90.91	62	65.96
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

As presented in Table 24, it shows the distribution of respondents according to the relevance of the D.M. students of the fifth objective. The majority of D.M. students 90.91 percent claimed that the fifth objective was fully relevant while 52.46 percent of NSU constituents were also fully relevant. On the overall, more than one-half 65.96 percent said fully relevant while a little 4.26 percent were partially relevant.

3.5 Objectives of Ed. D

Objectives 1 – Develop and sustain academic excellence and effective leadership for the socio-economic development of the country and the world through research and research-based higher instruction for the attainment of advance and specialized knowledge in order to improve the quality of life.

The first objective is to develop and sustain academic excellence and effective leadership for the socio-economic development of the country and the world through research and research-based higher instruction for the attainment of advance and specialized knowledge in order to improve the quality of life. The greatest proportion of Ed. D. students 76.67 percent and NSU constituents 49.18 percent fully aware of the aforecited objective.

Table 25: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the Ed.D. Objective One

Awareness	NSU Constituents		Ed.D. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.20
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.40
Aware	25	40.98	7	23.33	32	35.16
Fully Aware	30	49.18	23	76.67	53	58.24
TOTAL	61	100	30	100	91	100

On the overall, the greatest proportion of the whole respondents 58.24 percent fully aware of the first objective

Table 26: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the Ed.D. Objective One

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		Ed.D. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	3	4.92			3	3.30
Acceptable	26	42.62	11	36.67	37	40.66
Fully Acceptable	32	52.46	19	63.33	51	56.04
TOTAL	61	100	30	100	91	100

The first objective is to develop and sustain academic excellence and effective leadership for the socio-economic development of the country and the world through research and research-based higher instruction for the attainment of advance and specialized knowledge in order to improve the quality of life. The greatest proportion of Ed. D. students 63.33 percent and NSU constituents 52.46 percent fully acceptable with the aforecited objective. On the other hand, the lowest proportion of the overall respondents agreed but at a lower category of partially acceptable.

Table 27: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the Ed.D. Objective One

Relevance	NSU Constituents		Ed.D. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	3	4.92			3	3.30
Relevant	27	44.26	9	30.00	36	39.56
Fully Relevant	31	50.82	21	70.00	52	57.14
TOTAL	61	100	30	100	91	100

As gleaned in Table 27, the majority of the Ed. D. students 70 percent claimed that objective 1 is fully relevant to the program offered in the Graduate School. Meanwhile, 50.82 percent of the NSU constituents agreed that the aforementioned objective is also fully relevant.

On the overall, the greatest proportion of the whole respondents is more than one-half 57.14 percent fully relevant with the first objective while a little proportion 3.30 percent were partially relevant.

Objective 2 – Expand frontiers of knowledge by innovating ideas and theories based on advance research and communicating its findings and results to the different sectors and stakeholders.

Table 28: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the Ed.D. Objective Two

Awareness	NSU Constituents		Ed.D. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.20
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.40
Aware	28	45.90	8	26.67	36	39.56
Fully Aware	27	44.26	22	73.33	49	53.85
TOTAL	61	100	30	100	91	100

As presented in Table 28, the majority of the Ed. D. students 73.33 percent claimed that they were fully aware with the objective 2. Meanwhile, 45.92 percent of the NSU constituents were aware of the aforementioned objective.

On the overall, the greatest proportion of the whole respondents is more than one-half 53.85 percent fully aware of the first objective while a little proportion 2.20 percent were not aware.

Table 29: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the Ed.D. Objective Two

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		Ed.D. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	3	4.92			3	3.30
Acceptable	27	44.26	11	36.67	38	41.76
Fully Acceptable	31	50.82	19	63.33	50	54.95
TOTAL	61	100	30	100	91	100

As presented in Table 29, the majority of the Ed. D. students 63.33 percent claimed that they fully accepted with the objective 2. Meanwhile, 50.82 percent of the NSU constituents were also fully accepted of the aforementioned objective.

On the overall, the greatest proportion of the whole respondents is more than one-half 54.95 percent fully acceptable with the first objective while a little proportion 3.30 percent were partially acceptable.

Table 30: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the Ed.D. Objective Two

Relevance	NSU Constituents		Ed.D. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	4	6.56			4	4.40
Relevant	24	39.34	9	30.00	33	36.26
Fully Relevant	33	54.10	21	70.00	54	59.34
TOTAL	61	100	30	100	91	100

As gleaned in Table 30, the majority of the Ed. D. students 70 percent claimed that objective 2 is fully relevant to the program offered in the Graduate School. Meanwhile, 54.10 percent of the NSU constituents agreed that the aforementioned objective is also fully relevant.

On the overall, the greatest proportion of the whole respondents is more than one-half 59.34 percent fully relevant with the second objective while a little proportion 4.40 percent were partially relevant.

3.6 Objectives of MPM

Objective 1 – Familiarize the nature, duties, and composition of the different government agencies in the local and national levels, Government Corporation and higher education institution.

Table 31: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the MPM Objective One

Awareness	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.15
Partially Aware	3	4.92	1	3.13	4	4.30
Aware	26	42.62	7	21.88	33	35.48
Fully Aware	30	49.18	24	75.00	54	58.06
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

The first objective of MPM program is to familiarize the nature, duties, and composition of the different government agencies in the local and national levels, Government Corporation and higher education institution. The table shows that the greatest proportion of MPM students 75.0 percent and NSU constituents 49.18 percent were fully aware with the aforecited objective 1.

On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 58.06 percent but at a lower category of not aware of 2.15 percent.

Table 32: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the MPM Objective One

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially Acceptable	4	6.56			4	4.30
Acceptable	29	47.54	13	40.63	42	45.16
Fully Acceptable	28	45.90	19	59.38	47	50.54
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Table 32 presents the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the MPM objective 1. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MPM students 59.38 percent fully accepted the objective one while the NSU constituents 47.54 percent were acceptable and 45.90 percent were fully acceptable. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 50.54 percent were fully acceptable but at a lower category of partially acceptable with 4.30 percent.

Table 33: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the MPM Objective One

Relevance	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	4	6.56			4	4.30
Relevant	27	44.26	10	31.25	37	39.78
Fully Relevant	30	49.18	22	68.75	52	55.91
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Objective 2 – Recognize the various dimensions of public administration such as its fundamental courses, policies, rules, regulations and procedure.

The second objective of the MPM program is to recognize the various dimensions of public administration such as its fundamental courses, policies, rules, regulations and procedure. As gleaned in the table, the majority of MPM students 68.75 percent stated that they were fully aware with the objective 2 while 49.18 percent of NSU constituents were also fully aware.

On the overall, more than one-half 55.91 percent said that they are fully aware while a little 2.15 percent were not aware.

Table 34: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the MPM Objective Two

Awareness	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.15
Partially Aware	3	4.92			3	3.23
Aware	26	42.62	10	31.25	36	38.71
Fully Aware	30	49.18	22	68.75	52	55.91
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Table 35: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the MPM Objective Two

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially acceptable	4	6.56			4	4.30
Acceptable	29	47.54	11	34.38	40	43.01
Fully Acceptable	28	45.90	21	65.63	49	52.69
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Table 35 presents the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the MPM objective 2. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MPM students 65.63 percent fully accepted the objective 2 while the NSU constituents 47.54 percent were acceptable and 45.90 percent were fully acceptable. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 52.69 percent were fully acceptable but at a lower category of partially acceptable with 4.30 percent.

Table 36: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the MPM Objective Two

Relevance	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	4	6.56			4	4.30
Relevant	27	44.26	11	34.38	38	40.86
Fully Relevant	30	49.18	21	65.63	51	54.84
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Table 36 shows the distribution of respondents according to the level of relevance of the MPM objective 2. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MPM students 65.63 percent claimed that objective 2 was fully relevant

while the NSU constituents 49.18 percent said fully relevant. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 54.84 percent were fully relevant but at a lower category of partially relevant with 4.30 percent.

Objective 3 – Enhancement proper work attitudes, values, ethics, and conduct.

Table 37: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the MPM Objective Three

Awareness	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.15
Partially Aware	3	4.92			3	3.23
Aware	26	42.62	7	21.88	33	35.48
Fully Aware	30	49.18	25	78.13	55	59.14
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

The third objective of the MPM program is to enhance the proper work attitudes, values, ethics and conduct. As gleaned in the table, the majority of MPM students 78.13 percent stated that they were fully aware with the objective 3 while 49.18 percent of NSU constituents were also fully aware.

On the overall, more than one-half 59.14 percent said that they are fully aware while a little 2.15 percent were not aware

Table 38: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the MPM Objective Three

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially acceptable	4	6.56			4	4.30
Acceptable	28	45.90	11	34.38	39	41.94
Fully Acceptable	29	47.54	21	65.63	50	53.76
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Table 38 presents the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the MPM objective 3. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MPM students 65.63 percent fully accepted the objective 3 while the NSU constituents 47.54 percent were fully acceptable. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 53.75 percent were fully acceptable but at a lower category of partially acceptable with 4.30 percent.

Table 39 shows the distribution of respondents according to the level of relevance of the MPM objective 3. It is

noted that the greatest proportion of MPM students 65.63 percent claimed that objective 3 was fully relevant while the NSU constituents 45.90 percent said fully relevant. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 52.69 percent were fully relevant but at a lower category of partially relevant with 4.30 percent.

Objective 4 – Hone the competencies of government employees and officials for managerial and executive functions.

Table 39: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the MPM Objective Three

Relevance	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	4	6.56			4.30%	4.30
Relevant	29	47.54	11	34.38	43.01%	43.01
Fully Relevant	28	45.90	21	65.63	52.69%	52.69
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	100%	100

Table 40: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the MPM Objective Four

Awareness	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.15
Partially Aware	3	4.92			3	3.23
Aware	26	42.62	5	15.63	31	33.33
Fully Aware	30	49.18	27	84.38	57	61.29
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

The fourth objective of the MPM program is to hone the competencies of government employees and officials for managerial and executive functions. As gleaned in the table, the majority of MPM students 84.38 percent stated that they were fully aware with the objective 4 while 49.18 percent of NSU constituents were also fully aware. On the overall, more than one-half 61.29 percent said that they are fully aware while a little 2.15 percent were not aware.

Table 41 presents the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the MPM objective 4. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MPM students 65.63 percent fully accepted the objective 4 while the NSU constituents 50.82 percent were fully acceptable. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 55.91 percent were fully acceptable but at a lower category of partially acceptable with 4.30 percent.

Table 41: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the MPM Objective Four

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially acceptable	4	6.56			4	4.30
Acceptable	26	42.62	11	34.38	37	39.78
Fully Acceptable	31	50.82	21	65.63	52	55.91
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Table 42: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the MPM Objective Four

Relevance	NSU Constituents		M.P.M. Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	4	6.56			4	4.30
Relevant	25	40.98	10	31.25	35	37.63
Fully Relevant	32	52.46	22	68.75	54	58.06
TOTAL	61	100	32	100	93	100

Table 42 shows the distribution of respondents according to the relevance of the MPM objective 4. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MPM students 68.75 percent claimed that objective 4 was fully relevant while the NSU constituents 52.46 percent said fully relevant. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 58.06 percent were fully relevant but at a lower category of partially relevant with 4.30 percent.

3.7 Objectives of Maed

Objective 1 – Create greater opportunities for knowledge generation, skills development, and desirable attitudes not only for personal gain but also for other's welfare.

The first objective of the MAED program is to create greater opportunities for knowledge generation, skills development, and desirable attitudes not only for personal gain but also for other's welfare.

As gleaned in the table, the majority of MAED students 72.73 percent claimed that they were fully aware with the objective 1 while 55.74 percent of NSU constituents were also fully aware.

On the overall, more than one-half 61.70 percent said that they are fully aware while a little 2.13 percent were not aware.

Table 43: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the MAED Objective One

Awareness	NSU Constituents		MAED Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.13
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.26
Aware	21	34.43	9	27.27	30	31.91
Fully Aware	34	55.74	24	72.73	58	61.70
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 44: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the MAED Objective One

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		MAED Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Acceptable						
Partially acceptable	5	8.20			5	5.32
Acceptable	22	36.07	10	30.30	32	34.04
Fully Acceptable	34	55.74	23	69.70	57	60.64
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 44 presents the distribution of respondents according to the acceptability of the MAED objective 1. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MAED students 69.70 percent fully accepted the objective 1 while the NSU constituents 55.74 percent were fully acceptable. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 60.64 percent were fully acceptable but at a lower category of partially acceptable with 5.32 percent.

Table 45: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the MAED Objective One

Relevance	NSU Constituents		MAED Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	3	4.92			3	3.19
Relevant	25	40.98	8	24.24	33	35.11
Fully Relevant	33	54.10	25	75.76	58	61.70
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

Table 45 shows the distribution of respondents according to the relevance of the MAED objective 1. It is noted that the greatest proportion of MAED students 75.75 percent claimed that objective 1 was fully relevant while

the NSU constituents 54.10 percent said fully relevant. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 61.70 percent were fully relevant but at a lower category of partially relevant with 3.90 percent.

Objective 2 – Strengthening and expand the skills and abilities of the teachers and other professionals in the education arena to actively engage in research particularly in the fields of education science and practice.

Table 46: Distribution of Respondents according to the Level of Awareness of the MAED Objective Two

Awareness	NSU Constituents		MAED Students		Overall	
	Freq.	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
Not Aware	2	3.28			2	2.13
Partially Aware	4	6.56			4	4.26
Aware	21	34.43	11	33.33	32	34.04
Fully Aware	34	55.74	22	66.67	56	59.57
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

The second objective of the MAED program is to strengthen and expand the skills and abilities of the teachers and other professionals in the education arena to actively engage in research particularly in the fields of education science and practice. As illustrated in table 46, the majority of the MAED students 66.67 percent were fully aware with the objective 2 while 55.74 percent attained by the NSU constituents described as fully aware.

Meanwhile, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 59.57 percent were fully aware but at a lower category of not aware of 2.13 percent.

Table 47: Distribution of Respondents according to the Acceptability of the MAED Objective Two

Acceptability	NSU Constituents		MAED Students		Overall	
	Freq.	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
Not Acceptable						
Partially acceptable	5	8.20			5	5.32
Acceptable	22	36.07	12	36.36	34	36.17
Fully Acceptable	34	55.74	21	63.64	55	58.51
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

As illustrated in Table 47, most of the MAED students 63.64 percent were fully acceptable with the objective 2 while 55.74 percent attained by the NSU constituents described as fully acceptable. Meanwhile, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 58.51 percent were fully acceptable but at a lower category of partially acceptable with 5.32 percent.

Table 48 shows that majority of the MAED students 78.79 percent were fully relevant with the objective 2 while 55.74 percent attained by the NSU constituents described as fully relevant.

Meanwhile, the highest proportion of the overall respondents agreed more than one-half 63.83 percent were fully relevant but at a lower category of partially relevant with 3.19 percent.

Table 48: Distribution of Respondents according to the Relevance of the MAED Objective Two

Relevance	NSU Constituents		MAED Students		Overall	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not Relevant						
Partially Relevant	3	4.92			3	3.19
Relevant	24	39.34	7	21.21	31	32.98
Fully Relevant	34	55.74	26	78.79	60	63.83
TOTAL	61	100	33	100	94	100

3. Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1 Conclusion

The graduate school students' respondents of the study were fully aware, fully relevant and fully acceptable of the NSU Vision and Mission and Graduate School Goals and Objectives of the different courses (i.e. DM, Ed. D., MPM, MAED). On the NSU Vision of awareness, relevance, and acceptability, MAED students got the highest percentage. While the NSU Mission of awareness Ed. D. students got the highest percentage, DM got the highest percentage in acceptability and relevance. As regards to graduate school goals, DM got the highest percentage in awareness, MAED got the highest percentage in acceptability and DM and MAED share the highest percentage in acceptability. The respondents' responses on the objectives of the courses in graduate school like Doctor of management, Doctor of Education, Master of Public Management and Master in Elementary Education have clearly indicated that they are fully aware, fully relevant and fully acceptable in the said objectives.

4.2 Recommendation

Anchored on the findings of this study, Naval State University, and the Graduate School should sustain the core principles of NSU's Vision and Mission and Graduate School's Goals and Objectives. Strategies, programs, and activities that contributed to the high level of awareness, relevance, and acceptability should be strengthened and continued. Assessment of the awareness, relevance, and acceptance of the VMGOs by the students be done periodically to determine the need for revision in order to meet innovations and challenges of the changing

needs of the times. And finally, a study on the extent of dissemination of the NSU and the Graduate School's VMGOs should be conducted to sustain their effectiveness.

References

[1] S.P. Robbins, M. Coulter, & R. Stuart-Kotze. (2003). Management. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

[2] CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 37, Series of 2012

[3] AACCUP Revised Instrument. The Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, Inc., 2010

[4] R. Castillo. (2014). "Awareness, acceptance, and perception of Batangas State University stakeholders towards its vision, mission, goals, and objectives." International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research, 14(1), 546-563.

[5] M. Salom, & Z. Florendo. (2013). "Awareness, acceptability, and relevance of the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the BSEMT program", International Scientific Research Journal, 5(1) 236-245.

[6] S.P. Robbins, M. Coulter, & R. Stuart-Kotze. (2003). Management. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

[7] L. MacDonald. "What Do Clear Vision & Mission Statements Contribute to the Strategic Management Process?" Internet: http://smallbusiness.chron.com/clear-vision-mission-statements-contribute-strategic-management-process-24100.html, [August 2016].

[8] J.M. Spallina. (2004). "Strategic Planning - Getting Started: Mission, Vision, and Values", Journal of Oncology Management. January-February.

[9] C. Bratianu, & I. Jianu. (2007). "The Vision and Mission of the University. Case Study – The Academy of Economic Studies of Bucharest." Internet: http://econpapers.repec.org/article/ephjournl/v_3a2_3ay_3a2007_-3ai_3a2_3an_3a4.htm, [August 2016]