Evaluation of Graduating Students of the Impact of Graduate School Education and Services in Rizal Technological University
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ABSTRACT. The students are the reasons for the establishment of learning institutions which are the key factors to quality education. At present, the mission of the RTU-GS is to produce world-class professionals and leaders to meet the multifarious expectations and needs of society. Since 1977 up to presents, no one has ever conducted a research on graduate students’ assessment of the Graduate School and its student services. It is in this end that the researchers brought about an exit interview to Graduate School graduating students.

This study used the causal comparative design and had 80 respondents representing the RTU graduating students’ population for school year 2012-2013. The respondents were described as to gender, age, GS course and number of year of degree completion.

From the salient findings of the study, the researchers concluded that the GS graduating students are very satisfied with the personal impact of education, the development of their professional skill, and the personnel and various offices. The GS students suggest the fixed format on thesis writing, special lanes or windows for business transaction and the maintenance of good interpersonal relationship between school personnel and students. The overall rating of the GS students of the education is very satisfactory. Finally, there are significant differences in the assessment of GS students by personnel and offices.

1. INTRODUCTION
The Graduate Program of the Rizal Technological University, known then as Rizal Technological Colleges (RTC) started in 1977 under the initiative of Dr. Lydia M. Profeta, the then first President of RTC. This was in consortium with San Sebastian Graduate School which supervised the RTC graduate program.

The students are the reasons for the establishment of learning institutions. They are also one of the key factors to quality education. The quality of GS graduates would depend upon the quality and adequacy of the enumerated items in the conceptual framework which are adopted from the ten (10) areas of quality assurance.

This research will be focused on the exit interview to be conducted to RTU GS graduate for SY 2012-2013 as regards to the impact of GS education to the personal attributes, professional skills, and delivery of support services by the different personnel and offices of the University and Graduate School.

Performance of a SUC is enhanced if it voluntarily pursues educational quality though self-evaluation and peer visitation by going through the process of accreditation. A school’s accredited status establishes its academic standard. The task force found out that accreditation has significantly helped improve the quality of the accredited schools.
Since the Graduate School is the premier college in any educational institution, quality assurance focuses on its areas that would guaranty the best of academic and intellectual products and processes. These are:

Faculty: The quality of the Graduate School depends greatly on the qualifications of its faculty who should be composed of the best qualified very competent and an expert in his field of specialization.

Curriculum and Instruction: are of utmost importance in any educational program. A continuous enhancement of their quality is necessary.

Students: are the recipient of the best educational exercise. The quality of graduate education obtained by a student depends on him/her inputs such as inherent abilities, motivation, and discipline, the quality and quantity of school inputs, the effectiveness of the curriculum and teaching method, and the quality of the school and home environment.

Through research, new knowledge is discovered needed for the improvement of educational processes.

Extension: is the knowledge obtained from research need to be shared with the people in the community to improve their quality of life.

Library: is the heart of any educational institution. It is the depository of information and knowledge and are essentials to the attainment of the goals and objectives of the GS.

Physical Plant and Facilities: These are needed for the successful implementation of anything related to education.

Laboratories: are the places where students have their practicum activities essential to the successful implementation of curricular programs.

Administration: is the machinery of any educational institution for the attainment of its vision, mission, goals, and objectives (VMGO). It sees to it that processes are very satisfactorily implemented.

VMGO is actually the first area of quality assurance since it is the most fundamental of all the ten (10) areas. All activities, operations and all policies of any graduate school or any educational institution for that matter, are geared/directed towards the attainment of its VMGO.

2. THE PERSONAL IMPACT OF EDUCATION PROVIDED BY RTU-GS TO GRADUATE SCHOOL GRADUATING STUDENTS.

Table 1. Weighted Mean, Verbal Interpretation and Rank of the Education Provided by RTU-GS

| Personal Impact of Education                  | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation | Rank |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|
| 1. Development of self confidence            | 4.06          | Very Satisfactory      | 6    |
| 2. Development of self esteem                | 4.10          | Very Satisfactory      | 4    |
| 3. Contribution to the great understanding of self | 4.09          | Very Satisfactory      | 5    |
| 4. Influence on one’s value system           | 4.13          | Very Satisfactory      | 3    |
| 5. Deepening belief in Superbeing            | 4.26          | Very Satisfactory      | 2    |
| 6. Enhancement of Social Skills              | 4.33          | Very Satisfactory      | 1    |
| Average Weighted Mean                        | 4.16          | Very Satisfactory      |      |

Table 1 shows the personal impact of education provided by the RTU-GS to the graduate school students. Rank 1 is the enhancement of social skills with a weighted mean of 4.33 interpreted as very satisfactory. Second in rank is deepening belief in the super being with a weighted mean of 4.26 or very satisfactory. Succeeding third in rank is the influence on the value system with a weighted mean of 4.13 rated as very satisfactory. A closer scrutiny of Table 5 on the distribution of obtained weighted mean responses shows an average weighted mean of 4.16 interpreted as very satisfactory. These findings are in consonance on the evaluation of the student services of RTU.
3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL SKILLS OF THE GS GRADUATING STUDENTS

Table 2. Weighted Mean, Verbal Interpretation and Rank of the Professional Skills Provided by RTU-GS to Graduate School Graduating Students

| Professional Skills                                                                 | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation | Rank |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|
| 1. Enhancement of theoretical knowledge needed in the course                        | 4.31          | Very Satisfactory      | 1.5  |
| 2. Enhancement of clinical, technical/practical skills in my area of specialization | 4.10          | Very Satisfactory      | 5    |
| 3. Improvement in oral communication                                                | 4.06          | Very Satisfactory      | 6    |
| 4. Improvement in written communication                                            | 4.14          | Very Satisfactory      | 4    |
| 5. Development of presentation skills                                              | 4.31          | Very Satisfactory      | 1.5  |
| 6. Updates on the latest trends in my profession                                    | 4.28          | Very Satisfactory      | 3    |
| Average Weighted Mean                                                               | 4.20          | Very Satisfactory      |      |

Table 2 presents the impact on the development of professional skills provided by the RTU-GS to the graduate school students. Both the enhancement of theoretical knowledge needed in the course and the development of professional skills of the graduate school students rank 1.5 with obtained weighted mean of 4.31 rated very satisfactory. Next in rank is the updates on the latest trends of their profession with a weighted mean of 4.28 or very satisfactory. The improvement in written communication gets a weighted mean of 4.14 interpreted as very satisfactory. The average weighted mean of 4.20 or very satisfactory in this table manifests a very consistent perception of graduate school students on their professional skills development. These findings manifest the same results on the performance of faculty member in the higher education institutions [1].

4. THE PERFORMANCE RATINGS OF THE PERSONNEL AND THE SUPPORT STUDENT OFFICES OF THE RTU-GRADUATE SCHOOL

Table 3. Weighted Mean, Verbal Interpretation, and Rank of the Performance Ratings of the Personnel and Support Student Offices of RTU-GS

| Personnel/Office                                                                 | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation | Rank |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|
| 1. GS Dean/Staff                                                                 | 4.46          | Very Satisfactory      | 2    |
| 2. Professorial Lecturers                                                         | 4.51          | Excellent              | 1    |
| 3. Student Affairs/ Guidance Services                                            | 4.06          | Very Satisfactory      | 7    |
| 4. Registrar                                                                     | 4.26          | Very Satisfactory      | 3    |
| 5. Classroom Facilities                                                           | 4.16          | Very Satisfactory      | 4    |
| 6. Library                                                                       | 4.15          | Very Satisfactory      | 5    |
| 7. Accounting                                                                    | 4.07          | Very Satisfactory      | 6    |
| 8. ID Sector                                                                     | 3.84          | Very Satisfactory      | 12   |
| 9. Security                                                                       | 3.88          | Very Satisfactory      | 13   |
| 10. Canteen                                                                      | 3.83          | Very Satisfactory      | 10   |
| 11. Laboratory (Computer, Science, English, Psychology, etc.)                    | 3.92          | Very Satisfactory      | 15   |
| 12. Cashier                                                                       | 3.83          | Very Satisfactory      | 10   |
An appraisal of the personnel and various offices of the university in the delivery of their services is shown in Table 3. An analysis of table 3 reveals that the professional lecturers are marked excellent with a weighted mean of 4.57 and ranks one. Second in rank is the GS Dean and Staff with a weighted mean of 4.46 interpreted as very satisfactory. An examination of the responses reveals that 15 personnel and offices are rated very satisfactory. The average weighted mean of 4.04 or very satisfactory is likewise clearly complimented by the graduate school students. The findings are similar as to the professional attributes of teachers with respect to professional knowledge and professional engagement [2].

5. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS RELATIVE TO THE DELIVERY OF GRADUATE EDUCATION BY RTU-GS

Table 4. Comments and Suggestions to the Delivery of Graduate Education by RTU-GS

| Comments and Suggestions |
|--------------------------|
| 1. The respondents suggest on thesis writing the fixed thesis format for consistency and to give at least two weeks’ time period for editing the manuscript after the final defense. |
| 2. The students clamor for good facilities like the comfort room exclusive for them and easier transaction with Registrar and Cashier offices especially during schedule of payment and the like. |
| 3. The GS students likewise ask for a special window for business transactions to minimize absences from work. In addition, the GS students appear to be aware of the provision for student lounge where they can relax and socialize. This lounge shall be provided with amenities like television, radio, educational games, disc player and others. On the overall, the comments appear to notice the very responsible personnel and staff of their tasks. |
| 4. Maintenance of a good interpersonal relationship between school personnel and students is highly emboldened, that is giving of courage sufficient to overcome timidity or reluctance. |

Table 4 points out the comments and suggestions of the graduate school students relative to the delivery of graduate education by RTU-GS. The respondents suggest on thesis writing the fixed thesis format for consistency and to give at least two weeks’ time period for editing the manuscript after the final defense. The students clamor for good facilities like the comfort room exclusive for them and easier transaction with Registrar and Cashier offices especially during schedule of payment and the like. The GS students likewise ask for a special window for business transactions to minimize absences from work. In addition, the GS students appear to be aware of the provision for student lounge where they can relax and socialize. This lounge shall be provided with amenities like television, radio, educational games, disc player and others. On the overall, the comments appear to notice the very responsible personnel and staff of their tasks. However, maintenance of a good interpersonal relationship between school personnel and students is highly emboldened, that is giving of courage sufficient to overcome timidity or reluctance. Some of the opposing views further articulated the outcome of this research which supports for professional learning not only on the personal impact of education and development of professional skills but also attitude through observation of the professional ethics and at the same time, the delivery of the different student services.
6. OVERALL RATING ON THE ASSESSMENT OF THE GS GRADUATES ON THE PROVISION OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL EDUCATION

Table 5. Over-all Rating on the Assessment of the GS Graduates on the Provision of Graduate School Education

| Factors Assessed by the GS Students | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Personal Impact of Education    | 4.16          | Very Satisfactory      |
| 2. Professional Skills Development | 4.20          | Very Satisfactory      |
| 3. Personnel and Various Offices   | 4.04          | Very Satisfactory      |
| Overall Weighted Mean              | 4.13          | Very Satisfactory      |

Table 5 establishes the composite weighted mean on the assessment of the Graduate School Education as 4.13 or very satisfactory. A close scrutiny on the overall weighted mean exhibits a very satisfactory evaluation of the GS students as to the GS education in terms of principles of learning as a way of developing the students’ competencies. These findings strongly agree that the teachers have professional competencies in performing the various teaching techniques, good classroom management and the personal effectiveness of the GS educational impact in terms of self-confidence, self-esteem, understanding of self, value system, belief in superbeing and social skills [3].

7. DIFFERENCES IN THE ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENTS BY PERSONNEL AND OFFICES

Table 6. Significant Difference Between the Assessment of the Respondents in the Areas of RTU Personnel and Offices

| Personnel/Office                      | z-value (computed value) | Standard Deviation | p-value (tabular value) | Decision | Remarks |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|---------|
| GS Dean/ Staff                       | 55.01                    | 0.78               | 0.01                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Professional Lecturers               | 59.62                    | 0.67               | 0.00                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Student Affairs Office/Guidance Service | 50.63                  | 0.72               | 0.02                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Registrar                            | 56.88                    | 0.67               | 0.01                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Classroom Facilities                 | 66.33                    | 0.56               | 0.03                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Library                              | 61.52                    | 0.60               | 0.03                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Accounting                           | 61.56                    | 0.59               | 0.02                    | Reject   | Significant |
| ID Sector                            | 60.98                    | 0.61               | 0.00                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Security                             | 49.52                    | 0.70               | 0.00                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Canteen                              | 54.64                    | 0.63               | 0.00                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Laboratory (Computer, Science, English, Psychology, etc.) | 36.89 | 0.95 | 0.02 | Reject | Significant |
| Cashier                              | 35.18                    | 0.96               | 0.00                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Comfort Room                         | 38.47                    | 0.89               | 0.02                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Student Lounge                      | 44.61                    | 0.78               | 0.02                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Medical/ Dental Clinic               | 44.32                    | 0.79               | 0.03                    | Reject   | Significant |
| Faculty Lounge (Consultation, others)| 44.97                    | 0.80               | 0.00                    | Reject   | Significant |
Table 6 shows the difference in the assessment of respondents in the areas of RTU Personnel and Offices. The $z$-score is the computed value at 0.05 level of significance and $p$-value is the tabular value which shows the rejection of the null hypothesis. The Gs Dean and staff obtain a $p$-value of 0.01 which is less than the computed $z$-value of 55.01 at .05, therefore, it fails to accept the null hypothesis or reject the null hypothesis. The same is true with the professional lecturers with $p$-value of 0.00 and the $z$-value of 59.62. Likewise, the $p$-value of OSA (0.02) $z$-value (50.63); registrar p. value (0.01) $z$ value (56.88); classroom facilities p. value (.03) $z$ value (66.33); library p. value (0.03) $z$ value (61.52); accounting p. value (0.02) $z$ value (61.56); laboratory p. value (0.02) $z$ value (36.89); comfort room p. value (0.02) $z$ value (38.47); student lounge p. value (0.02) $z$ value (44.61); medical dental clinic p. value (0.03) $z$ value (44.32) and others like security, canteen and faculty lounge.

There is indeed sufficient evidence to conclude that there is a lot of dissension among personnel and offices. These data express the significant level of assessment among personnel and staff under study because the $z$-values taken are greater than the $p$-values required to reach an alpha of .05 that the hypotheses of variance are rejected. The table shows the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the assessment of respondents in the areas of RTU Personnel and offices.

8. CONCLUSION

From the salient findings of the study, the researcher concluded that the Graduate School graduating students are very satisfied with the personal impact of education. The graduate school graduating students are very satisfied with the development of their professional skills. The graduate school students are very satisfied with the personnel and various offices. The graduate school students suggest the fixed format on thesis writing, special lanes or windows for business transactions and the maintenance of a good interpersonal relationship between school personnel and students. The overall rating of the graduate school students to the graduate school education is very satisfactory. There are significant differences in the assessment of graduate school students by personnel and offices.

Moreover, the researcher recommends that The institution may recognize the personal impact of education to graduate school students to be able to provide more compassion and understanding on the personal needs and human potentials of the students. The institution may have a dramatic paradigm shift not only focusing on personal development but also on pedagogical expertise and platform skills of professionalism that will bring the graduate school students diversity into teaching and learning equation. The institution may offer a comprehensive and institution wide programs that will upgrade the academic and professional careers and will address faculty needs for growth and development across career stages and roles, on national and international academic arena. The institution may review and reinvent the uniqueness of functions and requirements in relation to the nature of the operations of the university. The administration may consider the direct student support activities to the main line of work and the primary vision, mission, goals and objectives of the organization to discriminate between main functions and support functions. The institution may acknowledge the changing landscape of the organizational components to sustain teaching-learning services, to prepare further the professional knowledge, engagement and attributes of students to retool the instructional competency and a variety of ecological and crisis interventions. To address the limitations of the study, the other researchers may replicate this study using other settings and variables.
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