

# Strategic Plan Implementation of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Mimaropa Region towards Asean Integration

<sup>1</sup>Jesse T. Zamora, <sup>2</sup>Glecy M. Alquiza

<sup>1</sup>Ed.D. Ph.D., <sup>2</sup>Ed.D., <sup>1,2</sup>Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology, Oriental Mindoro, Philippines

---

**Abstract:** This study assessed the implementation of strategic plans of Higher Education Institutions (HEIS) in MIMAROPA towards ASEAN Integration in terms of ASEAN awareness, access to quality education, cross border mobility, and internationalization of education using the Descriptive-comparative method. Respondents were faculty and administrators of Private and Public HEIs in the region in SY 2014-2015. Findings revealed that strategic plans were partially implemented highlighting ASEAN awareness as the least implemented. ANOVA-Single Factor revealed the not significant difference on the perception of the respondents from Private HEIs on the implementation of their plans while there is significant difference in the implementation in Public HEIs. ASEAN awareness was less implemented compared to access to education, cross border mobility and internationalization of education. Access to quality education was prioritized compared to cross border mobility and internationalization of education. Sheffè test result revealed that Private and Public HEIs have significant difference on the perception in plans implementation. ASEAN awareness was less implemented than access to education and cross border mobility while access to education was given emphasis than cross border mobility and internationalization of education. T-test showed that Public HEIs greatly implemented plans for access to education, cross border mobility and internationalization of education than Private HEIs. With the findings Private and Public HEIs should revisit the curriculum to enhance the ASEAN awareness through classroom instructions and collaboration with other HEIs in the ASEAN. They should work on giving seminars, trainings and twinning programs to keep abreast with the demands of ASEAN Integration.

**Keywords:** ASEAN, strategic implementation, internationalization of education, strategic plans, MIMAROPA.

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

ASEAN Community has been the vision of 10 Member Nations since 2003 which aims to promote regional cooperation in Southeast Asia in the spirit of equality and partnership, thereby contributing towards peace, progress and prosperity in the region.

At this point, the Philippine government is making effort to be ready for ASEAN Integration especially in the education sector. As envisioned by ASEAN Leaders, education sector is central to the ASEAN's commitment to build the ASEAN Community. It is the heart of development where it is expected to contribute to the establishment of socially responsible ASEAN Community, one in which citizens share common identity and dwell in the society that enhances the well-being, livelihood and welfare of all people. (Cha'am Hua Hin Declaration 2009).

Higher education plays a crucial role in providing quality education to its people to respond to global and national challenges especially in the issue of competency of graduates, qualifications of faculty, academic and co-curricular programs, learning resources, support structures, nature of linkages, research and outreach activities. The Philippine Higher Education is strengthening its capacity and participation to ensure that Filipinos have the right competencies and attitudes

through excellent quality education at all levels. As stated in CHED Handbook on Typology, OBE, and ISA (2014) Philippine government has been implementing educational reforms for the past few years to address the demands and challenges of an international community.

Private and Public HEIs in MIMAROPA Region are particularly challenged to produce graduates who can engage meaningfully in their communities and in building the nation who are productive, especially in the context of ASEAN 2015 and the globalization of professional practice. Specifically they are providing experiences to train students to be at par with the neighboring ASEAN nations to survive with the rising of internationalization and globalization of higher education. They are working on the implementation of strategic plans in the category of ASEAN awareness, access to quality education, cross border mobility, and internationalization of education.

As the adoption of ASEAN Economic Community in the country, Private and Public HEIs in the region are investing resources to meet the expectations but of course they are facing great challenges particularly in answering the strategic issues on development and implementation of plans for ASEAN Integration and there is a lot to be done to enhance educational competitiveness [1]

This is the essence and challenge of ASEAN Integration for the Philippine Higher Education particularly the Higher Education Institutions in MIMAROPA Region to meet the expectations of the global education.

With this call for Higher Education Institutions to further create programs and plans on how to address this issue, the researcher was inspired to conduct an in-depth study on the extent of implementation in terms of ASEAN awareness, access to quality education, cross border mobility, and internationalization of education of Higher Education Institutions in MIMAROPA Region towards ASEAN Integration.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the questions: 1). What is the extent of implementation of the strategic plan of Private and Public Higher Education Institutions in MIMAROPA REGION towards ASEAN Integration in terms of ASEAN Awareness, Access to Education, Cross Border Mobility, and Internationalization of Education; 2). Is there a significant difference on the extent of implementation of strategic plan of Private HEIs in MIMAROPA region towards ASEAN Integration considering the four (4) mentioned indicators?; 3). Is there a significant difference on the extent of implementation of strategic plan of Public HEIs in MIMAROPA region towards ASEAN Integration considering the four (4) mentioned indicators?; 4). Is there a significant difference on the extent of implementation of strategic plan of Private and Public HEIs in MIMAROPA region towards ASEAN Integration considering the four (4) mentioned indicators?; 5). Is there a significant difference on the extent of implementation of strategic plan between Private and Public HEIs in MIMAROPA region towards ASEAN Integration considering the four (4) mentioned indicators?

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in selected Higher Education Institution (HEIs) in MIMAROPA Region, five of which is Public HEIs and another five is Private HEIs during S.Y. 2014-2015. Descriptive-comparative design was employed in order to determine the extent of implementation of strategic plans of these HEIs towards ASEAN Integration.

The sample respondents were chosen from the population of administrators and faculty using Stratified Proportional Random Sampling. Slovinc's Formula was also employed to determine the 60 respondents from Private HEIs and 213 respondents from Public HEIs.

Self-made questionnaire was used as instrument where it was patterned from ASEAN Work Plan on Education 2011-2015. The tool was validated by five most reliable and experts in the field of higher education. It has three parts. Part A was for the profile of the respondents, Part B dealt on the perception of respondents on the extent of implementation of strategic plans of selected HEIs towards ASEAN Integration in terms of ASEAN Awareness, Access to Quality Education, Cross Border Mobility and Internationalization of Education, and Part C asked about the respondents' awareness on ASEAN Integration.

The data collected from the respondents were treated statistically using descriptive and inferential test statistic like weighted mean, to summarize data on strategic plans; Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation for the reliability of the instrument; Analysis of Variance, to test the significant difference of the variables; Sheffè Method, to compare the absolute mean difference of the paired variables and T-test to test the difference of the plans between private and public HEIs towards ASEAN Integration.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

#### A. Extent of implementation of Strategic plan of HEIs towards ASEAN Integration:

Table 1 presents the summary of the perception made by the respondents regarding the extent of implementation of strategic plan of HEIs in the region towards ASEAN Integration. The overall mean of 2.12 was registered which implies that HEIs were partially implementing the plans in terms of ASEAN awareness, Access to quality education, Cross border mobility and Internationalization of education.

Specifically, both Private and Public HEIs partially implemented the plans for ASEAN Awareness as revealed by the mean of 2.00. This implies that there is a need for more intensive implementations in promoting ASEAN awareness among faculty and students. HEIs still need to provide opportunities for the development of curriculum guidelines, trainings, innovations, and scholarship grants. Teachers and students should be given venues for knowledge involvement and aspirations so that they could take part in the dynamics of building ASEAN Community [2]

In terms of Access to Quality Education, respondents believed that it was partially implemented as shown by the mean of 2.26. The results imply that there is a need to review this plan specifically on partnership programs and improved classroom instructions to answer the demands of ASEAN Integration. Seeing this importance, HEIs are to be strengthened and improved in the provision of equitable access to higher education [3] and produce college students who are competent, communicative, innovative, collaborative, critical thinker, technically skilled and life- long learners [4] and to achieve quality education there must be provision of appropriate trainings, workshops, faculty accreditation, partnership, sharing of practices, services, and outreach programs [5]

The mean of 2.16 was revealed for Cross Border Mobility. This indicates that Selected HEIs within the region had partially implemented the plans for cross border mobility. Empirically, not all HEIs were capable of sending their faculty/students abroad to expose them to cultures and norms of ASEAN member countries because of the limited resources of the HEIs. Likewise programs for exchange studies that would enable faculty/students to experience the educational system of ASEAN member countries which can hone their academic skills and deepen their intercultural understanding are to be provided to answer the need of today's globalized world.

Internationalization of education was also rated as partially implemented. The mean of 2.08 was obtained, indicating that selected HEIs in the region are aware of the need to come up with plans to promote international education by developing innovative international programs, strengthen study abroad programs, international conferences, and conduct of research since research is the currency of global academic community [6].

**TABLE 1. EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN TOWARDS ASEAN INTEGRATION**

Strategic Plans	Private and Public HEIs	Interpretation
ASEAN Awareness	2.00	Partially Implemented
Access to Quality Education	2.26	Partially Implemented
Cross Border Mobility	2.16	Partially Implemented
Internationalization of Education	2.08	Partially Implemented
OVERALL MEAN	2.12	Partially Implemented

Legend: 1.00-1.49- not implemented 1.50-2.49- partially implemented 2.50-3.00- fully implemented

#### B. Significant Difference on the extent of Implementation of Strategic Plans of Private HEIs towards ASEAN Integration:

Table 2 shows one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of strategic plans of selected Private HEIs in MIMAROPA Region as perceived by the respondents in preparation towards ASEAN Integration. Since the computed F-value of 1.15 does not exceed the critical F-value of 2.64 at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference among the variables compared.

The results imply that the perceptions of respondents on the preparations being done by the Private HEIs in MIMAROPA Region for ASEAN Integration are almost the same. Plans like ASEAN Awareness, Access to Quality education, Cross border Mobility and Internationalization of education were indistinguishably implemented.

**TABLE 2 ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE STRATEGIC PLANS OF PRIVATE HEIS TOWARDS ASEAN INTEGRATION**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	Result
Between Groups	0.98	3	0.33	1.15	0.33	2.64	NOT Significant
Within Groups	66.78	236	0.28				
Total	67.76	239					

**C. Significant Difference on the Extent of Implementation of Strategic Plans of Public HEIs towards ASEAN Integration:**

Table 3 shows one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of strategic plans of selected Public HEIs in MIMAROPA Region as perceived by the respondents in preparation for ASEAN Integration. The computed F-value of 11.65 is greater than the critical F-value of 2.62 at 0.05 level of significance, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**TABLE 3 ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA) OF THE STRATEGIC PLANS OF PUBLIC HEIS TOWARDS ASEAN INTEGRATION**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	Result
Between Groups	9.70	3	3.23	11.65	1.73E-07	2.62	Significant
Within Groups	235.29	848	0.28				
Total	244.90	851					

**D. Scheffé's Test Result for the difference in Means on the Implementation of Strategic Plans of Selected Public HEIs in MIMAROPA Region towards ASEAN Integration:**

Table 3.1 shows the Scheffé test result for the difference of implementation of strategic plans of selected Public HEIs in MIMAROPA Region towards ASEAN Integration. This shows that the implementation of plans for ASEAN awareness is less noticeable compared to the implementation of plans for access to quality education as depicted by the mean difference of 0.30 which is interpreted as significant. Respondents believed that ASEAN awareness has not yet incorporated in the curriculum, guidelines, and other capacity development while the implementation of access to quality education has been widely implemented through partnership, teachers' training/workshops, and mobility programs and outreach activities.

With regards to the implementation of ASEAN Awareness and Cross border mobility there is significant difference of 0.13 in their means. This implies that the respondents see in different perspective the way the Public HEIs promote ASEAN awareness compared to cross border mobility. They believed that cross border mobility of teachers and students was strengthened due to the advantage of Filipinos in speaking English language [7]. Public HEIs send teachers and students to ASEAN conferences, seminars and training to exchange ideas and knowledge with other ASEAN students [8]. In fact SEAMEO College facilitates the sharing of exchange of education ideas and initiatives in education among all Southeast Asian countries.

On the other hand, the perception of the respondents on the implementation of Public HEIs on ASEAN awareness and internationalization of education significantly differs as shown by the mean difference of 0.11. Respondents viewed that plans for internationalization of education was more stressed than plans for ASEAN awareness. This is because faculty/students were given opportunities to travel abroad since public HEIs participated in the ASEAN International Mobility for Students (AIMS) program of the CHED (CMO 11 s. 2014).

The perception of respondents in Public HEIs with regards to the implementation of access to quality and cross border mobility significantly differs. They see that Public HEIs are now engaged in accessing to quality education so they could cope with the demands of ASEAN Integration by subjecting themselves in periodic accreditation, mobility programs, and other study programs. But on the other hand, they noticed that sponsoring faculty/students to international consortia and forum is still lacking maybe for the reason of unavailability of funds.

Lastly, respondents viewed differently on the implementation of plans for implementing access to quality education and internationalization of education. They perceived that Public HEIs has providing avenues for teachers and students to share their best practices to other educational institutions but of course they still need to be provided with more trainings,

seminars and workshops to expose themselves to international education so they could explore the world and its diverse cultures.

**TABLE 3.1 SHEFFÈ'S TEST RESULT FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN MEANS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLANS TOWARDS ASEAN INTEGRATION**

Variables	MEAN DIFFERENCE	RESULT
ASEAN Awareness Versus Access to Education	0.30	**
ASEAN Awareness Versus Cross Border Mobility	0.13	**
ASEAN Awareness Versus Internationalization of Education	0.11	**
Access to Education Versus Cross Border Mobility	0.17	**
Access to Education Versus Internationalization of Education	0.19	**
Cross Border Mobility Versus Internationalization of Education	0.02	*

Legend: \*\*-significant \*- not significant

**E. Significant Difference on the Extent of Implementation of Strategic Plans of Private and Public HEIs towards ASEAN Integration:**

Table 4 shows one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of strategic plans of selected Private and Public HEIs in MIMAROPA Region as perceived by the respondents towards ASEAN Integration. The computed F-value of 11.70 is greater than the critical F-value of 2.61 at .05 level of significance; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**TABLE 4. ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STRATEGIC PLANS TOWARDS ASEAN INTEGRATION**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	Result
Between Groups	10.06	3	3.35	11.70	1.51E-07	2.61	Significant
Within Groups	311.92	1088	0.29				
Total	321.98	1091					

**Scheffè's Test Result for the difference in Means on the Implementation of Strategic Plans of Private and Public HEIs towards ASEAN Integration:**

Table 4.1 shows the Scheffè test result for the difference of implementation of strategic plans of selected Private and Public HEIs in MIMAROPA Region towards ASEAN Integration.

It shows that there is significant difference on perception of the respondents in the implementation of ASEAN Awareness and access to education. This implies that respondents see in different perspective the way the HEIs promote ASEAN awareness. Some of them noticed that there is establishing of ASEAN guidelines that promote ASEAN values. HEIs adapt the curriculum to ASEAN standards and provide teachers with trainings to develop their skills, talents and ideas gearing towards global competitiveness. Meanwhile, some respondents also see HEIs have varied methods of implementing plans for the access of quality education since some HEIs have resources to provide concrete programs for partnership, mobility programs, graduate scholarship programs, professional development programs and faculty accreditation programs and some other HEIs cannot do this because of lack of resources.

Meanwhile, respondents from private and public HEIs differ in their perception on the implementation of ASEAN awareness and cross border mobility. They perceived that ASEAN awareness was not yet widely implemented compared to cross border mobility.



Scheffè result also shows that there is significant difference on the implementation of HEIs in the region with regards to access to education and internationalization of education as perceived by the respondents. This implies that Private and Public HEIs in MIMAROPA have their way of accessing to quality education. It could be through accreditation, mobility programs, and or study programs. Meanwhile, the respondents perceived that internationalization of education requires providing opportunities for the faculty and students to travel/study abroad, explore the diverse cultures, develop international programs and strengthen ICT programs.

**TABLE 4.1 SCHEFFÈ'S TEST RESULT FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN MEANS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC HEIS TOWARDS ASEAN INTEGRATION**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>	<b>RESULT</b>
ASEAN Awareness <b>Versus</b> Access to Education	<b>0.26</b>	<b>**</b>
ASEAN Awareness <b>Versus</b> Cross Border Mobility	<b>0.11</b>	<b>**</b>
ASEAN Awareness <b>Versus</b> Internationalization of Education	<b>0.08</b>	<b>*</b>
Access to Education <b>Versus</b> Cross Border Mobility	<b>0.15</b>	<b>**</b>
Access to Education <b>Versus</b> Internationalization of Education	<b>0.18</b>	<b>**</b>
Cross Border Mobility <b>Versus</b> Internationalization of Education	<b>0.03</b>	<b>*</b>

Legend: \*\*- Significant \*- Not Signifacant

***F. Difference on the strategic plans between Private and Public HEIs in MIMAROPA Region towards ASEAN Integration:***

Table 5 displays that the t-computed value of 1.84 is less than the t-tabular value of 1.97 at 0.05 level of significance with 271 degrees of freedom, the null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference on strategic plans of selected Private and Public HEIs in the region in terms of ASEAN awareness. This implies that the perception of the respondents were almost the same with regards to the implementation of private and public HEIs on establishing ASEAN guidelines for promoting ASEAN awareness, providing trainings, scholarships, capacity development and revision of curriculum in preparation for ASEAN Integration .

With regards to access to education, results show that the t-computed value of 3.66 exceeded the t-tabular value of 1.97 at 0.05 level of significance with 271 degrees of freedom. This means that the null hypothesis is rejected thus there is significant difference on the perception of respondents in terms of access to quality education. The difference could be attributed to the opportunities given to private and public HEIs. Many of the Public HEIs in MIMAROPA region were given more chances of attending seminars and workshops on sharing practices and technical assistance in promoting equity in education. This gave them a better understanding of the strategies of how to provide appropriate guidelines, measure skills and competencies to acquire quality education. Oftentimes, some of the private HEIs in the region were not able to participate in seminars because of their awareness on ASEAN Integration therefore they were not informed about the newest innovations on accessing quality education with ASEAN perspective.

In describing cross border mobility, t- computed value of 2.72 is greater than the t-tabular value of 1.97 at 0.05 level of significance with 271 degrees of freedom thus the null hypothesis is rejected meaning there is significant difference on the perception of the respondents on the implementation of cross border mobility between private and public HEIs in the region. This means that plans of promoting community outreach, supporting language programs, attending academic consortia, exposing students/faculty, and exposing the learners to diverse cultures through study abroad were almost were different in private and public HEIs in the region.

With regards to the perception of the respondents on the implementation of internationalization of education, data revealed that the computed t- value of, 3.23 is greater than the t-tabular value of 1.97 at 0.05 level of significance with 271 degrees of freedom which means that there is significant difference, thus the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that Public HEIs in the region gave more opportunities for teachers and students to study or travel abroad, conduct more research, explore the diverse cultures.of ASEAN Members, and to strengthen the ICT infrastructure than private HEIs.

**TABLE 5 SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ON THE STRATEGIC PLANS OF BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC HEIS  
 ASEAN INTEGRATION**

STRATEGIC PLANS	Private HEIs	Public HEIs	t-computed value	t- tabular value	Interpretation
ASEAN Awareness	1.89	2.03	1.84	1.97	*
Access to Education	2.04	2.33	3.66	1.97	**
Cross Border Mobility	1.95	2.15	2.72	1.97	**
Internationalization of Education	1.88	2.14	3.23	1.97	**

Legend: \*\*- Significant \* Not Significant

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. Private and Public HEIs in the region have partially implemented the strategic plans for ASEAN awareness, access to quality education, cross border mobility and internationalization of education.
2. The implementation of strategic plan for ASEAN awareness, access to quality education, cross border mobility and internationalization of education of Private HEIs in the region were almost the same.
3. Public HEIs in the region implemented plans for access to quality education, cross border mobility and internationalization of education more than the plans for ASEAN awareness. Likewise access to quality education has been implemented more than cross border mobility and internationalization of education.
4. Private and Public HEIs in the region significantly differ in the implementation of strategic plan. It is concluded that ASEAN awareness was less implemented compared to access to quality education and cross border mobility while access to quality education was given more priority than cross border mobility and internationalization of education.
5. Private and Public HEIs differ in their implementation of strategic plans towards ASEAN Integration. Access to quality education, cross border mobility and internationalization were prioritized by Public HEIs than Private HEIs in the region.

#### V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Private and Public HEIs in the region need to revisit the curriculum, provide ASEAN study programs to students and faculty, orient them to diverse cultures to share their best practices in promoting universal and equal access to quality education through partnership, scholarships, and technical assistance.
2. Private HEIs in the region should further their plans for ASEAN awareness, access to quality education, cross border mobility and internationalization of education through partnership with other Public HEIs.
3. ASEAN awareness should be incorporated in classroom instruction, convocations, and in-service teachers' training. Likewise, it should be promoted by defining ASEAN Identity through enhanced classroom instructions, expansion of ASEAN studies, linkages, and collaboration with other ASEAN colleges and universities.
4. Private and Public HEIs in the region should work on internationalization of education through joint degree and twinning programs, conferences, seminars, trainings, and cultural events.
5. All teachers and non-teaching staff both in private and public HEIs in the region including the stakeholders should be oriented and intensively introduced to the pillars of ASEAN Integration.
6. Immediate follow-up study is recommended to assess the impact of ASEAN Integration to Private and Public HEIs in the region particularly on answering the needs of students and faculty to meet the demands of global competitiveness.

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Manzala, T. (2013) "Quality Assurance" a Lecture during 24<sup>th</sup> PACUCOA Annual General Assembly
- [2] Uriarte, Jr. F.A. "Promoting ASEAN among the Youth" ASEAN Foundation Japan ASEAN Solidarity Fund.
- [3] Yaakub, M. N. (2013) Special Lecture on "Challenges in Education towards the Realization of ASEAN Community 2015" pp.3-7
- [4] Licuanan, P. (2011). Challenges in Higher Education. Paper presented at the National Conference on the State of Research in the Philippine Higher Institutions themed Responding to the Issues and Challenges in Higher Education Research. June 16-17, 2011, Angelo King Hotel, Manila, Philippines.
- [5] ASEAN 5-Year Work Plan on Education on (2011-2015) Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, October 2012, pp. 3-6; 10-11;17-34
- [6] Licuanan, P.B. (2014) "Academic Calendar and Philippine Higher Education. Higher Education Development Center"
- [7] Flores, M. (2013) GLOBAL EDUCATION: ASIAN UNIVERSITIES' PURSUIT TOWARDS INTERNATIONALIZATION, The Philippine Experience, Office of the Extension Coordination University of the Philippine Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines 1101
- [8] Buendia, R.G. (2010) "The State of Philippine Higher Education System: Facing the Challenges of Regional Integration and Interdependence" a Full Paper from APISA 5 pp.2; 5-7