



OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF CRIMINOLOGY INSTRUCTORS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION

Jona C. Busto
Jay-R B. Roque

*Saint Ferdinand College-City of Ilagan Campus, City of Ilagan,
Isabela, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This study examined the opportunities and challenges experienced by criminology instructors in implementing Outcome-Based Education (OBE) in four higher education institutions in Cauayan City, Isabela, during School Year 2025–2026. It also investigated relationships between perceived opportunities and instructor profiles, differences in challenges across profile groups, and perceived contributions of OBE opportunities to instructional practices. A quantitative descriptive research design was employed, involving 54 criminology instructors selected through total enumeration. Data were collected using a validated 95-item questionnaire and analyzed using frequencies, percentages, weighted means, chi-square tests, and one-way analysis of variance. Findings revealed that instructors strongly agreed that OBE provided opportunities for professional development, improved teaching strategies, student-centered learning, curriculum alignment, assessment enhancement, instructional innovation, and student engagement, with an overall mean of 3.55. Professional development and improved teaching strategies received the highest ratings, both averaging 3.58. However, implementation challenges were rated very high, with an overall mean of 3.64. Preparing learning outcomes emerged as the greatest challenge, followed by instructional delivery and time management and institutional support and resources. Perceived opportunities were not significantly associated with any profile variable. Challenges differed significantly by employment status and institution type, but not by teaching experience, educational attainment, or seminar attendance. Respondents also reported favorable contributions to teaching and student support. The findings suggest that positive perceptions of OBE coexist with substantial implementation difficulties. Strengthening administrative support,

expanding faculty development, managing teaching workloads, and providing instructional resources and collaborative material development mechanisms are recommended to support sustainable OBE implementation in criminology programs.

Keywords: *outcome-based education, criminology instructors, implementation opportunities, implementation challenges, faculty development*

INTRODUCTION

Outcome-Based Education is not merely an administrative shift or a routine compliance exercise; it represents a profound philosophical revolution that demands a total restructuring of the educational ecosystem. It forces us to reject the legacy model of passive content coverage. Instead, it anchors the entire academic journey to a singular, uncompromising question: *What can the student actually do upon graduation?* By establishing clear, transparent, and performance-bound endpoints, OBE turns the classroom into a dynamic training ground. It shifts the role of the educator from a static presenter of information to an active facilitator of real-world competence.

This outcomes-driven paradigm has reshaped the international landscape of higher education over the past few decades. Pioneered by structural theorists like William Spady, modern OBE frameworks have become the baseline standard for institutions seeking international accreditation and global competitiveness. This global movement ensures that higher education directly feeds the economic and technical demands of modern industries, shifting accountability from what institutions claim to teach to what their graduates can demonstrably execute in the field.

In the Philippines, this transition was formalized through the mandates of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), which directed higher education institutions (HEIs) to adopt an outcomes-based framework to align the competencies of Filipino graduates with national and international standards. For professional programs such as Criminology, this transition carries significant national importance. Criminology education is not purely theoretical; it prepares future law enforcement officers, forensic specialists, correctional administrators, and other criminal justice professionals. Accordingly, CHED's policies and the Professional Regulation Commission's (PRC) Tables of Specifications require criminology students and licensure examinees to demonstrate practical competencies in fingerprint identification, forensic photography, forensic ballistics, criminal investigation, and other specialized areas before entering professional practice (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2012, 2018; Professional Regulatory Board of Criminology [PRBOC], 2024).

The need to produce graduates who are not only knowledgeable but also capable of applying their knowledge and skills in real-world situations has significantly influenced higher education in recent years. Outcome-Based Education (OBE) is one of the most important educational approaches developed to address this need. It focuses on clearly defined learning outcomes that specify what students should know, demonstrate, and

perform after completing a course or academic program (Nguyen et al., 2024; Spady, 1994).

With its emphasis on student-centered learning and clearly defined learning outcomes, OBE is increasingly recognized as an important approach to improving higher education. Through organized and goal-oriented teaching strategies, criminology educators can strengthen student engagement, align curricula and assessments with practical competencies, and improve the overall quality of teaching and learning. Evidence also indicates that properly implemented OBE encourages active student participation and supports the development of knowledge and skills relevant to professional practice (Katawazai, 2021; Nguyen et al., 2024).

However, challenges persist including faculty resistance, lack of adequate training and resources, heavy workloads, and infrastructural limitations that hinder effective implementation. These challenges may affect the capacity of faculty members to effectively adapt OBE principles and practices within their respective academic programs.

Having served as a faculty member at Isabela State University for five years, the researcher has personally encountered similar challenges in implementing OBE. This professional experience prompted the researcher to examine the opportunities and challenges criminology instructors encounter in implementing Outcome-Based Education.

This research aimed to explore the experiences of criminology instructors in implementing OBE, identify the opportunities that arose from this educational shift, and address the challenges they faced. The findings contributed to a better understanding of how to support educators in this transition, with the ultimate goal of improving criminology education and, by extension, the criminal justice system.

Research Questions

This study aimed to examine the opportunities and challenges criminology instructors experienced in implementing Outcome-Based Education (OBE). Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - a. Teaching experience;
 - b. Educational attainment;
 - c. Number of seminars attended;
 - d. Employment status (permanent, full-time, part-time, cos)
 - e. Type of HEI's (public, private)
2. What opportunities do Criminology instructors experience in the implementation of Outcome-Based Education in terms of:
 - a. professional development and training;
 - b. improved teaching strategies;
 - c. student-centered learning approaches;

- d. alignment of curriculum with industry needs;
 - e. enhancement of assessment methods;
 - f. instructional innovation; and
 - g. student engagement and participation.
3. Is there a significant relationship between the opportunities the Criminology instructors experience in the implementation of Outcome-Based Education and their profile?
4. What challenges do criminology instructors encounter in implementing Outcome-Based Education in terms of:
- a. Preparation of learning outcomes;
 - b. Instructional delivery and time management
 - c. Institutional support and resources;
 - d. Development of assessment tools;
 - e. Professional development; and
 - f. Preparation of OBE-based materials;
5. Is there a significant difference in the challenges encountered by criminology instructors in implementing Outcome-Based Education when grouped according to their profile?
6. How do these opportunities effectively affect the implementation of OBE in terms of:
- a. Instructional delivery;
 - b. Outcome alignment;
 - c. Assessment of learning;
 - d. Student engagement;
 - e. Classroom management;
 - f. Use of institutional resources;
 - g. Professional competence; and
 - h. Student support?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative-descriptive research design to examine the opportunities and challenges encountered by criminology instructors in implementing Outcome-Based Education (OBE). As a non-experimental approach, this design systematically describes phenomena and quantifies respondents' perceptions without manipulating variables. According to Slater and Hasson (2024), it is effective in measuring the prevalence and nature of conditions within a defined population. In this study, data were collected through a structured survey instrument and analyzed statistically to ensure objective and empirically supported findings.

The descriptive component enabled the researcher to examine the respondents' demographic characteristics and assess the opportunities, challenges, and effects of OBE implementation in terms of teaching practices, curriculum alignment, assessment,

student engagement, institutional support, professional development, and instructional resources. The quantitative component allowed the researcher to determine significant relationships and differences across demographic groups.

The design was considered appropriate because it provided an objective assessment of OBE implementation among 54 criminology instructors from four higher education institutions (HEIs) in Cauayan City, Isabela. The findings provide an empirical basis for identifying areas for improvement and formulating practical recommendations to strengthen OBE implementation in criminology programs.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in the city of Cauayan, Isabela, specifically focusing on the higher education institutions offering the Bachelor of Science in Criminology program. The primary locale is Isabela State University (ISU) – Cauayan Campus, a leading state-owned institution known for its high-performing College of Criminal Justice Education. ISU-Cauayan is a consistent top-performer in the Criminologist Licensure Examination and serves as a regional hub for criminological research and community outreach, providing a robust environment for the implementation of Outcome-Based Education (OBE). Our Lady of the Pillar College – Cauayan (OLPCC): A prominent Catholic private institution located in San Fermin, Cauayan City; Isabela Colleges, Inc. (ICI) is a prominent higher education institution in the region that offers a Bachelor of Science in Criminology program; and Isabela College of Arts and Technology (ICAT): Situated in Tagaran, Cauayan City, this private institution offers technical and professional programs, including Criminology, with an emphasis on practical skills development and industry readiness.

Selection and Description of Respondents

The respondents of this study were fifty-four (54) criminology instructors from four Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Cauayan City, Isabela, namely: Isabela State University – Cauayan Campus (ISU-Cauayan), Our Lady of the Pillar College – Cauayan (OLPCC), Isabela Colleges, Inc. (ICI), and Isabela College of Arts and Technology (ICAT). The researcher employed a total enumeration sampling technique, which was justified by the relatively small and accessible population of criminology instructors in the identified institutions. This approach ensured that all eligible faculty members were given the opportunity to participate, thereby enhancing the representativeness of the findings within the locale.

The respondents were delimited to instructors actively handling courses under the Outcome-Based Education (OBE) curriculum during the School Year 2025–2026, ensuring that all participants possessed direct, firsthand experience with OBE implementation. Of the fifty-four respondents, thirteen (13) came from the public institution (ISU-Cauayan), while forty-one (41) were drawn from the private HEIs (OLPCC, ICI, and ICAT). The diversity of the respondents in terms of teaching experience, educational attainment, seminar attendance, employment status, and type of HEI affiliation provided a comprehensive and multi-perspective understanding of the opportunities and challenges in implementing OBE within criminology programs.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher systematically followed a structured procedure to ensure the ethical and efficient collection of data for this study. Prior to data collection, the researcher secured permission from the respective heads of the four Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) included in the study, namely: Isabela State University – Cauayan Campus, Our Lady of the Pillar College – Cauayan, Isabela Colleges, Inc., and Isabela College of Arts and Technology. Upon receipt of institutional approval, the researcher coordinated with the program chairs and deans of the College of Criminal Justice Education in each institution to identify eligible respondents and schedule the administration of the survey.

The researcher personally distributed the validated 95-item survey questionnaires to the fifty-four (54) criminology instructors who met the inclusion criteria of actively handling courses under the OBE curriculum during the School Year 2025–2026. Prior to answering the questionnaire, each respondent was provided with an informed consent form that clearly explained the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, their right to withdraw at any time without penalty, and the assurance of confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. The respondents were given ample time to accomplish the survey, and the researcher remained available to clarify any questions or concerns regarding the items. Upon completion, the questionnaires were collected, encoded, and organized for statistical analysis. All data gathered were kept in a secure and confidential manner, accessible only to the researcher and the statistician, in compliance with ethical research standards.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The following were the statistical tool used in analyzing the data:

Frequency and Percentage. These tools were used to determine the demographic profile of the criminology instructors.

Weighted Mean. This was used to calculate the average rating or level of agreement/disagreement on various aspects of OBE implementation, such as the perceived effectiveness of improved teaching strategies, the extent of institutional support, or the overall impact of opportunities and challenges on OBE effectiveness.

Chi-square Test. This tool was used to test the significant relationship between the opportunities the Criminology instructors experience in the implementation of Outcome-Based Education and their profile.

One-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance). This was used to determine if there are any statistically significant differences in the mean scores of challenges encountered across the different profile groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

a. Teaching Experience

Table 1.1
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Teaching Experience

TEACHING EXPERIENCE	Frequency	Percent
BELOW 1 YR	4	7.4
1-3 YRS	13	24.1
4-6	15	27.8
7-8	11	20.4
9 AND ABOVE	11	20.4
Total	54	100.0

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to teaching experience. Among the respondents, 15 or 27.8 percent had 4–6 years of teaching experience, making this the largest group. In contrast, 4 or 7.4 percent had less than 1 year of experience, representing the smallest group. The results indicate that the respondents are generally composed of teachers with several years of professional experience, with the largest proportion having 4–6 years of teaching experience.

The relatively small number of teachers with less than 1 year of experience suggests that novice teachers are less represented in the study. Overall, the respondents have varied levels of teaching experience, with a greater concentration among those who have already gained practical experience in teaching.

Hence, the findings affirm the study of Podolsky et al. (2019) that teaching experience is positively associated with student achievement gains throughout much of a teacher's career; as teachers gain experience, their students are more likely to do better on measures of success beyond test scores; teachers make greater gains in their effectiveness when they teach in a supportive, collegial environment, or accumulate experience in the same grade, subject or district; and more experienced teachers confer benefits to their colleagues.

b. Educational Attainment

Table 1.2
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Educational Attainment

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	Frequency	Percent
Doctor of Philosophy	7	13.0
Master of Science in Criminal Justice	10	18.5

Bachelor of Science in Criminology	29	53.7
Others (Lawyers, Juris Doctor)	7	13.0
No Answer	1	1.9
Total	54	100.0

Table 1.2 presents respondents' educational attainment. Bachelor of Science in Criminology holders comprised the largest group, with 29 respondents (53.7%), followed by Master of Science in Criminal Justice holders, with 10 (18.5%). Doctor of Philosophy holders and those categorized as Others (Lawyers, Juris Doctor) each accounted for seven respondents (13.0%), while one (1.9%) did not respond.

The predominance of bachelor's degree holders indicates foundational preparation in criminology, while the smaller proportion with master's and doctoral degrees (31.5%) highlights opportunities for further academic advancement. Advanced degree holders contribute research expertise, curriculum leadership, and mentoring that support program quality and relevance. This finding aligns with Aldaba et al. (2024), who emphasized the importance of academically qualified faculty in strengthening institutional compliance, promoting innovative research, and guiding early-career instructors through curriculum transformation, particularly during OBE implementation.

c. Seminar Attended

Table 1.3
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Seminar Attended

SEMINAR ATTENDED	Frequency	Percentage
1. Implementation strategies for outcome-based education	22	40.7
2. Advanced trends in forensic photography and evidence preservation	1	1.9
3. Seminar on forensic ballistics; modern firearms and explosive analysis	4	7.4
4. Instructional competency in criminology education	8	14.8
5. Others	19	35.2
Total	54	100

Table 1.3 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to seminars attended. The results show that Implementation Strategies for Outcome-Based Education had the highest participation, with 22 respondents or 40.7 percent of the total. This indicates that OBE-related training was the most commonly attended seminar among the respondents, reflecting the relevance of OBE implementation to their teaching responsibilities.

The category Others ranked second, with 19 respondents or 35.2 percent, indicating that a considerable proportion of the respondents attended seminars other than those specifically listed in the table. Meanwhile, Instructional Competency in Criminology Education was attended by 8 respondents or 14.8 percent, followed by Seminar on

Forensic Ballistics; Modern Firearms and Explosive Analysis, with 4 respondents or 7.4 percent.

The least attended seminar was Advanced Trends in Forensic Photography and Evidence Preservation, with only 1 respondent or 1.9 percent. This may suggest that highly specialized forensic topics were less commonly included in the respondents' professional development activities compared with OBE-related and broader instructional training.

The result affirms the study of Lumingkit et al. (2024) showcasing the significant disparity in seminar attendance typically stems from systematic resource limitations for practical training on campus, when institutions lack the high-fidelity crime laboratories and advanced technical equipment necessary to sustain specialized domains like criminalistics, faculty members naturally prioritize general instructional strategies over niche technical seminars that they cannot practically implement in their local classrooms.

d. Employment Status

Table 1.4
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Employment Status

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	Frequency	Percent
Permanent	10	18.5
Contract of Service	1	1.9
Part Time Instructors	16	29.6
Full Time	27	50
Total	54	100

Table 1.4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of employment status. The table shows that faculty members employed full-time make up the largest segment of the study, with 27 respondents representing exactly 50 percent of the total sample—half of all participants. This clearly indicates that most respondents are employed full-time. As full-time employees, they are engaged in teaching as their primary occupation, with regular working hours, defined duties, and typically greater job security and benefits than other employment types. In the context of criminology education, having half of the workforce as full-time instructors ensures stability in instruction, consistent curriculum delivery, and better availability for student consultation, academic advising, and school-related activities.

This also reflects that the institution or group under study maintains a strong core of regular teaching staff, which is essential for sustaining quality education and academic programs. While Contract of Service is the lowest category, it recorded the lowest frequency, with only 1 respondent, or 1.9 percent of the total. Contract of service usually refers to employment arrangements that are temporary, project-based, or for a fixed period, often without the same benefits or security as permanent or regular positions. The

extremely low number implies that this type of employment is very rare among the respondents. It suggests that hiring in this setting rarely relies on short-term or contractual arrangements; instead, it prefers more stable employment forms such as full-time, part-time, or permanent status. The minimal presence of contractual workers also means that the workforce is largely composed of individuals with established or longer-term engagement in their teaching roles.

This finding aligns with the study of Al-samarrai et al. (2021) on structural patterns documented, and noted that higher education institutions heavily rely on full-time faculty cores to protect instructional continuity and meet national administrative compliance criteria. However, this high concentration of full-time personnel also means that these specific educators bear the brunt of local institutional weight, leaving them uniquely vulnerable to workload friction and operational fatigue whenever extensive, multi-preparational curriculum reforms like Outcome-Based Education are introduced.

e. Types of HEIs

Table 1.5
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondent's in terms of Type of HEIs

TYPE OF HEIs	Frequency	Percent
State University and Colleges (Public)	13	24.1
Private Higher Education Institutions (Private)	41	75.9
Total	54	100.0

Table 1.5 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of type of HEI. The table shows that Private Higher Education Institutions (Private) hold the largest share, with 41 respondents accounting for 75.9 percent of the total sample—more than three-quarters of all participants—compared with State Universities and Colleges, with 13 respondents representing 24.1 percent. This overwhelming majority indicates that most respondents are affiliated with private higher education institutions. Although this is a smaller portion, it still makes up nearly one-fourth of the sample, showing a meaningful presence of public-sector educators. State universities and colleges are government-funded, regulated by national education agencies, and often mandated to provide accessible and quality education. They typically follow stricter government guidelines on hiring, compensation, and curriculum implementation. The lower percentage compared to private institutions aligns with the general landscape, where fewer public HEIs offer Criminology programs relative to private ones, or where public institutions may have smaller faculty sizes than their private counterparts. Further, SUCs' enrollment capacity for criminology programs is strictly aligned with regional and national development priorities.

The findings adhere to the study of Granada (2021) that private higher education institutions historically absorbed the vast majority of student enrollment in specialized,

high-demand professional programs like Criminology due to their flexible expansion capabilities and agile institutional setups. However, it also underscores that while private colleges carry the primary burden of professional workforce production, they operate under distinct financial models that rely heavily on tuition revenue, creating a sharp contrast with public state universities that enjoy direct national budgetary subventions.

2. Opportunities of Criminology Instructors Experienced in the Implementation of Outcome-Based Education in terms of:

a. Professional Development and Training

Table 2.1
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Professional Development and Training

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. The professional development sessions I attended provide specific guidance on aligning my instructional materials with the CHED minimum standards for Criminology education.	3.72	Strongly Agree
2. I am trained on how to conduct internal quality audits of my own course syllabi to ensure they meet the requirements for institutional program compliance.	3.48	Strongly Agree
3. The training programs provided by the institution focus on upgrading my technical skills in specialized areas (e.g., Forensics, Ballistics, or Criminal Law) to match current industry demands.	3.54	Strongly Agree
4. The seminars I participated in taught me how to use student performance data and feedback to make 'corrective actions' in my teaching delivery, as suggested by quality assurance reports.	3.65	Strongly Agree
5. The institution fosters a 'culture of quality' by providing consistent financial or administrative support for instructors to pursue advanced certifications or masteral degrees in Criminal Justice.	3.50	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.58	Strongly Agree

Table 2.1 presents the professional development and training of criminology instructors in relation to OBE implementation. The overall mean of 3.58, interpreted as Strongly Agree, shows that respondents generally recognize the value of the professional development activities provided to them.

A mean of 3.72, the highest among the indicators, was obtained for the statement "The professional development sessions I attended provide specific guidance on aligning my instructional materials with the CHED minimum standards for Criminology education." This finding suggests that training activities are particularly effective in helping instructors

ensure that their instructional materials are aligned with established standards. The statement "The seminars I participated in taught me how to use student performance data and feedback to make 'corrective actions' in my teaching delivery, as suggested by quality assurance reports." also received a high mean of 3.65, indicating that instructors value training that enables them to use student performance information to improve their teaching.

Meanwhile, the indicators on upgrading technical skills in specialized areas and receiving institutional support for advanced certifications or masteral degrees obtained means of 3.54 and 3.50, respectively. Both results remain within the Strongly Agree category, reflecting favorable perceptions of opportunities for technical and academic professional growth.

With a mean of 3.48, the lowest-rated indicator was "I am trained on how to conduct internal quality audits of my own course syllabi to ensure they meet the requirements for institutional program compliance." Despite receiving the lowest mean, the indicator was still interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that respondents generally recognize the presence of such training, although it may warrant further enhancement.

The distribution of means, ranging from 3.48 to 3.72, demonstrates consistently positive perceptions across all aspects of professional development and training. This indicates that OBE-related professional development supports instructors not only in meeting educational standards but also in improving teaching practices, technical competencies, and quality assurance processes.

This finding is consistent with the study of Macayan et al. (2023), which found that the shift to OBE encourages faculty members to actively pursue professional development opportunities. According to their research, when institutions move away from traditional teaching methods and adopt outcome-based approaches, teachers become more motivated to upgrade their skills and seek further training to remain effective in their roles.

b. Improved teaching strategies

Table 2.2
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Improved Teaching Strategies

IMPROVED TEACHING STRATEGIES	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I have shifted my role from being the primary source of information to a facilitator who guides students through active, outcome-based learning activities.	3.57	Strongly Agree
2. My teaching strategies now prioritize hands-on simulations (e.g., crime scene processing or mock trials) over purely theoretical classroom discussions.	3.43	Strongly Agree
3. I employ varied teaching methods—such as blended learning, case-based analysis, or small-group problem	3.61	Strongly Agree

solving—to cater to the different learning styles of Criminology students.		
4. I ensure that every teaching activity I implement is explicitly designed to lead students toward the specific 'Intended Learning Outcomes' stated in the course syllabus	3.69	Strongly Agree
5. I integrate modern instructional technology and digital tools to enhance the delivery of complex topics, such as ballistics or forensic identification, making them more accessible to students	3.61	Strongly Agree
Over-all Mean	3.58	Strongly Agree

Table 2.2 presents criminology instructors' perceptions of improved teaching strategies under OBE. The overall mean of 3.58, interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicates favorable assessments. Aligning teaching activities with intended learning outcomes ranked highest (3.69), followed by using varied teaching methods and integrating instructional technology (both 3.61). Prioritizing hands-on simulations ranked lowest (3.43), although still interpreted as Strongly Agree.

The findings suggest that instructors recognize improvements in outcome alignment, instructional flexibility, technology integration, and learning facilitation. However, consistently implementing simulations may require additional institutional support to address resource limitations, time constraints, and large classes. These findings support Dela Cruz and Garcia (2022), who associated OBE with clearer instructional direction and constructive alignment. Clearly defined competencies encourage instructors to move beyond teacher-centered instruction and design learning activities that prepare students for professional requirements.

c. Student-Centered Learning Approaches

Table 2.3
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Student-Centered Learning Approaches

STUDENT CENTERED LEARNING APPROACHES	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I design classroom activities that require students to investigate and solve criminal justice scenarios independently rather than relying solely on my lectures.	3.56	Strongly Agree
2. I provide opportunities for students to work in teams to analyze case studies, simulating the collaborative nature of real-world law enforcement operations.	3.61	Strongly Agree
3. I encourage students to take responsibility for their learning by allowing them to choose specific topics of interest for their research or specialized projects within the Criminology curriculum.	3.59	Strongly Agree

4. I incorporate 'reflection periods' or journals where students can evaluate their own progress and identify which Criminology competencies they still need to master.	3.46	Strongly Agree
5. I adapt my instructional pace and materials to accommodate the diverse learning needs and academic backgrounds of the students in my Criminology classes.	3.59	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.56	Strongly Agree

Table 2.3 shows how criminology instructors rated their use of student-centered learning approaches under OBE. The statement "I provide opportunities for students to work in teams to analyze case studies, simulating the collaborative nature of real-world law enforcement operations" received the highest mean score of 3.61, interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that instructors strongly recognize the value of group work and collaborative learning in preparing students for the realities of law enforcement work, where teamwork is essential.

Two statements tied for the second highest rating with a mean of 3.59. The first, "I encourage students to take responsibility for their learning by allowing them to choose specific topics of interest for their research or specialized projects within the Criminology curriculum," suggests that instructors give students some freedom to explore topics that interest them, which helps develop their sense of ownership over their learning. The second, "I adapt my instructional pace and materials to accommodate the diverse learning needs and academic backgrounds of the students in my Criminology classes," indicates that instructors are mindful of their students' varying abilities and adjust their teaching to ensure that all learners can keep up.

The statement "I design classroom activities that require students to investigate and solve criminal justice scenarios independently rather than relying solely on my lectures" received a mean of 3.56. This shows that instructors encourage independent thinking and problem-solving, moving away from passive listening to active engagement with real-world scenarios.

The lowest-rated statement was "I incorporate 'reflection periods' or journals where students can evaluate their own progress and identify which Criminology competencies they still need to master" with a mean of 3.46. While this still falls under Strongly Agree, it suggests that although instructors see the value of self-reflection, this practice may not be as commonly used as other student-centered approaches. This could be due to time constraints or the perception that reflection activities are less directly related to immediate course requirements.

The overall mean of 3.56 indicates that instructors strongly agree that OBE has helped them adopt student-centered learning approaches. They feel confident in designing collaborative activities, giving students choices in their learning, adapting to diverse needs, and encouraging independent problem-solving. However, the slightly

lower rating for reflection activities suggests that while instructors value this approach, it may require more emphasis or structured implementation in criminology programs.

This instructional transformation directly supports the findings of Santos and Bautista (2023), who demonstrated that outcomes-based methodologies act as primary drivers for student autonomy in highly technical professional courses. According to their research, when clear exit performance criteria are established, the traditional classroom dynamic is completely transformed—students shift from being passive observers to active participants who take ownership of their learning and work together to meet the technical standards required by the curriculum.

d. Alignment of Curriculum with Industry Needs

Table 2.4
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Alignment of Curriculum with Industry Needs

ALIGNMENT OF CURRICULUM WITH INDUSTRY NEEDS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I participate in regular consultations with law enforcement practitioners (e.g., police officers, forensic experts) to ensure my course content reflects current field practices.	3.31	Agree
2. I map my syllabi directly against the latest Table of Specifications provided by the Professional Regulation Commission to ensure students are prepared for the Criminology Licensure Examination	3.63	Strongly Agree
3. I integrate 'real-case' analysis and current criminal justice issues in the Philippines into my lessons to bridge the gap between textbook theories and actual street situations.	3.61	Strongly Agree
4. My course requirements (e.g., marksmanship, report writing, or investigative photography) are designed to meet the technical standards required by future employers in the tri-bureau service.	3.46	Strongly Agree
5. I am encouraged to update my instructional materials annually to include new laws and modern technological advancements in criminology."	3.72	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.55	Strongly Agree

Table 2.4 shows how criminology instructors rated the alignment of their curriculum with industry needs under OBE. The statement "I am encouraged to update my instructional materials annually to include new laws and modern technological advancements in criminology" received the highest mean score of 3.72, interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that instructors feel strongly supported by their institutions in keeping their teaching materials current and relevant to the evolving demands of the criminal justice field.

On the other hand, the statement "I participate in regular consultations with law enforcement practitioners (e.g., police officers, forensic experts) to ensure my course content reflects current field practices" received the lowest mean score of 3.31, interpreted as Agree. While this still reflects a positive response, it suggests that although instructors recognize the value of collaborating with industry practitioners, such consultations do not happen as regularly as desired. This may be due to limited time, lack of formal partnerships between academic institutions and law enforcement agencies, or scheduling constraints.

Overall, the general mean of 3.55 indicates that instructors strongly agree that OBE has helped them align their curriculum with industry needs. However, the lower rating for practitioner consultations suggests that strengthening partnerships between academic institutions and law enforcement agencies could further enhance curriculum relevance.

This finding strongly supports the research of Aquino and Valenzuela (2023), who demonstrated that outcomes-based frameworks provide a critical mechanism for maintaining curriculum relevance in rapidly changing professional fields by ensuring that classroom tasks directly reflect the investigative, operational, and tactical skills required by modern law enforcement agencies.

e. Enhancement of Assessment Methods

Table 2.5
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Enhancement of Assessment Methods

ENHANCEMENT OF ASSESSMENT METHODS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I prioritize performance-based assessments (e.g., actual fingerprint lifting or crime scene sketching) over traditional multiple-choice exams to measure student mastery.	3.48	Strongly Agree
2. I utilize clearly defined rubrics for all practical exercises, ensuring that students understand the specific criteria and standards they are expected to meet.	3.61	Strongly Agree
3. I provide immediate and regular feedback during the learning process, allowing students to identify their weaknesses and improve before the final summative evaluation.	3.54	Strongly Agree
4. I ensure that every examination question or practical task is directly linked to a specific 'Intended Learning Outcome' (ILO) mentioned at the start of the course.	3.67	Strongly Agree
5. I integrate digital tools or simulation software to assess student competencies in areas that are difficult to replicate in a traditional classroom setting.	3.56	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.57	Strongly Agree

Table 2.5 presents the opportunities experienced by criminology instructors in enhancing assessment methods under the OBE framework. The composite mean of 3.57, interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicates that instructors perceive OBE as improving their assessment practices. Aligning examination questions and practical tasks with intended learning outcomes received the highest mean of 3.67, showing that instructors assess student performance based on established course competencies.

Prioritizing performance-based assessments, such as fingerprint lifting and crime scene sketching, obtained the lowest mean of 3.48, although still interpreted as Strongly Agree. This suggests that instructors value practical assessments but continue using traditional testing methods. Limited time, large class sizes, and inadequate resources or equipment may restrict the consistent use of performance-based assessment.

Popham (2018) emphasizes that performance-based assessments provide a clearer and more authentic measure of students' technical readiness for operational careers than traditional testing methods. Overall, the findings indicate that OBE strengthens assessment practices, particularly their alignment with intended learning outcomes. However, the comparatively lower rating for practical assessments highlights the need for greater institutional support to address implementation constraints and enable more consistent evaluation of students' practical competencies.

f. Instructional Innovation

Table 2.6
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Instructional Innovation

INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I utilize varied multimedia resources (e.g., crime scene walkthrough videos, virtual ballistics software) to supplement traditional textbook materials.	3.50	Strongly Agree
2. I employ Learning Management Systems (LMS) or online platforms to provide students with 24/7 access to instructional modules and interactive review materials.	3.37	Strongly Agree
3. I integrate innovative teaching techniques, such as educational games or competitive simulations, to increase student interest in complex Criminology subjects.	3.41	Strongly Agree
4. I develop my own localized instructional materials (e.g., workbooks or e-modules) that are specifically tailored to the cultural and legal context of the Philippine Criminal Justice System.	3.48	Strongly Agree
5. I regularly update my digital teaching tools based on their effectiveness in helping students achieve the required learning outcomes, as part of continuous program improvement.	3.57	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.47	Strongly Agree

Table 2.6 presents the opportunities experienced by criminology instructors in instructional innovation under the OBE framework. The composite mean of 3.47, interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicates that instructors recognize OBE as encouraging innovative practices that support learning outcomes.

Regularly updating digital teaching tools based on their effectiveness received the highest mean of 3.57, interpreted as Strongly Agree. This suggests that instructors evaluate and improve their digital resources to support student learning, reflecting OBE's emphasis on continuous improvement. Meanwhile, using Learning Management Systems (LMS) or online platforms to provide continuous access to modules and interactive review materials obtained the lowest mean of 3.37, although still interpreted as Strongly Agree. Limited institutional support, inadequate training, unreliable internet connectivity, and preparation time may affect consistent LMS utilization.

Overall, the findings suggest that OBE encourages multimedia resources, localized materials, innovative approaches, and digital tools. This aligns with Spady's (1994) outcomes-driven framework, which emphasizes adapting instructional approaches to help students achieve intended outcomes. However, the comparatively lower rating for LMS utilization highlights the need for additional institutional support and resources to strengthen technology-enhanced instruction.

g. Student Engagement and Participation

Table 2.7
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Student Engagement and Participation

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Students are encouraged to critique and analyze contemporary criminal justice issues rather than just memorizing definitions.	3.59	Strongly Agree
2. Students are engaged in group-based practical exercises (e.g., group surveillance simulations or team-based report writing) to foster teamwork and collective accountability.	3.50	Strongly Agree
3. Students are encouraged to ask clarifying questions and provide input on the pace and methods of the lessons to ensure they are fully grasping the competencies.	3.67	Strongly Agree
4. Students are enthusiastic during laboratory activities through the use of a variety of motivational strategies—such as merit-based recognition or performance badges—to .	3.44	Strongly Agree
5. Advanced students help their classmates master technical skills, fostering a collaborative learning environment in the Criminology department.	3.48	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.54	Strongly Agree

Table 2.7 presents the opportunities experienced by criminology instructors in student engagement and participation under the OBE framework. The general mean of 3.54, interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicates that instructors perceive OBE as enhancing students' active involvement in learning.

Encouraging students to ask clarifying questions and provide feedback on lesson pacing and teaching methods received the highest mean of 3.67, interpreted as Strongly Agree. This suggests that instructors promote open communication and adjust instruction according to students' needs, supporting their mastery of required competencies.

Meanwhile, sustaining students' enthusiasm during laboratory activities through motivational strategies, such as merit-based recognition and performance badges, obtained the lowest mean of 3.44, although still interpreted as Strongly Agree. This suggests that structured motivational strategies may be less consistently implemented, possibly because instructors prioritize content delivery or encounter difficulties maintaining enthusiasm.

Overall, instructors observe greater participation in analyzing criminal justice issues, collaborative exercises, and classroom discussions. These findings align with Kuh (2008), who emphasizes that clearly communicated performance expectations encourage student accountability and participation. Nevertheless, strengthening structured motivational approaches, particularly during laboratory activities, could further improve engagement and learning outcomes.

Table 2.8
Summary of Opportunities of Criminology Experienced in the Implementation of Outcome-Based Education

Opportunities of Criminology Experienced in the Implementation of Outcome-Based Education	Mean	DESCRIPTION
Professional Development and Training	3.58	Strongly Agree
Improved Teaching Strategies	3.58	Strongly Agree
Student Centered Learning Approaches	3.56	Strongly Agree
Alignment of Curriculum with Industry Needs	3.55	Strongly Agree
Enhancement of Assessment Methods	3.57	Strongly Agree
Instructional Innovation	3.47	Strongly Agree
Student Engagement and Participation	3.54	Strongly Agree
Average Mean	3.55	Strongly Agree

Table 2.8 summarizes the opportunities experienced by criminology instructors in implementing Outcome-Based Education (OBE). All seven areas were rated Strongly Agree, with means ranging from 3.47 to 3.58 and an overall average of 3.55. Professional Development and Training and Improved Teaching Strategies obtained the highest mean of 3.58 each. These were followed by Enhancement of Assessment Methods (3.57), Student-Centered Learning Approaches (3.56), Alignment of Curriculum with Industry Needs (3.55), and Student Engagement and Participation (3.54). Instructional Innovation received the lowest mean of 3.47, although still interpreted as Strongly Agree.

The findings indicate that instructors recognize OBE's opportunities for professional growth, improved instruction, assessment enhancement, student engagement, and curriculum relevance. However, the comparatively lower rating for instructional innovation suggests possible constraints involving resources, training, and institutional support.

These findings align with Macayan et al. (2023), who emphasized that outcomes-based transitions strengthen institutional capacity by encouraging faculty members to pursue advanced training and independently improve instructional design. The consistently positive ratings reflect this commitment to professional and instructional development, while highlighting the need for additional support to integrate innovative teaching practices.

2. Significant relationship between the opportunities the Criminology instructors experience in the implementation of Outcome-Based Education and their profile

Table 3
Result of the Test of Significant relationship between the opportunities the Criminology instructors experience in the implementation of Outcome-Based Education and their profile

Profile	Significance χ^2	Decision	Remarks
Teaching Experience	.481	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment	.913	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Seminar Attended	.432	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Employment Status	.992	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Type of HEI's	.440	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Table 3 presents the relationship between opportunities experienced by criminology instructors in implementing Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and their demographic profiles. The significance values for teaching experience (.481), educational attainment (.913), seminar attendance (.432), employment status (.992), and type of higher education institution (.440) were all greater than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected for any variable, indicating that no statistically significant relationships were identified.

These findings suggest that instructors' perceptions of OBE opportunities were not significantly associated with the measured profile characteristics. Instructors across different experience levels, educational qualifications, seminar attendance categories, employment arrangements, and institutional affiliations generally recognized opportunities for improved teaching, assessment alignment, and student engagement. However, these results do not establish that demographic factors have no influence or that opportunities are identical across groups.

The findings are consistent with the student-centered curriculum principles discussed by Biggs and Tang (2015), particularly the importance of aligning learning outcomes, instructional activities, and assessments. Such curriculum features may provide opportunities across diverse faculty backgrounds, supporting the relevance of OBE within the participating institutions.

3. Challenges of Criminology Instructors Encounter in Implementing Outcome-Based Education in Preparation of Learning Outcomes

a. Preparation of Learning Outcomes

Table 4.1
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Preparation of Learning Outcomes

PREPARATION OF LEARNING OUTCOMES	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Learning modules don't adequately address the varied academic abilities of incoming students	3.76	Very High Challenge
2. Instructors struggle to write clear and observable learning outcomes for technical subjects like Forensic Ballistics or Questioned Documents.	3.76	Very High Challenge
3. OBE outcomes don't align well with the recall-heavy Table of Specifications used in the Criminology Licensure Exam.	3.76	Very High Challenge
4. It's difficult to create fair and standardized rubrics for complex, practical skills such as crime scene processing or marksmanship.	3.76	Very High Challenge
5. Competencies across the 4-year program aren't sequenced logically, causing repetition or gaps in skills.	3.76	Very High Challenge
OVERALL MEAN	3.76	Very High Challenge

Table 4.1 presents the challenges encountered by criminology instructors in preparing learning outcomes under the OBE framework. All five indicators obtained an identical mean of 3.76, interpreted as Very High Challenge, indicating consistently substantial difficulties in translating instructional goals into measurable and aligned learning outcomes.

Specific challenges include developing modules suited to students' varied academic abilities, writing observable outcomes for technical subjects, aligning outcomes with licensure examination specifications, creating standardized rubrics for practical skills, and sequencing competencies throughout the four-year program without repetition or gaps. These difficulties reflect the demands of teaching legal concepts alongside technical competencies, such as crime scene processing and marksmanship. Instructors must address students' foundational learning gaps while maintaining course standards and translating practical performance into objective assessment criteria.

The overall mean of 3.76 emphasizes the difficulty of preparing learning outcomes in criminology education. This finding aligns with Spady (1994), who emphasized that OBE requires instructional components to be organized around clearly defined, observable outcomes demonstrating real-world competence. However, the findings indicate substantial barriers to meeting this requirement within a technical and licensure-driven discipline.

b. Instructional Delivery and Time Management

Table 4.2
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Instructional Delivery and Time Management

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY AND TIME MANAGEMENT	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Required OBE documentation consumes time, reducing actual teaching	3.70	Very High Challenge
2. Too many students prevent individualized feedback.	3.70	Very High Challenge
3. Not enough time for hands-on mastery in skill-based subjects.	3.70	Very High Challenge
4. Practical exercises are difficult to manage within restricted lab schedules.	3.70	Very High Challenge
5. Syllabi and resources lag behind frequent changes in laws and police protocols	3.70	Very High Challenge
OVERALL MEAN	3.70	Very High Challenge

Table 4.2 presents the challenges encountered by criminology instructors in instructional delivery and time management. All five indicators and the overall category obtained a mean of 3.70, interpreted as Very High Challenge, indicating consistently high ratings across the identified concerns.

Instructors reported difficulties balancing OBE documentation with actual teaching, providing individualized feedback in large classes, and allocating sufficient time for mastery of practical skills. Restricted laboratory schedules further complicate the management of practical exercises, while frequent changes in laws and police protocols create difficulties in keeping syllabi and instructional resources updated.

These findings highlight interconnected challenges involving administrative requirements, class size, instructional time, laboratory scheduling, and curriculum updating. Together, these concerns may limit instructors' capacity to provide adequate classroom instruction and meaningful opportunities for practical learning.

The discussion relates these findings to Hargreaves (2000), emphasizing the preparation and delivery demands associated with instructional change. Within this study, the consistently high ratings suggest tension between the demands of OBE implementation and fixed academic schedules, underscoring the need to address workload and scheduling constraints.

c. Institutional Support and Resources

Table 4.3
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Institutional Support and Resources

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND RESOURCES	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Limited and obsolete equipment and materials hinder authentic performance-based assessments.	3.67	Very High Challenge
2. No dedicated personnel to help faculty manage heavy OBE compliance paperwork.	3.67	Very High Challenge
3. Instructors receive inadequate funding for certifications, technical training, and seminars essential for OBE teaching.	3.67	Very High Challenge
4. Vague and inconsistent guidelines on departmental OBE requirements and compliance metrics.	3.67	Very High Challenge
5. Few criminology references are aligned with the Philippine OBE framework.	3.67	Very High Challenge
OVERALL MEAN	3.67	Very High Challenge

Table 4.3 presents the challenges encountered by criminology instructors regarding institutional support and resources under the OBE framework. All five indicators and the overall category obtained a mean of 3.67, interpreted as Very High Challenge, indicating consistently substantial difficulties in accessing essential institutional support.

Specific concerns include limited or outdated equipment, insufficient personnel to assist with OBE documentation, inadequate funding for professional development, unclear departmental guidelines, and limited criminology references aligned with the Philippine OBE framework. These constraints hinder authentic performance-based assessments and practical instruction, particularly in forensic photography, ballistics, and

fingerprinting. Inadequate laboratory facilities and instructional tools require instructors to improvise, while documentation demands and inconsistent guidelines increase administrative burdens and implementation uncertainty.

The discussion contrasts these findings with Aquino and Valenzuela (2023), who emphasized the role of outcomes-based frameworks in connecting instructional goals with professional competencies. Although their work highlights curriculum relevance, the present findings emphasize resource constraints that complicate this alignment. Thus, recognizing the importance of industry-aligned instruction is insufficient without adequate equipment, funding, personnel, and clear institutional guidance to support effective OBE implementation.

d. Development of Assessment Tools

Table 4.4
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Development of Assessment Tools

DEVELOPMENT OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Hard to set clear standards that separate just “passing” from true mastery in skill rubrics.	3.59	Very High Challenge
2. Struggle to create test questions that measure critical thinking instead of simple memorization.	3.61	Very High Challenge
3. Complex real-world simulations (like mock trials) require too many resources and are difficult to organize.	3.59	Very High Challenge
4. Vague scoring rules for journals and portfolios lead to inconsistent grading and personal bias.	3.59	Very High Challenge
5. Classroom performance-based assessments don’t align well with the multiple-choice format of the Criminology Licensure Exam	3.59	Very High Challenge
MEAN	3.60	Very High Challenge

Table 4.4 presents the challenges encountered by criminology instructors in developing assessment tools under the OBE framework. The overall mean of 3.60, interpreted as Very High Challenge, indicates substantial difficulties in designing assessments that accurately measure student competencies.

Creating questions that assess critical thinking rather than memorization received the highest mean of 3.61. The remaining indicators each obtained 3.59, covering difficulties in distinguishing basic passing from mastery through rubrics, organizing resource-intensive simulations, establishing clear scoring criteria for journals and portfolios, and aligning classroom performance assessments with the multiple-choice format of the Criminology Licensure Examination.

These findings highlight the technical demands and administrative workload involved in developing objective, criterion-referenced assessment tools. Instructors must

balance meaningful competency evaluation with available resources, manageable assessment procedures, consistent grading, and licensure examination requirements.

The discussion relates these findings to Popham (2018), emphasizing the substantial time and effort required to translate complex performance objectives into explicit assessment criteria. Overall, the consistently high ratings reflect the difficulty of developing assessment tools that are both educationally appropriate and practical within existing institutional constraints.

e. Professional Development

Table 4.5
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Professional Development

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Instructors struggle to update course content with current criminology and forensic evidence because they lack time and research assistance.	3.57	Very High Challenge
2. Teachers cannot confidently teach specialized criminology topics without certifications in areas like cybercrime or ballistics.	3.57	Very High Challenge
3. Institutions provide insufficient workshops on modern teaching technologies and student-centered methods.	3.59	Very High Challenge
4. There is no formal process for colleagues to review and standardize syllabi and assessment tools.	3.59	Very High Challenge
5. Faculty research focus (e.g., MSCJ/PhD topics) does not align with the immediate competency needs of undergraduate criminology programs.	3.59	Very High Challenge
OVERALL MEAN	3.59	Very High Challenge

Table 4.5 presents the professional development challenges encountered by criminology instructors in implementing OBE. The reported overall mean of 3.59, interpreted as Very High Challenge, indicates substantial difficulties in strengthening professional knowledge and instructional competencies.

Insufficient workshops on modern teaching technologies and student-centered methods, the absence of structured peer review for syllabi and assessment tools, and the mismatch between faculty research and undergraduate competency needs each received a mean of 3.59. Meanwhile, difficulties updating course content because of limited time and research assistance, together with insufficient specialized certifications in areas such as cybercrime and ballistics, each obtained 3.57. All indicators were interpreted as Very High Challenge.

The narrow range of ratings suggests that professional development difficulties extend across several interconnected areas. These findings highlight the need for relevant training, structured peer review, research assistance, and specialized

certification opportunities. They align with Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), whose work emphasizes sustained, content-focused professional development rather than isolated training activities. Strengthening these forms of institutional support could improve instructors' capacity to maintain current knowledge, develop specialized competencies, and implement OBE effectively.

f. Preparation of OBE-Based Materials

Table 4.6
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of Preparation of OBE-Based Materials

PREPARATION OF OBE-BASED MATERIALS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Difficulty in designing self-paced learning materials around specific outcomes instead of following traditional textbook chapters.	3.54	Very High Challenge
2. Struggle to link basic criminology theories with advanced technical applications in instructional materials.	3.54	Very High Challenge
3. Teaching resources are too rigid and cannot keep up with frequent changes in laws and law enforcement protocols.	3.52	Very High Challenge
4. Lack of expertise and tools to create quality digital or visual learning aids, such as video tutorials for forensic photography.	3.52	Very High Challenge
5. Difficulty in keeping a clear and consistent link between learning outcomes and all supplementary materials, presentations, and lab manuals	3.52	Very High Challenge
OVERALL MEAN	3.53	Very High Challenge

Table 4.6 presents the challenges encountered by criminology instructors in preparing OBE-based materials. The overall mean of 3.53, interpreted as Very High Challenge, indicates substantial difficulties in developing instructional resources aligned with intended learning outcomes.

Designing self-paced materials around specific outcomes rather than traditional textbook chapters and connecting basic criminology theories with advanced technical applications received the highest mean of 3.54 each. These findings highlight difficulties in shifting from content-based resources toward materials that integrate foundational knowledge and practical competencies.

The remaining indicators each obtained 3.52, also interpreted as Very High Challenge. These concerns involve updating resources to reflect changing laws and law enforcement protocols, developing digital and visual learning aids despite limited expertise and tools, and maintaining consistent alignment between learning outcomes and supplementary materials.

The narrow range of ratings indicates consistently high challenges across materials development. The discussion relates these findings to Tomlinson (2012), emphasizing the demands of translating learning goals into meaningful, learner-centered resources. Overall, the findings suggest stronger institutional support for outcome-based design, digital content creation, curriculum updating, and the alignment of presentations, laboratory manuals, and other instructional materials.

Table 4.7
Summary of Challenges Encountered by Criminology Instructors in the Implementation of Outcome-Based Education

Areas of Challenges	Mean	Description
Preparation of Learning Outcomes	3.76	Very High Challenge
Instructional Delivery and Time Management	3.70	Very High Challenge
Institutional Support and Resources	3.67	Very High Challenge
Development of Assessment Tools	3.60	Very High Challenge
Professional Development	3.59	Very High Challenge
Preparation of OBE-Based Materials	3.53	Very High Challenge
Average Mean	3.64	Very High Challenge

Table 4.7 summarizes the challenges encountered by criminology instructors in implementing Outcome-Based Education (OBE). All six areas were interpreted as Very High Challenge, with means ranging from 3.53 to 3.76 and an overall average of 3.64. Preparation of Learning Outcomes ranked highest (3.76), followed by Instructional Delivery and Time Management (3.70) and Institutional Support and Resources (3.67). These findings highlight difficulties in developing measurable outcomes, balancing instructional demands with available time, and accessing adequate institutional resources.

Development of Assessment Tools (3.60), Professional Development (3.59), and Preparation of OBE-Based Materials (3.53) received comparatively lower ratings but remained substantial concerns requiring institutional attention. Their lower rankings do not diminish their importance.

Overall, the findings indicate interconnected challenges involving curriculum design, instructional delivery, faculty development, and resource allocation. Although instructors recognize OBE's value, implementing its principles remains demanding. These findings align with Spady (1994), who emphasized organizing instructional components around clearly defined, observable outcomes demonstrating real-world competence. The consistently high challenge ratings reflect the complexity of meeting this requirement within the technical and licensure-driven context of criminology education, underscoring the need for coordinated institutional support.

5. Significant difference in the challenges encountered by criminology instructors in implementing Outcome-Based Education when grouped according to their profile

Table 5
Result on the Test of Significant Difference between Challenges Encountered by Criminology Instructors in Implementing Outcome-Based Education when Grouped according to their Profile

Profile	Significance F	Decision	Remarks
Teaching Experience	.119	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment	.082	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Seminar Attended	.569	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Employment Status (Full Time)	.040	Reject Ho	Significant
Type of HEIs (Private)	.036	Reject Ho	Significant

Table 5 presents differences in the challenges encountered by criminology instructors across profile groups using analysis of variance at the .05 significance level. The p-values for teaching experience, educational attainment, and seminar attendance exceeded .05; therefore, the null hypotheses were not rejected. No statistically significant differences were identified across these groups.

Conversely, p-values for employment status and institution type were below .05, indicating significant differences in reported challenges. These findings suggest that employment arrangements and institutional environments are relevant to understanding OBE implementation difficulties. However, these results alone do not establish causation or identify which specific employment groups experience greater challenges without supporting group comparisons.

The discussion links these findings to Al-Samarrai et al. (2021), emphasizing institutional structures and employment conditions as possible sources of implementation strain. Full-time instructors in private institutions may experience heavier teaching, preparation, and administrative demands, particularly where resources are constrained. Such conditions offer a possible explanation for the observed differences rather than a conclusion established by the ANOVA alone. Overall, the findings highlight the importance of examining workload allocation, institutional resources, and administrative support when addressing OBE implementation challenges.

6. Effect of OBE among Criminology Instructors

a. Instructional Delivery

Table 6.1
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Instructional Delivery

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I have improved my ability to act as a facilitator of learning, guiding students through practical scenarios rather than just delivering one-way lectures.	3.54	Very Much
2. OBE has helped me ensure that every lesson I deliver is clearly linked to a specific competency required for the Criminology profession.	3.44	Very Much
3. I have become more adept at using various instructional methods (e.g., case studies, simulations, and group work) to reach different types of learners.	3.59	Very Much
4. The OBE framework has trained me to adjust my teaching pace and style based on the real-time progress and needs of my Criminology students.	3.57	Very Much
5. I feel more confident in my delivery because I am now using a structured, evidence-based approach that is aligned with national program standards (CHED).	3.57	Very Much
Overall Mean	3.54	Very Much

Table 6.1 presents the perceived effects of OBE on criminology instructors' instructional delivery. The overall mean of 3.54, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Using varied instructional methods ranked highest (3.59), followed by adapting teaching to students' needs and increased confidence through structured instruction (both 3.57). Facilitating practical learning received 3.54, while linking lessons to professional competencies ranked lowest (3.44), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest that instructors perceive improvements in teaching flexibility, confidence, and facilitation. However, consistently connecting lessons to specific competencies remains an area for improvement. These findings align with Biggs' (2003) concept of constructive alignment, which emphasizes connecting instructional activities with explicit learning outcomes to support student mastery. Overall, the ratings indicate instructors' perceived adoption of alignment principles in instructional delivery.

b. Outcome Alignment

Table 6.2
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Outcome Alignment

OUTCOME ALIGNMENT	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. OBE has improved my ability to ensure that my daily classroom activities are strictly consistent with the 'Intended Learning Outcomes' (ILOs) stated in my syllabus.	3.61	Very Much
2. I am now more capable of mapping my lessons to the specific professional competencies required by the Criminology Licensure Examination (CLE) Table of Specifications.	3.48	Very Much
3. The framework has helped me understand how my specific subject (e.g., Forensic Photography) aligns with the broader goals of the Criminology program and other related courses.	3.39	Very Much
4. I have become more efficient at removing 'filler' content or outdated topics that do not contribute directly to the achievement of the required student outcomes.	3.44	Very Much
5. OBE has trained me to design examination questions and practical tasks that precisely measure the specific skills promised in the learning objectives.	3.43	Very Much
Over-all Mean	3.47	Very Much

Table 6.2 presents the perceived effects of OBE on criminology instructors' outcome alignment. The overall mean of 3.47, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Aligning classroom activities with intended learning outcomes ranked highest (3.61), followed by mapping lessons to licensure competencies (3.48), removing irrelevant content (3.44), and designing aligned assessments (3.43). Understanding how individual subjects connect with broader program goals ranked lowest (3.39), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest improved consistency among teaching activities, learning outcomes, and assessments. However, connecting individual courses with overall curriculum goals remains an area for improvement. These findings align with Biggs and Tang (2015), who emphasize that linking instructional components and assessment criteria to explicit outcomes strengthens evaluation validity and transparency. Overall, instructors reported adopting constructive alignment principles in their teaching practices.

c. Assessment of Learning

Table 6.3
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Assessment of Learning

ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. OBE has improved my ability to design 'authentic' assessments where students demonstrate their skills in simulated criminal justice environments.	3.48	Very Much
2. I have become more efficient in developing detailed rubrics that ensure student performance is graded objectively and fairly across the Criminology department.	3.44	Very Much
3. The framework has enhanced my skill in using assessment results to provide constructive feedback, helping students understand exactly which competencies they need to improve.	3.41	Very Much
4. I have improved my use of 'formative assessments' (quick checks) during the semester to track student progress before they take the final Criminology Board-style exams.	3.43	Very Much
5. I am now more capable of evaluating my own test questions to ensure they are valid, reliable, and aligned with the standards set by the PRC and CHED.	3.44	Very Much
Overall Mean	3.44	Very Much

Table 6.3 presents the perceived effects of OBE on criminology instructors' assessment practices. The overall mean of 3.44, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Designing authentic assessments ranked highest (3.48), followed by developing objective rubrics and evaluating test quality and alignment with professional standards (both 3.44). Using formative assessments received 3.43, while providing constructive feedback based on assessment results ranked lowest (3.41), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest that instructors perceive improvements in authentic assessment, fair grading, progress monitoring, and test evaluation. However, translating assessment results into meaningful feedback remains an area for improvement. These findings support Popham (2018), who emphasizes that performance assessments aligned with behavioral outcomes provide a clearer and more authentic measure of students' technical readiness for professional practice.

d. Students Engagement

Table 6.4
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Student Engagement

INDICATORS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. OBE has improved my ability to create a classroom environment where students feel empowered to lead discussions and share their analytical perspectives on criminal cases.	3.50	Very Much
2. I have become more skilled at facilitating group-based simulations (e.g., mock crime scene investigations) that require students to practice teamwork and leadership.	3.44	Very Much
3. The use of clear learning outcomes has helped me show students the 'real-world' value of every lesson, which significantly increases their interest and motivation to participate.	3.54	Very Much
4. I have enhanced my ability to use questioning techniques that encourage students to think critically and 'think like a police officer' rather than just reciting definitions.	3.48	Very Much
5. The framework has helped me develop varied activities that engage students with different learning strengths—whether they are visual, auditory, or kinesthetic learners.	3.52	Very Much
Over-all Mean	3.50	Very Much

Table 6.4 presents the perceived effects of OBE on student engagement. The overall mean of 3.50, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Demonstrating lessons' practical relevance through clear learning outcomes ranked highest (3.54), followed by developing varied activities (3.52), encouraging student-led discussions (3.50), and using critical-thinking questions (3.48). Facilitating group-based simulations ranked lowest (3.44), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest that instructors perceive improvements in student motivation, participation, analytical thinking, and ownership of learning. However, implementing collaborative simulations remains an area for improvement, potentially because of time and resource constraints. The discussion connects these findings with Kuh (2008), emphasizing that clear performance expectations and meaningful learning activities encourage students to participate actively and take responsibility for developing practical skills.

f. Classroom Management

Table 6.5
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Classroom Management

INDICATORS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. OBE has improved my ability to organize the classroom routine so that students transition smoothly from lecture to practical exercises (e.g., transitioning to the crime laboratory).	3.46	Very Much
2. I have become more efficient at managing limited classroom resources and specialized equipment (e.g., fingerprint kits or handcuffs) to ensure every student gets hands-on time.	3.43	Very Much
3. The framework has helped me reduce classroom distractions by keeping students focused on clear, goal-oriented tasks that they find professionally relevant.	3.37	Very Much
4. I have enhanced my skill in managing safety protocols during high-risk simulations (e.g., arrest and seizure drills) to ensure a controlled and professional learning atmosphere.	3.41	Very Much
5. OBE has trained me to foster a classroom culture based on mutual respect and professional ethics, reflecting the discipline required in the tri-bureau service (PNP, BJMP, BFP).	3.46	Very Much
Over-all Mean	3.43	Very Much

Table 6.5 presents the perceived effects of OBE on classroom management. The overall mean of 3.43, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Organizing classroom transitions and fostering mutual respect and professional ethics ranked highest (both 3.46), followed by managing resources and equipment (3.43) and maintaining safety during simulations (3.41). Reducing classroom distractions ranked lowest (3.37), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest that instructors perceive improvements in classroom organization, professional conduct, resource management, and simulation safety. However, maintaining student attention remains an area for improvement, potentially influenced by class size and student motivation. The discussion relates these findings to Emmer et al. (2001), emphasizing how proactive classroom management and structured, goal-oriented activities can support orderly routines and reduce behavioral difficulties.

g. Institutional Resources

Table 6.6
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Institutional Resources

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. OBE has improved my ability to integrate the school's physical facilities (e.g., crime scene room or mock court) into my regular teaching schedule to ensure students get hands-on experience.	3.44	VERY MUCH
2. I have become more proficient in utilizing available institutional technology (e.g., multimedia equipment or forensic software) to simulate real-world criminal justice processes.	3.39	VERY MUCH
3. The framework has enhanced my skill in using 'improvised' or alternative instructional materials when high-tech equipment is unavailable, without sacrificing the quality of the learning outcome.	3.35	VERY MUCH
4. I have improved my coordination with other faculty members to share specialized departmental resources (e.g., fingerprint kits or ballistics specimens) more effectively for student use.	3.39	VERY MUCH
5. OBE has encouraged me to better utilize the institutional library and online databases to provide students with the most current and localized Criminology research materials.	3.35	VERY MUCH
Overall Mean	3.39	VERY MUCH

Table 6.6 presents the perceived effects of OBE on criminology instructors' use of institutional resources. The overall mean of 3.39, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Integrating physical facilities into teaching ranked highest (3.44), followed by utilizing institutional technology and sharing specialized resources with colleagues (both 3.39). Using alternative instructional materials and accessing library resources and online databases ranked lowest (both 3.35), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest that OBE encourages instructors to maximize facilities, technology, shared equipment, alternative materials, and research resources to support practical and outcome-oriented learning. The discussion connects these findings with Lawson et al. (2015), emphasizing that outcomes-driven curricula encourage educators to move beyond content coverage and use institutional resources purposefully to support active learning and demonstrated student performance.

h. Professional Development

Table 6.7
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Professional Competence

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. OBE has improved my professional competence by teaching me how to apply modern educational theories specifically to the technical training of Criminology students.	3.46	Very Much
2. The requirement for 'Outcome Alignment' has pushed me to stay updated with the latest laws, jurisprudence, and forensic technologies to ensure my expertise remains relevant.	3.41	Very Much
3. I have become more competent in performing 'self-evaluation' or reflection after each semester, identifying my own professional weaknesses and seeking ways to correct them.	3.33	Very Much
4. The framework has enhanced my ability to contribute meaningfully to departmental meetings on curriculum revision and improving Criminology course syllabi.	3.39	Very Much
5. OBE has strengthened my professional identity as an educator, motivating me to pursue higher educational attainment (MSCJ/PhD) to better serve the institutional goals of quality.	3.44	Very Much
Over-all Mean	3.41	Very Much

Table 6.7 presents the perceived effects of OBE on criminology instructors' professional competence. The overall mean of 3.41, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Applying modern educational theories to technical instruction ranked highest (3.46), followed by strengthening professional identity and pursuing advanced education (3.44). Maintaining current professional knowledge received 3.41, while participating in curriculum development obtained 3.39. Self-evaluation and reflective practice ranked lowest (3.33), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest that OBE supports instructors' pedagogical knowledge, professional development, curriculum participation, and commitment to improvement. However, reflective practice remains an area for further strengthening. The discussion relates these findings to Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), emphasizing professional learning that develops teaching expertise and supports student-centered instruction. Overall, instructors perceive OBE as encouraging continued improvement in their knowledge, skills, and educational practice.

i. Student Support

Table 6.8
Mean and Descriptive Interpretation of the Effects of OBE on Student Support

STUDENT SUPPORT	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. OBE has improved my ability to identify 'at-risk' students early in the semester by monitoring their progress against specific learning competencies.	3.33	Very Much
2. I have become more efficient in designing targeted remediation activities (e.g., extra laboratory practice) for students who fail to meet specific course outcomes."	3.31	Very Much
3. The framework has enhanced my role as a mentor, allowing me to provide career-specific guidance to students based on their strengths in various Criminology sub-fields.	3.50	Very Much
4. I have improved my ability to support students with diverse learning needs by providing alternative ways for them to demonstrate their mastery of the course outcomes.	3.41	Very Much
5. OBE has encouraged me to be more available for student consultations, ensuring that learners have a clear 'feedback loop' to discuss their academic performance and professional growth.	3.46	Very Much
Overall Mean	3.40	Very Much

Table 6.8 presents the perceived effects of OBE on student support provided by criminology instructors. The overall mean of 3.40, interpreted as Very Much, indicates positive perceptions across all indicators. Career-specific mentoring ranked highest (3.50), followed by student consultations and feedback (3.46) and providing alternative ways to demonstrate competency (3.41). Early identification of at-risk students received 3.33, while targeted remediation ranked lowest (3.31), although still interpreted as Very Much.

The findings suggest that OBE strengthens mentoring, consultation, differentiated support, progress monitoring, and remediation. However, identifying struggling students and designing targeted interventions remain areas for improvement. The discussion connects these findings with Tinto (2012), emphasizing timely, focused academic support to help students overcome learning difficulties and persist in their studies. Overall, instructors perceive OBE as encouraging responsive assistance based on students' needs and progress toward learning outcomes.

Conclusions

The study concludes that criminology instructors have positively embraced OBE, contributing to improved instructional delivery, student engagement, and alignment of

learning outcomes. However, implementation remains challenged by faculty qualification gaps, limited specialization, heavy workloads, time constraints, and inadequate resources. Therefore, sustainable OBE implementation requires strong administrative support, manageable teaching loads, faculty development, adequate staffing, and sufficient instructional resources and facilities.

Recommendations

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions of the study, the following are recommended for implementation.

For School Administration and College Leadership

It is highly recommended that Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), particularly private colleges, urgently establish a mandatory, fully-funded Faculty Upskilling and Specialization Pipeline. This program must prioritize institutional scholarships and thesis grants to transition baccalaureate-only faculty into Master of Science in Criminal Justice (MSCJ) or Ph.D. programs to achieve immediate CHED compliance. Concurrently, institutions must forge strategic partnerships with law enforcement agencies—such as the Philippine National Police (PNP) Forensic Group, the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI), and local crime laboratories—to provide instructors with certified, hands-on masterclasses and technical training in specialized criminalistics fields (e.g., polygraphy, ballistics, dactyloscopy, and forensic chemistry)."

Review Workload Allocations for Full-Time Faculty

The administration should implement a policy that reduces the active teaching unit loads (de-loading) or limits the number of distinct subject preparations (preps) for full-time instructors during heavy curriculum transition phases. At the same time, the college must provide standardized, pre-formatted OBE template banks and institutionalize collaborative "Syllabus and Assessment Workshops" at the start of each semester. By legally reducing teaching hours and providing ready-made structural templates, the institution directly relieves faculty cognitive and administrative burden, giving them the time to design high-quality learning outcomes and aligned assessment tools.

Establish an OBE Material Clearinghouse

To mitigate the high preparation fatigue around creating learning materials and outcomes, the department should create a centralized digital repository where faculty members can share, standardize, and peer-review high-quality syllabus templates and simulation checklists.

Leverage Student-Centered Tracking Tools

Instructors should fully utilize the structural clarity of OBE to create simplified, self-guided student evaluation trackers. This maximizes the framework's strong potential for

student engagement while keeping individual consultation hours highly structured and manageable.

Future Researchers

Future graduate researchers should replicate this study across a wider network of public and private HEIs within the region to further validate these institutional trends. Additionally, utilizing quantitative or mixed-method approaches could help capture the specific everyday coping mechanisms of criminology teachers working in resource-limited educational settings.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The study observed ethical principles by securing permission from the heads of the participating higher education institutions before collecting data. Informed consent was obtained from the respondents after explaining the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Respondents were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses and were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaire and seek clarification when necessary. Collected data were securely stored, with access restricted to the researcher and the statistician, to protect respondents' privacy throughout the research process.

Acknowledgements

The researcher would like to wholeheartedly acknowledge the following people who extended their knowledge, effort, and time in making this work successful.

First, the researcher expresses her deepest appreciation to Saint Ferdinand College for serving as the academic institution that fostered her intellectual growth and excellence. She likewise extends her gratitude to the Graduate School faculty for providing the academic foundation and professional training essential to this undertaking.

She extends her sincere appreciation to PMsgt. Jay-R B. Roque for his invaluable guidance, scholarly insights, and steadfast support throughout the preparation and completion of this research. The researcher is also grateful to the respondents from Isabela State University–Cauayan Campus, Our Lady of Pillar College, Isabela Colleges, Inc., and Isabela College of Arts and Technology for their cooperation, time, and willingness to provide the necessary data essential to this study.

Furthermore, she expresses her appreciation to her statistician, Sir Mario Servilla, for his expertise in the interpretation and analysis of the research findings.

Above all, the researcher offers the highest recognition to Almighty God for His unconditional love, guidance, and provision throughout this undertaking. The researcher thanks Him for His protection and, most of all, for the wisdom He gave her to make this research possible and successful.

REFERENCES

- Aldaba, J. M., Armas, R. L., & Jose, M. C. (2024). Compliance dynamics among higher educational institutions offering criminal justice programs: Structural limitations and faculty qualification paradigms. *Journal of Higher Education Governance and Policy*, 12(2), 114–129.
- Al-Samarrai, S., Ryan, M., & El-Kogali, S. E. (2021). Institutional differences and faculty workloads: Examining structural challenges in private versus public higher education curriculum reform. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 84, Article 102421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102421>
- Aquino, M. S., & Valenzuela, G. D. (2023). Industry-aligned law enforcement training: Bridging the gap between criminology curriculum design and public safety field operation. [Publication information needed.]
- Biggs, J. (2003). *Aligning teaching for constructing learning*. Higher Education Academy.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2015). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2012). Policy-standard to enhance quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA (CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012). <https://legacy.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.46-s2012.pdf>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2018). Policies, standards and guidelines for the Bachelor of Science in Criminology (BS Criminology) program (CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, s. 2018). <https://legacy.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/CMO-No.-05-s.-2018-PSG-for-BS-Criminology.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hylar, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311>
- Dela Cruz, R. A., & Garcia, M. L. (2022). Constructive alignment and instructional efficacy in professional higher education programs: Shifting paradigms under outcomes-based education. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education Reform*, 14(2), 76–91.
- Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103–112. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_5
- Granada, M. T. (2021). The political economy of higher education in the Philippines: Institutional typology, enrollment dynamics, and the commercialization of professional programs. *Philippine Journal of Public Policy*, 17(1), 45–63.
- Hargreaves, A. (2000). Mixed emotions: Teachers' perceptions of their interactions with students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(8), 811–826. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(00\)00028-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00028-7)
- Katawazai, R. (2021). Implementing outcome-based education and student-centered learning in Afghan public universities: The current practices and challenges. *Heliyon*, 7(5), Article e07076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07076>
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lawson, A., Davis, C., & Son, J. (2015). Institutional resources and the challenges of implementing outcome-based education in professional fields. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(4), 412–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1056601>

- Lumingkit, P. T., Dagohoy, R. J., & Bation, M. L. (2024). Breaking barriers: Issues encountered by criminology students in science-related and forensic subjects. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, 9(6), 142–157.
- Macayan, J. V., Garinto, L. A., & de Guzman, M. F. (2023). Professional development trajectories and pedagogical adaptability among faculty members during institutional transitions to outcomes-based education. *Journal of Educational and Human Resource Development*, 11, 89–104.
- Nguyen, C. H., Nong, H. H. T., Saynavong, N., & Nguyen, S. T. (2024). Implementing outcome-based education in higher education programs: A multiple case study in Vietnam and Laos. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 8(2), 112–120.
<https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2024.385>
- Podolsky, A., Kini, T., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of US research. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-12-2018-0032>
- Popham, W. J. (2018). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Professional Regulatory Board of Criminology. (2024). Enhanced tables of specifications for the subjects in the Licensure Examination for Criminologists based on the standardized format aligned with the Philippine Qualifications Framework (Resolution No. 2, s. 2024). Professional Regulation Commission.
[https://www.prc.gov.ph/sites/default/files/2024-02%20Published%20\(1\)%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.prc.gov.ph/sites/default/files/2024-02%20Published%20(1)%20(1).pdf)
- Santos, D. K., & Bautista, E. C. (2023). Inverting the criminal justice classroom: Student-centered learning paradigms and competency development under outcomes-based education frameworks. *Philippine Journal of Criminology Education*, 19(3), 112–128.
- Slater, P., & Hasson, F. (2024). Quantitative research designs, hierarchy of evidence and validity. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 32, 656–660.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.13135>
- Spady, W. G. (1994). Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers. American Association of School Administrators. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED380910.pdf>
- Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action*. University of Chicago Press.
<https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226804545.001.0001>
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 45(2), 143–179. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528>

APA Citation:

Busto, J. C., & Roque, J.-R. B. (2026). OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF CRIMINOLOGY INSTRUCTORS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(9), 1593–1632.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22876078>

Corresponding author: jonacristin2@gmail.com