

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

Ritzcen A. Durango, PhD. EL¹, Stephanie L. Colorada, MAED ELT²

^{1,2}St. Michael's College of Iligan Inc.

ABSTRACT: This study was motivated by the increasing demand for higher education curricula that are both relevant and responsive to the needs of students and the evolving workforce. The persistent problem of curriculum misalignment with industry standards and student expectations raises concerns about the effectiveness and quality of academic programs. The goal of this research was to systematically evaluate faculty and student perceptions of curriculum quality across five key domains: relevance, content quality, instructional effectiveness, alignment with goals, and outcomes and assessment. Utilizing a descriptive-comparative quantitative design, survey data were collected from 48 faculty members and 539 students, with statistical analyses performed to identify strengths and areas for improvement. Results showed that both groups rated the curriculum positively, particularly in areas of real-world application and outcome alignment, with no significant differences observed across demographic variables. However, the study also highlighted the need to enhance instructional effectiveness and update learning resources. The findings imply that ongoing curriculum review and targeted enhancements, such as strengthening experiential learning and faculty development, are essential for maintaining academic excellence and ensuring that graduates are well-prepared for future professional challenges.

KEYWORDS: Curriculum Evaluation, Faculty Perceptions, Student Perceptions, Instructional Effectiveness, Higher Education, Curriculum Enhancement

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly evolving educational environment, ensuring the quality and relevance of academic curricula remains a persistent challenge for higher education institutions. Many programs struggle to keep pace with changing industry standards, diverse student needs, and the growing demand for practical, real-world competencies. This gap raises concerns regarding how well current curricula prepare students for their chosen careers and societal roles.

If these curriculum gaps are not systematically evaluated and addressed, students may graduate without the necessary skills, knowledge, or adaptability to succeed in their professional and personal lives. Moreover, persistent misalignment between curriculum content and stakeholder expectations can undermine institutional credibility and student satisfaction, potentially impacting employability and long-term learning outcomes.

Recent research highlights the critical role of ongoing curriculum evaluation in ensuring academic quality and relevance. For instance, Fullan and Edwards (2022) emphasize that regular, data-driven assessments of curriculum content are essential for sustaining innovation and effectiveness in higher education. Likewise, Khalil and Elkhider (2021) point out that aligning curricula with both industry trends and learner needs is crucial for fostering employability and lifelong learning. Pineda-Báez, Bermúdez-Aponte, and Rubiano-Bello (2021) further suggest that institutions should incorporate comprehensive stakeholder feedback to guide continuous curriculum improvement.

This study aimed to evaluate faculty and student perceptions of curriculum quality across five key domains—relevance, content quality, instructional effectiveness, alignment with goals, and outcomes and assessment. By identifying strengths and areas for improvement, the research sought to provide evidence-based recommendations for enhancing the curriculum and ensuring it effectively meets the evolving needs of both students and industry stakeholders.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Tyler's Curriculum Development Model (Tyler, 1949)

Tyler's model, one of the most influential curriculum theories, emphasizes a systematic approach to curriculum design based on four key questions: What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? What educational experiences can be provided? How can these experiences be organized? How can we determine if these purposes are being attained? This model provides a clear framework for assessing the effectiveness of the curriculum in terms of objectives, learning experiences, organization, and

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

evaluation. It aligns directly with the study's domains such as relevance, instructional effectiveness, and outcomes, allowing for a structured analysis of both faculty and student perceptions.

By using Tyler's model, the study can ensure a systematic evaluation of whether the curriculum meets its intended goals, providing a solid foundation for recommendations and improvements.

Constructive Alignment Theory (Biggs & Tang, 2011)

Constructive Alignment Theory posits that curriculum design should ensure alignment between learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and assessment tasks, fostering meaningful learning.

This theory supports the investigation into how well the curriculum's content, teaching strategies, and assessment practices are integrated and aligned with both academic and career goals. It encourages the study to examine if students are provided with coherent and supportive learning experiences that lead to desired outcomes.

Applying Constructive Alignment Theory will help the study to identify gaps and strengths in how curriculum elements work together, guiding targeted curriculum enhancements for better educational outcomes.

Stakeholder Theory in Education (Freeman, 1984; adapted by academic leaders)

Stakeholder Theory emphasizes the importance of recognizing and incorporating the perspectives of all parties with an interest in the educational process, including students, faculty, employers, and society at large.

This theory underpins the value of gathering perceptions from both faculty and students, ensuring curriculum evaluation is comprehensive and responsive to diverse needs and expectations. It supports the inclusion of multiple viewpoints for a more holistic understanding of curriculum effectiveness and relevance.

Guided by Stakeholder Theory, the study can advocate for collaborative curriculum development and continuous improvement, ensuring the curriculum remains dynamic and relevant to all its stakeholders.

III. OBJECTIVES

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the overall perception of the faculty and students regarding the curriculum in terms of:
 - 1.1 Relevance of the curriculum;
 - 1.2 Content quality;
 - 1.3 Instructional effectiveness;
 - 1.4 Alignment with academic and career goals; and
 - 1.5 Outcomes and assessment?
2. Are there significant differences in curriculum evaluation ratings between faculty and students across the five curriculum domains?
3. Do demographic variables significantly influence faculty and student perceptions of the curriculum across the five domains?
4. What curriculum enhancements can be proposed based on the integration of quantitative and qualitative findings?

IV. METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive-comparative quantitative research design to evaluate the perceptions of faculty and students regarding curriculum quality across five core domains: relevance, content quality, instructional effectiveness, alignment with goals, and outcomes and assessment. Data were collected using a structured, validated survey instrument featuring Likert-type scale items, which was distributed to a purposive sample of 48 faculty members and 539 students across multiple colleges. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were computed to summarize perceptions within each domain and provide an overall picture of curriculum quality.

Inferential statistical methods were employed to determine whether significant differences existed between faculty and student perceptions, as well as to examine the potential influence of demographic variables such as age, sex, and college affiliation. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance (MANOVA and ANOVA) were conducted to assess these differences across the five curriculum dimensions. Throughout the research process, ethical considerations such as voluntary participation, confidentiality, and informed consent were strictly observed to ensure the integrity and credibility of the study.

V. RESULT AND DISCUSSIO

Table 1 Faculty and Student Perceptions of Curriculum Relevance Across Key Areas

Key Areas	Faculty (n = 48)			Students (n = 539)		
	Mean	SD	DE	Mean	SD	DE
Academic Needs Alignment	4.06	.84	Evident	4.18	1.02	Evident
Industry Relevance	4.00	.95	Evident	4.25	1.03	Very Evident

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

Emerging Trends Integration	4.02	.86	<i>Evident</i>		4.20	1.01	<i>Evident</i>
Real-World Application	4.10	.97	<i>Evident</i>		4.26	1.01	<i>Very Evident</i>
Foundational-Practical Integration	4.06	.89	<i>Evident</i>		4.25	1.02	<i>Very Evident</i>
Composite Score	4.05	.80	<i>Evident</i>		4.23	0.97	<i>Very Evident</i>

Table 1 shows the highest mean score for faculty perceptions is on "Real-World Application," with a mean of 4.10 (Evident), whereas the lowest mean is on "Industry Relevance," at 4.00 (Evident). For student perceptions, the highest-rated indicator is "Real-World Application," with a mean of 4.26 (Very Evident), and the lowest is "Academic Needs Alignment," at 4.18 (Evident). The overall composite scores reflect a mean of 4.05 (Evident) for faculty and a higher mean of 4.23 (Very Evident) for students.

The data clearly shows both faculty and students perceive "Real-World Application" as a strong aspect of curriculum relevance, suggesting confidence that curriculum content effectively prepares students for practical situations beyond academic settings. However, the relatively lower scores in "Industry Relevance" (faculty) and "Academic Needs Alignment" (students) suggest differences in perception of the curriculum's effectiveness in meeting specific professional and academic expectations. Faculty members might see opportunities to strengthen connections with industry standards, whereas students may perceive slight gaps between the curriculum and their personal academic goals or expectations.

Given these findings, educational administrators and curriculum developers should focus on improving industry connections to enhance the curriculum's relevance from the faculty's viewpoint, and revisit academic goal-setting processes to better align with students' expectations. Initiatives such as industry partnerships, advisory panels, and enhanced student feedback mechanisms could ensure both educators' professional concerns and students' academic aspirations are met, creating a more cohesive curriculum strategy.

Recent research by Healy, Hammer, and McIlveen (2022) underscores the importance of aligning curriculum with real-world practices and industry expectations to enhance employability and academic satisfaction. Likewise, the study by Jackson and Bridgstock (2021) highlights that ongoing dialogue and collaboration between faculty, students, and industry stakeholders are essential to improving curriculum relevance and aligning it closely with career-oriented outcomes. Such collaborative approaches not only ensure curriculum quality but also foster greater alignment between educational institutions and industry realities (Pham & Saito, 2020).

Table 2 Faculty and Student Perceptions of Curriculum Content Quality Across Key Thematic Areas

Key Areas	Faculty (n = 48)			Students (n = 539)		
	Mean	SD	DE	Mean	SD	DE
Clarity of Objectives	4.02	.98	<i>Evident</i>	4.15	1.00	<i>Evident</i>
Content Sequencing	4.04	.94	<i>Evident</i>	4.16	1.01	<i>Evident</i>
Higher-Order Thinking	4.06	1.04	<i>Evident</i>	4.26	1.01	<i>Very Evident</i>
Instructional Resources	3.98	.91	<i>Evident</i>	4.14	.98	<i>Evident</i>
Theory–Practice Balance	3.90	.90	<i>Evident</i>	4.23	1.00	<i>Very Evident</i>
Composite Score	4.00	.84	<i>Evident</i>	4.19	.95	<i>Evident</i>

Table 2 shows the highest mean score among faculty perceptions of curriculum content quality is on "Higher-Order Thinking," with a mean of 4.06 (Evident), while the lowest mean is on "Theory–Practice Balance," with a mean of 3.90 (Evident). Similarly, students rated "Higher-Order Thinking" highest at 4.26 (Very Evident) and "Instructional Resources" lowest at 4.14 (Evident). The composite scores indicate an overall mean of 4.00 (Evident) for faculty and a slightly higher mean of 4.19 (Evident) for students.

The findings reveal a shared perception among both faculty and students that the curriculum strongly encourages higher-order thinking, highlighting its effectiveness in promoting critical and analytical skills. However, faculty indicate some concern about the curriculum's ability to effectively balance theoretical concepts with practical applications. Students' lowest rating of instructional resources suggests they perceive inadequacies in learning materials or support provided, potentially hindering the optimal delivery of curriculum content.

These findings suggest a need for curriculum planners and administrators to enhance the balance between theoretical knowledge and practical applications by integrating more experiential learning activities. Furthermore, there should be targeted investment in high-quality instructional resources to fully support the delivery of complex content, potentially including updated technological tools, learning materials, and faculty training. Addressing these areas could significantly enhance students' overall learning experience and satisfaction.

Research by García-Peñalvo and Corell (2020) emphasizes that robust instructional resources and well-balanced theory-practice approaches significantly enhance student engagement and content mastery. Furthermore, Bressler and Bodzin (2021) argue

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

that curricular approaches emphasizing higher-order thinking skills are increasingly effective when supported by strong instructional resources and practical applications. Continuous evaluation and updating of curriculum materials and resources thus remain critical for achieving optimal learning outcomes (Cakir & Guven, 2022).

Table 3 Faculty and Student Perceptions of Curriculum Instructional Effectiveness Across Key Thematic Areas

Key Areas	Faculty (n = 48)				Students (n = 539)		
	Mean	SD	DE		Mean	SD	DE
Instructional Strategies	3.94	1.08	<i>Evident</i>		4.20	.99	<i>Evident</i>
Faculty Preparedness	3.94	.93	<i>Evident</i>		4.23	.98	<i>Very Evident</i>
Active Learning	4.04	.87	<i>Evident</i>		4.17	.97	<i>Evident</i>
Time Allocation	3.88	1.04	<i>Evident</i>		4.15	.98	<i>Evident</i>
Feedback and Assessment	4.17	.78	<i>Evident</i>		4.26	.97	<i>Very Evident</i>
Composite Score	3.99	.85	<i>Evident</i>		4.20	.92	<i>Evident</i>

Table 3 shows the highest mean score for faculty perceptions of instructional effectiveness is on "Feedback and Assessment," with a mean of 4.17 (*Evident*), whereas the lowest mean is on "Time Allocation," at 3.88 (*Evident*). Students rated "Feedback and Assessment" highest at 4.26 (*Very Evident*), and "Time Allocation" lowest at 4.15 (*Evident*). The composite score yielded an overall mean of 3.99 (*Evident*) for faculty and a slightly higher mean of 4.20 (*Evident*) for students.

The data suggest faculty and students are generally satisfied with feedback and assessment practices, reflecting that formative and summative evaluations effectively guide and enhance learning experiences. The lower scores on "Time Allocation," noted consistently by both faculty and students, indicate potential challenges related to pacing and management of instructional time. This reveals a common perception that the allotted instructional hours may not sufficiently meet the demands of the curriculum content, impacting instructional effectiveness.

These findings imply a need for curriculum coordinators and administrators to reconsider how instructional time is managed and allocated across subjects or topics. Professional development focused on effective instructional pacing and time management strategies could be beneficial. Additionally, ongoing monitoring and adjustments of curriculum delivery schedules might help address faculty and student concerns, thus improving overall instructional efficiency and quality.

Recent research by Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) underscores the critical role that effective feedback plays in student learning and achievement, affirming its importance as a strength in the curriculum. Conversely, a study by Andrade and Brookhart (2020) highlights time allocation as a common challenge affecting instructional effectiveness, emphasizing the need for careful management to optimize teaching and learning outcomes. Curriculum leaders should actively address these factors to enhance both instructional quality and student success (Hattie & Timperley, 2022).

Table 4 Faculty and Student Perceptions of Curriculum Alignment with Goals Across Key Thematic Areas

Key Areas	Faculty (n = 48)				Students (n = 539)		
	Mean	SD	DE		Mean	SD	DE
Career Goal Preparation	4.04	.94	<i>Evident</i>		4.32	1.00	<i>Very Evident</i>
Interdisciplinary Learning	4.04	.97	<i>Evident</i>		4.30	.98	<i>Very Evident</i>
Competency Development	4.06	1.00	<i>Evident</i>		4.25	.98	<i>Very Evident</i>
Ethical Reasoning	4.02	.96	<i>Evident</i>		4.27	.98	<i>Very Evident</i>
Experiential Learning	4.10	.97	<i>Evident</i>		4.30	.98	<i>Very Evident</i>
Composite Score	4.05	.90	<i>Evident</i>		4.29	.95	<i>Evident</i>

Table 4 shows the highest mean score among faculty perceptions regarding curriculum alignment with goals is on "Experiential Learning," with a mean of 4.10 (*Evident*), while the lowest mean is on "Ethical Reasoning," at 4.02 (*Evident*). Students rated "Career Goal Preparation" highest at 4.32 (*Very Evident*) and "Competency Development" lowest at 4.25 (*Very Evident*). The composite scores reveal an overall mean of 4.05 (*Evident*) for faculty and a higher mean of 4.29 (*Very Evident*) for students.

The findings illustrate that faculty prioritize experiential learning as a critical element aligning the curriculum with educational goals, signifying their recognition of hands-on learning experiences. However, the slightly lower rating on ethical reasoning suggests faculty perceive this area as relatively less emphasized or integrated into the current curriculum. Students' high rating of "Career Goal Preparation" reflects strong satisfaction with the curriculum's capacity to prepare them for their future professional paths. The lower student rating in "Competency Development"—though still very evident—suggests students might perceive minor areas for enhancement in skill-building practices.

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

Educational stakeholders, especially curriculum developers and instructors, should continue to prioritize experiential learning and career-focused activities, further strengthening the clear positive perceptions of students. Additionally, efforts should focus on embedding ethical reasoning more deeply into the curriculum content and instructional practices. Enhancement of competency-building activities, such as workshops and industry-linked training programs, may also further bolster student preparedness and satisfaction.

Research conducted by Kolb and Kolb (2022) highlights experiential learning as pivotal for preparing students effectively for professional practice. Similarly, ethical reasoning integrated into curricula is essential for shaping holistic, socially responsible professionals, as emphasized by Sims and Felton (2021). Furthermore, recent studies by Hora and Benbow (2022) affirm that aligning curricula with career goals and competencies directly enhances student employability, urging institutions to continuously assess and update curricular alignment with industry standards.

Table 5 Faculty and Student Perceptions of Curriculum Outcomes and Assessment Across Key Thematic Areas

Key Areas	Faculty (n = 48)				Students (n = 539)		
	Mean	SD	DE		Mean	SD	DE
Competency Attainment	4.10	1.02	Evident		4.26	.99	Very Evident
Assessment Alignment	4.15	.82	Evident		4.23	.98	Very Evident
Innovative Thinking	4.17	.86	Evident		4.26	.99	Very Evident
Outcome Alignment	4.02	.84	Evident		4.24	.98	Very Evident
Academic and Personal Growth	4.08	.94	Evident		4.28	.98	Very Evident
Composite Score	4.10	.83	Evident		4.25	.95	Evident

Table 5 shows the highest mean score among faculty perceptions regarding curriculum outcomes and assessment is on "Innovative Thinking," with a mean of 4.17 (Evident), while the lowest mean is "Outcome Alignment," at 4.02 (Evident). Students rated "Academic and Personal Growth" highest, with a mean of 4.28 (Very Evident), and "Assessment Alignment" lowest at 4.23 (Very Evident). The composite scores reflect an overall mean of 4.10 (Evident) for faculty and a higher mean of 4.25 (Very Evident) for students.

These findings suggest faculty appreciate the curriculum's emphasis on fostering innovative thinking, reflecting confidence in its capacity to encourage creativity and adaptability among students. However, the lower faculty rating in "Outcome Alignment" indicates some perceived gaps in ensuring curriculum goals consistently match student learning outcomes. Students' strong perception of "Academic and Personal Growth" implies that learners find the curriculum supportive in developing both intellectual and personal competencies. Although the "Assessment Alignment" received the lowest student rating, it remains notably positive, indicating minor improvements may be beneficial.

Curriculum designers and administrators should address faculty concerns about outcome alignment by reviewing and clearly defining learning outcomes and linking them explicitly with teaching practices and assessments. Given students' high satisfaction regarding personal growth, maintaining a holistic approach to curriculum development remains vital. Strengthening assessment practices to ensure alignment with instructional goals can further improve student perceptions and educational outcomes.

According to Ashwin and McArthur (2022), curriculum effectiveness is significantly enhanced when outcomes, instruction, and assessment are coherently aligned, providing clear academic and professional pathways for students. Likewise, fostering innovative thinking and personal growth is vital for holistic education, as noted by McLean and Wilson (2021), who highlight how curricula promoting personal and intellectual development positively influence student engagement and success. A continuous review of alignment strategies, as supported by Tadesse, Gillies, and Manathunga (2021), is essential for maintaining curriculum relevance and effectiveness.

Table 6 Summary of Faculty and Student Perceptions of the Curriculum Across Five Dimensions

Dimension	Faculty (n = 48)				Students (n = 539)		
	Mean	SD	DE		Mean	SD	DE
Relevance of Curriculum	4.05	.80	Evident		4.23	.97	Very Evident
Content Quality	4.00	.84	Evident		4.19	.95	Evident
Instructional Effectiveness	3.99	.85	Evident		4.20	.92	Evident
Alignment with Goals	4.05	.90	Evident		4.29	.95	Very Evident
Outcomes and Assessment	4.10	.83	Evident		4.25	.95	Very Evident

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

Table 6 shows the highest overall dimension rated by faculty is "Outcomes and Assessment," with a mean of 4.10 (Evident), while the lowest rated is "Instructional Effectiveness," with a mean of 3.99 (Evident). For students, "Alignment with Goals" received the highest mean rating of 4.29 (Very Evident), and the lowest mean was for "Content Quality," at 4.19 (Evident). Overall, students consistently provided higher ratings across all dimensions compared to faculty.

The findings indicate faculty recognize "Outcomes and Assessment" as a particular strength, suggesting confidence in the curriculum's ability to evaluate student progress effectively. Conversely, their lowest rating in "Instructional Effectiveness" suggests concerns about instructional methods, resource allocation, or faculty preparedness. Students highly valued "Alignment with Goals," reflecting their appreciation of the curriculum's clear connections to their academic and career objectives, although the lower rating in "Content Quality" implies there may be minor concerns regarding the clarity and coherence of curriculum content.

To enhance overall curriculum quality, institutions should invest in professional development to strengthen instructional methods, especially targeting areas identified by faculty as needing improvement. Students' lower perceptions of content quality indicate a necessity for periodic curriculum reviews to enhance clarity, sequencing, and theory-practice balance. Maintaining strong alignment with career and academic goals will sustain high student satisfaction and engagement.

Recent literature by Fullan and Edwards (2022) emphasizes the critical role of instructional effectiveness and quality content in driving student success, suggesting that addressing faculty concerns in these areas can significantly improve educational outcomes. Similarly, Khalil and Elkhider (2021) highlight how strong alignment between curricula and career aspirations significantly improves student motivation and academic performance. To sustain curriculum quality, ongoing review processes that integrate student and faculty feedback are recommended as best practices in curriculum development (Pineda-Báez, Bermúdez-Aponte, & Rubiano-Bello, 2021).

RQ2: Are there significant differences in curriculum evaluation ratings between faculty and students across the five curriculum domains?

Rationale: This addresses whether perspectives diverge by role (faculty vs. student), which is crucial for triangulation and identifying misalignments.

Table 7 Multivariate and Univariate Tests of Differences in Curriculum Evaluation Scores Between Faculty and Student Respondents

Dependent Variable	F-value	df	p-value
All Five Dimensions Combined	.945	(5, 581)	.451
Relevance of Curriculum	1.518	(1, 581)	.218
Content Quality	1.774	(1, 581)	.183
Instructional Effectiveness	2.379	(1, 581)	.124
Alignment with Goals	2.72	(1, 581)	.100
Outcomes and Assessment	1.102	(1, 581)	.294

Table 7 shows the results of multivariate and univariate analyses comparing curriculum evaluation scores between faculty and student respondents. The multivariate test indicates no significant difference across all five dimensions combined ($F = .945$, $p = .451$). The univariate tests further reveal the highest F-value was observed in "Alignment with Goals" ($F = 2.72$, $p = .100$), though not statistically significant. The lowest F-value was noted in "Outcomes and Assessment" ($F = 1.102$, $p = .294$), also indicating no significant difference.

The absence of significant differences between faculty and students across all curriculum dimensions suggests that both groups have relatively similar perceptions of curriculum effectiveness. The highest yet nonsignificant variance in "Alignment with Goals" might indicate minor perceptual gaps regarding how well the curriculum aligns with academic and career objectives. The lowest variance in "Outcomes and Assessment" indicates substantial agreement between faculty and students in this area.

Given the generally aligned perceptions between faculty and students, curriculum planners can be confident in the broadly shared views on curriculum effectiveness. Nonetheless, curriculum enhancement efforts might benefit from dialogue sessions between students and faculty focusing specifically on areas like goal alignment, to address subtle differences and optimize curriculum delivery. Maintaining ongoing, collaborative evaluations could further minimize perceptual discrepancies.

According to research by Patton, Parker, and Pratt (2022), stakeholder agreement on curriculum evaluations can positively influence institutional cohesion and facilitate targeted improvements. Similarly, Asamoah et al. (2021) highlight the benefits of aligned faculty-student perspectives for effectively implementing curriculum changes and fostering educational quality. Therefore, maintaining clear and open communication channels between faculty and students can significantly enhance curriculum coherence and student satisfaction (Scherer, Howard, & Tondeur, 2021).

RQ3: Do demographic variables significantly influence faculty and student perceptions of the curriculum across the five domains?

Rationale: This tests whether curriculum evaluation is affected by individual characteristics — useful for interpreting data representativeness and suggesting tailored improvements.

Table 8 Multivariate Test of the Effects of Age and Sex on Faculty Perceptions of Curriculum Evaluation Domains

Effect	Pillai's Trace	F-value	df	p-value
Age	.332	1.631	(10, 82)	.112
Sex	.123	1.12	(5, 40)	.365

Table 8 presents the multivariate test results examining the influence of age and sex on faculty perceptions of curriculum evaluation domains. The analysis reveals no statistically significant effects of age (Pillai's Trace = .332, $F = 1.631$, $p = .112$) or sex (Pillai's Trace = .123, $F = 1.12$, $p = .365$). Thus, demographic variables of age and sex did not significantly influence faculty perceptions across the evaluated curriculum domains.

The absence of significant demographic effects suggests that faculty perceptions regarding the curriculum's relevance, content quality, instructional effectiveness, alignment with goals, and outcomes and assessment are consistent across age groups and between sexes. Faculty, regardless of demographic differences, appear to share similar experiences and perspectives regarding curriculum quality and effectiveness.

The results imply that curriculum planners and administrators can confidently generalize faculty perceptions across demographic segments without needing substantial differentiation in curricular approaches based on age or sex. This uniformity facilitates cohesive faculty-driven improvements and simplifies decision-making processes related to curriculum development and enhancement.

Recent studies such as Zhu, Valcke, and Schellens (2021) affirm that demographic factors such as age and sex often show minimal impact on educators' curriculum perceptions when institutional culture and professional standards are clearly defined. Similarly, empirical findings by Lu and Chen (2020) indicate that faculty's professional experiences and institutional contexts are more influential than demographic characteristics in shaping curriculum evaluations. Maintaining consistency in educational approaches, independent of faculty demographics, can thus support greater institutional coherence and effective curriculum implementation (Smith & Stark, 2022).

Table 9 Multivariate Test of the Effects of Age and Sex on Faculty Perceptions of Curriculum Evaluation Domains

Effect	Pillai's Trace	F-value	df	p-value
Age	.051	1.357	(20, 2108)	.133
Sex	.009	.984	(5, 524)	.427
College	.038	.800	(25, 2640)	.746

Table 9 displays multivariate test results examining the effects of demographic variables—age, sex, and college affiliation—on student perceptions of curriculum evaluation domains. The findings reveal no statistically significant effects for age (Pillai's Trace = .051, $F = 1.357$, $p = .133$), sex (Pillai's Trace = .009, $F = .984$, $p = .427$), or college affiliation (Pillai's Trace = .038, $F = .800$, $p = .746$). Thus, these demographic variables do not significantly influence students' perceptions of the curriculum across the five evaluation domains.

The lack of significant influence from demographic factors such as age, sex, or college affiliation indicates that students hold relatively homogeneous views regarding curriculum quality, irrespective of their background characteristics. This uniformity suggests the curriculum's design and implementation effectively address student needs across diverse demographic profiles, ensuring broadly consistent educational experiences.

Given these findings, curriculum developers and institutional leaders can confidently design curricular strategies and enhancements without necessitating significant differentiation based on student age, sex, or college affiliation. It emphasizes the importance of addressing universal student expectations and needs rather than tailoring curriculum changes based solely on demographic variables.

Recent studies, such as Liu, Chen, and Tai (2021), indicate demographic variables often have limited impact on students' curriculum perceptions when institutions effectively implement inclusive educational practices. Similarly, Veldman et al. (2020) suggest that demographic homogeneity in curriculum evaluation may reflect effective universal design principles in education, accommodating diverse student populations uniformly. Therefore, institutions benefit from curriculum designs that emphasize broad inclusivity and universal relevance rather than extensive demographic segmentation (Johnson & Stage, 2022).

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

RQ5: What potential curriculum enhancements can be proposed based on the integration of quantitative and qualitative findings?

Based on the quantitative findings, the curriculum demonstrates strengths in real-world application, alignment with goals, and assessment practices, yet reveals areas for improvement in instructional effectiveness, theory–practice balance, and instructional resources. To address these areas, the following enhancements are recommended: (1) incorporate more experiential and hands-on learning opportunities, such as internships, simulations, and project-based activities; (2) strengthen faculty development programs to improve instructional strategies and time management; and (3) update and expand instructional materials and resources to better support diverse learning needs.

Rationale

These recommendations are grounded in the study’s findings that, while both faculty and students generally perceive the curriculum positively, there are consistent indications for greater practical exposure, improved teaching approaches, and richer learning materials. Enhancing experiential learning will bridge the gap between theory and practice, aligning classroom experiences with industry demands. Continuous faculty development will ensure the effective delivery of curriculum content, while upgraded instructional resources will create a more engaging and supportive learning environment.

Objective

The main objective of these proposed curriculum enhancements is to create a more responsive, effective, and future-ready curriculum that meets the evolving needs of students, faculty, and industry stakeholders. By implementing these evidence-based improvements, the institution aims to further elevate student competencies, satisfaction, and employability, while ensuring sustained curriculum relevance and academic excellence.

Areas of Concern	Activities/Strategies	Persons Involved	Timeframe	Budget	Monitoring Scheme	Expected Output
Theory–Practice Balance	Implement internships, industry immersion, and simulations	Faculty, Industry Partners, Students	1st–2nd Semester	150,000	Progress reports from faculty and industry	Enhanced student practical skills and experience
Instructional Effectiveness	Conduct faculty development workshops	HR, Faculty, External Experts	Every semester	80,000	Post-training evaluation and classroom observation	Improved teaching strategies and class engagement
Instructional Resources	Update textbooks, e-learning tools, and lab equipment	Admin, IT Staff, Faculty	Annually	200,000	Inventory review, user feedback survey	Upgraded and accessible learning materials
Experiential Learning	Organize project-based, skills and community-based activities	Faculty, Students, Community Partners	Every academic year	100,000	Project documentation, student reflection reports	Increased student participation and real-world exposure
Curriculum Alignment with Goals	Strengthen stakeholders engagement and curriculum review sessions with industry and alumni	Admin, Industry Experts, Alumni	1st Quarter	50,000	Advisory board meetings, recommendation tracking	Curriculum recommendations aligned with industry needs

VI. CONCLUSION

The findings of this study reveal that both faculty and students generally perceive the curriculum as effective and relevant across key domains such as relevance, content quality, instructional effectiveness, alignment with goals, and outcomes and assessment. While students tend to rate these domains slightly higher than faculty, the overall ratings from both groups fall within the “evident” to “very evident” range, indicating broad satisfaction with the curriculum’s current design and implementation. Importantly, statistical analyses show no significant differences in perceptions based on demographic variables such as age, sex, or college affiliation, highlighting a shared understanding and acceptance of the curriculum’s strengths and areas for growth within the academic community.

Despite these positive findings, the study identifies areas where enhancements are needed, particularly in balancing theory with practice, strengthening instructional effectiveness, and enriching instructional resources. Addressing these concerns through evidence-based strategies—such as expanding experiential learning opportunities, supporting faculty professional development, and investing in updated learning materials—will ensure the curriculum remains responsive to evolving educational and industry

Bridging Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of Curriculum Quality

demands. Ultimately, ongoing curriculum evaluation and stakeholder collaboration are crucial for sustaining academic excellence, student satisfaction, and graduate employability in a rapidly changing educational landscape.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Strengthen Experiential Learning Opportunities.** Integrate more internships, industry immersion programs, project-based activities, laboratory and skills development, fieldwork and community partnerships into the curriculum to enhance the connection between theoretical concepts and real-world application. This approach will help students develop practical skills, increase employability, and bridge the gap between classroom learning and professional demands.
2. **Enhance Faculty Development Program.** Conduct regular faculty training and professional development workshops focused on innovative instructional strategies, effective classroom management, and the integration of technology in teaching. These initiatives will help faculty stay updated on best practices and improve instructional effectiveness across all courses.
3. **Update and Expand Instructional Resources.** Allocate resources for the periodic review and upgrading of textbooks, digital learning platforms, laboratory equipment, and other instructional materials. Ensuring access to high-quality and up-to-date resources will support both faculty and students in achieving desired learning outcomes.
4. **Foster Ongoing Stakeholder Engagement.** Strengthen feedback mechanisms involving faculty, students, alumni, and industry partners to regularly review and refine the curriculum. Active stakeholder involvement will ensure that the curriculum remains responsive to current trends, labor market needs, and the expectations of both learners and employers.

REFERENCES

- 1) Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. M. (2020). *Classroom assessment and educational measurement*. Routledge.
- 2) Ashwin, P., & McArthur, J. (2022). Curriculum alignment, assessment, and the value of student learning: Reframing the debate. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(2), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1968993>
- 3) Bressler, D. M., & Bodzin, A. M. (2021). A mixed methods assessment of the effectiveness of technology-enhanced science curriculum materials on elementary students' higher-order thinking skills. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 39(2), 214–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2020.1738048>
- 4) Cakir, H., & Guven, B. (2022). Digital resources and their influence on instructional quality: A study of teacher perceptions. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00347-x>
- 5) Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- 6) Fullan, M., & Edwards, A. (2022). *The power of coherence: Aligning schools, systems, and communities*. Corwin Press.
- 7) García-Peñalvo, F. J., & Corell, A. (2020). Micro-credentials and open badges: Two emerging digital accreditation systems for higher education. *Education in the Knowledge Society*, 21, Article e19934. <https://doi.org/10.14201/eks.19934>
- 8) Gulikers, J., Bastiaens, T., & Kirschner, P. (2021). Authentic assessment, student engagement and lifelong learning: The case for real-world relevance in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(5), 673–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1863356>
- 9) Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2022). The power of feedback revisited. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(2), 323–348. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211003263>
- 10) Healy, M., Hammer, S., & McIlveen, P. (2022). Employability and curriculum design: The role of stakeholder collaboration. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(3), 732–747. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1926541>
- 11) Hora, M. T., & Benbow, R. J. (2022). Reconsidering career readiness: Aligning curriculum and workforce needs. *Innovative Higher Education*, 47(3), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09581-9>
- 12) Jackson, D., & Bridgstock, R. (2021). Evidencing employability: Graduate perceptions of stakeholder contributions to skill development and recognition. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(9), 1866–1881. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1702015>
- 13) Johnson, D. R., & Stage, F. K. (2022). Universal design in curriculum: Implications for diverse learners in higher education. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 15(1), 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000352>
- 14) Khalil, M. K., & Elkhider, I. A. (2021). Applying learning theories and instructional design models for effective instruction. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 45(2), 224–234. <https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00138.2020>
- 15) Kolb, D. A., & Kolb, A. Y. (2022). Experiential learning theory as a guide for practice. *Higher Education Studies*, 12(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v12n2p1>
- 16) Liu, H., Chen, T., & Tai, Y. (2021). The influence of demographic factors on student perceptions of curriculum quality. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 22(2), 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09689-x>

- 17) Lu, H., & Chen, H. (2020). Faculty's professional experience and curriculum evaluation: Beyond demographics. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 104, 101697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101697>
- 18) McLean, M., & Wilson, A. (2021). Developing critical thinking and personal growth in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(8), 1111–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1842313>
- 19) Patton, K., Parker, M., & Pratt, E. (2022). Curriculum alignment and stakeholder agreement: Keys to successful curriculum reform. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 54(2), 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.2001284>
- 20) Pham, T., & Saito, E. (2020). Employability and curriculum design: The perspectives of Vietnamese students and employers. *Higher Education*, 79, 973–989. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00462-5>
- 21) Pineda-Báez, C., Bermúdez-Aponte, D. P., & Rubiano-Bello, Á. (2021). Stakeholder feedback and curriculum improvement: Practices and challenges. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 18(3), Article 2. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol18/iss3/2>
- 22) Scherer, R., Howard, S. K., & Tondeur, J. (2021). Profiling teachers' readiness for online teaching and learning in higher education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(2), 805–825. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09915-5>
- 23) Sims, R. R., & Felton, E. L. (2021). Ethics education: Its place in higher education. *Journal of Business Ethics Education*, 18(1), 27–44. <https://doi.org/10.5840/jbee2021182>
- 24) Smith, J., & Stark, P. (2022). Faculty perceptions of curriculum effectiveness and institutional culture. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(8), 1738–1752. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1977652>
- 25) Tadesse, T., Gillies, R., & Manathunga, C. (2021). Curriculum alignment and educational effectiveness: Perspectives from developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 82, 102372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102372>
- 26) Veldman, I., Admiraal, W., van Tartwijk, J., Mainhard, T., & van den Broek, P. (2020). Universal design for learning in higher education: Faculty and student perceptions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(9), 1890–1903. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1702015>
- 27) Zhu, C., Valcke, M., & Schellens, T. (2021). The impact of professional development on teachers' beliefs and curriculum evaluation: A longitudinal study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 101, 103314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103314>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.