

Instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in hospitality management programs of selected higher education institutions in Bulacan: Inputs to quality assurance system

Dela Fuente, Ravenal ✉

Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines (ravendela Fuente@yahoo.com)

Received: 15 June 2026
Available Online: 23 July 2026

Revised: 19 July 2026
DOI: 10.5861/ijrsm.2026.26103

Accepted: 22 July 2026



ISSN: 2243-7770
Online ISSN: 2243-7789

OPEN ACCESS

Abstract

This study examined instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) offering Hospitality Management programs in Bulacan. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study gathered data from 369 respondents, consisting of program chairs, faculty members, students, and quality assurance officers from five HEIs. Data were analyzed using frequency and percentage, weighted mean, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The findings revealed that instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation were consistently perceived as evident across the participating institutions. Statistical analysis further showed no significant differences in the assessments of the four respondent groups, indicating a shared perception of the current practices implemented in their respective programs. However, a very strong positive relationship was found between instructional leadership and curriculum innovation, as well as between faculty competence and curriculum innovation, emphasizing the importance of effective leadership and competent faculty in promoting curriculum enhancement. Respondents also acknowledged challenges related to leadership practices, faculty development, and curriculum implementation. Based on these findings, a comprehensive Quality Assurance System was developed to address identified concerns and strengthen continuous program improvement. The proposed framework was evaluated as highly suitable, highly acceptable, and highly feasible by the respondents, demonstrating its potential to support institutional quality enhancement. The study concludes that strengthening instructional leadership, enhancing faculty competence, and sustaining curriculum innovation are essential strategies for improving the quality and competitiveness of Hospitality Management programs in Higher Education Institutions.

Keywords: instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, quality assurance system, hospitality management, higher education institutions, Bulacan

Instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in hospitality management programs of selected higher education institutions in Bulacan: Inputs to quality assurance system

1. Introduction

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) play a significant role in developing competent graduates by ensuring that academic programs remain relevant, responsive, and aligned with industry demands. In Hospitality Management education, program quality is essential because graduates are expected to possess the knowledge, skills, and competencies required in a dynamic and competitive industry. Instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation are widely recognized as fundamental elements in achieving and sustaining the quality of academic programs in higher education. Effective instructional leadership provides strategic direction, promotes collaboration, supports faculty development, and ensures that teaching and learning practices are aligned with the institution's mission, vision, and quality standards. Through strong leadership, academic institutions are better positioned to foster a culture of continuous improvement, accountability, and instructional excellence.

Equally important is faculty competence, as the quality of instruction largely depends on educators' knowledge, skills, professional experience, research capability, and technological proficiency. Competent faculty members are better equipped to implement learner-centered teaching strategies, integrate emerging technologies into instruction, and create meaningful learning experiences that promote student engagement and academic success. Continuous professional development further enables educators to respond effectively to evolving educational practices and the changing demands of the hospitality industry. Curriculum innovation also plays a vital role in ensuring that Hospitality Management programs remain relevant, responsive, and aligned with current industry expectations. Regular curriculum review, the integration of outcomes-based education, digital learning approaches, sustainability concepts, and experiential learning opportunities help prepare graduates with the competencies required in today's dynamic hospitality and tourism sector. A responsive curriculum not only enhances the quality of instruction but also strengthens graduates' employability and readiness for professional practice.

While numerous studies have examined instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation, these variables have often been investigated separately, focusing on their individual effects on educational outcomes. Relatively few studies have explored how these three factors work together to influence the overall quality of academic programs and institutional quality assurance. This gap is particularly evident in Hospitality Management education, where program quality depends not only on effective leadership or competent faculty but also on the continuous alignment of the curriculum with industry standards and stakeholder expectations. By examining these variables collectively, the present study seeks to provide a more holistic understanding of the factors that contribute to quality assurance and the continuous improvement of Hospitality Management programs in selected higher education institutions.

Anchored in the principles of outcomes-based education and quality assurance, this study views program quality as the result of effective instructional leadership, competent faculty, and innovative curriculum implementation. Understanding how these variables relate to one another may provide valuable insights for strengthening academic programs and improving institutional performance. Therefore, this study aims to assess instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation; determine their relationships with program quality; identify existing challenges; and develop inputs for a Quality Assurance System for selected Higher Education Institutions offering Hospitality Management programs in Bulacan.

Objectives of the Study - The main objective of this study is to assess the instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in the Hospitality Management programs of selected higher education

institutions (HEIs) in Bulacan. Specifically, it aims to evaluate instructional leadership practices, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation as perceived by program chairs, faculty members, students, and evaluators; determine whether significant differences exist in the assessments of the four groups of respondents; examine the relationship among instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation; identify the challenges encountered in these areas; and propose quality assurance system inputs, as well as assess their suitability, acceptability, and feasibility.

2. Methods

Research Design - This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design to examine instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in Hospitality Management programs at selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Bulacan. Descriptive research is widely used to systematically describe existing conditions, characteristics, perceptions, attitudes, and practices of a specific population without manipulating the variables under investigation. According to Creswell et al. (2023), descriptive research provides an accurate and objective description of phenomena as they naturally occur, allowing researchers to obtain factual information that can serve as the basis for analysis, interpretation, policy formulation, and program improvement.

Since the present study sought to determine the current status of instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation; identify the challenges encountered; and evaluate the proposed Quality Assurance System, the descriptive research design provided an appropriate framework for gathering quantitative data from multiple stakeholder groups. The design enabled the researcher to examine the perceptions of program chairs, faculty members, students, and quality assurance officers without introducing any intervention or experimental manipulation. Moreover, the findings from this approach provided empirical evidence that served as the foundation for developing a Quality Assurance System to strengthen Hospitality Management programs at the participating higher education institutions.

The descriptive quantitative research design was appropriate because the study focused on describing and assessing the existing conditions of instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation rather than establishing causal relationships or testing interventions. It enabled the researcher to collect standardized data from different stakeholder groups using a structured questionnaire, allowing comparisons across respondents. Furthermore, because the study aimed to generate evidence-based inputs for a proposed Quality Assurance System, a descriptive design was the most suitable approach for obtaining reliable baseline information that accurately reflects current institutional practices and serves as a sound basis for educational planning and continuous quality improvement.

Population and Sampling - The study involved 369 respondents from selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Bulacan offering the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM) program. The respondents comprised 5 Program Chairs/Coordinators, 5 Academic Evaluators or Quality Assurance (QA) Officers, 57 Faculty Members, and 302 Students. These stakeholder groups were selected because of their direct involvement in the planning, implementation, supervision, evaluation, and continuous improvement of Hospitality Management programs, providing comprehensive perspectives on instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, and quality assurance.

The study employed purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique that selects participants based on characteristics relevant to the research objectives. According to Campbell et al. (2020), purposive sampling enables researchers to identify information-rich participants who possess the knowledge and experience necessary to provide meaningful insights. Program Chairs and QA Officers were included through complete enumeration because of their limited number and critical roles in academic leadership, curriculum implementation, accreditation, and quality assurance. Faculty Members were purposively selected due to their responsibilities in instruction, research, and curriculum delivery, while Students were included as the primary beneficiaries of instructional and curricular practices.

The final sample provided adequate representation of the major stakeholders in Hospitality Management education across the participating HEIs. By incorporating the perspectives of academic leaders, quality assurance personnel, faculty members, and students, the study generated comprehensive, credible, and relevant data. This sampling procedure strengthened the validity of the findings and provided a sound basis for developing the proposed Quality Assurance System for Hospitality Management programs.

Research Instrument - The primary data-gathering instrument used in this study was a researcher-made structured questionnaire developed based on the study's objectives, conceptual framework, and an extensive review of related literature and studies. The questionnaire was designed to assess instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, challenges encountered, and the proposed Quality Assurance System for Hospitality Management programs in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Bulacan. The questionnaire was anchored on established theories, standards, policies, and quality assurance frameworks. It was reviewed by the research adviser, validated by experts, and revised based on the validators' recommendations to ensure its content validity and relevance.

The questionnaire consisted of eight parts. Part I gathered the respondents' demographic profile, including age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and years of service. Part II assessed instructional leadership in terms of vision and mission alignment, academic planning and supervision, faculty motivation and mentoring, evaluation and performance monitoring, resource allocation and management, and collaboration and shared governance. Part III measured faculty competence in the areas of pedagogical skills and instructional design, research capability and publication, industry experience and certification, technological integration in teaching, professional development and training, and student engagement and mentorship. Part IV evaluated curriculum innovation in terms of outcomes-based education alignment, integration of sustainability and hospitality concepts, digital and hybrid learning models, assessment and feedback systems, entrepreneurial course components, and continuous curriculum review and benchmarking. Part V identified the challenges encountered in instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation. Parts VI, VII, and VIII assessed the suitability, acceptability, and feasibility, respectively, of the proposed Quality Assurance System. All items in Parts II to VIII were measured using a five-point Likert scale to determine the respondents' perceptions and assessments of the study variables. The responses served as the basis for evaluating instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, challenges encountered, and the proposed Quality Assurance System.

Data Gathering Procedures - The data collection process followed a systematic procedure to ensure ethical compliance and the integrity of the research. First, the researcher secured permission to conduct the study by submitting a request letter to the Presidents, Academic Heads, or authorized officials of the selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Bulacan offering Hospitality Management programs. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the concerned offices to identify the qualified respondents based on the established inclusion criteria. Survey questionnaire was then administered to the Program Chairs, QA Officers, Faculty Members, and Students through Google Forms. Before answering the questionnaire, the respondents were informed of the study's purpose and provided with the necessary instructions. After the data collection period, the accomplished questionnaires were retrieved and checked for completeness. The collected data were subsequently organized, coded, tabulated, and subjected to appropriate statistical analysis. Finally, the results were presented in both tabular and textual forms to facilitate interpretation and discussion of the findings.

Statistical Treatment of Data - The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques to analyze the data and address the research objectives. Percentage was used to describe the respondents' demographic profile, while the weighted mean determined the respondents' assessments of instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, challenges encountered, and the proposed Quality Assurance System. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significant differences among the assessments of the four groups of respondents. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Pearson r) measured the strength and direction of the relationships among instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation, while the t -test was used to determine the significance of the computed correlation coefficients. These statistical tools provided a

Instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in hospitality management programs

comprehensive basis for interpreting the findings and developing the proposed Quality Assurance System.

Percentage was used to present the distribution of respondents according to their demographic profile and participating institution. As noted by Lohr (2022), percentage is widely used in survey research to describe respondent characteristics. Weighted Mean was used to determine the level of instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, challenges encountered, and the evaluation of the proposed Quality Assurance System. Boone et al. (2012) stated that the weighted mean is an appropriate measure for summarizing responses obtained through a Likert scale. The weighted mean was used to answer the statements of the problem concerning the assessment of instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, challenges encountered, and the suitability, acceptability, and feasibility of the proposed Quality Assurance System. All assessment items were measured using a five-point Likert scale with corresponding verbal interpretations. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to determine whether significant differences existed in the assessments of the four groups of respondents. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Pearson *r*) was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationships among instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation. Schober et al. (2018) explained that Pearson *r* measures the degree of linear relationship between continuous variables. The *t*-test for the significance of the coefficient of correlation was used to determine whether the computed correlation coefficients were statistically significant. The interpretation of the correlation coefficients followed the guide proposed by Schober et al. (2018): 0.00–0.10 (negligible), 0.11–0.39 (weak), 0.40–0.69 (moderate), 0.70–0.89 (strong), and 0.90–1.00 (very strong). The same interpretation was applied to both positive and negative correlation coefficients.

3. Result and discussion

Table 1

Summary of Instructional Leadership in Hospitality Management Program

Criteria	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Vision and Mission Alignment	3.94	E	4.32	HE	3.59	E	4.50	HE	4.09	E	1
Academic Planning and Supervision	3.76	E	4.31	HE	3.54	E	4.34	HE	3.99	E	4
Faculty Motivation and Mentoring	3.64	E	4.30	HE	3.54	E	4.30	HE	3.94	E	6
Evaluation and Performance Monitoring	3.76	E	4.32	HE	3.57	E	4.38	HE	4.01	E	3
Resource Allocation and Management	3.52	E	4.33	HE	3.59	E	4.44	HE	3.97	E	5
Collaboration and Shared Governance	3.86	E	4.34	HE	3.57	E	4.42	HE	4.05	E	2
Grand Mean	3.75	E	4.32	HE	3.57	E	4.40	HE	4.01	E	

Table 1 presents the assessment of instructional leadership in the Hospitality Management program, which obtained a grand mean of 4.01, verbally interpreted as Evident. Among the dimensions, vision and mission alignment ranked first with a composite weighted mean of 4.09, followed by collaboration and shared governance (4.05), evaluation and performance monitoring (4.01), academic planning and supervision (3.99), resource allocation and management (3.97), and faculty motivation and mentoring (3.94). All dimensions were rated Evident. Among the respondent groups, Academic Evaluators/QA Officers gave the highest assessment, rating instructional leadership as Highly Evident (4.40), followed by Faculty Members (4.32). Meanwhile, Program Chairs/Coordinators (3.75) and Students (3.57) assessed instructional leadership as Evident.

This shows that the Hospitality Management program has generally effective instructional leadership that supports improvements in teaching, academic management, and program operations. It highlights that leadership practices are helping maintain the quality of instruction and alignment with institutional goals. At the same time, it shows that there is still room for improvement, as most areas were rated only as evident, indicating the need for continuous development and stronger leadership practices to achieve greater effectiveness. This implies that instructional leadership is effectively evident in the Hospitality Management program and contributes to

improvements in teaching, academic management, and program quality. This perspective is consistent with Bush (2021), who emphasized that instructional leadership is a comprehensive process that promotes teaching effectiveness, organizational performance, and continuous school improvement through strategic direction, instructional support, and effective management practices. The author further noted that instructional leaders play a vital role in fostering a culture of excellence by guiding instructional programs, supporting faculty development, and ensuring that institutional goals are achieved. Consequently, the findings suggest that while instructional leadership is generally evident in the Hospitality Management program, continuous enhancement of leadership practices remains necessary to strengthen instructional quality, improve program effectiveness, and sustain quality assurance initiatives.

Table 2
Summary of Faculty Competence in Hospitality Management Program

Criteria	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Pedagogical Skills and Instructional Design	3.94	E	4.54	HE	3.56	E	4.38	HE	4.10	E	2.5
Research Capability and Publication	3.98	E	4.54	HE	3.58	E	4.22	HE	4.08	E	4
Industry Experience and Certification	3.78	E	4.52	HE	3.55	E	4.28	HE	4.03	E	6
Technological Integration in Teaching	3.98	E	4.52	HE	3.56	E	4.56	HE	4.15	E	1
Professional Development and Training	3.86	E	4.50	HE	3.54	E	4.36	HE	4.07	E	5
Student Engagement and Mentorship	3.88	E	4.54	HE	3.60	E	4.38	HE	4.10	E	2.5
Grand Mean	3.90	E	4.53	HE	3.57	E	4.36	HE	4.09	E	

Table 2 presents the assessment of faculty competence in the Hospitality Management program, which obtained a grand mean of 4.09, verbally interpreted as Evident. Among the dimensions, technological integration in teaching ranked first with a composite weighted mean of 4.15, followed by pedagogical skills and instructional design (4.10), student engagement and mentorship (4.10), research capability and publication (4.08), professional development and training (4.07), and industry experience and certification (4.03). All dimensions were rated Evident. Among the respondent groups, Faculty Members gave the highest assessment, rating faculty competence as Highly Evident (4.53), followed by Academic Evaluators/QA Officers (4.36). Meanwhile, Program Chairs/Coordinators (3.90) and Students (3.57) assessed faculty competence as Evident.

This implies that faculty competence in the Hospitality Management program is evident across areas, indicating that faculty members possess the knowledge, skills, and teaching practices needed to support quality instruction. This further implies that the program values effective teaching, technological integration, research, professional growth, and industry relevance in developing competent educators.

This interpretation is reinforced by Villaluna (2024), who found that Hospitality and Tourism faculty members demonstrated high levels of competency across various professional and industry-related domains. The study emphasized that competent educators possess the knowledge, skills, and professional expertise necessary to deliver relevant and effective instruction and to prepare students for industry demands. Findings highlighted the importance of continuous professional engagement and competency enhancement to maintain instructional quality and responsiveness to evolving educational and industry standards. These findings suggest that while faculty competence is generally evident, continuous improvement remains essential to ensure that quality teaching practices and professional competencies are consistently demonstrated in the learning environment.

Table 3 presents the assessment of curriculum innovation in the Hospitality Management program, which obtained a grand mean of 4.01, verbally interpreted as Evident. Among the dimensions, digital and hybrid learning models ranked first with a composite weighted mean of 4.03, followed by integration of sustainability and hospitality concepts (4.02). Assessment and feedback systems, entrepreneurial course components, and continuous curriculum review and benchmarking each obtained a composite weighted mean of 4.00, while outcomes-based

education alignment ranked last with a composite weighted mean of 3.99. All dimensions were rated Evident. Among the respondent groups, Faculty Members gave the highest assessment, rating curriculum innovation as Highly Evident (4.36), followed by Academic Evaluators/QA Officers (4.32). Meanwhile, Program Chairs/Coordinators (3.88) and Students (3.47) assessed curriculum innovation as Evident. This implies that curriculum innovation in the Hospitality Management program is generally evident, showing that the program continuously adapts its curriculum to support quality, relevant, and industry-responsive education. This further implies that the program promotes modern teaching approaches, sustainability, entrepreneurship, and continuous curriculum improvement to enhance student learning. This perspective is echoed by Stensaker et al. (2022), who emphasized that curriculum innovation and quality enhancement are continuous processes that enable higher education institutions to respond effectively to changing educational demands, industry expectations, and stakeholder needs. The study highlighted that innovative curricular practices contribute to improved program relevance, enhanced student learning experiences, and stronger institutional quality.

Table 3*Summary of Curriculum Innovation in Hospitality Management Program*

Criteria	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Outcomes-Based Education Alignment	3.94	E	4.35	HE	3.44	E	4.24	HE	3.99	E	6
Integration of Sustainability and Hospitality Concepts	4.04	E	4.37	HE	3.47	E	4.20	HE	4.02	E	2
Digital and Hybrid Learning Models	3.92	E	4.36	HE	3.47	E	4.38	HE	4.03	E	1
Assessment and Feedback Systems	3.72	E	4.34	HE	3.47	E	4.46	HE	4.00	E	3.33
Entrepreneurial Course Components	3.74	E	4.38	HE	3.48	E	4.40	HE	4.00	E	3.33
Continuous Curriculum Review and Benchmarking	3.94	E	4.34	HE	3.46	E	4.24	HE	4.00	E	3.33
Grand Mean	3.88	E	4.36	HE	3.47	E	4.32	HE	4.01	E	

Table 4*Correlation Between Instructional Leadership and Curriculum Innovation in Hospitality Management Program*

Indicators	r-value	VI	df	t-value	Critical value	Int.	Decision
Vision and Mission Alignment	0.99	VSC	41	4.24027	1.734	Significant	Reject H ₀
Academic Planning and Supervision	0.99	VSC	41	4.23826	1.734	Significant	Reject H ₀
Faculty Motivation and Mentoring	0.99	VSC	41	4.23981	1.734	Significant	Reject H ₀
Evaluation and Performance Monitoring	0.99	VSC	41	4.23142	1.734	Significant	Reject H ₀
Resource Allocation and Management	0.99	VSC	41	4.24135	1.734	Significant	Reject H ₀
Collaboration and Shared Governance	0.99	VSC	41	4.24022	1.734	Significant	Reject H ₀

Legend: 1.00 – Perfect Correlation (PC); 0.71–0.99 – Very Strong Correlation (VSC); 0.51–0.70 – Strong Correlation (SC); 0.31–0.50 – Moderate Correlation (MC); 0.11–0.30 – Weak Correlation (WC); and 0.00–0.10 – Negligible Correlation (NC).

Table 4 presents the relationship between instructional leadership and curriculum innovation in the Hospitality Management program. Using a t-test at the 0.05 level of significance with 41 degrees of freedom and a critical value of 1.734, all indicators yielded an r-value of 0.99, indicating a Very Strong Correlation (VSC). The computed t-values ranged from 4.23142 to 4.24135, all of which exceeded the critical value. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected for all indicators, indicating a significant relationship between instructional leadership and curriculum innovation. The findings imply that instructional leadership and curriculum innovation are significantly related in the Hospitality Management Program. The very strong positive correlations indicate that effective leadership practices contribute substantially to the development, implementation, and continuous improvement of innovative curricular initiatives. This observation is reinforced by Tanveer et al. (2025), who emphasized that effective educational leadership fosters innovation, organizational improvement, and responsiveness to changing academic and industry demands. The study highlighted that leadership practices that support collaboration, professional growth, and strategic decision-making create favorable conditions for the successful implementation

of educational innovations. Consequently, the significant relationship between instructional leadership and curriculum innovation suggests that strengthening leadership practices can further enhance the quality, relevance, and continuous improvement of the curriculum within the Hospitality Management Program.

Table 5*Correlation Between Faculty Competence and Curriculum Innovation of the Hospitality Management Program*

Indicators	r-value	VI	df	t-value	Critical value	Int.	Decision
Pedagogical Skills and Instructional Design	0.99	VSC	41	4.24124	1.734	Significant	Reject H_0
Research Capability and Publication	0.99	VSC	41	4.23853	1.734	Significant	Reject H_0
Industry Experience and Certification	0.99	VSC	41	4.24039	1.734	Significant	Reject H_0
Technological Integration in Teaching	0.99	VSC	41	4.24076	1.734	Significant	Reject H_0
Professional Development and Training	0.99	VSC	41	4.24121	1.734	Significant	Reject H_0
Student Engagement and Mentorship	0.99	VSC	41	4.24085	1.734	Significant	Reject H_0

Table 5 depicts the correlation between faculty competence and curriculum innovation in the Hospitality Management Program. The relationship was tested using a t-test with 41 degrees of freedom at the 0.05 level of significance, with a critical value of 1.734. The results revealed that all indicators obtained an r-value of 0.99, interpreted as Very Strong Correlation (VSC). The computed t-values were 4.24124 for Pedagogical Skills and Instructional Design; 4.23853 for Research Capability and Publication; 4.24039 for Industry Experience and Certification; 4.24076 for Technological Integration in Teaching; 4.24121 for Professional Development and Training; and 4.24085 for Student Engagement and Mentorship. Since all computed t-values were greater than the critical value of 1.734, the null hypothesis was rejected in all indicators. The findings imply that faculty competence and curriculum innovation are significantly related in the Hospitality Management Program. The very strong positive correlations indicate that competent faculty members contribute substantially to the development, implementation, and continuous improvement of innovative curricular practices. This finding is consistent with the study of Allen et al. (2024), who emphasized that faculty competence plays a crucial role in promoting instructional innovation and improving educational outcomes. The authors highlighted that educators who continuously develop their pedagogical, technological, and professional competencies are better positioned to implement innovative teaching practices and contribute to curriculum enhancement.

Table 6 presents the assessment of the challenges encountered relative to instructional leadership, which obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.85, verbally interpreted as Encountered. The most frequently encountered challenge was difficulty in coordinating with external stakeholders (3.94), followed by insufficient leadership training for program administrators (3.93), limited clarity in the alignment of vision and mission with program implementation (3.91), lack of transparency in leadership processes (3.89), constraints in decision-making authority (3.87), challenges in academic planning and monitoring (3.86), limited faculty participation in shared governance (3.85), insufficient mentoring support for faculty members (3.80), delayed feedback on faculty performance evaluation (3.79), and inadequate supervision of instructional delivery (3.65). All indicators were rated Encountered. Among the respondent groups, Students and Academic Evaluators/QA Officers reported the highest level of challenges, both with an overall weighted mean of 3.88, followed by Program Chairs/Coordinators (3.84) and Faculty Members (3.79). All groups assessed the challenges as Encountered.

Table 6*Challenges Encountered Relative to Instructional Leadership*

Indicators	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Identifies limited clarity in the alignment of vision and mission with program implementation.	4.00	E	3.86	E	3.79	E	4.00	E	3.91	E	3
Experiences inadequate supervision of instructional delivery.	3.40	E	3.75	E	3.86	E	3.60	E	3.65	E	10
Encounters insufficient mentoring support for faculty members.	3.80	E	3.74	E	3.84	E	3.80	E	3.80	E	8
Reports delayed feedback on	3.80	E	3.74	E	3.81	E	3.80	E	3.79	E	9

Instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in hospitality management programs

faculty performance evaluation.											
Observes limited participation of faculty in shared governance.	3.80	E	3.68	E	3.90	E	4.00	E	3.85	E	7
Notes challenges in effective academic planning and monitoring.	3.80	E	3.91	E	3.91	E	3.80	E	3.86	E	6
Experiences constraints in decision-making authority.	3.80	E	3.72	E	3.94	E	4.00	E	3.87	E	5
Identifies lack of transparency in leadership processes.	4.00	E	3.79	E	3.95	E	3.80	E	3.89	E	4
Encounters difficulties in coordinating with external stakeholders.	4.00	E	3.86	E	3.91	E	4.00	E	3.94	E	1
Reports on insufficient leadership training for program administrators.	4.00	E	3.81	E	3.90	E	4.00	E	3.93	E	2
Overall Weighted Mean	3.84	E	3.79	E	3.88	E	3.88	E	3.85	E	

Legend: 4.20–5.00 (5) – Highly Encountered (HE); 3.40–4.19 (4) – Encountered (E); 2.60–3.39 (3) – Moderately Encountered (ME); 1.80–2.59 (2) – Least Encountered (LE); and 1.00–1.79 (1) – Not Encountered (NE).

This implies that Instructional Leadership Challenges are encountered in the Hospitality Management program through difficulties in stakeholder coordination, limited leadership training, a lack of transparency in leadership processes, constraints in decision-making authority, and challenges in academic planning, monitoring, and faculty participation. This study is supported by Prestoza et al. (2025), who identified several challenges related to instructional leadership, faculty development, and instructional improvement. Their study highlighted difficulties in sustaining professional development, balancing responsibilities, and strengthening collaboration and leadership support to improve teaching quality and student outcomes. Similarly, the present study found that faculty members in the Hospitality Management program face challenges with industry integration, research involvement, access to technology, and professional development. The findings also indicate that stronger institutional support and more opportunities for training and skills enhancement are necessary to further improve faculty competence and instructional performance.

Table 7 presents the assessment of the challenges encountered relative to faculty competence, which obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.91, verbally interpreted as Encountered. The most frequently encountered challenge was difficulty in integrating industry practices into instruction (4.09), followed by insufficient research engagement and publication support (4.07), limited access to updated instructional technologies (4.07), challenges in student engagement and mentoring (4.07), gaps in pedagogical skills enhancement (4.03), limited opportunities for professional development and training (3.89), limited support for advanced studies (3.88), inadequate industry exposure and certification opportunities (3.77), insufficient institutional support for skills upgrading (3.77), and difficulty in balancing teaching, research, and extension roles (3.44). All indicators were rated Encountered. Among the respondent groups, Academic Evaluators/QA Officers reported the highest level of challenges with an overall weighted mean of 4.06, followed by Program Chairs/Coordinators (4.02), Students (3.86), and Faculty Members (3.69). All groups assessed the challenges as Encountered.

This implies that faculty members in the Hospitality Management program encounter several challenges that may affect the continuous improvement of their competence and instructional performance. This further implies that difficulties with industry integration, research involvement, access to technology, and professional development are evident within the program.

This study is supported by Cruz et al. (2026), who identified several challenges affecting faculty competence and instructional delivery in hospitality education. Their study highlighted difficulties in pedagogy, student engagement, access to technology, and online instructional practices, as well as the need for stronger institutional support and additional training. Present study found that faculty members in the Hospitality Management program face challenges with industry integration, research involvement, access to technology, and professional development. The findings also indicate that continuous support, training opportunities, and skills enhancement programs are necessary to further improve faculty effectiveness and professional growth.

Table 7
Challenges Encountered Relative to Faculty Competence

Indicators	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Identifies limited opportunities for professional development and training.	4.00	E	3.81	E	3.96	E	3.80	E	3.89	E	6
Experiences difficulty in integrating industry practices into instruction.	4.20	HE	3.86	E	3.88	E	4.40	HE	4.09	E	1
Reports insufficient research engagement and publication support.	4.20	HE	3.82	E	3.85	E	4.40	HE	4.07	E	2.33
Encounters gaps in pedagogical skills enhancement.	4.00	E	3.82	E	3.88	E	4.40	HE	4.03	E	5
Notes limited access to updated instructional technologies.	4.20	HE	3.82	E	3.84	E	4.40	HE	4.07	E	2.33
Experiences challenges in student engagement and mentoring.	4.40	HE	3.63	E	3.86	E	4.40	HE	4.07	E	2.33
Identifies inadequate industry exposure and certification opportunities.	3.80	E	3.63	E	3.84	E	3.80	E	3.77	E	8.5
Reports limited support for advanced studies.	3.80	E	3.77	E	4.15	E	3.80	E	3.88	E	7
Encounters difficulty in balancing teaching, research, and extension roles.	3.40	E	3.26	ME	3.68	E	3.40	E	3.44	E	10
Observes insufficient institutional support for skills upgrading.	4.20	HE	3.46	E	3.63	E	3.80	E	3.77	E	8.5
Overall Weighted Mean	4.02	E	3.69	E	3.86	E	4.06	E	3.91	E	

Table 8 presents the assessment of the challenges encountered relative to curriculum innovation, which obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.40, verbally interpreted as Encountered. Six indicators were rated Encountered, with delays in curriculum review and revision processes ranking first (3.53), followed by limited stakeholder involvement in curriculum development (3.50), insufficient incorporation of sustainability concepts (3.47), limited integration of digital and hybrid learning models (3.45), inadequate resources for curriculum innovation (3.41), and difficulty aligning the curriculum with current industry standards (3.40). Four indicators were rated Moderately Encountered, namely difficulty in updating assessment and feedback systems (3.39), limited benchmarking with leading hospitality programs (3.34), resistance to curricular changes among stakeholders (3.26), and challenges in implementing outcomes-based education (3.24). Among the respondent groups, Faculty Members (3.59) and Students (3.53) assessed the challenges as Encountered, while Program Chairs/Coordinators (3.32) and Academic Evaluators/QA Officers (3.16) rated them as Moderately Encountered.

Table 8
Challenges Encountered Relative to Curriculum Innovation

Indicators	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Identifies delays in curriculum review and revision processes.	3.60	E	3.21	ME	3.50	E	3.80	E	3.53	E	1
Experiences difficulty aligning curriculum with current industry standards.	3.40	E	3.53	E	3.48	E	3.20	ME	3.40	E	6
Reports limited integration of digital and hybrid learning models.	3.60	E	3.49	E	3.52	E	3.20	ME	3.45	E	4
Encounters challenges in implementing outcomes-based education.	3.00	ME	3.58	E	3.57	E	2.80	ME	3.24	ME	10
Notes insufficient incorporation of sustainability concepts.	3.80	E	3.56	E	3.52	E	3.00	ME	3.47	E	3

Instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation in hospitality management programs

Experiences limited benchmarking with leading hospitality programs.	3.80	E	3.84	E	3.52	E	2.20	LE	3.34	ME	8
Identifies inadequate resources for curriculum innovation.	3.80	E	3.74	E	3.49	E	2.60	ME	3.41	E	5
Reports resistance to curricular changes among stakeholders.	3.00	ME	3.35	ME	3.50	E	3.20	ME	3.26	ME	9
Encounters difficulty in updating assessment and feedback systems.	2.80	ME	3.75	E	3.59	E	3.40	E	3.39	ME	7
Observes limited stakeholder involvement in curriculum development.	2.40	LE	3.84	E	3.57	E	4.20	HE	3.50	E	2
Overall Weighted Mean	3.32	ME	3.59	E	3.53	E	3.16	ME	3.40	E	

This implies that the Hospitality Management program encounters several challenges related to curriculum innovation that may affect the timely improvement and relevance of the curriculum. This further implies that issues involving curriculum review, stakeholder participation, sustainability integration, and digital learning implementation are evident within the program. This study is supported by Miranda et al. (2023), who identified several challenges related to curriculum innovation in Tourism and Hospitality Management programs. Their study highlighted issues such as increased faculty workload, technical difficulties, reduced student participation, and challenges in implementing practical hospitality subjects through flexible learning modalities. The study also emphasized the need for continuous curriculum enhancement, technological readiness, and stronger institutional support to maintain instructional quality and industry relevance.

Table 9 presents the assessment of the suitability of the proposed inputs to the Quality Assurance System, which obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.21, verbally interpreted as Highly Suitable. Three indicators were rated Highly Suitable, with addressing the identified gaps in instructional leadership and faculty competence ranking first (4.42), followed by supporting innovation in hospitality curriculum delivery and instructional practices (4.33) and enhancing the overall quality, relevance, and effectiveness of the program (4.24). Two indicators were rated Suitable, namely meeting the requirements of CHED and recognized accrediting bodies (4.05) and aligning the proposed inputs with the institutional goals, vision, and standards of Hospitality Management programs (4.01). Among the respondent groups, Faculty Members gave the highest assessment, rating the proposed inputs as Highly Suitable (4.36), followed by Program Chairs/Coordinators (4.28). Meanwhile, Academic Evaluators/QA Officers (4.16) and Students (4.04) rated the proposed inputs as Suitable. This implies that the proposed inputs to the quality assurance system are generally considered highly suitable for addressing the needs and challenges of the Hospitality Management program. This further implies that the proposed measures can help strengthen instructional leadership, faculty competence, curriculum innovation, and overall program quality. The findings also suggest that the proposed inputs align with institutional goals and quality standards, thereby supporting continuous improvement and program effectiveness.

Table 9
Suitability of the Proposed Inputs to Quality Assurance System

Indicators	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Aligns the proposed inputs with the institutional goals, vision, and standards of Hospitality Management programs.	3.80	S	4.12	S	3.92	S	4.20	HS	4.01	S	5
Addresses the identified gaps in instructional leadership and faculty competence.	4.60	HS	4.53	HS	4.14	S	4.40	HS	4.42	HS	1
Supports innovation in hospitality curriculum delivery and instructional practices.	4.40	HS	4.37	HS	4.15	S	4.40	HS	4.33	HS	2
Enhances the overall quality, relevance, and effectiveness of the program.	4.40	HS	4.35	HS	4.01	S	4.20	HS	4.24	HS	3

Meets the requirements of CHED and recognized accrediting bodies.	4.20	HS	4.44	HS	3.96	S	3.60	S	4.05	S	4
Overall Weighted Mean	4.28	HS	4.36	HS	4.04	S	4.16	S	4.21	HS	

Legend: 4.20–5.00 (5) – Highly Suitable (HS); 3.40–4.19 (4) – Suitable (S); 2.60–3.39 (3) – Moderately Suitable (MS); 1.80–2.59 (2) – Least Suitable (LS); and 1.00–1.79 (1) – Not Suitable (NS).

This perspective is consistent with the ASEAN University Network-Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) Internal Quality Assurance Framework (2024), which emphasizes that an effective quality assurance system should be supported by integrated processes involving leadership and governance, human resource development, curriculum management, teaching and learning, assessment, stakeholder engagement, monitoring, and continuous quality improvement. The framework further highlights that quality assurance inputs must be relevant, evidence-based, and aligned with institutional objectives to ensure meaningful educational outcomes and sustainable quality enhancement. Through systematic monitoring, evaluation, and feedback mechanisms, institutions are better able to identify strengths, address areas for improvement, and foster a culture of continuous quality improvement. Consequently, the high suitability ratings of the proposed inputs indicate that the developed Quality Assurance System has the potential to serve as a responsive and effective framework for enhancing program quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement in Hospitality Management education.

Table 10
Acceptability of the Proposed Inputs to Quality Assurance System

Indicators	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Gains approval from administrators, program chairs, and academic leaders.	4.20	HA	4.44	HA	3.97	A	4.40	HA	4.25	HA	4
Receives positive acceptance from faculty members involved in implementation.	4.00	A	4.68	HA	3.96	A	4.80	HA	4.36	HA	3
Achieves support from students and external evaluators.	4.00	A	4.56	HA	3.93	A	4.40	HA	4.22	HA	5
Encourages active participation of stakeholders in the quality assurance process.	4.40	HA	4.65	HA	3.96	A	5.00	HA	4.50	HA	2
Reflects shared institutional values, priorities, and commitment to improvement.	5.00	HA	4.72	HA	4.01	A	5.00	HA	4.68	HA	1
Overall Weighted Mean	4.32	HA	4.61	HA	3.97	A	4.72	HA	4.40	HA	

Legend: 4.20–5.00 (5) – Highly Acceptable (HA); 3.40–4.19 (4) – Acceptable (A); 2.60–3.39 (3) – Moderately Acceptable (MA); 1.80–2.59 (2) – Least Acceptable (LA); and 1.00–1.79 (1) – Not Acceptable (NA).

As explained in Table 10, the assessment of the acceptability of the proposed inputs to quality assurance system rated as Highly Acceptable with an overall weighted mean of 4.40. All items rated as Highly Acceptable, these are: reflects shared institutional values, priorities, and commitment to improvement with a composite weighted mean of 4.68 as rank 1; encourages active participation of stakeholders in the quality assurance process with a composite weighted mean of 4.50 as rank 2; receives positive acceptance from faculty members involved in implementation with a composite weighted mean of 4.36 as rank 3; gains approval from administrators, program chairs, and academic leaders with a composite weighted mean of 4.25 as rank 4; and achieves support from students and external evaluators with a composite weighted mean of 4.22 as rank 5.

As to assessments of the groups of respondents on the acceptability of the proposed inputs to quality assurance system are as follows: academic evaluators / QA officers rated as Highly Acceptable with an overall weighted mean of 4.72, faculty members rated as Highly Acceptable with an overall weighted mean of 4.61, program chairs/coordinators rated as Highly Acceptable with an overall weighted mean of 4.32, and students rated as Acceptable with an overall weighted mean of 3.97. This implies that the Proposed Inputs to the Quality Assurance System are highly acceptable among program chairs/coordinators, faculty members, students, and academic evaluators/QA officers, reflecting stakeholder support, active participation, shared institutional values, and commitment to continuous quality improvement. This perspective is reinforced by Kayyali (2023), who

emphasized that quality assurance in higher education involves systematic processes and mechanisms that promote accountability, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement. The author further highlighted that effective quality assurance systems integrate curriculum development, faculty enhancement, assessment practices, and stakeholder engagement to ensure that academic programs remain relevant and aligned with quality standards. Moreover, quality assurance frameworks encourage evidence-based decision-making and collaborative participation among stakeholders, which are essential in fostering institutional commitment and support for quality initiatives. Consequently, the high acceptability ratings indicate that the proposed inputs are well aligned with stakeholder expectations and have the potential to contribute significantly to educational quality, program effectiveness, and continuous quality improvement in Hospitality Management education.

Table 11
Feasibility of the Proposed Inputs to Quality Assurance System

Indicators	Program Chairs / Coordinators		Faculty Members		Students		Academic Evaluators / QA Officers		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
Considers the availability of institutional resources and support systems.	4.60	HF	4.58	HF	4.00	F	4.80	HF	4.50	HF	2
Matches the proposed inputs with the competencies of faculty and staff.	3.60	F	4.60	HF	4.06	F	5.00	HF	4.32	HF	4
Aligns implementation plans with existing academic policies and timelines.	4.00	F	4.74	HF	3.89	F	4.60	HF	4.31	HF	5
Utilizes existing quality assurance mechanisms and organizational structures.	4.20	HF	4.70	HF	4.05	F	4.80	HF	4.44	HF	3
Demonstrates practicality and sustainability within institutional constraints.	4.80	HF	4.68	HF	3.99	F	4.60	HF	4.52	HF	1
Overall Weighted Mean	4.24	HF	4.66	HF	4.00	F	4.76	HF	4.41	HF	
<i>Legend: 4.20–5.00 (5) – Highly Feasible (HF); 3.40–4.19 (4) – Feasible (F); 2.60–3.39 (3) – Moderately Feasible (MF); 1.80–2.59 (2) – Least Feasible (LF); and 1.00–1.79 (1) – Not Feasible (NF).</i>											

As identified in Table 11, the assessment of the feasibility of the proposed inputs to the quality assurance system was rated as Highly Feasible with an overall weighted mean of 4.41. All items rated as Highly Feasible, namely: demonstrates practicality and sustainability within institutional constraints with a composite weighted mean of 4.52 as rank 1; considers the availability of institutional resources and support systems with a composite weighted mean of 4.50 as rank 2; utilizes existing quality assurance mechanisms and organizational structures with a composite weighted mean of 4.44 as rank 3; matches the proposed inputs with the competencies of faculty and staff with a composite weighted mean of 4.32 as rank 4; and aligns implementation plans with existing academic policies and timelines with a composite weighted mean of 4.31 as rank 5.

As to assessments of the groups of respondents on the feasibility of the proposed inputs to quality assurance system are as follows: academic evaluators / QA officers rated as Highly Feasible with an overall weighted mean of 4.76, faculty members rated as Highly Feasible with an overall weighted mean of 4.66, program chairs/coordinators rated as Highly Feasible with an overall weighted mean of 4.24, and students rated as Feasible with an overall weighted mean of 4.00. This implies that the Proposed Inputs to the Quality Assurance System are highly feasible in terms of resource availability, faculty and staff competencies, alignment with academic policies, utilization of existing quality assurance mechanisms, and sustainability within institutional constraints.

This view is affirmed by Yeboah (2024), who emphasized that quality assurance serves as a mechanism for continuous improvement, adaptation, and innovation in higher education institutions. The author explained that effective quality assurance initiatives require aligning institutional policies, resources, curriculum, faculty competence, and operational processes to ensure successful implementation and long-term sustainability. Furthermore, quality assurance measures are considered feasible when they support evidence-based decision-making, address stakeholder needs, and contribute to continuous quality enhancement. Consequently, the high

feasibility ratings suggest that the proposed inputs possess the practical, institutional, and operational requirements necessary to support the successful implementation and sustainability of the Quality Assurance System in Hospitality Management education.

PROPOSED INPUTS TO QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

A proposed Input to the Quality Assurance System was designed and developed to establish a sustainable and comprehensive Quality Assurance System that promotes continuous improvement, academic excellence, effective program implementation, and stakeholder satisfaction in the Hospitality Management Program.

I. Introduction

The proposed Inputs to Quality Assurance System was developed to support the continuous improvement of the Hospitality Management program by addressing the challenges identified in instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation. It serves as a guide in strengthening institutional practices, enhancing instructional effectiveness, and ensuring that academic programs remain responsive to industry standards and educational demands. This proposed system emphasizes the importance of collaboration, professional growth, effective resource management, and continuous monitoring in achieving quality education. Through strategic action plans and targeted interventions, the institution aims to promote a culture of excellence, accountability, and innovation that will contribute to the overall development of both faculty members and students in the Hospitality Management program.

II. Rationale

In the rapidly changing landscape of higher education, maintaining quality in academic programs has become more important than ever. For the Hospitality Management Program, providing quality education goes beyond classroom instruction—it also requires effective leadership, competent faculty, a relevant curriculum, efficient student support services, and strong industry partnerships. As the hospitality industry continues to evolve, institutions must ensure that their programs remain responsive to the needs of students, stakeholders, and the industry itself. The implementation of a proposed Quality Assurance System is essential in promoting continuous improvement and sustaining academic excellence within the program. While the institution consistently strives to deliver quality instruction and services, there are still areas that require enhancement, particularly in instructional supervision, faculty development, assessment practices, technological integration, research engagement, and curriculum innovation. Addressing these concerns through a structured, organized quality assurance system will help ensure consistency, accountability, and effectiveness across all academic and administrative processes.

The Quality Assurance System serves as a guiding framework in monitoring program performance and ensuring compliance with institutional standards, CHED policies, and accreditation requirements. It encourages collaboration among administrators, faculty members, students, industry partners, and other stakeholders in achieving shared educational goals. Through regular evaluation, monitoring, feedback, and evidence-based planning, the institution can identify strengths, address gaps, and implement necessary improvements that will contribute to better learning outcomes and institutional development. This proposed Quality Assurance System aims to cultivate a culture of excellence, innovation, professionalism, and continuous improvement in the Hospitality Management Program. It seeks to strengthen the institution's commitment to producing competent, globally competitive, and industry-ready graduates while ensuring that academic practices remain relevant, effective, and aligned with the institution's vision and mission.

III. General Objectives

To establish a sustainable and comprehensive Quality Assurance System that promotes continuous improvement, academic excellence, effective program implementation, and stakeholder satisfaction in the Hospitality Management Program.

IV. Specific Objectives

- To improve the quality of instruction, academic supervision, and curriculum implementation within the Hospitality Management Program.
- To strengthen the implementation of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) through aligned learning outcomes, instructional strategies, and assessment practices.
- To enhance faculty competence through professional development programs, industry exposure, research engagement, and mentoring initiatives.
- To improve assessment, monitoring, evaluation, and feedback mechanisms for effective decision-making and program improvement.
- To promote research, innovation, and extension activities that contribute to academic and professional growth.
- To integrate technology and innovative teaching approaches that support effective and flexible learning experiences.
- To ensure the efficient management, utilization, and maintenance of instructional resources, facilities, and learning materials.
- To encourage collaboration, shared governance, and active stakeholder participation in academic planning and program development.
- To ensure alignment of academic practices and institutional initiatives with the vision, mission, core values, CHED policies, and accreditation standards.
- To strengthen student support services, experiential learning opportunities, and career development programs that will help produce competent and industry-ready graduates.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:. Instructional leadership and faculty competence are manifested in the Hospitality Management Program in selected Higher Education Institutions in Bulacan. The program chairs/coordinators, faculty members, students, and academic evaluators/QA officers have similar assessments regarding instructional leadership and faculty competence in the Hospitality Management Program. Curriculum innovation is observed in the Hospitality Management Program through the integration of outcomes-based education, industry relevance, digital and hybrid learning models, sustainability concepts, research-based curriculum enhancement, and continuous improvement practices. There is a very strong association between instructional leadership and curriculum innovation, as well as between faculty competence and curriculum innovation in the Hospitality Management Program in selected Higher Education Institutions in Bulacan. The challenges relative to instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation are generally experienced by the respondents. The Quality Assurance System was systematically developed based on the identified findings and needs of the institution. The inclusion of key result areas, objectives, strategies, activities, responsible individuals, funding sources, time frames, and performance indicators ensures a comprehensive, structured framework for implementing quality assurance. Thus, the proposed Quality Assurance System provides a practical and responsive guide for continuous improvement, effective monitoring, and the achievement of institutional goals and standards. The proposed inputs to the quality assurance system are viewed by the respondents as appropriate, responsive, and applicable within the Hospitality Management Program.

Based on the findings and conclusions presented, the following recommendations are strongly suggested: Higher Education Institutions offering Hospitality Management programs may continuously strengthen

instructional leadership practices through effective communication systems, collaborative governance, and strategic academic planning. Institutions are encouraged to provide continuous faculty development programs focusing on pedagogical enhancement, research capability, technological integration, industry immersion, and professional certification. Hospitality Management programs are highly recommended to continuously review and improve curriculum innovation practices by strengthening Outcomes-Based Education alignment, sustainability integration, digital and hybrid learning models, entrepreneurial competencies, and curriculum benchmarking activities. Administrators and academic leaders are strongly encouraged to invest in leadership capability-building programs, faculty empowerment initiatives, and collaborative academic practices to further strengthen curriculum development and instructional effectiveness within Hospitality Management programs. Institutions are highly recommended to establish sustainable support systems to address the challenges encountered in instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation. The institution may consider adopting and implementing the proposed Quality Assurance System to strengthen quality management practices and support continuous improvement initiatives. The proposed quality assurance inputs may be adopted and pilot-tested by Higher Education Institutions offering Hospitality Management programs. Continuous evaluation, monitoring, and improvement of the proposed quality assurance measures are highly recommended to further support the sustainability, acceptability, feasibility, and effectiveness of efforts to improve program outcomes and institutional performance. Future researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies in other academic disciplines, institutions, or geographical locations to further validate the findings of the study. Additional variables such as student employability, industry satisfaction, institutional culture, digital transformation, and learning outcomes may also be explored since these factors are closely associated with educational quality, curriculum effectiveness, institutional performance, and the overall responsiveness of Hospitality Management programs to industry and academic demands.

In addition to the general recommendations of the study, the following stakeholder-specific recommendations are proposed: For Program Chairs/Coordinators. Program chairs and coordinators may strengthen instructional leadership practices by enhancing academic planning, faculty supervision, performance monitoring, and collaborative governance mechanisms. They are also encouraged to sustain quality-assurance initiatives and to continuously align program objectives with institutional goals and industry standards. For Faculty Members. Faculty members are encouraged to continuously improve their pedagogical competencies, research productivity, technological integration skills, industry engagement, and mentorship practices through active participation in professional development activities, research programs, and industry immersion opportunities. For Students. Students may actively participate in curriculum evaluation, feedback mechanisms, and experiential learning activities to support continuous curriculum improvement. Their involvement in quality assurance initiatives may provide valuable insights for enhancing teaching effectiveness and learning experiences. For Academic Evaluators and Quality Assurance Officers. Academic evaluators and quality assurance officers are encouraged to continue providing objective assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of program implementation and quality assurance practices. They may also recommend evidence-based improvements to strengthen instructional leadership, faculty competence, and curriculum innovation. These recommendations are intended to promote collaborative participation among key stakeholders in sustaining educational quality, program effectiveness, and continuous improvement within Hospitality Management programs.

5. References

- Allen, S., Bardach, L., Jirout, J., Mackey, A., McCoy, D., Pesando, L. M., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2024). *Implementing New Technology in Educational Systems*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.12039>
- Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2012). Analyzing Likert data. *Journal of Extension*, 50(2). <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.50.02.48>
- Bush, T. (2021). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). *Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples*. *Journal of Research in Nursing*,

- 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cruz, M. A. D., Serna, J. D., Feliciano, L. D., David, M. H. M., Punsalan, M. F. B. L., Lacsá, G. B. L., Castro, M. C., & Miranda, J. P. (2026). *Barriers and enablers of online instruction in hospitality education in the Philippines: An exploratory study*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COSITE68330.2025.11414335>
- Kayyali, M. (2023). *An overview of quality assurance in higher education: Concepts and frameworks*. International Journal of Management, Sciences, Innovation, and Technology (IJMSIT), 4(2), 1–4. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED629115&utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Lohr, S. L. (2022). *Sampling: Design and analysis* (3rd ed.). Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Miranda, J. P., & Cruz, M. A. D. (2023). *Tourism and hospitality management faculty satisfaction towards flexible learning: A cross-sectional survey from higher educational institutions in Central Luzon, Philippines*. Tuning Journal for Higher Education, 10(2), 127–159. <https://doi.org/10.18543/tjhe.2319>
- Prestoza, M. J. R., & Naldoza, N. D. (2025). *Challenges and practices of instructional leadership: A qualitative inquiry of principals' and teachers' perspectives*. The Normal Lights, 19(1). Philippine Normal University. Available at: <https://po.pnuresearchportal.org/ejournal/index.php/normalights/article/download/3112/664>
- Schober, P., Boer, C., & Schwarte, L. A. (2018). Correlation coefficients: Appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia Essays and Researches*, 12(1), 176–181. https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_378_17
- Stensaker, B., et al. (2022). Quality assurance in higher education: Trends and challenges. *Higher Education Policy*, 35(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-021-00244-7>
- Tanveer, M., Sittar, K., & Munawar, S. (2025). *Effect of instructional leadership practices on teachers' performance at the university level*. Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences, 6(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390315354_Effect_of_Instructional_Leadership_Practices_on_Teachers%27_Performance_at_the_University_Level?utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Villaluna, M. P., Jr. (2024). *Professional industry experiences and competencies of hospitality and tourism educators: Basis for a proposed work immersion program*. Journal of Sustainable Tourism and Entrepreneurship, 13(1), 72–87. <https://doi.org/10.51200/bejstd.v13i1.5926>
- Yeboah, S. A. (2024). *Quality assurance in developing nations*. Munich Personal RePEc Archive. <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/122486/>

