International Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 14 (6) (2025) 482-491

International Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences

Website: www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/IJBAS
https://doi.org/10.14419/3dz0ze90
Research paper

Satisfaction of MDRM Alumni with The Program's Curriculum, College Advisement, Facilities, and Overall Educational Experience

Dr. Nickie Boy A. Manalo *

Batangas State University, The National Engineering University, Philippines
**Corresponding author E-mail: nickieboy.manalo@g.batstate-u.edu.ph*

Received: June 30, 2025, Accepted: August 5, 2025, Published: October 22, 2025

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to determine the level of satisfaction among MDRM students with the program's subject matter. It focused on the curriculum, academic advisement and support, and the respondents' overall educational experience. A total of 24 program alumni participated in the survey, providing both quantitative and qualitative feedback. The results revealed that most respondents were male, aged between 30 and 39, currently residing outside Batangas Province, and working in the field of DRRM. Additionally, the majority expressed satisfaction with the program's curriculum, the college's advisement and support, and reported a high level of satisfaction with their overall educational experience. Most of the identified strengths were related to the expertise and depth of knowledge of the DRRM faculty, as well as the relevance of the courses included in the curriculum. However, the most notable weakness was the lack of coordination and communication between the college and other units regarding admissions and program information. It was also found that most respondents would recommend the program to others and are open to receiving updates from the ACTION Center/DREAM Academy and CABEIHM. Based on these findings, a set of recommendations is proposed to maintain the quality of education and improve areas related to the delivery and management of the program.

Keywords: *MDRM Students; Curriculum; Educational Experience; Strengths and Weaknesses.*

1. Introduction

The Disaster Resilience Education and Advocacy Movement (DREAM) Academy of Batangas State University, in collaboration with the College of Accountancy, Business, Economics, and International Hospitality Management (CABEIHM), conducted a comprehensive survey among graduates of the Master's in Disaster Risk Management (MDRM) program. This study aimed to evaluate alumni satisfaction in terms of curriculum content, instructional methods, academic advising, and the quality of facilities and services. The study also sought to gather recommendations for the continuous improvement of the program's delivery and alignment with evolving demands in disaster risk governance.

Evaluating graduate-level academic programs through the lens of alumni feedback is a widely acknowledged global practice. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), alumni perceptions provide valuable insights into the relevance, applicability, and effectiveness of higher education in addressing real-world challenges (OECD, 2021). In the context of disaster risk management, academic institutions must produce graduates who are not only theoretically competent but also practically prepared to lead and respond effectively to increasingly complex disasters and climate-related risks.

Globally, universities and educational networks are shifting toward more competency-based DRM education models, integrating interdisciplinary approaches and experiential learning. For instance, the International Consortium on Landslides (ICL) and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) emphasize the need for DRM programs to adapt to global frameworks such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, which prioritizes education and knowledge as pillars of disaster resilience (UNDRR, 2015; UNESCO-ICL, 2019).

Furthermore, countries such as Japan, New Zealand, and the United States have established institutionalized program review systems that actively involve alumni and employers in evaluating curriculum effectiveness. For example, the University of Tokyo's Inter-Graduate School Program for Disaster Management involves annual alumni-tracer studies to evaluate how their graduates are contributing to national and international disaster resilience systems (University of Tokyo, 2020). Similarly, New Zealand's National Disaster Resilience Strategy mandates integration of feedback mechanisms from practitioners and former students in shaping postgraduate DRM programs (New Zealand Ministry of Civil Defense & Emergency Management, 2019).

While existing evaluations suggest that the MDRM program offers a solid foundation in curriculum relevance, instructional quality, and administrative support, significant gaps remain in areas critical to academic effectiveness and long-term impact. For instance, library and

research resource limitations—including a lack of specialized DRRM journals and limited access to international e-databases—continue to hinder the research capacities of graduate students. Moreover, communication lapses in administrative workflows, particularly those related to the registrar and student advisement processes, have been frequently cited by alumni as barriers to efficient academic progress.
Compared to established global DRRM programs, such as the University of Tokyo's Inter-Graduate School Program for Disaster Management and New Zealand's practice-integrated postgraduate frameworks, the MDRM program has yet to institutionalize structured alumni impact studies, global benchmarking, and robust field-based components. These omissions create a disconnect between the program's potential and the standards set by international DRRM education models that emphasize cross-sectoral collaboration, longitudinal feedback loops, and real-world engagement.
At the same time, the MDRM program shows unique strengths, such as its early adaptation to blended learning during the COVID-19 pandemic and its graduates' direct involvement in high-impact events like the Taal Volcano eruption response. These reflect a degree of institutional agility and relevance to local disaster governance. However, such achievements highlight the need for deeper documentation, sustained alumni tracking, and expanded networks with global DRRM institutions, such as the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR).
Therefore, this study explores how alumni perceive the MDRM program in terms of academic quality, instructional delivery, administrative support, and research infrastructure. It also aims to identify specific areas for improvement, propose innovative solutions—such as AI-driven advising systems and digital resource expansion—and benchmark the program against leading international models. In doing so, the study contributes to ongoing efforts to elevate the MDRM program as a resilient, inclusive, and globally competitive graduate offering.

2. Research Method

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design complemented by qualitative elements, consistent with a mixed-methods approach. The aim was to obtain comprehensive insights into the satisfaction levels of alumni from the Master's in Disaster Risk Management (MDRM) program. This design allowed the researchers to quantify observable trends and patterns while also capturing deeper perceptions through open-ended responses (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The target population consisted of 68 MDRM graduates from Batangas State University between 2019 and 2021. A non-probability convenience sampling method was utilized, where participation depended on alumni availability and willingness to respond to the online questionnaire. Although this sampling method does not allow for strict randomization, it is appropriate for alumni tracer studies, particularly when the population is geographically dispersed and when complete access to the sampling frame is limited (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). The voluntary participation of respondents introduced a degree of randomness, as those who took part did so independently and without coercion. Out of the 68 potential participants, 24 alumni completed the survey, resulting in a 35.29% response rate. While modest, this rate is typical of alumni surveys and is sufficient for deriving preliminary insights (Fowler, 2014). The main data-gathering tool was a structured questionnaire developed by the researchers and validated through expert review. It included both closed-ended questions to measure satisfaction levels across various dimensions—such as curriculum, faculty support, and facilities—and open-ended questions to collect qualitative feedback. The survey was administered via Google Forms due to its accessibility, ease of use, and ability to reach alumni regardless of their location. The questionnaire was distributed in May 2021 and remained open until the end of July 2021, providing respondents with ample time to participate despite varying professional schedules. Upon completion of data collection, responses underwent a data cleaning process to ensure accuracy and consistency. Entries with missing or incomplete answers in key sections were excluded from the final dataset to maintain the reliability and validity of the findings, as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013).
Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistical tools, including frequency counts, percentages, and mean calculations, to summarize respondent demographics and satisfaction levels. The use of descriptive statistics is standard in tracer studies and facilitates the clear interpretation of alumni feedback trends (Bryman, 2016). Meanwhile, qualitative responses from the open-ended questions were examined through thematic analysis, which involved coding and categorizing answers to identify recurring themes and narratives. The integration of both quantitative and qualitative data is a defining feature of mixed-methods research, providing a more comprehensive understanding of alumni satisfaction and enriching the interpretation of the study's results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

3. Results and Discussions

Table 1: Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Sex

Sex	Frequency
Male	20
Female	4
Total	24

According to the table and figure presented above, the majority of the respondents are male. Specifically, 20 out of 24 respondents, or approximately 83%, identified as male, while only 4 respondents, or 17%, identified as female. This notable gender disparity suggests that male graduates dominate the composition of the MDRM program alumni from 2019 to 2021. The imbalance in gender distribution may reflect broader patterns observed in the disaster risk management (DRM) sector, where men are often more represented in technical, operational, and leadership positions. In many countries, DRM-related fields—such as emergency response, environmental risk assessment, and infrastructure planning—have historically been male-dominated due to prevailing social norms, occupational expectations, and gender role stereotypes (UNDRR & UN Women, 2020). Understanding this demographic breakdown is crucial, not only in analyzing the program's inclusivity and reach but also in guiding future strategies for promoting gender balance in student enrollment. Encouraging more women to enroll in DRM-related academic programs can help advance gender-responsive policies and strengthen inclusive resilience planning across communities.

Table 2: Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Age

Age Groupings	Frequency
Younger than 20	2
30-39	16
40-49	3
50-59	2
60-69	1
Total	24

The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by age are presented in Table and Figure 2. Based on the data, the majority of respondents fall within the 30 to 39 age group, comprising 67% of the total participants (16 out of 24 respondents). This suggests that most MDRM graduates are mid-career professionals, likely occupying active roles in disaster risk management or related fields.
The second most represented group includes respondents aged 40 to 49, accounting for 13% (3 out of 24 respondents). Meanwhile, two respondents each (or 8% in total) were recorded in the 50–59 and below 20 age categories, each representing 5% of the total sample. Lastly, only one respondent, or approximately 4%, belonged to the 60–69 age group.
This age distribution reflects a diverse range of career stages among MDRM alumni, but with a noticeable concentration in the 30–39 age bracket. This trend may indicate that the program appeals most to early to mid-career professionals who seek to enhance their expertise in disaster resilience and risk management, which aligns with global patterns in postgraduate disaster education (Aitsi-Selmi et al., 2016). The presence of older respondents also highlights the program's accessibility to individuals with extensive professional experience, which may enrich peer learning and interdisciplinary collaboration within the cohort.

Table 3: Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Current Residence

Current Residency	Frequency
Within Batangas Province	8
Outside Batangas Province	16
Total	24

The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by current place of residence are presented in Table and Figure 3. As shown, 16 out of the 24 respondents, or 67%, currently reside outside the province of Batangas, while the remaining 8 respondents, equivalent to 33%, are residents of Batangas Province. This finding suggests that a significant portion of MDRM program graduates have either pursued career opportunities outside the province or were already based in other regions during their enrollment. The geographic dispersion of alumni underscores the broad reach and flexibility of the program, indicating that it caters not only to local professionals but also to those from various parts of the country—or potentially abroad—who are engaged in disaster risk management roles. This aligns with current trends in graduate education, where remote learning tools and modular delivery formats are making advanced programs more accessible across regions (UNESCO, 2020). Furthermore, the high percentage of graduates living outside Batangas may imply the potential of the program to create a network of disaster professionals who can apply their knowledge in different geographic and risk contexts. It also highlights the importance of continuous engagement and communication strategies for alumni, especially those located beyond the university's immediate community.

Table 4: Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Being A DRRM Practitioner

Response	Frequency
Yes	15
No	9
Total	24

The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of their current professional engagement in Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) is presented in Table and Figure 4. The data reveal that 15 out of 24 respondents, representing 62%, are presently employed as DRRM practitioners. These individuals are likely engaged in roles directly related to disaster preparedness, emergency response, climate adaptation, or community resilience building, whether at the local, national, or organizational level. Meanwhile, the remaining 9 respondents, or 38%, indicated that they are not currently serving as DRRM practitioners, but are employed in private companies or government agencies. Although these roles may not fall under the formal classification of DRRM, it is possible that the knowledge and skills acquired from the MDRM program still contribute to their work, especially in areas where disaster risk and resilience are cross-cutting concerns—such as infrastructure, health, planning, and environmental compliance. This distribution suggests that while the majority of MDRM graduates are utilizing their training in direct DRRM roles, a significant portion are applying their competencies in other sectors. This reflects the interdisciplinary nature of disaster risk management, which allows professionals to contribute to resilience efforts beyond traditional emergency response roles (Aitsi-Selmi et al., 2015). It also indicates the program's potential for producing graduates who are versatile and capable of addressing risk in both direct and indirect ways across different sectors.

Table 5: Level of Satisfaction Towards the Curriculum of the Program

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Core required courses	4.46	Satisfied
Number and choice of elective courses	4.06	Satisfied
Overall design of the curriculum for my program	4.38	Satisfied
Class size of core courses	4.38	Satisfied
Class size of elective courses	4.50	Very Satisfied
Scheduling of classes (e.g., days & times, frequency, etc.)	4.50	Very Satisfied
Mix of face-to-face and online courses	4.46	Satisfied
Quality of instruction	4.46	Satisfied
Composite Mean	4.43	Satisfied

Table 5 shows the respondents' satisfaction with the program's content/Curriculum of the program. The table displays an average of 4.43 responses/compound mean of 4.43, which can be verbally interpreted as satisfied. This signifies that the program's curriculum fulfills its goal of providing students with learning based on current and situational DRRM operations. It could also mean that the curriculum satisfies them by delivering more insights comparable to their expertise as a DRRM practitioner. Specifically, the items, "class size of elective courses" and "scheduling of classes (e.g., days & times, frequency, etc.)" generate the highest response rates of 4.50, respectively, which can be both interpreted as satisfied. This was followed by the items, "mix of face-to-face and online courses" and "quality instructions." Further, the items, overall design of the curriculum for the program, and "class size of core courses" generate 4.38 average responses. Other items indicate respondents' satisfaction, implying a positive brand image for the program, particularly the curriculum, which emphasizes foundation, core, elective, and elective courses that professionalize their experience as DRRM practitioners and provide a strong foundation for students planning to work in the field of DRRM or related functions.

Table 6: Level of Satisfaction Towards the Advisement and Support of the College

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Advice and information received prior to admission	4.29	Satisfied
Advice and direction on course selection	4.21	Satisfied
College and program administration (Dean, Assistant Dean, Program Director, Office Staff)	4.42	Satisfied
Career advisement	4.15	Satisfied
Placement information and services provided by the program	4.25	Satisfied
Opportunity to participate in program governance	4.15	Satisfied
Opportunity to participate in student organizations	4.75	Very Satisfied
Opportunity to participate in activities that have introduced me to the "culture" of the information professions	4.10	Satisfied
Composite Mean	4.29	Satisfied

Table 6 presents the respondents' level of satisfaction with the advisement and support services provided by the college. The overall results yielded a composite mean of 4.29, which is verbally interpreted as "satisfied." This indicates that, in general, the MDRM alumni expressed positive feedback regarding the guidance and assistance extended to them during their academic journey. Among the indicators, the opportunity to participate in student organizations received the highest mean score of 4.75, interpreted as "very satisfied." This suggests that students greatly appreciated the chance to engage in co-curricular activities organized by the graduate school, whether conducted on campus or through online platforms. Such involvement is vital for fostering student engagement, leadership skills, and a sense of academic community—especially in graduate-level programs (Terenzini et al., 1996). The next highest rating was given to college and program administration, which includes the Dean, Assistant Dean, Program Director, and office staff. This aspect received a mean score of 4.42, indicating a general level of satisfaction among respondents. This result may be attributed to the administrators' commitment to delivering quality service and academic support. The effective collaboration between the DREAM Academy and the College of Accountancy, Business, Economics, and International Hospitality Management (CABEIHM) likely contributed to the smooth delivery of services and the maintenance of academic standards. In addition, placement services and career-related information provided by the program received a mean rating of 4.25, also interpreted as "satisfied." This implies that the college and its associated centers were able to provide timely and relevant responses to student inquiries, particularly through online communication platforms—an important factor in ensuring continued support, especially during and after the transition to remote or hybrid learning formats. Other indicators within the advisement and support category also showed favorable responses, reinforcing the perception that the MDRM program is well-regarded by its alumni. The consistently positive ratings suggest that the program maintains a strong institutional brand, grounded in its ability to deliver responsive, student-centered guidance and support services.

Table 7: Level of Satisfaction Towards the Available Facilities

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
The classrooms and general space for instruction	4.41	Satisfied
The electronic classrooms	4.54	Very Satisfied
Computer laboratory and equipment	4.08	Satisfied
Blackboard and other online learning resources/support	3.95	Satisfied
Student lounge	4.08	Satisfied
Accessibility of physical facilities	3.95	Satisfied
Library resources and support for coursework and research	3.67	Satisfied
Composite Mean	4.10	Satisfied

Table 7 presents the respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the available facilities of the MDRM program. The data show a composite mean of 4.10, which is verbally interpreted as "satisfied." This rating reflects the general satisfaction of alumni who experienced the program through varying modes of delivery, including fully physical classroom settings and a blended or "brick-and-click" learning environment, where face-to-face instruction was supplemented with digital tools. Among the various facility-related items, electronic classrooms received the highest average satisfaction rating. These facilities continue to be utilized by the program and have proven essential for delivering course content and fostering interaction between faculty and students. Even during the pre-pandemic years (2017 to 2019), MDRM instructors were already incorporating email communication, learning management systems, and other digital platforms to support instruction. This forward-looking approach positioned the program well for the shift to hybrid or remote modalities during the COVID-19 pandemic. This finding aligns with global trends in higher education, where the integration of technology-enhanced learning environments has become increasingly important. Institutions worldwide are now expected to offer flexible and adaptive learning spaces that support digital fluency and academic continuity (UNESCO, 2020). Blended learning models have also been recognized as effective in disaster resilience education, where both theoretical knowledge and practical skills must be delivered in accessible and engaging formats (UNDRR, 2022). However, while most facility-related items received favorable evaluations, a notable area of concern is the library resources, which received the lowest mean score of 3.67, albeit still within the "satisfied" range. This lower rating warrants deeper examination, especially considering the academic demands of a graduate-level DRRM program. Respondents may have encountered limitations such as a lack of updated and specialized DRRM-related journals, limited access to international e-databases, and insufficient support for research-intensive activities like thesis writing or policy analysis. These deficiencies can hinder students' ability to access credible, up-to-date information—particularly critical in a field where evidence-based decision-making and emerging risk frameworks are foundational.

To address these gaps, targeted improvements are recommended. The university library should consider subscribing to specialized digital platforms, such as Scopus, ScienceDirect, JSTOR, and ProQuest, with an emphasis on disaster science, emergency management, public policy, and sustainability. Additionally, institutional access to open-access repositories like ReliefWeb, UNDRR's PreventionWeb, and The International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction could provide students with timely and relevant global perspectives. On-campus efforts could also be strengthened by assigning dedicated research librarians, conducting graduate-level library orientation workshops, and integrating research mentorship support into capstone and thesis advising.

Improving library services is not merely a matter of convenience but a core element of academic quality assurance. In graduate programs—particularly in applied fields like DRRM—enhanced access to scholarly literature, case studies, and technical reports equips students to engage critically with theory, apply best practices, and contribute meaningfully to disaster risk governance. Failing to resolve library resource gaps may undermine student research capabilities and the overall academic integrity of the program.

Table 8: Level of Satisfaction Towards the Overall Quality of Educational Experience

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Overall Quality of Educational Experience	4.54	Very Satisfied

As shown in Table 8, the respondents rated the overall quality of their educational experience with a composite mean of 4.54, which is verbally interpreted as "very satisfied." This high level of satisfaction suggests that the MDRM program of Batangas State University delivers an exceptional learning experience, effectively meeting the academic and professional expectations of its students.

The result reflects the program's ability to maintain high-quality instruction and student engagement across varied learning environments, whether through traditional face-to-face classes or online and blended modalities. This finding is especially noteworthy given the transition many institutions had to make during the COVID-19 pandemic, where maintaining academic continuity and student satisfaction became a global challenge. The program's seamless adaptation to online platforms while preserving instructional quality highlights its institutional resilience and preparedness.

This aligns with global standards on quality assurance in higher education, which emphasize student-centered learning, adaptability, and strong academic support as key indicators of a successful graduate program (OECD, 2021; UNESCO, 2020). Programs that can sustain quality across delivery modes—whether physical or digital—are increasingly valued in a post-pandemic academic landscape where flexibility, relevance, and support are essential to a positive educational experience.

Table 9: Significant Differences in the Assessment of the Satisfaction with the Curriculum of the Program when Respondents are Grouped According to Profile

Profile of the Respondents	Sum of the Squares	F value	P-Value	Decision on Ho
Sex	3.361	.847	.368	Failed to reject
Age	1.323	1.038	.413	Failed to reject
Place of Origin	1.654	.843	.368	Failed to reject
DRRM Status	1.569	.518	.479	Failed to reject

The results revealed that none of these variables exhibited significant differences in the satisfaction ratings. Specifically, the variable sex yielded a sum of squares of 3.361, an F-value of 0.847, and a p-value of 0.368; age produced a sum of squares of 1.323, F-value of 1.038, and p-value of 0.413; place of origin recorded a sum of squares of 1.654, F-value of 0.843, and p-value of 0.368; and DRRM status had a sum of squares of 1.569, F-value of 0.518, and p-value of 0.479. In all cases, the p-values exceeded the 0.05 significance threshold, leading to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis. This means that the differences observed in the satisfaction levels across these groups are not statistically significant. However, it is important to consider the context of the response rate and sample size when interpreting these results. With only 24 respondents, representing a 35.29% response rate, the statistical power of the ANOVA tests is likely limited. A small sample size reduces the ability of statistical tests to detect actual differences between groups (if they exist), increasing the risk of Type II errors—failing to detect a significant effect that is present. Therefore, while the current analysis indicates no statistically significant differences in satisfaction ratings across the groups based on sex, age, place of origin, and DRRM status, these findings must be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size (n = 24). The limited number of respondents reduces the statistical power of the ANOVA tests, making it less likely to detect true differences between groups if they exist. For instance, the relatively high p-values observed may not necessarily indicate the absence of group differences, but rather reflect insufficient data to confirm them with confidence. This constraint affects the robustness and generalizability of the conclusions drawn. Within these constraints, the data indicate a generally positive and consistent perception of the curriculum across diverse demographic and professional backgrounds. This tentative consistency reinforces the intention of institutions like Batangas State University to provide equitable and inclusive graduate education, aligning with the broader goals of quality assurance and student-centered learning promoted by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) in the Philippines. However, to substantiate these interpretations more confidently and ensure they reflect the broader student population, further studies with larger and more representative samples are necessary. Globally, the uniformity in satisfaction aligns with international benchmarks for academic inclusivity and curricular responsiveness. Organizations like UNESCO (2017) and the OECD (2020) advocate for educational programs that ensure equitable learning outcomes and inclusive participation. These results highlight the program's ability to meet diverse learner needs and reinforce the value of accessible, well-structured curricula that empower future leaders and practitioners in the global DRRM landscape.

Table 10: Significant Differences on the Assessment Towards the Satisfaction with the Advisement and Support of the College when Respondents are Grouped According to Profile

Profile of the Respondents	Sum of the Squares	F value	P-Value	Decision on Ho
Sex	1.01	.594	.456	Failed to reject
Age	1.246	.482	.749	Failed to reject
Place of Origin	1.240	.342	.565	Failed to reject
DRRM Status	1.272	.282	.601	Failed to reject

The results presented in Table 10 illustrate the outcome of a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) that examined whether there were significant differences in respondents' satisfaction with the advisement and support provided by the college, based on their demographic and professional profiles. The variables considered include sex, age, place of origin, and DRRM practitioner status. While the analysis revealed no statistically significant differences across these groups, it is important to note that these findings are based on a relatively small sample size (n = 24). The limited number of respondents reduces the statistical power of the test, increasing the likelihood of Type II errors and limiting the ability to detect true differences if they exist.

For the variable sex, the analysis yielded a sum of squares of 1.01, an F-value of 0.594, and a p-value of 0.456. For age, the sum of squares was 1.246, the F-value was 0.482, and the p-value stood at 0.749. The variable place of origin recorded a sum of squares of 1.240, an F-value of 0.342, and a p-value of 0.565. Lastly, DRRM status resulted in a sum of squares of 1.272, an F-value of 0.282, and a p-value of 0.601. In each case, the p-value was greater than the 0.05 significance level, leading to a consistent decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis.

This suggests that, within the limitations of the current sample, the academic and administrative support mechanisms of the MDRM program are perceived as equitable and consistently accessible to students from various demographic and professional backgrounds. In particular, the lack of significant differences in satisfaction levels across sex, age, geographic origin, and DRRM practitioner status implies that the program's advisement and support services are being delivered in a manner that does not favor any specific group. This perception

of fairness is a critical indicator of inclusive academic governance and reflects the program's commitment to upholding the principles of equal opportunity in higher education.

From a local perspective, this outcome demonstrates the commitment of institutions like Batangas State University to uphold inclusivity and fairness in student services, which is in alignment with the Philippine Commission on Higher Education's emphasis on equal educational opportunity and quality assurance. On a global scale, the results mirror the expectations set by international educational standards such as those outlined by UNESCO and the World Bank, which advocate for student-centered support systems that cater to the diverse needs of learners in a manner that is fair, responsive, and non-discriminatory. The findings affirm the college's ability to provide consistent advisement and administrative support regardless of individual background, thus fostering a positive and inclusive academic environment.

Table 11: Significant Differences in the Assessment of the Satisfaction with Available Facilities when Respondents are Grouped According to Profile

Profile of the Respondents	Sum of the Squares	F value	P-Value	Decision on Ho
Sex	1.702	.425	.521	Failed to reject
Age	1.902	.212	.929	Failed to reject
Place of Origin	1.769	1.44	.708	Failed to reject
DRRM Status	1.425	.263	.613	Failed to reject

The results presented in Table 11 summarize the statistical outcomes of a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) performed to determine whether significant differences exist in respondents' satisfaction with the facilities of the MDRM program when grouped by sex, age, place of origin, and DRRM practitioner status. For sex, the sum of squares was 1.702, with an F-value of 0.425 and a p-value of 0.521. For age, the sum of squares was 1.902, F-value 0.212, and p-value 0.929. The variable place of origin yielded a sum of squares of 1.769, an F-value of 1.44, and a p-value of 0.708. Finally, for DRRM status, the sum of squares was 1.425, with an F-value of 0.263 and a p-value of 0.613. In each case, the p-values were above the 0.05 threshold, resulting in a consistent decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis—indicating that no statistically significant differences in satisfaction were found across these demographic and professional groups.

While these results suggest a perception of uniform satisfaction with the facilities among respondents, it is important to interpret them with caution due to the limited sample size (n = 24). The small number of participants reduces the statistical power of the ANOVA tests, increasing the risk of Type II errors or failing to detect actual differences that may exist. Therefore, the absence of statistical significance does not conclusively confirm uniform satisfaction but rather reflects the data limitations.

Nonetheless, within the scope of the current data, the findings imply that key facilities—such as electronic classrooms, laboratories, library access, and digital learning spaces—are generally viewed as sufficient and accessible by students across different backgrounds. This perceived consistency indicates that the physical and digital learning environments of the MDRM program may be supporting inclusivity and fairness in resource allocation and use.

From a local institutional perspective, these results reflect positively on Batangas State University's DREAM Academy and CABEIHM, suggesting a meaningful commitment to delivering equitable academic infrastructure that meets the needs of diverse student populations. This aligns with national standards from the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), which emphasize the importance of accessible, safe, and functional learning environments for both face-to-face and blended modalities. On a global scale, the findings also resonate with the educational quality frameworks of organizations such as UNESCO and the International Association of Universities (IAU), which underscore equitable access to facilities as a pillar of inclusive and quality higher education.

Table 12: Major Strengths of the Program

No.	Items
1	Lessons and courses can be viewed as a good introduction to the world of DRRM.
2	Completeness of all educational materials needed for the program, and having credible instructors during the program.
3	DRR Professor
4	The teachers are the best educators for me.
5	Professionalism of faculty
6	Proven ability to multitask and can get on with anybody.
7	Student engagement with different and unique scenarios
8	The foundation of knowledge and experience of most of our professors that made and molded us to be leaders, and skillful in management style as professionals.
9	The professors are experts in their field.
10	The program is applied very timely, already during this pandemic and the Taal Volcano eruption
11	Quality education and supportive administration
12	Applicability and scalability of the program
13	Instructors have great knowledge of the subject taught.
14	Core and experienced DRRM practitioner
15	Empowers eager and deserving individuals aspiring to be in the know and field of MDRM
16	Effectiveness and efficiency of DRM Practitioners
17	Accessibility of the program, cost-efficient
18	Subject Matter Experts of MDRM professors
19	The MDRM Program has a good line-up of subjects that are handled by competent professors.
20	MDRM is a new program that is not so common in other universities

Table 12 presents the major strengths of the MDRM program as identified by the respondents. The qualitative responses reflect a strong and consistent appreciation for the program's quality, especially in terms of faculty competence, curriculum relevance, and institutional support. The respondents consistently emphasized the credibility and expertise of the professors, referring to them as subject matter experts and seasoned DRRM practitioners. Descriptions such as "the teachers are the best educators," "professionalism of faculty," and "core and experienced DRRM practitioners" highlight the central role of the faculty in delivering meaningful and effective instruction. This level of faculty engagement aligns with global standards in graduate education, which stress the importance of having academically and professionally experienced instructors to bridge theory and practice in disaster management education (Aitsi-Selmi et al., 2016).

In addition to faculty expertise, the curriculum itself was praised for its completeness and practical relevance. Several respondents noted that the lessons and courses served as a strong introduction to the world of disaster risk reduction and management. Others emphasized that the subjects were timely and applicable, particularly in the context of recent disasters such as the Taal Volcano eruption and the COVID-19 pandemic. This reinforces the value of dynamic and context-responsive academic content, a key criterion in international disaster education frameworks such as those promoted by the UNDRR and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR, 2022). The integration of real-world scenarios and unique learning

experiences also contributed to students' positive perceptions, as reflected in comments about student engagement and applicability of the program in current events.

Respondents also pointed to the program's capacity to foster leadership and professional growth. They acknowledged the role of the MDRM program in building their foundational knowledge and in shaping them into leaders equipped with management skills and resilience-based thinking. Phrases such as "empowers eager and deserving individuals" and "molds us to be a leader" reflect the transformative impact of the program. This echoes international perspectives that graduate education in DRRM should not only impart technical knowledge but also foster leadership, decision-making capacity, and adaptive thinking (Paton & Johnston, 2017).

Accessibility and institutional support were additional themes highlighted by the respondents. The program was described as cost-efficient and accessible, indicating its ability to serve a diverse group of professionals. Respondents also noted the quality of classroom facilities, positive relationships with program leaders, and administrative support. These institutional strengths are essential for ensuring an inclusive and supportive learning environment, which is a critical component of equitable graduate education worldwide (UNESCO, 2020).

However, a closer look at the thematic responses also revealed concerns about communication gaps and delays in administrative processes. These issues, while not dominant, point to potential inefficiencies in specific workflows—particularly within the registrar's office, such as unclear enrollment procedures, delayed release of grades, or inconsistencies in disseminating academic schedules and deadlines. These communication issues mirror challenges reported in other DRRM programs globally, particularly in developing contexts where disaster education systems face resource and coordination constraints (Shiwaku et al., 2016). The lack of a streamlined, responsive communication channel between students and administrative staff can erode students' sense of support and predictability, which is essential for adult learners balancing academic, professional, and personal responsibilities. Addressing these gaps through more transparent digital platforms, regular updates, and student feedback loops could enhance overall program delivery and satisfaction.

Table 13: Weaknesses of the Program

No.	Items
1	Registrar and the academe's lack of communication with students. Most of the time, we are caught off guard by a sudden announcement such as "document liabilities"
2	Technology connectivity is required because of the online classes
3	Information Dissemination from BatStateU to students regarding requirements, to-do, instructions, especially on clearances and paperwork.
4	It is not a weakness but rather a challenge due to the absence of face-to-face learning, where students can learn more.
5	Probably the information management in terms of program specifics (from DDRM to MDRM)
6	Schedule of subjects
7	The initial effect of the pandemic took time for all to adjust
8	The application of DRM in diverse aspects of government offices
9	Coordination from top management down to the students on administrative matters
10	Lack of field activities and access to facilities due to the pandemic, which is, of course, understandable.
11	Student follow-ups, we were entirely blind, no next steps. Nobody informed us.
12	Lack of a standard syllabus at the start of the program, which could have guided instructors and students

Table 13 outlines the perceived weaknesses of the MDRM program as identified by the respondents. The insights, gathered through open-ended survey responses, offer critical reflections on administrative processes, communication channels, technological challenges, and instructional delivery—many of which were influenced by the shift to remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic.

A recurring concern raised by the respondents centers on ineffective communication and coordination between the administration and the student body. Multiple entries point to issues such as the registrar's lack of timely announcements (e.g., unexpected notices about "document liabilities"), unclear guidance on paperwork and clearance procedures, and inconsistent dissemination of instructions. Statements such as "we were entirely blind, no next steps," and "nobody informed us" underscore a communication gap that hindered the student experience. These findings indicate the need for a more structured and transparent student support system, particularly in digital learning environments. Globally, higher education institutions are encouraged to establish clear, responsive communication frameworks to enhance student satisfaction and reduce procedural confusion, especially in online or hybrid settings (UNESCO, 2020).

Another significant challenge identified was technology connectivity and digital learning limitations. While not necessarily a program design flaw, unstable internet access and technological constraints were cited as obstacles to effective participation in online classes. This was compounded by the pandemic's initial disruption, during which both students and instructors required time to adapt. The sudden pivot to digital learning highlighted inequalities in access and preparedness—a challenge shared by universities worldwide (OECD, 2021).

Respondents also noted limitations in field activities and reduced access to university facilities, which they acknowledged as understandable consequences of pandemic-related restrictions. However, the absence of experiential learning opportunities—such as fieldwork, simulations, and hands-on community engagements—was seen as a missed component of a program that deals with disaster preparedness and real-world application. Internationally, practical exposure is considered an essential element in disaster risk education, reinforcing skills in leadership, coordination, and rapid decision-making (Aitsi-Selmi et al., 2016).

Additional concerns included the lack of a standard syllabus at the program's inception, which reportedly caused inconsistencies in teaching approaches. This gap affected the ability of both instructors and students to align on course expectations and learning outcomes. Likewise, the scheduling of subjects and clarity regarding the transition from DDRM to MDRM were cited as areas needing improvement. These administrative and curricular issues, while not major failings, suggest the need for clearer program structuring and academic planning.

It is also worth noting that one respondent clarified that what they identified was not a weakness per se but a challenge due to the absence of face-to-face learning, which limited interpersonal interaction and in-depth classroom engagement. This comment reflects the broader impact of the global health crisis on education delivery and highlights the value placed on human connection and interactive pedagogy in graduate studies.

Table 14: Recommending the Program to Others

Response	Frequency
Yes	23
No	1
Total	24

As shown in Table 14, a large majority of respondents (96%) expressed that they would recommend the MDRM program to others, indicating high overall satisfaction and a strong endorsement from alumni. Only one respondent, or 4%, expressed otherwise.

Table 15: Receiving an Update from ACTION Center/DREAM Academy and CABEIHM

Response	Frequency
Yes	21
No	3
Total	24

The data reveal that a significant majority of respondents (87.5%) expressed a willingness to receive future updates from the ACTION Center, DREAM Academy, and CABEIHM. This reflects a strong indication of continued interest and engagement among alumni toward the institution and its programs, even after graduation. Such a high level of receptiveness highlights the value placed by graduates on maintaining open channels of communication with the university. This ongoing connection can serve multiple purposes: it enables the dissemination of information regarding future training opportunities, professional development programs, and DRRM-related events; it contributes to the establishment and strengthening of an alumni network; it fosters a culture of lifelong learning and institutional collaboration; and it supports initiatives aimed at program evaluation and improvement through sustained alumni feedback. Meanwhile, the 12.5% of respondents who indicated disinterest in receiving further updates may represent individuals who are no longer active in the DRRM field or those who prefer to limit their post-graduate institutional interaction. This distinction underlines the importance of offering flexible and consent-based communication mechanisms tailored to varying levels of alumni engagement.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the summary of findings, the following are concluded:

1) Based on the demographic profile of the respondents, the majority are male graduates between the ages of 30 and 39, who are currently residing outside Batangas Province and are actively employed in the field of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM). This suggests that the program has been able to attract and cater to mid-career professionals working in geographically diverse locations, particularly those embedded in the practice of DRRM.
2) The overall findings indicate a high level of satisfaction among the respondents in terms of the program's curriculum structure, the quality of college advisement and academic support services, and the general educational experience. The high composite mean scores across different indicators confirm that the MDRM program is perceived as both relevant and responsive to the needs of adult learners and working professionals.
3) The perceived strengths of the program are primarily attributed to the expertise, professionalism, and subject-matter knowledge of the faculty, particularly those with field experience in DRRM. The alignment of course offerings with practical and theoretical dimensions of disaster governance further enhanced the program's effectiveness. However, a notable area of concern centers on inconsistent communication and coordination between the students and the institutional units involved in program admissions, academic advisories, and administrative processes. These gaps have caused confusion among students, especially concerning document requirements, subject schedules, and program updates.
4) The overwhelming majority of respondents expressed a willingness to recommend the MDRM program to prospective students, indicating a strong degree of program endorsement and perceived value. This reflects the success of the program in delivering a positive and professionally meaningful learning experience.
5) Most of the respondents also expressed an interest in continuing engagement with the institution, particularly through receiving regular updates from the ACTION Center, DREAM Academy, and CABEIHM. This suggests the potential for maintaining a dynamic relationship with alumni, which can support continuous program improvement, professional development, and a collaborative network.

Given the growing demand for skilled professionals in the field of disaster risk reduction and climate resilience, it is recommended that similar graduate programs globally consider the following:

1) Institutionalize DRRM education in multi-disciplinary contexts by integrating it not only in public administration but also in urban planning, public health, education, and business continuity frameworks. The global trend emphasizes holistic disaster risk governance (UNDRR, 2022), which requires academic programs to adopt cross-sectoral perspectives.
2) Leverage digital platforms to improve accessibility, especially for working professionals and students from geographically isolated or disaster-prone areas. Blended learning approaches and asynchronous content delivery can democratize access to high-quality DRRM education worldwide.
3) Establish international academic and professional partnerships with global agencies such as UNDRR, the World Bank, and the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR) to expose students to global best practices, current policy dialogues, and real-world DRRM applications.
4) Invest in faculty development and training to ensure that educators are not only subject-matter experts but also well-versed in adult learning methodologies, inclusive pedagogy, and technology integration—key components in resilient and future-ready education systems
5) Encourage the formation of regional alumni networks and professional associations to create a pipeline of knowledge-sharing, policy influence, and collaborative projects among DRRM professionals across borders.
6) To strengthen future research and enhance the generalizability of findings, future researchers should implement strategies that improve response rates. These may include offering incentives for participation, ensuring confidentiality to promote honest responses, using multiple modes of survey distribution (e.g., online, face-to-face, email), sending follow-up reminders, and actively engaging with participants through student organizations or program coordinators.
7) Implement an AI-driven advising and support system. Drawing on recent higher education research, algorithm-assisted advising (e.g., Georgia State University's system) has been shown to effectively flag at-risk students and deliver automated, yet personalized, policy and administrative guidance, while still allowing human discretion to adapt to individual context

5. Specific Recommendations

Table 16: Recommendations on Curriculum Enhancement

Concern	Recommended Action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	Basis
Limited DRRM application in diverse contexts	Integrate case studies and real-world simulations	Curriculum Committee	2025–2026 AY	CHED Outcomes-Based Education (OBE)
Unclear elective course pathways	Provide orientation on electives during enrollment	Faculty Advisers	Every Semester	Alumni feedback
Interdisciplinary opportunities lacking	Collaborate with allied disciplines (e.g., Engineering, Public Health)	DREAM Academy	Long-term	UNESCO DRR Education Framework

To enhance the curriculum's relevance and applicability, it is essential to bridge theory with practice by embedding applied learning tools such as simulations and case analysis. Orientation on electives will guide students in maximizing course selection, while interdisciplinary options align with global DRRM education trends promoting holistic, systems-based approaches.

Table 17: Recommendations on Advisement and Student Support

Concern	Recommended Action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	Basis
Unclear communication on requirements	Launch centralized student information portal	Student Affairs & IT Unit	2026	CHED memo on institutional automation
Missing syllabus and unclear academic deliverables	Require mandatory syllabus distribution on the first day	Faculty Members	Every term	Institutional Academic Manual
Lack of regular feedback loops	Conduct mid-semester consultation forums	Program Director	Bi-annually	Student-centered learning framework

Efficient academic advisement hinges on strong communication. By adopting digital systems and setting clear policies on course transparency, student confusion can be minimized. Regular feedback mechanisms also reinforce engagement, as supported by best practices in student success models (OECD, 2020).

Table 18: Recommendations on Facility and Resource Improvement

Concern	Recommended Action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	Basis
Limited digital library access	Improve e-library subscriptions and training	Library & IT	2025–2026	IAU Library Support for Remote Learners
Learning system gaps during blended delivery	Upgrade LMS and faculty training	E-Learning Unit	Annually	UNESCO Digital Education Guidelines
Orientation gaps in virtual tools	Offer LMS onboarding to all new students	DREAM Academy	Every term	Philippine HEI Remote Learning Guide

While physical facilities rated well, online resource accessibility—particularly library support—was a weak area. This is crucial in a blended modality. Strengthening digital infrastructure and user guidance can ensure learning continuity and satisfaction, especially for distance learners.

Table 19: Recommendations on Alumni Engagement and Institutional Feedback

Concern	Recommended Action	Responsible Unit	Timeline	Basis
Weak post-graduate tracking	Implement the alumni tracer study	Planning & Development Office	2026	CHED QA Policies
No alumni-led body	Formalize MDRM Alumni Association	ACTION Center	2025	UNESCO Lifelong Learning
Poor program feedback loop from graduates	Establish Alumni Advisory Panel	CABEIHM	2025–2026	SDG 4 Quality Education

Maintaining alumni relations is not only for community-building but also for academic program development. Globally, institutions leverage alumni insights to review curricula and measure real-world application. Creating an alumni association and institutionalizing feedback mechanisms can close the loop between learning and long-term impact.

References

[1] Alumni Affairs Office. (2020). The importance of alumni feedback in curriculum development. Philippine Journal of Higher Education, 12(1), 45–53.

[2] Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2017). Policies, Standards and Guidelines (PSG) for Graduate Programs. Retrieved from https://ched.gov.ph.

[3] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

[4] Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394260645.

[5] Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11.

[6] Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

[7] Harvey, L. (2001). Student feedback: A report to the Higher Education Funding Council for England. Centre for Research into Quality, University of Central England.

[8] Kometa, S. S., Tiku, N. E., & Ndenecho, E. N. (2019). Disaster risk education and administrative challenges in graduate-level programs in Cameroon. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 41, 101278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101278.

[9] New Zealand Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management. (2019). *National Disaster Resilience Strategy 2019*. https://www.civildefence.govt.nz.

[10] OECD. (2021). *The impact of alumni engagement on higher education quality*. OECD Education Policy Perspectives, 28, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1787/19939019.

[11] Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
[12] UNDRR & UN Women. (2020). *Gender and disaster risk reduction: Policy brief*. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. https://www.undrr.org/publication/gender-and-disaster-risk-reduction-policy-brief.
[13] UNDRR. (2015). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030*. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. https://www.undrr.org/publication/sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030.
[14] UNDRR. (2022). Sendai Framework Voluntary Commitments Synthesis and Analysis Report 2022. https://www.undrr.org.
[15] UNESCO. (2020). *COVID-19 and higher education: Today and tomorrow – Impact analysis, policy responses and recommendations*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375693.
[16] UNESCO-ICL. (2019). *Kyoto Landslide Commitment 2020: Education for resilience*. https://www.landslide-iclhq.org.
[17] United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). (2015). Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030. Retrieved from https://www.undrr.org/publication/sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030.