

Angelica P. Pascual

pascualangelicapadilla@gmail.com

Graduate School PHINMA Araullo University, Bitas, Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, 3100 Philippines

---

## Abstract

This research will be entitled "Level of Implementation of Equitable Quality Education in a Private University: Basis for a Sustainability Plan." This study determined how educational leaders contribute to equitable education at PHINMA Araullo University. It described the educational leaders' demographic profiles and professional backgrounds according to department affiliation, position, years of experience in teaching, and years of experience in administrative work. The study aimed to find out how educational leaders make principles of equity accurate in practice concerning access to learning, forming collaborative relationships, and involving a culture of inclusion in learning. This study applied a quantitative research design, collecting data through surveys presented to educational leaders in various departments. The statistics analysis shows a significant correlation between the perceptions of leaders implementing equity and their demographic independent variables. More specifically, affiliation with a department and tenure in administration had much to do with the view of access and resource distribution within educational leadership. Further, positive relationships exist among the different dimensions of equitable education, signifying that these are interdependent endeavours. The results suggested that characteristics of and experiences within the fields of educational leadership significantly influenced leaders' approaches to promoting equity. Leaders who held long administrative experience and those from the stated specific departments were more likely to see high levels of equity implementation. Based on the findings, the study recommended a sustainability plan that included policy changes, focused training, leadership development courses, stakeholder engagements, and solid monitoring mechanisms. Research on practices and perceptions regarding equity has been an essential contribution to educational management for educational leaders. It brings up the need for professional development and policy support for them to breed more effective equity initiatives. Ultimately, this research will encourage the growth of inclusive environments within schools where all students can realize their full potential. It also shows the critical importance of consistent reflection and re-adjustment of strategies for sustainability and relevance in implementing equitable education practice.

**Keywords:** Equitable Education; Educational Leadership; Access to Learning; Collaborative Relationships; Inclusion in Education; Quantitative Research; Educational Management; Sustainability Plan; Policy Support; Professional Development; Demographic Profiles; Resource Distribution; Administrative Experience; Survey Analysis; Stakeholder Engagement; Leadership Development; Inclusive Environments; Equity Implementation; Reflective Practices; Educational Policy

---

Education is a fundamental right and a key driver of social and economic development. However, achieving equitable quality education remains a significant challenge, particularly in diverse and resource-constrained settings. This paper aims to explore the level of implementation of equitable quality education at PHINMA Araullo University. The study focuses on how educational leaders contribute to equity in education through access to learning, collaborative relationships, and inclusive practices.

The research examines the demographic profiles and professional backgrounds of educational leaders, considering variables such as department affiliation, position, years of teaching experience, and administrative tenure. By applying a quantitative research design and conducting surveys among educational leaders, this study seeks to uncover the correlation between these demographic factors and leaders' perceptions and practices regarding equitable education.

The findings of this research will inform a sustainability plan aimed at enhancing equity in education through policy changes, focused training, leadership development, stakeholder engagement, and robust monitoring mechanisms. Ultimately, this study contributes to the broader discourse on educational equity and provides practical recommendations for fostering inclusive learning environments where all students can thrive.

| Nomenclature     |                                                   |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <b>CELA</b>      | College of Education and Liberal Arts             |
| <b>CCJE</b>      | College of Criminal Justice Education             |
| <b>CAHS</b>      | College of Allied Health Sciences                 |
| <b>CAS</b>       | College of Arts and Sciences                      |
| <b>CMA</b>       | College of Management and Accountancy             |
| <b>CITE</b>      | College of Engineering and information Technology |
| <b>PHINMA AU</b> | PHINMA Araullo University                         |

**Accessibility.** In this study, accessibility means ensuring that educational resources, facilities, and support services are inclusive to all students and faculty, covering both physical aspects like wheelchair ramps and digital access for individuals with disabilities.

**Building equity.** Creating a level playing field for all students, regardless of background. This means providing all students with the resources and support they need to succeed in school.

**Customer Support Services.** It encompasses a range of services provided by the university to support student success and well-being. This includes academic advising, counseling, mentoring, and other support services aimed at addressing academic or personal challenges and promoting student retention and success.

**Educational Leaders.** An individual employed by PHINMA Araullo University who holds a leadership role overseeing specific aspects of the university's daily operations that can directly or indirectly impact student access to quality education.

**Equitable Education.** Equitable education means providing all students, regardless of their background, with equal opportunities, resources, and support for academic success. In this study, it refers to private universities' efforts to create fair and inclusive learning environments.

**Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms.** It refers to processes and systems used by the university to assess the effectiveness of equity-related policies, programs, and initiatives.

**Faculty and Staff Diversity.** It refers to having a diverse faculty and staff, including individuals from underrepresented or marginalized groups, with efforts focused on recruitment, support, and retention to reflect the student body and promote inclusive practices.

**Faculty.** In this study, the faculty members serve as validators of the respondents. They are teachers who have been working at PHINMA Araullo University for at least four years.

**Inclusive Policies and Practices.** In the context of the study, it includes institutional policies and practices that foster inclusivity, diversity, and cultural responsiveness in academic and administrative processes, such as admissions, curriculum design, and campus climate assessments, to create a welcoming environment for all students.

**Level of Implementation.** The extent to which equitable education practices are put into practice within a private university. It assesses how effectively these practices are applied across the institution to promote equity and inclusivity in education.

**Participation in Equity and Inclusion-Related Training.** This variable assesses the extent to which educational leaders have acquired knowledge, skills, and strategies to promote equitable quality education within PHINMA Araullo University.

**Partnerships.** It refers to agreements and partnerships between the university and external entities to address educational disparities, enhance resource access, and foster collaboration, including efforts with local communities to support diverse student populations and promote equity.

**Private School.** For this study, private schools specifically refer to higher education institutions offering undergraduate and/or graduate programs, including universities, colleges, and professional schools, that operate independently of government control.

**Professional Development.** It refers to opportunities provided by the university to enhance the competencies of faculty and staff it includes training, workshops, seminars, and other initiatives focused on equity, diversity, and inclusion.

**Resource Allocation.** The distribution and allocation of resources, such as funding, staffing, facilities, and technology, across departments or programs to support equity initiatives and address the needs of diverse student populations.

**Socioeconomic disparities.** It refers to the unequal distribution of resources, opportunities, and outcomes among students in a private university based on socioeconomic status, including family income, parental education, household wealth, access to resources, and neighborhood characteristics.

Providing students with the necessary skills and confidence is critical to progress in any country. However, making this vision a reality is a complicated problem, particularly when attempting to empower all students, regardless of background. This is especially crucial for burgeoning private universities, which often grapple with resource allocation issues while endeavouring to provide equal opportunities for diverse groups of learners. PHINMA Araullo University's tagline, "Gawing Possible" (Making Possible), expressed the institution's commitment to fostering a potential-oriented atmosphere and empowering students. Like any other nation, the Philippines aimed to provide its students with an education that would make them feel confident. Nevertheless, it is still hard to realize an equitable quality education where every student succeeds regardless of their circumstances or background until now (Bautista & Cruz, 2020). This problem became particularly acute in rapidly growing educational institutions such as private universities that face difficulty ensuring fair resource distribution and maintaining inclusive learning environments for students with different backgrounds (Muijs & Harris, 2014).

Education was the cornerstone for personal and societal development. Ideally, educational institutions should have provided an equitable atmosphere where students from diverse backgrounds could thrive. Nonetheless, institutions throughout the world have struggled to establish accurate educational equity. Educational leaders' leadership styles and practices significantly impact student achievement and school climate (Leithwood & Fullan, 2015). In the decentralized structure of private institutions, educational leaders greatly affected students' educational experiences. Their choices on resource allocation, teacher professional development opportunities, and the implementation of inclusive policies directly influence the university's capacity to meet its equitable quality education objectives (Terenzini & Pascarella, 2018).

Equity was not synonymous with justice in education; it was only a precondition for excellence and social mobility. By equity, we refer to the design of an educational system to ensure every student's access to appropriate, high-quality learning experiences, regardless of socioeconomic status, ethnic heritage, gender, and disabilities. In higher education, it meant providing an atmosphere conducive to developing all potential in various student groups. This research acknowledged that attaining fairness necessitated addressing structural barriers and establishing targeted efforts to assist underrepresented and disadvantaged groups (Ladson-Billings, 2014).

Implementing equitable education practices in most private universities presents unique challenges. Most institutions serve a diverse student body and cater to many socioeconomic backgrounds, ethnicities, and educational histories. Ensuring all students get the necessary support necessitates a nuanced understanding of their needs and both heterogeneous and systemic barriers to facing them. Previous research highlighted those disparities in resource allocation, lack of culturally responsive teaching practices, and insufficient support services could hinder the success of marginalized students (Gay, 2010; Banks, 2015).

Educational leaders were the first to tackle these issues. Their leadership styles, decision-making processes, and devotion to equity were instantly reflected in the academic prosperity of their educational establishments. Influential educational leaders went beyond their administrative roles to advocate for policies and practices that led to inclusion and diversity. This responsibility was pivotal in building institutional culture and ensuring fairness in all aspects of the learning experience (Khalifa et al., 2016).

This study investigated the critical role of educational leaders in promoting equitable education within PHINMA Araullo University. It explored these leaders' demographic profiles and professional backgrounds, focusing on factors such as department affiliation, position, and years of experience in teaching and administrative roles. By examining how educational leaders translated equity principles into action, the study aimed to identify effective strategies for enhancing education accessibility, fostering collaborative partnerships, and cultivating inclusive learning environments. Additionally, the research sought to understand the relationship between leader profiles and their implementation strategies, pinpointing areas where targeted development efforts could be most effective.

Driven by the researcher's pursuit of a Master of Arts in Educational Management and her experience as a Grade 12 Program Head, the researcher recognized the vital role of educational leaders in promoting equitable education within institutions. The researcher aimed to utilize the research findings to craft a comprehensive action plan that empowered educational leaders to champion equitable education at all levels. This action plan focused on policy revision, targeted training, leadership enhancement, stakeholder engagement, robust monitoring, and recognition programs to create a more inclusive learning environment and drive continuous improvement in equity strategies across the institution.

The study aimed to contribute significantly to educational management by providing insights into the practices and perceptions of educational leaders regarding equity. It intended to identify critical factors influencing the successful implementation of equitable education practices to inform policymakers and practitioners about enhancing inclusivity and diversity in higher education institutions. Ultimately, the study sought to support the development of more equitable and inclusive educational environments.

## Literature Review

The Philippines, like many other nations, aspires to provide high-quality education that empowers all pupils. However, creating equal quality education in which every student flourishes regardless of background or situation is a constant issue (Bautista & Cruz, 2020). This imbalance is especially worrisome in fast expanding educational systems such as private schools, where guaranteeing equitable access to resources and creating inclusive learning environments for a diverse student body becomes even more difficult. This section examines existing studies on systemic and classroom-level challenges to equal quality education in the Philippine setting. It then investigates effective theories and strategies used in other contexts to promote inclusion, with an emphasis on their possible relevance in private schools.

## Equity

Before the adoption of SDGs, the focus had been on correcting gender disparities in school enrollment, and achieving equality in terms of quantity had been emphasized rather than the promotion of equity (Kuroda 2014; Nishimura and Sasaoka 2016). Nishimura and Sasaoka (2016) describe the equality and equity of education as follows: equality refers to a state in which all people are equal, while equity refers to the different educational treatment of people in different environments to achieve equality (Nishimura and Sasaoka 2016). From the viewpoint of equity, it is justifiable to offer more support to groups who are in a position of disadvantage (Miwa 2005). UNESCO (2017) thus analyzed the equity of education based on items such as gender equality, geographical conditions, income status, language, and disability.

In addition, Schleicher (2014, p. 19) argued that equity in education can be interpreted from two perspectives, namely, fairness/equity and inclusion/inclusiveness. The perspective of fairness refers to education not being restricted by gender, ethnic group, family environment, or other personal or socioeconomic conditions. In turn, equity from an inclusion perspective relates to how all students should acquire at least basic academic skills (Schleicher 2014). In other words, equitable education is concerned with helping students develop their potential learning abilities without experiencing any barriers. The interpretation of equity based on these two perspectives is also consistent with the concept of inclusive education, which is discussed in more detail later.

Nishimura and Sasaoka (2016) compared equity definitions from international organizations (World Bank, OECD, FTL, UNESCO) and found differing interpretations. The international community needs to work towards a consensus on promoting equity. Currently, equity is closely linked to the quality and inclusivity of education, requiring comprehensive consideration in education approaches.

## Inclusive Education

As noted previously, SDG4 includes an inclusion perspective. Inclusion can be defined in a variety of ways. For instance, UNESCO (2003, p. 7) defines inclusion in education as “a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education.” In this sense, inclusive education is understood as an educational approach that realizes the concept of inclusive education, which values its process and response to diverse needs.

Inclusive education was internationally proposed in the Salamanca Statement, which was adopted by the World Congress on Special Needs Education (WCSNE) in 1994. Article 2 of this statement presents the basic concept of inclusive education, which can be summarized as “...every child has a fundamental right to education, and regular schools must provide education opportunities that takes into account the special educational needs that each child has” (UNESCO and Ministry of Education and Science in Spain 1994, p. viii). The concept of integrated education, which had been the mainstream approach to schooling until the adoption of inclusive education, required that the children with special needs adapt themselves to regular classes. Inclusive education differs from this concept of integrated education in that it supports the notion that teachers and schools should respond to children’s needs (Kawaguchi and Kuroda 2013).

Until 2015, the aim of Universal Primary Education (UPE) focused on providing access to education. Despite this goal, there were still vulnerable children who faced difficulties in accessing schooling (Kawaguchi and Kuroda 2013; Hayashi 2016). For example, children with disabilities, children belonging to minority racial, ethnic, or linguistic groups, children from low-income families, and other children from diverse backgrounds had unique educational needs. It is crucial to employ educational methods that cater to diverse needs and promote equity in order to enhance the quality of education.

## Quality Education

Quality education is a fundamental pillar of sustainable development, encompassing not only academic achievement but also the holistic development of learners, including cognitive, social, emotional, and ethical dimensions. This section reviews recent literature published within the last decade on quality education, exploring definitions, frameworks, indicators, challenges, and strategies for enhancing educational quality.

Recent literature emphasizes a multidimensional understanding of quality education, acknowledging its multifaceted nature beyond mere academic performance. Quality education is often characterized by its ability to foster critical thinking, creativity, problem-solving skills, and values such as equity, diversity, and social responsibility (UNESCO, 2019).

Scholars have proposed various frameworks for conceptualizing and assessing quality education. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 4, emphasize the importance of inclusive and equitable quality education for all, outlining targets and indicators to monitor progress towards this goal (United Nations, 2015).

Additionally, frameworks such as the Education 2030 Framework for Action provide guidance on key principles and strategies for achieving quality education at the national and global levels (UNESCO, 2015).

Measuring quality education requires comprehensive indicators that capture various dimensions of learning and development. Recent literature has identified a range of indicators, including student engagement, teacher quality, curriculum relevance, learning outcomes, school climate, and the availability of resources and infrastructure (OECD, 2019; World Bank, 2018). Despite significant progress in expanding access to education globally, numerous challenges persist in ensuring quality education for all.

Recent studies have explored various strategies and interventions for enhancing educational quality. These include investment in teacher professional development, curriculum reform, innovative pedagogical approaches, technology integration, community engagement, and inclusive policies that address the needs of marginalized and vulnerable populations (Fullan & Langworthy, 2014; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2018).

## Exploring Strategies for Promoting Equitable Quality Education in Private Universities

Private universities have historically played a pivotal role in higher education, catering to diverse student populations and striving for quality education while navigating challenges of equity (Marginson, 2014). Central to this endeavor is institutional culture and leadership, recognized as critical drivers for fostering inclusive environments conducive to equitable educational practices (De Boer et al., 2015). Additionally, the capacity and ongoing professional development of faculty and staff are essential for effective teaching and learning strategies (Teichler, 2017).

Case studies offer valuable insights into successful models and best practices for promoting equitable quality education in private universities. For instance, Fairholm and Thomas (2019) explored the implementation of inclusive pedagogical approaches, demonstrating positive impacts on student engagement and outcomes. Similarly, Johnson et al. (2020) identified innovative curriculum design strategies enhancing equity and access for underrepresented student groups.

Despite these efforts, private universities face numerous challenges and barriers in their pursuit of equitable quality education. Constraints such as limited financial resources can impede the implementation of comprehensive support services for marginalized students (Dunne, 2018). Moreover, addressing issues related to socio-economic status and cultural diversity requires proactive interventions to mitigate systemic inequalities (Archer et al., 2017).

Moving forward, the development of an action plan for promoting equitable quality education in private universities necessitates a focus on collaborative leadership, faculty development, and targeted support services. Recommendations include establishing diversity and inclusion task forces, integrating inclusive pedagogies into curriculum design, and allocating resources for student support initiatives.

## Barriers to Equitable Quality Education

Students encounter numerous systemic barriers that limit their access to quality education. Socioeconomic disparities are a major concern, with students from underprivileged backgrounds often facing disadvantages in enrollment, participation, and access to resources (Bautista & Cruz, 2020). Research by Pascua and Anota (2018) highlights the inequitable distribution of qualified teachers and educational resources across different schools, further exacerbating these disparities.

Policy and governance also play a significant role. Reyes (2019) examines how national policies and funding allocation models can differentially impact educational equity across regions and school types. Understanding these systemic challenges is crucial for developing strategies that ensure all students, regardless of their background, have the opportunity to succeed.



Beyond systemic factors, traditional classroom practices can also contribute to educational inequities. Rote memorization and standardized testing approaches often fail to cater to diverse learning styles and backgrounds, leading to disengagement and low academic achievement for many students (Aso & Ibading, 2019).

The lack of training for teachers in culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) and differentiated instruction further hinders equity. Research by Guzman and De Leon (2020) underscores the importance of CRP in fostering inclusive classrooms that value students' cultural backgrounds and incorporate them into the learning process. Similarly, studies by Mendoza (2018) and Lopez (2021) highlight the effectiveness of differentiated instruction in ensuring all students receive the support and challenge necessary to reach their full potential.

The school climate also significantly impacts student success. Discrimination, prejudice, or a lack of inclusive practices can create an unwelcome environment that hinders learning and engagement (Manalang & Punzalan, 2018). This underscores the need for schools to create positive school climates through programs that promote social-emotional learning and actively combat bullying (Bautista et al., 2022).

### **Factors Influencing Equitable Education**

According to Lee (2016), accessibility plays a crucial role in ensuring that educational resources, facilities, and support services are inclusive and available to all students and faculty members, regardless of their backgrounds or abilities. Collaborative partnerships between educational institutions, community organizations, and industry partners have been identified as effective mechanisms for addressing educational disparities and promoting access to resources and opportunities (Brown & Garcia, 2019; Rodriguez & Thompson, 2021). Additionally, community partnerships have shown promise in enhancing educational equity by leveraging community resources and support networks to meet the diverse needs of student populations (Anderson & Davis, 2017; Wang & Garcia, 2018). Customer support services, such as academic advising, counseling, and mentoring, have been emphasized by Lee (2016) as playing a pivotal role in bolstering student success and retention, particularly for those encountering academic or personal challenges.

According to Clark and Johnson (2019) and Martinez and Thompson (2020), evaluation and feedback mechanisms are indispensable for gauging the efficacy of equity-related policies and programs within higher education institutions. Initiatives promoting faculty and staff diversity have been highlighted by Smith and Jones (2019) and Brown and Garcia (2018) as essential for fostering representation from diverse backgrounds and cultivating inclusive teaching and leadership practices. Inclusive policies and practices, including admissions criteria, curriculum design, and campus climate assessments, are pivotal for establishing welcoming and inclusive learning environments for all students (Johnson & Williams, 2020; Wang & Garcia, 2018). Furthermore, professional development opportunities centered on equity, diversity, and inclusion have been emphasized by Lee and Johnson (2016) and Rodriguez and Smith (2021) as critical for enhancing the competencies of faculty and staff in addressing the diverse needs of student populations.

Resource allocation practices, according to Clark and Johnson (2019) and Martinez and Thompson (2020), are instrumental in addressing the needs of diverse student populations and promoting equitable access to educational opportunities. Additionally, addressing socioeconomic disparities is paramount for fostering equitable access and success in higher education (Anderson & Davis, 2017; Brown & Garcia, 2018). Interventions such as financial aid programs, scholarships, and support services have been underscored by Martinez and Thompson (2020) as indispensable for mitigating socioeconomic barriers and ensuring equal opportunities for all students to thrive.

According to the literature, through an examination of these factors and the integration of insights from pertinent sources, this study aims to comprehensively understand the challenges and opportunities associated with promoting equitable education among faculty and educational leaders in a private university setting.

### **Education Policies and Initiatives**

Education policies and initiatives play a crucial role in shaping the structure, governance, and practices of educational systems at local, national, and international levels. This section reviews recent literature published within the last decade on education policies and initiatives, examining their development, implementation, impact, and challenges.

This literature highlights the complex process of education policy development, involving multiple stakeholders, political agendas, socio-economic contexts, and educational priorities. Scholars have emphasized the importance of evidence-based policymaking, stakeholder engagement, and participatory approaches in shaping effective education policies (Mundy & Verger, 2017).

The past decade has witnessed significant efforts to develop global education agendas aimed at promoting inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all. Initiatives such as the Education for All (EFA) movement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 4, have influenced national and regional education policies worldwide, setting targets and indicators for monitoring progress (UNESCO, 2019; United Nations, 2015).

Many countries have undertaken ambitious education reforms in response to changing societal needs, economic challenges, technological advancements, and educational research findings. Recent literature has examined the design, implementation, and outcomes of various reform initiatives, including curriculum revisions, teacher professional development programs, assessment reforms, and efforts to promote inclusive education (OECD, 2020; Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016). The efforts to develop and implement education policies and initiatives, numerous challenges and implementation issues persist. These include issues related to policy coherence, resource allocation, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, stakeholder coordination, and sustainability (Schleicher, 2019; Spillane et al., 2019).

Recent literature has highlighted innovative approaches and best practices in education policy development and implementation. These include strategies such as evidence-based policymaking, decentralized decision-making, public-private partnerships, data-driven accountability systems, and the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning (Bjork, 2019; Levin, 2020).

### **Community Engagement and Stakeholder Involvement**

In the pursuit of equitable education, community engagement, and stakeholder involvement emerge as vital components in fostering inclusive learning environments and addressing systemic barriers to educational equity. Recent literature underscores the pivotal role of partnerships between educational institutions, local communities, families, businesses, and other stakeholders in promoting equitable access to high-quality education (Bryk et al., 2015; Epstein, 2018). These collaborations empower communities to actively participate in decision-making processes, curriculum development, and the provision of support services tailored to the diverse needs of students. By leveraging the collective expertise, resources, and perspectives of stakeholders, educational institutions can develop more responsive and culturally relevant practices that advance equity and inclusion (Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 2014).

Community engagement initiatives aim to amplify the voices of marginalized communities and address historical inequities through targeted interventions and advocacy efforts. For example, partnerships with community organizations may facilitate outreach programs, mentorship opportunities, and access to social services for underserved students, thereby mitigating socioeconomic disparities and enhancing educational outcomes (Epstein, 2018). Additionally, collaborative efforts between schools and families can create a supportive ecosystem that nurtures students' holistic development and well-being, fostering a sense of belonging and agency among diverse student populations (Bryk et al., 2015).

Furthermore, stakeholder involvement in educational governance and policy-making processes is essential for ensuring transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to the needs of all learners. By actively engaging stakeholders in decision-making forums, educational leaders can cultivate a culture of shared responsibility and ownership, fostering trust and collaboration among all members of the educational community (Epstein, 2018; Penuel et al., 2017). Such inclusive practices not only enhance the effectiveness of educational policies and initiatives but also contribute to the creation of more equitable and democratic learning environments where every voice is valued and respected.

### **Case Studies and Best Practices**

Achieving equitable education necessitates continuous exploration of effective strategies and interventions. This RRL explores the valuable insights offered by case studies and best practices in promoting educational equity. These resources showcase successful initiatives that have demonstrably addressed barriers faced by marginalized and underserved student populations.

Research by Bates (2019) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2019) emphasizes the importance of case studies and best practices. They provide tangible examples of innovative approaches, interventions, and collaborative efforts that have led to improved educational outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged students. By analyzing these successful initiatives, educators and policymakers can gain valuable insights into strategies for promoting equity within their own contexts.

One key area highlighted in case studies is the implementation of innovative teaching and learning methods. Approaches like project-based learning, inquiry-based learning, and personalized learning have demonstrated positive impacts on student engagement, motivation, and achievement (Bates, 2019; Darling-Hammond et al., 2019). These methods create more inclusive and dynamic learning environments that cater to diverse student needs and preferences, fostering a more equitable educational experience.

Case studies often emphasize the critical role of community engagement and partnerships in promoting equity (Bryk et al., 2015; Epstein, 2018). Successful initiatives frequently involve collaboration between schools, families, community organizations, and other stakeholders. These partnerships provide holistic support and additional resources for students, addressing not only academic needs but also the socio-emotional, cultural, and economic barriers that may hinder

student success. By fostering a more inclusive and supportive educational ecosystem, these collaborative efforts contribute significantly to equity.

Case studies further illuminate efforts to address equity gaps and promote social justice within educational systems (Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 2014). By implementing evidence-based strategies like culturally responsive teaching, inclusive classroom practices, and targeted support for marginalized students, educational institutions can work towards narrowing achievement gaps and creating more equitable learning opportunities. These interventions aim to dismantle systemic barriers and ensure all students have a fair chance to thrive academically.

### **Evaluation and Assessment in Educational Equity Research**

Evaluation and assessment play pivotal roles in educational equity research by providing insights into the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and policies aimed at promoting equitable outcomes for all students. This section reviews recent literature published within the last decade, focusing on evaluation and assessment practices in the context of educational equity research and highlighting key methodologies, challenges, and best practices.

Evaluation and assessment serve as essential tools for measuring progress, identifying disparities, and informing evidence-based decision-making in educational equity research. By systematically collecting and analyzing data, researchers can assess the impact of interventions, monitor changes in educational outcomes over time, and identify areas for improvement (Rossi et al., 2018; Stufflebeam et al., 2015).

Recent literature presents a variety of methodologies and approaches for evaluating educational equity initiatives. These include quantitative methods such as experimental designs, quasi-experimental designs, and statistical analyses to measure the effectiveness of interventions on student outcomes (Cook & Shadish, 2014; Rubin, 2016). Qualitative methods such as case studies, interviews, focus groups, and participant observations are also employed to capture the lived experiences and perspectives of diverse stakeholders affected by equity initiatives (Patton, 2015; Stake, 2013).

Despite the importance of evaluation and assessment in educational equity research, several challenges and considerations must be addressed. These include issues related to data collection, measurement validity and reliability, sample representativeness, ethical considerations, cultural responsiveness, and the interpretation and dissemination of findings (Mertens & McLaughlin, 2019; Weisberg et al., 2016).

Additionally, the complex and multifaceted nature of educational equity requires researchers to adopt interdisciplinary and intersectional approaches that consider the intersectionality of factors such as race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, language, and disability (Collins, 2015; Crenshaw, 2018).

Recent literature offers best practices and recommendations for conducting rigorous and culturally responsive evaluations in educational equity research. These include engaging diverse stakeholders in the evaluation process, employing mixed-methods approaches to triangulate findings, using culturally relevant assessment tools and measures, conducting formative evaluations to inform ongoing improvement efforts, and ensuring transparency and accountability in reporting evaluation findings (Guba & Lincoln, 2018; King, 2017; Morrow & Smith, 2015).

### **School Manager Efforts and Equitable Quality Education**

School managers, including deans, principals, and program heads, play a crucial role in creating and sustaining an equitable learning environment for all students. Their leadership sets the tone for the school culture and influences the implementation of initiatives that address educational equity. This section explores how school managers can contribute to breaking down barriers and promoting equity within their institutions.

School managers' multifaceted roles in fostering equitable quality education are highlighted. According to Hallinger and Heck (2010), effective school leadership encompasses instructional, transformational, and distributed leadership, contributing to improved student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps.

Additionally, Leithwood et al. (2012) stress the significance of creating a positive school culture and fostering collaborative relationships to promote equity and excellence. Despite their critical role, school managers encounter various challenges. Limited resources and bureaucratic constraints hinder effective interventions (Bush & Glover, 2014; Lumby & Foskett, 2011). Research indicates positive outcomes from effective school management efforts. Robinson et al. (2008) found strong instructional leadership significantly associated with improved student achievement and reduced achievement gaps. Fullan (2014) highlights the transformative impact of distributed leadership models.

Supportive policies are crucial to empower school managers. Investments in professional development and fostering a conducive policy environment are recommended (OECD, 2016). School managers' efforts are instrumental in advancing equitable quality education. Sustained support from policymakers and stakeholders is essential to realize their full potential in promoting educational equity and excellence.



### Understanding Barriers and Promoting Inclusive Practices

Driven by the imperative to address disparities in educational outcomes among diverse student populations. In their seminal work, Gomez and Chen (2018) conducted a thorough examination of equity issues in education, focusing on the experiences of marginalized students in accessing and benefiting from quality education. Drawing on empirical studies and theoretical frameworks, Gomez and Chen (2018) underscored the complex interplay of social, economic, and cultural factors that shape educational opportunities and outcomes.

Gomez and Chen (2018) highlighted the disproportionate impact of inequitable educational practices on marginalized groups, including students from low-income backgrounds, racial and ethnic minorities, and those with disabilities. Their analysis revealed systemic barriers such as inadequate funding, discriminatory policies, and lack of culturally responsive pedagogy, which perpetuate disparities in educational access and attainment. Moreover, Gomez and Chen (2018) emphasized the importance of adopting an intersectional approach that acknowledges the intersecting identities and experiences of students within diverse contexts.

Building on the insights provided by Gomez and Chen (2018), it becomes evident that achieving equity in education requires addressing structural inequalities and promoting inclusive practices at all levels of the education system. Efforts to enhance educational equity must go beyond narrow conceptions of access and fairness to encompass broader dimensions of social justice and human rights. Furthermore, Gomez and Chen (2018) highlighted the need for collaborative partnerships between policymakers, educators, community leaders, and stakeholders to enact meaningful change and promote equity-oriented policies and practices.

In addition to the seminal work of Gomez and Chen (2018), scholars have explored various dimensions of equity in education, including the role of teacher diversity (Johnson & Smith, 2019), curriculum inclusivity (Lee, 2020), and community engagement (Brown et al., 2017). By synthesizing and building upon existing research, this study aims to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on equitable quality education and inform policy and practice interventions that promote educational equity for all students.

These related studies have shed light on the complexities of promoting equitable quality education in a university setting. The research underscores the persistent challenges of socioeconomic disparities, resource allocation, and the need for inclusive practices. In the context of PHINMA Araullo University's rapid growth, these challenges necessitate a proactive approach. By synthesizing the insights from existing research and exploring best practices from similar institutions, PHINMA Araullo University can develop evidence-based strategies to address these barriers. Prioritizing initiatives that promote culturally responsive pedagogy, strengthen community engagement, and ensure equitable resource allocation will be crucial in creating a truly inclusive learning environment for all students. Further research investigating the university's specific context and the effectiveness of its current efforts is recommended to inform ongoing improvement efforts.

### Implementing Equitable Quality Education in Private Universities

Private universities are key players in higher education, aiming to provide quality education while ensuring fairness for their diverse student body. This review assesses the current implementation of equitable quality education practices within private universities and lays the groundwork for an actionable plan to enhance these efforts.

Explorations into the implementation levels of equitable quality education practices within private universities have yielded insightful findings. For instance, Smith et al. (2018) surveyed faculty members to gauge their perceptions of equity initiatives, uncovering variances in implementation levels across departments and pinpointing areas ripe for enhancement.

The deployment of assessment tools and methodologies is crucial for gauging the efficacy of equity initiatives. Jones and Brown (2016) devised a comprehensive assessment framework to evaluate the implementation of equitable quality education practices in private universities, furnishing valuable guidance for institutions aspiring to fortify their efforts.

Comparative analyses provide valuable insights into implementation variations across different private universities. Lee et al. (2020) undertook a comparative study, juxtaposing the implementation of equity initiatives between private and public universities. Their findings delineated common challenges and successful strategies applicable to improvement endeavors. The influence of policies and governance structures on implementing equitable quality education in private universities is significant. Johnson (2017) delved into the impact of governmental regulations and institutional policies on equity initiatives, underscoring the necessity of supportive frameworks to streamline implementation.

## Methodology

### Research Design

The researcher used a quantitative study to determine how educational leaders contribute to promoting equal education at private universities. This entailed obtaining numerical data via surveys and standardized equipment, allowing for an objective and statistically accurate analysis. Focusing on quantitative data collection ensured that the findings were impartial and could be applied to a wider group of educational leaders across universities. This approach was especially useful in understanding the diverse backgrounds of leaders, identifying effective strategies for promoting equity, and exploring possible connections between leader characteristics and their approaches to implementation.

### Participants

The study involved educational leaders from PHINMA Araullo University. These leaders included six (6) Deans representing each college, twenty-one (21) Program Heads from various departments, and twenty-seven (27) faculty members who served as validators for the survey questionnaire. The researcher conducted a comparative analysis by comparing the responses to the survey questionnaire with those provided by the faculty members. The purpose of this analysis was to explore similarities and differences in perceptions and practices regarding the level of the promotion of equitable education within the private university. The specific breakdown of Program participants is as follows:

| Department                                           | Deans    | Number of<br>Program Heads | Number of<br>Faculty<br>(Validators) |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| College of Education and Liberal Arts                | 1        | 6                          | 7                                    |
| College of Criminal Justice Education                | 1        | 4                          | 5                                    |
| College of Allied Health Sciences                    | 1        | 3                          | 4                                    |
| College of Arts and Sciences                         | 1        | 5                          | 6                                    |
| College of Management and Accountancy                | 1        | 2                          | 3                                    |
| College of Engineering and information<br>Technology | 1        | 1                          | 2                                    |
| <b>Total</b>                                         | <b>6</b> | <b>21</b>                  | <b>27</b>                            |

### Data Analysis

A total sampling approach was employed for selecting educational leaders as respondents for data collection. This aligns with the recommendations of researchers like Newman and Benz (2017), who advocate for total sampling approach in situations where the population is well-defined and relatively small. By conducting a total sampling approach, the study ensured the inclusion of all educational leaders, fostering a comprehensive understanding of their perspectives on barriers to equitable education. This approach minimized potential bias that could be introduced through sampling procedures, as emphasized by Bryman (2016) in his discussion on the importance of minimizing selection bias in small-population research. According to Johnson et al. (2019), department-level analyses can provide more granular insights without being affected by variations in respondent numbers across departments. Therefore, the per-department implementation will be measured only at the department level, not across the university, so the number of respondents per department will not affect the overall findings.

In selecting faculty members as validators, the study adopted a purposive sampling approach to ensure the representation of seasoned faculty members within PHINMA Araullo University. Purposive sampling is often employed in research to focus on particular characteristics of a population that are of interest, which will best enable the researcher to answer the research questions Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim (2016). This inclusive approach aligns with recommendations for incorporating experienced voices and enhances the validity and reliability of the findings. This approach aligns with the principles of inclusivity and representation, echoing recommendations by scholars such as Johnson & Smith (2018), who stress the importance of incorporating diverse and experienced voices in research endeavors.

## Research Site

The study was conducted at PHINMA Araullo University Main Campus, Barangay Bitas, Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija. PHINMA Araullo University is the largest private school in Nueva Ecija it is also a prestigious school dedicated to promoting academic achievement and offering high-quality education. The university functions as a center for education and learning, providing a range of courses and programs meant to provide students the tools they need to advance both personally and professionally.

## Materials and Instrument

The study utilized surveys or questionnaires, to gather numerical data on demographic profiles, the level of implementation in promoting equitable education among Faculty and Educational Leaders, and if there is a significant relationship between the level of implementation by faculty and educational leaders in promoting equitable education. These surveys were distributed to a sample of educational leaders within PHINMA Araullo University.

## Data Collection

The researcher obtained permission to conduct the study from the Chief Operating Officer of PHINMA Araullo University Campus. To ensure a proper understanding of the instructions, the researcher personally administered the survey questionnaire to all participants. Before data collection, an expert was consulted to provide feedback and suggestions on the prepared materials and equipment. These recommendations and insights then were incorporated into the refinement of the instruments and the survey text.

## Data Analysis

In analyzing the data collected from participants of the study, this study employed a quantitative approach. Frequency and percentage analysis were used to establish the demographic and professional profiles of the participants of the study, providing a foundation for understanding their experiences and perspectives (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

A weighted mean analysis was conducted to thoroughly assess the level of implementation of equitable education. This analysis examined how faculty and educational leaders rated the department efforts in various areas, including the Accessibility, Partnerships, Customer Support Services, Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms, Faculty and Staff Diversity, Inclusive Policies and Practices, Professional Development, Resource Allocation and Socioeconomic Disparities. This approach offered a detailed understanding of the obstacles encountered in achieving fair education, aligning with Newman and Benz's (2017) focus on comprehending these challenges.

The study used a comparison of means test to analyze the differences in implementation levels between faculty and educational leaders in various departments. The analysis considered factors such as department, position, employment status, number of years in teaching roles, number of years in an administrative role and participation in equity and inclusion-related training. Specifically, an independent samples t-test was used to identify significant differences in implementation scores between faculty and leaders, while an ANOVA was employed to explore differences across multiple groups within the university. This approach was based on previous research, with Newman and Benz (2017) emphasizing the importance of comparing means between groups and Bryman (2016) highlighting the usefulness of ANOVA in analyzing variance across multiple categories.

## Results and Discussion

### The Demographic Profile of Educational Leaders

The table below shows the demographic profile of the respondents who are the Educational Leaders of PHINMA Araullo University.

**Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Educational Leaders-Respondents in terms of Department, Position, Employment status, Number of years in teaching roles, Number of years in an administrative role and Participation in equity and inclusion-related training**

| Department | Frequency | Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|
| CELA       | 7         | 25.9    |
| CCJE       | 5         | 18.5    |
| CAHS       | 4         | 14.8    |
| CAS        | 6         | 22.2    |
| CMA        | 3         | 11.1    |

|                                       |                  |                |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| CITE                                  | 2                | 7.4            |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>27</b>        | <b>100.0</b>   |
| <b>Employment Status</b>              | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| Regular                               |                  |                |
| Probationary                          | 3                | 11.1           |
| Part time                             | 0                | 0              |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>27</b>        | <b>100.0</b>   |
|                                       |                  |                |
| <b>Designation</b>                    | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| Dean                                  |                  |                |
| Program Head                          | 21               | 77.8           |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>27</b>        | <b>100.0</b>   |
| <b>Number of Years in Admin Roles</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| 1-2                                   |                  |                |
| 3-4                                   | 8                | 29.6           |
| 4-5                                   | 6                | 22.2           |
| 6-10                                  | 4                | 14.8           |
| More than 10                          | 4                | 14.8           |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>27</b>        | <b>100.0</b>   |
| <b>No of Years in Teaching Roles</b>  | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| 1-2                                   |                  |                |
| 3-4                                   | 1                | 3.7            |
| 4-5                                   | 7                | 25.9           |
| 6-10                                  | 11               | 40.7           |
| More than 10                          | 7                | 25.9           |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>27</b>        | <b>100.0</b>   |
| <b>No of Trainings Attended</b>       | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| None                                  |                  |                |
| 1-5                                   | 8                | 29.6           |
| 6-10                                  | 11               | 40.7           |
| More than 10                          | 7                | 25.9           |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>27</b>        | <b>100.0</b>   |

### Department

Looking at the table, it can be gleaned that the College of Education and Liberal Arts (CELA) had the highest number of respondents with 25.9% of the total sample size. Departments like the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and College of Criminal Justice Education (CCJE) followed closely at 22.2% and 18.5%, respectively. The College of Allied Health Sciences (CAHS) is 14.8% and College of Management Arts (CMA) had 11.1%, of the total sample size. Finally, the College of Information Technology and Engineering (CITE) had the lowest number of respondents which is at 7.4% of the total sample size. This departmental distribution provides a foundational understanding of the background of Educational Leaders involved in the study.

The departmental breakdown of respondents in this study is key because it allows us to examine how leadership styles vary across PHINMA Araullo University. Research by Smith et al. (2020) aligns with this, highlighting the importance of diverse backgrounds in educational leadership. Their findings show that leaders from different academic areas bring unique perspectives to decision-making, impacting overall strategies. For example, educators might prioritize student-centered approaches, while leaders from engineering might emphasize innovation (Smith et al., 2020). This diversity enriches discussions and strengthens decision-making within the university. It emphasizes the importance of including leaders from various departments to fully understand leadership practices and how the university functions. According to Cheng (2019) it is important to consider how leaders' academic backgrounds might influence their leadership styles and approaches to equity in education. Research suggests that leaders' experiences, including their disciplinary background, can shape their focus on equity initiatives.

The distribution of respondents by department provides valuable insights into the composition of Educational Leaders at PHINMA Araullo University. The number of respondents per department does not impact the assessment of implementation levels, as investigation are completed independently within each department.

### **Employment Status**

Table 2 shows the Employment status of the educational leaders-respondents. The data reflected that 89% of the Educational leaders holding regular positions, while 11.1% of the Educational leaders are in probationary and there are no part-time educational leaders in the sample.

The employment status distribution among educational leaders at PHINMA Araullo University, detailed in Table 2, provides valuable insights into the organizational structure and leadership dynamics within the institution. The data reveals that 89% of educational leaders hold regular positions, indicating a strong emphasis on stability and continuity in leadership roles. This aligns with findings from Jones and Smith's (2019) study, which emphasized that leaders in regular positions often contribute more effectively to organizational stability and long-term strategic planning. Such stability is crucial for maintaining consistency in decision-making processes and fostering institutional resilience against challenges.

The presence of 11.1% of leaders in probationary status reflects a deliberate approach to leadership development and succession planning at PHINMA Araullo University. Jones and Smith (2019) noted that probationary periods allow institutions to assess new leaders' alignment with organizational goals and culture before fully integrating them into leadership roles. This strategic use of probationary status supports the university's efforts to cultivate leadership talent and ensure leadership transitions are smooth and aligned with institutional objectives.

The absence of part-time educational leaders within the sample underscores the university's preference for full-time commitment among its leadership team. According to Jones and Smith (2019), full-time leaders are better positioned to dedicate themselves to comprehensive leadership strategies, contributing to institutional cohesion and strategic alignment over the long term. This decision likely reflects PHINMA Araullo University's focus on maximizing leadership effectiveness and promoting a cohesive organizational culture through dedicated leadership engagement.

The distribution of employment statuses at PHINMA Araullo University not only reflects a strategic approach to leadership development but also aligns with established research highlighting the benefits of stable, full-time leadership in higher education institutions. By prioritizing regular positions and leveraging probationary periods effectively, the university demonstrates its commitment to fostering a stable and effective leadership environment conducive to sustained organizational growth and success.

### **Designation**

As shown in Table 2, there are six (6) deans, which make up 22.2% of the sample size, and twenty-one (21) program heads, which account for 77.8% of the sample size.

Research conducted by Thomas and Brown (2018) supports this organizational structure by emphasizing the advantages of decentralized leadership in higher education settings. Their research shows that a higher concentration of Program Heads is often associated with a decentralized strategy, which increases response to academic difficulties and supports innovation within individual programs. Program heads have critical roles in monitoring curriculum creation, improving student engagement techniques, and optimizing day-to-day operational efficiencies in their particular domains.

This decentralized strategy is aided by the presence of deans in senior leadership roles, who provide general guidance and departmental coordination. Johnson and Martinez (2019) mention studies that demonstrate the critical role deans play in establishing cooperation, ensuring the quality of education, and advancing the university's strategic goals. Their direction ensures consistency in organizational initiatives and facilitates the seamless integration of diverse departmental contributions toward the achievement of institutional goals.

The Deans and Program Heads structure of PHINMA Araullo University is an example of a strategic organizational architecture that combines centralized leadership direction with localized knowledge. This dual method enhances operational effectiveness, decision-making procedures, and the institution's overall capacity to innovate and adapt in a changing educational environment.

### **Number of Years in Administrative Roles**

The analysis of Educational Leaders' experience in administrative roles at PHINMA Araullo University reveals a diverse distribution of tenure among its leadership cohort, as depicted in Table 2. The largest proportion, comprising 29.6%, reported having 3-4 years of administrative experience, indicating a significant group of leaders in early to mid-career stages. This finding is supported by research conducted by Smith and Johnson (2018), who discussed how leaders with 3-4 years of experience often bring fresh perspectives and enthusiasm to organizational roles, contributing to adaptability and innovation within higher education settings.



Additionally, 22.2% of educational leaders at the university reported 4-5 years of administrative experience, highlighting a substantial segment of mid-career leaders. Studies by Brown and Davis (2019) underscore the pivotal roles played by mid-career leaders in ensuring institutional stability and driving strategic initiatives. Their research suggests that leaders with this tenure are adept at navigating complexities and implementing sustainable solutions that support organizational growth.

In contrast, 18.5% of leaders reported having 1-2 years of administrative experience, indicating a cohort of emerging leaders in the early stages of their careers. Research by Garcia and Martinez (2020) emphasizes the importance of supporting early-career leaders with mentorship and professional development opportunities to enhance their leadership effectiveness and long-term retention within educational institutions.

Moreover, 14.8% of educational leaders reported having between 6-10 years of administrative experience, alongside another 14.8% with more than 10 years of experience. This diversity in tenure reflects a continuum of leadership maturity and experience within the university's administrative ranks, contributing to a well-rounded leadership team capable of addressing varied institutional challenges.

The analysis of tenure among educational leaders at PHINMA Araullo University, supported by studies from Smith and Johnson (2018), Brown and Davis (2019), and Garcia and Martinez (2020), underscores a strategic approach to leadership development. This approach ensures that the university can leverage both the enthusiasm of early-career leaders and the experience of mid-career and seasoned leaders to foster organizational resilience, innovation, and sustained growth.

### **Number of Years in Teaching Roles**

The educational leaders of PHINMA Araullo University come from diverse backgrounds, as indicated by the analysis of their teaching experiences in Table 2, significant portion 40.7% held 6-10 years of teaching experience. A notable sign of the diverse leadership team was the presence of leaders with over 10 years of experience 25.9% and 4-5 years 25.9% of teaching experience. On the other hand, less Educational Leaders 3.7% and 3-4%, respectively, stated that they had been teachers for one to two or three years.

Johnson and Smith (2017) highlight the critical role of teaching experience in educational leadership, emphasizing how leaders with extensive teaching backgrounds contribute to effective decision-making and understanding of educational contexts, which benefits both educators and students. Thomas and Brown (2019) go deeper into the consequences of varied teaching backgrounds in educational leadership, highlighting how such variety improves decision-making and develops inclusive learning environments, supporting fair educational results. Garcia and Martinez (2020) argue that early-career leaders in education should be supported, with a focus on mentoring and professional development to improve teaching effectiveness and promote fair educational outcomes. They claim that investing in various leadership experiences and developing emerging leaders allows institutions to better meet the different needs of students and communities, resulting in more fair educational opportunities.

The diverse teaching experience of Educational Leaders at PHINMA Araullo University enriches the leadership team and aligns with research emphasizing the benefits of diverse leadership in advancing equitable education outcomes. Leaders with varied teaching backgrounds are better equipped to understand and address the diverse needs of students and communities, fostering inclusive learning environments and advancing educational equity initiatives.

### **Participation in Equity and Inclusion-related Training**

In Table 2, the analysis of Educational Leaders' participation in equity and inclusion training shows a strong commitment to professional development in this area. A significant portion 40.7% of Educational Leaders have attended 6-10 training sessions, while a noteworthy 25.9% have attended more than 10 training sessions. Additionally, a smaller proportion 29.6% have participated in 1-5 training sessions. It is important to note that only a small percentage 3.7% reported attending no training sessions.

According to Brown and Lee (2018), equity and inclusion training transforms educational leadership by improving leaders' ability to build inclusive workplaces, eliminate structural hurdles, and promote fair results for all students. Their findings emphasized the need of participation in Equity and Inclusion Training programs in order to foster a conducive educational environment. Similarly, Smith et al. (2020) found a relationship between considerable engagement in equality training, changes in the organizational environment, and student performance results. Their findings show the need of ongoing professional development in equity and inclusion for meeting educational objectives and boosting overall student accomplishment.

Educational Leaders' proactive engagement in equity and inclusion training at PHINMA Araullo University not only demonstrates a commitment to personal development, but also highlights the institution's commitment to promoting inclusive educational settings. Leaders who engage in ongoing training and development are better suited to provide diverse and inclusive learning environments that benefit all students and contribute to larger educational equity goals.

**Table 3. Weighted Mean and Qualitative Description Level of Implementation in Promoting Equitable Education among Educational Leaders and Faculty**

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Educational Leaders |                           | Faculty     |                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | wm                  | Verbal Description        | wm          | Verbal Description        |
| <b>Accessibility</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                     |                           |             |                           |
| 1. The department is committed to ensuring that all instructional spaces, including classrooms, laboratories, and other learning environments, are accessible to every student.                                                                                               | 3.85                | Highly Implemented        | 3.63        | Highly Implemented        |
| 2. The department recognizes the importance of accessible educational materials. This includes ensuring textbooks and online resources that are designed to accommodate students with diverse needs and learning styles.                                                      | 3.67                | Highly Implemented        | 3.89        | Highly Implemented        |
| 3. The department is committed to ensure that all students have access to necessary resources, such as academic support services and financial aid and actively promotes a safe and inclusive learning environment for all students, free from discrimination and harassment. | 3.85                | Highly Implemented        | 3.85        | Highly Implemented        |
| 4. The departments share resources and expertise to support student success programs, such as tutoring services or mentoring initiatives, for students from underrepresented backgrounds.                                                                                     | 3.85                | Highly Implemented        | 3.78        | Highly Implemented        |
| <b>Average weighted mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>3.81</b>         | <b>Highly Implemented</b> | <b>3.79</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> |
| <b>Partnerships</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                     |                           |             |                           |
| 1. The department works with industry partners to develop experiential learning opportunities (e.g., internships, immersions) that allow students to apply their skills in real-world settings.                                                                               | 3.74                | Highly Implemented        | 3.93        | Highly Implemented        |
| 2. The department collaborates with external partners to develop or expand financial aid programs and scholarship opportunities specifically tailored to increase access to higher education for students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds in the program.              | 3.37                | Highly Implemented        | 3.78        | Highly Implemented        |
| 3. The department collaborates with other departments to share resources and expertise in developing curriculum that equips students with a well-rounded skillset for their chosen field. This may include guest                                                              | 3.78                | Highly Implemented        | 3.78        | Highly Implemented        |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |             |                           |             |                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| lectures, joint workshops, or career guidance.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |             |                           |             |                           |
| 4. The department collaborates with other departments within the university to benchmark learning materials that reflect diverse perspectives and promote cultural competency.                                                                                        | 3.70        | Highly Implemented        | 3.74        | Highly Implemented        |
| <b>Average weighted mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>3.65</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> | <b>3.81</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> |
| <b>Customer Support Services</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |             |                           |             |                           |
| 1. The department offers multiple channels for students to access support services like online portals, Facebook page etc.                                                                                                                                            | 3.81        | Highly Implemented        | 3.93        | Highly Implemented        |
| 2. The department maintain regular office hours and are readily available for student consultations.                                                                                                                                                                  | 3.96        | Highly Implemented        | 3.89        | Highly Implemented        |
| 3. The department support-staff are knowledgeable about resources and services available to students from diverse backgrounds.                                                                                                                                        | 3.96        | Highly Implemented        | 3.89        | Highly Implemented        |
| 4. The department actively solicits feedback from students regarding their experience with faculty and departmental support services.                                                                                                                                 | 3.93        | Highly Implemented        | 3.96        | Highly Implemented        |
| <b>Average weighted mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>3.92</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> | <b>3.92</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> |
| <b>Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |             |                           |             |                           |
| 1. The department incorporates student surveys or focus groups to gather feedback on their experiences with various departmental resources and equity-related initiatives.                                                                                            | 3.74        | Highly Implemented        | 3.63        | Highly Implemented        |
| 2. The department regularly shares the results of its feedback analysis with students, faculty, and staff, outlining key findings and planned actions.                                                                                                                | 3.74        | Highly Implemented        | 3.63        | Highly Implemented        |
| 3. The department partners with student organizations and diversity committees to gather feedback on equity and inclusion efforts within the program.                                                                                                                 | 3.67        | Highly Implemented        | 3.63        | Highly Implemented        |
| 4. The department incorporates student feedback into collaborative decision-making processes when developing or revising policies and initiatives related to equity and inclusion.                                                                                    | 3.78        | Highly Implemented        | 3.67        | Highly Implemented        |
| <b>Average weighted mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>3.73</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> | <b>3.64</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> |
| <b>Faculty and Staff Diversity</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |             |                           |             |                           |
| 1. The department actively seeks out and encourages applications from diverse backgrounds during faculty and staff recruitment searches while the department search committee utilizes inclusive search practices to ensure a diverse pool of qualified candidates is | 3.70        | Highly Implemented        | 3.56        | Highly Implemented        |

|                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                           |      |                    |      |                    |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|--------------------|------|--------------------|
| considered for open positions.   |                                                                                                                                                                                           |      |                    |      |                    |
| 2.                               | The department actively works to create a departmental culture that celebrates the richness of diversity and promotes the value of diverse perspectives.                                  | 3.81 | Highly Implemented | 3.48 | Highly Implemented |
| 3.                               | The department meetings and professional development opportunities regularly address topics related to diversity and its role in teaching, learning, and the work environment.            | 3.78 | Highly Implemented | 3.56 | Highly Implemented |
| 4.                               | 4. The department leadership actively promotes diversity as a core value within the department and university community.                                                                  | 3.74 | Highly Implemented | 3.67 | Highly Implemented |
| Average weighted mean            |                                                                                                                                                                                           | 3.76 | Highly Implemented | 3.56 | Highly Implemented |
| Inclusive Policies and Practices |                                                                                                                                                                                           |      |                    |      |                    |
| 1.                               | The department implements inclusive teaching strategies that cater the diverse needs and experiences of students, fostering an environment where all feel valued and included.            | 3.85 | Highly Implemented | 3.56 | Highly Implemented |
| 2.                               | The department curriculum considers and incorporates the needs and experiences of students from diverse backgrounds.                                                                      | 3.78 | Highly Implemented | 3.59 | Highly Implemented |
| 3.                               | The department regular communication and dialogue occur regarding best practices for promoting inclusion and addressing student’s needs.                                                  | 3.70 | Highly Implemented | 3.59 | Highly Implemented |
| 4.                               | The department actively works to create a welcoming and inclusive learning environment for all students, regardless of their background or identity.                                      | 3.81 | Highly Implemented | 3.48 | Highly Implemented |
| Average weighted mean            |                                                                                                                                                                                           | 3.79 | Highly Implemented | 3.56 | Highly Implemented |
| Professional Development         |                                                                                                                                                                                           |      |                    |      |                    |
| 1.                               | The department allocates resources (e.g., time, funding) to support faculty and staff participation in external professional development opportunities on equity and inclusion.           | 3.59 | Highly Implemented | 3.30 | Highly Implemented |
| 2.                               | The department information about professional development opportunities related to diversity and inclusion is readily available and accessible to faculty and staff.                      | 3.52 | Highly Implemented | 3.33 | Highly Implemented |
| 3.                               | The department provides training sessions on cultural competency on faculty and staff with strategies for creating inclusive learning environments for students from diverse backgrounds. | 3.48 | Highly Implemented | 3.33 | Highly Implemented |
| 4.                               | The department variety of                                                                                                                                                                 | 3.56 | Highly             | 3.41 | Highly             |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                  |             |                           |             |                           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| professional development formats (e.g., workshops, seminars, online modules) are available within the department or university to address the diverse learning preferences of faculty and staff. |             | Implemented               |             | Implemented               |
| <b>Average weighted mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>3.54</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> | <b>3.34</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> |
| <b>Resource Allocation</b>                                                                                                                                                                       |             |                           |             |                           |
| 1. The department allocates resources to support faculty participation in professional development programs focused on cultural competency and inclusive teaching.                               | 3.52        | Highly Implemented        | 3.37        | Highly Implemented        |
| 2. The department receives adequate funding to support initiatives and programs specifically aimed at promoting equitable education within our program.                                          | 3.41        | Highly Implemented        | 3.44        | Highly Implemented        |
| 3. The department clearly communicates the criteria for allocating resources to support initiatives related to equitable education.                                                              | 3.44        | Highly Implemented        | 3.48        | Highly Implemented        |
| 4. The department advocates for and supports the allocation of resources to university-wide student support services that cater to the needs of diverse student population.                      | 3.63        | Highly Implemented        | 3.44        | Highly Implemented        |
| <b>Average weighted mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>3.50</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> | <b>3.44</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> |
| <b>Socioeconomic Disparities</b>                                                                                                                                                                 |             |                           |             |                           |
| 1. The department actively promotes awareness and encourages students to explore financial aid options and scholarships.                                                                         | 3.78        | Highly Implemented        | 3.67        | Highly Implemented        |
| 2. The department collaborates with financial aid services to ensure clear communication about available resources to students from low-income backgrounds.                                      | 3.74        | Highly Implemented        | 3.70        | Highly Implemented        |
| 3. The department actively seeks opportunities to partner with local organizations or programs that provide academic support and resources to low-income students.                               | 3.81        | Highly Implemented        | 3.63        | Highly Implemented        |
| 4. The department data on student needs and challenges are used to inform departmental initiatives aimed at mitigating the impact of socioeconomic disparities.                                  | 3.85        | Highly Implemented        | 3.70        | Highly Implemented        |
| <b>Average weighted mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>3.80</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> | <b>3.68</b> | <b>Highly Implemented</b> |

### Accessibility

Table 3 presented the level of implementation for equitable education in terms of accessibility among educational leaders and faculty at PHINMA Araullo University. Both groups prioritized creating accessible learning spaces like



classrooms and laboratories, with educational leaders scoring a weighted mean of 3.85 and faculty scoring 3.63, both described as "Highly Implemented." Providing educational materials, such as textbooks and online resources, in formats that cater to diverse needs and learning styles was also highly implemented, with educational leaders rating it at 3.67 and faculty at 3.89. The university ensured access to resources like academic support services and financial aid, which both educational leaders and faculty rated at 3.85, also described as "Highly Implemented." Additionally, the commitment to fostering a safe and inclusive learning environment free from discrimination was evident. Programs like tutoring and mentoring initiatives designed to help students from underrepresented backgrounds were strongly supported, with educational leaders giving a score of 3.85 and faculty 3.78. The overall average weighted mean scores of 3.81 for educational leaders and 3.79 for faculty indicated a high level of implementation of accessibility measures within the equitable education practices at PHINMA Araullo University.

Supporting research underscores the importance of these efforts. Maxwell and Rose (2019) emphasized that creating accessible learning environments and resources is crucial for promoting inclusive education and improving academic outcomes for all students. Their research showed that institutions committed to accessibility see enhanced student engagement and success. Similarly, Martinez and Cooper (2020) found that providing necessary academic support and fostering an inclusive learning environment free from discrimination are essential components of equitable education, leading to better student retention and achievement. These studies highlight the importance of PHINMA Araullo University's commitment to accessibility and equitable education practices.

The university's leadership in establishing an inclusive educational environment that caters to the diverse needs of its students. By integrating accessibility principles into all aspects of educational practice, the institution can enhance student outcomes and promote equitable education.

## Partnerships

The degree of partnership level of implementation is shown in Table 3. The institution took an active role in forming partnerships to improve student learning. Initiatives like creating experiential learning opportunities with industry partners were highly praised by educational leaders, with a weighted mean of 3.74, although faculty gave it a slightly higher rating with a weighted mean 3.93, designating it as "Highly Implemented". Collaboration with external partners to expand financial aid and scholarship opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds also received high marks, with educational leaders at 3.37 and faculty at 3.78, both classified as "Highly Implemented". There was strong collaboration among departments to develop comprehensive curricula that prepare students with diverse skill sets. Collaboration among university staff members to diversify course materials and advance cultural competency was evaluated as "Highly Implemented" by educational leaders and faculty with an average weighted mean of 3.74. Also, collaborative efforts such as career counseling and guest lectures received strong support from educational leaders and faculty, both educational leaders and faculty evaluated these initiatives equally and assigned a weighted average score of 3.78, classifying them as "Highly Implemented". The department has demonstrated a consistent high level of implementation and success in forming partnerships and working together to broaden educational experiences, as evidenced by the average weighted mean scores of 3.81 for faculty and 3.65 for educational leaders.

According to Elliott-Johns and Anderson (2017), educational collaborations, particularly those engaging industry for experiential learning and curriculum expansion, significantly increase student learning outcomes and institutional performance. Educational leaders and professors have praised such initiatives, demonstrating a significant link between effective collaborations and educational equity (Elliott-Johns & Anderson, 2017). Teitel (2014) also emphasized the transformative power of cooperative partnerships in education, emphasizing how they may improve educational outcomes for a variety of student populations by advancing cultural competency and developing inclusive curricula. This reaffirms the institution's focus on encouraging comprehensive learning experiences via teamwork (Teitel, 2014). According to Janssen et al. (2016), industry-academia collaborations reinforce the benefits of partnerships aiming at improving educational fairness by helping to prepare students with a variety of skill sets and by extending educational options.

The emphasis on collaboration among educational leaders, faculty, and industrial partners fosters an active learning environment. Initiatives such as industry collaborations, more financing, and broad skill-based courses demonstrate a commitment to student achievement. According to the data presented, PHINMA Araullo University appears to be on the right track in terms of providing a well-rounded and equal educational experience to its students.

## Customer Support Services

As shown in Table 3 Educational Leaders has a high level of implementation in equitable education in terms of Customer Support Services. The department at PHINMA Araullo University demonstrates a strong commitment to student support services across several key areas. Both educational leaders and faculty emphasize the availability of multiple channels for accessing support services, such as online portals and a dedicated Facebook page, rating these initiatives highly

with means of 3.81 and 3.93 respectively which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Regular office hours and readily available consultations are also “Highly Implemented”, with a weighted mean of 3.96 and 3.89 from educational leaders and faculty, respectively. The department's support staff are recognized for their knowledge of resources and services for students from diverse backgrounds, with a weighted mean of 3.96 and 3.89 which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Efforts to solicit feedback from students about their experiences with faculty and support services are highly rated by both groups, with a weighted mean of 3.93 and 3.96 which is described as “Highly Implemented”. These high level of implementation, averaging 3.92 overall, underscore the department's dedication to providing comprehensive and accessible support services that enhance the student experience and foster a supportive learning environment.

In the study of Kim and Lee (2017) the role of various support services, including online portals and social media, in enhancing student engagement and satisfaction. Kim and Lee (2017) found that institutions offering diverse channels for accessing support contribute significantly to students' academic success and overall well-being. Garcia and Hernandez investigated the effect of open office hours and consultation availability on students' perceptions of support and institutional commitment. In the research it is found that these approaches improve the student experience and build a supportive learning environment.

Based on the findings the university has a strong commitment to providing comprehensive and accessible customer support services. Both educational leaders and faculty place a high emphasis on multiple access channels like as internet portals and social media, rating them as "Highly Implemented". Regular office hours and easily accessible consultations are also promoted. Recognizing support workers for their expertise and effectiveness in supporting students from varied backgrounds promotes inclusion. Proactive student feedback reinforces a student-centered approach. These studies demonstrate how strategically implementing customer support services improves student satisfaction, creates a supportive learning environment, and promotes academic performance.

### **Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms**

As shown in Table 3 Educational Leaders has a high level of implementation in equitable education in terms of Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms. Educational leaders and faculty highly implemented gathering feedback through student surveys or focus groups on departmental resources and equity initiatives, with a weighted mean of 3.74 and 3.63 respectively which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Educational leaders and faculty consistently share feedback analysis results with stakeholders, earning high rating with a weighted mean of 3.74 from educational leaders and 3.63 from faculty which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Collaboration with student organizations and diversity committees to gather feedback on equity efforts is highly implemented, with a weighted mean of 3.67 and 3.63 from educational leaders and faculty, respectively which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Lastly educational leaders and faculty emphasize incorporating student feedback into decision-making processes for equity and inclusion policies, with a weighted mean of 3.78 and 3.67, respectively which is described as “Highly Implemented”. With a weighted mean of 3.78 and 3.67, respectively, educational leaders and faculty stress incorporating student feedback into decision-making processes for equality and inclusion policies, which is classified as "Highly Implemented". These high levels of implementation of equitable education in terms of evaluation and feedback mechanisms, with an average weighted mean of 3.92, demonstrate the department's proactive approach to gathering, sharing, and acting on student feedback, effectively enhancing equity and inclusion efforts.

Supporting this findings, Wilson and Adams (2019) investigated the impact of feedback mechanisms on student satisfaction and retention in higher education. Their study highlights that institutions with robust feedback systems see higher rates of student success and satisfaction, especially regarding equity-related initiatives. Also Park and Kim (2016) discussed in their research the integration of student feedback into organizational decision-making processes in educational settings. Park and Kim (2016) argue that meaningful engagement with student perspectives through feedback mechanisms enhances institutional responsiveness and effectiveness in addressing equity issues.

PHINMA Araullo University is devoted to improving equitable education in the learning environment through effective evaluation and feedback mechanisms. Educational leaders and faculty prioritize the collection and use of student feedback using instruments including as surveys, focus groups, and cooperation with student organizations. This inclusive approach ensures that student perspectives are considered in decision-making processes inside the school. Such methods are supported by research that shows that active student engagement improves institutional performance and student achievement in pursuing equitable goals. This dedication to a full feedback loop demonstrates the university's proactive approach to promoting an inclusive educational environment that benefits the whole student body.

### **Faculty and Staff Diversity**

As shown in Table 3 Educational Leaders has a high level of implementation in equitable education in terms of Faculty and Staff Diversity. Educational leaders (3.70) and faculty (3.56) highly implemented prioritized inclusive recruitment practices, actively encouraging applications from diverse backgrounds to ensure a diverse candidate pool for faculty and staff positions, with a weighted mean of 3.70 for educational leaders and 3.56 for faculty, which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Emphasizing creating a departmental culture that celebrates diversity and values diverse

perspectives, fostering an inclusive environment is also “Highly Implemented” with a weighted mean of 3.81 educational leaders and 3.48 for faculty. Department meetings and professional development opportunities regularly address diversity's role in teaching, learning, and the work environment, rated highly by both educational leaders with a weighted mean of 3.78 and 3.56 weighted mean for faculty, which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Department leadership actively promotes diversity as a core value within the department and university community, supported by educational leaders and faculty with a weighted mean of 3.74 and 3.67 respectively, which is described as “Highly Implemented”. These highly implemented practices underscore the department's commitment to fostering diversity, integrating it into recruitment, culture, professional development, and institutional values with an average weighted mean of 3.74 for educational and a weighted mean of 3.67 for faculty both described as “Highly Implemented”.

Supporting these finding is Harrison and Sullivan (2018) research, which discovered that varied academics had a beneficial influence on educational settings by encouraging inclusivity and boosting student success through different viewpoints and role modeling. The study emphasized the significance of varied representation in teacher recruitment and retention in fostering a healthy learning environment. Robinson and Harris (2020) found that inclusive leadership may promote diversity in academic departments by emphasizing open decision-making and creating a sense of belonging, leading to increased recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and staff. These studies emphasize the benefits of expanding faculty and staff diversity in educational environments, with an emphasis on inclusive leadership practices, effective diversity training, and policies that promote good organizational outcomes and student accomplishment. PHINMA Araullo University focuses creating a diverse and inclusive teaching and staff environment. This is demonstrated by their emphasis on inclusive recruiting processes, fostering a friendly departmental culture, incorporating diversity into professional development, and presenting it as a key value. High implementation scores from both educational leaders and faculty demonstrate this dedication to creating a vibrant academic community that represents a diverse range of experiences and opinions.

### **Inclusive Policies and Practices**

As shown in Table 3 Educational Leaders has a high level of implementation in equitable education in terms of Inclusive Policies and Practices. The department demonstrated strong implementation of inclusive teaching strategies with a weighted mean of 3.85 for educational leaders and 3.56 for faculty, ensuring all students feel valued and included through diverse instructional approaches. Both Educational Leaders and Faculty integrated diverse student needs into the curriculum, reflecting a commitment to inclusivity in educational content and experiences, with a weighted mean of 3.78 for educational leaders and 3.59 for faculty, which is described as “Highly Implemented”. Regular communication on best practices for inclusion is also highly implemented with a weighted mean of 3.70 for educational leaders and 3.59 for faculty, it shows proactive efforts to address student needs and promote inclusivity. The department actively creates a welcoming environment for all students it has a weighted mean of 3.81 for educational leaders and 3.48 for faculty, both described as “Highly Implemented” emphasizing inclusivity regardless of background or identity.

Smith et al. (2021) found that implementing inclusive policies and practices in educational institutions adds greatly to promoting an equal learning environment. Their research underlines the importance of inclusive teaching practices and curricular integration that are adapted to varied student needs in increasing engagement and academic accomplishment. The study also stressed the need of continuous communication about best practices for inclusion in creating a supportive educational climate that encourages student accomplishment across diverse backgrounds. These findings are consistent with the department's high implementation ratings for inclusive teaching strategies, curricular integration, communication about inclusion practices, and creating a welcoming workplace, as evidenced by both Educational Leaders and Faculty.

PHINMA Araullo University focuses creating an equitable and inclusive learning environment for all students. This is evident in their emphasis on different teaching methodologies, including diverse student needs into the curriculum, and encouraging inclusion via open communication and a welcoming environment. High implementation ratings, particularly among educational leaders, indicate a strong commitment to these practices. The overall emphasis on inclusivity is consistent with research demonstrating its favorable influence on student engagement and success.

### **Professional Development**

As shown in Table 3 Educational Leaders has a high level of implementation in equitable education in terms of Professional Development. The department demonstrates strong support by allocating resources with a weighted mean of 3.59 for educational leaders and 3.30 for faculty, which is both described as “Highly Implemented” this is to ensure faculty and staff can participate in external professional development opportunities focused on equity and inclusion. Both Educational Leaders and faculty have ensured that information about professional development opportunities related to diversity and inclusion is readily available and accessible to all faculty and staff, with a weighted mean of 3.52 for educational leaders and 3.33 for faculty, which is both described as “Highly Implemented”. Educational Leaders and faculty highlight the department's provision of training sessions aimed at enhancing cultural competency among faculty and staff, essential for creating inclusive learning environments. It is also “Highly Implemented” with a weighted mean of 3.48 for educational leaders and 3.33 for faculty. Both Educational Leaders and Faculty emphasize the availability of diverse

professional development formats (e.g., workshops, seminars, online modules) within the department or university, accommodating various learning preferences among faculty and staff. Which is also “Highly Implemented” for educational leaders it is rated with a weighted mean of 3.56 and 3.41 for faculty. Overall, the level of implantation of equitable education in terms of professional development is “Highly Implemented” it has an average weighted mean of 3.54 for educational leaders and 3.34 for faculty.

According to Taylor and Lee (2020), funding for external professional development focused on equity and inclusion helps faculty and staff create inclusive learning environments. Garcia and Nguyen (2019) emphasize that easy access to information about diversity-related professional development opportunities is crucial for ensuring widespread participation among faculty and staff. Cultural competency training for instructors and staff significantly fosters inclusive learning environments, as shown by Smith et al. (2021). These studies demonstrate the department's dedication to promoting an equitable learning environment and reinforce its exceptional professional development outcomes for the implementation of equality and inclusion.

PHINMA Araullo University effectively allocates resources for professional development centered on equity and inclusion, ensuring that information about diversity-related opportunities is accessible. By emphasizing cultural competence training to create inclusive learning environments, these initiatives positively influence student outcomes and faculty engagement, highlighting the university's commitment to fairness and inclusivity in education.

### Resource Allocation

As shown in Table 3 Educational Leaders has a high level of implementation in equitable education in terms of Resource Allocation. Both educational leaders and faculty rated the allocation of resources to support faculty participation in professional development programs focused on cultural competency and inclusive teaching as “Highly Implemented,” with weighted means of 3.52 and 3.37, respectively. Adequate funding to support initiatives aimed at promoting equitable education within the program is also “Highly Implemented,” with a weighted mean of 3.41 for educational leaders and 3.44 for faculty. The clear communication of criteria for resource allocation to support equitable education initiatives is “Highly Implemented” with a weighted means of 3.44 from educational leaders and 3.48 from faculty. Advocating for and supporting the allocation of resources to university-wide student support services that address the needs of a diverse student population is “Highly Implemented,” with a weighted mean of 3.63 from educational leaders and 3.44 from faculty. Overall the level of implementation in equitable education terms Resource allocation is “Highly Implemented”, the average weighted mean is 3.50 for educational leaders and 3.44 for faculty, indicating a strong commitment to resource allocation for equitable education.

Means et al. (2019) found that devoting resources to professional development in cultural competency and inclusive teaching improves faculty effectiveness and student results in a variety of educational settings. Adeyemi and Adeyinka's (2020) research shows that appropriate investment for efforts to promote equitable education leads to better academic performance and retention rates among underrepresented student groups. According to Taylor and Booker's (2021) research, accurate communication of resource allocation criteria is critical for the successful implementation of equitable education programs, since it ensures openness and accountability. Additionally, Kendi and Eberhardt (2021) argue that advocating for and supporting resource allocation to university-wide student support services is essential in meeting the diverse needs of the student population, ultimately fostering an inclusive and supportive educational environment.

These studies collectively underscore the importance of resource allocation in achieving equitable education goals, aligning with the high implementation ratings observed at PHINMA Araullo University. PHINMA Araullo University's strategic resource allocation demonstrated a firm commitment to providing an equitable and inclusive educational environment that improves both teacher involvement and student results.

### Socioeconomic Disparities

As shown in Table 3 Educational Leaders has a high level of implementation in equitable education in terms of Socioeconomic Disparities. The university is highly committed to promoting awareness and guiding students in exploring financial aid options and scholarships, as indicated by a weighted means of 3.78 for educational leaders and 3.67 for faculty, which is both described as “Highly Implemented”. Educational leaders and faculty have also “Highly Implemented” coordinated efforts with financial aid agencies to promote clear communication about available resources for students from low-income families, with a weighted mean of 3.74 for educational leaders and 3.70 for faculty. The institution aggressively pursues relationships with local organizations to provide academic help and resources for low-income students, with a weighted mean of 3.81 for educational leaders and 3.63 for faculty, all regarded as “Highly Implemented”. Utilizing student data to inform initiatives aimed at addressing socioeconomic disparities is also “Highly Implemented”, with a weighted mean of 3.85 for educational leaders and 3.70 for faculty. These initiatives demonstrated the university's strong commitment to reducing the impact of socioeconomic disparities, as seen by an average weighted mean of 3.80 for educational leaders and 3.68 for professors, both of which are defined as “Highly Implemented”.

Lee and Chen (2020) discovered that universities that aggressively promote awareness and help students in obtaining financial assistance and scholarships make a major contribution to eliminating socioeconomic gaps. Their findings highlight the need of clear communication and coordination between schools and financial assistance agencies in supporting low-income students, which is consistent with the beneficial methods identified at PHINMA Araullo University. It can be gleaned that the importance of addressing concerns about Socioeconomic disparities in achieving equitable education goals, aligns with the high implementation ratings observed at PHINMA Araullo University.

**Table 4: Significant Relationship Between the Level of Implementation in Equitable Education and Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

|                                    |                         | Department | Employment Status | Designation | No years Admin Roles | No of years in Teaching Roles | Training Attended |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Accessibility                      | Correlation Coefficient | .469*      | -.282             | -.427*      | .534**               | .134                          | .091              |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .014       | .153              | .026        | .004                 | .504                          | .651              |
|                                    | N                       | 27         | 27                | 27          | 27                   | 27                            | 27                |
| Partnerships                       | Correlation Coefficient | .196       | .165              | -.012       | .110                 | .117                          | .217              |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .327       | .410              | .953        | .586                 | .563                          | .277              |
|                                    | N                       | 27         | 27                | 27          | 27                   | 27                            | 27                |
| Customer Support Services          | Correlation Coefficient | .045       | -.039             | -.313       | .174                 | .121                          | .450*             |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .822       | .845              | .111        | .386                 | .549                          | .019              |
|                                    | N                       | 27         | 27                | 27          | 27                   | 27                            | 27                |
| Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms | Correlation Coefficient | .343       | .064              | -.218       | .435*                | .091                          | .282              |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .080       | .751              | .275        | .024                 | .651                          | .154              |
|                                    | N                       | 27         | 27                | 27          | 27                   | 27                            | 27                |
| Faculty and Staff Diversity        | Correlation Coefficient | .191       | .209              | .152        | .185                 | -.303                         | .042              |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .340       | .295              | .449        | .355                 | .124                          | .836              |
|                                    | N                       | 27         | 27                | 27          | 27                   | 27                            | 27                |
| Inclusive Policies and Practices   | Correlation Coefficient | .213       | -.025             | .193        | .112                 | -.174                         | -.060             |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .287       | .903              | .334        | .579                 | .386                          | .765              |
|                                    | N                       | 27         | 27                | 27          | 27                   | 27                            | 27                |
| Professional Development           | Correlation Coefficient | .147       | -.141             | .148        | .214                 | -.102                         | -.091             |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .463       | .484              | .462        | .284                 | .613                          | .651              |
|                                    | N                       | 27         | 27                | 27          | 27                   | 27                            | 27                |
| Resource Allocation                | Correlation Coefficient | .044       | .077              | -.175       | .480*                | .269                          | -.025             |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .826       | .702              | .383        | .011                 | .175                          | .901              |



|                                  |                                |       |       |       |      |      |      |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
|                                  | N                              | 27    | 27    | 27    | 27   | 27   | 27   |
| <b>Socioeconomic Disparities</b> | <b>Correlation Coefficient</b> | -.046 | -.010 | -.097 | .315 | .099 | .284 |
|                                  | <b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>         | .820  | .961  | .632  | .109 | .624 | .151 |
|                                  | N                              | 27    | 27    | 27    | 27   | 27   | 27   |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 presented the correlation between accessibility and the demographic profile of the respondents. The results indicate a significant positive correlation ( $r = 0.469$ ,  $p = 0.014$ ) that suggests that accessibility initiatives tend to benefit specific employment statuses within the department more than others, implying that accessibility initiatives may be more accessible to particular groups within the organization. In contrast, there is a weak negative correlation ( $r = -0.282$ ,  $p = 0.153$ ) between accessibility and job designation, implying that job titles may not significantly influence accessibility efforts. The correlation between accessibility and years in administrative roles is moderately negative ( $r = -0.427$ ,  $p = 0.026$ ), suggesting that individuals with less administrative experience might find accessibility measures more impactful. Conversely, a strong positive correlation ( $r = 0.534$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ) exists between accessibility and years in teaching roles, indicating that longer teaching experience correlates with more effective accessibility initiatives. However, correlations with training attended ( $r = 0.134$ ,  $p = 0.504$ ) and employment status ( $r = 0.091$ ,  $p = 0.651$ ) are not statistically significant.

It can be gleaned also that Partnerships, weak positive correlations with employment status ( $r = 0.196$ ,  $p = 0.327$ ) and job designation ( $r = 0.165$ ,  $p = 0.410$ ) suggest a tendency for specific employment categories and job titles to engage more in partnerships within the department. Partnership activities has weak positive correlation influenced to administrative experience, as evidenced by the lack of significant connection ( $r = -0.012$ ,  $p = 0.953$ ) between years in administrative jobs and years of experience. Correlations with job position ( $r = 0.217$ ,  $p = 0.277$ ), training attended ( $r = 0.117$ ,  $p = 0.563$ ), and years spent in teaching roles ( $r = 0.110$ ,  $p = 0.586$ ) all fail to show a statistically significant difference.

Regarding Customer Support Services the researcher found out, no significant correlations are observed with employment status ( $r = 0.045$ ,  $p = 0.822$ ), job designation ( $r = -0.039$ ,  $p = 0.845$ ), or years in teaching roles ( $r = 0.174$ ,  $p = 0.386$ ). The researcher also found that less years of administrative experience may be associated with better customer support services, since there is a somewhat negative association ( $r = -0.313$ ,  $p = 0.111$ ) with years in administrative jobs. Relative to the department's assessment and feedback systems, there is a slight positive connection ( $r = 0.450$ ,  $p = 0.019$ ) indicating that efficient customer support services might reinforce them.

The researcher also found that with Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms, there is a moderate positive correlation with employment status ( $r = 0.343$ ,  $p = 0.080$ ), indicating that certain employment categories within the department may benefit more from evaluation and feedback mechanisms. However, correlations with job designation ( $r = 0.064$ ,  $p = 0.751$ ), years in administrative roles ( $r = -0.218$ ,  $p = 0.275$ ), years in teaching roles ( $r = 0.435$ ,  $p = 0.024$ ), training attended ( $r = 0.091$ ,  $p = 0.651$ ), and employment status ( $r = 0.282$ ,  $p = 0.154$ ) do not reach statistical significance.

Lastly it can be gleaned at Table 4 that Faculty and Staff Diversity, no significant correlations are found with employment status ( $r = 0.191$ ,  $p = 0.340$ ), job designation ( $r = 0.209$ ,  $p = 0.295$ ), years in administrative roles ( $r = 0.152$ ,  $p = 0.449$ ), years in teaching roles ( $r = 0.185$ ,  $p = 0.355$ ), or training attended ( $r = -0.303$ ,  $p = 0.124$ ). A weak positive correlation with employment status ( $r = 0.042$ ,  $p = 0.836$ ) suggests a slight association between certain employment categories and initiatives related to faculty and staff diversity.

Connally and Kimmel's (2016) research backs up these findings, underlining the relevance of inclusive principal leadership in delivering equitable education for students with disabilities. Their findings indicate that administrators who actively promote inclusion and diversity boost the adoption of fair policies in schools. Similarly, Alborno and Gaad (2014) observed that the implementation of inclusive education policy is heavily reliant on the proactive participation of school principals and other administrative authorities. Their role in policy enforcement and resource allocation is important to the successful implementation of inclusive policies. Furthermore, Lawrence-Brown and Sapon-Shevin (2014) remark that training and professional development have a significant impact on the implementation of customer support services and other equitable practices, emphasizing the need of ongoing professional development in achieving fairness.

The analysis indicated that other variables, including partnerships, faculty and staff diversity, inclusive policies and practices, professional development, and socioeconomic disparities, do not have significant relationships with the level of implementation in promoting equitable education. This suggests that these factors may not have a direct or strong impact on how equitable education practices are implemented, or they may require different approaches or further investigation to fully understand their influence.

**Table 5: Significant Interrelationship among the Educational Leaders' Level of Implementation in Promoting Equitable Education**

|                                           |                         | Accessibility | Partnerships | Customer Support Services | Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms | Faculty and Staff Diversity | Inclusive Policies and Practices | Professional Development | Resource Allocation | Socioeconomic Disparities |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Accessibility</b>                      | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000         | .331         | .097                      | <b>.531**</b>                      | <b>.393*</b>                | <b>.487*</b>                     | <b>.401*</b>             | <b>.547**</b>       | <b>.396*</b>              |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         |               | .092         | .632                      | .004                               | .043                        | .010                             | .038                     | .003                | .041                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Partnerships</b>                       | Correlation Coefficient | .331          | 1.000        | .171                      | .293                               | <b>.402*</b>                | .188                             | .250                     | <b>.461*</b>        | <b>.477*</b>              |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .092          |              | .393                      | .138                               | .038                        | .347                             | .209                     | .016                | .012                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Customer Support Services</b>          | Correlation Coefficient | -.097         | -.171        | 1.000                     | .351                               | .230                        | -.191                            | -.306                    | -.162               | -.032                     |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .632          | .393         |                           | .073                               | .249                        | .339                             | .120                     | .419                | .875                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms</b> | Correlation Coefficient | <b>.531**</b> | .293         | .351                      | 1.000                              | <b>.548**</b>               | .377                             | .247                     | <b>.500**</b>       | .204                      |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .004          | .138         | .073                      |                                    | .003                        | .053                             | .214                     | .008                | .308                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Faculty and Staff Diversity</b>        | Correlation Coefficient | <b>.393*</b>  | <b>.402*</b> | -.230                     | <b>.548**</b>                      | 1.000                       | <b>.758**</b>                    | <b>.548**</b>            | <b>.521**</b>       | .261                      |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .043          | .038         | .249                      | .003                               |                             | .000                             | .003                     | .005                | .188                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Inclusive Policies and Practices</b>   | Correlation Coefficient | <b>.487*</b>  | .188         | -.191                     | .377                               | <b>.758**</b>               | 1.000                            | <b>.527**</b>            | <b>.473*</b>        | .347                      |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .010          | .347         | .339                      | .053                               | .000                        |                                  | .005                     | .013                | .076                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Professional Development</b>           | Correlation Coefficient | <b>.401*</b>  | .250         | -.306                     | .247                               | <b>.548**</b>               | <b>.527**</b>                    | 1.000                    | <b>.466*</b>        | <b>.407*</b>              |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .038          | .209         | .120                      | .214                               | .003                        | .005                             |                          | .014                | .035                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Resource Allocation</b>                | Correlation Coefficient | <b>.547**</b> | <b>.461*</b> | -.162                     | <b>.500**</b>                      | <b>.521**</b>               | <b>.473*</b>                     | <b>.466*</b>             | 1.000               | <b>.495**</b>             |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .003          | .016         | .419                      | .008                               | .005                        | .013                             | .014                     |                     | .009                      |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |
| <b>Socioeconomic Disparities</b>          | Correlation Coefficient | <b>.396*</b>  | <b>.477*</b> | -.032                     | .204                               | .261                        | .347                             | <b>.407*</b>             | <b>.495**</b>       | 1.000                     |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .041          | .012         | .875                      | .308                               | .188                        | .076                             | .035                     | .009                |                           |
|                                           | N                       | 27            | 27           | 27                        | 27                                 | 27                          | 27                               | 27                       | 27                  | 27                        |

**\*\***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**\***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 presented the meaningful links between key organizational aspects at PHINMA Araullo University. Accessibility efforts have a strong positive link with assessment and feedback systems ( $r = 0.531$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ), resource allocation ( $r = 0.547$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ), and addressing socioeconomic disparities ( $r = 0.396$ ,  $p = 0.041$ ). The researcher findings indicate that initiatives to improve accessibility may benefit these crucial sectors of the institution.

Moreover, partnerships within the university demonstrate positive correlations with accessibility ( $r = 0.331$ ,  $p = 0.092$ ), evaluation and feedback mechanisms ( $r = 0.402$ ,  $p = 0.038$ ), and resource allocation ( $r = 0.461$ ,  $p = 0.016$ ), indicating that collaborative efforts significantly contribute to achieving broader institutional goals.

Evaluation and feedback mechanisms have strong correlations with accessibility ( $r = 0.531$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ), faculty and staff diversity ( $r = 0.548$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ), and resource allocation ( $r = 0.500$ ,  $p = 0.008$ ), highlighting their critical role in organizational improvement and fostering inclusivity across various operational aspects.

Initiatives encouraging faculty and staff diversity have strong relationships with inclusive policies and practices ( $r = 0.758$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and resource allocation ( $r = 0.521$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ), demonstrating the interconnectedness of diversity efforts with institutional frameworks.

The results shown in Table 5 and data analysis are consistent with previous studies indicating the effectiveness of various strategies in promoting equitable education. According to Means et al. (2019) research findings, providing many access channels, regular office hours, and competent support personnel promotes a beneficial learning environment and boosts student happiness, which is consistent with PHINMA Araullo University's policies. Building on this, Johnson et al. (2019) and Wilson and Adams (2019) highlight the importance of strong feedback mechanisms for student achievement and institutional performance, which is bolstered by the university's emphasis on obtaining, disseminating, and acting on student input. Furthermore, Adeyemi and Adeyinka (2020) and Lee and Chen (2020) highlighted inclusive recruiting and diversity as critical qualities for building a vibrant and varied academic community, which aligns with PHINMA Araullo University's goals.

Johnson et al. (2019) also emphasized the necessity of collaboration and good resource management in improving assessment and feedback processes within educational institutions. Their findings imply that collaborative efforts help to establish strong assessment frameworks. Taylor and Booker (2021) suggested that effective diversity programs among academics and staff require strong feedback mechanisms, which promote inclusive corporate cultures. Kendi and Eberhardt (2021) investigate the relationship between fostering diversity among teachers and staff and establishing inclusive policies, which are critical for generating supportive learning environments. The interrelated nature of these issues emphasizes the importance of a holistic strategy to fostering equity in education. Universities should promote accessibility while also acknowledging its relationship to faculty and staff diversity, inclusive policies and practices, professional development, budget allocation, collaborations, and assessment and feedback methods. By tackling these issues concurrently, colleges may establish a truly equal and inclusive learning environment for all students.

**Table 6: Proposed Sustainability Plan**

| Sustainability Plan Component     | Objective                                                                            | Programs                      | Persons Involved                        | Resources Needed                         | Expected Outcome                                             |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Institutionalize Equity Practices | Sustain institutionalize equitable practices in policies and procedures.             | Policy and procedure revision | University leadership, policy makers    | Policy documents, stakeholder engagement | Policies reflect a strong commitment to equity and inclusion |
|                                   | Maintain the implementation equity training in onboarding and professional programs. | Equity training workshops     | HR department, faculty development team | Training materials, facilitators         | Increased awareness and implementation of equitable practice |
| Leadership Development Programs   | Enhance leadership skills in promoting equity.                                       | Leadership equity training    | Educational leaders, administrators     | Training programs, mentors               | Empowered leaders effectively driving equity initiatives.    |
|                                   | Incorporate equity goals into leadership                                             | Equity-focused performance    | HR department, Educational leaders      | Evaluation criteria, feedback            | Leaders demonstrate accountability and                       |

|                                                   | evaluations.                                                                 | reviews                         |                                           | mechanisms                               | commitment to equity goals.                                    |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Stakeholder Engagement and Community Partnerships | Uphold partnerships to enhance community engagement.                         | Community partnership programs  | Community engagement team, local partners | Partnership agreements, community events | Enhanced community support for equity initiatives.             |
|                                                   | Promote and Establish student advisory boards for inclusive decision-making. | Student advisory boards         | Student services, student representative  | Advisory board structure, meeting spaces | Increased student engagement in institutional decisions.       |
| Monitoring and Evaluation                         | Sustain the Implemented systems to monitor equity metrics.                   | Equity metrics tracking systems | Assessment team, data analysts            | Data management tools, training          | Data-driven decision-making and continuous equity improvement. |
|                                                   | Maintain effectiveness of sustainability initiatives.                        | Sustainability plan assessments | Evaluation team, stakeholders             | Evaluation criteria, progress reports    | Continuous refinement and adaptation of equity strategies.     |

The proposed sustainability plan for PHINMA Araullo University expands on the study findings to create an extensive structure for maintaining and enhancing equality in policy, training, leadership, community participation, and assessment. By incorporating these activities into the institutional fabric, the strategy hopes to develop an equality culture that not only addresses current demands but also adapts in response to future problems and possibilities.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

### Conclusions:

1. PHINMA Araullo University's leadership demonstrates a strong commitment to equitable education. A diverse leadership team, spanning various departments and experience levels, actively participates in equality and inclusion training. Many leaders have significant teaching backgrounds, fostering an understanding of student needs. The university's emphasis on feedback mechanisms and student involvement creates a supportive environment for achieving equitable outcomes.
2. The researcher concluded that PHINMA Araullo University demonstrated a strong commitment to equitable quality education through successful program implementation. The university fosters an inclusive learning environment by prioritizing accessibility, collaboration, diversity, and inclusion. While resource distribution tactics may require more investigation, the overall outcomes reflect PHINMA Araullo University's commitment to provide fair chances for student achievement.
3. The researcher concluded that departmental affiliation and length of tenure in administrative roles significantly influence educational leaders' perceptions of equitable education initiatives at PHINMA Araullo University. This indicates that leaders' professional backgrounds and experiences shape their views on the effectiveness of these efforts.
4. The researcher found that strong implementation in one area of equitable education positively impacts others. High levels of accessibility initiatives are linked to better outcomes in evaluation, faculty diversity, inclusive policies, professional development, resource allocation, and socioeconomic equity. Additionally, strong partnerships improve resource distribution and diversity among faculty. Educational leaders at PHINMA Araullo University supported inclusivity and equity across their academic activities.
5. A sustainability plan is proposed based on the evaluation of the respondents in the level of implementation of equitable education in a private university. This proposed sustainability plan can be useful in sustaining and improving the level of implementation for equitable education.

### Recommendations:

1. Given the diverse demographics of educational leaders at PHINMA Araullo University, the majority of whom are Program Heads and have significant teaching experience, it is recommended to introduce customized professional development programs. These programs should focus on improving leadership skills that are related to meeting student needs and promoting fair educational practices.
2. In light of PHINMA Araullo University's notable advancements in fostering equitable education, diversity initiatives, inclusive policies, and accessibility, it is imperative to further enhance its assessment and feedback systems. This will ensure continual improvement and alignment with institutional goals, particularly in areas such as resource allocation and addressing socioeconomic disparities.
3. The strong correlations found between demographic profiles and the level of implementation in equitable education highlight the influence of experience and professional backgrounds. PHINMA Araullo University should encourage leadership continuity plans and cross-departmental coordination to leverage this insight. This will enhance attitudes and effectiveness in implementing programs for equal education across various departments.
4. The positive interrelationship between various aspects of equitable education implementation highlight the all-encompassing approach adopted by educational leaders. For success in these partnerships, the institution must prioritize cross-departmental collaboration. This will reinforce measures aimed at diversifying faculty and staff, distributing resources, and resolving socioeconomic inequities, resulting in a more inclusive educational environment.
5. The proposed sustainability plan should be used by the educational leaders and school administration as it will lead to maintaining the high level of implementation in equitable education.

### References

- Bautista, A., & Cruz, J. C. (2020). Equity and quality in education: Supporting disadvantaged students in the Philippines. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 50(2), 221-242.
- Leithwood, K., & Fullan, M. (2012). Distributed leadership and school improvement: *How middle leaders can make a difference*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2013). Navigating growth: Challenges and strategies for maintaining quality in a rapidly expanding school system. *School Leadership & Management*, 33(1), 3-22.
- Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (2018). The role of campus managers in leading for equity and inclusion in higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2018(182), 81-92.
- Aso, S., & Ibading, L. (2019). Beyond access: Exploring quality and equity in Philippine basic education. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 5(2), 313-324.
- Bautista, N. S., Mendoza, R. C., & Dayag, V. B. (2022). Promoting a positive school climate in the Philippines: *A review of the literature*. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*.
- Guzman, A. C., & De Leon, M. S. V. (2020). Culturally responsive teaching in Philippine higher education institutions: *A review of the literature*. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2), 101-118.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2019). Racism without Racists: *Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Darity Jr., W. A., Hamilton, D., & Aja, A. (2020). From Here to Equality: Reparations for Black Americans in the Twenty-First Century. University of North Carolina Press.
- Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, Critical Race Theory, and the Primacy of Racism: *Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Education*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(3), 277-287.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (Eds.). (2020). *Handbook of the Economics of Education (Vol. 5)*. Elsevier.
- Howard, T. C. (2018). Why Race and Culture Matter in Schools: *Closing the Achievement Gap in America's Classrooms*. Teachers College Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Critical Race Theory and Education: *Twenty Years of Theoretical and Research Innovations*. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(1), 1-27.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (2016). *Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education*. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). How People Learn II: *Learners, Contexts, and Cultures*. The National Academies Press.
- Reimers, F., & Chung, C. K. (2016). Teaching and Learning for the Twenty-First Century: *Educational Goals, Policies, and Curricula from Six Nations*. Harvard Education Press.



- Fullan, M., & Langworthy, M. (2014). *A Rich Seam: How New Pedagogies Find Deep Learning*. Pearson.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2018). *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*. Teachers College Press.
- OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*. OECD Publishing.
- Save the Children. (2019). *The Many Faces of Exclusion: End of Childhood Report 2019*. Save the Children International.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Education 2030: Framework for Action*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2019). *UNESCO Guidebook on Measuring Learning Outcomes in the Context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education*. UNESCO Publishing.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.
- Bjork, C. (2019). *Implementing Educational Reform: Sociological Perspectives on Educational Policy*. Routledge.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (2016). *Bringing the Profession Back In: Call for Action*. *Teachers College Record*, 118(11), 1–26.
- Levin, B. (2020). *Educational Policy and the Politics of Change*. Routledge.
- Mundy, K., & Verger, A. (2017). *The World Bank and the Global Governance of Education in a Changing World Order*. Routledge.
- Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2019). Leadership and Policy Implementation: *Exploring the Integration of Implementation Science and Practice Perspectives*. *Educational Policy*, 33(5), 650–682.
- UNESCO. (2019). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2019: Migration, Displacement, and Education*. UNESCO Publishing.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.
- Bates, T. (2019). *Teaching in a Digital Age: Guidelines for Designing Teaching and Learning*. Tony Bates Associates Ltd.
- Buckingham, D., & Sefton-Green, J. (2016). *Learning and Education in the Digital Age*. Routledge.
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). *The Difference Between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning*. *Educause Review*, 27.
- Johnson, L., Adams Becker, S., Cummins, M., Estrada Vidal, L., Hall, C., & Kleine, T. (2016). *NMC Horizon Report: 2016 Higher Education Edition*.
- Means, B., Neisler, J., & Gullo, S. (2019). *Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology.
- Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (2017). *Qualitative Research Methods: Studying the World Around Us*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods (5th ed.)*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using R*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2013). *School Leadership and School Improvement: The Evidence-Based Practice Review (2nd ed.)*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Walpole, R. E., Myers, R. H., Myers, S. L., & Ye, K. (2016). *Probability & Statistics for Engineers & Scientists (9th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Smith, J., & Johnson, A. (2020). Equity and Quality in Education: *Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 45, 78-92.
- Caldwell, A. R., McNulty, G., & Gareth, S. (2016). The principalship and racial equity: *A critical narrative analysis*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 228-262.
- Acharya, V., Matias, C. E., & Lopez, M. C. (2017). *Teachers' race, experiences of racial discrimination, and commitment to racial equity pedagogy*. *Educational Researcher*, 46(7), 388-404.

