

The University of Santo Tomas Viewed from the Lens of Total Quality Management: Implications to Total Quality Education

Allan B. de Guzman

Josefina R. Torres

University of Santo Tomas
Philippines

Considered as a major management approach for improving organizational performance and competitive advantage, Total Quality Management (TQM) poses a challenge to dynamic institutions to adopt a systemic philosophy that places emphasis on customer needs and a commitment to a culture of excellence. Higher education institutions (HEIs) as learning organizations are expected to respond proactively to this challenge by examining closely how their educational centerpiece operates in an environment of quality. This inquiry aims to determine how the oldest university in Asia implements TQM as regards its Vision, Involvement, Continuous Improvement, Training and Education, Ownership, Reward, Yearning for Success, and Customer Focus (VICTORY-C). Moreover, it documents the best practices of the institution under study, categorized in the light of TQM principles and identifies implications for total quality education.

Key Words: best practices, Total Quality Management, VICTORY-C model

*The university is to provide a haven where the search for truth
may go on unhampered by utility or pressure for results.*

Robert Hutchins

Universities, like public schools, face multiple and diverse problems, among them, that of resources (Bullough, Kauchak, Crow, & Hobbs, 1997). The success and advancement or progress (Kreitner, 1998; Saylor, 1996) of today's universities depend on their responsiveness and resiliency (El-Khawas, 2001); their ability to preserve and strengthen quality (Thorens, 1996), and to effect reconstruction efforts (Castillo, 1987) and to pursue quality, equality and equity, institutional diversity, regional development, flexible curricula, stable financing,

Allan B. de Guzman, Director, University of Santo Tomas Center for Educational Research and Development and Associate Professor, College of Education and Graduate School.

Josefina R. Torres, Associate Professor, UST College of Education. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Allan B. de Guzman, UST Center for Educational Research and Development Room 201 Thomas Aquinas Research Complex, España, Manila Philippines (1008). Electronic mail may be sent to ustcerd@yahoo.com.

evaluation and innovation, governability, social relevance and internationalization (Gomez, 1999; Holtta & Malkki, 2000). The changing context of higher education requires the reorganization of the processes of decision-making, reward systems, and planning (Galbraith, 1999) to enable the system to be more internally efficient, which, according to Trow (1994), is "soft managerialism". Hard managerialism is redirecting of program efforts through the adoption of new management systems which call for a high degree of openness in school sectors and a kind of systems thinking characterized by alignment of delivery and attunement of values and value systems.

Traditionally, universities operate through their transmission, preservation, and enrichment functions. Today, a plurality of university functions has gradually emerged. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), as cited by Caraca, Conceicao, and Heitor (2000), advanced the viewpoint that universities are expected to (1) provide post-secondary education; (2) develop research and produce new knowledge; (3) provide society with essential skills; (4) pursue highly specialized training; (5) strengthen the competitiveness of the economy; (6) operate as a selection

filter for highly demanding jobs; (7) contribute to social mobility; (8) provide services to the community; (9) serve as a paradigm of social equality; and (10) prepare leaders for the future generations.

The foregoing plurality of functions poses the challenge to institutions of higher learning to rethink and retool their educational efforts, guided by sound philosophical bases and andragogical tenets and constructs geared toward heightened quality and excellence, relevance and responsiveness, access and equity, and efficiency and effectiveness as centers of development and formation (Commission on Higher Education, 1995), while maintaining critical balances such as growth vs. equity, internationalism vs. relevance, technological modernity vs. cultural preservation, and individual development vs. cohesion (International Commission of Education for the 21st Century, 1996).

Today, interdisciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity instead of exclusivity in development efforts and approaches are paramount to the competitive advantage of schools, colleges and universities. There is close similarity in the way education and business operate (Bonstingl, 1996). Consequently, academic institutions can no longer dissociate themselves from business thinking and processes, considered as the “best practices” for organizational transformation. One of these practices is systems re-engineering through Total Quality Management (TQM) application.

As a quality movement, TQM is based on the concept of continuous improvement (Saylor, 1996; Ross, 1994; Jurow & Barnard, 1993; Robbins, 1993; Jablonski, 1992,). Team teaching, site-based management, cooperative learning, and outcomes-based education are examples of educational translations of TQM constructs and principles (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2000). Efforts to apply TQM in an organizational context are geared toward customer satisfaction, which is perceived as the best measure of quality (Besterfield, Besterfield, Besterfield & Besterfield, 1998; Hamlin, 1994; Go, 1993). It is the state of quality of products and services that shapes organizational structure (Milevo, 1995) and organizational behavior (Stevenson, 1994). Moreover, quality is based on and is evident in the behavior of people. Within the context of academic institutions, quality is observed in the administrative, management and leadership components of the school organization. When quality becomes part of the school culture, various possibilities unfold and desired goals are achieved. If universities were to become institutions of quality, then higher education as UNESCO puts it, has to assume a leading role in the renewal of the education system as a whole (Tunnermann, 1996).

Today’s universities are challenged by various trends, among them, quantitative expansion, differences in institutional structures and study programs, and financial restrictions. These trends constitute concurrent processes such as democratization, globalization, regionalization, polarization, marginalism and fragmentation (Tunnermann, 1996). Systemically treated, these trends may lead to the emergence of what the UNESCO envisions—a *proactive university*. Any higher education institution, transformed into a proactive university, assumes a unique status characterized by proactiveness, efficiency and effectiveness, and excellence, as follows:

A place where high quality training is provided, students are trained and prepared so they can perform more efficiently and effectively a wide range of civic and professional functions and activities, including the most diverse, current and specialized;

A place in which entry depends only on the intellectual merit of the individual and on his/her capability to participate actively in curricular programs and activities which foster social equity;

A fully developed community tasked to search, create and disseminate knowledge, promote the progress of science, and participating in the development of innovations and technological inventions;

A learning environment premised on quality and knowledge, and instills in future graduates the commitment to search unremittingly for knowledge to intensify their sense of responsibility in order to use their training as an instrument for social development;

A place where updating and continuous improvement of knowledge is fostered;

A community in which cooperation with industry and the service sectors is encouraged and actively supported for economic progress of the region and the nation;

A place where the most relevant local, regional, national, and international problems and their solutions are identified, analyzed and discussed in an environment of critical thinking and learning, where the active participation of individuals is encouraged in discussions that relate to social, cultural, and intellectual advancements;

A place where governments and other public agencies can address the search for reliable scientific information which is increasingly needed for decision- making at all organizational levels and where public participation is fostered in the decision-making process;

A community, the members of which, commit themselves fully to the principle of academic freedom, devote themselves to the search of truth, to the promotion and defense of human rights, democracy, social justice and tolerance within their own communities and all over the world, and take part in the education and training of individuals who genuinely participate in the development of a culture of peace;

A well placed institution within the context of the world, adapted to the pace of contemporary life and varying characteristics of regions and countries.

The foregoing attributes of a proactive university are explicit evidences of the impact of TQM as a paradigm shift in education, the application of which paves the way for academic discourses and provides unique opportunities for research-based explorations such as this inquiry.

The present study

This paper aims to describe and analyze how Total Quality Management (TQM), as an educational management framework is adhered to in an academic context, specifically, the University of Santo Tomas, which by 2011, looks forward to its 400th year of service to the country and humanity and proves its timeliness and timelessness, despite its being the oldest university in Asia.

Specifically, this study seeks to determine how a time-tested institution of higher learning adheres to and practices the following TQM constructs: Vision, Involvement, Continuous Improvement, Training and Education, Ownership, Rewards and Recognition, Yearning for Success and Customer Focus (VICTORY-C); identify if significant differences exist in the way academic and administrative sectors of the institution under study assess the extent of adherence of the university to TQM constructs and principles; codify TQM-based best practices of the institution under study that may be used as benchmarks of other higher education institutions in effecting systemic changes with *quality* as their guiding philosophy; extract major education implications of total quality management for “total quality education”

Study framework

When an educational institution commits itself to adopt TQM as its way of life, careful analysis of how to structure the TQM framework is necessary. The TQM framework, as interpreted by Saylor (1996), serves as the guiding philosophy

of the institution in determining what, when, and how to direct its efforts towards a desired goal, the solution of problems, the execution of an educational plan, thus avoiding educational wastage of time effort and resources. The TQM framework, otherwise known as the VICTORY-C Model, requires: FOCUSING ON CUSTOMERS, Instituting modern LEADERSHIP, Visioning a common focus (VISION), Involving everyone and everything (INVOLVEMENT), Continuously improving people, processes and product (CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT), Training, educating, coaching, facilitating and mentoring (TRAINING AND EDUCATION), Owning the institution, TQM processes and work (OWNERSHIP), Recognizing and Rewarding (RECOGNITION AND AWARDS), and YEARNING FOR SUCCESS.

The educational institution must ensure that the TQM framework is well structured and interpreted into long-term perspectives. Structuring the framework must involve all school sectors, and responsibility and accountability for results and outcomes, and be committed to by the particular sectors concerned. For a TQM framework focused on total customer satisfaction to succeed in attaining VICTORY, strong leadership is needed. Transformational leadership does not direct the faculty and staff as to what to do, but provides opportunities for leadership in performing instructional and administrative tasks and assuming responsibility and accountability for results and outcomes. Transformational leadership trains teachers and staff members to become leaders themselves.

Strong, unified leadership ensures the VICTORY of organizational efforts. However, victory is not certain without benchmarking. Benchmarking, a recent aspect of educational thinking and practice, is a quality assessment tool that operates effectively in a strategic planning environment. Etymologically, the term “benchmark” comes from a surveyor’s mark which indicates elevation. In business as well as in higher education, benchmark means a standard of excellence against which the results and efforts are measured or judged. Grundstorm (1995, p. 131) describes benchmarking as “the practice of being humble enough to admit that someone else is better at something, and being wise enough to learn how to match and even surpass them at it”. Simply stated, to benchmark is to establish a desired goal of excellence towards which all efforts must be directed. The common benchmarking strategies are internal benchmarking, competitive benchmarking, functional benchmarking and generic benchmarking.

Method

Study Site

As of 1998, higher education in the Philippines consisted of 1383 colleges and universities enrolling about 2.4 million students-*2nd in the world next to the US* (The 1998 Philippines Education Sector Study). One distinguishing feature of the Philippine Higher Education System is that about 81 per cent of the institutions (1118 out of 1383) are privately owned and managed without subsidies from the government. Such status invites further probing whether or not these private schools, despite their self-liquidating condition, still manage to effect quality improvement efforts. Interestingly, the University of Santo Tomas, a 393-year old institution of higher learning is a good locus for close examination of quality education viewed from the lens of total quality management.

By the year 2011, the University of Santo Tomas shall have reached its 400 years of existence. Its long years of service to society deserves quality auditing and assessment systems, both by internal and external agencies. These systems include a voluntary accreditation system, Commission on Higher Education-identified Centers of Excellence and Development and the short-lived Asiaweek Survey of Top 50 universities. Results of these quality assessment initiatives have given the university the opportunity to identify its strengths, limitations vis a vis areas of opportunities and threats (SLOT) for improvement.

With a student population of 33,322 as of 2002-2003 and 1500 faculty, the University of Santo Tomas has managed to maintain its status as one of the four best universities in the Philippines listed in the Asia Week top performing institutions.

The University Santo Tomas, as it works for its quadricentennial year by 2011 has crystallized its long term agenda of (1) enhancing its Christian identity; (2) upgrading the quality of instruction; (3) asserting its research equipment; (4) sowing the deeds of hope; (5) improving physical resources; (6) enhancing organizational performance; (7) strengthening current funding sources; (8) expanding educational service communities; (9) intensifying institutional presence; and (10) innovating teaching and learning through information technology. These identified thrusts of the institution are anchored to the idea of continuous improvement, which in a nutshell speaks of what management experts call "total quality management".

The year 2003 marked the collective effort of the University to place "quality" at the core of its educational activities. Operating under the motto of "Total Quality

Education", the university has introduced and institutionalized a *Total Quality Management Program*. This program aims at instilling productivity and quality consciousness among its academic and non-academic personnel; creating awareness on how TQM can be linked and applied in the various activities of the university in order to attain customer-focused services; assessing areas where the organization should focus on improvement activities; and implementing quality and productivity programs and activities that will strengthen and complement TQM in the academe.

Survey instrument

To assess the unique attributes of the educational institution under study substantially and objectively, a modified version of Saylor's instrument (1996) was used, with nine (9) variables, each of which has ten (10) indicators. The 80-item modified instrument was subjected to reliability test. Results of the split-reliability method indicated a high reliability coefficient of .92. With the VICTORY-C as framework of the instrument, each variable was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (5= agree to a very much extent, 4= agree to a much extent, 3=agree to a moderate extent, 2=agree to a little extent, 1= agree to the least extent) and was interpreted, using the Dedekind cut (4.51-5.00= *agree to a much extent* , 3.51-4.50= *agree to a large extent* 2.51-3.50= *agree to a moderate extent* , 1.51-2.50= *agree to a little extent*, 0.50-1.50= *agree to the least extent*). Data were treated, using descriptive and inferential statistics, including mean, weighted mean, ranking, Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation and t-test. Qualitative aspects of the study consisted of unstructured interviews with the deans, department chairs and faculty of the colleges under study. Data yielded by the questionnaire and the interviews were cross-validated through documentary analyses of faculty manuals and the annual president's reports, which were made available by the Offices of the deans and the Office of the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs (OVRAA).

Sampling procedures

At the time the study was conducted, there were seventy six (76) administrators (College Deans, Assistant Deans, Faculty Secretaries, and Department Chairpersons), nine hundred and twenty four (924) tenured faculty members and four thousand five hundred thirty eight (4,538) senior students representing the different colleges in the university. From these population base, and using the Sloven's formula with an estimate of error equal to .05, sixty four (64) administrators

were purposively chosen; five-hundred and sixty five (565) faculty members were also chosen through stratified sampling and applying ratio and proportion, using the academic colleges and the years of teaching experience as bases. Three hundred and seventy one (371) senior students were identified as respondents through stratified random sampling and applying ratio and proportion. The selection of student respondents was based on the faculty class record, while stratification, on specific individual areas.

Results and Discussion

As Tables 1 and 2 indicate, it is evident that, on the whole, the top three principles adhered to by all sectors of UST administrators, faculty and students, regardless of college affiliations, are Vision (3.95), Training and Education (3.75), and Recognition and Rewards (3.69), interpreted as “to a great extent”. The emergence of vision, training and education and recognition and rewards as the most adhered TQM constructs of the university finds their resemblance to what systems thinkers call as input-process-output orientation. Considered as the guiding path of any educational enterprise, vision serves as the institution’s main input in all its processes. When the school’s vision is clearly articulated and communicated via oral and written means, the spirit of oneness in purpose becomes evident in the workplace. Interview results indicate

that the vision of the school understudy is clearly spelled out in major information bulletins like the faculty and student manuals and is discussed during orientation, meetings and other important gatherings in the university. As the institution’s vision states:

By the year 2011, the University of Santo Tomas envisions itself as a center of excellence in various programs of teaching, an acknowledged expert in key areas of research in the pure and applied sciences, a leader in community/extension services, and as the Center of Contextualized Theology in Asia. It also envisions for itself an extended physical presence beyond Manila, and a more functional networking mechanism with other universities/institutions (Abaño & Cabading, 2003, p. 3).

The extent to which the said vision is actualized is gauged in terms of the quality of the human resource program of the university. It should be noted that training and education as a construct of TQM clearly plays a vital role toward this end. Documentary analysis of available data discloses the aggressive and programmatic attempts of the university to improve the quality of its faculty profile through the introduction of various improvement schemes. Among these are the offshore Master’s program, theses and dissertations grants and other innovative programs in collaboration with partner institutions and funding agencies.

With the desire to sustain faculty effort to improve their

Table 1. *The extent of adherence of the University of Santo Tomas to the TQM constructs and principles in the overall management of its educational delivery services*

TQM Constructs	GM	VI	Rank
Vision	3.95	AGE	1
Involvement	3.56	AGE	8
Continuous Improvement	3.63	AGE	5
Training and Education	3.75	AGE	2
Ownership	3.68	AGE	4
Recognition and Rewards	3.69	AGE	3
Yearning for Success	3.61	AGE	7
Focus on Customer	3.62	AME	6

Note. GM=Grand Mean,
 VI= Verbal Interpretation
 AVE=Agree to a Very Great Extent
 4.51-5.00 AVGE = Agree to a Very Great Extent
 3.51-4.50 AGE = Agree to a Great Extent
 2.51-3.50 AmoE = Agree to a Moderate Extent
 1.51-2.50 ALiE = Agree to a Lesser Extent
 0.50-1.50 AleE= Agree to the Least Extent
 (No. of Colleges=10)

craft, rewards and recognition have become a built-in process in the life of the university. Scholarships, fellowships and other exchange programs, in collaboration with local and foreign institutions and agencies, are in place for faculty members with strong teaching and research repertoire. Relevant and high quality teaching, research and community extension outputs are given equal attention in the institution's faculty classification and promotion system and are given due recognition in the university-wide activities.

The interplay between and among the constructs of vision, training and education and rewards and recognition imply the need for the development of a professional culture and the utilization of resources and expertise for work innovation (Vandenberghe, 1995). They are indicative of administrative and instructional leadership for school effectiveness (Harchar & Hyle 1996); transformational leadership, for school restructuring (Chui, Sharpe and McCormick, 1996) as indicated in the communication and formation of values, the professional development and empowerment of teachers, people orientation and structural leadership. Studies have shown that training and education are vital to the improvement of individual skills and organizational capabilities, while involvement encourages and nurtures individual sense of personal ownership (Cotton, 1994).

Table 2 reveals a coefficient of correlation r which indicates that there is "slight or almost negligible correlation"

between the aggrupation of UST by college and UST's extent of adherence to the following TQM constructs and principles: Vision ($r=0.056$); Involvement ($r=0.026$); Continuous Improvement ($r=0.078$); Training and Education ($r=0.059$); Ownership ($r=0.029$); Rewards and Recognition ($r=0.020$); Yearning for Success ($r=0.056$) and Focus on Customer ($r=0.017$). The table further reveals, that when grouped by colleges, except for the t -value of Continuous Improvement ($t=2.02$) which is greater than the tabulated t -value of 1.96, there is no significant relationship between UST and the college assessments of the extent of adherence to the TQM constructs and principles. This can be attributed to the multidisciplinary and comprehensive nature of the university. Though programs, projects and activities initiated by the different colleges differ, it is expected that the realized outputs harmonize with what the university has envisioned. Colleges are then challenged to effect continuous improvement in their respective delivery systems. The true measure of the said harmony is gauged in terms of the institution's performance in national examinations and the high employability index of the graduate in the workforce. Records show that high percentage passing rates were seen in 15 disciplines surpassing the national passing rates.

As revealed in Table 3, the computed t -values of the eight (8) TQM constructs, with the exception of Training and Education (0.72) and Rewards and Recognition (0.18), are

Table 2. r Values of the extent of adherence of the academic sectors of UST to the TQM constructs and principles (by college)

TQM Constructs	r	VI	Computed t -value	Sig.
Vision	0.056	SAN	1.45	NS
Involvement	0.026	SAN	0.67	NS
Continuous Improvement	0.078	SAN	2.02	S
Training and Education	0.059	SAN	1.52	NS
Ownership	0.029	SAN	0.75	NS
Recognition and Rewards	0.020	SAN	0.52	NS
Yearning for Success	0.056	SAN	1.45	NS
Customer Focus	0.017	SAN	0.44	NS

Note. r = coefficient of correlation

NS=not significant

S=significant

Magnitude of r Verbal Interpretation

less than .20 slight, almost negligible (SAN)

.20 - .40 low correlation; relationship definite but small (LC)

.41 - .70 moderate correlation; substantive relationship (MC)

.71 - .90 high correlation; marked relationship (HC)

.91 - 1.00 very high correlation; very dependable correlation (VHC)

Table 3. *r* Values of the extent of adherence of the academic sectors of UST TQM constructs and principles (by academic sector)

TQM Constructs	r	VI	Computed t-value	Sig.
Vision	-0.220	LC	5.68	S
Involvement	-0.101	SAN	2.61	S
Continuous Improvement	-0.160	SAN	4.14	S
Training and Education	-0.028	SAN	0.72	NS
Ownership	-0.097	SAN	2.51	S
Recognition and Rewards	0.007	SAN	0.18	NS
Yearning for Success	-0.077	SAN	1.99	S
Customer Focus	-0.101	SAN	2.61	S

Note. *r*= coefficient of correlation

NS=not significant S=significant

Magnitude of <i>r</i>	Verbal Interpretation
less than .20	slight, almost negligible (SAN)
.20 - .40	low correlation; relationship definite but small (LC)
.41 - .70	moderate correlation; substantive relationship (MC)
.71 - .90	high correlation; marked relationship (HC)
.91 - 1.00	very high correlation; very dependable correlation (VHC)

greater than the tabulated value of 1.96, which indicate that correlation is significant: Vision (t=5.68); Involvement (t=2.61); Continuous Improvement (t=4.14); Ownership; (t=2.51); Yearning for Success (t=1.99); and Focus on Customer (t=2.61). Considering these results, the null hypothesis that

there is no significant difference in group perceptual assessments of the extent to which the UST adheres and practices TQM constructs and principles is rejected.

Significant differences in the way TQM principles are being observed may be attributed to policies in the

Table 4. *UST Benchmarking matrix*

	Rank								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
College	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Archi	V	T	O	Y	F	R	I	C	
AB	V	T	O	R	C	I	F	Y	
Com	V	T	R	I	F	Y	C	O	
Educ	V	T	R	O	F	Y	C	I	
Eng'g	V	T	R	C	O	F	Y	C	
CFAD	V	O	T	R	F	I	Y	C	
Music	V	O	Y	F	T	R	C	I	
Nurs	V	R	T	C	F	Y	O	I	
Phar	V	T	O	C	R	F	I	Y	
Sci	V	R	O	T	F	Y	C	I	

Note. V=Vision; I=Involvement; C=Continuous Improvement; T= Training and Education; O=Ownership; R=Rewards and Recognition; Y=Yearning for Success; F=Focus on Customer Archi=Architecture; AB= Arts and Letters; Com=Commerce; Educ=Education; Eng'g=Engineering; CFAD=Fine Arts and Design; Music; Nurs=Nursing; Phar=Pharmacy; Sci=Science

Table 5. "Best Practices" of UST Colleges

College	Best Practices/ TQM Constructs/ Results Yielded
Arts and Letters	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Periodic review of the curriculum; faculty development programs focusing on instruction, curriculum development; standard grading system for each department</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Center of Excellence in Philosophy and Literature Programs; Level II Accredited</p>
Commerce	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Comprehensive curriculum in the Accountancy Program (4yrs + 2 summers); in-house board review classes; reward system for board topnotchers; class participation in the choice of class advisers</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Training and Education, Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Reward and Recognition, Involvement</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Achievement Award for Accounting Licensure Examinations, Level II Accredited; Center of Development in Business Education</p>
Architecture	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Comprehensive Curriculum in Architecture; Exposure of Students and Faculty to Field Practice</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Center of Excellence</p>
Education	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Full Immersion Practicum for all fields of study (Education, Nutrition, Hotel and Restaurant, Tourism and Food Technology); Maintenance of a laboratory school, hostel, cafeteria and operational travel bureau for better field practice;</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Level II Accredited, High Passing Rate in Licensure Examinations in Teacher Education, Nutrition and Food Technology)</p>
Engineering	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Periodic review of the curriculum; strong national and international linkages; In-house review classes for students; pool of faculty-engineer practitioners</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Center for Excellence in Electronics and Communications Engineering and Centers of Development (Chemical, Electrical, Industrial, Mechanical, and Civil Engineering)</p>
Fine Arts and Design	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Introduction of Innovative Program in Museology for faculty members; comprehensive curriculum in interior design; system-wide participation through consultative committees</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education, Involvement</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Improved faculty profile, Rank # 2 (National Passing rate) in Interior Design Board Examinations</p>

Table 5. “Best Practices” of UST Colleges

College	Best Practices/ TQM Constructs/ Results Yielded
Music	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> The only music school in the country with a student orchestra (UST Symphony Orchestra); Annual Music Camp to train music teachers in the country; comprehensive curriculum offering all majorships in musical instruments.</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education, Ownership</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Center of Excellence in Music; Consistent 1st Prize winner in the National Music Competition for the Youth</p>
Nursing	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Strong tie-up with other graduate education institutions; in-house board review classes; reward system for board topnotchers and passers</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education Reward and Recognition</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Center of Excellence in Nursing; 80% of the faculty with graduate degrees; 98% passing rate in Board Examinations</p>
Pharmacy	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Comprehensive examinations for junior Medical Technology students including Senior interns for the Licensure Exams and Internships; Brain Empowerment Training Seminar for board reviewees; reward system for board topnotchers</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education, Reward and Recognition</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Level II accredited, high passing rates; 97% and 84% for Pharmacy and Medical Technology Examinations, respectively</p>
Science	<p><i>Best Practice:</i> Periodic review of the curriculum; faculty involvement in research projects and advising in the graduate school; exposure of the faculty to international scholarships and fellowships; strong national and international linkages</p> <p><i>TQM Constructs:</i> Continuous Improvement, Yearning for Success, Training and Education</p> <p><i>Results Yielded:</i> Center of Excellence in Chemistry; Level III Accredited; National Recognition for Scientific Investigations; Improved faculty profile</p>

management of human and non-human resources, which, in the words of Sackney and Dibski (1994) redound to school-based management issues. These issues include decision-making processes, leadership, productivity, organizational change, survival of the fittest, fiscal adequacy and equity. Moreover, the concept of shared norms and meanings (Middlewood & Burton, 2001), which is the foundation or basis of the ethos or culture of an educational institution, explains why divergence or convergence of organizational practices exists. Similarly,

TQM, as a philosophy in continuous improvement is not an individual effort. Hill and Taylor (1991), for their part, pointed out that structuring and involving the whole organization; every department, every activity, every single person at every level is what TQM is all about.

In the case of the institution under study, decentralization efforts still fall under deconcentration, where the colleges are given some discretion to plan and implement programs and projects, or to adjust central directives to local conditions,

within the guidelines set by the central administration. Such deconcentration effort is assessed in terms of the college's achievement reports vis-à-vis the university's identified key results areas (KRAs) and key performance indicators (KPIs).

Table 4 presents the UST benchmarking matrix which summarizes the ranking of the extent of adherence of the ten colleges under study to the TQM constructs and principles. The identified adherence status serves as entry point for the benchmarking efforts of the different colleges. As a strategy for system-wide changes and paradigmatic educational reforms, benchmarking constitutes the dual process of measurement and emulation (Jackson & Hund, 2000; Saylor, 1996; Grundstorm, 1995). In the final analysis, the benchmarking efforts of schools as learning and development institutions lead to a common vision and mission, and common strategies, goals and objectives characterized by productivity, collegiality, efficiency and effectiveness.

The matrix further shows that Vision is the most adhered to construct by all the colleges (Rank 1), followed by Training and Education (Architecture, Arts and Letters, Commerce, Education, Engineering and Pharmacy); Ownership (Fine Arts and Design and Music); and Reward and Recognition (Nursing and Science).

To describe qualitatively the extent of adherence of the institution to TQM constructs and principles, the following tables show the institutionalized projects and activities of the various colleges considered as "best practices". These were culled through interviews with key informants, ocular inspections and documentary analyses.

It is likewise evident in the Matrix that in terms of adherence, the following TQM constructs and principles ranked last in all colleges: a) Continuous Improvement, Colleges of Arts and Letters and Fine Arts; b) Yearning for Success, Colleges of Arts and Letters and Pharmacy; c) Involvement, Colleges of Education, Engineering, Music, Nursing, Science and d) Ownership, College of Commerce.

Conclusions

Though the bulk of information gathered in this study deals with quantitative aspects of perceptions and backed-up by some qualitative data culled from documentary analyses and interview results, the attempt to describe quality improvement efforts of the oldest university in Asia has painted a context on how higher education institutions may be viewed from the lens of a business management philosophy which is gradually gaining grounds in the management of educational enterprises.

Quality education is achieved through quality-driven efforts and practices. Total Quality Management or TQM, as a construct of educational management is a good rubric in determining how institutional planning is done and how benchmarking is observed and practiced, taking into account the university's levels of capability and cope-ability. Findings of this study have clearly identified how collective attempts to effect continuous improvement may help institutions define the parameters of quality education. Knowledge of TQM, codified or tacit, once applied to and applied systematically constitutes much to organizational success. TQM, like education, is all about learning. Learning, in the Chinese language, which literally means to "study and practice constantly" (Senge, 1990) is an important feature in a TQM program, for the following reasons: a) it requires administrators and faculty to know what are actually being done in their study programs, and to gather data on how these practices affect the quality of students' learning; and b) it helps develop in the administrators and faculty depth of understanding of the meaning of quality education, which requires provision of learning experiences which are functional and relevant to the students' field of study, and more importantly, relevant to their life and life in this country today. Quality education is committed to the formation and change of attitudes (Argyris & Schon, 1995; Hargreaves, 1990), hence, formation of values must be integrated in student' learning experiences. Educational innovations initiated in both local and national levels should be examined closely and reflectively by educational planners for purposes of benchmarking and contextualization.

The university, as an institution of higher learning, is a system. It operates through a network of human interrelationships, marked by similarities, differences and other deviations due to varying backgrounds, beliefs, values and attitudes. Confronted with risks, certainties and uncertainties in their social, economic, cultural, technological, and political milieus, universities are expected to effect synergistic relationships, and pursue continuing improvement of policies and standards of performance and behavior. Knowledge is a very potent force for renewed organizational learning, but both the effectiveness of the renewal of teaching and the teaching itself also depends on how knowledge is being delivered. (Tunnermann, 1996). All these are being incarnated by schools in their educational delivery systems, which projects an institutional status of quality. As earlier cited, quality in today's universities is a construct not easy to define. It is a status that calls for judicious planning, implementation and evaluation of educational efforts, coupled with an aggressive

and risk taking attitude of openness to change.

Finally, the initial findings of this study suggest that subsequent research be undertaken on the success stories of institutions whose philosophy of educational management is TQM-driven. A discourse on quality outputs realized by quality improvement efforts may be initiated using other quantitative and qualitative means.

References

- Abaño, I., & Cabading, W. (Eds.). (2003). *Rector's Report Academic Year 2002-2003*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas, Office of the Rector.
- Argyris, C., & Schon D. (1995). *Organizational learning II: theory, method and practice*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Besterfield, D., Besterfield, C. B., Besterfield, G., & Besterfield, M.S. (1998). *Total Quality Management* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Bonstingl, J. J. (1996). *Schools of Quality: An Introduction to Total Quality Management in Education* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr., Kauchak, N. A., Crow, S., & Hobbs, D. (1997). Professional Development Schools: Catalyst for Teacher and School Change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(2), 153-169.
- Castillo, N. M. (1987). Education and National Reconstruction. *UNITAS*. 60(3), 271-282.
- Caraca, J., Conceicao, P., & Heitor, M. V. (2000). Towards a public policy for the research university in Portugal. *Higher Education Policy*, 13(1), 181-201.
- Chui, H. S., Sharpe, F. G., & McCormick, J. (1996). Vision and leadership of principals in Hong Kong. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(3) 30-48.
- Cotton, K. (1994). Applying total quality management principles to secondary education. In *School Improvement Research Series* (No. 1). Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Commission on Higher Education. (1995). Executive Summary. In *Long-Term Higher Education Development Plan 2001-2010*. Philippines: Commission on Higher Education (CHED).
- El-Khawas, E. (2001). Today's universities: responsive, resilient, or rigid? *Higher Education Policy*, 14(1), 241-248.
- Galbraith, P. L. (1999). Systems thinking: a missing component in higher educational planning? *Higher Education Policy*, 12(1), 141-157.
- Go, J. (1993). *Marketing Mix Strategy in the Philippine Setting*. Quezon City: National Bookstore, Inc.
- Gomez, R. R. (1999). The modernization of higher education in Mexico. *Higher Education Policy*, 12(1), 53-67.
- Grundstorm, W. (1995). C + Q + P/M = Benchmarking: TQM and Academic Libraries in "Total Quality Management in Academic Libraries: Initial Implementation Efforts. *Proceedings from the 1st International Conference on TQM and Academic Libraries*. 131.
- Harchar, R. L., & Hyle, A. E. (1996). Collaborative power: a grounded theory of administrative instructional leadership in the elementary school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(3), 15-29.
- Hargreaves, D. H. (1990). *Interpersonal relations and education*. London, NY: Routledge.
- Hill, F., & Taylor, W. E. (1991). Total quality management in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 5(5), 4-9.
- Holtta, S., & Malkki, P. (2000). Response of Finnish higher education to the national information society. *Higher Education Policy*, 13(1), 231-243.
- International Commission of Education for the 21st Century. (1996). *Learning: The Treasure Within* (No. 96-56). France: UNESCO Publishing.
- Jablonski, J. R. (1992). *Implementing TQM: Competing in the Nineties through Total Quality Management*. Amsterdam: Pfeiffer and Company.
- Jackson, N., & Hund, H. (2000). *Benchmarking for Higher Education*. London: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Jurow, S., & Barnard, S. B. (1993). Introduction to TQM fundamentals and overview of contents. *Journal of Library Administration*, 18(1/2), 1-13.
- Kreitner, C. (1998). *Total Quality Management*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lunenberg, F., & Ornstein, A. (2000). *Educational Administration*. Australia: Wadsworth.
- Middlewood, D., & Burton, N. (2001). *Managing the curriculum*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Co.
- Milevo, R. M. (1995). *A Handbook on Product Design and Development*. Quezon City: National Bookstore, Inc.
- Robbins, A. (1993). *Total Quality Management*. NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ross, J. E. (1994). *Total Quality Management: Text, Cases and Readings*. London: St. Lucie Press.
- Sackney, L. E., & Dibsky, D. J. (1994). School-based management: a critical perspective. *Educational Management and Administration*, 22(2), 104-112.

- Saylor, J. H. (1996). *TQM Simplified: A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Senge, P. (1990) *The fifth discipline*. NY: Doubleday.
- Stevenson, W.J. (1994). *Production/Operations Management* (4th ed.). NY: Richard D. Irwin.
- Thorens, J. (1996). Role and mission of the University at the dawn of the 21st century. *Higher Education Policy*, 9(4), 267-275.
- Trow, M. (1994). Managerialism and the academic profession: the case of England. *Higher Education Policy*, 7(2), 11-18.
- Tunnermann, C. (1996). A new vision of higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 9(1), 11-27.
- Vandenberghe, R. (1995). Creative management of a school: a matter of vision and daily interventions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(2), 31-51.

Received October 7, 2003

Revision received May 25, 2004

Accepted July 4, 2004