STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT IN THE REALIZATION OF VISION AND MISSION OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION: BASIS FOR RE-BRANDING STRATEGIES

Mica Jean E. Labe[1]

[1,2]Faculty Member, Marketing Officer

[1,2]Manuel V. Gallego Foundation Colleges, Inc. Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

Abstract: **This study explores the pivotal role of stakeholder engagement in re-branding initiatives within higher education institutions, focusing on Manuel V. Gallego Foundation Colleges in the Philippines. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, the research engages stakeholders—faculty, non-academic staff, students, parents, alumni, and community partners—to investigate their contributions to institutional identity and their influence on student enrollment and retention. The study underscores the profound impact of stakeholder interactions and conducive environments on enrollment decisions, emphasizing affordability, program availability, and institutional reputation as critical factors. By examining the nuanced dynamics of stakeholder engagement, the study offers actionable insights for educational leaders and policymakers seeking to foster a supportive and inclusive educational environment conducive to sustainable institutional growth. Recommendations include tailored communication strategies, enhanced partnerships with alumni and community stakeholders, and ongoing evaluation of stakeholder feedback to ensure alignment with evolving educational needs and market demands. Ultimately, this research contributes to advancing understanding of stakeholder dynamics in higher education re-branding efforts, providing a comprehensive framework for enhancing institutional visibility and positioning amidst evolving educational paradigms and competitive pressures.**

Keywords: **Stakeholder, Engagement, Vision, Mission, Rebranding, Strategies, Education, Institution.**

I. INTRODUCTION

In the evolving higher education landscape of the Philippines, rebranding requires more than superficial changes; it demands proactive engagement with key stakeholders to support student retention and attract new enrollments. Effective rebranding involves faculty and staff, board of trustees, alumni, community partners, and parents, each playing a vital role.

Faculty and staff shape the institution's culture and environment. Their involvement in recruitment and events helps create a positive perception and supports student enrollment. The board of trustees influences strategic direction and financial support; aligning rebranding efforts with their vision fosters trust in the institution's offerings. Alumni serve as advocates by sharing success stories, participating in mentorship, and providing testimonials, which enhances the institution's reputation. Community stakeholders, including local businesses and government bodies, help increase visibility and demonstrate the institution's commitment to community development. Parents, though often overlooked, significantly impact enrollment decisions. Engaging them through family-friendly events and open communication underscores the institution's dedication to quality education.

In summary, successful rebranding in Philippine higher education relies on active stakeholder participation. Understanding the institution's internal environment and stakeholder expectations helps in crafting effective strategies. Research on this need is crucial for identifying challenges, opportunities, and stakeholder perspectives, and for benchmarking against best practices. Evaluating past rebranding efforts informs future strategies, ensuring a well-rounded approach to institutional development.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

Stakeholders in Education and Their Purpose

Stakeholders in education encompass a diverse range of individuals and groups, each with distinct roles and purposes. Students are the central beneficiaries, seeking knowledge and personal development. According to Indeed Editorial Team (2023), stakeholders in education are individuals with a vested interest in the system, encompassing those actively involved or potentially impacted by it [1]. Should you aspire to play a role in enhancing the success of an educational institution or any organization, you might find value in becoming an engaged participant. This discussion delves into the diverse stakeholders within education, shedding light on the distinct purposes they serve in contributing to the overall effectiveness of the system.

According to Pile and Gilchrist (2020), school stakeholders encompass students, their families, school personnel, and the local community. These stakeholders collectively possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and resources essential for advancing the educational system's objectives [2]. Their collaborative efforts play a crucial role in nurturing the growth of our children, ensuring a positive impact both in the present and for the future [3]. Moreover, stakeholders play a pivotal role in school management by collaborating with administrators to establish a conducive environment for teaching and learning, as emphasized by Pelayo (2018) [4]. The engagement of stakeholders in schools, coupled with the leadership's ability to influence them, can significantly impact academic performance outcomes [5].

Gichohi (2015) underscores the potential influence of stakeholders on the effective utilization of available material and human resources, thereby affecting overall performance [6]. Consequently, meaningful collaboration among all stakeholders is imperative for the development of effective educational systems and learning environments. Active interaction from all involved parties is essential for fostering an effective partnership, and open and honest communication enhances fairness and respectful relationships among stakeholders. Ultimately, positive connections, fostered by connection and compassion, contribute to the achievement of educational goals and outcomes, as highlighted by Alomes (2020) [7].

Partners in Building a Strong School Community

In the study by Cruzat, Cruzat, and Javillonar (2022), they illuminated the perspectives of stakeholders on the concept of partnership, assessed their level of participation in school-initiated activities, and examined the practices implemented by schools involving these key contributors [8]. The overarching goal of this investigation was to gain insights into the dynamics of the partnership between schools and stakeholders, with a specific focus on cultivating a robust and interconnected school community.

Aligning the Vision and Mission of an Educational Institution

According to Castillo (2014), vision and mission statements are integral components of institutional strategy, providing a long-term perspective on the institution's purpose, role, and aspirations within its operational context [9]. These statements articulate the fundamental purpose of the institution's existence and outline how it intends to achieve its goals. Additionally, program educational objectives are formulated as broad statements that outline the career and professional accomplishments expected of graduates within three to five years after graduation. These objectives are developed based on the needs and expectations of the program's stakeholders, ensuring alignment with industry demands and societal needs [10].

Enhancing Competitive Edge

In the increasingly competitive landscape of higher education, institutions must differentiate themselves to attract prospective students. According to Foroudi et al. (2017), effective rebranding helps institutions stand out by clearly communicating their unique values, strengths, and offerings [11]. This differentiation is essential for institutions to remain relevant and appealing amid a growing number of alternatives [12].

Aligning with Market Trends and Expectations

Rebranding allows educational institutions to align themselves with current market trends and the evolving expectations of stakeholders. As suggested by Rutter, Lettice, and Nadeau (2017), schools need to continuously adapt to the changing preferences of students, parents, and employers to maintain their attractiveness and credibility [13]. Rebranding helps institutions present themselves as modern, forward-thinking, and responsive to contemporary educational needs [14].

Improving Stakeholder Engagement

A successful rebranding effort involves engaging key stakeholders, including students, parents, faculty, alumni, and the community. According to Whisman (2016), involving these groups in the rebranding process fosters a sense of ownership and loyalty, which is crucial for long-term success [15]. Engaged stakeholders are more likely to support and promote the institution, thereby enhancing its reputation and influence [16].

Addressing Institutional Changes

Rebranding is often necessary to reflect significant changes within the institution, such as new leadership, mergers, expansions, or shifts in academic focus. As noted by Balmer (2017), rebranding helps communicate these changes effectively, ensuring that the institution's image remains consistent with its current mission, vision, and values [17]. This is particularly important for maintaining trust and credibility among existing and potential stakeholders [18].

Adapting to Technological Advancements

The rapid advancement of technology necessitates that educational institutions update their branding to reflect their capabilities and commitment to innovative learning environments. As highlighted by Chapleo (2015), rebranding to showcase technological integration and digital readiness can attract tech-savvy students and reassure stakeholders of the institution's future-oriented approach [19].

Responding to Market Research

Conducting market research is fundamental to understanding the perceptions and needs of various stakeholders. According to Joseph et al. (2019), rebranding efforts that are informed by comprehensive market research are more likely to succeed, as they are based on empirical evidence rather than assumptions [20]. This research helps identify gaps, opportunities, and areas for improvement, guiding the rebranding strategy effectively [21].

III. METHODOLOGY

The study used a descriptive design to assess stakeholder engagement at the College, employing a structured survey to collect data on attendance, participation, and satisfaction. Statistical and qualitative analyses were used to understand engagement dynamics. Stratified random sampling was applied to 565 respondents: 20 faculty, 40 staff, 30 parents, 30 alumni, 20 partners, and 425 students. This approach ensured diverse representation. Two sets of surveys were administered: one for internal stakeholders (faculty, staff, students) and one for external ones (parents, alumni, partners), focusing on the institution's mission and values. Informed consent was obtained, and surveys with 15 Likert-scale questions were distributed. Data were analyzed using Weighted Mean Analysis to assess engagement dimensions and Frequency Analysis to identify patterns and preferences.

IV. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Table 1. Weighted Mean and Verbal Description of Faculty Members and Non-academic Staff's Engagement

	Faculty		Non-Academic Staff	
	Weighted Mean	Verbal Description	Weighted Mean	Verbal Description
Reflective and Ethical Development	3.83	Highly Engaged	3.47	Highly Engaged
Professional Development	3.78	Highly Engaged	3.35	Highly Engaged
Community Engagement	3.61	Highly Engaged	3.36	Highly Engaged
Quality Education and Support	3.85	Highly Engaged	3.79	Highly Engaged

Legend: 1.00-1.74 – Not Engaged; 1.75-2.49 – Less Engaged; 2.50-3.24-Engaged; 3.25-4.00 – Highly Engaged

Table 1 reveals that Reflective and Ethical Development: Faculty (mean = 3.83) and non-academic staff (mean = 3.47) show strong commitment, with faculty excelling in workshops and ethical behavior. Professional Development: Faculty (mean = 3.78) are highly engaged in leadership and skill application, while non-academic staff (mean = 3.35) are engaged but to a lesser extent. Community Engagement: Faculty (mean = 3.61) are highly involved in community programs, with non-academic staff (mean = 3.36) also participating but slightly less. Quality Education and Support: Both groups are highly engaged, with faculty (mean = 3.85) contributing significantly to a supportive learning environment and non-academic staff (mean = 3.79) supporting institutional policies and development.

Table 2. Weighted Mean and Verbal Description of Engagement of Alumni, Parents, and Partners

	Alumni		Parents		Partners	
	Weighted Mean	**Verbal Description**	**Weighted Mean**	**Verbal Description**	**Weighted Mean**	**Verbal Description**
Reflective and Ethical Development	3.12	Engaged	3.21	Engaged	3.07	Engaged
Professional Development	3.43	Highly Engaged	2.70	Engaged	2.53	Engaged
Community Engagement	2.91	Engaged	2.71	Engaged	2.42	Less Engaged
Quality Education and Support	3.39	Highly Engaged	3.00	Engaged	2.60	Engaged

Legend: 1.00-1.74 – Not Engaged; 1.75-2.49 – Less Engaged; 2.50-3.24-Engaged; 3.25-4.00 – Highly Engaged

Table 2 shows that in Reflective and Ethical Development, alumni are "Engaged" (mean = 3.12), with the highest scores in upholding honesty (mean = 3.93) and personal responsibility (mean = 3.63). Parents are also "Engaged" (mean = 3.21), showing strong commitment to honesty (mean = 3.73) and participation in events (mean = 3.43). Partners are "Engaged" (mean = 3.07), excelling in personal accountability (mean = 3.50) and providing feedback (mean = 3.20). Regarding Professional Development, alumni are "Highly Engaged" (mean = 3.43), with top scores in fostering networks (mean = 3.60) and advocacy (mean = 3.53). Parents are "Engaged" (mean = 2.70), with the highest engagement in fostering collaboration (mean = 2.80). Partners are also "Engaged" (mean = 2.53), particularly in fostering collaboration and network building (mean = 2.60). In Community Engagement, alumni are "Engaged" (mean = 2.91), especially in collaborating with organizations (mean = 3.27) and raising awareness (mean = 3.17). Parents are "Engaged" (mean = 2.71), focusing on raising awareness (mean = 3.20). Partners are "Less Engaged" (mean = 2.42), with lower scores in volunteerism and civic activities (mean = 2.50 and 2.41). For Quality Education and Support, alumni are "Engaged" (mean = 2.91), with highest scores in collaboration (mean = 3.27) and raising awareness (mean = 3.17). Parents are "Engaged" (mean = 2.71), showing notable involvement in raising awareness (mean = 3.20). Partners are "Less Engaged" (mean = 2.42), with limited participation in volunteerism and community support (mean = 2.50 and 2.41).

Table 3. Weighted Mean and Verbal Description of Engagement of Students.

	Students	
	Weighted Mean	**Verbal Description**
Reflective and Ethical Development	3.08	Engaged
Professional Development	3.21	Engaged
Community Engagement	3.07	Engaged
Quality Education and Support	3.11	Engaged

Legend: 1.00-1.74 – Not Engaged; 1.75-2.49 – Less Engaged; 2.50-3.24-Engaged; 3.25-4.00 – Highly Engaged

Table 3 shows that Reflective and Ethical Development Students are "Engaged" with a mean score of 3.08. They are most involved in "open dialogues" (3.18) and "collaborative projects" (3.10), and least in "upholding integrity" (3.08). While participation is positive, deeper engagement is needed to fully align with the school's mission. Professional Development: Students are "Engaged" with a mean score of 3.21. They excel in "professional development participation" (3.24) and "leadership skills" (3.24), and are less engaged in "applying knowledge" (3.20). More consistent application of skills is needed to meet the school's goals. Community Engagement: Students are "Engaged" with a mean score of 3.07. They score highest in "collaboration with organizations" (3.11) and "raising awareness" (3.10). Engagement is positive but requires

more depth to achieve the school's objectives. Quality Education and Support: Students are "Engaged" with a mean score of 3.11. They are most engaged in "supporting policies" (3.14) and least in "extracurricular activities" (3.11). Academic pressures limit broader involvement, suggesting a need for more flexible opportunities.

V. CONCLUSION

1. The institution's faculty and non-academic staff exhibit strong engagement in reflective and ethical development, professional growth, and community activities that strongly align with the institution's mission and vision. Their high levels of commitment amplify their major roles in fostering a supportive learning environment and upholding educational excellence. While there are areas for ongoing enhancement, the current achievements reflect significant strides towards realizing institutional' s vision and mission.

2. The institution sees moderate engagement in reflective and ethical development from alumni, parents, and partners, bolstered by effective communication and recognition strategies. While alumni lead in professional development and community engagement aligns well with the institution's mission and vision, there's room to enhance involvement from parents and partners to better support the school's vision. Overall, while successes are evident, ongoing efforts are needed to fully realize the institution's mission, particularly by strengthening partner engagement strategies.

3. The current level of student engagement in reflective and ethical development, professional growth, community activities, and educational support holds promise but is not completely in line with the institution's mission and vision. Continuous improvement is needed in these areas to enhance student experiences and bolster the institution's ability to fully achieve its educational mission.

4. A rebranding strategy that aims to leverage current strengths, address areas for improvement, and align promotional efforts with the school's mission and vision shall be proposed.

REFERENCES

[1] Indeed Editorial Team (2023). Who are the stakeholders in education? (And their purpose). Retrieved from: https://uk.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/who-are-stakeholders-in-education

[2] Pile J, Gilchrist L. (2020). Getting clearer: Stakeholders at the heart of education. Getting Smart. https://www.gettingsmart.com/2020/09/16/getting-clearer-stakeholders-at-the-heart-of-education/

[3] Pelayo D. Stakeholders' Role in School-Based Management. Sun. Star Pampanga, (2018). https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstarpampanga/20180505/281586651225039

[4] Gichohi, GW. (2015). Stakeholder involvement in schools in the 21st century for academic excellence. International Journal of Education and Research. 2015; 3(2):13-21.

[5] Alomes, B. (2020). The importance of stakeholders when it comes to creating successful learning outcomes. Natural Pod, 2020. https://naturalpod.com/the-importance-of-stakeholders-when-it-comes-to-creating-successful-learning-outcomes/

[6] Cruzat, M., Cruzat, R., & Javillonar, A. (2022). Illuminating the perspectives of stakeholders on the concept of partnership and participation in school-initiated activities. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation (online): 2582-7138, Volume: 03 Issue: 04, July-August 2022, Pages: 314-318. Received: 05-07-2022; Accepted: 21-07-2022.

[7] Castillo, R. C. (2014). Awareness, Acceptance and Perception of Batangas State University Stakeholders towards its Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives. International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR), ISSN 2307-4531

[8] Foroudi, P., Melewar, T. C., & Gupta, S. (2017). Corporate logo: history, definition, and the role of consulting firms in its development. Journal of Business Research, 70, 426-433.

[9] Johnson, B. R., & Christensen, L. B. (2017). Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches. 6. Los Angeles: SAGE; 2017.

[10] Joseph, M., Mullen, E. W., Spake, D. F., & Helm, M. (2019). University branding: Understanding students' choice of an educational institution. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 41(1), 21-34.

[11] Rutter, R., Lettice, F., & Nadeau, J. (2017). Brand personality in higher education: anthropomorphized university marketing communications. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 27(1), 19-39.

[12] Williams, Sara, McEwen, Lindsey J., & Quinn, Nevil. (2017). As the climate changes: Intergenerational action-based learning in relation to flood education. The Journal of Environmental Education, Vol 48(3), May 2017, 154-171 https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2016.1256261

[13] Whisman, R. (2016). Internal branding: A university's most valuable intangible asset. Journal of Education Advancement & Marketing, 1(4), 337-351.

[14] Shaker, G. G., & Plater, W. M. (2016). The public good, productivity, and purpose: New economic imperatives for assessing alumni giving. Philanthropy & Education, 1(1), 1-34.

[15] Balmer, J. M. T. (2017). Corporate brand orientation: What is it? What of it? Journal of Brand Management, 24(3), 77-90.

[16] Chapleo, C. (2015). Brands in higher education: Challenges and potential strategies. International Studies of Management & Organization, 45(2), 150-163.

[17] Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta (2023). Development of professional tolerance in medical students through professionally-oriented foreign language training., doi: 10.17223/15617793/480/26

[18] McDearmon, J. T. (2013). Hail to Thee, Our Alma Mater: Alumni Role Identity and the Relationship to Institutional Support Behaviors. Research in Higher Education, 54(3), 283-302.

[19] Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2014). Creating value in nonprofit-business collaborations: New thinking and practice. John Wiley & Sons.

[20] Joseph, M., Mullen, E. W., Spake, D. F., & Helm, M. (2019). University branding: Understanding students' choice of an educational institution. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 41(1), 21-34.

[21] Rosna, Awang-Hashim., Amrita, Kaur., Norhafezah, Yusof., S., Kanageswari, a, Shanmugam., p, Suppiah., Nor, Aziah, Abdul, Manaf., Ainol, Madziah, Zubairi., Angelina, Yee, Seow, Voon., Marzura, Abdul, Malek. (2021). Reflective and integrative learning and the role of instructors and institutions—evidence from Malaysia. Higher Education, 1-20. doi: 10.1007/S10734-021-00689-5