

Evaluation of a Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management: Basis for Outcome-Based Course Enhancement

Dr. Jan Vincent S. Carmen¹

¹Faculty, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST)

Publication Date: 2025/10/09

Abstract: This study evaluated a proposed instructional module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management as a tool for enhancing course delivery in Criminology through the Outcome-Based Education (OBE) framework. Anchored on Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) and guided by CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018, the research was conducted by a single researcher and involved 272 third-year BS Criminology students from the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology during the First Semester of Academic Year 2025–2026. Using complete enumeration and a validated evaluation instrument, respondents assessed the module across six components: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting Up, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning. Results showed consistently high mean scores across all components, with grand means ranging from 4.40 to 4.45, interpreted as “Strongly Agree.” Key strengths included clarity of module titles, relevance of objectives, applied learning activities, and credible references. Minor areas for improvement were noted in the diversity of materials, accessibility of sources, and provision of pre-assessments. Findings affirm the module’s alignment with OBE principles and its potential to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes. To further enhance learning outcomes, it is recommended that the module incorporate more multimedia content, clarify assessment instructions, and include pre-assessment tools to better tailor instruction to student readiness. This study contributes to the continuous improvement of Criminology education by promoting structured, learner-centered instructional design focused on real-world competencies in peacekeeping and conflict management.

Keywords: *Dispute Resolution, Crises Management, Incidents Management, Outcome-based Education, BS Criminology.*

How to Cite: Dr. Jan Vincent S. Carmen (2025) Evaluation of a Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management: Basis for Outcome-Based Course Enhancement. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(10), 280-287. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct251>

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, higher education in the Philippines increasingly adopted Outcome-Based Education (OBE) to ensure that graduating students achieve clearly defined competencies aligned with societal needs. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) mandated OBE implementation in criminology programs via CMO No.5, series of 2018, emphasizing the creation of instructional materials that are outcome-oriented and responsive to 21st-century demands. Despite this, many criminology curricula continue to rely on traditional modules that insufficiently integrate practical skills such as conflict resolution and crisis management, competencies that are critical for practitioners in law enforcement, corrections, and community safety.

Globally, evidence supports that well-designed instructional modules, particularly those with strong alignment between objectives, content, and assessments, can significantly enhance student outcomes. For instance, Homillano (2025) evaluated a Moodle-based module in a professional education course and found that expert and learner ratings deemed it “very good” in content, design, and pedagogical alignment. Likewise, Zhenduo and Othman

(2023) demonstrated that interdisciplinary modules that emphasize usability and clarity contribute to higher-order thinking and stronger learner engagement. These findings reinforce the need for modular instructional innovations that integrate clarity, alignment, and usability, especially in technically and socially demanding fields.

Recognizing these imperatives, this study evaluated a newly developed module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management among 272 third-year BS Criminology students at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST) during the first semester of AY 2025–2026, using complete enumeration to ensure comprehensive feedback. Respondents assessed the module across six components: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning—with the goal of identifying strengths and areas for improvement. The results were intended to inform revisions that ensure the module fully aligns with OBE principles, CHED standards, and real-world criminology practice demands, thereby contributing to the continuous improvement of criminology education in the Philippines in support of SDG 4: Quality Education.

Objectives:	
General Objective:	:
Specific Objective:	The primary objective of this study is to evaluate the proposed module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management as a basis for enhancing course design through an outcome-based education (OBE) approach. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions: 1. How do the respondents evaluate the proposed module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management in terms of the following components: 1.1. Module Title; 1.2. Learning Objectives; 1.3. Setting Up; 1.4. Content; 1.5 References; and 1.6 Assessment of Learning? 2. What strengths and areas for improvement can be identified in the proposed module based on the respondents' evaluation? 3. Based on the findings, what enhanced module Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management can be proposed?

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a descriptive-evaluative research design to assess the effectiveness of a proposed instructional module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management intended for third-year BS Criminology students. The evaluation focused on the module’s content quality, instructional design, and alignment with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles as prescribed by CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018.

➤ Respondents

The respondents were 272 third-year BS Criminology students enrolled in the relevant course at the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST) during the First Semester of Academic Year 2025–2026. Complete enumeration was used to select respondents, ensuring the inclusion of all students taking the course during that term. This method was chosen to gather comprehensive feedback from the intended end users of the module and ensure the robustness of the data collected.

➤ Research Instrument

The main tool for data collection was a structured evaluation questionnaire developed by the researcher and validated by three experts in criminology, instructional design, and education research. The questionnaire consisted of six major components corresponding to key areas of module evaluation:

- Module Title
- Learning Objectives
- Setting (Instructional Activities)
- Content
- References
- Assessment of Learning

Each component was measured through ten indicators using a 5-point Likert scale, where 5 indicated "Strongly

Agree" and 1 indicated "Strongly Disagree." The scale was later interpreted using equal interval ranges to determine the respondents' level of agreement with each statement.

➤ Procedure

The proposed module was distributed to the students, who were then given adequate time to read, engage with, and study the material. Afterward, the evaluation questionnaire was administered. Students were informed of the purpose of the study, assured of the confidentiality of their responses, and instructed to answer honestly based on their experience with the module. Data collection was carried out through Google Forms.

➤ Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, particularly the mean for each indicator. The grand mean for each component was also computed to determine overall respondent perception. Mean scores were interpreted based on the following ranges:

- 4.20–5.00 = Strongly Agree
- 3.40–4.19 = Agree
- 2.60–3.39 = Neutral
- 1.80–2.59 = Disagree
- 1.00–1.79 = Strongly Disagree

The evaluation results were then used to identify both strengths and areas for improvement in the module design.

➤ Reproducibility and Reliability

Although the study was not experimental in nature, it ensured reproducibility by providing detailed documentation of procedures, instruments, and participant inclusion. The use of complete enumeration and standardized questionnaire administration minimized sampling bias and procedural variation. The internal consistency of the instrument was validated using Cronbach’s alpha, which yielded a value of 0.92, indicating high reliability.

III. RESULTS

Table 1. Respondents’ Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management in terms of Module Title

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1.	Each module title clearly reflects the topic covered in the lesson.	4.55	Strongly Agree
2.	The module titles are organized, well-written, and easy to understand.	4.48	Strongly Agree
3.	Each module title gives a clear idea of what the student can expect to learn.	4.42	Strongly Agree
4.	The module titles help the student remember key concepts.	4.38	Strongly Agree
5.	The module titles are specific and directly related to the lesson content.	4.49	Strongly Agree
6.	The module titles are consistent in format and structure throughout the material.	4.39	Strongly Agree

7.	Each module title meaningfully represents the content of the module.	4.51	Strongly Agree
8.	The module titles make it easier for the student to follow the flow of the lessons.	4.42	Strongly Agree
9.	The module titles are clearly connected to the learning goals.	4.47	Strongly Agree
10.	The module titles help set clear expectations for student learning.	4.41	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		4.45	Strongly Agree

Table 2. Respondents’ Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management in terms of Learning Objectives

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1.	The learning objectives are clearly stated at the beginning of each unit or topic.	4.43	Strongly Agree
2.	The learning objectives are easy for the student to understand and follow.	4.40	Strongly Agree
3.	The objectives reflect what the student is expected to learn after each lesson.	4.38	Strongly Agree
4.	The objectives are relevant to the course and the needs of the student.	4.45	Strongly Agree
5.	The learning objectives help the student stay focused on important topics.	4.40	Strongly Agree
6.	The student finds the learning objectives achievable and realistic.	4.40	Strongly Agree
7.	The objectives include both knowledge-based and practical skills.	4.42	Strongly Agree
8.	The objectives are consistent with the course content discussed in the module.	4.39	Strongly Agree
9.	The objectives helped the student understand the purpose of each lesson.	4.39	Strongly Agree
10.	The learning objectives reflect the appropriate level of difficulty for the student.	4.35	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		4.40	Strongly Agree

Table 3. Respondents’ Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management in terms of Setting

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1.	The module included pre-assessment or diagnostic activities before each lesson.	4.39	Strongly Agree
2.	The pre-assessment activities helped the student identify what was already known about the topic.	4.42	Strongly Agree
3.	The activities in the module prepared the student for new lessons.	4.44	Strongly Agree
4.	The activities helped the student connect prior knowledge to new content.	4.48	Strongly Agree
5.	The module activities allowed the student to apply what was learned in practical ways.	4.48	Strongly Agree
6.	The module provided enough practice activities to reinforce learning.	4.44	Strongly Agree
7.	The activities helped the student monitor their own understanding throughout the lesson.	4.46	Strongly Agree
8.	The progression of activities in the module followed a logical learning sequence.	4.44	Strongly Agree
9.	The activities encouraged active participation from the student.	4.41	Strongly Agree
10.	The student found the activities useful in understanding the learning objectives.	4.44	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		4.44	Strongly Agree

Table 4. Respondents’ Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management in terms of Content

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1.	The module includes essential and relevant topics for the subject.	4.50	Strongly Agree
2.	The assessments included in the module are aligned with the content.	4.44	Strongly Agree
3.	The topics are organized logically and are easy for the student to follow.	4.43	Strongly Agree
4.	The content matches the cognitive level and academic needs of third-year students.	4.44	Strongly Agree
5.	Assessment activities are provided at the end of each chapter or unit.	4.46	Strongly Agree
6.	The content reflects updated guidelines and relevant industry practices.	4.44	Strongly Agree
7.	The test items are based on learning outcomes and relate to the module content.	4.41	Strongly Agree
8.	The topics contribute to the student's knowledge and awareness of real-world issues.	4.42	Strongly Agree
9.	A variety of materials (e.g., texts, visuals, examples) are used to support the lessons.	4.40	Strongly Agree
10.	The content is simplified for better understanding without losing its academic value.	4.46	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		4.44	Strongly Agree

Table 5. Respondents’ Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management in terms of References

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1.	The module includes proper citations for all sources used.	4.43	Strongly Agree
2.	The references are relevant and directly related to the topics discussed.	4.42	Strongly Agree
3.	The sources used in the module are up-to-date.	4.42	Strongly Agree
4.	The student can access the materials cited in the module.	4.38	Strongly Agree
5.	The references help the student better understand the lesson content.	4.40	Strongly Agree
6.	The module gives proper credit to original authors.	4.50	Strongly Agree
7.	The references support and strengthen the accuracy of the content.	4.47	Strongly Agree
8.	The references are presented in a clear and organized format.	4.48	Strongly Agree
9.	The references show that the module is based on well-researched information.	4.48	Strongly Agree
10.	The use of references increases the credibility of the instructional material.	4.54	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		4.45	Strongly Agree

Table 6. Respondents’ Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management in terms of Assessment of Learning

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1.	The post-lesson assessments helped the student evaluate what was learned.	4.43	Strongly Agree
2.	The assessments given after each lesson reflected the key topics discussed.	4.46	Strongly Agree
3.	The post-lesson tests or tasks matched the learning objectives of the module.	4.42	Strongly Agree
4.	The assessment questions were clear, understandable, and based on the lesson content.	4.43	Strongly Agree
5.	The assessments helped the student apply knowledge from the lessons.	4.46	Strongly Agree
6.	The student felt that the assessments measured actual learning and understanding.	4.44	Strongly Agree
7.	The post-lesson assessments provided the student with a sense of progress.	4.46	Strongly Agree
8.	The module included a variety of assessment activities (e.g., quizzes, written tasks, reflections).	4.45	Strongly Agree
9.	The student had enough time and guidance to complete the assessments after each lesson.	4.40	Strongly Agree
10.	The assessments encouraged the student to review and reflect on the lesson.	4.49	Strongly Agree
	Grand Mean	4.44	Strongly Agree

Table 7. Identified Strengths and Areas for Improvement Based on Respondents’ Evaluation

Component	Strengths (Highest-Rated Indicators)	Areas for Improvement (Lowest-Rated Indicators)
Module Title	Titles clearly reflect lesson content (Mean = 4.55)	Titles help the student remember key concepts (Mean = 4.38)
Learning Objectives	Objectives are relevant to the course and student needs (Mean = 4.45)	Objectives reflect appropriate level of difficulty (Mean = 4.35)
Setting	Activities connect prior knowledge and promote application (Mean = 4.48)	Pre-assessment/diagnostic activities before each lesson (Mean = 4.39)
Content	Includes essential and relevant topics (Mean = 4.50)	Variety of materials used to support lessons (Mean = 4.40)
References	Use of references increases credibility of material (Mean = 4.54)	Accessibility of cited materials (Mean = 4.38)
Assessment of Learning	Assessments encouraged review and reflection (Mean = 4.49)	Enough time and guidance to complete assessments (Mean = 4.40)

➤ Description of the Enhanced Module Based on Evaluation Results

In revising the instructional module, the researcher ensured that all identified strengths were preserved while addressing areas for improvement based on the students’ evaluation.

For the Module Title, the titles were retained as they clearly reflected the lesson content, which was highly rated by the respondents. To enhance their effectiveness in helping students remember key concepts, the titles were revised to include action-oriented language. For example, a title originally written as “Conflict Management Techniques” was improved to “Conflict Management Techniques: Identify, Prevent, Resolve.” This version includes action verbs to support memory retention and clarify learning expectations.

In terms of Learning Objectives, the original objectives were maintained due to their strong relevance to the course and student needs. However, improvements were made to ensure that the objectives reflect an appropriate level of difficulty and cognitive challenge. For instance, the objective “Understand conflict resolution strategies” was revised to “Analyze and apply conflict resolution strategies in simulated scenarios.” This change aligns better with higher-order thinking skills and the OBE framework.

Within the Setting or lesson setup, activities that encouraged the application of knowledge and connection to prior learning were kept. To address the lack of diagnostic activities, pre-assessments were introduced at the beginning of each lesson. A simple example includes a short quiz or reflection prompt such as, “What do you already know about crisis strategies? List two examples.” This helps activate prior knowledge and prepares students for new content.

For the Content, the inclusion of essential and relevant topics was preserved. To enrich the learning experience and support diverse learning styles, a wider variety of instructional materials was incorporated. These include short YouTube videos demonstrating real-life incident management, current news articles for case analysis, and infographics summarizing steps in crisis response. These resources aim to make learning more interactive and relatable.

With regard to References, credible academic sources were retained to maintain the quality and reliability of the module. To improve accessibility, the researcher ensured that all cited materials are easily available through open-access platforms or institutional subscriptions. Features such as clickable links and QR codes were added so students can quickly access full texts using their devices.

Lastly, for the Assessment of Learning, reflective and review-oriented assessments were maintained. To respond to feedback about time and guidance, improvements included clearer instructions, specific word counts, and suggested deadlines. For example, the original prompt “Write a reflection on crisis management” was revised to “In 300 words, reflect on a recent crisis in the news. What strategies were used? Submit within 3 days. Use the rubric provided.” These adjustments help students manage their time better and understand expectations more clearly.

IV. DISCUSSIONS

The respondents’ evaluation of the proposed module on *Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management* across six key components: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning revealed consistently high ratings, indicating the module’s

overall instructional effectiveness and alignment with learner needs. All components received grand mean scores above 4.40, interpreted as Strongly Agree, affirming that the module was well received in terms of clarity, coherence, relevance, and academic rigor.

In terms of the Module Title, the grand mean of 4.45 reflects strong agreement among learners that titles were clear, informative, and well aligned with lesson content. The highest-rated item, “Each module title clearly reflects the topic covered in the lesson” (4.55), underscores the importance of precision and relevance in naming instructional units. Conversely, the slightly lower rating of 4.38 for “The module titles help the student remember key concepts” suggests a minor opportunity to enhance the mnemonic function of titles. These findings echo Sheridan’s (2023) assertion that well-structured curriculum components, such as titles and headers, support learners in organizing and recalling information. Similarly, Rawlings et al. (2025) emphasized that coherent instructional elements, like appropriately framed titles, foster alignment between course structure and learner expectations. Tadesse and Gillies (2021) further reinforce that clarity in instructional design boosts motivation and facilitates cognitive engagement, especially in higher education settings.

Evaluation of the Learning Objectives yielded a grand mean of 4.40, indicating that objectives were regarded as clear, relevant, and aligned with learners’ academic and practical needs. The item rated highest, “The objectives are relevant to the course and the needs of the student” (4.45), suggests strong recognition of goal relevance, while the lowest, “The learning objectives reflect the appropriate level of difficulty for the student” (4.35), reveals an area for fine-tuning content difficulty to better match learner readiness. These results are supported by Ellis et al. (2024), who found that clear and well-aligned course objectives were stronger predictors of perceived course quality than instructor performance alone. Additionally, the findings of the University of the People’s instructional design study (QA Instructional Designer, 2024) validate that precise learning objectives reduce extraneous cognitive load and enhance content retention. The observed effectiveness of objectives in the proposed module thus mirrors best practices in instructional alignment and learner-centered design.

Regarding Setting, the module also garnered a high grand mean of 4.44, highlighting its effectiveness in providing structured learning environments, scaffolded tasks, and practical application. The dual highest means (4.48) for “The activities helped the student connect prior knowledge to new content” and “The module activities allowed the student to apply what was learned in practical ways” point to strong integration of constructivist learning principles. The slightly lower score of 4.39 for the inclusion of pre-assessment activities suggests room for expanding diagnostic tools to activate prior knowledge more systematically. These outcomes are aligned with Patiño, Ramírez Montoya, and Buenestado Fernández (2023), who emphasized that well-sequenced and scaffolded activities are critical to fostering deep, applied learning. Similarly, Li et al. (2024) found that active learning approaches in blended formats significantly improved both student confidence and performance. The results affirm that the module effectively activates prior knowledge and encourages learner engagement through meaningful, real-world activities.

Evaluation of Content also yielded a grand mean of 4.44, reinforcing the perception that the module’s subject matter is essential, logically sequenced, and academically suitable. The

top-rated item, “The module includes essential and relevant topics for the subject” (4.50), confirms that learners find the content appropriately targeted and applicable. The lowest-rated item, “A variety of materials (e.g., texts, visuals, examples) are used to support the lessons” (4.40), though still strong, suggests a need to further enhance multimodal content delivery. This aligns with findings from the 2024 study on constructive alignment in higher education, which emphasized that tight alignment among content, learning outcomes, and assessments leads to deeper learning (Constructive Alignment in a Graduate-Level Project Management Course, 2024). Furthermore, integrating varied learning materials supports different learning preferences and helps reduce cognitive overload (Sheridan, 2023). The module’s strong performance in this area affirms its alignment with contemporary standards for inclusive and engaging instructional design.

In the evaluation of References, the module earned a grand mean of 4.45, indicating high learner confidence in the accuracy, relevance, and academic integrity of cited materials. The highest score, 4.54, for “The use of references increases the credibility of the instructional material,” suggests that learners value proper source attribution as a marker of scholarly rigor. However, the lowest score, 4.38, was attributed to the accessibility of cited materials, reflecting a modest gap in availability or user-friendliness. García, Froment, and Bohórquez (2023) asserted that teacher and material credibility significantly influence student engagement and trust, particularly when source usage is transparent and traceable. Similarly, the Frontiers (2025) study highlighted that well-sourced materials enhance both instructional authority and learner satisfaction. Accessibility concerns are consistent with broader information literacy challenges, where even well-cited materials may be difficult for students to locate without institutional access or proper guidance (Frontiers, 2024). Nevertheless, the findings validate that the module upholds strong academic standards in source selection and attribution.

Finally, the component on Assessment of Learning was also rated favorably, with a grand mean of 4.44, suggesting that the module’s assessment strategies are clear, aligned, and conducive to student understanding. The highest mean of 4.49 was for “The assessments encouraged the student to review and reflect on the lesson,” pointing to the assessments’ effectiveness in promoting metacognitive engagement. The lowest, 4.40, regarding time and guidance for assessments, implies a potential need for clearer instructions or more flexible pacing. Baló and Sanchez (2025) found that learner satisfaction and performance are significantly enhanced when assessments are tightly aligned with module objectives and provide opportunities for reflection. Similarly, formative assessment models stress that clarity, feedback, and self-monitoring are key elements of effective evaluation practices (Effective Feedback and Assessment Strategies, 2023). These findings affirm that the module’s assessments are robust, thoughtfully integrated, and well-received, with only minor improvements needed in implementation logistics.

Overall, the proposed module received consistently high ratings across all instructional components, demonstrating strong alignment with current pedagogical standards and learner expectations. The results not only validate the module’s effectiveness but also highlight specific strengths in clarity, content relevance, and applied learning, while suggesting minor improvements in accessibility of references and learner guidance during assessments. These insights reinforce the importance of continuous, research-informed development in educational material design.

On the other hand, Table 7 presents a summary of the highest- and lowest-rated indicators across each component of the proposed module on *Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management*, highlighting both its strengths and areas for improvement. Overall, the strengths consistently reflect strong agreement among respondents regarding the module's clarity, relevance, and instructional effectiveness.

For Module Title, the highest rating was for the indicator stating that titles clearly reflect the lesson content (Mean = 4.55), indicating that the naming of modules strongly supports learner comprehension. However, a slightly lower rating was given to the titles' ability to help students remember key concepts (Mean = 4.38), suggesting an opportunity to improve the mnemonic or recall value of titles.

In the Learning Objectives component, the top-rated strength was the alignment of objectives with course relevance and student needs (Mean = 4.45), emphasizing the objectives' appropriateness. In contrast, the lowest-rated item was the reflection of the appropriate level of difficulty (Mean = 4.35), pointing to the need for slight adjustment to better match learners' cognitive readiness.

The Setting was praised for effectively connecting prior knowledge with new content and promoting application through activities (Mean = 4.48). However, the inclusion of pre-assessment activities before each lesson received a lower score (Mean = 4.39), indicating room to strengthen diagnostic entry points to learning.

In terms of Content, the module was highly rated for including essential and relevant topics (Mean = 4.50), affirming its academic relevance. Nonetheless, the use of a variety of supporting materials (Mean = 4.40) was identified as an area for enrichment, possibly by incorporating more visuals, examples, or multimedia elements.

Regarding References, the module excelled in enhancing credibility through proper citation (Mean = 4.54), demonstrating scholarly integrity. Yet, accessibility of the cited sources (Mean = 4.38) emerged as a minor concern, possibly due to limited access to full texts or lack of direct links.

Finally, the Assessment of Learning component showed strong agreement that assessments encouraged student reflection and review (Mean = 4.49), a key element of deep learning. The lowest rating in this area was for the sufficiency of time and guidance provided during assessments (Mean = 4.40), highlighting the importance of supportive instructions and pacing.

In sum, while the module's strengths are firmly rooted in relevance, clarity, and credibility, the areas identified for improvement offer valuable insights for refinement, particularly in enhancing accessibility, instructional scaffolding, and cognitive alignment.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

The module demonstrated strong instructional quality across all six key components: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning, with all grand mean scores exceeding 4.40 (Strongly Agree). This indicates high satisfaction and perceived

effectiveness among learners and affirms that the module is pedagogically sound and aligned with student needs.

Respondents strongly agreed that the module's structure and content were clear, coherent, and academically rigorous. Titles, objectives, and activities were recognized for their relevance and alignment with learning outcomes, reinforcing constructive alignment principles and reflecting current best practices in instructional design.

The module's learning objectives were deemed relevant and appropriately designed to address academic and practical competencies. Students also valued the constructivist and application-oriented learning activities, successfully promoting real-world application and metacognitive engagement.

The content was perceived as logically sequenced and essential, affirming its appropriateness for the subject area. However, there was a slight need to diversify content delivery, particularly through enhanced multimedia and varied instructional materials, to cater to different learning preferences and improve engagement.

The References component received high ratings for credibility and scholarly rigor, with students appreciating using reliable sources. However, there was a minor concern regarding the accessibility of these references, indicating a need to ensure that materials are readily available or supported with access instructions or alternatives.

Assessment tools were considered well-aligned with the learning content and effective in fostering student reflection and review. Nonetheless, slightly lower ratings were given to the clarity of instructions and pacing, suggesting the value of improving guidance and flexibility in assessment delivery.

While the module excels in all evaluated areas, the findings highlight refinable regions, such as:

Enhancing the mnemonic quality of module titles, adjusting difficulty levels of learning objectives better to match student readiness, including more pre-assessment activities to activate prior knowledge, improving accessibility of references, and providing more explicit assessment instructions and time management support.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations may be considered to further enhance the design, delivery, and effectiveness of the module on *Dispute Resolution and Crises/Incidents Management*:

Module titles may be revised to improve their mnemonic quality by incorporating keywords or thematic phrases that help students better remember key concepts.

Learning objectives may be adjusted to reflect the appropriate difficulty level better, ensuring that they match students' cognitive readiness and prior knowledge. A preliminary learner assessment may help tailor the objectives' complexity to the target audience.

The module may include more pre-assessment tools, such as short quizzes or reflective prompts, to help activate prior knowledge and guide personalized learning.

The instructional content may be diversified by integrating multimedia elements (e.g., videos, interactive

visuals, case studies) to cater to different learning styles. This approach may enhance student motivation, comprehension, and retention.

Efforts may be made to ensure that cited references are readily accessible, such as by using open-access materials or providing direct links and access instructions. Supplementary or alternative resources may be offered when original references are difficult to obtain.

Assessment instructions may be clarified to ensure students fully understand the expectations, format, and criteria. Including pacing guides and estimated completion times may support better time management and reduce anxiety during assessment periods.

Regular feedback collection from learners may be implemented to inform ongoing revisions and improvements to the module. A system for iterative module development based on student input and learning analytics may sustain instructional quality over time.

Furthermore, the module may be adapted in related disciplines or professional training programs where dispute resolution and crisis management are relevant. It may also be integrated into blended or online learning environments to expand reach and accessibility. Lastly, Further studies may explore the long-term effects of the module on learners' performance, practical application, and professional readiness. Comparative research across institutions or learning formats may provide deeper insights into best practices in instructional design.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wishes to acknowledge the invaluable support and cooperation of the 272 Criminology students from the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology who served as respondents in this study. Sincere thanks are also extended to the faculty validators and experts who reviewed the evaluation instrument. The researcher also gratefully acknowledges the significant contributions of the 3rd year Presidents of BS Criminology at NEUST to the successful completion of this study. Their assistance, support, and insights were invaluable throughout the research process. The researcher extends sincere appreciation to Princess Heart Bernabe (3-Alpha), Kryzia Mikaela G. Barleso (3-Alpha), Lian Rayniel V. Erguiza (3-Bravo), Roxanne M. Joaquin (3-Charlie), John Marco C. Malubay (3-Delta), Jamile G. De Guzman (3-Echo), Marcus Adrian A. Serdenia (3-Foxtrot), and Stephanie F. Dela Cruz (3-Golf). Lastly, gratitude is given to the NEUST administration for allowing the conduct of this research. This study was conducted without external funding support.

REFERENCES

[1]. Balo, V. T. M. and J. M. P. Sanchez, 2025. Evaluation of educational assessment module for flexible STEM education. *STEM Educ.*, 5(1):130–151. <https://doi.org/10.3934/steme.2025007>

[2]. Ellis, J., et al., 2024. Course design as a stronger predictor of student evaluation of quality and student engagement than teacher ratings. *High. Educ.*, 88:1997–2013.

[3]. García, A. J., F. A. Froment and M. R. Bohórquez, 2023. University teacher credibility as a strategy to motivate students. *J. New Approaches Educ. Res.*, 12:292–306.

[4]. Hephher, B. and Y. Pruginin, 1981. Commercial Fish Farming. John Wiley & Sons, New York. 261 pp.

[5]. Li, H., X. Yu, Y. Sun and H. Yang, 2024. Impact of active learning instruction in blended learning on students' anxiety levels and performance. *Front. Educ.*, 9:Article 1332778.

[6]. Patiño, A., M. S. Ramírez-Montoya and M. Buenestado-Fernández, 2023. Active learning and education 4.0 for complex thinking training: Analysis of two case studies in open education. *Smart Learn. Environ.*, 10:Article 8.

[7]. QA Instructional Designer & Research Scholar, 2024. The impact of cognitive load theory on the effectiveness of microlearning modules. *Eur. J. Educ. Pedag.*, 5(2):Article 799.

[8]. Rawlings, C., A. Mohammed and H. Al Hammadi, 2025. Assessing learning management system success in UAE universities: How quality measures link to students' academic performance. *Front. Educ.*, 10:Article 1154321.

[9]. ScienceDirect, 2023. Role of course relevance and course content quality in MOOCs acceptance and use. *Comput. Educ. Open*, 5:Article 100147.

[10]. Sheridan, D., 2023. Designing online teaching curriculum to optimise learning for all students in higher education. *Curric. J.*, 34(2):239–255.

[11]. Student-Centered Active Learning Study, 2023. Student-centered active learning improves performance in solving higher-level cognitive questions in health sciences education. *Health Sci. Educ. J.* [MDPI].

[12]. Tadesse, T. and R. M. Gillies, 2021. Active learning strategies and their effects on students' motivation in higher education. *Int. J. Educ. Res. Open*, 2:100043.

[13]. Unknown Author, 2023. Alignment analysis of teaching–learning–assessment within the classroom: How teachers implement project-based learning under the curriculum standards. *Discip. Interdiscip. Sci. Educ. Res.*

[14]. Unknown Author, 2023. Effective feedback and assessment strategies. Module on designing assessments (Module 2). <https://sites.google.com/view/effective-feedback-and-assessm/module-2>

[15]. Unknown Author, 2024. Constructive alignment in a graduate-level project management course: An innovative framework using large language models. *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*

[16]. Unknown Author, 2024. Pre-service teachers evaluating online texts about learning styles: There is room for improvement in justifying the credibility. *Front. Educ.*

[17]. Unknown Author, 2025. The impact of teaching materials on instructional design and teacher development. *Front. Educ.*