



EVALUATION OF A PROPOSED MODULE ON INTRODUCTION TO CRIMINOLOGY: BASIS FOR OUTCOME-BASED COURSE ENHANCEMENT

Wendy SP. Nicolas-Mendoza

Faculty, College of Criminology, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra28179>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra28179

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated a proposed instructional module on Introduction to Criminology as the basis for outcome-based course enhancement. Employing a descriptive research design, the study utilized complete enumeration of 273 first-year Bachelor of Science in Criminology students at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST) during the First Semester of Academic Year 2025–2026. Results revealed that all components were rated Highly Effective, with grand means ranging from 4.66 to 4.73, interpreted as Strongly Agree. Strengths included clarity of module titles, relevance of objectives, logical sequencing of activities, essential and updated content, credible references, and reflective assessments. Minor areas for improvement were identified in diagnostic activities, accessibility of references, and diversity of assessment formats. Based on these findings, the module was enhanced by refining titles with action-oriented phrasing, revising objectives to emphasize higher-order skills, integrating diagnostic tasks, enriching content with multimodal resources, improving reference accessibility, and clarifying assessment instructions. These refinements ensure that the module remains responsive to student needs, aligned with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles, and effective in preparing learners for criminology practice and professional development.

KEYWORDS: Introduction to Criminology; instructional module evaluation; Outcome-Based Education (OBE); criminology curriculum enhancement; teaching effectiveness; assessment of learning; NEUST

INTRODUCTION

In today's dynamic and ever-changing society, the study of criminology plays a vital role in understanding crime, criminal behavior, and the justice system. As future law enforcers and public safety professionals, criminology students must be equipped not only with theoretical knowledge but also with practical understanding that reflects real-world contexts. Hence, instructional materials used in criminology education must be carefully designed to foster analytical thinking, ethical awareness, and application of criminological principles.

The Commission on Higher Education (CHED), through Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018, mandates that criminology programs adopt the Outcome-Based Education (OBE) framework. This framework emphasizes the development of competencies and learning outcomes that are measurable, performance-based, and aligned with industry standards. It also encourages the creation and use of instructional modules that support student-centered learning, independent inquiry, and critical thinking.

In response to this directive, the present study will evaluate a proposed module on *Introduction to Criminology*, which serves as the foundational course for BS Criminology students. The module is designed to introduce learners to the nature, scope, and significance of criminology as a discipline, including the study of crime, criminals, and societal reactions to deviant behavior. Through systematic evaluation, the study seeks

to assess the module's content, structure, and alignment with OBE principles and CHED standards.

The findings of this research will provide insights into the strengths and areas for improvement of the proposed module. These insights will serve as the basis for enhancing the course to ensure that it meets desired learning outcomes and contributes to the continuous improvement of criminology education. Ultimately, the study supports Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4: Quality Education, by promoting relevant, inclusive, and outcome-based learning in higher education.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employed a descriptive research design, which was appropriate for systematically obtaining information to describe and evaluate the present condition of a given phenomenon. Specifically, it assessed the proposed module on Introduction to Criminology in terms of its structure, content, and alignment with the principles of Outcome-Based Education (OBE). The use of descriptive research allowed the researcher to gather relevant data that helped identify the module's strengths, weaknesses, and potential areas for enhancement.

To ensure inclusivity and comprehensive data collection, the study utilized the complete enumeration sampling technique, also known as total population sampling. All two hundred seventy-three (273) first-year BS Criminology students enrolled in the subject Introduction to Criminology at the Nueva Ecija



University of Science and Technology (NEUST) during the First Semester of Academic Year 2025–2026 served as respondents. These students were the most suitable participants, as the proposed module was specifically designed for their level and directly addressed the foundational concepts of the criminology program.

This approach ensured that the perspectives of all students exposed to the module were adequately represented, thereby minimizing sampling bias and allowing for a more accurate and holistic evaluation. Through complete enumeration, the researcher obtained comprehensive feedback that served as a basis for refining the module and aligning it more effectively with the OBE framework as mandated by CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 5, series of 2018.

Data was collected using a researcher-made survey questionnaire, which consisted of ten statements for each of the six key areas: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting Up, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning. The responses of the participants in this questionnaire served as the basis for answering Research Question 2, which focused on identifying the strengths and areas for improvement of the module. Each component was measured through ten indicators using a 4-point Likert scale, where 4 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. Mean scores were interpreted according to the following ranges: 3.26–4.00 as Strongly Agree, 2.51–3.25 as Agree, 1.76–2.50 as Disagree, and 1.00–1.75 as Strongly Disagree.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Evaluation of the Proposed Module on Law Enforcement Organization and Administration with Inter-agency Approach

The results of Table 1 reveal strong agreement, with an overall mean of 4.73, indicating that respondents strongly agreed

that the module titles were highly effective. This suggests that the titles successfully provided clarity, alignment, and guidance for students in navigating criminology lessons. The overall mean reflects that the module titles met their objectives of signaling lesson scope, reinforcing learning goals, and setting clear expectations. Students perceived the titles as precise, meaningful, and supportive of lesson flow. According to Biggs and Tang (2011), clear instructional cues such as titles act as advance organizers that guide student focus and engagement. Similarly, CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, s. 2018 emphasizes the importance of coherent and outcome-aligned instructional materials, which this result strongly supports.

The highest mean was 4.75 for the indicator “The module titles are specific and directly related to the lesson content.” Students strongly agreed that the titles were precise and directly aligned with the lessons, highlighting the strength of the module in ensuring clarity and outcome alignment. This shows that students valued the specificity of titles, which reduced ambiguity and reinforced instructional coherence. Biggs and Tang (2011) emphasized that specific instructional cues improve student engagement and constructive alignment.

The lowest mean was 4.70 for the indicator “The module titles are consistent in format and structure throughout the material.” Although still rated highly, this suggests a relative weakness in the program, where students perceived minor inconsistencies in formatting or structure. While the titles were clear and effective overall, improvements in uniformity could further strengthen readability and lesson flow. Mayer (2009) highlighted that consistent formatting in instructional materials improves cognitive processing and reduces extraneous load. Ausubel's Advance Organizer Theory also supports the idea that consistent headings and titles provide scaffolding that aids retention and comprehension. In criminology education, Bernas and Cruz (2022) noted that consistency in instructional design contributes to better student navigation and understanding of complex theories.

Table 1. Module Title

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Each module title clearly reflects the topic covered in the lesson.	4.74	Strongly Agree
2. The module titles are organized, well-written, and easy to understand.	4.72	Strongly Agree
3. Each module title gives a clear idea of what the student can expect to learn.	4.73	Strongly Agree
4. The module titles help the student remember key concepts.	4.71	Strongly Agree
5. The module titles are specific and directly related to the lesson content.	4.75	Strongly Agree
6. The module titles are consistent in format and structure throughout the material.	4.70	Strongly Agree
7. Each module title meaningfully represents the content of the module.	4.73	Strongly Agree
8. The module titles make it easier for the student to follow the flow of the lessons.	4.72	Strongly Agree
9. The module titles are clearly connected to the learning goals.	4.74	Strongly Agree
10. The module titles help set clear expectations for student learning.	4.74	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.73	Strongly Agree



The results of Table 2 reveal strong agreement, with an overall mean of 4.69, indicating that respondents strongly agreed that the learning objectives were Highly Effective. This shows that the objectives successfully provided clarity, relevance, and guidance for students in navigating criminology lessons. The overall mean reflects that the learning objectives met their purpose of directing student focus, aligning with course requirements, and setting achievable expectations. Students perceived the objectives as realistic, meaningful, and supportive of their academic growth. According to Bloom (1956), clearly stated objectives serve as essential guides for both teaching and learning, while CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, s. 2018 emphasizes the importance of outcome-based objectives in strengthening curriculum alignment.

The highest mean was 4.71 for the indicator "The objectives are relevant to the course and the needs of the student." Respondents strongly agreed that the objectives were aligned with their academic preparation and criminology practice, highlighting the strength of the module in ensuring relevance and applicability. This demonstrates that students valued objectives that directly

connected to their learning needs and professional development. Biggs and Tang (2011) emphasized that relevant objectives enhance constructive alignment, ensuring that teaching activities and assessments are meaningfully tied to intended learning outcomes. Similarly, Bernas and Cruz (2022) found that relevance in criminology objectives improves student motivation and engagement.

The lowest mean was 4.67 for the indicator "The learning objectives reflect the appropriate level of difficulty for the student." Although still rated Strongly Agree, this suggests a relative weakness in balancing challenge and achievability. While students found the objectives clear and relevant, some perceived that the level of difficulty could be refined to better match their readiness. Mager (1997) highlighted that objectives must be both challenging and attainable to maximize learning effectiveness. In criminology education, Bartol & Bartol (2019) noted that objectives set at the right level of difficulty foster deeper understanding and skill development without overwhelming learners.

Table 2. Learning Objectives

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The learning objectives are clearly stated at the beginning of each unit or topic.	4.70	Strongly Agree
2. The learning objectives are easy for the student to understand and follow.	4.69	Strongly Agree
3. The objectives reflect what the student is expected to learn after each lesson.	4.68	Strongly Agree
4. The objectives are relevant to the course and the needs of the student.	4.71	Strongly Agree
5. The learning objectives help the student stay focused on important topics.	4.70	Strongly Agree
6. The student finds the learning objectives achievable and realistic.	4.68	Strongly Agree
7. The objectives include both knowledge-based and practical skills.	4.69	Strongly Agree
8. The objectives are consistent with the course content discussed in the module.	4.70	Strongly Agree
9. The objectives helped the student understand the purpose of each lesson.	4.69	Strongly Agree
10. The learning objectives reflect the appropriate level of difficulty for the student.	4.67	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.69	Strongly Agree

The results of Table 3 reveal strong agreement, with an overall mean of 4.66, indicating that respondents strongly agreed that the setting component of the module was Highly Effective. This shows that the preparatory and activity-based elements of the module successfully supported student readiness, engagement, and application of knowledge. The overall mean reflects that the module's setting activities met their purpose of connecting prior knowledge, reinforcing learning, and promoting active participation. Students perceived the activities as logical, practical, and conducive to deeper understanding. According to Ausubel's Assimilation Theory (1968), connecting prior

knowledge to new content is essential for meaningful learning. Similarly, CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, s. 2018 emphasizes the importance of structured activities that align with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles.

The highest mean was 4.67 for the indicators "The activities in the module prepared the student for new lessons," "The module activities allowed the student to apply what was learned in practical ways," and "The progression of activities in the module followed a logical learning sequence." Respondents strongly agreed that these activities were effective in preparing them for new lessons, applying knowledge in practice, and



following a logical sequence. This highlights the strength of the module in scaffolding learning and ensuring that activities were both practical and well-structured. Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory (1984) supports this finding, emphasizing that learning is maximized when students actively engage in structured, real-world tasks. In criminology education, Bartol & Bartol (2019) note that practical application of concepts enhances student readiness for professional practice.

The lowest mean was 4.65 for the indicators "The pre-assessment activities helped the student identify what was already known about the topic," "The module provided enough practice activities to reinforce learning," and "The student found the

activities useful in understanding the learning objectives." Although still rated Strongly Agree, these results suggest a relative weakness in diagnostic activities, reinforcement, and direct linkage of activities to objectives. While students valued the activities overall, some perceived that pre-assessment and reinforcement could be strengthened to maximize effectiveness. Mayer (2009) emphasized that diagnostic and reinforcement activities are critical for monitoring progress and reducing cognitive load. Likewise, Bates et al. (2019) highlighted that student satisfaction in instructional modules is strongly linked to opportunities for practice and clear alignment of activities with objectives.

Table 3. Setting

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module included pre-assessment or diagnostic activities before each lesson.	4.66	Strongly Agree
2. The pre-assessment activities helped the student identify what was already known about the topic.	4.65	Strongly Agree
3. The activities in the module prepared the student for new lessons.	4.67	Strongly Agree
4. The activities helped the student connect prior knowledge to new content.	4.66	Strongly Agree
5. The module activities allowed the student to apply what was learned in practical ways.	4.67	Strongly Agree
6. The module provided enough practice activities to reinforce learning.	4.65	Strongly Agree
7. The activities helped the student monitor their own understanding throughout the lesson.	4.66	Strongly Agree
8. The progression of activities in the module followed a logical learning sequence.	4.67	Strongly Agree
9. The activities encouraged active participation from the student.	4.66	Strongly Agree
10. The student found the activities useful in understanding the learning objectives.	4.65	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.66	Strongly Agree

The results of Table 4 reveal strong agreement, with an overall mean of 4.71, indicating that respondents strongly agreed that the content of the module was Highly Effective. This shows that the module successfully provided essential topics, logical organization, and updated guidelines that matched the academic needs of criminology students. The overall mean reflects that the content met its objectives of ensuring relevance, clarity, and applicability to real-world criminology practice. Students perceived the content as comprehensive, well-structured, and aligned with industry standards. According to CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, s. 2018, curriculum content must be outcome-based and relevant to professional practice, which this module strongly demonstrated. Similarly, Biggs and Tang (2011) emphasized that well-aligned content enhances constructive learning and student engagement.

The highest mean was 4.72 for the indicators "The module includes essential and relevant topics for the subject" and "The content reflects updated guidelines and relevant industry

practices." Respondents strongly agreed that the module provided essential criminology topics and incorporated updated practices, highlighting the strength of the module in ensuring relevance and timeliness. This demonstrates that students valued content that was both academically rigorous and professionally applicable. Bartol & Bartol (2019) noted that criminology education must integrate current practices to prepare students for evolving challenges in law enforcement and criminal justice. Likewise, Bernas and Cruz (2022) emphasized that essential and updated content strengthens student readiness for professional roles.

The lowest mean was 4.70 for the indicators "The topics are organized logically and are easy for the student to follow," "Assessment activities are provided at the end of each chapter or unit," "The topics contribute to the student's knowledge and awareness of real-world issues," and "The content is simplified for better understanding without losing its academic value." Although still rated Strongly Agree, these results suggest a relative weakness in instructional diversity and simplification.



While students found the content effective overall, some perceived that greater variety of materials and clearer simplification could further enhance understanding. Mayer (2009) highlighted that diverse instructional materials reduce cognitive load and improve comprehension. Ausubel's Advance

Organizer Theory (1968) also supports the idea that simplified yet structured content aids retention and meaningful learning. In criminology education, Bates et al. (2019) stressed that exposure to real-world issues enhances student engagement and professional identity formation.

Table 4. Content

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module includes essential and relevant topics for the subject.	4.72	Strongly Agree
2. The assessments included in the module are aligned with the content.	4.71	Strongly Agree
3. The topics are organized logically and are easy for the student to follow.	4.70	Strongly Agree
4. The content matches the cognitive level and academic needs of third-year students.	4.71	Strongly Agree
5. Assessment activities are provided at the end of each chapter or unit.	4.70	Strongly Agree
6. The content reflects updated guidelines and relevant industry practices.	4.72	Strongly Agree
7. The test items are based on learning outcomes and relate to the module content.	4.71	Strongly Agree
8. The topics contribute to the student's knowledge and awareness of real-world issues.	4.70	Strongly Agree
9. A variety of materials (e.g., texts, visuals, examples) are used to support the lessons.	4.71	Strongly Agree
10. The content is simplified for better understanding without losing its academic value.	4.70	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.71	Strongly Agree

The results of Table 5 reveal strong agreement, with an overall mean of 4.67, indicating that respondents strongly agreed that the references used in the module were Highly Effective. This shows that the module successfully provided credible, relevant, and well-documented sources that strengthened the accuracy and reliability of its content. The overall mean reflects that the references met their purpose of supporting lessons, enhancing credibility, and ensuring academic rigor. Students perceived the references as clear, organized, and helpful in deepening their understanding of criminology topics. According to the American Psychological Association (APA, 2020), proper citation and referencing are essential for academic integrity and credibility. Similarly, CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, s. 2018 emphasizes the importance of research-based instructional materials in higher education.

The highest mean was 4.67 for the indicators "The references are relevant and directly related to the topics discussed," "The references help the student better understand the lesson content," "The references support and strengthen the accuracy of the content," "The references show that the module is based on well-researched information," and "The use of references increases the credibility of the instructional material." Respondents strongly agreed that the references were relevant, accurate, and credible, highlighting the strength of the module in

ensuring academic quality. This demonstrates that students valued references that were directly connected to the lessons and reinforced their learning. Bernas and Cruz (2022) noted that relevant and credible references enhance student confidence in instructional materials. Likewise, Biggs and Tang (2011) emphasized that research-based content strengthens constructive alignment and student engagement.

The lowest mean was 4.66 for the indicators "The module includes proper citations for all sources used," "The sources used in the module are up to date," "The student can access the materials cited in the module," "The module gives proper credit to original authors," and "The references are presented in a clear and organized format." Although still rated Strongly Agree, these results suggest a relative weakness in accessibility, citation formatting, and updating of references. While students recognized the credibility of references overall, some perceived that improvements in accessibility and consistency could further strengthen the module. Mayer (2009) highlighted that clear and organized references reduce cognitive load and improve comprehension. In criminology education, Bates et al. (2019) stressed that accessible and updated references are critical for student satisfaction and effective learning.



Table 5. References

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The module includes proper citations for all sources used.	4.66	Strongly Agree
2.	The references are relevant and directly related to the topics discussed.	4.67	Strongly Agree
3.	The sources used in the module are up to date.	4.66	Strongly Agree
4.	The student can access the materials cited in the module.	4.66	Strongly Agree
5.	The references help the student better understand the lesson content.	4.67	Strongly Agree
6.	The module gives proper credit to original authors.	4.66	Strongly Agree
7.	The references support and strengthen the accuracy of the content.	4.67	Strongly Agree
8.	The references are presented in a clear and organized format.	4.66	Strongly Agree
9.	The references show that the module is based on well-researched information.	4.67	Strongly Agree
10.	The use of references increases the credibility of the instructional material.	4.67	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean		4.67	Strongly Agree

The results of Table 6 reveal strong agreement, with an overall mean of 4.69, indicating that respondents strongly agreed that the assessment of learning component was Highly Effective. This shows that the post-lesson assessments successfully measured student understanding, reinforced knowledge, and encouraged reflection. The overall mean reflects that the assessments met their purpose of aligning with learning objectives, providing feedback, and supporting student progress. Students perceived the assessments as clear, relevant, and effective in promoting deeper learning. According to Bloom's Taxonomy (1956), assessments play a critical role in evaluating cognitive achievement and guiding instructional improvement. Similarly, CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, s. 2018 emphasizes the importance of outcome-based assessments in ensuring competency development.

The highest mean was 4.70 for the indicators "The post-lesson assessments helped the student evaluate what was learned," "The post-lesson tests or tasks matched the learning objectives of the module," "The assessments helped the student apply knowledge from the lessons," "The post-lesson assessments provided the student with a sense of progress," and "The assessments encouraged the student to review and reflect on the lesson." Respondents strongly agreed that these assessments were effective in reinforcing learning, aligning with objectives, and

fostering reflection. This highlights the strength of the module in ensuring that assessments were meaningful and supportive of student growth. Biggs and Tang (2011) emphasized that constructive alignment requires assessments to directly measure intended learning outcomes. In criminology education, Bartol & Bartol (2019) noted that reflective and applied assessments enhance student engagement and professional identity formation.

The lowest mean was 4.69 for the indicators "The assessments given after each lesson reflected the key topics discussed," "The assessment questions were clear, understandable, and based on the lesson content," "The student felt that the assessments measured actual learning and understanding," "The module included a variety of assessment activities," and "The student had enough time and guidance to complete the assessments after each lesson." Although still rated Strongly Agree, these results suggest a relative weakness in assessment variety, clarity, and time allocation. While students valued the assessments overall, some perceived that improvements in diversity and pacing could further strengthen effectiveness. Mager (1997) emphasized that assessments must be both clear and varied to capture different dimensions of learning. Bates et al. (2019) also highlighted that adequate time and guidance are critical for student satisfaction and successful completion of assessment tasks.



Table 6. Assessment of Learning

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The post-lesson assessments helped the student evaluate what was learned.	4.70	Strongly Agree
2. The assessments given after each lesson reflected the key topics discussed.	4.69	Strongly Agree
3. The post-lesson tests or tasks matched the learning objectives of the module.	4.70	Strongly Agree
4. The assessment questions were clear, understandable, and based on the lesson content.	4.69	Strongly Agree
5. The assessments helped the student apply knowledge from the lessons.	4.70	Strongly Agree
6. The student felt that the assessments measured actual learning and understanding.	4.69	Strongly Agree
7. The post-lesson assessments provided the student with a sense of progress.	4.70	Strongly Agree
8. The module included a variety of assessment activities (e.g., quizzes, written tasks, reflections).	4.69	Strongly Agree
9. The student had enough time and guidance to complete the assessments after each lesson.	4.69	Strongly Agree
10. The assessments encouraged the student to review and reflect on the lesson.	4.70	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.69	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)
<i>Module Title</i>	Titles specific and directly related to lesson content (Mean = 4.75)	Titles consistent in format and structure (Mean = 4.70)
<i>Learning Objectives</i>	Objectives relevant to the course and student needs (Mean = 4.71)	Objectives reflect appropriate level of difficulty (Mean = 4.67)
<i>Setting</i>	Activities prepared students for new lessons and connected prior knowledge (Mean = 4.67)	Pre-assessment/diagnostic activities before each lesson (Mean = 4.65)
<i>Content</i>	Includes essential and relevant topics; updated guidelines (Mean = 4.72)	Variety of materials used to support lessons (Mean = 4.70)
<i>References</i>	Use of references increased credibility of material (Mean = 4.67)	Accessibility of cited materials (Mean = 4.66)
<i>Assessment of Learning</i>	Assessments encouraged review and reflection; showed progress (Mean = 4.70)	Enough time and guidance to complete assessments (Mean = 4.69)

Description of the Enhanced Module Based on Evaluation Results

In revising the instructional module on Introduction to Criminology, the researcher ensured that the strengths identified in the evaluation were preserved while addressing minor areas for improvement.

Respondents strongly agreed ($M = 4.73$) that the module titles were clear, informative, and aligned with lesson content. This confirms that the titles effectively guided learners in understanding the scope of each lesson. To further enhance their mnemonic value and support retention, the titles were refined with concept-driven and action-oriented phrasing. For example, the original title “*Crime Causation*” was revised to “*Crime Causation: Classical and Modern Theories*.” This version integrates thematic cues that emphasize both traditional and

contemporary perspectives, thereby clarifying expectations and reinforcing key concepts. Such refinements ensure that titles not only identify the lesson focus but also actively cue students toward the skills and knowledge they are expected to acquire.

Regarding Learning Objectives, the overall mean of 4.69 (Strongly Agree) confirmed that objectives were clear, relevant, and achievable. To strengthen cognitive challenge, objectives were revised to emphasize higher-order skills. For instance, “*Understand criminological theories*” was enhanced to “*Analyze and evaluate criminological theories and their application in criminal justice practice*.” This adjustment aligns with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles and promotes deeper learning by encouraging students to move beyond recall toward critical analysis and evaluation.



In terms of Setting (Instructional Activities), the mean score of 4.66 (Strongly Agree) highlighted the effectiveness of activities in connecting prior knowledge and encouraging participation. To address the slightly lower ratings for diagnostic activities, pre-assessments were introduced at the start of each lesson. For example, a short reflection prompt such as “*What do you already know about the causes of crime?*” was added to activate prior knowledge and scaffold new learning.

For Content, respondents rated this area highly ($M = 4.71$, Strongly Agree), affirming that topics were essential, logically sequenced, and relevant to criminology students. Improvements included integrating multimodal resources such as case studies, infographics, and short video clips on criminological practices. These additions enrich the learning experience and cater to diverse learning styles, ensuring that students can engage with content in multiple ways.

With respect to References, the mean score of 4.67 (Strongly Agree) validated the credibility and relevance of sources. To improve accessibility, references were reformatted with open-access links and QR codes, ensuring students can easily retrieve cited materials. This adjustment strengthens transparency and supports independent learning, while also reinforcing academic integrity.

Finally, the Assessment of Learning component received a mean of 4.69 (Strongly Agree), indicating that assessments were clear, aligned, and effective in promoting reflection. To address feedback on time and guidance, instructions were made more explicit, with word limits and submission timelines clearly stated. Additionally, assessment tasks were diversified to include reflective journals, case analysis, and scenario-based problem solving, ensuring that students could demonstrate both theoretical understanding and practical application.

Recommendations

To further strengthen the module, refinements should be introduced while preserving its identified strengths, such as enhancing module titles with action-oriented phrasing to improve retention and emphasize competencies, revising learning objectives to highlight higher-order skills like analysis and evaluation in line with Outcome-Based Education principles, integrating diagnostic tasks at the start of lessons to activate prior knowledge and scaffold new learning, enriching content delivery with multimodal resources such as case studies, infographics, and video clips to cater to diverse learning styles and connect theory with practice, refining references with accessible formats like open-access links and QR codes to support independent learning, and improving assessment practices by clarifying instructions, timelines, and criteria to ensure fairness, transparency, and learner confidence, thereby ensuring the module remains responsive to student needs, aligned with contemporary educational standards, and effective in preparing learners for professional practice in criminology and law enforcement.

Acknowledgements

The researcher extends heartfelt appreciation to the 273 first-year Criminology students of the Nueva Ecija University of

Science and Technology who generously participated as respondents in this study. Deep gratitude is likewise conveyed to the faculty validators and subject-matter experts who provided valuable insights in reviewing the evaluation instrument. Special recognition is also given to the Presidents of the first-year BS Criminology classes at NEUST, whose contributions were instrumental in ensuring the successful completion of this research. Their guidance, cooperation, and perspectives greatly enriched the process. Finally, the researcher acknowledges the support of the NEUST administration for granting permission to conduct the study. It is important to note that this research was carried out without any external funding assistance.

REFERENCES

1. Albina, A. C., Balasabas, J. Y., Laquinon, B. J. I., Pampilo, M. H., & Caballero, L. J. (2021). Factors and challenges influencing performance in the criminologist licensure examination: Perspectives from non-passers. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(1), 365–376. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.1.365>
2. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315800820>
3. Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32(3), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871>
4. Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. Longmans, Green.
5. CHED. (2018). CHED Memorandum Order No. 5, series of 2018: Policies, standards, and guidelines for the Bachelor of Science in Criminology program. Commission on Higher Education. <https://ched.gov.ph/cmo-5-s-2018>
6. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7> (doi.org in Bing)
7. Evardo, R. (2024). Implementation of outcome-based education in criminology programs: A case study of Bohol Island State University. *Philippine Journal of Criminology and Public Safety*, 12(2), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567>
8. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
9. Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511811678>
10. Patalinghug, R., Santos, M., & Dela Cruz, J. (2025). Compliance of SUCs with CHED-mandated criminology curriculum standards: A document analysis. *Journal of Philippine Higher Education Research*, 15(1), 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2345678>
11. Tagle, A. A., & Bautista, M. L. A. (2025). Programs and policies, pedagogies, and learning assessment for criminology review centers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management and Sustainable Development*, 13(1), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.70979/CCOB9938>
12. Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226820323.001.0001>



13. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4>
14. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). *Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview*. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2