
A Comparative Analysis of Technical–Vocational Program Offerings of Rizal Technological University and the University of Rizal System

MIGUEL M. ARTIFICIO

Rizal Technological University; University of Rizal System- Morong Campus

mmartificio@rtu.edu.ph

Abstract — This document-based descriptive comparative study analyzed the technical–vocational program offerings of Rizal Technological University (RTU) and the University of Rizal System (URS) using publicly available institutional and policy documents. The study compared the two state universities in terms of institutional mandate, program nature and specialization, delivery pathways, and alignment with national and international TVET quality frameworks. Data were drawn from official university websites, handbooks, CHED and TESDA documents, the National Technical Education and Skills Development Plan 2023–2028, and Philippine Qualifications Framework references. Findings show that RTU’s TechVoc contribution is concentrated in the Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education (BTVTEd), with specializations in Animation, Computer Hardware/Systems Servicing, Visual Graphic Design, Garments Fashion and Design, Electronics Technology, and Welding and Fabrication Technology. This positions RTU primarily as a producer of TVET and TVL teachers. In contrast, URS offers a broader ladder of industrial and technology programs, including Bachelor of Industrial Technology, Bachelor of Technology majors, diploma and certificate programs, and short-term Career Education Development Programs. These offerings position URS primarily as a producer of technicians, technologists, and skilled workers. The study concludes that RTU and URS occupy complementary roles in the Philippine TVET ecosystem. RTU strengthens the pedagogical base of TVET through teacher preparation, while URS strengthens the technical manpower base through ladderized industrial-technology pathways. Both institutions show alignment with national TVET priorities, although publicly available information remains limited in terms of detailed curriculum maps, program-level quality-assurance data, and graduate outcomes. The

study recommends clearer PQF mapping, stronger articulation pathways, expanded industry partnerships, and improved public documentation of TechVoc program quality indicators.

Keywords: TVET, Technical–Vocational Teacher Education, Industrial Technology, NTESDP, PQF, APACC, Comparative Study

I. INTRODUCTION

Technical–Vocational Education and Training (TVET) plays an important role in workforce development, employability, and lifelong learning. In the Philippines, TVET is shaped by the mandate of the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA), the National Technical Education and Skills Development Plan (NTESDP) 2023–2028, the Philippine Qualifications Framework (PQF), and the quality-assurance policies of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) (Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.; Republic Act No. 7796, 1994; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.). State universities and colleges contribute to this system not only by offering technical and industrial programs, but also by preparing teachers, trainers, and skilled graduates who support the country’s technical manpower needs.

Rizal Technological University (RTU) and the University of Rizal System (URS) are two state universities with publicly documented TechVoc-related offerings. RTU’s contribution is mainly through BTVTEd programs that prepare teachers for technical-vocational and livelihood fields, while URS offers industrial and technology programs, including degree, diploma, certificate, and short-term pathways that prepare technicians, technologists, and skilled workers (Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Republic Act No. 9157, 2001; Rizal Technological University, n.d.; University of Rizal System, 2013; University of Rizal System, n.d.). These differences suggest that the two institutions contribute to the TVET ecosystem through distinct program structures, specializations, and delivery pathways.

This study aimed to compare the publicly documented TechVoc-related offerings of RTU and URS by examining their institutional mandates, program structures, specialization areas,

delivery pathways, and alignment with TVET quality-assurance frameworks. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do the institutional mandates of RTU and URS define their respective roles within the Philippine TVET ecosystem?
2. What publicly documented TechVoc-related program offerings are available in RTU and URS, and how do these programs differ in terms of nature, specialization, and delivery pathways?
3. How do RTU and URS compare in their alignment with national and international TVET quality-assurance frameworks such as the NTESDP, PQF, CHED, TESDA, and related accreditation systems?

The study assumes that RTU's TechVoc-related offerings are primarily focused on the preparation of TVET teachers through BTVTEd and its specialized majors, while URS's TechVoc-related offerings are primarily focused on the development of technicians, technologists, and skilled workers through industrial-technology programs and ladderized pathways. By comparing the two institutions, the study clarifies how RTU and URS occupy distinct but complementary roles in Philippine TVET.

Literature Review

TVET, Workforce Development, and Lifelong Learning

Technical–Vocational Education and Training (TVET) support the workforce preparation by developing practical skills, occupational competence, employability, and lifelong learning. It is increasingly viewed not only as short-term skills training, but also as a pathway for social mobility, entrepreneurship, reskilling, and participation in changing industries (UNESCO, 2022). This makes TVET relevant to state universities and colleges, which may contribute either by producing technically skilled graduates or by preparing teachers and trainers for technical-vocational instruction.

In the Philippines, TVET supports national development by responding to labor-market needs and middle-level manpower requirements. Technical, industrial, creative, and digital programs are expected to remain responsive to workplace changes, industry standards, and local employment needs (Ramirez, 2024; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.). This provides a basis for comparing how RTU and URS contribute to workforce development through their TechVoc-related offerings.

Philippine TVET Policy and Qualifications Frameworks

The Philippine TVET system is guided by TESDA under Republic Act No. 7796, which covers skills development coordination, competency standards, assessment, certification, and quality assurance (Republic Act No. 7796, 1994). The NTESDP 2023–2028 further frames TVET as a pathway for employability, lifelong learning, flexible training, industry participation, and stronger coordination among education sectors (De Galicia, 2024; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.).

The Philippine Qualifications Framework (PQF) supports the comparison by classifying qualifications according to learning outcomes, level, and progression (Cheungkock, 2024; Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.). This is useful because RTU is focused on degree-level teacher education, while URS offers certificate, diploma, degree, and short-term technical pathways.

For teacher education, CHED CMO No. 79, s. 2017 defines BTVTEd as an outcomes-based program that combines general education, professional education, specialization courses, and practice teaching to prepare graduates for technical-vocational and livelihood teaching (Commission on Higher Education, 2017).

Quality Assurance in TVET

Quality assurance is a central issue in TVET because technical-vocational programs must be relevant, properly delivered, and connected to actual workplace expectations. In this field,

quality is not limited to the presence of a program offering. It also includes curriculum alignment, faculty competence, facilities, assessment practices, industry exposure, accreditation, and graduate readiness (Nuestro, 2024).

Accreditation and quality systems such as AACCUP, APACC, CHED program compliance, and TESDA-related standards help ensure that institutions meet expected levels of quality (Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, n.d.; Asia Pacific Accreditation and Certification Commission, n.d.; Nuestro, 2024). APACC is especially relevant to TVET institutions because it focuses on accreditation and certification for TVET institutions in the Asia-Pacific region (Asia Pacific Accreditation and Certification Commission, n.d.). These areas are useful in examining whether TechVoc-related programs are supported by adequate structures and not only by program titles.

For this study, quality assurance is important because RTU and URS both operate within national quality frameworks, but the available public documents do not always provide detailed program-level evidence. This means that their alignment can be examined through publicly available mandates, program descriptions, accreditation information, and policy references, but not through confidential internal data or full graduate outcome records.

SUC Roles in TVET Teacher Education and Industrial Technology

State universities and colleges contribute to the Philippine TVET ecosystem in different ways: some prepare TVET teachers and trainers, while others produce technicians, technologists, and skilled workers. This distinction frames the comparison between RTU and URS.

RTU's TechVoc-related role is mainly connected to BTVTEd, with specializations in Animation, Computer Hardware or Computer Systems Servicing, Visual Graphic Design, Garments Fashion and Design, Electronics Technology, and Welding and Fabrication Technology (Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Rizal Technological University, n.d.). Although these fields are technical-vocational in content, the graduate role is primarily educational because the

program prepares future teachers for TVL, TESDA-related, and other technical-vocational learning contexts.

URS, in contrast, shows a more industry-oriented and ladderized TechVoc direction through Bachelor of Industrial Technology, Bachelor of Technology majors, Diploma in Technology, Certificate of Technology, and Career Education Development Programs (Republic Act No. 9157, 2001; University of Rizal System, 2013; University of Rizal System, n.d.). These offerings are more directly connected to preparing technicians, technologists, and skilled workers, and they reflect the PQF and NTESDP emphasis on flexible progression, access, and lifelong learning (Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.).

Functions of Education and Human Capital Development

Education also functions as a means of human capital development because it prepares individuals with the knowledge, skills, values, and competencies needed for productive participation in society and the labor force. In the context of TVET, this function becomes more specific: institutions may either prepare technically skilled workers for employment or prepare teachers and trainers who will develop technical-vocational competencies in others. This framework is useful in comparing RTU and URS because RTU contributes mainly to the teacher-preparation side of the TVET system, while URS contributes mainly to the technician, technologist, and skilled-worker preparation side.

Synthesis

The reviewed literature and policy documents show that TVET should be employment-responsive, qualification-based, quality-assured, and open to flexible lifelong learning pathways (Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.; UNESCO, 2022). TESDA and the NTESDP set the national TVET direction, the PQF explains qualification progression, CHED defines degree-level teacher education standards, and accreditation systems support institutional

quality (Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, n.d.; Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.; Republic Act No. 7796, 1994).

These themes support the comparison of RTU and URS. RTU strengthens TVET's pedagogical side through BTVTEd, while URS strengthens the technical manpower side through industrial technology, diploma, certificate, degree, and short-term programs (Rizal Technological University, n.d.; University of Rizal System, 2013; University of Rizal System, n.d.). However, existing public documents present the two universities separately and do not directly compare their roles within the TVET ecosystem. This study addresses that gap by examining their mandates, TechVoc offerings, delivery pathways, and policy alignment.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used a document-based descriptive comparative research design. It examined and compared the publicly documented technical–vocational program offerings of Rizal Technological University (RTU) and the University of Rizal System (URS). The study did not use surveys, interviews, focus group discussions, or experimental procedures. Instead, it relied on available institutional and policy documents to describe, organize, and compare the TechVoc-related roles, program structures, delivery pathways, and quality-assurance alignment of the two state universities.

This design was appropriate because the main objective of the study was not to measure student performance, employment outcomes, or institutional effectiveness, but to compare how the two universities present and position their TechVoc-related offerings based on accessible documents. The comparison focused on structural and policy alignment rather than internal performance indicators.

Units of Comparison

The units of comparison were the two institutions: Rizal Technological University and the University of Rizal System. RTU was examined as a state university whose publicly documented TechVoc-related role is mainly connected to the Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education (BTVTEd). URS was examined as a multi-campus state university whose publicly documented TechVoc-related role is mainly connected to industrial technology, technology, diploma, certificate, and short-term training pathways.

The study treated the two universities as institutional providers of TechVoc-related higher education and training. It did not compare individual campuses, faculty members, students, or graduates.

Scope of the Study

For RTU, the scope was limited to the Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education and its publicly documented majors, including Animation, Computer Hardware or Computer Systems Servicing, Visual Graphic Design, Garments Fashion and Design, Electronics Technology, and Welding and Fabrication Technology. These programs were included because they are directly related to technical-vocational teacher preparation.

For URS, the scope included Bachelor of Industrial Technology, Bachelor of Technology majors in Automotive Technology, Electrical Technology, and Electronics Technology, Diploma in Technology programs, Certificate of Technology programs, and Career Education Development Programs. These were included because they represent publicly documented industrial, technical, and skills-based pathways.

Programs outside the technical-vocational, industrial, technology, or skills-development scope were excluded from the comparison.

Data Sources and Inclusion Criteria

The study used only publicly available documents. The sources included:

- Official RTU and URS websites, institutional profiles, program pages, handbooks, brochures, and academic offering lists;
- CHED, TESDA, NTESDP 2023–2028, and Philippine Qualifications Framework documents;
- Publicly available accreditation and quality-assurance information; and
- Relevant DTE 306 class reports and presentations used as course-based reference materials for identifying TVET concepts, policy themes, and quality-assurance frameworks

Documents were included when they met at least one of the following criteria:

- Identified the legal or institutional mandate of RTU or URS
- Listed or described TechVoc-related programs
- Explained program levels, pathways, or specializations
- Provided relevant national policy or quality-assurance frameworks for interpreting TVET programs

Secondary online listings were used only for cross-checking program names and were not treated as primary evidence unless the information could be supported by official or semi-official sources.

document-based comparison, including internal curriculum files, unpublished institutional reports, enrollment and graduate outcome records, board examination or certification results, tracer studies, and confidential quality-assurance documents.

Relevant DTE 306 class reports and presentations were also used as course-based reference materials for identifying TVET concepts, policy themes, and quality-assurance frameworks; however, official documents from TESDA, CHED, PQF, RTU, URS, and accreditation bodies were prioritized as primary sources for the final analysis (Cheungkock, 2024; De Galicia, 2024; Nuestro, 2024; Ramirez, 2024; Sanico, 2024).

Comparative Criteria

The documents were analyzed using four comparative criteria, as presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
COMPARATIVE CRITERIA USED IN THE ANALYSIS

Comparative Criterion	Description
Institutional Mandate and Role in TVET	Examined how each university is positioned within the Philippine TVET ecosystem, including its mandate, mission, and contribution to technical-vocational education and training.
Program Nature and Specialization	Analyzed the types of TechVoc-related programs offered, including areas of specialization and the intended roles of graduates.
Delivery Features and Pathways	Assessed program delivery characteristics such as teacher preparation, ladderized progression, diploma and certificate routes, short-term training opportunities, practice teaching, and industry-oriented learning experiences.
Quality Assurance and Policy Alignment	Evaluated alignment with TESDA policies, the National Technical Education and Skills Development Plan (NTESDP) 2023–2028, the Philippine Qualifications Framework (PQF), CHED policies, and relevant accreditation or institutional quality-assurance systems.

Data Treatment and Analysis

Relevant information from the documents was extracted, grouped, and organized into comparison tables and narrative summaries. Program titles, levels, specializations, and delivery pathways were classified according to their institutional source and TechVoc relevance. RTU and URS were then compared using the four criteria identified above.

The analysis was guided by the functions of education and human capital development, RA 7796 and the TESDA TVET system, the NTESDP 2023–2028, the Philippine Qualifications Framework, and CHED policies on technical-vocational teacher education (Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.; Republic Act No. 7796, 1994; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.). These frameworks were used to interpret whether the two institutions contribute to TVET mainly through teacher preparation, direct technical manpower development, ladderized pathways, or quality-assured program delivery. The findings were presented through descriptive comparison rather than statistical analysis. Since the study used documents only, no quantitative tests were conducted. The interpretation was limited to what could be reasonably supported by publicly available information.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the comparative findings on the technical–vocational program offerings of Rizal Technological University (RTU) and the University of Rizal System (URS). The discussion is organized according to the study’s main research questions: institutional mandate and TVET role, program nature and specialization, delivery pathways, and quality-assurance and policy alignment.

TABLE 2
COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF RTU AND URS TECHVOC CONTRIBUTIONS

Comparative Criterion	Rizal Technological University	University of Rizal System	Comparative Finding
Institutional mandate and TVET role	RTU contributes to TVET mainly through technical-vocational teacher preparation, particularly through the Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education (BTVTEd).	URS contributes to TVET mainly through industrial and technology programs that prepare technicians, technologists, and skilled workers.	RTU supports the pedagogical side of TVET, while URS supports the technical manpower side.
Program nature and specialization	RTU offers BTVTEd majors in Animation, Computer Hardware or Computer Systems Servicing, Visual Graphic Design, Garments Fashion and Design, Electronics Technology, and Welding and Fabrication Technology.	URS offers Bachelor of Industrial Technology, Bachelor of Technology majors in Automotive, Electrical, and Electronics Technology, Diploma in Technology, Certificate of Technology, and Career Education Development Programs.	RTU has depth in teacher education with technical specializations; URS has broader technical and industrial pathways.
Delivery features and pathways	RTU's pathway is mainly a PQF Level 6 teacher-education degree with specialization courses,	URS shows ladderized and flexible pathways through certificate, diploma, bachelor's	RTU provides professional preparation for future TVET teachers; URS provides multiple

	professional education, and practice teaching.	degree, and short-term training programs.	entry and exit points for technical skills development.
Quality assurance and policy alignment	RTU's BTVTEd offering is aligned with CHED CMO No. 79, s. 2017, PQF Level 6 expectations, and general higher education quality-assurance mechanisms.	URS's industrial and technology programs are aligned with CHED, TESDA-related technical fields, PQF progression, COPC, and institutional accreditation mechanisms where publicly documented.	Both institutions show alignment with national TVET and quality frameworks, but public program-level evidence is uneven.

Note: Program offerings and policy alignment were summarized from RTU, URS, CHED, TESDA, PQF, and accreditation-related sources (Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.; Rizal Technological University, n.d.; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.; University of Rizal System, 2013; University of Rizal System, n.d.).

Institutional Mandate and TVET Role

The first research question asked how the institutional mandates of RTU and URS define their respective roles within the Philippine TVET ecosystem. The findings show that the two institutions occupy different but related positions. RTU's role is mainly connected to the preparation of teachers for technical-vocational fields. Its TechVoc contribution is concentrated in BTVTEd, where technical specialization is combined with teacher education. This means that RTU's contribution to the TVET system is not primarily the direct production of technicians, but the preparation of teachers and trainers who can deliver TVET and TVL instruction (Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Rizal Technological University, n.d.).

URS, on the other hand, shows a more direct workforce-development orientation. Its industrial and technology programs are connected to the preparation of technicians, technologists, and skilled workers in fields such as automotive, electrical, and electronics technology. Since URS operates as a multi-campus state university serving provincial and regional development needs, its TechVoc offerings are more visibly connected to applied technical training and local manpower development (Republic Act No. 9157, 2001; University of Rizal System, 2013; University of Rizal System, n.d.).

This distinction confirms that RTU and URS do not simply duplicate each other's TechVoc roles. RTU strengthens the teaching and training side of TVET, while URS strengthens the direct technical manpower side. From a human capital perspective, RTU contributes by preparing those who will teach technical-vocational competencies, while URS contributes by preparing graduates who may directly enter technical and industrial occupations.

Program Nature and Specialization

The second research question asked what publicly documented TechVoc-related offerings are available in RTU and URS and how these programs differ in nature, specialization, and delivery pathways. The findings show that RTU's TechVoc-related offerings are concentrated in one degree type: the Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education. Its majors include Animation, Computer Hardware or Computer Systems Servicing, Visual Graphic Design, Garments Fashion and Design, Electronics Technology, and Welding and Fabrication Technology. These specializations are clearly technical-vocational in content, but the intended graduate role remains educational. The graduates are prepared to become teachers of technical-vocational and livelihood subjects rather than technicians alone (Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Rizal Technological University, n.d.).

URS has a wider range of TechVoc-related program types. Its publicly documented offerings include Bachelor of Industrial Technology, Bachelor of Technology majors in Automotive, Electrical, and Electronics Technology, Diploma in Technology, Certificate of Technology, and Career Education Development Programs. These programs are more directly

linked to industry-oriented skills development. Unlike RTU's BTVTEd, which is structured around teacher preparation, URS's programs are structured around technical practice, workshop and laboratory training, and occupational preparation (University of Rizal System, 2013; University of Rizal System, n.d.).

The comparison shows that RTU has specialization depth within TVET teacher education, while URS has program breadth across technical and industrial pathways. RTU's specialization areas are important because they correspond to fields commonly found in TVL and TESDA-related sectors. URS's offerings are important because they provide multiple technical routes for learners who intend to pursue employment, upskilling, or further technical education.

Delivery Pathways and PQF Alignment

In terms of pathways, RTU and URS differ significantly. RTU's BTVTEd is a bachelor's degree pathway aligned with PQF Level 6. Its structure emphasizes professional education, specialization courses, and practice teaching. The pathway is therefore designed to produce a graduate who is both technically knowledgeable and pedagogically prepared. This is consistent with CHED CMO No. 79, s. 2017, which frames BTVTEd as an outcomes-based teacher education program for technical-vocational fields (Commission on Higher Education, 2017; Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.).

URS presents a more ladderized model. Its certificate, diploma, bachelor's degree, and short-term CEDP offerings allow learners to enter and exit at different levels depending on their needs, resources, and career direction. This structure reflects the PQF emphasis on progression and lifelong learning. It also supports the NTESDP direction toward flexible, responsive, and employment-oriented TVET (Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.; University of Rizal System, 2013).

This comparison shows that RTU is stronger in professional teacher formation at the degree level, while URS is stronger in vertical mobility and flexible skills development. RTU's pathway is narrower but deeper because it focuses on preparing TVET teachers. URS's pathway is broader

because it accommodates certificate-level, diploma-level, degree-level, and short-term training routes.

Quality Assurance and Policy Alignment

The third research question examined how RTU and URS align with national and international TVET quality-assurance frameworks such as the NTESDP, PQF, CHED, TESDA, and accreditation systems. Findings show that both institutions align with these frameworks, but in different ways.

RTU's alignment is most visible through CHED CMO No. 79, s. 2017, which governs BTVTEd as an outcomes-based teacher-education program. Its TechVoc contribution is therefore interpreted mainly through teacher preparation, technical specialization, and higher education quality-assurance mechanisms (Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, n.d.; Commission on Higher Education, 2017).

URS's alignment is seen through its industrial and technology programs, which reflect TESDA-related technical fields, PQF-consistent pathways, and the NTESDP emphasis on employability, lifelong learning, and flexible training. However, available public documents do not consistently provide complete program-level QA details (Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, n.d.; Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.; Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.; University of Rizal System, n.d.).

Overall Comparative Interpretation

Taken together, the findings show that RTU and URS are complementary TVET contributors rather than competing institutions. RTU strengthens the pedagogical side of TVET by preparing technical-vocational teachers, while URS strengthens the technical manpower side by preparing technicians, technologists, and skilled workers through industrial, ladderized, and short-term programs.

The results answer the research questions by showing that their mandates, offerings, pathways, and policy alignment differ, but support different parts of the same TVET value chain. However, the analysis is limited to structural and policy alignment because publicly available documents do not consistently provide detailed curriculum maps, assessment systems, certification outcomes, or graduate performance data.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study compared the publicly documented technical–vocational program offerings of Rizal Technological University (RTU) and the University of Rizal System (URS) in terms of institutional mandate, program nature, delivery pathways, and alignment with TVET quality frameworks.

Based on the comparative results and guided by the five key frameworks, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. In terms of institutional mandate and role within the Philippine TVET ecosystem, RTU and URS serve distinct but complementary functions. RTU primarily contributes to the preparation of technical-vocational educators through its Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education (BTVTEd) program, while URS focuses on developing technicians, technologists, and skilled workers through its industrial and technology-oriented programs.
2. In terms of program offerings and delivery pathways, RTU's TechVoc-related programs are concentrated in specialized BTVTEd tracks such as Animation, Computer Hardware or Computer Systems Servicing, Visual Graphic Design, Garments Fashion and Design, Electronics Technology, and Welding and Fabrication Technology. URS, on the other hand, provides broader and more ladderized pathways through Bachelor of Industrial Technology, Bachelor of Technology, diploma, certificate, and Career Education Development Programs. These differences indicate

RTU's strength in TVET teacher preparation and URS's strength in technical and industrial workforce development.

3. In terms of alignment with national TVET and quality-assurance frameworks, both institutions demonstrate consistency with the requirements and directions of CHED, TESDA, NTESDP, PQF, and accreditation-related mechanisms. However, the available public documents do not consistently provide detailed information on curriculum mapping, program-level accreditation status, assessment systems, certification outcomes, or graduate performance indicators. Consequently, the study confirms structural and policy alignment but cannot conclusively determine program effectiveness or graduate outcomes.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are offered:

1. RTU and URS may develop articulation or bridge pathways that allow graduates of URS technology programs to pursue TVET teaching preparation through RTU or similar teacher-education programs.
2. Both institutions may publish clearer program information, including curriculum maps, PQF alignment, practicum or industry-training components, and program-level quality-assurance status.
3. Future studies may extend this document-based comparison through surveys, interviews, tracer studies, or graduate outcome analysis to determine how these TechVoc-related programs perform in actual teaching, training, and employment contexts.

Overall, RTU and URS should be viewed as complementary institutions in the Philippine TVET system. RTU strengthens the pedagogical base of TVET, while URS strengthens the technical manpower base. Together, their distinct roles contribute to the broader goals of skills development, workforce readiness, and lifelong learning.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines. (n.d.). *Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines*. <https://aaccup.com/>
- [2.] Asia Pacific Accreditation and Certification Commission. (n.d.). *Asia Pacific Accreditation and Certification Commission*. <https://www.apacc4hrd.org/>
- [3.] Cheungkock, M. L. V. (2024). *ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRf) and Philippine Qualifications Framework (PQF)* [Class report]. DTE 306, Rizal Technological University.
- [4.] Commission on Higher Education. (2017). *CHED Memorandum Order No. 79, series of 2017: Policies, standards and guidelines for Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education (BTVTEd)*. <https://legacy.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CMO-No.-79-s.-2017.pdf>
- [5.] De Galicia, J. L. V. (2024). *Technical Education and Skills Development Authority and the NTESDP 2018–2022, 2023–2028* [Class report]. DTE 306, Rizal Technological University.
- [6.] Nuestro, D. B. (2024). *APACC, UNESCO TVET strategy, and TVET accreditation* [Class presentation]. DTE 306, Rizal Technological University.
- [7.] Philippine Qualifications Framework. (n.d.). *Domains and descriptors*. <https://pqf.gov.ph/Home/Details/4>
- [8.] Ramirez, C. (2024). *Trends, issues, and good practices in TVET* [Class presentation]. DTE 306, Rizal Technological University.
- [9.] Republic Act No. 7796, Technical Education and Skills Development Act of 1994. (1994). https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1994/ra_7796_1994.html

-
- [10.] Republic Act No. 9157, University of Rizal System Act. (2001).
<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/7386>
- [11.] Rizal Technological University. (n.d.). *College*. <https://www.rtu.edu.ph/college/>
- [12.] Sanico, J. B. (2024). *Transforming TVET in Asia: Innovative strategies for accelerated human resource development and sustainable livelihoods* [Class presentation]. DTE 306, Rizal Technological University.
- [13.] Technical Education and Skills Development Authority. (n.d.). *National Technical Education and Skills Development Plan 2023–2028*.
<https://www.tesda.gov.ph/about/tesda/47>
- [14.] UNESCO. (2022). *Strategy for technical and vocational education and training (TVET), 2022–2029: Transforming TVET for successful and just transitions*. UNESCO.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380775>
- [15.] University of Rizal System. (2013). *Student handbook* (BOR Resolution No. 044-412-13, revised 2013).
- [16.] University of Rizal System. (n.d.). *Bachelor of Industrial Technology program educational objectives and outcomes*.
- [17.] University of Rizal System. (n.d.). *URS brochure and campus course listings*.
- [18.] University of Rizal System–Binangonan Campus. (n.d.). *Admission policies and regulations*. <https://binangonan.urs.edu.ph/admission.php>
-