Indonesian Journal of Education Research (IJoER)
Vol. 6, No. 6, December 2025, pp. 612~626
ISSN: 2722-1326, DOI: 10.37251/ijoer.v6i6.2204

Enhancing Accessibility for Inclusive Education: Basis for Faculty Profiling and Facility Enhancement Input

Jeniel G. Reyes
Bataan Peninsula State University – Balanga Campus, Philippines

Article Info

Article history:

Received Oct 8, 2025
Revised Nov 6, 2025
Accepted Dec 27, 2025
Online First Dec 30, 2025

Keywords:

Facility Enhancement
Faculty Profiling
Inclusive Education
Students with Disabilities

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: This study explored the potential for promoting inclusive education at the Bataan Peninsula State University – Balanga Campus (BPSU-BC).

Methodology: The study employed a convergent parallel design. The researcher gathered both quantitative and qualitative data to assess the awareness and knowledge levels among faculty members regarding campus accessibility in inclusive education.

Main Findings: The findings indicate that the faculty members are well informed and sensitive to inclusive education, especially in their willingness to accommodate the students with disabilities, however, in spite of the willingness and the knowledge and awareness of the faculty members, increased institutional support may further enhance inclusive practice within the campus. Likewise, faculty finds the campus to be overall accessible, with signage being given the highest rating, followed by architecture. Though the overall rating is good, the low accessibility of assistive tools for students with disability shows that investment in inclusive tools is still needed. Moreover, the findings indicate that neither the awareness nor the knowledge of the faculty regarding inclusive education are significantly related to campus accessibility to inclusive education. More so, the findings revealed a need for explicit policies that integrated inclusivity into teaching, student activities, and daily campus operations. Faculty training on accommodating students with physical disabilities and mental health conditions was also deemed necessary. Furthermore, facility improvements were suggested to support learners with physical challenges.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This study provided recommendations for faculty profiling and facility enhancements, aligning BPSU-BC with national policies for inclusive education.

Corresponding Author:
Jeniel G. Reyes
Bataan Peninsula State University – Balanga Campus, Capitol Dr, City of Balanga, 2100 Bataan, Philippines
Email: jgreyes@bpsu.edu.ph

1. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is a core principle that aims to ensure equal opportunities for every student, regardless of their abilities or disabilities. Collaboration and inclusive group engagement are essential in higher education, greatly enhancing the learning experience and equipping students with the necessary skills for the real world. In the professional realm, teamwork and diverse perspectives are highly valued, making these practices even more significant.

Republic Act 11650, also known as the 'Instituting a Policy of Inclusion and Services for Learners with Disabilities in Support of Inclusive Education Act [1] mandates the implementation of measures to ensure that

education is accessible to everyone at all levels. It acknowledges, protects, and advocates for the rights of learners with disabilities, including those from ethnic, religious, or linguistic minority groups, as well as individuals of indigenous origin. The Act guarantees that no learner with a disability shall be denied the right to access an inclusive, fair, and high-quality education.

In the context of higher education, it is essential to guarantee that students with disabilities, regardless of their limitations, have the opportunity to access collaborative and inclusive learning environments. Collaborative learning and inclusive group participation not only improve academic results but also foster social integration, personal development, and empowerment for students with special needs.

Furthermore, in accordance with the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 23, Series of 2000, titled 'Quality Education for Learners with Special Needs,' [2] which aims to enhance the educational achievements of individuals with disabilities in the Philippines, the National Council on Disability Affairs encourages higher educational institutions to accept learners with special needs, incorporate Special Education (SPED) programs into teacher training institutions, and make necessary modifications to facilities and equipment to ensure that learners with special needs have access to quality education.

Universities around the world keep talking about inclusive education, but in reality, they're still far from making it work. The way schools handle inclusion swings wildly and problems pop up everywhere such as faculty aren't trained well enough, buildings and classrooms aren't set up for everyone, and campus support often falls short. Elicerio et al. [3] point out that even when universities have policies on paper, real-world problems with faculty training and infrastructure get in the way of genuine inclusion.

Furthermore, Ristad et al. [4] back this up as they show that inclusion isn't automatic. Too many professionals don’t have the skills or teamwork needed to help all kinds of students, so any progress made toward real inclusion ends up shaky at best. Oswal et al. [5] dig into case studies and find more trouble in both how campuses are built and how courses are designed. These barriers keep students with disabilities from fully taking part and keep true equity out of reach.

Nevertheless, according to the research conducted by Arnilla and Biray [6], the academic community within the university is receptive to the notion of admitting students with disabilities. However, this acceptance is accompanied by concerns stemming from the university's inability to adequately cater to the specific needs of these students. The current programs available at the campus may not be suitable for individuals with certain types of physical disabilities. Furthermore, Ecoben [7] made significant findings in their study, which showed that state-funded teachers are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of inclusive education. However, it is necessary to incorporate a separate subject on disability and inclusive education into teacher training courses.

For the local coontext, in BPSU-BC, there are 195 learners with disabilities documented out of 4445 students, which is about 4.39% of the total enrolment of the said campus. This record comprises the narrative of a totally blind student who was in the Bachelor of Elementary Education program. Inclusive education is essential for ensuring that all students have equal opportunities to pursue their educational goals and is a fundamental principle that seeks to provide equal opportunities for all students, regardless of their abilities or disabilities.

More students with disabilities are enrolling in colleges and universities, and online learning keeps expanding. Lomellini et al. [8] point out that schools still struggle to make both digital and in-person learning environments truly accessible. There's a gap between what students with disabilities need and what institutions actually provide. Thus, there is a need for a stronger evidence about what works and where the gaps are, both in capacity and in everyday practice.

With this, the challenge ties in directly with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. SDG 4 demands quality education for everyone, and SDG 10 [9] pushes for removing barriers that hold some groups back, including students with disabilities. These goals call for real, evidence-driven action. Colleges and universities must move past basic compliance and commit to accessibility in a way that supports every learner.

With these identified gaps, the present study examines faculty profiles, including their educational backgrounds, competencies, and approaches to inclusion, while also assessing the perceived accessibility of the institution’s physical environment. The primary objective is to generate empirical evidence that can inform targeted faculty development initiatives and strategic facility enhancements, thereby advancing inclusive education practices.

This research distinguishes itself through its integrative approach. Whereas prior studies often focus narrowly on faculty perceptions or isolated aspects of accessibility, few have simultaneously investigated faculty preparedness alongside the tangible elements of campus infrastructure within a single institutional context. By addressing both dimensions, this study provides a comprehensive analysis that can more effectively guide policy decisions and future planning to foster greater inclusivity in higher education.

In the context of higher education, it is crucial to ensure that blind students have access to learning environments that are collaborative and inclusive. By fostering collaboration and inclusive group engagement, this study shall not only enhance learning outcomes but also promote social integration, personal growth, and

empowerment for blind students. Therefore, this study explored the campus accessibility of inclusive education at BPSU-BC, the results served as a basis for faculty profiling and input on facility enhancement.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1. Type of Research

The study employed a convergent parallel design. According to Maruyama & Ryan [10], this mixed-method design e entails the simultaneous collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, aiming to combine the findings to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the research subject. The researcher gathered both quantitative and qualitative data to assess the awareness and knowledge levels among faculty members regarding campus accessibility in inclusive education. Additionally, the researcher sought input from faculty members about the current campus facilities and their accessibility features. This information was used to gain insights and suggestions on potential enhancements that can be implemented to improve accessibility and inclusivity on campus.

For the quantitative part, the study assessed the level of awareness and knowledge among faculty members in inclusive education in terms of Institutional Support, Attitudinal Favorability, Awareness, and Accommodation, Willingness to Receive Students with Disabilities, and Knowledge of Universal Design for Instruction as well as the level of campus accessibility on inclusive education in terms of Architectural Design and Assistive Technology, which were analyzed using mean and standard deviation.

2.2. Population and Research Sample

All faculty members of the Bataan Peninsula State University – Balanga Campus were given questionnaire which assessed the level of their awareness and knowledge in inclusive education as well as level of campus accessibility on inclusive education. Meanwhile for the qualitative part, interviews comprised of collecting information by inquiring questions by means of a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) invigorating discussion around a particular theme. An FGD is driven by a facilitator who postures questions and the members provide their contemplations and suppositions [11]. The researchers floated a survey questionnaire to the different department faculty rooms and simultaneously conduct an FGD.

2.3. Research Instrument

Furthermore, semi-structured interview questions were developed for the study to obtain detailed information on the research topic and to interact with the quantitative instrument (questionnaire), where some of the research participants shared their personal thoughts on the topic. The qualitative data collection instrument (semi-structured interview) was designed using the same questions used to structure the quantitative data, but with greater insight. This analysis was complemented by the faculty members' needs assessment on training and facility enhancement. Open-ended questions were analyzed using thematic analysis with QDA Miner software..

This study utilized a combination of two questionnaires: "Questionnaire for Accessibility Audit to Assess the Accessibility of College/University Campus to the Students with Disabilities in Higher Education" [12] and the "Survey for College Faculty Preparation and Comfort in Teaching Students with Disabilities" [13]. These questionnaires have been adapted and contextualized to suit the specific context of the Philippine education system.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data gathered using the questionnaire was coded, encoded, and statistically analyzed using statistical software called IBM-Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistics version 21. The data were analyzed using various statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Frequency or percentage distribution was used to illustrate the profile of the faculty in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, college/department, length of service, and socio-economic status. Moreover, the weighted mean was applied to assess the level of awareness and knowledge among faculty members in inclusive education in terms of institutional support, attitudinal favorability, awareness, accommodation, willingness to receive students with disabilities, and knowledge of universal design for instruction. Also, it was used to evaluate the level of campus accessibility on inclusive education in terms of architectural design, appropriate signage, and assistive technology.

Furthermore, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was carried out to determine the relationship between awareness and knowledge among faculty members and campus accessibility. In terms of hypothesis testing, SPSS provides significance or probability values. These values are then simply compared with the 0.05 level, which was established in the study as the accepted level of significance. If the significance or p-value is lower than 0.05, the statistical value is considered significant, leading to the rejection

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents an analysis and interpretation of data relevant to exploring the campus accessibility of inclusive education at BPSU-BC, which will serve as a basis for faculty profiling and input on facility enhancement.

3.1. Profile of the Faculty

Table 1 describes the personal profile of the faculty in terms of age, sex, and highest educational attainment.

Table 1. Personal Profile of the Faculty

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
21-35 years old	13	38
36-45 years old	6	18
46-55 years old	13	38
56-65 years old	2	6
Total	34	100
Sex		
Male	15	44
Female	19	56
Total	34	100
Highest Educational Attainment		
Doctorate Graduate (Ed. D. / Ph. D.)	11	32
Doctoral Units	10	29
Master's Degree (MAEd / MA)	6	18
Master's Units	7	21
Total	34	100

Number of cases = 34

According to Table 1, thirty-eight percent (38%) of the total faculty members are aged 21 to 35 years and 46 to 55 years, eighteen percent (18%) are aged 36 to 45 years, and six percent (6%) are aged 56 to 65 years. Additionally, fifty-six percent (56%) of the total faculty members are female, whereas forty-four percent (44%) are male. In terms of educational attainment, thirty-two percent (32%) hold a Doctoral Degree (Ed.D/Ph.D), twenty-nine percent (29%) have Doctoral units, wenty-one percent (21%) have earned Master's units, and eighteen percent (18%) hold a Master's Degree (MAEd/MA).

The age profile of faculty suggests a mix of young and experienced faculty. The fairly low ratio (18%) of faculty in the 36–45 years category might, however, indicate a potential gap of mid-career professionals, which could affect leadership succession and institutional stability.

According to Archer et al. [14], the retention of academic leadership and the efficient dissemination of institutional knowledge may be impacted by the concentration of senior faculty members and the smaller number of mid-career academics. To close this possible gap, mid-career professionals must be the focus of targeted faculty recruiting and retention initiatives. Institutions can preserve academic quality and organizational resilience by doing this and ensuring a strong pipeline of seasoned teachers prepared to take on leadership roles.

As to sex, the majority of faculty members (56%) are female, which is in line with the global trend in higher education as more women are pursuing teaching positions. However, the gender distribution is reasonably even, as evidenced by the 44% male faculty. There are significant regional and educational-level variations in the gender distribution of faculty members worldwide. Although some universities claim to have a larger proportion of female faculty, this is not always indicative of worldwide patterns.

As such, the majority of academic staff in member nations are men, according to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Women make up, on average, 45% of academic personnel throughout all tertiary education levels. These figures demonstrate that, despite the fact that some universities may have a predominant of female faculty, the global trend in higher education still favors male faculty predominance [15].

As to the educational attainment, the fact that 79% of faculty members possess or are pursuing Doctoral and Master's degrees is a testament to a high level of commitment to professional and academic development. This observation is evidence that faculty credentials have a direct influence on teaching quality, research output, and institutional reputation. According to Balanquit et al. [16] comparing the performance of Philippine state universities and colleges on the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), those with a larger percentage of doctorate-holding professors often have better LET scores. This implies that faculty members with advanced degrees have a positive impact on both institutional outcomes and student performance.

Table 2 entails the work profile of the faculty in terms of college/department, length of service, and socio-economic status.

Table 2. Work Profile of the Faculty

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
College/Department		
College of Business and Accountancy	5	15
College of Education	19	56
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences	2	6
Department of Arts and Sciences	8	23
Total	34	100
Length of Service		
Less than 1 year	3	9
1-5 years	8	23
6-10 years	6	18
11-15 years	2	6
16-20 years	2	6
Above 20 years	13	38
Total	34	100
Socio-economic Status		
PhP 20,000 - PhP 39,999	15	44
PhP 40,000 - PhP 59,999	7	20
PhP 60,000 - PhP 79,999	6	18
PhP 80,000 - PhP 99,999	6	18
Total	34	100

Number of cases = 34

Based on Table 2, fifty-six percent (56%) of the total faculty members are from the College of Education, twenty-three percent (23%) are from the Department of Arts and Sciences, fifteen percent (15%) are from the College of Business and Accountancy, and six percent (6%) are from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The College of Education is home to the majority of faculty members (56%) indicating a strong institutional emphasis on teacher preparation and educational initiatives. A broad academic organization is reflected in the presence of faculty members from various disciplines, such as the College of Business and Accountancy (15%) and the Department of Arts and Sciences (23%). The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences' comparatively low number (6%) would, however, suggest that faculty involvement in this area is not entirely extensive.

Warshaw et al. [17] asserted that the reputation of a faculty member's graduate program and institution can have a profound influence on their career success, such as the institution type where they find employment, their research productivity, and salary levels. This emphasizes the need for not just earning higher degrees but also the quality and reputation of the graduate programs pursued. The pursuit of higher academic qualifications by faculty members is therefore a significant factor in increasing teaching effectiveness, improving research contributions, and enhancing the prestige of educational institutions.

Regarding their length of service, thirty-eight percent (38%) of the total faculty members have been working for more than 20 years, twenty-three percent (23%) have been working for 1 to 5 years, eighteen percent (18%) have been working for 6 to 10 years, nine percent (9%) have been working for less than 1 year, and six percent (6%) have been working for 11 to 15 years and 16 to 20 years.

In addition, a large percentage of the faculty (38%) have been employed for over 20 years, indicating high faculty retention and institutional commitment. Nevertheless, the fact that there is a large percentage (23%) of faculty with 1 to 5 years of service and 9% with less than 1 year reflects continuous faculty hiring and possible turnover. The lower percentages (6%) of faculty with 11–15 years and 16–20 years of service may reflect a possible gap in mid-career faculty, which might affect leadership succession.

As reported by Baker et al. [18], the comparatively lower proportions of faculty reflect a possible mid-career gap. This discrepancy may create challenges in leadership succession and institutional continuity. Studies emphasize the significance of mid-career faculty in taking on leadership roles; however, institutions are often confronted with a "leaking leadership pipeline," with mid-career faculty either being unprepared or unwilling to move into leadership roles. This emphasizes the necessity for focused development programs to facilitate and retain mid-career academics.

In line with their socio-economic status, forty-four percent (44%) have a monthly income of PhP 20,000 - PhP 39,999, twenty percent (20%) have a monthly income of PhP 40,000 - PhP 59,999, and eighteen percent (18%) have a monthly income of PhP 60,000 - PhP 79,999 and PhP 80,000 - PhP 99,999.

Additionally, the distribution of income reflects that 44% of the faculty receive between PhP 20,000 - PhP 39,999, within the range of salary of entry- to mid-level faculty at Philippine higher educational institutions. At the same time, 20% receive PhP 40,000 - PhP 59,999, and 18% receive PhP 60,000 - PhP 99,999, representing a portion of faculty members' higher income levels, most probably as a consequence of tenure, rank, or administrative status.

Socio-economic inequalities among the faculty members emphasize the requirement for competitive pay arrangements to achieve monetary security and contentment. Fixing mid-career stagnation and offering sequential professional development prospects will be decisive in maintaining the engagement of the faculty and institution.

Lu et al. [19] identified a significant relationship between faculty compensation, job satisfaction, and access to professional development opportunities within higher education. Their analysis of university instructors revealed that salary levels and career advancement prospects were critical determinants of workplace satisfaction, alongside broader factors such as the institutional environment. Competitive remuneration, transparent promotion processes, and substantive professional development support were found to enhance faculty satisfaction and promote long-term engagement. Conversely, pronounced disparities in income or advancement opportunities among faculty members were shown to negatively affect motivation and retention.

3.2. Level of Awareness and Knowledge among Faculty Members in Inclusive Education

Table 3 summarizes the faculty members' level of awareness and knowledge in inclusive education.

Table 3. Faculty Members' Level of Awareness and Knowledge in Inclusive Education

Indicator	Mean	SD	DE	Interpretation
Institutional Support	2.87	1.10	Neither	Moderate Level
Attitudinal Favorability	3.79	0.84	Somewhat Agree	High Level
Awareness on Inclusive Education	3.06	1.06	Neither	Moderate Level
Accommodation	4.01	0.93	Somewhat Agree	High Level
Willingness to Receive Students with Disabilities	4.19	0.80	Somewhat Agree	High Level
Knowledge of Universal Design for Instruction	3.98	0.99	Somewhat Agree	High Level
Composite	3.65	0.73	Somewhat Agree	High Level

Scale of Means: 5.00–4.21 Strongly Agree/Very High Level; 4.20–3.41 Somewhat Agree/High Level; 3.40–2.61 Neither/Moderate Level; 2.60–1.81 Somewhat Disagree/Low Level; 1.80–1.00 Strongly Disagree/Very Low Level; SD-Standard Deviation; DE-Descriptive Equivalent

Table 3 presents all indicators of the Level of Awareness and Knowledge in Inclusive Education. Among these, the indicator "Willingness to Receive Students with Disabilities" *(Mean=4.19; SD=0.80; Somewhat Agree; High Level)* has the highest rating, followed by "Accommodation" *(Mean=4.01; SD=0.93; Somewhat Agree; High Level)*. Contrarily, "Institutional Support" *(Mean=2.87; SD=1.10; Neither; Moderate Level)* has the lowest rating. Overall, the rating *(Mean=3.65; SD=0.73; Somewhat Agree)* denotes that the faculty members' level of awareness and knowledge in inclusive education is "*High*."

The findings indicate that the majority of faculty members possess a solid understanding of inclusive education, demonstrating both subject-matter competence and a welcoming attitude toward students with disabilities. Faculty exhibit a readiness to implement accommodations and generally hold positive views regarding inclusion. Furthermore, their high scores in Universal Design for Instruction suggest that they are well-prepared to address diverse learning needs.

However, the data reveal a notable limitation in terms of institutional support, which remains at a moderate level. This highlights deficiencies in institutional policies, resource allocation, and administrative processes. Additionally, while faculty demonstrate foundational knowledge of inclusive education, their overall awareness could be further enhanced. These observations underscore the need for expanded training and professional development opportunities.

In summary, while faculty members are supportive and prepared to advance inclusive education, institutional commitment and infrastructure require strengthening. Enhanced support systems and ongoing professional development are essential to effectively implement inclusive practices across the institution.

Besides, Al-Korbi et al. [20] argues that low awareness and participation in inclusive education imply that institutional support and training are not adequately promoted or provided, and therefore the ability of faculty members to provide effective support to SEN students is hampered. The study implies the necessity for targeted interventions, including professional development and training workshops, to enhance faculty awareness and utilization of accessible support services, thereby fostering an inclusive learning environment.

3.3. Level of Campus Accessibility on Inclusive Education

Table 4 outlines the level of campus accessibility for inclusive education.

Table 4. Level of Campus Accessibility for Inclusive Education

Indicator	Mean	SD	DE	Interpretation
Architectural Design	2.94	0.57	Agree	Accessible
Appropriate Signage	3.32	0.41	Strongly Agree	Highly Accessible
Assistive Technology	1.94	0.78	Disagree	Somewhat Accessible
Composite	2.73	0.47	Agree	Accessible

Scale of Means: 4.00–3.26 Strongly Agree/Highly Accessible; 3.25–2.51 Agree/Accessible; 2.50–1.76 Disagree/Somewhat Accessible; 1.75–1.00 Strongly Disagree/Not Accessible; SD-Standard Deviation; DE-Descriptive Equivalent

Table 4 highlights all indicators of the Level of Campus Accessibility for Inclusive Education. Amongst these, the indicator "Appropriate Signage" *(Mean=3.32; SD=0.41; Strongly Agree; Highly Accessible)* has the highest rating. It is succeeded by "Architectural Design" *(Mean=2.94; SD=0.57; Agree; Accessible)*. However, the indicator "Assistive Technology" *(Mean=1.94; SD=0.78; Disagree; Somewhat Accessible)* has the lowest rating.

Taken altogether, the rating *(Mean=2.73; SD=0.47)* signifies that the faculty members responded "*Agree*" to statements regarding campus accessibility for inclusive education, which is considered "*Accessible*" on campus.

This finding provides a clear overview of perceptions regarding campus accessibility for inclusive education. The data indicate that most respondents view the campus as accessible, with signage emerging as a particular strength. Participants reported that navigation is facilitated by effective signage and directions, and the architectural design of buildings also received positive evaluations. Thus, physical mobility does not appear to be a significant barrier for the majority of individuals.

However, the findings highlight a notable deficiency in the area of assistive technology, which received the lowest ratings and was classified as only "somewhat accessible." This suggests a shortage of technological resources and supports available to students with disabilities. While the campus performs adequately in terms of fundamental accessibility features, the limited availability of assistive technology presents a substantial obstacle to achieving full inclusion. Addressing this gap should be prioritized to enhance the overall inclusivity of the educational environment.

Improving assistive technology devices is of the highest priority in developing an accessible learning environment, especially for visually and hearing-impaired students. In spite of this, there are constraints in utilizing assistive technology, like financial constraints. Schools typically have limited budgets that discourage the acquisition and maintenance of available assistive technology. There is a need to invest in these devices to cater to the varied needs of students. Additionally, the lack of proper awareness and training among teachers about accessible tools may lead to underutilization. Providing comprehensive training programs ensures teachers can easily integrate these technologies into teaching practices [21].

3.4. Relationship between Faculty Members' Level of Awareness and Knowledge in Inclusive Education and Campus's Accessibility to Inclusive Education

Table 5 represents the relationship between the awareness and knowledge among faculty members and campus accessibility.

Table 5. Relationship between Faculty Members' Level of Awareness and Knowledge in Inclusive Education and Campus's Accessibility to Inclusive Education

Awareness and Knowledge in Inclusive Education	Campus Accessibility for Inclusive Education											
	Architectural Design			Appropriate Signage			Assistive Technology			Overall		
	r	*p-value*	*Remarks*	*r*	*p-value*	*Remarks*	*r*	*p-value*	*Remarks*	*r*	*p-value*	*Remarks*
Institutional Support	.01 ns	.972	Negligible Relationship	-.05 ns	.795	Negligible Relationship	.08 ns	.669	Negligible Relationship	.04 ns	.815	Negligible Relationship
Attitudinal Favorability	-.09 ns	.601	Negligible Relationship	-.12 ns	.508	Negligible Relationship	-.02 ns	.924	Negligible Relationship	.12 ns	.503	Negligible Relationship
Awareness on Inclusive Education	.18 ns	.312	Negligible Relationship	-.07 ns	.684	Negligible Relationship	.34 *	.047	Low Relationship	.07 ns	.690	Negligible Relationship
Accommodation	-.03 ns	.878	Negligible Relationship	.05 ns	.783	Negligible Relationship	.11 ns	.525	Negligible Relationship	.02 ns	.900	Negligible Relationship
Willingness to Receive Students with Disabilities	-.02 ns	.892	Negligible Relationship	-.18 ns	.308	Negligible Relationship	.17 ns	.328	Negligible Relationship	.06 ns	.728	Negligible Relationship
Knowledge of Universal Design for Instruction	.02 ns	.906	Negligible Relationship	-.01 ns	.964	Negligible Relationship	.14 ns	.437	Negligible Relationship	-.05 ns	.781	Negligible Relationship
Overall	.02 ns	.902	Negligible Relationship	-.08 ns	.668	Negligible Relationship	.19 ns	.290	Negligible Relationship	.06 ns	.755	Negligible Relationship

* significant at 0.05 alpha level; ns–significant at 0.01 alpha level; Strength of Relationship: ±.80–±1.0 High Relationship; ±.60–±.79; Moderately High Relationship; ±.40–±.59 Moderate Relationship; ±.20–±.39 Low Relationship; ±.01–±.19 Negligible Relationship

As demonstrated in Table 5, the corresponding significant values for all sub-variables related to the faculty members' level of awareness and knowledge in inclusive education, as well as the campus's accessibility to inclusive education, exceed the 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, no significant relationships are observed among these indicators.

The analysis reveals that the faculty members' level of awareness and knowledge in inclusive education exhibits a negligible relationship with the sub-variables of campus accessibility to inclusive education. Specifically, the relationships with "Architectural Design" *(r=.02; p-value=.902)*, "Appropriate Signage" *(r=-.08; p-value=.668)*, and "Assistive Technology" *(r=.19; p-value=.290)* are all negligible.

Similarly, negligible relationships were found between campus accessibility to inclusive education and the sub-variables of the faculty members' level of awareness and knowledge in inclusive education, including "Institutional Support" *(r=.04; p-value=.815)*, "Attitudinal Favorability" *(r=.12; p-value=.503)*, "Awareness on Inclusive Education" *(r=.07; p-value=.690)*, "Accommodation" *(r=.02; p-value=.900)*, "Willingness to Receive Students with Disabilities" *(r=.06; p-value=.728)*, and "Knowledge of Universal Design for Instruction" *(r=-.05; p-value=.781)*.

However, a low relationship was observed between the "Awareness on Inclusive Education" sub-variable of faculty members' level of awareness and knowledge and the "Assistive Technology" sub-variable of campus accessibility to inclusive education *(r=.34; p-value=.047)*.

In conclusion, there is no sufficient evidence that a significant relationship exists between the faculty members' level of awareness and knowledge in inclusive education and the campus' accessibility to inclusive education, as denoted by the correlation coefficient *(r=.06; p-value=.755)*.

The findings indicate that neither the awareness nor the knowledge of the faculty regarding inclusive education are significantly related to campus accessibility to inclusive education. The negligible correlation of most of the sub-variables indicates that faculty awareness is not always equivalent to more campus accessibility, and campus accessibility is not significantly related to faculty awareness.

Nonetheless, the significant but weak relationship between Awareness on Inclusive Education and Assistive Technology *(r=.34; p-value=.047)* indicates that more aware faculty members of inclusive education may be more aware of the use of assistive technologies. This implies an intervention area, raising assistive technology training among faculty members to close the accessibility gap.

Overall, the findings imply that greater campus accessibility would involve autonomous institutional effort and not simply exposing faculty attitudes and understandings. A strong policy, infrastructure, and support system would be more effective and successful in bringing about an inclusive learning environment.

Sanderson et al. [22], reports that the low correlation between staff awareness of inclusive education and their competence in assistive technology identifies a key area for development. Research has confirmed that while teachers are likely to be favourably inclined towards inclusive education, they are likely to lack the knowledge and skills necessary to deliver it effectively. For instance, it has been confirmed that a high percentage of teachers report that they have "some knowledge" of accessibility, with a low percentage considering themselves expert.

3.5. Insights about Inclusive Education As Articulated By The Faculty Members

This research offers a general description of the Inclusivity in Education theme, which is further supplemented by three recurring codes that continue to reappear in the analysis: Contextualization of Inclusivity, Accepting Community, and Lack of Actual Integration.

The presence and detection of the code Contextualization of Inclusivity strongly indicate that considerable effort is being made to thoughtfully fine-tune inclusive practices in a way appropriate to the unique context and individualized needs of the particular institution. This discovery indicates that while inclusivity is recognized and known as a key priority within the education community, its practical implementation in real-world practice is necessarily subject to and determined by the particularized environment, policies in place, and varied education practices embraced by the institution. The ongoing reappearance of this code further indicates that inclusivity should not be conceived as a fixed or changing concept; instead, it should be conceived as a fluid and iterative process that continues to be modified and adapted to serve the various needs and demands of the academic community. However, this further indicates that the institution may still be defining, researching, and developing the concept of inclusivity when put into practice.

Magnússon et al. [23] see inclusive education as a policy phenomenon made up of a variety of ideas of what the purpose of education is, what education is and how education is to be organized. As a political ideal expressed through policy, inclusive education is in competition with other political ideals for education, like economic discourses where effectivity and achievement become the ultimate goals of education. Thus, inclusive education needs to be realized in environments where current opportunities for action are constrained by diverse and frequently competing educational policies at different levels of the education system. Thus, any definition of inclusive education is always within a policy of general education and determinants of what inclusive school depends on, such as political definitions of inclusive education, the distribution of resources and political rhetoric at the national and local level of education.

The Accepting Community code stresses and reinforces the significant impression that the institution engages in building an inclusive and tolerant community specifically for diverse individuals from diverse backgrounds. This discovery strongly verifies that students and faculty members can sense and value the constant efforts undertaken to promote inclusivity, reflected through significant interpersonal relationships, favorable faculty-student interactions, and institutional policies advocating respect for diversity in all its manifestations. The dominance of this specific code verifies that inclusivity is strongly valued in the institution, further signifying that there is a prevailing culture typified by openness and acceptance. It is, however, important to consider that although acceptance forms a vital aspect of inclusivity, this does not necessarily translate into total integration of all individuals. Effective inclusivity requires much more than a warm setting; it requires the enforcement of tangible mechanisms and strategies that facilitate equal access to opportunities, resources, and support mechanisms for all individuals.

Corcoran & Kaneva [24] say that in creating inclusive pedagogies with teachers leading the way to offer support, the application of labels to sort specific groups of learners based on perceived learning needs can further stigmatize them, influencing their sense of belonging at school and their academic and social identities. They stress the importance of interpreting experiences through common stories and conversation, beginning with students' experiences to build pedagogies and inclusive communities in and out of schools.

Despite the strong emphasis on the worth of contextualization and the promotion of an accepting community, the repeated and disquieting phenomenon of that which has been termed a Lack of Actual Integration demonstrates a stark disconnect between the institution's high-minded inclusive ideals and the very much-lived reality of members. This dynamic suggests that, while the ideals of inclusion are clearly recognized and actively promoted, certain structural barriers may unfortunately prevent full engagement and equal treatment for all students and faculty members alike. Some factors, including but not limited to restricted accessibility accommodations, weak support structures, or the presence of underlying biases, might notably contribute to this lack of actual integration. The jarring disconnect between the existence of an accepting community and the disquieting failure of actual integration serves to define the urgent necessity for more systematic and inclusive efforts at inclusivity, a step that moves beyond symbolic gesture and ensures that actual participation remains enabled for all members of the academic community. These findings note the urgent need for the refinement of institutional policies, the expansion of faculty training programs, and the introduction of targeted initiatives specifically closing the existing disconnect between inclusivity in theory and the reality of inclusivity in practice.

Jarvis et al. [25] convey that inclusive education is attuned to each individual child and seeks flexibility, and not requiring the child to have to alter himself/herself in an effort to 'fit' fixed school structures. Such an approach typifies integration, and inclusion further does not mesh with segregation where children with impairment are typically schooled separately from other children. Nonetheless, even with policy and legislative demands around inclusive education, there continues to be little consensus within the profession regarding definition and models of inclusion. As such, inclusion's essential features need to be considered as a whole and accounted for in detailed planning so they operate in tandem and are integrated into the emergent inclusive character of the school.

Moreover, this research likewise comprehensively describes that the dominant theme recognized as Faculty Profile on Inclusivity reflects itself through three unique codes, namely Unprofiled Faculty, Personal Initiative, and Lack of Formal Training on Inclusive Education.

The presence of the Unprofiled Faculty describes that there is a very apparent lack of any systematic documentation or exhaustive categorization of faculty members in line with various parameters like their backgrounds, personal experiences, or competencies particularly related to inclusive education practices. Such an important gap could indicate that the concerned institution does not have a systematically organized and structured approach toward identifying those faculty members who have the required expertise or significant experience in inclusive teaching practices appropriately and effectively. In the absence of having access to clear and comprehensive information on faculty preparedness, it becomes difficult to properly identify the institutional capacity for inclusivity and prepare and implement specific professional development programs appropriately and effectively that can respond to the specific needs of the faculty and the institution as a whole.

Bačová [26] discusses the case of the primary school teacher within the framework of inclusive education. Based on him/her, the professional teacher is positively disposed towards inclusive education, employs multiple teaching strategies resulting in active engagement of the students, is engaged in his/her professional development and school development as a community, applies individualization and differentiation in his/her work, and is a member of a multidisciplinary team. A required element is the establishment of an understanding of inclusive education with overlap in society and the generation of a professional standard or model as part of teacher professional learning with emphasis on soft skills.

The Personal Initiative code signals the important point that faculty members are most likely to rely on individual personal effort to apply inclusive practices successfully to their classrooms. This specific finding implies an important point that, lacking explicit institutional directions or guidelines, teachers are most likely to take it upon themselves to alter and adapt their teaching styles in a manner whereby they can better meet a

diverse range of different learners. Such forward-looking behaviors may entail an array of tactics, including precise adjustment of lesson plans, employment of differentiated instruction techniques, or positive creation of a more inclusive classroom setting through concerted personal effort and dedication. While this no doubt implies the admirable commitment of certain faculty members to the precepts of inclusivity, it also implies an important concern with the lack of a single and unified institution-wide method for such important educational practices. An over-reliance on the individual personal initiative of faculty members has the potential to result in variation in the implementation and success of inclusive education as it is most likely that certain teachers may evidence a higher level of proactiveness than others in conforming to the divergent learning demands of their pupils.

Ainscow [27] is concentrating on one of the biggest dilemmas for global education systems, that of considering means of mainstreaming all children into schools. In poorer countries economically this is primarily about the millions of children who cannot receive formal schooling [28]. At the same time, in more affluent nations, numerous young people exit school without any meaningful qualifications, while others are put in special provision outside of mainstream education and some opt to leave because the lessons appear irrelevant. Confronted with these difficulties, there is evidence of greater interest in the concept of widening education to make it more inclusive and equitable. Yet, the discipline is unclear about what must be done in order to advance policy and practice.

The absence of systematic training in inclusive education poses grave obstacles that further exacerbate the problems that members of the faculty experience in the application of inclusive modes of instruction. This is a strong indicator that an overwhelming majority of teachers have not been subjected to systematic training or professional development programs specifically targeting inclusive education methods. The glaring lack of formal training gravely diminishes the ability of members of the faculty to properly respond to and address the myriad needs of students from diverse backgrounds, particularly those individuals who need special support to achieve. In the absence of institutional support in the form of training workshops, seminars, or explicitly articulated policy guidelines, initiatives toward the provision of inclusive education may continue to be piecemeal and heavily dependent on the goodwill and previous experience of individual members of the faculty. Such observations reveal a grave need for a systematic and organized process of faculty development, which must include the provision of formal training programs, the establishment of mentorship sessions, and the inclusion of policy-based initiatives that allow educators to have the skills to provide a truly inclusive learning environment for all students.

Moriña et al. [29] examine, from the perspective of academic staff, the training requirements they need to offer inclusive education to disability students. There is actually a necessity to identify profile of academics based on prior training, relevance of such training for them and motives for training, and contents regarded as relevant for training. Therefore, need for universities to develop and implement training policies is imperative. Second, they asserted that there is also a need to be more sensitive and better equipped if teaching staff were trained on issues of disability. A simple conclusion of this research is that inclusive universities necessitate the participation of all.

In addition, this study explains that the theme Areas of Improvement is reflected in multiple recurring codes, indicating key gaps in the institution’s efforts toward inclusive education, which reflects three unique codes, namely Lack of Policy, Lack of Physical Facility, and Lack of Resources for Student Use.

One of the most prominent issues is the Lack of Policy, suggesting that there are no formal guidelines or structured frameworks governing the implementation of inclusivity. The absence of institutionalized policies results in inconsistencies in practice, making it difficult to standardize inclusive education efforts across departments. This also affects accountability, as there are no clear directives on how faculty and administrators should implement and sustain inclusivity within the institution.

Obah [30] discusses the effects of inclusive education policies on students with disabilities. It demonstrates that in the face of difficulties such as scarce resources and adverse attitudes, inclusive education policies remain crucial in building educational inclusion and academic achievement in regular settings. In his/her view, the imperative of responding to systemic barriers, cultivating positive attitudes, and continually updating policies to suit changing circumstances of students with disabilities. It also calls for policy changes that enhance equity and social inclusion, greater cooperation between stakeholders, and additional resources to support inclusive education initiatives.

And still another urgent concern that has cropped up is the Lack of Physical Facility, a recurring issue during sessions, and therefore further contributing to the argument that the school's physical facility is perhaps not properly equipped for the varied needs of all students. An inadequacy of available classrooms, specific learning environments particularly designed for addressing individualized learning needs, or even the fundamental assistive technology severely impinges on learners' ability, particularly learners with disabilities, to access and be benefited by many learning opportunities. To really address this glaring problem, the school may be compelled to undertake an intense Needs Assessment with the goal of systematically analyzing and clarifying facility deficits, accessible resources, and pedagogy that actually inhibit the quest for inclusiveness in learning. A

well-designed needs assessment would provide evidence-based data which are absolutely essential to informed decision-making and effective resource allocation in the school.

Kabwos & Bitok [31] discusses how the provision of adapted physical facilities influences the integration of inclusive education. It shows that there are accessible classrooms in most schools, yet many lack other necessary features like rails at entrances, adapted toilets, ramps, and appropriate furniture, which undermines the implementation of inclusive education. They suggest that the County Government invest enough money to adapt existing facilities to be more inclusive for learners with disabilities.

Moreover, the consequent Lack of Resources for Student Use reveals an acute challenge offered to students seeking to acquire the proper learning materials, required assistive devices, and other relevant tools that provide the foundation of ensuring an inclusive learning system. As a result of these glaring resource shortages, teachers are bound to be pushed into Improvisation for Students' Special Needs, while admittedly commendable and evidence of teachers' dedication to learner achievement, it is still reflective of more of an ad hoc strategy rather than a designed plan towards bringing about genuine inclusivity in the learning environment.

Goldan et al. [32] indicate that positive resource perception is strongly related to improved school well-being, greater social inclusion, and a better academic self-concept among pupils. These findings highlight the critical role of sufficient resourcing in supporting effective inclusive education.

The results of the present study also explain the necessity of the recruitment of specialized teachers who have the particular skills and knowledge needed to effectively serve students with varying learning needs. The consistent occurrence of this code indicates that the present faculty members might be lacking the specialized knowledge that is needed to support students who are experiencing disabilities or have multiple learning issues. The collaboration with other institutions also presents itself as an area of improvement, indicating that the formation of partnerships with organizations that have expertise in inclusive education could offer valuable expertise, necessary training, and significant resources that could significantly be of value to the learning environment. The study also indicates a disturbing lack of intentionality in the efforts towards inclusivity, which indicates that such efforts are not necessarily integral to the core strategies of the institution, but are instead in the form of incidental or voluntary efforts that lack the necessary focus. As a result, teachers are left with having to make accommodations on their part, which supports the implication that the responsibility of ensuring inclusivity rests on the individual educator's shoulders and not as an institutional priority that is to be addressed as a whole. These findings explain the necessity of a holistic and systematic approach to inclusivity that should involve policy-making, mass training of the faculty, infrastructure improvement, and collaborative efforts with external agencies, all to ensure sustainable and meaningful inclusion of all students in the education system.

4. CONCLUSION

As to the personal profile of the respondents, the faculty composition shows a mix of young and veteran teachers, but a low percentage (18%) in the 36–45 age bracket could be a challenge for leadership succession. Sex distribution is fairly balanced, with a slight female preponderance (56%), which is consistent with international trends in higher education. There is a high commitment to professional development, as 79% of the faculty have or are working towards advanced degrees, which has a positive effect on teaching quality, research, and institutional reputation.

The College of Education has most of the faculty (56%), which indicates high emphasis on teacher education. Distribution of faculty across other fields, including Business and Accountancy (15%) and Arts and Sciences (23%), indicates a wide academic framework, while the small representation (6%) in Social and Behavioral Sciences indicates minimal faculty engagement in this area. The high faculty retention rate is noted, with 38% serving for more than 20 years. But a notable proportion (23%) with 1–5 years of service and 9% with less than one year shows continuous hiring and potential turnover. The low proportions (6%) of professors with 11–20 years of service show a mid-career gap that can affect leadership succession. Salary distribution is mixed, with 44% receiving PhP 20,000–39,999, while 20% and 18% receive higher pay, possibly because of tenure or administrative positions. Solving mid-career stagnation and maintaining competitive pay scales are crucial to faculty retention and institutional stability.

As to the Faculty Members' Level of Awareness and Knowledge in Inclusive Education, the findings indicate that the faculty members are well informed and sensitive to inclusive education, especially in their willingness to accommodate the students with disabilities. Their firm commitment to the accommodation required is found to be facilitative of inclusive practice. The less highly rated institutional support, on the other hand, is found to indicate poor resources, training, or administrative support that may impede successful delivery of inclusive education. This indicates that in spite of the willingness and the knowledge and awareness of the faculty members, increased institutional support may further enhance inclusive practice within the campus.

As to the Level of Campus Accessibility for Inclusive Education, the findings indicate that the faculty finds the campus to be overall accessible, with signage being given the highest rating, followed by architecture. The low rating of assistive technology, however, is a revealing area for development. Though the overall rating

is good, the low accessibility of assistive tools for students with disability shows that investment in inclusive tools is still needed. More assistive technology, such as Braille systems, screen readers, and auditory assistance devices, would be a significant leap in strengthening the campus's commitment to inclusive education.

The findings indicate that neither the awareness nor the knowledge of the faculty regarding inclusive education are significantly related to campus accessibility to inclusive education. The negligible correlation of most of the sub-variables indicates that faculty awareness is not always equivalent to more campus accessibility, and campus accessibility is not significantly related to faculty awareness. Nonetheless, the significant but weak relationship between Awareness on Inclusive Education and Assistive Technology (r=.34; p-value=.047) indicates that more aware faculty members of inclusive education may be more aware of the use of assistive technologies. This implies an intervention area, raising assistive technology training among faculty members to close the accessibility gap. Overall, the findings imply that greater campus accessibility would involve autonomous institutional effort and not simply exposing faculty attitudes and understandings. A strong policy, infrastructure, and support system would be more effective and successful in bringing about an inclusive learning environment.

As to the insights about inclusive education as articulated by the faculty members, the study offers a general description of the Inclusivity in Education theme, which is further supplemented by three recurring codes that continue to reappear in the analysis: Contextualization of Inclusivity, Accepting Community, and Lack of Actual Integration. Moreover, this research likewise comprehensively describes that the dominant theme recognized as Faculty Profile on Inclusivity reflects itself through three unique codes, namely Unprofiled Faculty, Personal Initiative, and Lack of Formal Training on Inclusive Education. Furthermore, this study explains that the theme Areas of Improvement is reflected in multiple recurring codes, indicating key gaps in the institution’s efforts toward inclusive education, which reflects three unique codes, namely Lack of Policy, Lack of Physical Facility, and Lack of Resources for Student Use.

The BPSU Balanga Campus faculty profiling depicts a heterogeneous faculty with differences in levels of experience, education, and socio-economic status influencing their awareness and knowledge about inclusive education. Even with faculty members displaying a high level of attitudinal favorability, accommodation, and readiness to accept students with disabilities, institutional support and awareness are only moderate, calling for further upgrading of these aspects. Increased institutional support through well-crafted policies, additional funding, and designated training programs is called for in facilitating inclusive education effectively. On top of that, formal professional development programs, particularly in Universal Design for Instruction, will enhance faculty competency and preparedness. As a whole, this study signifies the imperative for continuous capacity-building programs to narrow the gap between faculty willingness and capacity to utilize inclusive education practices.

The recommended enhancements are to improve campus accessibility from "Accessible" to "Highly Accessible" in all aspects to make campus life more accessible for individuals with disabilities. Priority is to be accorded to upgrading assistive technology and hearing-impaired facilities, which ranked the lowest on accessibility. Stakeholder feedback and regular review should be incorporated to facilitate continuous improvement in accessibility features.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher would like to extend their sincere appreciation to our university President, Dr. Ruby B. Santos-Matibag, whose visionary leadership has ever been a strong driving force, inspiring us to serve the purposes of the university through research activities.

Sincere appreciation is accorded to Professor Monica B. Tanchiatco-Hipolito, Vice President for Research and Extension, for her significant inputs in charting the direction of the university research towards meaningful outputs.

I also express our heartfelt appreciation to Mr. Job D. Paguio, Research Development Office Chairperson Balanga Campus, whose relentless drive for research has significantly influenced and supported the efforts of researcher across the campus.

I acknowledge with gratitude the invaluable support of Ms. Richael F. Rodrigo, whose careful effort and unwavering commitment have facilitated our research administrative processes with ease and precision.

I would like to extend our sincerest gratitude to Dr. Leandro T. Olubia, Dean of the College of Education, for his invaluable guidance and leadership, which have helped greatly in the determination of suitable research topics that serve the interests of our stakeholders.

I would like to acknowledge the contribution of the distinguished members of faculty in the College of Education, College of Business and Accountancy and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences for their valuable inputs of expertise and counsel, which have significantly influenced our research work.

Above all, I would like to express our sincerest gratitude to the Supreme Being, whose divine call led us to the noble profession of research. I pray that He will continue to bless us and guide us as I strive to make our research work a means to glorify His name and serve others.

REFERENCES

[1] Republic Act No. 11650, Philippines, 2022.
[2] Commission on Higher Education (CHED), "About CHED," Philippines. https://ched.gov.ph/
[3] D. E. Conchas, P. G. Hernández Carrillo, and R. Pérez Zúñiga, "Factors fostering the inclusion of students with disabilities during their academic career at the University Center of Health Sciences of the University of Guadalajara," *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 10, Art. no. 1631418, 2025, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1631418.
[4] T. Ristad, J. Østvik, S. Horghagen, L. Kvam, and A. E. Witsø, "A multi-stakeholder perspective on inclusion in higher education: Ruling on fragile ground," *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, vol. 6, Art. no. 100311, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100311.
[5] N. Oswal, M. H. Al-Kilani, R. Faisal, and M. Fteiha, "A systematic review of inclusive education strategies for students of determination in higher education institutions: Current challenges and future directions," *Education Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 5, Art. no. 518, 2025, doi: 10.3390/educsci15050518.
[6] A. K. Arnilla and E. Biray, "Prospects for inclusive education in the Aklan State University – Main Campus," 2016.
[7] M. E. Ecoben, "Readiness of public-school teachers in handling inclusive education," *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1–10, Jun. 2019.
[8] A. Lomellini, P. R. Lowenthal, C. Snelson, and J. H. Trespalacios, "Accessible and inclusive online learning in higher education: A review of the literature," *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 1306–1329, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s12528-024-09424-2.
[9] UNESCO, "SDG 4: Education 2030," Dec. 16, 2025.
[10] G. Maruyama and C. S. Ryan, *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.
[11] K. Abawi, "Data collection instruments (questionnaire and interview)," Geneva Foundation for Medical Education and Research, 2013.
[12] A. Jagtap, "Questionnaire for accessibility audit to assess the accessibility of college/university campus to the students with disabilities in higher education," *Global Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 6, pp. 16–25, 2017.
[13] D. Polk, "College faculty preparation and comfort in teaching students with disabilities," Ph.D. dissertation, Seton Hall Univ., South Orange, NJ, USA, 2021.
[14] T. Archer and T. Makkai, "Academic leadership succession planning," 2015, doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1993.6801.
[15] UNESCO, *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Teachers' Attitudes on Gender Affect Student Education Experiences*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2020.
[16] E. P. Balanquit, M. A. P. Ladia, and N. R. Nool, "The influence of faculty members' educational attainment on the performance in the licensure examination for teachers (LET) among state universities and colleges in the Philippines," *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 247–256, 2023, doi: 10.5430/jct.v12n1p247.
[17] J. B. Warshaw, R. K. Toutkoushian, and H. Choi, "Does the reputation of a faculty member's graduate programme and institution matter for labour market outcomes?" *Journal of Education and Work*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 793–812, 2017, doi: 10.1080/13639080.2017.1380300.
[18] V. L. Baker, L. G. Lunsford, and M. J. Pifer, "Patching up the 'leaking leadership pipeline': Fostering mid-career faculty succession management," *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 60, pp. 823–843, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11162-018-9528-9.
[19] Y. Lu, L. Ting, Z. Jiang, Y. Liu, and S. Y. Lee, "Professional development, work environment, and job satisfaction in higher education: Implications for teacher education," *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 2200–2213, 2025, doi: 10.53894/ijirss.v8i6.10093.
[20] H. Al-Korbi, M. A. Al-Hamdani, A. Ghareeb, M. Al-Asmakh, and A. M. Abdallah, "Facilitating inclusive education: Assessing faculty awareness and attitudes towards students with special educational needs at Qatar University," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 10, Art. no. e31076, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31076.
[21] The Insurance Universe, "Enhancing learning opportunities with assistive technology in education," Apr. 30, 2024.
[22] N. C. Sanderson, S. Kessel, and W. Chen, "What do faculty members know about universal design and digital accessibility? A qualitative study in computer science and engineering disciplines," *Universal Access in the Information Society*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 351–365, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10209-022-00875-x.
[23] G. Magnússon, K. Göransson, and G. Lindqvist, "Contextualizing inclusive education in educational policy: The case of Sweden," *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 67–77, 2019, doi: 10.1080/20020317.2019.1586512.
[24] S. L. Corcoran and D. Kaneva, "Developing inclusive communities: Understanding the experiences of education of learners of English as an additional language in England and street-connected children in Kenya," *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 1239–1256, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13603116.2021.1886348.
[25] J. M. Jarvis *et al*., *Inclusive School Communities Project: Final Evaluation Report*. Adelaide, Australia: Flinders University, 2020.
[26] V. Bačová, "The profile of the primary school teacher in inclusive education from the Finnish experience," *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 90–96, 2023, doi: 10.24018/ejedu.2023.4.3.662.
[27] M. Ainscow, "Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences," *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 7–16, 2020, doi: 10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587.
[28] UNESCO, *Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2015.

[29] A. Moriña, V. H. Perera, and R. Carballo, "Training needs of academics on inclusive education and disability," *SAGE Open*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2158244020962758.
[30] A. Obah, "The effectiveness of inclusive education policies for students with disabilities," *International Journal of Humanity and Social Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 45–67, 2024.
[31] R. C. Kabwos and E. C. Bitok, "Influence of adapted physical facilities on the execution of inclusive education in public preschools in Belgut Sub-County, Kenya," *East African Journal of Education Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 392–401, 2022, doi: 10.37284/eajes.5.2.819.
[32] J. Goldan, L. Hoffmann, and S. Schwab, "A matter of resources? Students' academic self-concept, social participation and school well-being in inclusive education," in *Resourcing Inclusive Education*, J. Goldan, J. Lambrecht, and T. Loreman, Eds., vol. 15. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing, 2021, pp. 89–100, doi: 10.1108/S1479-363620210000015008.