

Feasibility study for reengineering the existing building at NEUST San Isidro Campus: A long-term infrastructure solution



Romeo B. Campos Jr¹, Jennilyn C. Mina^{1,*}, Pastora S. De Guzman²

¹College of Management and Business Technology, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City, Philippines

²College of Education, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 5 February 2025

Received in revised form

25 May 2025

Accepted 5 August 2025

Keywords:

Building renovation

Space utilization

Enrollment forecast

Educational facilities

Infrastructure planning

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the feasibility of reengineering the existing building at the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST) San Isidro Campus, located on Jose Abad Santos Avenue, San Isidro, Nueva Ecija, Philippines. The aim was to address the university's growing space requirements, enhance safety, and integrate modern educational facilities. A comprehensive approach was used, including analysis of historical enrollment data, evaluation of current space utilization, and collection of feedback through surveys and interviews with students, faculty, and administrators. Statistical techniques were applied to forecast enrollment trends and perform a cost-benefit analysis to determine financial viability. The results indicated a notable increase in deteriorating classrooms, leading to overcrowding, decreased quality of education, and safety issues. The COVID-19 pandemic further limited maintenance activities, accelerating the decline of classroom conditions. The findings highlight the urgent need for regular maintenance, repair work, and long-term infrastructure planning. Constructing a new building emerged as a crucial solution to support academic growth, provide a safe and conducive learning environment, and align with NEUST's institutional goals. The study offers strategic recommendations for optimizing space and improving campus facilities.

© 2025 The Authors. Published by IASE. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

For almost a century, the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST) San Isidro Campus has been a fundamental educational institution in the province of Nueva Ecija. It has functioned as a productive educational institution for several stakeholders, providing them with the information and abilities essential to succeed in a constantly changing world (Adel, 2024). Nevertheless, the organization is now facing a crucial point in its development, as it must address difficulties that need a significant and fundamental change: The construction of a new structure (Dabić, 2024).

The existing structure, while previously sufficient, has now become totally inadequate to serve the rapidly growing number of students

(Dominguez and Ueno, 2025). The exponential growth in enrollment numbers in the previous decade has resulted in significant pressure on current infrastructure, resulting in congestion and unconducive learning environments (Nyiwul, 2021). Classrooms that were formerly sufficiently large are now overcrowded, impeding the ability to teach and learn effectively (Shanta and Wells, 2022). Students have difficulties in locating accessible areas for studying and collaborating, which negatively impacts the overall academic ambiance of the campus (Kumaran et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the declining condition of the structure presents significant safety risks. The object's structural integrity has been significantly compromised due to many years of use, leading to noticeable evidence of decay (Hassani and Dackermann, 2023). Cracked walls, leaky roofs, and antiquated electrical systems are signs of significant risk to the safety of students, instructors, and staff (Garcia-Diaz and Smith, 2024). Accidents and property damage pose a significant threat to the campus community (Smith et al., 2023). Given the extensive nature of these structural issues, refurbishment would be a costly and time-

* Corresponding Author.

Email Address: zedka_jen27@yahoo.com (J. C. Mina)

<https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2025.09.002>

Corresponding author's ORCID profile:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0081-8326>

2313-626X/© 2025 The Authors. Published by IASE.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

consuming process that may not fully address the underlying problems (Fang et al., 2022).

An exhaustive evaluation of the building's state has determined that the magnitude of the damage is so substantial that the cost and duration of repairs would be unaffordable and time-consuming (Amran et al., 2022). Allocating significant resources towards renovating a deteriorating building would eventually serve as a temporary measure since it would not effectively tackle the fundamental issues of insufficient space and safety problems (Lehmann, 2021). Constructing a new institution is the only feasible and enduring course of action (Beckert, 2022). An up-to-date, meticulously planned structure would provide enough room to handle the expanding student body, guaranteeing each student access to superior educational settings.

Additionally, it would be highly important to ensure safety and accessibility, therefore fostering an environment favorable for teaching, research, and student growth (Chan, 2023). In addition, constructing a new building provides a chance to integrate cutting-edge technology and environmentally friendly characteristics (Pan and Zhang, 2023), establishing NEUST San Isidro Campus as a frontrunner in educational advancement. The choice to create a new structure is not only a physical project but a strategic investment in the institution's future and the community it serves (Nasta and Cundari, 2024). The objective is to provide students with an exceptional learning experience that enables them to achieve their maximum potential (Jaboob et al., 2025). Constructing a new facility would enhance NEUST San Isidro Campus's status as a distinguished institution of higher education and sustain its beneficial influence on the students and the whole community (Tiyanes and Ponsades, 2024). The objective of this study was to conduct a feasibility analysis for the reengineering of the NEUST San Isidro Campus building. It aimed to identify the specific requirements and design considerations for a new structure that will meet the campus's growing needs, enhance safety, and integrate modern educational facilities.

2. Methodology

This feasibility study utilized a multifaceted method to assess the viability of constructing a new building for the NEUST San Isidro Campus. This indicates that the case study was performed at NEUST San Isidro Campus at Jose Abad Santos Avenue, San Isidro, Nueva Ecija, Philippines. The NEUST commenced in June 1908 as a vocational program at the Wright Institute in San Isidro, Nueva Ecija, where young Filipinos received training in carpentry and fundamental telegraphy. The aforementioned vocational training continued until 1927–1928, when the general secondary school relocated to Cabanatuan City. This indicates that the geography of the case study was the first campus of NEUST, and the focus of the Project Feasibility Study

was the initial building on this campus. The primary objective of this study was to determine if a new structure could effectively address the campus's growing needs, enhance safety, and incorporate modern educational facilities.

This study involved data collection that analyzed historical enrollment data to predict future student population growth, assessed current space utilization and faculty workload, and gathered financial information about construction costs and potential funding sources (Jones, 2025).

The researchers also utilized stakeholder engagement by conducting surveys and interviews with students, faculty, and administrators to gather their perspectives on campus conditions and safety concerns. They desired features in a new building (Marks and Al-Ali, 2022).

Data analysis, which utilized statistical techniques to forecast enrollment trends and conduct a cost-benefit analysis to evaluate the project's financial feasibility, was also employed in this study (Senić et al., 2025).

Lastly, the viability of the new construction project was evaluated according to its capacity to fulfill anticipated spatial demands, guarantee financial viability, emphasize safety and accessibility, conform to educational objectives, and cater to the interests and desires of stakeholders (Effiong, 2025).

3. Results and discussion

This section presents the findings obtained from the primary research instrument, which was designed to identify the viability of establishing a new building in front of the NEUST San Isidro Campus. The data was collected through focus group discussions and was analyzed using descriptive statistics.

With 13 classrooms overall, the College of Education (COED) Building is notable based on Table 1. By comparison, the Laboratory High School Building features the fewest classrooms, just 8. With an average floor size per classroom of 819.00 square meters, the COED Building once more leads in spaciousness. The College of Management and Business Technology (CMBT) building closely follows, with 567.00 square meters per classroom. Conversely, with an average floor area of 315.00 square meters per classroom, the ICT Building boasts the least Effective space distribution in educational buildings, which is essential to establishing ideal learning conditions. Research indicates that the average size of each classroom and the number of classes can significantly affect the level of comfort experienced by teachers and pupils and the quality of education (Huang et al., 2022). Analyzing several buildings inside a school reveals different ways of using space, each with particular effects on academic performance (Rocha and Figueira, 2025). On the other hand, the Laboratory High School Building boasts only eight classrooms, the lowest count among all the buildings. This lower count could point to a more focused instructional

strategy, incorporating, maybe, specialized classes that require less physical space. Facilities with fewer classrooms often concentrate on specialized or advanced instruction, according to [Luchenko and Kovinko's \(2024\)](#) research, which can be helpful given the lower student-to-instructor ratio.

Conversely, with its 315.00 square meters average floor space per classroom, the ICT Building

boasts the lowest. Though smaller than in the COED and CMBT buildings, the classroom sizes in this building are suitable for computer-based learning environments requiring individual workstations ([Swart and MacLeod, 2021](#)). The modest area could reflect the particular emphasis of ICT education, which calls for fewer students to enable ideal hands-on instruction.

Table 1: The current profile of the San Isidro campus in terms of the number of classrooms

Building	Number of classrooms	Average floor area
Laboratory high school building	8	504.00 m ²
CMBT building (front building)	9	567.00 m ²
ICT building	5	315.00 m ²
COED building	13	819.00 m ²
Total	35	2,205.00 m ²

According to the Philippine Building Code, the standard classroom size is approximately 63 square meters. This is typically measured as 7.00 meters × 9.00 meters, with dimensions taken from the center of the walls

Students enrolled over several academic years and semesters are listed in [Table 2](#). Student enrollment has exhibited swings overall; some years indicate rises, and others show falls. Usually, for most academic years, the First Semester has more enrollment than the Second Semester. This is especially clear in the years 2013–2014, 2014–2015, 2018–2019, and 2021–2022. There are, nevertheless, certain exceptions where the enrollment numbers for the first and second

semesters are somewhat similar: 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2020–2021. Unlike 2013–2014 and 2018–2019, which saw a rather higher number of students registered during the summer semester, summer enrollment has been continuously low. Although student enrollment has changed over time, generally, the pattern shows a slight rise in student population. More research is required to pinpoint the fundamental causes of these variations and create plans for preserving and raising enrollment.

Table 2: Student's historical profile

Academic year	1st semester	2nd semester	Summer
2013 – 2014	2,559	2,205	122
2014 – 2015	2,921	2,573	6
2015 – 2016	3,215	2,302	
2016 – 2017	2,400	2,302	
2017 – 2018	1,831	1,810	
2018 – 2019	2,203	1,916	247
2019 – 2020	2,302	2,079	
2020 – 2021	2,391	2,235	
2021 – 2022	2,448	2,123	
2022 – 2023	2,371	2,054	
2023 – 2024	2,371	2,280	

Various elements can affect student enrollment patterns in educational institutions: Economic situation, institutional repute, program offers, and demographic developments ([Cox, 2021](#)). Although the general tendency in many academic environments shows a minor rise in student population, variances are typical due to these external and internal factors ([Balalle, 2024](#)). Economic downturns, for example, can cause lower enrollment if families prioritize financial stability above education ([Al Khalili, 2025](#)). Furthermore, the

reputation of a university and the perceived quality of its programs influence student decisions; colleges with high ratings frequently see either more consistent or rising enrollment levels ([Plata, 2025](#)).

[Table 3](#) shows a notable difference between the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology San Isidro Campus to the global average of the actual student-to-classroom space ratio and the advised range of 2.5–3.0 square meters per student for institutions ([Ready et al, 2004](#)).

Table 3: Classroom ratio analysis according to m²

Academic year	Average number of enrollees	Ratio per m ²
2013 – 2014	2,559	0.86
2014 – 2015	2,921	0.75
2015 – 2016	3,215	0.69
2016 – 2017	2,400	0.92
2017 – 2018	1,831	1.20
2018 – 2019	2,203	1.00
2019 – 2020	2,302	0.96
2020 – 2021	2,391	0.92
2021 – 2022	2,448	0.90
2022 – 2023	2,371	0.93
2023 – 2024	2,371	0.93

The ratio continually exceeds the ideal across all academic years, implying a lack of classroom capacity to handle the rising student enrollment. With just 0.69 square meters of classroom space available per student, the academic year 2015–2016 boasts the lowest ratio recorded—0.69. It is below the advised level, causing congestion, discomfort, and hampered learning (Kanwal and bashir, 2022). Furthermore, exposing a changing pattern in the ratio over the years is the data. Some years show development, while others show a fall. This mismatch points to insufficient, consistent planning and resource allocation to handle the rising student population and guarantee enough classroom space (Yangambi, 2023). The study finds the university's

classroom space to be seriously lacking. The learning environment, student comfort, and general educational quality (Guan and Scott, 2024) suffer from this insufficient room per student. The institution should expand classroom facilities or use techniques to prioritize current space to solve this problem (Dearborn and Braun, 2025). Long-term planning and resource allocation are also crucial to ensure the institution can sustain a suitable learning environment for its students and handle upcoming expansion (Lo, 2024).

Table 4 shows a persistent difference between the suggested 1:40 ratio and the actual student-to-classroom ratio at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, San Isidro Campus.

Table 4: Classroom ratio analysis according to the number of students

Academic year	Average number of enrollees	Ratio per classroom (Average number of students per classroom)
2013 – 2014	2,559	73
2014 – 2015	2,921	83
2015 – 2016	3,215	92
2016 – 2017	2,400	69
2017 – 2018	1,831	52
2018 – 2019	2,203	63
2019 – 2020	2,302	66
2020 – 2021	2,391	68
2021 – 2022	2,448	70
2022 – 2023	2,371	68
2023 – 2024	2,371	68

The average number of student-learners in a classroom throughout all academic years much exceeds the ideal, suggesting a shortage of classroom capacity to handle the rising student count. Far above the advised limit, 92 students per classroom in the school year 2015–2016 is the highest ratio noted. Although the ratio has changed over time, generally, the tendency points to a continuous difficulty in keeping enough classrooms to satisfy the growing student demand. Lessening of classroom space for higher education influences quality, student comfort, and learning (Ikram and Kenayathulla, 2023). Over the years, classroom-to-student ratio fluctuations have highlighted the challenges of maintaining adequate classrooms to meet student demand (Preña and Labayo, 2024). This study addresses the consequences of insufficient classroom space and provides strategies for universities to maximize space plans and distribute resources to fit future expansion.

Because students may have few chances for involvement and engagement, overcrowded classrooms often lower the quality of instruction and learning (Makena, 2025). Studies show that crowding can lead to higher noise levels and distractions, impairing instructors' ability to run their courses and students' ability to concentrate (Adsız and Dinçer, 2025). Moreover, limited classroom space can make students uncomfortable, leading to discontent and reduced academic performance (Egan et al., 2024).

Enhancing physical infrastructure is a principal method to resolve classroom space challenges (Li and Wise, 2025). Constructing or enlarging

classrooms will help to reduce crowding and offer more favorable learning conditions. Therefore, Long-term planning is necessary to control classroom demand properly and guarantee that colleges can support future expansion (Hoque, 2025).

Table 5 shows a constant difference between the recommended standards and the student-to-classroom ratio. Although the total number of classrooms has stayed relatively steady, the average student count in each classroom consistently exceeds the ideal of forty students. This suggests a shortfall of classroom space to handle the rising student count. Furthermore, the ratio per square meter regularly shows below the advised range of 2.5–3.0, implying insufficient classroom capacity for the enrolled student count. These results emphasize the importance of the institution prioritizing building new classroom facilities or using techniques to maximize current space to guarantee a suitable learning environment for its students.

A good learning environment in higher education depends on maintaining suitable student-to-classroom ratios. Studies repeatedly find that ideal class sizes improve student involvement, contentment, and learning results.

The educational experience can be significantly changed by exceeding the advised student-to-classroom ratio (Kehan et al., 2024). Personalized learning and effective teaching depend on limited student-teacher interactions, which overcrowded classrooms may produce (Bano et al., 2025). Teachers may find it difficult in such settings to run the classroom properly, give each student individualized attention, and include students in

meaningful conversations (Alam and Mohanty, 2023). Furthermore, large student-to-classroom ratios could cause distractions and higher noise levels, impairing concentration and learning (Gervas, 2024). Larger class sizes have also significantly impacted student performance and satisfaction (Carro and Gallardo, 2024). Students in packed

classrooms reported lower degrees of happiness and engagement, which are vital elements of academic achievement, Johnson (2025) discovered. These results imply that preserving high-quality education and favorable student outcomes depends on keeping a suitable student-to-classroom ratio (Brown et al., 2023).

Table 5: Campus profile analysis according to the ratio of the students and m²

Academic year	Number of classrooms	Ratio according to class size	Ratio according to m ²
2013 – 2014	35	73	0.86
2014 – 2015	35	83	0.75
2015 – 2016	35	92	0.69
2016 – 2017	35	69	0.92
2017 – 2018	35	52	1.20
2018 – 2019	35	63	1.00
2019 – 2020	35	66	0.96
2020 – 2021	35	68	0.92
2021 – 2022	35	70	0.90
2022 – 2023	35	68	0.93
2023 – 2024	35	68	0.93

Expanding classroom facilities to fit rising student counts is part of long-term fixes (Kolié et al., 2023). This could involve constructing new buildings, adding more classes to existing structures, or using underused areas (Grazuleviciute-Vileniske and Zmejauskaite, 2025). Strategic planning and resource allocation should also be activities of universities to guarantee they can sustainably support their academic programs and future expansion (Kayyali, 2025).

Table 6 shows a worrying pattern of reducing operable classrooms at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology for the past ten years. Although the overall count of classrooms has stayed

the same, the number of run-down classrooms has continuously climbed, lowering the accurate count of usable classrooms. The university may suffer from overcrowding, worse educational quality, higher maintenance costs, and safety issues resulting from the lack of suitable classrooms. The COVID-19 epidemic has probably accelerated the drop since maintenance and repairs under lockdowns and limitations are difficult.

The institution should give constant maintenance and repairs of current classrooms top priority, as well as long-term planning and resource allocation to guarantee a suitable learning environment for its students.

Table 6: Comparative analysis of the current number of classrooms versus the actual number of classrooms

Academic year	Number of classrooms	Dilapidated number of classrooms	The actual number of serviceable classrooms
2013 – 2014	35	0	35
2014 – 2015	35	1	34
2015 – 2016	35	2	33
2016 – 2017	35	3	32
2017 – 2018	35	4	31
2018 – 2019	35	4	31
2019 – 2020	35	5	30
2020 – 2021	35	5	30
2021 – 2022	35	9	26
2022 – 2023	35	9	26
2023 – 2024	35	9	26

The drop in classroom quality might affect the morale and drive of professors and students (Manueke and Tung, 2024). While declining circumstances could cause emotions of indifference and apathy, studies have demonstrated that well-kept and aesthetically beautiful learning spaces favorably influence student attitudes and actions (Buttazzoni et al., 2023). When faculty members are educated in inadequate conditions, they may become more stressed and frustrated, influencing their job satisfaction and teaching efficacy (Bange et al., 2025).

Maintaining classroom infrastructure has been more difficult due to the COVID-19 epidemic (Musikavanhu and Scheepers, 2024). Lockdowns, social distancing rules, and financial restrictions

have upset routine maintenance plans and postponed repairs (Huderek-Glapska and Antczak, 2025). The epidemic caused budget cuts for many organizations, limiting the money available for maintenance and infrastructure upgrades (Arapis and Chatterjee, 2025). Consequently, the number of deteriorated and unserviceable classrooms has grown, aggravating problems with safety and congestion.

4. Conclusion and recommendations

The analysis of classroom space utilization at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology reveals a significant shortfall in capacity regarding the number of classrooms and their size. The

persistent decline in serviceable classrooms due to dilapidation further exacerbates this issue. The current situation has negative implications for the quality of education, student comfort, and overall campus efficiency. To address these challenges, the university should prioritize constructing a new building. This investment will provide additional classroom space and alleviate the burden of maintaining and retrofitting existing dilapidated buildings. A new building can be designed with modern infrastructure, adequate ventilation, lighting, and other essential amenities, creating a more conducive learning environment for students.

Moreover, a new building can reduce operational costs associated with maintaining aging infrastructure. The university can streamline operations and improve efficiency by consolidating resources and facilities into a modern, well-designed building. This can free up funds for other critical areas, such as academic programs, faculty development, and student support services. In conclusion, constructing a new building is a strategic investment that can significantly improve the quality of education at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology. By addressing the current shortage of classroom space and providing a modern, well-equipped learning environment, the university can enhance student satisfaction, improve academic outcomes, and strengthen its reputation as a leading institution of higher education.

Compliance with ethical standards

Ethical considerations

The study adhered to ethical research standards. Participation in surveys, interviews, and focus group discussions was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. Responses were treated with confidentiality and anonymity.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Adel A (2024). The convergence of intelligent tutoring, robotics, and IoT in smart education for the transition from Industry 4.0 to 5.0. *Smart Cities*, 7(1): 325-369. <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities7010014>
- Adsız M and Dinçer S (2025). The analysis of classroom management challenges faced by teachers in online classrooms. *TechTrends*, 69: 345-361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01042-8>
- Al Khalili T (2025). Parental strategies and educational inequalities during severe economic, political and refugee crises in conflict-affected Lebanon. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 26: 553-566. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-025-10040-7>
- Alam A and Mohanty A (2023). Facial analytics or virtual avatars: competencies and design considerations for student-teacher interaction in AI-powered online education for effective classroom engagement. In: Tomar RS, Verma S, Chaurasia BK, Singh V, Abawajy JH, Akashe S, Hsiung PA, and Prasad R (Eds.), *International conference on communication, networks and computing*: 252-265. Springer, Cham, Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43145-6_21
- Amran M, Huang SS, Onaizi AM, Murali G, and Abdelgader HS (2022). Fire spalling behavior of high-strength concrete: A critical review. *Construction and Building Materials*, 341: 127902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2022.127902>
- Arapis T and Chatterjee V (2025). Analysing cutback management strategies amidst the COVID 19 pandemic: Insights from Pennsylvania municipalities. *Public Money and Management*, 45(1): 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2024.2305681>
- Balalle H (2024). Exploring student engagement in technology-based education in relation to gamification, online/distance learning, and other factors: A systematic literature review. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 9: 100870. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100870>
- Bange J, Gao W, and Crawford K (2025). Graduate nurses' experience of support, training, and education during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study. *Collegian*, 32(2): 120-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2025.02.002>
- Bano S, Minaz M, and Idris M (2025). Overcrowded classroom: Challenges for elementary school teachers. *ProScholar Insights*, 4(1): 8-17. <https://doi.org/10.62997/psi.2025a-41036>
- Beckert J (2022). Durable wealth: Institutions, mechanisms, and practices of wealth perpetuation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 48(1): 233-255. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-030320-115024>
- Brown LE, Kim HY, Tubbs Dolan C, Brown A, Sklar J, and Aber JL (2023). Remedial programming and skill-targeted SEL in low-income and crisis-affected contexts: Experimental evidence from Niger. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 16(4): 583-614. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2022.2139785>
- Buttazzoni A, Ferguson KN, and Gilliland J (2023). Barriers to and facilitators of active travel from the youth perspective: A qualitative meta-synthesis. *SSM-Population Health*, 22: 101369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2023.101369> PMID:36909930 PMCID:PMC9996358
- Carro JM and Gallardo P (2024). Effect of class size on student achievement in the COVID-19 "new normal." *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 76(2): 303-318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/boer.12426>
- Chan CKY (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20: 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3>
- Cox J (2021). The higher education environment driving academic library strategy: A political, economic, social and technological (PEST) analysis. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(1): 102219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102219>
- Dabić M (2024). Science, technology and innovation policies in the European Union: Paradigm shifts. In: Dabić M, Švarc J, and Daim TU (Eds.), *Digital entrepreneurship in science, technology and innovation*: 20-43. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035311422.00008>
- Dearborn C and Braun J (2025). Space and pedagogy: A survey of special collections instructional spaces. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 51(2): 103006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2025.103006>
- Dominguez R and Ueno K (2025). Organizational constraints on campus support programs: A case for former foster care

- youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 168: 108036. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilcyouth.2024.108036>
- Effiong CJ (2025). Climate justice in land use planning: Exploring the potential and challenges of nature-based solutions integration in Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 377: 124717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2025.124717> PMID:40020374
- Egan CA, Orendorff K, Merica CB, and Brush CJ (2024). Movement, my favourite thing: Children's perceptions of movement integration in school. *Curriculum Studies in Health and Physical Education*, 1: 19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25742981.2024.2374321>
- Fang C, Wang W, Qiu C, Hu S, MacRae GA, and Eatherton MR (2022). Seismic resilient steel structures: A review of research, practice, challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, 191: 107172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2022.107172>
- Garcia-Diaz A and Smith JM (2024). Final synthesis. In: Garcia-Diaz A and Smith JM (Eds.), *Facilities planning and design*: 501-536. Springer, Cham, Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54259-6_12
- Gervas I (2024). Educational quality management in public and private secondary schools under SEDP II: A case of selected secondary schools in Morogoro Region, Tanzania. *Global Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(6): 246-258. <https://doi.org/10.36348/gajhss.2024.v06i06.001>
- Grazuleviciute-Vileniske I and Zmejauskaite D (2025). 'Archeology' of hidden values of underutilized historic industrial sites in context of urban regeneration and nature-based solutions. *Buildings*, 15(2): 205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15020205>
- Guan W and Scott T (2024). An examination of students' perspectives of medical English course quality in Guangdong medical universities. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2024.2368074> PMID:38896532
- Hassani S and Dackermann U (2023). A systematic review of advanced sensor technologies for non-destructive testing and structural health monitoring. *Sensors*, 23(4): 2204. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23042204> PMID:36850802 PMID:PMC9965987
- Hoque KE (2025). Introduction changing roles of educational managers. In: Hoque KE (Ed.), *The changing roles of educational managers: Essential skills in an era of rapid change*: 1-23. Springer, Singapore, Singapore. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-1086-0>
- Huang Y, Richter E, Kleickmann T, and Richter D (2022). Class size affects preservice teachers' physiological and psychological stress reactions: An experiment in a virtual reality classroom. *Computers and Education*, 184: 104503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104503>
- Huderek-Glapska S and Antczak D (2025). Attitudes of airline passengers under uncertainty: A case study of the COVID-19 pandemic in Poland. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 124: 102734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2024.102734>
- Ikram M and Kenayathulla HB (2023). Education quality and student satisfaction nexus using instructional material, support, classroom facilities, equipment and growth: Higher education perspective of Pakistan. *Frontiers in Education*, 8: 1140971. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1140971>
- Jaboob M, Hazaimah M, and Al-Ansi AM (2025). Integration of generative AI techniques and applications in student behavior and cognitive achievement in Arab higher education. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 41(1): 353-366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2300016>
- Johnson JC (2025). My journey from educator to a teacher support role: Empowering student success beyond the classroom. In: West EK (Ed.), *Former educators' roles in supporting student growth and learning*: 229-244. IGI Global, Pennsylvania, USA. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6427-7.ch009>
- Jones RP (2025). Capacity planning (capital, staff and costs) of inpatient maternity services: Pitfalls for the unwary. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(1): 87. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22010087> PMID:39857540 PMID:PMC11764809
- Kanwal A and Bashir R (2022). Classroom dynamics in government special education institutions for students with hearing impairment in Punjab-Pakistan. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 3(3): 867-878. [https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2022\(3-III\)81](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2022(3-III)81)
- Kayyali M (2025). A practical guide to strategic planning in higher education. In: Kayyali M (Ed.), *Building organizational capacity and strategic management in academia*: 1-34. IGI Global, Pennsylvania, USA. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6967-8.ch001>
- Kehan L, Kaur A, Yu Z, Yuzhen H, Yuchong H, Yinuo Z, and Noman M (2024). Seat selection as a function of cultural and individual differences: Insights from undergraduate students in China. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 12: 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninginquiry.12.7>
- Kolié D, Van De Pas R, Codjia L, and Zurn P (2023). Increasing the availability of health workers in rural sub-Saharan Africa: A scoping review of rural pipeline programmes. *Human Resources for Health*, 21: 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-023-00801-z> PMID:36918864 PMID:PMC10013286
- Kumaran M, Farnum C, Gupta A, and Levesque L (2025). Marginalized graduate students navigating the academy during the COVID-19 pandemic: A phenomenological approach. *College and Research Libraries*, 86(2): 209-234. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.86.2.209>
- Lehmann S (2021). Growing biodiverse urban futures: Renaturalization and rewilding as strategies to strengthen urban resilience. *Sustainability*, 13(5): 2932. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052932>
- Li F and Wise AF (2025). From filling gaps to amplifying strengths: Exploring an asset-based approach to learning analytics. In the 15th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference, Association for Computing Machinery, Dublin, Ireland: 924-930. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706468.3706542>
- Lo LS (2024). Transforming academic librarianship through AI reskilling: Insights from the GPT-4 exploration program. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 50(3): 102883. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2024.102883>
- Luchenko O and Kovinko K (2024). Exploring staffing patterns and multilingual classrooms in teaching Japanese as a foreign language. In the Society, Integration, Education: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference, Rēzekne, Latvia, 2: 198-212. <https://doi.org/10.17770/sie2024vol2.7891>
- Makena B (2025). Congested lectures: A case for educational quality. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 8(1): 151-165. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2025.9>
- Manueke JML and Tung KY (2024). The implementation of transformational leadership and teacher work engagement on increasing number of students: Transformational leadership, principal, teacher work engagement, student enrollment. *Journal of Education Research*, 5(4): 6696-6704. <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v5i4.905>
- Marks A and Al-Ali M (2022). Digital transformation in higher education: A framework for maturity assessment. In: Alaali M (Ed.), *COVID-19 challenges to university information technology governance*: 61-81. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13351-0_3

- Musikavanhu TB and Scheepers EI (2024). A systematic literature review of synchronous e-learning challenges in higher education institutions in developing nations during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Acta Educationis Generalis*, 14(3): 121-137. <https://doi.org/10.2478/atd-2024-0023>
- Nasta L and Cundari V (2024). Aligning multinational corporate strategies with sustainable development goals: A case study of an Italian energy firm's initiatives in developing markets. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 31(5): 3902-3915. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2779>
- Nyiwul L (2021). COVID-19 regulatory responses and FDI in the United States: Trends and implications for capital flows. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 13(2): 156-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19186444.2021.1934361>
- Pan Y and Zhang L (2023). Integrating BIM and AI for smart construction management: Current status and future directions. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 30(2): 1081-1110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11831-022-09830-8>
- Plata C (2025). Mission statement on the higher education system in Colombia and its relationship with its quality. In: Saeed S, Rana O, and Dhanaraj RK (Eds.), *Higher education and quality assurance practices*: 159-190. IGI Global, Pennsylvania, USA. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6765-0.ch006>
- Preña EM and Labayo CP (2024). Policy responses to extreme heat and its impact on education: The Philippine experience. *Policy Futures in Education*, 23(3): 652-675. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103241288276>
- Ready DD, Lee VE, and Welner KG (2004). Educational equity and school structure: School size, overcrowding, and schools-within-schools. *Teachers College Record*, 106(10): 1989-2014. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810410601005>
- Rocha B and Figueira Á (2025). Post, predict, and rank: Exploring the relationship between social media strategy and higher education institution rankings. *Informatics*, 12(1): 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics12010006>
- Senić A, Ivanović M, Dobrodolac M, and Stojadinović Z (2025). Prioritization of preventive measures: A multi-criteria approach to risk mitigation in road infrastructure projects. *Mathematics*, 13(2): 278. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math13020278>
- Shanta S and Wells JG (2022). T/E design based learning: Assessing student critical thinking and problem solving abilities. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 32: 267-285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-020-09608-8>
- Smith K, Fearnley CJ, Dixon D, Bird DK, and Kelman I (2023). *Environmental hazards: Assessing risk and reducing disaster*. Routledge, London, UK. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351261647>
- Swart W and MacLeod K (2021). Evaluating learning space designs for flipped and collaborative learning: A transactional distance approach. *Education Sciences*, 11(6): 292. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11060292>
- Tiyanes TMM and Ponsades OP (2024). Employment journey of technical teachers: Stories to tell. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, 10(3): 239-277. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejsss.v10i3.1820>
- Yangambi M (2023). Impact of school infrastructures on students learning and performance: Case of three public schools in a developing country. *Creative Education*, 14(4): 788-809. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2023.144052>