

Budget Management and Financial Reporting Practices of Campus Organizations

MC. DENVER E. ARENAS¹, JESUS REMAR C. DASSUN, DBA²

^{1,2} *Institute of Graduate and Advanced Studies, Urdaneta City University*

Abstract- This study sought to analyze the financial reporting and budget management practices of Urdaneta City University campus organizations regarding budget planning, budget preparation, budget execution, and accountability. For the purpose to improve financial management and reporting systems, it specifically aimed to ascertain the degree to which these practices are adopted by campus groups. A quantitative descriptive research design was employed, involving thirty-one (31) duly elected presidents and treasurers of recognized campus organizations during the Academic Year 2025–2026. Data was gathered using a structured questionnaire with a four-point Likert scale and analyzed through weighted mean. Results revealed that all indicators across the four domains were interpreted as “Highly Practiced,” indicating strong financial management and reporting practices. Budget execution and accountability were particularly evident in proper documentation and adviser review, while areas for improvement included environmental scanning, detailed budget formulation, and analytical financial evaluation. The study concluded that although practices are generally strong, further enhancement of strategic and analytical financial skills is necessary for improved organizational sustainability.

Index Terms- Accountability, Budget Execution, Budget Management, Budget Planning, Budget Preparation, Financial Reporting

I. INTRODUCTION

Budget management and financial reporting practices are widely recognized in international literature as essential pillars of organizational governance, particularly in educational institutions where student organizations are entrusted with managing limited, however, significant financial resources. Globally, Darteh (2023) emphasizes that effective budget planning, preparation, execution, and accountability promote transparency, financial discipline, and sustainability in organizational operations. The study of Uleh et al. (2025) further underscores that organizations with structured budgeting systems and

reliable financial reporting mechanisms are better able to allocate resources efficiently, minimize financial risks, and strengthen stakeholder trust. In this sense, budget management ensures that financial resources are strategically planned and allocated, while financial reporting guarantees that these resources are properly documented, monitored, and evaluated for accountability and continuous improvement.

In the Philippine context, existing studies reveal that while student organizations and educational institutions generally practice basic budgeting and reporting procedures, challenges remain in strengthening financial forecasting, documentation accuracy, and analytical reporting (Alba et al., 2026; Belandres, 2021; Tuliao, et al., 2021; Smith, 2019). Budget execution and accountability are often implemented through adviser oversight and routine reporting; however, deeper financial analysis and long-term evaluation are less emphasized. These findings suggest that although compliance with financial procedures exists, there is still a need to enhance financial literacy and strategic financial management among student leaders.

Within Pangasinan and similar local higher education settings, limited studies indicate that campus organizations often prioritize short term budget execution over comprehensive planning and systematic financial evaluation (Belandres, 2018; Long, 2018; Salman, et al., 2023). While basic reporting and documentation practices are observed, weaknesses remain in integrating budget planning with accountability mechanisms. This reflects a broader regional pattern of procedural compliance rather than advanced financial analysis and strategic budgeting.

Despite these insights, a significant research gap remains in the integrated examination of budget planning, preparation, execution, and accountability within campus organizations at Urdaneta City University. Theseing literature rarely consolidates these dimensions into a unified framework, and there is limited empirical evidence on how student organizations operationalize both budget management and financial reporting in practice. Additionally, the specific dynamics of financial decision making among student leaders remain underexplored.

This study is significant as it provides empirical evidence on the financial management and reporting practices of campus organizations at UCU. The findings may enhance financial literacy, strengthen accountability systems, and improve organizational efficiency. Moreover, the study may guide university administrators and organization advisers in developing targeted interventions and policies that promote responsible budget management and transparent financial reporting, ultimately fostering more sustainable and well-being student organizations.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to examine the budget management and financial reporting practices of campus organizations at UCU. A total population approach was utilized, involving all 31 duly elected presidents or treasurers of recognized campus organizations during the Academic Year 2025–2026. The respondents were selected due to their direct involvement in organizational financial management and reporting activities. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire utilizing a four-point Likert scale to determine the extent to which financial management practices were implemented. The instrument covered the dimensions of budget planning, budget preparation, budget execution, and accountability. Descriptive statistical tools, particularly the weighted mean, were employed to analyze and interpret the data systematically.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Budget Management and Financial Reporting Practices of Campus Organizations

Table I: Weighted Mean on Budget Management and Financial Reporting Practices of Campus Organizations in terms of Budget Planning

Indicators	WM	DE
<i>Our organization</i>		
... conducts regular meetings to discuss and plan the annual budget before the fiscal year starts.	3.21	Practiced
... involves members and advisers in planning discussions for transparency and input.	3.22	Practiced
... documents planning decisions, including justifications for estimated figures.	3.42	Highly Practiced
... aligns budget planning with organizational goals and university policies.	3.55	Highly Practiced
... identifies and evaluates potential funding sources during planning meetings (e.g., membership fees or sponsorships).	3.58	Highly Practiced

... monitors external trends (e.g., economic changes) that could affect funding availability.	3.06	Practiced
... assesses financial risks associated with funding sources during planning.	3.24	Practiced
... estimates income from diverse sources, such as event revenues and university allocations.	3.58	Highly Practiced
... estimates expenses based on historical data and upcoming activities (e.g., events or supplies).	3.42	Highly Practiced
... revises planning estimates quarterly based on new information or feedback.	3.30	Highly Practiced
Average Weighted Mean	3.36	Highly Practiced

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 - Not Practiced; 1.76 - 2.50 - Slightly Practiced; 2.51 - 3.25 - Practiced; 3.26 - 4.00 - Highly Practiced

The findings reveal that the organizations of UCU demonstrate a substantial level of engagement in budget planning, as evidenced by an overall average weighted mean (AWM) of 3.36, interpreted as “Highly Practiced.” This suggests that student-led organizations possess a functional level of financial planning competence, particularly in aligning projected activities with anticipated financial

resources. Notably, the highest-rated indicator, identifying and evaluating potential funding sources, reflects a strong capacity for financial forecasting and resource mobilization. This aligns with the study of Obonyo and Kimutai (2025) on student organization financial management, which emphasizes the importance of diversified funding strategies, including membership fees, sponsorships, and institutional support, as critical to organizational sustainability and operational continuity. Empirical studies in nonprofit and student-led financial governance further support this finding, indicating that proactive resource identification enhances budget reliability and reduces financial uncertainty (Akbar and Indani, 2026; Barr and McClellan, 2018; Smith, 2019; Sarif and Wahdiat, 2024).

Conversely, the lowest-rated indicator, which pertains to monitoring external trends such as economic changes that may influence funding availability (WM = 3.06), while still categorized as “Practiced,” suggests a relative gap in strategic environmental scanning. This implies that although organizations are proficient in internal budgeting processes, they may be less attuned to macro-level financial dynamics that could impact resource inflows. The perspective of Mamat et al. (2021) and Salman, et al. (2023) in financial management underscore the significance of environmental scanning as a component of strategic budgeting, particularly in volatile economic contexts where inflation, policy shifts, and funding reallocations can affect organizational finances. Studies of Liying and Mengying (2024) and Sriyono, et al. (2024) on financial literacy and planning among youth and student leaders highlight that limited exposure to broader economic analysis often constrains the ability to anticipate financial risks and adjust budgets proactively.

The disparity between strong internal financial planning practices and comparatively weaker external awareness suggests an opportunity for institutional intervention through capacity-building initiatives. Training programs focusing on financial literacy, risk assessment, and strategic forecasting could enhance students’ ability to integrate both internal and external financial considerations into their budgeting processes. Furthermore, the study of Aiel, et al.

(2025) on governance in campus organizations indicates that embedding structured financial planning frameworks, including periodic financial reviews and scenario analysis, can significantly improve budget responsiveness and sustainability. Hence, the data reflects a commendable level of budget planning practice among campus organizations, while also identifying a critical area for development in the integration of environmental and economic awareness into financial decision-making.

Table II: Weighted Mean on Budget Management and Financial Reporting Practices of Campus Organizations in terms of Budget Preparation

Indicators	WM	DE
<i>Our organization</i>		
... prepares a detailed annual budget based on sources and estimations from planning.	3.36	Highly Practiced
... computes total expected income and expenses accurately in the budget.	3.39	Highly Practiced
... involves advisers in reviewing and approving the prepared budget.	3.42	Highly Practiced
... requires officer approval for the total budget amount before implementation.	3.58	Highly Practiced
... documents all computations and allocations for accountability.	3.52	Highly Practiced
... ensures the budget reflects diversification of funding sources for sustainability.	3.52	Highly Practiced
... prioritizes expenditures based on organizational needs and goals.	3.70	Highly Practiced
... appropriates funds by allocating specific amounts to categories (e.g., events or operations).	3.67	Highly Practiced
... allocates resources	3.58	Highly

proportionally to high-priority items in the budget.
 ... communicates the approved total budget amount to all members for awareness.

Average Weighted Mean	3.54	Highly Practiced
-----------------------	------	------------------

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 - Not Practiced; 1.76 - 2.50 - Slightly Practiced; 2.51 - 3.25 - Practiced; 3.26 - 4.00 - Highly Practiced

The presented results demonstrate that organizations at UCU exhibit a high level of competence in budget preparation, as reflected by an overall average weighted mean (AWM) of 3.54, interpreted as “Highly Practiced.” This indicates that financial preparation processes are systematically carried out and embedded within organizational operations. The highest-rated indicator, prioritizing expenditures based on organizational needs and goals (WM = 3.70), highlights a strong adherence to goal-oriented financial management, wherein resources are strategically allocated to support programmatic objectives. This finding is consistent with the findings of Lagoro (2025) on financial management practices and funds management, which underscores prioritization as a core element of effective budgeting, ensuring that limited resources are aligned with mission-critical activities and institutional mandates. Studies further suggest that organizations demonstrating disciplined expenditure prioritization tend to exhibit greater financial efficiency and accountability, as decisions are guided by clearly defined strategic goals (Abiel, et al., 2025; Jalali Aliabadi, et al., 2021; Kalume, et al., 2024).

However, the relatively lower rating for the preparation of a detailed annual budget based on planning estimates (WM = 3.36), although still within the “Highly Practiced” category, reveals a comparative gap in the foundational stage of budget formulation. This suggests that while organizations are proficient in allocating and managing funds, there may be less emphasis on formalizing comprehensive budget documents at the outset of the planning cycle. Existing literature in financial management emphasizes that detailed budget preparation serves as

the backbone of sound fiscal governance, providing a structured framework for forecasting revenues and expenditures, monitoring financial performance, and ensuring transparency (Alba, et al., 2026; Fauzi, et al., 2022; Zarita, et al., 2025). Without a rigorously developed initial budget, organizations may face challenges in tracking variances, justifying expenditures, and maintaining consistency between planned and actual financial activities.

The observed pattern, where execution-oriented practices such as prioritization are more strongly developed than preparatory processes, aligns with findings on youth-led and campus-based organizations, which often report stronger operational decision-making than formal financial documentation skills (Smith, 2019). This may be attributed to limited training in technical budgeting procedures or a greater focus on immediate program implementation. Consequently, strengthening competencies in detailed budget formulation, including the use of planning estimates, financial projections, and standardized budget templates, is essential. Integrating capacity-building initiatives such as financial management workshops and guided budget preparation frameworks can enhance the overall robustness of financial practices. Ultimately, reinforcing the initial stages of budget preparation will complement existing strengths in resource allocation, thereby promoting more comprehensive, transparent, and sustainable financial management among campus organizations.

Table III: Weighted Mean on Budget Management and Financial Reporting Practices of Campus Organizations in terms of Budget Execution

Indicators	WM	DE
<i>Our organization</i>		
... executes the budget based on established priorities and needs.	3.59	Highly Practiced
... disburses funds for expenses in alignment with approved allocations.	3.52	Highly Practiced
... manages spending through controlled purchases	3.45	Highly Practiced

and cash advances.

... monitors expenditures regularly to stay within allotted amounts.	3.33	Highly Practiced
... adjusts allotments for unforeseen needs while maintaining budget integrity.	3.45	Highly Practiced
... ensures purchases are justified and documented (e.g., receipts for supplies).	3.61	Highly Practiced
... tracks cash advances and ensures timely reimbursements.	3.27	Highly Practiced
... involves officers in approving significant expenditures during execution.	3.52	Highly Practiced
... maintains records of all transactions for future reporting.	3.55	Highly Practiced
... evaluates execution progress quarterly to align with the prepared budget.	3.36	Highly Practiced
Average Weighted Mean	3.47	Highly Practiced

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 - Not Practiced; 1.76 - 2.50 - Slightly Practiced; 2.51 - 3.25 - Practiced; 3.26 - 4.00 - Highly Practiced

The presented findings demonstrate that budget execution practices among campus organizations at UCU are performed at a high level, as evidenced by an overall average weighted mean (AWM) of 3.47, interpreted as “Highly Practiced.” This indicates that organizations are generally capable of implementing their planned budgets with a considerable degree of efficiency, control, and accountability. Notably, the highest-rated practice, ensuring that purchases are justified and properly documented, reflects a strong adherence to fundamental principles of financial management, particularly transparency and internal control. This aligns with the study of Salman, et al. (2023), which emphasizes that proper documentation and justification of expenditures are critical in preventing misallocation of funds and ensuring audit readiness. Such practices are also consistent with accountability frameworks in nonprofit and

educational organizations, where financial stewardship is essential to maintaining stakeholder trust and organizational credibility.

Conversely, the lowest-rated indicator, tracking cash advances and ensuring timely reimbursements, although still categorized as “Highly Practiced,” suggests a relative gap in liquidity monitoring and short-term financial control. This finding is significant, as inefficient tracking of cash advances may lead to discrepancies in financial records, delayed reporting, and potential misuse of funds. Recent studies highlight that timely reconciliation of cash transactions is a crucial component of effective financial reporting systems, as it ensures accuracy, prevents fraud, and enhances operational efficiency (Alba, et al., 2026; Liying and Mengying, 2024; Obonyo and Kimutai, 2025; Syarif and Wahdiat, 2024; Zarita, et al., 2025). The relatively lower emphasis on this aspect may indicate procedural delays, limited monitoring mechanisms, or insufficient enforcement of reimbursement policies within campus organizations.

Furthermore, the overall pattern of results suggests that while execution-level controls, such as documentation and approval of expenditures are well established, certain transactional processes require further strengthening to achieve a more comprehensive financial management system. This observation is supported by Abiel, et al. (2025), who argues that effective financial management is not only dependent on strategic planning and allocation but also on the robustness of monitoring and control systems during implementation. In the context of campus organizations, this implies the need for enhanced financial tracking systems, clearer guidelines on cash handling, and possibly the integration of digital tools to streamline reimbursement processes.

Therefore, while budget execution practices at UCU are commendably strong, targeted improvements in cash flow monitoring and reimbursement procedures can further enhance financial accountability, accuracy, and overall organizational efficiency.

Table IV: Weighted Mean on Budget Management and Financial Reporting Practices of Campus Organizations in terms of Accountability

Indicators	WM	DE
<i>Our organization</i>		
... conducts internal audits to verify budget execution and financial accuracy.	3.55	Highly Practiced
... prepares presentations of financial performance for members and advisers.	3.36	Highly Practiced
... submits financial reports to the college as required.	3.55	Highly Practiced
... submits financial reports to CSLD as required.	3.55	Highly Practiced
... generates statements of cash receipts and disbursements for accountability.	3.52	Highly Practiced
... prepares statements of financial position (assets and liabilities) annually.	3.52	Highly Practiced
... reconciles actual cash disbursements and audited cash collections.	3.31	Highly Practiced
... ensures all financial statements are reviewed by advisers for transparency.	3.64	Highly Practiced
... attaches supporting documents (e.g., receipts) to statements for verification.	3.58	Highly Practiced
... compares financial statements across periods to identify trends.	3.21	Practiced
Average Weighted Mean	3.48	Highly Practiced

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 - Not Practiced; 1.76 - 2.50 - Slightly Practiced; 2.51 - 3.25 - Practiced; 3.26 - 4.00 - Highly Practiced

The findings indicate that accountability practices in budget management and financial reporting among campus organizations at UCU are implemented at a high level, as reflected by an overall average weighted mean (AWM) of 3.48, interpreted as “Highly Practiced.” This suggests that student organizations demonstrate a strong commitment to financial transparency, oversight, and responsible

stewardship of funds. The highest-rated indicator, ensuring that all financial statements are reviewed by advisers (WM = 3.64), highlights the critical role of supervisory mechanisms in strengthening financial accountability. Adviser review functions as an internal control measure that promotes accuracy, compliance, and ethical financial practices, aligning with governance principles that emphasize oversight and verification as essential components of sound financial management (Lagoro, 2025). In the context of educational institutions, such practices are as they ensure that financial activities of student organizations remain aligned with institutional policies and standards.

In contrast, the lowest-rated indicator, comparing financial statements across periods to identify trends (WM = 3.21), interpreted as “Practiced”, reveals a relative gap in analytical financial management. While organizations demonstrate competence in preparing and reviewing financial reports, they appear to place less emphasis on longitudinal analysis and performance evaluation. This is a critical observation, as trend analysis is widely recognized in financial literature as a key tool for informed decision-making, enabling organizations to assess financial health, detect inefficiencies, and anticipate future resource needs (Barr and McClellan, 2018; Liying and Mengying, 2024; Sriyono, et al., 2024). The limited focus on this practice may suggest constraints in technical expertise, lack of training in financial analysis, or insufficient emphasis on strategic financial planning within campus organizations.

Moreover, the overall pattern of results suggests that compliance-based accountability practices, such as documentation, reporting, and adviser verification are more strongly institutionalized than analytical and evaluative practices. This finding is consistent with the study of Jalali, et al. (2021) indicating that many small or student-led organizations prioritize procedural compliance over strategic financial analysis due to limited capacity and resources. However, advancing from basic accountability to strategic financial governance requires the integration of analytical tools, such as ratio analysis, variance analysis, and trend evaluation, which enhance the

quality of financial decision-making and organizational sustainability.

Even if the accountability practices among UCU campus organizations are robust and well-established, particularly in terms of oversight and verification, there remains an opportunity to strengthen analytical competencies in financial reporting. Enhancing the practice of comparing financial statements across periods can significantly improve financial insight, promote data-driven decision-making, and ultimately contribute to the long-term sustainability and effectiveness of campus organizations.

IV. CONCLUSION

The findings of the study reveal that organizations at UCU demonstrate a consistently high level of budget management and financial reporting practices across the four domains of budget planning, budget preparation, budget execution, and accountability. The results indicate that these organizations are “Highly Practiced” in managing financial resources, reflecting a strong adherence to fundamental principles of financial governance, transparency, and responsibility. In terms of budget planning, organizations exhibit competence in identifying funding sources, although less emphasis is placed on monitoring external financial trends. For budget preparation, prioritization of expenditure is well established, however, the formal development of comprehensive budget documents requires further strengthening. Budget execution practices are effectively implemented, particularly in ensuring proper documentation and justification of expenses, though improvements are needed in tracking cash advances and reimbursements. Lastly, accountability practices are robust, especially in adviser review of financial statements, but the limited use of comparative financial analysis suggests a gap in strategic financial evaluation. Collectively, these findings imply that while procedural and compliance-based practices are well institutionalized, enhancing analytical and forward-looking financial strategies may further improve organizational sustainability and effectiveness.

V. REFERENCES

- [1] Abiel, P., Warui, F., & Musau, S. (2025). The effect of public budget accountability on operational efficiency of public universities in South Sudan. *International Academic Journal of Economics and Finance (IAJEF)*, 5(1), 451–469.
- [2] Akbar, M., & Indani, F. T. (2026). Systematic literature review: Analysis of research trends and methodologies regarding budgeting and financial analysis practices (2015–2025). *Winter Journal: IMWI Student Research Journal*, 7(1), 23–37.
- [3] Alba, M. J., Lee, A., & Moreno, F. (2026). Fiscal accountability and budget transparency in public higher education: Evidence from financial management practices at a state college in Zamboanga City, Philippines. In *Colloquium Proceedings 2026: Governance, Public Administration, and Policy Innovations in the Zamboanga Peninsula, Philippines* (p. 177).
- [4] Barr, M. J., & McClellan, G. S. (2018). *Budgets and financial management in higher education*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [5] Belandres, E. B. (2018). *Operations management: Quantitative techniques in decision making*.
- [6] Belandres, E. B., & Cristobal, E. C. (2021). Controlling managerial challenges in the local colleges and universities through response-based theory. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 10(5), 361.
- [7] Darteh, M. F. K. (2023). Challenges in revenue and expenditure reporting: Implications for budget management. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Management*, 2(11), 1–8.
- [8] Fauzi, N. A. M., Azhar, Z., & Kishan, K. (2022). Financial management system and the dynamics of university's operations and activities: The case of a Malaysian public university. *Global Business and Management Research*, 14(3s), 1393–1412.
- [9] Jalali Aliabadi, F., Farooq, M. B., Sharma, U., & Mihret, D. G. (2021). Institutional work and the interplay of stability and change in public budgeting reform: The case of public universities in Iran. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 34(4), 786–818.
- [10] Lagoro, J. L. (2025). Budgeting and financial management at Gulu. *Quality in African Higher Education: Development Perspectives from Selected Regions*, 20, 134.
- [11] Liying, H., & Mengying, Z. (2024). How political influence and financial pressure contribute to performance-based budgeting and university performance: Evidence from SEM and NCA. *SAGE Open*, 14(2), 21582440241256637.
- [12] Long, J. (2018). *Effects of responsibility center management system on financial performance indicators among 50 public universities* (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University).
- [13] Mamat, S., Nik Ahmad, N. N., & Mohd Said, J. (2021). Financial sustainability in Malaysian public universities: Coping with or embracing change? *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 33(5), 599–617.
- [14] Obonyo, B. T., & Kimutai, C. (2025). *Budgeting techniques and quality of financial reporting in Nairobi City County, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, Kenyatta University).
- [15] Salman, F., Hashemi, S. A., & Foroghi, D. (2023). Feasibility of establishing operational budgeting in Iraqi public universities. *Risks*, 11(2), 44.
- [16] Smith, D. O. (2019). *University finances: Accounting and budgeting principles for higher education*. JHU Press.
- [17] Sriyono, S., Saepudin, A., Rahmanda, G. A., & Pradessa, S. G. (2024). Optimizing university finances: Implementation of performance-based budgeting at UPN “Veteran” Yogyakarta. *Journal of Business and Information Systems*, 6(2), 197–210.
- [18] Syarif, M., & Wahdiat, I. S. (2024). Implementation of the school budget activity plan application (ARKAS) and the BOS fund management information system on the accountability of BOS financial reporting in education entities in Cirebon City. *Return: Study of Management, Economic and Business*, 3(9), 704–713.
- [19] Tulliao, M. D., Al-Sharif, M. A. B., McNaughtan, J., & Garcia, H. (2021).

Understanding budget cuts within student services in community colleges: A critical review of practical responses for human resource leaders. *Journal of Education Human Resources*, 39(4), 430–451.

- [20] Uleh, A., Asmapane, S., & Setiawati, L. (2025). The influence of employee performance and budget management on the quality of financial reports with the implementation of internal control as a moderating variable at Mulawarman University. *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, 8(3), 14580–14592.
- [21] Zarita, S. S., Agustian, K., Novriza, F., & Saputra, H. (2025). Assessing the effect of budget efficiency on educational staff performance in public universities of West Aceh Regency. *Tadbir: Jurnal Studi Manajemen Pendidikan*, 9(2), 703–734.