



**PHILIPPINE ACCREDITING ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS,
COLLEGES, AND UNIVERSITIES
(PAASCU)**

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION
SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| GUIDE TO PAASCU PROGRAM ACCREDITATION | 3 |
| PREFACE | 3 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 3 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION TO PROGRAM ACCREDITATION | 4 |
| 1.1. Quality Assurance | 4 |
| 1.2. Accreditation | 4 |
| 2. PAASCU ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK | 5 |
| 2.1. Institutional Accreditation Framework | 5 |
| 2.2. Program Accreditation Framework | 5 |
| 3. THE SELF SURVEY REPORT | 6 |
| 4. THE SURVEY VISIT | 9 |
| 5. PAASCU SURVEY REPORT | 9 |
| 6. COMMISSION REVIEW AND BOARD APPROVAL OF ACCREDITING TEAM'S DECISION | 11 |
| 7. FAAP CERTIFICATION OF THE ACCREDITATION LEVEL | 11 |
| 8. ISSUANCE OF REPORT TO THE INSTITUTION | 11 |
| 9. AREAS AND SUB-AREAS | 12 |
| Area 1. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT | 12 |
| Sub-area 1.1 Human Resources | 12 |
| Area 2. TEACHING-LEARNING | 14 |
| Sub-area 2.1 Criminal Justice Education Curricular Program | 14 |
| Sub-area 2.2 Teaching and Learning Methods | 16 |
| Sub-area 2.3 Assessment Methods | 18 |
| Area 3. STUDENT SERVICES | 20 |
| Sub-area 3.1 Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement | 20 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Area 4. EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 22 |
| Sub-area 4.1 Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships | 22 |
| Sub-area 4.2 Community Engagement and Service | 24 |
| | |
| Area 5. RESEARCH | 26 |
| Sub-area 5.1 Research Management and Collaboration | 26 |
| | |
| Area 6. RESULTS | 28 |
| Sub-area 6.1 Educational Results | 28 |
| Sub-area 6.2 Community Engagement and Service Results | 30 |
| Sub-area 6.3 Research Results | 31 |
| | |
| Statistical Summary of Ratings | 34 |

GUIDE TO PAASCU PROGRAM ACCREDITATION

PREFACE

PAASCU's purpose is "to assist and integrate the efforts of schools, colleges and universities to raise the quality of education they offer" (*PAASCU, Articles of Incorporation, 2007*). This purpose is realized through a developmental approach to accreditation of its member school's academic programs. Accreditation involves not only the assessment of the areas pertinent to a particular program of study, i.e., the areas of Teaching-Learning, Resource Management particularly those on Faculty Staff and Laboratories, and Research but in the assessment of the other areas that support it, i.e., the areas of Leadership and Governance, QA Systems, Student Services, and External Relations. PAASCU firmly believes in the interrelationship of these various areas in assuring the quality of the academic programs and ultimately achieving the school's vision-mission. PAASCU believes that the quality of the academic programs is determined by the institution's quality that delivers such programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Board acknowledges the hard work done by the Institutional Accreditation Working Group who drafted the instrument, and the Board of Trustees' Standards Committee.

To ensure alignment, this survey instrument was drafted based on the Institutional Accreditation Instrument by the members of the Commission on Tertiary Education.

1. INTRODUCTION TO PROGRAM ACCREDITATION

1.1. Quality Assurance

According to the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE), Quality assurance *"may relate to a program, an institution or a whole higher education system. In each case, quality assurance is all those attitudes, objects, actions and procedures which, through their existence and use, and together with the quality control activities, ensure that appropriate academic standards are being maintained and enhanced by each program"*. This definition is focusing on ensuring the maintenance and enhancement of standards of quality.

Quality in education is defined and measured in many different ways. It is always a concept with many facets considering different understanding of what constitutes quality and the many aspects of educational objectives, processes, and outcomes that will be assessed using a quality perspective.

PAASCU has a four-fold definition of quality as:

1. Achievement of minimum standards based on learning outcomes
2. Achievement of evidenced excellence based on learning outcomes
3. Institutional implementation of the vision, mission, and goals of the university
4. Responsiveness to stakeholders

This definition states that quality should not only meet standards required by regulatory bodies and those that are considered standards of excellence as determined by PAASCU but encompass a program or an institution's fitness for purpose and how this responds to identified stakeholders.

1.2. Accreditation

"In a number of countries, accreditation schemes have been developed as an instrument to regulate and control the higher education market. There is no generally accepted definition of accreditation in higher education, and in many cases, the term is used also to indicate procedures of recognition of institutions, ex-ante authorisation or licensing of programmes of new providers, approval of nationally controlled curricula, etc. Here, we use a rather pragmatic definition of accreditation, namely the formal and public statement by an external body, resulting from a quality assurance procedure that agreed standards of quality are met by an institution or programme." (*Van Damme, UNESCO Higher Education in the Age of Globalization, 2001*)

PAASCU, as an independent, external agency, is consistent with the above definition, particularly as it accredits a program of studies. However, even if it has done mainly program accreditation, it has always defined accreditation in relation to the institution, i.e., accreditation indicates that the institution has:

1. clearly defined and appropriate objectives
2. established conditions under which they can be achieved

3. that it is substantially achieving them now
4. that it should be able to continue doing so in the future

2. PAASCU ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK

2.1. Institutional Accreditation Framework

In conducting institutional accreditation, the following framework is adopted:

| Strategic and Systemic QA | | Process QA | | Results |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Leadership and Governance | | 4. Teaching-Learning | | 8. Results |
| 2. QA Systems | → | 5. Student Services | → | |
| 3. Resource Management | ← | 6. External Relations | ← | |
| | | 7. Research | | |

The framework above has 8 areas to be assessed in undertaking institutional accreditation categorized into Strategic and Systemic Quality Assurance as inputs, the Process Quality Assurance, and the Results as outputs. The 8 areas are further divided into 23 sub-areas representing principles of quality that must be found in excellent institutions.

2.2. Program Accreditation Framework

The 8 areas and 23 subareas were all looked into when the school initially had its Liberal Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education programs accredited or any program that was accredited by the PAASCU considering all areas and subareas. The accreditation of any of these programs is necessary before undertaking the accreditation of the Criminal Justice Education program. This is the reason why in conducting the accreditation for this program, only the following areas are considered:

- Area 1. Resource Management (1 sub-area)
Sub-area 1.1 Human Resources

- Area 2. Teaching-Learning (3 sub-areas)
Sub-area 2.1 Criminal Justice Education Curricular Program
Sub-area 2.2 Teaching and Learning Methods
Sub-area 2.3 Assessment Methods

- Area 3. Student Services (1 sub-area)
Sub-area 3.1 Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement

- Area 4. External Relations (2 sub-areas)
Sub-area 4.1 Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships
Sub-area 4.2 Community Engagement and Service

- Area 5. Research (1 sub-area)
 - Sub-area 5.1 Research Management and Collaboration

- Area 6. Results (3 sub-areas)
 - Sub-area 6.1 Educational Results
 - Sub-area 6.2 Community Engagement and Service Results
 - Sub-area 6.3 Research Results

It should be noted, however, that the survey visit will be limited to the above areas and sub-areas when an institution has been awarded "clean" accreditation in any of the programs previously visited, i.e., Liberal Arts, etc., and the visit to the Criminal Justice Education program will be conducted in the first 2 years after the awarding of such status. If the survey on this program will be visited 3 years after, the institution will be requested to prepare a Progress Report on the sustained implementation of the recommendations given by the previous survey team in the other areas and sub-areas not included in the above.

3. THE SELF SURVEY REPORT

The first and critical component of the accreditation process is a meticulous, rigorous, and comprehensive self-evaluation of the institution's educational resources, processes, and results. Self-evaluation aims to understand, evaluate, and improve, and not merely to defend what already exists. A well-conducted self-evaluation should result in a renewed effort to reflect on quality assurance practices and outcomes towards ongoing school improvement. The self-evaluation is expected to be an inclusive process. It becomes optimally effective when it is completed by a diverse group of key stakeholders (i.e., administrators, faculty, students, staff, alumni, etc.) who are knowledgeable about the institution and its academic programs as they pertain to the standards under consideration. Stakeholder engagement allows for a fair and objective assessment of how well the institution has achieved its vision, mission, and objectives for self-improvement. The self-survey report and the supporting evidence provide the institution the opportunity to demonstrate to the survey team that it has complied with the standards.

The **self survey report (SSR)** is an account of the institution's QA practices. The institution here refers to the college, school, or department managing the programs under accreditation. The criteria checklist under each area and subarea (standard) provides a guide on what to account for in the institution's quality system.

The SSR shall be written following the sequencing of the area and sub-area. The write-up mainly describes how the institution meets the criteria under each area and sub-area. Therefore, only the sub-area criteria will be rated.

The SSR should be submitted in both hardcopy and softcopy to the PAASCU Secretariat two months before the site visit.

Contents of the Self Survey Report

The SSR has six parts: School Profile, Follow-up Action on the Recommendations of Previous Survey, Analysis of School/Program Practices Using the Standards and Criteria, Conclusion, Appendices, and Summary of Ratings.

Part 1: School Profile

This section provides the following information about the school:

1. A brief history of the school
2. Vision, mission, goals, objectives, and core values of the school
3. Organizational structure
4. Governing Board and list of top executives
5. Educational programs, including student population for each program and accreditation level
6. Enrollment data per year level of the program being visited (3-year data for a preliminary visit, 2-year data for a formal visit, and 5-year for resurvey visit)
7. Description of the regulatory environment in which the institution operates
8. Identified strategic challenges, including planned and implemented strategies to address the same.

PART 2: Follow-up Action on the Recommendations of Previous Survey (only for formal and resurvey visits)

PART 3: Analysis of the School/Program Practices Using the Standards and Criteria

A write-up is a narrative that describes the program quality practices using the criteria under each standard. The write-up should meet the following requirements:

1. It should provide information that focused on how the school meets the criteria under each standard. An explanation should be provided if the school failed to meet a criterion.
2. The information should be presented based on the sequencing of the criteria. They should be written in whole sentences but should be straightforward, concise, and factual. More importantly, the information should be supported by evidence that directly supports the information given. A checklist of evidence is provided under each standard. However, this does not preclude the institution from using other sources of evidence that will support its claim.
3. In the presentation of evidence, the following guidelines should be considered:
 - a. Where statistical data, graphs, tables, or matrices are used, label the same and present them either within the narrative or attach them to the SSR with appropriate reference. Where a policy statement is used, summarize the policy or attach the same to the SSR with proper reference.
 - b. The documents and any other evidence used to support the information provided should be listed per standard and attached to the SSR. If the same evidence supports multiple standards, attach the evidence once and list it under each relevant standard.
4. The write-up should not only be descriptive but analytical, citing both the strengths and weaknesses in the features described in the criteria. The guide questions and the explanations can assist in analyzing the quality practices of the institution. When analyzing the institution's

quality practices, it is also important to benchmark with the practices of other reputable institutions or with those that are considered 'good' practices.

- The school should provide a rating for each criterion under each standard based on the following scale:

| RATING | MEANING | REMARKS |
|--------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | Excellent | The practice is exemplary and serves as a model to others. The implementation of the criterion has led to excellent results. |
| 4 | Very Good | The criterion has been effectively implemented, and this has led to very good results. |
| 3 | Good | The criterion has been implemented adequately and has led to good results. |
| 2 | Needs Minor Improvement | The criterion has been implemented but needs minor improvement. In addition, the implementation has led to inconsistent or limited results. |
| 1 | Needs Major Improvement | The criterion has been inadequately implemented and needs significant improvement. The implementation has led to insignificant or unsatisfactory results. |
| 0 | Not Implemented | The criterion has not been implemented. Furthermore, no evidence is presented to show that initiatives have been carried out to implement it. |

PART 4: Conclusion

This section provides the following:

- An overall assessment of the school's best practices per area
- Summary of the strengths of the school or program practices per area
- Summary of the weaknesses of the school or program practices per area

PART 5: Appendices

This section contains the documents and other evidence that are identified in the self-survey report. Provide a summary listing before the presentation of documents.

PART 6: Summary of Ratings

4. THE SURVEY VISIT

The **site visit** will be scheduled in advance and will take place not earlier than a month after submitting the SSR to the PAASCU Secretariat. The visit will be for 2 days.

The visit will include the following activities:

- Orientation meeting
- Interviews
- Observations

4. Review of exhibits
5. Writing of report
6. Wrap-up session
7. Debriefing to Management and Self Survey Team

5. PAASCU SURVEY REPORT

The site visit will result in a survey report that represents the assessment of the institution against the checklist. The reports will be treated as confidential by the accreditors and will be used as the basis for the granting of program accreditation status.

The Chair will be responsible for collating the inputs from each accreditor to come up with a consolidated, coherent, and concise report that corresponds to the team's judgment. The findings must be written in a way that reveals both the evidence for and the analysis behind the team's conclusion on whether or not the institution is aligned with each of the standards.

The survey report should contain the following:

1. Chairman's report containing the following:
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Summary of Area Reports
 - c. Preparation of the Program Self-Survey by the Institution
 - d. Recommendation of the Team
 - e. Conclusion
2. Summary of Ratings
3. Write-up per area containing the following:
 - a. Evidence – a short description of the evidence gathered
 - b. Analysis – a consideration of the extent of alignment of practice with the standards, based on the evidence available, and an explanation for lack of alignment
 - c. Commendations, if any
 - d. Recommendations, if any

The ratings of the criteria in a sub-area are averaged to arrive at the **sub-area average rating**.

The sub-area average ratings in an area are averaged to arrive at the **area average rating**.

The 5 area average ratings are averaged to arrive at the **overall average rating**.

| Statistical Summary of Ratings | Ratings (in two decimal places) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Area 1. Resource Management | |
| Sub-area 1.1 Human Resources | |
| Area 1 Average Rating | |
| Area 2. Teaching-Learning | |
| Sub-area 2.1 Criminal Justice Education Curricular Program | |
| Sub-area 2.2 Teaching and Learning Methods | |
| Sub-area 2.3 Assessment Methods | |
| Area 2 Average Rating | |
| Area 3. Student Services | |
| Sub-area 3.1 Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement | |
| Area 3 Average Rating | |
| Area 4. External Relations | |
| Sub-area 4.1 Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships | |
| Sub-area 4.2 Community Engagement and Service | |
| Area 4 Average Rating | |
| Area 5. Research | |
| Sub-area 4.1 Research Management and Collaboration | |
| Sub-area 4.2 Intellectual Property Rights and Ethics in Research | |
| Area 5 Average Rating | |
| Area 6. Results | |
| Sub-area 6.1 Educational Results | |
| Sub-area 6.2 Community Engagement and Service Results | |
| Sub-area 6.3 Research Results | |
| Area 6 Average Rating | |
| | |
| Overall Average Rating | |

6. COMMISSION REVIEW AND BOARD APPROVAL OF ACCREDITING TEAM'S DECISION

Requirements to Pass a Formal Survey or Resurvey Visit:

The following criteria need to be complied with to pass a survey or resurvey visit:

I. Academic Qualifications of Program Administrators (Dean, Program Chair, Program Heads or Coordinator)

Program administrators must possess the required academic degrees/qualifications as stipulated in the most recent CHED's Policies, Standards, and Guidelines (PSGs) of the program being accredited.

II. Faculty Requirements and Teaching Assignments

Faculty members, regardless of status (full-time, part-time), must possess the required academic qualifications as stipulated by the most recent CHED's PSGs of the program being accredited.

III. Teaching Assignments

50% of all courses must be taught by full-time faculty members, and 40% of all General Education courses must be taught by master's degree holders in their field of specialization.

IV. Performance in the Licensure Examination

For programs with a licensure examination, the performance of graduates must consistently be above the national passing average or at par with the national average. The yearly performance will be calculated based on the simple average of results for programs with 2 or more examinations in a year.

The team's report will be forwarded to the Commission, and then the Board for review and final approval.

7. FAAP CERTIFICATION OF THE ACCREDITATION LEVEL

The Board of Trustees' decision will be forwarded to the Federation of Accrediting Agencies of the Philippines (FAAP), certifying the level of accreditation.

8. ISSUANCE OF REPORT TO THE INSTITUTION

The final accreditation report will be sent to the school after the Board's approval and the FAAP certification.

PRINCIPLES OF QUALITY PRACTICES IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION PROGRAM

AREA 1. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Sub-area 1.1. Human Resources

Standard 8.

The institution has adequate and qualified human resources, both teaching and non-teaching, that enable it to perform its teaching, research, and community service functions. It has programs for recruitment, selection, hiring, deployment, training, and retirement of personnel.

| Criteria | Rating |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Human resource plans, policies, and programs are defined and implemented to enable the institution to achieve its teaching, research, and community service functions. | |
| 2. Recruitment, selection, and hiring policies are formulated and communicated and are consistently applied. | |
| 3. Training and development programs are needs-based and are provided to both full-time and part-time employees. | |
| 4. Deployment, promotion, succession, and career pathing programs are in place. | |
| 5. Consistency of the teaching and work assignments with the personnel's qualifications and capabilities is ensured. | |
| 6. A performance management system covering job evaluation, reward, recognition, coaching, and mentoring is in place. | |
| 7. Salaries, incentives, and benefits are set at levels that ensure the institution's ability to attract and retain qualified staff. | |
| 8. Provisions for separation, resignation, termination, and retirement are in place. | |
| 9. There is a sufficient workforce to attend to the needs of the institution. | |
| 10. The working environment is risk-free and safe for the employees. | |
| 11. Human resource plans, policies, and programs are periodically assessed for improvement. | |
| Average Rating | |

Explanation:

Plans, policies, and programs on recruitment, selection, hiring, deployment, training, and retirement define the quality of an institution's workforce. Career paths, if properly identified and monitored, resulting in productive and fulfilled personnel. A highly motivated workforce greatly enhances the delivery of services in an institution. Therefore, management should take responsibility for ensuring the safety, growth, and well-being of its human resources.

Guide Questions:

1. Are the HR plans, policies, and programs on human resources defined, communicated clearly, and supportive of institutional goals?
2. How are the recruitment, selection, and hiring policies formulated and applied?
3. Are there specific contracts that define the job functions, terms of employment, and tenure for all personnel?
4. How does the institution ensure that the training and development plans for the academic and non-academic personnel are participative, relevant, and needs-based?
5. Do personnel participate in the formulation of their career goals and plans?
6. Are deployment, promotion, and succession policies clear to all concerned?
7. How does the institution ensure the consistency of the teaching and work assignments with the personnel's qualifications and capabilities?
8. Has the college or department ensured the adequacy of qualified teaching personnel?
9. Among the teaching personnel, is there an adequate number of industry practitioners in technical and allied fields of Criminal Justice Education?
10. Are there clear provisions for separation, resignation, retirement, and termination?
11. Is there a performance management system that covers reward, recognition, coaching, and mentoring?
12. What are the provisions for staff orientation and discussion of personnel-related issues and concerns?
13. How are the plans, programs, and policies regularly evaluated for improvement?

Sources of Evidence:

- Employee profiles
- Organizational chart
- Human resource manual
- HR plans and programs
- Job descriptions
- Recruitment, selection, and hiring criteria
- Employment contracts
- Training needs analysis
- Training and development plan and budget
- Performance management system
- Job performance appraisal system
- Salary and benefits, ranking and promotion scheme
- Resignation, termination, and retirement policies
- Succession plans
- Personnel and faculty files
- Faculty retention and turnover reports

- Industry immersion program for full-time Criminal Justice Education faculty
- MOA with industry partners for immersion of Criminal Justice Education faculty

AREA 2. TEACHING-LEARNING

Sub-area 2.1. Criminal Justice Education Curricular Program

A system to ensure that the Criminal Justice Education program offering is designed, developed, reviewed, and updated is established and functioning effectively. In designing the program offering, alignment with the institution's vision, mission, and goals is ensured, and that the design considers stakeholders' needs and expectations. Developing the program includes determining its structure and content and defining the expected learning outcomes. Reviewing the curriculum design, process, and curricula and the achievement of learning outcomes are carried out regularly for improvement and updating.

Standard 11.

A system to design, develop, and review the Criminal Justice Education program is established, ensuring alignment with the its vision-mission and goals, with program objectives and learning outcomes, and are relevant to meet stakeholders' needs.

| Criteria | Rating |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. A system with defined policies, guidelines, and processes in the design, development, review, and periodic updating of Criminal Justice Education program offerings is established. | |
| 2. Students and key stakeholders participate in the design, development, review, and periodic updating of Criminal Justice Education program offerings. | |
| 3. The Criminal Justice Education program offerings are aligned with the institution's vision, mission, and goals. | |
| 4. The Criminal Justice Education program and course objectives, including the expected learning outcomes, are established. | |
| 5. Delivery plans and syllabi are developed for each course and communicated based on the attainment of expected learning outcomes. | |
| 6. The system of managing Criminal Justice Education program offerings is regularly reviewed and assessed for improvement and updating. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- What process do the college and department follow in Criminal Justice Education curricular development, review, and revision?
- Who is responsible for designing and developing the curriculum?
- Who is involved in the process of curricular design, development, review, and revision?

- How are the institutional vision, mission, and goals reflected in the various Criminal Justice Education curricula/course offerings?
- How are the learning outcomes established and communicated?
- Who is responsible for implementing the curriculum?
- How are the programs and courses evaluated?
- What benchmarking activities does the Criminal Justice Education program engage in to ensure that its program curricula are relevant and at par with comparable institutions?
- What process is undertaken to review and assess the relevancy and attractiveness of Criminal Justice Education program offerings?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- Curricular development and review process
- Curriculum committee composition, functions, and minutes of meeting
- Curricular offerings
- Bulletin of Information
- Reports of external examiners or accrediting agencies
- Course syllabi and development plan
- Faculty and student feedback on program and course offerings
- Employer feedback on graduates report
- Curricular evaluation reports
- Report on academe-industry dialogue

Sub-area 2.2. Teaching and Learning Methods

The teaching and learning approach in the Criminal Justice Education program reflects the educational philosophy of the institution. It should facilitate the achievement of the expected learning outcomes and promote life-long learning. Therefore, a system should be established to ensure that appropriate teaching and learning methods, new modalities in the delivery of flexible learning, and approaches are selected, deployed, and regularly evaluated by relevant stakeholders.

Standard 12.

The Criminal Justice Education program has a system to select, develop, and evaluate the appropriate teaching and learning methods and activities is established, aligned with the its educational philosophy, and intended to achieve the desired learning outcomes.

| Criteria | Rating |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. There is a system to select, develop, use, and evaluate appropriate teaching and learning methods and activities. | |
| 2. The methods and activities employed are aligned with the educational philosophy of the institution. | |
| 3. Stakeholders' feedback is considered in the selection, development, and use of teaching and learning methods and activities. | |
| 4. The methods and activities adopted to promote the achievement of the institutional and program outcomes and life-long learning. | |
| 5. The methods employ a learning management system and new modalities in the delivery of flexible learning. | |
| 6. There are regular monitoring and evaluation of the methods and activities deployed for improvement. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- What is the educational philosophy of the institution and the Criminal Justice Education program?
- What is the process undertaken to select, develop, deploy, and evaluate teaching and learning methods and activities?
- What are the different methods and activities adopted?
- What learning management system and new modalities in flexible learning are adopted?
- How are the methods and activities aligned with the expected learning outcomes?
- What methods and activities promote life-long learning?
- How does IT facilitate teaching and learning?
- How are teaching and learning methods and activities evaluated and improved?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- The educational philosophy of the institution and the Criminal Justice Education programs
- Teaching strategies and instructional methods
- Learning management system (LMS) and flexible learning modalities adopted
- Faculty and student feedback on teaching and learning strategies employed
- Evaluation reports on teaching and learning methods and activities
- Reports on laboratory activities, practical training, projects, and other action-learning activities
- Community extension service reports
- Criminology students internship and community immersion reports
- MOA with partner agencies for community immersion and internship of students

Sub-area 2.3. Assessment Methods

Student assessment provides a link between student performance and learning outcomes. It is the gauge of how the curricular programs and the delivery of instruction helped the students achieve the expected learning outcomes. Since assessment provides the evidence to document and validate students' meaningful learning, it should start from admission and continue as the student progress from one level to another up to the time the student graduates. The types and methods of assessment must be constantly reviewed to ensure validity, reliability, and fairness.

Standard 13.

The Criminal Justice Education program has a system in place to plan and select the most appropriate assessment types that are aligned to the achievement of the expected learning outcomes.

| Criteria | | Rating |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. | There is an established system to track students' progress from admission, their progression from one level to the other up to the time of graduation. | |
| 2. | Various assessment methods are used to determine the achievement of the expected learning outcomes. | |
| 3. | Results of the assessment are utilized to validate learning outcomes that are valid, reliable, and fair. | |
| 4. | Methods for assessment and results are regularly reviewed and evaluated for improvement. | |
| 5. | Exit interviews of graduating students are regularly conducted to serve as inputs for assessment methods and course improvements. | |
| Average Rating | | |

Guide Questions:

- What are the assessment types and methods used in the Criminal Justice Education program?
- How are assessment methods differentiated considering the diversity of students in the Criminal Justice Education program?
- What is the process for designing assessment methods?
- Are rubrics employed, and how are they designed and used?
- How is assessment during admissions done on new students?
- How is exit assessment done with graduating students?
- Who conducts the assessment, and what are the controls instituted to ensure its validity, reliability, and fairness?
- How satisfied are the students and key stakeholders with the assessment methods used?
- Is there an appeal process as regard assessment results?
- How are the assessment results utilized for quality improvement?
- How often are the assessment methods reviewed, analyzed, and improved?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- List of assessments used from student entry, progression up to exit before graduation
- Program and course specifications, including learning outcomes
- Rubrics
- Grading system
- Progression, attrition, and completion rates
- The official report on licensure examination results
- Tracer studies
- Studies on employer's satisfaction on graduate performance

AREA 3. STUDENT SERVICES

Sub-area 3.1. Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement

The quality of Criminal Justice Education graduates is significantly affected by the quality of students that an institution recruits and admits. Therefore, the recruitment and admission program of the institution should provide for the proper selection and placement of students. The related plan, structure, and policies should reflect the objectives of the institution and the various programs and meet regulatory requirements. Through well-defined, reliable, and valid admissions criteria, the institution should select and classify students who show a reasonable chance for success in their chosen programs.

Standard 14.

The Criminal Justice Education program has effective recruitment, admission, and placement of Criminology students with defined criteria that are valid and reliable.

| Criteria | Rating |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. A system with defined plans, structures, and policies is established for the recruitment and admission of students. | |
| 2. Criteria for student selection and placement are defined, promoting proper matching of student aptitudes and capabilities to their programs. | |
| 3. Defined procedures are implemented to ensure effective implementation of recruitment, admission, and placement of students. | |
| 4. Measures are undertaken to monitor the effectiveness of the system for recruitment, admission, and placement. | |
| 5. Student recruitment, admission, and placement are improved to ensure that they remain relevant and effective. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- How does the Criminal Justice Education program develop its admission policies?
- Who defines the selection criteria for both regular students and those in special groups?
- How are the admission policies and selection criteria for the program communicated to the stakeholders?
- How are students selected, and who selects them?
- What office/person is in charge of recruitment, admission, and placement?
- How are student intakes monitored and analyzed?
- What measures are taken to influence the quality and the number of admitted students in the program?
- What is the process in the conduct of student recruitment, admission, and placement in the program?
- Is there a regular review of the effectiveness of the program's recruitment, admission, and placement system?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- Recruitment programs
- Admission and placement policies
- Student selection process and criteria
- The trend of applicants and admitted students
- Student handbook
- Publications such as the prospectus, brochures, etc.
- Marketing collaterals
- Social media
- Press media
- Job placement programs
- Industry linkages
- Report on placement

AREA 4. EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Sub-area 4.1. Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships

Standard 16.

The Criminal Justice Education program has established networks, linkages, and partnerships with local, national, regional, and international agencies and groups to pursue its vision, mission, and goals.

| Criteria | Rating |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. A plan is in place to network, link, and partner with various agencies and groups at the local, national, and international levels for mutual benefits and pursuance of its goals and objectives. | |
| 2. Appropriate structure and mechanisms are in place to carry out such engagements on the institutional level. | |
| 3. Linkages and partnerships are supported by appropriate agreements and contracts. | |
| 4. Networks, linkages, and partnership activities are regularly evaluated to assess how they help achieve the vision and mission. | |
| Average Rating | |

Explanation:

The Criminal Justice Education program recognizes that establishing linkages, networks, and partnerships are critical in achieving its vision, mission, and goals. Through a broad range of activities such as fellowships, staff and student exchanges, mobility programs for students, international internships, dual degree programs, joint research activities, twinning programs, sharing of resources, fund sourcing, etc., the Criminal Justice Education program is helped improve its deliverables, making it sustainable and relevant. These activities should be supported by an appropriate mechanism to ensure their effectivity and the same should be evaluated to ensure

Guide Questions:

- What steps are taken to select the institutions, associations, groups the Criminal Justice Education program would like to link /partner/collaborate with?
- What priority areas did the program consider in forging linkages or fostering networks with their selected partners?
- What benefits so far have the program derived from collaboration, partnerships, and linkages?
- How often are the MOU/MOA reviewed? Who is involved in the review?
- How functional are these MOU/MOA?
- What kind of support (i.e., financial, staff, technological, etc.) is given by the program to those participating in collaboration activities, networks, and linkages?

- Who has the decision-making role as far as the external relations activities of the program are concerned?
- How have the effectiveness data been utilized to improve the program's networking and linkages?
- What office/person is responsible for linkages?
- What can the external partners benefit from this?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- MOU/MOA with partner organizations
- Surveys measuring the effectiveness and benefits of the partnerships/linkages/networks
- Evaluation and assessment data on linkages, networks, and similar activities
- Sources of financial grants and other financial gains generated by the partnerships
- Minutes of meetings of concerned offices
- Awards, citations, recognition granted to the program as a valued partner
- Support provided by the program for external relations activities

Sub-area 4.2. Community Engagement and Service

The Criminal Justice Education program exists not only to perform the functions of teaching, learning, and research but also commits itself to service to the community/society. This commitment necessitates engaging with a wide range of stakeholders (i.e., other educational institutions, alumni, industry partners, employers, professional bodies, etc.) and the community to establish and sustain constructive and productive collaboration with them. The goal of such collaboration is to bring about a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources within the context of partnership and reciprocity. Community service and engagement cover such activities as community outreach, consultancy, and other kinds of professional services.

Standard 17.

The Criminal Justice Education Program commits to community engagements and service activities as part of its social responsibility and corporate citizenship.

| Criteria | Rating |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. The Criminal Justice Education Program has a strategic plan for community engagement and service aligned to its vision, mission, and goals. | |
| 2. Community engagement and service activities are implemented to provide benefits and promote the development of their targeted clients and beneficiaries. | |
| 3. Community engagement and services utilize the competencies of the Criminal Justice Education Program and the non-academic departments of the institution. | |
| 4. Appropriate structures with adequate resources are in place to support community engagement and service activities. | |
| 5. Community engagement and service activities are systematically monitored and evaluated against established criteria. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- What mechanisms are existing for partnering with community partners/stakeholders?
- What criteria are used in the selection of the Criminal Justice Education program's partners?
- What kind of services are provided by the Criminal Justice Education program, and what are the agreed-upon conditions between the Criminal Justice Education program and its partners?
- Who participates in the Criminal Justice Education program's engagement and service activities, and what is the extent of their involvement?
- What mechanisms and guidelines are in place to monitor and evaluate community engagement and service plans, activities, and performance results?
- Who is involved in monitoring and evaluation?

- How does the Criminal Justice Education program gather feedback regarding the effectiveness of its services/engagement activities?
- How are feedback results utilized in the areas of planning, QA, and quality enhancement?
- How are feedback results disseminated to the concerned sectors?
- What benefits are derived from community service and engagement activities?
- What support is available for the Criminal Justice Education program's community service and engagement plans, projects, and activities (i.e., human, financial, physical, etc.)?
- What office manages community engagement of the Criminal Justice Education Program?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- Community service and engagement plans, policies, guidelines, projects, etc.
- Job descriptions of individuals overseeing community service and engagement activities, if applicable
- MOU/MOA with partner communities and organizations
- Community/client surveys (performance feedback documents)
- Community engagement and service assessment/evaluation tool/s

Area 5. Research

Sub-area 5.1. Research Management and Collaboration

The Criminal Justice Education program has a research program that produces various types of research outputs aligned with the vision and mission and addresses local and national development needs. The research program is supported by a robust structure with a qualified staff, adequate funds, and policies and guidelines. The faculty staff researching, in particular, are provided incentives, rewards, and benefits. There exist local and international linkages, collaborations, and partnerships among educational institutions and agencies to conduct research activities. The program and the various activities are regularly assessed for improvement.

Standard 18.

The Criminal Justice Education program implements a research program aligned with its mission and vision, supports its teaching-learning and community engagement functions, and addresses local and national development needs.

| Criteria | Rating |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. There is a defined research agenda, both institutional and in the Criminal Justice Education program, with defined goals, plans, policies, and activities. | |
| 2. The Criminology research program complies with institutional and regulatory requirements. | |
| 3. An appropriate structure with qualified staff is established. | |
| 4. Funds and other resources are adequate in the promotion and conduct of research. | |
| 5. The conduct of research is part of the criteria for faculty promotion awards and for which they are adequately compensated. | |
| 6. Research linkages, collaboration, and partnerships are established in pursuit of research goals. | |
| 7. The research program and activities are regularly assessed, using performance indicators and stakeholder needs satisfaction, from which the continuous improvement of the research program ensues. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- What process is being followed in determining the institution's research agenda and the Criminal Justice Education programs?
- How does the Criminal Justice Education research program comply with institutional and regulatory requirements?
- Is there an office created with qualified personnel who manages the institution's research agenda and the Criminal Justice Education program?

- How adequate are the funds and other resources in the promotion and conduct of research activities?
- What are the incentives, rewards, and benefits given to faculty and staff who conduct research activities?
- Are there established linkages, partnerships, and collaboration in the conduct of research with local and international academic institutions and associations, professional and research bodies, government and non-government organizations, and business and industrial entities?
- How are the research activities monitored and assessed for improvement?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- Research program
- Research manual including the related policies and guidelines
- Research budget
- List of research activities and completed in recent five years
- List of relevant institutions and organizations with established research partnership and collaboration
- Evaluation results on research activities

Area 6. Results

Sub-area 6.1. Educational Results

Educational results are the measures of the quality of education the institution provides. Results are the outputs of the transformation process the student underwent. In assessing the quality system, it is important not only to assess the process but also to establish, monitor, and assess indicators of the quality of Criminology graduates. These include the achievement of learning outcomes, pass and dropout rates, the average time to graduate, the employability of graduates, the pass and failure rates in licensure examinations, and the satisfaction levels of key stakeholders on graduates. The information is gathered, analyzed, and used to make improvements in the programs, its delivery, and the institution's quality assurance system.

Standard 20.

The educational process results include the achievement of the expected learning outcomes, pass rates, and dropout rates, the average time to graduate, employability of graduates, pass rates of graduates in Criminologist's licensure examination, and the satisfaction levels of graduates, among others.

| Criteria | Rating |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. The expected institutional and expected program and course learning outcomes are defined, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 2. The pass and drop out rates for the Criminal Justice Education program and courses are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 3. The completion rate and average time to graduate for Criminal Justice Education program are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 4. The employability of graduates of all programs is established, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 5. Graduates' pass and failure rates in Criminologist's licensure examinations are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 6. The satisfaction levels of key stakeholders on the quality of Criminology graduates are established, monitored, and assessed for improvements. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- What are the indicators and the methods used in determining, monitoring, and assessing the quality of Criminology graduates?
- What measures are utilized to determine whether institutional and program learning outcomes are achieved when students graduate?
- If the results of the pass and dropout rates are unsatisfactory, what measures have been undertaken to improve the same?

- How satisfactory are the graduation rates in the Criminal Justice Education program? What measures have been undertaken when graduation rates are low?
- What studies have been made regarding dropouts, and how have the results been used to improve the sustainability of the Criminal Justice Education program?
- What measures have been undertaken to improve the performance of graduates in the Criminologist's licensure examination?
- What is the average time for Criminology graduates to find employment, and what are the reasons why graduates are not immediately employed?
- How does the institution track the satisfaction of faculty, students, alumni, and employers about the program of studies, teaching-learning process, resources provided, competencies acquired, and strengths of Criminology graduates?

Supporting Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- Performance reports
- Licensure examination results
- Stakeholders' satisfaction results
- Tracer studies of graduates
- Employment surveys and statistics
- Criminology graduates, alumni, and employer surveys
- Stakeholders feedback

Sub-area 6.2. Community Engagement and Service Results

The outcomes of community engagement and service activities should produce results that have a positive and significant impact on society, the institution, faculty, staff, students, the beneficiaries of these activities, and other stakeholders. Therefore, the impact should be identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.

Standard 21.

The institution's community engagement and service programs and the Criminal Justice Education program produce results that impact the institution, its stakeholders, and society.

| Criteria | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. The nature and volume of community engagement and service activities of the Criminal Justice Education program are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 2. The societal impact and achievements of these activities are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 3. The impact on the institution, Criminology faculty, staff, and students are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 4. The impact on the beneficiaries of these activities and other stakeholders are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- What are the nature of the community engagement and service activities that the institution is carrying out among its Criminal Justice Education program faculty, staff, and students?
- What criteria were used in selecting these types of activities?
- Are the activities aligned with the vision and mission of the institution?
- How are community engagement and service activities assessed for improvement and matched with best practices?
- What impact have these activities have on society, the institution, faculty, staff, students, the target beneficiaries, and other stakeholders?

Sources of Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- Strategic plans and goals on community engagement and service
- Performance reports of community engagement and service activities
- Faculty and staff feedback
- Students reports and feedback
- Community reports and feedback
- Partners and other stakeholders feedback

Sub-area 6.3. Research Results

Research activities of the institution and the Criminal Justice Education program should produce research outputs that are varied and significant in number. The results are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement and impact.

Standard 22.

The Criminal Justice Education program has produced research outputs as seen through new knowledge embodied in publications, citations, journals, research-informed teaching, technology transfers, innovations, inventions, creative work, etc.

| Criteria | Rating |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. The nature and number of research outputs done by the Criminal Justice Education program faculty members and staff are documented, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 2. The nature and number of research done by research teams and students are documented and assessed for improvement. | |
| 3. The nature and number of research publications are documented, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 4. The nature and number of intellectual property are documented, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 5. The impact of research outputs and their publications are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement. | |
| 6. The stakeholders' satisfaction in research activities is determined and used to guide further development of research and publications in the institution. | |
| Average Rating | |

Guide Questions:

- What is the nature of the research activities carried out by the institution, Criminology faculty, staff research teams, and students?
- What criteria were used in selecting these types of research activities?
- Are the activities aligned with the research agenda of the institution?
- How are research outputs monitored and assessed for improvement?
- What impact have these activities have on society, the target beneficiary of the research, the institution, and the research proponents?

Sources of Evidence:

- Institutional policies and guidelines related to this standard
- Performance reports on research activities of the Criminal Justice Education program
- Research agenda

- Research funds and related resources
- Publications and citations
- Registration of copyrights, trademarks, and patents

Statistical Summary of Ratings

| Statistical Summary of Ratings | Ratings (in two decimal places) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Area 1. Resource Management | |
| Sub-area 1.1 Human Resources | |
| Area 1 Average Rating | |
| Area 2. Teaching-Learning | |
| Sub-area 2.1 Criminal Justice Education Curricular Program | |
| Sub-area 2.2 Teaching and Learning Methods | |
| Sub-area 2.3 Assessment Methods | |
| Area 2 Average Rating | |
| Area 3. Student Services | |
| Sub-area 3.1 Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement | |
| Area 3 Average Rating | |
| Area 4. External Relations | |
| Sub-area 4.1 Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships | |
| Sub-area 4.2 Community Engagement and Service | |
| Area 4 Average Rating | |
| Area 5. Research | |
| Sub-area 4.1 Research Management and Collaboration | |
| Sub-area 4.2 Intellectual Property Rights and Ethics in Research | |
| Area 5 Average Rating | |
| Area 6. Results | |
| Sub-area 6.1 Educational Results | |
| Sub-area 6.2 Community Engagement and Service Results | |
| Sub-area 6.3 Research Results | |
| Area 6 Average Rating | |
| Overall Average Rating | |