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

CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

2021

Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities

>**Contact Details:**
>**PAASCU**
>**Unit 107, The Tower at Emerald Square**
>**J.P. Rizal cor. P. Tuazon Sts.,**
>**1109 Quezon City**
>**Tel.: 8911-2845, 8913-1998**
>**Fax: 8911-0807**
>**Email: info@paascu.org.ph**
>**Website: www.paascu.org.ph**

2021 Revised Edition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GUIDELINES TO ACCREDITATION

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU) is to support member schools in their journey towards quality improvement founded on the institution's educational philosophy and its unique vision and mission. This purpose is grounded on the fundamental principle that quality is primarily the school's responsibility and that the external quality assurance initiative complements this. PAASCU envisions accreditation as a continuous development process that engages the entire school community and its stakeholders in a careful and thorough evaluation of its objectives, plans, programs, systems, resources, and results through self-survey and an external review done by peer educators.

The accreditation process involves assessing different areas: Leadership and Governance, Quality Assurance, Resource Management, Teaching-Learning, Student Services, External Relations, Research, and Results. The interrelationship among these areas is vital in ensuring the school's programs' quality towards achieving the school's vision and mission. PAASCU believes that the quality of the school's programs and services determines the overall quality of the institution that offers such programs and services.

In recent years local and international agencies have defined standards to be used in quality assurance processes. PAASCU now shifts to principles-based standards in the accreditation process that focuses on principles rather than a list of good practices in the various areas to be assessed in the accreditation process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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. ACCREDITATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION PROGRAM

1.1. Quality Assurance

PAASCU has adopted 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. Implementation of the vision, mission, and goals of the school
4. Responsiveness to stakeholders

1.2. Accreditation

Educational accreditation is a quality assurance process where an external body evaluates the operations of educational institutions or programs to determine if standards are met as the basis for granting an accreditation status. Accreditation is 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 program (Van Damme, UNESCO Higher Education in the Age of Globalization, 2001).

An accredited status from PAASCU indicates that an educational institution or program has met its defined standards. There is a sufficient basis for assuming that the educational institution or program will continue doing so in the future.

The PAASCU accreditation process does not prescribe any specific way of proceeding. It seeks to encourage institutions or programs to aspire for and work towards higher levels of excellence as defined in its quality standards. The focus is on the context and needs of the institution or program under survey; hence, the process allows these institutions and programs to be innovative in exploring solutions to the challenges they face.

2. ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK

2.1. Accreditation Framework

In conducting institutional accreditation, the following framework is adopted:

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

The framework shows that there are eight areas to be assessed. These areas include three areas under Strategic and Systemic Quality Assurance, four areas under Process Quality Assurance, and the area covering the Results. The arrows denote the constant interplay among the different areas in continuously upgrading educational quality and services.

2.2.   Program Accreditation Framework

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

Area 3.   Resource Management (1 sub-area)
             Sub-area 3.1 Human Resources

Area 4.   Teaching-Learning (3 sub-areas)
             Sub-area 4.1 Curricular Programs
             Sub-area 4.2 Teaching and Learning Methods
             Sub-area 4.3 Assessment Methods

Area 5.   Student Services (1 sub-area)
             Sub-area 5.1 Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement

Area 6.   External Relations (2 sub-areas)
             Sub-area 6.1 Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships
             Sub-area 6.2 Community Engagement and Service

Area 7.   Research (1 sub-area)
             Sub-area 7.1 Research Management and Collaboration

Area 8.   Results (3 sub-areas)
             Sub-area 8.1 Educational Results
             Sub-area 8.2 Community Engagement and Service Results
             Sub-area 8.3 Research Results

However, it should be noted 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. Also, the Criminal Justice Education program will be conducted in the first two years after the awarding of such status. Suppose the survey on this program will be visited three years after. In that case, the institution will be requested to prepare a Progress Report

on implementing the recommendations given by the last survey team in the other areas and sub-areas not included in the above.

2.3. Alignment of PAASCU Framework with other QA Frameworks

The framework adopted by PAASCU is aligned with regional and international frameworks on quality assurance. The following were used as benchmarks in the preparation of the instrument:

1. ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework (AQAF) Internal Quality Assurance Principles
2. ASEAN University Network (AUN) Guide to Assessment at the Institutional Level
3. Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Institutional Sustainability Assessment Self-Evaluation Document (ISA-SED)
4. Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) Standards and Guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance

2.4. Development of the 2021 Principles-Based Standards

The evolving and challenging higher education landscape globally and the continuing evolution of accreditation in form and substance served as an impetus in pivoting PAASCU's approach to program accreditation from functional to one that uses principle-based standards. The program accreditation standards are designed to ensure the provision of high-quality educational experiences. These standards reflect principles of good practice and are supported by a set of criteria that subscribes to the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle. The standards are not prescriptive as PAASCU understands that high-quality education can be achieved in various ways. However, the standards and how the program executes them should allow for consistency in the quality of program delivery. The program standards define the quality, effectiveness, and continuous improvement expected of accredited programs. They serve as indicators of a program's ability to fulfill its unique purpose, deliver quality education, and promote student achievement is comprehensively examined.

Each of the standards articulates a dimension of the quality of a program. In applying the Standards, PAASCU assesses and decides the effectiveness of the program as a whole. A program that meets the Standards indicates that:
- its purposes are clearly defined and appropriate to an institution of higher learning;
- defined learning outcomes are achieved;
- its practices are aligned with defined standards and criteria; and
- it is unceasingly striving for continuous improvement.

Therefore, it is essential to understand that a program must demonstrate substantial compliance with the standards regardless of location or delivery modalities to earn accreditation.

2.5. The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument consists of the following:
1. the main area for review and evaluation;
2. the standards under each area;
3. a set of criteria against which the achievement of the standard is measured;
4. a brief explanation of the standard;
5. a series of guide questions to assist the institution in assessing its compliance with the standards and criteria; and
6. a suggested the list of evidence.

The set of criteria will be rated using the guidelines provided below in the Self-Survey Report section of this guideline.

3.   PROGRAM ACCREDITATION

Program accreditation applies to academic programs, departments, institutes, or schools that are parts of an institution. The accredited unit may be as large as a college, or school within a university, an academic program, or course within a discipline. The accredited status of one department or specific program/course does not extend to other programs within the same department or departments in the institution.

This survey instrument is for program accreditation.

4.   THE SELF SURVEY REPORT

The first and critical component of the accreditation process is a rigorous and comprehensive self-evaluation of the institution's educational resources, methods, 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 completed by a diverse group of key stakeholders (i.e., administrators, faculty, students, staff, alumni, etc.) knowledgeable about the institution and its academic programs. 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 standard guides what to account for in the institution's quality system.

The SSR is written following the sequencing of the area and standards.   The write-up mainly

describes how the institution meets the criteria under each standard. Therefore, only the set of criteria under each standard will be rated.

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

4.1.   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 Survey Instrument, 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 under survey (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 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 focuses on how the school meets the criteria under each standard. An explanation should be provided if the school partially or did not comply with the criteria.

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 based on evidence that is presented immediately after such information. The evidence should be clickable to ensure immediate access. Each

standard provides a checklist of suggested evidence. The institution may present other additional evidence to 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 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 be descriptive and analytical, citing both the strengths and weaknesses of the practice related to 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.

5.   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:
1. An overall assessment of the program's compliance with the standards
2. Summary of the strengths per area
3. Summary of planned initiatives to address weaknesses identified per area

PART 5:   Appendices

This section contains the evidence that is identified in the self-survey report. This section consists of the following:
1. List of the supporting evidence
2. The actual evidence

For virtual visits, these supporting documents are accessed using the digital storage facility of the school. Therefore, when evidence is cited in the narrative, reference to that evidence is clickable, so the actual evidence can immediately be viewed.

PART 6:   Summary of Ratings

5.   THE SURVEY VISIT

The **site visit** will be scheduled in advance and not earlier than two months after submitting the SSR to the PAASCU Secretariat. External accreditors assigned by PAASCU will undertake the two-day visit.

The typical PAASCU Survey Team will be composed of accreditors who will be assigned to handle the following areas:

Accreditor 1a	Leadership and Governance Results: Financial and Competitiveness
Accreditor 1b	QA Systems Resource Management
Accreditor 2a	Teaching-Learning Results: Education
Accreditor 2b	Student Services
Accreditor 3a	External Relations Results: Community Engagement and Service
Accreditor 3b	Research Results: Research

The number of accreditors may change depending on the number of programs being accredited.

The visit usually includes the following activities:
1.   Accrediting Team meetings
2.   Interviews and meetings with various stakeholders groups
3.   Observations
4.   Review of exhibits
5.   Writing of report
6.   Wrap-up session
7.   Debriefing to Management and Self Survey Team

6. PAASCU SURVEY REPORT

The site visit will result in a survey report that represents the institution's assessment against the checklist. The report is used as the basis for determining the accreditation status to be granted.

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 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:
   f. Evidence – a short description of the evidence gathered
   g. Analysis – a consideration of the extent of alignment of practice with the criteria based on the evidence presented
   h. Commendations, if any
   i. Recommendations, if any

The ratings of the criteria under each standard are averaged to arrive at the **average rating per standard**.
The average ratings per standard in an area are averaged to arrive at the **average area rating**.
The six area average ratings are averaged to arrive at the **overall survey rating.**

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

Additional 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

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

III.   Teaching Assignments

Full-time faculty members must teach 50% of all courses, and master's degree holders must teach 40% of all General Education courses 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 two or more examinations in a year.

The team's report is submitted to the Commission and the Board for review and final approval.

8.   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.

9.   RELEASE OF ACCREDITATION DECISION TO THE INSTITUTION WITH THE SURVEY TEAM REPORT

The PAASCU Secretariat will inform the school of the accreditation decision and provide the accreditation report after the Board's approval and the FAAP certification.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION

AREA 3.   RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Sub-area 3.1.   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 in place for the 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 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 attracts and retains 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 an institution's workforce quality. Career paths, if correctly identified and monitored, will result in productive and fulfilled personnel. A highly motivated workforce dramatically enhances the delivery of services in an institution. 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 consistently 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. Is there an adequate number of industry practitioners in technical and allied fields of Criminal Justice Education among the teaching personnel?
10. Are there explicit 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?

Supporting 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 4.   TEACHING-LEARNING

Sub-area 4.1.   Curricular Programs

STANDARD 11.
A system to design, develop, and review the program offerings is established, ensuring alignment with the institutional vision-mission and goals, with program objectives and learning outcomes, and relevant to meeting stakeholders' needs.

Criteria	Rating
1. A system with defined policies, guidelines, and processes is established in designing, developing, reviewing, and periodic updating of Criminal Justice Education program offerings.	
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 expected learning outcomes.	
6. The system of managing Criminal Justice Education program offerings is regularly reviewed for improvement and updating.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
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 offerings, alignment with the institution's vision, mission, and goals is ensured, and that the design considers stakeholders' needs and expectations. Developing the program includes defining the learning outcomes and determining the program structure and content. Reviewing the curriculum design, process, and curricula and achieving learning outcomes are regularly carried out for improvement and updating.

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?

14

- 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 curricula are relevant and comparable with other 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 4.2.   Teaching and Learning Methods

STANDARD 12.
A system to select, develop, and evaluate the appropriate teaching and learning methods and activities is established 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 selecting, developing, and using 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 using current innovation and trends in teaching-learning modalities.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
The teaching and learning approaches in the Criminal Justice Education program reflect the institution's educational philosophy and should facilitate the attainment of the learning outcomes and promote life-long learning. A system should be established to ensure appropriate teaching and learning methods and approaches are selected, deployed, and regularly evaluated by relevant stakeholders.

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 training of students

Sub-area 4.3.   Assessment Methods

STANDARD 13.
A system is in place to plan and select the most appropriate assessment types to achieve 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 next, 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	

Explanation:
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 evidence to document and validate students' meaningful learning, it should start from admission and continue as the student progresses from one level until the student graduates. The types and methods of assessment must be constantly reviewed to ensure validity, reliability, and fairness.

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 controls are 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 5.   STUDENT SERVICES

Sub-area 5.1.   Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement

STANDARD 14.
The institution has effective recruitment, admission, and placement of 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	

Explanation:
The quality of Criminal Justice Education graduates is significantly affected by the quality of students that an institution recruits and admits. 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.

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 chooses 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 6.   EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Sub-area 6.1.   Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships

STANDARD 16.
The institution establishes networks, linkages, and partnerships with local, national, regional, and international agencies and groups to pursue its vision, mission, and goals.

Criteria	Rating
1. There is a plan 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. Appropriate agreements and contracts support linkages and partnerships.	
4. Networks, linkages, and partnership activities are regularly evaluated for improvement.	
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, the institution is helped to improve its deliverable, making it sustainable and relevant. These activities include 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. Appropriate mechanisms should support these activities to ensure their effectiveness and relevance to intended purposes.

Guide Questions:
- What steps are taken to select the institutions, associations, or groups the Criminal Justice Education program would like to 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 6.2.   Community Engagement and Service

STANDARD 17.
The institution commits to conduct 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	

Explanation:
The Criminal Justice Education program exists to undertake teaching, learning, and research activities and provide service to society.   This commitment necessitates engaging with many critical stakeholders and the community to establish and sustain constructive and productive collaboration. Such partnership aims to bring about a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources within the context of cooperation and reciprocity.   Community service and engagement cover community outreach, consultancy, and other kinds of professional services.

Guide Questions:
- What mechanisms exist for partnering with community partners/stakeholders?
- What criteria are used in the selection of the Criminal Justice Education program's partners?
- What 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 the community service and engagement activities?
- What support is available for the Criminal Justice Education program's community service and engagement plans, projects, and activities?
- 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, procedures, projects, etc.
- Job descriptions of individuals overseeing community service and engagement activities, if applicable
- MOU/MOA with partner communities and organizations
- Community surveys or feedback information
- Community engagement and service assessment tools

Area 7.   RESEARCH

Sub-area 7.1.   Research Management and Collaboration

STANDARD 18.
The institution 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. A defined research agenda, both institutional and in the Criminal Justice Education program, with defined goals, plans, policies, and activities is in place.	
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	

Explanation:
The Criminal Justice Education program has a research program that produces various 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 are provided incentives, rewards, and benefits. Local and international linkages, collaborations, and partnerships with educational institutions and agencies are established to conduct research activities. The program and the various activities are regularly assessed for improvement.

Guide Questions:
- What process is being followed in determining the research agenda of the institution and the program?
- 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 researching 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 8.   RESULTS

Sub-area 8.1.   Educational Results

STANDARD 20.
The educational process results include the achievement of the expected learning outcomes, pass rates, dropout rates, the average time to graduate, employability of graduates, pass rates of graduates in board examinations of board-related program offerings, 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	

Explanation:
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 essential to establish, monitor, and evaluate 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 improve the program.

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 conducted on dropout rates have been done 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 faculty, students, alumni, and employers' satisfaction with the program of studies, teaching-learning process, resources provided, competencies acquired, and strengths of Criminology graduates, etc.?

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 8.2.   Community Engagement and Service Results

STANDARD 21.
The institution's community engagement and service programs produce results that impact the institution, its stakeholders, and society.

Criteria	Rating
1. The nature and volume of the Criminal Justice Education program's community engagement and service activities 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 is identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
4. The impact on these activities' beneficiaries and other stakeholders are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
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. The effect should be identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.

Guide Questions:
- What is the nature of the community engagement and service activities that the institution carries 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 had on society, the institution, faculty, staff, students, the target beneficiaries, and other stakeholders?

Supporting Evidence:
- 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 8.3.   Research Results

STANDARD 22.
The institution has produced research outputs through new knowledge embodied in publications, citations, journals, research-informed teaching, technology transfers, innovations, inventions, creative works, etc.

Criteria	Rating
1. The nature and number of research outputs done by the Criminal Justice Education program faculty members and staff are documented and assessed for improvement.	
2. The nature and number of researches 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 properties 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 research development and publications in the institution.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
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.

Guide Questions:
- What is the nature of the institution's 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 had on society, the target beneficiary of the research, the institution, and the research proponents?

Supporting 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 3. Resource Management	
Sub-area 3.1 Human Resources	
Area 3 Average Rating	
Area 4. Teaching-Learning	
Sub-area 4.1 Curricular Programs	
Sub-area 4.2 Teaching and Learning Methods	
Sub-area 4.3 Assessment Methods	
Area 4 Average Rating	
Area 5. Student Services	
Sub-area 5.1 Student Recruitment, Admission, and Placement	
Area 5 Average Rating	
Area 6. External Relations	
Sub-area 6.1 Networks, Linkages, and Partnerships	
Sub-area 6.2 Community Engagement and Service	
Area 6 Average Rating	
Area 7. Research	
Sub-area 7.1 Research Management and Collaboration	
Area 7 Average Rating	
Area 8. Results	
Sub-area 8.1 Educational Results	
Sub-area 8.2 Community Engagement and Service Results	
Sub-area 8.3 Research Results	
Area 8 Average Rating	
Overall Average Rating	