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

DESIGN AND ARTS PROGRAMS
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 DESIGN AND ARTS PROGRAMS

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 Design and Arts programs. This practice is the reason why in conducting the accreditation for these programs, 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 Design and Arts programs will be conducted in the first two years after the awarding of such status. Suppose the survey on these programs 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 DESIGN AND ARTS

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 attracting and retaining 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. Among the teaching personnel, is there an adequate number of industry practitioners in technical and allied fields?
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 faculty
- MOA with industry partners for immersion of 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. The program consistently implements institutional policies on curricular development, delivery, review, and improvement.	
2. Students and key stakeholders actively participate in the design, development, review, and periodic updating of program offerings.	
3. The program offerings are aligned with the vision, mission, goals, and current regulatory requirements of the institution.	
4. The program and course objectives, including the expected learning outcomes, are established. (MANDATORY APPENDIX: PROGRAM SPECIFICATIONS)	
5. Learning delivery modalities and syllabi are developed for each course and openly communicated based on expected learning outcomes.	
6. The system of managing program offerings is regularly reviewed, assessed for improvement and updating.	
7. Policies and guidelines for curricular adaptation to flexible learning modalities are in place.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
A system to ensure that program offerings are designed, developed, reviewed, and updated is established and functioning effectively. In creating the program offerings, alignment with the institution's vision, mission and goals are 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, including its design, the implementation process, and learning outcomes, are carried out regularly for improvement and updating. With the advent of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), systems must adequately be provided to support the Teaching-Learning processes needed in the various programs.

Guide Questions:
- What process does the institution follow in curricular development, review, and revision?
- Who is involved in the process of curricular design, development, review, and revision?
- How the institutional vision, mission, and goals are reflected in the various curricula/course offerings?
- How adequately prepared are both faculty and students using flexible learning modalities, including VLE in their courses? – interim
- What training programs have been administered to ensure their preparedness for these flexible learning modalities, especially VLE courses? – interim
- How are learning outcomes established and communicated?
- What benchmarking activities does the institution engage in to ensure that its curricula are relevant and comparable to other institutions?
- What process is undertaken to review and assess the relevancy and attractiveness of program offerings?
- How are Board examination results utilized in the improvement of programs where they are required?

Supporting Evidence:
- Program specifications, including learning outcomes
- Curricular development and review process
- Curriculum committee composition, functions, and minutes of meeting 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
- Minutes of meetings on curricular revision
- Training programs provided the faculty for the delivery of the VLE methodologies?
- Learning outcomes established for the various E-Learning methodologies
- Evaluative criteria used in determining the effectiveness of VLE in the curricular programs
- Report on academe-industry dialogues
- Licensure board examination results where applicable

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. The program allows flexibility to select, develop, use, and evaluate appropriate teaching and learning methods and activities.	
2. The methods and activities employed are aligned with the program's educational objectives, program outcomes, and course outcomes.	
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 graduate/learning outcomes and promote life-long learning.	
5. There are regular monitoring and evaluation of the program methods and activities deployed for improvement using current innovation and trends in teaching-learning modalities.	
6. The flexible learning and teaching methods and strategies are aligned to the institution's Vision-Mission-Goals.	
7. There is adequate support given to faculty to train them in crafting/ developing various learning materials needed for multiple flexible learning modalities.	
8. Desired learning outcomes are established, monitored, and evaluated against performance indicators.	
9. A system of assessing teaching performance is in place for different teaching-learning modalities.	
10. There are formal structures that strengthen the teaching, research, and community service function of the program.	
11. Consistency of the teaching and work assignments with the faculty's qualifications and capabilities are ensured.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:

The teaching and learning approaches reflect the institution's educational philosophy and should facilitate the expected 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. In addition, the schools provide continuous training in the use of new methodologies.

Guide Questions:
- What are the different methods and activities adopted?
- How are the methods and activities aligned with the expected learning outcomes?
- What learning management system and new modalities in flexible learning are adopted? Briefly describe the various learning modalities utilized in the different courses/programs.
- What structures are in place to support/assess the flexible learning modalities, especially online learning for both faculty and students?
- What methods and activities promote life-long learning?
- How does IT support teaching and learning?
- How are teaching and learning methods and activities evaluated and improved?

Supporting Evidence:
- The educational philosophy of the institution
- Teaching strategies and instructional methods
- Faculty and student feedback on teaching and learning strategies employed
- Evaluation reports on teaching and learning methods and activities
- Reports on practical training, projects, and other action-learning activities
- Internship reports
- Industry immersion programs
- Internship reports or alternative activities, if any
- Security measures used by the institution to protect the intellectual property rights of the members of the academic community
- MOAs and contracts with external parties and service providers
- Budgets allocated for the new Learning modalities
- Community service reports
- Licensure board examination results where applicable

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, and the methods used are valid, reliable, and fair.	
3. Results of the assessment methods are used to validate learning outcomes to be sound, reliable, and fair.	
4. Exit interviews of graduating students are regularly conducted to serve as inputs for assessment methods and course improvements.	
5. Methods for assessment and results are regularly reviewed and evaluated for improvement.	
6. Assessment methods are in place for flexible learning modalities.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
Student assessment provides the link between student performance and learning outcomes. It is the gauge of how the curricular programs and the delivery of instruction help 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 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?
● How are assessment methods differentiated considering the differences in programs, courses, and learning outcomes?
● What is the process for designing assessment methods?
● How are evaluations of various teaching methodologies, including those using VLE, conducted? Who conducts these assessments, and how are the results used for improvement?
● Are rubrics employed, and how are they created and used?
● How is assessment during admissions done on new students?
● How is exit assessment done on graduating students?
● Who conducts the evaluation, and what controls are instituted to ensure its validity, reliability, and fairness?

- Are there established policies and structures to track down progress graduates, even those with special needs?
- 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:
- Grading system
- Progression, attrition, and completion rates
- The official report on board 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. The program prescribes a second layer of admission mechanism (i.e., talent, portfolio, audition, etc.) to ensure the students' suitability for the program.	
3. Criteria for student selection and placement are defined, promoting proper matching of student aptitudes and capabilities to their programs.	
4. Defined procedures are implemented to ensure effective implementation of recruitment, admission, and placement of students.	
5. Measures are undertaken to monitor the effectiveness of the system for recruitment, admission, and placement.	
6. Student recruitment, admission, and placement are improved to ensure that that they remain relevant and effective.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
The quality of 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 institution 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 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?
●   Is there a defined process in the conduct of student recruitment, admission, and placement?

- Is there a regular review of the effectiveness of the recruitment, admission, and placement system?

Supporting Evidence:
- Recruitment programs
- Admission and placement policies
- Student selection process and criteria
- The trend of applicants and admitted students
- Student handbook
- Publications such as a prospectus, brochures, etc.
- Marketing collaterals
- Social media
- Press media
- Job placement programs
- Industry linkages
- Report on placement
- Licensure board examination results where applicable
- MOAs with industry partners where applicable

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. A strategic plan is 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 to help achieve the vision and mission.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
The institution 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 deliverables, 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. An appropriate mechanism should support these activities to ensure their effectiveness and relevance to intended purposes.

Guide Questions:
●   How does the institution decide which institutions, associations, or groups they would like to link /partner/collaborate with?
●   What priority areas did the institution consider in forging linkages or fostering networks with their selected partners?
●   What benefits so far have the institution derived from collaboration, partnerships, and linkages?
●   How often are the MOUs/MOAs reviewed? Who is involved in the review?
●   How functional are these MOUs/MOAs?
●   What kind of support (i.e., financial, staff, technological, etc.) is given by the institution to those participating in collaboration activities, networks, and linkages?
●   Who has the decision-making role as far as the external relations activities of the institution are concerned?

- How have the effectiveness data been utilized to improve the institution's networking and linkages?
- What office/person is responsible for linkages?
- What can the external partners benefit from this?

Supporting Evidence:
- 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 institution as a valued partner
- Support provided by the institution 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. There is a program-wide, strategic plan of community engagement and service activities aligned to the institution's and its vision, mission, and goals.	
2. Community engagement and service activities are implemented to provide benefits and promote the development of its targeted clients and beneficiaries.	
3. Community engagement and services utilize the competencies of the different academic programs and the non-academic departments of the institution.	
4. An appropriate structure with adequate resources is 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:
An educational institution exists to perform teaching, learning, research, and service to the community and society. This commitment necessitates engaging with many 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:
●   How do the different programs use their expertise to serve the partner communities?
●   Describe activities done by various courses aligned to their expertise.

Supporting Evidence:
●   Community service and engagement plans, policies, guidelines, projects, etc.
●   MOU/MOA with partner agencies
●   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 programmatic, with defined goals, plans, policies, and activities are crafted.	
2. The 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.	
8. There are established systems to evaluate creative works and other activities equivalent to research output.	
9. There is a clear and well-defined program research agenda.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
The institution 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 and 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 its various academic programs?
- How does the research program comply with institutional and regulatory requirements?
- How are Creative Works (fine arts, multimedia projects, performing arts, business projects, modules, etc.,) evaluated and how are equivalencies established? Who evaluates these creative works, and how are they defined in the promotion system of the institution?
- 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:
- List of research activities and completed in recent three years, including creative works
- List of relevant institutions and organizations with established research partnership and collaboration
- Evaluation results on research activities

Area 8.   RESULTS

Sub-ara 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. All programs and courses' pass and dropout rates are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
3. The average time to graduate for all programs is 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 board examinations of board-related programs are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
6. The satisfaction levels of key stakeholders on the quality of graduates are established, monitored, and assessed for improvements.	
7. The institution addresses the needs of the industry and profession based on the results of the appropriate and timely research undertaking.	
8. Constant communication happens between the institution and the industry partners to ascertain that the program is aligned.	
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 graduates' quality. 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 board examinations, and the satisfaction levels of key stakeholders on graduates. The information is gathered, analyzed, and used to improve the programs.

Guide Questions:
- What are the indicators and the methods used in determining, monitoring, and assessing the quality of graduates?
- What measures are utilized to determine whether learning outcomes set on the institutional and programmatic level 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 per course offerings? 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 programs?
- What measures have been undertaken to improve the performance of graduates in board examinations?
- What is the average time for graduates to find employment, and what are the reasons why graduates are not immediately employed?
- How does the institution track the faculty, students, alumni, and employers' satisfaction with the program of studies, teaching-learning process, resources provided, competencies acquired, strengths of graduates, etc.?

Supporting Evidence:
- Performance reports
- Board examination results
- Stakeholders' satisfaction results
- Tracer studies of graduates
- Employment surveys and statistics
- 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 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.	
3. The impact on the program, faculty, staff, and students is identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
4. The impact on these activities' beneficiaries and other stakeholders is 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 carried out by the institution, 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 stakeholder's 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 faculty members and staff are documented, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
2. The research outputs done by the research teams and students are documented and assessed.	
3. The nature and number of research publications are documented, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
4. The program's nature and the number of intellectual properties are documented, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
5. The Program research outputs and their publications are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
6. The impact of research outputs and their publications/creative works are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
7. Stakeholders satisfaction studies/ surveys are done per program.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:
Research activities of the institution 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, faculty, staff research teams, and students?
● What criteria were used in selecting these types of research activities in the different courses/programs?
● 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:
- Performance reports on research activities of the institution
- Research agenda
- Research funds and related resources
- Publications, creative works, 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	