



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

**ARTS, SCIENCES, BUSINESS,
AND EDUCATION
ADDITIONAL 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 Edition

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission from PAASCU.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
GUIDELINES TO ACCREDITATION	1
INTRODUCTION	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
1. ACCREDITATION OF ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS	2
1.1. Quality Assurance	2
1.2. Accreditation	2
2. ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK	2
2.1. Accreditation Framework	2
2.2. Program Accreditation Framework	3
2.3. Alignment of PAASCU Framework with other QA Frameworks	4
2.4. Development of the 2021 Principles-Based Standards	4
2.5. The Survey Instrument	5
2.6. Additional Requirements	5
3. PROGRAM ACCREDITATION	7
4. THE SELF SURVEY REPORT	7
4.1. Contents of the Self Survey Report	8
5. THE SURVEY VISIT	11
6. PAASCU SURVEY REPORT	12
7. COMMISSION REVIEW AND BOARD APPROVAL OF ACCREDITING TEAM DECISION	12
8. FAAP CERTIFICATION OF THE ACCREDITATION LEVEL	13
9. RELEASE CERTIFICATION AND BOARD APPROVAL OF ACCREDITING TEAM DECISION	13
SURVEY INSTRUMENT	14
AREA 3. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	14
Sub-area 3.1 Human Resources	14
Sub-area 3.3 Learning, Physical and IT Resources	17

AREA 4. TEACHING-LEARNING	19
Sub-area 4.1 Curricular Programs	19
Sub-area 4.2 Teaching and Learning Methods	21
AREA 8. RESULTS	23
Sub-area 8.1 Educational Results	23
STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF RATINGS	25

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 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.

This survey instrument was drafted based on the Institutional Accreditation Instrument by the Commission on Tertiary Education members.

1. ACCREDITATION OF ADDITIONAL 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		4. Teaching-Learning		8. Results
2. QA Systems	→	5. Student Services	→	
3. Resource Management	←	6. External Relations	←	
		7. Research		

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 an additional program. This practice is the reason why in conducting the accreditation for this program, only the following areas are considered:

AREA 3. Resource Management

- Sub-area 3.1 Human Resources
- Sub-area 3.3 Learning, Physical and IT Resources

AREA 4. Teaching-Learning

- Sub-area 4.1 Curricular Programs
- Sub-area 4.2 Teaching and Learning Methods

AREA 8. Results (Optional)*

- Sub-area 8.1 Educational Results

* These are optional if the institution has already given a comprehensive report on these areas.

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 additional 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.

2.6. Additional Requirements:

The table below enumerates the additional requirements for accreditation of the additional programs under Liberal Arts, Business, and Education.

A. General Policies
1. For General Education (GE) Courses: 1.a. 50% of all courses must be taught by Full-Time (FT) Faculty (Due to the COVID pandemic, the requirement will not be strictly enforced.) 1.b. Master's degree holders must teach 40% of all GE courses in their field of specialization
2. Faculty teaching professional courses in programs that require PRC licensure examinations should have updated (most recent) PRC-issued ID.
B. Eligibility Requirement Pertinent to Licensure Exams
1. For institutions seeking Initial Accreditation: The performance of first takers in all examinations during the last three years should at least be at par with or above the national passing rate (six exams if board examinations are given twice a year; three for those given yearly)
2. For institutions seeking Re-accreditation: The performance of first takers in all examinations during the last five years should be at par with or above the national passing rate (10 exams if board examinations are given twice a year; five for those given yearly)

C. Guidelines for Granting Re-Accreditation

1. A rating of 3.0 or higher in all areas is granted accreditation.

2. An Interim Visit will be required in the following instances:

- a. A rating of 3.0 in either the area of Faculty* or Curriculum and Instruction **
- b. A rating below 3 in one to two areas, exclusive of Faculty and the area of Curriculum and Instruction

**In the 2021 Survey Instrument, this refers to Standard 8 (Human Resources)*

***In the 2021 Survey Instrument, this refers to Standards 11, 12, 13 (Curricular Programs, Teaching-Learning Methods, Assessment Methods), and Standard 20 (Educational Results)*

Note: The re-accreditation status will be granted for five years with an Interim Visit on the second year in the area/s of deficiency.

3. Accreditation will be deferred in the following instances:

- a. A rating below 3 in either the area of Faculty or the area of Curriculum and Instruction
- b. Ratings lower than 3 in three or more areas
- c. A considerably poor rating (2.5 or lower) in any area

NOTE: The deferral of accreditation will be lifted once the reason for the deferral is addressed by the school. If the reason for the deferral has not been addressed within five years, the program will lose its accreditation status.

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 three 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

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.

For Administrators (Deans/Program Head)

The institution practices responsible management and models leadership that results in an effective and efficient running of the institution.

Criteria	Rating
1. Program administrators (i.e., Dean, Head, and Chair) are well qualified and have relevant experience that enables them to function in their respective roles.	
2. The program administrators promote good governance, integrity, and accountability. Adequate supervision of both faculty members and students is ensured.	
3. The program administrators are open to suggestions and are proactive in anticipating and responding to changes that may affect the administration and operations of the program.	
4. Leadership training and development and succession planning are provided to ensure continuity of program operations whenever the need arises.	
5. There is an established system of evaluating the performance of administrators with feedback mechanisms in place.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:

The strategic role of management and leadership in an organization cannot be overemphasized. The school environment, resulting from its officers' management and leadership styles, significantly affects teaching and learning and is a critical factor in the smooth operations of any institution. The institution should have academically qualified, experienced, and competent administrators who model and promote good governance and leadership and proactively respond to changes in the environment. There is a succession plan to ensure that there will be a wealth/pool of trained administrators available when the need arises.

Guide Questions:

- How qualified are the program administrators in terms of academic and professional experience?
- How are program administrators selected? What criteria are used, and how are these aligned with the job specifications for the position.
- Who evaluates the program administrators? How often are they evaluated?
- How is feedback given to the ratee? How are evaluation results utilized (i.e., re-appointment, promotion, etc.)?
- What kind of supervision is employed to ensure that Faculty are updated with their course content, delivery of instruction, and consultation program with students when needed?

Supporting Evidence:

- Organizational chart (institutional and program)
- Appendix: Administrators and Faculty Qualifications Matrix (including GE faculty)
- Performance Management System
- Evaluation Instrument for Administrators
- Sample evaluation results
- Administrative Manual
- Management Development Program
- Succession planning program, if any (optional)

For the Faculty

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.

Criteria	Rating
1. There is an adequate number of qualified Faculty who handle the General Education, core, and specialized/professional components of the program.	
2. Faculty handling professional courses have sufficient field exposure and practice to integrate the real-world experience into their teaching.	
3. A needs-based training and development program is provided to full-time and part-time Faculty to address the skills set needed for the new modalities in teaching and learning	
4. The Faculty Evaluation System is straightforward and acceptable to all concerned.	
5. Consistency of the teaching and work assignments with the Faculty's qualifications and capabilities are ensured.	
6. Policies are implemented to regulate the number of subject preparations and overloads assigned to the Faculty.	
7. Open and two-way communication channels provide opportunities for faculty-administration feedback and dialogues.	

8. Human resource plans, policies, and programs are periodically assessed for improvement.	
	Average Rating

Explanation:

The program has sufficient academic and non-academic personnel and staff to ensure delivery of instruction is efficiently carried out. Professional licenses for Faculty where and when needed are available and current. Training programs are made available to part-time and full-time Faculty to ensure they are abreast with the latest developments/teaching techniques in their fields. Faculty-administration collaboration and engagement are evident by effective two-way channels of communication that also allow Faculty to air their concerns, especially in matters that directly affect them. All technical resources are in place to ensure that teaching/learning is not hampered by inadequate bandwidth, lack of devices, etc. Evaluation forms for the program content, faculty performance, and student performance are regularly monitored and assessed for improvement.

Guide Questions:

- How sufficient are the full-time and part-time faculty resources in handling all the different courses (GE, foundation, core, and specialized/professional courses)?
- How does the institution ensure that the training and development plans for the academic personnel are participative, relevant, and needs-based?
- What have training and development programs been given to the Faculty?
- How does the program ensure alignment of teaching and work assignments with the qualifications of the Faculty?
- What are the normal teaching load and the number of subject preparations of the Faculty? Who assigns these loads?
- How are overloads treated in terms of assignment and compensation?
- What communication channels are available to the Faculty at the institutional and program levels?
- How effective are these channels of communication in both academic and non-academic issues that need immediate attention?

Supporting Evidence:

- Human Resource manual/Faculty Manual
- Rank and Promotion System
- Salary Scale in the Program and Sample Ranks of Faculty in the program (FT and PT)
- Samples of 201 files
- Training needs analysis conducted
- Job Performance/Appraisal system
- Appraisal Instrument (used by Dean/Chair, student, and peer)
- Ranking and Promotion system of the institution/college/program
- List of the Faculty with professional licenses and latest issuance)

Sub-area 3.3. Learning, Physical and IT Resources

STANDARD 10.

The institution has adequate, conducive, up-to-date, well-maintained, and safe facilities to support the functions of teaching-learning, research, and community service.

Criteria	Rating
1. The program has a documented and regularly updated facilities, learning, and IT development plan supported by a sufficient budget.	
2. The Library, including its collections, laboratories, and equipment, is adequate, accessible, up-to-date, and with a budget for continuous improvement/enhancement.	
2. Facilities, IT support, and teaching and learning resources are available and accessible regardless of the instructional modality.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:

The physical facilities and equipment's availability, adequacy, and accessibility contribute to an environment that directly affects teaching and student learning, motivation, engagement, and sense of personal safety. The physical facilities will also facilitate the conduct of research and community service. Effective management of these facilities with sufficient budget commitment is necessary so that the needs of the various stakeholders are met and are optimally utilized.

Guide Questions:

- Are the required facilities and equipment needed by the course adequately provided?
- How adequate are the library collections, facilities, laboratories, and equipment to support Faculty and students' teaching, learning, and research needs?
- How sufficient is the budget allocated to program facilities' development and maintenance?
- How are the policies and procedures related to physical facilities defined, documented, and subscribed to?
- Are the classrooms, lecture halls, seminar rooms, and computer rooms adequate, kept clean, and free from distractions?
- Are the library and laboratories adequate, accessible, up-to-date?
- Is there a sufficient budget for the development of the required collections?
- How sufficient is the IT support (hardware and software) to meet teaching, learning, and research requirements?
- Are there adequate provisions that promote the health and safety of students and staff?
- Do these facilities comply with health and safety standards?
- Are there provisions to cater to students with special needs?

Supporting Evidence:

- Development plans (facilities, library, laboratory)
- Budget for physical facilities, library, laboratories
- List of required program facilities and equipment, including computer hardware and software
- Library collections needed for the programs under survey
- Safety and maintenance policies and procedures
- Inspection reports/Maintenance reports
- Safety, health, and environmental policies
- Stakeholders' feedback
- Certificates of compliance with regulatory agencies
- Insurance coverage for the physical plant

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 course/program offerings align with the institution's vision, mission, goals, and current regulatory requirements.	
2. Students and key stakeholders participate in the design, development, review, assessment, and periodic updating of program offerings.	
3. Institutional policies on curricular development, delivery, review, and improvement are consistently carried out.	
4. The program and course objectives, policies, and guidelines for curricular adaptation to flexible learning modalities are in place. In addition, expected learning outcomes are established and understood by stakeholders.	
5. Learning delivery modalities and syllabi are developed for each course, communicated to students, and aligned with the program's expected learning outcomes.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:

The curricular program and the desired learning outcomes are disseminated to all concerned. They comply with all the regulatory requirements. With the advent of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), systems are adequately provided and sustained to support the teaching-learning processes utilized in the various programs. Learning outcomes set are achievable and are adapted to the world of work the future graduates will find themselves in.

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 are the institutional vision, mission, and goals-reflected in the various curricula/course offerings?
- How adequately prepared are both Faculty and students in using flexible learning modalities for interim or long-term use?
- What training programs have been administered to ensure their preparedness for these flexible learning modalities, especially courses delivered in a virtual classroom.
- How are learning outcomes established and communicated?
- What process is undertaken to review and assess the relevancy and attractiveness of program offerings?

- What formal structures are in place that strengthens the program's teaching, research, and community service functions?
- How are Board examination results utilized in the improvement of programs where they are required?

Supporting Evidence:

- Program specifications, including learning outcomes (i.e., Program Specifications, especially those given by regulatory bodies)
- Curricular development and review process including samples of minutes of meetings on curricular revision
- Curriculum committee composition, functions
- Curricular evaluation reports
- Bulletin of Information
- Reports of external examiners or accrediting agencies
- Course syllabi for general education, core, and professional courses
- Faculty, student, and alumni feedback on program and course offerings
- Employer Satisfaction Surveys
- Training Programs provided the Faculty for the delivery of the VLE methodologies
- Learning outcomes expected of graduates
- Evaluative criteria used in determining the effectiveness of VLE in instructional delivery
- Report on academe-industry dialogues
- Official Board Exam results from PRC (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. Regardless of modality, the teaching methods and activities align with the program objectives and student learning outcomes.	
3. There is regular monitoring and evaluation of the Learning Management System (LMS) and the activities deployed in the various course offerings with results used for course improvement.	
4. Stakeholders' feedback is considered in selecting, developing, and using specific teaching and learning methods and activities.	
5. Faculty has adequate support to train them in crafting/ developing various learning materials needed for various flexible learning modalities.	
6. Desired learning outcomes are established, monitored, and evaluated against selected performance indicators.	
7. A system of assessing teaching performance is in place for different teaching-learning modalities.	
Average Rating	

Explanation:

The teaching and learning (TL) approach used in the program reflects the institution's educational philosophy. They facilitate the achievement of the expected learning outcomes and promote life-long learning. Appropriate teaching and learning methods and approaches, including the new modalities in the delivery of flexible learning, are well selected, deployed, and regularly evaluated by relevant stakeholders. In addition, the institution provides continuous training in the use of new methodologies.

Guide Questions:

- How does the institution's educational philosophy articulate the teaching-learning processes adopted in the programs/courses offered?
- How are the methods and activities utilized aligned with the expected learning outcomes?
- What learning management system (LMS) and new modalities in flexible learning are adopted to deliver various courses? Briefly describe the various learning modalities utilized in the different courses.
- What structures are in place to support/assess the flexible learning modalities, especially online learning, for Faculty and students?
- How does IT support teaching and learning, and are IT facilities sufficient for the needs of the programs/courses?

- How are teaching and learning (TL) methods and activities evaluated and improved?
- Who or what office is in charge of conducting the regular evaluation of the teaching-learning (TL) methodologies?

Supporting Evidence:

- Teaching strategies and instructional methods, i.e., LMS used
- Faculty and student feedback on teaching and learning strategies employed
- Evaluation/Feedback reports on teaching and learning methods and activities (administration, faculty, students)
- Reports on practical training, projects, and other action-learning activities
- In-campus and off-campus teaching exposure reports
- Industry immersion programs
- Internship Reports or alternative activities, if any
- MOAs and Contracts with external parties
- Budgets allocated for the new learning modality
- Official Board Exam results from PRC (where applicable)

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.

Note: Documentation and explanation of tracer studies and employee satisfaction will be sufficient for programs that do not require board examinations.

An explanation should cover how learning outcomes set for the course are achieved. Challenges they face, if any, and what measures are being undertaken to address these challenges.

Criteria	Rating
1. The program and course expected learning outcomes are well defined, periodically reviewed, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
2. The students' pass and dropout rates for all programs are recorded, regularly monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
3. The employability of graduates of the program is established, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
4. Graduates' pass and failure rates in board examinations of board-related programs are identified, monitored, and assessed for improvement.	
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 graduates. While these are usually set for the institution, the program/course offering may have indicators peculiar to the course.

Guide Questions:

- What are the indicators and the methods used in determining, monitoring, and assessing the quality of graduates for the course?
- Describe measures that have been undertaken to improve dropout rates if needed?
- What measures have been undertaken to improve the performance of graduates in board examinations, when applicable?

Commented [I1]:

Commented [C2R1]:

Commented [C3R1]:

Supporting Evidence:

- Board examination results
- Stakeholders' satisfaction results
- Tracer studies of graduates
- Employment surveys and statistics
- Graduates, alumni, and employer surveys

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF RATINGS

Statistical Summary of Ratings	Ratings (In two decimal places)
Area 3. Resource Management	
Sub-area 3.1 Human Resources	
Sub-area 3.3 Learning, Physical and IT Resources	
Area 3 Average Rating	
Area 4. Teaching-Learning	
Sub-area 4.1 Curricular Programs	
Sub-area 4.2 Teaching and Learning Methods	
Area 4 Average Rating	
Area 8. Results (Optional)*	
Sub-area 8.1 Education Results	
Area 8 Average Rating	
Overall Average Rating	