

# **PROCEEDINGS 2007**

## **20<sup>TH</sup> AACUP ANNUAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE**

**Polkabal – Pandango Ballroom, Manila Hotel, Manila  
February 26-27, 2007**

**THEME:  
20 Years of Accreditation: Trials,  
Tribulations and Triumphs...**

**ACCREDITING AGENCY OF CHARTERED COLLEGES AND  
UNIVERSITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES (AACUP)**

# **PROCEEDINGS 2007**

**20<sup>TH</sup> AACUP ANNUAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE**

**Polkabal – Pandango Ballroom, Manila Hotel, Manila**

**February 26-27, 2007**

***Theme: 20 Years of Accreditation: Trials,  
Tribulations and Triumphs...***

**DOCUMENTATION COMMITTEE**

**Dr. Alberto J. Trinidad**  
Chairman

**Dr. Marcela T. Caluscosin**

**Dr. Miriam S. Cervantes**

**Dr. Nilo E. Colinares**

**Dominic T. Martinez**

**Paul John L. Cabugao**

Members

**Dr. Manuel T. Corpus**  
Consultant

## FOREWORD

The 20<sup>th</sup> AACCUP National Annual Conference deviated a bit from the usual run-of-the mill assemblies, because it was a review of the past, a recall of the trials and tribulations that threatened the very roots of its survival, and the subsequent triumphs that it experienced and continues to experience up to the present.

The recognition of the individuals and institutions which stuck it out with the Agency and made the attainment of the triumphs possible, was the other main feature of the conference.

On hand to witness the proceedings which awarded the “firsts” in AACCUP was Dr. Angel C. Alcalá, the first Chairman of the Commission On Higher Education (CHED) and incumbent Chair of the National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA). With him was the Hon. Edgardo J. Angara, author of R.A. 7222 creating the CHED which for its part, issued the CMO 01 s. 2005 authorizing the establishment of, and consequently recognizing the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA as main components of the NNQAA. Other distinguished officials and personalities who graced the occasion with their presence were Hon. Cynthia A. Villar, Chair, Committee on Higher and Technical Education, Guest of Honor and Speaker during the Final Plenary session; Hon. Nenilyn P. Defensor, CHED Commissioner who conducted a Dialogue on Quality Assurance; Dr. Heracleo D. Lagrada, CHED Office of Program and Standards Director III, who sketched a global picture of Quality Assurance in the Next Five Years, and most important, all of the 554 participants from 101 SUCs whose attendance made the conference a concrete reality.

The pages that follow give us a picture of the metamorphosis of AACCUP – from its origins as one of the humble siblings of a mother federation, later a weanling and now on its own, as a major, dynamic constituent of the NNQAA, a leading nationally- and internationally-recognized accreditation agency.

In behalf of AACCUP, I would like to acknowledge with thanks the painstaking work of the Documentation Committee led by Dr. Alberto J. Trinidad, Chairman, and the Members of the Committee: Dr. Marcela T. Caluscasin, Dr. Miriam S. Cervantes, Dr. Nilo E. Colinares, and the production staff for putting together this excellent piece documenting the proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> AACCUP National Conference.

**MANUEL T. CORPUS**  
Executive Director

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Pages</b>
Foreword	i
I. Program of Activities	1
II. Proceedings	3
III. Keynote Speech	3
IV. Panel Discussions	
A. AACCU <b>P</b> Revisited: Accreditation Circa 1987	8
B. Accreditation Under AACCU <b>P</b> Assessed: AACCU <b>P</b> 's Accomplishment...	14
C. Quality Assurance in the Next Five Years: IQUAME	17
D. Year-end Report of the President	29
E. Accreditation as a Tool in Achieving Academic Excellence	42
V. Income Statement	46
VI. Balance Sheet	47
VII. Report of the Independent Certified Public Accountant	48
VIII. List of Participants	49
IX. Officers and Members of the Board of Trustees 2006-2007	59



**20<sup>TH</sup> AACCU<sup>P</sup> NATIONAL CONFERENCE**  
**February 26-27, 2007**

**PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES**  
**(Polkabal-Pandango Ballroom, Manila Hotel)**

**FEBRUARY 26, 2007 (MONDAY)**

P.M.	6:00	-	9:30	REGISTRATION and RECEPTION	<b>Dr. Aladino L. Leccio</b> Member, AACCU <sup>P</sup> Board of Trustees, and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Capiz State University <i>Coordinator</i>
	9:30	-	9:45	COFFEE BREAK	
	9:45		10:00	PARTICIPANTS and GUESTS ASSEMBLE	
	10:00	-	11:30	OPENING PROGRAM	
				- Invocation	<b>Dr. Priscilla C. Viuya</b> President, Tarlac State University
				- National Anthem	<b>Prof. Marina S. Quesada</b> Faculty Regent, Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University
				- Opening Statement and Welcome	<b>Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel</b> President, AACCU <sup>P</sup> , and President, Bulacan State University
				- Keynote Speech	<b>Dr. Angel C. Alcala</b> Chairman National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies
				- Speech by the Guest of Honor and Speaker	<b>Hon. Edgardo J. Angara</b> Senator, Republic of the Philippines
				- Intermission Number	
				Dr. Nelson T. Binag Vice President, AACCU <sup>P</sup> President, Sultan Kudarat Polytechnic State College <i>Presiding</i>	
	11:30	-	12:00	PLENARY SESSION: NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR AACCU <sup>P</sup> BOARD MEMBERS	<b>Dr. Pablo T. Mateo, Jr.</b> Director, NNQA <i>Comelec Chair</i>
<b>P.M.</b>	12:00	-	1:00	LUNCH BREAK	
	1:00	-	1:15	GUESTS and PARTICIPANTS ASSEMBLE	
	1:15	-	3:15	AACCU <sup>P</sup> REVISITED: ACCREDITATION CIRCA 1987	<b>Dr. Manuel T. Corpus</b> Executive Director Founding President of AACCU <sup>P</sup>
				ACCREDITATION UNDER AACCU <sup>P</sup> ASSESSED	<b>Dr. Catalino P. Rivera</b> President, University of Pangasinan, and Director, NNQAA
				Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang Member, AACCU <sup>P</sup> Board of Trustees, and President, Cavite State University <i>Presiding</i>	

3:15 - 3:45 COFFEE BREAK  
3:45 5:15 DIALOGUE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE

**Hon. Nenalyn P. Defensor**  
Commissioner, Commission on  
Higher Education

Dr. Ester B. Velasquez  
Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees  
President, Cebu Normal University  
*Presiding*

**FEBRUARY 27, 2007 (TUESDAY)**

8:30 - 10:30 ELECTION OF AACCUP BOARD MEMBERS

**Dr. Pablo T. Mateo, Jr.**  
Director, NNQAA  
*Presiding*

BUSINESS MEETING

**Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel**  
*Presiding*

10:30 - 11:00 BREAK

11:00 - 12:00 PLENARY SESSION  
— Quality Assurance in the Next Five Years

**Dr. Heracleo D. Lagrada**  
Director III, Office of Programs  
and Standards, CHED

Dr. Danilo S. Hilario  
Auditor, AACCUP Board of Trustees  
VP for Planning, Research and Extension  
Bulacan State University  
*Presiding*

P.M. 12:00 - 1:00 LUNCH BREAK

1:00 - 1:15 PROCLAMATION OF THE ELECTED  
BOARD MEMBERS

**Dr. Pablo T. Mateo, Jr.**

1:15 - 3:00 FINAL PLENARY SESSION

SPEECH OF THE GUEST OF  
HONOR AND SPEAKER

**Hon. Cynthia A. Villar**  
Chair, Committee on  
Higher and Technical Education  
House of Representatives

AWARDS OF DISTINCTION AND  
RECOGNITION

AWARD OF CERTIFICATES OF  
ASSESSED PROGRAMS (2006)

CLOSE OF CONFERENCE

Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel  
*Presiding*

Dr. Grace G. Lopez  
Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees, and  
Director, Internal Assessment Body  
University of Southern Mindanao  
*Overall Plenary Session Manager*

**20<sup>TH</sup> AACCUP NATIONAL CONFERENCE**  
**Manila Hotel, Manila**  
**February 26-27, 2007**

**PROCEEDINGS\_**

**February 25, 2007**

Registration of participants officially began at 3:00 p.m. of February 25 with Dr. Aladino L. Leccio, AACCUP Trustee from Capiz State University, as coordinator.

A management briefing was also held at 3:00 p.m. to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the different committees created for the smooth management of this year's AACCUP Annual National Conference. In attendance were members of the AACCUP Board and of the designated committees and consultants with Dr. Manuel T. Corpus, Executive Director, presiding.

The committees were concerned with registration, documentation/newsletter, meal and snacks, reception, finances, conference facilities, powerpoint presentation and sound system, and election.

**February 26, 2007**

**Morning**

***Registration***

Registration of participants continued until 9:00 a.m., preceding the opening program. Participants totaled 554.

Region VI (Western Visayas) had the largest regional delegation with 86 participants while the Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University had sent the biggest number, with 21 delegates. Among the participants were SUC presidents, vice presidents, deans and directors, Internal Assessment Body heads, senior faculty members and accreditors.

***Opening Program***

Dr. Nelson T. Binag, AACCUP Vice President and President of the Sultan Kudarat Polytechnic State College, presided over the opening program which started with the invocation by Dr. Priscilla C. Viuya, President of Tarlac State University and the Pambansang Awit led by Prof. Marina S. Quesada, Faculty Regent of Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University.

Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel, President of the AACCUP and of the Bulacan State University, welcomed the delegates and gave an opening statement.

The keynote speech was delivered by Dr. Angel C. Alcalá, Chairman of the National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA). Expressing privileged pleasure to be part of the AACCUP's 20<sup>th</sup> Annual National Conference, Dr. Alcalá cited the AACCUP's distinctive leadership in the NNQAA and its becoming the fourth accrediting agency in the country during his term as Chairman of the CHED. Dr. Alcalá stressed the vital role of institutional accreditation

in the SUCs' quest for global excellence. He further noted that many SUCs are well-equipped and capable of performing lead services and functions and may further aim for recognition as Centers of Development or Centers of Excellence.

In conclusion, Dr. Alcala expressed his strong confidence in the AACCUP as a lead accrediting agency as he looked forward to more achievements in program and institutional accreditation in the coming years.

The keynote address was followed with a speech by Senator Edgardo J. Angara, guest of honor. Sen. Angara's speech focused on: (1) globalization of higher education, (2) revisit of CHED's mission and (3) quality of education.

Sen. Angara pointed out that students should be trained for the world; students' performance should be continuously upgraded; teachers' quality and training enhanced; and Filipinos' awareness raised that they are competing with the rest of the world.

He mentioned the Philippines' deplorable performance in international academic tests, where the Philippines, ranked 41<sup>st</sup> in Science and 43<sup>rd</sup> in Mathematics among 44 countries.

The Senator likewise stated the importance of reviewing the mission of the CHED, advancing the belief that the Commission should veer back to its original developmental task rather than pursue its present regulatory activities.

### ***Plenary Session I***

Originally set at 11:30 a.m., Plenary Session I, the Nomination of Candidates for AACCUP Board Members, was held an hour earlier due to some schedule modification.

The Election Committee was composed of Dr. Pablo T. Mateo Sr., as Chairperson; with Dr. Mariano J. Guillermo and Dr. Nilo E. Colinares, as members.

To facilitate the nomination procedures, additional members were selected from among the delegates to take charge of the nomination activities for the three geographical areas:

For Luzon - Dr. Eledio Acibar of EARIST and Dr. Aida Tobes of Samar State College of Agriculture and Forestry;

For the Visayas - Dr. Tomasa C. Iringan of Cagayan State University and Dr. Juanito V. Garcines of Agusan del Sur State College of Agriculture and Technology; and

For Mindanao - Dr. Max P. Guillermo of Tarlac College of Agriculture and Dr. Cristina B. Coloma of Mariano Marcos State University.

In his presentation, Dr. Mateo stressed that the election procedures had been approved by the AACCUP Board of Trustees and initially implemented in 2005.

He reminded the assembly that the BOT is composed of 11 three-category members: Category 1 - from SUC presidents/vice presidents (2 from Luzon and 1 each from the Visayas and Mindanao); Category 2 - from deans/directors (2 from Luzon and 1 each from the Visayas and Mindanao); and 3 faculty members (1 each from Luzon, the Visayas and Mindanao).

## Afternoon

### ***Plenary Session II***

Plenary Session II was presided over by Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang, member of the AACCUP Board of Trustees and President of Cavite State University.

The session included two presenters - Dr. Manuel T. Corpus, Executive Director and Founding President of the AACCUP, on - "AACCUP Revisited: Accreditation CIRCA 1987" and Dr. Catalino P. Rivera, President of University of Pangasinan and NNQAA Director – on "Accreditation Under AACCUP Assessed."

In his presentation, Dr. Corpus, brought back a torrent of recollected historical vignettes about the AACCUP with his comprehensive and graphic delineation of the Agency since it was established in 1987.

Dr. Corpus' presentation paid homage to the prominent individuals instrumental in the conceptualization and establishment of the AACCUP, the first Board of Trustees, the first Technical Committee members, the incorporators and the pioneer accreditors. Also mentioned were the first four SUCs to provide manpower, material and financial resources and the first six SUCs to submit for accreditation.

The difficulties and achievements of the AACCUP were likewise recalled-- the problems encountered with the CHED and the FAAP and their final resolutions, the creation of the NNQAA in cooperation with the ALCU-COA, the establishment of international quality assurance linkages, the conduct of accreditation-related seminars, training and workshops, the promotion of institutional accreditation and other related matters.

For his part, Dr. Rivera gave a lucid narration of the AACCUP's relentless pursuit of the attainment of quality higher education, particularly among state-funded universities and colleges. He underscored the AACCUP's success in introducing and sustaining quality improvement measures as well as the positive impact of the Agency's accreditation efforts on the continued development of the SUCs' program provisions.

A dialogue on quality assurance with Dr. Nenalyn P. Defensor, CHED Commissioner, followed. Dr. Ester B. Velasquez, AACCUP Trustee and President of Cebu Normal University, was the presiding officer.

The dialogue, although attempting to dwell on various other concerns such as requests for CHED support by some SUCs, basically focused on the IQuAME being pushed by the CHED. Certain related comments, reactions and questions were: The IQuAME is beneficial to private schools and not to SUCs. How is the IQuAME reconciled with the accreditation conducted by private agencies like the AACCUP? Doesn't IQuAME overlap with private agency accreditation? Is IQuAME compulsory for both private and public schools? Isn't the IQuAME contrary to the autonomous status SUCs'? The IQuAME must begin with low-performing schools. These and other queries and comments were hurled during the dialogue.

**February 27, 2007**

**Morning**

***Election of AACCUP Officers***

Under Dr. Pablo T. Mateo Jr.'s supervision, as Chairperson of AACCUP COMELEC, with Dr. Mariano Guillermo and Dr. Nilo Colinares as members, the election of AACCUP Board members was conducted at 8:30 -10:30 a.m. Voting was made by institution, with the ballot for each institution accomplished and cast only by the head of the delegation.

Before election, however, the candidates were requested to ascend the stage to be appropriately seen and recognized by the conference participants. A few lucky candidates even had the chance to speak for a few minutes.

Three ballot boxes were provided, one for each of the three areas: Luzon, the Visayas and Mindanao.

***The President's Report/Business Meeting***

Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel, President, Bulacan State University and Concurrent President of AACCUP, gave his report for the year 2006. Highlights of the report included the AACCUP's accomplishments and related activities. Major problems were also cited.

The AACCUP's 2006 accomplishments were: (1) CHED's recognition of the NNQAA as umbrella network for the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA; (2) the 2006 Annual National Conference; (3) implementation of the revised AACCUP policies and procedures; (4) training on "Managing Accreditation Survey Visits"; (5) the 2006 training of accreditors on the "New Criteria, Instrument, Procedures and Roles; (7) AACCUP's exposure in international conferences; and (8) 392 accredited programs and 58 programs with on-going assessment.

Other activities were: (1) consultancy visits; (2) national and international linkages; (3) publication of a journal and a newsletter; and (4) insurance of accreditors.

Among the major problems were: (1) inability to automate data; (2) limited resources; and (3) lack of qualified technical personnel.

***Plenary Session III***

Dr. Danilo S. Hilario, AACCUP Accreditor and VP for Planning, Research and Extension of Bulacan State University, presided over Plenary Session III.

Dr. Heracleo D. Lagrada, Director III of the Office of Programs and Standards of the CHED, presented a paper on "Quality Assurance in the Next Five Years". Dr. Lagrada's presentation was actually a detailed delineation of the IQuAME and the CHED's push for quality assurance.

Dr. Lagrada was emphatic in stating that the IQuAME is different from, but complementary to, the program accreditation carried out by accrediting bodies. The IQuAME, he clarified, is outcomes-based and developmental. He also explained the IQuAME framework, HEI

categorization under the IQuAME, the self-evaluation document, and the assessment visits it conducts.

### **Afternoon**

#### ***Proclamation of the Elected Board Members***

The afternoon session started with the proclamation of the elected board members by Dr. Mateo.

The elected members were:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>1. DR. RUPERTO S. SANGALANG</b>       | ▪ <i>Cavite State University</i>  |
| <b>2. DR. NELSON T. BINAG</b>            | ▪ <i>Sultan Kudarat Polytechnic State College</i>   |
| <b>3. DR. DANILO S. HILARIO</b>          | ▪ <i>Bulacan State University</i>   |
| <b>4. DR. ESTER B. VELASQUEZ</b>         | ▪ <i>Cebu Normal University</i>   |
| <b>5. DR. MIRIAM S. CERVANTES</b>        | ▪ <i>Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University</i>   |
| <b>6. DR. MARCELA T. CALUSCOSIN</b>      | ▪ <i>Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University</i>   |
| <b>7. DR. GRACE G. LOPEZ</b>             | ▪ <i>University of Southern Mindanao</i>  |
| <b>8. DR. BRIGIDA A. ROSCOM</b>          | ▪ <i>Mindanao State University – Iligan Institute of Technology</i>                           |
| <b>9. DR. MARIA THERESA S. J. VALDEZ</b> | ▪ <i>Tarlac College of Agriculture</i>  |
| <b>10. DR. GRACE B. BELO</b>             | ▪ <i>West Visayas State University</i>  |
| <b>11. DR. RAUL F. MUYONG</b>            | ▪ <i>Western Visayas College of Science and Technology</i>                                    |
| <b>12. DR. MANUEL T. CORPUS</b>          | ▪ <i>Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACUP)</i> |

#### ***Plenary Session IV***

Representative Cynthia A. Villar, Chair of the Committee on Higher and Technical Education of the House of Representatives, was the guest of honor and speaker for the closing session. Presiding officer of the session was Dr. Grace G. Lopez, AACUP Trustee and Director for Internal Assessment of the University of Southern Mindanao.

Congressman Villar's speech revolved around "Accreditation as a Tool in Achieving Academic Excellence." She presented an update of what her committee had lately accomplished, such as a number of House Bills converting state colleges into state universities, the amendment of the UP Charter and a resolution for full funding of the continuing training of basic education teachers.

Rep. Villar expressed her strong belief in education that is responsive to the needs of the times and of the people in need of finding satisfactory means of livelihood. This, to her, is the challenge to the Philippine educational system and to all Filipino educators.

The conference ended with the distribution of awards of distinction and recognition and the certificates of assessed programs in 2006.

**AACCUP REVISITED: ACCREDITATION CIRCA 1987**  
*(Twenty Years of Accreditation: Trials, Tribulations and Triumphs:  
The AACCUP Story)*

By

**Manuel T. Corpus**  
Executive Director & Founding President

For a deeper understanding and appreciation of our trials, tribulations and triumphs, we have divided the first twenty years into seven episodes, to wit:

- Phase I – Idea Stage (1980-86)
- Phase II – Organizational Stage (1987-89)
- Phase III – Mobilization & Activation (1988-92)
- Phase IV – Accreditation Takes Off (1992-95)
- Phase V – Accreditation Surges (1995-95)
- Phase VI – The Dark Ages (1999-2003)
- Phase VII – The Triumph of Reason (2004-05)

Phase I - Idea Stage (1980-86)

At this time, Accreditation was heard only in the conference halls of SUCs.

Dr. Bonifacio P. Sibayan presented a paper on accreditation in 1980 and this elicited various reactions from the President-participants. They chorused that accreditation is not needed in the autonomous SUCs. Nevertheless, Dr. Abraham I. Felipe sounded off PASUC on the scheme in 1984, which for its part, constituted a Committee On Accreditation in 1985-87. After making studies on the various accrediting systems, the committee recommended the organization of the State Colleges and Universities Accrediting Association of the Philippines (SCUAAP).

Phase II - The Organizational Stage (1987-1989)

The SCUAAP came into being at the Philippine Normal University on November 19, 1987 with the First Board constituted as follows:

Manuel T. Corpus, CagSU	Maria D. Manuel, MMSU
Mariano P. Albayalde, PBMIT	Pureza T. Vallejos, EARIST
Teresita T. Tumapon, BSC	Eden M. Deveza, TUP

Among other accomplishments, the first Board crafted the SCUAAP Articles of Incorporation, and later, that of the AACCUP, and organized the First Technical Committee with themselves as the working Board in 1988. They were later joined by Prof. Monserrat Babaran and Dr. Flor Mandac of CagSU, Dr. Florentina L. Gorospe representing SCUAAP, Prof. Perla S. Roxas of TUP, Dr. Fara Santos of PNC and Dr. Gloria C. Camarao of TUP.

The FTC held workshops to prepare a “Manual on Accreditation” containing the Philosophy, Nature and Benefits of Accreditation, Qualification of Accreditors,

Objectives, Criteria and Procedures; Accreditation Survey Instruments and Design for Training of Accreditors.

An Office Staff was organized in 1987 with Prof. Monserrat Babaran as the First Official to perform the function of Executive Director, Prof. John S. Imlan as the first duly appointed Executive Director (1988) and Dr. Florentina L. Gorospe as the First Technical Consultant. (1988)

During that time, there was no budget for the operations of the agency. There was, therefore, no form of compensation for the Board and Technical committee members; office space was provided for free; travel expenses of Board and Committee members were paid by their respective institutions; and workshop expenses were shouldered by SUCs.

But SCUAAP was not lacking in volunteers for aid. The first four SUCs to provide material and financial assistance were:

1. Cagayan State University
2. Technological University of the Philippines
3. Polytechnic University of the Philippines
4. Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University

#### Phase III - Mobilization and Activation (1989-1992)

What began as SCUAAP, was renamed AACCUP by technical advice of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The AACCUP Articles of Incorporation was approved on September 4, 1989. The Agency then found a new home in TUP in 1988 and at PUP, in 1992. Dr. F.L. Gorospe took over the chairmanship of the Technical Committee. By that time, the membership had increased and the Technical Committee finalized the Manual On Accreditation and the Accreditation Survey Instruments. A Training on Accreditation subsequently followed. The "Ideology of Accreditation" continued to gain adherents and advocates.

#### Phase IV - Accreditation Takes Off (1992-1995)

AACCUP was now all set for action for accreditation survey visits, but no institution dared to take the first move. The Board then decided to begin accreditation surveys in the institutions they represented. The AACCUP President, at that time President of DMMMSU, leading by example, volunteered his institution to be visited by AACCUP. This was followed by five other SUCs. Thus, the first six SUCs brave enough to tread on unfamiliar grounds in 1992 were:

1. DMMMSU – Sept. 15-17  
(Teacher Education & Agriculture)
2. DSAC – Oct. 5-7 (Agriculture)
3. Pangasinan SU – Oct. 8-10 (Fisheries)  
Nov. 16-19 (Teacher Education)
4. NVSPC – Nov. 9-13  
(Grad. Educ. & Arts & Sciences)
5. MMSU – Nov. 23-25 (Graduate Education, Teacher Ed. & Agriculture)

## 6. BU – Dec. 7-10 (Graduate Education)

Starting with only 11 programs in 6 state universities and colleges during its maiden year, AACCUP recorded a harvest of 33 programs in 13 institutions three years later. The progress was slow, but accreditation had been put in place.

### Phase V - Accreditation Surges (1996-1999)

By the middle of the decade (1995), AACCUP has practically remained as an unknown entity. But with about 33 accredited programs to its credit, accreditation designed for state universities and colleges had been noticed by no less than the Secretary of Education, Armand Fabella, who at that time was the Chairman of the Board of state universities and colleges.

Finding the building enthusiasm of the SUCs in accreditation, Secretary Fabella committed financial assistance from the Accreditation Subsidy Fund. Being the umbrella organization of accrediting agencies at that time. FAAP objected to this generous gesture of support. AACCUP was admitted Member of FAAP on October 6, 1995. Dr. Angel C. Alcala, the first Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education, then released a P1.85M subsidy in 1996.

The infusion of financial assistance further fired the interest to get into accreditation. During this period, accreditation survey visits increased from 33 programs in 13 SUCs in 1992-95 to 97 programs in 27 SUCs in 1996-99.

AACCUP became a member of FAAP and financial subsidy was in place. Dark clouds however began to appear in the horizon. Rumors floated that AACCUP was going too fast, so that there was already a big number of Level III programs. The quality of accreditors was poor and consequently, the quality of accreditation. It was a case of "scratch my back, and I scratch yours" in many instances, according to the malicious gossip.

AACCUP's response to the accusations was direct. "Let us have common standards; we invite you to join the AACCUP Training of Accreditors, and let us conduct joint Survey Visits." AACCUP also opted for CHED's stronger role in the oversight of Accreditation and a review of the present standards in FAAP certification of accredited programs.

### Phase VI - The Dark Ages (1999-2003)

As the youngest member, AACCUP had lofty expectations of its membership in the FAAP. It expected professional assistance, equal treatment among peers, financial subsidy and leadership rotation among the four member agencies. Dreams were however shattered when it did not get a share of FAAP's "hidden wealth" of criteria, standards, procedures, etc.; AACCUP was bluntly labeled a neophyte; it was not given a subsidy which seemed to be reserved for old members of the agency.

Dr. Ester Garcia became the CHED Chairperson and in the January 28, 2000 Annual Convention, she lionized AACCUP and continued to provide the P2M subsidy started by Chairman Alcala.

Ironically, it was in this same forum where the general assembly composed of all its participants in the Convention aired their gripes against AACCCUP's membership in FAAP principally because of FAAP's non-certification of AACCCUP-accredited programs and its refusal to reveal the standards for certifying programs, and other issues. The assembly adopted a resolution urging AACCCUP to withdraw membership from FAAP. This collective action was followed by a similar resolution from PASUC on February 11, 2000.

The AACCCUP Board unanimously approved the withdrawal from FAAP for the following reasons:

1. Fundamental Incompatibilities
  - a. There was a call for the adoption of common standards for all member-agencies by AACCCUP but the umbrella organization seemed not to heed it.
  - b. The wish of AACCCUP was for the CHED to have an active role in the oversight of accreditation but the federation would not entertain the idea.
  - c. Certification of Accreditation by FAAP seemed evasive for AACCCUP-accredited programs but was readily and easily available for other agencies.
2. Anomalous Practices in Certifying AACCCUP Accredited Programs
3. Absence of Standards in Certifying Programs
4. Refusal to share the CHED financial subsidy
5. Exclusion of AACCCUP from the Rotation of Leadership

With all these developments, there was no response from FAAP. Neither were there comments from CHED.

On August 12, 2000, AACCCUP in full force, sought a conference with CHED. Request granted, this was attended by Chair Ester Garcia and Commissioner Kate Botengan. The talking points which AACCCUP recommended were for CHED to: 1) certify AACCCUP-accredited programs 2) play stronger oversight of Accredited Agencies in accordance with the recommendations of the Presidential Commission for Educational Reforms (PCER) 3) grant financial subsidy to AACCCUP.

The coming of the Dark Age was deliberate. CHED apparently wanted to eradicate AACCCUP or "starve it to death." The annual subsidy in 2002 was denied. The CHED Chair dangled P2M to AACCCUP provided it asked the grant from FAAP. During the PASUC meeting of February 1, 2002, the CHED Chairman announced that "AACCCUP-accredited programs are not recognized by CHED." On May 27, 2002, the PASUC issued a memorandum on the "Moratorium in Accreditation Surveys". Rumors circulated that the SUC Presidents' expenses on Accreditation will be disallowed by COA". Dr. Eldigario Gonzales tried to stop the AACCCUP Annual National Convention and a move was made to investigate AACCCUP.

Overwhelmed by these negative developments, 6 SUCs capitulated. They stopped their accreditation activities. The majority, however, were undaunted in their resolve to pursue quality education through accreditation through AACCCUP accreditation for that matter. Surprisingly, requests for accreditation visits even soared: from 93 programs in 1999 to 318 in 2003 or an increase of 343%, from 27 SUCs in 1999 to 58 SUCs in 2003 or an increase of 230%.

A new era on accreditation had come: Institutional Accreditation. On March 1, 2001, the AACCUP Board commissioned a study on the new scheme. Workshop outputs were tested in the INQUAAHE Conference in Bangalore, India on March 19-22, 2001. A Study Team under the British Council studied Institutional Accreditation in UK and Australia. On November 11-13, 2002, a workshop was held at the Bulacan State University with Dr. John Randall of the British Council as Seminar Director.

On July 24-25, 2005, AACCUP conducted an international training on Institutional Accreditation attended by delegates from the Asia-Pacific institutions. The Deputy Adviser of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council of India, a Professor Emeritus from the University of Otago in New Zealand, an official of the Australian University Quality Assurance (AUQA) and the AACCUP Executive Director, served as Resource Speakers and Facilitators. On February 28-March 1, 2007, another workshop was held to prepare accreditation instruments for Institutional Accreditation as a sequel to the July 2005 workshop. Other orientation-workshops followed in May-July 2007.

#### Phase VII - The Triumph of Reason (2004-2006)

After all the trials and tribulations that besetted the agency that gave rise some doubting Thomases among its members, the AACCUP rose to higher dimensions with reason as its saving grace. Reason triumphed over the malicious innuendoes hurled against the agency which was able to prove its innocence by persistently continuing to in its task of evaluating SUC programs.

Reason also stood victorious in the appointment of a new CHED Chair in 2003, Dr. Rolando C. Dizon.

Dr. Dizon restored respect for AACCUP and motivated member-institutions to join forces with another association of government HEIs, the ALCU-COA, which would eventually compose the NNQAA. He also brought back the financial assistance for the agency. The next Chairman, Dr. Rolando de la Rosa (2004), continued Bro. Dizon's initiatives. Most significantly, he issued CHED Order No. 1, s. 2005 on February 15, 2005 (Revised Policies and Guidelines On Voluntary Accreditation in Aid of Quality and Excellence in Higher Education) which superseded CHED Order No. 31, s. 1995.

CHED Order No. 01 s. 2005, solved all of AACCUP's problems with FAAP. All programs accredited by AACCUP prior to the issuance of the Order were recognized. This another affirmation of the Triumph of Reason. The National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA) was organized in 2003 with Dr. Benjamin Tayabas of ALU-COA, Dr. Ceferina Taringting of ALCU-COA and Dr. Rosario Pimentel and Dr Manuel T. Corpus of AACCUP, as prime movers.

With everything in place again, AACCUP continued to gain international recognition. Through its Executive Director, AACCUP was elected Member of the Board of Trustees of the Asia-Pacific Quality Network. A team of five countries was constituted by APQN to work on "Qualifications Framework" and AACCUP Executive Director, Dr. Manuel T. Corpus as designated Project Leader. Later, he presented papers in New Zealand (2005), Shanghai, China (2006) and Kuala Lumpur Malaysia (2007). Services of foreign consultants were availed of for Institutional Accreditation Training in 2005 and some members of the AACCUP Board sponsored by APQN to participate in foreign conferences and fora.

As we gather here today in celebration of our 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, we are proud to present the current figures which clearly define our triumphs overcoming years of trials and tribulations. This is what AACCCUP is today:

450 Programs Assessed in 2006

101 SUC members as of December 2006

98 SUCs – Represented in the 2007 Conference by 554 Participants

## **AACCUP'S ACCOMPLISHMENT AT A GLANCE: MAKING QUALITY IMPROVEMENT INTEGRAL TO PROGRAM PROVISIONS**

**Dr. Catalino P. Rivera**  
President, University of Pangasinan  
Dagupan City

The Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP) has pursued, since its establishment in 1987, an organizational goal and mission to contribute to the attainment of quality higher education particularly among state-funded higher education institutions. In pursuit of this goal and mission, the AACCUP strategically has put in place a system that externally assesses the quality of provisions of degree offerings among chartered colleges and universities. This external assessment of quality, AACCUP believes, will drive these institutions to improve continuously and further enhance the quality not only of the provisions of the degree offerings but critically to improve the overall quality of higher education programs that they offer.

On this occasion of the AACCUP's twentieth foundation year, the aforesaid goal and mission has been revisited through a survey (of about 20% of AACCUP's active institutional members) on their general impressions of the AACCUP's contribution to quality improvement in higher education. The results of the survey show that the AACCUP has been successful in helping state colleges and universities improve their program provisions. All respondents claimed that, as a result of the external assessment of program provisions conducted by the AACCUP, quality improvement measures have been introduced and sustained. The perceived positive impact of AACCUP accreditation is so great that respondents look forward to the agency's continuing program assessment to insure continuing and further development of their program provisions. These institutions regard AACCUP accreditation as 'quality assurance' and understand the AACCUP to be synonymous to 'prestige and quality'.

Given the results of this survey, it can be claimed that the AACCUP has registered highly positive influence on quality improvement of program provisions in state colleges and universities and is continuing to do so. The goal and mission it has set for itself to accomplish has been substantially realized as the institutions whose programs have been accredited by the AACCUP have embarked on institutionalizing quality improvement measures in all ten areas of program provisions, namely: faculty, curriculum, teaching performance, student services, research, extension/community involvement, library, physical facilities including classroom and laboratory, and program management and supervision.

The specific results reveal a very good performance of the AACCUP in the field of program accreditation:

- 85.75% (617) each of the state colleges and universities surveyed claimed that the improvements introduced based on external assessment of program provisions have been sustained.
- All program provisions have been improved in both colleges and universities. The extent of improvement ranges from 'moderate' to 'large'. [Improvement to a large extent refers to those that create great impact on the area of provision; moderate, refers to minor yet necessary improvements that register a substantial impact on an area of provision; and improvement on a limited extent refers to change in an area of provision creating hardly discernible impact.]

- The program provisions where improvements have been introduced to a large extent in state colleges include the following: (a) faculty, (b) teaching performance, (c) student services, and (d) management and administration.
- In state universities, the program provisions where improvements have been introduced to a large extent include the following: (a) curriculum, (b) student services, and (c) management and administration.

The respondents further cited, among others, the following improvements introduced in their respective programs:

- In state universities, the following have been introduced and sustained: (a) systematization and strict implementation of faculty development program including faculty recruitment and selection guided by well-defined policies and guidelines; (b) installation of regular program review and evaluation with the participation of external and/or community-based resource persons including regular updating and continuing improvement of instructional materials; (c) regular and continuous evaluation and assessment of teacher performances and adoption of varied teaching methods and techniques; (d) establishment of student services office with expanded functions manned by highly qualified counselors and staff and increasing student-oriented programs and activities; (e) institutionalization of faculty research capability upgrading and conduct of joint faculty-student research activities; (f) provision of budgetary requirements for community and extension services and adoption of community/school in collaboration with local government units; (g) improvement of library facilities and increased procurement of library collections including the extension of library services to community residents and people outside the university; (h) continuing upgrading of physical facilities particularly laboratories for general education and major subjects and acquisition of equipment including computers for students' use; and (i) improvement of administration and services units particularly finance, record keeping, health and medical services including provision of increased faculty and personnel benefits, monitoring and evaluation of administration and operations policy implementation.
- In state colleges, the following improvements have been introduced and sustained, among others: (a) strict enforcement of faculty hiring policy, provision of faculty scholarships, and faculty loading by expertise; (b) curriculum development and revision/updating of syllabi; (c) monitoring and evaluation of classroom teaching through class observations; (d) increased participation of students in decision-making and improvement of guidance and counseling services; (e) involvement of students in research activities and establishment of statistics and training center for research; (f) intensified involvement of faculty in extension activities and adoption of barangays; (g) establishing library linkages with other institutions and acquisition of textbooks and references including semi-automation of library services; (h) purchase of laboratory equipment and expansion of laboratory spaces including audio-visual spaces and science laboratories; and (i) preparation and adoption of manual of operations.

Accredited programs are expected to draw the following benefits namely: program prestige, increased national budgetary allocation, and attainment of priority status for CHED rewards. In so far as program prestige is concerned, the respondent state colleges (approximately 86%) claimed that this has been realized to a large extent. The same percentage of state college-respondents claimed that increased national budgetary allocation has been realized to a moderate extent. Having been accorded priority status for CHED rewards as a result of accreditation has been realized only by more than half of the respondents.

In the case of state university-respondents, the realization of above-mentioned benefits is mixed. Program prestige has been realized by 71% of the respondents to a large extent and the rest to a limited extent by about 42% of the respondents, 28% to a moderate extent; and 15% to a limited extent. In respect to having been accorded priority status for the CHED's

rewards, roughly 55% of the respondent state universities claimed that this has been realized to a large extent, 15% to a moderate extent, and 15% to a limited extent.

Accreditation brings to the program unintended benefits. These include, among others: increase in enrolment; increase in student retention; increase in students completing the program; increase in the number of students graduating; increase in the percentage of passing the board examinations; and enhanced employability/placement of graduates. Notably, for both colleges and universities, these unintended benefits have been realized from moderate to large extent.

Overall, the survey results indicated that the AACCUP has effectively influenced quality improvement of program provisions in state colleges and universities. The institutionalization of quality improvement measures in each of the areas of program provisions that have been adopted by these institutions is a tangible proof that the AACCUP has been true to its goal and mission to “make the attainment of quality an integral part of higher education, more particularly among chartered state colleges and universities in the Philippines.” Undoubtedly, this accomplishment has been largely due to the AACCUP’s assessment of programs in these institutions.

# QUALITY ASSURANCE IN PHILIPPINE HIGHER EDUCATION: THE CASE OF IQAME AND ACCREDITATION

**Dr. Heracleo D. Lagrada**

Director, Office of Programs and Standards  
Commission on Higher Education

## Background

The strategic approach to quality assurance is based on developing the capacity of higher education institutions to design and deliver high quality programs that meet the needs of the Philippines, and which achieve standards comparable to those of universities in other countries with which the Philippines competes in global markets.

At the global and regional levels, countries need to demonstrate that their education systems match world-class standards. Jobs can be moved readily from one country to another, and multi-national employers do not hesitate to relocate jobs to their maximum advantage. There will be many factors influencing relocation, including cost, access to markets and the regulatory environment. However, one factor is undoubtedly the availability of a workforce with appropriate skills. Increasingly, the skills that are sought are those provided by higher education.

One measure of the international standing of national higher education systems and of individual universities is the ability of their graduates to secure employment, or to progress to postgraduate study in other countries. This international mobility is of particular importance to a country like the Philippines, for which remittances from citizens working overseas make an important contribution to the economy. Increasingly, another measure of international standing is the willingness of multinational employers to take advantage of the skills of a workforce as a whole, by locating their operations in the country concerned. Meeting international standards is no longer an option or an aspiration; it has become a necessity. The achievement of the few is no longer a sufficient indicator of international standing; it is the achievement of the many

Governments are concerned with attracting employment to their countries, thus governments need to be able to demonstrate that they can offer a workforce with appropriate skills. Evaluation processes need to be able to demonstrate that higher education institutions are producing graduates with relevant competencies. Benchmarking learning outcomes against world standards becomes vital.

At the national level, countries have high expectations of their higher education institutions. Universities have a vital role to play in meeting the developmental needs of the country, and the challenge of global competition. At the same time, policies of equity and social inclusion demand a widening of participation in the opportunities offered by higher education. Growing awareness of the importance of higher education means that its achievements are no longer taken for granted and left unquestioned. As countries educate a greater proportion of their citizens to a higher level, it can be expected that the skills of questioning and of constructive criticism that come from that education, and the expectations of accountability that are a characteristic of a democratic society, will be applied as much to universities as to any other institutions of society.

## **Quality Assurance: Defined**

Quality assurance is a process through which a higher education institution guarantees to itself and its stakeholders that its teaching, learning and other services consistently reach a standard of excellence. Such assurance is a necessary goal for the institution itself. Increasingly, it is also necessary for publicly funded institutions to be accountable, and provide assurances, to the society and the state that they are delivering the services for which they are funded, thus ensuring that they are providing value for money. Therefore quality assurance incorporates all the processes internal to the institution, whereby quality is evaluated, maintained and improved (Duff et al; 2000).

The UNESCO defines Quality Assurance as an all-embracing term referring to an ongoing, continuous process of evaluating (assessing, monitoring, guaranteeing, maintaining and improving) the quality of higher education systems, institutions or programmes.

## **Objectives of Monitoring and Evaluation**

As part of its mandate, the CHED monitors and evaluates higher education institutions in the country. Section 8 (e) of Republic Act No. 7722, otherwise known as the Higher Education Act of 1994, directs the Commission to:

“monitor and evaluate performance of programs and institutions of higher learning for appropriate incentives as well as the impositions of sanctions such as, but not limited to, diminution or withdrawal of subsidy, recommendation on the downgrading or withdrawing of accreditation, program termination or school closure.”

It is the declared policy of the Commission to support and value the significant role of higher education institutions, academic, community and other stakeholders in establishing a quality assurance system for the higher education sector. Institutional monitoring and evaluation for quality assurance (IQUAME) is deemed complementary to accreditation. It looks at the effectiveness of an institution in its entirety, particularly the development of institutional systems that ensure the quality and standards of programs.

Monitoring and evaluation of the whole institution is necessary for two purposes. First, the CHED needs to make judgments about the effectiveness of institutions in their entirety. It is the institution that manages programs of study and the other activities that higher education delivers for the benefit of the community such as research, knowledge transfer and community involvement. As noted above, governments have proper expectations that universities will promote policies of equity and social inclusion, and that they will play their part in the economic development of the country. In doing this, institutions are more than the sum of the programs.

Second, the CHED needs to monitor and evaluate the development of those institutional systems that ensure the quality and standards of programs. Systematic monitoring of these will generate action for improvement. In turn, improvements in institutional systems of academic management will increase the likelihood of both the CHED and individual accrediting bodies being able to place a greater reliance in those systems in the future.

The CHED has four objectives in monitoring and evaluating higher education institutions in their entirety:

The outcomes, which are achieved by students who follow programs of study, should meet internationally recognized standards and should be relevant to employment. Institutions should have sufficiently robust procedures for approving programs, to ensure that appropriate standards are achieved by students, and that the programs are responsive to changing needs.

Institutions of higher education should perform effectively, i.e., they are committed to continuous improvement, they make efficient use of the resources that are available to them, and they take effective steps to increase the likelihood of their students achieving the learning outcomes required to graduate.

Institutions should be effective in addressing policy issues. In general, institutions should focus on those matters that are relevant to their distinctive missions so that the Philippines has a healthy plurality of types of higher education institutions. In addition, all institutions should address effectively the need to improve equity in and access to higher education, so that higher education serves all sections of our society.

The monitoring and evaluation system will assist in the provision of information about higher education in the Philippines. Information is needed to demonstrate the standards of achievement of our students, within the country and internationally, to those who recognize qualifications for the purpose of admission to advanced study, professional careers, and employment; to assist those with responsibility for policy towards and planning of higher education in the Philippines; and to inform customer choice- by students and their families considering higher education programs and by employers who recruit graduates.

## **Renewed Push for Quality Assurance**

1. Movement to mass higher education
  - a. Greater diversity of institutions and programmes
  - b. Large increase in number and size of HEIs
  - c. Variety of program/course delivery modes (Distance Education, Transnational)
  - d. Franchising arrangements
  - e. Increase in satellite campuses
2. Emerging new challenges: national educational systems have to be competitive in the international market place
3. Workforce has become global and geographically fluid
4. Development of advanced information and communication technologies

## **Mechanisms of Quality Assurance**

1. Program-based Mechanisms
  - a. CHED authority to grant permit, recognition
  - b. CHED Standards Setting
    - Policies and Standards (PS) for minimum standards
    - Technical Panels, Task Forces, Technical Committees and Technical Working Group
    - Regional Quality Assessment Teams (RQATS)
  - c. Accreditation

- conducted by accrediting bodies federated under FAAP and NNQAA (voluntary)
- d. International Certifications
  - APEC Registry; Washington Accord, etc.
- e. Center of Development (COD); Center of Excellence (COE)
- f. International Benchmarking

## 2. Institution-based Mechanisms

- a. IQUAME
- b. Assessment for SUC Leveling
- c. Philippine Quality Award (PQA)
- d. Autonomous and Deregulated Status of Private HEIs
- e. PSG for University Status
- f. Local Colleges and Universities

### **IQUAME and Accreditation**

The role of the CHED is different from, but complementary to, the program accreditation carried out by the accrediting bodies, which will continue. Program accreditation is concerned with the outcomes of individual programs. The IQUAME is concerned with the overall strategic operation of an institution.

Under the present system, higher education institutions are now treated as the sum of their programs. While there will have been some assessment of some institution-wide resources (such as library and student counseling services), there is no separate assessment of the effectiveness of overall institutional systems for managing academic affairs. Good programs are taken as proxy for effective overall systems. In some cases the proxy may be valid but, in other cases it may not, with the expertise that produced good programs remaining at the program level, and not being used to enhance the performance of the institution as a whole. Direct evaluation of institutional systems and management would provide a more reliable basis for judgment about the degree of autonomy that an institution should be granted.

Program accreditation remains important, because of the current state of development of higher education in the Philippines; performance at program level provides a part of the evidence needed to evaluate institutional systems and program accreditation will be needed. Accreditation of programs should continue to be the responsibility of the accrediting associations.

On the other hand, monitoring and evaluation of entire institutions is the direct responsibility of the CHED, acting mainly through its regional offices. The CHED already undertakes monitoring and evaluation of institutions for the purpose of its main regulatory responsibilities, and in connection with the administration of grants and subsidies to private institutions.

### **Accreditation**

Accreditation is a process for assessing and upgrading the educational quality of higher education institutions and programs through self-evaluation and peer judgment. It leads to the grant of accredited status by an accrediting agency and provides public recognition and information on educational quality (CMO # 1 Series 2005)

It is the declared policy of the State to encourage and assist, through the CHED, higher education institutions (HEIs) which desire to attain standards of quality over and above the minimum required by the state.

For this purpose, the CHED encourages the use of voluntary non-governmental accreditation systems in aid of the exercise of its regulatory functions. The CHED will promote a policy environment which supports the accreditation's non-governmental and voluntary character and protects the integrity of the accreditation process.

The CHED acknowledges the pioneering work and efforts of the accrediting agencies now federated under the Federation of Accrediting Agencies of the Philippines (FAAP), namely the Association of Christian Schools, Colleges and Universities Accrediting Agency, Inc. (ACSCU-AAI), the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU) and the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA).

Further, the CHED acknowledges the existence of the National Network of Quality Accrediting Agencies (NNQAA), now made up of the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCU) and the Association of Local Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (ALCUCOA).

The CHED shall authorize federations/networks of accrediting agencies which shall certify to CHED the accredited status of programs/institutions granted by their member accrediting agencies and in accordance with their own standards, as accepted by the CHED, for granting benefits to the institutions/programs at various accredited levels, and as contained in Article No. V of this CHED Memorandum Order.

The CHED shall recognize one federal/network largely serving the public sector educational institutions and one for the private sector educational institutions, without restricting the freedom of any educational institution, public or private, to choose an accrediting agency for various educational programs which may belong to either federation/network.

The CHED demands responsibility and accountability from federations or networks for their certification of the quality of education offered in accredited programs/institutions.

### **Federation/Networks of Accrediting Agencies**

Accrediting agencies shall join either the above-mentioned federations/networks; the federation/network must have procedures and guidelines in accepting accrediting agencies as members, following this CMO.

Federations/networks of accrediting agencies shall have the following functions:

- a. Accept and recognize its member accrediting agencies. The applicant accrediting agency must be required to have the following:
  - standards for accreditation which are adequately rigorous, competitive and reflect current acceptable practice;
  - appropriate survey and assessment instruments and processes;
  - effective mechanism for assessing compliance of programs/institution with its own standards;

- policies and procedures for the grant, suspension or revocation of accredited status of programs/institutions, in accordance with the federation/network policies and procedures;

Furthermore, the accrediting agency shall submit required annual reports and documents to the federation/network.

- Monitor the operations of member agencies, including their processes and procedures, and training and selection of accreditors;
- Certify to the CHED the accreditation status of programs/institutions accredited by its member agencies;
- Assure the comparability of standards of member accrediting agencies;
- Upgrade and update standards, procedures and criteria for accreditation;
- Contribute to quality education through the enhancement and development of the accreditation movement;
- Establish procedures for addressing complaints by higher education institutions regarding procedures and processes of accrediting agencies;
- Maintain a valid and reliable data management and analysis system relating to their member accrediting agencies; and
- Submit annual reports to the CHED on its operations, especially programs/institutions accredited.

### **Accreditation Levels (CMO #1, Series 2005)**

**Candidate Status:** for programs which have undergone a preliminary survey visit and are certified by the federation/network as being capable of acquiring accredited status within two years;

**Level I accredited status:** for programs which have been granted initial accreditation after a formal survey by the accrediting agency and duly certified by the accreditation/network, effective for a period of three years;

**Level II re-accredited status:** for programs which have been re-accredited by the accrediting agency and duly certified by the accreditation federation/network, effective for a period of three or five years based on the appraisal of the accrediting agency;

**Level III re-accredited status:** for programs which have been re-accredited and have met the additional criteria/guidelines set by the federation/network for this level.

Only programs that have been granted “clean” re-accreditation, meaning that no progress report or interim visit is required within the five-year accreditation period, may apply for Level III status.

**Level IV accredited status:** accredited programs which are highly respected as very high quality academic programs in the Philippines and with prestige and authority comparable to similar programs in excellent foreign universities.

These programs must have met the following additional criteria/guidelines:

- Research as seen in the number, scope and impact of scholarly publications in referred national and international journals;
- Teaching and learning as proven in excellent performance of graduates and continuing assessment of student achievement;
- Community service and the impact of contributions to the economic and social upliftment, on both regional and national levels;
- Evidence of international linkages and consortia;
- Well developed planning processes which support quality assurance mechanisms.

HEIs should provide adequate documentation in support of application for Level IV accredited status.

### **IQUAME: Outcomes-based and Developmental**

CMO # 15 Series of 2005 on May 25, 2005 institutionalized IQUAME for all higher education institution in the Philippines.

The overall approach to monitoring and evaluation is developmental. The CHED will work with institutions to assist them in strengthening their management of academic and administrative processes so that they are better able to achieve their educational objectives. Where there are serious weaknesses, or failures to comply with conditions attached to permits or recognitions, the CHED expects remedial action to be taken by higher education institutions. Notwithstanding this, review teams will approach their engagements with institutions in a spirit of cooperation, and with the intention of supporting developments and strengthening academic management.

The CHED is adopting an outcome-based approach to evaluation because of its great potential to increase both the effectiveness of the quality assurance system, and the quality and efficiency of higher education institutions. Particularly in professional fields, there is a need to demonstrate the achievement of outcomes that match international norms.

Mature evaluation systems are based upon the outcome and, in particular, the learning outcomes that are intended for graduates to achieve. Inputs and processes are of vital importance, as they shape the learning experience that is made available to students. Peer judgments of processes remain valid. However, for those outside higher education institutions, and in particular employers, it is the abilities of graduates that matter. They are concerned with what graduates are able to do in their first employment. That is why many national benchmarks for higher education qualifications address skills that are transferable from academic study to the work environment and to the community more generally.

There are two main approaches to outcome-based evaluation. The first approach is that of direct assessment of educational outcomes. This can provide a basis for program accreditation. The second approach is that of an audit of the quality systems of the whole institution, to determine whether these are sufficiently robust and effective to ensure that all programs are well designed and deliver appropriate outcomes. Such an audit will not normally make direct judgments on academic programs, but it will consider program-level evidence to the extent necessary to establish that institutional systems are functioning properly.

A move to outcome-based evaluation from an evaluation system based more on inputs represents a shift from the quantitative to qualitative. The process is more searching, because

the account must be reflective, and provides a justification of why things are done, and why they are done in the way that has been chosen. Effectiveness of process has to be demonstrated, in relation to intended outcomes. Factual data is still required, but to support a case that a department is performing effectively, rather than as an end in itself. The approach is less prescriptive, for example a department must decide whether a particular set of data is relevant to a demonstration of effectiveness, rather than providing it simply because it has been required.

## **The IQUAME Framework**

The monitoring and evaluation framework has five key result areas within which judgments are made about the performance of institutions:

- Governance and Management
- Quality of Teaching and Research
- Support for Students
- Relations with the Community
- Management of Resources

Within each key result area are indicators. Some of these are core indicators that apply to all institutions. The other indicators apply to institutions to the extent that is appropriate in relation to the mission and stage of development of the institution. In total, there are 12 indicators, 8 of which are core and 4 are supplemental indicators. Indicators are assessed through a criterion or set of criteria. Under a criterion are guide key questions for the guidance of both the institution and the assessors.

## **Categories of Philippine HEIs under IQUAME**

Based on the IQUAME, assessment of higher education institutions in the country may be categorized into A(r), A(t), B or C.

**Category A (r).** These are institutions that undertake the full range of higher education functions, including research. Such institutions undertake advanced and extensive researches and will normally be evaluated against all the indicators in the framework.

To be placed in Category A (r) an institution would have to achieve scores of at least 3 in 75% of the indicators against which it was assessed, no scores less than 2, and a score of at least 3 in the research indicator.

**Category A (t).** These are institutions that have teaching as their core business. Although faculty will keep up to date with developments in their discipline through their personal study and scholarship, they will undertake other forms of advanced scholarships, the results of which will often merit publication in refereed journals, in fields such as professional practice and higher education pedagogy. They may undertake such activities as extension and networking, and they may house centers of excellence or development.

Such institutions will be evaluated against all indicators except research capability.

To be placed in Category A (t) an institution would have to achieve scores of at least 3 in 75% of the indicators, against which it was assessed, with no scores less than 2.

**Category B.** This category contains institutions that are in a stage of development, and which have the potential to be placed in one of the A categories at a future date. Usually, they will undertake only those activities covered by the core indicators. As they mature, they are likely to add activities covered by some of the other indicators; as they reach that stage, they may qualify for one of the A categories. While in Category B, they will normally be evaluated against the core indicators only.

To be placed in Category B, following an initial application, an institution must achieve scores of at least 3 in 50% of the indicators, against which it is assessed, with no scores less than 2. To remain in the developmental category, an institution must achieve, at the next following monitoring and evaluation visit, an increase in the number of scores of at least 3, with no scores less than 2. After successful evaluation in the B category, an institution should normally apply, at the next monitoring and evaluation visit, for inclusion in the appropriate A category.

**Category C.** This category contains all other institutions.

### **The Self- Evaluation Document (SED)**

The Self Evaluation Document or SED is prepared by the HEI with the assistance of the CHED Regional Office. Before preparation is started, the HEI decides as to which category it wishes to be assessed.

In the self-evaluation document, the institution is asked to reflect, in a constructively self-critical manner, on its performance against the criteria in the CHED monitoring and evaluation framework. It is an opportunity for the institution to reflect in what it is doing, why it is doing it and why it does it in the way that it does. It is also an opportunity to judge for itself the extent to which it is succeeding in its vision, mission and objectives.

By discussing strengths, weaknesses and ways by which weaknesses are being (or will be) addressed, this document can be a means of promoting continuous improvement within the institution. A complete and well-organized document will make the task of reviewers easier and thus, place a minimum burden on the institution when the visit is made. Otherwise, more inquiries will be made as to the reviewers, it should:

- Be reflective and evaluative, rather than merely descriptive
- Be structured to address the criteria of the CHED monitoring and evaluation framework
- Draw upon robust internal review of procedures of the institution
- Indicate where supporting evidence may be found (e.g. within specified institutional documents)
- Provide purely factual information in annexes, rather than in the main text

The document usually begins with a brief statement of the mission of the institution in order to give context to the document as a whole, followed by a discussion of institutional performance against each criterion in the CHED monitoring and evaluation framework. The statements regarding each of the criteria should be supported by a list of evidences. These evidences should be made available to the reviewers.

Data that will be useful to the reviewers (and, thus, must be appended) include those about student recruitment, progression and performance, enrolment, cohort survival rate, performance in Licensure Examinations, employment rate, etc.

## **IQUAME ASSESSMENT VISITS**

### **a. Notice to HEI**

The OPS shall notify institutions due to be visited of the dates on which it is intended that visits should take place, and the deadline for submission to the CHEDRO of the self-evaluation document.

A minimum of four months notice should be given of the date by which the self-evaluation document is to be submitted. To ensure that the self-evaluation remains current at the time of the visit, there should be no more than three months between the deadline for submission of the self-evaluation document and the date of commencement of the visit.

### **b. Assistance of CHEDRO in SED Development**

On receipt of the self-evaluation document, there should be an initial assessment of it by the CHEDRO to determine whether it provides an adequate basis for the review visit. If the document falls significantly short of meeting the criteria or if the statistical data is incomplete, the institution shall be asked to revise the document and to re-submit it.

The institution should be notified of the need for revision within three weeks of the date of receipt of the self-evaluation document, and the institution should be allowed a further four weeks from the date of notification to make amendments and to re-submit.

If, after revision, the self-evaluation document remains inadequate, the visit will still proceed as planned, but the institution should be aware that an inadequate document will make it less likely that the review team will be able to reach favorable conclusions on the performance of the institution.

Copies of the self-evaluation document must be supplied to all members of the review team at least one month before the commencement of the visit. After consultation with the members of the review team, the team leader may request the institution to make further information available. Any such request should be made at least two weeks in advance of the date of the visit and should specify whether the team would wish to receive the information in advance of the visit, or whether it is acceptable for the information to be provided during the course of the visit.

### **c. The Review Team**

The Team of Assessors shall be composed and assigned by the OPS. In general, there shall be a Team Leader with four members. They shall be drawn from the pool of Zonal and National Assessors who have undergone intensive training conducted by CHED and they shall be assigned to HEIs in regions other than their home regions.

### **d. The Conduct of the Visit**

Reviews will be conducted in a spirit of dialogue and cooperation between the institution and the review team.

Depending on the size and complexity of the institution, two or three days will be allocated for the visit. Exceptionally, a longer visit may be needed for very large or complex institutions.

### **e. Making Judgments**

The review team will make judgments against each of the criteria, using the following scale:

- 4: The criterion is fully met, and elements of it are achieved at a level of excellence that provides a model for others.
- 3: The criterion is met, with most elements demonstrating good practice
- 2: The criterion is met in most respects, but improvement is needed to overcome weakness in some elements.
- 1: The criterion is met in some respects, but much improvement is needed to overcome weaknesses.
- 0: The criterion is not met

In making judgment, the following are considered: presence, extent of implementation, outcome and effectiveness.

### **f. The Report**

The team of assessors should meet at the end of the visit, before leaving the HEI, to discuss the scores for the different criteria being considered for the institution. Ideally, the final report should be written before leaving the site. However, because this may be difficult for particular locations, the report shall be submitted to the CHEDRO within 48 hours of the conclusion of the visit.

The team members are responsible for drafting the sections for the key result areas assigned to them. The team leader will be responsible for compiling and editing the final draft.

The report should discuss briefly for each criterion the strengths and weaknesses of the institution, and should refer to the evidence that the team took into account in reaching its judgment in respect of the criterion. The report should conclude with a short summary, which may include commendations for matters in respect of which the institution is performing well, or has made significant progress since the last review.

The report should be narrative in style. In respect to each criterion it should discuss briefly the strengths and weaknesses of the institution, and should refer to the evidence that the team took into account in reaching its judgment in respect of the criterion.

The CHEDRO shall review the report and after which submit it to the Commission through the Office of Programs and Standards. The Commission en banc, after deliberation, shall approve the category of the HEI.

### **g. Complaints and Appeals**

Should an institution have any complaint about the way in which a visit is being conducted, the team leader will endeavor to resolve the matter in a speedy and courteous manner. If an institution remains dissatisfied, the matter may be referred to the CHED Director.

Formal appeals will be entertained normally only on grounds of procedural irregularity or abuse of process. Appeals should be made to the CHEDRO Director. If the CHEDRO Director

finds that there was irregularity or abuse, he or she will then consider if that irregularity or abuse had a material effect on the judgments made. If there was no material effect on the judgments, they will stand. If there was a material effect, the judgments will be set aside, and a re-visit ordered. In the event that the CHEDRO Director was a member of the review team, a CHEDRO Director from another region will consider the appeal.

As with all matters dealt with by CHEDROs, appeals against their decisions lie on the decision of the Commission en banc.

## **YEAR END REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Calendar Year 2006**

**Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel**  
President and Chairman of the Board  
AACCUP

This report has six (6) parts, to wit: I. Introduction; II. Accomplishments; III. Major Problems; IV. Governance; V. Finance; and VI. Main Thrusts for the Calendar Year 2007

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

2006 marks a milestone in the history of the AACCUP as an accrediting body. After a few seemingly insurmountable trials and tribulations during its 20 years of existence, it found its true identity among fellow government institutions, in the recognition of the National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA), the umbrella network for the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA.

The NNQAA saw the light of day after nine months of academic infanticipating when the CHED decided to approve in its en banc meeting of February 13, 2006, all the required documents submitted by the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA in May 2005 or 9 months before.

On the eve of our 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary, this annual report is presented as a book of achievements to be reflected in the Souvenir Book and the Newsletter, a testimonial to those who have stuck with the AACCUP through thick and thin, as it continues to “review, reward and reinvigorate the pursuit of quality in education” and endeavors to strengthen its workforce of accreditors, team leaders, coordinators and survey consultants, to be able to render a more concrete, significant service to quality assurance in the country.

### **II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

#### **A. FLAGSHIP PROJECTS**

***1. Recognition by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) of the National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA) as umbrella network for the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCUP) and the Association of Local Colleges and Universities-Commission on Accreditation (ALCU-COA).***

Spadework for the project began as early as May 2005 when the NNQAA became the first agency, in both the public and private sector, to submit the required documents regarding its existence, memberships, procedures, accredited programs and summary of procedures in accepting and recognizing members, in accordance with the provisions of CMO No, 01, s. 2005.

After follow-ups and the active support by the Hon. Nenalyn P. Defensor as Commissioner In-Charge for Quality Assurance, with the Chairman and other Members of the Commission, the CHED approved the recognition of the NNQAA as umbrella network for the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA in its en banc meeting of February 13, 2006.

## **2. The 2006 Annual National Conference**

The 19<sup>th</sup> Annual AACCUP National Conference on February 15-17, 2006 at the Manila Pavilion Hotel was the maiden project for 2006. The theme of the conference was "Toward Strong Quality Assurance: Go Institutional; Be Global". Hon. Nenalyn P. Defensor, CHED Commissioner In-Charge for Quality Assurance was the keynote speaker.

Commissioner Defensor reemphasized the role the CHED plays in voluntary accreditation spelled out in CMO No. 01, s. 2005, and, among other things, announced the CHED's en banc approval of the recognition of the NNQAA as umbrella network for the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA.

Mr. Peter Cheung, keynoted Plenary Session I, with his address "Different Approaches to Quality Assurance." Mr. Cheung is President of the Asia-Pacific Quality Assurance, and Executive Director of the Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation. A former Secretary-General of the University Grants Committee in Hong Kong, he has been actively involved in the work of the Institutional Network for Quality Assurance Agency in Higher Education.

Other panel discussants during the various plenary sessions - key AACCUP officials and seasoned accreditors led by the Executive Director - deliberated on "Institutional Accreditation: An Approach to Quality Assurance," "The New AACCUP Scheme of Program Accreditation", "Data Sourcing and the Tool for Evaluation", "Mechanics in Accrediting Programs: the Accreditors' Guide". The Hon. Saturnino M. Ocampo, Jr., Commissioner, CHED, delivered the last plenary address on "Search for Quality in Education".

## **3. Implementation of the Revised AACCUP policies and procedures.**

In the letters sent by the Executive Director confirming the dates requested for survey visits by the concerned institutions beginning 2006, the AACCUP asked the requesting parties to prepare separate individual Program Performance Profiles (PPPs) for each of the programs applied for and revise the PPP of each of the programs using the new (2006) PPP format. The agency then forwarded a copy of the revised PPP to all SUCs by mail, if only to re-emphasize the need to use the newly-revised material.

Institutions which had submitted their PPPs in 2005 based on the old format were required to reproduce two revised copies to be retained at their own Accreditation Center for use by the visiting accreditors, with no need to send a copy to the AACCUP office. The two-pronged instructions aimed at helping the applicant institution avoid unnecessary expenses for materials.

The revised 2006 version of the Master Survey Instrument for Accreditation of Programs and the Manual on Accreditation also came in handy with the initial implementation in 2006 of the provisions of CMO 01 s. 2005. The benchmarks for adequacy and effectiveness and the new status levels spelled out in the CHED memo are clearly delineated in the Master Survey Instrument and the Manual on Accreditation, respectively.

Implementation of the above policies was the fruit of years of conferences, deliberations and consultations. As early as the year 2003, workshops were conducted in strategic places of the country to bring the AACCUP materials to near perfection. Consultations *cum* pilot-testing were held in Manila, Iloilo, Cebu, Davao and Tacloban, after which a national committee reviewed the outputs of the various countrywide exercises.

The revisions gained momentum after the historic launch for Institutional Accreditation on February 2005, where moves had been made to finish all the work on the Framework of Institutional Accreditation and the accompanying materials. On October 17- 20, 2005, a national workshop for senior and new accreditors was conducted for the purpose and as a follow-up of the series of the training of accreditors held in SUCs throughout the country. The revised AACCUP materials were then presented for the participants' scrutiny and critiquing. Suggestions and recommendations for further refinement were drawn from the workshop.

On December 14-17, 2005 a committee of four language experts selected from among accreditors all over the country worked on the final editing of the materials – the Master Survey Instrument for Accreditation, the Handbook for Accreditors, the Manual on Accreditation, the Program Performance Profile and the Framework on Institutional Accreditation. All of these were made possible with the moral and financial support of the CHED.

And, finally, on December 29, 2005, the Board of Trustees approved the scheme for implementation effective 2006. The same was presented to the SUC officials and accreditors during the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual National Conference on February 15-17, 2006 at the Manila Pavilion Hotel. These laid the foundations for the 2006 implementation of the revised policies and procedures.

#### ***4. The Training on “Managing Accreditation Survey Visits”***

With a solid roster of trained and retrained accreditors now in place, the AACCUP focused on accreditation activities. A National Training-Workshop on “Managing Accreditation Survey Visits” for team leaders, coordinators and survey consultants was held in strategic places in Luzon, Mindanao and the Visayas on October 23-25, 2006; December 17-19, 2006; and December 21-23, 2006, respectively. The workshops at the Richville Hotel in Mandaluyong, for Luzon; University of Southeastern Philippines in Davao, for Mindanao; and the Leyte Normal University in Tacloban for the Visayas updated the selected participants on the basics of accreditation: levels, procedures and administration and funding of activities as spelled out in CMO No. 01, s. 2005, CMO No. 23, s. 2006, CHED-SUC MOA on subsidies for selected institutions via AACCUP, and other HEDF-funded accreditation ventures.

The training-workshops throughout the country were managed by the Executive Director, Dr. Manuel T. Corpus, assisted by Dr. Nilo E. Colinares, AACCUP Consultant, and Mr. Dominic T. Martinez, IT Specialist. Selected senior accreditors, who served as training staff in past training activities, helped manage the workshops. In Luzon, they were Dr. Maria Teresa S.J. Valdez of the TCA; Dr Soledad M. Roguel, CLSU; Dr. Marcela T. Caluscasin, DMMMSU; Dr. Grace G. Lopez, USM; and Dr. Danilo S. Hilario, BSU. For the Visayas, the training staff was composed of Dr. Purita P. Bilbao of the WVSU; Dr. Marjorie A. Caipang, WVCST; Dr. Manuel K. Palomar, LSU; Dr. Zenaida S. Lucero, UEP; and Dr. Nestor C. Sedanza, LNU. For Mindanao, Pres. Nelson T. Binag of the SKPSC; Dr. Grace G. Lopez, USM; Dr. Manuel T. Corpus and Dr. Nilo E. Colinares constituted the management team. Dr. Brigida A. Roscom, MSU-IIT; Dr. Emmanuel A. Lariosa, CMU; Dr. Rolando F. Hechanova, SKPSC; and Dr. Filomeno A. Gargar, USEP, made up the training staff.

The exercises also apprised the senior accreditors of the status, trends, practices and problems in the management of accreditation survey visits after which they identified and adopted the best practices. This set the pace for the formulation of more broad-based policies for accreditation survey visits.

All these training activities had the support of the CHED in terms of subsidies such as those given for the handbooks and manuals used during the training, and the financial aid for SUCs applying for preliminary visits.

**5. The 2006 Training of Accreditors (on the new Criteria, instrument, Procedures, Roles)**

In addition to the 36 training activities from February to December 2005, for a total of 1,102 participants, the AACUP undertook four more workshops from January 8, 2006 to March 9, 2006, for a total of 154 participants in the following venues:

SUC	No. of Participants
Laguna State Polytechnic College Los Banos, Laguna	56
Capiz State University Pontevedra, Capiz	28
Bukidnon State College Malaybalay City	33
Pampanga Agricultural College Magalang, Pampanga	37

**6. The Marathon Phase II Evaluation for the award of the Level III status.**

In a bid to give to the more dynamic SUCs the much-coveted Level III award after having passed the 3<sup>rd</sup> Survey Visit, the AACUP launched a marathon evaluation for the second phase of the Level III assessment of the four areas in which the program excels.

The Phase 2 evaluation for Level III is conducted for SUCs which have passed the Level III Phase 1 requirements i.e., a grand mean of 4.00 with no area rated lower than 3.50, among the ten areas evaluated.

In Phase 2, the institutions concerned are advised to improve the performance of areas with ratings lower than 4.00 and must show a reasonably high standard of instruction and a highly visible community extension program in the case of undergraduate programs or a highly visible research tradition in the case of graduate programs. They should also choose any two of the following options: (a) a highly visible research tradition (except for the graduate programs where this is compulsory), (b) a highly visible community extension program (except for the undergraduate programs where this is compulsory), (c) strong faculty development tradition, (d) a highly creditable performance of its graduates in the licensure examinations for the last three years; (e) existence of consortia or linkages with other schools and/or agencies; and (f) extensive and functional library and other learning resource facilities;

In the last meeting for the year 2006 held December 8, the AACUP Board of Trustees approved the award of Level III to three programs in two schools visited on October 27 and December 4, 2006. It further authorized the Executive Director to act on the recommendations to be made by evaluation teams from December 12 to December 20, 2006, in the absence of a meeting by the Board.

Following are the state universities and their programs awarded Level III by the Board, in the order of their date of evaluation:

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM	DATE
Pangasinan State University	Elementary Teacher Education Secondary Teacher Education	Oct. 27
Benguet State University	Science (Applied Statistics)	Dec. 4
Leyte State University	Agriculture Elementary Teacher Education Secondary Teacher Education Graduate: Masters (Agriculture) Graduate: Masters (Education)	Dec. 12
Isabela State University	Elementary Teacher Education Secondary Teacher Education	Dec. 14
Mariano Marcos State University	Agriculture Agricultural Engineering Forestry	Dec. 14
Nueva Vizcaya State University	Arts and Soc. Sci. (English)	Dec. 15
Cebu Normal University	Elementary Teacher Education Secondary Teacher Education Nursing Graduate: Master's (Nursing) Graduate: Master's (Education) Graduate: Doctor's (Education)	Dec. 16
West Visayas State University	Elementary Teacher Education Secondary Teacher Education Special Teacher Education Nursing Arts and Soc. Sci. (English & Pol. Sc.) Science (Biology)	Dec. 20

The above programs passed the 3<sup>rd</sup> Survey evaluation conducted by a regular team with a Grand Mean of 4.00, and with no area rated lower than 3.50. In accordance with AACCUP policies based on Art. IV, Section 1.d of the CMO No. 01, s. 2005, before the award of Level III, the programs must strictly satisfy the two aforementioned compulsory additional criteria plus two of any of the five criteria mentioned above.

### **7. Global Exposure of the AACCUP in international conferences**

To prove ourselves equal to the challenge of global recognition through participation in international conferences on accreditation, the AACCUP authorized the attendance of members in a few selected seminar-workshops on quality assurance beginning with the key officials of the agency so that their exposure could guide them in their functions of policy-making.

- a. For 2006, the Asia Pacific Quality Network (APQN) Annual General Meeting in Shanghai served as the first global exposure for the year. The AACCUP Board members were brought into a discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the APQN Board, the APQN's funding proposal and long-term plans and plans in 2006

for training and development staff movements, external reviewers and advisory services. The local board then adopted some of these practices.

On hand to attend the Shanghai conference were Executive Director Manuel T. Corpus, AACCUP Vice-President Nelson T. Binag, Board Members Grace G. Lopez and Aladino L. Leccio. Dr. Ernesto R. Gapasin and Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang, were also invited to attend, being Presidents of the universities whose programs obtained the first Level III award in the country - DMMMSU for Teacher Education, CavSU for Agriculture. President Lauro B. Tacbas of the UNP, the first Level III awardee for Graduate Programs in Educational Management and Public Administration, could not make it to Shanghai due to a previous commitment in the Philippines. The six AACCUP delegates formed part of the 90 people from 52 agencies/universities across 24 countries/territories in attendance.

b. Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel, AACCUP, Conference Delegate

Global Trend and Perspectives on the Quality Assurance of Engineering Education  
Cross Border Cooperation of Accreditation Agencies in Asia

Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education (JABEE)  
December 15-16, 2006  
Soukairou Hall  
National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS)  
Tokyo Japan

Organized by the JABEE, the Symposium had for its objective the strengthening of the systems of countries and regions in Asia, to assure and continuously improve the quality of higher education and to assure substantial equivalency of its quality at the institutional level.

c. Dr. Marcela T. Caluscosin, AACCUP Secretary, Delegate

International Conference on Student Participation in Quality Enhancement (Conference)  
National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC)  
September 16-17, 2006  
Bangalore, India

The conference, organized by the NAAC with the theme "Promoting Student Participation in Quality Enhancement," deliberated on the why, where and how of student involvement, student feedback systems, good practices, country experiences, and tools for student empowerment which ended with a Roadmap for Promoting Good Practices of Student Participation and Quality Literacy in Asia-Pacific Region.

d. Dr. Manuel T. Corpus, Executive Director and Member, Board of Directors, Center for Educational Measurement (CEM), CEM Delegate

"Making a Greater Difference: Connecting to Transformational Agendas"  
International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSOTL)  
Washington, D.C., USA  
November 9-12, 2006

The ISSOTL Conference tackled in its Plenary Sessions such questions as "What's needed for effective teaching and learning in our fast-changing world and how can we make it happen?," "Student Intercultural and Intellectual Development and the Growth of

a Moral Imagination”, and “What does it take to make technology work in higher education?” in “The Teacher as Action Researcher: Using digital Tools to Capture Pedagogic Form”.

### **8. Major Concern: Accreditation Survey Results**

While the previous year underscored the development of manpower for the existing accreditation by program and in preparation for the initial implementation of Institutional Accreditation by a selected few, the year in review concentrated on the enhancement of the management of accreditation survey visits through a rigid training of Team Leaders, Coordinators and Survey Consultants. This decidedly was a felt need, considering that applications for accreditation survey visits had become voluminous thus ensuing in more activities to be managed. This is evidenced by the following list of 63 institutions visited and the 450 programs evaluated from January to March, June to October, and November to December 2006.

Of the 450 programs, 58 failed to meet standards so that action was “deferred” until such standards were met. In the summary below, programs with “deferred” status were given the accreditation status of “assessment on-going for Level \_\_\_\_”. The 392 programs, which met the standards, were awarded the corresponding levels of accreditation status.

Accreditation Status	No. Of SUCs	No. of Programs awarded accreditation status	Programs with Assessment On-going	Percentage (%)
Candidate	38	137		30.45
Assessment On-going for Candidate status	2		2	0.44
Level I Accredited	26	83		18.44
Assessment On-going for Level I	3		5	1.11
Level II Re-accredited	25	84		18.67
Assessment On-going for Level II	6		12	2.66
Qualified for Level III	15	59		13.11
Level III Re-accredited	8	29		6.44
Assessment On-going for Level III	10		39	8.67
	Sub-Total	392	58	99.99 *
	Grand Total	450		100%

\* discrepancy due to rounding off

The complete list of the 450 programs will be published in a pamphlet/document labeled "Consolidated List of Accredited Programs," to be released by the AACCCUP.

## **B. RELATED ACTIVITIES**

### **1. Consultancy Visits**

Having been proven to be an effective strategy in parrying the hasty moves of some SUCs to prematurely apply for a survey visit, the practice of mutual consultancy to determine the readiness of applicant institutions continued to be a regular feature of the accreditation process. Member institutions, whether applying for the first time or for a more advanced level, were properly advised through consultancies.

In general, the rationale behind pre-survey consultancy visits are: (1) to guide the SUCs on what individual or cluster programs to assess; (2) to clarify some procedural matters; and (3) to assess the readiness of the program for the proposed visit. Considering however that many of the SUCs, which have had their consultations during their first crack at accreditation, are now on a semi-advanced stage, coupled with the dearth of available consultants, consultancy visits for this year were few. Instead, survey consultants were assigned either to give a briefing on the first day of the visit, or act as overall coordinator and survey consultant during the visit in concurrent capacity.

Whatever was the case, the AACCCUP management felt that there was an utmost need to continue with the survey consultancies if only to remind the accreditors of routine official functions and personal obligations.

### **2. Linkages with National and International Accrediting Bodies**

As a policy-making body, the AACCCUP Board exerted efforts to have selected members attend national and international conferences, to share experiences and, in some way, partake of the expertise of foreign assurance evaluators even as they imparted their own. The practice resulted in mutually advantageous linkages, which proved beneficial to the agencies concerned, like the following:

- a. Consultations with the CHED, resulting in the recognition of the NNQAA during the Commission's, en banc meeting on February 13, 2006, as umbrella network for the AACCCUP and the ALCU-COA, after submission of all required documents in consonance with CMO No. 01, s., 2005.
- b. Agreement with the CHED to help disseminate CMO No. 23, s. 2006 (Procedures and Guidelines on Granting CHED Financial Assistance to Higher Education Institutions Undergoing Voluntary Accreditation) and to issue the necessary certifications for the SUCs concerned.

Certifications needed by the CHED were for both the Preliminary Survey Assistance for Accreditation (CHED-PSAA), intended to assist HEIs in the expenses to be incurred in applying for accreditation and for the Institutional Development for Accreditation (CHED-IDAA), intended to assist HEIs in upgrading their library and laboratory facilities necessary for complying with the requirements of the accreditation process.

- c. The sustained membership status of the AACCCUP in the extended Board of APQN in recognition of its commendable performance in quality assurance

(QA) particularly in providing leadership to the study of qualifications framework (QF).

A more advanced, expanded version of a multi-country study, "Qualifications Frameworks in the Asia Pacific Region", has been assigned by the APQN to a Project Team composed of the following countries, with the AACCUP Philippines as Project Leader:

- Philippines - Manuel T. Corpus, AACCUP, Project Team Leader
- Hong Kong - Felix Leung, Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation
- Philippines - Miriam S. Cervantes, Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines
- Australia - Judy Forsyth, Australian Qualifications Framework Advisory Board
- New Zealand - Anthony Davies, New Zealand Quality Assurance
- Sri Lanka - Kapugamage Tillekeratne, Wayamba University, Sri Lanka

- d. Participation of the Hon. Nenalyn P. Defensor, CHED Commissioner In-Charge for Quality Assurance, as Keynote Speaker in the 2006 AACCUP National Conference at the Manila Pavilion Hotel on February 15-17, 2006, with the theme "Toward Strong Quality Assurance: Go Institutional; Be Global."
- e. Participation in the 12<sup>th</sup> World Conference in Education of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction at the Manila Hotel on August 7-12, 2006.

The AACCUP obliged with a construction of a booth for the NNQAA which showed a high-tech presentation of a historical sketch of the agency, with its structure and composition inclusive of the members of its component agencies, the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA.

Visiting dignitaries from other agencies and public and private schools in the Philippines and other countries, formed part of the Guest List. To mention a few, the booth had for its visitors, the CHED Regional Directors of Regions IV, IV-A, XII, CARAGA, and delegates from TESDA, Pamantasan Lungsod Ng Muntinglupa, Pasay, Malabon etc. TUP, Cvsu, ASU, Namdi Azikiwe University of Awka, Nigeria, the Hong Kong Institute of Education, WITS University, USA etc.

- f. Consultations with the CHED on the latest developments of different fields of disciplines which usually results in newly-issued CMOs.

The latest CMOs issued which found their way into the various survey visits where the SUCs involved had no copies yet, were CMO No. 24, s. 2005 (Minimum Policies and Standards for Bachelor of Science in Biology and CMO No. 35, s. 2005 (Minimum Policies and Standards for Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science (BS ES) The agency is still in touch for the latest developments in curricular revisions.

### **3. Publication of a Journal and a Newsletter**

Pursuant to its goal to provide a forum for national and international issues on accreditation and to have a venue for selected papers of conference presentors, the AACCCUP publishes a journal at least once every two years. This is supplemented by a Newsletter, which comes out semi-annually. Volume VI, Issue I for 2007 will be released during the Annual Conference on February 26-27.

### **4. Insurance of Accreditors**

After surveys on what type of insurance would fit the nature of work of the accreditors' who report only once or twice a semester or two to four times a year, and a canvass on which insurance firm might be willing to accommodate such exposure to the unique kind of work environment, the AACCCUP has at last gotten its long-time desire to insure its accreditors.

On January 8, 2007, we signed a conforme with the Philam Insurance relative to the terms and conditions for the Personal Accident Policy coverage for accreditors.

Benefits stipulated are a total of P250,000 for Accidental Death/Disablement; with P25,000.00 Accident Medical Expense and P25,000.00 Accident Burial Expense. Unprovoked Murder/Assault is also covered. The AACCCUP pays a premium of P248.00 each inclusive of taxes.

The "total number of insureds" per Philam stipulation is 500. The roster of accreditors based on those who were assigned and/or accepted assignments during the first and second semester of SY 2005-2006 and the first semester of 2006-2007 contains only 396 names. Additional names will be submitted at the end of the School Year 2006-2007.

## **III. MAJOR PROBLEMS**

Although a few have been partially addressed, the areas needing improvement have remained a hindrance to the smooth and more productive operation of the agency:

- a. Inability to automate data (assessed programs, etc.) to maximize spatial utilization, to effect efficient records-keeping, due to lack of time and personnel. At this time, the only automated file in the agency is the partially-completed roster of trained/retrained accreditors in the country.
- b. Limited resources (space, equipment and facilities) to address the needs of the vastly expanding operations of AACCCUP. Attempts to purchase additional units/space have been hampered by financial and other constraints.
- c. Lack of qualified personnel to perform technical work like the evaluation of accreditors' reports, training of accreditors, research on accreditation, programming schedules and administrative work.

#### IV. GOVERNANCE

Authority of the AACCUPE emanates from its Constitution and By-Laws duly ratified by the general membership and registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission. As an autonomous body, the agency's governance rests on the AACCUPE Board of Trustees which is mandated to meet every quarter for regular meetings and conduct special meetings as the need arises. The officials and staff are as follows:

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES (2005-2007)	
DR. ROSARIO P. PIMENTEL President and Chairman of the Board	DR. ESTER B. VELASQUEZ Trustee
DR. NELSON T. BINAG Vice President and Vice-Chairman	DR. ALBERTO J. TRINIDAD Trustee
DR. JOHN S. IMLAN Treasurer and Trustee	DR. GRACE G. LOPEZ Trustee
DR. DANILO S. HILARIO Auditor and Trustee	DR. ALADINO L. LECCIO Trustee
DR. MARCELA T. CALUSCOSIN Secretary and Trustee	DR. FLORINDA V. GARCIA Trustee
DR. MANUEL T. CORPUS Executive Director and Trustee	DR. RUPERTO S. SANGALANG Trustee

SECRETARIAT	
DR. MANUEL T. CORPUS Executive Director	
MR. SEGUNDO R. ROGELIO, JR. Program Assistant	MR. DOMINIC T. MARTINEZ IT Specialist
MS. FE TERESITA T. LUZANO Cashier	MS. MARITES S. BOLANOS Bookkeeper
MR. PAUL JOHN L. CABUGAO Part-time Staff	MR. MARK GREG T. CARREON Part-time Staff
MR. NIEL ANTHONY T. BAQUIRAN Part-time Staff	MR. HONORATO L. BAYLON Utility/Driver

CONSULTANTS	
DR. NILO E. COLINARES Consultant	DR. MARIANO J. GUILLERMO Consultant
DR. CATALINO P. RIVERA Consultant	DR. PABLO T. MATEO Consultant

## ***The NNQAA as Umbrella Organization of the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA***

Article I, Section 6 of the CMO No. 01, s. 2005, on voluntary accreditation, provides that “the CHED shall recognize one federation/network largely serving the public sector educational institutions and one for the private sector educational institutions...”

The NNQAA, composed of the AACCUP and the ALCU-COA is such network serving the public sector. The Board of Trustees has three members representing the AACCUP, three members representing the ALCU-COA and five members representing education, industry and professional education groups, per constitutional provisions.

The National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA) acquired a new image after revision of its Constitution and By-laws.

Under the new provisions, a private sector citizen may now qualify for membership in the Board. Thus, Dr. Angel C. Alcala, former Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education, was elected Member of the Board and in no time at all, chosen Chairman of the Board of Directors.

Another official elected from the private sector was Dr. Pablo T. Mateo, AACCUP Consultant and former President of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP), The Executive Director of the AACCUP is now also a Member of the Board.

Meanwhile, there are plans in the near future, to have the Executive Director act as Vice-Chairman of the Board. Proponents of the measure believe that, more than any other member of the Board, it is the Executive Director who conceptualizes the agency’s plans of activities, have them brought to the attention of the President and the Board, and manages their execution/implementation.

## **V. FINANCE**

Accreditation fees serve as the major source of funding for accreditation visits and projects. In this regard, member institutions are encouraged to update their membership and annual fees to augment the Agency’s coffers and to strengthen the AACCUP bond among SUCs. For the past five years, the Agency has had very minimal source of funding. Normal operations, however, had been sustained, with the annual dues, some membership, accreditation and training fees partially answering for the financial requirements of the various projects and activities.

The income statement for the Calendar Year 2006, which consists of the annual dues, accreditation and consultancy visits, sale of instruments, annual convention, mid year conference, workshops and trainings, is reflected in the income statement as of December 31, 2006, with a total amount P5,236,393.44. The excess of income over expenses is 955,721.74.

## **VI. MAIN THRUSTS FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2007**

- a. Strengthen the linkages with national and international bodies concerned with quality assurance and sustain the gains made as in the APQN decision to have the AACCUP, Philippines lead the team composed of the Sri Lanka, Hong Kong, The Netherlands and Australia in the project to expand the research on qualifications framework;

- b. Continue to invite experts on quality assurance for the training of trainers and accreditors on institutional accreditation;
- c. Constitute a pool of Team Leaders and Coordinators for both program and institutional survey visits;
- d. Encourage and reemphasize the necessity of organizing Internal Assessment Bodies in SUCs;
- e. Help strengthen preparations for eligibility to apply for institutional accreditation through workshops and training by AACCUP and NNQAA experts in consultation with CHED, INQAAHE and APQN;
- f. Vigorously pursue survey visits of institutions applying for either preliminary or advanced program accreditation:
- g. Conduct the initial institutional accreditation visit; and
- h. Raise the level of resources (personnel, equipment, space) of AACCUP to be able to handle its present expanded level of operations.

## **ACCREDITATION AS A TOOL IN ACHIEVING ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE**

**Rep. Cynthia A. Villar**

Chair, House Committee on Higher Education  
and Technical Education

It is an honor for me to address the participants of the 20<sup>th</sup> National Congress of Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines.

First of all, I congratulate the people who have made this agency a dynamic and potent force in the continuing search for academic excellence in Philippine higher education. The past two decades may have been filled with many trials and challenges. However, our gathering today is a proof that you also have triumphs that give you much cause to celebrate.

All of your efforts - individually and collectively - have not gone unnoticed; hence, our awarding ceremonies. My warmest congratulations go to all the awardees. And my deepest appreciation for those among you who have remained unwavering in upgrading and meeting the standards that are necessary for our institutions for higher learning to maintain their academic integrity.

Debates have been on-going about how little of our national budget goes to education. But this has not deterred the House Committee on Higher and Technical Education of the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress from taking up bills that may greatly affect our chartered colleges and universities.

I often begin by stating my belief that education is the key that opens doors to various opportunities for advancement - for the benefit of both the person and the nation. Coming up with the relevant and necessary legislation is, however, not an easy task. Your active participation during public hearings and consultations continue to be an important factor in this endeavor. So, I hope that you will not relinquish your right to participate.

With the limited time and budget, the committee was able to attain some humble accomplishments towards the goal of enhancing the state of private higher education in our country.

To date, four bills converting state colleges into state universities have been passed in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, are awaiting the signature of the President before these become laws, namely:

- a. HB 5336, Converting the Bataan Polytechnic State College and the Bataan State College into one state university to be known as the BATAAN PENINSULA STATE UNIVERSITY;
- b. HB 5953, Converting the Laguna State Polytechnic College into a state university to be known as the LAGUNA STATE UNIVERSITY;
- c. HB 5977, Converting the Southern Luzon Polytechnic College into a state university to be known as the SOUTHERN LUZON STATE UNIVERSITY; and
- d. HB 4910, Converting the Bukidnon State College into a state university to be known as the BUKIDNON STATE UNIVERSITY;

Likewise awaiting the signature of the President before becoming laws are:

- a. HB 5330 renaming Leyte State University into VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY; and
- b. HB 5332 which refers to the amendment of Republic Act No. 9045 which created the Batangas State University, excluding from its coverage the Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP) campus in Sto. Tomas, Batangas.

Next in the pipeline is the Amendment of the UP Charter. Both the House and the Senate have approved the bill and the same is now scheduled for bicameral conference for fine-tuning before the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress ends. The House has also approved and transmitted to the Senate the bill amending RA 8292 or the “Higher Education Modernization Act of 1997,” which embodies the necessary changes to the law that governs the state universities and colleges to come at par with the prevailing times.

One of the initiatives I am pleased with is the passing on the committee level of the Resolution Seeking the Continuing Education, Training, and Professional Enhancement of Teachers by strengthening the Teacher Education Council of the Department of Education through the release of its mandated full initial funding intended primarily for continuing training of basic education teachers; and directing the CHED and the TESDA to engage in massive public information and dissemination of their respective faculty development programs, training and scholarships for availment by college instructors and tech-voc trainers, all leading to world-class and globally competitive basic, higher and technical-vocational education. This is aimed at enhancing the status of our educators through better mastery of their subject matter and improved communication skills and presentation techniques, among others. Continuing education and training for our teachers are necessary in order for them to stay abreast with the newer teaching techniques. Our teachers also need to stay well-informed of the changes in information and technology and even of the principles of the various sciences that are affected by constantly evolving research studies.

As educators, I know that you need to be ten or even twenty steps ahead of your students. With the wealth of information and knowledge that they can access through the internet, this becomes a more challenging task for you. The resolution we passed seeks to address this need. Due to lack of material time of this Congress, the resolution has not been reduced into a bill. Given the opportunity, I commit to endeavor to make a follow-up of this concern in the next Congress.

Several other bills were also filed during the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress. However, due to some constraints, largely that of time, some bills remain at the committee level. These bills should be refiled in the next Congress and I likewise commit to endeavor to initiate this move.

These include the:

1. Rationalization of the typology of Higher Education Institutions to allow our SUCs to focus on their core competencies and eventually produce graduates who are fully qualified for employment or successful entrepreneurship;
2. Establishment of a College Education Trust Fund for GSIS and SSS grantees;
3. Provision of scholarships and other benefits for public and private school teachers; and
4. Provision of free tuition and other school fees for children of teachers and employees in public and private institutions of higher learning.

I am personally pushing for the institutionalization of the distance learning concept and the creation of a National Open University.

We firmly believe that a highly skilled and educated labor force contributes to national growth and development. It is for this reason that we seek to expand and further democratize educational opportunities for Filipinos in a more effective and economical manner, utilizing innovative educational technology through the institutionalization of the open learning system.

The open learning system will allow for wider access to educational opportunities, utilizing distance teaching and learning where students shall not be required to regularly attend conventional classrooms. This will permit people to study and earn degrees even while they are in their places of work or even as they reside in distant areas. This opens avenues for attaining higher levels of learning for people in remote areas as well as people who do not have the luxury of taking time off from work.

A country with limited resources like ours will greatly benefit from this system which also seems responsive to the needs of our people, most of whom are financially in need.

Close cooperation between and among private and public higher educational institutions will effect the success of this system. This will eventually be for the benefit of the citizenry as well as the progress of the country.

The other item that I am a staunch advocate of is the ladderized system of curriculum.

On September 15, 2004, President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo issued Executive Order (EO) 358 seeking “to institutionalize a ladderized interface between technical-vocational education and training (TVET) and higher education (HE)”. The EO mandates the TESDA and the CHED to organize from their present staff complements a permanent Technical Secretariat and to develop and implement a unified national qualifications framework called the Philippine National Qualifications Framework (PNQF).

The PNQF is a system that establishes two pathways based on existing equivalency systems and proposed mechanisms for mobility within the entire system.

First, there is the *access ramp* which, for the qualifiers of TVET, addresses the more academic requirements of formal education such as academic communication in English and Filipino, quantitative skills and other foundational learning skills.

Then, there is the *equivalency pathway*, which strengthens and rationalizes the current systems of recognizing prior knowledge acquired from TVET learning experiences and/or actual practical work experiences. This allows TVET graduates to pursue higher educational courses offered in colleges and universities without having to lose credit of what they have already earned or completed in a TVET program under the TESDA.

In other words, we want to institutionalize a flexible mechanism, which provides for an efficient and effective system that will allow individuals to **improve themselves continuously without being hampered by their initial choice in their education.**

It is also envisioned to allow students to attain skills, knowledge, and qualification for certain jobs that do not necessarily require a full four- or five-year college degree. A clear example of this point is the Nursing course in the United States, where several levels of training and education are available. There is the Nursing Aide certificate, the Licensed Practical Nurse, Registered Nurse, and the Bachelor of Science in Nursing—all of which are attainable within

varying periods of time, from about two years to five years, depending on the student's course load. This practical approach allows students access to employment opportunities within a shorter period, while at the same time providing the options for higher levels of study in order to advance their career in their chosen profession.

Another example is the modular offering of courses that can eventually lead to the attainment of a diploma in a particular field. This can be seen being offered by some colleges wherein students are able to enroll in modular courses that eventually build up to a diploma, like restaurant management or organization development.

This, we believe, is education that is responsive to the current needs of the times and of our people who are in need of finding satisfactory means of livelihood. This is the challenge to our educational system and to our educators.

It is our hope that such a system will benefit our students who strongly desire to learn skills for livelihood and gain knowledge for a meaningful life.

After all, we have to keep in mind that "*the whole purpose of education is to turn mirrors into windows.*" Personally, I hope to be able to open as many windows of opportunities to as many people possible. I know that, together, we can achieve this goal.

I thank you again for inviting me today and giving me a chance for a productive exchange of ideas with you. Let us work together towards enhancing the state of higher education in the Philippines.

I wish you all a good day!

**ACCREDITING AGENCY FOR CHARTERED COLLEGES AND  
UNIVERSITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES INC.  
AACCU**

**812 Future Point Plaza I, 112 Panay Avenue, South Triangle Q.C.**

**INCOME STATEMENT  
For the Year Ended December 31, 2006**

**INCOME/REVENUE**

ANNUAL DUES/MEMBERSHIP FEE		1,638,000.00
FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE-CHED		500,000.00
ACCREDITATION FEES	7,097,780.00	
Less: Expenses	4,560,815.71	2,536,964.29
WORKSHOP/TRAINING	753,900.00	
Less: Expenses	443,380.08	310,519.92
NATIONAL CONVENTION		
Registration Fees	1,532,000.00	
Less: Expenses	1,281,090.77	250,909.23
Other Income		33,050.00
<b>TOTAL INCOME/REVENUE</b>		<b>5,236,393.44</b>
<b>LESS: OPERATING EXPENSES</b>		
Salaries & Wages-Regular	794,344.38	
Salaries & Wages-Part Time	71,257.50	
Year End Benefits	304,977.00	
Other Personnel Benefits	101,127.50	
Representation Allowance	25,000.00	
Honoraria/Token	545,418.18	
Meals & Snacks	186,967.22	
Office Supplies Expenses	179,459.39	
Transportation Expenses	545,569.66	
Telephone, Telegraph & Internet	170,845.20	
Contributions, HDMF, PHIC and SSS	17,547.00	
Rent Expenses	60,000.00	
Seminars and Conference Expenses	441,475.00	
Water	2,340.00	
Electricity Expenses	90,830.60	
Gasoline Oil and Lubricants	21,965.92	
Professional Fees	5,000.00	
Printing Expenses	116,900.00	
Association Dues & Water	16,608.04	
Certification and Review (NNQAA)	328,000.00	
Membership Expenses	50,000.00	
Repairs & Maintenance	15,700.00	
Bank Charges	906.00	
Taxes & Licenses	500.00	
Insurance Expenses	19,086.96	
Depreciation Expenses	145,310.05	
Miscellaneous	23,536.10	4,280,671.70
<b>EXCESS INCOME OVER EXPENSES</b>		<b>955,721.74</b>

Certified correct

(Sgd.) **MARITES S. BOLANOS**  
Accountant

Audited by:

(Sgd.) **DANILO S. HILARIO**  
Auditor

**ACCREDITING AGENCY FOR CHARTERED COLLEGES AND  
UNIVERSITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES, INC.  
(AACCUP)  
812 Future Point Plaza I, 112 Panay Avenue, South Triangle, Q.C.**

**BALANCE SHEET  
December 31, 2006**

---

**ASSETS**

**CURRENT ASSETS:**

Cash in Bank (LBP)	965,789.25	
Accounts Receivable	22,300.00	
Cash Advance for Accreditation & Operation	150,000.00	
Deposit-Manila Hotel	50,000.00	
Prepaid Insurance	84,895.81	1,272,985.06

**FIXED ASSETS**

Motor Vehicle (net)	965,150.00	
IT Equipment (net)	238,636.42	
Office Equipment (net)	138,879.75	
Office Furnitures & Fixtures (net)	76,736.80	
Real Property	1,921,563.94	3,341,166.91

---

<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>		<b>4,614,151.97</b>
---------------------	--	---------------------

---

**LIABILITIES & EQUITY**

**LIABILITIES**

**EQUITY**

AACCUP Equity	2,715,648.44	
Prior Years Adjustment	942,781.79	
Add: Excess of Income over Expenses	955,721.74	4,614,151.97

---

<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES AND EQUITY</b>		<b>4,614,151.97</b>
-------------------------------------	--	---------------------

---

Certified correct

Audited by:

(Sgd.) **MARITES S. BOLANOS**  
Accountant

(Sgd.) **Danilo S. Hilario**  
Auditor

**HELEN A. GAMBOA, C.P.A.**  
**CPA Cert. No. 0087940**  
**TIN # 101-897-306**

**9556 Gena cor. Gene Street**  
**Airport Village**  
**Parañaque City**

---

## **REPORT OF INDEPENDENT CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT**

**THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges**  
**And Universities in the Philippines, Inc. (AACCUPI)**  
Room # 812 Future Point Plaza I, 112 Panay Avenue  
South Triangle, Quezon City

I have audited the accompanying Balance Sheet of **ACCREDITING AGENCY OF CHARTERED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES, INC.** as of **December 31, 2006** and the related Income Statement for the year ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the management. My responsibility is to express an opinion of these financial statements based on my audit.

I have conducted my audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. An audit includes examining on a test basis evidence supporting the amounts and disclosure assessing the accounting principles used and significant in the financial statement presentation. I believe that my audit provides reasonable basis for my opinion.

In my opinion, the financial statement referred to above presents fairly in all material respects, the financial position of **ACCREDITING AGENCY OF CHARTERED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES, INC.** as of **December 31, 2006** and the results of its operation for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

(Sgd.) **HELEN A. GAMBOA**  
PTR No. 5663456  
January 19, 2007  
Manila

January 23, 2007

## PARTICIPANTS

### 20<sup>th</sup> AACUP NATIONAL CONFERENCE

February 26-27, 2007

#### Region I

##### **University of Northern Philippines**

Dr. Lauro B. Tacbas  
Dr. Lumen H. Almachar  
Dr. Arsenia C. Domingo  
Dr. Ocarina B. Fiquerres  
Dr. Wilma F. Medrano  
Dr. Jimmy R. Soria  
Prof. Briqida F. De Leon  
Dr. Milagros R. Remular  
Dr. Witerico T. Balbuena

##### **Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College**

Dr. Alejandro V. Directo  
Dr. Florida T. Adolfo  
Dr. Corazon A. Gines  
Prof. Jeanno M. Manzano  
Dr. Helen C. Abella  
Prof. Olivia C. Directo

##### **Pangasinan State University**

Dr. Manolito C. Manuel  
Dr. Zenaida U. Suyat  
Dr. Victoriano C. Estira  
Dr. Artemio M. Rebugio

##### **Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University**

Dr. Marcela T. Caluscasin  
Dr. Angelita J. Prado  
Dr. Julie Mason  
Dr. Juanito B. Rualo  
Dr. Concepcion L. Bederio  
Dr. Merlyn H. Caoile  
Dr. Leticia B. Tinaza  
Dr. Rogelio C. Tanagon  
Dr. Eduardo C. Corpuz  
Dr. Clarita O. Manzano  
Engr. Elson H. Yumul  
Dr. Salvacion C. Loyola  
Dr. Manuel T. Libao  
Dr. Editha T. Vasay  
Dr. Eufemia D. Calica  
Dr. Gil F. Dela Vega  
Dr. Virginia O. Rudio  
Engr. Albert P. Tablatin  
Prof. Lilito D. Gavina  
Prof. Elpidio B. Lanton  
Dr. Miriam S. Cervantes

##### **Mariano Marcos State University**

Dr. Nancy GB. Balantac  
Dr. Cristina B. Coloma  
Dr. Josephine R. Domingo

#### Region II

##### **Cagayan State University**

Dr. Fernando M. Natividad  
Dr. Margarita L. Babaran  
Dr. Tomasa C. Iririgan  
Dr. Leticia A. Dumlaog  
Dr. Nelia Z. Cauilan  
Dr. Lina M. Garan  
Engr. Policarpio L. Maborang  
Dr. Apolonia M. Cariga  
Dr. Mariden T. Ventura

##### **Nueva Vizcaya State University**

Dr. Marilou S. Gilo-Abon  
Dr. Edwin P. Rarnos  
Dr. Jocelyn P. Cabrera  
Dr. Emirita R. Hongo  
Engr. Enrico B. Dulay

### **Isabela State University**

Dr. Romeo R. Quilang  
Dr. Emerenciana B. Claravall  
Dr. Thelma T. Lanuza  
Dr. Janet B. Quilang  
Dr. Editha F. Ausa  
Dr. Evalinda G. Victoria

Dr. Nenita T. Magno  
Dr. Edwin F. Macaballug  
Dr. Joel L. Reyes  
Dr. Reynaldo L. Raymundo  
Dr. Quirino D. Parallag  
Dr. Myrna G. Maramag  
Dr. Clarinda C. Galiza  
Dr. Aurea A. dela Cruz  
Dr. Felipe P. Ammugauan, Sr.

### **Region III**

#### **Bulacan Agricultural State University**

Dr. Josie A. Valdez  
Dr. Herminio B. Giron  
Dr. Gerardo I. Mendoza  
Dr. Alicia SP Gomez

#### **Tarlac College of Agriculture**

Dr. Philip B. Ibarra  
Dr. Eleanor G. Hilario  
Dr. Honorio M. Soriano, Jr.  
Dr. Max P. Guillermo  
Dr. Maria Teresa SJ Valdez  
Dr. Jeremias DC Rodriguez

#### **Bataan Polytechnic State College**

Engr. Rodrigo C. Muñoz  
Mr. Benjamin M. Adraneda, Jr.  
Mr. Edmundo C. Tungol  
Mr. Rolliver M. Baciles  
Mr. Camilo L. Dominguez  
Miss Lirio C. Baluyot

#### **Bulacan State University**

Dr. Rosario P. Pimentel  
Dr. Danilo S. Hilario  
Dr. Cecilia A. Geronimo  
Dr. Danilo D. Faustino  
Dr. Luzviminda F. Tantoco  
Dr. Alfredo G. Mendoza  
Dr. Ladislao D. Marcelo  
Dr. Alexander D.R. Dela Paz  
Engr. Audie L. Geronimo  
Engr. Zenaida J. Buendia  
Ms. Evangelina G. Custodio

#### **Pampanga Agricultural College**

Dr. Nora P. Lucero  
Dr. Emelita C. Kempis  
Dr. Epifania S. Gosioco  
Dr. Jacqueline V. Bagunu  
Dr. Rogelio D. Cosio

#### **Tarlac State University**

Dr. Priscilla C. Viuya  
Dr. Myrna Q. Mallari  
Prof. Michaela P. Sagun  
Dr. Dalisay V. Rigor  
Dr. Gabriel S. Tabion  
Dr. Brigido B. Corpuz

#### **Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology**

Atty. Hilario C. Ortiz  
Dr. Angel A. Pangilinan  
Dr. Zenaida R. Guillasper  
Dean Ricardo M. Dizon  
Dr. Nenita L. Pongco  
Dr. Virgilio N. Dulay  
Dr. Juanaria M. Aquino  
Dr. Miguel R. Santos  
Prof. John T. Dumayas

#### **Central Luzon State University**

Dr. Soledad M. Roguel  
Dr. Lilia D. Torres  
Dr. Mario S. Suba

**Ramon Magsaysay Technology University**

Dr. Domingo C. Edano  
 Dr. Irene M. Ebal  
 Dr. Ricardo S. Reyes

**Philippine Merchant Marine Academy**

Dr. Obdolia M. Guanzon  
 Capt. Orlando S. Dimailig  
 Ms. Normelita G. Yaneza

**Don Honorio Ventura College of Arts and Trades**

Dr. Laura Miriam B. Buenviaje  
 Dr. Esperanza F. Salinas  
 Engr. Rohel S. Secrano  
 Dr. Yolanda E. Crisostomo

**Region IV-A****Southern Luzon Polytechnic College**

Dr. Cecilia N. Gascon  
 Dr. Walberto A. Macaraan  
 Dr. Conrado L. Abraham  
 Dr. Clarissa D. Maguyon  
 Prof. Nordelina B. Ilano

**Cavite State University**

Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang  
 Dr. Lorna L. Penales  
 Dr. Constancia G. Cueno  
 Dr. Luzviminda A. Rodrin  
 Dr. Hernando D. Robles  
 Dr. Reynaldo F. Samonte  
 Dr. Julio G. Alava

**University of Rizal System**

Dr. Olivia F. De Leon  
 Dr. Demetria A. San Juan  
 Dr. Gloria P. Sarabia

**Batangas State University**

Dr. Nora L. Magnaye  
 Engr. Victor A. Semira  
 Mrs. Jellie M. Molino  
 Dr. Aile T. Amorado  
 Erma B. Quinay  
 Rogelio A. Antenor  
 Dr. Matilda H. Dimaano

**Laguna State Polytechnic University**

Dr. Ricardo A. Wagan  
 Prof. Olivia P. Magpily  
 Dr. Nestor M. De Vera  
 Dr. Teresa M. Yambao  
 Dr. Avelina B. Urate  
 Dr. Ruperto C. Espinueva  
 Dr. Mila E. Isles  
 Dr. Librada L. Abanto  
 Mrs. Mary Grace P. Gallardo

**Lipa City Public College**

Mr. Romulo H. Valencia  
 Mr. Felicisimo B. Diodio, Jr.  
 Mr. Rogelio Guce

**Region IV-B****Occidental Mindoro National College**

Mrs. Simplicia T. Tordenillas  
 Dr. Arnold N. Venturina  
 Dr. Victoria V. Ungria  
 Mrs. Judith G. Gamit  
 Mr. Reynaldo F. Escalada

**Palawan State University**

Engr. Melecio M. Gener  
 Dr. Lorna C. Gelito

**Marinduque State College**

Dr. Romulo H. Malvar  
Dr. Rosalina J. Villero  
Mrs. Alicia M. Maalindog

**Romblon State College**

Dr. Mario A. Fetalver, Jr.  
Engr. Amada S. Mayuga  
Dr. Alexander F. Formento  
Prof. Edgar V. Andalecia  
Dr. Cydippe F. Meñez

**Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology**

Dr. Levy B. Arago, Jr.  
Dr. Jesse T. Zamora  
Dr. Cecilia G. Salazar  
Dr. Edna G. Pidol  
Prof. Gregoria C. Pesigan  
Prof. Rosalia F. Soriano

**Region V****Sorsogon State College**

Mrs. Lydia D. Doctor  
Ms. Lynn F. Carpio  
Dr. Madelyn L. Monreal  
Dr. Shirley V. Lo  
Dr. Ruby L. Leander

**Partido State University**

Dr. Modesto D. Detera  
Dr. Minda P. Formalejo  
Dr. Nita V. Morallo  
Dr. Nancy P. Penacilia  
Mr. Dennis D. Pena  
Mrs. Adoracion M. Penetrante  
Mrs. Evelyn P. Taduran  
Mrs. Ercelida B. Joven  
Mrs. Nehlia P. Esmeralda  
Mrs. Arabella R. Pilapil

**Camarines Sur Polytechnic College**

Dr. Monsito G. Ilarde  
Dr. Dulce F. Atia  
Dr. Araceli E. Carreras  
Dr. Arly B. Balingbing  
Mrs. Teresita B. Salazar  
Mrs. Elena V. Rull  
Engr. Francia H. Tomenio  
Dr. Zoraida Monserate  
Dr. Richard H. Cordial  
Dr. Abner Pardinias

**Bicol University**

Dr. Susana C. Cabredo  
Engr. Atanacio A. Barajas, Jr.  
Dr. Ofelia S. Vega  
Prof. Wilhelmina M. Nerveza  
Dr. Heidi C. Dyangko  
Prof. Flor A. Jenkin  
Dr. Nora L. Licup  
Dr. Obdulia E. Rojas  
Epifania B. Nuñez

**Camarines Sur State Agricultural College**

Atty. Marito T. Bernales  
Dr. Yolanda L. Castroverde  
Dr. Belen A. Relleno  
Engr. Henry A. Mabesa, Jr.  
Dr. Eden C. Paz  
Dr. Evelyn R. Reyteran  
Dr. Begilda Soriao  
Dr. Salvador V. Calisura  
Dr. Mecilia M. dela Torre

**Camarines Norte State College**

Dr. Wenifredo T. Oñate  
Dr. Erlinda J. Porcincula  
Dr. Cecilia B. Guevarra

**DEBESMSCAT**

Prof. Salvador T. Turco

## Catanduanes State Colleges

Dr. Asuncion V. Asetre  
Dr. Evelyn A. Bagadiiong  
Dr. Moises L. Toyado  
Dr. Maria S. Tugano  
Dr. Mila D. Vela

### Region VI

#### **Carlos Hilado Memorial State College**

Dr. Remia J. Tipon  
Dr. Victoria L. Ojas  
Prof. Salvador B. Zaragosa, Jr.  
Prof. Mario N. Abeto  
Dr. Edwin H. Bugna  
Dr. Orlando Z. Benales

#### **Iloilo State College Fisheries**

Dr. Ramon C. Cabag  
Dr. Precy P. Perez  
Dr. Regina D. Clavel  
Prof. Salvador C. Ballano, Jr.  
Prof. Nenita B. Barrido  
Prof. Noel C. Genturo  
Dr. Emma D. Gulmatico  
Dr. Elvira C. Delgado  
Prof. Irvin C. Haro

#### **Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology**

Dr. Rogelio T. Artajo  
Dr. Ma. Elena L. Defallo  
Dr. Wynne S. Silva  
Prof. Myrna G. Dañas  
Mary Ann T. Arceno  
Dean Jessie R. Orpilla

#### **Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College**

Dr. Hemogene R. Guanaco  
Dr. Rolando B. Guillermo  
Dr. Rodelo G. Temporosa  
Dr. Severa B. Francisco  
Prof. Merle R. Plantig  
Prof. Tessie A. Masongsong  
Prof. Ricardo A. Ayupan  
Dr. Francis B. Gasapo

#### **Capiz State University**

Dr. Rochellir D. Dadvivas  
Dr. Aladino L. Leccio  
Dr. Evaristo M. Magoncia  
Dr. Cora F. Navarra  
Dr. Nieves V. Aguirre  
Dr. Lucy A. Beluso  
Dr. Nilda B. Contreras  
Dr. Florentina Pahila  
Dr. Roman V. Belleza  
Dr. Annalie G. Campos  
Prof. Diony J. Cahilig  
Dr. Louella Lachica  
Dr. Josephine Orocio

#### **West Visayas State University**

Dr. Lourdes C. Aranador  
Dr. Lourdes N. Morano  
Prof. Ma. Asuncion Christine V. Dequilla  
Dr. Merna R. Lopez  
Prof. Leo D. Dagum  
Dr. Purita P. Bilbao  
Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo  
Dr. Raymund B. Gemora  
Dr. Antonio S. Urbano, Jr.  
Prof. Virgie R. Andarza  
Prof. Eleanor C. Bugante  
Dr. Roel A. Alli

#### **Western Visayas College of Science and Technology**

Dr. Luis M. Sorolla, Jr.  
Dr. Marjorie A. Caipang  
Dr. Ricardo B. Abaleña  
Dr. Emma Q. Quidato  
Engr. Gabriel M. Salistre, Jr.  
Dr. Raul F. Muyong  
Dr. Ma. Eugenita C. Capaciete  
Dr. Antonio D. Derequito  
Dr. Lourdes R. Diasnes

**Aklan State University**

Dr. Benny A. Palma  
Dr. Elenita B. Andrade  
Prof. Loneto R. Berlandino  
Dr. Eleanor T. Mationg  
Dr. Marilyn E. Romaguin  
Dr. Maria Regina C. Cabañez  
Dr. Mary Eden M. Teruel  
Prof. Lea I. Dulla

**Technological University of the Philippines - Visayas**

Prof. Darla C. Diamante

**Guimaras State College**

Prof. Josephine G. Piodena  
Dr. Domingo G. Umani, Jr.  
Prof. Elizabeth P. Cercado

**La Carlota City College**

Ms. Lydia V. Penafiel  
Mrs. Helen C. Donguines  
Mrs. Virgie S. Rendon

**Polytechnic State College of Antique**

Dr. Victor E. Navarra  
Dr. Elena M. Calumbiran  
Dr. Laura G. Perales  
Dr. Nelibeth P. Galido  
Prof. Nelida D. Alecando  
Prof. Jocelyn C. Morales  
Prof. Armando I. Cabrillos  
Dr. Yolanda T. Garcesa  
Prof. Ma. Josephine M. Mercado  
Ms. Rose Mae U. Mena

**Negros State College of Agriculture**

Dr. Joel A. Perez

**Region VII****Negros Oriental State University**

Dr. Henry A. Sojor  
Dr. Victoria P. Dinopol  
Dr. Teresita F. Acopiado  
Dr. Asteria O. Villalon  
Dr. Silveria L. Ochotorena  
Dr. Violeta B. Taring  
Dr. Maria Elsa Ilona A. Bulado

**Cebu Normal University**

Dr. Ester B. Velasquez  
Dr. Marcelo T. Lopez  
Dr. Angel O. Pesirla  
Dr. Floriza N. Laplap  
Dr. Marylou B. Ong  
Dr. Evelyn G. Tradio  
Dr. Filomena T. Dayagbil  
Dr. Isabelo T. Genegaboas

**Cebu State College of Science and Technology**

Dr. Victor D. Villaganas  
Dr. Cecilia P. Delos Reyes  
Dr. Cecilio S. Baga  
Dr. Severino R. Romano  
Dr. Pedrito C. Pontillas  
Mrs. Esmeralda M. Egos  
Dr. Romeo G. Pableo  
Dr. Edwin A. Pilapil

**Central Visayas State College of Agriculture, Forestry and Technology**

Dr. Loius T. Palapar  
Dr. Dioscoro A. Avergonzado  
Dr. Inocencio L. Cosare  
Prof. Arnulfo C. Olandria  
Prof. Fernando L. Restificar  
Prof. Jose T. Traverro

## Region VIII

### **Palompon Institute of Technology**

Dr. Delia T. Combista  
Dr. Jacinto P. Balunan  
Dr. Angelita F. Pajaron  
Dr. Presentacion R. Sevilla  
Dr. Filipina L. Pagaran

### **Samar State University**

Dr. Simon P. Babalcon Jr.  
Dr. Eusebio T. Pacolor  
Dr. Marilyn D. Cardoso

### **Leyte Normal University**

Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada  
Dr. Marietta B. Arinto  
Dr. Leonardo G. Oñate

### **Eastern Samar State University**

Dr. Reynaldo A. Lombrio  
Dr. Leonor T. Obon  
Dr. Jose V. Palada  
Dr. Emilia L. Baquilod  
Dr. Norma V. Lombrio  
Dr. Edmundo A. Campoto  
Dr. Cristina A. Mendoza  
Dr. Teresita B. Caharop  
Mrs. Florita C. Cabato  
Dr. Nelly O. Robin  
Dr. Elpidio M. Cabacaba  
Dr. Marina S. Apilado  
Ms. Fe C. Padit

### **University of Eastern Philippines**

Dr. Zenaida S. Lucero  
Dr. Mindanilla B. Broto  
Dr. Anita D. Colinares

### **Samar State College of Agriculture and Forestry**

Dr. Aida L. Tobes  
Dr. Francisca B. Sultan  
Dr. Romeo N. Paldez  
Dr. Manuel J. Baylon

### **Leyte State University**

Dr. Paciencia P. Milan  
Dr. Mauel K. Palomar  
Dr. Jose L. Bacusmo

### **Tiburcio Tancinco Memorial Institute of Science and Technology**

Dr. Socorro O. Bohol  
Prof. Louella F. Macanip  
Dr. Helen S. Cabral

### **Eastern Visayas State University**

Dr. Catalino B. Beltran  
Dr. Dominador O. Aguirre, Jr.  
Dr. Danilo B. Pulma  
Dr. Segunda A. Lacaba  
Dr. Rosita E. Nical

### **Naval Institute of Technology**

Dr. Edita S. Genson  
Dr. Loreta M. Besayo  
Dr. Rossini B. Romero  
Dr. Susan S. Bentor

### **Southern Leyte State University**

Dr. Jane N. Labastida

## Region IX

### **Zamboanga City State Polytechnic College**

Mr. Lionel R. Villavieja  
Mr. Edwin U. Evangelista  
Mr. Felixberto B. Pagayonan  
Dr. Nilo D. Partosa  
Dr. Roberto T. Eyo

### **Zamboanga State College of Marine Sciences and Technology**

Dr. Enrie A. Caracle  
Dr. Florinda V. Garcia  
Dr. Evelyn B. Campos

**Jose Rizal Memorial State College**

Dr. Edgar S. Balbuena  
Dr. Cecilia S. Saguin  
Dr. Nenfa R. Taub  
Dr. Luvisminda N. Paquibot  
Dr. Evelyn E. Agecia  
Prof. Wilfredo D. Carreon  
Prof. Josephine B. Martinez  
Dr. Erieda C. Acas  
Dr. Narcisa S. Bureros  
Prof. Aida D. Lanioso

**Basilan State College**

Dr. Idris M. Hakim  
Dr. Orlando L. Fajardo  
Dr. Joseph P. San Juan

**Western Mindanao State University**

Dr. Carmelita M. Felisilda

**J.H. Cerilles State College**

Dr. Carlicita A. Saniel  
Agnes S. Riñon

**Region X****Mindanao Polytechnic State College**

Dr. Ricardo E. Rotoras  
Dr. Ruel R. Cabahug  
Dr. Ruth G. Cabahug  
Prof. Ledacs

**Central Mindanao University**

Dr. Lucy B. Ledres

**Region XI****Davao Oriental State College of Science and Technology**

Dr. Joy M. Sorrosa  
Prof. Elizabeth R. Espejo

**Davao del Norte State College**

Prof. Julieta S. Abarquez

**University of Southeastern Philippines**

Dr. Julieta I. Ortiz  
Dr. Daniel T. Ugay, Jr.  
Ms. Maureen M. Mamilic  
Prof. Ronald B. Jayectin  
Dr. Felomino A. Gargar  
Dr. Surlita M. Sumugat

**SPAMAST**

Dr. Geronima M. Estimada  
Prof. Lynette A. Bontia

**Region XII****Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology**

Dr. Makalutang B. Luna  
Dr. Zacaria E. Dalam  
Dr. Erlinda B. Aliman

**Cotabato City State Polytechnic College**

Dr. Dingan C. Ali  
Dr. Thelma F. Villa  
Dr. Francisco B. Balucas, Jr.

**Sultan Kudarat Polytechnic State College**

Dr. Nelson T. Binag  
 Dr. Jerry L. Marquez  
 Dr. Rolando F. Hechanova  
 Dr. Jesusa D. Ortuoste  
 Dr. Jeannelle B. Argonza  
 Dr. Edwin C. Alido  
 Prof. Rex F. Dapitan  
 Prof. Eulogio L. Apellido  
 Prof. Susie D. Daza  
 Dr. Jeremiah V. Mosquera

**University of Southern Mindanao**

Dr. Virgilio G. Oliva  
 Dr. Grace G. Lopez  
 Dr. Joy Gloria P. Sabutan  
 Dr. Lope E. Dapun  
 Dr. Abubakar A. Murray  
 Prof. Aleja P. Salik  
 Dr. Manuel G. Sabutan  
 Prof. Anita Sornito  
 Dr. Demetrio Oria

**C A R A G A****Surigao Del Sur Polytechnic State College**

Dr. Remegita C. Olvida  
 Dr. Rebecca S. Sanchez  
 Dr. Wivina A. Tering  
 Mrs. Trinidad E. Laguesma  
 Mrs. Aida C. Osorio  
 Dr. Cirila O. delos Arcos  
 Dr. Elenita S. Santamaria

**Agusan Del Sur State College of  
Agriculture and Technology**

Dr. Doroteo E. Jacquias  
 Dr. Juarlito V. Garcines

**Northern Mindanao State Institute of  
Science and Technology**

Dr. Edgar W. Ignacio  
 Dr. Gaudencio G. Petalcorin

**A R M M****Mindanao State University - IIT**

Dr. Arnulfo P. Supe  
 Dr. Brigida A. Roscom  
 Dr. Nasroden B. Guro  
 Dr. Rosa Villa B. Estoista  
 Dr. Fe I. Destura

**N C R****Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of  
Science and Technology**

Dr. Herculano V. Sabas  
 Dr. Alberto B. Celestial  
 Dr. Esteban T. Robiso  
 Dr. Noel B. Cabrera  
 Dr. Eledio T. Acibar  
 Dr. Lourdes G. Bandyoy  
 Dr. Editha V. Pillo  
 Dr. Rowena A. Bolotaolo  
 Dr. Elizabeth E. Soriano

**Philippine Normal University**

Atty. Lutgardo B. Barbo  
 Dr. Jesus A. Ochave  
 Dr. Angelita D. Romero  
 Dr. Dalisay G. Brawner  
 Dr. Lolita H. Nava  
 Dr. Lydia B. Liwanag  
 Dr. Lolita M. Salmorin  
 Dr. Benjamin M. Domingal, Jr.

**Rizal Technology University**

Dr. Jesus RF. Torres  
 Dr. Marilou C. Asturias  
 Dr. Amelita L. De Guzman  
 Dr. Marivic T. Sanchez  
 Engr. Nestor C. Competente  
 Dr. Eugenia M. Yangco  
 Prof. Rosa F. Diestro

**Technological University of the Philippines**

Dr. Vicky R. Galiza  
 Prof. Roselie F. Galiga  
 Prof. Belen S. Junia

**Marikina Polytechnic College**

Dr. Helen C. Parcon  
 Dr. Limuel C. Cirineo  
 Prof. Efren F. Azares  
 Prof. Virginia D. Bacay  
 Prof. Merliwinda S. Collo

**Polytechnic University of the Philippines**

Dr. Samuel M. Salvador  
 Dr. Victoria C. Naval  
 Dr. Milagrina A. Gomez  
 Prof. Raquel G. Ramos

**Philippine State College of Aeronautics**

Dr. Enerico M. Sampang  
 Engr. Reynaldo P. Roca

**C A R****Mountain Province State Polytechnic College**

Dr. Nieves A. Dacyon  
 Dr. Nena D. Perez  
 Dr. Geraldine L. Madjaco  
 Dr. Christie Lynne B. Cuning  
 Dr. Marcelino P. Gaqui

**Abra State Institute of Science and Technology**

Dr. Eusebia Pagluanan  
 Prof. Noel Begnalen

**Kalinga Apayao State College**

Dr. Eduardo T. Bagtang  
 Dr. Carmelita T. Ayang-Ang

**Tagoloan Community College**

Dr. Beatriz G. Bentuzal  
 Prof. Deborah I. Ople  
 Prof. Peter O. Elman  
 Prof. Rolando E. Seno

**CHED**

Dr. Isabela L. Mahler

**Benguet State University**

Dr. Rogelio D. Colting  
 Dr. Feliciano G. Calora, Jr.  
 Dr. Edna A. Chua  
 Prof. Lory C. Balaoing  
 Dr. Percyveranda A. Lubrica  
 Dr. Asuncion L. Nagpala  
 Dr. Macario D. Cadatal

**Ifugao State College of Agriculture and Forestry**

Dr. Adela B. Nebres  
 Dr. Camilo A. Pimentel

**Western Philippines University**

Prof. Lily R. Ocapan  
 Lucia L. Peneyra  
 Dr. Noel L. Gauran

**AACCUP**

Dr. Alberto J. Trinidad  
 Dr. Nilo E. Colinares  
 Dr. Catalino P. Rivera  
 Dr. Mariano J. Guillermo  
 Dr. Pablo T. Mateo

<b>OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES (2007-2009)</b>	
<b>DR. RUPERTO S. SANGALANG</b> President and Chairman of the Board	<b>DR. MANUEL T. CORPUS</b> Executive Director and Trustee
<b>DR. NELSON T. BINAG</b> Vice President and Vice-Chairman	<b>DR. GRACE G. LOPEZ</b> Trustee
<b>DR. DANILO S. HILARIO</b> Treasurer and Trustee	<b>DR. BRIGIDA A. ROSCOM</b> Trustee
<b>DR. ESTER B. VELASQUEZ</b> Auditor and Trustee	<b>DR. MARIA TERESA SJ. VALDEZ</b> Trustee
<b>DR. MIRIAM S. CERVANTES</b> Auditor and Trustee	<b>DR. GRACE B. BELO</b> Trustee
<b>DR. MARCELA T. CALUSCOSIN</b> Secretary and Trustee	<b>DR. RAUL F. MUYONG</b> Trustee

<b>SECRETARIAT AND CONSULTANTS GROUP</b>	
<b>DR. MANUEL T. CORPUS</b> Executive Director	
<b>DR. NILO E. COLINARES</b> Consultant	<b>DR. MARIANO J. GUILLERMO</b> Consultant
<b>DR. CATALINO P. RIVERA</b> Consultant	<b>DR. PABLO T. MATEO</b> Consultant
<b>DR. MARIO S. SUBA</b> Consultant	<b>PROF. MARINA S. QUESADA</b> Consultant
<b>MR. SEGUNDO R. ROGELIO, JR.</b> Program Assistant	<b>MR. DOMINIC T. MARTINEZ</b> IT Specialist
<b>MS. FE TERESITA T. LUZANO</b> Cashier	<b>MS. MARITES S. BOLANOS</b> Bookkeeper
<b>MR. IRAGEL A. DOCTOLERO</b> Clerk I	<b>MR. HONORATO L. BAYLON</b> Utility/Driver