

PROCEEDINGS 2010



23rd AACCUP National Conference

**ACCREDITING AGENCY OF CHARTERED COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES (AACCUP), INC.**

Suite 812 Future Point Plaza I, 112 Panay Avenue, South Triangle 1103, Quezon City

Tel: 02-4159016, 02-4101305; Mobile: 09285013387; Fax: 02-4158995

Email: aaccup@axti.com; Website: www.aaccupqa.org.ph

FOREWORD

Complementation of Program and Institutional Accreditation, spelled out the theme of the 23rd AACCUP Annual National Conference. Constituting the dominant activities of the previous conferences, trainings, policy formulation engagements and pilot test exercises, the objectives of the conference to expose participants to the updated new standards, policies, practices and materials, and to the similarities and differences of institutional and program accreditation were easily discernible and possible of fulfillment.

Due to the nature and the major concerns of the conference this year, brought about by a Resolution of the Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges (PASUC), all plenary sessions were provided with panels composed of the members of the AACCUP Board of Trustees, who the day before, had a lengthy, no-holds-barred discussion of the various practices and subsequent issues ensuing from accreditation surveys. The Board concerned ably responded to all queries and individually addressed all concerns of the assembly.

Dr. Lauro Tacbas, President of PASUC which sponsored the Resolution requesting for a revisit of AACCUP policies, recognized the role the agency has played in effectively influencing quality improvement of curriculum, faculty, student services, teaching performance, management and administration among others. On the other hand, as SUCs voluntarily subject their programs to accreditation, the PASUC Executive manifested some seven concerns of its member institutions for study by the Board which held the bull by its horns in a marathon meeting the day before the opening of the conference.

The other Keynote Speaker, Hon. Nilo L. Rosas, Commissioner of the Professional Regulatory Commission, drew a statistically-backed picture of the state of education, specifically the performance of its products in government licensure examinations. After challenging the SUCs to a manifestation of their status of excellence by correlating its Level III-Reaccredited programs to the Centers of Excellence of CHED, and the top performing institution awardees of PRC, the former Undersecretary of Education and PNU President, came to realize that indeed many of the highly accredited SUCs are recipients of both the CHED and PRC awards of excellence. He then commended the objectivity, accuracy and relevance of the AACCUP criteria for evaluation being privy to these, as a former member of the Board.

The speakers of the plenary sessions that followed, dealt squarely on the issues of Program and Institutional Accreditation with the respective panelists extending support and/or asking or giving clarifications where needed. Two institutional accreditation applicant state universities, which had been visited by a team of Consultants, shared their experiences on the preparations for the new scheme.

This book is a record of the events which transpired during the two-day conference reflecting the previous years attempts to embrace Institutional Accreditation as a more appropriate strategy for quality assurance in our country, finally reaching this stage of hands-on, actual practice of the new scheme, with a few SUCs queuing up for consultation visits.

DOCUMENTATION COMMITTEE

Dr. Nilo E. Colinares
Chairman

Dr. Miriam S. Cervantes
Co-Chairman

Dr. Mariano J. Guillermo
Jimson L. Lamarroza
Members

Dr. Manuel T. Corpus
Consultant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	
Program of Activities	v
Proceedings	1
Keynote Address	15
Program Accreditation in 2009	25
Institutional Accreditation: Planning and Implementation	
☛ The Central Luzon State University (CLSU) Experience	33
☛ The Visayas State University (VSU) Experience	38
Accreditation: Issues and Trends	47
We have overcome	57
List of Participants	59
Officers and Members of the Board of Trustees	65

The AACCUP Annual National Conference 2009 Program
Philippine Normal University
Taft Avenue, Manila

PART I. THE CONFERENCE PARTICULARS

- Activity : 23rd AACCUP Annual National Conference
Theme : Complementation of Institutional and Program Accreditation
Objectives : At the end of the conference, the participants shall have been:
1. updated on the new standards, policies, practices and materials (institutional portfolio format and institutional accreditation materials and the revised policies, procedures, materials (Manual, Program Performance Profile and Institutional Portfolio)
 2. exposed to the minimal similarities and differences of institutional and program accreditation.
- Venue : AV Theatre
Edilberto Dagot Building (Library)
Philippine Normal University
Taft, Manila
- Date. : February 24-25, 2010
- Participants : A limited total of 100 participants composed of the following:
1. SUC officials and faculty (limited number)
 2. The National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA).
 3. Members of the Association of Local Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (ALCU-COA), and other Local Government Colleges and Universities
 4. CHED Central and Regional Offices and their Staff
 5. Coordinating Council On Accreditation
 6. House of Representatives Committee on Higher and Technical Education
 7. Senate Committee on Education, Arts and Culture
 8. Professional Regulation Commission (PRC)
 9. Teacher Education Council (TEC), DepEd
 10. Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs)
 11. Foreign Participants from APQN and INQAAHE member countries
 12. Accrediting Agencies for PHEIs.
- Fees : A Conference fee of P2,000.00 will be charged per participant which includes the privilege to attend sessions, lunch and snacks, for two (2) days; conference bag, printed materials and handouts.

PART II. PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES

Day 1 – February 24, 2010 (*Wednesday*)

AM

6:30	-	9:30	-	Registration and Reception	Coordinator Dr. Maria Teresa S.J. Valdez <i>Dean, Institute of Education Tarlac College of Agriculture, and Treasurer and Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees</i>
9:30		9:45	-	Coffee Break	
9:45	-	10:00	-	Participants and Guests Assemble at Plenary Session Hall	
				PLENARY SESSION I	Plenary Session Manager: Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo <i>Director, Office of Instruction and Quality Assurance, West Visayas State University and Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees</i>
10:00	-	12:00	-	Opening Program	Presiding: Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang <i>Former President, Cavite State University and AACCUP</i>
				▫ Invocation	Philippine Normal University Chorale Prof. Luzviminda B. Modelo <i>Director, PNU Chorale Conducting</i>
				▫ National Anthem	PNU Chorale
				▫ Words of Welcome	Dr. Lutgardo B. Barbo <i>President, Philippine Normal University</i>
				▫ Statement of Purpose	Dr. Serafin L. Ngohayon <i>President, AACCUP and President, Ifugao State University</i>

- Introduction of the Keynote Speakers Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang
- Keynote Address Dr. Lauro B. Tacbas
President, Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges and University of Northern Philippines
- Keynote Address Dr. Nilo L. Rosas
Commissioner, Professional Regulation Commission
- Entertainment Number PNU Chorale

PM

12:00 - 1:00 - Lunch Break

1:00 - 1:15 - Guests and Participants Assemble

PLENARY SESSION II Plenary Session Manager:
Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo

1:15 - 2:30 - *“Program Accreditation in 2009”* Presiding: Dr. Soledad M. Roguel
Dean, Graduate School, Central Luzon State University, and Secretary and Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees

Paper Presentation Dr. Nilo E. Colinares
Consultant, AACCUP

Panelists:

- Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada
President, Leyte Normal University and Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees
- Dr. Raul F. Muyong
Campus Dean, Western Visayas College of Science and Technology and Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees
- Dr. Manuel T. Corpus

2:30 - 3:00 - Coffee Break

3:00 - 5:00 - *“Institutional Accreditation: Planning and Implementation”*

Presiding: Dr. Soledad M. Roguel

Paper Presentation

“The Central Luzon State University (CLSU) Experience”

Dr. Mario S. Suba
University Accreditation Coordinator, Central Luzon State University and Member, AACCCUP Board of Trustees

“The Visayas State University (VSU) Experience”

Dr. Manuel K. Palomar
Former Vice President for Academic Affairs, Visayas State University

Dr. Oscar B. Posas
Vice President for Academic Affairs, Visayas State University

Dr. Lualhati M. Noriel
Director of Accreditation, Visayas State University

Panelists:

- Dr. Maria Teresa S.J. Valdez
- Dr. Danilo S. Hilario
- Dr. Manuel T. Corpus
- Dr. Brigida A. Roscom
University Coordinator-DOST CHED Scholar; Chairman, Internal Audit Board-Mindanao State University-IIT and Auditor and Member, AACCCUP Board of Trustees

Day 2 – February 25, 2010 (*Thursday*)

AM

PLENARY SESSION III

Plenary Session Manager:
Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo

8:30 - 10:00

“Accreditation: Issues and Trends”

Presiding: Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada

Paper Presentation

Dr. Manuel T. Corpus
Executive Director and Member, AACCCUP Board of Trustees

Panelists:
Dr. Serafin L. Ngohayon
Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada
Dr. Raul F. Muyong
Dr. Brigida A. Roscom

10:00 - 10:30 - Coffee Break

10:30 - 12:00 - Business Meeting Presiding: Dr. Serafin L. Ngohayon

- Paper Presentation
“*The Presidents Report*”
- Plenary Discussion
Panelists:
AACCUP Board
Members

PM

12:00 - 1:00 Lunch Break

1:00 - 1:15 - Participants and Guests
Assemble

PLENARY SESSION IV Plenary Session Manager
Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo

1:15 - 4:00 - Closing Program Presiding: Dr. Felomino A. Gargar
Dean, College of Education, University of Southeastern Philippines and Member, AACCUP Board of Trustees

- Synthesis Dr. Nilo E. Colinares
Dr. Miriam S. Cervantes
Dr. Mariano J. Guillermo

- Introduction of the Guest of Honor and Speaker Dr. Felomino A. Gargar

- Speech by the Guest of Honor and Speaker Dr. Angel C. Alcala
President, National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies and Director Silliman University-CHED Zonal Research Center

- Closing Remarks Dr. Danilo S. Hilario
*Vice President for Research and
Extension Planning, Bulacan State
University and Vice President/Vice
Chairman, AACUP Board of Trustees*

- Distribution of Certificates
 - Accredited Programs (2009)
 - Participation
 - Appearance

AACCUP NATIONAL CONFERENCE 2010

Philippine Normal University

Taft Avenue, Manila

24-25 February 2010

PROCEEDINGS

February 23, 2010

The First Day of Preparations

Actually the first day was February 22, 2010 as planned so that room and board reservations had to be made, when the 23 members of the Board and staff would arrive for the meeting next day, the 23rd. Due perhaps to hectic home institution schedules, only five Board members came on the 22nd, with the two staff deciding also not to go, thus temporarily causing some confusion in the Hostel reservations as many other AACCUP participants, University Presidents at that, had been angling for accommodation. In due time however, the staff and the Board registered an almost 100% attendance on the day of the meeting which was called to order at 10:00 A.M. and adjourned at 7:30 P.M.

The historic marathon discussions were centered on the unnumbered PASUC Resolution requesting the AACCUP Board for a revisit of the existing accreditation policies, from what it labeled “exorbitant fees,” to the “immediate awards of accreditation levels once earned, to doing away with preliminary or extra visits like the Phase 2 of Level III.”

All issues were tackled one by one complete with financial statements and existing records of CHED memos, Board resolutions and current practices among quality assurance agencies in the more advanced countries in Asia and the world.

The meeting ended with the Board following one direction, united and stronger than ever, to parry any external threats possibly based on unfounded premises. They were now prepared for the panel assignments the next day.

Day 1, February 24, 2010, Tuesday Morning Session

Arrival of participants and Registration

At 6:00 A.M., breakfast was prepared for the Registration Committee headed by Dr. Maria Teresa S.J. Valdez, AACCUP Treasurer who acted as Registration Coordinator, and many others joined the early coffee break to gain a clearer view of the early morning preparations of the physical makeup of the stage, conference hall, registration and food services venues.

Opening Program

Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo, Director of Instruction and Quality Assurance of the West Visayas State University acted as Manager for the first plenary session, to be dubbed later as the “woman for all sessions” to manage all other sessions. Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang, Former President of Cavite State University and AACCUP, was Presiding Officer.

Plenary Session I began with the solemn, majestic tones of the Invocation and the National Anthem by the multi-awarded, internationally recognized PNU Chorale under the baton of Prof. Luzviminda Modelo of the Level III Reaccredited candidate Music Program.

This was followed by the Words of Welcome of the PNU President, Atty. Lutgardo Barbo who after the usual amenities and a few tidbits of PNU history, intoned:

WE SHOULD ALLOW OUTSIDERS TO LOOK INTO US. OUTSIDERS SHOULD LOOK INSIDE US. THE ONLY WAY TO CONTINUE THE PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE IS TO ALLOW OUR PEERS TO MAKE JUDGEMENTS ON WHAT WE HAVE. WE CANNOT BE TELLING OURSELVES THAT WE ARE THE GREATEST AND FOLLOW THE FOOTSTEPS OF MOHAMMAD ALI WHO AFTER BOASTING “I AM THE GREATEST” EXPERIENCED HIS WORST DOWNFALL AND WENT INTO THE ABYSS OF OBLIVION.

This brought to mind the words of a UP alumnus and De La Salle University Professor Emeritus, Isagani Cruz, who criticized the stand of his Alma Mater not to submit for accreditation by saying that “no Philippine University could be comparable with Sorbonne or Harvard until De La Salle and Ateneo submitted themselves for outside judgment and were awarded Level IV Reaccredited status.”

The words of welcome sustained the momentum obtaining in the conference hall with participants all eager to adopt institutional accreditation via program accreditation.

Next came the Statement of Purpose of the AACCUP President, Dr. Serafin L. Nghayon, who revealed that the Board had a marathon meeting from 10:00 A.M. to 7:30 P.M. the day before, to chart the direction of the agency for the coming year. He was thankful for the inputs and, feedbacks from the members and officers of PASUC. He then closed his lines with a quote from David Rockefeller: AIM FOR SUCCESS AND NOT FOR PERFECTION. Never give up your right to be wrong because then you will lose the ability to learn new things and move forward with your life.”

The PASUC President, Dr. Lauro B. Tacbas, also President of the University of Northern Philippines, was the first Keynote Speaker. He reported on an unnumbered Resolution by PASUC requesting AACCUP to revisit some policies relative to the conduct of accreditation of SUCs.

President Tacbas began with a review of the history of AACCUP, saying that in 1987, the agency “was organized under the auspices of PASUC as an independent entity, and since then has assumed its role in ensuring quality education in SUCs”.

“Survey results” according to the Resolution cited by the President, “revealed that AACCUP has effectively influenced quality improvement of curricular offerings in SUCs particularly in the improvement of curriculum, student services, faculty, teaching performance, management and administration among others.”

However, the following concerns have to be addressed:

1. exorbitant fees;
2. more quantifiable evaluation instrument to avoid subjectivity;
3. immediate award of levels to which institutions qualify; with no preliminary visit and level 3 enhancement; and no downgrading of levels already awarded;
4. indorsement by PACUIT of Industrial Technology program accreditors;
5. increase of honorarium and limit of frequency of participation in survey visits by individual accreditors;
6. evaluation of accreditors by AACCUP and suspension of participation of those not deserving; and
7. assignment of accreditors from SUCs with equal or higher levels of accreditation to the peer institution being evaluated.

Other concerns mentioned outside of the Resolution were –

- in a world ranking of universities, the most prestigious in the Philippines ranked below 200; the premiere state U, was only 299th; and
- expansion and even focus of programs outside of the SUC’s vision, mission, mandates.

A little warning was then sounded off, on the timeliness of the concerns due to CHED’s creation of the Coordinating Council on Accreditation (CCA) which according to Dr. Tacbas is all set to implement accreditation harmonization - common sets of standards, criteria, instruments, fees, levels, training, and the constitution of a pool of accreditors from the five different accrediting agencies.

The PASUC president ended his talk with an anecdote on St. Peter, heaven, hell and lay people, emphasizing the role of cooperation, communication, competition, competence, and exposing greed.

Dr. Nilo L. Rosas, Commissioner of the Professional Regulation Commission delivered the other Keynote Speech.

The former PNU President began his talk “Raising the Quality of Education and Quality Assurance Efforts of the Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines,” with statistics on Higher Education in the Philippines - the number of higher education institutions, public and private, the passing rate for selected professions, the overall passing percentage in various licensure examinations (2004-2008), the distribution of SUC passers by licensure examinations (2004-2008), and made the following observations/conclusions:

1. There are so many HEI students and he cited Dr. Andrew Gonzales' comparison of the excessive number to soft drink bottles being manufactured by numerous factories. But the "brutal question is: Who will drink all these bottles of soft drinks? Who will employ all of our graduates who may not be of the same flavor and the same quality, even if the packaging is the same.
2. There seems to be a deterioration of the performance of our graduates in Board examinations.
3. Quality control is then the responsibility of the CHED, the accrediting agencies and the PRC, if we do not want to repeat the incident at the Toyota which had to recall its products distributed in various parts of the world, after an error in quality control.
4. At present, the Commission supervises 43 Professional Regulatory Boards (PRBs) which regulate the professions and accredit the professional organizations representing the professionals. The PRC is continuously advocating stronger policies to ensure the validity, reliability, and integrity of licensure examinations.
5. Accreditation they say, is objective judgment. Judgment by peers from the outside that is. Would a Level III award for instance be comparable to a Center of Excellence award by the CHED? Does any of the Level III accredited programs, happen also to be the Center of Excellence identified by the CHED? Have any of the SUCS with a high number of AACCUP-accredited programs been awarded for high performance by the PRC?
6. The raw survey results of Presidents and SUCs manifesting their current standing with the CHED and PRC, prove only one thing: the AACCUP HAS ONE OF THE FAIREST, ACCURATE, AND OBJECTIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION AMONG THE FIVE ACCREDITING AGENCIES IN THE COUNTRY.
7. The Chairman/commissioner representative, presides and perhaps influences SUC Boards, but the Board itself makes decisions en banc. The Coordinating Council on Accreditation, is composed of representatives of the five accrediting agencies in the country as members, but a Commissioner of the CHED is Chairman. This is harmonization at its best.
8. The PRC will continue to supervise and regulate without necessarily controlling the 43 professions in the country, thus respecting their particular interests. In fact, the PRC has policies to safeguard the general department of the various professions just as the CHED has a CMO No. 01, s. 2005 which covers all accreditation matters
9. It is to the credit of the SUCs that they have not only survived after the reduction of government budgetary allotments. They have produced topnotchers as evidenced by their graduates' individual performance, and as top performing schools in the same PRC-conducted examinations and evaluations. The AACCUP on the other hand, continues to ensure that SUCs remain competitive

and relevant in the light of global competitiveness, and I personally believe that you have been partially successful in this endeavour as our records at the PRC show.

10. Just as the higher education institutions have the COCOPEA for the private and the PASUC for the public institutions, considering that they have interests which may not be exactly in tandem with each other; just as for Teacher Education alone, we have the PAFTE, the SUCTEA, the NOPTI, the ACT to mention a few; for such specific discipline as language, we have the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, the PALT, the CETA or College English Teachers Association, and another one for Filipino teachers whose acronym skips my memory for the moment; so we have the PAASCU, PACU-COA, ASCU-AAI, AACCUP and ALCUA-COA in the practice of accreditation. This is democracy and we are in a free enterprise society and there will always be room for unity in diversity.

The former AACCUP Board member wrapped up his Keynote speech with the philosophy underlying the Total Quality Management, or the Continuous Quality Improvement patterned along Deming's fourteen points constituting the total quality-oriented institution, from 1) Continuous Improvement, to 14) recognition and reward of those who work to improve quality.

He then ended with an anecdote for the AACCUP, PASUC, PRC and CHED. "The Geese" story gave five lessons of sharing the same direction and working as a team, staying united, sharing the leadership with mutual respect, manifesting "courage and encouragement, and staying beside each other no matter what the differences, specially in times of difficulty and great challenges."

The 1st half of the afternoon session by Dr. Nilo E. Colinares, was devoted to the discussion of the paper on Program Accreditation in the year 2009 with Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada, Dr. Raul F. Muyong, and Dr. Manuel T. Corpus as panelists. Dr. Soledad M. Roguel was presiding officer.

In his report, Dr. Colinares said that the year 2009 started with some sort of confusion arising from a letter of the CHED Chairman which asked for the suspension of all accreditation activities. These incidentally involved not only AACCUP but all the other accrediting agencies as well. In spite of this confusion, the SUCs pursued unabated accreditation activities including the National Conference in 2009 and various accreditation visits. However, this problem resulted in a situation where the SUCs revolted against the problem which led to the assessment of 567 programs in 74 SUCs; the highest production ever made by AACCUP in a single year. He also reported that 16 SUCs have achieved a total of 63 Level III accredited programs, the highest level so far in accreditation among SUCs. Dr. Colinares, however, noticed that in spite of this achievement, there were certain concerns that need to be addressed which are grouped into three: 1) on the part of the SUCs: the home duties of the accreditor such as absences incurred by the accreditor from his/her classes and other job assignments; 2) on the part of the accreditors: travel inconveniences, meager honorarium and home institution's permission to leave; and 3) on the part of AACCUP: difficulty of getting qualified accreditors, and the tendency of accreditors to select places of assignments. He also made mention of the ramifications of the programs, the standard report format which is SANIR, and training and retraining of accreditors in the coming months.

The 2nd half of the afternoon was centered on the discussion of the experiences regarding the planning and implementation in two leading SUCs, the Central Luzon State University and the Visayas State University. The CLSU experience was presented by Dr. Mario S. Suba while the VSU experience was presented by Dr. Manuel K. Palomar with Dr. Oscar B. Posas and Dr. Lualhati M. Noriel on his side. Panelists were Dr. Maria Teresa SJ. Valdez, Dr. Danilo S. Hilario, Dr. Manuel T. Corpus and Dr. Brigida A. Roscom.

Following are similarities experienced in the two institutions prior to their pursuit of Institutional Accreditation:

1. CLSU and VSU are similar in the sense that major programs to promote quality education have been the obsession of both even before the planning of Institutional Accreditation.
2. Both institutions pursued parallel activities related to the implementation of Institutional Accreditation. This included the invigorating of committees in accreditation.
3. Both undertook the initiation through INTENT to go into Institutional Accreditation; the holding of workshops on orientation of Institutional Accreditation as early as December 2008; the workshops on how to prepare the Institutional Portfolio and the workshop on how to prepare or consolidate documents.

Lessons learned from their experiences that others could emulate are:

1. Enjoy what you are doing
2. Plan ahead
3. Foresight is an added virtue
4. When in doubt, be bold enough to ask; and
5. Use CCP...C – connection in all offices including personnel

C – Charm – use charm and right approach to the right people

and P – Prayers – in everything we do, our Creator should be the center...

And if all things fail, PWERSAHAN na!..emphasize your point in a subtle way.... But in a very professional manner!

As a result, both institutions now claim to be ready for Institutional Accreditation visit which is in June or July in the case of VSU and December in the case of CLSU.

At this point, Dr. Corpus made a comment as a member of the panel that the common thread of the two (2) institutions is the STRONG LEADERSHIP and PASSION for the improvement of educational quality. The crowd gave them high marks for the presentation and even asked that they be provided CDs for their reference.

The activities of the second day, February 25, was called to order at 8:30 A.M. by the Presiding Officer, Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada, President of the Leyte Normal University, and Member of the AACCCUP Board of Trustees.

The first speaker, Dr. Manuel T. Corpus was introduced as the AACCCUP Executive Director, who is more popularly known as the Father of AACCCUP having been at the helm of this agency since its inception 20 years ago and has seen it grow to its present stature as a nationally and internationally recognized quality assurance organization. As an acknowledged international expert on quality assurance, he has written and presented papers on this subject in various regional and international fora.

Dr. Manuel T. Corpus' paper was on "Accreditation: Issues, and Trends," The panelists during the presentation were Dr. Serafin L. Ngohayon; Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada; Dr. Raul F. Muyong; and Dr. Brigida A. Roscom.

Issue No. 1 – Costs.

Dr. Corpus identified Costs as one of the issues in accreditation. He said that Accreditation Fees are not exorbitant. While there may be some savings from income generated from accreditation fees, the savings are spent for operating expenses. From his slide presentation, the following can be derived: that out of a total income in 2009 of P13, 164,050.00, the sum of P550, 253.19 was realized as unexpended balance after deducting a total expenditure of P12, 613,796.81

INCOME	EXPENDITURES	BALANCE
Annual Dues Php 1,140,000.00	Operating/Administrative Exp. Php 3,446,631.80	Php 2,306,631.80
Accreditation Fees Php 9,937,700.00	Php 7,236,805.48	Php 2,700,894.52
Special Projects Php 2,086,350.00	Php 1,930,359.53	Php 155,990.47
Total Php 13,164,050.00	Php 12,613,796.81	Php 550,253.19

Dr. Corpus said that accreditation costs are not exorbitant. Any excess income derived from accreditation fees is used to cover overhead or operational costs. In fact, if the proposal to increase in annual dues and accreditation fees is approved, then out of the income generated, the following urgent items will be funded:

1. Bigger office unit ----- P 240,000.00
 2. Two Senior Staff ----- 600,000.00
 3. Research and Publication ----- 480,000.00
 4. Increase in honoraria of Accreditors ----- 1,000,000.00
- Total P 2,320,000.00

The present office is congested. There is hardly enough elbow room for the already lean office staff. Files have to be stored in an extra space outside the office, but despite

remedial measures such as installation of shelves, time has come to move to a more commodious office unit.

The present personnel complement of the AACCUP Secretariat is composed of the Executive Director; a Technical Consultant; a program assistant; an IT specialist; an office staff; an accountant; a cashier; an office assistant; and a utility worker/driver. The services of the skeletal staff are even necessary during weekends to cope with the office backlog and the increasing demand for accreditation services from member SUCs. The move to finally go into institutional accreditation will all the more require more senior staff members.

The appointment of two additional senior staff members will help in responding to the increasing demands of accreditation. Related to this is the need for a robust Research and Publication Section. There is always a need for research in the various aspects of accreditation and to complement this is the publication of research outputs for a wider circulation among the member-SUCs, and other interested parties such as the academe and practitioners. As of the present, the only publication of the AACCUP is AACCUP Newsletter which comes out only during the annual conference.

Issue No. 2 – Evaluation Instrument

The Master Survey Instrument has been revised to make it program-specific and to incorporate the CHED policies and guidelines prescribed for specific programs. Eventually, all program accreditation will be program-specific.

Evaluation is outcomes-oriented expressed as much as possible in quantifiable terms, particularly in determining the adequacy of inputs and processes. Outcomes are non-quantifiable and subjective, per se, but what will be evaluated is the effectiveness of the outcomes.

The Program Performance Profile is a document that encapsulates all information necessary to provide the interested reader/accreditor a point of departure to delve deeper into the accreditation process. This will hopefully minimize the “documents-counting” orientation of some accreditors and for them to get information either through interviews or other means of getting the needed data.

Issue No. 3 – Equivalent Points

3.1 and 3.2. Set equivalent points corresponding to the different levels and award immediately the level in which the programs qualify. The minimum points corresponding to the different levels are:

Level	Minimum Points	Grand Mean	Level	Minimum Points	Grand Mean
I	150	3.00	III	200	4.00
II	175	3.50	IV	225	4.50

3.3 Do away with preliminary visits. This is a CHED requirement and besides it helps prepare a program for accreditation.

3.4 and 3.5. Do away with Level III, Phase II. Pursuant to CMO 1, the following changes in Accreditation Levels have been effected:

CMO 1	Type of Visit	Level	Rating Req'd	Accreditation Status
Before	Preliminary	I	2.5	Candidate
After	Preliminary	-	2.5	Candidate
Before	Formal	II	3.0	Accredited
After	1 st Survey	I	3.0	Accredited
Before	1 st Re-Survey	II	3.5	Level II Reaccredited
After	2 nd Survey	II	3.5	Level II Reaccredited
Before	2 nd Re-Survey	III	4.0	Level III Reaccredited
After	3 rd Survey	III	4.0	Level III Reaccredited
Before	4 th Survey	IV	4.5	Level IV Reaccredited
After	4 th Survey	IV	4.5	Level IV Reaccredited

Issue No. 4 – Use of PACUIT Instrument and Accreditors

PACUIT is the acronym of the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities of Industrial Technology. Presumably PACUIT Accreditation Instrument has been designed to fit the specific requirements of industrial technology. Therefore, such an instrument, if ever it be considered for adoption by AACCUP, will require a lot of adjustments to fit the requirements of the member HEIs of AACCUP. As of now, to our knowledge, there are no CHED policies and guidelines specific to Industrial Technology; and perhaps even the CHED Technical Panel in Industrial Technology has not prescribed any related policies. If Industrial Technology is classified as a Tech-Voc program, then its instrument may not meet the requirements of AACCUP programs.

On the hiring of PACUIT accreditors, one concern is whether they are adequately trained to accredit programs considered to be within the ambit or domain of AACCUP. If not, then they have to be retrained which means added cost for AACCUP to shoulder. The amount required might as well be invested in the training of new AACCUP accreditors and for the retraining of accreditors in the light of developments which includes Institutional Accreditation to complement Program Accreditation.

Issue No. 5 – Increase honorarium of accreditors

This has been an issue that has been begging for resolution. But such increase would mean raising the annual dues and in accreditation fees. Thanks to the dedication and commitment of our accreditors, they have accepted accreditation assignments despite the low honorarium. There are non-monetary benefits, call them psychic benefits, which accreditors enjoy such as a chance to visit other schools; expand their spectrum of professional colleagues, and learn about good practices that might be introduced in their

respective schools. If annual dues and accreditation fees are to be implemented, then consideration of increased honoraria may be feasible.

Issue No. 6 – Evaluation of Accreditors in terms of competence, relationships, and behavior.

This process is done during survey visits and during the review of reports. An Evaluation Matrix is accomplished for each accreditor by his/her team leader. Most ratings, however, are very subjective; very few, if there are any, get a failing mark. Perhaps some other complementary approach may have to be adopted such as peer evaluation, and evaluation by selected counterparts from the host institutions being accredited.

If the process is objective, dropping low performing accreditors from the Roster of Active Accreditors would be accepted which means that such accreditors would not be invited again in any accreditation assignment, especially those accreditors who make unreasonable demands of the host institution.

AACCUP needs all the assistance in determining good accreditors and in reporting undesirable behavior. Assistance is also needed in screening so that only the desirable ones are recommended for training.

Issue No. 7 – Accreditors to accredit only institutions which have accreditation levels equal to or lower than theirs.

Dr. Corpus agrees, however, operationally, it is difficult to assemble the suggested Accreditors and he raises the question: "Who will accredit Level III and Level IV?"

Issue No. 8 – Harmonized standards?

Standards are already harmonized under CHED CMO No. 1, s. of 2005.

Issue No. 9 – NO LEVELS of Accreditation.

Programs are either Accredited or Deferred. This issue is not practicable since there are more SUCs with programs that are already in Level II & III combined, than there are in Level I.

Issue No. 10 – Deployment of composite pool of Accreditors.

Difficult to implement but it might be done on a voluntary basis subject to the approval of the Coordinating Council for Accreditation (CCA).

Issue No. 11 – Adoption of common fees per program.

The prevailing fees charged are uniform per program.

Issue No. 12 – Lapsed Programs

There were a total 484 lapsed programs in 41 SUCs and AACCUP Board of Trustees wrote to inform the SUCs concerned about their respective lapsed programs and to apply for accreditation correspondingly. Out of the 484 lapsed programs, 215 programs were subjected to accreditation; 56 applied for accreditation; and 141 programs were left subject to accreditation; and 72 programs from 8 SUCs did not reply.

During the open forum that followed Dr. Corpus' presentation, some alternatives to deal with the issues raised were discussed. To help augment the accreditation fees, SUCs shoulder transportation costs by providing vehicles to fetch the accreditors at pre-arranged meeting points and to bring them to these meeting points after the end of the accreditation visits. To maximize the time of accreditors, they may be asked to lengthen the accreditation to enable them to conduct survey visits in two proximate SUCs, thus saving on transportation costs and maximizing the time of accreditors by conducting another survey visit after finishing one visit in one SUC that can be easily reached because of proximity.

The AACCUP Business Meeting

At 10:30 AM, after the Coffee Break, the AACCUP Business Meeting was held with Dr. Serafin L. Ngohayon presiding with all AACCUP Board Members in attendance. After ascertaining that there was a quorum, the Call to Order was made by the Presiding Officer which was followed by the presentation and approval of the Agenda. The reading of Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Board during the previous 22nd Annual Conference in 2009 was dispensed with as there were no copies of such meeting.

Thanking the body for having been elected as the AACCUP President, Dr. Ngohayon proceeded to the presentation of his "President's Report." According to him, 2009 brought a set of young set of AACCUP officers dedicated to the pursuance of quality assurance during their terms of office from 2009 to 2011 supported by the more senior members to face the challenges such as the increasing number of simultaneous survey visits sometimes generating a mini-crisis of sorts because of the need for and availability of accreditors.

Dr. Ngohayon said that during his brief watch, AACCUP was able to improve its financial position. To save on expenditures, the number of full time consultants was reduced. Weak points detailed in the 2009 Annual Report were addressed such as the appointment of a full time accountant. Insurance of accreditors will begin this June 2010 during the next round of accreditation. During the open forum, following the concept of equity, it was suggested that a socialized scheme be adopted in the payment of membership dues, so that the more affluent SUCs will pay more than the less financially endowed SUCs.

AACCUP will conduct a series of training and retraining: one national training on institutional accreditation and four regional training on program accreditation. Accreditors who complete these training programs will be issued two IDs: a wallet-sized ID and a big ID to be prominently worn by each accreditor during accreditation visits. This measure will replace the practice of IDs being issued by the host HEI.

Citations and commendations will be awarded to accreditors for performance beyond the normal call of duty such as risking life and limb riding in ships that sink to be supported by a complete report on such performance and validated by the AACCUP Secretariat.
Reforms in the Accreditation Process:

1. Simplify the Preliminary Visit process to be conducted only in SUCs with limited accreditation experience and to be done with 1 to 3 consultants without sacrificing quality.
2. Fast track the period between accreditation levels to six months, subject to the results of the previous survey that exceed the mean passing mark.

Dr. Ngohayon then enumerated the banner accomplishments such as (1) the increase of 2009 assessed programs from a total of 567 compared to that of the previous year which was 488; (2) a remarkable increase in the number of Level III-Reaccredited programs to sixty three (63) compared to the previous year's record of only forty (40) Level III-Reaccredited programs; (3) a Planning Workshop on Institutional Accreditation held during the 22nd Annual National Conference which had as resource personalities Dr. Angel C. Alcala, NNQAA President; CHED Chair Emmanuel Q. Angeles; Prof. Supachai Yavaprabhas, SEAMEO Regional Center Director; and Dr. Heracleo Lagrada, CHED Director of Programs and Standards; (4) workshops on institutional accreditation designed to review, revise, and update accreditation tools; (5) award of appreciation for outgoing members of the AACCUP Board of Trustees as well as outgoing consultants; (6) granting of leave benefits for the regular staff members; (7) appointment of a full-time Accountant.

The Agency carried out the following principal activities: (1) Active participation in International Conferences/Quality Assurance Activities; (2) Consultancy visits and workshops on Institutional Accreditation; (3) established linkages with APQN; Malaysian Quality Assurance Officers; and CHED by virtue of Executive Order No. 705-A which established the Coordinating Council on Accreditation which stipulates the membership of AACCUP through its Executive Director, Dr. Manuel T. Corpus; (4) recognition by the CHED through NNQAA of AACCUP-accredited programs; (5) implementation of CHED Minimum Standards as embodied in various CMOs; (6) issuance of AACCUP Certification on the accreditation status of SUC programs which is one of the requirements for a P50,000 CHED financial assistance for Preliminary Survey Assistance (PSAA); and for a P150,000-P200,000 Institutional Development Assistance for Accreditation (IDAA) for the improvement of library or laboratory facilities; and (7) Interface Meeting of the AACCUP BOT and the PASUC Executive Board to discuss the complementary roles of these bodies in addressing common issues and concerns.

Among the major concerns of AACCUP are (1) Automation of data to maximize spatial utilization and to make records keeping more efficient to compensate for lack of time and personnel.; (2) due to limited funds, the limited space, equipment and facilities for accreditation activities have not been addressed; (3) lack of personnel to perform technical work such as the evaluation of accreditors' reports; research on accreditation; and administrative functions; (4) coping with increasing requests for accreditation visits and consultancies exacerbated by the sudden withdrawal of accreditors who have initially confirmed their attendance and the limits imposed by their mother units to accept invitations to only once or twice a year because such accreditors have to attend to their own academic duties and responsibilities; and an exceptional few SUC authorities do not allow their faculty to accept accreditation invitations at any time of the school year.

On governance, AACCUP has a set of newly elected Board of Trustees who will serve a term of two years (February 2009 – January 2011). They are:

Chairman and President - Dr. Serafin L. Nghayon, Concurrent President, Ifugao State University

Vice Chairman and Vice President - Dr. Danilo S. Hilario, Concurrent Vice President for Research and Extension Planning, Bulacan State University

Treasurer - Dr. Ma. Theresa S.J. Valdez, Concurrent Dean, College of Education/Chair. IAB, Tarlac College of Agriculture

Secretary - Dr. Soledad M. Roguel, Concurrent Dean, Graduate School, Central Luzon State University

Auditor - Dr. Brigida A. Roscom, Concurrent University Coordinator, DOST/CHED Scholar-ship Program; and Chair, Internal Audit Board, MSU Iligan Institute of Technology

Executive Director and Trustee - Dr. Manuel T. Corpus

TRUSTEES:

Dr. Ricardo E. Rotoras, Concurrent President, Mindanao University of Science and Technology

Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada, Concurrent President, Leyte Normal University

Dr. Mario S. Suba, Concurrent University Accreditation Coordinator, Central Luzon State University

Dr. Raul F. Muyong, Concurrent Campus Dean, West Visayas College of Science and Technology

Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo, Concurrent Director, Office of Instruction and Quality Assurance, West Visayas State University

Dr. Felomino A. Gargar, Former Dean, College of Education, University of Southeastern Philippines

Plenary Session IV

The Closing Program

The Closing Program was presided over by Board Member Felomino E. Gargar who did the introductions for the Keynote speaker, Dr. Angel C. Alcala, and for the AACCUP Vice-President, Dr. Danilo S. Hilario. The AACCUP VP delivered the Closing Remarks.

The President of the National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA) commended the efforts of the organizers, for a job well-done. He mentioned primarily the

AACCUP President, Dr. Serafin L. Ngohayon, the Founding President and Executive Director, Dr. Manuel T. Corpus. He also included the Consultant, Dr. Nilo E. Colinares.

The NNQAA President stated that the 23rd AACCUP Conference was a landmark event in the history of quality assurance in the country where AACCUP was leading the way to a more holistic and comprehensive view of accreditation.

In his closing remarks, Vice-President Danilo S. Hilario first recognized the officials in the presidential table, particularly Dr. Angel Alcala, emphasizing that after the latter's stint at CHED, he steered AACCUP to where it is now, as he is our Board Chairman and President of the NNQAA. And he bails us out, according to the AACCUP VP, from challenges, every now and then.

Dr. Hilario then cited that instance when they had to visit the incumbent CHED Chairman who had written a letter advising accrediting agency Presidents to temporarily stop accreditation activities due to some possible revision of procedures being deliberated upon by of the Coordinating Council on Accreditation. The President (Dr. Hilario) and the Executive Director were on their way to the Chairman's office when they chanced upon Dr. Alcala who gladly obliged to accompany them to his predecessor's office. With the NNQAA and former CHED Chairman in the company of the AACCUP officers, the conversation became cordial, smooth and easy.

He made a joke about the missing yellow paper, Dr. Colinares' notes on his "Synthesis...." as an introduction to his saying that "you were so good in your recollection of your part of the synthesis, capped with the editorial from the Newsletter which began with the wish "We shall overcome" and ended with the gleeful exclamation, "We have overcome!"

The Vice-President ended his talk with the wish that the revelations of Drs. Mario Suba and Manuel Palomar, would also be theirs as all are aiming for Institutional Accreditation even as it is being complemented by program accreditation.

KEYNOTE SPEECH

23rd AACCUP Annual National Conference
February 24, 2010, 9:30 A.M.
AV Theatre, Philippine Normal University

By:

Dr. MLO L. ROSAS

Commissioner, Professional Regulation Commission

“RAISING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE
EFFORTS OF THE CHARTERED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE
PHILIPPINES”

PASUC President, Dr. Lauro Tacbas, Dr. Serafin Ngohayon, President of the Ifugao State University and the AACCUP, Dr. Manuel Corpuz, former President of the Cagayan State University, the Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University and the AACCUP, Dr. Ruperto S. Sangalang, former President, Cavite State University and AACCUP, President, Atty. Lutgardo Barbo of the Philippine Normal University, SUC Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and their respective institutions' Accreditation Chairs, officials of the NNQAA and the AACCUP, Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, a pleasant Quality Assurance, Maganda at Mapagpalang umaga po ang pinaabot ko sa inyong lahat!

When Dr. Colinares, came to my office as the personal envoy of Dr. Corpuz to hand me the invitation for this 23rd AACCUP Annual National Conference, and hinted that this was an exclusively AACCUP affair with the PNU as venue, I immediately welcomed the idea of accepting the invitation. For the information of everyone, this is officially the first time I will again be setting foot here in my beloved PNU after my term ended as President. I was very happy though that I got a very warm welcome from President Barbo and some staff and faculty of PNU. Whatever reservations I had were gone after I learned that no less than the Executive Director, the “Father and Saviour of AACCUP and the foremost Advocate of Institutional Accreditation in the country today”, expected me to be here, no other than Dr. Manuel Corpuz, as a former Board Member of the AACCUP. I had to accede to the request because I consider this a great honor.

For indeed I welcome this opportunity to rub elbows again not only with former fellow SUC Presidents and other officials, but with prominent educators of the country in general, having been once a consumer of their products when I was with the DepEd, a producer of education products while President of this PNU, and a quality control officer when appointed first Chairman of the Board for Professional Teachers, and now, Commissioner of the Professional Regulation Commission.

And along these lines, if my memory serves me right, it was my former Boss, Bro. Andrew Gonzales, former De La Salle University President and Secretary of Education, who likened Philippine education to a giant soft drink factory, putting out thousands and thousands of bottles. The liquid in each bottle, he stated, may not be of the same quality and the same flavour, but the packaging is certainly the same. The brutal question is: Who will drink all these bottles of soft drinks? Thus asked, if you may allow me a little

pun, the late Secretary who died, God bless his soul, of complications with diabetes, partially caused perhaps, by so many bottles of soft drinks.

With thousands and thousands of education outputs being churned out by academic factories year in and year out, where and how does quality control and consequently, education come in? Where do the Professional Regulation Commission and the accrediting agencies of the country enter and what are the meeting points of the two bodies – with one government, and the other private. This is what AACCUP has assigned me through the letter of the brand new AACCUP President from the equally brand new Iligan State University, President Serafin Ngohayon.

That a huge number of education bottles flood our educational firmament, the way the Toyota cars flooded the motoring market, but had to make a recall of their products after discovering an error in quality control, is a given as shown in the statistics that follow:

For the year 2008-2009 alone, the CHED reported 2,789,250 enrollees in 2,060 institutions composed of 110 SUCs, 77 LCUs, 334 Satellite Campuses, 16 other government schools and 1,523 Private Higher Education Institutions.

May I present some data on HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE PHILIPPINES which I obtained from the CHED-MIS 2008:

There are 2,789,250 total number of enrollees for academic year 2008-2009 across all disciplines. Out of which, 497,217 were enrolled for NURSING EDUCATION, 134,688 for HOTEL and RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT and 100,760 for COMPUTER SCIENCE.

Now, clearly, Nursing, HRM and Computer Science dominate the academic factories in the recent years. But if we go back to Bro. Gonzales, can we drink all these soft drink bottles? Do we have enough industries to absorb all of these graduates? And granting that we have enough; will all these education outputs qualify for the existing vacancies? They of course had undergone the same packaging – a 4-year or a 5-year curriculum – but the liquid in each bottle might not be of the same quality and the same flavor.

To illustrate, there seems to be a deterioration of the performance of our graduates in Board examinations. Nursing for instance, which tops in the number of enrollees, recently experienced a downturn in performance as shown by the latest results of the Board examination. Where could have we gone wrong? Other programs have had a similar experience, a decline in the percentage of passers as indicated in the following tables.

Profession	Passing Rate (%)				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Accountancy	24.58	24.12	34.09	32.79	36.81
Mechanical Eng	50.36	49.14	51.75	56.44	56.14
Nursing	52.24	46.03	45.79	43.9	40.7
Teacher Ed- E	27.55	29.28	27.55	29.52	23.09
Teacher Ed- S	25.93	32.46	29.12	33.12	26.84

Of course, we should consider performance in Board Examination as just one of the factors in determining whether one is a quality institution or not.

This now is where quality control, quality assurance in your lingo, comes in. And of course, the Professional Regulation Commission

At present, the Commission supervises 43 Professional Regulatory Boards (PRBs) which regulate the professions and accredit the professional organizations representing the professionals. The PRBs regulate the practice of more than two million registered Filipino professionals. Through the portals of PRC pass hundreds of thousands of aspiring professionals who take licensure examinations every year.

The theme of last year's anniversary celebration will give us an idea of what the PRC stands and works for. This was: "Strengthening the Image of PRC on Integrity, Transparency and Competence." The PRC at age 36, is continuously advocating stronger policies to ensure the validity, reliability, and integrity of licensure examinations in accordance with Her Excellency President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo's directive to establish a closer linkage with education and industry sectors and really assure the public that what we test are valid, reliable and relevant.

During the Education Summit held some two years ago, the role of the PRC is defined in the Main Education Highway. As you all know, this education highway is designed with the goal of attaining the social being and job opportunity for each individual.

Thus the PRC, with its defined role in the main education highway, aims to sustain the progressive momentum of functions as it aspires to be a resilient, progressive, and respected institution that nurtures world class professionals.

In an effort to enhance the quality of education, pass the licensure examinations and practice their professionals to the best of their ability, PRC undertook a review of the performance of the 43 PRC boards across 5 years as basis in enhancing the plans and strategies of the Commission.

In a report to the Commission (PRC) of the Board of Medicine on the performance of examinees in the last five years, it was prefaced, and this may serve as reference in analyzing the data, that:

If a SCHOOL has –

- GOOD GOVERNANCE
- WELL-IMPLEMENTED ACADEMIC PROGRAM
- COMPETENT AND DEDICATED FACULTY
- GOOD AND WELL-MOTIVATED STUDENTS
- ADEQUATE MATERIALS
- ADEQUATE RESOURCES
- ENVIRONMENT CONDUCIVE TO TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

THEN, it should be able to produce COMPETENT GRADUATES who will pass the licensure exams who will practice his profession well.

May I also take this opportunity to show some of our statistics at PRC on the performance in the different Board Examination in the last 5 years. (See Enclosed Tables)

OVERALL PASSING PERCENTAGE IN VARIOUS LICENSURE EXAMINATIONS, 2004-2008

LICENSURE EXAMINATIONS WITH 50% OR ABOVE NATIONAL PASSING PERCENTAGE-2004-2008 (GROUP A)

1.	Licensure Examinations	Examinees	Passers	Passing %
2.	Geologists	230	163	71%
3.	Mining Engineers	181	126	70%
4.	Optometrists (6 Years Curriculum)	291	197	68%
5.	Optometrists (4 Years Curriculum)	976	601	62%
6.	Guidance Counselors	140	84	60%
7.	Metallurgical Engineers	232	131	56%
8.	Physicians	22,886	12,772	56%
9.	Pharmacists	12,353	6,769	55%
10.	Landscape Architects	125	66	53%
11.	Midwives	26,164	13,784	53%
12.	Environmental Planners	224	117	52%
13.	Nutritionists-Dietitians	2,604	1,355	52%
14.	Social Workers	5,618	2,850	51%
15.	Marine Engineer Officers-O.I.C. E. W.	12,609	6,341	50%
16.	Medical Technologists	14,954	7,449	50%
17.	Chemical Engineers	4,910	2,414	49%
18.	Mechanical Engineers	16,890	8,296	49%
19.	Chemist	2,554	1,220	48%
20.	Marine Deck Officers-O.I.C. Navigational Watch	27,207	12,567	46%
21.	Nurses	439,951	202,991	46%
22.	Interior Designers	931	416	45%
23.	Agricultural Engineers	2,238	952	43%
24.	Registered Electrical Engineers	19,720	8,307	42%
25.	Architects	10,656	4,446	42%
26.	Radiologic Technology	4,494	1,789	40%
27.	Foresters	2,483	982	40%
28.	Occupational Therapists	1,402	554	40%
29.	Geodetic Engineers	2,310	910	39%

LICENSURE EXAMINATIONS WITH LESS THAN 36.93 PASSING PERCENTAGE
(GROUP B)

	Licensure Examinations	Examinees	Passers	Passing %
1.	Civil Engineers	37,850	13,871	37%
2.	Master Plumber	2,134	781	37%
3.	Sanitary Engineers	571	207	36%
4.	Physical Therapists	12,933	4,673	36%
5.	Naval Architects and Marine Engineers	142	51	36%
6.	Dentists	11,160	3,957	35%
7.	Veterinarians	2,937	1,037	35%
8.	Electronics Engineers	34,276	11,705	34%
9.	Aeronautical Engineers	541	182	34%
10.	Fisheries Technologists	716	239	33%
.				
11.	Criminologist	64,249	20,072	31%
.				
12.	X-Ray Technologists	979	299	31%
.				
13.	Librarians	4,057	1,232	30%
.				
14.	Agriculturists	10,305	3,053	30%
.				
15.	Teachers-Secondary Level	298,862	88,412	30%
.				
16.	Teachers-Elementary Level	330,601	93,258	28%
.				
17.	Certified public Accountants	58,190	15,687	27%
.				
18.	Customs Brokers	6,411	1,133	18%
.				

It will be noted that there are 46 Licensure Examinations while there are only 43 Boards. The Board of Physical Therapists administers two Licensure Examinations namely: Occupational Therapist and Physical Therapists; the Board of Professional Teachers administers Elementary Education and Secondary Education and the Board of Radiologists conducts Radiologic Technology and X-ray Technologists.

In this presentation, performance refers to the percentage of passing in the various licensure examinations. The performance of the various boards from 2004-2008 are classified with reference to the national passing percentage which is 36.90.

Group A are the licensure examinations whose passing rate is higher than the national passing percentage. The number of examinees, number of passers and percentage of passing are reflected to enlighten the readers which course have limited number of examinees due to the limited number of enrollees.

In Group A, there are 28 Licensure Examinations that performed above the national passing percentage of 36.90. The percentage of passing ranges from 39.39 to 70.87 percent (Geology and Mining Engineering) cursory analysis of the data reveals that generally, Licensure Examinations with lesser number of examinees and longer years to finish the course have higher percentage of passing.

While PRC have been using norm-reference in determining the cut-off score in the past where no cut-off scores should be lower than the mean plus one-half standard deviation. There are some boards that lower their cut-off score from the norm because of the demand of industry and some other factors. However, they do not go lower than the mean score. This time, PRC has shifted to criterion reference cut-off score where the criterion is that, the examinee must have passed at least 50 percent of the total number of test items per subject. Licensure Examination for Midwives, a three year course with higher number of examinees surpasses the national passing percentage. What could be the reason for being an exception to the general observation? Could it be their curriculum, the faculty preparation, the kind of students or the kind of licensure Examination given? Your guess may be as good as mine. This calls for further research. (AACUP and PASUC can help PRC with the researches)

In Group B, 18 Licensure Examinations obtained passing percentage below the national passing percentage of 36.90 where the lowest is 17.67 percent (Customs Brokers), and the highest is 36.65 percent for civil engineers. Licensure Examinations for teachers, both for the secondary and elementary levels are among those with lower passing percentage. A careful analysis of examinees performance from the time the LET was administered in 1986 to date the mean score are approximately one-third of the total number of test items, This information signifies that the examinees have learned about one-third only of what are expected be learned by them. This situation is also true with majority of the results in other Licensure Examinations. This information is food for thought for all educators.

PRC has signed a memorandum of agreement with CHED to disseminate the performance of the HEIs in the various Licensure Examinations. The result of the item analysis are revealed to the different HEIs for further improvement of the quality of their instruction. Some Boards have noted the difference in the content of the course syllabi being used in some schools from that of CHED's.

The tables of specifications in the various Licensure Examinations of PRC are made congruent to the competencies stipulated by the technical panels and committees of CHED. If all the HEIs will strive to tell their students the competencies required in their perspective courses, their prospect to pass the Licensure Examination will be higher and quality of education will be enhanced.

Since the concern of AACUP is on the chartered colleges and universities in the Philippines, it would be worthy to mention that in 2004-2008 data of PRC, SUC's examinees in various licensure examinations, 29% took nursing, 22% took elementary teacher education, 20% secondary teacher education, and the rest of 29% distributed among various professions. This has resulted to a passing rate distributed as follows: nursing, 36%, elementary teacher education, 17%, secondary teacher education, 16%, and the rest of the professions, 31%.

And now, to you. Where will the efforts of the accrediting agencies be directed to? The CHED Order No. 1 s. 2005, stipulates two umbrella organizations for accrediting agencies: the Federation of Accrediting Agencies (FAAP) for the private assessors which includes- PAASCU, PACU-COA and ASCU-AAI; and the National Network for Quality Assurance Agencies (NNQAA) for the public sector, which includes – AACCUP and ALCU-COA.

We shall then be concerned at the moment with the efforts being exerted by AACCUP and how we at the academic observation deck of the PRC, look at them.

For the year 2009 alone, your President's Year-End Report claims to have evaluated a total of 567 programs in 74 State Universities and Colleges from 16 geographical regions throughout the country. The highest level of accreditation so far attained by SUCs and awarded by the AACCUP, certified by the NNQAA and recognized by the CHED in accordance with CMO No. 01, s. 2005, has been Level III. I am told that your sister agency from the private sector, the PAASCU has awarded Level IV to two private institutions, the De La Salle University and the Ateneo de Manila University, but then they are some 30 to 40 years your elder. On the other hand, you are catching up, despite your youth as an accrediting agency for the public sector, with one SUC having been evaluated for Level IV, only a week or two ago, in Region II, the region with the highest number of accredited programs in the country. I hope they had passed because as a former Member of the Board of Trustees, I know for a fact that AACCUP does not easily give its imprimatur to a recommended accreditation level until after a meticulous review by the office and the Board. And I am glad that despite the rigid scrutiny, the agency has awarded various levels of accreditation to a total of 1,503 programs after 3,816 on-site visits, from its first year of survey visit in 1992, up to the year 2009.

But how do these statistics fare with the sister government agencies – particularly the CHED and the PRC? Accreditation they say is objective judgment. Judgment by peers from the outside that is. Would a Level III award for instance be comparable to a Center of Excellence or Center of Development award by the CHED?

Does any of the Level III accredited programs, happen also to be the Center of Excellence or Center of Development identified by the CHED? Has any of the SUCs with a high number of AACCUP-accredited programs been awarded for high performance by the PRC?

Presently, we do not have any available statistics as this will need intensive research. But let it suffice for the moment, that we have an overall crack at the possible answers to these questions.

Which SUCs have programs identified and awarded as Centers of Excellence by the CHED? May I request the Presidents concerned will please raise their hands to be recognized. What levels of accreditation have those programs attained?

Which SUCs have received the top performing institution awards from the PRC? Again please raise your hands. Congratulations then! The raw survey results proves only one thing: the AACCUP HAS ONE OF THE FAIREST, ACCURATE, AND OBJECTIVE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION AMONG THE FIVE ACCREDITING AGENCIES IN THE COUNTRY. We likewise have statistics on which college and universities have been recognized by PRC as top performing. We are very happy that recently many SUCs are

being recognized as top performing colleges/universities. In every oath-taking ceremony, I always publicly make my happiness known to the audience that there are topnotchers and top performing schools from the SUCs. TOP PERFORMING is categorized in PRC based on the number of passers, ranging from 10-25 examinees, then 26-55 examinees, and 55 and more. For Teacher Education, this category is expanded in such a way that:

Category A is with 10-99 examinees

Category B is with 100 – 299 examinees

Category C is with 300 – 499 examinees

Category D is with 500 or more examinees.

Going back to AACCUP, fortunately, as a former member of the Board, I know that there used to be consultations when the AACCUP was still with the FAAP and before some minor misunderstandings cropped up so that the two federations- FAAP for the private and NNQAA for the public sector, came into being in accordance with the provisions of CMO No. 01, s. 2005, which stipulates for the establishment of both. Just as the higher education institutions have the COCOPEA for the private and the PASUC for the public institutions.

Which is very normal considering that they have interests which may not be exactly in tandem with each other. Just as for Teacher Education alone, we have the PAFTE, the SUCTEA, the NOPTI, the ACT to mention a few; for such specific discipline as language, we have the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, the PALT, the CETA or College English Teachers Association, and another one for Filipino teachers whose acronym skips my memory for the moment.

The CHED itself, I have been told by reliable sources, has recommended for a return to the instruments by program instead of the present Master Survey Instrument for all programs. This is democracy and we are in a free enterprise society and there will always be room for unity in diversity.

On the other hand, our laws, particularly RA 8292 known as the Higher Education Modernization Act, provides that the CHED Chairman will sit as Chairman of the Board for all SUCs. This is where harmonization will come in. The Chairman presides and perhaps influences, but the Board makes decisions en banc. The Coordinating Council on Accreditation itself, is composed of the five accrediting agencies in the country as members, but a Commissioner of the CHED serves as Chairman. This is harmonization at its best. And because we all have the same lofty, high quality goals for higher education, there will always be a meeting point for all of us. The PRC for its part will continue to supervise and regulate the practice of profession without necessarily controlling the 43 professions in the country, thus respecting their particular interests. In fact, the PRC has policies to safeguard the general department of the various professions just as the CHED has a CMO No. 01, s. 2005 which covers all accreditation matters

To all Presidents here present then who are Vice-Chairpersons of their respective Boards, I say as a brotherly advice, respect your Chairman the way your Chairman respects you. For after all have been said and done, we have all but one goal. The CHED, the PRC, and the AACCUP are all for quality education through accreditation.

We accredit professions and individuals. You accredit institutions which produce and utilize the professions and individuals.

And in evaluating institutions through the ten areas of:

1. Vision Mission
2. Goals and Objectives to Faculty
3. Curriculum
4. Support to Students
5. Research
6. Extension and Community Involvement
7. Library
8. Physical Facilities
9. Laboratories, and
10. Administration,

you are efficiently and effectively producing versatile and life-long-learning graduates very much aware of the emergence of the knowledge-based economy and the inventions in the field of information and communications technology, but most of all, fully cognizant of the role of knowledge in the growth of the economy, in the now knowledge-intensive world.

In a speech entitled "SUCs as Leaders in RP's Economic Development," the erstwhile CHED Chairman stated that HEIs are not just for social development. "While education is considered the greatest equalizer of all time," the incumbent President and CEO of the United Coconut Chemicals Inc. stated, educational institutions can provide the spark that will ignite the economic development in our country." Thus impliedly saying that, through accreditation, ensues quality education and consequently quality of life.

But the SUCs in general, and AACCUP in particular, should be considered the academic heroes of the day. In the days of yore, the sharing of the allotment from the national government was 90% with only 10% required from the revenues of the SUC. The AACCUP on the other hand used to receive P2M subsidy from CHED. Now this has been reversed. And yet, it is to the credit of the SUCs that they have not only survived, they have produced topnotchers as evidenced by their graduates' individual performance, and as top performing schools in the same PRC-conducted examinations and evaluations. The AACCUP on the other hand, continues to ensure that SUCs remain competitive and relevant in the light of global competitiveness, and I personally believe that you have been successful in this endeavour as our records at the PRC show.

Before I close and to wrap up what I have been trying to articulate thus far, please indulge me to share with you - as a former President of the PNU, and at present a Commissioner of an education oriented government instrumentality, and as a friend of the AACCUP - the philosophy underlying the Total Quality Management, or the Continuous Quality Improvement which is patterned along Deming's fourteen points

constituting the total quality-oriented institution, which is for the institution to give serious commitment to. Our respective institutions must commit to:

1. Continuous Improvement - which should be forever, and which its people should always think of how to get better;
2. Identify whom it wishes to serve, and what these potential clients want and need. Client groups include students, recipients of faculty research and service activities, and members of the community;
3. Address the needs of its clients in its mission statement;
4. Identify the values that guide its actions;
5. Develop a vision of what it would like to be in the future;
6. Provide strong leadership that communicates the mission, goals, values and the vision of the institution continuously to faculty, staff and students;
7. Identify its critical processes which are teaching, research and service or extension;
8. Align the implementation of its activities with its mission and values;
9. Provide continuing educational opportunities for all employees, both group process and in job-related skills (for us at PRC, this is called CPE);
10. Use cross-functional teams to improve processes: works with its supplier, builds quality into each process, and cease dependence on inspection to achieve quality;
11. Push decision making to the lowest appropriate level, thus creating an attitude of interdependence and trust throughout the institution;
12. Base decisions about the allocation of resources on data. Use quantitative thinking, along with competence in group problem-solving skills and relevant statistical procedures. These should be in widespread use throughout the institution;
13. View itself as a learning organization, one that produces student learning, research, and service. One that studies, monitors, and evaluates the processes that produce the products. And one that makes active collaborators in the improvement of process of all concerned, including faculty, staff and students, parents, suppliers, employers, and community members; and
14. Recognize and reward those who conscientiously work to improve quality.

With that said, allow me then to end my talk, with the loudest of GLEEFUL CHEERS and a BIG SALUTE!! to the DYNAMIC LEADERS, the PRESIDENTS AND VPs OF SUCs, and the GUARDIANS OF STANDARDS, THE QUALITY ASSURANCE MOGULS OF AACUP. MAY YOU HAVE MORE PRODUCTIVE YEARS OF ASSOCIATION AND PLEASANT AND PROSPEROUS DAYS OF EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIP, ALL FOR THE SAKE OF QUALITY EDUCATION AND THE ENSUING QUALITY OF LIFE FOR OUR PEOPLE. May I end this with the Story of the Geese. THANK YOU.

PROGRAM ACCREDITATION IN 2009 FACTS CONCERNS

Dr. Nilo E. Colinares

With the current momentum on the implementation of Institutional Accreditation Program still remains the relish of the day. In fact only a week ago, the Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University (DMMMSU), the school which began the history of accreditation, did it again as the first state higher education institution to apply for a Level IV Reaccredited survey visit. The latest issue of our AACCUP Newsletter reveals the historic event in this wise:

FIRST LEVEL IV SURVEY VISIT CONDUCTED

The first Level IV evaluation among SUCs in the country was conducted last February 17-20, 2010 at the Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University, South La Union campus (SLUC) in Agoo, La Union.

The program assessed was Teacher Education - Elementary and Secondary.

The select accreditors for this historic first were led by an AACCUP Board Member. Dr. Felomino A. Gargar of USEP, Davao, as Coordinator and Team Leader for Secondary. He is Dean of the USEP College of Education, Coordinator-designate of the CHED-RQ.AT and IQUAME member, snf Chairman of the Council of Deans of Teacher Education and Council of Deans for Graduate Education of Region XI. Dr. Helen F. de los Santos, Chairperson of the Department of Professional Education of PNU, the National Center for Teacher Education, whose graduate program for Elementary Teacher Education is also Level II Reaccredited, served as Team Leader for Elementary Education. Lead accreditors, most of whom I belong to universities whose undergraduate and graduate Teacher Education programs are Level III-Reaccredited, were Dr. Marietta B. Arinto, former VPAA and incumbent VO for Administration and Extension of the LNU; Dr. Elvira L. Arellano, University Professor and Director of the Center for Research and Innovation for Science and Mathematics Education, WVSU; Dr. Conchita R. Cauinian, former Dean, College of Education, currently Chairperson of the Graduate School Master of Arts in Education program, ISU; Dr. Demetria A. San Juan, past Campus Director and Director of Instruction, and incumbent VP for Administration and Finance, Dr. Gloria P. Sarabia, former Campus Director and Dean, College of Education, now Cluster 3 Chancellor (Antipolo, Angono, Binangonan, Pililla) and Prof. Eleanor M. Vibar, University Librarian, all of the URS. Dr. Nilo E. Colinares, AACCUP Part-time Consultant/Consultant On Call, served as Survey Consultant for the survey visit.

DMMMSU occupies a special place in the AACCUP chronicle, being one of the four SUCS which dared to tread upon the unknown accreditation grounds in 1992 when accreditation was alien to many and/or anathema to a few. Fifteen years later, its Teacher Education program stood out as the First Level III-Reaccredited program among SUCs in the country.

Program accreditation however was not all roses for 2009. The initial days of the first month were all confusion and apprehension but ended in clarification and decision.

The concerns - the confusion and apprehension were brought about by a letter from the Commission on Higher Education Chairman. This was addressed to the Presidents of the five accrediting agencies in the Philippines - the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities (PAASCU); the Philippine Association of Universities and Colleges- Commission on Accreditation (PACU-COA); the Association of Christian Schools, Colleges and Universities-Accrediting Agency Inc. (ACSCU-AAI), the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCU); and the Association of Local Colleges and Universities-Commission on Accreditation (ALCU-COA).

Based on Executive Order 705-A establishing the Coordinating Council on Accreditation, the letter advised the accrediting agency presidents to stop accreditation activities for the moment, while the CCA was still reviewing the accreditation policies of the country with the end in view of harmonizing practices, from fees to instruments, to the training and the subsequent pool of accreditors, award of levels of accreditation and other concerns. Commissioner Nenilyn Defensor was designated Chairperson of the CCA while the CHED Chairman would just sit in during the two meetings held so far.

With all accrediting agencies caught by surprise, AACCU key officials, NNQAA President Angel Alcala, AACCU Founding President and Executive Director Manuel Corpus, and incumbent President Danilo Hilario, paid the Chairman a visit. After revealing the agency's predicament about stopping the current and incoming activities at that time - the Manila Hotel conference for which a non-refundable deposit had been made; the plane tickets of accreditors bought in advance for on-going survey visits; the preparations of SUCs to be visited etc., the CHED Chair gave in to the request for the issuance of a memorandum authorizing the conduct of the AACCU Annual National Conference 2009, thus indirectly and partially deviating from the content of the letter. It was also clarified that there was no memorandum issued, there was only a letter of request.

After the clarifications, decisions were made and what followed was an avalanche of requests for visits which the AACCU found difficult to handle, but eventually solved with a innovative scheme of conducting one visit after another, with the same set of accreditors hopping from one SUC to another SUC.

The statistical figures that follow are hard facts which swallowed up all plans/intents to the contrary. First, there was an increase of SUC clientele as shown below, together with the breakdown of the current total:

THE FACTS

Increase of SUC clientele

- | <u>2008</u> | <u>2009</u> |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 488 programs in 63 SUCs• 40 Level III Reaccredited programs in 11 SUCs | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 567 programs in 74 SCUs• 63 LEVEL III Reaccredited programs in 16 SUCs |

- 1992-2008

 - 1,300 programs in 95 SUCs
- 1992-2009

 - 1,503 after 3,816 on-site visits to 98 SUCs

Breakdown of Accreditation Status Awarded to the 567 SUCs

Status/Level	Number		SUCs*
	Program	Percent	
1. Candidate Status	203	35.80	42
2. Level I Accredited	124	21.87	36
3. Level II Reaccredited	177	31.22	55
4. Level IV Reaccredited	63	11.11	16
TOTAL	567	100%	-

And more than these factual totals, competition for the highest levels of accreditation - Level III Reaccredited for SUCs, soared from 40 last year to 63 this year. Considering that preparations for this highest level is the most difficult and complicated, these achievements of the concerned institutions contradicted the expected downturn of accreditation activities caused by previous events. Peak performance by regions and SUCs also became the order of the day.

SUCS AWARDED LEVEL III-REACCREDITED STATUS IN 2009

SUCs/College	Number of Program
1. Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University (DMMMSU), Bacnotan, La Union	4
2. Bulacan State University (BSU), City of Malolos, Bulacan	4
3. Central Luzon State University (CLSU), Science City of Munoz, Nueva Ecija	5
4. Pampanga Agricultural College (PAC), Magalang, Pampanga	2
5. Tarlac College of Agriculture (TCA), Camiling, Tarlac	4
6. University of Rizal System (URS), Tanay and Morong, Rizal	2
7. Western Philippines University (WPU), Aborlan and Puerto Princesa City, Palawan	4
8. Bicol University (BU), Daraga, Albay	2
9. Iloilo State College of Fisheries (ISCOF), Barotac Nuevo, Iloilo	1
10. Leyte Normal University (LNU), Tacloban City, Leyte	3
11. Palompon Institute of Technology (PIT), Palompon, Leyte	7
12. Samar State University (SSU), Catbalogan City, Samar	7
13. Southern Leyte State University (SLSU), Tomas Oppus, Southern Leyte	2
14. Bukidnon State University (BSU), City of Malaybalay, Bukidnon	2
15. University of Southern Mindanao (USM), Kabacan, North Cotabato	1
16. Benguet State University (BSU), La Trinidad, Benguet	13
TOTAL	63

TOP 5 PERFORMING REGIONS

❖ Region III (BASC, BSU, CLSU, DHVTSU, NEUST, PAC, RMTU, TCA, TSU) - - - -	82
❖ Region VIII (ESSU, LNU, NSU, NwSSU, PIT, SSU, SLSU, UEP) - - - - - - - - - -	66
❖ Region V (BU, CNSC, CSPC, CSC, CBSUA, DBESMSCAT, PSU, SSC) - - - - - - - - - -	60
❖ Region IV-A (BSU, CvSU, LSPU, SLSU, URS) - - - -	56
❖ Region II (ISU, NVSU) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	43

TOP PERFORMING SUCs

❖ Isabela State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	31
❖ Benguet State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	25
❖ Cavite State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	23
❖ Bataan Peninsula State University - - - - - - - - - - - -	17
❖ Bohol Island State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	17
❖ Bukidnon State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	17
❖ Surigao del Sur Polytechnic State College - - - - - - - - - -	16
❖ Central Luzon State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	13
❖ Partido State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	13
❖ University of Eastern Philippines - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	13

TOP PERFORMING SUCs

❖ Candidate - Bohol Island State University - - - - - - - - - -	17
❖ Level I - Isabela State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	11
- Cavite State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	11
- Eulogio "Amang Rodriguez Ins. of Sci and Tech (EARIST) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	11
❖ Level II - Nueva Viscaya State University - - - - - - - - - - - -	10
❖ Level III - Benguet State University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	13

With the hard facts, President Ngohayon's "Statement of Purpose" quote of David Rockefeller' dictum "Aim for success but not for perfection," comes into play. Success had been attained by the top performers without necessarily aiming for perfection, which might not be possible of fulfillment at a given time. On the other hand, PRC Commissioner Nilo Rosas' evaluation of the AACCU criteria being objective, accurate

and relevant became more concrete with those statistics. But still, there are minor areas of concern, the major areas tackled by the Board to be exhaustively discussed by the Executive Director in the “Trends and Issues.....” presentation, which have to be addressed, as the following:

1. Common concerns on the part of SUCs, the Accreditors and AACCU~~P~~.

ON THE PART OF SUCs

Absences of accreditor from classes

Safety of accreditors

Home duties of accreditors

ON THE PART OF ACCREDITORS

Travel inconveniences

Meager travel allowance

Home institution permission to leave

ON THE PART OF AACCU~~P~~

Difficulty of getting qualified accreditors

Tendency of accreditors to select places of assignment

▪ *Availability of accreditors in general*

▪ *Simultaneous survey visits*

2. Clustering

◦ *Cutting across 2 to 4 programs by Area Lead Accreditor*

◦ *Cluster Coordinator in VMGO*

◦ *Team Leader in curriculum of own specialization or allied field*

◦ *For economy and efficiency.*

◦ *Issue: For the economy of AACCU~~P~~ at the sacrifice of the accreditors?*

The issue here had been the comment of an accreditor: For the economy of AACCU~~P~~ at the expense of the accreditors?

But this is more for the economy of man hours spent when you assign two to three accreditors for the same area in two or three different programs, and for efficiency

When only one accreditor makes similar recommendations for an area in two to three similarly situated programs

3. Confirmation and approval of programs for evaluation and AACCUP-issued Assignments

- *Application by host institution*
- *Tentative list of programs and schedule by AACCUP*
- *Confirmation by SUC*
- *Approval by AACCUP*
- *Concern: Different interpretations by host institution and accreditor*

Because of this repetitive view and review of programs and levels of accreditation by both the AACCUP and the institution evaluated, the accreditor will be please be reminded that their primordial duty is to evaluate, no more no less. Administrative concerns should be left to the AACCUP and the SUC concerned. However, if there is, in the view, the interpretation, the opinion of the accreditor/s some inconsistency, they should just make a notation about the matter, which should form part of the Team Leader's report. The same is true for the programs and levels determined by the SUC and AACCUP and the CHED Minimum Requirements. Notations may be made - lack of such or inadequacy of another, but evaluation will continue as scheduled. Absence of the AACCUP-issued CHED Minimum Requirements may mean there is no CHED Memo for that particular program so that AACCUP criteria and Professional Associations' guidelines will prevail.

4. Travel convenience and Budgetary Constraints

- *AACCUPs utmost desire to provide most convenient travel arrangements*
- *Accreditation fees as source for survey visit allotments*
- *Inconvenient, albeit partial solution for host institution*

Because of the voluminous work the accreditors will face in a survey visit, AACCUP will always see to it that they have the most convenient of travel arrangements depending however on the limited budget for a particular visit.

5. Individual Action on AACCUP invitation

- *Confirmation*
- *Regrets*
- *Yes or No. No suspense pls.*
- *Unnecessary inquiries on -Team mates*
- *Mode of Travel*
- *Duration of Assignments*
- *AACCUP Limitations:*
 - FAX transmittals*

-Coping up with voluminous requests for Survey Visits

As much as possible, the accreditor should immediately act on an invitation to enable the office, to look for other alternative in case of regrets, and unless in case of emergency, a confirmed assignment should have no place for one's whim and caprice for a sudden change of mind.

6. From II to II, what a transition to progress!! And Pre/Post 200 Levels, to be elaborated in the "Trends and Issues . . ." by the Executive Director.

- *WE WERE AWARDED LEVEL II WITH THE APPROPRIATE CERTIFICATE AND COPY OF BOARD APPROVAL. NOW WE ARE AGAIN ON A 2ND SURVEY UPON PASSING OF WHICH WE SHALL LAND AGAIN ON LEVEL II!!! What kind of arithmetic is this?*

7. Standards Report Format

- *SANIR*
- *STRENGTHS*
- *MOTHERHOOD STATEMENTS*
- *ANI*
- *SPECIFIC*
- *RECOMMENDATIONS*
- *Respond to ANI, realistic and possible of fulfilment*

The present format will please be followed as is. If there are any suggestions for revision, they may be part of the report submitted. These will be discussed during conferences, taken u by the Board for appropriate action. Until such time when there is a BOT-approved format, the current one prevails.

8. Training and Retraining of Accreditors.

The present predicament of AACCUP to address the lack of available, qualified accreditors at the time they are most needed, demands that AACCUP conduct training and retraining programs. Along these lines, prospective accreditors should be selected by the recommending SUCs with the AACCUP-issued qualifications and eligibilities as guides.

- *Educationally qualified nominees*
- *Appropriate Academic Rank*
- *Willing to serve fellow SUCs*
- *A professional with correct/right personal attributes*

9. Submission of PPPs, Narrative Reports for Level III, Phase 2 should be limited only to one (1) copy per program for AACUP which is only an office with no space for storage. Other copies should be given to the accreditors upon their arrival to the institution to be evaluated.

- *Instructions in PPP simply to be followed*
- *No. of copies for both PPPs, NRs submitted, limited to ONE (1) per program for evaluation.*
- *AACUP Bodega*
- *and space problems reason for phasing out of Class Observation and Interview forms*

Preparing for Institutional Accreditation: The Central Luzon State University Experience

Mario S. Suba

University Accreditation Coordinator
CLSU, Science City of Munoz, Nueva Ecija

QUEST FOR SUSTAINABLE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

CLSU is an avid advocate of academic excellence. By way of telling our sister SUCs as to what kind of school we are, which has ventured to travel on hitherto unknown paths of accreditation, we shall give you our vision and our goals and the strategies to attain them.

The CLSU Strategic Plan 2009-2013

Enhancing CLSU's proactive strategic plan for progress from 2008 to 2013 is its vision as a world class knowledge-based people's university, pro-active, relevant and committed to service and excellence.

Anchored on this vision are our goals to wit:

- Quality and Excellence in Learning
- Discovery of New Knowledge
- Proactive Engagement

To attain these goals, we have adopted strategies for quality and excellence in learning.

"We create, develop, and implement undergraduate and graduate curricular programs which are compliant to regional, national and international needs and standards and submit the same through voluntary accreditation, monitoring and evaluation."

With these strategies come the performance indicators which will guide us through the long journey to Institutional Accreditation. These are:

- Course offerings recognized through program evaluation, accreditation and monitoring
- Programs with strong specialization and discipline structures that meet quality standards for international comparability
- Increase in graduate and undergraduate enrollment
- Excellent performance in licensure examinations

Major programs and activities will have to be undertaken, mainly voluntary accreditation of undergraduate and graduate programs. Our present target is to have all graduate and undergraduate programs accredited Level III and Institutional Accreditation undertaken by December 2010. Other programs and activities include voluntary monitoring and evaluation through AACUP, IQAME and ISO certification and accreditation. Again, our target is for CLSU to be accredited and a certified institution by AACUP, IQAME and ISO by December 2014. To go with these semi-academic ventures is the physical aspect - the construction of the University Accreditation Center which hopefully will be in place by 2010.

Continuous Voluntary Accreditation - Program and Institutional Accreditation

Back now to our preparations for Institutional Accreditation, the preliminaries consisted of a series of meetings, dialogue, and consultation with university officials, faculty and staff. The major issues tackled were focused primarily on the readiness of the University for Institutional Accreditation. Subsequently the creation of university accreditation working committees was realized.

Partially done with the internal preparations, we sought outside professional help which came in the form of a consultation with AACUP, a seminar in fact. The first one was held on December 8, 2008. Dr. Manuel T. Corpus was with us at CLSU for consultation, and with the assistance of Dr. Nilo E. Colinares, conducted a briefing and orientation about Institutional Accreditation which consisted of a delineation between Institutional versus Program Accreditation and the advantages and disadvantages of both were appropriately discussed. Likewise, the requirements for Institutional Accreditation and the documents needed namely Institutional Portfolio, Master Instrument, and Self Survey were emphasized.

They also ran a review on the requirements for Institutional Accreditation based on the General Framework for Institutional Accreditation, Criteria and Evaluation and the basic requirements to satisfy the definition of a university as set in the Framework and that to have at least 75% of programs pass the standards based on AACUP scheme for Level I.

As to the 75% of all existing eligible for accreditation programs requirement, here are our accredited programs at CLSU;

Programs	Level
I. Undergraduate:	
Elementary Teacher Education	Level III – Reaccredited
Secondary Teacher Education	Level III – Reaccredited
Agriculture	Level III – Reaccredited
Fisheries	Level III – Reaccredited
Agribusiness Management	Level III – Reaccredited
Science (Chemistry)	Level III – Reaccredited
Science (Biology)	Level III – Reaccredited
Veterinary Medicine	Level III – Reaccredited
Business Administration (Econ, Mgt, Mktg)	Level III – Reaccredited
Agricultural Engineering	Level III – Reaccredited
Agricultural Teacher Education	Level II – Reaccredited
Civil Engineering	Level II – Reaccredited
Accountancy	Level II – Reaccredited
Home Technology (BSHE, BSTGT, BSFT)	Level II – Reaccredited
Social Sciences	Level II – Reaccredited
Development Communication	Candidate Status
Information Technology	Candidate Status
Science (Statistics)	Candidate Status
II. Graduate	
Agricultural Engineering (Master’s and Doctoral)	Level III – Reaccredited
Rural Development (Doctoral), Development Education (Masters)	Level III – Reaccredited
Agriculture (Master’s and Doctoral)	Level III – Reaccredited
Development Ed (Doctoral), Masters (Education)	Level III – Reaccredited
Aquaculture (Masters)	Level III – Reaccredited
Masters (Chemistry Education, Chemistry)	Candidate Status
Masters (Biological Sciences)	Candidate Status
Masters (Environmental Science)	Candidate Status
Masters (Veterinary Studies)	Candidate Status

Supplementing our accredited programs are our Centers of Excellence/ Development in Agriculture and Fisheries which are also bestowed by CHED as the National University College of Agriculture and Fisheries (NUCA an NUCF), respectively. Also newly awarded COE because of their Level III re-accredited status are the programs

in Agricultural Engineering, and Veterinary Medicine. Our existing COD's are the Chemistry, Biology and Teacher Education programs.

GO for Institutional Accreditation

So, all in all 95% of our programs are accredited. By all means, we should then GO for Institutional Accreditation!!! But first, we go to the basics.

1. We have to manifest a letter of Intent to undergo Institutional Accreditation
2. Beef up the preparation through:
 - 2.1. Invigoration of Accreditation Working Committees Chair and co-chairs for each of the 9 criteria for Institutional Accreditation Members in each Area assignment (the more volunteers, the better!!!)
 - 2.2. Brainstorming and intellectual discussion of area assignments based on the Master Instrument, Institutional Portfolio, and Self Survey documents.
 - 2.3. Initial Collation of documentary requirements with the main consideration of beating the deadlines.

But the further we dug into the abysmal labyrinth of our goal, the more there were more queries, clarifications. But this is where our related Involvement in AACUP executive workshops as Member of the Board of Trustees and former Consultant came into play. I had the privilege to be invited to the series of seminar workshops in the past years which followed the launch of Institutional Accreditation, on the;

1. Fine Tuning of the Master Instrument;
2. How to Prepare the Institutional Portfolio;
3. Manual on Institutional Accreditation;
4. Rating Scheme/System;
5. Accreditors Guide; and the
6. Validation/Pre test of Institutional Accreditation Master Instrument.

By this time, we felt another need to consult AACUP. Thus, a second AACUP Seminar was held on January 6, 2009 with Dr. MT Corpus at the helm of the learning activity. Clarifications were made on Institutional Accreditation, The Master Instrument, How to prepare the Institutional Portfolio, and other documentary Requirements

On our part, a series of meetings of the different committees assigned in each of the nine areas was conducted and a continuous collation of pertinent data was pursued.

Simultaneously, other related activities continued are being undertaken to fine tune our preparation. This includes budget proposal per Area, Initial Procurement of Supplies, initial bidding for the construction of the University Accreditation Center, and finalization of the timeline for the pilot testing of Institutional Accreditation at CLSU.

Still not content with what we had absorbed from the past exercises and guided by the Tagalog adage “ang nagtatanong matalino,” we opted to request for a third seminar by AACCUP. On January 20, 2010, Dr. MT Corpus, Dr. NE Colinares and Dr. Miriam S. Cervantes visited us again to advise on clarifications by Area in the Master Instrument and concerned officials at CLSU solicited specific strategies to facilitate the preparation of the Institutional Portfolio, rating scheme by area and the additional documentary requirements.

Updates on Institutional Accreditation: Lessons Learned

Probably by this time, you might be asking: What is the current status/updates of the CLSU preparations? I might as well say “Very Well”. Preparation of the IP is on-going, self survey is set in March, 2010 and the construction of the University Accreditation Center is already finished. We plan to submit the IP, and Self Survey Results to AACCUP. We can proudly say that we are all set for Institutional Accreditation in July 2010.

With everything said and done, we might as well ask ourselves: What lessons have we learned from the Institutional Accreditation preparation experience? I venture to manifest the following: Enjoy what you are doing, Plan ahead, Foresight is an added virtue, Ask when in doubt, and use CCP – connection, charm and prayers.

And lastly, may I admonish all to “Go” for Institutional Accreditation!!!

Good luck to all of US!!!

TOWARDS INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION OF SUCS — THE VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE

Manuel X. Dalomar, Oscar B. Rosas and Lualhati M. Noriel
VSU, Visca, Baybay City, Leyte

INTRODUCTION

Visayas State University (VSU) is a premier agricultural university with its original charter as a state college in 1974. Initially, VSU (as ViSCA) had only College of Agriculture with a few undergraduate programs in 1974, to which more were added in the succeeding years including graduate education. After becoming a state university in 2001, the University has launched new and in-demand programs. Today VSU comprises 5 campuses, with the Main Campus (in Baybay) grouped into the Graduate School and eight Colleges. The campus area of VSU in Baybay is about 1,100 hectares, located between Mt. Pangasugan and Camotes Sea. The faculty strength of VSU is now 270 and it has student strength of over 5000, of which a large proportion is from the Visayas.

Higher education in the Philippines, meanwhile, is at a crossroads. It is confronted with globalization even as it struggles to overcome the inadequacies created by issues on governance, corruption and the demands of development. With the resources now available, VSU must choose between two alternatives. It can concentrate on advanced technical and professional education and research in agriculture and allied fields to remain in the forefront of knowledge even with declining enrollment, or it can offer a variety of vocational and service-oriented courses to take advantage of employment opportunities abroad and those that are generated as multinationals locate labor-intensive production processes in the Philippines.

In the last few years, VSU (and earlier LSU) has been conducting an introspection of its programs and activities and also of the various procedures established at the university, with a view to identify its strengths and weaknesses. In this connection, VSU has got agriculture cluster, education cluster, and graduate cluster assessed and accredited by the AACCUP in 2006 as Level 3 (Reaccredited) and also had 9 programs assessed on Feb. 8-10, 2010 for Preliminary Survey. Continuing in this direction, VSU volunteered to be assessed and accredited by AACCUP for Institutional Accreditation, the first in the Visayas, together with CLSU for Luzon.

The Team was scheduled to visit VSU on Feb 15-16, 2010 but it was postponed to a later date. This paper presents the experiences of VSU as it faces the rigors of institutional accreditation.

ViSCA to LSU to VSU

1. Changing of the Guards

As the Visayas Agricultural College, it offered BSA (majors in Agronomy and Animal Husbandry), BSAg Education (majors in Agronomy, Animal Husbandry and Elem. Agric. & Industrial Arts) and BSAg Homemaking (majors in Clothing & textiles and Handicraft). With Dr. FABernardo as the first ViSCA President, the agriculture program was expanded and offered more majors in BSA, 4 new undergraduate degree programs, 3 certificate courses and 7 MS and 4 Master of Agric. Development. Dr. MR Villanueva raised the ante by offering 2 PhD programs, 4 additional MS, and 5 undergraduate courses. Dr. SSG0 expanded the PhD to include 3 more fields, 3 in MS, Master of Education in 5 areas and 2 BS programs. Dr. PPMilan added 5 MS and 10 BS that included Biotechnology Nursing, Geodetic Engineering, and Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Management plus 2 Certificate courses. Presently, Dr. JLBacusmo has the new Master of Management with majors in Agribusiness and Business Management and BS in Civil Engineering, with more curricular programs proposed for implementation in 2010-2011 such as BS in Industrial Pharmacology, MS in Biofuel Engineering and Doctor of Plant Medicine.

2. Program Accreditation

Historically, VSU has always embraced assessment, evaluation and monitoring of its programs and activities. As a state college, ViSCA had to pass a rigid process of evaluation to get the World Bank Loan for its infrastructure, equipment and scholarships. And fund release for any research from national and international donors had to pass through the proverbial "eye of the needle". Thus, VSU has been recognized for its efforts and some of them are as follows:

- Tanglaw Award (1980; 1977) given by PCARRD
- Ugnay Award for VICARP, with VSU as lead agency (1997; 2003; 2008), given by PCARRD
- Zonal Research Center in the Visayas (2000 to date) given by CHED
- Center of Excellence in Agriculture (2001-2004; 2009-2012)
- Center of Excellence in Agricultural Engineering (2001-2004)
- Center of Excellence in Forestry (2001-2004)
- Dark Green School (2008) given by EENP; first accredited institution in the Visayas
- Eco-Friendly University (2009) given by DENR; first in the region, second in the country

- Member of the Science Consortium University for graduate programs (2009) given by DOST
- National University of Agriculture (NUCA) in the Visayas (2009)

The willingness of VSU to face accreditation by AACCUP is reflected in the active involvement of past and present VSU Presidents in this endeavor, as shown below:

Level III Re-Accredited (Dec.16, 2006 — Dec. 15, 2010) for 4 Agriculture Programs, Secondary Teacher Education, Elementary Teacher Education, 9 MS/ MAGDEV in Agriculture Cluster and 4 MS/MAGDEV in the Education Cluster (Pres. PPMilan)

Level II Re-Accredited (June 27, 1999-June 26, 2004) Agriculture and Graduate Education (Pres. PPMilan)

Level II Accredited (June 27, 1996-June 26, 1999) Agriculture and Graduate Education (Pres. SSG0)

Level I Candidate; given on May 6, 1993
Agriculture and Graduate Education (Pres. MRVillanueva)

Preliminary Survey (date of visit February 8-10, 2010)
9 Programs (Pres. JLBacusmo)

WORKING FOR INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

A. Format for Institutional Accreditation by AACCUP

THE NINE CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION ARE:

Criterion One: Governance and Management. The institution adopts a sufficient system of governance and management to manage existing operations, and has the ability to respond to development and change.

Criterion Two: Teaching, Learning and Evaluation. The institution has clearly defined mission and academic programs, with set objectives and learning outcomes at appropriate levels and has effective mechanisms of delivery and testing to ensure success in meeting these objectives to enable students to achieve intended outcomes.

Criterion Three: Faculty and Staff. The standard of the institution is measured to a great extent by the qualification and performance of its faculty. It maintains highly qualified members in terms of their academic qualifications, experiences and professional competence.

Criterion Four: Research. The institution maintains an environment of fostering creative and scientific research that produces scholarly outputs and appropriate technologies.

Criterion Five: Extension, Consultancy and Linkages. The institution demonstrates the capability to conduct extension programs that take into consideration the economic and developmental needs of the country at local, regional and national level for people empowerment and self-reliance. The institution is likewise valued as a partner by other higher educational and professional institutions, government organizations and industries, within the Philippines and in the international community.

Criterion Six: Student Support. The institution demonstrates the capability to provide resources and services to support its students throughout their academic life in order that they can attain their maximum potential and total development thus, becoming worthy citizens of the country.

Criterion Seven: Infrastructure and Learning Resources. The institution provides an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning and supports the educational programs offered by the institution. The adequacy of physical plant and facilities, library, classrooms, shops, laboratories, information technology, multi-media center, student center and general education laboratories are paramount.

Criterion Eight: Financial Generation and Management. The institution has sufficient resources to support the educational programs and services which are efficiently managed and utilized.

Criterion Nine: Healthy Practices. The institution adopts certain healthy practices which are not common among average quality institutions. It adopts a system of continuous examination and improvement of its programs and operation. In some cases, it has earned recognition of, and is even given award by, other entities or groups. It has a respectable image to the community, region or country.

B. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

1. Initial Steps

AACCUP has strongly pursued the adoption of institutional accreditation as a unit of assessment. In the AACCUP Annual National Conference held at Rizal Technological University in January, 2001, the AACCUP General Assembly recommended a study on the possibility of adopting accreditation by institution as a model more appropriate for state universities and colleges. After the 2001 study team output, the theme of subsequent annual conferences of AACCUP to date always revolved around institutional accreditation. The conferences were

complemented with a series of trainings conducted by experts from other countries familiar with institutional accreditation.

Throughout these initiatives of AACCCUP, VSU has shown its full support by sending participants to all these conferences and trainings. In fact, the university has consented to be an academic “guinea pig” in the pilot-testing of this new scheme of accreditation together with four other SCUs.

VSU is of the firm belief that the institutional accreditation process provides an opportunity for critical self-analysis leading to improvement in quality especially with advice from persons from other institutions. Thus, accreditation provides public certification of acceptable institutional quality and an opportunity and incentive for institutional self-improvement.

2. *Middle Ground*

VSU then started preparing its documents using the instrument provided by AACCCUP. Since the instrument was a work in progress, there were some changes incorporated after a particular meeting/training/conference, which necessitated revisions/modifications of the prepared materials.

Dr Manuel T Corpus, Executive Director of AACCCUP, was invited by VSU to deliver an Orientation Seminar on Institutional Accreditation (IA) on December 8, 2008. The seminar was attended by VSU key personnel and faculty. It was followed by a training-workshop (a pre-requisite before actual accreditation) on January 22-23, 2009, with Dr. Corpus and Dr. Nilo E. Colinares as resource speakers. The training-workshop was attended by members of the VSU Task force on IA. The output of nine groups from VSU corresponding to the nine criteria for IA was submitted to AACCCUP as basis for the improvement of the evaluation instrument

A Pre-Evaluation Workshop was conducted on December 17, 2009 to determine the readiness of VSU for IA, with Dr. Corpus, Dr. Colinares and Dr. Miriam S Cervantes as resource persons On December 23, 2009, Dr Corpus informed VSU that the schedule for simultaneous survey for IA and the Preliminary Survey for nine programs was set for February 8-12, 2010. Finally, the Institutional Profile, consisting of a hard copy and a soft copy, was submitted to the office of AACCCUP on January 8, 2010. The results of the Self Survey were also submitted together with the IP.

3. *Present Status*

With regard to quality assurance, VSU cooperates in all initiatives to establish a system of quality assurance and assessment for higher education. The

recently established University Accreditation Center (UAC) is responsible for managing the program of external and internal evaluation of VSU. UAC will promote and provide support for accreditation, program review and assessment by applying practices, strategies, and quality standards that are nationally and regionally recognized. It will impart accurate, timely, and easily accessible information to designated stakeholders in support of institutional strategic planning, policy-making, and performance evaluations. It shall also serve as database or repository of documents for that purpose.

Prior to the formal establishment of UAC, VSU has already embarked on activities to prepare appropriate documentation and evidence and arrange for their personnel, governing bodies, stakeholders and others to provide additional information for conducting both internal and external evaluations. In line with its strategic plans, VSU tapped SEARCA to provide external evaluators to assess the institution and to recommend measures to assure continuing pursuit of excellence. Under the leadership of Dr. Fernando A. Bernardo, former ViSCA President, with Dr. Dely P. Gapasin, World Bank Consultant, Dr. Tito Contado, FAO Consultant and Dr. E.N. Bernardo, former UPLB Vice-President of Academic Affairs, they conducted an External Program Monitoring Review in 2006 and wrote a book of recommendations for VSU to face new challenges and global directions.

The original schedule for institutional accreditation of VSU on February 15-16, 2010 has been tentatively re-set for late June or early July 2010.

C. PROBLEMS WITH IA

- 1. Choice between being Teaching Institution or Research Institution in IA.** All SCUs are expected to do both teaching and research in addition to extension and production VSU is thus faced with the dilemma of what classification to choose. It is confident it has excellent research activities but it is also believes that its teaching output will face muster.
- 2. Constant change of the IA instrument.** The IA instrument is a work in progress and as such VSU has had to revise its documents, add and even delete materials that have been gathered.
- 3. Mistaken notion that IA is primarily the responsibility of university officials.** With Program Accreditation, the faculty, staff and students of that program under review can immediately relate to the importance of them doing remarkably well. Various excuses were made by some faculty so they minimally be involved in IA
- 4. Scheduling of IA.** As early as 2008, VSU has been looking forward to submitting itself to IA Representations were made to AACCUP if VSU can have its IA in Dec 2008 then in June 2009. In both instances, it was not administratively possible (from

AACCUP's end). After a series of consultations, it was finally set to run simultaneously with the Preliminary Survey of nine programs on February 8-1, 2010 with the last 2 days devoted solely to IA. Just before the appointed date, the IA was changed to February 15-16, 2010. But on February 8, 2010, Dr. Corpus suggested that it be moved to either on the last week of June or in early July 2010 because the IA instrument has yet to be pre-tested.

5. **Lack of incentive for IA.** No additional budget will be given to VSU if it passes IA but it will be a morale booster if it will be given the Level it deserves after evaluation instead of starting at the lowest rung no matter what score it gets.
6. **Shifting from a primarily agricultural college or university to a comprehensive university.** When VSU was Visayas State of Agriculture, all of its Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in Agriculture and allied fields were submitted for accreditation and received Level I (Candidate Status). The same programs in Agriculture were evaluated for Level II but the report inadvertently omitted 10 undergraduate degree programs. VSU did not realize the mistake until later and it was too late. Meanwhile, more courses were added to the overall offering of VSU (as it fully grasps its comprehensive university status) that have not been accredited as yet. With this development, VSU apparently lacks the accredited number of programs required to qualify for IA.

D. Solutions

1. The instrument should have only one classification - a combination of both teaching and research for all institutions that will submit itself to accreditation. Under the present set-up, it would appear that an institution accredited as Teaching Institution has an inferior research program and vice versa. Besides, it appears incongruous to award an SCU as Research Institution when in fact the weight is only 8% of the total; compare this with 16% for Teaching in this classification.
2. Accepting the reality that the only thing constant is change.
3. Explaining to the faculty and other non-believers the important role played by everyone (not only the officials) in the scheme of things with IA.
4. The birthing process for IA is difficult and VSU will abide by the decision of AACCUP regarding the definite schedule for IA. For now, IA at VSU has been tentatively scheduled in late June or in early July 2010.
5. Perhaps AACCUP should consider announcing that SCUs submitting itself to IA within a particular period will be ranked according to their output but after that period it will start at Level I. This move will ensure the participation of many SCUs that bodes well for IA in the Philippines.
6. Nine programs were submitted for Preliminary Survey. Some of these programs have had the survey done earlier but as a compromise, it was suggested that if a

particular program is deemed qualified for the next Level(s), AACUP shall shorten the waiting period, i.e., from 2 years to 6 months.

CONTINUING QUEST FOR EXCELLENCE

1. Academics

VSU has always put emphasis on strengthening its ongoing courses and also starting new and innovative courses in many disciplines, in pursuit of its mission. The university now offers technical and professional programs, which include Civil Engineering, Geodetic Engineering, Computer Science, Environmental Management, Nursing and Biotechnology. There is also a provision to review the structure of the curricula and update them periodically.

VSU takes up research and teaching programs keeping in view the manpower planning at regional and national levels. It has provision for Lectures by eminent experts from premier Institutions and the industry. It frequently invites scholars and practitioners as Guest Faculty, and strives to introduce new courses regularly.

2. Faculty

VSU continues to employ a faculty that has earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by the institution. To protect the integrity of the faculty/institution work relationship and avoid circumstances involving conflict of interest, policies regarding the amount of outside work for pay and safeguards surrounding the use of institutional resources and facilities for their intended purposes are required. The relationship of full-time faculty serving as adjunct faculty or program advisors and using the learning resources and facilities of their full-time employer for programs of study offered by other institutions (accredited or non-accredited) should conform to their institution's policies and standards on these matters.

3. Physical Facilities

VSU has always put a premium on the immediate environment of its faculty, staff and students. Even without accreditation, buildings are constantly repaired, facilities are upgraded and interconnectivity of department/units fast-track to meet the exacting demands of the times. New structures are built especially to cater to visitors, students and the public so that VSU will become the place to be in the Visayas.

4. Administration

VSU continues to enter into MOU's with many national/international institutions and organizations to strengthen academic and research work at VSU. It will ensure sustainability by instilling order and discipline on the campus so that the

atmosphere is marked by peace and harmony. It shall enhance its resources through Income Generating Projects, donations from alumni and other stakeholders from the Philippines and abroad, and fund sourcing via research, extension activities and increased enrollment.

CONCLUSION

Ever since its establishment as SCU in 1974 and more so since it became Visayas State University, VSU has made significant progress in the pursuit of its vision to become a center of excellence in education and research. It has emphasized on imparting knowledge and skills for the development of manpower for regional and national development without losing its focus on global standards. VSU has been laying strong emphasis on academic programs, research work and extension service to society in this pursuit.

VSU has been doing a number of activities that ensure the quality and standard of its education and is now ready to face the challenge of Institutional Accreditation.

REFERENCES

CORPUS, M.T. 2009. Complementation of Program and Institutional. Accreditation, 22nd AACCUP Annual National Conference, February 16-17, 2009, Manila Hotel, Philippines

CORPUS, M.T. 2008. A Proposed Framework of Institutional Accreditation. 21st AACCUP Annual National Conference, February 27-28, 2008, Traders' Hotel, Roxas Boulevard, Philippines

CORPUS, M.T. 2007. AACCUP Revisited: Accreditation Circa 1987 (Twenty Years of Accreditation: Trials, Tribulations and Triumphs: The AACCUP Story). 20th AACCUP Annual National Conference, February 26-27, 2007, Manila Hotel, Philippines

CORPUS, M.T. 2006. Redesigning the Philippine Quality Assurance System, featured in Opinion-Editorial, Manila Bulletin, Philippines.

CORPUS, M.T. 2005. The Proposed Scheme of Institutional Accreditation for SCU5. 18th AACCUP Annual National Convention, February 16-17, 2005, Century Park Hotel, Manila

CORPUS, M.T. 2004. Framework of Institutional Accreditation. 17th AACCUP Annual National Convention, February 11-13, 2004, Manila.

ACCREDITATION ISSUES AND TRENDS

By

MANUEL T. CORPUS

During the China Anniversary (20th) of AACCCUP we divided into seven stages, the twenty years of trials, tribulations and triumphs, in the AACCCUP Story, 'AACCCUP REVISITED: ACCREDITATION CIRCA 1987.

The sixth stage – The Dark Ages, came with a happy ending: The Triumph of Reason.

Indeed up to the present, reason rules in all our activities and decisions made, and to be made.

Thus, when we were informed of a resolution coming from our sister association, the Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges (PASUC), we became enthusiastic about taking hold of its contents so that we could institute reforms where these were needed.

In our accreditation process, strengths, areas needing improvement and recommendations are given at the end of the day when all records have been scrutinized and everything has been evaluated.

With scrutiny however comes validation so that the team could come out with a fair honest judgement.

The PASUC resolution is such a document. Areas needing improvement have been pointed out and the Board of Trustees has scrutinized and validated the issues item by item, with the hope that the explanations will enlighten our clientele – the PASUC members, who are also our AACCCUP members.

Issue No. 1 – The exorbitant accreditation fees. SUCs still shoulder the transportation, meals and snacks of the accreditors. The application fees should already cover such expenses.

1.1. AACCCUP Accreditation fees are not exorbitant. They can compare favorably with the fees charged by the other accrediting agencies and the expenses incurred in IQUAME. Our unofficial information is that AACCCUP charges the lowest accreditation fees.

1.2. It is correct to say that “excess income” is realized from accreditation fees, *per se*. This can be attributed to:

- reduction of cost due to transportation provided by SUCs to fetch Accreditors at certain pick up points. (The major travel expenses are shouldered by AACCCUP paid out from the accreditation fees.)
- economy measures adopted which can however damage the quality of accreditation services.

e.g., assigning an Accreditor to two sets of programs for 6 days (3 days for each SUC) a week.

1.3. Consider the following financial analysis based on actual and official 2009 AACCCUP Financial Report.

Summary of Income and Expenses - 2009:

Annual dues	P	1,140,000.00
Less: Operating/Administrative expenses		<u>3,446,631.80</u>
Excess of expenses over income (deficit)		<u>(2,306,631.80)</u>

Total accreditation fees	P	9,937,700.00
Less: Accreditation expenses		<u>7,236,805.48</u>
Excess of income over expenses (earnings)		<u>2,700,894.52</u>

	Amount
Average fee or rate per program	P 17,526.81
Average cost per program	<u>12,763.33</u>
	<u>4,763.48</u>

Special Projects (National Conference)		
Income	P	2,086,350.00
Less: Direct expenses		<u>1,930,359.53</u>
Excess of income over expenses (earnings)		<u>155,990.47</u>

Income from accreditation	P	2,700,894.52
Income from special projects		<u>155,990.47</u>
Total Increase (earnings)		2,856,884.99
Less: Excess of expenses over annual dues (deficit)		<u>(2,306,631.80)</u>
Total excess of total income over expenses (profit)		<u>550,253.19</u>

Annual funding needed to sustain AACCU as a viable and respectable quality assurance agency:

1	.	A bigger office unit		P	240,000.00
2	.	Two (2) senior staff			600,000.00
		Basic	P20,000.00		
		Benefits	5,000.00		
		Monthly compensation	<u>25,000.00</u>		
3	.	Research and publication unit			480,000.00
4	.	Increase in honoraria of Accreditors			
		Increase honoraria by 500.00 per accreditor/ assignment	P	500.00	
		Multiplied by # of accreditors per program		<u>4</u>	
		Increase in honoraria per program			2,000.00
		Multiplied by # of programs		<u>500</u>	
		Total increase in honoraria			<u>1,000,000.00</u>
		Total increase in expenses		P	<u>2,320,000.00</u>

This will entail adopting one of the following 3 alternative schemes:

Scheme 1. Annual dues to increase to 38,200.00 or an increase by 23,200; or

Total increase of expenses	P	2,320,000.00
Divide by # of members		<u>100</u>
Increase in annual dues		23,200.00
Add current amount of annual dues		<u>15,000.00</u>
Total amount of annual dues, or	P	<u>38,200.00</u>

Scheme 2. Accreditation fee to increase to 24,640.00 per program; or

Total increase of expenses	P	2,320,000.00
Divided by # of programs		<u>500</u>
Increase in accreditation fee per program		4,640.00
Add current accreditation rate		<u>20,000.00</u>
Total accreditation rate per program, or	P	<u>24,640.00</u>

* Scheme 3. Combination of both, e.g.

Increase annual dues to 20,000.00 or an increase by 5,000.00; and	P	500,000.00
---	---	------------

Increase accreditation fee to P 23, 640.00/ program or
increase by 3,640.00

	<u>1,820,000.00</u>
P	<u><u>2,320,000.00</u></u>

Issue No. 2 – There is a need for AACCCUP to improve the existing evaluation instrument making this more quantifiable in order to avoid subjectivity. This then would lead to a more objective assessment of the indicators. Relative to this, the listing of documents should already be done in the program profile and validation be done only during the ocular visit.

2.1. The Master Survey has been revised with the following features:

- We do away with the one-“Master-Survey”-instrument system. There will be one instrument tailored for each curricular program to be adopted starting SY 2010-11;
- The “one-program-one-instrument” system includes standards to evaluate the unique or special features of the program; and
- Incorporates the CHED minimum requirements.

2.2. AACCCUP evaluation is “outcomes”-oriented. (This is a global best practice) It involves evaluation based on standards which include:

- Adequacy, which is usually quantifiable; and
- Outcomes in terms of effectiveness which in most cases is “non-quantifiable” and judgment is subjective. Accreditors are trained to use “professional judgment” in assessing non-quantifiable outcomes.

2.3. Yes, we initially rely on the Program Performance Profile for the data/information needed to be able to respond to the items in the survey instrument. The Accreditor can take the following actions:

- If the PPP has adequate information, the Accreditors may either:
 - accept the information/data; and
 - validate it in documents where the PPP was sourced.
- If the PPP is not adequate, the Accreditor may look for the data/information needed from the Accreditation Center, or from other sources, like interviews, observations, or conferences.

2.4. Not mentioned in the resolution are measures taken by the Agency to minimize the documents required and to train Accreditors not to be “documents-counting”-oriented.

Issue no. 3 – For AACCCUP to set equivalent points corresponding to the different levels and once the institutions attain this, they will be awarded immediately the

level in which they qualify. The accrediting body must do away with the preliminary visit and level 3 enhancement. Further, AACUP should not downgrade the level already awarded to the institutions except in instances where they fail to sustain excellence.

3.1. Set equivalent points corresponding to the different levels.

- The minimum points and ratings to qualify for each level are already set:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Minimum Points</u>	<u>Grand Mean</u>
I	150	3.0
II	175	3.5
III	200	4.0
IV	225	4.5

3.2. And, once the institutions attain this, they will be awarded immediately the level in which they qualify.

- Yes, Good point. Thank you. This is doable. (This method is already adopted in institutional accreditation).

3.3. Do away with preliminary visit.

- Yes, why not, provided we consider and meet the following:
 - legally, it is a requirement in CMO No. 1. s. 2005; and
 - operationally, it may not be advisable to some programs as the purpose of a preliminary visit is to determine the institution's "extent of readiness" to meet the standards required to gain an accredited (at least Level I) status.

3.4. Do away with Level III enhancement:

- Good point. This can be done provided that a mechanism be devised to be able to fulfill CHED's requirement under CMO No. 1 s. 2005:

Act. IV Sec. 1.d. "Level III Reaccredited status: for programs which have been Level III re-accredited and have met the additional criteria/guidelines set by the federation/network for this level.

"Level III reaccredited undergraduate programs must satisfy the first two of the following criteria and two others of the succeeding ones:

1. a reasonably high standard of instruction;
2. a highly visible community extension program;
3. a highly visible research program;

4. A strong faculty development tradition evidenced by an appropriate budget allocation and/or systematic plan for faculty development;
5. A highly credible performance of its graduates in licensure examinations over the last 3 years;
6. Working consortia or linkages with other schools and/or agencies; and
7. Extensive and functional library and other learning resource facilities.

Level III accredited graduate program must satisfy 1 and 3 and any two of 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 above."

3.5. Should not downgrade the level already awarded to the institution except in instances where they fail to sustain excellence.

- The only instance when a program is down-graded is if it "lapsed" beyond the allowable grace period.
- If the case referred to is the change in the numbering of levels, this involves a rationalization of numbers, but is not a case of down-grading. It is required under CMO No. 1.
- Consider the following:

CMO 1	Type of Visit	Level	Rating Required	Accreditation Status
Before	Preliminary	I	2.5	Candidate
After	Preliminary	-	2.5	Candidate

Before	Formal	II	3.0	Accredited
After	1 st Survey	I	3.0	Accredited

Before	1 st Re-Survey	II	3.5	Level II Reaccredited
After	2 nd Survey	II	3.5	Level II Reaccredited

Before	2 nd Re-Survey	III	4.0	Level III Reaccredited
After	3 rd Survey	III	4.0	Level III Reaccredited

Before	4 th Survey	IV	4.5	Level IV Reaccredited
After	4 th Survey	IV	4.5	Level IV Reaccredited

Issue No. 4 – For AACUP to consider that accreditors who will evaluate the industrial technology programs should be endorsed by the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities of Industrial Technology (PACUIT) Incorporated and for said accreditors to use the evaluation instrument designed purposely for this discipline.

- 4.1. Yes, why not, provided the Accreditors endorsed by PACUIT:
- are AACCCUP Accreditors, or
 - if PACUIT becomes a registered Accrediting Agency, and is accepted for membership and recognized by the NNQAA, Accreditors may be in the AACCCUP Pool of Accreditors.
- 4.2. PACUIT can even do the Accreditation with its Accreditors if it establishes itself as a duly recognized accrediting agency.
- 4.3. And for said accreditors to use the evaluation instrument designed purposely for this discipline.
- AACCCUP can use only its instrument containing the standards approved by NNQAA, which is the duly recognized umbrella agency that clears standards, procedures, instruments, etc.
- PACUIT may recommend its instrument in the revision of the AACCCUP instrument in consultation with PACUIT and non-PACUIT members.

Issue No. 5 – To increase the minimal honorarium given to the accreditors.

- 5.1. Yes, our Accreditors deserve a higher rate of honorarium. Up to this time we have been appealing to the Accreditors' sense of personal service to the profession, and not mainly be motivated by financial rewards. We should also be willing to fund this increase of honorarium.
- 5.2. Consider this. Our Accreditors get a low rate of P 1,000 per assignment for three days. If we increase the honorarium by P 500 for each Accreditor, we need, at least, an additional amount of 2,000 per program. If this is done, the 20,000 being charged for accreditation of each program has to be raised to P 22,000.
- 5.3. And, limit their participation to at most once per semester.

Yes, we have to train more Accreditors. At present, we have only 977 Accreditors, and only half are active. During accreditation months, on the average, we engage about 50 to 70 warm bodies a week.

Issue No. 6 – For AACCCUP to evaluate their accreditors and suspend those who are very demanding.

- 6.1. AACCCUP is continuously evaluating its Accreditors. Those found violating its standards particularly on competence, relationship with Team Members and Hosts and professionalism are scratched out from the Register of Accreditors. However, the task of selecting and retaining the

best is a continuing challenge. We have adopted the following measures of evaluating Accreditors through:

- technical review of team reports; and
- evaluation during accreditation visits, done by Coordinators and Team Leaders, and/or Consultants.
- SUCs can help us by:
- reporting undesirable performance and behavior or attitude of Accreditors; and
- recommending for training only those who qualify under AACCCUP standards.

6.2. Very demanding Accreditors do not get invited again.

Issue No. 7 – For AACCCUP accreditors to accredit only institutions which have accreditation levels equal to or lower than theirs.

- We agree that this is desirable, although operationally it is difficult to assemble Accreditors who have this qualification, “equal to or higher than theirs,” and who are available for the accreditation for which they are being invited. Who will accredit programs applying for Level IV and Level III?

Issue No. 8 – Harmonized standards and criteria.

- Our standards are already harmonized with all the other Accrediting Agencies. All standards are based on CHED guidelines and are accepted by CHED under the previous regimes. Of course, we have provided for certain areas where we differ because of the nature and requirements of our respective clientele.
-

Issue No. 9 – Adaptation of accredited or deferred status without specifying any level of accreditation.

- The “accredited/not accredited” system has antedated the Philippines’ use of levels of accreditation. It is also commonly used in the European countries.
- The use of levels is an improvement of the system of using accredited/not accredited.” It is a refinement as it distinguishes the degree or level of quality. For instance, Level I may be described as “good” having passed just the threshold of what can qualify as accredited. Level II as “very good,” Level III as “excellent,” and Level IV as “outstanding.”

- While “accredited/not accredited” is used widely, many countries that are new in accreditation adopt the use of levels. A prominent example is the National Accreditation Council (NAAC) of India which is the biggest quality assurance agency in the Asia-Pacific region.
- Furthermore, the use of levels in the Philippines has practical value or use. It is a criterion in the leveling of state universities and colleges in their normative financing in the selection of centers of excellence or centers of development, and in the conversion of state colleges into universities.

Issue No. 10 – Deployment of composite pools of accreditors

- Presently, AACCUP invites and deploys 50-70 Accreditors a week during accreditation months, i.e., January to March; July to September; and November to December. It is not an easy task to assemble that number.
- AACCUP taps ALCU-COA Accreditors and vice versa. It is also desirable to top Accreditation from the private sector but this is almost impossible. As a matter of policy, AACCUP and the other accrediting agencies from FAAP using exchange Accreditors.
- It would probably be possible to exchange Accreditor drawn from the “Pool of Accreditation” organized on a voluntary basis where Accrediting Agencies can draw accreditors, also as a voluntary basis. It is administratively difficult to force accrediting agencies to draw from a “Pool of Accreditors.”
- The basic concept of accreditation in the Philippines is that it is “private and voluntary.”

Issue No. 11 – Adoption of common fees per program.

- We are amendable to this. We suggest that it be taken up in the Coordinating Council on Accreditation.

Issues No. 12 – Lapsed programs

- Consider the following data.

Summary of Lapsed Programs

	No. of Lapsed Programs				
	Total	Accreditation Conducted	Applied for Accreditation	No. of Programs Left After Conducted and Applied for	SUCs that did not reply
	484	215	56	141**	72
No. of SUCs	41	30	8+3=11*	---	8***

*Out of the 11 SUCs that applied for accreditation to be conducted in 2010, 8 have also conducted accreditation before December 31, 2010.

**This represents the number of programs that were not included among the programs where accreditation was conducted in 2009 and programs applied for accreditation to be conducted in 2010. There are 25 SUCs involved here.

- SUCs with lapsed program will be granted extended grace period Until December 31, 2010.

***These 8 SUCs are:

1. University of Northern Philippines
2. Cagayan State University
3. Palawan State University
4. La Carlota City College
5. Eastern Visayas State University
6. University of Southeastern Philippines
7. Mindanao State University (Marawe)
8. Mindanao State University (Gen. Santos City)

WE HAVE OVERCOME!

Danilo A. Hilario

Vice-President and Trustee, AACCCUP

Our Guest Speaker, the NNQAA President, Dr. Angel A. Alcala, AACCCUP key officials in the presidential table, President Serafin L. Ngohayon, Executive Director. Manuel T. Corpus, Trustees Rosana Grace Belo and Felomino Gargar, Synthesizers Nilo Colinares, Miriam Cervantes and Mariano Guillermo, SUC Presidents, Vice-Presidents and Accreditation coordinators, Good afternoon:

I would like to begin by reiterating my sincere greetings to Dr. Angel Alcala because all of us know that after his stint as the pioneering Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education, he steered the Accrediting Agency of Chartered colleges and Universities (AACCCUP) to where it is now. And being the Chair of the National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies, (NNQAA), he bails us out in some challenges we meet every now and then.

One instance here was in the early part of the year 2009, I as AACCCUP President, received a letter from the incumbent Chairman, the Hon. Emmanuel Y. Angeles, advising among others that we stop for the moment, accreditation activities, while the Coordinating Council on Accreditation, were deliberating on important issues on accreditation.

At about this time, the second week of January, survey visits were on-going specially for programs which had lapsed, future surveys had been scheduled, accreditors had been invited and plane tickets where necessary had been bought on promotional bases. But more than these, invitations for our 22nd national conference had been sent out, a few SUCs had responded and paid in advance to take advantage of discounts, and AACCCUP had made a deposit at the Manila Hotel for the February 16-17, 2009 national conference. To say the least, we would be in for trouble, if halted our activities.

We then met with the Executive Director, and scheduled a date for a visit to the CHED Chairman. On the designated day, we proceeded to the new CHED offices with Consultant Nilo Colinares, a former Technical Panel for Teacher Education Member of

the CHED in tow. And whom did we meet on our way to the office but Dr. Alcala himself! The presence of course of the original Chairman of CHED boosted our spirits as he personally accompanied us to one of his successors, Chairman Angeles. Needless to state, the conversation became very cordial, in fact smooth and easy thanks for the help of our NNQAA President. This illustrates one of the instances where he bailed us out of a challenge, even if his appearance was a happy coincidence.

Talking of coincidence , it was not one where Dr. Colinares, after an hour of looking for his notes of his Synthesis in a yellow paper with searches including the back and right pockets of polo shirt and pants, he found it later, after his synthesis, in his left pocket! But seriously, he was so good in that part of the recollection of the synthesis taken from his banner article of the Newsletter capped by an editorial. He was damn accurate in the description of events in the past, trials that we had to overcome in pursuance of higher levels of accreditation, the struggles and the restoration of the momentum of accreditation. And the editorial which began with the bold challenge of “We shall overcome!” said it all when it ended with the chant of the triumphants and victors, “We have overcome!”

Indeed, we have overcome and the show has gone on, and on, and on. Recent events all led us to this happy denouement. The validation of instruments, the pilot-test, the consultations visits and the eager preparations for institutional accreditation were encapsulated in the reports of experiences of the Central Luzon State University and the Visays State University of Dr. Mario Suba and Dr. Manuel Palomar, respectively. These two universities represented by their Accreditation coordinators, symbolized the desires and serious attempts of all of us to embrace institutional accreditation still to be complemented with program accreditation.

Finally, may I close this “Closing Remarks” wishing all participants a safe journey back home to their respective SUCs. And this wish comes from the third part of a triumvirate. Tukayong Nilo, (you were all praises for Commissioner Rosas whom you said has something in common with you, NILO, that is;) there is also something in common among the three of us ... since I’m Danilo, it’s also NILO.

Thank you and happy trip back home and regards to all.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

REGION I

Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University (DMMMSU)

1. Dr. Rosita P. Abubo
2. Dr. Angelita J. Prado
3. Dr. Elsie M. Pacho
4. Dr. Concepcion L. Bederio

University of Northern Philippines (UNP)

1. Dr. Wilma F. Medrano
2. Dr. Nelia V. Aman

Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College (ISPSC)

1. Dr. Rafael B. Querubin
2. Dr. Florante O. Vizcarra
3. Mr. Carmelo F. Beria

Mariano Marcos State University (MMSU)

1. Dr. Cristina B. Coloma

Pangasinan State University (PSU)

1. Dr. Victoriano C. Estira

REGION II

Isabela State University (ISU)

1. Dr. Emerenciana B. Claravall
2. Dr. Thelma T. Lanuza

Quirino State College (QSC)

1. Dr. Rosalyn R. Libunao
2. Ms. Isabella C. Lasquite

Nueva Vizcaya State University (NVSU)

1. Dr. Rodolfo B. Cudal
2. Dr. Jocelyn P. Cabrera

REGION III

Bataan Peninsula State University (BPSU)

1. Dr. Danilo C. Galicia
2. Ms. Arlene I. Pascual

Pampanga Agricultural College (PAC)

1. Dr. Honorio M. Soriano
2. Dr. Albert B. Leung

Bulacan State University (BSU)

1. Dr. Danilo D. Faustino
2. Dr. Alfredo G. Mendoza

Philippine Merchant Marine Academy (PMMA)

1. Dr. Obdolia M. Guanzon

Central Luzon State University (CLSU)

1. Dr. Mario S. Suba
2. Dr. Soledad M. Roguel
3. Dr. Rolando D. Dollete

Ramon Magsaysay Technological University (RMTU)

1. Dr. Thelma Q. Meer
2. Dr. Cornelio Garcia

Don Honorio Ventura Technological State University (DHVTSU)

1. Dr. Alegria C. Rivera
2. Engr. Reden M. Hernandez

Tarlac College of Agriculture (TCA)

1. Dr. Eleanor G. Hilario
2. Dr. Maria Teresa SJ. Valdez

Tarlac State University (TSU)

1. Dr. Lolita V. Sicat
2. Dr. Julieta M. Lagasca
3. Mr. Ryan C. Rivera

REGION IV-A

Batangas State University (BSU)

1. Dr. Leonila V. Antonio
2. Dr. Jimmy V. Eroa

Cavite State University (CvSU)

1. Dr. Lorna L. Penales
2. Dr. Constanca G. Cueno

Southern Luzon State University (SLSU)

1. Dr. Walberto A. Macaraan
2. Dr. Clarissa D. Maguyon

University of Rizal System (URS)

1. Dr. Araceli M. Bobadilla
2. Dr. Lourdes N. Robles

REGION IV-B

Marinduque State College (MSC)

1. Dr. Homer L. Montejo
2. Dr. Leodigario M. Jalos, Jr.

Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology (MinSCAT)

1. Dr. Cecilia G. Salazar
2. Prof. Edna G. Piol

Occidental Mindoro State College (OMSC)

1. Prof. Veronica C. Ferrer
2. Prof. Nimfa B. Pastrana

Romblon State University (RSU)

1. Dr. Jeter S. Sespene
2. Engr. Amada S. Mayuga

Western Philippines University (WPU)

1. Dr. Lourdes S. Arcilla

REGION V

Bicol University (BU)

1. Dr. Helen M. Llenaresas
2. Prof. Wilhelmina M. Nerveza
- 3.

Camarines Norte State College (CNSC)

1. Dr. Sonia S. Carbonell
2. Dr. Ela N. Regondola
3. Dr. Elsa T. Manlangit
4. Prof. Manolo A. Carbonell

Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges (CSPC)

1. Dr. Dulce F. Atian
2. Dr. Araceli E. Carreras

Catanduanes State Colleges (CSC)

1. Dr. Asuncion V. Asetre
2. Dr. Aida A. Dianela

Central Bicol State University of Agriculture (CBSUA)

1. Atty. Marito T. Bernales
2. Dr. Celeste V. Francia

Dr. Emilio B. Espinosa Sr. Memorial State College of Agriculture and Technology (DEBESMSCAT)

1. Dr. Beda C. Mingoy
2. Prof. Judith M. Loyola

Partido State University (PSU)

1. Dr. Nehlia P. Esmeralda
2. Dr. Minda P. Formalejo

Sorsogon State College (SSC)

1. Dr. Antonio E. Fuentes
2. Prof. Lydia D. Doctor

REGION VI

Aklan State University (ASU)

1. Dr. Ersyl T. Biray
2. Dr. Edna I. Gonzales
3. Prof. Clarita R. Tambong
4. Dr. Cecile O. Legaspi

Capiz State University (CapSU)

1. Dr. Aladino L. Leccio
2. Dr. Herminia B. Gomez
3. Dr. Amelita M. Sison
4. Dr. Lucy A. Beluso

Carlos Hilado Memorial State College (CHMSC)

1. Dr. Renato B. Salmingo
2. Dr. Orlando Benales
3. Dr. Edwin H. Bugna

Guimaras State College (GSC)

1. Prof. Josie H. Gaitano
2. Prof. Joel V. Japitana

Iloilo State College of Fisheries (ISCOF)

1. Dr. Teresita D. Figueroa
2. Dr. Regina P. Clavel

La Carlota City College (LCCC)

1. Ms. Virgie S. Rendon

Negros State College of Agriculture (NSCA)

1. Dr. Freddie C. Maningo
2. Dr. Joel A. Perez

Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College (NIPSC)

1. Dr. Severa M. Francisco
2. Prof. Merlyn B. Causing
3. Dr. Rolando B. Guillermo

Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology (NNSCST)

1. Prof. Myrna G. Danas
2. Dr. Adybier M. Lobaton

Technological University of the Philippines – Visayas

1. Prof. Moises M. Bonache
2. Mrs. Darla C. Diamante

Western Visayas College of Science of Technology (WVCST)

1. Dr. Ricardo B. Abalena
2. Dr. Raul F. Muyong
3. Dr. Carmelo V. Ambut
4. Dr. Ma. Asusina Asuncion Echaveria

West Visayas State University (WVSU)

1. Dr. Editha Y. Sillorequez
2. Dr. Rosana Grace B. Belo

REGION VII

Bohol Island State University (BISU)

1. Dr. Louis T. Palapar
2. Dr. Arnulfo C. Olandria
3. Dr. Inocencio L. Cosare
4. Prof. Virgilia D. Tejada
5. Dr. Fernando L. Restificar
6. Dr. Dioscoro A. Avergonzado

Cebu Normal University (CNU)

1. Prof. Aida L. dela Cerna

Cebu Technological University (CTU)

1. Dr. Rebecca D. Manalastas
2. Dr. Adora A. Villaganas
3. Dr. Ledesma R. Layon

Negros Oriental State University (NORSU)

1. Dr. Ester V. Tan

Siquijor State College (SSC)

1. Dr. Maria Imogen T. Quilicot
2. Mr. Jose Emilio E. Artiaga

REGION VIII

Eastern Samar State University (ESSU)

1. Dr. Leonor T. Obon
2. Dr. Norma V. Lombrio
3. Dr. Cristina A. Mendoza

Eastern Visayas State University (EVSU)

1. Dr. Catalino B. Beltran
2. Dr. Dominador O. Aguirre, Jr

Leyte Normal University (LNU)

1. Dr. Evelyn C. Cruzada
2. Dr. Nestor R. Sedanza

Naval State University (NSU)

1. Dr. Edita S. Genson
2. Dr. Loreta M. Besayo
3. Mrs. Nenita S. Sereno

Northwest Samar State University (NwSSU)

19. Dr. Avelina N. Bergado

Palompon Institute of Technology (PIT)

1. Dr. Jacinto P. Balunan
2. Dr. Jimmy R. Combista

Samar State University (SSU)

1. Dr. Eusebio T. Pacolor
2. Dr. Marilyn D. Cardoso

Southern Leyte State University (SLSU)

1. Dr. Jane M. Labastida
2. Dr. Juanita M. Costillas

University of Eastern Philippines (UEP)

1. Dr. Felisa L. Sanico
2. Dr. Gregorio T. dela Rosa

Visayas State University (VSU)

1. Dr. Oscar B. Posas
2. Dr. Lualhati M. Noriel

REGION IX

Jose Rizal Memorial State University (JRMSU)

1. Dr. Cecilia S. Saguin
2. Dr. Luvisminda N. Paquibot
3. Dr. Wilfredo D. Carreon. Jr.
4. Dr. Bernard G. Gilaga
5. Dr. Nenfa R. Taub
6. Dr. Luz L. Sy

Zamboanga City State Polytechnic College (ZCSPC)

1. Dr. Edwin L. Evangelista
2. Dr. Felixberto B. Pagayonan
3. Dr. Carlos C. Lolo

REGION X

Bukidnon State University (BSU)

1. Dr. Cornelia T. Partosa
2. Dr. Beatriz C. Garcia

Camiguin Polytechnic State College (CPSC)

1. Mr. Alexander N. Morados

Central Mindanao University (CMU)

1. Dr. Maria Luisa R. Soliven
2. Dr. Nenita I. Prado

Mindanao University of Science and Technology (MUST)

1. Dr. Ruth G. Cabahug
2. Dr. Ruel R. Cabahug
3. Dr. Nenita D. Palmes

REGION XI

Davao del Norte State College (DNSC)

1. Dr. Julieta S. Abarquez

Southern Philippines Agri-business, Marine and Aquatic School of Technology (SPAMAST)

1. Dr. Alexander M. Campaner
2. Prof. Maychelle M. Nugas

Davao Oriental State College of Science and Technology (DOSCST)

1. Dr. Apolinar T. Paulican

University of Southeastern Philippines (USEP)

1. Dr. Daniel T. Ugay, Jr.
2. Dr. Felomino A. Gargar

REGION XII

Cotabato City State Polytechnic College (CCSPC)

1. Dr. Thelma F. Villa
2. Prof. Mohamadtaha S. Pentaliday
3. Prof. Erlinda M. Bunao

Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology (CFCST)

1. Dr. Makalutang B. Luna
2. Dr. Delfin P. Moreno
3. Dr. Analiza B. Valencia

University of Southern Mindanao (USM)

1. Dr. Ruth C. Mapanao

Sultan Kudarat State University (SKSU)

1. Dr. Teresita L. Cambel
2. Dr. Rebecca L. Loja
3. Dr. Rolando F. Hechanova

CAR

Abra State Institute of Sciences and Technology (ASIST)

1. Prof. Conrado T. Agdalpen
2. Prof. Evangeline B. Alcos

Ifugao State University (IfSU)

1. Dr. Serafin L. Ngohayon
2. Dr. Diosdado M. Aquino
3. Dr. Faith B. Basilio

Apayao State College (ASC)

15. Prof. Evelyn P. Alvarez
16. Arch. Maria Ionica N. Naz

Kalinga Apayao State College (KASC)

1. Dr. Carmelita T. Ayang-ang
2. Dr. Elsie C. Coyoy

Benguet State University (BSU)

1. Dr. Asuncion L. Nagpala
2. Dr. Feliciano G. Calora, Jr.

Mountain Province State Polytechnic College (MPSPC)

1. Dr. Geraldine L. Madjaco
2. Dr. Nena D. Perez

CARAGA

Agusan del Sur State College of Agriculture and Technology (ASCAT)

1. Dr. Doroteo E. Jaquias
2. Dr. Juarlito V. Garcines

Surigao del Sur Polytechnic State College (SSPSC)

1. Dr. Remegita C. Olvida
2. Mrs. Lourdes C. Doliente
3. Dr. Rebecca S. Sanchez

Caraga State University (CaragaSU)

1. Dr. Myrna D. Kuizon
2. Dr. Luisito I. Tabada

Surigao State College of Technology (SSCT)

1. Dr. Virginia D. Akiate
2. Prof. Emmylou A. Borja

ARMM

Basilan State College (BSC)

1. Dr. Orlando L. Fajardo

Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology (MSU-IIT)

1. Dr. Brigida A. Roscom

NCR

Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST)

1. Dr. Elizabeth Soriano
2. Dr. Lourdes G. Bandy

Philippine Normal University (PNU)

1. Dr. Lolita H. Nava
2. Dr. Rene R. Belecina
3. Dr. Lydia B. Liwanag
4. Dr. Glenda O. de Lara

Marikina Polytechnic College

1. Ms. Virginia D. Bacay
2. Prof. Merliwinda S. Collo

Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP)

1. Dr. Milagrina A. Gomez
2. Dr. Amalia C. Rosales
3. Prof. Maria Teresa C. Villar

Rizal Technological University (RTU)

1. Prof. Rosa F. Diestro

Technological University of the Philippines (TUP)

1. Dr. Viola T. delos Reyes
2. Dr. Benedicto N. Fortaleza

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

(2009-2011)

DR. SERAFIN L. NGOHAYON

President and Chairman

DR. DANILO S. HILARIO

Vice-President and Vice-Chairman

DR. SOLEDAD M. ROGUEL

Secretary and Trustee

DR. MARIA TERESA S.J. VALDEZ

Treasurer and Trustee

DR. BRIGIDA A. ROSCOM

Auditor and Trustee

DR. EVELYN C. CRUZADA

Trustee

DR. MARIO S. SUBA

Trustee

DR. RICARDO E. ROTORAS

Trustee

DR. ROSANA GRACE B. BELO

Trustee

DR. RAUL F. MUYONG

Trustee

DR. FELOMINO A. GARGAR

Trustee

DR. MANUEL T. CORPUS

Executive Director and Trustee