

ACCREDITATION SYSTEM

Standards

Based on AACCUP, the following are the standard systems followed when having an accreditation:

- Adherence to government policies (CMO # 1 s. 2005)
- Membership in NNQAA
- Membership in international bodies
 - APQN, which is based in Hong Kong
 - INQAAHE, which is based in Dublin, Ireland
- Ten Areas of Evaluation
- Levels of Accreditation (based on CMO #1 series of 2005)
 - Level I accredited status (Minimum GM of 3.0)
 - Level II reaccredited status (Minimum of GM 3.5)
 - Level III reaccredited status (Minimum of GM 4.0)
 - Level IV reaccredited status (Minimum of GM 4.5)
 - Candidate Status is awarded to programs subjected to preliminary survey visit and obtains a grand mean of not less than 2.5 and with no area rated lower than 2.0
- Rating System provides a guide for analytical evaluation
 - Numerical and descriptive ratings for adequacy, effectiveness or both
 - 5-point scale excluding zero, with 5 as highest and 1 as lowest
 - Peer rating and team decision making.

Process

- Preparing Documents in Area I to Area IV
 - PPP
 - Self-survey instrument
- Internal Quality Assurance Team (IQAT)
 - Headed by Internal Accreditation Body and will give:
 - Recommendation
 - Activities, standards, accreditation process
- Formal application of SUC for an AACCUP visit, thru its President, with the letter accompanied by submission of the PPP (hard and soft copies)
- Acceptance and approval of the request with an official letter from AACCUP detailing the following:
 - Particulars of the program (scope, location)

- Type of Accreditation survey
- Schedule of on-site visit
- Accreditors to be invited
- Accreditation fee
- Accommodation/arrangements (working areas, meals, transport, etc)
- Staff counterparts
- Responsibilities of the host SUC
- Responsibilities of AACCUP
- Organization of team/s of accreditors by AACCUP 3-4 weeks prior to the visit with consideration of the following:
 - Accreditors belong to the official AACCUP register and are active
 - Accreditors have specializations that are the same or related to the program to be assessed
 - Accreditors has no conflict of interest (do not come from the same region, are not alumni of the SUC, has no relative in the SUC whether student, faculty or employee)
 - Accreditors are not unacceptable to the host SUC
- Conduct of on-site visit
 - 3 days for preliminary, 1st and 2nd survey visits with 5 accreditors
 - 4-5 days for 3rd and 4th survey visits with 6-8 accreditors
 - Major activities include:
 - Team meetings
 - Courtesy call, opening program, orientation/briefing
 - Data/information gathering (documents, interviews, on-site visitations, ocular inspection/observation, etc)
 - Data/information analysis, team reporting, rating, decision making
 - Exit conference
 - Administrative matters (reimbursement of travelling expenses, payment of per diem allowance & token honorarium)
- Submission of team report/s to AACCUP by the OC or TL

The Survey Instrument

- The survey instruments are program specific. These are tools used as guide to the accreditors for rating. It consists of a set of ten areas/criteria and benchmark statements under each criteria. The benchmark statements are specific standards based on specific policies and good practices.
- The survey instrument has provision for rating of each benchmark statement, section mean and the area mean. Area means are summarized for computing the grand mean using weighted average.

- Each of the areas is evaluated in the context of some parameters.

Area	Parameters	Number of Parameters
Area I. Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives	Vision of the Institution 1. Statement of VMGO 2. Dissemination and Acceptability	3
Area II. Faculty	1. Academic Qualification And Professional Experiences 2. Recruitment, Selection and Orientation 3. Faculty Adequacy and Loading 4. Rank and Tenure 5. Faculty and Development 6. Professional Performance and Scholarly Works 7. Salaries, Fringe Benefits and incentives 8. Professionalism	8

- For the remaining areas, the Undergraduate Teacher Education program is cited.

Area	Title	Number of Parameters
Area III	Curriculum and Instruction	7
Area IV	Support to Students	6
Area V	Research	4
Area VI	Extension and Community Development	4
Area VII	Library	7
Area VIII	Physical Plant and Facilities	11
Area IX	Laboratories	4
Area X	Administration	8

- The PPP is basically for internal evaluation, while the survey instrument is for external evaluation by peers, of the academic program. The information in both sources can be used to make judgment in rating the benchmark statement.

Procedures of Evaluating a Program

Activities in evaluating a program are most critical, to come up with an objective and fair judgment. Hence the following are recommended as guide to accreditors.

- Familiarize yourself with the survey instrument, especially the area/s assigned to you.
- Know the minimum standards of the program under survey. Sources of minimum standards may be extracted from CHED CMOs or from the Professional Regulation Board.
- Know exactly what data/information such as the following:
 - PPP
 - Documents at the Accreditation Center
 - Interviews with students, staff, administrators, beneficiaries of project and other stakeholders.
 - Class observations
 - Campus tours
 - Conferences
 - Visits to projects
 - Annual reports, etc.

The Rating System

- Guide to rating using a scale of 0-5
- The concept of adequacy and effectiveness

The rating system provides a guide for analytical evaluation. Based on the pieces of evidence gathered from various sources, the rating involves two (2) steps as it considers two (2) aspects, i.e. the adequacy or effectiveness of the provision. What follow are the details of how the evaluation is done:

- Assess the evidence obtained from various sources. Establish the existence of the required provision/s. In the instrument, the code M stands for missing; NA for not applicable, and E for existing provision. This is the first step of evaluation.
- The second step of evaluation applies to provisions that are existing. A provision is rated according to its adequacy, functional effectiveness, or both. Note that a provision (benchmark statement) is rated only once as either on adequacy (A), effectiveness (E), or a composite of both adequacy and effectiveness (AE). The choice is predetermined, and is indicated by the highlighted (___) item. The process of giving numerical score is outlined below:
 - Each benchmark statement calls for judging its adequacy, functional effectiveness or both adequacy, functional effectiveness or both adequacy and effectiveness. Coding for each category is presented in the instrument, using the letter A, for adequacy; E, for effectiveness; and AE for a composite of both adequacy and effectiveness.
 - Adequacy and effectiveness statements are rated using numerical scores shown in Table 1 below. The score ranges from 0 to 5, and each score is given its description.

Table 1. Adequacy and Effectiveness Descriptive Rating:

Numerical Rating	Adequacy	Effectiveness
5	Very Adequate	Functioning and Excellently Effective
4	More than Adequate	Functioning and Very Effective
3	Adequate	Functioning and Effective
2	Moderately Adequate	Functioning but Not Effective
1	Not Adequate	Functioning Poorly
0	Missing	Not functioning

- For statements referring to adequacy and where there are available standards and policies prescribed by agencies such as DOST/CHED/PRC or similar appropriate bodies, the scheme of determining the level of adequacy and its corresponding rating is described in Table 2. Note that when a provision is necessary but missing, it gets a zero (0) score.

Provision	Level of Adequacy
126% and above of the prescribed minimum	5
101% - 125% of the prescribed minimum	4
76% - 100% of the prescribed minimum	3
51%-75% of the prescribed minimum	2
50% and below the prescribed minimum	1
Provision is necessary but missing	0

Table 2. Guide to Level of Adequacy

When the provision calls for a quantifiable requirement as in “a.1” below, adequacy score is 3 for minimum compliances.

Illustration A:

	Provision	Adequacy
a.1	At least 60% of the faculty is in full-time assignment in the program.	3
	If the numerical requirement of 60% is complied with, the rating will be 3 (since 3 is the minimum required rating for accredited status).	
	Compliance above the 60% requirement may be rated either 4 or 5; below 60%, rating is either 2 or 1.	

- To assess the functional effectiveness of a service, a system, a process, or a practice, an ordinal score is determined using the scheme below.

Table 3. Assessment of Functional Effectiveness

Functional Effectiveness	Rating
81-100% implementation/participation	5
61-80% implementation/participation	4
41-60% implementation/participation	3
21-40% implementation/participation	2
1-20% implementation/participation	1
Not implemented/no participation	0

Illustration B:

	Provision	Functional Effectiveness
b.2.	Recruitment and selection of faculty is a participative process.	4

The rating score of 4 refer to the process, representing 61-80% participation.

- For benchmarks processing the two aspects of evaluation, namely, adequacy and effectiveness, the two scores are combined to give a composite rating (A E) using the table shown below.

Table 4. Composite Rating

Adequacy (A)	Functional Effectiveness (E)	Numerical Rating	Description
5	5	5	Excellent
	4	4	Very Satisfactory
	3	4	Very Satisfactory
	2	3	Satisfactory
	1	3	Satisfactory
	0	2	Poor
4	5	5	Excellent
	4	4	Very Satisfactory
	3	3	Satisfactory
	2	3	Satisfactory
	1	2	Poor
	0	2	Poor
3	5	4	Very Satisfactory
	4	4	Very Satisfactory
	3	3	Satisfactory
	2	2	Poor
	1	2	Poor

	0	1	Very Poor
2	5	4	Very Satisfactory
	4	3	Satisfactory
	3	3	Satisfactory
	2	2	Poor
	1	1	Very Poor
	0	1	Very Poor
1	5	3	Satisfactory
	4	3	Satisfactory
	3	2	Poor
	2	2	Poor
	1	1	Very Poor
	0	0	Not functioning
0		0	Provision is necessary but missing
N/A		N/A	Provision does not apply

- Accomplishing the Instrument's Rating:
 - Numerical rating for each item or sub-item is a whole number. Where there is a need to get the average of two (2) or more items, limit decimal places to two (2).
 - Section Mean: Average the numerical rating of each major item in each Section. Use only two (2) decimal places.
 - Use the spaces provided to indicate for the M and NA symbols when needed.
 - Complete the Statistical and Descriptive Area Rating.
 - Using the above data, complete the Summary of Ratings.
- Computing and Interpreting the Ratings:

AREA	Weight	Area Mean	Weighted Mean
I. Mission, Goals and Objectives	--		
II. Faculty	8		
III. Curriculum and Instruction	8		
IV. Students	8		
V. Research	5		
VI. Extension and Community Involvement	4		
VII. Library	5		
VIII. Physical Plant and Facilities	3		
IX. Laboratories	4		
X. Administration	5		
Over total	50		
Grand Mean			
Descriptive Rating			

- Area Mean x Weight Value = Weighted Mean
- Sum of Weighted Means/ Sum of Weights (50) = Grand Mean
- Indicate the Descriptive Rating using the scale below:

1 – 1.49	-	1	-	Poor
1.5 – 2.49	-	2	-	Fair
2.50 – 3.49	-	3	-	Good
3.50 – 4.49	-	4	-	Very Good
4.50 – 4.99/5.00	-	5	-	Excellent

- Required Ratings for the award of Accreditation Status:

<u>Type of Survey</u>	<u>Required Ratings</u>	<u>Accreditation Status</u>
a. Internal Survey Visit (Preliminary)	Grand Mean ≥ 2.50 None among the areas is rated less than 2.00	Candidate Status
b. 1 st Survey Visit (Formal)	Grand Mean ≥ 3.00 None among the areas is rated less than 2.50	Accredited Level I
c. 2 nd Survey Visit (First Resurvey)	Grand Mean ≥ 2.50 None among the areas is rated less than 2.00	Accredited Level II
d. 3 rd Survey Visit (Second Resurvey)	Grand Mean ≥ 2.50 None among the areas is rated less than 2.00	Accredited Level III