

**ASIA PACIFIC
QUALITY NETWORK
CONFERENCE AND
ANNUAL GENERAL
MEETING**

MAY 25-27, 2016

NATADOLA, FIJI

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

NENITA I. PRADO, PhD
Faculty, CENTRAL MINDANAO UNIVERSITY
Secretary, AACUP Board

INTRODUCTION

AACCUP has taken cognizance of the following potential incentives granted to accredited programs or institutions:

1

- as a national basis for budgetary allocation and normative financing

2

- as a factor in the selection of COE/COD and for leveling of SUCs

3

- as a requirement for the conversion of a college to a university

4

- as a factor in assessing the appointment of a SUC President.

Despite all these benefits derived from accreditation, considerably less attention has been given to a study on the ideal accreditor in terms of:

- Commendable Practices
- Challenges
- Rewards

Several problems arose in the preparation for accreditation.

Dumancas and Prado (2013) cited “preparation of documents” as one of the serious problems in preparing for accreditation visit.

This is followed by:

- Facilities
- Administrative Support
- Attitudes of faculty towards accreditation and
- Qualifications of accreditors

Dumancas (2013) found that the best predictor of the quality of program is the best practices in the preparation of AACUP accreditation.

This is followed by the school factors such as:

- number of students;
- passing rate in the licensure examinations conducted by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC);
- CHED recognition as COE/COD; and
- improvement of learning outcomes.

School factors include the identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Once the strengths of the program are nurtured and the weaknesses are being addressed, there is no reason for a school to fail in program quality.

Attitude towards accreditation is another variable that correlates with program quality.

This indicates that the more positive the attitude of faculty and accreditors toward accreditation, the higher the quality of the program.

Prado, et.al (2012) pointed out that the attitudes of the accreditors is also a serious problem.

In the same study, among the demographic characteristics only the **position or designation** of the accreditor is significantly related with **program quality**.

This means that there is positive relationship between **position** and the **quality of academic program**.


This implies that accreditors with high position or educational qualification are effective in assessing the quality of academic programs.

This result is substantiated by the statement of **Corpus and Ngohayon (2012)** that AACUP adopts a very careful process in selecting its accreditors.


However, experience shows that drawing the **best from the academe** is not a guarantee of their **fitness** for doing the delicate task of assessing programs and institutions.

METHODOLOGY

The instrument used in this study was adopted from the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology ABET (2013) and was modified to suit the needs of the participants of the study.



It was **pilot tested** to make sure that it fits the Philippine setting.



The survey questionnaires were answered by 183 **participants** and subjected to reliability analysis.



It has a reliability coefficient of **0.96** which indicates that the questionnaire is **very highly reliable** since it is greater than the standard value of **0.821**.

RULES OF THUMB

(GLIEM AND GLIEM, 2003)

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient	Interpretation
Above 0.90	Excellent
0.81- 0.89	Good
0.71-0.80	Acceptable
0.61-0.70	Questionable
0.50-0.60	Poor
Below 0.50	Unacceptable

As an exploratory study, **factor analysis** was used to determine the constructs for an ideal AACUP **accreditor**.

Qualifications, competencies, credibility and accountability of accreditors were obtained through a **survey questionnaire**.

Challenges as well as **rewards** for accreditors were obtained through **focus group discussions, interviews and observations**.

As to factor interpretation, **Comrey** points out, as cited by Prado and Tan (2012), that **high factor loading suggests a greater overlapping of true variance between the factor and the statement.**

ORTHOGONAL FACTOR LOADING (COMREY)

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient	Interpretation
0.75 above	Excellent
0.63-0.74	Very Good
0.55-0.62	Good
0.45-0.54	Fair
0.32-0.44	Poor

Heise, Guertin and Bailey as cited by Salvendy (2011) says that a **factor loading of 0.5** is a **very suitable** item for evaluating a factor.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Indices of Factor Analysis

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.735
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approximate Chi-Square	7755.933
	df	3003
	Sig.	0.000

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Eigenvalues and percent of variance explained

Factor Extracted	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percent of Variance
1	19.177	24. 586	24. 586
2	4.222	5.413	30.000
3	3.207	4.111	34.111
4	2.716	3.482	37.593
5	2.514	3.223	40.617
6	2.414	3.095	43.912
7	2.138	2.741	46.653
8	2.047	2.624	49.277

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3. Factor Loadings of the Accreditor as an Effective Communicator

Construct 1. Competence	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. Report is written grammatically correct.	0.79	Excellent
2. The accreditor dresses appropriately.	0.73	Excellent
3. Courtesy is shown to all.	0.72	Excellent
4. AACCCUP code of conduct are observed at all times.	0.63	Very Good
5. Active participation in all sessions and group activities is evident.	0.62	Very Good
6. Punctuality in all sessions is observed.	0.62	Very Good

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Construct 1. Competence	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
7. Reports are submitted on time.	0.61	Good
8. Knowledge on the accreditation process is adequately exhibited.	0.61	Good
9. Pronunciations and enunciations are clear.	0.57	Good
10. Specific findings are prepared specifically.	0.54	Fair
11. Deadlines are met.	0.51	Fair
12. Report is delivered within time allotment.	0.49	Fair

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4. Factor Loadings of the Professional Accreditor

Construct 2. Professional Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. There is evidence that institutional management includes leadership, feasibility and adequacy.	0.624	Very Good
2. Audience's attention is captured.	0.593	Very Good
3. Interest in improving education is demonstrated.	0.573	Very Good
4. Quality and ongoing quality improvement in courses, programs and degrees are assured.	0.572	Very Good
5. Evidence that students are subjected to meaningful assessments where they get "real information on their performance" are shown.	0.552	Good
6. Observations to stimulate innovation and further the program's effort toward improvement are made.	0.527	Fair

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Construct 2. Professional Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
7. Technical knowledge is applied to ascertain the level of conformance to program accreditation requirements.	0.526	Fair
8. Relevance that the surrounding environment and global society is felt.	0.523	Fair
9. Supportive observations are effectively cited that relates to appropriate criteria and suggests possible venues to resolution.	0.504	Fair
10. Program findings are compared with other team members to improve consistency.	0.499	Fair
11. Report is presented in logical sequence.	0.498	Fair
12. Contribution to the evaluation process is committed and value added.	0.484	Fair

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Construct 2. Professional Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
13. Focused, concise oral briefings are presented.	0.474	Fair
14. Performance in the written examination is very high.	0.464	Fair
15. Lifelong learning is engaged in and field of specialization is updated.	0.415	Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 5. Factor Loadings of the Organized Accreditor

Construct 3. Organized Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. Professional appearance and demeanor are conveyed.	0.627	Good
2. The accreditor is educationally qualified.	0.623	Good
3. Specific requirements are disseminated.	0.539	Fair
4. Collaboration and networking are applied among the members of the team for decision making.	0.486	Fair
5. Word processing programs, spreadsheets are used.	0.482	Fair
6. Program Performance Profile (PPP) is made available in the Accreditation Center.	0.463	Fair

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Construct 3. Organized Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
7. Inputs into the context are considered.	0.461	Fair
8. There is evidence that sustainability includes continuity, selectivity and equity.	0.448	Fair
9. Briefing and orientation about their assignment of key areas are conducted among accreditors.	0.419	Poor
10. Membership in technical and professional societies is given importance.	0.409	Poor
11. Other team members are assisted as needed during the visit.	0.408	Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 6. Factor Loadings of the Objective Accreditor

Construct 4. Objective Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives (VMGO) of the institution are made clear as the basis of other key areas.	0.671	Very Good
2. Formal education and degree appropriate to the field are possessed by the accreditor.	0.641	Very Good
3. Experiences with accreditation processes and quality improvement are valued.	0.569	Very Good
4. There is evidence that efficiency includes punctuality, effectiveness and productivity.	0.492	Fair
5. High integrity and ethical standards are observed carefully.	0.453	Fair

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Construct 4. Objective Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
6. Professional respect for institutions faculty and staff is shown.	0.405	Poor
7. Take charge initiative is shown.	0.401	Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 7. Factor Loadings of the Accreditor as a Team Player

Construct 5. Team Player	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. Program strengths and weaknesses are evaluated constructively.	0.679	Very Good
2. Findings for exit conference are objective.	0.597	Good
3. Common issues across programs are discussed thoroughly.	0.574	Good
4. There is evidence that academic atmosphere shows conducive climate for academic activities.	0.479	Fair
5. Members are introduced with their assigned key areas.	0.419	Poor
6. AACCUP and responsible technical society are represented very well as practicing professional.	0.408	Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 8. Factor Loadings of Technically Current Accreditor

Construct 6. Technically Current	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. Documents prepared are complete and accurate.	0.584	Good
2. The PPP is complete and accurate.	0.525	Fair
3. Compliance of the recommendations of the last visit in the PPP is included.	0.437	Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 9. Factor Loadings of the Service-Oriented Accreditor

Construct 7. Service-Oriented Accreditor	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. Courtesy call with the President of the institution is encouraged.	0.578	Good
2. Documents are arranged according to the items in the instrument.	0.515	Good
3. Triangulation is used in assessing the different key areas.	0.500	Fair
4. The accreditor possesses both oral and written competence	0.445	Fair
5. Cluster coordinator and the Team Leader are introduced during the opening program.	0.435	Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 10. Factor Loadings of the Educationally Qualified Accreditor

Construct 8. Educationally Qualified	Factor Loading	Qualitative Description
1. Preliminary program strengths and weakness assessment based upon review of materials supplied prior to the visit are formulated.	0.564	Good
2. Program is evaluated against criteria within the context of the institution.	0.531	Fair
3. Findings are validated through interviews.	0.515	Fair
4. Critical issues are given attention and minute details are avoided.	0.456	Fair
5. Pointing against criteria within the context of the institution is minimized.	0.421	Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 11. Commendable Practices of the Accreditors

No.	Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Meaning
1	Writes accurate reports of the results of assessment.	5.0	Very Highly Commendable
2	Delivers accurate report on the strengths, areas needing improvement and recommendation during the exit conference.	5.0	Very Highly Commendable
3	Encourages to have a courtesy call with the President of the institution.	5.0	Very Highly Commendable
4	Arranges document according to the items in the instrument.	4.9	Very Highly Commendable
5	Sees to it that the PPP is complete and accurate	4.9	Very Highly Commendable
6	Checks to see if documents prepared follow the items in the instrument.	4.8	Very Highly Commendable
7	Prepares complete and accurate document.	4.8	Very Highly Commendable

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

No.	Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Meaning
8	Applies collaboration and networking among the members of the team for decision making.	4.7	Very Highly Commendable
9	Makes sure that Program Performance Profile (PPP) is available in the Accreditation Center	4.7	Very Highly Commendable
10	Meets accreditors for briefing and orientation about their assignment of key areas.	4.61	Very Highly Commendable
11	Searches for evidence that students are subjected to meaningful assessments where they get “real information on their performance”.	4.6	Very Highly Commendable
12	Uses triangulation in assessing the different key areas.	4.6	Very Highly Commendable
13	Ensures that assessments of all key areas are being done at the Accreditation Center to allow comparison across programs.	4.6	Very Highly Commendable

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

No.	Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Meaning
14	Searches for evidence that institutional management includes leadership, feasibility and adequacy.	4.5	Highly Commendable
15	Assures and strengthen quality and ongoing quality improvement in courses, programs and degrees.	4.5	Highly Commendable
16	Makes the Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives of the institution as the basis of other key areas.	4.4	Highly Commendable
17	Assures that relevance at the surrounding environment and global society is felt.	4.3	Highly Commendable
18	Searches for evidence that academic atmosphere shows conducive climate for academic activities.	4.3	Highly Commendable
19	Introduces their members with their assigned key areas.	4.3	Highly Commendable

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

No.	Indicator	Mean	Descriptive Meaning
20	Searches for evidence that efficiency includes punctuality, effectiveness and productivity.	4.2	Highly Commendable
21	Searches for evidence that sustainability includes continuity, selectivity and equity.	4.2	Highly Commendable
22	Includes compliance of the recommendations of the last visit in the PPP.	4.2	Highly Commendable
23	Introduces cluster coordinator and the Team Leader during the opening program.	4.1	Highly Commendable
24	Requires survey visit for all programs.	4.0	Highly Commendable
25	Creates a Task Force by the institution are introduced in the opening program.	3.67	Highly Commendable

ACCREDITORS' QUALIFICATIONS, COMPETENCIES, CREDIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Factor Analysis on the Qualifications, Competencies, Credibility and Accountability of the AACCCUP Accreditor Scale

Of the **89 items subjected to reliability analysis 75 items** were left with correlation coefficients of **.61** and above included in the factor analysis because these were the only items considered reliable.

CHALLENGES

Results revealed that the accreditors faced a lot of challenges.

One challenge is how to sustain the professional commitment and dedication of accreditors considering the many responsibilities they perform in their respective stations.

The risks they may take in traveling to institutions located in far places create fear for some accreditors.

Long distance and travel time from station to the destination discourage accreditors to accept invitation.

Late invitation poses challenge to the accreditors especially in adjusting with their programmed schedule of engagements, which in most cases result to non-acceptance to the invitation.

CHALLENGES


In addition, accreditors find it hard to carry the big task of accreditation for a short period of time.


More so, they find it difficult to work in many areas or programs in cases when only a few accreditors finally report to the institution.


Accreditors with personality problems also create discomfort to the team members and even to the local task force.

Finally, ensuring the highest level of objectivity and fairness remain a big challenge to professional accreditors especially with their personal biases and prejudices.

REWARDS

- 
- Results disclosed that because of the potential risks from participation in accreditation, accreditors would like AACCUP to have group insurance to protect their welfare.

- 
- The token or honorarium they receive is deemed minimal; hence, they suggested its increase to reward them for the tedious job of accreditation.

- 
- The participants of the study suggested that AACCUP should issue designation to accreditors as supporting evidence for promotion under NBC 461.

- 
- International travel grants may be considered for senior accreditors for benchmarking of best practices in prestigious higher education institutions abroad.

CONCLUSIONS

Factor analysis generates eight constructs of qualifications as an accreditor, namely **effective communicator, professional, organized, objective, team player, technically current, service-oriented, and educationally qualified.**

Very highly commendable practices of accreditors include among others **writing accurate reports** of the results of the assessment; **delivering accurate report** on the strengths, areas needing improvement and recommendation during the exit conference; and encouraging to have a **courtesy call** with the President of the institution.

CONCLUSIONS

Challenges faced by accreditors come in various forms. They include **sustaining commitment** amidst multiple responsibilities in their home institutions, the **potential risks** of participation, **long distance and travel time**, **late invitation**, **short period of time** in carrying the task of accreditation, **multiple area or program assignments**, **personality problems** of some team members, and ensuring the highest level of **objectivity and fairness**.

CONCLUSIONS

Rewards to boost the motivation of accreditors in the form of **group insurance**, **increased honorarium** or token, **issuance of designation** by AACCCUP to accreditors to support promotion under NBC 461, and **international travel grants** may be granted to them.

REFERENCES

AACCUP, 2006.

- MANUAL ON Accreditation, AACCUP, Quezon City.

Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET) 2013.

- “Competency Model for Program Evaluators”, ABET, 111 Market Place, Ste 1050, Baltimore, MD 21202-4012.

Corpus, M.T. and S. Ngohayon. 2012.

- The Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines(AACCUP). Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures and practices. AACCUP, Quezon City.

Dumancas, G. A. 2013.

- Impact of Accreditation on the Quality of Academic Programs of Central Mindanao University: Future Directions and Challenges. Unpublished Dissertation. Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Bukidnon.

Dumancas, G. A. & Prado, N.I. 2015.

Gliem, J.A. and R.R Gliem. 2003.

- Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert - Type Scales. Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing and Community Education. Retrieved September 21, 2011 from <http://www.alumni-osu.org/midwest>.

Salvan, E. P. 2011.

- Constructs of Self-efficacy Beliefs Among Mathematics Teachers: A Validation. Unpublished Masters’ Thesis. Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Bukidnon.

Soliven, M.L.R., A.M.Penaso and N.I.Prado. 2012.

- “Managing a Vast Program for Accreditation in the Sciences, Engineering and Technology: The CMU Experience”. Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures and Practices. AACCUP, Quezon City.

Impact of Accreditation on the Quality of Academic Programs of Central Mindanao University: Future Directions and Challenges

Thank you very much for listening!

Questions

