

PRIMER ON THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT OF HEIS

Introduction

Quality in higher education is often defined as “fitness for purpose”, but it can also be understood in terms of “transformation” of stakeholders, especially for mature institutions (Harvey & Green, 1993). Thus, CHED views *quality as the alignment and consistency of outcomes with the institution’s vision-mission and goals, demonstrated by learning and service outcomes at exceptional levels, and by a shared culture of quality.*

HEIs must engage this challenge of having, preserving, and improving quality for it to develop into a mature institution, and this translates to having a mindset for quality assurance (QA). According to Church (1988; Harvey & Green, 1993), “Quality assurance is not about specifying the standards or specifications against which to measure or control quality. Quality assurance is about *ensuring that there are mechanisms, procedures and processes in place to ensure that the desired quality, however defined and measured, is delivered.*”

The internal capacity of HEIs to translate policy into quality programs and quality results depends on established internal QA systems. The starting point of QA is the articulation of the desired quality outcomes, set within the context of the HEI’s Vision, Mission, and Goals (VMG). This is the foundation for the development of a proper learning environment (content, methodology, and resources for the delivery of programs and services), assessment tools (performance indicators, instruments), and the systems and processes that are responsible for quality outcomes as well as sustainable programs and initiatives. QA will then look at institutional performance in terms of the HEI’s capacity to translate policy (in terms of VMG) into quality programs and quality results.

Furthermore, CHED takes the view that the strategic approach to QA involves developing the capacity of HEIs to design and deliver high quality programs that meet the needs of the Philippines, and which achieve standards comparable to those of universities in other countries with which the Philippines competes in global markets.

At the global and regional levels, countries need to demonstrate that their education systems match world-class standards. The changing realities spurred by globalization underscore the shift in contemporary international education discourse from education to lifelong learning, from education as transmission of expert knowledge to education as building learner competencies—including learning how to learn. Jobs can be moved readily from one country to another, and multi-national employers do not hesitate to relocate jobs to their maximum advantage. There will be many factors influencing relocation, including cost, access to markets, and the regulatory environment. However, one factor is undoubtedly the availability of a workforce with appropriate skills. Increasingly, the skills that are sought are those provided by higher education.

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

necessity. The achievement of the few is no longer a sufficient indicator of international standing; it is the achievement of the many that matters as well.

At the national level, policies of equity and social inclusion demand a widening of participation in the opportunities offered by higher education. The national role of HEIs includes:

- Service to the nation by developing human resources with various types of knowledge, competencies, and expertise, especially in support of the social, economic, and development needs of the Philippines
- The maintenance, development, and critical appraisal of cultural values
- Preparation of individuals to play an active role in society

Evaluation processes thus need to demonstrate that HEIs are producing students with relevant competences that respond to the global challenges and national development needs, with sound values, and with social responsibility.

Objectives

As part of its mandate to promote quality tertiary education in the Philippines, CHED supports the development of HEIs into mature institutions by engaging them in the process of promoting a culture of quality. Premised on a shared understanding of quality, CHED encourages institutional flexibility of HEIs in translating policies into programs and systems that lead to quality outcomes, assessed and enhanced within their respective internal QA systems.

This takes into consideration that particular types of HEIs will respond fittingly to global and national challenges, play their part in the economic development of the country, and promote policies of equity and social inclusion. As such, CHED supports the evaluation of the effectiveness of institutions according to their typology, with a view to developing institutional systems that ensure effective governance and management, high quality and standards of teaching-learning, relevant and responsive professional/research programs, student support, linkages and community involvement.

The objectives of CHED in assessing the performance of higher education institutions are:

1. To support HEIs in developing institutional systems that lead to quality outcomes, as demonstrated by students and graduates whose competencies meet internationally recognized standards and are relevant to employment.
2. To support HEIs in developing a culture of quality, reflected in internal QA systems that will help them perform effectively and efficiently and meet their desired outcomes and performance targets.
3. To engage HEIs in addressing policy issues, especially those that address the need to improve quality assurance in higher education.

Types of Institutions

CHED recognizes that particular types of HEIs will respond fittingly to particular global and national challenges, and for its purposes classifies HEIs into horizontal and vertical typologies.

The horizontal typology includes the following types: Professional Institution, College, and University, and they are differentiated by features in the following areas:

- Desired competency of graduates
- Kinds of academic and co-curricular programs
- Qualification of Faculty
- Learning Resources and Support Structures
- Nature of linkages and outreach activities

The vertical typology is applied within each type, and the HEIs are differentiated by categories as follows:

- Autonomous (By Evaluation)
- Deregulated
- Regulated

Institutional Sustainability and Quality Assurance

As was mentioned above, QA will look at institutional performance in terms of the HEI's capacity to translate policy (in terms of VMG) into quality programs and quality results. This can be achieved through internal QA systems that look into the cycle of planning, implementation, review, and enhancement (Deming, 1986). From the VMG and desired learning outcomes will come the plan for setting up the proper learning environment, which includes the human and learning resources and support structures for the programs. The implementation of systems and processes for the programs will establish the teaching-learning systems, processes, and procedures, which can now be reviewed against performance indicators and standards defined in the assessment system. The results of the review should yield enhancement of programs and systems that give quality outcomes. The cycle continues as the HEI develops into a mature institution.

QA can also be carried out with the help of external agencies, like the CHED and accrediting bodies. The role of CHED is to oversee a rational and cohesive system that promotes quality according to the typology of HEIs. This recognizes that different types of HEIs have different requirements in terms of the desired competencies of its graduates, its programs, the qualifications of its faculty, its learning resources and support structures, and the nature of its linkages and outreach activities. This also means that CHED will have different incentives depending on the type of HEI, and programs of recognition within each type, e.g., autonomous and deregulated status, and COEs and CODs.

The overall approach to QA is *developmental*, with the goal of helping the HEI develop a culture of quality. CHED will work with institutions to assist them in strengthening their management of academic and administrative processes so that they are better able to achieve their educational objectives. Where there are serious weaknesses, or failures to comply with conditions attached to permits or recognitions, CHED will expect remedial action to be taken, and will use its powers in relation to such shortcomings as appropriate.

CHED will also coordinate closely with accrediting bodies especially in matters related to policies, standards, and guidelines as well as the development and use of appropriate assessment instruments.

CHED is adopting an *outcomes-based approach* to assessment (including monitoring and evaluation) because of its potential greatly to increase both the

effectiveness of the QA system, and the quality and efficiency of higher education generally. There is a need to demonstrate the achievement of outcomes that match international norms. Mature evaluation systems are based upon outcomes, looking particularly into the *intended, implemented, and achieved* learning outcomes. Inputs and processes remain important, as they shape the learning experience that is made available to students.

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

A move to outcomes-based evaluation from an evaluation system based more on inputs represents a shift to a review process that is more reflective, e.g., asking the HEI to provide justification for their initiatives and chosen strategies, in view of its vision-mission, goals, and desired outcomes. Factual data is still required to support the HEI's effective performance but not as an end in itself. The approach is less prescriptive, and gives the institution the opportunity to propose solutions that is more fitting to its vision-mission and goals, its culture, and its context.

The Assessment Framework

The Assessment Framework (Annex 1) has five key result areas within which judgments are made about the performance of institutions:

- Governance and Management (including Management of Resources)
- Quality of Teaching and Learning (competency, programs, faculty)
- Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work (incl. linkages)
- Support for Students (learning resources and support structures)
- Relations with the Community (extra-curricular linkages, service learning, outreach)

Within each key results area there is a number of indicators. Some of these are core indicators that apply to all institutions. The other indicators apply to institutions to the extent that is appropriate in relation to the mission and stage of development of the institution. There are fourteen indicators, eight of which are core indicators.

Pre-ISA Workshops

To help institutions establish or strengthen their internal QA systems, CHED will engage HEIs through workshops on Institutional Sustainability and Enhancement. Through active participation in these workshops, key HEI stakeholders will be able to:

- 1) answer the ISA self-evaluation document (SED) instrument properly;
- 2) assess the effectiveness and efficiency of their systems and processes; and

- 3) identify areas that need to be strengthened or enhanced.

This exercise will allow the HEIs to be familiar with the instrument in a non-threatening way.

Pre-Visit Arrangements

During the interim, when the HEIs are preparing for their quality assurance systems for their particular type, pre-visits may be requested to assist the HEI in achieving its desired outcomes.

Notice to Institutions

The CHEDRO should notify institutions due to be visited of the dates on which it is intended that official visits should take place, and the deadline for submission to the CHEDRO of the self-evaluation document. A minimum of four months notice is recommended before the deadline for the submission of the self-evaluation document to the CHEDRO. To ensure that the self-evaluation document remains current at the time of the visit, there it is recommended that it is no more than three months between the deadline for submission of the self-evaluation document and the date of official visit.

Self-Evaluation Document

The HEI may ask the CHEDRO for assistance in planning the SED. The CHEDRO should follow up with the HEI two months after the notice. The HEI should submit two copies of the SED to the CHEDRO *within four months after the notice*. On receipt of the self-evaluation document, there will be an initial assessment of it by the CHEDRO to determine whether it provides an adequate basis for the review visit. If the document falls significantly short of meeting the criteria set out in Annex 3, or if the statistical data is incomplete, the institution will be asked to revise the document and to re-submit 10 final copies.

The institution should be notified of the need for revision *within three weeks* of the date of receipt of the self-evaluation document, and the institution should be allowed further *four weeks from the date of notification* to make amendments and to re-submit. If, after revision, the self-evaluation document remains inadequate, the visit will still proceed as planned, but the institution should be aware that an inadequate document will make it less likely that the review team will be able to reach favorable conclusions on the performance of the institution.

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

Changes to the schedules may be considered on a case-to-case basis.

Visit of the Review Team

The Conduct of the Visit

Reviews will be conducted in a spirit of dialogue and cooperation between the institution and the review team; a confrontational approach from either side would be wholly inappropriate.

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

Making Judgments

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

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

Judgments are intended to assist institutions in identifying areas of strength and weakness, and to provide information about their general performance. However, where there are serious weaknesses in performance, the judgments will be used also to determine whether an institution should be subject to a requirement to produce an action plan to address weaknesses, and an early re-visit by CHED (usually within 12 months) to check on progress.

An action plan and an early re-visit will be required in two circumstances. First, if a score of 0 (the criterion is not met) is given in respect of any criterion, an action plan will be required in respect of the criterion or criteria concerned. Second, if scores of 1 or 2 (improvement needed) are made with respect to any two or more of the criteria that relate to the core business of providing good quality programs, taught by suitably qualified staff, to students selected in accordance with national priorities, then an action plan will be required with respect of those criteria. The six criteria are:

- Setting and achieving program standards:
 1. Program Approval
 2. Program Monitoring and Review
 3. Action to Strengthen Programs
- Quality of Teaching and Learning:
 1. Faculty Profile
- Support for students:
 2. Recruitment, Admission and Academic Support
 3. Student Scholarship

Note that, aside from scores, the review team will not give recommendations. This emphasizes the idea that the HEI is given a hand in looking for solutions within their particular context.

Post-Visit Arrangements

After the Visit

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

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

To ensure a consistency of treatment of all institutions visited, the report will be reviewed within the CHEDRO for consistency of approach and style, by a person not involved in the visit. Any adjustments to the text should be agreed with the team leader *within two weeks* of the submission of the report. The report should then be submitted to the TWG for final review. The report should be sent to the institution *no later than six weeks* from the conclusion of the visit, for comments on matters of factual accuracy only. The institution is entitled to ask for any errors of fact to be corrected, but no alteration will be made to the judgments reached, unless a factual inaccuracy had a material effect on a judgment. The response of the institution on matters of factual accuracy should be made *within two weeks* of receiving the report.

Publication of Reports

The full narrative report will be provided only to the Office of the President of the institution and to CHED. This limited circulation is intended to encourage frankness of commentary in the narrative parts of the report. However, should an institution quote or publish selectively from a report, CHED reserves its right to publish the entire narrative report, so as to present a balanced picture.

A summary report will be published by CHED, on its website. This will give the name of the institution, the date of the visit, the category assigned to the institution, and the best practices of the institution. Periodically, CHED will publish thematic reports on good practice in relation to particular criteria. These will draw on the narrative reports, but will not identify individual institutions.

Complaints and Appeals

Should an institution have any complaint about the way in which a visit is being conducted, the team leader will endeavor to resolve the matter in a speedy and courteous manner. If an institution remains dissatisfied, the matter may be referred to the CHEDRO director. Formal appeals will be entertained normally only on grounds of procedural irregularity or abuse of process. Appeals should be made to the CHEDRO director. If the CHEDRO director finds that there was irregularity or abuse, he or she will then consider if that irregularity or abuse had a material effect on the judgments made. If there was no material effect on the judgments, they will stand. If there was a material effect, the

judgments will be set aside, and a re-visit ordered. In the event that the CHEDRO director was a member of the review team, a CHEDRO director from another region will consider the appeal.

As with all matters dealt with by CHEDROs, appeals against their decisions lie to the Commission *en banc*.

References

Church, C. H. (1988), "The qualities of validation", *Studies in Higher Education*, 13, 27-43.

Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the Crisis*. MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study. ISBN 0-911379-01-0.

Harvey, L., Green, D. (1993), "Defining quality", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 18 No.1, pp.9-34.

Shewhart, W. A. (1939). *Statistical Method from the Viewpoint of Quality Control*. New York: Dover. ISBN 0-486-65232-7.

Table 1. ISA: Core Indicators and Criteria

<i>KRA 1: GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT</i>	
Core Indicator: Governance	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution's governance arrangements demonstrate probity, strategic vision, accountability, awareness and management of risk, and effective monitoring of performance.
Core Indicator: Management	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution's management, financial control, and quality assurance arrangements are sufficient to manage existing operations and to respond to development and change.
Indicator: Enabling Features	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution has enabling features such as the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for more efficient and effective management; and a viable, sustainable and appropriate resource generation strategy to support its development plans.
<i>KRA 2: QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING</i>	
Core Indicator: Setting and Achieving Program Standards	<i>Criterion 1:</i> Program Approval. The institution sets the objectives and learning outcomes of its programs at appropriate levels, and has effective mechanisms to ensure that its programs achieve those objectives and enable students to achieve the intended outcomes. <i>Criterion 2:</i> Program Monitoring and Review. The institution has effective arrangements for monitoring the effectiveness of its programs. <i>Criterion 3:</i> Action to Strengthen Programs. The institution takes effective action to address weakness, build on strengths, and to enhance performance by the dissemination of good practice.
Core indicator: faculty profile	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution has an adequate number of faculty with the appropriate expertise and competence to teach the courses offered by the institution.
Core Indicator: Use of ICT & Learning Resources	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution makes effective use of learning resources, such as library resources, laboratories, and information and communications technology, to support student learning.
<i>KRA 3: QUALITY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPOSURE, RESEARCH, & CREATIVE WORK</i>	
Indicator: Professional Exposure	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution has programs that allow students to practice their learned competencies in view of their future careers, such as programs for practicum, internship, on-the-job training (OJT), and case writing (for graduate HEIs).
Indicator: Research Capability	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution has a research community of faculty, postgraduate students and postdoctoral research workers that fosters and supports creative research and other advanced scholarly activity.
Indicator: Creative Work and/or Innovation	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution has programs that promote creative work in the arts and/or innovation in science and technology.
<i>KRA 4: SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS</i>	
Core Indicator: Equity and Access	<i>Criterion 1:</i> Recruitment, Admission, and Academic Support. The institution is effective in recruiting, admitting, supporting, and graduating students, including those from indigenous groups, the handicapped, low level income classes, foreign students, and other special groups.

KRA 4: SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS	
Core Indicator: Equity and Access	<i>Criterion 2:</i> Student Scholarships. The institution operates effective arrangements to direct scholarships and study grants on merit to support the most able students on programs that develop competences needed to support the Filipino economy and to enable the country to compete in global labor markets.
Core Indicator: Student Services	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution has programs for student services, to support the non-academic needs of the students.
KRA 5: RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY	
Core Indicator: Relevance of Programs	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution offers programs that take into consideration the social, cultural, economic, and developmental needs of the country at local, regional, and national levels, as well as the need for the country to compete effectively in global markets.
Indicator: Networking and Linkages	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution is valued as a partner by other higher education institutions; professional, government, and non-government organizations; and industry, within the Philippines and internationally.
Indicator: Extension Programs	<i>Criterion:</i> The institution is valued by its local community as a provider of extension programs that are responsive to the needs of the community for people empowerment and self-reliance.

Table 2. ISA Indicators by HEI Type

Indicator	Professional Institute	College	University
<i>Governance and Management</i>			
Governance	Core	Core	Core
Management	Core	Core	Core
Enabling Features	Indic	Indic	Indic
<i>Quality of Teaching and Learning</i>			
Setting and Achieving Program Standards	Core	Core	Core
Faculty Profile	Core	Core	Core
Appropriate Learning Resources	Core	Core	Core
<i>Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work</i>			
Professional Exposure	Req	Indic	Indic
Research Capability	Indic	Indic	Req
Creative Work and/or Innovation	Indic	Req	Indic
<i>Support for Students</i>			
Equity and Access	Core	Core	Core
Student Services	Core	Core	Core
<i>Relations with the Community</i>			
Relevance of Programs	Core	Core	Core
Networking and Linkages	Req	Indic	Req
Extension Programs	Indic	Req	Indic

Legend:

- **Core** – Core indicator; **Req** – Required indicator; **Indic** – Indicator

Table 3. Scale and Score Interpretation for Rating Each Indicator

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

Table 4. Minimum Scores to Qualify for Autonomous and Deregulated Status, in Relation to HEI Type

Indicator	Professional Institution	College	University
AUTONOMOUS			
<i>Governance and Management</i>			
C-Governance	3*	3*	3*
C-Management	3*	3*	3*
I- Enabling Features			
<i>Quality of Teaching and Learning</i>			
C-Setting and Achieving Program Standards	3*	3*	3*
C-Faculty Profile	3*	3*	3*
C-Use of ICT and Learning Resources	3*	3*	3*
<i>Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, and Creative Work</i>			
I- Professional Exposure	3*		
I- Research Capability			3*
I- Creative Work and/or Innovation		3*	
<i>Support for Students</i>			
C-Equity and Access	3*	3*	3*
C-Student Services	3*	3*	3*
<i>Relations with the Community</i>			
C-Relevance of Programs	3*	3*	3*
I- Networking and Linkages	3*		3*
I- Extension Programs		3*	
Minimum Average Score = 2.75			
No score below 2			
DEREGULATED			
<i>Governance and Management</i>			
C-Governance	3*	3*	3*
C-Management	3*	3*	3*
I- Enabling Features			
<i>Quality of Teaching and Learning</i>			
C-Setting and Achieving Program Standards	3*	3*	3*
C-Faculty Profile	3*	3*	3*
C-Appropriate Learning Resources	3*	3*	3*
I- Professional Exposure	3*		
I- Research Capability			3*
I- Creative Work and/or Innovation		3*	
<i>Support for Students</i>			
C-Equity and Access	2*	2*	2*
C-Student Services	3*	3*	3*
<i>Relations with the Community</i>			
C-Relevance of Programs	2*	2*	2*
I- Networking and Linkages	2*		2*
I- Extension Programs		2*	
Minimum Average Score = 2.50			
No score below 1			

*Required

Table 5. Summary of Requirements According to Type

<i>Professional Institutions</i>	
Core Indicators:	Governance, Management, Setting and Achieving Program Standards, Faculty Profile, Use of ICT and Learning Resources, Equity and Access, Student Services, Relevance of Programs
Required Indicators:	Professional Exposure, Networking and Linkages
Optional Indicators:	Enabling Features, Research Capability, Creative Work and/or Innovation, Extension Programs
<i>Colleges</i>	
Core Indicators:	Governance, Management, Setting and Achieving Program Standards, Faculty Profile, Use of ICT and Learning Resources, Equity and Access, Student Services, Relevance of Programs
Required Indicators:	Creative Work and/or Innovation, Extension Programs
Optional Indicators:	Enabling Features, Professional Exposure, Research Capability, Networking and Linkages
<i>Universities</i>	
Core Indicators:	Governance, Management, Setting and Achieving Program Standards, Faculty Profile, Use of ICT and Learning Resources, Equity and Access, Student Services, Relevance of Programs
Required Indicators:	Research Capability, Networking and Linkages
Optional Indicators:	Enabling Features, Professional Exposure, Creative Work and/or Innovation, Extension Programs

Types of Institutions (Horizontal Typology)

Professional Institutions contribute to nation building by providing educational experiences to develop technical knowledge and skills at the graduate and undergraduate levels, which lead to professional practice, e.g., Engineering, Medicine, Law, IT, Management, Teacher Education, Maritime Education. Professional Institutions develop adults who will have the technical and practical know-how to staff the various professional sectors that are required to sustain the economic and social development of the country and the rest of the world, as well as to contribute to innovation in their respective areas. Given the nature of the Philippine economy and the competencies that are needed to make it more competitive, as well as the current trends in the labor market, the country needs a good number of excellent professional institutions.

In order to attain its mandate of developing technical knowledge and skills that lead to professional practice, Professional Institutions should have

- Full-time faculty members who have the relevant degrees, as well as professional licenses and/or professional experience in the subject areas they handle;
- Degree programs in professional fields that develop graduates with specialized skills;
- Learning resources and support structures that are appropriate for developing professional knowledge and skills, including laboratories, practicum sites or internship programs, linkages with the relevant professional sectors, etc.;
- Sustained program linkages with relevant industries, professional groups, and organizations that support the professional development programs; and
- Outreach programs involving all students in social-development oriented experiences that allow them to develop the service orientation in their professions.

They are operationally defined as follows:

1. At least 70% of the enrollment (graduate and undergraduate levels) is in degree programs in the various professional areas¹.
2. At least 60% of the academic degree program offerings are in the various professional areas¹ and have active enrollees.
3. There should be a core of permanent faculty members, with at least 50% of full time permanent faculty members having the relevant degrees, as well as professional licenses (for licensed programs) and/or professional experience in the subject areas they handle. All other faculty should have the relevant degrees, professional licenses (for licensed programs), and/or professional experience in the subject areas they handle.
4. Learning resources and support structures are appropriate to the HEI's technical or professional programs.
5. There are sustained program linkages with relevant industries, professional groups and organizations that support the professional development programs. Outreach programs develop in students a service orientation in their professions.

¹ e.g., Engineering, Health, Medicine, Law, Teacher Education, Maritime, Information Technology, Management, Communication, Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries

These minimum requirements for Professional Institutions should be reviewed by 2017, to see if these are responsive to the development needs of the country.

Colleges contribute to nation building by providing educational experiences to develop adults who have the thinking, problem solving, decision-making, communication, technical, and social skills to participate in various types of employment, development activities and public discourses, particularly in response to the needs of the communities they serve.

In order to attain its mandate, Colleges should have

- Full time permanent faculty members who have the relevant graduate degrees and/or experience in the subject areas they handle;
- Degree programs characterized by a core curriculum that holistically develops thinking, problem solving, decision-making, communication, technical, and social skills;
- Learning resources and support structures that are appropriate for developing knowledge and skills in the specific natural science, social science, humanities, and professional disciplines offered by the college, including laboratories, books and journals, etc.;
- Links with the community that would ensure the development of relevant academic and extension programs as well as the application of their learning outcomes; and
- Outreach programs involving students in social-development oriented experiences that allow them to contextualize their knowledge within actual social and human experiences.

They are operationally defined as follows:

1. At least 70% of undergraduate programs have a core curriculum that *develops thinking, problem solving, decision-making, communication, technical, and social skills*.
2. There should be a core of permanent faculty members, with at least 50% of full time permanent faculty members having the relevant graduate degrees in the subjects they handle. All other faculty should have the relevant degrees, licenses (for licensed programs), and/or experience in the subject areas they handle.
3. Learning resources and support structures are appropriate for the HEIs' programs.
4. Outreach programs allow students to contextualize their knowledge within actual social and human experiences.

These minimum requirements for Colleges should be reviewed by 2017, to see if these are responsive to the development needs of the country.

Universities contribute to nation building by providing highly specialized educational experiences to train experts in the various technical and disciplinary areas and by emphasizing the development of new knowledge and skills through research and development. The focus on developing new knowledge is emphasized from baccalaureate programs through to doctoral programs; thus, a research orientation is emphasized in the Bachelor, Master's and doctoral degree programs. Universities contribute to nation building by producing experts, knowledge, and technological innovations that can be resources for long-term development processes in a globalized context.

In order to attain its mandate, Universities should have

- Faculty members with advanced (masters and doctoral) degrees in their areas of specialization, and who participate in research and development activities in their respective disciplines as evidenced by refereed publications, and other scholarly outputs;
- A comprehensive range of degree programs in all levels, from basic post-secondary to doctoral programs;
- Viable research programs in specific (disciplinary and multidisciplinary) areas of study that produce new knowledge as evidenced by refereed publications, citations, inventions and patents, etc.;
- Comprehensive learning resources and support structures (e.g., libraries, practicum laboratories, relevant educational resources, and linkages with the relevant disciplinary and professional sectors) to allow students to explore basic, advanced, and even cutting edge knowledge in a wide range of disciplines or professions;
- Links with other research institutions in various parts of the world that would ensure that the research activities of the university are functioning at the current global standards; and
- Outreach activities that allow the students, faculty, and research staff to apply the new knowledge they generate to address specific social development problems, broadly defined.

They are operationally defined as follows:

1. The presence of graduate students manifests the training of experts, who will be involved in professional practice and/or discovery of new knowledge.
2. Academic degree programs should be comprehensive and manifest the pursuit of new knowledge.
 - a) There are at least *twenty (20)* active academic degree programs, at least six of which is at the graduate level.
 - b) There is at least one active doctoral program in *three* different fields (disciplines or branches of knowledge).
 - c) All graduate programs and at least *50%* of baccalaureate programs require the submission of a thesis/project.
 - d) There should be a core of permanent faculty members. All full-time permanent faculty members and researchers have, at least, relevant master's degrees. All faculty members teaching in the doctoral programs have doctoral degrees. All other faculty should have the relevant degrees, professional licenses (for licensed programs), and/or relevant experience in the subject areas they handle.
 - e) At least *thirty (30) full-time faculty* members or *20%* of all full-time faculty, whichever is higher, are actively involved in research.
 - f) Any one of these conditions:
 - Annual research cost expenditure for the past five years is equivalent to at least PhP75,000 x the number of faculty members involved in research²; or

²Including external grants, monetary value of research load of faculty members, equipment, and similar expenses credited to research

- At least 5% of full-time faculty members engaged in research have patents, articles in refereed journals, or books published by reputable presses in the last ten years³
3. Comprehensive learning resources and support structures allow students to explore basic, advanced, and even cutting edge knowledge in a wide range of disciplines or professions.
 4. Links with other research institutions in various parts of the world ensure that the research activities of the university are functioning at the current global standards.
 5. Outreach activities allow the students, faculty, and research staff to apply the new knowledge they generate to address specific social development problems, broadly defined.

These minimum requirements for Universities—particularly the numbers and percentages pertaining to academic degree programs, faculty, and costs—should be reviewed by 2017, to see if these are responsive to the development needs of the country.

³Includes the CHED-accredited journals

Vertical Classification of HEIs

Autonomous HEIs (by Evaluation) demonstrate exceptional institutional quality and enhancement through internal QA systems, and demonstrate excellent program outcomes through a high proportion of accredited programs, the presence of Centers of Excellence and/or Development, and/or international certification. In particular, they show evidence of outstanding performance consistent with their horizontal type, e.g., research and publications for universities; creative work and relevant extension programs for colleges; and employability or linkages for professional institutes.

Deregulated HEIs (By Evaluation) demonstrate very good institutional quality and enhancement through internal QA systems, and demonstrate very good program outcomes through a good proportion of accredited programs, the presence of Centers of Excellence and/or Development, and/or international certification. In particular, they show evidence of very good performance consistent with their horizontal type.

Regulated HEIs are those institutions, which still need to demonstrate good institutional quality and program outcomes.

Criteria

Vertical classification is an indicator of quality. A maximum of 70 points is awarded for Commitment to Excellence (i.e., Program Excellence), and a maximum of 30 points is awarded for Institutional Sustainability and Enhancement.

The criteria for Commitment to Excellence include the presence of Centers of Excellence and/or Development, program accreditation (local/ international), and international program certification (see Table 7). HEIs that wish to qualify for Autonomous and Deregulated status should highlight type-based evidences, which should already have formed part of the materials for COEs/CODs and/or accreditation.

The criteria for Institutional Sustainability and Enhancement include institutional accreditation, institutional certification (local/ international), ISA scores, and international institutional certification (see Table 8).

Table 6. Criteria for Commitment to Excellence (70%)

Criteria	No. of points	Max points that can be awarded (points)
COE (type-based) COD (type-based)	10/COE 5/COD	60
Local accreditation	Please refer to Annex 3 of CMO No. 46, s.2012	60
International accreditation (CHED recognized-mobility)	10/program	40
International certification	10/program	20

Table 7. Criteria for Institutional Sustainability and Enhancement (30%)

Criteria	No. of points	Max points that can be awarded (points)
Institutional accreditation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • based on program accreditation⁴ • using instrument for type-based institutional accreditation 	25 Points to be aligned with ISA	30
IQuAME (Categories from 2005-2010) ⁵	Category A: 30 Category B: 25	30
ISA scores	Ave \geq 2.75: 30 2.75 > Ave \geq 2.50: 25 2.50 > Ave \geq 2.00: 20 Six sigma, Baldrige, PQA (different kinds)	30
Institutional certification	ISO 2014: 25 ISO 9001: 20	25
Additional evidence(type-based) ⁵ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance & Management • Quality of Teaching & Learning • Quality of Professional Exposure/Research/Creative Work • Support for Students • Relations with the Community 	Max 4/key result area	20

⁴Program-based institutional accreditation is considered only for the transition period. After the interim, accrediting agencies are recommended to have their own type-based institutional accreditation that may use elements of the ISA.

⁵ In the interim

Self-Evaluation Document

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

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

In order for this document to be truly helpful to the institution, as well as to the reviewers, it should:

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

It is suggested that the document begin with a brief statement of the *mission of the institution* in order to give context to the document as a whole, followed by a discussion of institutional performance against each criterion in the CHED assessment framework. The statements regarding each of the criteria should be supported by a list of evidences. These evidences should be made available to the reviewers.

Data that will be useful to the reviewers (and, thus, must be appended) are those about student recruitment, progression, and performance:

- Student enrolment figures
- Cohort survival rates
- Graduation rates
- Performance in licensure examinations
- Employment rates

Aggregate data for the whole institution should be presented for:

- All students
- Students enrolled on priority courses
- Disadvantaged students
- Foreign students

Data broken down by program should be available to reviewers on request.

The accompanying SED Guide will give a clearer idea of the points that the HEI needs to reflect upon.