

Accreditation of Academic Programs: Implications on Quality Governance and Administration of Taguig City University

Dr. Amer Hani Al-Kassem¹, Benjamin B. Aguenza², Dr. Zainab Esmaeel Alghurabli³

¹Skyline University College, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

²Quality Assurance Office, Taguig City University, Philippines

³City University College of Ajman, United Arab Emirates

Abstract :

Quality assurance services, including accreditation processes, occur as tools to pursue quality higher education and provide diversified information to stakeholders. In this study, the Taguig City University (TCU) attained accreditation of the ALCU-COA on December 27, 2018, and March 05, 2019. ALCU-COA accreditation concluded with a full constitutional review, managed as a self-evaluation method with a unique TCU Accreditation Team and amiable benefaction of different colleges and departments. The aim of the present study was to investigate this current review situation of the University adhered to these requirements from specific ALCU-COA standards for the attainment of accreditation and competitiveness. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed to examine the objectives of the study. An adapted research questionnaire was used to collect data from a convenience sample of 215 teaching and non-teaching personnel who were involved in the accreditation process. The study used descriptive statistics such as the means and percentages to present and describe the data. It is disclosed that TCU practices all indicators and have positive attitude towards accreditation. Also, the respondents believed that accreditation had moderate impact on school factors and agreed to meet the needs of the accreditors during accreditation visits. The most common problems encountered during the accreditation as perceived by the respondents is administrative support. It is believed that TCU academic programs are generally good with quality. All independent variables are related to the quality of academic programs. The predictors such as importance of accreditation for improving TCU resources, attitude towards accreditation, and TCU's management of accreditation visit were statistically significant.

Keywords: Accreditation, Internal and External Audit, Quality Assurance, Taguig City University

1. INTRODUCTION

Article 14 of the 1987 Philippine Constitution asserted that the Country was required to produce excellent learning to its general public. It is to monitor and control many private and public schools to rigorously hold to quality education norms as implemented toward the law. With this law, the government authorities of Taguig City discerned a call to advance and obtain more distinguished models in education, arts and sciences, technology, engineering, criminal justice, hospitality and tourism, and business management to invest and

raise the individual abilities. There is actual that higher education institutions in this region perform a fundamental function in this assignment. For instance, the city's marketplace is expanding, and the market for real estate specialists, business process outsourcing, services, and other manufacturing sectors increased numerically. While, the colleges and universities were active in conventional education materials, which were unsuccessful in keeping measure with the developments (Kafoor, 2019). Tertiary education is the central to economic and

political development, and vital to competitiveness in an increasingly globalizing knowledge society. Accreditation is an optional set of the process by which recognized bodies like ALCU-COA evaluate and identify educational institutions that meet applicable pre-determined published standards and seek continuous improvement (Gabriel et al., 2018). Cambel et al. (2012) state that accreditation affirms that an institution should provide a quality education that the community has a right to expect and endorses the instruction to the world. This academic exercise is a means of stimulating growth and development for encouraging high-standard educational institutions to perform even better (Ngyohan et al., 2012). The accreditation goals include assessing quality education and promoting a quality culture through participation of professionals in each process and attaining external recognition. These accrediting bodies install necessary measures intended to display those rates of solid and informative details. They strengthen methods to define regardless of the academic programs and systems that adhere to specific criteria. In conjunction with setting guidelines, certifying organizations are responsible for assessing and attending universities and granting recognition to the programs and schools that suffice their standards (Ibrahim, 2014). Accreditation designates and confirms that the whole system has reached specific quality measures of education. It evaluates both conventional efficiency and student education results. It implies that every organization's elements, such as its academic units or quality programs, provide to achieving the organization's overall institutional goals. In addition to the institutional program offerings, different components are also evaluated and imposed, such as governance and administration, faculty, curriculum and instructions, student development and services,

entrepreneurship and employability, community extension services, research, library, laboratories, and physical plant. This interchange of acceptance of facilitation and requirements of teaching and non-teaching personnel's movement is guarantee through the evaluation process. Moreover, it is believed that the accreditation scheme is a way for the government to monitor and manage higher education specifically in the context of the Philippines (Arcelo, 2003). In support of this, the Commission on Higher Education, otherwise known as CHED, supports and to an extent encourages HEIs across the country to undergo voluntary evaluation (Dotong & Laguado, 2015). Moreover, incentives are provided to institutions such as autonomy, greater budget allocation, scholarships, bonuses, among others. These forms of reward afforded to agencies that underwent the accreditation process and have earned certifications are a form of encouragement and motivation. Scientific evidence indicates that expanding tertiary education may promote faster technological change and advance a nation's capability to augment its economic growth (Caliskan, 2015). Thus, there is an imperative requirement to adjust their education quality to adapt to these new demands. In recognition of this challenge, a more significant consideration focuses on quality assurance as an essential factor in ensuring educational relevance. It underlines that establishing a persuasive quality assurance system can be addressed and solved today's accountability, value-adding, and transparency (Huang, 2017). In this regard, on December 12-14, 2018, and February 26-28, 2019, TCU was visited by ALCU-COA, a team of certified accreditors from different universities and backgrounds to scrutinize documents in a matter of three days, in some cases. The mission was to bring its members' academic standards to greater heights through quality higher education validated by relevant and responsive quality

assurance and accreditation of programs. Therefore, this study presented preliminary results by investigating the perceptions of accreditors and institutional stakeholders toward accreditation's impact on TCU.

2. METHODS

This study employed a descriptive research design. This research design involves the process of gathering relevant data from various sources. It may include materials such as published papers, statistical data, review articles, and other pieces that have a descriptive or analytical purpose. The used of this questionnaire gauges the implication of accreditation, modifying some items and scale to suit the target respondents using an adapted research questionnaire of Dumancas and Prado (2015). The decision of the researchers in the modified Likert scale was anchored on the concept that an odd number of choices encourage respondents to choose neutral responses which would provide no essential information for this investigation. The study was conducted at TCU and its programs accredited were included in the study. This involved the following programs: psychology, secondary education major in mathematics, criminology, entrepreneurial management, office management, secondary education majors in English, elementary education, hospitality management, computer science, marketing management, secondary education major in Science, and tourism management. The survey questionnaire, which consisted of 215 teaching and non-teaching personnel form part of the sample size.

Letter of permission to administer the survey were sent to respective TCU officials. Upon approval, the questionnaire were sent through Goggle Form services. Accomplished survey forms were retrieved approximately two weeks after the accreditation. The sources of data for this paper are considered as primary sources. Data gathered were

tallied using Microsoft Office Excel 2016. The study used descriptive statistics such as the mean, percentage, and standard deviation to present and describe the data.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In adherence to TCU's vision of being a distinguished core of outstanding education for expected improvement, the university officials filed its application and required documents to undergo accreditation to ALCU-COA as authorized accrediting agency for LUCs. TCU administered an internal review rating as prescribed by the agency. This structured internal review provides the applicants to document its effectiveness and infirmities concerning its objectives and other significant determinants of education (Ching, 2013; Hernes & Martin, 2005). With the painstaking evaluation process, ALCU-COA granted TCU the accreditation certificates with their corresponding validity date for the twelve (12) academic programs, as shown in Table 1.

Based on the preliminary results, these twelve (12) academic programs of TCU passed the accreditors' initial visit requirements. They were given the "Candidate Status" as certified. However, candidacy application is not accredited and not guarantee as final approval of accreditation. Therefore, TCU has shown sufficient promise to be worthy of continuing in the accreditation process. Passing the candidate status means that TCU's academic programs were ready to be reassessed for the level 1 accreditation status since the validity of their accreditation status will soon be expired on December 15, 2020 and March 1, 2021. Previous research argued that various institutions with a candidate status could apply for a higher accreditation level. However, the level of accreditation is given depending on the points garnered during the accreditation process.

Table 1. Accreditation Status of Academic Programs at TCU

No.	Program	Level (Accreditation Status)	Validity Date
1	Psychology	Candidate Status	Dec. 15, 2018 to Dec. 15, 2020
2	Tourism Management	Candidate Status	Dec. 15, 2018 to Dec. 15, 2020
3	Hospital Management	Candidate Status	Dec. 15, 2018 to Dec. 15, 2020
4	Secondary Education in English	Candidate Status	Dec. 15, 2018 to Dec. 15, 2020
5	Secondary Education in Mathematics	Candidate Status	Dec. 15, 2018 to Dec. 15, 2020
6	Secondary Education in Science	Candidate Status	Dec. 15, 2018 to Dec. 15, 2020
7	Elementary Education	Candidate Status	Dec. 15, 2018 to Dec. 15, 2020
8	Office Administration	Candidate Status	March 1, 2019 to March 1, 2021
9	Marketing Management	Candidate Status	March 1, 2019 to March 1, 2021
10	Entrepreneurial Management	Candidate Status	March 1, 2019 to March 1, 2021
11	Computer Science	Candidate Status	March 1, 2019 to March 1, 2021
12	Criminology	Candidate Status	March 1, 2019 to March 1, 2021

Source: Quality Assurance Office, 2021

Table 2. Ratings on TCU Programs by Key Results Areas

No.	Program	Key Areas										G M	D R	R
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VII I	IX	X			
1	PSY	3.4 4	3.4 5	3.7 9	2.9 4	3.0 9	2.9 2	2.6 3	3.0 2	2.0 9	2.8 8	3.0 6	S	1.5
2	TM	3.4 8	2.1 9	2.1 1	2.7 0	2.2 5	2.2 5	2.1 7	3.0 2	2.0 4	3.0 1	2.5 1	F	10. 5
3	HM	3.3 7	2.6 3	2.6 3	2.8 2	2.4 9	2.3 2	2.5 5	3.0 2	2.7 3	2.5 3	2.6 8	F	8.5
4	SEmE	3.3 7	2.7 2	2.8 7	2.8 1	2.5 0	2.3 5	2.2 9	3.0 2	2.0 3	2.8 9	2.6 9	F	7
5	SEmM	3.3 8	2.7 8	3.4 1	3.0 5	2.7 9	3.2 3	3.0 6	3.0 2	2.8 1	2.9 4	3.0 6	S	1.5
6	SEmS	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.8	2.3	2.1	2.4	3.0	2.1	3.0	2.5	F	10.

		7	3	0	3	4	5	1	2	1	9	1	5
7	EE	3.3	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.2	2.4	3.0	2.1	2.8	2.6	F 8.5
		7	0	1	0	6	2	2	2	2	3	8	
8	OA	2.9	2.1	2.5	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.7	F 6
		8	9	0	2	0	1	6	1	2	7	5	
9	MM	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.5	2.8	2.2	2.9	2.4	3.0	2.8	F 4.5
		7	6	0	5	2	0	1	1	8	8	3	
10	EM	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.5	2.8	2.2	2.9	2.4	3.0	2.8	F 4.5
		7	5	0	5	2	0	1	1	8	8	3	
11	CS	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.9	2.5	3.0	2.6	F 7
		8	2	4	2	7	1	7	1	3	6	5	
12	CRIM	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.3	2.9	2.7	3.0	2.8	F 3
		8	9	9	2	6	2	8	1	5	7	9	
	Overall Mean	3.1	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.9	2.4	2.9	2.7	F
		6	4	7	1	8	8	2	7	2	6	6	

Legend: GM=Grand Mean; DR=Descriptive Rating; R=Rank;S=Satisfactory; F=Fair
Source: Quality Assurance Office, 2021

Table 2 indicates the accreditation ratings given by ALCU-COA to the twelve (12) academic programs of TCU. These programs are PSY-Psychology, TM-Tourism Management, HM-Hospitality Management, SE-Secondary Education major in (English, Science, and Mathematics), EE-Elementary Education, OA-Office Administration, MM-Marketing Management, EM-Entrepreneurial Management, CS-Computer Science, and CRIM-Criminology. The program accreditation conducted based on the ten (10) areas of evaluation, namely: 1) Governance and Administration, 2) Faculty, 3) Curriculum and Instructions, 4) Student Development and Services, 5) Entrepreneurship and Employability, 6) Community Extension Services, 7) Research, 8) Library, 9) Laboratory, and 10) Physical Plant. The measurement for these ten critical criteria is through descriptive rating of ALCU-COA, namely: Outstanding (5), Very Satisfactory (4), Satisfactory (3), Fair (2), and Poor (1).

As can be understood in Table 2, among the twelve (12) academic programs, only two (2) programs emerged and were interpreted as “Satisfactory” with the highest rank among others. These programs include: PSY-Psychology and SEM-Secondary Education major in Mathematics programs where both have areas are rated less than 2.00 and with a weighted mean of 3.06, respectively. The researchers can parallel the results to the current school performance rating of the 2019 PRC Licensure Examination. TCU garnered a total of 52.31% for Psychometrician and 48.86% for Teachers in Secondary Education (PRC, 2019a, 2019b). Undoubtedly, TCU has a robust administration and retention process resulting in an actual national passing rate. The remaining programs with a weighted mean of 2.89 up to 2.51 were equivalently ranged to 2.00-2.99 and verbally interpreted as “Fair”. The overall computed weighted mean has 2.76 with a “Fair” descriptive rating.

Table 3. Importance of Accreditation for improving TCU resources

Indicators	M	SD	DR
------------	---	----	----

IAR1	2.83	2.39	I
IAR2	2.96	2.50	I
IAR3	2.95	2.49	I
IAR4	2.96	2.50	I
IAR5	2.93	2.49	I
Overall Mean	2.93		I

Legend: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; DR=Descriptive Rating

The importance of accreditation for improving TCU resources are presented in Table 3. The findings revealed that items indicator IAR2 “Enabling TCU to identify needs” and IAR4 “Keeping TCU updated and equal as regards the quality of their resources” got the highest mean (M=2.96) and interpreted as Important. The overall mean has 2.93 with an “Important” descriptive rating and the remaining item indicators (see appendix A) are all important. In this results, respondents perceived that accreditation is important in meeting the minimal prescribed standards to fulfill ever-changing requirements of quality resources. According to Council on Accreditation and School Improvement-Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in Georgia, accreditation helps ensure that schools have access to the resources necessary for translating their vision into reality (SACS-CASI, 2004). They affirmed that those accredited schools can have access to multiple

resources (publications, manuals, software, professional development, and conferences) designed to support and facilitates school improvement.

Generally, respondents believed that in the pursuit of excellence, accreditation is incredibly important as multifaceted requirement to consider. These notions conform to the statements of Garfalo and L’Huillier (2015) that accreditation provides a benchmark for quality and integrity. The process of accreditation examines the philosophy, goals, programs, facilities, resources and financial viability of institutions. It also provides substantial information that can be used to support resource decisions. Lewis (2016) further stated that accreditation involves the active participation of chosen members from a pool of nominees that includes administrators, faculty members, and governing board members in the planning and implementation of the various activities.

Table 4. Best Practices of TCU in the Preparation of Accreditation

Indicators	M	SD	DR
BPP1	3.13	2.67	P
BPP2	3.07	2.62	P
BPP3	3.10	2.65	P
BPP4	3.16	2.70	P
BPP5	3.15	2.68	P
Overall Mean	3.12		P

Legend: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; DR=Descriptive Rating

The best practices of TCU in the preparation of accreditation are demonstrated in Table 4. It displays that all indicators are practiced by teaching and non-teaching personnel of TCU. Based on the results, majority of the respondents practiced BPP4 “The mission statement” for the preparation of accreditation with the highest mean rating of (M=3.16) while BPP2 “Resources” as the lowest rating with (M=3.07). The overall mean has 3.12 with a “Practiced” descriptive rating and the remaining item indicators (see appendix A) are all practiced. According to Cortés Sánchez (2018) mission statements are the discernible consensus on the importance of coordinating and measuring organizational performance, employee behavior and commitment, public or internal image, and value creation among other factors.

Commonly, the respondents perceived that mission statement can contribute to

creating competitive fields of universities. These results conform to the statement of Kosmutzky (2012) that mission statements contribute to constructing university images. Further, several authors argued that the gap between institutional mission and market position, requires that educational institutions must do a better job of monitoring their environments, reevaluating and adjusting their mission statements, identifying the trends that will meaningfully impact their central purpose, and diligently proceeding to examine how the institution should best utilize its resources and best practices (Bingham et al., 2001). Overall, TCU used the mission statement of the university to set as an aspirations and guidelines for enhancing the quality of higher education. It also demonstrate that the school has the resources to achieve its mission while showing evidence of the mission being achieved.

Table 5. Attitude towards Accreditation

Indicators	M	SD	DR
ATA1	3.07	2.61	P
ATA2	3.05	2.59	P
ATA3	2.97	2.53	P
ATA4	2.98	2.53	P
ATA5	3.04	2.59	P
Overall Mean	3.02		P

Legend: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; DR=Descriptive Rating

Table 5 reveals the attitude of respondents towards accreditation. Based on the results, majority of the respondents have positive attitude towards accreditation which is ATA1 “The accreditation process has been beneficial in terms of enhancing the overall quality of education at the institution”. The item indicator ATA1 has the highest mean rating of (M=3.07) and verbally interpreted as “Positive” while (M=2.97) as ATA3 “Participation in the accreditation has led to improvements in

the work environment for the staff” is the least. The overall mean has 3.02 with a “Positive” descriptive rating, including the remaining item indicators (see appendix A).

According to the study of Rosales (2019), for example, investigated on the attitude towards accreditation process involved 55 teachers of state college in Mindanao. It is disclosed that the respondents are possessing a positive attitude towards the external evaluation process. However, a

research study of Kakemam et al. (2020) explained that there was low support for accreditation and even less among staff who fail to see accreditation having a positive impact with quality. Staff stated that the main reasons for low support were a lack of education and training to act upon the accreditation survey results and a lack of management visibility and support

for quality improvement. Therefore, TCU should find accreditation towards, but not limited to, improvement of facility, communication and work environment, appreciation of the process yields the noted result. In the end, this means that accreditation, is perceived to be something beneficial by the respondents.

Table 6. TCU's Factors Impacted by Accreditation

Indicators	M	SD	DR
FIA1	3.04	2.59	MI
FIA2	3.02	2.57	MI
FIA3	2.99	2.54	MI
FIA4	3.05	2.58	MI
FIA5	3.06	2.60	MI
Overall Mean	3.03		MI

Legend: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; DR=Descriptive Rating

Accreditation had high impact on school factors (Mensching, 2012) and that accreditation visits were managed well by responsible authorities. Table 6 displays the degree of impact on accreditation towards TCU selected factors. Item indicator FIA5 "Enabled TCU to identify strengths and weaknesses" as the highest mean rating of (M=3.06) while FIA3 "Improved TCU resources" with (M=2.99) is the lowest rating. Based on the results, majority of the respondents believed that accreditation will identify the strength and weakness of the university or a project in the light of the external environment opportunities, and threats. The overall mean has 3.03 with a "Moderate Impact" descriptive rating. The respondents believed that all item indicators (see appendix A) included are found to be "Moderate Impact".

Accreditation at its most effective serves the TCU community and stakeholders'

interest on two levels. By identifying and weeding out institutions of substandard quality, it protects potential students from making bad choices and helps assure policymakers and taxpayers that resources are invested in high-quality institutions. Financial resources of TCU has tremendously been increasing as a result of accreditation. CHED always consider the accreditation status of the university prior to granting of financial assistance. According to Berliner & Schmelkin (2010) posited that financial resources must be recognized especially when much of higher education is resource constrained or worse. It is claimed that accreditation, under common and unified national standards, is the only way to increase the professionalism of teaching and non-teaching personnel and financial resources (Wise, 2005).

Table 7. TCU's Management of Accreditation Visit

Indicators	M	SD	DR
MAV1	3.00	2.55	A
MAV2	2.95	2.50	A
MAV3	3.02	2.57	A
MAV4	2.99	2.53	A
MAV5	3.01	2.55	A
Overall Mean	2.99		A

Legend: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; DR=Descriptive Rating

Table 7 displays the TCU's management of accreditation visit. Based on the results, majority of the respondents revealed that MAV3 "Staff works together to meet the needs of the accreditors" got the highest mean rating of (M=3.02) and verbally interpreted as Agree. The overall mean has 2.99 with an "Agree" descriptive. According to the study of Burkhardt and Lewis (2005) explained that universities working together to serve multiple communities. In TCU, working together with community organizations can help to build a presence within the community for implementing various elements of university-community joint projects. For example, in a project involving tutoring, the university could help raise funds to support tutor coordinators at the schools at which tutoring takes place. In general,

rating. Also, respondents agree to all indicators (see appendix A) on managing accreditation visits. This means that teaching and non-teaching staff of TCU worked together to comply with eligibility requirements, accreditation, and recognition set by the accrediting bodies during visit.

TCU should establish and implement a written policy providing for teaching and non-teaching personnel, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

Table 8. Quality of Academic Programs

Indicators	M	SD	DR
QAP1	3.03	2.58	G
QAP2	3.00	2.56	G
QAP3	3.02	2.57	G
QAP4	2.99	2.54	G
QAP5	2.96	2.51	G
Overall Mean	3.00		G

Legend: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; DR=Descriptive Rating

The respondents' perception on the quality of programs at TCU based on the selected indicators are presented in Table 8.

Majority of the respondents revealed that "Faculty and administrators hold high expectations for learning and articulate

them clearly to students” with the highest mean rating of (M=3.03, QAP1) and verbally interpreted as Good while “The institution provides competitive salaries to sustain a critical mass of faculty” is in the least indicator (M=2.96, QAP5). The overall mean has 3.00 with a “Good” descriptive rating, including the remaining indicators (see appendix A).

To clarify expectations, the quality of education carried out at TCU depends largely on the performance of teachers and administrators in cooperation. According to Aslanargun(2015) teachers’ expectations and administration is the keys of better communication in schools. Also, the behaviors of both are shaped by considerations of leadership and communication. TCU has been widely

praised for the collaborative relationship that exists between its teachers and administrators. Not only has the constituency received a great deal of positive result about this partnership. It also served as the basis for research and how working together to improve student achievement.

Furthermore, what makes TCU so special is not just the fact that a strong partnership between teachers and administrators exists. It is the fact that the collaboration has been institutionalized. The partnership has thrived under multiple superintendents which has led to a culture of shared planning, decision-making, and responsibility that is built on respect, commitment, and trust

Table 9. Correlation between IV and DV

Variables	R	R ²	p-value
HEA	-0.101	0.010	0.139
WOA	-0.033	0.001	0.630
IAR	0.844	0.712	0.000
BPP	0.805	0.648	0.000
ATA	0.876	0.770	0.000
FIA	0.836	0.698	0.000
MAV	0.902	0.814	0.000

Legend: R=Correlation Coefficient; R²=Coefficient of Determination

Table 9 presents the correlation of independent variables such as Highest Educational Attainment (HEA) and Work Assignment (WOA) to the Quality of TCU Academic Programs (QAP). Based on the table, the demographic profile of the respondents are not significantly correlated with the program quality. Other independent variables like Importance of Accreditation for improving TCU resources (IAR), Best Practices of TCU in

the Preparation of Accreditation (BPP), Attitude towards Accreditation (ATA), TCU’s Factors Impacted by Accreditation (FIA), and Management of Accreditation Visit (MAV) correlated to program quality. This implies that the more positive the attitude towards accreditation and better management during accreditation visits, the higher the quality of the programs. More importantly, TCU enabled to identify the needs and strengths

and weaknesses of the university. Also, they keep on practicing the mission statement while updating their resources

based on the recommendations of the accrediting body.

Table 10. Regression Analysis

REGRESSION MODEL	C	SE	t	Sig.
IAR	0.205	0.058	3.520	0.001
BPP	0.001	0.061	0.021	0.983
ATA	0.272	0.074	3.692	0.000
FIA	0.022	0.065	0.339	0.735
MAV	0.512	0.070	7.272	0.000

Legend: C=Coefficient; SE=Standard Error; t=t Stat; Sig=Significance

Among those independent variables analyzed for prediction, only the “Importance of accreditation for improving TCU resources (IAR)”, Attitude towards accreditation (ATA)”, and “TCU’s management of accreditation visit (MAV)” are statistically significant. Obtaining an R^2 value of 0.853, means that 85.3% of the quality of TCU academic

programs is attributable to those three variables mentioned while the remaining 14.7% can be explained by other variables such as “Best practices of TCU in the preparation of accreditation (BPP)” and “TCU’s factors impacted by accreditation (FIA)”. The overall regression model was significant, $F(5,209) = 243.19$, $p < .001$, $R = 0.924$, $R^2 = 0.853$.

Table 11. Problems Encountered during Accreditation Visit

Indicators	M	SD	DR
PEA1	2.17	1.87	P
PEA2	2.37	2.04	P
PEA3	2.33	2.00	P
PEA4	2.42	2.09	P
PEA5	2.33	2.00	P
PEA6	2.21	1.89	P
PEA7	2.34	2.02	P
PEA8	2.33	2.00	P
PEA9	2.38	2.04	P
PEA10	2.31	1.98	P
Overall Mean	2.32		P

Legend: M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; DR=Descriptive Rating

Table 11 displays the degree of common problems encountered by the respondents during accreditation visit. Indicator

reveals that item PEA4 “Administrative support” got the highest mean rating of (M=2.42) and PEA1 “Inadequate

researches of the faculty” with mean rating of (M=2.17) is on the least. Both of them are verbally interpreted as a Problem, respectively. The overall mean has 2.32 and understood that all identified problems included as indicators (see appendix A) are found to be “a Problem”. The respondents also corroborated that some faculty and administrative staff of TCU are difficult to motivate in working for accreditation.

These findings are consistent with studies regarding issues, challenges, and solution for accreditation mentioned in the literature review. A study of Akhter and Ibrahim (2016) has acknowledged the principal barriers that need to be addressed in the accreditation process. In their results, the challenges include the inability to properly prepare required forms and documents, lack of faculty commitment to the accreditation process, high faculty turnover, and lack of proper administrative support from higher administration. In general, the respondents believed that TCU officials prioritized and resolved some hindrances for the optimization process of accreditation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

TCU academic programs were evaluated by the accrediting agency ALCU-COA. Programs are “Candidate Status” accredited as certified and subjected for evaluation to the next level. Psychology and Secondary Education major in Mathematics has the highest mean rating, while the Tourism Management and Secondary Education major in Science has the least mean rating. It is explained by the fact that both programs are still in a fancy stage of accreditation. However, these programs garnered high-performance ratings in the Licensure Examination for teachers at the secondary and college of hospitality and tourism management accredited as the center of excellence.

This qualification procedure implies that the current institutional quality rank ultimately confirms the distinct areas of

governance and administration, faculty, curriculum and instructions, student development and services, entrepreneurship and employability, community extension services, research, library, laboratories, and physical plant are commendable. Nevertheless, several suggestions by ALCU-COA have been presented for TCU to attend:

1. To enhance efficiency and effectiveness of performance, multi-tasking may avoid as much as possible. Job analysis was conducted, and results of performance evaluation were utilized to rationalize human resources utilization. Existing ordinances need to be reviewed and amended to conform to the CHED requirement on institutional recognition.
2. To strengthen the faculty members’ research capability vis-à-vis responsiveness to community needs in line with the university’s vision.
3. To create plantilla positions to attract highly qualified faculty and increase the morale of existing faculty.
4. To encourage faculty members to experiment with new approaches in teaching especially now with the OBE curricula.
5. To take the lead of the increasing number of industry partners in the area, not only to design relevant curricula but also to ensure the employability of its graduates. The inclusion of entrepreneurship courses across disciplines needs more strict attention if only to teach graduates that societal transformation starts with the self, their families, and eventually, society. Entrepreneurship training will open opportunities for the students not to be employed but to become future employers.
6. To conduct community extension services in the chosen barangay and defining the terms of agreement for

both parties could result in a more sustainable program. The alignment of TCU's community extension services to the barangay officials' plan could generate financial support on their part.

7. Consider the provisions under Batas Pambansa bilang 344 (Accessibility Law); e.g., ramps with proper gradient and railings, unobstructed passageways and sidewalks, and CR PWD with appropriate grab bars, parking for PWD nearest the buildings served.

4. REFERENCES

1. Akhter, F. & Ibrahim, Y. (2016). Intelligent Accreditation System: A Survey of the Issues, Challenges, and Solution. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 7(1), 477-484.
2. Arcelo, A. (2003). In pursuit of continuing quality in higher education through accreditation: The Phillipine experience. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.
3. Aslanargun, E. (2015). Teachers' expectations and school administration: Keys of better communication in schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 60, 17-34. DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2015.60.2
4. Berliner, H. A. & Schmelkin, L. P. (2010). Accreditation Best-Practices and Implications in a Resource Constrained Environment. *Advancing Higher Education*. TIAA-CREF Institute.
5. Bingham, F. G., Quigley, C. J., & Murray, K. B. (2001). A response to beyond the mission statement: Alternative futures for today's universities. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 11(4), 19-27. DOI: 10.1300/J050v11n04_02
6. Burkhardt, J. C. & Lewis, R. (2005). Research Universities Working Together to Serve Multiple Communities: The Committee on Institutional Cooperation Engagement Initiative. In P.A. Pasque, R.E. Smerek, B. Dwyer, N. Bowman, & B. L. Mallory (Ed.). *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* (pp.38-44). Michigan, USA: University of Michigan.
7. Caliskan, H. K. (2015). Technological change and economic growth. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 649-654. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.174
8. Cambel, T. L., Tabares, M. L. & Barraca, L. (2012). The role of accreditation in the conversion of a college to a university: The SKSU Experience. *Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures, and Practices*. AACUP, Quezon City
9. Ching, G. S. (2013). Higher education accreditation in the Philippines: A literature review. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 2(1), 63-74. DOI: 10.5861/ijrsm.2021.162
10. Cortés Sánchez, J. D. (2018). Mission statements of universities worldwide: Text mining and visualization. *Intangible Capital*, 14(4), 584-603. DOI: 10.3926/ic.1258
11. Dotong, C., & Laguardo, J. (2015). Philippine Quality Assurance Mechanisms in Higher Education towards Internationalization. *Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(3), 156-167.
12. Dumancas, G., & Prado, N. (2015). Impact of Accreditation on the quality of academic programs of Central Mindanao University: Future directions and challenges. Conference: 2015 Asia Pacific Quality Network Conference & AGM. Kunming, China.

13. Gabriel, C. S., Bogarin, D. F., Mikael, S., Cummings, G., Bernardes, A., Gutierrez, L. & Caldana, G. (2018). Brazilian nurses' perspective on the impact of hospital accreditation. *Enfermeria Global*, 408-419. DOI: 10.6018/eglobal.17.1.283981
14. Garfalo, B. T. & L'Huillier, B. (2015). Demystifying Assessment: The Road to Accreditation. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 12(4), 151-170.
15. Hernes, G. & Martin, M. (2005). Policy rationales and organizational and methodological options in accreditation: Findings from an IIEP research project. Paper presented at the accreditation and the global higher education market.
16. Huang, F. (2017). The multiple challenges facing HE quality assurance. *University world news*. The global window on higher education, April 28
17. Ibrahim, H. A. (2014). Quality assurance and accreditation in education. *Open Journal of Education*, 2(2), 106-110. DOI: 12966/oje.06.06.2014
18. Kafoor, S. (2019). Quality assurance and accreditation at the University of Kurdistan Hewler. *UKH Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1), 62-66. DOI: 10.25079/ukhjs.v3n1y2019
19. Kakemam, E., Rajabi, M. R., Raeissi, P. & Ehlers, L. H. (2020). Attitudes towards Accreditation and Quality Improvement Activities among Hospital Employees in Iran: A Quantitative Study. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 13, 799-807. DOI: 10.2147/JMDH.S263811
20. Kosmutzky, A. (2012). Between Mission and Market Position: Empirical findings on mission statements of German Higher Education Institutions. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 18(1), 57-77. DOI: 10.1080/13583883.2011.617466
21. Lewis, S. (2016). Perceptions of University Faculty Regarding Accreditation in a College of Education. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/6300>
22. Mensching, B. (2012). School Accreditation and Its Impact on our Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) schools (Master thesis). Martin Luther College: New Ulm, MN.
23. Ngohayon, S. L., Guimpatan, J. A. & Basilio, F. (2012). The impact of accreditation to IFSU's quest for quality and excellence. *Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures, and Practices*. AACCUP, Quezon City
24. Professional Regulatory Commission (2019, November 4). Performance of Schools: October 2019 Psychometrician Board Examination Results. Retrieved May 25, 2020 from <https://shorturl.at/mxNXZ>
25. Professional Regulatory Commission (2019, December 2). Licensure Examination for Teachers: LET Results September 2019. Retrieved May 26, 2020 from <https://shorturl.at/zABJP>
26. Rosales, E. H. (2019). Examination of attitude towards the accreditation process: A case of higher education teachers in a state college in Mindanao, Philippines. *Science International (Lahore)*, 31(6), 955-958.
27. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Council on Accreditation and School Improvement (2003). Benefits of Accreditation. https://www.cpsb.org/cms/lib/LA01907308/Centricity/Domain/91/Accreditation_Benefits.pdf

28. Wise, A. E. (2005). Establishing teaching as a profession the essential role of professional accreditation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(4), 318-331.

Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire Code

IAR	Importance of accreditation for improving TCU resources
IAR1	Using existing resources more effectively
IAR2	Enabling TCU to identify needs
IAR3	Justifying needs to the TCU community
IAR4	Keeping TCU updated and equal as regards the quality of their resources
IAR5	Helping TCU plan and budget for resources
BPP	Best practices of TCU in the preparation of accreditation
BPP1	Collaboration
BPP2	Resources
BPP3	Decision Making
BPP4	The Mission Statement
BPP5	Documentation
ATA	Attitude towards accreditation
ATA1	The accreditation process has been beneficial in terms of enhancing the overall quality of education at my institution
ATA2	Participation in the accreditation process has led to improvements in the professional development training for teacher
ATA3	Participation in the accreditation has led to improvements in the work environment for the staff
ATA4	The accreditation process has led to improvements in institutional leadership
ATA5	Participation in the accreditation process has led to improvements in the quality of classroom instruction
FIA	TCU's factors impacted by accreditation
FIA1	Improved professional development
FIA2	Improved organizational effectiveness and long term planning
FIA3	Improved TCU resources
FIA4	Fostered teamwork and collegiality
FIA5	Enabled TCU to identify strengths and weaknesses
MAV	TCU's management of accreditation visit
MAV1	Peer interactions have a positive affect and tone
MAV2	All staff are given orientation to the job
MAV3	Staff works together to meet the needs of the accreditors
MAV4	There are sufficient materials to support the accreditation activities
MAV5	All staff are professionally qualified to work with accreditors
QAP	Quality of academic programs
QAP1	Faculty and administrators hold high expectations for learning and articulate them clearly to students
QAP2	Institution provides adequate funding to maintain suitable laboratory, classroom, office and performance facilities
QAP3	The institution establishes linkages and network with other institutions, professional organizations and agencies through consortia, partnerships,

	and research collaborations
QAP4	Publication of articles or researches by faculty
QAP5	The institution provides competitive salaries to sustain a critical mass of faculty
PEA	Problems encountered during accreditation visit
PEA1	Inadequate researches of the faculty
PEA2	Self-survey instrument
PEA3	Physical plant facilities
PEA4	Administrative support
PEA5	Educational qualification of the faculty
PEA6	Preparation of the documents
PEA7	Equipments
PEA8	Library facilities
PEA9	Assignment of task force
PEA10	Inadequate laboratory facilities