Exploring The Relationship Between Accreditation Status and School Performance at a State College

ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| This study aimed to correlate academic programs’ accreditation status to school performance which includes employability of graduates, board performance, graduation rate, faculty research and publication, community extension, and compliance to CMOs for the past six years. Descriptive-correlational research design was used. Survey questionnaires were distributed to the graduates of the seven programs of ASC for the past six years to gather information on graduates’ profiles and employability. Data on school performance variables were gathered through focused group discussions. The licensure performance of board programs of ASC was retrieved from the official website of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). The data on accreditation status, level, and ratings were based on official accreditation results from AACCUP, Inc. Study revealed that the accreditation level and status of programs show insignificant differences. Majority of the programs manifested good performance along with community extension and compliance to CMOs, however, BSCE program needs further improvement to most of its areas which are subject for compliance requirements in CMO. It was concluded that further improvement is needed in most of the performance variables especially on the employability of graduates, board performance, involvement of faculty members to research, research publication, and compliance to laboratory facilities and library collections.  |
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1. INTRODUCTION

Accreditation is a means of stimulating and accelerating the institutional growth and development of schools desiring to achieve excellence, relevance, and effectiveness. It is a process by which schools are evaluated along specific standards of excellence. It is assumed then that when a school is awarded with an accreditation status, it possesses academic, organizational, administrative, physical, and social attributes that are better than those of non-accredited schools (Gutierrez, 2016).

In the context of accreditation and school performance or improvement, the study conducted with higher education teachers by Kemenade and Hardjono (2009), as cited in Collins (2015), made the conclusion, which is probably the most unfavorable criticism of accreditation, that accreditation has little effect on improving the quality of education, has created substantial administrative obligations, and takes up too much time.

At the national level, the Philippine Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) monitors the licensure examination performance of schools as part of the efforts toward quality education. Performance in licensure examinations is a gauge or indicator of the quality of graduates in board courses or programs of academic institutions. As such, schools' licensure examination performance is published to recognize their efforts and to encourage them to upgrade their course programs leading to a high quality of education (Gutierrez, 2016).

Moreover, graduates’ employability and licensure examination performance are almost always used as a gauge of the effectiveness of a curricular program offered by HEIs (Figuerres, 2010; Tan, 2016; Visco, 2015).

Apayao State College (ASC) was established in 1998 and is the lone state college in the province of Apayao which offers various undergraduate degree courses and several graduate programs. The college has two (2) campuses: Conner Campus and Luna Campus. The Luna Campus is located in San Isidro Sur, Luna, Apayao, while the Conner Campus, also the main campus, is located in Malama, Conner, Apayao, with an extension campus in Cubet, Malama, Conner, Apayao. The Conner Campus offers nine (9) undergraduate programs of which five (5) are board programs, such as Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd), Bachelor in Elementary Education (BEEd), Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (BSA), Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering (BSCE), and Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education (BTVTEd). Four (4) are non-board programs such as Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA), Bachelor of Science in Hotel & Restaurant Management (BSHRM), Bachelor of Science in Industrial Technology (BSIT), and Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BS Info Tech).

Moreover, the college consistently undergoes institutional accreditation of its programs as it aims to provide quality education and university status in the future. Recognizing institutional accreditation as a factor attributed to success in the licensure examination, it is therefore imperative to provide research-based information to the school administrators, the faculty, the students, and the community. Thus, this study was conceptualized to establish the relationship between institutional accreditation and school performance

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The Accrediting Association of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP) views accreditation as a process by which an institution at the tertiary level evaluates its educational activities, in whole or in part, and seeks an independent judgment to confirm that it substantially achieves its objectives, which are generally equal in quality to comparable institutions. Thus, quality and quality assurance are often addressed when an educational institution submits itself for accreditation which, by nature, is a private and voluntary endeavor (Liquido, 2018). Simply put, accreditation is a means of stimulating and accelerating institutional growth and development of schools desiring to achieve excellence, relevance, and effectiveness. Ultimately, the goal of accreditation is to ensure that education provided by HEIs meets acceptable levels of quality (Ching, 2013). Such areas are recognized to contribute to the effectiveness of the institution and ensure the quality and standards of programs offered (Ordonez & Ordonez, 2007).

Accreditation per se is a tool for quality assurance and a mechanism for check and balance in administration, a seal of excellence, and a status symbol of prestige. While accreditation may not be a new idea in today’s educational milieu, over time, accreditation vis-à-vis the discourse on quality and quality assurance in higher education is significantly a perennial issue. Thus, quality and quality assurance are often addressed when an educational institution submits itself for accreditation which, by nature, is a private and voluntary endeavor (Liquido, 2018).

In the Philippines, accreditation is considered as a concept based on self-regulation focused on evaluation and continuous improvement of quality of education and a continuous process which institutions or programs continuously undergo. It is also a status granted to an educational institution or program that meets commonly accepted standards of quality or excellence (PAASCU, 2006).

Gutierrez (2016) further identified several objectives of accreditation: 1) Accreditation aims to identify schools whose competence and performance in a particular field warrant public and professional recognition. 2) Accreditation aims to guide students in the choice of quality schools, colleges, and universities that will meet their individual educational needs. 3) Accreditation aims to help institutions of learning achieve maximum educational effectiveness through self-evaluation and self-discipline. 4) Accreditation aims to enlist the cooperation of institutions of learning and professional associations in the mission of advancing the interests of education.

Moreover, accreditation is not just a whimsical impulse of an institution to show superiority over other schools, but it is an intelligent effort to promote standards that will be beneficial for the institution, its clients, and the public (Gutierrez, 2016). As such, accreditation is viewed as the formal recognition of an institution as possessing high quality or excellence based on an analysis of the merits of its educational operation in attaining its objectives and its unique role in the community it serves. Accreditation on the part of institutions ensures quality of learning, quality of graduates, recognition of schools, deregulation of schools in their program offering, preference for school subsidy from the government, and many other positive effects. Hence, accreditation is a worthwhile endeavor for all institutions. Gutierrez (2016) further related that accreditation is like tasks that could be difficult in the beginning but gets easier once the institution works on the prescribed standards and recommendations.

It is interesting to note that Philippine HEIs are at par with the global concept of correlating accreditation and quality education. Though it began as a concept based on self-regulation among private HEIs, it has evolved to include state-run or public colleges and universities. The concept of accreditation throughout its history in the country has also changed to be more aligned with quality education and sets of standards. In addition, there are several accrediting agencies in the country with specific coverage or membership based on institutional management or institutional preference.

Apayao State College (ASC) is mandated to submit for accreditation facilitated by the Accrediting Association of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCUP). The major steps in the accreditation process are as follows: (1) institutional self-survey or self-evaluation; (2) preliminary visit (4 to 6 months after the start of self-survey); (3) formal survey visit (a minimum of six months after preliminary visit); and (4) decision by governing board of accrediting agency (Segismundo, 2017). Moreover, the AACCUP Accreditation Instrument is composed of 10 areas with a total of 700 indicators. The areas are as follows: (I) Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives; (II) Faculty; (III) Curriculum and Instruction; (IV) Support to Students; (V) Research; (VI) Extension and Community Involvement; (VII) Library; (VIII) Physical Plant & Facilities; (IX) Laboratories; and (X) Administration.

The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) provides accreditation benefits to HEIs depending on their accreditation status. Level I/II accredited HEIs enjoy: 1) limited visitation, inspection, and/or supervision by CHED supervisory personnel or representatives; 2) full administrative deregulation, provided that reports of promotion of students and lists of graduates are available for review by CHED at all times; 3) financial deregulation in terms of setting of tuition and other school fees and charges; 4) authority to revise curriculum and give degrees from accredited courses or programs as long as they comply with the minimum requirements set by CHED; 5) priority in the award of grants/subsidies or funding assistance from CHED Higher Education Development Fund (HEDF) for scholarships and faculty development, facilities improvement, and other development programs; and 6) the right to use in their publications or advertisements the word "ACCREDITED," pursuant to CHED policies and rules (CHED, 2007).

The Accrediting Agency for Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP) has taken cognizance of the following potential incentives to be granted to accredited programs/institutions: 1) as a national basis for budgetary requests; 2) for normative financing; 3) as a factor in the selection of Centers of Excellence (COEs) and Centers of Development (CODs); 4) for SUCs leveling; 5) as a requirement for the conversion of a college to a university; 6) as a factor in assessing the appointment of an SUC president; and 6) for matching-fund schemes where required for accreditation are matched with funds from CHED (Dumancas & Prado, 2015).

The Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) promulgates the registration and issuance of valid professional license to successful passers of board examinations (PRC, 2000). As a partner agency, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) monitors the performance of Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) to ensure competency and quality of instruction in the Philippines.

On the other hand, Gutierrez (2016) posited that licensure examinations and monitoring schools’ performance by the PRC is one of the efforts to move toward quality education in the country. The quality of graduates in board courses or programs is gauged through licensure-examination performance. As a common practice, schools' licensure-examination performances are published to show cognizance of efforts and excellence and to encourage schools to upgrade their course programs leading to a high quality of education.

According to Padua (2003), one of the common measures of HEIs’ quality of performance in the country is the performance of their graduates in state-licensure examinations. De Leon (2016) also noted that passing percentage in licensure examination is one of the indicators of institutional performance. Tan et al. (2015) argued that graduates’ performance in licensure examination reflects the quality of education and training provided by their schools.

However, a study by Baylan (2018), which involved premier Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in the country, revealed that there is a considerable number of premier TEIs that are performing below the national passing standard. This underperformance in the licensure examination for teachers characterized by ‘fluctuating’ trend among TEIs depicts that these universities failed to perform their mandate as COEs and CODs in teacher-education programs. The study further disclosed that the majority of the premier TEIs in both BEEd and BSEd programs can barely maintain the national passing standard of 60%. This result runs parallel with the finding of Ladia et al. (2012) that TEIs that were COEs and CODs had below 50% passing rate. The researchers recommended that program accreditation should be re-evaluated and awarded to universities that deserve the prestigious title of COEs and CODs.

Literature and studies have shown direct relationship between licensure-examination performance and school performance. Licensure performance of graduates in board examinations reflect the quality of education provided by their academic institutions and their technical/professional competencies. Moreover, licensure-examination performance ratings have been commonly accepted as a gauge of quality education among HEIs.

Antiojo (2017) asserted that licensure examination is one of the factors that influence the quality of teachers and teaching in the country. Thus, a passing average performance in licensure examination for teachers (LET) is one of the outcome indicators under curriculum and instruction parameter of the new Outcomes-Based Quality Assurance (OBQA) instrument of AACCUP evaluation.

The quality of graduates is a source of prestige of an educational institution. The performance of graduates in licensure examination is a positive measure of the quality and standard of education a school provides. It is an indicator of the kind of training and learning the graduates acquired (Basaen et al., 2005). Buenaobra and Medallon (2013) also corroborated that the true measure of any board program of a school is passing the licensure exam.

The 21st century emphasizes that teachers’ role in higher education is not only limited to transmitting knowledge; teachers also have a role of generating and disseminating knowledge through scholarly conference presentations and journal publications (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015). Quitoras and Abuso (2021) emphasized that research is a major function of HEIs in which faculty members are expected to produce knowledge beneficial to the institution and national development. In the case of China, Chen (2012) discussed in her study that Chinese higher education system has transformed its function from knowledge dissemination and personnel training to knowledge production and transfer. Chinese universities contribute knowledge through research output and knowledge transfer, which are usually measured by research and development activities and output.

In the Philippines, however, Nuqui and Cruz (2012) noted that most often HEIs do not focus on conducting and publishing research despite research and publication having become a global standard in the international community of academes and education systems. Unfortunately, the number of those publishing is significantly low among Philippine HEIs, and it has been consistently claimed over the years that few faculty members are conducting research and even fewer are publishing scholarly journal articles (Dumbrique & Alon, 2013; Hardé, 2014; Nuqui & Cruz, 2012; Wa-Mbaleka, 2014). Also, according to Acar (2012), despite the consistent recommendations of accrediting bodies and the CHED that faculty members should publish, the issue of limited publication has persisted for years. As such, recommendations have been made over the years on the need for more research and more publications, but the number of publications is still insignificant compared to the large number of educators currently teaching in Philippine colleges and universities (Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007; Wa-Mbaleka, 2014).

At the level of higher-education faculty, they are expected to generate knowledge through research and disseminate their findings through scholarly conferences and journal publications. This expectation has created much pressure on faculty members in higher education, even more so in recent years, as greater emphasis is placed on presenting and publishing research (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015). Several literatures cited a number of problems related to faculty involvement in research and publication in HEIs. These problems include: disconnect between research or theory and practice (Boyer et al., 2016; Boykin & Noguera, 2011); little visibility of Filipino scholars in the international arena of scholarly publications (Valencia & Gonzalez, 2007); quality of publications (Japos, 2012); lack of cooperation between universities and industries (Leon, 2011); and limited financial resources for research and development (Justimbaste, 2004).

These problems are supported by the study of Wa-Mbaleka (2015) investigating the factors leading to limited faculty publications in Philippine HEIs. The study gathered data from higher-education faculty members of three (3) different universities about the reasons for their having no or limited number of publications. The findings revealed that the seven (7) most challenging factors preventing faculty members from publishing enough or not publishing at all include having limited time, lack of training on publication, fear of rejection, lack of interest, faculty laziness, limited funds, and lack of institutional support. The study hoped to help raise scholars’ awareness of the common issues expressed by the faculty, towards starting some constructive discourse in colleges and universities on how to better support the work involved in publication.

Graduate employability is an issue of growing importance in higher education internationally and is of relevance to each of the principal stakeholders: students, their families and sponsors, HEIs, employers, professional bodies, national governments, and regional entities. As such, HEIs compete on a national and international basis, particularly as new performance measures, including employability, emerge (Smith et al., 2000). Also, employability is one of the indicators of relevance of program offerings in HEIs. It measures the marketability of graduates in any program. If graduates cannot land a job based on the course and specialization they took up in college, it means the graduates are not employable (Abarro, 2017). Angeles (2009) stated that one of the goals of improving higher education is to “improve the capability of public and private HEIs to equip students with the required skills and competencies for national development and to prepare them for gainful employment.” Also, Dotong et al. (2016) emphasized that employability of graduates is one of the measures of HEIs to ensure that the quality of education they provide is suitable for the needs of the industry.

Universities and institutions of higher learning are no longer expected to simply prepare graduates for a world of work, but to continuously support the learning and professional development of working people (Boateng et al., 2015). It is therefore important for academic institutions to develop more flexible and creative models of delivery to support the development of autonomous, lifelong learners who are skilled in reflecting on their learning (both formal and informal) and in planning for their personal, educational, and professional development (Gray & Knight, 2013).

Chavez et al. (2016) posited that giving students the right opportunity to participate in community-extension programs of their university provides deeper understanding and meaning of volunteerism with clear image of the present condition of the environment and society. Some of the extra-curricular activities of colleges help students develop a sense of volunteerism and responsibility through community-extension projects. The same was pointed out by Rubio et al. (2016), that community-extension program is an activity where an individual can experience a different way of learning. They learn how to sympathize in identifying the problems and be part of the proactive solution to current and emerging challenges. Their contribution to the improvement of the quality of living in the adopted community of their university would mean a lot to them as part of their small and great achievements.

Knowledge of community relations would somehow help them in their future employment on how to develop community-development plans, considering that most organizations have activities related to corporate social responsibility (Buenviaje, 2013). The findings of the study of Chavez, et al. (2016) on the employability of engineering graduates of Lyceum of the Philippines University, Batangas City, Philippines, revealed that the graduates believed that community extension, linkages, and research have the highest relevance to their job placement.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to analyze and correlate the accreditation status and school performance of Apayao State College (ASC). The results served as a basis for a proposed action plan to improve school performance.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To analyze the accreditation profile of various programs at Apayao State College over the past six years, focusing on:

1.1. Accreditation status.

1.2. Accreditation ratings across ten specified areas.

2. To determine if there are significant differences in the accreditation profiles of different programs based on:

2.1. Accreditation status.

2.2. Accreditation ratings across the ten areas.

3. To evaluate the school performance of different programs in relation to the following variables:

3.1. Extent of employability.

3.2. Board performance (if applicable).

3.3. Graduation rate.

3.4. Performance in research.

3.5. Performance in publication.

3.6. Performance in community extension.

3.7. Compliance with Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Orders (CMOs).

4. To assess whether there are significant differences in school performance among different programs regarding:

4.1. Extent of employability.

4.2. Board performance (if applicable).

4.3. Graduation rate.

4.4. Performance in research.

4.5. Performance in publication.

4.6. Performance in community extension.

4.7. Compliance with CMOs.

5. To investigate the existence of a significant relationship between accreditation profiles and school performance variables.

4. METHODOLOGY

**4.1. Research Design**

This study used descriptive-correlational research design. It also used both the quantitative and qualitative approaches, with documentary analysis and survey as the primary methods of data collection. The descriptive approach was based on secondary-data analysis of accreditation level, status, and rating, including the different variables of school performance identified in the study. Correlational test was used to determine the relationship between school accreditation and school performance.

**4.2. Participants of the Study**

The participants of the study were the college administrators of Apayao State College (ASC): one (1) Vice President for Academic Affairs, one (1) Director for Instruction, one (1) Campus Administrator, four (4) College Deans, seven (7) Program Chairpersons, one (1) Quality Assurance Director, one (1) Campus Research Coordinator, one (1) Campus Extension Coordinator, and the graduates of the different programs in the past six (6) years. Total enumeration was employed for college administrators and for graduates of the different programs in the past six (6) years.

***Table 1. Graduates of the Different Programs in 2014-2019***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cluster | Year Graduated | Total |
| Programs | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | Total  |
| Education | BSE | 34 | 46 | 39 | 44 | 54 | 50 | 267 |
| BEED | 9 | 18 | 20 | 56 | 25 | 46 | 174 |
| Engineering and Info Tech | BS Info Tech | 21 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 28 | 16 | 101 |
| BSCE | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 22 |
| CBHRM and Agriculture | BSHRM | 13 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 18 | 64 |
| BSBA | 20 | 14 | 7 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 78 |
| BSA | 4 | 7 | 9 | 23 | 8 | 14 | 65 |
| Total | 771 |

**4.3. Instrumentation**

A researcher-made survey instrument was administered to the graduates of the different programs to gather data on their degree, year of graduation, and employment.

Secondary data analysis was conducted to gather data on accreditation status and ratings from official accreditation results from AACCUP, Inc.

Focus-group discussions (FGDs) were facilitated by the researcher among the employee participants to gather data on graduation rate in the different programs, faculty research and publication, community extension, and program compliance with their respective CHED Memorandum Orders (CMOs).

**4.. Data Gathering Procedures**

The researcher sought the approval of the College President through a request letter for the conduct of the study. The survey questionnaire was administered to the graduates of the different programs from 2014 to 2019. Secondary data analysis was based on Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) data on licensure examinees per school and the accreditation status and ratings were based on the official AACCUP accreditation results in the past six (6) years obtained from the Office of the Quality Assurance Director.

**4.5. Data Analysis**

*Narrative Analysis*. This was used in the presentation and discussion of the school-performance variables specifically extent of employability, board performance, graduation rate, faculty research and publication, community extension, and program compliance with their respective CMOs.

*One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)*. It was used to test for significant difference in the accreditation profile of the different programs in terms of accreditation status and ratings and the significant difference in the level of performance of the different programs in terms of the identified variables.

*Chi-Square Test*. This was used to determine the significant relationship between accreditation status and school performance.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**5.1. Accreditation Profile of the Different Programs of Apayao State College (ASC) in the Past Six (6) Years**

**Accreditation Status**

In terms of the accreditation status of the programs, Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSE) is Re-accredited Level II and passed phase 1 of level III accreditation status. The Bachelor in Elementary Education (BEEd), Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BS Info Tech), Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA), and Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSA) are Re-accredited Level II status. Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering (BSCE) and Bachelor of Science in Hotel and Restaurant Management (BSHRM) are Re-accredited Level I status as shown in table 2.

The accreditation status of the programs towards higher levels further implies that the school puts great importance on the accreditation of its program offerings. As mandated by CHED (2007), the school needs to continue to pursue higher level of accreditations status. Along this line, Conchada and Tiongco (2015) discussed the additional benefits of accreditation, emphasizing that increasing levels of accreditation attained would eventually lead to grant of institutional autonomy.

**Table 2. Accreditation Status of the Different Programs of Apayao State College.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Cluster** | **Program** | **Accreditation Status** |
| Education | BSE | Re-accredited Level II, Passed Level III of Phase 1 |
| BEED | Re-accredited Level II |
| Engineering & Information Technology | BS Info Tech | Re-accredited Level II |
| BSCE | Re-accredited Level I |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | BSHRM | Re-accredited Level I |
| BSBA | Re-accredited Level II |
| BSA | Re-accredited Level II |

**Accreditation Ratings of the Different Programs of ASC along the 10 Areas**

The table 3 shows the accreditation ratings of the different programs of Apayao State College along the ten (10) areas of AACCUP accreditation. As regards the 10 areas of accreditation evaluation, the VMGO, Library, and Administration have a Very Satisfactory rating across all programs, followed by Support to Students and Extension and Community Involvement in which six (6) of the programs except for BS Info Tech have a rating of Very Satisfactory. The area of Faculty has four (4) Very Satisfactory ratings under the BSEd, BS Info Tech, BSBA, and BSA programs and three (3) Satisfactory ratings under the BEEd, BSCE, and BSHRM programs. Research has four (4) Very Satisfactory ratings under the BSEd, BSCE, BSHRM, and BSA programs and three (3) Satisfactory ratings under the BEED, BS Info Tech, and BSBA programs. Curriculum and Instruction have three (3) Very Satisfactory ratings under the BSEd, BSBA, and BSA programs and four (4) Satisfactory ratings under the BEEd, BS Info Tech, BSCE, and BSHRM programs. Physical Plant has two (2) Very Satisfactory ratings in the BSEd and BSA programs and five (5) Satisfactory ratings in the BEEd, BS Info Tech, BSCE, BSHRM, and BSBA programs. Finally, the area of Laboratory recorded one (1) Very Satisfactory rating and six (6) Satisfactory ratings in all the programs. These imply that among the 10 areas of accreditation, the weakest areas are the Physical Plant and Laboratory.

In the overall result, five (5) of the programs such as BSEd, BEEd, BS Info Tech, BSBA, and BSA have a rating of Very Satisfactory along the ten areas while two (2) programs, BSCE and BSHRM, have an overall rating of Satisfactory. Further, the area of Laboratory needs much attention across all six programs (BEEd, Info Tech, BSCE, BSHRM, BSBA, and BSA). Physical Plant, on the other hand, has a consistent Satisfactory rating across five (5) programs: BEEd, BS Info Tech, BSCE, BSHRM, and BSBA.

**Table 3. Accreditation Ratings of the Different Programs of ASC along the 10 Areas**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Areas** | **Program Cluster** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| BSE | SD | BEED | SD | BS Info Tech | SD | BSCE | SD | BSHRM | SD | BSBA | SD | BSA | SD |
| VMGO | 4.17 | VS | 3.58 | VS | 3.58 | VS | 3.57 | VS | 3.57 | VS | 3.54 | VS | 4.14 | VS |
| Faculty | 4.23 | VS | 4.05 | S | 4.01 | VS | 2.94 | S | 2.94 | S | 4.40 | VS | 4.25 | VS |
| Curriculum & Instruction | 4.48 | VS | 3.30 | S | 3.23 | S | 2.90 | S | 2.90 | S | 3.52 | VS | 3.55 | VS |
| Support to Students | 3.84 | VS | 3.55 | VS | 3.32 | S | 3.57 | VS | 3.57 | VS | 3.56 | VS | 3.84 | VS |
| Research | 3.98 | VS | 3.30 | S | 3.18 | S | 3.51 | VS | 3.51 | VS | 3.36 | S | 3.52 | VS |
| Extension & Community Involvement | 4.28 | VS | 3.55 | VS | 3.21 | S | 3.67 | VS | 3.67 | VS | 3.75 | VS | 3.66 | VS |
| Library | 3.65 | VS | 4.06 | VS | 4.02 | VS | 3.54 | VS | 3.54 | VS | 3.54 | VS | 3.54 | VS |
| Physical Plant & Facilities | 3.51 | VS | 3.20 | S | 3.20 | S | 3.10 | S | 3.10 | S | 3.10 | S | 3.51 | VS |
| Laboratory | 3.58 | VS | 3.10 | S | 3.09 | S | 3.05 | S | 3.05 | S | 3.08 | S | 3.07 | S |
| Administration | 4.02 | VS | 4.00 | VS | 4.10 | VS | 3.76 | VS | 3.76 | VS | 3.92 | VS | 3.53 | VS |
| Overall Ratings | 4.01 | VS | 3.60 | VS | 3.52 | VS | 3.31 | S | 3.31 | S | 3.65 | VS | 3.67 | VS |

**Legend:** *The scale used includes the following adjectival descriptions: a rating of 4.50 to 5.00 is interpreted as Excellent (E), 3.50 to 4.49 as Very Satisfactory (VS), 2.50 to 3.49 as Satisfactory (S), 1.50 to 3.49 as Fair (F), and 1.00 to 1.49 as Poor (P).*

**5.2. Significant differences in the accreditation profiles of the different programs in terms of accreditation status and accreditation ratings in the 10 areas**

**Significant Difference in the Accreditation Profile of the Different Programs in Terms of Accreditation Status**

Table 4 shows the result of the test for significant difference in the accreditation profile of the different programs in terms of accreditation status. The probability value of 0.290 is higher than the 0.05 level of significance; hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is no significant difference in the accreditation profile of the different programs in terms of accreditation status. The result further reveals that Apayao State College (ASC) equally subjects its academic programs for accreditation evaluation. As Cambel et al. (2012) stated, accreditation is the affirmation that an institution provides quality education that the community has a right to expect and which the education world endorses.

**Table 4. Significant Difference in the Accreditation Profile of the Different Programs in Terms of Accreditation Status**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Program Cluster** | **N** | **x̄** | **S.D.** | **F** | **PV** | **Decision at α=0.05** |
| Accreditation Status | Education | 2 | 3.80 | 0.289 | 1.69 | 0.290 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.41 | 0.148 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.54 | 0.202 |

**Significant Difference in the Accreditation Profile of the Different Programs in Terms of Accreditation Ratings in the 10 Areas**

Table 5 shows the result of the test for significant difference in the accreditation profile of the different programs in terms of accreditation ratings along the ten 10 areas. The probability values along the ten areas of accreditation such as VMGO, Faculty, Curriculum, Support to Students, Research, Extension, Library, Physical Plant, Laboratory, and Administration, which are 0.660, 0.650, 0.340, 0.380, 0.590, 0.390, 0.350, 0.630, 0.270, and 0.330, respectively, are higher than the 0.05 level of significance; hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is no significant difference in the accreditation profile of the different programs in terms of accreditation ratings in the ten (10) areas.

This result is supported by what Ching (2013) mentioned that based on the requirements of the various accreditation levels, HEI accreditation in the Philippines is centered on four key result areas, namely, quality of teaching and research, support for students, relations with the community, and management of resources. Thus, accreditation is a process that could bring out the best in all areas of the academic institution.

**Table 5. Significant Difference in the Accreditation Profile of the Different Programs in Terms of Accreditation Ratings in the 10 Areas**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Areas** | **Program Cluster** | **N** | **x̄** | **S.D.** | **F** | **PV** | **Decision at α=0.05** |
| VMGO | Education | 2 | 3.87 | 0.417 | 0.45 | 0.660 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.57 | 0.007 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.75 | 0.338 |
| Faculty | Education | 2 | 4.14 | 0.127 | 0.47 | 0.650 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.47 | 0.756 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.86 | 0.803 |
| Curriculum | Education | 2 | 3.89 | 0.834 | 1.41 | 0.340 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.06 | 0.233 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.32 | 0.366 |
| Support to Students | Education | 2 | 3.69 | 0.205 | 1.21 | 0.380 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.44 | 0.176 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.65 | 0.158 |
| Research | Education | 2 | 3.64 | 0.480 | 0.58 | 0.590 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.34 | 0.233 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.46 | 0.089 |
| Extension | Education | 2 | 3.91 | 0.516 | 1.19 | 0.390 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.44 | 0.325 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.69 | 0.049 |
| Library | Education | 2 | 3.85 | 0.289 | 1.38 | 0.350 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.78 | 0.339 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.54 | 0.000 |
| Physical Plant | Education | 2 | 3.35 | 0.219 | 0.51 | 0.630 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.15 | 0.070 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.23  | 0.236 |
| Laboratory | Education | 2 | 3.34 | 0.339 | 1.81 | 0.270 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.07 | 0.028 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.23 | 0.236 |
| Administration | Education | 2 | 4.01 | 0.014 | 1.47 | 0.330 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.93 | 0.240 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.73 | 0.196 |
| Mean | Education | 2 | 3.80 | 0.289 | 1.69 | 0.290 | Accept Ho |
| Engineering & Info Tech | 2 | 3.41 | 0.148 |
| CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 3.54 | 0.202 |

**5.3. School Performance of the Different Programs**

**Extent of Employability**

Table 6 presents the school performance of the different programs in terms of graduates’ employability.As shown in the table, BSEd has a Moderately High extent of employability at 58.82% in the year 2014, Low extent of employability in the following years: 2015 at 32.60%, 2016 at 38.46%, 2017 at 31.81%, and 2018 at 25.92%. The lowest is in 2019 at 18.00% described as Very Low extent of employability. Similarly, the BEED program has a Moderately High extent of employability in 2014 at 55.55% and Low employability rate in 2016 and 2017 at 25.00% and 40.90%, respectively. BEED has a Very Low extent of employability in the years 2015, 2018, and 2019 at 15.21%, 12.96%, and 10.00%, respectively.

BS Info Tech has High extent of employability at 61.53% in 2016 followed by Moderately High employability at 42.85% in 2014. The Info Tech marks a Very Low employability in 2015, 2017, 2018, and 2019 with the corresponding percentages of 17.39, 11.36, 18.51, and 10.00. The BSCE program recorded its Very High extent of employability in the years 2014 and 2016 with the same percentage of 100.00, while Very Low extent of employability in the years 2015, 2017, 2018, and 2019. These extreme employability ratings for the program in the identified years could be attributed to the number of their graduates, either all their graduates are employed or there is no graduate of the program to be employed.

The year 2014 recorded a Low employability rate at 38.46% for the BSHRM program and the rest of the years mark a Very Low extent of employability. No graduate of the program was employed in the years 2015, 2016, 2018, and 2019, and this gives the program the lowest employability rate among the seven programs in the past six years.

The BSBA program has its Low employability rate in 2014 and 2016 with percentages of 25.00 and 28.57, respectively. The program has recorded its Very Low employability rates in the years 2015, 2017, 2018, and 2019 with percentages of 10.86, 13.63, 7.40, and 6.00, respectively. The BSA program has its Moderately High employability rate in 2014 and 2016 at 50.00% and 44.44%, respectively, and Low employability at 25.00% in 2017. The Very Low employability rate for the BSA program was in 2015 at 6.52%, in 2018 at 3.70%, and in 2019 at 12.00%.

The over-all analysis shows that 2019 reflects the lowest employability rates for the five (5) programs while 2015 is the year when most of the programs have a Moderately High extent of employability. The majority of the programs have a Low employability rate in the past six years. This finding can be attributed to the low performance of graduates in the licensure examination and to the satisfactory performance of the non-board programs along Curriculum and Instruction in the accreditation evaluation. This claim is supported by the study of Boateng et al. (2015) in Wisconsin International University College (WIUC), which reported that putting the right (aligned) curriculum in place and effectively delivering it will equip graduates with the skills they need for advancement and in achieving employment-related outcomes.

**Table 6. School Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of Extent of Employability**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** |  **Employability Rate (%)** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| **BSE** | **DI** | **BEED** | **DI** | **BS Info Tech** | **DI** | **BSCE** | **DI** | **BSHRM** | **DI** | **BSBA** | **DI** | **BSA** | **DI** |
| 2014 | 58.82 | MH | 55.55 | MH | 42.85 | MH | 100.00 | VH | 38.46 | L | 25.00 | L | 50.00 | MH |
| 2015 | 32.60 | L | 15.21 | VL | 17.39 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 10.86 | VL | 6.52 | VL |
| 2016 | 38.46 | L | 25.00 | L | 61.53 | H | 100.00 | VH | 0.00 | VL | 28.57 | L | 44.44 | MH |
| 2017 | 31.81 | L | 40.90 | L | 11.36 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 2.27 | VL | 13.63 | VL | 25.00 | L |
| 2018 | 25.92 | L | 12.96 | VL | 18.51 | VL | 3.70 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 7.40 | VL | 3.70 | VL |
| 2019 | 18.00 | VL | 10.00 | VL | 10.00 | VL | 8.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 6.00 | VL | 12.00 | VL |
| Over-all Performance | 34.27 | L | 26.60 | L | 26.94 | L | 35.28 | L | 6.79 | VL | 15.24 | VL | 23.61 | L |

Legend: *The scale used includes the following adjectival descriptions: 81% to 100% is interpreted as Very High, 61% to 80% as High, 41% to 60% as Moderately High, 21% to 40% as Low, 0% to 20% as Very Low.*

**Board Performance**

As presented in the table below, there are three (3) non-board programs of ASC: BS Info Tech, BSHRM, and BSBA. The BSE program has Low board performance rating in 2017 and 2018 with percentages of 30.64 and 34.96, respectively. It is followed by a Very Low board performance in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2019 with the ratings of 16.39%, 16.22% 13.16%, and 17.09%, respectively. The years 2016 and 2019 show a Low board performance rating for the BEEd program with percentages of 25.81 and 23.88, respectively. In 2014, 2015, 2017, and 2018, the BEED program recorded its Very Low board performance with the ratings of 11.76%, 11.11%, 18.46%, and 12.77%, respectively. Generally, it can be deduced that the board performance of the BSEd program is better than that of the BEEd program.

The BSCE program has a zero percent board rating for consecutive years from 2014 to 2017. There were graduates in 2015 and 2017, and some re-takers had not passed the board exam, thus the zero rating of passers in the said years. The program's board performance in 2018 and 2019 is Very Low with a rating of 20.00% and 16.67%, respectively. Similarly, the BSA program has no board takers in 2014, and two consecutive years (2015 and 2016) have no board passer. In 2017, the BSA program has a Very Low performance board rating of 12.50% while 2018 and 2019 mark a Moderately High board performance with the same rating of 50.00%.

Generally, the BSE and BSA programs have a Low board performance while the BEED and BSCE programs have a Very Low performance in the board exams in the past six years.

The above finding is similar to the study of Baylan (2018) that investigated premier Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in the country, revealing that there is a considerable number of premier TEIs that are performing below the national standard passing rate.

**Table 7. School Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of Board Performance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Board Performance (%)** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| **BSE** | **DI** | **BEED** | **DI** | **BS Info Tech** | **DI** | **BSCE** | **DI** | **BSHRM** | **DI** | **BSBA** | **DI** | **BSA** | **DI** |
| 2014 | 16.39 | VL | 11.76 | VL | - | - | 0.00 | VL | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | 16.22 | VL | 11.11 | VL | - | - | 0.00 | VL | - | - | - | - | 0.00 | VL |
| 2016 | 13.16 | VL | 25.81 | L | - | - | 0.00 | VL | - | - | - | - | 0.00 | VL |
| 2017 | 30.63 | L | 18.46 | VL | - | - | 0.00 | VL | - | - | - | - | 12.50 | VL |
| 2018 | 34.96 | L | 12.77 | VL | - | - | 20.00 | VL | - | - | - | - | 50.00 | MH |
| 2019 | 17.09 | VL | 23.88 | L | - | - | 16.67 | VL | - | - | - | - | 50.00 | MH |
| Over-all Performance | 21.41 | L | 17.30 | VL | - | - | 6.11 | VL | - | - | - | - | 22.50 | L |

Legend: *The scale used includes the following adjectival descriptions: 81% to 100% is interpreted as Very High, 61% to 80% as High, 41% to 60% as Moderately High, 21% to 40% as Low, 0% to 20% as Very Low.*

**Graduation Rate**

Table 8 shows the graduation rate of the seven programs in the past six years. As shown in the table, the BSEd program has a Very High graduation rate in the years 2014, 2015,2017, and 2018 with percentages of 100.00, 86.79, 88.00, and 87.10, respectively. It is followed by a high graduation rate in 2019 at 73.53% and a Moderately High graduation rate in 2016 at 54.93%. Similarly, the BEEd program has High graduation rates in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2019 with percentages of 100.00, 93.33, and 90.20, respectively. The years 2014 and 2018 mark a Low graduation rate for BEED at 28.13% and 40.32%, respectively. For BS Info Tech, the graduation rate is Very High in 2017 at 83.33%, Moderately High in 2018 at 45.16%, and Low in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2019 at 26.25%, 23.21%, 37.14%, and 34.04%, respectively. The BSCE program has no graduate in 2015 and 2017. In 2014 its graduation rate is at 14.29% and in 2018 at 6.45% which are consistently Very Low graduation rate. In 2016, the BSCE program recorded a Low graduation rate at 36.36% and in 2019 marked a high graduation rate at 72.22%. BSHRM recorded a Very High graduation rate in 2017 at 90.00% and a high graduation rate in 2019 at 78.26%. The program has a Low graduation rate in 2014 and 2015 and a Very Low graduation rate in 2016 and 2018. The BSBA department also had a Very High graduation rate in 2015 and 2017 at 82.35% and 94.44%, respectively, while in 2014 and 2019 had a high graduation rate. In 2016 the BSBA has a Low graduation rate and Very Low in 2018 at 16.13%. Lastly, the BSA program has a Moderately High graduation rate at 57.50% in 2017 and the rest of the years have Low and Very Low graduation rates.

In summary, most of the programs in 2017 have a Very High graduation rate while they have a high graduation rate in 2019. The rest of the years covered in the study show a Low and Very Low level of performance in terms of graduation rate. This can be attributed to students choosing to shift to other courses when they are in their second year.

BSE has a Very High graduation rate, BEED has a high graduation rate, and three of the programs, BS Info Tech, BSHRM, and BSBA, have a Moderately High graduation rate. Only the BSA program marks a Low graduation rate in the past six years. The above findings imply that the graduation rates in the different programs are relatively Moderately High.

**Table 8. School Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of Graduation Rate**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Graduation Rate (%)** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| **BSE** | **DI** | **BEED** | **DI** | **BS Info Tech** | **DI** | **BSCE** | **DI** | **BSHRM** | **DI** | **BSBA** | **DI** | **BSA** | **DI** |
| 2014 | 100.00 | VH | 28.13 | L | 26.25 | L | 14.29 | VL | 37.14 | L | 74.07 | H | 0.00 | VL |
| 2015 | 86.79 | VH | 100.00 | VH | 23.21 | L | 0.00 | VL | 27.78 | L | 82.35 | VH | 25.93 | L |
| 2016 | 54.93 | MH | 100.00 | VH | 37.14 | L | 36.36 | L | 15.00 | VL | 30.43 | L | 18.37 | VL |
| 2017 | 88.00 | VH | 93.33 | VH | 83.33 | VH | 0.00 | VL | 90.00 | VH | 94.44 | VH | 57.50 | MH |
| 2018 | 87.10 | VH | 40.32 | L | 45.16 | MH | 6.45 | VL | 12.90 | VL | 16.13 | VL | 12.90 | VL |
| 2019 | 73.53 | H | 90.20 | VH | 34.04 | L | 72.22 | H | 78.26 | H | 62.50 | H | 34.15 | L |
| Over-all Performance | 81.73 | VH | 75.33 | H | 41.52 | MH | 21.55 | L | 43.51 | MH | 59.99 | MH | 24.81 | L |

Legend: *The scale used includes the following adjectival descriptions: 81% to 100% is interpreted as Very High, 61% to 80% as High, 41% to 60% as Moderately High, 21% to 40% as Low, 0% to 20% as Very Low.*

**Faculty Involvement in Research**

Table 9 presents the involvement of faculty members in research. Both programs of Teacher Education are at par in performance in terms of faculty involvement in research in 2014 to 2019. The BSEd and BEED programs have Moderately High performance of faculty in research from 2014 to 2016 at 46.15% and 58.82%, respectively, Low performance in 2017 and 2019, and Very Low performance in 2018.

BS Info Tech records a low performance in the years 2014 (28.15%), 2015 (28.57), 2016 (40.00%), and 2019 (40.00%), while in the years 2017 and 2018 has a Very Low performance at zero per cent and 16.67%, respectively. The BSCE program performed only in 2015 at 20.00%, and in rest of the years considered has a zero performance which brought a consistently Very Low performance in research. Between the BS Info Tech and BSCE, the former has a better faculty performance in research than the latter.

The BSHRM program has a high performance in faculty research in 2014 and 2019 at 75.00% and 66.67%, respectively, Moderately High performance in 2017, Low performance in 2015 and 2016, and Very Low performance in 2018. Similarly, the BSBA program has a Moderately High performance in 2015 and 2017, while its performance in 2019 is Low at 25.00% and Very Low in 2014 and 2018. The BSA program has a Moderately High performance in 2015 and 2019 at 50.00% and 60.00%, respectively, Low performance in 2014, 2017, and 2018 and Very Low in 2016.

Generally, in 2015 most of the programs’ performance in research is Moderately High. The majority have a Very Low performance in 2018 and Low performance in 2019. Moreover, the majority of the seven programs have a Low performance in terms of faculty involvement in research in the past six years.

These findings of the study are consistent with the reviews of Dumbrique and Alon (2013), Hardé (2014), Nuqui and Cruz (2012), and Wa-Mbaleka (2014) that in the Philippine HEIs, it has been consistently claimed over the years that few faculty members are conducting research and even fewer are publishing scholarly journal articles.

**Table 9. School Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of Faculty Involvement in Research**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Research Involvement (%)** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| **BSE** | **DI** | **BEED** | **DI** | **BS Info Tech** | **DI** | **BSCE** | **DI** | **BSHRM** | **DI** | **BSBA** | **DI** | **BSA** | **DI** |
| 2014 | 46.15 | MH | 46.15 | MH | 28.15 | L | 0.00 | VL | 75.00 | H | 0.00 | VL | 25.00 | L |
| 2015 | 46.15 | MH | 46.15 | MH | 28.57 | L | 20.00 | VL | 25.00 | L | 50.00 | MH | 50.00 | MH |
| 2016 | 58.82 | MH | 58.82 | MH | 40.00 | L | 0.00 | VL | 25.00 | L | 75.00 | H | 16.66 | VL |
| 2017 | 21.43 | L | 21.83 | L | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 50.00 | MH | 50.00 | MH | 33.33 | L |
| 2018 | 10.00 | VL | 20.00 | VL | 16.67 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 40.00 | L |
| 2019 | 25.00 | L | 40.00 | L | 40.00 | L | 0.00 | VL | 66.67 | H | 25.00 | L | 60.00 | MH |
| Over-all Performance | 34.59 | L | 38.83 | L | 25.57 | L | 3.33 | VL | 40.28 | L | 33.33 | L | 37.50 | L |

Legend: *The scale used includes the following adjectival descriptions: 81% to 100% is interpreted as Very High, 61% to 80% as High, 41% to 60% as Moderately High, 21% to 40% as Low, 0% to 20% as Very Low.*

**Research Publication**

Table 10 shows that both BSEd and BEEd programs under the Teacher Education cluster have Low research publication in 2015 at 38.46%, Very Low publication from 2015 to 2019, and have not published research in 2018 and 2019. Also, it can be seen in the table that the percentage of published research decreases as the year progresses.

The BS Info Tech has only published research in 2016 at 20.00% and for the past six years, the program has a Very Low performance in publication. BSCE is the program with zero-percent performance in research publication in the past six years. BSHRM and BSBA programs have only published research in 2015 and 2017. On the other hand, the BSA program was able to publish research consecutively from 2015 to 2017.

Based on the over-all result, research publication of the different programs in the past six years equates to a Very Low performance. The data presented in the table above is consistent with the data revealed on faculty’s involvement in research.

The findings are supported by Acar (2012) who reported that despite the consistent recommendations of accrediting bodies and the CHED that faculty members publish, the issue of limited publications has persisted for years. Recommendations have been made over the years on the need for more research and more publications but the number of publications is still insignificant compared to the large number of educators currently teaching in Philippine colleges and universities (Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007; Wa-Mbaleka, 2014).

**Table 10. School Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of Research Publication**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Research Publication (%)** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| **BSE** | **DI** | **BEED** | **DI** | **BS Info Tech** | **DI** | **BSCE** | **DI** | **BSHRM** | **DI** | **BSBA** | **DI** | **BSA** | **DI** |
| 2014 | 38.46 | L | 38.46 | L | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL |
| 2015 | 14.28 | VL | 14.28 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 25.00 | L | 25.00 | L | 50.00 | MH |
| 2016 | 17.64 | VL | 17.64 | VL | 20.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 16.67 | VL |
| 2017 | 7.14 | VL | 7.14 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 25.00 | L | 25.00 | L | 16.67 | VL |
| 2018 | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL |
| 2019 | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 0.00 | VL |
| Over-all Performance | 12.92 | VL | 12.92 | VL | 3.33 | VL | 0.00 | VL | 8.33 | VL | 8.33 | VL | 13.89 | VL |

Legend: *The scale used includes the following adjectival descriptions: 81% to 100% is interpreted as Very High, 61% to 80% as High, 41% to 60% as Moderately High, 21% to 40% as Low, 0% to 20% as Very Low.*

**Community Extension**

The table 11 below presents the performance of the different programs along Community Extension in the past six years. As shown, BSEd has a Very High performance in Community Extension in 2015 at 83.33%, in 2018 and 2019 at 100.00%, followed by a high performance at 66.67% in 2014 and a Moderately High performance in 2016 and 2017 both at 50.00%. On the other hand, the BEED program recorded its High performance in Community Extension in the years 2015 and 2018 at 66.66%, Moderately High performance in 2014, 2017, and 2019 at 50.00% but Very Low performance in 2016 at 16.66%. The Very Low performance of the BEEd program along Community Extension in 2016 means that it did not meet the target performance in the said year.

BS Info Tech has a Very High performance in Community Extension in 2015 at 83.33%, High performance in 2016, 2018, and 2019 while Moderately High in 2014 and 2017. The BSCE program marks its Very High performance in Community Extension in 2015 at 83.33%, Moderately High in 2014 at 50.00%, Very Low performance in 2016 and 2017, and Low performance in 2018 and 2019 at 33.33%. The Very Low performance of the BSCE program for two (2) consecutive years from 2016 to 2017 means that the program did not conduct any community extension in the said years.

For BSHRM, its Very High performance along Community Extension is in 2015 and 2018 at 83.33% and 100.00%, respectively, High performance in 2014 at 66.66%, followed by Moderately High performance in 2016 and 2017 but Low performance in 2019 at 33.33%. The BSBA program marks its Very High performance at 83.33% in 2015, High performance in 2016, 2018, and 2019, Moderately High performance in 2014 and 2017. Lastly, the BSA program consistently has a Very High performance in Community Extension at 100.00% and 83.33%.

In summary, BSA has a consistently Very High performance in Community Extension among the programs in the past six years. BSCE and BEEd have shown the Lowest Community-Extension-performance levels for three (3) years, and they are the programs with the lowest over-all performance. In the over-all result, most of the programs have a high level of performance along Community Extension.

**Table 11. School Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of Community Extension**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Community Extension (%)** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| **BSE** | **DI** | **BEED** | **DI** | **BS Info Tech** | **DI** | **BSCE** | **DI** | **BSHRM** | **DI** | **BSBA** | **DI** | **BSA** | **DI** |
| 2014 | 66.67 | H | 50.00 | MH | 50.00 | MH | 50.00 | MH | 66.66 | H | 50.00 | MH | 100.00 | VH |
| 2015 | 83.33 | VH | 66.66 | H | 83.33 | VH | 83.33 | VH | 83.33 | VH | 83.33 | VH | 100.00 | VH |
| 2016 | 50.00 | MH | 16.66 | VL | 66.66 | H | 0.00 | VL | 50.00 | MH | 66.66 | H | 100.00 | VH |
| 2017 | 50.00 | MH | 50.00 | MH | 50.00 | MH | 0.00 | VL | 50.00 | MH | 50.00 | MH | 83.33 | VH |
| 2018 | 100.00 | VH | 66.66 | H | 66.66 | H | 33.33 | L | 100.00 | VH | 66.66 | H | 100.00 | VH |
| 2019 | 100.00 | VH | 50.00 | MH | 66.66 | H | 33.33 | L | 33.33 | L | 66.66 | H | 100.00 | VH |
| Over-all Performance | 75.00 | H | 50.00 | MH | 63.88 | H | 33.33 | L | 63.8 | H | 63.88 | H | 97.22 | VH |

Legend: *The scale used includes the following adjectival descriptions: 81% to 100% is interpreted as Very High, 61% to 80% as High, 41% to 60% as Moderately High, 21% to 40% as Low, 0% to 20% as Very Low.*

**Compliance with CMOs**

As shown in Table 12, in terms of compliance with CMO specifically along Organization and MVO, 100% of the programs are compliant. In terms of Program Administration, the majority of the programs are compliant except for BSCE because the dean of the program is not a holder of the appropriate degree. As to Curriculum, all programs have complied with the requirements. For the area of Faculty, the majority of the programs are compliant except for the BSCE program along three areas such as Appropriate Postgraduate Degree, Full Time Faculty Requirement, and Faculty Development Program. The BSCE program did not comply with the requirements in most of the areas under Faculty because most of the faculty members are not master’s degree holders; there is only one permanent faculty while the rest are under Contract of Service (COS), and the program has no approved faculty-development plan. Along Library, the programs are compliant with most of the requirements but not with Library Holdings because the programs did not meet the CMO requirement that there should be five titles of references in every major subject both for print and non-print materials. In terms of Facilities and Equipment, only the BSCE and BSA programs have not complied with the CMO requirements on Laboratory; however, all the programs have complied with the classroom requirements.

The 100% compliance with the CMO specifically in terms of Organization and MVO is attributed to each program's clear and functional organizational structure and realistic and attainable program mission, vision, and objectives. There is enough faculty per program except for BSCE and BSA. Library compliance would improve if the number of print and non-print materials for each program is also increased. Further, the majority of the programs were compliant with the requirements of the different areas of evaluation except for the BSCE program which acquired the most number of non-compliance.

**Table 12. School Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of Compliance with CMOs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Compliance with CMOs** | **Program Cluster** |
| **Education** | **Engineering & IT** | **CBHRM & Agriculture** |
| **Areas of Evaluation** | **BSED** | **BEED** | **BS Info Tech** | **BSCE** | **BSHRM** | **BSBA** | **BSA** |
| **I.Organization & MVO** |
| 1. Presence of organizational chart (University, College, Department)
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Presence of Mission/Vision/Objectives (University, College and Department Level)
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Presence of clear program objectives
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| **II.Program Administration** |
| 1. The Dean of the Unit/College is a holder of appropriate degrees
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Not Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. The Dean of the Unit/College is a licensed professional
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. The program head is a holder of appropriate degrees
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. The program head is a licensed professional
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Must have full-time appointment in the department
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| **III.Curriculum** |
| 1. Taught conform with the minimum courses per Policies and Standards for Undergraduate
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| **IV. Faculty** |
| 1. Appropriate degree
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Appropriate postgraduate degree
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Not Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Full Time Faculty Requirement
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Not Complied | Complied | Complied | Not Complied |
| 1. Faculty Teaching Load
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Faculty Development Program
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Not Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| % of compliance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **V. Library** |
| 1. Head Librarian
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Library Staff
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Staff requirement
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| 1. Library Holdings

4.1 Print materials | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied |
| * 1. non-print

materials | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied | Not Complied |
| * 1. Library

Area | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
|  4.4 Library  Accessibility  and networking | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |
| **VI. Facilities and Equipment** |
| 1. Laboratory Requirements
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Not Complied | Complied | Complied | Not Complied |
| 1. Classroom Requirements
 | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied | Complied |

* 1. **Significant Difference in the Performance of the Different Programs**

Table 13 shows the result of the test of significant difference in the level of performance of the different programs in terms of school-performance variables. The probability values of 0.110, 0.810, 0.50, 0.080, 0.410, and 0.414 are all higher than 0.05 level of significance; hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of performance of the different programs in terms of school-performance variables such as Employability, Board Performance, Graduation Rate, Faculty Research Involvement, Community Extension and Compliance with CMO.

On the other hand, the computed probability value of 0.027 for the area of Research Publication is lower than 0.05 level of significance; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is a significant difference in the performance of the different programs in terms of Research Publication. Significant difference is observed in the research publication under the Education cluster. This implies that the programs under this cluster have performed more considerably than the other program clusters.

**Table 13. Significant Difference in the Performance of the Different Programs in Terms of School-Performance Variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Indicator** |  | **Program Cluster** | **N** | **x̄** | **S.D.** | **F** | **PV** | **Decision at α=0.05** |
| Employability |  | Education | 2 | 30.44 | 5.420 | 4.042 | 0.110 | Accept Ho |
|  | Engineering & InfoTech | 2 | 31.11 | 5.896 |
|  | CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 15.21 | 8.411 |
| Board performance |  | Education | 2 | 6.50 | 8.945 | 0.252 | 0.810 | Accept Ho |
|  | Engineering & InfoTech | 2 | 0.06 | 0.00 |
|  | CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 0.23 | 0.00 |
| Graduation rate |  | Education | 2 | 0.78 | 0.049 | 6.974 | 0.050 | Accept Ho |
|  | Engineering & InfoTech | 2 | 0.32 | 0.141 |
|  | CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 0.45 | 0.150 |
| Faculty research involvement |  | Education | 2 | 0.37 | 0.028 | 4.782 | 0.080 | Accept Ho |
|  | Engineering & InfoTech | 2 | 0.15 | 0.163 |
|  | CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 0.37 | 0.035 |
| Research publication |  | Education | 2 | 0.13ab | 0.00 | 10.19 | 0.027 | Reject Ho |
|  | Engineering & InfoTech | 2 | 0.02a | 0.021 |
|  | CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 0.10b | 0.035 |
| Community Extension |  | Education | 2 | 72.91 | 20.62 | 1.107 | 0.410 | Accept Ho |
|  | Engineering & InfoTech | 2 | 56.71 | 25.20 |
|  | CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 87.50 | 22.45 |
| Compliance with CMOs |  | Education | 2 | 91.90 | 0.00 | 1.107 | 0.414 | Accept Ho |
|  | Engineering & InfoTech | 2 | 79.40 | 8.24 |
|  | CBHRM & Agriculture | 3 | 84.68 | 4.19 |

* 1. **Significant Relationship Between Accreditation Profile and School Performance**

Table 14 presents the significant relationship between accreditation profile and school performance. There are two (2) accreditation profiles: status and rating. On the other hand, there are seven (7) school-performance variables which are employment, board performance, number of graduates, research, publication, extension, and CMO.

In terms of accreditation status and school performance, only one (1) variable which is compliant with CMO has a computed probability value lower than 0.05 level of significance; hence, the null hypothesis is rejected which means that the probability value of 0.024 indicates that accreditation status has a very high positive correlation with compliance with CMO. This means that the greater is extent of the compliance of the program with CMO, the higher is the accreditation level of the program. The other six (6) school-performance variables have probability values higher than 0.05 level of significance; hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that these variables have no significant relationship with accreditation status.

Lastly, all the school-performance variables have computed probability values higher than 0.05 level of significance when related to accreditation rating; thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that the school-performance variables have no significant relationship with accreditation profile and school performance.

Overall, compliance with CMO is the only school-performance variable found to have a significant relationship with accreditation status. This means that the quality of improvement in the delivery of learning is dependent on how the programs strictly follow the CMOs of the programs.

**Table 14. Significant Relationship between Accreditation Profile and School-Performance Variables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Profile Variables  | Computed Value | PV | Decision at α=0.05 |
| Accreditation  | School Performance  |  |  |  |
| Accreditation Status | Employability | 0.357 | 0.432 | Accept Ho |
| Board Performance | 0.846 | 0.154 | Accept Ho |
| Graduation Rate | 0.703 | 0.078 | Accept Ho |
| Faculty Research | -0.066 | 0.889 | Accept Ho |
| Research Publication | 0.675 | 0.096 | Accept Ho |
| Community Extension | 0.550 | 0.201 | Accept Ho |
| Compliance to CMO | 0.819 | 0.024 | Reject HO |
| Accreditation Rating | Employability | -0.179 | 0.701 | Accept Ho |
| Board Performance | 0.332 | 0.668 | Accept Ho |
| Graduation Rate | -0.237 | 0.609 | Accept Ho |
| Faculty Research | -0.099 | 0.833 | Accept Ho |
| Research Publication | 0.054 | 0.908 | Accept Ho |
| Community Extension | 0.239 | 0.606 | Accept Ho |
| Compliance to CMO | -0.345 | 0.448 | Accept Ho |

6. CONCLUSIONS

Considering the SUC level and regional SUC status of the Apayao State College (ASC), it is evident that ASC puts importance on the accreditation of its program offerings with the high possibility of attaining higher accreditation status as manifested in the Very Satisfactory overall ratings of most of the programs in the 10 areas of evaluation. The findings on the accreditation status among the programs showing insignificant differences suggest consistency of the College in the accreditation of all its program. The study concludes that the different programs have a Low performance along most of the performance variables such as employability of graduates, board performance, involvement of faculty members in research, research publication, and compliance with the requirements for laboratory facilities and library collections. Most of the programs have a good performance along community extension and compliance with CMOs; however, continuing improvement needs to be maintained and further improvement is needed for the BSCE program. Furthermore, this study gives relevant information about the status of performance of ASC, paving way for addressing school-performance issues and concerns. Hence, a proposed action plan was crafted.
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