

# Impact of Accreditation on the Quality of Academic Programs in a Private Higher Education Institution

NENITA I. PRADO

ORCID NO. 0000-0001-6451-747X

ncprado@liceo.edu.ph

Liceo de Cagayan University  
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

## ABSTRACT

The general objective of the study was to determine the predictors of the quality of academic programs in a private higher education institution. This study was conducted in a non-sectarian private university in Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines. The study was participated by administrators, faculty, and staff. A descriptive correlational and causal research design was used to describe the data with the corresponding descriptive Statistics such as mean, Pearson – product moment correlation, and multiple regression. Accreditation is extremely important in the pursuit of excellence. Best practices in accreditation are evident. There is a high level of impact of accreditation in the institution. Accreditation visits are well managed, and the programs have very good quality. There is a significant relationship between the quality of the programs and: best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA accreditation, attitude towards accreditation, the impact of accreditation, and management of accreditation visit. There is only one best predictor of program quality, attitude toward accreditation. Problems encountered during accreditation visits range from moderately serious to serious, which have to be addressed by the administration.

**Keywords:** quality programs, attitude, accreditation, impact, best practices

## INTRODUCTION

Tertiary education is central to economic and political development and vital to competitiveness in an increasingly globalizing knowledge society. Research findings indicate that expanding tertiary education may promote faster technological catch-up and improve a country's ability to maximize its economic output (Bloom et al., 2006). Thus, tertiary education is challenged to adjust their program structures, curricula, teaching, and learning methods to adapt to these new demands. In recognition of this challenge, greater attention is being focused on quality assurance as a critical factor in ensuring educational relevance. The World Bank's *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education* underscores the importance of establishing strong quality assurance systems as necessary instruments for addressing today's challenges (World Bank, 2002).

Dumancas and Prado (2015) cited that accreditation started as a private initiative and has officially started in the Philippines 62 years ago in 1957. The first accreditation agency was the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities (PAASCU). Two (2) other accrediting agencies followed after two decades: the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities-Commission on Accreditation (PACU-COA) in 1973 and the Association of Christian Schools and Colleges-Accrediting Agency (ACSC-AA) in 1976. According to Corpus (2003), these three accrediting agencies organized themselves into the Federation of Accrediting Agencies in the Philippines (FAAP) in 1977.

Cambel et al. (2012) state that accreditation is the affirmation that an institution provides a quality education that the community has a right to expect and which the education world endorses. This academic exercise is a means of stimulating growth and development for encouraging high-standard academic institutions to perform even better (Ngohayon et al., 2012).

The heightened concern in the reviews and assessments of program quality can be traced to a widespread interest in improving program or educational quality and the need to respond creatively to severe financial constraints and external constituencies' expectations for accountability (Adams, 2008). Compelling explanations for the interest in the study of academic program quality included: skepticism that higher educational institutions are preparing individuals for the demanding challenges of their current and future job and rising cost of higher education which pressure institutions to become more accountable through

quality control initiatives and program review mandates (Caro, 2010). Ehlers et al. (2020) indicated that accreditation could be an important tool to improve organizational quality. They agree that accreditation is an important tool to improve organizational quality, increase the motivation of staff, encourages teamwork and collaboration, and contribute to implementing changes. The higher the accreditation level of the institution, the better the program quality. Accreditation offers many benefits from the institution as this would be the basis for granting Centers of Excellence and Centers of Development among the programs in any higher education institution (Dumancas & Prado, 2015). Moreover, they cited that attitudes are important for understanding the effectiveness of accreditation. Also, attitudes towards the accreditation benefits were more positive.

However, despite all these benefits derived from accreditation, considerably less attention has been given to research conducted on institutional practices that affect teaching and learning. For example, there is little research on school accreditation, a process affecting a range of institutional practices, including those governing classroom instruction, capital resources, finances, staffing needs, student services, administrative and professional development. The scarcity of research on accreditation may be explained in that accreditation affects many types of schools in various ways (NEASC, 2005). Hence, this study was conducted to assess the impact of accreditation on the quality of programs of a non-sectarian private university.

## FRAMEWORK

According to (Fitzgerald, 2001), to create significant change in the results, a change in attitudes, behaviors, methods, tools, or techniques must also be created. A true catalyst for change in giving vision and direction toward educational reforms is Total Quality Management (TQM). Deming founded Program quality based on the quality theory of widely regarded “father” of the total quality management movement. TQM is focused on the customers (teachers, students, stakeholders), culture (school culture), and the capacity for continuous improvement, which is a signature features of a total quality environment. It is an all-encompassing determination to meet the needs of students and to deliver quality education.

The accreditation levels of curricular programs were made use by CHED as key criteria for the grant of university status, the selection of Centers of Excellence and Centers of Development in various disciplines, and the grant of full autonomy

and deregulated status to higher education institutions. “Engagement Theory of Program Quality” is a qualitative study that came up with the definition of high-quality academic programs and the attributes of these programs. This theory of quality-centered around one central idea: student, faculty, and administrative engagement in teaching and learning. (Eich, 2008) noted that high-quality programs are those in which students, faculty, and administrators invest significant time and effort in mutually supportive and enriching teaching and learning experiences that positively affect students’ growth and development. Likewise, high-quality programs invite the participation of alumni and employers of program graduates.

According to the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA, 2007), three factors influence the quality assurance trends in international higher education. First, quality assurance is more competitive and rigorous than ever before. Second, quality assurance is becoming recognized regionally. Third, there is a need for an international quality assurance framework with acknowledgment and reciprocity across countries. Program offerings across international boundaries require students to enroll in multiple jurisdictions as part of their degree programs. These innovative approaches to higher education demand greater awareness of the attributes and requirements of quality assurance organizations worldwide. Wong (2012) expressed the importance for institutions to demonstrate value and performance and states that higher education organizations apply principles for private industry to assess quality initiatives. “Accreditation is a review of the quality of higher education institutions and programs” (CHEA, 2014, para.1). An institution or program is granted accreditation for meeting minimum standards of quality. One common accreditation theme is quality assurance assessment and continuous improvement. Accrediting agencies have developed standards and procedures to guide institutions in voluntary commitment to continuous improvement by way of application for accreditation. These standards are used by review committees as the basis for judgment and to make recommendations and decisions.

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

This study aimed to assess the predictors of the quality of programs of a non-sectarian private university. Specifically, it sought to: a) describe the accreditation status of the university; b) ascertain the level of impact of accreditation; c)

determine the level of quality of the academic programs of the university; d) correlate between the level of quality of the academic programs and: a. importance, b. practices, c. attitudes, d. school factors, and management; e) identify the variables, singly or in combination, contribute to the level of quality of academic programs; and f) assess the problems encountered during the accreditation.

## **METHODS**

A descriptive-correlational and causal research design was employed in the study. This was conducted in a non-sectarian private university, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines. Programs with Accredited at least Level I status were included in the study. A total of 107 administrators, faculty, and staff involved in the accreditation process were the participants. Purposive sampling of participants from the administrators, faculty, and staff of the programs accredited at least Level I were included in the study.

A set of questionnaires for the purpose of collecting data for this study were adopted from the study of Dumancas and Prado (2015). The study made use of descriptive statistics such as the means, standard deviation to present and describe the data. Pearson – Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the association between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the influence of each variable on the program quality.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### Status of PACUCOA Accreditation of LDCU Academic Programs

In adherence to LDCU's vision for excellence, mitigated by the pressing need for program quality, the administrators applied for accreditation by the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities-Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA). With the rigors of the evaluation, LDCU academic programs were awarded their respective certificates of accreditation. Table 1 shows the twenty-one (21) academic programs of Liceo de Cagayan University with their corresponding status of accreditation and date of effectivity issued by the PACUCOA.

Table 1

*Accreditation Status of Academic Programs at Liceo de Cagayan University*

Accredited Programs	Level (Accreditation Status)	Validity
1. Liberal Arts	Level IV Reaccredited	October 2023
2. Business Administration	Level IV Reaccredited	October 2023
3. Nursing	Level IV Reaccredited	February 2020
4. Master in Management	Level IV Accredited	February 2020
5. Master of Arts in Nursing	Level IV Accredited	February 2020
6. Elementary Education	Level III Reaccredited	October 2020
7. Secondary Education	Level III Reaccredited	October 2020
8. Biology	Level III Reaccredited	October 2020
9. Psychology	Level III Reaccredited	October 2020
10. Doctor in Management	Level II First Reaccredited	September 2019
11. Radiologic Technology	Level II First Reaccredited	September 2019
12. Information Technology	Level II First Reaccredited	September 2019
13. High School	Level II Reaccredited	September 2019
14. Elementary	Level II Reaccredited	September 2019
15. Tourism	Level II First Reaccredited	June 2021
16. Accountancy	Level II First Reaccredited	June 2021
17. Master of Arts in Education	Level I Formal	March 2021
18. Physical Therapy	Level I Formal	March 2021
19. Medical Technology	Level I Formal	March 2021
20. Criminology	Level I Formal	March 2021
21. Pharmacy	Level I Formal	March 2021

Among the twenty-one (21) academic programs of Liceo de Cagayan University, three (3) have accreditation status of Level IV Re-Accredited as certified by PACUCOA. These programs are Liberal Arts, Business Administration, and Nursing. Likewise, there are four Level III Reaccredited (Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Biology, and Psychology), five (5) programs that are Level II First Re-accredited. These are Doctor of Management, Radiologic Technology, and Information Technology, Tourism, and Accountancy, while two programs

are Level II Accredited, and these are High School and Elementary. The rest of the programs have undergone Level I formal survey visits, which is the following: Master of Arts in Education, Physical Therapy, Medical Technology, Criminology, and Pharmacy.

### Significance of PACUCOA Accreditation

The perception of participants on the importance of accreditation of the programs can be gleaned in Table 2. In all the indicators, the participants perceived accreditation as extremely significant and important. Accreditation evaluates the availability, adequacy, and effectiveness of instructional materials and support facilities, according to AUSA et al. (2012). According to them, after having gone through the cycles of the accreditation process, good practices were eventually developed, adopted, improved, and sustained through the years. The workplace, equipment, facilities, delivery of instruction, administrative and student-related services tremendously improved and created a demand for accreditation of more programs, expanding and even radiating to the other campuses of the University.

Accreditation is extremely important as generally perceived by the participants because they believed that in the pursuit of excellence. These results conform to the statements of Arce et al. (2012) that accreditation is very important as it helps in providing the University of Northern Philippines the continuous updates of information to all stakeholders.

Table 2

### *Degree of Importance of Accreditation for Improving School Resources*

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
1. Enabling schools to identify needs.	4.75	Extremely Important
2. Keeping schools updated and equal as regards the quality of their resources.	4.77	Extremely Important
3. Justifying needs to the school community	4.65	Extremely Important
4. Helping schools plan and budget for resources.	4.70	Extremely Important
5. Using existing resources more effectively.	4.65	Extremely Important
Overall Mean	4.70	Extremely Important

Accreditation also sustains good human and public relations with all sectors concerned, including the accreditors. An important objective of standards-based quality assurance is to create an environment and conditions where these standards can be made more transparent and open to public scrutiny (Jackson, 2008). Soliven et al. (2012) obtained similar findings that faculty and administrators of the Sciences, Engineering, and Technology Programs at CMU consider the accreditation of programs to be very important and significant in the pursuit of improving the resources of the schools.

Best Practices in the Preparation of PACUCOA Accreditation

The best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA accreditation are shown in Table 3. It appears that all indicators for best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA accreditation are highly practiced by faculty members of Liceo de Cagayan University.

Table 3

*Preparation for PACUCOA Accreditation: Best Practices*

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
1. The Mission Statement	4.58	Very highly practiced
2. Documentation	4.56	Very highly practiced
3. Collaboration	4.47	Highly practiced
4. Encouraging effective assessment of strengths and weaknesses	4.53	Very highly practiced
5. Decision making	4.49	Highly practiced
6. Enabling effective assessment of strengths and weaknesses	4.55	Very highly practiced
7. The Standards for Accreditation	4.52	Very highly practiced
8. Resources	4.42	Highly practiced
9. Self-Study process	4.30	Highly practiced
10. Peer Review	4.25	Highly practiced
11. Thoroughness of the process	4.38	Highly practiced
12. More effective planning	4.47	Highly practiced
13. Accountability (public and quality assurance)	4.56	Very Highly practiced
Overall Mean	4.47	Highly practiced

The “preparation for the mission statement” got the highest mean rating. This is followed by “documentation” and “accountability.” The third best practice is



“enabling effective assessment of strengths and weaknesses,” “encouraging effective assessment of strengths and weaknesses,” and “the standards for accreditation.” The rest of the indicators were also highly practiced by the faculty members of the university. Generally, LDCU faculty and administrators highly practiced the identified best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA accreditation. These finding conformed to the study of (Dumancas & Prado, 2015).

Table 4

*Attitude of Administrators, Faculty, and Staff toward Accreditation*

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
1. The accreditation process has been beneficial in terms of enhancing the overall quality of education at my institution.	4.66	Very Highly Positive
2. Participation in the accreditation process has led to improvements in the professional development training for teacher.	4.58	Very Highly Positive
3. I believe accreditation affects school improvement in both the short-and the long term.	4.71	Very Highly Positive
4. The standards set by the Commission will help improve teaching and learning at my institution.	4.69	Very Highly Positive
5. Participation in the accreditation process has led to improvements in academic environment, including the classroom and non-classroom environment for students.	4.66	Very Highly Positive
6. Participation in the accreditation process has led to improvements in the quality of classroom instruction.	4.62	Very Highly Positive
7. Participation in the accreditation process has improved organization and management at my institution.	4.61	Very Highly Positive
8. The accreditation process has led to improvements in institutional leadership.	4.47	Highly Positive
9. My institution was fairly evaluated.	4.44	Highly Positive
10. The recommendations of the visiting team were valid and thorough.	4.47	Highly Positive
11. Participation in the accreditation process has led to more teamwork among staff.	4.43	Highly Positive
12. Participation in the accreditation has led to improvements in the work environment for the staff.	4.38	Highly Positive
13. The accreditation process has resulted in better staff communication.	4.29	Highly Positive
14. My institution was adequately trained on how to prepare for an accreditation visit.	4.27	Highly Positive
15. The Commission provided sufficient guidance and support following the accreditation visit.	4.25	Highly Positive
Overall Mean	4.50	Very Highly Positive

The participants’ attitude toward accreditation is shown in Table 4. It can be seen that in the majority of the indicators and in general, the participants have a very highly positive attitude towards accreditation. These findings imply that participants believe that accreditation means a lot in improving the quality of academic programs at Liceo de Cagayan University. This findings find support in the study of Ehlers et al., (2020), who indicated that accreditation could be an important tool to improve organizational quality.

Table 5

*Level of Impact of Accreditation on Selected School Factors*

INDICATORS	QUALITATIVE	
	MEAN	INTERPRETATION
1. Enabled schools to identify strengths and weaknesses	4.62	Very High impact
2. Fostered teamwork and collegiality	4.42	High impact
3. Improved professional development	4.42	High impact
4. Improved organizational effectiveness and long term planning	4.45	High impact
5. Improved school resources	4.38	High impact
6. Improved instruction	4.40	High impact
7 Made school accountable	4.42	High impact
8. Exposed school to new learning trends and innovations	4.47	High impact
9. Raised staff morale	4.31	High impact
10. Provided staff with exposure to peer evaluators	4.39	High impact
11. Resulted in more continuity and consistency	4.31	High impact
12. Led to better staffing decisions	4.31	High impact
13. Increased community support for school initiatives	4.34	High impact
14. Increased community and parental involvement	4.35	High impact
Overall Mean	4.40	High impact

The granting of financial assistance by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and other financial institutions always consider the accreditation status of the school. That is why it is always important that the institution has to identify its strengths and weaknesses, which have a very high impact on accreditation. The rest of the indicators and the totality of them have all high impact (Table 5).

The performance of LDCU students in the different licensure examinations

conducted by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC), specifically in the paramedical courses, is a very good sign that the institution has improved instruction. This is corroborated by the study of Prado et al. (2012), which states that in the case of a state university, specifically, Central Mindanao University (CMU), it is a fact that the outcomes of the three programs: Sciences, Engineering, and Technology have improved a lot in instruction as shown by the results of the Licensure Examinations of its graduates.

The level of quality of academic programs of the university is high. This result conforms to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC, 2006) that the accreditation process has enhanced the overall quality of education at their institution.

Table 6

*The Nature of Management of Accreditation Visit*

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTION	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
1. Staff works together to meet the needs of the accreditors.	4.49	Agree	Well Managed
2. Staff responds appropriately to the needs of the accreditors.	4.44	Agree	Well Managed
3. All staff are professionally qualified to work with accreditors.	4.26	Agree	Well Managed
4. Peer interactions have a positive affect and tone.	4.26	Agree	Well Managed
5. Staff interacts with accreditors.	4.35	Agree	Well Managed
6. Staff take control and responsibility during accreditation.	4.19	Agree	Well Managed
7. There are sufficient materials to support the accreditation activities.	4.30	Agree	Well Managed
8. Staff receives appropriate support to make their work experience positive.	4.18	Agree	Well Managed
9. Program leaders inspire and motivate staff to contribute, learn and innovate.	4.35	Agree	Well Managed
10. All staff are given orientation to the job.	4.16	Agree	Well Managed
Overall Mean	4.26	Agree	Well Managed

Table 7

*Participants' Perception on the Quality of Programs Being Accredited*

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
1. Students are required to complete a tangible product – usually a thesis, project report, or artistic performance – in which they demonstrate their abilities as knowledgeable and skilled professionals in the field.	4.43	Very Good
2. Faculty and administrators hold high expectations for learning and articulate them clearly to students.	4.47	Very Good
3. Graduates find jobs after graduation.	4.04	Very Good
4. Level of class discussions manifest critical thinking and analysis.	4.30	Very Good
5. Faculty and students engage in disciplined and mutually-enriching discussions in which they critically question and scrutinize knowledge and practice in the field.	4.38	Very Good
6. Students demonstrate high intellectual quality.	4.26	Very Good
7. The institution establishes linkages and network with other institutions, professional organizations and agencies through consortia, partnerships, faculty exchange and research collaborations.	4.36	Very Good
8. Students have high grade point averages.	4.16	Very Good
9. Keeping abreast in modern educational and research trends in their field.	4.32	Very Good
10. The institution provides competitive salaries to sustain a critical mass of faculty.	4.04	Very Good
11. Productivity in terms of research.	4.18	Very Good
12. Library services are efficient and available.	4.21	Very Good
13. Graduate library holdings are adequate and comprise all types/formats of recorded information (print & non-print, electronic & digital).	4.25	Very Good
14. Institution provides adequate funding to maintain suitable laboratory, classroom, office and performance facilities.	4.06	Very Good
15. There is abundant financial support for faculty development.	3.82	Very Good
16. Publication of articles or researches by faculty.	4.19	Very Good
17. Computers and internet services are available for students.	4.05	Very Good
Overall Mean	4.21	Very Good

The participants' perception of the quality of programs at Liceo de Cagayan University based on the selected indicators is shown in Table 6. All of the indicators for program quality have a very good ratings. This means that the program quality of the courses offered at LDCU is very good, as perceived by the participants.

Table 8

*Correlation Between the Independent Variables and the Quality of LDCU Academic Programs*

Variables Correlated With Quality of Academic Programs	Correlation Coefficients	P-value
Importance of accreditation	0.105	0.363 <sup>ns</sup>
Best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA accreditation	0.539	0.000 <sup>**</sup>
Attitude towards accreditation	0.686	0.000 <sup>**</sup>
Impact of Accreditation	0.499	0.000 <sup>**</sup>
Management of accreditation visit	0.498	0.000 <sup>**</sup>
Problems Encountered	0.091	0.433 <sup>ns</sup>

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

There is a significant relationship between the program quality of academic programs and the best practices in preparing PACUCOA accreditation, attitude towards accreditation, the impact of accreditation, and management of accreditation visit. These results imply that in any academic institution in higher education, accreditation is of important consideration. Arce (2012) who said that accreditation helps in providing continuous updates of information to all stakeholders and keep their file of documents updated and relevant.

Table 9

*Regression Analysis of Selected Predictor Variables and Quality of Academic Programs*

MODEL	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	11.084	10.313		1.075	0.266
Attitude toward accreditation	0.733	0.181	0.567	4.048	0.000

R = 0.713

F = 12.095

R2 = 0.509

p = .000

To determine the amount of influence of the independent variables such as the importance of accreditation, best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA visit, attitude toward accreditation, degree of impact, management of accreditation, perceptions, and problems encountered during an accreditation visit on the quality of programs, multiple regression was done. The R2 = 0.509 means that 50.90% of the quality of the academic program is anchored on the importance of accreditation and the best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA visit. In contract, while the remaining 49.10 % can be explained by other variables not included in the study. The lone best predictor of program quality is the attitude toward accreditation with beta weight=0.567. This finding is in conformance with Prado et al. (2012), who found the attitude toward accreditation predicts program quality. This implies that the more positive the attitude of administrators, faculty, and students toward accreditation, the better the program quality of the institution.

The regression equation for program quality is:  $Y' = 11.084 + 0.733X_1$

Where: Y' = Quality of Academic Program and X1 = Attitude toward Accreditation

Common Problems Encountered

Administrative Support, inadequate extension activities of the faculty, internal assessment team, inadequate laboratory facilities, assignment of the task force, availability of master survey instrument, library facilities, educational qualification of faculty, and self-survey instrument were found by the administrators, faculty, and students as moderately serious.

Table 10

*Problems Encountered During the AACUP Accreditation Visit*

INDICATORS	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
1. Preparation of the documents	4.01	Serious
2. Administrative support	3.40	Moderately Serious
3. Facilities	3.61	Serious
4. Attitude towards accreditation	3.52	Serious
5. Qualification of accreditors	3.35	Moderately Serious
6. Attitudes of the accreditors	3.34	Moderately Serious
7. Physical plant facilities	3.70	Serious
8. Library facilities	3.29	Moderately Serious
9. Equipment	3.51	Serious
10. Educational qualification of the faculty	3.29	Moderately Serious
11. Availability of Master Survey Instrument	3.29	Moderately Serious
12. Self-survey instrument	3.25	Moderately Serious
13. Assignment of Task Force	3.29	Moderately Serious
14. Curriculum	3.17	Moderately Serious
15. Inadequate laboratory facilities	3.30	Moderately Serious
16. Internal Assessment Team	3.32	Moderately Serious
17. Inadequate Researches of the faculty	3.53	Serious
18. Inadequate Extension activities by the faculty	3.39	Moderately Serious

On the other hand, the problems considered serious by the participants were on the preparation of the documents, facilities, attitude toward accreditation, physical plant facilities, equipment, and inadequate researches of the faculty. This finding is corroborated by the study of Prado and Dumancas (2015) and Prado et al. (2012).

## CONCLUSIONS

The University's academic programs are already accredited by the PACUCOA. More than half of the programs are Level III accredited as certified by PACUCOA while the rest of the programs shall be subjected for evaluation to the next level. Staff, faculty, and administrators perceive that accreditation is "very important". They highly practiced all the indicators for best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA accreditation and have positive attitude towards accreditation. They believed that accreditation has high impact on school factors and agree that accreditation visits are managed well. The University have very good academic programs as perceived by the participants though there are moderately serious

and serious problems encountered during accreditation visits. The best practices in the preparation of PACUCOA accreditation, attitude towards accreditation, impact of accreditation, and management of accreditation visit are highly correlated with program quality. There is a lone predictor of program quality considered as the best predictor for quality programs. This is attitude toward accreditation. The common problems encountered during the accreditation visits considered serious are preparation of the documents, facilities, attitude towards accreditation, equipment, and inadequate researches of the faculty. Problems encountered during the accreditation should be addressed as soon as possible to pave the way for future direction of institutional accreditation and further challenges.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The top management may enhance the attitudes of the faculty and motivate them to manage well the preparation of the documents during accreditation visits because accredited programs will lead to quality administrators, faculty, students and an increase in remuneration. This will also lead to quality programs, thereby attaining excellence in instruction, research, and extension of the university. The faculty and staff might consider giving extra effort and time to give full support in enhancing the institutions' facilities and equipment. These will provide additional contributions for successful accreditation. Administrators may provide incentives to the faculty in order for them to get motivated to conduct research for the improvement of instruction which will rebound to quality teaching and learning, enhancement of research productivity, and service-learning. There is a need to create a very conducive work environment, school culture, and organizational climate to develop a positive attitude of the administrators, faculty, and staff towards accreditation.

### LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, R. (2008). Self-review for Higher Education Institutions. Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA), Australia
- Arce, .R., S.S. Eder, and W.P. Medrano. (2012). Sustaining the Implementation of the First Level III Reaccredited Program Among SUCs in the Country: The UNP Experience. Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures, and Practices. *AACCUP*, Quezon City.



- Ausa, E.F., Claravall, E.B., and Quilang, R.R. (2012). Sustaining Quality and Excellence Through Accreditation: The ISU Experience. Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures, and Practices. *AACCUP*, Quezon City.
- Cambel, T.L., Tabares, M.N.C. L., and 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. *AACCUP*, Quezon City.
- Caro, V.B. (2010). The quality of the doctoral in educational management programs of Region 10: A Causal Model. Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Bukidnon, Philippines.
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2010). Annual Report. San Miguel Avenue. Ortigas Center, Pasig City. Retrieved February 2013 from <http://www.ched.gov.ph/projects/index.html>.
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2006). A Handbook on Processes, Standards, and Guidelines for Quality Assurance. Kenya.
- Corpus, M.T. (2003). Historical Perspectives of the Philippine Quality Assurance System. *Journal of Philippine Higher Education: Quality Assurance*, Vol. 1, No. 1. *AACCUP*, Quezon City.
- Dumancas, G. A., & Prado, N. I. (2015). Impact of Accreditation on the Quality of Academic Programs at Central Mindanao University: Future Directions and Challenges. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development. Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan, Asia Pacific Quality Network*, 9(1).
- Jackson, N. (2008). Understanding standards-based quality assurance: Part 1- rationale and conceptual basis. *Quality Assurance in Education*.
- Ngohayon, S.L., Guimpatan, J. A. , and Basilio, F. (2012). The Impact of Accreditation to IFSU's Quest for Quality and Excellence. Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures, and Practices. *AACCUP*, Quezon City.

Ngohayon, S.L. and Bolintao, J.J.M. (2012). The Impact of Accreditation in the Improvement of State Universities and Colleges. Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures, and Practices. *AACCUP*, Quezon City.

PAASCU @ 50: Raising the Standards of Excellence in Philippine Education. (2007). *Golden Jubilee Programme, 1957-2007*.

Soliven, M.L.R., Prado, N.I., and Penaso, A.M. (2012). Managing a Vast Program for Accreditation in the Sciences, Engineering, and Technology: The CMU Experience. Quality Assurance: Concepts, Structures, and Practices. *AACCUP*, Quezon City.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This accomplishment in research would not have been possible without the support of many individuals. The President of Liceo de Cagayan University, Dr. Alain Marc P. Golez, for the financial support and for approving the request to conduct the study, the staff of the Office of the Vice President for Research, Publication, and Extension for data gathering, encoding, and processing, and for running the plagiarism and Grammarly tests, the Head of the Quality Assurance Office and his staff for the support extended in data gathering, the participants of the study, thank you very much. This study should not have been realized without your kind and generous support.