

Readiness of Sdssu for Ched Typology

Dr. Alan S. Compe

Head Office of the Student Affairs and Welfare Services
Surigao del State University San Miguel Campus, San Miguel,
Surigao del Sur, Philippines
Email add.:compealan1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to find out the level of readiness of SDSSU for CHED typology. This employed qualitative-descriptive designs. The level of readiness was investigated through ISA Framework that has five key result areas. The study revealed that SDSSU is capable to be ready for Institutional Sustainability Assessment. The University has to encourage faculty and students to participate in creative work/or innovation. However, challenges are a hindrance to meet the Higher Education Institutions standards in education. In order to enhance the level of readiness of the institution to Institutional Sustainability Assessment SDSSU may consider the challenges in Governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work, support to students and relations with the community in order to improve the quality of Higher Education Institutions standards in education.

Keywords: Readiness, Challenges, CHED Typology, Institutional Sustainability Assessment.

1.0 Introduction

Higher Education Institutions ensure highest degree of standards along the fourfold function of the university. The aim of education is to produce quality graduates, who are ready to be employed in the different field of industries. To maintain quality education HEIs must submit for

accreditation. According to the study of Compe (2017) which revealed that in order to be ready for Institutional Sustainability Assessment the Higher Education Institutions must consider the challenges encountered in operationalizing CHED Horizontal Typology. This study is all about the readiness of SDSSU for CHED typology, taking into consideration the issues and concerns encountered by SDSSU key officials, faculty, staff and other stakeholders.

Several studies on typology of higher education institutions have been undertaken. Abankina, et al. (2015) emphasized that typology in Malaysian Higher Education is based on availability of resources, research, educational performance and the combination of these results with efficiency score. To respond the global challenge, CHED classifies horizontally the various HEI (Hapin et al., 2016). Analysis and findings may be used by policy makers and researchers to facilitate cross-national comparisons of program design, implementation, and outcomes (Perna et al., 2014) according to CHED standards.

The above studies shown that a common element that the classification results of higher education institutions could be the basis for designing interventions for continuous quality improvement. In implementing Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA), there are challenges that

key officials, faculty, staff and other stakeholders may encounter but knowing the readiness of the institution to Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA), policy-makers could identify the strengths and weaknesses among the different Key Result Areas (KRAs), formulate and execute policies and plans to support SDSSU s' efforts to comply the requirements of CHED's typology.

One of the commitment of the Philippine government particularly SDSSU is to have continuous quality improvement. Findings of this study can be utilized to enhance the level of readiness of SDSSU for CHED typology. Considering the challenges encountered by University's key officials, faculty, and staff, and stakeholders, intervention can be designed to enhance the level of readiness of the institution to CHED's typology specifically to the Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA).

2.0 Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

This study is anchored mainly on Deming's Theory of Total Quality Management (TQM) which states that in order to achieve the highest level of performance requires not just a good philosophy, but also the education and innovativeness of the organization using the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) approach. The PDCA approach is necessary for institutions to plan, do or implement, check, monitor or evaluate progress, activities and projects and act again to prepare and be ready for assessment.

Liu (2016) explained that the external quality assessment can provide the impetus for university change. Both the governing

4.0 Results and Discussions

forces of the evaluation's owner and the influence of the evaluation results on the financial resources and reputations of institutions push the evaluated institutions to meet the demands of the external quality assessment. However, universities are not completely shaped by external pressures only but also the internal environment of universities and their initiatives in creating change should also be noted.

As stated in CMO No. 46 series of 2012, the horizontal typology includes the following types: Professional Institution, College, and University, and they are differentiated by features in the following areas: desired competency of graduates, kinds of academic and co-curricular programs, qualification of faculty, learning resources and support structures, nature of linkages and outreach activities. Horizontal typology is done through Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA) which serves as a learning process for the HEI and contributes to its continuing quality cycle.

3.0 Methods

The study employed qualitative-descriptive designs. The level of readiness was investigated through ISA Framework that has five key result areas such as governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work support to students and Relations with the Community. This study employed the following statistical tools in treating the data: **Simple Percentage**. This was used to analyze the data gathered through the query of problem number 1. **Weighted Mean**: was used to determine the level of readiness of SDSSU for CHED Typology.

Table 1 presents the level of readiness as to governance and management.

Table 1
Level of Readiness as to Governance and Management

KRA 1	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
Governance		
Presence of Governance System	3.10	MR
Extent of Implementation	3.13	MR
Outcomes: Policy Formulation Decision Making Sustainability of Operations Monitoring Communication Systems	3.11	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3.10	MR
Total	3.11	MR
Management		
Presence of Management System	3.14	MR
Extent of Implementation	3.17	MR
Outcomes: Operations Support of Stakeholders Lines of Communication Responsiveness Monitoring	3.18	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3.15	MR
Total	3.16	MR
Enabling Features		
Presence of System for ICT for management, resource generation and other enabling features	3.08	MR
Extent of Implementation	3.06	MR
Outcomes: Achievement of development plans	3.11	MR
Delivery of services	3.14	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3.19	MR
Total	3.12	MR
Overall mean	3.13	MR

Mean Interval: 0-.80-Not Ready, .81-1.60-Less Ready, 1.61-2.40-Ready, 2.41-3.20-Moderately Ready, 3.21-4.0-Very Much Ready

As shown in table 1, Surigao del Sur State University declared as moderately ready in the governance, management and enabling features. These findings revealed that SDSSU has a good practice in governance system that demonstrated probity, strategic vision, accountability, awareness and management of risk, and effective monitoring of performance. According to Varghese and Martin (2014) the

readiness of institution has positive effects on the restructuring of governance and management, curriculum development, human resource management, financial arrangement and management, decision-making procedures, resource allocation and management, student recruitment and assessment, and staff management and evaluation.

Table 8 presents the level of readiness as to quality of teaching and learning.

Table 2
Level of Readiness as to Quality of Teaching and Learning

KRA 2	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
Setting and Achieving program Standards		
Presence of Mechanisms Program Approval and Implementation Program Monitoring and Review Action to Strengthen Programs	4	VMR
Extent of Implementation	4	VMR
Outcomes: Student Performance Employability	4	VMR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	4	VMR
Total	4	VMR
Faculty Profile		
Presence of System for Faculty Hiring, Evaluation, Development	4	VMR
Extent of Implementation	4	VMR
Outcomes: Student Performance Rate of Completion Faculty Competence	4	VMR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	4	VMR
Total	4	VMR
The Use OF ICT and Learning Resources		
Presence of System for ICT, library resources, and other learning resources	3	MR
Extent of Implementation	3	MR
Outcomes: Delivery of services Academic performance of students	3	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	MR
Total	3	MR
Overall mean	3.66	VMR

Mean Interval: 0-.80-Not Ready, .81-1.60-Less Ready, 1.61-2.40-Ready, 2.41-3.20-Moderately Ready, 3.21-4.0-Very Much Ready

It could be viewed from the table that Setting and Achieving Program Standards was rated 4 or very much ready indicates that there is a system for approving academic programs, while the faculty profile, rated 4 or

very much ready indicates that the institution has an adequate number of faculty members with the appropriate expertise and competence to teach the courses offered by the institution. Use of ICT and learning

resources rated 3 or moderately ready, this means that the institution has effective use of learning resources, such as library resources, laboratories and information and communications technology to support student learning.

The level of readiness as to quality of teaching and learning was 3.66 or very much ready. These findings revealed that the institution was very much ready for Institutional Sustainability Assessment in quality of teaching and learning. This confirms on the study of Fong-Yee, D. &

Normore, A. H. (2010) which revealed that the mandate of Federal government’s “No Child Left Behind” act, education leaders, policymakers and educators need to invest the critical areas that impact the quality of teacher and the quality of teaching. While it is no secret that better teacher produces better learning. Educational reform must work toward restructuring and reinventing teacher preparation and professional development by connecting clinical work in school with knowledge about what work for teaching and subject matter knowledge.

Table 3 shows the level of readiness as to quality of professional exposure, research and creative work.

Table 3

Level of Readiness of SDSSU as to Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, & Creative Work

KRA 3	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
Professional Exposure		
Presence of Professional Exposure Programs OJT Practicum Internship Others	3	MR
Professional exposure programs Resources Mechanisms	3	MR
Outcomes: Employment rate	3	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	MR
Total	3	MR
Research Capability		
Presence of Research Programs and Research Community Faculty Students Researchers	4	VMR
Extent of Implementation	3	MR
Research agenda Resources Mechanisms		
Outcomes: Publications by faculty Research Program	3	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	MR
Total	3.25	VMR
Creative Work and/or Innovation		
Presence of Programs for Creative Work and/or Innovation Level of skills Quality of output	3	R
Extent of Implementation	3	R
Relevance of programs Adequacy of resources		

Mechanisms for support		
Outcomes: Awards and recognitions	3	R
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	R
Total	3	R
Overall mean	3.08	MR

Mean Interval: 0-.80-Not Ready, .81-1.60-Less Ready, 1.61-2.40-Ready, 2.41-3.20-Moderately Ready, 3.21-4.0-Very Much Ready

As reflected in table 3 the highest rating of 3.25 or very much ready in research capability, indicates that the institution contributes to the discovery of new knowledge through its overall strategy for managing and developing its research. Professional exposure with the rating of 3 or moderately ready, indicates that the students practice competencies in real settings through the institution's overall strategy for the professional exposure of its students. Creative Work and/or Innovation with the rating of 3 or moderately ready, indicates that the institution has a good implementing programs to creative work and innovation.

The total mean rating of 3.08 or moderately ready, in quality of professional exposure, research, & creative work indicates the SDSSU was moderately ready for Institutional Sustainability Assessment. The result of the table negates to the study of Paqueo et al. (2012) which stated that most of the higher education institutions are of low quality as evidenced by a low passing rate in the board exams and have few accredited programs.

Table 4 presents the level of readiness as to Support for Students.

Table 4
Level of Readiness as to Support for Students

KRA 4	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
Equity and Access		
Presence of Mechanisms Recruitment Admission Support and tracking	3	MR
Extent of Implementation Effectiveness of system Quality of academic support	3	MR
Outcomes: Student Quality Rate of Completion Employment Rate	3	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	MR
Total	3	MR
Student Services		
Presence of Programs for Student Services Personal development Guidance and Counseling Career orientation and job placement Other support services	3	MR
Extent of Implementation Effective programs Contribution to learning environment	3	MR

Outcomes: Graduates Level of competency Leadership qualities Level of empowerment Quality of Formation	3	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	MR
Total	3	MR
Overall mean	3	MR

Mean Interval: 0-.80-Not Ready, .81-1.60-Less Ready, 1.61-2.40-Ready, 2.41-3.20-Moderately Ready, 3.21-4.0-Very Much Ready

As shown in table, the rating of 3 or moderately ready in equity and access indicates that the institution recruits and selects students based on clear policies and operational guidelines. Student services also rated 3 or moderately ready, means that the institution demonstrates deserving students get an education through the institution's scholarship program, which include various groups of beneficiaries, including special groups. The total mean rating of 3 or moderately ready means that SDSSU was moderately ready for Institutional Sustainability Assessment. These revealed that the institution has recruitment, admission, academic support, student scholarships and student services.

As stated on CHED Handbook (2014), Systems for the recruitment and admission of and academic support for students, and student scholarships ensure student diversity that could improve the teaching-learning quality and student performance which in turn could be instrumental in preparing citizens who can contribute to social development and compete in global labor markets. Structures and systems for student services (such as guidance, counseling, and placement services) contribute to the well-being of students which may in turn contribute to their performance.

The level of readiness as to relationship with community is presented on table 5.

Table 5

Level of Readiness of SDSSU as to Relationship with the Community

KRA 5	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
Relevance of Programs		
Presence of Mechanisms Social, cultural, economic, developmental Reach	3	MR
Extent of Implementation	3	MR
Outcomes: Student Quality Rate of Completion Degree of competitiveness	3	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	MR
Total	3	MR

Networking and linkages		
Presence of System for Networking & Linkages	3	MR
Extent of Implementation	3	MR
Outcomes: Partnerships reach	3	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	4	MR
Total	3.25	MR
Extension Programs		
Presence of Extension Programs	4	MR
Extent of Implementation	4	MR
Outcomes: Development	4	MR
Effectiveness of implementation, based on outcomes	3	MR
Total	3.75	MR
Overall mean	3.33	MR

Mean Interval: 0-.80-Not Ready, .81-1.60-Less Ready, 1.61-2.40-Ready, 2.41-3.20-Moderately Ready, 3.21-4.0-Very Much Ready

As reflected in table 5 relevance of programs rated 3 or moderately ready, means that the institution has demonstrated good practice in most of their mechanisms for ensuring program relevance. The rating of 3 or moderately ready for networking and linkages indicates that the institution has demonstrated good practices in the networks and linkages. Extension Programs rated 3 or moderately ready, means that the institution has demonstrated good practice in most aspects of the extension programs. The findings revealed that the institution has demonstrated good practice in relevance of

the program, networking and linkages and extension programs.

This confirms on the study of Zwane (2014), explained that to make better serve to its clients, the human resources extension professionals need to have a mastery of specialized knowledge, and they have to demonstrate professionalism i.e., they are skillful and knowledgeable, can evaluate the context and have good rapport with their clients, and clients greatly benefit from their services. Highlighting the importance and urgency for professionalism in extension services,

Table 6 shows the over-all level of readiness of CHED Typology.

Table 6
Over-all level of readiness to CHED Typology

ISA KRA	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1 Governance and Management	3.00	MR

2. Quality of Teaching and Learning	3.66	VMR
3. Quality of Professional Exposure, Research, & Creative Work	3.08	MR
4. Support for Students	3.00	MR
5. Relations with the Community	3.33	VMR
Over-all mean	3.214	VMR

Mean Interval: 0-.80-Not Ready, .81-1.60-Less Ready, 1.61-2.40-Ready, 2.41-3.20-Moderately Ready, 3.21-4.0-Very Much Ready

The over-all mean rating 3.214 or very much ready implies that SDSSU was very much ready for Institutional Sustainability Assessment. This confirms the study of Scherbakova et al. (2013) which emphasized that when the role of universities and their development programs increases, a new funding model should give more autonomy to the HEIs and secure sustainability in the implementation of their development strategies. This served as a catalyst in the course of the modernization of the education sector and everybody would benefit if it were more coordinated with general reforms.

3.0 Conclusions

The SDSSU is capable to be ready for Institutional Sustainability Assessment in governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, support to students and relations to community are strength to overcome weaknesses in quality of professional exposure, research, & creative work. The University has to encourage faculty and students to participate in creative work/or innovation. However, challenges are a hindrance to meet the Higher Education Institutions standards in education.

In order to enhance the level of readiness of the institution to Institutional Sustainability Assessment SDSSU may consider the challenges in Governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work, support to

students and relations with the community in order to meet the Higher Education Institutions standards in education.

Recommendations

The SDSSU may implement its development plans, supported by viable, sustainable, and appropriate resource generation strategies. It must see to it that ICT resources are properly allocated. There will be a formulated policy to contribute a creative work and innovation through its programs. Clear policies and operational guidelines on the recruitment of and support for foreign students. Enhance policies and system, processes and internationalization plan to be reflected in the extension manual.

REFERENCES CITED

Abankina, et al., (2015) Performance-Based Typology of Universities: Evidence from Russia. Higher School of Economics Research Paper No. WP BRP 33/STI/2015 Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2550217> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2550217>

Abankina I. V., Scherbakova I. (2013) Russian Higher Education Reforms and the

Bologna Process, Journal of the European Higher Education Area. No. 3, pp. 3 – 25.

Ang L., (2010) Community relationship management and social media. Journal of

Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management (2011)

18, 31 – 38.: 10.1057/dbm.2011.3

Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order Number 46, series 2012. Policy-standard to enhance quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA.

Commission on Higher Education (2014). Handbook on Typology, Outcomes-Based Education, and Institutional Sustainability Assessment.

Dill, D. D. (2010). We can't go home again: Insights from a quarter century of experiments in external academic quality assurance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(2), 159–161.

Fong-Yee, D. & Normore, A. H. (2010). The Impact of Quality Teachers on Student Achievement.

Hapin et.al. (2016). The Sorsogon State College on Becoming a University Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 4, No. 3, August 2016

P-ISSN 2350-7756, E-ISSN 2350-8442

Hart, L. (2012) Factors Associated with Student Persistence in an Online

Program of Study: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Interactive Online*

Learning www.ncolr.org/jiol Volume 11, Number 1, Spring 2012 ISSN:

1541-4914

Hou, Y., Morse, R., Ince, M., Chen, H., Chiang, C., & Chan, Y. (2015). Is the Asian quality assurance system for higher education going global? Assessing the impact of three types of program accreditation on Taiwanese universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(1), 83–105.

Liu (2016). *Quality Assurance and Institutional Transformation, Higher Education*

in Asia: Quality, Excellence and Governance, Springer Science Business

Media Singapore, DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-0789-7-2.

Paqueo, V. B., J. R. G. Albert, and A. C. Orbeta. (2012). “A Critical Look at the Education Sector: Achievements, Challenges, and Reform Ideas. Chapter 3 of PIDS 2011 Economic Policy Monitor: Education for Development. Makati City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Perna, L. W., Orosz, K., Gopaul, B., Jumakulov, Z., Ashirbekov, A., & Kishkentayeva, M. (2014). Promoting human capital development: A typology of international scholarship programs in higher education. *Educational Researcher*, 43(2), 63-73.

Rebora, G., & Turri, M. (2011). Critical factors in the use of evaluation in Italian universities. *Higher Education*, 61(5), 531–544.



Son, N. H. (2012). Opportunities and challenges to Vietnam Higher Education in international integration. International Conference on Vietnam Higher Education in Globalization Process, Ho Chi Minh City.

Stensaker, B., Langfeldt, L., Harvey, L., Huisman, J., & Westerheijden, D. (2011). An in-depth study on the impact of external quality assurance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(4), 465–478.

Varghese, N.V. and Martin, Michaela. (2013). Governance reformism higher education: A study of institutional autonomy in Asian countries (forthcoming).

Zwane, E. M. (2014). The role of extension as a profession is critical in delivering excellent services: An experience from Limpopo, South Africa. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 6(11), 1-7. doi:10.5539/jas.v6n11p.