6.1 Introduction

"The Philippine higher education is mandated to contribute to building a quality nation capable of transcending the social, political, economic, cultural, and ethical issues that constrain the country's human development, productivity, and global competitiveness" as reiterated and re-emphasized last in Sec. 1, CMO 46 S. 2012[1] (Commission on Higher Education's Memorandum Order entitled, "Policy-Standard to Enhance Quality Assurance in Philippine Higher Education Through Outcomes-Based and Typology-based QA). As enshrined in the Philippine Constitution of 1987, the state shall "establish, maintain, and support a complete, adequate, and integrated system of education relevant to the needs of the people and the society" (Phil. Constitution, Art. XIV Sec. 2). It "shall protect, foster and promote the right of all citizens to affordable quality education at all levels (See Sec 2, RA 7722 or Higher Education Act of 1994) and, in so doing, mandates the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), the governing body responsible for the development and implementation of state policies which "shall set minimum standards for programs and institutions of higher learning".

The above mandates invariably translate to multiple missions for the Philippine higher educational system as revisited in Sec.2 of the above CMO 46 S. 2012, which include, among others, the development of thoughtful graduates, with high levels of academic, thinking, behavioral and technical skills/competences that are aligned with national academic and industry standards and needs, as well as, with international standards. Moreover, these graduates are expected to have the capabilities to respond effectively to changing societal needs and conditions, and provide solutions to problems at the local community, regional and national levels.

Sec. 3 CMO 46 S. 2012 further stipulates that the fulfillment of the above missions "entails a critical mass of diverse higher educational institutions (HEIs) offering quality programs that meet national standards, and international standards for disciplines/professions (e.g. engineering; information technology and computing; maritime education; accounting; nursing) with such widely accepted standard." And for state institutions of higher learning, the Higher Education Act of 1994 that established the CHED, stipulates that these "shall gear their programs to national, regional or local development plans." Necessarily, as a matter of whole-of-nation approach, private institutions are encouraged and are expected to respond to this same call for national contribution.

Taking into considerations the above national policies and strategies and in pursuit of its own missions, PTC established, maintains and implements this Tier Classification System which,

complementary with its PTC Certification and Accreditation System for Engineering Education, is developed to:

- Foster the development of a critical mass of diverse and quality higher educational institutions (HEIs) from among state institutions and private HEIs offering engineering and technology programs through PTC's external quality assurance and accreditation works;

- Foster and prioritize the development of quality programs by these HEIs that meet national and, as well as, international standards of engineering and technology leading to international recognition of both accredited programs and graduate qualifications;

- Ensure that HEIs, whose accredited programs are internationally recognized for substantial equivalency, has the capacity to sustain and maintain the level of quality to the standards of the international recognition body over time; and

- Provide guidance to all HEIs intending to submit their engineering and technology programs for accreditation under either the PTC CASEE or PTC CASETE.

6.2. Principles and Policies

The Tier Classification System (TCS) for Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) is established and implemented to ensure that accredited engineering programs for recognition under the Washington Accord are delivered by higher educational institutions (or HEIs) with continuing and robust capability and institutional autonomy balanced with public accountability to deliver consistently the accredited engineering programs to the Accord standards over time. PTC believes that such an HEI must have the following characteristics:

1. Its mandate and its vision, mission and strategic goals (VMGs) are maintained and continually aligned with national and/or regional development plans as one of its overarching priorities;

2. It has the necessary and appropriate leadership, the organization and the capacity in terms of governance and management, infrastructures, systems and resources to actively pursue the VMGs and its mandate.

3. Its quality leadership and commitment to quality education and quality assurance, in general, and to engineering and technology education, in particular, is considered at the forefront of practice in engineering and technology education.

The development and implementation of the TCS is guided by the following principles and policies:

1. Submission of a program for accreditation is voluntary.

2. Submission of an HEI to the TCS is only for the intended purpose of prioritizing those accredited engineering programs being offered by Tier I HEIs for international recognition.

3. An institution submitting its engineering programs for accreditation under PTC CASEE shall be assessed and evaluated under the TCS prior to proceeding with the program accreditation process.

4. An HEI, irrespective of tier classification, may choose to proceed with accreditation review of its engineering programs for purposes of continuous quality improvement.

5. Only the accredited engineering programs of an institution which has been classified as Tier I institution, however, will be submitted for recognition under the Washington Accord.

6. There are two categories of HEIs under the TCS, namely:

- **Tier I** – An institution which meets the criteria stipulated herein may be classified as a Tier I institution. Accredited programs of an institution categorized as Tier I will be eligible for recognition under the Washington Accord.

- **Tier II** – An institution which currently has some identified areas for improvement in any of the three criteria stipulated in the TCS. For purposes of further continuous improvement and while the HEI prepares to meet Tier I criteria, engineering programs of HEI categorized as Tier II institution maybe reviewed upon the request of HEI towards national accreditation, i.e., without Washington Accord recognition..

7. The HEI shall undertake a self-assessment and prepare the Self-Tiering Assessment Report (STAR), which shall be submitted to PTC together with the request for evaluation (RFE) unless, otherwise, advised.. The STAR and the guidelines for its preparation are provided herein below in this document.

6.3 Requirements and Preparation of the Self-Tiering Assessment Report (STAR)

This guideline is intended to assist the institution and the engineering program to demonstrate that the institution satisfies or, at most, exceeds, all the criteria. Thus, it is important that the institution and the program administrators prepare the STAR to completely address all the criteria and conform to all the pertinent and relevant provisions therein. Necessarily, those responsible for the preparation of the STAR must always refer back and defer to the provisions on the classification criteria, should there be any conflict between the contents of the STAR Guidelines and the former.

In the preparation of the STAR, it is compulsory that the name of the HEI used on the cover of the STAR must be identical to that used in the institutional publications and on the PTC ACBET EAC - Initial Request for Evaluation (RFE). The current name of the HEI must be used in the narrative, unless the use of the old name is relevant to the narrative and will help in the overall understanding of the narrative itself. Furthermore, for an HEI which is composed of a system or campuses, the name of the HEI and the specific campus, whose engineering programs are being applied for accreditation, must be strictly specified in the STAR to avoid confusion or misinterpretation.

Generally, the HEI will have to provide the narrative and evidences that will demonstrate that the institution and its engineering administrative unit are compliant to the requirements of each of the criteria and sub-criteria.

The sections of the STAR shall be keyed to the tier criteria and sub-criteria, i.e., a narrative written in section on Tier Criterion 1 (TC1) shall discuss mainly the HEI's compliance to the requirements of TC1. To minimize duplication or overlapping of information in TC2 and TC3, any discussion on quality and quality systems in the section on TC2 shall be limited only to the relationship of the systems to

the overall management system of the HEI. Details on quality, overall quality plans, quality policies and quality assurance systems shall be discussed in the narrative for TC3.

Tables in the guidelines may be modified in format to more clearly present the information for the TCS. When this is done, it is suggested that a brief explanatory footnote be included about why the table was modified. Rows may be added to or deleted from tables to better accommodate program information.

6.4 Plan-Do-Check-Act

In preparing the narrative to demonstrate compliance and meeting the requirements of a criterion, it is appropriate to consider the use of the P-D-C-A cycle as follows:

- *Plan* – This involves planning how to meet the requirements of the criteria? Meeting the "plan" requirements may include, among others, the identification, development and setting up of frameworks, policies and guidelines, objectives and targets, outcomes, performance indicators, processes and procedures, timelines and organizational responsibilities, etc. that will assure the system meets the criterion.   The fundamental questions include, among others: 1) Are the above, as required, in place within the system?, 2) Are the appropriate stakeholders involved in the planning and development process?, 3) Are the responsibilities and timelines established and known?, and, 4) Is there alignment of purposes and the various elements of the system?

- *Do* – This involves assuring the above plans are already being implemented regularly, or at the least, have been initially implemented. The narrative to demonstrate a "do" compliance to a criterion requirement shall discuss the extent to which the system, policies, guidelines, process or procedure has been deployed and implemented across the institution.

- *Check* – This involves regularly monitoring, assessing and evaluating whether the implementation is in accordance with the plans and that the institutional objectives, targets and outcomes expected from the systems, processes and procedures are continually being achieved. Evidences of "check" compliance to a criterion requirement include assessment data and results of evaluation and analyses, as well as, performance gaps identified.

- *Act* – This involves the formulation of corrective and preventive actions to enhance and continually improve the levels of attainment of objectives, targets and outcomes.

6.5 Supplemental Materials

The following materials are to be supplied in addition to the Self Tiering Assessment Report:

- The general institution catalog covering operations manual and or quality manual, course offerings, proceedings and other institutional information applicable at the time of the review.

- Strategic framework, promotional brochures or literature describing program offerings of the institution.

6.6 Submission and Distribution of Self Tiering Assessment Report

The Self-Tiering Assessment Report (STAR) and Supplemental Materials shall be submitted as follows:

- To PTC-ACBET Headquarters at least ninety (90) calendar days prior to the targeted dates of the review visit and, preferably, together with the Request for Evaluation (RFE);

- Submit one hard copy of the STAR including all appendices for each campus, whose programs are being submitted for accreditation; and

- Submit one (1) set of the supplemental materials;

- Also submit an e-copy of the STAR including all the e-copies of all the documents included in the hard copy version.

- No mixed media submission and no hot links in the e-copy.

- Submit all of the above to:

Accreditation and Certification Board for Engineering & Technology
PHILIPPINE TECHNOLOGICAL COUNCIL

Postal Address:	c/o PTC Executive Directorate Office Room 405-406 National Engineering Center UP Campus, Diliman, Quezon City, 1101 Philippines
Email Address	acbet@ptc.org.ph, edo@ptc.org.ph

6.7 Confidentiality

In compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 or the RA 10173, all information supplied is for the confidential use of PTC-ACBET and its authorized agents. Any information will not be disclosed without authorization of the institution concerned, except for summary data not identifiable to a specific institution, or information contained in documents in the public domain.

6.8 Handling and Disposal of Information

All information received by PTC and PTC-ACBET and its authorized agents shall be destroyed and disposed of after tier classification and accreditation decisions shall have been declared and deemed to be final.

6.9 STAR Template

The following pages constitute the template for the STAR.

PTC-ACBET

Self-Tiering Assessment Report

for the

<Higher Educational Institution Name>

<Location>

<Date>

CONFIDENTIAL

Background Information

A. Contact Information

Provide name, mailing address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address for the primary contact person for the program. The primary contact person shall have the authority from the institution to transact business with PTC-ACBET on any and all arrangements related to the tier classification review process.

Name and address of the institution, name and title of the chief executive officer of the institution and the name and title of the person submitting the self-study report.

B. The Institution and its History

Description of the type of managerial control of the institution, e.g., private-non-profit, private-other, denominational, state, national, public-other, etc.

Provide the appropriate institutional historical narrative of the institution.

C. Organization

Provide the organization of university up to the level of the college of engineering, head of engineering educational unit.

D. Delivery Modes

Describe the delivery modes used by the institution, e.g., days, evenings, weekends, cooperative education, traditional lecture/laboratory, off-campus, distance education, web-based, etc.

TIER CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA

CRITERION 1. National and/or Regional Significance of Institution, its Engineering Units and Engineering Programs

1.1 Basic Mandate and Purposes

a. Provide the mission and vision and strategic goals of the institution. Discuss how the VMGs reflect the commitment of the HEIs to its stakeholders and to the development and enhancement of the contribution of engineering and technology to national and or to regional development.

b. Provide the strategic goals and action plans of the institution and discuss how it is being pursued towards the attainment of the vision and mission of the institution.

c. Provide the strategic goals that includes the adoption and institutionalization of the outcome-based education throughout the institution and especially the adoption of OBE for engineering education. Describe the current status of OBE implementation in the institution.

1.2 Formulation, Periodic Review and Deployment of Vision, Mission and Strategic Goals

a. Provide the formal mechanisms for the formulation, assessment and periodic review of the vision, mission and strategic goals of the HEI corresponding to the changing development needs of the country and or the region. Discuss how the VMGs and strategic goals and plans are constantly reviewed against the changing needs. Show evidence such as but not limited to minutes of meetings, reports from the strategic planning, and the strategic goals and framework, approaches, and output that support the narrative.

b. Provide a list of stakeholders from the economic sectors, industry, government, and the engineering community of which are formally and actively engaged in the formulation and review of the VMGs of the HEI and its engineering educational units *(See template at Annex Table 1.2.b).*

c. Provide the deployment plans and systems ensuring VMGs permeates the institution and to all levels of its organization. Also show evidence or activities when and where VMGs are deployed.

d. Provide samples of inputs from the stakeholders and partners in the process of formulation and reviews of the VMGs.

1.3 Partnership and Linkages

a. Provide institutional plans involving the development, growth and maintenance of partnerships and linkages with relevant parties within the country and across the region or in the international arena.

b. Provide a list of partnerships and linkages, the objectives and purpose of each, and the contributed impacts on the HEIs mandate and VMGs. Show some evidences where these impacts have contributed soundly in the institution *(See template at Annex Table 1.3.b).*

c. Explain thoroughly the impact of the partnerships and linkages on the institution. Provide regular assessment and evaluation forms and show sample results.

CRITERION 2. Institutional Leadership, Governance and Management

2.1. Leadership, Institutional Autonomy and Public Accountability

a. Discuss the general system and standards for appointing or electing members of the governing body and management. Provide supporting documents such as but not limited to minutes of meetings, election proceedings, standard of appointment or procedures, and any other related document supporting the narrative.

b. Discuss how the institution leadership conducts periodic strategic planning and reviews ensuring the alignment of the institution mandate, purposes, and its VMGs. Provide supporting documents such as but not limited to minutes of meetings, evaluation or assessment report, and any relative documents supporting the narrative.

c. Discuss how the governing body and management's decision-making process involves the highest consideration of public accountability, risk management and mitigation, ethical practice, and transparency. Provide supporting documents such as but not limited to minutes of meetings, annual reports, public accountability reports, or any relative documents that support the narrative.

2.2. Organizational Structure and Responsibilities

a. Show the organizational structure and discuss how it was framed or formed. Discuss how the structure supports the attainment of the VMGS. Does the organization enable the consistent and effective communication of policies, guidelines, systems, and procedures? Explain.

b. Discuss the succession arrangements for critical functions and how this is supported by effective recruitment and on-boarding systems. Show the continuing performance evaluation and retention strategies, processes, and standards for all its personnel.

c. Provide a sufficient and appropriate authority accompanying the responsibilities assigned to personnel to participate actively in the planning for and implementation of their roles. Provide definition of roles and its responsibilities.

d. Show and discuss the professional development plans. Provide a list of all critical personnel including engineering personnel (e.g. deputy / associate / assistant deans up to the top executives *(See template at Annex Table 2.2.d.1).* Lastly, provide a summary of personnel with masters, doctoral degrees of all critical personnel including engineering personnel (e.g., deputy / associate / assistant deans up to the top executives *(See template at Annex Table 2.2.d.2).*

2.3. Institutional Resources, Systems and Processes

a. Discuss the institutional management system. Show the policies, procedures, and processes critical to the successful realization of the institution's VMGs. Deployment process or strategies of the management system, policies, procedures, and processes must be explained. Attached sample documents with evidence that these are deployed in the organization.

b. Show or provide assessment and review forms and the results for the management systems, policies and procedures from internal and external organization bodies. Explain the relevance of this activity to the attainment of the goals and objectives of the institution.

c. Show the effective system that implements the financial strategy of the HEI. Explain or discuss how sufficient and appropriate human, physical and other resources on a timely basis to support operations and development plans of the institution are provided on a regular basis..

2.4. Institutional Performance Effectiveness and Outcomes

a. Provide and discuss the recorded level of performance of the institution according to its goals and outcomes, especially academic and financial goals. Show a 5-year historical financial data, a 5-year enrollment and graduate data, and the list of academic support services *(See template at Annex Table 2.4.a.1, Table 2.4.a.2, Table 2.4.a.3).*

b. Provide and explain the institution's continues demonstration and maintenance of its management, academic, and support service capabilities ensuring continuity and sustainability of operations and development plans.

c. Provide evidence or proof of transparency underpinned by ethical standards manifested by consistent performance and respect for established processes, standards and organizational authority.

Tier Criterion 3 – Quality Leadership, Quality System and Strategies

3.1 Institutional Quality Leadership and Commitment

a. Provide or show the institution's vision, mission and goals, quality policy and strategic plans for institutional quality assurance (IQA) of the institution. Explain how top

management demonstrate and maintain quality leadership and commitment. How are the quality policies and plans crafted to be able to anticipate risk and ensure successful performance? Explain how these are related to and support the overall strategic plans of the institution. Explain how.

b. Discuss how the top management supports the institution-wide quality system. Are there necessary organizational infrastructures in place in ensuring an effective implementation and sustainability? What are the criteria crafted for the appointment of the organizational infrastructure of IQA Unit? Provide minutes of meetings, published quality manuals, administrative orders or any other relative legal documents to show claim. What are the resources invested involved for the IQA System? Are there fund allocation for IQA plans and activities? Provide the lists of resources and or innovations created / applied / implemented for the system such as IQA Unit, Infrastructures for Digitalization, and etc *(See template at Annex Table 3.1.b).*

c. Discuss how top management formulates and reviews the attainment of its strategic objectives and quality plans. Is this a part of the institution's higher level strategic initiatives? Are the formulation and review done periodically? Who are the involved parties associated with the formulation/review of its strategic objectives and quality plans? Provide minutes of meetings, annual report, administrative orders or any legal relative documents.

d. Discuss how top management adopts a holistic approach to the development of tertiary education, especially engineering and technology education that puts emphasis on outcomes and objectives which are necessarily benchmarked against international standards and for global comparability. Provide minutes of meetings, annual report, administrative orders or any legal relative documents.

3.2 Institutional Quality Assurance System (IQA System)

a. Describe the institutional quality assurance system in place and discuss how this works within the wider institutional management system. Explain how the quality function and responsibilities are deployed to all operating and support services units. Explain how the relevance of IQA system in attaining the VMGs and Strategic objectives.

b. Discuss how the institution involves the academic staff, students, and other stakeholders in the planning, assessment, and review of the IQA System? Does the institution orient and educate the stakeholders, its academic and non-academic staff? Are there events organized for these specific stakeholders? Does the IQA have responsibilities and functional units such as departments, faculties and other service centers, and the system for teaching? Show and explain the learning and assessment to the continual attainment of learning outcomes and program objectives enabling the functional units to get actively involved in IQA at their levels.

c. Explain how the institution maintains the IQA systems and activities for effective implementation and sustainability? Show evidence that the institution provides sufficient and appropriate resources such as human and financial to support and maintain the IQA system.

d. Discuss how the periodic review of the IQA system is conducted. Provide information resulting from these reviews either by internal or external bodies, if any. Provide information on certifications issued by these external bodies as appropriate. *(See template at Annex Table 3.2.d).*

3.3 Institutional Quality Planning, Assessment and Review

a. Describe the formal and regular quality planning, assessment and review mechanism in place in the institution. Show how the alignment with overall institutional strategies and the needs of the stakeholders is maintained. Provide minutes of meeting, annual report or legal documents relevant to the matter.

b. Discuss the formal mechanism for the formulation and approval, periodic review, assessment, monitoring and evaluation of programs and awards. Explain how the institution involves its academic and non-academic staff as well as its stakeholders.

c. Provide evidence that approved quality plans are widely disseminated and deployed to all units across levels and divisions of the institution.

3.4 Institutional Quality Performance and Results

a. Describe the realistic, benchmark-setting milestone and quality objectives which the institution has set for itself, if any. Discuss the level of achievement of these objectives and how these impacted not only the institution but also a bigger part of the wider engineering community. Discuss how the institution came-up with the benchmark and its quality objective. Show evidence such as circulars, newsletters, and promotional materials or any relevant materials.

b. Provide list/s of achievements of the institution in the area of quality and quality management *(See template at Annex Table 3.4.b.1)* especially those with recognition from third party institutions and the government which highlight these achievements. *(See template at Annex Table 3.4.b.2).* Show evidence such as circulars, newsletters, and promotional materials or any relevant materials.

c. Provide evidence that the HEI has shared with, and to a large extent, mentored other institutions and even government agencies, on quality and quality management practices. Explain its impact to the society and the institution itself and its impact on attaining the institutions VMGs. Show evidence such as circulars, newsletters, and promotional materials or any relevant materials.

ANNEX

List of Tables

Table 1.2.b   List of stakeholders and its engagements in the formulation and revision of VMGS.

Name of Stakeholders	Sector Represented *(E.g. Industry, Alumni, etc)*	Highlights of Engagement / Contribution

Table 1.3.b   Partnership and linkages.

Partnership / Linkages	Year Established	Objective	Impact

Table 2.2.d.1   List of all critical personnel including engineering personnel.

Name of Personnel	Office/s	Position

Table 2.2. d.2   List of all personnel with a degree finished.

Name of Personnel	Degree Finished

Table 2.3.a.1   Show a 5-year historical financial data.

Year	Total Allocated Budget	Percent Allocated Budget for Engineering

Table 2.4.a.2   5-year enrollment and graduate data.

Year	Number of Enrolled	Percent Enrolled in Engineering	Number of Graduates	Percent Graduated in Engineering

Table 2.4. a.3   List of academic support services.

Year	List of Academic Supports in Engineering for the IQA	Purpose / Objective	Outcome

Table 3.1.b   Lists of resources/innovations created, applied or implemented for the IQA System

Year	List of Resources or Innovations for IQA System	Purpose	Impact

Table 3.2. d   List of internal and external auditing bodies, organization, and name of certification / accreditation.

Year	Certification / Accreditation	Objective of Accreditation / Certification	Impact

Table 3.4. b.1   List of achievements of engineering and technology in the institution

Year	Achievement	Objective of Achievement	Impact

Table 3.4. b.2   List of formal recognitions by 3rd party institutions and government highlighting achievements in the area of quality management practices

Year	Achievement	Recognizing Body