

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Accreditation of Private Schools

James J. Meany

Philippine Studies vol. 3, no. 3 (1955): 237–259

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

Accreditation of Private Schools

JAMES J. MEANY

ACCREDITATION of private schools is nothing new in the Philippines. It has been going on for years. The Department of Education or other governmental bodies have formulated standards of education; they have compared existing schools with these standards; then, when the results of the comparison have seemed favorable to the school under examination, the accrediting agencies have, in one way or another, notified the public that this school has met the standards. In this process is the essence of accreditation.

In 1951, when private school educators were discussing "the needs for accreditation" in the Philippines, Dr. Daniel M. Salcedo, then assistant director of the Bureau of Private Schools, called attention to this fact that accreditation already existed. He suggested that the subject of discussion should read instead: "The Needs for Better Accreditation."¹ He frankly admitted that there is such a need:

In the face of the decadence in standards prevalent in a vast number of the private schools and colleges today; in the face of the numberless graduates receiving certificates and diplomas from institutions operating under low standards and giving education that prepares them very inadequately for any work, what shall become of this nation ten years hence unless we apply today proper remedies to the situation?²

Dr. Salcedo attributed the defects of the government's own system of accreditation to the lack of sufficient personnel in

the Bureau of Private Schools. For "better accreditation," therefore, he suggested a larger appropriation for the expenses of the Bureau in order that it might be able to maintain an adequate force of competent supervisors.³ He admitted, however, the need of the cooperation of the private schools themselves: "the stupendous task of maintaining desirable standards in private schools cannot be and should not be the job of the government alone." The private schools should join in the task of regulation and supervision. Otherwise there will be no improvement of the situation — unless, he said, "we introduce a 'police-state' system of supervision."⁴ He joined, therefore, in the proposal to institute a limited system of accreditation by the private schools themselves:

For the attainment of the objectives of raising and maintaining high standards of instruction in our private schools, it is proposed that the best of our educational institutions, to begin with, must band themselves together and jointly with the government, determine the standards that are desired for our schools; and after the determination of the same, said institutions shall collectively exert all efforts to influence others to follow the same either by bearing or causing to bear moral pressure upon them or marshalling public opinion against them for refusal to keep up the standards.⁵

Prior to the 1951 speech of Dr. Salcedo, there had been some efforts at establishing a system of accreditation of private schools by the private schools themselves; since that time the efforts have been intensified — with what success, we shall describe below. The private school educators engaged in these efforts have been motivated by the same general principles contained in Dr. Salcedo's speech. It is recognized that for *better* accreditation the private schools themselves must have a share in the work of determining educational standards and, by some system of self-supervision, see to it that the standards are met. This private-school cooperation will not only effect an improvement in the present inadequate system of accreditation but also will do so without introducing a "police-state system of supervision." It will provide the solution to the two-fold problem of private schools: to raise their standards and to preserve their liberties.

As recently as last month, the Secretary of Education himself urged private schools to cooperate in the work of accreditation. In a speech delivered at the annual convention of the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities (PACU) on July 23, 1955, Secretary Hernandez expressed his concern over "the real danger that the private school system in the Philippines may, under the growing load of government rules and regulations, lose more and more of its spirit of initiative, and independence." To avert this "tragedy for education in the Philippines" the Secretary of Education advised the private schools themselves to set up some system of supervision, regulation and accreditation.

For one of the reasons why government supervision and regulation of the private schools has become more and more rigid over the years is because, despite their phenomenal growth in the past twenty years, the private schools have not yet succeeded in developing a voluntary system of supervision, regulation, and accreditation of their own which could set up and maintain standards of excellence among their members.

The Secretary saw no reason why governmental supervision and regulation could not be reduced to the minimum required by the Constitution "when the government becomes convinced that the task of imposing and maintaining standards of excellence is being carried out more effectively by responsible private professional associations like the PACU." Accordingly, he suggested that the PACU confer with the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines and the Association of Christian Schools and Colleges on ways and means towards "honest self-evaluation, self-improvement, and accreditation" by the private schools.⁶

A significant step forward towards the realization of a system of accreditation by *the private schools themselves* was made last month (August, 1955) when the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines (CEAP) issued its own *Manual of Accrediting* and distributed it to the member colleges of the CEAP, inviting the schools to make their own self-survey and apply for accreditation by the CEAP. The CEAP plan for accreditation is an outcome of an earlier movement to form the Philippine Accrediting Association for Universities and

Colleges. The remainder of this article will describe this movement and the CEAP plan itself.

The Philippine Accrediting Association

On January 12, 1951, in response to an invitation from Mr. Francisco Dalupan, President of the University of the East, a group of twenty-six educators representing private universities and colleges in Manila and other areas met at the Manila Hotel to discuss the need for a voluntary, non-governmental system of accreditation.⁷ Mr. Dalupan had recently returned from a trip abroad during which he sought for accreditation of his university by one of the regional accrediting groups in the United States. None of the regional groups in the United States were prepared to extend their activities to a foreign country; they suggested, instead, that Mr. Dalupan work for the organization of a Philippine accrediting society. The prevailing opinion of the educators at the Manila Hotel meeting was in favor of this proposal, and a committee was appointed to consider ways and means. The membership of this committee was to be as follows: two representatives of each of the educational associations, namely, the CEAP, the PACU and the Association of Christian Schools and Colleges (ACSC), and one representative from each of the three universities not attached to any of the associations, namely, the University of the Philippines, the University of the East and the University of Santo Tomas. This committee of nine was to meet at the Conference on Higher Education to be held a few weeks later on the occasion of the formal Inauguration of the University of the East.

The Conference on Higher Education convened on January 26, 1951. But the committee on accreditation, as originally constituted, did not convene: the PACU had not sent official representatives. It was decided, instead, to form a committee of all the educators present at the Conference, who might be interested in this accrediting movement. The committee met on January 27 with the following membership: Dr. Antonio Isidro, University of the Philippines; Escolastico Duterte, University of Southern Philippines; Prudencio Langcauon,

University of the East; Rev. Benigno Benabarre, O.S.B., San Beda College; Brother Gabriel, F.S.C., De la Salle College; Dr. Eufonio M. Alip, San Pablo Colleges; Alfredo Y. Evangelista, Laguna Colleges; Dr. A. S. Alonzo, M.L.Q. Educational Institution; Rev. James J. Meany, S.J., Ateneo de Manila; Nicanor G. Teodoro, Araneta Institute of Agriculture; Roque S. Alba, Nueva Cáceres Colleges; José Casimiro, Mapua Institute of Technology; Carlos R. Luzuriaga, Silliman University; Clemente Uson, Uson Colleges; Jesus Paredes, Jr., Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines; and Marciano P. Quiocho, Association of Christian Schools and Colleges. At a later meeting, Dr. Benicio T. Catapusan took the place of Mr. Quiocho as representative of the ACSC, and two members were added to the committee: Mr. José Motomal, University of Santo Tomas, Dr. Gregorio Zara, FEATI Institute of Technology.

This committee drew up a constitution for an organization to be entitled The Philippine Accrediting Association for Universities and Colleges.⁸ As stated in the constitution, the objectives of the Association were to be as follows: 1) To cooperate with the Government in its efforts to maintain a high standard of education in the Philippines; 2) To promote cooperation and understanding among institutions of higher education and to stimulate and integrate their efforts to elevate the standards of education in the Philippines; 3) To formulate standards and criteria of higher education; 4) To provide guidance to students and parents in the choice of universities and colleges.

The same committee of organizers constituted itself the *ad interim* Executive Board of the association, and elected the following officers: President, Prudencio Langcauon; Vice-President, James J. Meany, S.J.; Secretary, Antonio Isidro; Treasurer, Clemente Uson. By the "Transitory provisions" of the constitution, this *ad interim* Board would carry on the work of the incipient organization until the first fifteen courses (i.e. "colleges") had been accredited. The representatives of these fifteen courses would then constitute the general Council of the permanent organization, and the *ad interim* Board would

thereby cease to exist. The General Council, through an Executive Board to be elected by it, would conduct the work of the Association—revising the criteria of evaluation, designating the members of the evaluation committees, deciding whether to grant accreditation or not, etc.

It was planned to accredit, not entire institutions, but rather individual courses or "colleges." At least in the beginning, accreditation by the Association would extend only to colleges of Liberal Arts, Commerce and Education.

From the outset, the members of the *ad interim* Board expressly recognized the fact that their membership on the Board was no guarantee that the colleges from which they came would be among the first fifteen to be accredited. In fact, they described themselves not as official representatives of these colleges but rather as a group of private individuals voluntarily taking upon themselves the task of launching an accrediting association. In one of the talks at the Conference preliminary to the first meeting of the accrediting committee, Dr. Vidal Tan had warned that it would be useless to set up standards of accreditation "unless the men called upon to apply them are men of sound judgment, of great experience and, above all, of unquestioned integrity." The members of the *ad interim* Board were convinced that the qualities described by Dr. Tan were present among their fellow-members in a degree sufficient to insure the success of the Board in the fulfillment of its single and well-defined mission: to choose the first fifteen members of the permanent Accreditation Association.

The Board began work on the criteria of evaluation in February, 1951, and completed this difficult task early in the following September. During this period of eight months the members of the board either in special committees or as a whole, met on an average of once a week. The present writer attended these meetings and was greatly impressed not only by the diligence of the members but also by their awareness of current educational problems in the Philippines and their good judgement in the choice of criteria of excellence.

The criteria were divided into these eight areas: 1) Purposes and Objectives; 2) Faculty; 3) Instruction; 4) Library; 5) Laboratories; 6) Physical Plant; 7) Student Services; 8) Administration.¹⁰ In the preparation of the criteria the Board found much help in the literature of various accrediting associations in the United States, particularly in the *Revised Manual of Accrediting* of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It did not, however, adopt any criteria merely because these were used in the United States, but was constantly aware of local conditions and circumstances. It strove to set up a standard of collegiate excellence somewhat higher than the minimum required by the Bureau of Private Schools for colleges applying for recognition by the Government, and yet not so high as to be unattainable by colleges in the Philippines. Though the Board never so expressed itself, it is the personal opinion of this writer that the standard envisaged was one which could have been met almost immediately (i.e. in 1951) by approximately ten college courses in the Manila area and within six months or a year—that is, when the colleges would have had sufficient opportunity to make improvements and readjustments in accordance with the criteria—by a great number of other colleges in Manila and elsewhere.

Profiting by the long experience of accrediting associations in the United States, the Board expressed the greater number of criteria in qualitative rather than in quantitative terms. Likewise, it stressed the need of evaluating a college in terms of the college's own objectives and purposes. The college would be judged on the *total pattern* presented by it; failure to meet some of the individual criteria might be compensated for by superiority in other respects. The criteria would be frequently revised—and *upwards*, it was expected, as the educational situation would gradually improve. Accredited colleges would be periodically re-examined in order to insure continued compliance with the requirements of the Association.

Opposition to the Ad Interim Board

With the completion of the criteria in September, 1951, the *ad interim* Executive Board expected that the remainder

of its task would be completed in four steps. 1. It would prepare a "score-card," a kind of check-list for the convenience of the evaluation committees; this "score-card" would express the criteria in more detailed and concrete terms and provide the evaluation committees with a form on which to record their observations. 2. It would print the criteria and distribute copies to interested colleges. 3. When colleges had applied for accreditation, the *ad interim* Board would appoint an evaluation committee or committees made up of disinterested educators whose function it would be to visit the colleges, observe their conformity with the criteria and submit their observations and recommendations to the Board. 4. The Board would then consider the report of the evaluation committees and decide upon the accreditation.¹¹

That was the Board's blueprint for the future. Some little work was done on the preparation of the "score-card" but otherwise the blueprint remains in that stage until today. A partial if not the whole reason for this lack of further progress may be found in the opposition which began to manifest itself against the work of the *ad interim* Board.

At the monthly meeting of Manila Rotary in July, 1951, Dr. Vidal Tan, President of the University of the Philippines, expressed his doubts about the feasibility of the Philippine Accrediting Association for Universities and Colleges. It seemed quite evident from his words that he considered the Association as already formed, with the institutions then represented on the *ad interim* Board as already assured of accreditation. In view of this misunderstanding, it is not surprising that he should object to the Association by asking, in equivalent terms: "Who will accredit the accreditors?" This objection, expressed more privately, was evidently shared by many if not all educators not members of the *ad interim* Board.

Dr. Tan's doubts about the work of the *ad interim* Board were removed at a luncheon meeting of the Board on October 2, 1951. Members of the Board explained to their guest, Dr. Tan, the "transitory provisions" of the constitution and the other principles accepted by the Board precisely in order to

meet such objections.¹² Dr. Tan very graciously expressed his confidence in the project and, as a practical token of his desire to cooperate, offered the Board the use of a vacant office in the University's Science Building on Herran St., Manila. This offer was most welcome, in view of another objection to the accrediting project quite widespread among the schools. From the very beginning, the *ad interim* Board had been using facilities offered to it by the University of the East. Mr. Dalupan, President of U.E. and the original sponsor of the accrediting movement, had generously allowed the Board the use of office-space, secretarial help, supplies, etc. of his University. This caused a widespread impression that the budding Accrediting Association was attached in some special way to this particular institution. The *ad interim* Board, in agreement with both Mr. Dalupan and Mr. Langcaun, was glad to counteract this impression by transferring its headquarters to a kind of "neutral territory" in the University of the Philippines. (The Science Building office was used for only two meetings before the Board lapsed into inactivity.)

New opposition came from an unexpected source. In June, 1951, the Rev. Fr. Pius J. Barth, O.F.M., had arrived in Manila from the United States as Fulbright Adviser on Higher Education to the Philippine Government. During July and August he attended a few of the meetings of the *ad interim* Executive Board, engaged at that time in the work of completing the evaluative criteria. His immediate reaction was one of enthusiastic approbation of this accrediting movement and great praise for the Board itself. But later his attitude changed greatly. He lost confidence in the future of the Philippine Accrediting Association and began, in September, to make plans for another type of accrediting group.

He objected to the criteria prepared by the *ad interim* Board on the grounds that they contained "a great deal of absolute rather than relative standards." Relative criteria, he said, "provide for growth while absolute standards tend toward self-satisfaction." He objected, moreover, to the composition of the *ad interim* Board on the grounds that it represented only a few institutions. To be successful, he claimed, the Board

would have to enlist the cooperation of most of the institutions in the Philippines, particularly those belonging to the PACU.¹³

The *ad interim* Board, on the other hand, believed that its criteria were sufficiently "relative" for a successful beginning of the work of accreditation. The criteria were not chosen arbitrarily and without reference to actual conditions in Philippine colleges. Moreover, they would be subject to constant revision.

The Board members regretted that the PACU had not joined the CEAP and the ACSC when the accrediting movement was started at the beginning of 1951. They did not think, however, that this was necessarily fatal to the movement's chances of success. After all, no colleges were as yet regular members of the Philippine Accrediting Association. When preparations for accreditation were finally completed, any college in the Philippines would be a welcome applicant. In the meantime, a small group of educators was needed for the preparation of the criteria, "score-card" and so forth; a large group would have been inefficient. And the *ad interim* Board thought that, as a group, it was as competent as any other that might be mustered — an opinion with which at first Father Barth had enthusiastically concurred. Nevertheless, recognizing the fact that its work would have more chance for success if it had the good-will of the PACU, the *ad interim* Board decided to attempt a *rapprochement* with this organization. A meeting was arranged between two representatives of the PACU — Dr. Mariano de los Santos and Professor Vicente Sinco—and two representatives of the *ad interim* Board — Mr. Langcauon and the present writer. This meeting failed of its purpose and the composition of the *ad interim* Board remained as before.

In the meantime, Father Barth had gone on with his plans for a new accrediting association. On January 16, 1952, Dr. Manuel L. Carreon, then Director of the Bureau of Private Schools, called together representatives of colleges and universities in the Manila area and of the various educational associations for a "conference on accreditation." At this meeting,

of which Dr. Carreon was chairman, Father Barth presented his plan. He recommended the organization of a "cooperative non-governmental committee through the initiative of the government." This committee would be composed of representatives of the universities, colleges and associations. It would set up "relative criteria" on the basis of which the "prestige institutions" among the private schools would be designated and a list of them given to the public. Schools placed on this prestige list would be exempted from government regulation of any but "fundamental items and policies"; schools not on the list would continue to be subject to the usual detailed regulations and inspections.

The schools would be evaluated in certain "critical areas" such as percentage of full-time faculty members, percentage of faculty members with various graduate degrees, student-faculty ratio, average annual expenditure for library books, average annual educational expenditure per student, etc. etc. Comparative percentile rankings would reveal the actual position of a college or university in relation to similar institutions in the Philippines. Those institutions above a certain percentile rank—Fr. Barth mentioned, as an example, the fiftieth percentile—would be designated as the "prestige institutions." Those institutions below the fiftieth percentile would be induced to improve themselves to reach the upper category. As more institutions improved themselves in the critical areas of evaluation, the institutions already regarded as prestige would also have to continue to improve or they would soon fall below the fiftieth percentile and would be dropped from the prestige list.

Father Barth insisted on the need of the government "initiative" for the success of the accrediting program. The "non-governmental committee," however, would do all the work—it would prepare the criteria, make the evaluations and publish the list of prestige institutions. The expenses of the examiners would be borne by the institution being examined. The institutions from which the examiners came "should be willing to spare the services of the examiners during the days required for the examination." The prestige institutions would share the expenses involved in publishing the prestige list.

"Thus the government will exercise initiative and leadership while non-governmental educational statesmen will bear the responsibility of implementation."¹⁴

Had this accrediting plan been presented a year earlier it would probably have been welcomed by all the private institutions of the Philippines. At that time, the beginning of 1951, it would have been considered a definite *step forward* towards private-school participation in the work of accreditation. But coming as it did almost exactly a year after the plans for the Philippine Accrediting Association had been made and after considerable progress had been made towards the implementation of these plans, Fr. Barth's plan was considered by many to be a *long step backward*. This was the opinion of the *ad interim* Board of the Philippine Accrediting Association, as well as that of the representatives of the CEAP and the ACSC present at the January 16 meeting and two subsequent meetings in the Bureau of Private Schools. It was considered a step backward for two reasons: 1) It would cancel out the work already done by the Philippine Accrediting Association, and 2) by insisting on the "initiative and leadership" of the Department of Education, it would discourage the healthy initiative manifested by the private schools in forming their own association and restore what many of the private schools considered the more objectionable features of government accreditation.

Mr. Francisco Dalupan, President of the University of the East, in a speech delivered on March 12, 1952 at the University of Southern Philippines in Cebu, said this of Father Barth's plan:

The move is clearly diversionary in purpose and, at the very least, will set back the work of accreditation in the Philippines for a whole year. As I have already stated, the Philippine Accrediting Association for Universities and Colleges, at present in the form of an *ad Interim* Board, has already finished the intricate and difficult work of formulating the criteria which will guide the Association in its work of accreditation. In this tedious work have participated some of the country's leading educators under the chairmanship of a career educator, a former Secretary of Education. A new group, however constituted, will have to

start all over again from scratch. On the basis of the loss of time to be incurred, the step taken is ill-advised. If, on the other hand, the purpose of the move is to raise the standards of Philippine higher education by inviting and challenging colleges and universities to meet indicated criteria, then others can more effectively work towards this objective by joining and cooperating with the existing association. The Association is not exclusive. It welcomes all institutions which can meet the criteria set up by its *ad Interim* Board. One who is sincere in his search for the remedies of the shortcomings of Philippine education should induce others to join the existing accrediting association and, within its framework, cooperate with those who have already started the work with courage and resolution.¹⁵

The members of the *ad interim* Board did not claim that Father Barth's *purpose* was "diversionary," nor was there any doubt of his sincerity in proposing this remedy for educational problems. After his six months in the Philippines and in the light of his long experience with the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in the United States, he was convinced that the Philippine Accrediting Association was doomed to failure and that his plan was a better one. Many critics of his plan, nevertheless, thought that *in effect* his proposal would make accreditation merely what it had always been previously, the function of the Department of Education alone. They could see no other good reason for the insistence on governmental "initiative and leadership." (It might be well to mention, in this connection, that the *ad interim* Board never considered itself either in opposition to the Department of Education nor in competition with it. In its criteria it insisted that colleges applying for accreditation be *already recognized by the government*. It based the right of the Philippine Accrediting Association to exist on the natural right of association.)

To formulate the relative criteria proposed by Father Barth would take a very long time. The list of "prestige institutions" in the Philippines would have little meaning unless all, or nearly all of the existing institutions were first evaluated. The fact that this evaluation would have to be done under the sponsorship of the government would most likely make it necessary that absolutely all of the institutions be first

evaluated; any government-sponsored movement must be "democratic" and so it could not be presumed that some institutions would be and some others would not be on the list. But this task of evaluation would be gigantic; it would involve much expense and labor. As Mr. Dalupan expressed it, it would "set back the work of accreditation in the Philippines for a whole year." A completely voluntary and non-governmental group such as the *ad interim* Board of the Philippine Accrediting Association, while beginning with a comparatively small group of colleges and gradually extending its work as time, finances and energies allowed, would not be beset by these difficulties. From the beginning it would have the effect desired by all educators—the raising of standards—and any cry of "prejudice" or "discrimination" could be shown to be illogical.

The pros and cons of Father Barth's plan were discussed at three meetings held in the Bureau of Private Schools—on January 16, February 1, and March 6. Some modifications were made as a result of these meetings. It was agreed that the accreditation would be of individual colleges (College of Liberal Arts, College of Education, etc.) rather than of entire institutions. In response to objections raised by representatives of the *ad interim* Board and of the CEAP and the ACSC, it was agreed that criteria of educational excellence already developed by various groups "would be studied and collated towards the development of a score-card acceptable to the majority of the members of the committee." Furthermore, "it was made clear that as soon as the proposed accrediting body is organized, the government will withdraw although it will continue its system of authorization and recognition of institutions not included in the prestige list."¹⁰

At a "caucus" held subsequent to the March 6 meeting, the *ad interim* Board of the Philippine Accrediting Association decided that it would participate in the new accrediting movement. The modifications had made it less objectionable and, what was more to the point, any further opposition was judged at the time to be futile. Consequently, at a meeting held in the Bureau of Private Schools on March 17, a study committee was formally appointed to complete the plans for the ac-

crediting body. The committee was composed of two representatives of the *ad interim* Board, two of the PACU, two of the CEAP, two of the ACSC, one from the Philippine Normal College, and one from the University of the Philippines—with the Director of the Bureau of Private Schools as Chairman.

There are three curious points to be noted about this study committee. First, its composition was quite similar to that proposed a year previously at the January meeting in the Manila Hotel. Secondly, the *ad interim* Executive Board of the Philippine Accrediting Association had a majority in the committee—for the CEAP and ACSC representatives were also members of the Executive Board! And thirdly, the committee has never been convened from that day to this. The right of convening this government-sponsored committee was solely that of the Director of the Bureau of Private Schools.

Nor has there been any progress towards the formation of the Philippine Accrediting Association since the year 1952. The *ad interim* Board held two more meetings—both in October of that year—but since then it has been inactive. Expectancy of some activity on the part of the group appointed to plan for the government-sponsored accreditation held the Board for some time in a state of “suspended animation.” Then, months later, when it was quite clear that there would not be any action in that sector, the members of the Board were burdened by other duties or had lost interest. Mr. Langcauon, the president, felt that he had no time to spare from his many administrative duties in the University of the East. The vice-president, because of his peculiar circumstances, knew that any attempt on his part to assume leadership would be both unwelcome and of no avail. The other members of the Board seemed content to let the project lapse. Perhaps they themselves had succumbed to the pessimistic attitude concerning the future success of the Philippine Accrediting Association so often expressed by outsiders. Perhaps they were worn out by the opposition. Whatever the reason, the *ad interim* Executive Board, if not defunct, is quite moribund.

But its work has not been entirely fruitless: The accreditation movement within the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines has profited from it.

*CEAP Accreditation*¹⁷

On May 2, 1953, the Board of Governors of the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines, in a special meeting, agreed that the CEAP should take steps towards a system of accreditation of its member institutions. At its regular quarterly meeting on the following June 13, the Board of Governors decided to ask the Board of the Philippine Accrediting Association for the use of its criteria and to request the CEAP member colleges in the Manila area to test their feasibility by applying them to their own courses. On June 27 of that year, Mr. Langcauon, in the name of the *ad interim* Board gave permission to the CEAP for the use of the criteria, and they were thus distributed to the Manila colleges. Within the scholastic-year 1953-1954, and the first few months of 1954-1955, a number of the Catholic colleges of Manila applied the criteria to their courses and reported that the standards were attainable. At the quarterly meeting of the Board of Governors of the CEAP in September, 1954, it was decided to include the question of accreditation on the *Agenda* of the annual General Assembly to be held during the coming October.

At the General Assembly it was resolved: a) that the CEAP create a voluntary Accrediting Association and invite CEAP colleges in Manila and suburbs to be the first applicants for membership; b) that the present Evaluative Criteria prepared for the Philippine Accrediting Association for Universities and Colleges be accepted substantially as the basis on which the first members of the Accrediting Association would be accepted.

For the implementation of these resolutions, the General Assembly empowered the CEAP Departments for Men's and Women's Colleges to appoint an Accreditation Committee with the following functions:

1. To revise the evaluative criteria in those minor points which may be suggested by the CEAP colleges;

2. To determine the procedures for the application of the criteria;
3. To invite the colleges of the Manila area to apply for accreditation;
4. To appoint a team of Accreditors who will inspect the colleges who have accepted the invitation.

The Departments of Men's and Women's Colleges, in a joint meeting, appointed the Accreditation Committee with the following members: Brother H. Gabriel, F.S.C., Rev. James J. Meany, S.J., Rev. Benigno Benabarre, O.S.B., Mr. José Motomal, Atty. Jesús Paredes, Jr., and representatives from the following colleges for women: Holy Ghost College, St. Joseph's College, St. Scholastica's College and St. Theresa's College. The five members designated by name were all members of the *ad interim* Executive Board of the Philippine Accrediting Association and had been very active in the formulation of the evaluative criteria.

The first meeting of the Accreditation Committee was held on December 12, 1954. At this meeting and subsequent meetings Brother Edward, F.S.C., represented Brother Gabriel. The representatives of the women's colleges were as follows: Sister Josefina, S.Sp.S., and Sister Bellarmine, S.Sp.S.; Mother Chantal, O.S.F., and Mother Magdala, O.S.F.; Sister Kuniberta, O.S.B., and Sister M. Caridad, O.S.B.; Mother Edmund, C.M.S.A., and Mother Ignatia, C.M.S.A., to whom were added Sister M. Caritas, O.P., and Sister M. Siena, O.P., of Maryknoll College.

The Committee first revised the Evaluative Criteria in accordance with its instructions. No substantial changes were made. There were a number of slight modifications. The only notable addition to the criteria was a list of *objectives* which should be proper to Catholic colleges, viz.:

1. The completion by each of its students of a course in religion on the collegiate level. The college course in Religion will include the study of the Life of Christ, Christian Dogma, Sacramental, Moral and Ascetical Theology—adapted, of course, to the capacities and needs of college students.

2. The development in its students of such a lasting appreciation and love of the truths learned in the Religion course that they will motivate daily Christian living.
3. The active participation of its students in the daily sacramental and liturgical life of the Church.

In order to aid the teams of Accreditors in the application of the criteria to the actual circumstances of the colleges under survey, the Accreditation Committee decided to prepare *Survey Forms* for each of the seven areas of evaluation, namely, purposes and objectives, faculty, instruction, library, laboratories, physical plant, student services, and administration.

Each Survey Form has a number of divisions corresponding to the main divisions of the Evaluative Criteria for the area. For each division there is *Analysis* and *Evaluation*. The Analysis is essentially a check-list by which is gathered all the information that may serve as a basis for evaluation. The Evaluation is the assigning of quantitative ratings to the information gathered in the Analysis. At the end of the Survey Form for each area, provision is made for a statistical summary, in which is gathered together and recorded all the evaluations made in this area, and there is computed the numerical average not only for each division but also for the entire area. A graphic summary presents the same data in bar-graph form.

In order to prepare the Survey Forms, the Accreditation Committee was divided into sub-committees for the different areas. Their work was reviewed and criticized by all the members of the Accreditation Committee and revised accordingly. When, after three months of work, the sub-committees had completed their drafts of the Survey Forms, these were given to a Style Committee comprised of Brother Edward, Atty. Paredes, Mr. Motomal, and the present writer. At the time of writing (August 13, 1955), the Style Committee has completed the Survey Forms for the areas of Purposes and Objectives, Faculty and Instruction. It will complete the other Forms before the beginning of the Second Semester of this scholastic-year.

The Style Committee also undertook to write the *Manual of Accrediting*. The manuscript was submitted to the Board

of Governors of the CEAP at its June meeting. The Board voted its approval and directed that it be printed and distributed to the colleges. The *Manual* was printed early in August and is now being distributed.

The *Manual* lists the objectives of the CEAP in establishing an Accrediting Association as follows:

1. To describe the characteristics of colleges worthy of designation as institutions of higher education;
2. To provide guidance to students and parents in the choice of colleges;
3. To serve individual institutions as a guide in intercollegiate relationships, particularly in the transfer of students;
4. To stimulate and integrate the efforts of Catholic colleges to elevate the standards of education in the Philippines.

The complete list of Evaluative Criteria is printed in the *Manual* and a description given of the accrediting procedure. The interested college will fill out the Survey Forms supplied to it, thus making its own *self-survey*. Upon the completion of the self-survey, the college may then make formal application for accreditation to the CEAP Accreditation Committee. The Committee will appoint a Team of Accreditors which will consist of "educators known to be expert in their field and in no way associated or connected with the group of colleges applying for accreditation." The Team of Accreditors will corroborate the college's self-evaluation, as it appears in the survey-forms, and will recommend the accreditation or not, according to its findings. The colleges which on or before November 1, 1957, will have been approved for membership by the Team of Accreditors will be the "charter members" of the CEAP Accrediting Association. Upon the admission of these "charter members" the present Accreditation Committee will cease to exist, and thenceforward, the representatives of the "charter members" will conduct the work of the Accrediting Association. In larger matters touching upon general policy, the decisions of the Association will be subject to the approval of the CEAP Board of Governors.

This and other information concerning accreditation procedures and policies is contained in the *Manual of Accrediting*.

In preparing the *Manual* and the Survey Forms, the Accreditation Committee profited not only from the work of the *ad interim* Board of the Philippine Accrediting Association but also from the experience and printed literature of regional accrediting associations in the United States, notably the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The near future will probably tell whether this accrediting movement is, like its predecessors, to languish or is to be carried through to fruition. Much of its success will depend upon the composition of the *Team of Accreditors* to be appointed by the Accreditation Committee. If the members of this Team fit the description given above and if, in addition, they fit Dr. Vidal Tan's description of "men of sound judgment, of great experience and, above all, of unquestioned integrity," then in the opinion of the educated *public*, membership in the Accrediting Association of the CEAP will be indeed a hallmark of excellence; membership will be sought after by other schools through the raising of their own standards; the member colleges will be, in a very true sense, *accredited*. Otherwise, there is real danger that the public will consider the Association to be what one member of the Accreditation Committee bluntly described as "merely a mutual admiration society."

In this connection it is well to note that the CEAP accrediting movement is not a revolt against any existing organization; it is no symptom of exclusiveness nor of isolationism; it is not an escape from comparative rating, on a competitive basis, with other institutions not members of the CEAP. For the fact is that no other accrediting organization is functioning at the present time. (We can except the Bureau of Private Schools, for with relation to its standardizing procedures the CEAP colleges are as other colleges in the Philippines.) The CEAP accrediting movement is the result of two factors: 1) the belief that for the raising of educational standards there is a need for some form of accreditation of private schools by private schools; and 2) the fact that no such accreditation exists at the present time. From the very beginning of the

movement to form the Philippine Accrediting Association for Universities and Colleges—which was meant for *all* universities and colleges in the Philippines—the CEAP actively cooperated. CEAP members on the *ad interim* Executive Board “sold” the movement to their organization, and the CEAP colleges stood ready to apply for accreditation by the PAAUC. At the time of the discussion concerning the government-sponsored accrediting group of Father Barth, the CEAP representatives, like those of the *ad interim* Board of the PAAUC, objected to it on the same grounds as the Board. But the CEAP, too, after the March 6 (1952) meeting in the Bureau of Private Schools, held a meeting of its Board of Governors and decided to cooperate in the formation of the new group. As already mentioned, it was officially represented on the erstwhile “study committee.”

At least in the beginning, the CEAP Accreditation Committee will confine its activities to the colleges in Manila and suburbs. This limitation is for two reasons. Because of material circumstances the members of the Committee are perforce from the Manila colleges, and they do not consider themselves competent to formulate and apply criteria to the varying scholastic conditions in the Provinces. Secondly, any attempt to start an accrediting movement which, from the very beginning, embraces the whole country is thought to be too ambitious; the movement is starting in a comparatively small way—as its organizers gain in experience and resources it can be gradually extended. Perhaps the CEAP colleges outside of Manila can begin their own regional accrediting associations—to be coordinated later with each other and, eventually, with the organization in Manila.

The colleges which since last December have been cooperating in the revision of the criteria and the preparation of the survey forms, have already profited from the accrediting movement. Consciously or not, they have been making their own self-surveys. With the distribution of the *Manual of Accrediting* and the survey forms to the other colleges, this self-survey becomes a conscious process in all the colleges. This is a great benefit of the accrediting process, perhaps the chief benefit.

There is solid hope that soon the other benefits will be reaped, to the good of Philippine education in general and the greater glory of God.

* * *

¹ Daniel M. Salcedo, "The Needs of Accreditation," *U.E. Landmark: Inauguration of the University of the East, Addresses, Papers, Acts and Proceedings* (Manila, Jan. 26-28, 1951), 81-82.

² *Ibid.*, p. 87.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 89.

⁶ Gregorio Hernandez, Jr., Secretary of Education, "Operations Decontrol," a speech delivered at the Annual Convention of the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities on July 23, 1955, printed in full in *The Philippines Herald*, Saturday, July 30, 1955, pp. 4-5.

⁷ The list of guests at this dinner meeting was as follows: The Very Rev. Fr. Castañón, O.P., University of Sto. Tomas; President Mariano V. de los Santos, University of Manila; President Vicente G. Sinco, Foundation College; Dean A. S. Alonzo, MLQ. Educational Institution; Dr. Enrique Sobrepeña, Union College of Manila; Prof. Antonio Isidro, University of the Philippines; Dean Perfecto Laguio, Manila Law College; Jesús Paredes, Jr., Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines; Marciano P. Quiocho, Association of Christian Schools and Colleges; President George L. Adamson, Adamson University; President Francisca T. Benitez, Philippine Women's University; Dr. Gregorio Zara, FEATI Institute of Technology; Dean Roberto J. Kelemen, Francisco Law School; President Tomas Mapua, Mapua Institute of Technology; President Ricardo C. Lacson, Philippine Law School; Feliciano Ledesma, San Beda College; Rev. Fr. James J. Meany, S.J., Ateneo de Manila; Brother H. Gabriel, F.S.C., President of De la Salle College; Prof. Molano, San Juan de Letran College; Lino J. Castillejo, University of Southern Philippines; Susano Negado, Cebu Institute of Technology; and Carlos Luzuriaga, Silliman University. (*U.E. Landmark*, p. 99).

⁸ Constitution, *U.E. Landmark*, pp. 103-108.

⁹ Vidal A. Tan, "The Benefits of Accreditation," *U.E. Landmark*, p. 95.

¹⁰ Cf. *Manual of Accrediting* of the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines (August, 1955), pp. 5-18. The CEAP criteria are substantially the same as the criteria originally prepared for the PAAUC, as will be noted below in this article.

¹¹ "In considering the eligibility of membership of any course applying for accreditation at least two-thirds vote of the members of the *ad interim* Executive Board shall be necessary for approval," Constitution, Chapter Thirteen, Article 1.

¹² *Supra*, pp. 5-6.

¹³ Minutes of the Conference on Accreditation held at the Bureau of Private Schools, on January 16, 1952.

¹⁴ Father Barth's plan is described in his report on "Higher Education in the Philippines", dated January 7, 1952 and distributed in mi-

meographed form at the meeting of January 16; see also the Minutes of that meeting.

¹⁵ Address of President Francisco Dalupan of the University of the East at the Educational Conference on the General Theme "Accreditation of the Philippine Universities and Colleges" held in connection with the Silver Jubilee of the University of Southern Philippines, Cebu City, March 15, 1952—Mimeographed copy of address, p. 6.

¹⁶ Minutes of March 6 Meeting.

¹⁷ The data on CEAP Accreditation is contained in the Minutes of the meetings of its Board of Governors between May 1953 and June, 1955 and in the *Manual of Accrediting* (Manila, August, 1955).