CHED Memorandum Order No. 46 s. 2012

AN OVERVIEW

ATTY. JANUARY FAYE RISONAR-BELLO
PERCEIVED THRUSTS OF CHED*:

- Expanded and enhanced career and life chances and choices for students
- Higher education and higher education institutions in the full service of national development.
CHED’S PERCEIVED ROLE IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT *

- Instrument for poverty alleviation (instruction, research, extension providing capacity and opportunities for the poor)

- Vehicle for technologically-driven national development and global competitiveness
CHED’S PERCEIVED CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT*

- Human capital formation
  Services sector / Business processing outsourcing
- Technologically-driven national competitiveness
  High-level scientific and technologically-oriented professionals and Human resource for research, development and innovation
CHED’S PERCEIVED CRITICAL AREAS OF CONCERN*

- LACK OF OVERALL VISION, FRAMEWORK, PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
- DETERIORATING QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
- LIMITED ACCESS TO QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION
AREAS OF CONCERN SEEN IN CONTEXT:

- **LACK OF OVERALL VISION, FRAMEWORK, PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION** = job skills mismatch; proliferation of HEIs; undersubscribed and oversubscribed programs

- **DETERIORATING QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION** = declining performance of graduates; inadequate faculty credentials and facilities; lack of accreditation of HEIs and programs; unplanned expansion; declining Global competitiveness

- **LIMITED ACCESS TO QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION** = low participation and completion rate; increasing costs, limited student assistance programs
CHED’S KRA RELATIVE TO THE CMO

- Rapid, equitable and sustained economic growth achieved thru:

1. **Rationalization of Higher Education**
   - thru developing typologies of HEIs, amalgamation of HEIs, Moratorium on new HEIs and programs, Harmonization of public and private HEIs, K to 12.

2. **Improving Quality and Standards thru:**
   - QA, phase out/closure of substandard programs, compliance with international standards, Fac Devt/HEIs Management Devt. Programs, CODs/COEs, Zonal and Research Centers established and supported, Natl Universities/Colleges for Fisheries and Agriculture, Prov. Institutes for Agriculture and Fisheries.
THE HIGHER EDUCATION LANDSCAPE

As of 2010-2011:

Total HEIs (including SUCs campuses) – 2, 247

Public HEIs 643
- SUCs 110 (main)
- SUCs Campuses 424 (satellite)
- LUCs 93
- Others 16

Private HEIs 1,604
- Sectarian 334
- Non Sectarian 1,270

HOW IS THIS TRANSLATED IN THE CMO?
CHED’S BASIS FOR PROMULGATION OF CMO 46

- **Constitutional Premise?**
  Article XIV Section 1, 1987 Constitution.
  Section 2
  Section 4

- **Legal Grounds?**
  Sec. 2 and 3. BP 232 (Educ. Act of 1982)
  Section 8d RA 7722 (Higher Educ. Act 1994)
ARTICLE 1 – RATONALE FOR ENHANCING QA

Section 1 – Philippine Higher Ed mandated to contribute to building a quality nation...

Section 2 – mandate translated into 4 missions:
   a. produce “thoughtful graduates” ...
   b. produce graduates with high levels of academic and technical skills ...
   c. provide focused support to research
   d. help improve quality of life for Filipinos

Section 3 – 4 missions would entail a “critical mass of divers HEIs offering quality programs meeting national and international standards...
ARTICLE 1

- Sec. 4 - quality and QA; and the need to move Filipinos out of poverty
- Sec. 5 – focus on QA underscored by the ff:
  a. “research findings” suggesting a lack of critical pool of graduates with necessary thinking, technical and behavioural competencies
  b. ASEAN Community by 2015; free flow of qualified labor in the region
  c. RPs commitment to develop a system of comparable qualifications, degrees and diplomas across the Asia Pacific (UNESCO)
  d. Acceptance of internationally agreed upon frameworks and mechanism for the global practice of professions.
ARTICLE 2 – QA FRAMEWORK

- Sec. 6 – CHED’s definition of “quality” (fitness for purpose, exceptional, developing a culture of quality.)
- Sec. 7 – QA as ensuring that there are mechanisms in place to ensure that the desired quality is delivered.
- Sec. 8 – internal QA system explained.
- Sec. 9 – QA to be done by “external agencies” (CHED; accrediting bodies.)
- Sec 10 – CHED approach as “developmental” and will work with private institutions. (N.B. last sentence: CHED’s use of powers to take remedial action on shortcomings of HEIs.)
ARTICLE 3 – RATIONALE FOR ADOPTING CBL
AND OB-QA MONITORING & EVALUATION

- Sec. 11 to 12 – globalization; shift in contemporary international education discourse to lifelong learning and building learner competencies; UNESCO’s Faure Report; Delors Report
- Sec. 13 to 14 – CHED’s commitment to developing CB learning standards that complies w/ intl. standards (when applicable); CHED’s commitment to developing & implementing OB approach to QA monitoring and evaluation
- Sec. 15 – recognition of value of specific inputs (vis-à-vis outputs)
- Sec. 16 – CHED’S “2-PRONGED” APPROACH: direct assessment of educational outcomes w/ evaluation of individual programs leading to those outcomes; audit of quality systems of an HEI
Sec. 17 – notion of quality as fitness for purpose; adoption of OB-QA framework presupposing quality goals anchored to an HEI’s vision and mission statement.

Sec. 18 – CHED debunking the “one-size fits all” QA system (“university”); consequences of such a QA system (inefficiencies within HEIs, penchant for university status, lack of focused support for impt. research, presumption that academic excellence achievable only by universities.)

Sec. 19 – benefits of having a “good typology”

Sec. 20 – what CHED and other concerned agencies stand to gain from HEI differentiation/typology
ART. 5 – ADOPTION OF HORIZONTAL TYPOLOGY OF HEIS FOR QA

- **Sec. 21** – a horizontal typology based on functional differentiation of HEIs vis-à-vis their service to the nation, a vertical typology w/in each type.

- **Sec. 22** – basis for differentiation of HEIs
  1) qualifications & corresponding competencies of graduates
  2) nature of degree programs offered
  3) qualifications of faculty members
  4) types of available learning resources & support structures
  5) nature of linkages & community outreach activities.
ART. 5 – SECTION 23 “HORIZONTAL TYPOLOGY”

23.1. PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS - Provide educational experiences to develop *technical* knowledge and skills that lead to *professional practice*. e.g. Engineering, Medicine, Law, IT, Management, Teacher Ed, Maritime Ed.

23.2 COLLEGES – provide educational experiences to develop adults who have the thinking, problem-solving, decision-making, communication, technical & social skills to participate in various types of employment, particularly *in response to the needs of the communities they serve*.

23.3 UNIVERSITIES - Provide *highly specialized* educational experiences to train experts in various *technical and disciplinal* areas and by embracing the development of new knowledge and skills through *research and development*. 
Art. 6 – Vertical Typology

- Sec. 24 – Vertical Typology as the classification of HEIs accdg. to the 3 elements of quality: alignment & consistency of the learning environment with the HEIs VM-G; demonstration of exceptional learning & service outcomes; development of a culture of quality. (LEVEL OF PROGRAM EXCELLENCE & INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY.)
ART. 6 – VERTICAL TYPOLOGY

- Sec. 25
  A. AUTONOMOUS HEIs by EVALUATION
  B. DEREGULATED HEIs by EVALUATION
  C. REGULATED HEIs

- Sec. 26 – VT as based on the assessment of the HEIs Commitment to excellence and Institutional Sustainability and Enhancement
- Sec. 27 – long term goal for VT
ART. 7 – TRANSITORY PROVISIONS

- **Sec. 28** – CHED extension of status to autonomous HEIs and existing COEs and CODs until 31 May 2014.
- **Sec. 29** – extent and coverage of 31 May 2014 extension given by CHED; after said date new CODs and COEs will be selected by Technical Panel using new criteria.
- **Sec. 30** – private HEIs w/ pending applications for university status; public HEIs with pending bills for conversion will be assessed using new criteria or thru CMO 48 s. 1996 criteria
- **Sec. 31** – HEIs granted university status retains as such unless they choose to be typed differently.
- **Sec. 32** – “lead university” for private HEIs with pending applications for university status must meet reqts by 2014. By 2017 entire system to meet the requirement for university status.
- **Sec. 33** – policy and implementing guidelines for other quality and QA mechanisms will be the subject of other CMOs.
ARTICLE 8 – REPEALING CLAUSE

- Sec. 39 – all previous issuances pertaining to the grant of university status, system status, autonomous and deregulated status that are inconsistent with the provisions of the CMO are deemed repealed, revoked or rescinded after the transitory provisions are implemented.

- ARTICLE 9. SEC. 40 – EFFECTIVITY
  15 DAYS after publication in an official gazette or in a newspaper of general circulation.

(signed: 11 December 2012.)
POINTS TO CONSIDER:

- Concept of “complementary role” of private education vis-a-vis public education how translated in this CMO?
- Does the OBTB-QA truly address the KRAs identified? Can it effectively deliver the promise of Quality and Quality Assurance of HEIs?
- The manner by which the OBTB-QA is interpreted in the CMO, within the purview of authority granted to CHED by virtue of RA 7722? (w/in ambit of “reasonable regulation?” of HEIs? Can they regulate accrediting agencies?)
- Legality of CMO – is there a need to legislate? (i.e. HB 363) or is this permissible subordinate legislation?
- Violative of academic freedom? (esp. private HEIs)
- Is there a “level playing field” between public and private HEIs allowing for equal and fair implementation of the CMO?
- OPERATIONALLY FEASIBLE? - cf. 2013 CHED budget
A certain level of “untruthfulness” in the interpretation of CMO 46?

Does it CLARIFY the CONTENTIOUS issues?

Why push thru with QA at the same time as K to 12?

Answer 1: for HEIs to contribute more vigorously to natl. development by producing competent graduates to boost national and regional economies. (A reiteration of the premise in Sec. 1 of CMO 46?)

BUT, CMO articulates: production of “thoughtful graduates” ... & those with high levels of academic thinking & technical competencies aligned with natl.academic & industry standards & needs and international standards, WHEN APPLICABLE. (s. 2)
Why push thru with QA at the same time as K to 12?

Answer 2: to regain the Philippine’s competitive advantage in Asia or close the competitiveness gap

+ But NOT mentioned in CMO 46.
+ Data can be shown to dispute this claim (Pajano presentation)
answer 3: to adopt approaches that will *resonate with national needs and international practice*; most of our HEI programs are not yet based on learning competencies; learner-centered, competency based, industry linked education necessary to produce Filipino graduates that meet the demands of employers...

CMO 46’s articulation appears to favor production of skilled employees serving employers needs (usually international market) over production of graduates who are innovators, entrepreneurs. *Confining V/Ms of private HEIs as aligned to (economic) national development?*
**WHY PUSH THRU WITH QA AT THE SAME TIME AS K TO 12?**

- **answer 4:** to remain in step with the ASEAN in adopting and substantiating a National Qualifications Framework
- **CMO 46, not the articulation of the PQF.** but found in a belated issuance of an EO w/c only provides a “skeletal structure” for the creation of a PQF. (does not yet exist as of this time)
- in other countries a NQF is a legislative measure. Can this be done merely by an EO?
**WHY PUSH THRU WITH QA AT THE SAME TIME AS K TO 12?**

- **Answer 5**: to enhance competitiveness of Filipino graduates, reduce their vulnerability to sub-optimal working conditions, help RP catch up with its neighbors.

- But is QA really the solution?
  - Why not improve on curriculum, programs?
  - leveling the playing field between public and private HEIs (which accounts for the “extremely uneven quality of HEIs) before govt sets up a QA framework?
CHED ANSWER: yes, pursuant to sec. 8 par. 4, 5, 6, 8, and 15.

But is banking on “PERFORM SUCH OTHER FUNCTIONS AS MAY BE NECESSARY FOR ITS EFFECTIVE OPERATIONS...” (sec. 15)

Principle of *ejusdem generis*

must CONFINE itself to “setting minimum standards”
CHED campaigns the necessity to Shift to OBE.

+ To comply with ASEAN 2015?
+ HEI challenged to develop relevant curriculum, instruction and assessment tools as well as develop QA systems
+ For CHED, they will give DIRECTION and SUPPORT to HEIs ONLY (but is unclear as to how); but CMO clearly articulates QA WILL BE DONE BY EXTERNAL AGENCIES LIKE CHED & other ACCREDITING AGENCIES (sec. 9, CMO)
IMPERATIVES UNDER THE CMO?

CHED campaigns the necessity to adopt a HORIZONTAL & VERICAL TYPOLOGY for HEIs.

- VOLUNTARY? = the transitory provisions in CMO 46 signify a mandatory compliance for HEIs.
- NOTE: CHED has to prepare its staff and its systems for this! (CMO already in effect and yet CHED personnel not competent to implement?)
- SNUBBING the history and reputation of voluntary accreditation?; CHED co-opting the private accreditaton agencies or worse CHED now the supervisor of accrediting agencies?
BENEFICIARIES OF THE CMO 46?

- CHED: credibility of Philippine higher education; mobility of students & graduates; self improvement of HEIs; good for students and for the industry
  - Glossing over private accreditation?
  - Employer-oriented?
  - Restricting operations of private HEIs?
  - Increased difficulty in access to education by students?
TIMELINE OF EVENTS

- Jan-June 2011, Nov-Dec 2011, April-May 2012: Meetings with rights-bearers (CHED OFFICIALS) and the TWG; Zonal consultations w/ technical panels and reps of HEIs
- October 2011: 1st report of the Task Force on QA “Towards an Outcomes and Typology Based QA”
- November 2011: Consultations with HEI associations
- April 2012, May 2012: 3rd round of consultation w/ revised Report of the TF on QA
- August – Sept 2012: Zonal public hearings
- September 2012: Letters from HEI reps sent to CHED for postponement of implementation of OBTBQA / questioning the CMO itself
- 3 December 2012: PAASCU’s position for deferment of implementation of CMO
- 12 December 2012: Reply letter of Chairperson Licuanan of CHED to PAASCU re 3 December 2012 letter
- 26 December 2012: CMO takes effect.
Daghang Salamat!
Maraming Salamat!

THANK YOU!